UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 109—PART 17

NOVEMBER 18, 1963, TO DECEMBER 3, 1963
(PAGES 22015 TO 23188)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1963

J
11
.R
v.109
pt.17

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. ALBERT.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOM,
November 18, 1963.

I hereby designate the Honorable CARL ALBERT to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Rev. Adolfs Klaupiks, director of the Relief Department of the Baptist World Alliance, offered the following prayer:

Almighty and gracious God, our Father in Heaven, we come to Thee with gratitude and thanksgiving for the wonderful gift of life which we receive from Thee day by day.

We are ever grateful to Thee for the freedom to dedicate our lives in service to our country, to our Nation, and to our fellow human beings everywhere.

Lord of the great and of the small nations; Lord of the free and of the captive peoples, we humbly pray: Grant us courage and wisdom so to use our strength, our resources, and our influence that people who are still under the yoke of oppression and in bondage of fear and frustration might enjoy liberty and freedom to serve Thee joyfully and to choose their own way of life under Thy guidance.

Most merciful God, as we commemorate today the anniversary of independence of Latvia, we humbly beseech Thee, bless Latvia, O God. Bless the people of Latvia. May all human malice disappear. May right and justice triumph.

God of our fathers, we pray that Thy light and grace might be shed on America, on the President of the United States, and on the Congress and on all the people.

In the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, November 14, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7885. An act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. AIKEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1561. An act to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

Mr. BOGGS assumed the chair.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 567

Resolved, That Honorable CARL ALBERT, a Representative from the State of Oklahoma, be, and he is hereby elected Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

Resolved, That the President and the Senate be notified by the Clerk of the election of Honorable CARL ALBERT as Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ALBERT resumed the chair.

OATH OF OFFICE AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

Mr. ALBERT. The Chair requests the gentleman from Georgia, dean of the House, to administer the oath.

Mr. ALBERT took the oath of office as Speaker pro tempore administered by Mr. VINSON.

THE LATE HONORABLE EDWARD J. McCORMACK

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it is my sad duty today to announce, to the Members of the House, the death of the brother of our beloved Speaker, Mr. Edward J. McCormack.

Mr. Speaker, all of us know how close the Speaker and his brother were. As members of a close-knit, mutually devoted family, they shared a common passion for service to others—to humanity as separate individuals and to humanity generally. Throughout his life, Edward McCormack served his fellow man with devotion and with passion, and of him it may be said in the poet's words, "To live in hearts we leave behind is not to die at all."

As a part of this desire to do for others, he imbued his son, Edward, the former attorney general of Massachusetts, with that same love of public service—a public service that this son has rendered in many capacities with great distinction and great honor.

So, Mr. Speaker, to his widow and to his sons, and to our own beloved Speaker and his surviving brother, I extend my deepest sympathy and my prayer that God will grant to them consolation and a healing balm in the sad hour for which none of us is ever prepared.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the distinguished Member from the State of Louisiana, the acting majority leader, in expressing my deepest sympathy to the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House, on the passing of his brother, Edward J. McCormack. Edward J. McCormack was a native of South Boston and it was my privilege to know him. He was a man of strong character, his word was his bond, he had a heart as big as his body, he was never known to turn his back on a friend in need. Raised in a section of Boston that has great civic pride, Edward J. McCormack, like his illustrious brother, Speaker MCCORMACK, was self-made. He was a successful businessman. He served in the local precincts in the successful campaigns of the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK. He gave of his time unstintingly in behalf of the Democratic Party, locally, statewide and also in the national elections. Edward J. McCormack was a family man, the husband of Mary C. McCormack, his beloved wife, father of two sons, one the former Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Edward J.

McCormack, Jr., and John W. McCormack. Sadness visited his home several years ago when he lost his beautiful daughter Mary Ellen McCormack in the Cocoanut Grove fire in Boston.

Edward J. McCormack served his Nation on two occasions in our country's time of need, once with the 9th Massachusetts Volunteer Militia during the Mexican Border incident and again he served brilliantly with the famous 101st Infantry, Company B in France during World War I.

His World War I buddies honored him on two different occasions. He served as former Commander of the 101st Infantry Association and also as National Commander of the Y.D. Veterans Association.

Edward J. McCormack was a great public benefactor, his works of charity knew no bounds. He loved life. He took great joy in helping underprivileged children. The people of South Boston loved him. He was always in the vanguard helping those who could not help themselves. He loved and respected his brother, our beloved Speaker of the House. The Speaker, in turn, gave him the same love and affection that only can develop in a good family. They both knew poverty. They both learned from an early age the trials and tribulations of life.

I know I echo the sentiments of every Member of Congress when I say our hearts and prayers go out to the Speaker of the House, to Edward J. McCormack's family, his beloved wife Mary, to his two sons, Edward J. and John W., to his brother Daniel, to his grandchildren Edward J. McCormack III, John W. McCormack and Sean Michael McCormack.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to join the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] in expressing my deep sorrow and my personal condolences to our beloved Speaker, who has lost a younger brother, Edward J. McCormack.

I understand the funeral service will take place in Boston on November 20. I know I speak the sentiments of all Members when I say that this profound loss to the Speaker and his entire family fills us with grief.

The late Edward J. McCormack was an official of the city of Boston, Mass. He was forever active in the civic affairs of his city, both as a government servant and as a public-minded citizen.

He was widely known for his activities in behalf of veterans. He himself compiled a splendid war record in World War I, serving with great bravery and distinction with the 101st Infantry of the Yankee Division. He maintained an active association with his Yankee Division buddies until his death, serving at one time as the president of their association.

The late Edward J. McCormack was one of two brothers of the Speaker, the other being Donald McCormack, who resides in Texas.

The late Edward J. McCormack and his wife, Mrs. May McCormack, who survives him, were the parents of the former attorney general of Massachusetts, Edward J. McCormack, Jr., of John W. McCormack of Boston, who was named after the Speaker, and of the late May McCormack, a daughter who lost her life in the Coconut Grove fire in Boston several years ago.

In this moment of great sorrow for the Speaker and all the members of his fine and distinguished family, I know that the House's fervent wish is for a way of transferring to itself a part of their sorrow and grief. They have our deepest commiserations. Our prayers go with them. May they have God's fullest comforts.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the loss of a beloved brother is a cruel blow under any circumstances. When such a blow falls upon one already heavily burdened with the responsibility of national leadership, it must certainly command the deepest sympathy. Our warmest, deepest sympathy goes today to Speaker McCormack and his entire family.

I know that every Member of the House joins today in a common prayer that our much loved Speaker and his family will find providential strength and comfort in this hour of sorrow.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and a tremendous feeling of loss that I rise today to offer my deepest sympathy on the death of Edward J. McCormack, Sr., beloved brother of the Honorable John W. McCormack, and father of the former outstanding attorney general of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the Honorable Edward J. McCormack, Jr.

It was my privilege to have known Mr. McCormack for many years. He was truly an outstanding, able, and talented person. To meet him brought brightness into one's life. To know him was to love him. To him there was no day he would consider successful unless he had befriended another.

He was long a political figure in the city of Boston and always he had gathered around him a devoted following, for he was a marvelous speaker who held his listeners enthralled. He was particularly active as a veteran and was at one time the commander of the famed Yankee Division.

I think now of the many, many good things which he did in his own neighborhood of South Boston, particularly among those hard-working men who make their livelihood on the docks in our city, and of the thousands of other citizens of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts who were so fortunate as to have shared his friendship.

Many the remembrances of his kindness and many the tears which will be shed. Mrs. O'Neill joins with me to express to Mrs. McCormack, to her sons, Eddie and John, and to the others in the family our wish that in their sorrow they may know that he has but found a greater forum.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana, Congressman Boggs, concerning the death of Edward J. McCormack, Sr., the brother of our esteemed Speaker, the Honorable John W. McCormack.

Edward J. McCormack was affectionately known as "Knocko" McCormack to his many friends, and he would hasten to correct and admonish me by pointing out that he was from South Boston, or "southie" as he used to call that section of the Massachusetts capital city. He was rated as the No. 1 South Boston booster, and he devoted his energy and every effort to the people of the area and their needs. A distinguished veteran of Massachusetts' own Yankee Division in World War I, Mr. McCormack was a very charitable man who devoted much of his time working on behalf of the unfortunate, the afflicted and the deserving in his section of the city, South Boston. An ardent Democrat, he was an outspoken advocate of his party and he demonstrated his leadership in many party conventions and political campaigns.

Edward J. "Knocko" McCormack was a unique individual and a public-spirited citizen. He was thoroughly Democratic and he was thoroughly South Boston.

May I take this opportunity to offer my condolences to his widow, Mrs. Mary McCormack, his two sons, John W. McCormack II, and Edward J. McCormack, Jr., who is the former distinguished attorney general of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; and to our beloved Speaker, Mr. McCormack on the passing of Edward J. McCormack, Sr.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, while I realize that no words or act of any mortal being can beguile one from the grief that accompanies the loss of a loved one, I wish to add my expressions of sympathy and condolences to the Speaker, upon the untimely passing of his brother, and to members of his family and the family of the late Hon. Edward J. McCormack.

The full measure of a man is determined by what he did before his death. The Speaker's brother Edward carried the honorable name of McCormack well and contributed toward immortalizing that name in the history of the State of Massachusetts as well as that of this great Nation of ours.

As Hawaii's Representative to Congress, I extend my deepest sympathy to the Speaker and the surviving members of his family and his brother's family in the hope that they will find some comfort in the fact that there are many who share in their great loss.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks in the Record with respect to the death of Mr. Edward J. McCormack.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4 OF THE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Small Business Committee be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL RESEARCH

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Governmental Research be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

THE NATION'S TELEVISION INDUSTRY

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's television industry is often subjected to criticism and attack and has even been called by some of its more severe critics a vast wasteland.

Mr. Speaker, last Friday evening, however, the National Broadcasting Co. and the Hallmark Card Co. distinguished themselves by presenting to the American people one of the outstanding television dramas of all time. I am speaking of the 90-minute special television play, "The Patriots," which graphically portrayed some of the most memorable events of American history in the early days of our Republic.

Mr. Speaker, I think that "The Patriots," as the program was presented, was not only magnificent entertainment for the American people, but also represented a splendid reaffirmation of the faith which we have in the American political system.

Mr. Speaker, for those who are inclined to be pessimistic and to have a dark view about the future of our country, there was something greatly reassuring about the grim but inspiring portrayal of the dark days of our Republic, as it was presented in "The Patriots" last Friday evening.

Mr. Speaker, I think that NBC and its affiliated stations, as well as the Hallmark Card Co., are certainly due a vote of thanks from the American people for this outstanding presentation.

THE LATE HONORABLE SAM RAYBURN

Mr. ROBERTS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago on November 16, America lost a great leader and friend. The former Speaker of this House, the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Representative of the Fourth Congressional District of Texas and—in a larger sense—of the American people, passed away after a lifetime of service.

Mr. Rayburn was an honest, simple man who did not care for long, flowery speeches. And I do not propose to make one now. For a man of his stature and greatness, there is no need for such.

But as one who knew and respected him, as did many Members of this House, and as one who has the privilege of serving the district he especially loved, I wanted to make some official note of this day.

Sam Rayburn's example of integrity, patriotism, and devoted service stand as a model for all of us. He is remembered here in Congress and throughout the country he loved. History will record him as one of America's greatest statesmen.

LIBERALIZATION OF PENSION PROGRAM FOR WORLD WAR I AND WORLD WAR II AND KOREAN VETERANS

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on November 7, 1963, I introduced H.R. 9083, a bill to liberalize the pension program for World War I, World War II, and Korean conflict veterans. Inadvertently, the single word "or" was omitted from line 4, page 4, of this bill. This inadvertent omission drastically curtails the eligibility requirements to pension, and if enacted into law would deny pension to any veteran who has not reached the age of 65 years. This, of course, was not my intention. Rather, I intended through my bill to provide a more liberal pension program for truly needy veterans. I have today introduced a new bill which corrects the omission contained in the earlier bill and will carry out the worthy purpose for which it was intended.

THE SHOE INDUSTRY OF THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have addressed this House on other occasions to stress the critical position of the shoe industry in my State of New Hampshire and for that matter in all of New England. I repeat again something should and must be done now to protect this important industry so vital to the economy of our area. The President's study group is not enough. Frankly it is just a stall.

Let me emphasize that for the period of January to August 1963 the production of shoes in my district of New Hampshire fell a staggering 11.9 percent. Think of what this means to our workers in terms of loss of earnings: dollars lost as they face the rigors of a cold New England winter—dollars lost to the industry that are sorely needed to retool.

What is the cause of this dismal situation? It is the same story over and over again. It is competition in American markets from cheap foreign shoe imports that continue to drive downward the demand for our American domestic production.

Mr. Speaker, the American shoe industry is entitled to a larger share of the American market. How long can we sit idly by as our great and proud shoe industry is destroyed, little by little, by the refusal of the administration to give the industry long overdue quota protection?

We who represent these workers, this vital American industry, demand Government action now to protect the future of our people. For once, Mr. President, override your liberal internationalist advisers and give our shoe industry some quota protection against these floods of cheap shoe imports that are eating away our jobs and our profits. Congress has given you the authority in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

The industry does not ask financial aid, it merely asks for the equal opportunity to compete with foreign products in the markets of the United States. This is its fair and just right.

SAFEWAY TEAMSTERS' STRIKE

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, the Safeway Teamsters' strike, now in its 5th day, tends to shed some interesting light on the administration's labor policies.

I note that, according to all reports, a half million dollars of perishable foods are spoiling in the warehouses, and Safeway Stores, under present labor policies, is powerless to do anything about it.

How about contributing this valuable high-class merchandise to the poor and needy on the welfare rolls of the District of Columbia? No doubt the stores would gladly part with this extensive stock at the moment at less than cost for such a worthy purpose.

While the Chief Executive is politicking in Florida and Texas this week, surely someone must be left in charge of the White House.

How about one of those Executive orders that he has used so profusely? How about the contingent funds that have been so lavishly provided? In fact, how about the Chief Executive?

DEPUTY DEFENSE SECRETARY ROSWELL GILPATRIC

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, Attorney General Kennedy, for reasons best known to himself has found it expedient to "leak" a story from the Justice Department claiming that Deputy Defense Secretary Roswell Gilpatric is not guilty of conflict of interest in the award to General Dynamics Corp. of the multibillion-dollar TFX fighter plane contract.

Previously, the Attorney General tried to absolve Navy Secretary Fred Korth of conflict of interest only to witness his brother, President Kennedy, demand and obtain Korth's resignation.

With the McClellan committee today resuming its investigation into Korth's and Gilpatric's conflicts of interest and other elements of the huge contract award, it is inexplicable that Bobby Kennedy would attempt to throw obstacles in the path of a chairman and Senate committee which he once served as general counsel.

Bobby Kennedy's attempted intervention in behalf of Gilpatric, prior to the report of the McClellan committee, must be interpreted as purely political and self-serving until a valid explanation is provided.

THE HONORABLE CARL VINSON

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, a moment ago I had the sad experience of noting the passing of a great American, the brother of our Speaker. I am glad now to be able to refer to a very happy occasion.

Mr. Speaker, today is the 80th birthday of one of the great Americans of all time. I need not name the gentleman of whom I speak. You all know him.

He has served as a Member of this body longer than any other Member. He is one of our beloved leaders. He is a great man in every sense of the word. The contributions he has made to the strength, security, and vitality of our country will live many years and many centuries after he has left our midst.

Today all of us are happy to share this occasion, the 80th birthday of the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable CARL VINSON.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, the Georgia delegation is especially appreciative of the splendid remarks made by the gentleman from Louisiana concerning the dean of our delegation, the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable CARL VINSON.

As a Georgian and as an American I take great pride in the life, the history and the service of this outstanding American whose people in his district have permitted him to serve in this body longer than any other Congressman in the entire history of this country. I do not believe you would say this is local pride when I point out the fact that these things just do not happen. It takes tremendous ability, complete devotion, and everlasting work to set up a record that surpasses any record established by any other Congressman in the history of this country.

So we all are proud, we are exceedingly grateful, and we know that when he leaves us the people generally all over this country will long remember with very much gratitude the splendid service rendered by the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable CARL VINSON.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, for the majority side of the Committee on Armed Services I shall make an endeavor to say to you that we are so happy our chairman has reached this milestone in his incomparable career. With each succeeding day he establishes a record of service in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. No man since the dawn of this country has served as long as has this incomparable Georgian.

As one who has served with him on the old Naval Affairs Committee and on the Armed Services Committee since its inception, I believe I know a little something about the character of this great Georgian. A man who is dedicated to the cause of his party and the welfare of his country, he sets an example that few of us can emulate. His industry is fatiguing to most of us. We follow in his wake, in his giant strides, for the efforts he undertakes in the cause of this Nation. We try to emulate his dedication to his work and to his committee. He is jealous of his committee and he guards its dignity at all times.

Even today we had a little party for him over at the committee, a coffee break, when the girls and the staff gave him a little party. You should have seen how happy our distinguished chairman was with this gesture of devotion and affection from us all.

He is a bashful man. He did not want to have a big group. He does not like all this fanfare that many of us relish. He wants to retire from it all. He has always been this way. But we who have worked with him love him for the example he has set for us. As Paul sat at the feet of Gamaliel, the greatest teacher of all time, we have sat at the feet of this greatest legislator of our time. We have learned a lot, and we try to follow him. We do the best we can.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is the architect of the greatest navy since ships have plied the seas, the defender of every segment of the Department of Defense, the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Selective Service, the Central Intelligence Agency, and those other designated areas over which we have responsibility. He builds, he builds, he builds.

He is devoted to the cause of his Southland. He came from a time in his 80 years when his Southland was parched and smoldering under a hostile government, with everything against it. He remembers those days, and he was determined to reconstruct his homeland. This is what he has done.

I should like to quote for you a poem that is foremost in his heart. He loves to quote this poem, and I should like to quote it to you:

THE BRIDGE BUILDER

An old man, traveling a lone highway,
Came at the evening, cold and gray,
To a chasm deep and wide.
The old man crossed in the twilight dim,
For the sullen stream held no fears for him;
But he turned when he reached the other side,
And builded a bridge to span the tide.
"Old Man," cried a fellow pilgrim near,
"You are wasting your strength with building here;
Your journey will end with the ending day
And you never again will pass this way;
You have crossed the chasm, deep and wide,
Why build you a bridge at eventide?"
And the builder raised his old gray head—
"Good friend, on the path I have come," he said,
"There followeth after me today
A youth whose feet will pass this way.
This stream which has been as naught to me,
To that fair-haired boy may a pitfall be;
He, too, must cross in the twilight dim—
Good friend, I am building this bridge for him."

This is CARL VINSON. He wants youth to have opportunity and for all of America to have opportunity. He is a builder. This is the man whose birthday we are celebrating today. We are a little saddened at his announcement that he is going to retire, but we have a few days to work on this. But today let us celebrate this milestone in the life of an American the like of which will never pass your way again.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, representing Members on this side of the House extend our warmest greetings to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], who is 80 years young today. It has been my privilege, as many of you know, to serve on the Committee on Armed Services with the chairman, sitting next to him for many years. Unless someone has had that same opportunity, and privilege, he has missed something in the Congress of the United States.

Many, many fine tributes have been offered today concerning his 50 years' service in the Congress. I could add to them, but I think it would be repetitious in many respects. All the things that we say about our fine chairman are heartfelt expressions by those of us who have been privileged to work with him. I was a little upset this morning when I learned that the gentleman from Georgia [Chairman VINSON], had made an announcement to the press that he was, at the conclusion of this Congress, going to retire, after the wonderful span of 50 years of service to his country, his State and his district. But knowing our chairman rather well, I would not be at all surprised to see him back here January 1965, when the 89th Congress convenes. I have known him to change his mind before and I hope he will again. In the meantime, we extend to him our very best wishes on this wonderful occasion of his 80th birthday and wish him Godspeed and all good things in life.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, over the years the House has paid tribute to many illustrious men and women but it has never honored one more distinguished than the gentleman from Georgia who celebrates his 80th birthday today, nor has it ever honored one whom it holds in more affectionate regard.

In terms of prestige and power and of dedication, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] shares honors with few men in this body or throughout the country. In terms of service and seniority he has a unique position which will probably stand for generations.

He has served in the House of Representatives for half a century and last year became its dean.

Through 25 consecutive terms the people of his district have returned him to the House.

Throughout two World Wars and many brush fires he has participated in and guided the military programs of the United States.

He has been not only the legislative custodian of the Nation's military defense but the guardian of the constitutional powers of the Congress to provide for and oversee that defense.

The power which is his might well be dangerous in the hands of a lesser man.

But this power rests securely in the hands of a man incapable of self-interest, of meanness, of mediocrity.

The gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON, needs no eulogy.

History has set down his measure and recorded the story of his patriotism.

He has given 50 years of his life to his country.

His country has been his religion, his bride, his child.

He has never settled for less than the best in her defense.

Where the easy answer might have been accepted, he has rejected it in favor of the long view, the more-than-adequate solution.

Where he has encountered opposition, he has shown himself openminded but abiding in his pursuit of his convictions.

He has been swift and sure and courageous in a job where it would be easy to be uncertain and hesitant and less than brave.

The distinguished dean of the House, the eminent chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, has lived his life and carved out his career under the banner of duty, honor, country.

He epitomizes the highest concepts of public service and personal excellence.

If he has been lauded beyond the average, it is because he has earned this recognition many times over.

If he is loved and respected, it is because he has won his place of affection by many kindly acts and by the example of his own peerless ability and integrity.

I join with my colleagues in wishing him many happy returns of the day. I also join all good Americans in hoping that his constituents will veto any retirement plans he may now or hereafter have and will draft him again to occupy the seat which he has held with such renown for so many years.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, it is an unusual privilege to be permitted to observe the 80th birthday of our distinguished colleague, the dean of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Georgia, Hon. CARL VINSON. Since 1914 he has served his district and his Nation in the House. Soon he will complete one-half a century of service in this body. All Georgians are proud to have him as a Representative of our great State in the Congress. All of us in the delegation are proud to be able to call him our colleague. Mr. Speaker, I know I speak the sentiments of the 823,000 people in my district in wishing for him an 80th birthday filled with happiness.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for the Honorable THOMAS O'BRIEN, beloved dean of the Illinois delegation, and for myself, I extend warm welcome to the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable CARL VINSON, on his admission this 19th day of November of the year of our Lord, 1963, as a fellow member of the 80 Club. Great as have been the achievements of this matchless son of Georgia in statesmanship and in patriotic service to his country, no achievement transcends that of reaching his 80th birthday with a step as light as a runner at the Olympic games and a brain as keen and alert as that of any of the charters of history in the long story of mankind.

The 80 Club is richly honored to have among its members the great chairman of the Committee on Armed Services as well as the great chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and the club looks expectantly forward to the historic day not many months away when to this distinguished roll will be added the name of the chairman of the Rules Committee.

To the gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON, on this, his 80th birthday, goes from the bottom of our hearts the warmest greetings of affection and admiration.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in wishing our distinguished colleague from Georgia, CARL VINSON, a happy birthday. It gives me great personal pleasure to extend my very best wishes on his 80th anniversary.

All of us recognize the most important contribution the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has made to the defense of our Nation.

I hope he will enjoy many more of these anniversaries. I wish the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] good health and much happiness for many years to come.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be able to join in the many tributes being paid to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] on his 80th birthday. A grateful Nation owes a giant debt to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee for his tireless work on behalf of the security of the United States of America.

Only yesterday, I ran across an article in one of our West Virginia newspapers in which our beloved colleague outlines in capsule form his philosophy on national security. In this statement, the gentleman from Georgia reveals his customary instinct for the jugular.

Under unanimous consent, I ask that this article be included at this point in the RECORD.

REPRESENTATIVE CARL VINSON, DEMOCRAT, OF GEORGIA, CHAIRMAN, HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

The primary goal which we must never lose sight of is the goal of world peace and world survival in the age of the atom—the goal at which both our military and our nonmilitary policy must be aimed.

We have no choice but to maintain the strongest national defense possible. And this means continued progress technically and scientifically in outer space, in communications, in nuclear technology and in techniques of conventional warfare.

But strength alone without the will to use it loses much of its vitality. We must be willing to demonstrate our capability. Last October, the world saw a striking example of the value of strength, coupled with a strong will and a firm determination to use that strength if necessary.

As soon as the President had in his possession proof of the construction of missile sites in Cuba that could have been used to destroy American bases and American cities, he acted quickly. The orders were issued, and the movement of troops, ships, and aircraft began immediately.

Let there be no doubt in anyone's mind—if Khrushchev had not removed his missiles from Cuba, the island would have been invaded, notwithstanding the consequences. Here was displayed, for all the world to see, our might, and the wisdom of our military command structure.

What type of warfare—or what type of military forces—should receive greatest emphasis?

We cannot concentrate our efforts on any single kind of warfare. With each passing day I become more fully convinced that our ability to respond to any type of challenge is our greatest deterrent to war. Our intercontinental ballistic missile force certainly is a major deterrent to any aggression, but it would only be used as a last resort. For this reason, we must continue to modernize our Army so that it has both conventional and nuclear capability.

And for this same reason, the Strategic Air Command will, for years to come, play an essential role in our nuclear, limited nuclear, and conventional war capability. We should not be entirely dependent on missiles—ICBM's, IRBM's, Polaris, or others—because this allows us only one way to fight a war.

It is quite dangerous to get out of the manned bomber business entirely as we are doing right now. The last B-52's and B-58's rolled off the production line last fall. In time, they will wear out and we will then simply have no more bombers.

Obsolescence is also rapidly overtaking our naval fleet. The average life expectancy of a naval vessel is 20 years. The average age of our naval vessels in our active fleet is over 15 years. In a few years our fleet will be obsolete.

> The need for an expanded, modern naval force becomes obvious when we appraise the threat we face. We all know that the U.S.S.R. today has over 400 submarines with which to disrupt the world's commerce.
>
> We must not let ourselves be lulled by our missile capability into the adoption of a single defense concept, and lose our flexibility to respond to any kind of aggression anywhere. One of the principal reasons we were able to respond so quickly and so efficiently to the Cuban crisis was our flexibility.

Mr. Speaker, the people of West Virginia and of the Nation are indeed proud that our distinguished colleague is today celebrating his 80th birthday. We all hope that he will reconsider his decision to retire and be back with us again at the opening of the next Congress.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in saying happy birthday to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] who has been so aptly referred to as the incomparable Georgian. He has been a source of challenge and inspiration to all Members of the House. To me he has been a warm friend and counselor.

I have observed him at close range and I want to testify to his statesmanship, skill, and effectiveness. He has had an incomparable career in the House. His contributions to national defense are too extensive to discuss. They represent only one facet of his remarkable career.

May the Good Lord continue to bless our distinguished friend from Georgia.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, today being the 80th birthday anniversary of the very distinguished Member from the State of Georgia, Congressman Carl Vinson, I ask permission to extend my most sincere greetings and best birthday wishes.

I have not known the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] so long as a great many here in the House of Representatives, but in the relatively short time it has been my pleasure and privilege to be associated with him, I recognize with highest regard the unexcelled ability of leadership and the record of service of this most able legislator.

As dean of the House of Representatives and his record of having served in the House for 50 years—longer than any man in history, "Uncle Carl" Vinson has compiled a list of major accomplishments at least a mile long. Besides serving a half century in the Congress, Chairman Vinson has established himself in the hearts and minds of his colleagues here in the House and his constituents, as well, as a great legislative technician. His trademark has been imprinted on better government for 50 years plus, and the effects of his remarkable wisdom and astute perception will be felt by many generations of Americans.

By his extreme devotion to duty and his principles of efficient government, Chairman Vinson is held in highest regard and popularity. I consider it a privilege to know Chairman Vinson and to benefit and profit from his able leadership on the Armed Services Committee. He richly deserves all the acclaim directed his way today.

I extend most sincere felicitations on his 80th birthday anniversary and wish for him many more years of happiness as he continues to serve the people of the great State of Georgia and this Nation.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, happy occasions like birthdays can often be used by those celebrating them to announce news of retirement from public life. Our distinguished colleague from Georgia, Congressman Carl Vinson is observing his 80th birthday today and he has informed us that he desires to retire to private life at the end of the 88th Congress. This announcement saddens those of us serving with the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman Vinson, for we realize that from our midst will soon go one whom we have respected, sometimes feared, but always held in the highest esteem.

The gentleman from Georgia, Chairman Vinson, of the House Armed Services Committee was once referred to in a newspaper article as "Vinson the invincible." When he leaves Congress next year, he will have served a month more than 50 years in this House, setting a record of service in the House of Representatives to which he has devoted his mind, his heart, and his life. In his usual modest way he merely said he thought 25 terms were enough, but he promises to keep busy in local, community, and State affairs.

Mr. Speaker, during the forthcoming year that remains of Carl Vinson's dedicated service to his district in Georgia, to his party, to the House of Representatives and to the country, we indeed want to wish him well. And today we want to wish him a very happy birthday and a heartfelt thank you for his record length of service in the House.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in congratulating the gentleman from Georgia, Carl Vinson, on his 80th birthday, and I wish him many more birthdays and continued health and happiness.

He is the beloved dean of the House and has attained many honors and set many records for service in the House and is still attaining new honors and adding to his laurels.

He is now in his 50th year of service in the House and he has taken the occasion of his 80th birthday to announce that he plans to retire at the conclusion of this Congress. His retirement would mean a great loss to his district, the State of Georgia, the Nation, and a loss to the Members of this body who depend heavily upon his counsel on many important matters.

I know that it would be a personal sacrifice for him but it is the hope of many that this great American will change his mind and will decide to continue his service in the House, and on this day I want to wish him the happiest of birthdays and much continued happiness in his future endeavors. Good luck, Congressman Vinson, always.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the others in wishing the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable Carl Vinson, upon the occasion of his 80th birthday, many happy returns of the day. In the short time that I have spent in Congress, I have been enriched by getting to know this dedicated public servant who has devoted more than 50 years of his life for the cause of a greater America. The greatness of most men become known after they have shed their mortal role. Not so with Carl Vinson, for no one can dispute that he has, while still actively contributing to our Nation, carved for himself an honored place among our great Americans. To Carl Vinson Hawaii says "Aloha nui a loa" and happy birthday.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, how futile and useless it would be to attempt to add to what the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina has said in congratulating the beloved chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

The only addition would be to say: "May I repeat his words a thousand times over and a thousand times after that."

For my own part may I reflect with the bard that "take him all in all we shall not look upon his like again. This is a man."

I only hope that the future brings to him the great satisfaction of the past in serving his God and his country.

His life has been a life of 80 happy birthdays and I pray with you, my colleagues, that these happy birthdays will multiply manifold before Carl Vinson enters the halls of Valhalla to receive his eternal hosannas.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, since we are all junior in service when compared to the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, I suppose it is reasonable to say that all of us have had occasion when we have leaned upon him for advice, for assistance and, perhaps, consolation now and then, when things have not gone well. I know that, in the short time I have been a Member, I have knocked on his door a number of times.

On each of these occasions, he has received me warmly and he has offered assistance and encouragement. I am indebted to him for both.

It will be a long time before we see his equal, if, indeed we ever do. Fifty years of devotion to his country and this Congress sets a record that will be difficult to measure up to. On his birthday today, I would like to add my salute to those which have already been spoken and I wish for him many more yet to come.

Happy birthday, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for the 50 years you shared with us here in the Congress.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying the respect that is due to our colleague and mutual friend, the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman Carl Vinson, the distinguished and longtime chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, on the occasion of his 80th birthday and the announcement of his retirement from the Congress.

I approach this dual occasion with mixed emotions. I felicitate and congratulate the dean of this House upon his 50 years of devoted service to his State and country—a record that has not been achieved by any person in the history of the Congress. On the other hand, I am sorry that our friend has come to the point where he feels he should retire.

But certainly, Mr. Speaker, if any man in the history of the Congress deserves retirement, it is the esteemed gentleman from Georgia whom we honor here today.

It has been my pleasure to serve with this personable gentleman for 1 year more than three decades. My friendship and relationships with him have always been most pleasant.

Mr. Speaker, with all due deference to all other Members of the Congress with whom I have been privileged to serve, I can truthfully say that I have never observed a more effective legislator. As chairman of the former Naval Affairs Committee, and as the only Democratic chairman of the House Armed Services Committee under the Reorganization Act, Carl Vinson has had no superior in achieving the passage of legislation which he sponsored.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I salute and extend to my longtime friend my best wishes for a long, peaceful, and happy retirement.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to join in paying tribute to Carl Vinson—a distinguished American, a decisive leader, and a dedicated public servant—on this the occasion of his 80th birthday.

Those of us who have served under Carl Vinson's chairmanship of the House Armed Services Committee have learned to appreciate his great energy and enormous abilities, his vast wisdom and knowledge, his commitment to the security of our country and the welfare of our people.

The gentleman from Georgia, Chairman Vinson, is not only the oldest Member in service in the history of the House of Representatives, he is also one of the great statesmen of this or any other time. It is inconceivable that the Sixth District of Georgia, which he has served so faithfully and ably for these 25 terms, or this country, could allow him to retire next year.

Happy birthday, Mr. Chairman, and we hope you will be here, where you are needed, for many, many more.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, to honor Carl Vinson is to honor ourselves. This great Georgian represents the pinnacle of achievement in representative government. His career is a guiding light for every youngster who sees in America a land of opportunity. His work is a model to which every Congressman aspires. He is America's finest argument for representative government for all the world.

It is an astounding thing that at 80 his voice is clearer and stronger than most; his mind is sharper and more active than most; his physical stamina is that of a man 20 years younger. The Congress has been blessed indeed that we have in our midst this great source of strength and inspiration. The Nation is blessed that we have had through these 50 years of his service his great contributions to sound government and strong defense. There has never been another Carl Vinson. We would be a richer and a better land if there were many more Carl Vinsons. But, we can be proud and proud indeed that we have the one Carl Vinson—for guidance, for inspiration, for lasting achievement.

Congratulations, Carl Vinson—warm, sincere, and from my heart.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the subject of the 80th birthday of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

PROVIDING FOR ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN SQUARE 758 IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AS AN ADDITION TO THE GROUNDS OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT BUILDING

The Clerk called the bill (S. 254) to provide for the acquisition of certain property in square 758 in the District of Columbia, as an addition to the grounds of the U.S. Supreme Court Building.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

FACILITATING THE WORK OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7155) to facilitate the work of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that a member of the Committee on Agriculture will offer an amendment to this bill and, if so, I would have no objection to it—if the amendment which I understand the gentleman will offer is offered.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa is correct. This bill has been on the calendar for a long time. I think we have met the objections that the gentleman from Iowa and others have had with respect to the bill, and I do intend to offer the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of existing law and without regard to section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), but within the limitations of cost otherwise applicable, appropriations of the Department of Agriculture may be expended for the erection of buildings and other structures on land owned by States, counties, municipalities, or other political subdivisions, corporations, or individuals: *Provided,* That prior to such erection there is obtained the right to use the land for the estimated life of or need for the structure, including the right to remove any such structure within a reasonable time after the termination of the right to use the land: *Provided further,* That appropriations and funds available to the Department of Agriculture shall be available for expenses in connection with acquiring the right to use land for such purposes under long-term lease or other agreement.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make grants, for periods not to exceed five years' duration, to State agricultural experiment stations, colleges, universities, and other research institutions and organizations and to Federal and private organizations and individuals for research to further the programs of the Department of Agriculture.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to obtain insurance to cover the liability of any employee of the Department of Agriculture for damage to or loss of property or personal injury or death caused by the act or omission of any such employee while acting within the scope of his office or employment and while operating a motor vehicle belonging to the United States in a foreign country.

Sec. 4. Section 602 of the Agricultural Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 908) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(e) Any officer or employee appointed and assigned to a post abroad pursuant to this title may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, be assigned for duty in the continental United States, without regard to the civil service laws and without reduction in grade, for a period of not more than three years: *Provided,* That the total number of such employees assigned for duty in the continental United States under this provision shall not exceed fifteen at any one time: *Provided further,* That this Act shall not increase the number of persons employed at grade GS–16, GS–17, or GS–18."

Sec. 5. Section 602(b) of the Act of August 28, 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1762(b)), is amended by adding after "Attaché" the words, "Agricultural Counselor".

Sec. 6. Section 104(a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1956, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), is further amended by inserting, after the word "*Provided*", the following: "That the Secretary of Agriculture may release such amounts of the foreign currencies so set aside as he determines not to be needed, within a reasonable period of time, for such purpose: *Provided further*".

Sec. 7. Section 4 of the Act of August 2, 1956 (ch. 878, 70 Stat. 934, 7 U.S.C. 1884), is hereby amended—

(1) by striking the word "insurance" and substituting the word "benefits",

(2) by inserting after "Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954" the words "and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959," and

(3) by inserting after "employees' life insurance fund" the words "or the employees' health benefits fund, as the case may be,".

Sec. 8. Section 1 of the Act of July 12, 1943 (5 U.S.C. 542–1), is hereby amended by deleting the semicolon after the words "central services" in item (4) and inserting in lieu thereof a period and adding the following: "The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to transfer to the fund and capitalize equipment and other assets as he may determine necessary in furnishing approved central services;" and by striking out the word "reimbursed" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "credited with advances or reimbursements".

SEC. 9. Subject to limitations applicable with respect to each appropriation concerned, each appropriation available to the Department of Agriculture may be charged, at any time during a fiscal year, for the benefit of any other appropriation available to the Department, for the purpose of financing the procurement of materials and services, or financing activities or other costs, for which funds are available both in the financing appropriation so charged and in the appropriation so benefited; except that such expenses so financed shall be charged on a final basis, as of a date not later than the close of such fiscal year, to the appropriations so benefited, with appropriate credit to the financing appropriation.

SEC. 10. Section 702(b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (5 U.S.C. 572) is hereby amended by striking out "the miscellaneous expenses of the work of any bureau, division, or office of" and by striking out "such bureau, division, or office" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Department".

SEC. 11. Section 8f of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended (7 U.S.C. 608f), is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "law" insert "except the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act".

Page 2, line 14, following the period insert the following:

"Each recipient of assistance under this section shall keep such records as the Secretary shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such grants, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such funds are given or used, and the amount of that portion of the costs of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Comptroller General of the United States or any of their duly authorized representatives shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipients that are pertinent to the grants received under this section."

Page 3, line 14, strike out "'Agricultural Counselor'" and insert "', Agricultural Counselor,'".

Page 3, line 16, strike out "1956" and insert "1954".

Page 3, line 18, strike out "'*Provided*'" and insert "'*Provided*,'".

Page 3, line 22, strike out "*further*'" and insert "*further*,'".

Page 5, beginning on line 7, strike out all of section 10.

Page 5, line 13, strike out "11" and insert "10".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JONES OF MISSOURI

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri. On page 3, line 19:

"Strike out 'and without reduction in grade,' and insert '(and without reduction in grade if an appropriate position at the employee's grade is not available in any agency of the Department of Agriculture)'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD an explanation of the intent of the amendment previously adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, section 4(e) with the proposed amendment, will permit an agricultural attaché or other employee of the Foreign Agricultural Service assigned to duty overseas to be brought back to the United States for a period of reorientation with domestic agricultural operations without having to take a reduction in grade, in the event that there is no position available at his grade in any part of the Department of Agriculture.

The amendment would require that the search for a suitable position for the returning attaché not be limited to the Foreign Agricultural Service but include the whole Department of Agriculture. The returning employee would not be permitted to take advantage of the provisions of this section unless it was found that there was not, in any agency of the Department of Agriculture, an appropriate position which he could fill.

An "appropriate position" would be one which the employee is qualified to fill and which would give him some experience of value in his further assignment to a foreign post.

SAINT-GAUDENS NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE, N.H.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4018) to authorize establishment of the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site, N.H., and for other purposes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

LAKE ERIE SESQUICENTENNIAL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1828) to amend the joint resolution establishing the Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission so as to authorize an appropriation to carry out the provisions thereof.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, at the request of one of our colleagues, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

AMEND ORGANIC ACT OF NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5838) to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to make certain improvements of fiscal and administrative practices for more effective conduct of its research and development activities.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that a rule has been granted on this bill, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SOUTH PACIFIC COMMISSION

The Clerk called the House joint resolution (H.J. Res. 779) to amend the joint resolution of January 28, 1948, relating to membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission, so as to authorize certain appropriations thereunder for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(a) of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor", approved January 28, 1948 (22 U.S.C. 280b(a)), is amended by striking out "$100,000 annually" and inserting in lieu thereof "$150,000 for the fiscal year 1964, and $150,000 for the fiscal year 1965,".

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AGREEMENT BY NAVAJO TRIBE RELATING TO OIL LEASES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7123) approving an agreement entered into by the Navajo Tribe of Indians relating to oil and gas leases.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that S. 912, an identical bill, be considered in lieu of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the agreement entered into by the Navajo Indian Tribe, Shell Oil Company (a corporation), and Humble Oil & Refining Company (a corporation), dated May 1, 1959, as amended by subsequent agreements dated September 14, 1960, November 7, 1962, and January 7, 1963, respectively, and on file with the Secretary of the Interior, is hereby approved, such agreement having been entered into for the purpose of compromising and settling, among such tribe and corporations, certain matters arising out of disputed title claims between the Navajo Indian Tribe and the State of Utah to the oil and gas rights in section 16, township 40 south, range 24 east, Salt Lake meridian, and in section 16, township 40 south, range 26 east, Salt Lake meridian, both in San Juan County, Utah.

Sec. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Navajo Tribe of Indians is hereby authorized to lease, in accordance with the undertakings of such tribe in the aforementioned agreement, as amended, any interests which it might have or hereafter acquire in those lands described in the first section of this Act, and the Secretary of the Interior shall approve any lease so made.

Sec. 3. Nothing in this Act is intended or shall be construed as a finding, interpretation, or construction by the Congress of the validity or invalidity of the respective claims of the Navajo Indian Tribe and the State of Utah to the lands described in the first section of this Act, and the determination of such conflicting claims shall be unaffected by anything in this Act.

Passed the Senate August 28, 1963.

Attest:

Secretary.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 7123) was laid on the table.

WATERS IMPOUNDED BY FLAMING GORGE DAM

The Clerk called the resolution (S.J. Res. 17) to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Flaming Gorge Dam, Utah, in the States of Wyoming and Utah, as "Lake O'Mahoney."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice in connection with this bill we have filed dissenting views. It does not seem to me proper that the bill should go through with unanimous consent. Therefore, I withdraw my reservation and ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

STATUS OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2512) to clarify the status of members of the National Guard while attending or instructing at National Guard schools established under the authority of the Secretary of the Army or Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 32, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 502 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(f) Under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army or Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, a member of the National Guard may, with his consent, be ordered to perform training or other duty in addition to that prescribed under subsection (a)."

(2) Section 504 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 504. National Guard schools and small arms competitions

"(a) Under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army or Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, members of the National Guard may—

"(1) attend schools conducted by the Army or the Air Force, as appropriate;

"(2) conduct or attend schools conducted by the National Guard; or

"(3) participate in small arms competitions.

"(b) Activities authorized under subsection (a) for members of the National Guard of a State or territory, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, or the District of Columbia may be held inside or outside its boundaries."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTIONS 510 AND 591 OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3005) to amend sections 510 and 591 of title 10, United States Code, to remove the requirement that an alien must make a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States before he may be enlisted or appointed in a reserve component.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 510(b)(1) and 591(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code, are each amended to read as follows:

"(1) he is a citizen of the United States or of a possession thereof or has been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence under chapter 12 of title 8; or".

With the following committee amendment: Page 1, lines 5 and 6, delete "or of a possession thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This ends the call of the Consent Calendar.

ARMED FORCES PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL SPORTS

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2988) to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for participation by members of the Armed Forces in international sports activities, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 717(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking the figure "$800,000" and date "March 14, 1955" and inserting the figure "$2,000,000" and date "July 1, 1962" in place thereof, respectively.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 201]

Abbitt
Abele
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Avery
Ayres
Barrett
Barry
Battin
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Blatnik
Bolling
Bonner
Bow
Bromwell
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Burkhalter
Cahill
Cameron
Casey
Celler
Clark
Conte
Cramer
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Derwinski
Diggs
Dorn
Dowdy
Duncan
Ellsworth
Fogarty
Foreman
Frelinghuysen
Giaimo
Gibbons
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Gubser
Gurney
Halleck
Hanna
Harding
Harris
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hoffman
Holifield
Hosmer
Jennings
Jones, Ala.
Kelly
Kilburn
King, Calif.
Knox
Landrum
Leggett
Lesinski
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
McDowell
Macdonald
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Meader
Milliken
Morse
Nelsen
O'Brien, Ill.
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Pepper
Pilcher
Pillion
Powell
Quie
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Roberts, Ala.
Robison
Rodino
St. Onge
Shelley
Shipley
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Staebler
Stafford
Taft
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, N.J.
Tupper
Utt
Wallhauser
Weaver
Whalley
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Bob

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 323 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ARMED FORCES PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL SPORTS

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 2988 is to increase the statutory dollar ceiling on the maximum amount of appropriated funds that can be utilized by the military departments to support participation of members of the Armed Forces in international sports activities as authorized by section 717 of title 10, United States Code.

Under the provisions of the bill, the present $800,000 ceiling on the expenditure of appropriated funds over a 4-year period would be increased to $2 million.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Public Law 11, of the 84th Congress, authorized the participation by members of the Armed Forces in international sports activities, and also authorized the expenditure of not more than $800,000 of appropriated funds in support of such activities during each 4-year period, commencing March 14, 1955.

Public Law 11 now has been codified as section 717 of title 10, United States Code. The law specifies that military personnel of the Armed Forces may train for, attend, and participate in the pan-American games, the Olympic winter games, and the various Olympic games. Also, the law permits personnel of the Armed Forces to train for, attend, and participate in other international amateur sports competition, provided that the interests of the United States will be served by such participation.

In order to finance the participation of members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps in such athletic activities, the military departments were authorized to use appropriated funds. However, the statute provides that not more than $800,000 of appropriated funds could be used for this purpose during each 4-year period, beginning on the date of enactment of the act. Inasmuch as this act became effective on March 14, 1955, the 4-year period provided in the law began on that date.

The Department of Defense has now advised the Congress that the dollar authorization provided in existing law is inadequate. The Department points out that due to changes in costs together with the necessity for increased sports participation, the expenditure ceiling on the use of appropriated funds should be increased to $2 million for each 4-year period.

REQUIREMENT FOR INCREASED AUTHORIZATION

The $800,000 authorized under existing law has been used to finance participation of members of the Armed Forces in international civilian sports competition, such as the summer and winter Olympic games and the pan-American games. It is presently estimated that an additional $300,000 is needed for this purpose. This requirement results largely from an increase in transportation costs. For instance, when the $800,000 authorization was granted in 1955, the Military Air Transportation System (MATS) was not industrially funded, and reimbursement for the transportation of military athletes was not required.

The remaining $900,000 in increased authorization requested is presently planned for allocation over 4 years to permit participation of U.S. military athletes in international military sports competition with the military athletes of 33 other nations who are members of the Conseil International du Sport Militaire (CISM). Since 1948, CISM has grown from an original membership of five European countries—Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Norway, and France—with participation in only a few sports, to a worldwide organization of 33 nations participating in 17 sports. Some additional 10 nations have expressed interest in joining CISM.

Until 1961, U.S. participation in CISM was limited primarily to U.S. military athletes stationed in Europe with the U.S. European Command, and the cost of participation was defrayed by nonappropriated funds of the European Command. With the growth of CISM, beyond the geographical limits of the European Command, the Interservice Sports Council, in October 1961, assumed the responsibility for U.S. participation in CISM, and the Army was designated as the executive agency for coordinating all participation. During the calendar year 1962, participation in CISM was financed from nonappropriated welfare funds available to the military services. The expansion of CISM and the resulting added expense can no longer be supported from nonappropriated funds without seriously impairing the welfare and morale programs of the several services.

In summary, therefore, the Department estimates that an additional $300,000 over and above the $800,000 ceiling in existing law will be required for the next 4-year period to permit the existing level of Armed Forces participation in civilian sports competition such as the summer and winter Olympic games and the pan-American games.

In addition, the Department will require an estimated $900,000 in increased authorization for the next 4-year period to permit participation of military athletes in international military sports competition with the military athletes of 33 other nations who are members of the Conseil International du Sport Militaire—CISM.

Thus, the combination of the $1,100,000 to support military participation in international civilian sports competition, together with the estimated $900,000 which will be required to support military participation in CISM, constitutes the new $2 million authorization requested by the Department.

The bill as reported out by the Committee on Armed Services provides an amendment which would change the date in the bill from July 1, 1962, to July 1, 1963.

The purpose of the amendment is simply to bring the bill up to date.

Enactment of this legislation will not result in any increased requirements for appropriations to the Department of Defense.

The Department of Defense strongly favors enactment of this legislation as is indicated by the departmental letter which is contained in the committee report.

The Committee on Armed Services believes it is very much in our national interest that the United States provide its best possible representation in international athletic competition. Athletic representation from the Armed Forces is essential to achieving this objective.

A large number of the finest amateur athletes in the United States are now in the Armed Forces. In 1960, over 22 percent of the U.S. pan-American and Olympic squads were Armed Forces personnel, and the U.S. Olympic Committee has expressed the belief that according to the present trend, members of the U.S. Armed Forces should comprise over 25 percent of the U.S. Olympic squad in 1964.

In view of these facts, I urge the House to unanimously approve this important legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Would any of this money go to finance such projects as we have had in the past, such as the Squaw Valley deal in California? Would any of this money be used for the construction of buildings?

Mr. HÉBERT. No, sir.

Mr. GROSS. Or facilities?

Mr. HÉBERT. No, sir.

Mr. GROSS. Or physical plant?

Mr. HÉBERT. No, sir. This particular money is strictly for transportation, and per diem pay and some equipment for the athletes. No construction. No, sir.

Mr. GROSS. I ask that question because the General Accounting Office only recently investigated the spending in connection with Squaw Valley in California which was heavily underwritten by the Federal taxpayers both as to money and the use of military personnel and equipment. The General Accounting Office found, as I remember it, that some $509,000 had been spent for a building or buildings which were not authorized by law, outside of the area of the winter games that were held at Squaw Valley.

I do not want to be a party to a bill such as this if that sort of thing is going to happen again.

Mr. HÉBERT. I assure the gentleman from Iowa that there is nothing in this bill which permits such construction. I am thoroughly familiar with the legislation to which he addresses himself. It was separate legislation, and the matter is now, as I understand it, before the investigating committee of the Committee on Armed Services of the House which is thoroughly familiar with the General Accounting Office report, but there is no connection at all between that report and the present legislation before this body.

Mr. GROSS. Now, one other question, if the gentleman will yield further. I believe the gentleman stated that the increase in the authorization is made necessary as a result of the increased costs of transportation; is that correct?

Mr. HÉBERT. Three hundred thousand dollars of it is. Originally $800,000 was authorized but the entire amount was not used. I think the amount used was $760,000. However, because of the anticipated costs of transportation in particular, this money has to be authorized and, of course, appropriated.

Mr. GROSS. Well, now, is the gentleman saying that the cost of MATS transportation has increased this much?

Mr. HÉBERT. Not exactly. This is, in effect, and in reality, a bookkeeping exercise. The agency using MATS must reimburse MATS. But that was not the case at the time the $800,000 ceiling was established. Under the new industrial fund accounting system the using agency does have to reimburse MATS. In effect, it is taken out of one pocket and put in another pocket. But the bookkeeper says it has to be handled that way and that is the way it has to be.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, the costs to the military have increased substantially for transporting Members of Congress and others accompanying them? If this is true, then Members of Congress on their trips and junkets are costing the taxpayers a good deal more than I suspected they were.

Mr. HÉBERT. Well, not having participated in the type of activity to which the gentleman refers, I cannot reply with accuracy to the gentleman's comments. But, this has nothing whatever to do with traveling by Members of Congress. It is strictly limited to support costs for the man in uniform who represents this Nation in international sports activities.

Mr. GROSS. It seems to me it would follow that if the cost of MATS transportation for athletes has increased, it certainly has increased with respect to the transportation of Members of Congress.

I think it is about time Congress limited those costs by stopping the free transportation of those who accompany Members of Congress, and who have no official connection with the Government.

Does the gentleman agree with me that it is about time to take a hard look at transportation costs in that field, if it is true, as the gentleman says, that the costs of operating MATS have increased to the extent that they have in financing this sort of project?

Mr. HÉBERT. Well, I am sure that the gentleman recognizes, and every Member of this body recognizes the fact that as long as the gentleman from Iowa is a Member of this body there will always be a voice raised against what would be considered as any type of malpractice.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman but I would advise him that information on this subject is denied Members of Congress. At the Pentagon I am told that it is longstanding policy not to provide a Member of Congress with information as to the cost of transporting other Members of Congress. The right to know does not exist insofar as the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Louisiana is concerned. At least, I cannot get the cost figures for these various junkets.

I want to take this opportunity to say to the gentleman from Louisiana and to the other Members of the House that I am going to pursue this denial of information. I do not care whether it is a long standing or short standing policy. Any Member of Congress is entitled to know how the taxpayers' money is spent, whether it is spent upon traveling Members of Congress or the executive or judicial branches of Government.

Mr. HÉBERT. I am sure the gentleman's position is well recognized.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I would like to attempt to answer some of the questions that have been brought up about this bill.

First, when this matter was brought before the subcommittee, the witnesses, frankly, were not able to answer the questions. Not until they came a second time was the matter entirely clarified as to the requirement for $300,000 additional authorization to support the present level of military participation in civilian athletic competition. However, the $300,000 in additional money is accounted for by the industrial funding of MATS. I am not saying that the cost of operating MATS has become greater or less, but prior to 1961—and this recommendation was made by the Airlift Subcommittee which went into this matter thoroughly—let us assume a Member of Congress goes from here to Germany on official business by MATS. The cost of this transportation is then paid from one fund into a fund supporting MATS operations in order to clarify the entire situation. Until the past few years this travel was not charged up, since we carried it as merely a bookkeeping entry. Now, however, there is a bookkeeping account and it shows, in this instance, a requirement for $300,000 to operate MATS. In other words, we are not permitting MATS to be operated for nothing. This amounts to a transfer of funds from one department into another department.

Then, Mr. Speaker, there is the other matter which has been raised so much which has to do with the Conseil International du Sport Militaire, which is called CISM for our military games in which the United States participates. These games were commenced several years ago. At that time CISM was limited to the NATO countries in Europe.

There was no expense of transportation because we used railroad transportation when we went from Germany to France and Italy. This includes 33 nations around the world and it will include 10 more within the next 2 or 3 years. So that transportation has become quite a problem. It is important from the standpoint of participating militarily. It is one of the greatest training opportunities we have for the Olympic people.

A great part of the training of these athletes is handled by what we call nonappropriated funds at the post, money they make from the PX and sources of that kind. At the end we decided—and this is a most critical matter—this is a fair and just increase in the expenses. I think everyone in this body wants to see that the Americans properly participate and also I believe every Member of the body wishes to see that we get value received for every dollar we spend.

We studied this matter very thoroughly, and I am satisfied that the military handling these athletic programs has been unusually careful by governmental standards in the spending of money and I certainly hope we remain that way.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. I am quite interested in this source of funds. On page 3 of the report it is stated:

> During the calendar year 1962, participation in CISM was financed from nonappropriated welfare funds available to the military services.

You are going to supplant these funds with tax funds? How much was appropriated or taken from these welfare funds in 1962? What is that figure?

Mr. BRAY. I asked that same question and it is very hard to find out. For instance, Stuttgart, Germany, is the headquarters of the 7th Army in Germany. You will have at the base various teams, baseball, soccer, hockey, pole vaulting and running, and they will be transferred to various places in Germany or maybe for skiing down in Italy. Every base, as the gentleman is aware, has what we call nonappropriated funds.

I brought that matter up and discussed it and insisted they use those funds. They will be using those funds. How much this may cut down the expenses I do not know. Those funds are very zealously guarded, as the gentleman knows, and we want to continue to use those funds.

If we send a team to the Philippines from Germany as now we will be doing, you could not do so by using only nonappropriated funds for that purpose. Within Central Europe they continue that, and we have expressed verbally our desire that they continue to use those funds.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman is responding to my question, and bringing out the reason I wanted to find out. I am happy to hear that the welfare funds are being used and you are anticipating some of those will continue to be used to finance this participation in CISM. But it does become important. How do you figure you need $900,000 increased authorization if you do not know how much was being spent there out of welfare funds in 1962? How do you know that $900,000 is needed? Maybe they need more, maybe less.

Mr. BRAY. This is how they arrived at the $900,000. They estimate what it is going to cost to transport those military teams all over the world. No per diem was paid out of the unappropriated funds. It is an estimate. We did go into great detail in questioning these people and believe an additional amount is necessary.

Mr. CURTIS. Maybe I can answer it. This may clarify the situation. In other words, $900,000 is an estimate for the expansion you talk about. You are going to keep track of your welfare funds. Suppose they were spending $1 million on this, this $900,000 is the growth anticipated which will be necessary to take funds from other sources. But you are going to continue using the welfare funds for what they are doing now.

Mr. BRAY. That is correct. My desire is that they do not shove this over onto the $900,000. I am sure they will not. In all fairness, though, they will go a little bit beyond in the use of the expanded welfare funds, but never going beyond what they normally should have done.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman has been very clear in explaining this, and I appreciate it.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Will the regular Olympic committees raise funds for the regular teams to take care of the armed services athletes?

Mr. BRAY. Yes, after the individual is a member of the Olympic team he is treated like everyone else. There will be a certain per diem that will have to be paid, I think, out of this fund. I may be in error on that. But the regular Olympic team will take care of getting them in training and getting the right men on the team.

Mr. JONAS. After they are on the Olympic team the expenses will be taken care of just as if they were civilian members?

Mr. HÉBERT. The Olympic team pays the expenses once they are elected to the team, but it does not pay any expenses prior to that.

Mr. BRAY. The big job we have is to get the proper people trained for the Olympic team. I think we can do a little better job on that than we did in the past.

Mr. JONAS. This bill authorizes the payment of expenses of service teams competing with service teams of other countries and is not restricted to Olympic competition?

Mr. BRAY. That is correct.

Mr. HÉBERT. There is no violation of any Olympic regulation in this legislation. There is no subsidization of any athlete as we know that subsidy is in violation of the Olympic regulations. It is my hope that the Olympic committee will be as diligent in enforcing the rules against Russia as the Olympic team is diligent in enforcing the rules against our own Americans.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding. I objected to this bill's coming out of the full committee by unanimous consent, and was one of the 3 out of 26 that voted against it, because of many of the points that have been brought out here today.

I, too, favor our military's participating in the Olympics. I, too, understand the CISM. I am not sure but that we are not training or moving military athletes by subsidy here, but I do not want to get into a question of semantics here.

Second, I do not believe we can afford it.

Third, this is an additional million dollars only for the preparation of the athlete to start his trials. It is due to the formation of a new organization. It takes away the incentive not only for nonappropriated funds but for contributed funds by our participation. As the gentleman from Indiana said, I am quite sure it will be used in quantity over and above that anticipated when the funds become available.

Further, this is for 4 years. It jumped from $250,000 to $500,000, or half a million dollars each of those years, and in that sense is back-door spending.

After having said in the beginning that I was for the military participation and certainly in favor of Olympic competitive athletics, I just want it clearly understood that the purpose of this bill by definition is to increase the statutory dollar ceiling on the maximum amount of appropriated funds that can be utilized to support the participation of members of the armed services in international sports activities. I want us to win. I want us to be competitive with all nations on earth. But I do not want nor do I believe it is our function in Congress to appropriate the taxpayers' funds for this particular purpose. I object to the bill and I hope it is defeated.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. I want to concur with the gentleman from Missouri who just spoke. I opposed this bill in committee. With all respect to my subcommittee chairman and my ranking minority member, I would like it known that when the representatives of the Department came before our subcommittee they had to come two or three different times with two or three different civilian representatives, who did not even know what the bill conceived of. They had to be sent back to try to get us information so we could find out what this bill was going to do. Where are we going to go with this? Heretofore the Department has been using nonappropriated funds. They have been finding the money to do this and suddenly they come in and want us to increase this over threefold, while at the same time using money that was never appropriated for this purpose.

Second, we have gone from the Olympic games in which we want our servicemen to participate, as they have in the past, and now we have a new organization known as CISM who are going to participate in this. Here are maybe two other international organizations and we go from one to another and, therefore, the funds that are going to be requested will be pyramiding time after time. I want to see our athletes participate. I want to see them have the opportunity to participate, but I do not think this is the way we ought to do it. I do not think the departments came in with a legitimate program. They did not come in and give us the facts. I, too, am going to oppose this bill.

Mr. BRAY. In answer to that, I want to point out, as I stated earlier, we did have a great deal of trouble getting information and there has been no attempt to try to hide that from this body. In fact, we sent them back once because the men could not answer our questions. They came back a second time and did better. It finally became clear that the reason for this increase—and this is an authorization over a 4-year period—is that the $300,000 is really a matter of a bookkeeping transaction and because up to that time we made no reimbursement to MATS. After all, that is taking money out of one pocket and putting it in another pocket. I cannot object to that because I was on the subcommittee that went in and demanded that that be done to straighten out and clarify this entire matter. Furthermore, that is where the $300,000 goes.

The other is the matter of CISM and I do not believe anyone in this body would expect them to get this money out of nonappropriated funds; that is, funds coming from the PX and money collected from military bases. I do not think anyone would expect them to take a group say from Spain to Manila or, let us say, from Italy to Stockholm. That is getting far beyond what can be done with nonappropriated funds. The fact is that there was considerable strain on these nonappropriated funds up to this time. I do not want that to happen and neither do I want them to go hog wild on it. I am sure that this subcommittee has been very careful, and I am sure that they will continue to be careful. It was a difficult job getting this straightened out.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BECKER. I would like to compliment both the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] and my chairman of the subcommittee because actually when the three civilian members of the Department came before our committee, the only clarity that came out of it was the knowledge of the chairman of the subcommittee—he had to put the words in the mouths of the representatives of the departments and this is the only way it made any sense in the final analysis and I want to give him all the credit for that, but I say that that is not the way to do it, to keep pyramiding these funds for this purpose.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNYDER. I wonder if the gentleman was able to get enough information from the witnesses as to how many miles of travel were furnished with the $200,000 a year or almost that amount that has been used in the past?

Mr. BRAY. No; it was not broken down in that fashion. However, the hearings contain a very complete analysis of the prior use of these funds and the proposed use. Frankly, I am satisfied that there is no waste. I am satisfied that at times we may have spent more than was necessary and that depends on a question of judgment, and you cannot legislate judgment. However, I am satisfied that the officers and civilians who are running this are doing a good job.

Mr. SNYDER. Do you know how many people are involved or how much personnel is involved in the activities connected with this?

Mr. BRAY. No, it is very difficult to say. Take this example, let us go back to Stuttgart. There may be 500 men trying out. There are certain expenses in connection with that involving the use of nonappropriated funds for equipment and baseballs and gloves, boxing gloves, shots, and various other paraphernalia. It runs into an enormous amount. But gradually the better athletes are selected. Then you send a team to CISM. Let us say you send them on down to Italy. You gradually see how good they are performing. Now you pick your best team. You cannot go out and in 15 minutes determine that. I do know and I know personally that a great deal of money is spent from nonappropriated funds. Exactly where the nonappropriated funds should stop and these funds go into effect requires the wisdom of a Solomon to decide. So far, I assure you, I have been very critical of spending money and I have been very critical with respect to this program. Frankly, if I did not feel that it was worthwhile, I certainly would not have voted for the bill and supported it in the House.

Mr. **SNYDER**. In the gentleman's opinion, would he say a good-sized group of people are involved here or a very small group?

Mr. **BRAY**. There are many thousands involved in this in one way or another.

Mr. **SNYDER**. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. **HÉBERT**. As the gentleman from Indiana was about to explain, I will say that in round figures it costs $386 each to train some 2,000 athletes who are actual participants, and that is where the $764,000 went. On page 6366 of the printed hearings, this item is broken down in great detail.

I may say further to my good friend from New York, whom I respect and who is a member and a very valuable member of the committee which I am privileged to chair, I think it is a tribute to himself and the other members of our committee that we did not buy a pig in a poke but insisted on knowing the facts. We would not pass the bill or recommend the bill until we did know the facts. We waited until not only were we sure we had the facts, but we did not pass the bill out of the subcommittee and out of the full committee until then, and when we did we passed it with a vote of some 27 to 3.

There is just one other thing I would like to say. Let us ask ourselves one question. Do we want the best athletes to compete in international athletics and principally the Olympic games or do we not? If we do, then this is the method in which we can best accomplish this objective. If we do not take this method, you will have a second-rate representation at these contests.

Mr. **SECREST**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **HÉBERT**. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. **SECREST**. I think there is a matter of morale involved, also. This is the best money that we could spend. These boys are scattered all over the world. When they try out in the different places it builds up morale throughout the whole branch of the service that they are a part of wherever they are located. From that standpoint alone, it is good. We know that we are anxious, as Members of Congress, to get home to our constituents, and we are not very far away from our homes. These boys are very far away, and I think this is one of the finest things that can be done not only from the standpoint of the Olympic games but for servicemen all over the world where these things transpire.

Mr. **HÉBERT**. I thank the gentleman, and I also point out the fact that the use of nonappropriated funds involves the use of moneys which belong to the men in uniform. Some $100,000 a year, of nonappropriated funds have been used to support this program.

Mr. **PIRNIE**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **HÉBERT**. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. **PIRNIE**. I would like to say to my chairman that investigation at the scene confirms exactly what he is telling the House. Unappropriated funds will continue to be used in the preparation of these athletes within the military service, and the House will be interested to know that this development and the international competition among the military is proving a valuable factor of morale and is quite a stimulation to the men in uniform to compete. Progress is being made in the development of athletes and the promotion of morale. It is a very vital expenditure and I am proud to support this bill, because I believe it is in the interests of the service and the young men of the Nation as well as our country as a whole.

Mr. **HÉBERT**. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Louisiana that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 2988, as amended.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that in his opinion two-thirds had voted in favor thereof.

Mr. **BEERMANN**. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 285, nays 30, not voting 128, as follows:

[Roll No. 202]

YEAS—285

Addabbo
Albert
Anderson
Andrews, Ala.
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Bass
Bates
Beckworth
Belcher
Bennett, Fla.
Berry
Betts
Boggs
Boland
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Burke
Burleson
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cunningham
Curtin
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Diggs
Donohue
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Grabowski
Grant
Gray
Griffin
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halpern
Hansen
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Holland
Horan
Horton
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kunkel
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Lennon
Libonati
Long, Md.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McFall
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
MacGregor
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Morgan
Morris
Morton
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
Norblad
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quillen
Rains
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Rielhman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, N.Y.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
St. George
St Germain
Saylor
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Sheppard
Short
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Talcott
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Tuck
Tuten
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Van Pelt
Vinson
Waggonner
Watson
Watts
Weltner
Westland
Wharton
White
Whitener
Wickersham
Wilson, Charles H.
Winstead
Wright
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—30

Abernethy
Alger
Becker
Beermann
Bruce
Byrnes, Wis.
Colmer
Curtis
Devine
Dole
Griffiths
Gross
Hall
Hoeven
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Kyl
Mosher
O'Konski
Pillion
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
Schadeberg
Siler
Skubitz
Stinson
Sullivan
Williams
Wilson, Ind.

NOT VOTING—128

Abbitt
Abele
Adair
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Barrett
Barry
Battin
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Blatnik
Bolling
Bow
Bromwell
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Buckley
Burkhalter
Cahill
Cameron
Celler
Clark
Conte
Cramer
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Derwinski
Dingell
Dorn
Duncan
Ellsworth
Evins
Fascell
Fogarty
Foreman
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Gallagher
Gibbons
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Halleck
Hanna
Harding
Harris
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Herlong
Hoffman
Holifield
Hosmer
Jennings
Kelly
Kilburn
Knox
Leggett
Lesinski
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
McDowell
Macdonald
Madden
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Meader
Milliken
Moorhead
Morrison
Morse
Multer
Nelsen
O'Brien, Ill.
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Pepper
Pilcher
Quie
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Rhodes, Pa.
Robison
Rodino
Rooney, Pa.
St. Onge
Shelley
Shipley
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Smith, Calif.
Staebler
Stafford
Taft
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Trimble
Tupper
Ullman
Utt
Wallhauser
Weaver
Whalley
Whitten
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Bob

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Quie.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Staebler with Mr. Barry.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Dague.
Mr. Duncan with Mr. Weaver.
Mr. Harris with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Knox.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Bromwell.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Robison.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Ostertag.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Lindsay.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Shriver.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Stafford.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Taft.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Lloyd.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Sibal.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Battin.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Randall with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Brotzman.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Jennings with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Trimble with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Sickles with Mr. Foreman.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Mailliard.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Abele.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Friedel with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Harding with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Milliken.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Wallhauser.
Mr. Cameron with Mr. Teague of California.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Meader.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Utt.

Mr. DEVINE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DOLE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR ESTABLISHMENT AND ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC RECREATIONAL FACILITIES AT SANFORD RESERVOIR AREA, CANADIAN RIVER PROJECT, TEXAS

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 8135) to provide for the establishment and administration of public recreational facilities at the Sanford Reservoir area, Canadian River project, Texas, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to investigate, plan, construct, operate and maintain, or otherwise provide for basic public outdoor recreation facilities at the Sanford Reservoir area, Canadian Federal reclamation project, to acquire or otherwise include within the project area such adjacent lands or interests therein as are necessary for present or future public recreation use, and to provide for the public use and enjoyment of project lands, facilities, and water areas in a manner coordinated with other project purposes: *Provided,* That this Act shall not provide the Secretary with a basis for allocation to recreation of water, reservoir capacity, or joint project costs of the Canadian River project nor affect the priority for municipal use of water stored in Sanford Reservoir, or the priority of use for municipal purposes of the capacity of said reservoir. The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with Federal agencies or State or local public bodies for the operation, maintenance, or additional development of project lands or facilities, or to dispose of project lands or facilities to Federal agencies or State or local public bodies by lease, transfer, conveyance or exchange upon such terms and conditions as will best promote the development and operation of such lands or facilities in the public interest for recreation purposes. The cost of providing basic recreation facilities shall be nonreimbursable. In carrying out the aforesaid activities the Secretary shall take cognizance of the effect of the fish and wildlife plan approved by the President December 19, 1962, pursuant to the Act of December 29, 1950 (64 Stat. 1124) in providing facilities at the Canadian River project which have general recreation utility.

SEC. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts, but not more than $1,100,000, as may be necessary for the investigation, preparation of plans, construction and acquisition of lands authorized in this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Colorado, chairman of the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8135 authorizes the necessary Federal expenditures to take advantage of the tremendous recreation potential made possible by construction of the Sanford Reservoir in northwest Texas.

The bill provides for the establishment and administration of public recreational facilities at the reservoir. The Sanford Reservoir is a feature of the Canadian River project, Texas, which was authorized in 1950, and H.R. 8135 supplements the authority given in 1950 for construction of the project. When reclamation projects are authorized today, the authorizing act includes authority for recreation development as a project purpose. In 1950, Congress was not following the policy of authorizing recreation as a purpose in reclamation projects. The Canadian River project is the only Federal reclamation project presently under construction where recreational development is not authorized on a nonreimbursable basis.

The Canadian River project is located in northwest Texas and the Sanford Reservoir is about 38 miles northeast of Amarillo. Construction of the project is now well along and the project is scheduled for completion in 1967. In addition to the reservoir, the project includes an aqueduct system to deliver municipal and industrial water to Amarillo and 10 other towns and cities in the area. The project will also provide flood control and fish and wildlife benefits and these purposes are included in the authorizing act. The project will cost about $99 million and the Canadian River Municipal Water Authority is already under contract to repay about $93 million with interest. The remainder of the cost is allocated to flood control and to fish and wildlife. The authority which this legislation provides would add an additional cost, not exceeding $1,100,000 for developing recreation facilities. Department officials testified before the committee that the amount of $1,100,000, provided in the legislation, would be adequate to take care of those basic facilities which the Federal Government should provide and the acquisition of any additional lands which may be needed.

Sanford Reservoir is conveniently located to serve the outdoor recreation needs of a sizable population in Amarillo and the other cities in the general area. It is well suited for outdoor recreation activities including fishing, picnicking, camping, boating, water skiing, and waterfowl hunting. Speedboating and water skiing should be especially popular on the lake because of the expanse of lake surface provided.

A plan for recreation use of Sanford Reservoir was completed in 1962 but this plan is presently being reevaluated in light of the Federal Government's present policy and responsibility with respect to development of recreational facilities. The bill, as originally introduced, was amended by the committee to permit reevaluation of the recreation plan and provide for development on the basis of the plan which is finally approved, but with a cost ceiling of $1,100,000. However, in view of the fact that the final recreation plan has not been firmed up, the committee is asking that the Department's report setting out its final plan be submitted to it, and that all actions to implement the plan under this legislation be withheld for 60 days after such submittal. This will give the committee an opportunity to review the plan before any funds are expended under the authority of this act.

There is no opposition to this legislation in the local area or in the State of Texas. There was no opposition to the legislation in the committee. The need for providing recreational opportunities in the area is widely recognized and certainly all agree that this project should be treated in the same manner as other projects that are presently being built. The cost involved is nominal and is only the cost of the specific facilities to be built by the Federal Government. If this project were authorized today and treated like presently proposed projects with respect to cost allocation, at least $7 million of the reservoir cost would be allocated to recreation in addition to the cost of specific facilities.

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee recommends H.R. 8135 to the House favorably and urges its approval.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. As late as October 4, 1963, the Department of the Interior had this to say, as set forth in the report:

> The bill, if amended as suggested by the Department, would not contain a specific authorization to appropriate funds for basic recreation facilities; we believe that it is unnecessary to include such language, particularly when the cost of those facilities is as yet undetermined.

Mr. ASPINALL. If my friend will remember the way the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of this body operates, we make it absolutely sure that the authority which is necessary to do the work under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior is granted or not granted. In this particular instance, we have seen fit to accept that responsibility and grant that authority. We have limited the appropriation to not to exceed a certain amount and have denied the expenditure of these funds until our committee has an opportunity to see and study the plans that the Department of the Interior recommends as necessary for this recreational facility. This is exactly in line with what my friend from Iowa has been asking for all these years.

Mr. GROSS. I compliment the chairman, the gentleman from Colorado, and his committee for this new policy. So that there is, then, a firm policy and, as stated in the bill, a firm commitment to spend the moneys authorized, $1.1 million, for this specific purpose. In other words, the committee is convinced that the studies made so far warrant this kind of an appropriation?

Mr. ASPINALL. My friend from Iowa is correct. We do not know the extent of the expenditure, but we do know this: first that there is a limitation, and, secondly, when the plan comes back to our committee, as this authority says it must come back, we will have surveillance over whatever is to take place.

Mr. GROSS. One other question, if the gentleman will yield. What is the rate of interest?

Mr. ASPINALL. The rate of interest on the money for the project itself; that is, the municipal program, was 3 percent. On this particular part, that is the authorization now under consideration, this is nonreimbursable money, as my friend, the gentleman from Iowa understands, for recreational purposes, just like in the flood control bill last year where almost one-fourth of the total amount authorized was nonreimbursable money for fish and wildlife and recreation. In other words, in that legislation it was close to $235 million. That is the reason why I said that in my judgment this is perhaps one of the better bills as far as the ratio between the total expenditure for the construction of the project and the amount to be spent on fish and wildlife and recreation.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEERMANN. Does this change the criteria for an authorization?

Mr. ASPINALL. May I answer my friend, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Beermann] in this way? I know what is bothering the gentleman. This comes within any criteria that has ever been used or ever proposed. This is approximately 1.2 percent of the total, and as my friend knows, the criteria that has been suggested is some place between 5 and 25 percent now recommended for future water facilities projects.

Mr. BEERMANN. If the gentleman will yield further, I appreciate the clarification by the gentleman from Colorado and would like to suggest that I think there is another criterion that is going to have to be used soon, and that is in reclamation projects or flood control projects that we look at a new criterion and that is water for people. I mean water for human consumption. In areas where we do not have as much water as we have in the State of Nebraska, we are also looking for water for human use but it is not included in the criteria for projects.

Mr. ASPINALL. I would like to talk to my friend after the House adjourns today about this matter. However, in this particular project the total cost is $99 million and the amount for municipal water is $93 million. This is water for people, returnable, in toto, with interest from the time the construction starts.

Mr. BEERMANN. I appreciate the gentleman's explanation and I am very happy to hear it.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 8135, as amended.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 284, nays 30, not voting 120, as follows:

[Roll No. 203]

YEAS—284

Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson
Andrews, Ala.
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Baldwin
Baring
Bates
Beckworth
Beermann
Belcher
Bennett, Fla.
Berry
Betts
Boggs
Boland
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Brademas
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Burke
Burleson
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cunningham
Curtin
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Devine
Diggs
Dole
Donohue
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Finnegan
Fisher
Flood
Forrester
Fountain
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodling
Grabowski
Grant
Gray
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hansen
Hardy
Harrison
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Hechler
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Holland
Horan
Horton
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Jarman
Jensen
Joelson
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Lennon
Libonati
Long, Md.
McDade
McFall
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
MacGregor
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morton
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
Norblad
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Ostertag
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Rains
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
Saylor
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Sheppard
Short
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Springer
Staggers
Steed
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Tuck
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Watson
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Wharton
White
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Williams
Wilson, Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—30

Alger
Baker
Becker
Bray
Brock
Chamberlain
Clancy
Curtis
Derounian
Findley
Fino
Ford
Goodell
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
King, N.Y.
Laird
McClory
McCulloch
Mosher
O'Konski
Pillion
Poff
Quillen
St. George
Schadeberg
Siler
Snyder
Wydler
Wyman

NOT VOTING—120

Abbitt
Abele
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Auchincloss

Avery
Ayres
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Battin
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Blatnik
Bolling
Bow
Bromwell
Brotzman
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Buckley
Burkhalter
Cahill
Cameron
Celler
Clark
Conte
Cramer
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Derwinski
Dingell
Dorn
Duncan
Ellsworth
Evins
Fascell
Flynt
Fogarty
Foreman
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Gibbons
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Halleck
Hanna
Harding
Harris
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hemphill
Hoffman
Holifield
Hosmer
Ichord
Jennings
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
Knox
Landrum
Leggett
Lesinski
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
McDowell
Macdonald
Madden
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Meader
Milliken
Monagan
Morrison
Morse
Moss
Multer
Nelsen
O'Brien, Ill.
Osmers
Passman
Pepper
Pilcher
Quie
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Rhodes, Pa.
Robison
Rodino
St. Onge
Senner
Shelley
Shipley
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Smith, Calif.
Staebler
Stafford
Stephens
Taft
Taylor
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Toll
Trimble
Tupper
Utt
Vinson
Wallhauser
Whalley
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Bob

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Robison.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Bromwell.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Dague.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Shriver.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Barry.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Taft.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Battin.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Harris with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Hemphill with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Milliken
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Knox.
Mr. Bass with Mr. Lloyd.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Pilcher.
Mr. Mahon with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Staebler with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Fraser.
Mr. Burkhalter with Mr. Ichord.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Abele.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Foreman.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Duncan with Mr. Stafford.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Quie.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Lindsay.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Meader.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Wallhauser.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Brotzman.
Mr. Jennings with Mr. Hosmer.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Harding with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Randall with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Sickles with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Cameron with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Avery.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Sibal.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Bruce.
Mr. Thomas with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. BAKER and Mr. HARVEY of Michigan changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I think I answered late on the first rollcall and it was recorded as a "no" for the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch]. I do not think the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] is here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch], is recorded as having voted "no." The Chair is unable to ascertain whether the vote is correct or not.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE ADULT INDIAN VOCATIONAL TRAINING ACT

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1868) to amend the act of August 13, 1956 (70 Stat. 986), as amended, relating, to adult Indian vocational training, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the first section of the Act entitled "An Act relating to employment for certain adult Indians on or near Indian reservations", approved August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 986; 25 U.S.C. 309), is amended (1) by inserting in the first sentence thereof immediately after "twenty-four months," the following: "and, for nurses' training, for periods that do not exceed thirty-six months," and (2) by striking out the period at the end of the last sentence in such section and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "or with any school of nursing offering a three-year course of study leading to a diploma in nursing which is accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Secretary.".

(b) Section 2 of said Act of August 3, 1956, as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this Act the sum of $12,000,000 for each fiscal year, and not to exceed $1,500,000 of such sum shall be available for administrative purposes.".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second, in order that there might be some discussion of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall], chairman of the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I strongly recommend favorable consideration of S. 1868, a bill to expand the Indian Vocational Training Act of 1956 in two respects. First, the bill would permit Indian women to participate in 3-year nurse training programs, and second, would increase the funds to be authorized for the overall program from $7½ to $12 million per year.

On every Indian reservation in the United States there is a shortage of trained nurses in the hospitals and clinics according to testimony presented our committee by the Division of Indian Health and Sanitation Services of the Public Health Service and by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. For years a successful 1-year training program for practical nurses has been in operation and the graduates are highly sought by numerous institutions. Presently, the Indian Vocational Training Act limits the period of study to 24 months but in the case of nurses' training—and in this case only—the time would be extended to 36 months. We all know that 3 years' training beyond high school graduation is required for a girl to obtain a registered nurses' certificate. Indian girls have shown a marked degree of skill in the nursing profession and we would like to facilitate that training as much as possible, within limits of course.

The second provision of the bill increases the amount authorized to be appropriated for the Indian vocational training program from $7½ to $12 million per year and increases the amount that may be used for administering the program from $1 to $1½ million. We set this limitation to prevent the program from becoming topheavy with instructors, supervisors, clerical assistants, and others in administrative capacities. I have followed the course of this training program since its creation in 1956 and am pleased to be able to state that it is one of the more successful undertakings of the Bureau of Indian Affairs during the past 30 years.

Since I believe the program is well supervised and is training Indian men and women to take their places in our modern society I heartily commend it to our colleagues.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, very briefly, as the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall] has pointed out, this bill does two things: First, it increases the authorization for the Indian on-the-job training and apprentice training program from $7.5 to $12 million a year.

Mr. Speaker, this law was originally passed in 1956. As the chairman has pointed out, it has been probably one of the most effective pieces of Indian legislation that has ever been passed.

The second thing that it does is it enlarges the coverage of the law to include girls from between the ages of 18 and 35, giving them a 3-year training course, those who want to take nurses' training. A 3-year course is required in order for them to qualify as registered nurses.

Mr. Speaker, at the present time there are many Indian girls working in hospitals as nurses' aids but none of them have had the opportunity to become registered nurses.

This will make it possible for these girls to become registered nurses. I think it is an exceptionally good piece of legislation and I urge all the Members to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton].

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly interested in this bill. During the first war there were some Indian registered nurses that were as fine a group as anything we had in the Army or outside of it. I am happy as I can be that this bill makes it possible for the Indian girls to receive the kind of training that they are quite equal to and that they should have had some time ago.

I thank the committee very much for its foresight. We need nurses more than we need anything else and when we can get a group such as these Indian girls we should use them. My one question is whether the amount suggested is not overambitious. I trust the work will be constantly checked and that all waste will be eliminated.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Reifel].

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the chairman of the full committee for his observations in respect to this legislation. As some of you know, I was with the Bureau of Indian Affairs as an employee until I came to the Congress. I had an oportunity to help administer this particular program from its inception. On our Indian reservations we have the highest percentage of unemployment on account of lack of skills which can be developed. This program, I have found in my association with it, is one of the finest action programs that the Indian Bureau has been administering.

This takes young men and women from 18 to 35 without skills that can be developed and gives them an opportunity to go to a trade school and will make it possible for these young people to become eligible to enter nurses' training or other fields of adult schooling and receive training in skills that are in demand. We can, therefore, drain off the reservation the oversupply of unemployed labor that exists. This, as the chairman has pointed out, is going to help these individuals become self-supporting members of our society and will enable them to make their contribution as they are able and willing to do provided they get this kind of program made available to them.

I urge favorable consideration of this bill.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, this is a program which has been of considerable help to the Menominee Indians in my congressional district. The Menominee Indian Reservation under terms of a Wisconsin State law has now become Menominee County, the 72d county in Wisconsin.

It is my understanding that under the terms of this bill the Indian boys and girls will still qualify for active participation in this program.

Mr. BERRY. I would say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that certainly anyone who is presently participating would not be excluded from the provisions of this bill; but it does provide that they shall be living on or near an Indian reservation.

Mr. LAIRD. They are living near a reservation presently. It is my understanding that they do qualify, then, under the terms of this bill. If they do not I certainly would insist on an amendment to this bill.

Mr. BERRY. They do.

Mr. LAIRD. I am glad to have this point made clear for the future record. Under the terms of this bill all Indians qualify if they live on or near a reservation. Menominee County is next to a reservation and also near several more.

Mr. BERRY. Then they would qualify.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BERRY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Do I understand from the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota as one of the coauthors of the bill that this can lead either to training as a practical nurse's aid or to a registered nurse's degree; that is, a registered nurse with a degree as bachelor of nursing with complete training?

Mr. BERRY. At the present time they can obtain employment in the hospital as nurse's aids. This amended bill gives them an opportuity to take 3 years' college or training courses and graduate as registered nurses. So this gives them the opportunity to go from a nurse's aid to a registered nurse.

Mr. HALL. Are there additional funds in for practical nurses' training under the Vocational Training or Rehabilitation Act?

Mr. BERRY. It is all included in the same package.

Mr. HALL. Is there any reason why an Indian girl within the ages prescribed here cannot participate under the existing Vocational Training or Rehabilitation Act as practical nurses?

Mr. BERRY. This program is a 2-year program, as the law now stands. In order to be a registered nurse they must have a 3-year course. So we had to amend the law applicable only to nurses' training to give these girls an opportunity to attend nurses' training courses and graduate as registered nurses.

Mr. HALL. I am well aware of the requirements to be a registered nurse in the various States of the Union, as a physician and one who, like the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton], had considerable to do with the training and even the utilization of registered nurses and others by the medical department, U.S. Army, during World War II. But is there anything in this amendment that will require them to be trained on the reservation?

Mr. BERRY. No, they are trained at institutions approved by the Department of the Interior, any nurses' training school anywhere in the United States.

Mr. HALL. Is there a provision in the amendment to the act so that the funds can be made available to these Indians, to the nurses or practical nurses who wish to become registered nurses, so that for example they could be personally subsidized to pursue their training, for instance, at a large nurses' training school in connection with a hospital in New York or indeed even with our own Walter Reed Army Medical Center?

Mr. BERRY. That is the purpose of this amendment to the act, to make this training available to these Indian girls.

Mr. HALL. There is no question but what this is now rapidly becoming one of the more critical of the scarce categories of our trained personnel, and I again, as has been stated before on the floor of the House, knowing about the critical shortage of these trained personnel, commend the committee for bringing in this bill.

Mr. BERRY. I thank the gentleman very much. I would simply add that when the witnesses from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare were before our committee they told us that at the present time they had no Indian girls serving as registered nurses, and urged the passage of this amendment.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida, the able chairman of the subcommittee, for yielding to me, and would like to join others in commending him for his outstanding leadership in the field of Indian legislation. I do not believe the Indian people have a greater champion in the House of Representatives than the able gentleman from Florida. It is certainly a pleasure to rise here today in support of this bill.

The principal purpose of this bill is to enlarge the program that has demonstrated beyond any doubt that it is an outstanding success. I think the statistics from the Muskogee area office in Oklahoma demonstrate how successful it has been in our State. More than 500 Indians have been trained under this program in the area served by the Muskogee area office. The able and energetic director of that office, Mr. Virgil Harrington, has just informed me on the telephone that they have the remarkable record of placing in productive jobs 92 percent of all the Indians who have had this training. That figure includes not only those who have completed their training but also those who had their training interrupted before completion.

I think when you can take people who by and large have very low incomes and have unsatisfactory employment records and provide them with vocational skills and make it possible for a substantial majority of them to have better incomes for their families and be productive, taxpaying citizens, this is a very constructive and worthwhile program.

I am also informed that at the present time in the Muskogee area office there are more than 100 Indians who are completely qualified for this training whose applications have been processed for training and who are awaiting assignment to an institution for training and awaiting the availability of funds which will be made possible through this bill.

I should like to add one further thought. One of the reasons this program has been so successful in Oklahoma is the fact that more than half of these Indians have been trained at one of the outstanding vocational schools in the United States, the Okmulgee Technical School, which is part of Oklahoma State University. At Okmulgee, Indian students have had an opportunity to have modern, skilled training in everything from baking and cooking to auto mechanics and electronics. This is a program that is proving to be one of the outstanding successes of our overall Indian program. I certainly hope it will be overwhelmingly adopted here today.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNYDER. Can the gentleman tell me what is available under this program for the people involved that is not available under the vocational education bill that is now in conference?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I cannot tell the gentleman the details of the vocational education bill now in conference which would not provide similar opportunities. All I can tell the gentleman is that the category of Indians from 18 to 35 years of age has apparently been neglected in our other vocational training programs in the past. This is a program that has gone to the reservation areas and into the restricted land areas and has interested Indians who are in need of upgraded vocational skills and has brought them job opportunities they have not had before.

Mr. SNYDER. I am just trying to determine whether or not we are duplicating in this particular with the bill that passed the House earlier, which you will recall went over to the other body where they added NDEA and impacted areas; which bill is now in conference. I was just trying to determine if the gentleman knows whether whatever training the Indians can get under this bill can also be gotten under the other bill?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I have no doubt of the fact that there are some Indians who are getting job opportunities under the other program, but I think this is a program designed especially to reach areas and segments of the country where the other program has not been effective. I think it particularly makes use of skilled personnel in the Department of the Interior and its Bureau of Indian Affairs, and their knowledge of job requirements so far as Indians are concerned, and brings them into the overall vocational education program. I think it is entirely possible that there are some duplications in the process, but I think it is a wholesome duplication when we are able to reach folks who are not being reached through other programs.

Mr. SNYDER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill, S. 1868, and commend the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY] for the splendid work he has done for Indians and particularly for the work done in the training of adult Indians.

There is not anywhere in our economy a greater necessity for educational programs than among the adult Indians. Because of the rural residence of the majority of them, education of them has lagged. I am happy to note there are more Indians available for adult training than the program originally anticipated there would be. This program is very, very attractive to the adult Indians and they have responded very well and cooperated very well with the program. I think it is in this type of training that we will find we can bring Indians to join in the economy of the country so far as their productivity is concerned and in looking after themselves. I urge passage of this proposal for the expansion of education and training of adult Indians.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter and certain tables.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my chairman, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] in recommending enactment of S. 1868. It is by no means the entire solution of the Indian problem in the United States, but it is a move in the right direction.

Let me explain the Indian vocational training program which Congress created in 1956 to accommodate Indians living on or near their reservations. At that time we had two objects in mind. First, the program would be of great value in preparing and orienting participants in Indian relocation in off-reservation cities where there were opportunities for gainful employment. We also believed that a trained corps of Indian artisans would encourage industries to locate on or near reservations. In both respects the program has been successful. Over 3,500 students have completed their training and nearly all of them are gainfully employed. Today we have 31 industrial developments located on or near reservations and making use of Indian laborers. Today we have about 2,500 individuals enrolled in institutional training programs in some 20 Western States and another 1,300 in on-the-job training. Over 300 applications have been processed and are awaiting turns for registration. In addition many more who have already or soon will graduate from high school will take advantage of training opportunities. With the growing use of automation in industry, Indian unskilled laborers are having more and more difficulty in finding employment. When they do get jobs they are often the first to be replaced by machines or laid off in times of depression.

We are already spending well over $260 million a year on programs for some 345,000 Indians. Some programs are of questionable value, of course, and should be done away with. We know how difficult it is to dispense with a program when it once gets started. I have watched the Vocational Training Act develop since 1956. I have visited the trainees in the factories and in their homes. I have talked to personnel officers in factories who were unaware that some employees were Indians. This is as it should be. When they are able to hold down their jobs and take their places in the modern society there is little reason for the Indian tag to follow them—unless they want it to. Many of them do not. They want to take their places because they are American citizens and not because they are American Indians.

Mr. Speaker, I want our Indians to be just as good as non-Indians. I want them to have equal treatment to non-Indians. The reason I want the additional training that will be provided in S. 1868 is to make up for the lack of educational facilities and opportunities that they have received. I have every reason to believe that given the proper training and incentives our Indians can hold their own with non-Indians in both skilled and unskilled jobs.

Presently under the $7½ million appropriation about 2,500 training units—either a trainee and his family or an unmarried trainee—and 1,370 on-the-job training units are being financed. The added appropriation would increase the number of institutional training units to 3,900 and to 1,500 on-the-job training units.

I urge favorable consideration of our colleagues on S. 1868 and am confident the increased appropriation will be wisely used by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include data on vocational training provided by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS, BRANCH OF EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE, ADULT VOCATIONAL TRAINING ACTIVITY

I. NUMBER ENTERED ADULT VOCATIONAL TRAINING SINCE INCEPTION THROUGH JUNE 30, 1963

	Units
Institutional training	6,892
On-the-job training	2,358

II. NUMBER OF INDIANS TRAINED UNDER PUBLIC LAW 959 AND NOW EMPLOYED

Institutional training:	*Units*
Entered	6,892
Still in training	1,273
Completed or discontinued	5,619
Discontinued	2,045
Completed	3,574
Completed or discontinued and employed (estimated)	3,821

A study made in fiscal year 1962 showed that about 68 percent of those who completed or discontinued training were assisted and accepted employment. Does not include recent graduates who are awaiting job placement assistance.

On-the-job training:	*Units*
Entered	2,358
Employed by plants no longer under contract	137
Employed by plants still under contract	889
Total employed	1,026

III. NUMBER OF INDIANS EMPLOYED ON OR OFF RESERVATION

Information is not available. There is no exact figure for those employed on or off the reservation; however, it is estimated that no more than 5 percent of those trained through institutional training are employed on the reservation while all those trained by one-the-job training are employed on or near the reservation.

IV. SCHOOLS AND COURSES APPROVED BY STATES

State	Schools		Courses
	Public	Private	
Alaska	2	3	7
Arizona	2	10	20
California	13	46	142
Colorado	----------	13	21
Florida	2	3	7
Georgia	1	----------	4
Idaho	1	2	5
Illinois	1	16	40
Iowa	----------	1	1
Minnesota	4	12	31
Montana	4	7	36
Nebraska	----------	3	5
New York	1	----------	1
North Carolina	----------	2	2
North Dakota	2	4	17
Ohio	1	20	38
Oklahoma	2	5	34
Oregon	5	7	34
South Dakota	1	7	21
Tennessee	----------	1	1
Texas	3	11	36
Washington	6	6	66
Wisconsin	5	3	34
Wyoming	1	----------	1
New Mexico	3	6	22
Total, 25 States	60	188	626

V. AVERAGE YEARLY COST PER UNIT IN ADULT VOCATIONAL TRAINING

	Per unit
Institutional training	$3,100
On-the-job training	600

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with others in proposing legislation to increase adult Indian vocational training assistance, by introducing legislation which would increase the appropriation for this program from a $7,500,000 limitation to $12 million. My bill is H.R. 8266.

Though I feel we should try to hold Federal Government expenses down wherever possible, I cannot help but feel this is about as worthy a cause as any proposal we have had before us this Congress. There is a definite need to carry out this program which is a means of helping the Indian to help himself, which would encourage the pride and self-respect of the Indian rather than by the "dole" system, and which would lead in the direction of self-sustaining for the Indian youths and/or adults concerned with bettering their standards of living and present-day existence.

The number of Indians who are qualified and who wish to participate in the program greatly exceeds the number for which funds are presently available. Throughout the country there are over 1,200 individuals in training and 346 applicants waiting on registers and 624 applications in process at the reservation level. There are not sufficient funds available to take care of all present and interested applicants. Information from the Department of the Interior indicates that on a basis of present costs, an appropriation of $7,500,000 can be expected to finance the cost of 2,470 institutional training units and 1,370 on-the-job training units—in varying stages of training—during 1 fiscal year. An appropriation of $12 million would increase the number of training units to 3,906 institutional training units and 1,500 on-the-job training units. Since this group of American citizens have expressed a willingness and desire to better prepare themselves for employment on and off the reservation, and since there is practically no opportunity for unskilled labor today, what better place to assist than our own first citizens of the United States—the American Indian. We help people the world over. There is a definite need to increase the appropriations for this Indian vocational training program.

An important phase of this proposed legislation includes a 3-year nurses' training program for Indian women. It is believed a sizable number will take advantage of this extended training period provided by this legislation. Not a single registered nurse of Indian descent has been trained by the Public Health Service. Indian health officials have testified to the acute need for nurses and nurse's aids in every Indian hospital and sanitarium in the United States. We can do our country as well as our Indian population a great service by recommending favorable consideration of this proposal to amend the Adult Indian Vocational Training Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is: Shall the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1868, as amended?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] to make an announcement.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, with respect to item number four on the suspensions listed in the Whip Notice, Senate Joint Resolution 129, it may be that we will be able to consider that suspension after the conclusion of the bill about to be considered, namely, the military construction bill.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9139) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 2 hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] and one-half by myself.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 9139, with Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, budget estimates for the military construction program for fiscal year 1964 total approximately $1.9 billion. Your committee recommends appropriations of slightly over $1.5 billion, a reduction of about $403 million below the budget estimate. These reductions include the amount of $225,238,000, as a result of reductions made in the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1964 which is now Public Law 88-174.

I would like to discuss with you briefly the major areas of our reductions.

This bill consists of literally thousands of individual line items, varying from a few thousand to several million dollars. Your committee has reviewed each of these line items in its hearings and our actions are based on such considerations. There are, however, two major areas which account for a large portion of this reduction. The first of these relates to family housing. For the first time we have on the floor of the House all funds for military family housing in a single appropriation package. This includes construction of new housing facilities, improvements to existing facilities, operation and maintenance and debt payments, which includes payments for the Capehart and Wherry housing programs and the servicemen's mortgage insurance program. In the past, operation and maintenance and debt payments have been funded from appropriation items in the Department of Defense Appropriation Acts. The budget estimate for family housing is $734.4 million. The Military Construction Authorization Act reduced this program to $685.2 million. The committee recommends $645.1 million, a total reduction of approximately $89.2 million below the budget estimates. The reduction made by the committee relates to only two areas of family housing. In the fiscal year 1963 program, funds were provided for so-called relocatable family housing. This is a comparatively new method of constructing housing involving manufacturing a complete house at a plant, transporting it in one or two sections to the site and erecting it on a previously prepared base. The services encountered considerable difficulty in executing the fiscal year 1963 program. Contracts were not awarded until late in fiscal year 1963 and early fiscal year 1964. No houses have been erected or accepted by the services. The Defense Department requested an $17,175,000 for additional houses of this type in fiscal year 1964.

The other program involved in the committee reduction is that for the construction of prefabricated houses for oversea locations. To reduce the gold outflow from this country, an attempt has been made to design a prefabricated type house to be constructed in continental United States, transported to oversea locations and erected on previously prepared sites at these locations. This program also encountered considerable difficulties in fiscal year 1963. Contracts were awarded only a short time ago. No houses have been constructed and no sites have been prepared at overseas locations. The amount of $22,960,000 was requested for this program.

In their appearance before our subcommittee, officials of the Department of Defense agreed with the committee that these two housing programs were of an experimental type. They agreed that it would be necessary to await the execution of the fiscal year 1963 program to properly decide whether or not these houses were acceptable and to determine reasonable costs and construction experiences. It will be virtually impossible to receive such data during fiscal year 1964. Your committee has reluctantly removed these projects from the program, with specific directions to the Department of Defense to study in detail the execution of the fiscal year 1963 program and keep the appropriate committees of Congress informed of the results of such studies.

The request for conventional housing in the United States and in oversea locations has been approved. The total reduction attributable to denying funds for these programs is approximately $40.1 million.

Our experiences with military construction programs in the past have shown us that changes in requirements, advancing technology and highly competitive bidding constantly result in overall savings. We believe that maximum utilization must be made of funds appropriated in prior years which are still unobligated, and that the services must place real emphasis on the recoupment of funds of this nature from prior programs. Frankly, although some progress has been made in this area, but much remains to be done, there is still a tendency on the part of the services to build up so-called slush funds to provide funding for projects not included in the regular military construction program. In an attempt to effect more proper utilization of these funds, the committee has made a reduction of $21.2 million in this respect.

The balance-of-payments situation has been a problem to this committee and to the Congress for some time. In our hearings and markup sessions, we very carefully screened all oversea construction and have eliminated items we felt were not clearly essential to our operating forces. This includes such things as commissaries, administrative facilities, gymnasiums and the like. We have also insisted that others who would be serviced by some of these facilities bear a portion of the cost of their construction. As a result we have reduced the funds requested for oversea construction approximately $20.6 million below the budget estimates, based on our review of the oversea construction program, as well as those of the Department of Defense and the Armed Services Committees. In connection with the authorization bill, I believe that I can assure you that the bill now before you represents the very minimum of gold outflow consistent with our essential oversea military requirements.

Many of you have asked questions about armories and other construction projects for the Reserve and National Guard components of the military services. This year for the second time, authorizations for these facilities were requested in lump-sum fashion without specific line items. Congress authorized funds in this fashion. Your committee has appropriated the funds in similar fashion. There is no earmarking of funds for specific projects. I would like to emphasize however, that the committee has approved all of the funds requested for these programs in the three services.

You will find the details of the committee action set forth in our report. For your guidance, beginning on page 19 of the report, there is a State-by-State breakout of the funds approved for miliary construction, followed by the details of the family housing program.

Mr. Chairman, there is a particular item in this bill that I would like to discuss briefly this afternoon. Funds were requested in the amount of $200,000 for the alterations of facilities at Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind., for the Army Information School, and hopefully for a triservice information school. After considerable discussion, with the services and among ourselves, the committee has approved this item for two primary reasons.

First, because of the obvious savings which could accrue from the establishment of a triservice information school, and because of assurances that when such a school is established, it will be located at Fort Benjamin Harrison and use these facilities.

Second, was the testimony that the provision of these facilities at Fort Benjamin Harrison would result in the closure of Fort Slocum, N.Y., resulting in annual savings of approximately $1.1 million. The decision to close Fort Slocum has already been made by the Department of the Army. I was amazed to learn, however, that inactivation of Fort Slocum is not to take place until around the first of January 1966.

Mr. Chairman, I submit to you that this is ridiculous. Certainly, the alterations to the facilities which are necessary at Fort Benjamin Harrison can easily be accomplished during calendar year 1964. Frankly, I can see no good reason why Fort Slocum cannot be deactivated well before January 1966. As a matter of fact, it should be closer to January 1965, than 1966, when these considerable annual savings should begin to accrue. Certainly this committee will not tolerate such unconscionable delay and foot dragging on the part of the Department of Defense and the Army in deactivating this post and achieving these savings.

Mr. Chairman, when a committee recommends a reduction of this magnitude in a defense program, the question is always raised as to whether or not we are crippling the defense effort. First, let me point out to you that a major portion of the reduction is realized from recoupment of funds and other savings from prior year programs and the reduction in family housing. Second, your committee has approved the essential operating facilities requested in this program. Where there has been doubt in our minds we have resolved it in favor of a strong national defense. Mr. Chairman, your committee believes that we are presenting to you today a realistic military construction program. Those of us on both sides of the aisle who have participated in the lengthy and detailed hearings and in the writing of this bill do not believe that the actions taken will, in any way, shape, or form retard or damage our defense effort. On the contrary, if properly implemented, these actions will add to the defense effort of this country. This bill is based on long days and hours of searching, exhaustive hearings and research as well as careful and detailed committee markup sessions. I know that it will not satisfy every military service. Perhaps it will not satisfy every Member of this House. But I assure you that this is a solid bill. Our goal has been, and will be a program that, if properly implemented by the Defense Department and the military services will save money, make better use of existing facilities, and keep the military construction program under continuous review by those in authority in the executive branch and the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, if I might digress for a moment, the bill before you contains $9,026,000 to begin the replacement of World War II mobilization type facilities at Fort Jackson, S.C., with permanent construction. Our late colleague and onetime head of our military Construction Subcommittee on Appropriations, the Honorable John Riley, of South Carolina, long advocated such a move at this post. It has a record as being an ideal training base. John Riley had the vision to see its requirement in the Army training program. Fortunately, the Army and the Department of Defense have also finally seen this requirement. I regret that our colleague is not with us today to see the beginning of the fulfillment of his vision. Yet I am certain that as he looks down upon us today from that place where there are no wars or battles and maybe even no politics, he is smiling a happy smile that this program which he believed to be necessary for the military forces of this country, of which he was always a stanch supporter, is finally coming to pass. Its inclusion in this bill is a tribute to him and his farsighted vision.

In closing, let me call your attention to one thing. As I have stated in the past, this committee realizes that unfortunately it cannot win a popularity contest in handling these construction bills. In my opinion, the committee has done a thorough job in bringing this bill before you. I think it is a good bill. It deserves your attention, your consideration, and, I am personally convinced, your approval.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I wanted to ask a question of the gentleman from California while we are discussing this bill on the USAHOME programs. I note in the report that all of these homes have been eliminated for the fiscal year 1964, is that correct?

Mr. JONAS. That is correct, for the reason stated in the report and adverted to by the chairman of the subcommittee. We want to try them out first to see if they will work.

Mr. LAIRD. I agree with the gentleman they need to be tried out. I was hoping there would be some sort of competition which would require these individual builders to first erect a series of these homes so that we could see what we were buying. There is no requirement on the present bids in 1963 as to the time that they have to be constructed at the construction site. There are requirements as far as packaging is concerned. But as far as actual performance at the site is concerned, there are no firm requirements. It is my hope this program will be studied and that the people who are interested in constructing this kind of home will be required to perform in advance at least in the construction of one house.

Mr. JONAS. That is being done with respect to the relocatables and a contract has been let. Most of these homes are intended for use overseas, which presents a little difficult problem to construct when we take them overseas and erect them.

Mr. LAIRD. It does not have to be erected overseas. We could erect one here. We could see what the contractors do as far as performance is concerned. I am not talking about constructing them overseas. I think under the 1963 bid you will have all kinds of problems once you get the package overseas and after you start erecting homes and instead of taking 48 hours, in some cases it will take up to 5, 6, or 7 days, or possibly 2 weeks.

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to have the comment of the gentleman from Wisconsin. He will be pleased with the action the committee took this year in taking this item out of the bill because we want to prove to the satisfaction of the committee that these houses are workable and will work before we provide the money for them.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. As has been brought out, there is a requirement in the report that one of these homes be constructed. We will have information from that action before further action of the Congress in another year.

Mr. LAIRD. I want to commend the committee for its recommendations in this area because last year that was not done. I believe this is a step in the right direction.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Why not have one or more of these houses erected somewhere in the Washington area so that some of the garden-variety Members of Congress can take a look at them without having to impose the expense on the Government to haul them to some base out in the country?

Mr. JONAS. That is a good idea, but I will say to the gentleman from Iowa we have many bases in the Washington area, and we would not have any difficulty finding a place to erect a model.

Mr. Chairman, our subcommittee chairman has discussed with you, in general, the actions taken by the committee on this bill and the several major reductions we have made. I am convinced that these substantial reductions which have been made by the Congress in the authorization act and by our committee in the bill now under consideration will not impair the military efficiency of this country and will not do any disservice to the men who wear the uniform.

The bill contains funds for the complete family housing program of the military services, including construction, operation and maintenance, and debt payment. In the past, funds for the latter two activities have been carried in other appropriation acts. Due to the method of presenting these items in the President's current budget and the complications involved in comparing appropriations and estimates, it is necessary to show in our report the entire family housing program as an increase over last year. Actually, this is not the case. The family housing program recommended to you in this bill in its entirety is approximately $68,256,500 less than comparable appropriations in fiscal year 1963. The bill itself, in addition to being $403,436,000 below the budget estimates, is actually $229,640,000 under comparable appropriations for fiscal year 1963.

The family housing program before you, although providing less units than were authorized or requested in the President's budget, does provide 255 more units than were funded in fiscal year 1963. Our reductions in this field are related solely to holding in abeyance the program for relocatable housing in this country and prefabricated units overseas. We feel that it is necessary to have the benefit of the experience and knowledge derived from the execution of the fiscal year 1963 programs for these two types of housing before proceeding with the construction of additional units. I assure you that there is no one on our subcommittee who is not mindful of the requirement of adequate family housing for military personnel. This should be obvious to all concerned from our approval of funds requested for construction of conventional-type housing in this country and in oversea areas.

The reduction below the fiscal year 1963 amount is attributable in a large degree to the reduced estimates and requirements for facilities in support of our ballistic-missile weapon systems. As these systems become operational, the requirements for new facilities decrease.

Let us look at the actions taken by the committee on the specific military construction programs of the services, excluding housing and the Reserve components. The committee has approved $200,293,000 for the regular construction program of the Army. These funds, when added to unexpended balances from prior years, will make over $450 million available for military construction by the Department of the Army. A large portion of the funds approved for the Army is in support of air defense missile programs, research and development activities, and replacement of essential training facilities which are now outmoded and seriously deteriorated.

The amount of $194 million is recommended for the regular construction program of the Navy which, when added to carryover funds, will make in excess of $454 million available to the Navy for expenditure in fiscal year 1964. The projects approved for the Navy are in support of the operational efforts of the fleet and include such items as facilities in support of the Polaris ballistic missile, antisubmarine warfare, nuclear shipbuilding facilities, and essential communications items.

The committee has approved $451 million for the regular forces of the Air Force. This amount, when added to unexpended balances from prior years programs, will provide in excess of $1.2 billion for expenditure by the Air Force for fiscal year 1964. The largest single portion of the Air Force's appropriations, and for that matter the largest single item in the entire bill, is in support of the ballistic missile program. This is primarily for additional Minuteman operational sites, although funds are made available for improvements to existing Atlas and Minuteman bases. Other essential operational facilities have also been provided including continued support of the Strategic Air Command's operational forces.

In total, the bill as approved by the committee, when coupled with existing unexpended balances, will make over $2.1 billion available for the military construction programs in support of the Regular forces of the services in fiscal year 1964.

This bill also provides appropriations for loran stations. These are long range navigation facilities constructed by the Coast Guard in accordance with defense requirements approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. These facilities are, of necessity, frequently located in overseas territories. At the time of the committee action, no base rights had been obtained for over $6 million of the total program of $20.5 million. As a matter of fact, negotiations to obtain these rights had not yet been initiated. The committee has therefore denied funds for this portion of the program.

The committee has approved all of the funds requested for the Reserve components of the several services in the amount of $34 million. These funds, when added to carryover funds, will make over $107 million available for expenditure for the Reserve components in fiscal year 1964.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a sound bill. I think both the reductions which have been made and the projects which have been approved can all be justified. While I feel, in view of our national debt and other circumstances, we cannot justify such items as expensive additions to officers clubs, unnecessary branch post exchanges, unwarranted duplication of facilities, and the like, we must provide for our defense requirements.

We have made reductions in these nonessential activities, but at the same time we have provided funds which we know are necessary and justified, even in view of our critical fiscal situation, in order to preserve the military strength of this country and to provide the necessary support of military personnel at home and abroad.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. It comes to you with a unanimous recommendation of our subcommittee and our full committee and I urge its approval.

Following is a summary tabulation of actions taken to date on the military construction program for fiscal year 1964:

Budget estimate	$1,966,400,000
Reduction by authorization act	225,238,000
Revised estimate	1,741,162,000
Reduction by Committee on Appropriations	178,198,000
Total in bill under consideration	1,562,964,000
Total reductions from budget estimates (20.5 percent)	403,436,000

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would state for the record what the action of the committee was in respect to military hospitals—not in detail—but I am specifically interested due to the fact that the committee saw fit not to include funds for a military hospital at Vandenberg Air Force Base in California which, as the gentleman knows, is a relatively remote area which has grown up very rapidly. There is a tremendous influx of military personnel in that area and there are very inadequate facilities.

Mr. JONAS. I will say to my friend, the gentleman from California, that the committee report contains a discussion of the actions of the committee with respect to hospitals.

We eliminated some proposed hospitals for various reasons, in some cases the reason being that the design was not sufficiently advanced and in some cases adequate surveys had not been made indicating the facilities that were available in the civilian area where the hospitals were sought to be located. If the gentleman will read page 5, he will see a detailed explanation of what we are trying to do with respect to hospitals.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. If the gentleman will yield further, I have read that. It is my understanding that the committee felt that the Air Force had not made a sufficient survey. My question then would be this.

Inasmuch as the Vandenberg hospital is an authorized project, if the survey is made, is there every expectation that the committee will give consideration to this item next year?

Mr. JONAS. We considered every hospital request that was made. Of course, when those surveys are completed and when the proper information is presented to the committee, each hospital project will be considered on its merits.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I would respectfully refer the gentleman to the top of page 14 of the report which deals specifically with Vandenberg Air Force Base. You will note in the report there are two factors which entered into the postponement of the construction or replacement of medical facilities at this time. One is that the present facilities were rehabilitated just a few years ago when this base was reopened at a cost of $790,000. So there has been improvement of available hospital facilities. The other item is that we do not feel there has been sufficient planning with reference to the total area requirements for both Navy and Air Force installations. This is a very big base. It has an important mission. We realize we have to maintain hospital facilities and we must have adequate hospital facilities. But the committee does not feel there has been sufficient study of the actual requirements to permit a proper request for expenditures of funds.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. It is my understanding from what the gentleman from Florida has just said and from what the gentleman from North Carolina has just said that it is up to the Air Force to show by means of a survey a somewhat better justification than it has been able to do so far; is that correct?

Mr. JONAS. Yes, they would have to make out a good case and show a reason and give a justification before the committee.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McINTIRE. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman and the members of the committee to the fact that there are certain problems relating to Capehart housing at Loring Air Force Base at Limestone, Maine, and Dow Air Force Base at Bangor, Maine. Water is leaking into the cellars of these homes. I would appreciate information as to whether or not this matter has been brought to the attention of the committee and, if so, what action is taken in this bill relative to this situation.

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to respond to that. I do not think any presentation was made with respect to Loring, but we did have testimony concerning the need for repairs to about 348 housing units at Dow. The committee was amazed that the number of housing units would develop basement leaks. We went into that question quite thoroughly and explored the possibility that the contractor might be at fault and perhaps could be held responsible, but the witnesses from the Air Force told us that the leaks did not develop until after a year had expired following the completion of the construction and they did not see any basis on which the contractor could be held.

However, there is a pretty general discussion of that situation, and a pretty detailed one, I might add, beginning on page 279 and running through 280. If the gentleman from Maine will turn to that he will see what caused the damage there. It was stated that water had formed in these pockets and later drained into the basements. Apparently, from information that the gentleman from Maine now has, the same situation is developing at Loring, but we had no testimony before the committee about the situation there. We did provide funds for the repair of these units at Dow and several other Air Force bases.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida, for a further explanation.

Mr. SIKES. As the gentleman from North Carolina pointed out, there is $90,000 in this bill for the correction of the problem which exists at Dow, which is apparently quite similar to the one which has now developed at Loring. It is true that the problem at Loring is one which was not called to the attention of the committee during these hearings.

Consequently we are not now in position to attempt to do anything about the problem. Normally this is something which requires authorization. This was true in the case of Dow. An authorization by the Congress was necessary; now an appropriation is being made available. In those cases where repair or renovation is not a major problem, it sometimes is possible for it to be handled under minor construction. This is provided under general authorization and general appropriation. It appears, however, that the Loring problem is sufficiently serious in nature that it would be necessary for the Air Force to come to Congress for an authorization in advance of a request for an appropriation. May I take this opportunity to commend the distinguished gentleman from Maine for his zealous work in behalf of his constitutents.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, may I read into the RECORD at this point, for the benefit of the gentleman from Maine who raised this question, two responses by witnesses before the committee.

Colonel Manning said:

> Sir, as you recall, we built 1,010 Capehart units at Dow in two different projects. At the time our engineering analysis did not disclose pockets of water. Our test borings did not bring this out. Of course, in developing 1,000 units we changed the flow of water to some extent and undoubtedly dis-

> turbed the subterranean flow of water so that 348 out of the 1,000 units have this wet basement problem.

Mr. Julius, a witness for the Air Force, made this statement in response to questions as to whether we might not hold someone responsible for this damage. He said:

> I think this is something that nobody could foresee. We could not foresee the existence of these clay pockets which trap the water. The water builds up hydrostatic pressure on the foundation walls, and if there is the slightest crack in the wall, naturally water will seep into the basement.

Mr. McINTIRE. I appreciate the opportunity to bring this matter to the attention of the committee. Am I correct in assuming, then, that insofar as the committee was presented with the need at Dow Air Force Base, that appropriations are in this bill to cover that need?

Mr. JONAS. That is correct.

Mr. McINTIRE. And that the situation at Loring will be a matter that the Air Force must bring before the committee for appropriate authorization, if it is extensive to that point, and for appropriations in the next fiscal year?

Mr. JONAS. I may say that there will be an opportunity, if committee action is required, for them to undertake to take care of it on a reprograming basis, if that becomes necessary.

Mr. McINTIRE. If the gentleman will yield further, may I sincerely request that the committee give this matter its attention. These wet basements are a very serious problem. I will sincerely appreciate the committee's attention to this matter.

I thank the gentleman very kindly.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I have examined this bill most carefully. It involves some 400 different projects and some 1,300 line items. I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] and the able members of his subcommittee on the carefulness and thoroughness with which they have made these line-item appropriations.

I would like to take this opportunity to make a few observations concerning H.R. 9139, the military construction appropriation bill.

As the Members of the House are aware, the military construction authorization bill submitted by the Departments originally requested new construction authorization in the amount of approximately $1.9 billion. The committee by Public Law 88–174, reduced this authorization request to $1.68 billion, a reduction of more than $250 million.

The House Committee on Appropriations has now recommended appropriations for military construction for fiscal year 1964 amounting to approximately $1.5 billion. Included in this figure are appropriations applied against prior years authorization and, therefore, the figure recommended by the Committee on Appropriations is not directly comparable to the authorization provided for fiscal year 1964. However, my analysis of the recommended appropriation against the authorization originally provided by the Congress in Public Law 88–174 indicates a reduction by the Committee on Appropriations of approximately $132 million.

The major reductions which comprise this $132 million include the following:

	Million
Army	$13
Navy	16
Air Force	63
Housing	40
Total	132

On the basis of the reductions made by the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress in the authorization act, the Departments will receive almost $400 million less for military construction for fiscal year 1964 than was originally requested by the Departments. This is indeed a very drastic reduction in the departmental request.

I do not entirely agree with the reductions made by the Appropriations Committee at certain specific locations. However, I fully recognize that honest men can differ in their judgments as to the necessity for providing certain types of new facilities to the military. On the other hand, I am greatly disturbed by the unwillingness of the Committee on Appropriations to fully fund the housing requested by the Departments and approved by the Congress in Public Law 88–174.

The reduction made by the Committee on Appropriations in the funding requested for military housing will, if left unchanged, preclude the construction of 2,385 urgently required units of housing.

The report submitted by the Committee on Appropriations in support of H.R. 9139 indicates that the Committee on Appropriations fully concurs in the requirement for 10,140 units of military family housing in the fiscal year 1964 program as approved by the Congress in Public Law 88–174.

Nonetheless, the committee has seen fit to eliminate 2,385 units of this housing simply because it questions the practicality of satisfying this housing requirement by the use of relocatable houses or so-called USAHOMES. These types of housing are basically prefabricated housing, and would be utilized in instances in which it would be advantageous to our Government.

I have included in my statement a summary table which reflects economies which will result from the use of relocatables and USAHOMES. I believe that the approach taken by the Department of Defense in utilizing this type of housing is fully justified and deserves the support of not only the authorizing committee but the entire Congress.

Also included in my statement is a summary of the action taken by the Committee on Appropriations in respect to housing as contrasted to that originally provided in the authorization act.

ANALYSIS OF APPROPRIATION COMMITTEE CUTS IN FISCAL YEAR 1964 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION HOUSING AUTHORIZED BY PUBLIC LAW 88–174

The Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1964 authorized the construction of a total of 10,140 units of family housing at a cost of $183,969,000. The House Appropriations Committee has recommended appropriations for 7,755 of these units with a corresponding appropriation of $143,828,000.

The effect of the House Appropriations Committee action is a net reduction of 2,385 units of family housing representing a dollar reduction of $40,141,000.

The reductions made by the Appropriations Committee in the fiscal year 1964 military construction program for family housing was entirely confined to the elimination of those units which were programed for either so-called relocatable housing or USAHOMES.

Relocatable housing is prefabricated housing intended for use in continental United States. It is housing which is prefabricated at the factory in a unit which can be separated into two sections and transported by truck or rail to its ultimate site. It therefore lends itself to maximum salvage and reusability in the event housing no longer is required at the site.

USAHOMES are prefabricated homes which are panelized and lend themselves to being broken down into many relatively small units which can be shipped overseas and reassembled. This prefabricated housing is specifically designed to meet the gold-flow problem encountered by our military forces overseas. By virtue of fabrication of this housing in the United States, only a minimum amount of U.S. dollars is required overseas for the site preparation for this housing.

The Appropriations Committee has deleted both the relocatable housing and the USAHOMES housing included in the fiscal year 1964 program. The reason given in the committee report is that the Department has not as yet developed any actual cost experience in respect to the use of this type of home to satisfy its housing requirements both in domestic and foreign areas.

At the present time, the Department in the fiscal year 1963 program has entered into contracts involving 1,282 relocatable houses and 510 USAHOMES.

Of the 1,282 relocatable housing units presently under contract, 1,012 are intended for the domestic market in continental United States and 270 are scheduled for construction in the Philippines.

The Department advises that occupancy of the first available units of relocatable housing will occur early in March of 1964, with complete occupancy of all relocatable housing sometime late in the fall of 1964.

The Department has advised that all of the 510 USAHOMES scheduled for the fiscal year 1963 program have been placed under contract. These units are scheduled for four oversea locations. The first production unit of the USAHOMES is scheduled to be delivered on December 9, 1963, with beneficial occupancy of these homes overseas scheduled to begin in the early fall of 1964.

The Department has advised that the anticipated cost of USAHOMES delivered and constructed overseas will be less than conventional housing provided at the same locations.

CONCLUSION

The reductions made by the Appropriations Committee in the authorized military construction housing program for fiscal year 1964 was entirely confined to relocatable and USAHOMES housing.

All conventional-type housing scheduled for the domestic market and authorized in the fiscal year 1964 Military Construction Act—Public Law 88-174—is recommended for appropriations. The Committee on Appropriations also approved 790 units of conventionally constructed housing at foreign bases. This includes 490 at Fort Buckner, Okinawa—Army; 100 at Kadena AFB, Okinawa—Air Force; and 200 at Naha Air Force Base, Okinawa—Air Force.

A complete summary of the action taken by the Appropriations Committee on military housing, as contrasted to the authorization bill, follows:

Fiscal year 1964 military construction housing

SUMMARY OF DENIED APPROPRIATIONS

Service	Units	Amount
ARMY		
Authorized	1,847	$36,052,000
Appropriated	1,703	33,347,000
Total	−144	−2,705,000
NAVY		
Authorized	4,248	75,242,000
Appropriated	3,802	67,437,000
Total	−446	−7,805,000
AIR FORCE		
Authorized	4,045	72,675,000
Appropriated	2,250	43,044,000
Total	−1,795	−29,631,000
SUMMARY		
Authorized	10,140	183,969,000
Appropriated	7,755	143,828,000
Total	−2,385	−40,141,000

DENIED APPROPRIATIONS, BY LOCATION

Service	Units	Amount
ARMY (ALL FOREIGN)		
ASA location 04	60	$1,105,000
ASA location 23	84	1,600,000
Total	144	2,705,000
NAVY (ALL FOREIGN)		
NRS, Londonderry, Ireland	30	525,000
NSGA, Edzell, Scotland	90	1,575,000
NRS, Thurso, Scotland	26	455,000
Classified location	300	5,250,000
Total	446	7,805,000
AIR FORCE		
Domestic program:		
K. I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Mich	100	1,500,000
Malmstrom Air Force Base, Mont	200	3,000,000
Grand Forks Air Force Base, N. Dak	300	4,500,000
Minot Air Force Base, N. Dak	300	4,500,000
Various locations (aircraft control and warning)	(245)	(3,675,000)
Luke-Williams Air Force Station, Ariz	11	165,000
Klamath Air Force Station, Calif	18	270,000
Red Bluff Air Force Station, Calif	18	270,000
Rockville Air Force Station, Ind	10	150,000
Waverly Air Force Station, Iowa	20	300,000
Empire Air Force Station, Mich	23	$345,000
Chandler Air Force Station, Minn	10	150,000
Kalispell Air Force Station, Mont	10	150,000
Winnemucca Air Force Station, Nev	27	405,000
Sacramento Peak Observatory, N. Mex	10	150,000
Finley Air Force Station, N. Dak	20	300,000
North Bend Air Force Station, Oreg	18	270,000
Naselle Air Force Station, Wash	18	270,000
Othello Air Force Station, Wash	12	$180,000
Antigo Air Force Station, Wis	20	300,000
Subtotal, domestic	1,145	17,175,000
Foreign program:		
Goose Airbase, Canada	200	4,086,000
Clark Airbase, Philippines	250	4,650,000
Site QL	200	3,720,000
Subtotal, foreign	650	12,456,000
Total, Air Force	1,795	29,631,000

Fiscal year 1963 relocatable family housing program

Installation	Number of units	Contract amounts		Total estimated cost	Original estimate	Occupancy, 1964	
		Procurement	Site			Initial	Full
Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Mich.	300	$2,979,000	$1,199,986	$4,550,000	$5,130,000	February	June.
Kincheloe Air Force Base, Mich.	200	1,986,000	1,042,592	3,285,500	3,500,000	June	July.
Glasgow Air Force Base, Mont.	200	1,957,572	809,150	2,959,000	3,500,000	April	Do.
K. I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Mont.	100	993,000	417,997	1,572,000	1,750,000	July	August.
A.C. & W. sites	212	2,233,000	1,011,868	3,530,000	3,180,000	April	July.
Total				15,896,800	17,060,000		
Net savings				1,163,200			
Outside the United States (Philippine Islands):							
Clark Airbase, P.I.	250	2,593,700	462,037	4,324,000	4,650,000	March	Do.
Naval Station, Tarlac, P.I.	20	207,500	36,960	346,000	372,000	do	Do.
Total				4,670,000	5,022,000		
Net savings				352,000			

NOTE

Relocatables in the United States:
Procurement cost includes factory fabrication, transportation to the site, and erection on preprepared foundations.
Total cost includes design, supervision, and Government overhead.
Relocatables in the Philippines:
Procurement cost includes factory fabrication and transportation to U.S. dockside.
Total cost includes design, supervision, Government overhead, and transportation costs.

Fiscal year 1963 U.S. Army home family housing program

Location	Number of units	Procurement contract	Transportation	Estimate site costs	Estimate total costs	Original estimate	Occupancy, 1964	
							Initial	Full
ASA location 04	60	$457,080	$171,060	$180,000	$837,560	$900,000	April	July.
ASA location 12	156	1,268,627	368,100	447,000	2,153,280	2,705,500	July	November.
Naval Station, Argentia.	195	1,562,480	334,070	1,520,000	3,584,850	6,825,000	August	December.
Site I-5	100	761,800	243,800	210,000	1,260,690	1,750,000	October	Do.
Total					7,836,380	12,180,500		
Estimated savings.					4,344,120			

NOTE.—Procurement contract includes factory fabrication and delivery of export crated components to U.S. dockside.

Estimated reduction in foreign exchange costs (FEC) U.S. Army home concept versus conventional construction

	Conventional construction		U.S. Army home concept		Estimated FEC reduction
	FEC	Percent of total costs	FEC	Percent of total costs	
ASA location 04	$747,000	83	$149,920	17.9	$597,080
ASA location 12	2,245,570	83	381,130	17.7	1,864,440
Naval Station, Argentia	5,801,000	85	921,300	25.7	4,879,700
Site I-5	1,470,000	84	189,100	15.0	1,280,900
Estimated FEC savings					8,622,120

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, at this time I want to express my gratitude to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] for his comments in behalf of this bill, not only in my own behalf but on behalf of the committee. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman from Georgia that I did not have the opportunity earlier in the day to express my views pertaining to the gentleman's birthday and the possible retirement of the gentleman from the House of Representatives at some date in the future. Wherever the gentleman goes and whatever the gentleman does, I wish for him the utmost in happiness and a great longevity enjoying it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON].

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to thank the gentleman, the able chairman of the subcommittee, for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this military construction appropriation bill and to commend the subcommittee and its staff for their contribution to the military posture of this Nation. They deserve the commendation of this body and the American people for their dedication to duty and the countless hours spent in resolving the manifold problems of such a gigantic and important program.

While my enthusiastic support is given to the entire military construction program, designed to keep our Nation militarily prepared, I note with particular pride the $9 million appropriation for Fort Jackson, S.C., within my congressional district. For many years this superb installation has been recognized by military authorities as one of the most ideal infantry basic training facilities in the United States.

It is to the advantage of our overall military posture that the Defense Department has now, and wisely so, recommended and approved some permanent buildings for Fort Jackson. I trust that this appropriation will be only the beginning of the full development of Jackson on a permanent basis.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, let me say that while I am privileged to serve at this time when the first permanent construction is to be made at Fort Jackson, I should like to emphasize that this action is the fruition of the tireless efforts of the late Congressman John J. Riley and his devoted wife and successor in Congress, the Honorable Corrine Riley. His memory is revered by South Carolinians, and the best wishes of our citizens accompany Mrs. Riley during her period of temporary disability. Both were dedicated and able public servants.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, it is very pleasing that my distinguished chairman and my beloved colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], is back with us. It has been necessary for him to undergo minor surgery and I am glad he is better and that he is back

Mr. Chairman, the estimates considered by the subcommittee for military construction total $1,966,400,000. There was a cut of $225,238,000 by the authorizing committees. Your subcommittee recommends a total of $1,562,964,000, a reduction of $403,436,000 below the budget estimates, and a cut of $178,198,000 below the authorizing figures. This represents a reduction overall of slightly more than 20 percent, and a 10-percent cut by this committee.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out that all of the funds requested for the Reserves and the National Guard forces for armory construction are approved at locations designated by the National Guard and by the Reserves. The committee made no changes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in making the reductions to which I referred, the subcommittee adopted several basic policies. First, projects were eliminated or estimates were reduced where the costs appeared excessive or where plans and designs were too elaborate. There is considerable variation between the services for construction of similar-type facilities. This, we do not feel is a realistic or a justifiable practice. For example, the committee fails to see why bachelor officers' quarters for the Air Force in Korea should be programed at a cost of $5,700 per man, while Army facilities for similar requirements at the same location are programed at a cost of not to exceed $3,600 per man. That represents a difference of $2,100. This is an extreme case, but it emphasizes the point.

Second, projects were eliminated or estimates were reduced where plans and designs were inadequate.

For instance, funds were requested in the amount of $7.6 million for a science building at the Naval Academy in Annapolis. Of course, we must have adequate facilities for the education of cadets at the Military Academies and, of course, satisfactory facilities for a proper teaching job to be done in the sciences is essential. The committee realizes that. But this money was deleted because a new site is necessary. The original plans are not suitable for the new site and new plans must be prepared and approved. There is no way for those plans to be completed and a contract to be awarded during the fiscal year 1964.

The committee takes the position there is no point in appropriating money which cannot be used in this fiscal year.

Third. The committee insists, as it has in prior years, that maximum utilization be made of existing facilities. This is the toughest nut of all to crack. Everybody in the services wants new facilities. They want modern facilities. Sometimes these are necessary. This is a modern age. Military science is moving forward very rapidly and frequently new facilities are essential. But where the services can properly use present facilities or where an additional year of use can be obtained without injuring the defense program, we insist that it be done.

Fourth. The committee has disapproved projects that are not clearly essential to the military posture of the country at this time or in the foreseeable future. The military posture is constantly changing. What we think we need now may be out of date next year. We try to insist that only those facilities be constructed for which there will be a continuing need. There may be changes in troop locations. For instance, there may be troop withdrawals from Europe. Bases may be closed in this country. Those factors must be taken into consideration. This committee tries to stay abreast of the times.

Fifth. The committee insists that maximum utilization be made of funds appropriated for support of prior year programs that remain uncommitted or unobligated. Sometimes the picture changes so rapidly because of modernization in warfare that structures programed a year ago would not be useful now. Sometimes construction or other difficulties arise which make it impossible for contracts to be awarded. We want to be sure prior year authorizations are kept realistic and that we know where the money is and for what it is being expended.

These are nonyear funds, and the committee finds it must ride herd on them all the time until they are expended.

In addition to these basic policies which the committee follows and which we have followed in the past, we have very carefully screened all overseas construction and eliminated those items not clearly essential to the requirements of our operational forces. We have done this because of the critical situation with which we are all familiar regarding balance of payments.

In this connection I can point out to you that the program was carefully reviewed by the Department of Defense just prior to the markups and to the report on this bill. You may be sure that the bill now before you represents the very minimum gold outflow consistent with our oversea military requirements as we understand those requirements at this time.

Mr. Chairman, for the first time this bill carries in it all funds which are related to military family housing. This has not been true heretofore. This includes construction, operation, maintenance, and debt payments. Some of these items previously were carried under the defense appropriation bill. I believe this procedure over the years will give us savings, possibly appreciable savings. I am sure this will insure management of the program on the part of the military.

Some of our colleagues have expressed concern about the depth of the cuts in military family housing. On the surface there does appear to be a sharp cut in housing. I realize, and so do you, that housing is one of the most critical items in maintaining a high type of personnel in the armed services. This is true of family housing, it is true of quarters for troops, both officers and enlisted; we seek to be realistic and not injurious.

We had a budget estimate of $734,400,000 for housing. It has been reduced to $645,171,000, a cut of $89,229,000. Actually, however, we have approved all conventional housing which was proposed for the continental United States.

We took out the relocatable housing and USAHOMES portable housing, most of which is for oversea construction. For detailed explanation, I respectfully refer the committee today to pages 17, 18, and 19 of the report.

Please note this report spells out the fact that we do not disapprove these concepts of housing. We simply feel that there has not been sufficient experience in construction and use of these houses to determine whether they are going to be wholly satisfactory and economical for use by families of military personnel. We do feel that there should be additional construction and use experience by the defense agencies. Houses were authorized and funded in 1963 which have not yet been constructed. When they are built and in use we will have much more adequate information. We have asked the military to take a good, long, careful look and then come back with their recommendations. We want good housing where it is needed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the members of the committee will turn to the committee report, you will find the details of our actions set forth on the first 19 pages, and then beginning at page 19 there is a State-by-State list of all the construction by States. Beginning on page 36 there is a listing of all the items for family housing. This is a complete report. I think it will give you the entire story.

The bill was reported unanimously by the subcommittee after very detailed hearings and a very detailed markup session. There was harmony throughout in the efforts and work of the subcommittee. I know that my colleagues would want me to pay particular tribute to the leadership of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], and I am very pleased to pay similar tribute to the very fine work done by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] on the minority side.

This is a good bill. It represents a sizable reduction in budget estimates; one of the largest reductions that has been brought to you in an appropriation bill this year. At the same time, I believe it does provide adequately for this portion of our military posture, and I urge that the bill be approved.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, but would like to yield myself 2 minutes to associate myself with remarks made by the chairman of our subcommittee when he paid his compliments to the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, whose birthday we celebrate today, and who has announced he will voluntarily retire from Congress at the end of this term, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

We on the Military Construction Appropriations Subcommittee necessarily rely a great deal on the work of the Armed Services Committee. The Armed Services Committee, of which the distinguished Chairman of the Committee of the Whole this afternoon is also an outstanding member, and I know he will agree with what I say, gets the first crack at the military construction program. They have detailed hearings and present to the Congress an authorization bill. It is only after that bill becomes law that we are called upon to exercise our judgment and discretion in providing funds to implement the bill which they have approved and submitted to the House.

The distinguished gentleman from Georgia has for many years served as chairman of that committee. On the occasion of his birthday I should like to join my colleagues who have previously expressed their respect to him and to wish for him a long, happy, and useful life in retirement when he voluntarily surrenders his seat in the House of Representatives.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] and the members of his committee for the excellent work which has been done in bringing this bill to the floor. In particular, we in West Virginia are extremely grateful that $3,484,000 has been included in this bill for the relocation of communication facilities at the Naval Radio Station, Sugar Grove, W. Va.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, the military construction appropriation bill which we are now considering contains several items of interest and importance to the military in the State of Rhode Island. These items include: $400,000 for construction at the Naval War College, Newport, R.I.; $630,000 for construction at the Naval Public Works Center, Newport, R.I.; $834,000 for construction at the U.S. Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, R.I.; $3,350,000 for family housing at the U.S. Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, R.I.

The projects mentioned have been requested by the Department of Defense and approved by the Committee on Appropriations. I urge that the House vote favorably on the allocation of these funds which are much needed by the Rhode Island naval installations I have mentioned.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I find that I must vote against the passage of this bill (H.R. 9139) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, for the reason that it includes an appropriation of $200,000 in connection with the Brooklyn Navy Yard for new alterations for electronic data processing machine installation.

The allowance and expenditure of this substantial sum of money means the closing and discontinuance of activities now carried on within the Jay Street Annex in an eight-story modern building erected during World War II. I feel that the closing of this building and the proposed relocation of activities means further curtailment in the work of the Brooklyn Navy Yard. You may consider my vote a protest against reduction of work in the finest naval shipyard in the Nation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

FARM INCOME

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, there is featured on the front page of this morning's issue of the Washington Post a discussion of a topic seldom considered by the metropolitan press. It is entitled "Farm Income Expected to Drop by $1 Billion Over 2 Year Period."

It goes on to say that the Department of Agriculture had some bad news for the farmer yesterday.

The Department economists estimated that net farm income will decline by nearly $400 million this year and may go down by as much as another $600 million next year.

Thus making a total reduction of $1 billion in net farm income over a 2-year period.

The 1964 outlook issue of the department agricultural publication on the farm income situation attributes the 1963 decline in net income "to production expenses rising faster than realized gross farm income."

This article follows an article in the Washington Star, reported by the Associated Press on the subject of hog prices, as follows:

> Hogs are an important source of farm income and general economic well-being in Iowa, Illinois, Missouri, Nebraska, South Dakota, Minnesota, and Indiana.

Right now producers are getting disappointingly low prices for hogs and an Agricultural Department report issued Monday showed prices for the country as a whole in mid-September averaging $15.40 a hundred pounds, $2.70 lower than a year ago.

But the reduction in hog prices tells only a part of the story of dwindling returns from hog raising.

Here is a feature which is difficult for us to understand—action by the Department of Agriculture in deliberately encouraging and manipulating to lower the price of farm products and the total farm income.

I cannot imagine the Department of Labor advocating and urging lower wages and lower labor income. But according to this statement, the Department of Agriculture is following exactly that policy.

This article says that "profits on hogs are determined by the prices farmers have to pay for corn, the major livestock feed, as well as prices paid for hogs." It makes no effort to raise the price of hogs. But it proposes to hammer down the price of corn in order to make hog raising profitable. It states:

> In mid-September of this year, the national average for corn prices was $1.21 a bushel.
>
> The administration—

That is the Department of Agriculture—

> is moving quietly to correct this situation not by increasing the price of hogs but by lowering the price of corn and thereby reducing hog production costs.

They are sacrificing the corn farmer for the benefit of the hog farmer. But everybody knows that cheap feed means cheap livestock. In other words the Department is moving deliberately to decrease the prices and the income of both the corn farmer and the hog farmer. The press report says:

> Without public notice it has resumed offering Government-owned surplus corn on

> the market to compete with supplies held by farmers and dealers.

The storage of grain was initiated to permit the farmer to hold his crops for a better price. But the Department is using the agency intended to help the farmer to destroy farm economy. It is quietly throwing corn on the market just at the time calculated to depress the price.

Note what the editor says: "Officials"—that is, of the Department of Agriculture—"hope and expect"—hope and expect—"within a month or so, corn prices will drop."

I have never heard of any official of the Department of Labor hoping and expecting that the wages of labor will drop, but the Department of Agriculture officials expect that:

> Within a month or so corn prices will drop to the 1962 level of around $1.07 per bushel. Government sales coupled with movement of new-crop corn into the market, they said, should bring this about. And they are contributing to it by feeding into the market the reserves which they hold in order to force down the price.

The general decline of farm prices is also affecting the market for cattle.

The press reports:

> Prices for choice fed steers at Omaha last week dropped under $23. Farmers are gloomy about 1964 cattle prices. Cattle prices go from bad to worse.

By contrast there appears simultaneously an article by the Associated Press to the effect that, "New Wage Floors Giving Pay Raise to 2,600,000 People." "Some 2,600,000 workers receive a pay increase." While the farmers prices are dropping, wages of labor are going up.

> Labor Secretary Wirtz said the increase from $1.15 an hour will add about $365 million to their annual incomes. The new pay increase is applicable only to those covered by the law prior to 1961. Those added to coverage by the law since that time will continue receiving a minimum of $1 an hour, but will have to be paid premium pay for work beyond 44 hours in 1 week. The 4 million employees in this group will catch up to the first group in minimum wages and shorter workweek by 1965 under an escalator schedule.

This increase is purely by force of law passed by Congress and signed by the President. "The group originally covered by provisions of the act now must be paid at least time and a half for any work beyond 40 hours in 1 week.

"We have come a long way since the Fair Labor Standards Act was enacted 25 years ago," Mr. Witrz said in his statement. "Gains since that time have contributed to a higher standard of living and a stabilized national economy," he said.

The farmer starts work before dawn and works until after dusk. He does not have any 44-hour week. The laboring man is the only representative of his family at work. His children do not work. There is a child labor law but it does not apply to farm children or farm wives. On the farm the farmer is working from sunrise to sunset, and his entire family with him. The wife and the children work long hours without personal compensation.

And the farmer is producing as he has never produced before. Never before has the Nation been so well fed with such high quality food and in such variety at so low a price in hours of labor as today. But these newspaper accounts indicate that we are rewarding him by reducing farm prices and the little pittance he has been receiving.

Mr. Chairman, the implication we have is clear as far as wages are concerned. Further increases are ahead despite the emphasis or need for cost cutting across the board.

The estimates are that wages will increase 3 to 5 percent next year, plus higher fringe-benefit cost. And, there is no end in sight, no letup in the continued increase in wages. And that is as it should be.

Mr. Chairman, when I first came to the House of Representatives there was not a single law on the statute books that protected labor. They were at the mercy of their employer. They took whatever he paid. They had no rights of collective bargaining.

I have voted for every law to give labor its present status. I voted for the original Wagner Act. I do not think there is any other Member of Congress here today who voted for that act. It was the first law recognizing the rights of labor. I voted for the Fair Labor Standards Act. I voted to give labor the right of collective bargaining. I voted to reduce his hours and to increase his pay.

And that is my position today. Holy Writ tells us: "The laborer is worthy of his hire."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Everybody but the farmer is getting increased pay and getting increased prices, and getting increased income—everybody in America. Every other class, profession, or calling is receiving more every year.

Personal income this last year is up $60 billion here in the United States, an average of over $300 per person. Corporate profits are up 40 percent. Consumer prices increased an average of 3.8 percent a year and wholesale prices 4.4 percent. And, remember, that the farmer not only is getting less for his labor, less for products and less on his investment, but he must pay these increased prices paid everyone else.

As the price he receives comes down, the cost of production, farm machinery, fertilizer, insecticides, fencing, and everything else he must have goes up. He is being ground between the upper and the nether millstones. His prices are coming down, but his cost of living and his cost of production, is going up. Interest is higher. Taxes have practically doubled. The cost of sending his children to college is prohibitive.

Mr. Chairman, the net farm income according to the Department of Agriculture is to be down, perhaps, 5 percent from 1963, $600 million less from wheat alone. The Department says the average of all farm prices is due to be lower next year. There is no hope whatever unless Congress will do for the farmer what it has done for every other producer.

Mr. Chairman, we are having trouble in this country. We are facing critical economic problems. One of the first is unemployment. On top of that 15 percent of our factory capacity is idle. Why are there unemployed? Why are our factories not running to full capacity? Because the prime requirement for a high level economy is a strong market. We are dodging, twisting, and taking every step, turn, and device in the world to get rid of unemployment except the right one.

If American agriculture received a fair income it alone would constitute a market that would absorb every unemployed laborer and would consume everything our factories can turn out.

Mr. Chairman, if we are so un-American as to want to live at the expense of those who feed us—even if we are willing to grind them down to poverty and serfdom—let us for our own welfare open this exhaustless market for American industry.

The farmer does not hoard. He spends immediately every cent we pay him. Let us live and let live. Let us pay our way as we go and make this the most prosperous Nation the world has ever seen.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], on the splendid speech he has just made. He is 100 percent right. It must be remembered that all wealth springs from Mother Earth. Mother Earth is our economic generating plant, and when the farmer's dollar is worth 100 cents at the marketplace he purchases more than twice, dollarwise, in manufactured goods than do the rest of us on the average year in and year out.

The farmer's dollar during the past decade has only been worth on the average 80 cents at the marketplace. So you need not wonder why we have unemployment in this country of ours, why we have over 5 million people unemployed today. As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has said, if the farmer is prosperous today everybody would be at work and there would be no unemployment. He is so right.

Let us go back a few years when the top union bosses of the packinghouse unions asked for a 9-percent increase in wages. Mike DiSalle was then Director of Price Administration. So he had the Congress roll back cattle prices 10 percent as of July 1, 1951. The committee wanted to know why he was asking for this rollback. He said that cattle prices were too high. But the fact was he wanted to use that 10-percent saving to pay the union labor in the packinghouses the 9-percent increase they asked for.

Then he was asked, "Where does the consumer come in?" He said, "I am going to roll back prices 4 percent on September 1, and another 4 percent on December 1." He did not get the job done. But the Congress did let Mr.

DiSalle roll back cattle prices 10 percent.

If you will look at the record you will see from that day to this day not only cattle prices but hog prices, poultry prices and all meat prices have been on the toboggan.

Look at the record.

Then to add insult to injury, the tariffs have been reduced on live cattle, live hogs, poultry, and meat of every nature. And lo and behold, a day or so ago I saw where the President is considering another reduction in those tariffs of 50 percent.

What goes on here? Is the American farmer, from the breadbasket of America, to be ruined completely by his own Government? Well, I hope not. The American farmer is a patriotic person. During World War II, with his boys in the service all over the world, he and his wife and the younger children left at home, boys and girls, produced more feed, food, and fiber than has ever been produced before in the history of this Nation. Yes, Uncle Sam said produce, produce, produce, and he did, and he learned how to produce more, and he is producing more today than we can consume. And he is being penalized because of that demand on the farmers to produce, and today he is suffering with an 80-cent dollar.

I hope and pray that some day soon we will have a Secretary of Agriculture that was born and raised on a farm and that plowed a furrow or two before he was made Secretary of Agriculture, one who really knows what makes the old mare go. When I talk about making the old mare go on the farm, I am talking about our whole economy from top to bottom, which is dependent on the soil, the 6 inches of topsoil on which we all live, and from there on up, everybody that lives in this country. You let the farmer down much more and, believe you me, one of these fine days he may revolt, and then when we get a scarcity of feed, food, and fiber in America, then you will have something to worry about. But do not worry. The farmers of America are too patriotic to "take out" on anybody. God bless the farmers of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, and facilities for the Navy as currently authorized in military public works or military construction Acts, in sections 2673 and 2675 of title 10, United States Code, including personnel in the Bureau of Yards and Docks and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, to remain available until expended, $194,000,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order in part and to speak in order in part.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 204]

Abbitt
Abele
Ashbrook
Avery
Ayres
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Battin
Bennett, Mich.
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Bromwell
Brotzman
Broyhill, Va.
Buckley
Burkhalter
Cameron
Celler
Clark
Cooley
Cramer
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Denton
Derwinski
Diggs
Dorn
Duncan
Fascell
Feighan
Fogarty
Foreman
Frelinghuysen
Gary
Gibbons
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Gubser
Halleck
Hanna
Harding
Harris
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Healey
Hébert
Hoffman
Holifield
Hosmer
Jennings
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
Kluczynski
Knox
Leggett
Lesinski
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
McDowell
Macdonald
Madden
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Meader
Milliken
Morrison
Multer
Nelsen
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Neill
Osmers
Passman
Pepper
Pilcher
Powell
Quie
Randall
Rhodes, Pa.
Rodino
St Germain
St. Onge
Schwengel
Shelley
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Staebler
Taft
Taylor
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Trimble
Utt
Whalley
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) having resumed the chair, Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H.R. 9139, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 324 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to speak briefly about the agricultural situation and say that I agree wholeheartedly with my friend from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and my colleague from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] in their statements that the farmers of this country are taking a real financial shellacking these days. But this did not just start yesterday or the day before. This latest shellacking started some time ago, when an Agricultural Secretary, not by the name of Ezra Benson but by the name of Orville Freeman, started throwing Government-held surplus corn onto the market. As the gentleman from Missouri well knows, this New Frontiersman could not throw corn onto the market in such quantities without creating cheap feed, and cheap feed always means cheap prices for farmers, whether it be hogs, cattle, poultry, sheep, wool, hides, or whatever it may be.

The other day we had a bill on the floor of the House to stabilize coffee prices not to the consumers of this this country but to the coffee producers of South and Central America. With a substantial vote the House approved a bill to take care of the economy of the foreign coffee producers at the expense of American consumers. But on that day I did not see a single bleeding heart in the House feeling sorry for the farmers of this country, who are taking a price beating. So I am pleased to hear the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] raising the issue here today with respect to the injustices that are being dealt out by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman and others to the producers of the food and fiber for this Nation. I hope that in the future the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and I am sure he will, will have the same consideration for the agricultural producers of this country that he had for the coffee producers in South and Central America.

Now I should like to ask a question concerning the bill itself, and I refer to pages 6 and 7 of the bill.

If I may have the attention of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES]; what do you mean by the phrase "debt payments" on pages 6 and 7 of the bill?

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SIKES. These are payments for Capehart and Wherry housing that has been acquired by the Government.

Mr. GROSS. That is what you mean by "debt payments," the payment of debts outstanding in this bill?

Mr. SIKES. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. That is the only provision made in the bill for debt payments?

Mr. SIKES. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand that Congress has approved the spending of $141½ million on the Air Force Academy?

Mr. SIKES. That is the amount authorized and funded by the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. And it was supposed to have cost us—what was the original estimate—about $70 million or was it $40 million?

Mr. SIKES. What proved to be a very costly institution, but one which ranks among the leaders in educational facilities.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand then that there is no money in this bill for the Air Force Academy?

Mr. SIKES. There is no money in this bill for the Air Force Academy.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

A little while ago somebody suggested that troops may be withdrawn from Europe. Does this mean if troops are withdrawn from Europe that we are going to have to build new camps or have we available facilities in this country to house troops that may be returned from Europe?

Mr. SIKES. The point has been made that this bill was written so as to hold down to a minimum the construction to be done overseas. There is the distinct possibility that some troop units may be returned. That was the principal reason other than the question of the gold flow. If troops now stationed overseas are brought back to this country, there are adequate facilities for them to be housed without the necessity for additional construction, except possibly in cases involving modern operational facilities.

Mr. GROSS. That is without the building of any new camps?

One further question, if I have the time. Can anyone on the committee tell me what has hapened to the Air Force hospital that was built in France which up to 2 or 3 years ago had never been used? What is the status of that costly enterprise?

Mr. SIKES. It is now being used for storage facilities.

Mr. GROSS. A costly hospital is being used for a storage depot?

Mr. SIKES. Yes; a field hospital and other hospital supplies are stored there.

Mr. GROSS. It is a storage depot of some kind?

Mr. SIKES. That is correct. It is being used not as a hospital but as a hospital storage facility. This has not been a very bright chapter in Air Force annals—but it did happen. It was built; then the troops were moved away. In this bill we seek to avoid a repetition of this sort of thing.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this bill, calling for the expenditure of more than $1.5 billion, purely for military construction, is unacceptable to me. There is no reduction over spending for this purpose as compared with last year. The condition of the U.S. Treasury will not stand this strain. In view of the huge burden of spending for the missile program, the size of the conventional forces must be progressively reduced. It is impossible to maintain both at present levels.

And I am not at all impressed by the huge outlays of money that this bill provides for certain States such as California, Texas, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, Virginia, and others. This to the complete exclusion of some States and the virtual exclusion of others. This is in the nature of a public works bill for some States, and for these and other reasons I cannot support it.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House without amendment and that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9139) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 332, nays 5, not voting 96, as follows:

[Roll No. 205]

YEAS—332

Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Bates
Becker
Beckworth
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Bruce
Burke
Burleson
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cunningham
Curtin
Daddario
Daniels
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Grabowski
Grant
Gray
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hansen
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Holland
Horan
Horton
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jensen
Joelson
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Lennon
Libonati
Lindsay
Long, Md.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McFall
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
MacGregor
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
Norblad
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Ostertag
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quillen
Rains
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers; Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St Germain
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Sheppard
Short
Sibal
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Van Pelt
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Wharton
White
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—5

Alger
Curtis
Gross
O'Konski
Rooney, N.Y.

NOT VOTING—96

Abbitt
Abele
Ashbrook
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Battin
Bennett, Mich.
Bolling
Bow
Bromwell
Brotzman
Broyhill, Va.
Buckley
Burkhalter
Byrnes, Wis.
Cameron
Celler
Clark
Cramer
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Derwinski
Dorn
Duncan
Fascell
Fogarty
Foreman
Frelinghuysen
Gibbons
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Gubser
Halleck
Hanna
Harding
Harris
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hébert
Hemphill
Hoffman
Holifield
Hosmer
Jennings
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
Knox
Leggett
Lesinski
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
McDowell
Macdonald
Madden
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Meader
Milliken
Morrison
Multer
Nelsen
O'Brien, Ill.
Osmers
Passman
Pepper
Pilcher
Quie
Rhodes, Pa.
Rodino
St. Onge
Schwengel
Shelley
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Staebler
Taft
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Toll
Trimble
Utt
Whalley
Willis
Wilson, Bob

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Abele.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Foreman.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Shriver.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Duncan with Mr. Hosmer.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Dague.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Brotzman.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Battin.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Taft.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Milliken.

Mr. Thomas with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Lloyd.

Mr. Sickles with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. McDowell with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Cameron with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Knox.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.

Mr. Taylor with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Hemphill with Mr. Utt.

Mr. Staebler with Mr. Keith.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Quie.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Mailliard.

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Barry of New York.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Trimble with Mr. Meader.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Bromwell.

Mr. Harding with Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Burkhalter with Mr. Pilcher.

Mr. Harris with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Davis of Georgia.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Passman.

Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Bass.

Mr. Fascell with Mr. Hawkins.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter and tables on the military construction bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. PELLY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, in the Development Loan Fund and the Alliance for Progress Revolving Fund in the language of the Senate bill there is a requirement for an annual appropriation. I wanted to express my feeling, my very strong feeling, that when this bill goes to conference I want to urge the House conferees to take the Senate language in that regard.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MORGAN, ZABLOCKI, HAYS, ADAIR, and FRELINGHUYSEN.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN M. CARMODY

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the administration and rural America suffered a great loss last week in the passing of John M. Carmody, the second Administrator and a real pioneer of the Rural Electrification Administration.

He was among the talented and highly skilled men who first came to Washington during the early days of the Franklin Roosevelt administration.

He had served or directed the programs of more than a dozen Federal agencies, boards, and commissions in the two decades between 1932 and 1952.

One of the greatest of his contributions to the welfare of America's people and the progress of its economic system were the 3 years he spent as Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration in the late 1930's.

REA was just getting started in those days. In fact, John Carmody was its second Administrator, and he took on the job only a year after the Rural Electrification Act was passed.

The groundwork for this Nation's rural electrification program had been laid in the Congress, with the splendid leadership of the late Sam Rayburn, of Texas, and George Norris, of Nebraska. REA policy, guided by the act passed in 1936, had moved forward under the first REA Administrator, Morris Cooke.

What REA needed by 1937 was method and techniques. John Carmody was ideally equipped for the time and place. A former coal company manager and magazine editor, he believed in, and practiced thoroughly, the new industrial discipline known as scientific management.

One of the first moves he made was to make clear to our people living in rural areas that they had to organize, if they really wanted electricity in their homes and communities. In a radio speech, he said:

> Much as the farmers have wanted electricity * * * they have not seen the way clear to overcome the obstacles presented by the necessity of an organization for financing, promotion, construction, and operation. One doesn't go into a retail store and buy a package of electricity over the counter.

To get an REA loan, rural people first had to incorporate and organize under the laws of their State. Next, they had to show REA that their project could operate successfully and that they could repay the Government loan—with interest—in the required time.

John Carmody decided the rural people would have to have REA's help in these matters. Fieldworkers were sent out to show farmers how to design and organize their projects. Ever since that time, REA has worked closely and effectively through its direct contacts with the rural electric cooperatives.

By late 1939, John Carmody was able to announce that the use of standard procedures, shortcut methods had reduced the average time between loan approval and construction contract from 36 weeks in 1936 to only 12 weeks.

REA was on its way. The organization and methods installed by John Carmody were ready for the tremendous growth that began immediately after World War II. His contribution was vital to one of this country's most successful Government programs: rural electrification.

THE RELEASE OF YALE UNIVERSITY PROFESSOR BARGHOORN

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, the current rejoicing over release by the Soviet Government of Yale University Professor Barghoorn is entirely understandable.

It testifies to the traditional American concern for the safety of any one of its individual citizens traveling abroad. I do not criticize this public reaction; on the contrary, I share it.

Nevertheless, I suggest that this rejoicing ought to be tempered and restrained by a number of important considerations.

If, for example, our Government views Professor Barghoorn's release as an automatic green light for proceeding with negotiation of a new United States-Soviet cultural exchange agreement—which we postponed after the educator's arrest—we will be guilty, in my judgment, of a dangerously superficial response to the whole affair.

Nor will it be enough to insist, in such negotiation, on new or more specific Soviet assurances against a repetition of this kind of incident in connection with cultural exchanges. Such Soviet assurances would not be worth the paper they are written on.

I believe that the Barghoorn affair, instead, points up the need for a complete reappraisal of these so-called cultural exchanges with Soviet Russia—in terms of their value to us, if any, and more particularly in terms of the very real threat to U.S. security inherent in this program.

I further believe that the Congress should interest itself actively and decisively in this reappraisal through its appropriate committees—perhaps including, because of the foreign propaganda and internal security aspects of the matter, the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Of course, there is a great deal of current, unconfirmed conjecture as to Soviet motivations for both the seizure and release of Professor Barghoorn. One speculation regarding his arrest goes to the possibility that Barghoorn "may in fact have run afoul of the twilight zone in the extremely broad Soviet interpretation of 'espionage.'"

I believe both sides of this espionage coin—American and Soviet—ought to be examined very carefully. I suspect we should have some serious concern over whether we place too narrow and limited an interpretation on espionage.

I know—as I am sure many of my colleagues also do—that some of our most responsible security officials are deeply troubled over what they term "legal espionage," practiced in our midst by Soviet agents, including cultural exchange visitors. By "legal espionage" is meant, of course, the collection of important data which is more or less readily—and lawfully—available under our "open society."

I happen to believe that the cultural exchange programs give our enemies a cafeteria-service access to this type of information.

I happen to believe that United States-Soviet cultural exchange is heavily loaded in favor of both legal and illegal espionage, highly beneficial to Soviet Russia and deeply inimical to our own security.

I happen to think that the kind of "Russian roulette" we are playing with this exchange program is one in which the loaded chambers of the gun far outnumber the empty ones.

In my judgment, the Barghoorn affair ought, at the very least, to prompt a thorough and highly critical review of the whole matter before extension of the cultural exchange agreement is even considered.

What will it profit us—or, for that matter, him—to save Professor Barghoorn if, in the long run, we lose America?

There is another matter about which our rejoicing may be premature.

If President Kennedy's apparent firmness in the Barghoorn matter is in fact the beginning of a consistent policy of firmness toward Soviet Russia and international communism; if our Government is, at long last, refusing to swap Soviet spies for American captives; if we actually are abandoning automatic acquiescence to Communist blackmail—then there are grounds for rejoicing far and above our happiness over the deliverance of the Yale educator.

I doubt, however, whether we really know that the Soviet action releasing this American citizen was actually a response to firmness on our part.

Gromyko's pose of magnanimity, implicit in his pious claim that the Soviet Government freed Barghoorn because of the "personal concern" of President Kennedy, should fool no one save those determined to be deceived.

Right-thinking Americans, I suspect, will instead deeply and rightly resent this statement, which attempts to place the President of the United States in the false light of being beholden to the ruthless rulers of the Kremlin for a personal favor. The same ruthless rulers, I should add, who only a day or two earlier professed astonishment that we would make "a mountain out of a molehill" by coming to the aid of a single, individual citizen.

All of which, nonetheless, argues for more and not less hard-headed firmness in dealing with Soviet Russia. I reject the pathetic suggestion of one commentator that we should curb our rejoicing lest it embarrass the Soviet leaders and so make it difficult for them to be decent in the future. I merely propose that we save some of our cheering until we know with more certainty that we actually do have a new policy of firmness—and not merely a momentary posture of courage.

I suggest one further reason for restrained rejoicing at this juncture.

I refer to the seemingly incurable attachment of certain would-be molders of American opinion to the Communist doctrine of peaceful coexistence—an attitude which construes any slight Soviet concession as justification for wholesale appeasement and all-out optimism on our part.

I cite, as an example, the closing paragraph of the Sunday New York Times editorial entitled, "Freedom for Professor Barghoorn":

> Nevertheless, the central fact is that today common interests predominate over differences in the Soviet-American relationship. The chief common interest is that of national survival in an age when each nation can destroy the other with thermonuclear weapons. Rational men in both countries must prefer to live together, rather than die together. Professor Barghoorn's release is a sign that Moscow, as well as Washington, understands the limits which must be placed on the two nations' differences in this unprecedented situation.

I detect no evidence—or sign—from Professor Barghoorn's release that Soviet Russia has renounced nuclear blackmail as a means to gain its ends; that it has abandoned its avowed goal of world conquest or the threat to convert inner space into a thermonuclear-military base for Soviet intimidation and domination of the free world; or that it is terminating the practices of subversion and deceit it professed to renounce in the Litvinov-Roosevelt agreement signed 30 years to the day prior to the freeing of Professor Barghoorn.

If this latest Soviet act widely encourages the sort of softheaded reaction voiced in this New York Times editorial, Mr. Khrushchev will have already reaped a handsome propaganda dividend from his generosity.

LATVIA'S STRUGGLE FOR INDEPENDENCE

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, November 18 is the 45th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Latvia. The United States has a considerable group of responsible and valuable citizens who are refugees from Soviet Latvia, or are of Latvian descent. It is fitting for us to pause a moment in tribute to the men who led Latvia to independence in 1918, and to the Latvian people, who have suffered such unnecessary cruelty and repression for so many years.

The story of Latvia's struggle for freedom is an old one. She originally began her struggle for national unity while under the suzerainty of czarist Russia. Indeed, Russia has always been, but for 22 brief years, the oppressor of Latvian independence.

The First World War and the consequent collapse of czarist authority gave the aroused Latvians a chance to fight for their national identity. The two Latvian representatives to the Russian Duma, Janis Zalitis and Janis Goldmanis, were able parliamentarians and active nationalists. With their urging the Czar finally consented to the establishment of a small Latvian army. These 130,000 men contributed a bright page to Latvian history by fiercely defending their homeland for 2 years, tying down the German 8th and 10th armies and immeasurably aiding the Allies on the western front. Latvia lost 32,000 men in this campaign for freedom.

Political organization had been proceeding for some time, and the Latvian leaders were ready when the chance came, in July 1917, to establish a national political conference. This was the foundation from which evolved the first national government. Finally, on November 17, 1918, the various Latvian non-Communist parties united for the common good and formed a cabinet led by Janis Cakste as president, Gustav Zemgals as vice president, and Karlis Ulmanis as prime minister. These leaders proclaimed Latvian independence the next day. In their statements they repeatedly emphasized that Latvia was a democratic republic, with full rights for all citizens. For the next 22 years Latvians enjoyed the great pleasure of working hard, with much success, for the growth and improvement of their country.

When Latvian independence was first achieved, the Bolshevik leaders of Russia proved their intention to continue czarist imperialism by invading Latvia. After 5 months of hard fighting, the Bolsheviks were defeated in this first attempt. It is a tragedy that in 1940 they were finally able to conquer Latvia by brute force.

But though Latvia was occupied and controlled by Soviet Russia, her spirit was certainly not broken. Resistance in the spirit of the revolutionary leaders continues even today. The American Latvian Association in this country is a symbol of the continued hope of Latvians for freedom. We must admire their courage and ideals. We also hope for freedom and self-determination for Latvia.

INSCRIBING "IN GOD WE TRUST" BEHIND SUPREME COURT BENCH

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Fulton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, recently the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Earl Warren, refused to have the words "In God We Trust" inscribed on the wall behind the Supreme Court bench.

It seems to me the Supreme Court belongs to the people of this Nation and not to the Justices themselves.

My feelings on this matter have been very aptly put in an editorial which appeared in the November 15, 1963, Nashville Banner. The editorial reads as follows:

"In God We Trust"—Inscription of Reverence Not Warren's To Decide

By act of Congress, in July 1955, dollar bills now are engraved with the words "In God We Trust." And when the instruction went to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, it wasn't bounced back with a rejection slip.

When a year before that Congress inserted the words "under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance, no official objection was raised by any branch of Government. As President Eisenhower remarked in signing the authorization, "In this way we are reaffirming the transcendence of religious faith in America's heritage and future; in this way we shall constantly strengthen those spiritual weapons which forever will be our country's most powerful resource in peace and war."

But when Congressmen initiated legislation to inscribe "In God We Trust" on the wall behind the Supreme Court bench, Chief Justice Earl Warren dissented. His letter to the Capitol Architect, replying to the proposal by Representative Robert Ashmore of South Carolina, declared that such alteration in the courtroom would detract from its "beauty and symmetry."

Isn't that peculiar? Just what would it deface?

The Supreme Court building is beautiful and symmetrical—and belongs to the people of the United States. It is theirs—not Chief Justice Warren's. As the Constitution is theirs, and the system of government brought into existence by men who shunned not to declare the trust they placed in the Almighty.

The government of this design is a structure of marvelous beauty and symmetry, too. If these are marred, it won't be by any ornamentation of the whole with a simple declaration of faith—but by departures from it in cynical disdain.

As proprietor of whatever estate he owns, the Chief Justice can adorn such homestead as he chooses; and nobody outside the family will argue the point of taste, if he embellishes a wall with the likeness of Gunnar Myrdal, or mementos from the judicial trophy room. But the boundaries of his proprietorship do not embrace a public building—the environs simply of his august presence as a hired employee.

The genuine proprietors will agree, the Banner believes, with the congressional sentiment behind this proposal to manifest a conviction everywhere it is needed; and it assuredly wouldn't damage the symmetry of the temple of justice, where—by the biggest mistake of President Eisenhower's tenure—Earl Warren presides.

Certainly the tribunal can use the reminder that there is a higher authority.

Congress can and should require the inscription. If Chief Justice Warren just can't sit comfortably in a room desymmetrized that way, the exit isn't crowded; nor is the road back to California.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the majority of my colleagues here as well as a vast majority of the people of this great Nation overwhelmingly support the position outlined in this editorial.

GENERAL MARSHALL, A RESPECTED MILITARY EXPERT, SPEAKS OUT AGAINST THE BILL TO MANDATE A FLAT 4-YEAR TERM FOR THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Stratton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, sometime in the not too distant future we in this House will be called upon to vote for or against H.R. 6600, a bill requiring the President to make all appointments to the Joint Chiefs of Staff for a flat 4-year term, and forbidding him in normal circumstances, to extend their period of service beyond that 4-year limit.

H.R. 6600 has been voted out of the Committee on Armed Services together with a report setting forth the views of both the majority and the minority. I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that the number of members listed in the minority, 10 members, is one of the most sizable of any major bill coming out of the committee in recent years.

Since the report of the committee majority might tend to give the impression that all of the expert military opinion supports H.R. 6600, I think it may be helpful to Members to bring to their attention before the actual debate begins a very thoughtful article on H.R. 6600 written by a distinguished and highly regarded military expert, Brig. Gen. S. L. A. Marshall, military affairs analyst for the Los Angeles Times.

General Marshall clearly demonstrates that enactment of H.R. 6600, far from strengthening the Joint Chiefs of Staff machinery, would actually erode its power and prestige and work against the very things which the sponsors of H.R. 6600 say they are interested in promoting.

I believe General Marshall's views deserve to be read carefully by every Member of this House. And once these views are read I feel certain that a majority of this House will join with those in the committee minority to defeat this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the article referred to, which appeared in the November 3 issue of the Los Angeles Times:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Nov. 3, 1963]

Four-Year JCS Term No Cure—Wrong Lesson Drawn From Anderson-LeMay Limitations

(By S. L. A. Marshall)

The proposal to change the law so that members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff will be assured a minimum tenure of 4 years instead of the present 2-year appointment has impressive backing.

Representative Carl Vinson, the Georgian who chairmans the House Armed Services Committee, is sponsoring the bill. A majority of his colleagues favor it. Adm. Arleigh Burke, whose experience and character command respect, was a potent witness before the committee, urging support for the legislation. To disagree with such figures as these is never pleasant.

Epitomized, their argument for the change is that any member of the JCS, if given longer tenure, is more likely to take a strong position in opposition to what seems to be an ill-advised course set by his political superiors, than if he is beset by primary and personal worries about reappointment.

SOURCE OF ANXIETY

There is the clear implication in this argument that the exercise of arbitrary power by civilian control, and the latter's encroachment upon the rightful province of the military, is giving anxiety to the committee and to men like Burke. Nothing else would justify a change.

Why the issue arises now is also well indicated. Adm. George W. Anderson's failure to be reappointed after 2 years and the admonitory reappointment of Gen. Curtis LeMay to only a 1-year term must have prompted the current search for a corrective.

But if that is the only reason why a main change is being urged in the power balance within the Pentagon, the question remains whether the right lesson has been drawn from the incident.

KNEW POSITIONS

Anderson and LeMay both knew that the possibility of reappointment loomed just ahead. But the fact is that they continued to oppose when conscience whispered: "You must." They did so because each is that kind of man. Ambition does not blind them to the path of duty and the meaning of honor. Had they been weaker characters, more inclined to curry favor, they might have ridden out 4 years, and the JCS would have been the flabbier for their presence. But is that really what is wanted and would it beget a more favorable balance between the military and civilian chiefs?

Altogether unknown to me is any way to legislate character and dutifulness into mature men in high command. By the time they arrive there, it is too late to reform the opportunist in uniform who all along has been reaching for the top rung, this above all, and irrespective of how it is won and held.

One might as well believe that it is possible, by statute, to generate in their political superiors respect for military judgment, and that proportioned view of their own responsibilities in relation to the armed establishment which distinguished Franklin D. Roosevelt, Henry L. Stimson, Robert A. Lovett and a few others.

CIVILIAN WORD FINAL

Human equations cannot be perfected through law and ideal combinations are largely fortuitous. So the decisive point is that under our system, civilian control must have the final word, which principle will hold so long as the Republic endures in its present form. Should the fault be a compulsive use of arrogated power by the civilian controllers, entrenching the JCS members more strongly will not prove a remedy.

Nothing better may come of such a reform than the appointment to lead each of the services of more compliant individuals who will say yes, and nothing but yes, after the squawk box summons them to the front office.

Final choices are not the prerogative of the military selection boards. For that reason, the Nation is better served by a JCS formed in part of strong men who know their tasks and will risk being bounced after 2 years than it would be with five Chiefs chosen because they are prepared to respond like trained seals for twice that long.

SOME BAD CHOICES

And there's another thing. Each Chief is also, in effect, the commander of his service. Despite all the care taken in selection during the 15 years of unification, some lamentable choices have appeared. They topped the rise without really making the grade. Maybe they looked very promising on the way up. But once they arrived, it was only to prove that they might better have remained absent.

Not one of the services (including the Marines) has been spared these false alarms. Each can tell its own sad story of how it gladly hailed the strong man when he took over, later to discover that while his head size had grown, his feet were too small to fill the shoes. It has happened often enough that insuring a 4-year term for misfits at the top military levels may hardly be hailed as a sweet, sweet boon to troops.

Only one possible offsetting advantage comes to mind. Given 4 years, the Chiefs might deploy to camps, posts and stations occasionally instead of staying rooted to the Pentagon. To the people in the field the Chiefs are little more than pictures on a wall. Whether forces would be happier if the portraits had to be changed only half as often is beyond saying.

OUR CONTINUING TOP HEALTH NEED—FRONTIERSMEN

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Kornegay] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to include in the Record the text of the presidential address of Dr. J. W. R. Norton, delivered before the 91st annual meeting of the American Public Health Association, Kansas City, Mo., November 11, 1963. Dr. Norton's address is entitled "Our Continuing Top Health Need—Frontiersmen," and it is a most interesting and informative paper.

Dr. Norton is a native of North Carolina and since 1948 he has been North Carolina State health director and is also secretary-treasurer of the State Board of Health. Dr. Norton has had a distinguished career in the field of public health and has been accorded many honors and signal recognitions by reason of his accomplishments, not the least of which was his election a year ago as president of the American Public Health Association.

At this same meeting of the APHA, an event took place which will be of great interest to my colleagues here in the House, and this was the conferring of the 1963 APHA presidential citation upon our distinguished colleague and my chairman, the Honorable Oren Harris, of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, for his signal contributions to the health and well-being of the people of the United States. This citation was presented to Mr. Harris by Dr. Norton, president of the APHA.

Mr. Speaker, I should like, first, to include the text of this citation of Congressman Harris' notable legislative accomplishments in the health field which led to his receiving the APHA presidential citation; and to follow with the text of President Norton's address at the annual APHA meeting, believing that this material will be of great interest to my colleagues here in the House and to all those persons interested in the progress made in the fields of medicine and public health:

The 1963 APHA Presidential Citation

As chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, U.S. House of Representatives, his is a chief responsibility for Federal legislation affecting the health and well-being of our Nation's people.

He has authored or has skillfully guided to enactment several laws of major consequence to our public health and medical programs which include:

Amendments to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act which afford protection to consumers from deleterious effects of adulterated or poisoned products encompassed by this law.

The Research Facilities Construction Act which has helped to provide to universities, hospitals, and laboratories the physical requisites wherein is conducted medical research of far-reaching importance.

The Mass Vaccination Assistance Act providing for concerted immunization programs for four preventable diseases—poliomyelitis, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus.

Migrant health grants assisting States and communities, for the first time, in the providing of greatly needed preventive health services to domestic agricultural migratory workers and their families.

Establishment of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development wherein the many health problems of children may receive a coordinated research effort more appropriate to the severity of these problems.

The Community Health Services and Facilities Act which authorizes for the first time Federal funds for public health agencies to attack more effectively the costly and wasteful health problems of the chronically ill and aged.

The Community Mental Health Centers and Mental Retardation Act providing increased impetus to efforts with, and for, the mentally retarded and a sharp change and emphasis in programs for the mentally ill.

The Health Professions Educational Assistance Act which will increase training facilities for physicians, dentists, nurses, and public health personnel and loans for medical and dental school students.

Each and all of these enactments reflect the quality of his studied consideration and his skilled leadership. That these achievements of monumental importance to the health of our Nation has been accomplished during the 7 short years of his committee chairmanship provides eloquent tribute, and has earned the Honorable Oren Harris the admiration, respect, and gratitude of the American Public Health Association, and in token of which we proudly present the 1963 association presidential citation to the Honorable Oren Harris.

Our Continuing Top Health Need—Frontiersmen[1]

(By J. W. R. Norton, M.D., M.P.H.[2])

When elected as your president a year ago, I began the enjoyable and stimulating task of reading the addresses of all the presidents, from Stephen Smith to Glen King. It has been a year of work and fun as your president and I shall always be grateful to those whose devoted service and sacrifice made it possible.

For me, as the latest speaker in a panel of 91, it has been exciting, though frustrating, to find so much of public health so well covered in these 90 years.

Stephen Smith, in that first presidential address on May 1, 1873, in Cincinnati, quoted those familiar association objectives as "the advancement of sanitary science, and the promotion of organizations and measures for the practical application of public hygiene."

His own appraisal of the health and social conditions faced by those hardy public health frontiersmen of nearly a century ago is an example of the current discernment shown in each presidential address through these nine decades.

Hear Dr. Smith's appraisal:

"On every hand we witness the most prodigal waste of human life. Inheriting as a birthright health and longevity, we find that man lives but a moiety of his days. Of the children born, what vast percentages never see the anniversary of their birth. What other large percentage dies under 5 years. How few, comparatively, reach the age of 10. At 20 the generation has dwindled to an insignificant minority, and at 33 to 45 it disappears altogether. And even during his short and uncertain life, what physical evils cling like an inheritance to man's body, soul, and estate. His form is distorted with every conceivable deformity, and disease in protean shape preys upon every structure. His mind is often dwarfed to that of the meanest animal, and his moral perceptions may be so dulled and perverted that he has no knowledge of right and wrong. He voluntarily destroys every vestige of manhood by yielding to the most degrading passions, and by poisonous compounds of his own invention reduces himself to the condition of a helpless or an infuriated brute. He wrests from his fellow by fraud and chicanery the just allotments of property, and in turn has his own estate torn rudely from his grasp by the rapacity of a neighbor."

Yet Stephen Smith in that first presidential address showed the prophetic vision and confidence which characterize the true pioneer everywhere:

"The outlook, from our present standpoint, of the future of sanitary reform in this country is exceedingly favorable. An agitation has evidently begun which is daily taking on larger and yet larger dimensions. State and municipal boards of health are being rapidly organized in all parts of the country; the medical profession is beginning to manifest a deep interest in sanitary science as a department of study, and medical societies in all the States are earnestly discussing the various questions relating to its practical application."

And Wilson Smillie invites attention to Austin Flint's emphasis in 1872 on conservative medicine—by which he meant rehabilitation as the responsibility of the private physician and the health officer.

The experience of reading these discerning and prophetic APHA presidential addresses does give me a chance to start off with a constructive suggestion: Let's see that these addresses are made available in a volume or volumes to become more readily accessible to all our members.

Ira Hiscock, in 1956, provided a suggestion for my title when he said, "In a 'small' world where disease and poverty recognize no frontiers, health is basic for peace and prosperity."

In this address, "Our Continuing Top Health Need—Frontiersmen," I propose to give some of the association highlights for this year and also to suggest a few of the many health areas in which pioneering is needed at this time, and these two parts will be handled in reverse order.

---

[1] Presidential address, first general session, American Public Health Association, 91st annual meeting, Kansas City, Mo., Nov. 11, 1963.

[2] State health director, Raleigh, N.C.

In a visit to Brazil and Peru last April and May, I was impressed with the urgent need today for frontiersmen to move into the interior areas to develop and utilize the vast untapped material resources of those two great countries.

In many parts of the world today there are conditions which parallel those of nearly a hundred years ago to which Stephen Smith and others gave eloquent expression. We must assume our proper share of responsibility to see that basic public health safeguards and preventive programs are shared in these places of greatest need. We have a debt to discharge in this, for our hard-earned health progress has been helped by many vital contributions from other countries. Scientists and medical and health leaders in other countries join ours in continuing to discover new disability preventives, new ways to better health, and we are reaping the benefits.

Even when we count the unsung heroes, it is amazing how few have participated in pushing back our health frontiers. Our outlook and interest must increasingly include all human beings and there must be free interchange of scientific wisdom and qualified personnel.

Health progress has decidedly lacked uniformity. Malnutrition, poverty, disease, illiteracy, and other disabling conditions involve at least two-thirds of humanity. We must put less emphasis on boasting of progress and infinitely more on the pioneering of frontiersmen while less than a third of the peoples of the world enjoy today's optimum effectiveness. While we are yet unable to eradicate diseases and other disabling conditions we cannot relax our eternal vigilance anywhere.

Our needs and shortages everywhere, even in our own country, continue to involve the most elementary violations of health necessities, such as, pollution of soil, water, air and food. Pesticides, detergents, manufacturing processes, radiation, and atomic energy have vast potential for good and we should be able to assure health safeguards in their use. These shortages continually add new hazards to our working and traveling environment. Even in our more progressive areas there continues a disheartening lag in the general application of newly acquired vital health information. We look confidently to the behavioral scientists to speed up and strengthen our communications and motivations.

Our association and the Public Health Service as well are overlooking a strong supportive group by not utilizing more actively the public information specialists in our 50 States. An annual general conference of this personnel perhaps during the time of our association meeting or of the State and territorial health officers would help public health programs to become better understood and to be given more adequate public support.

Frontiersmen in public health are needed for we have come only a little way relatively in the long struggle to postpone death, reduce noneffectiveness and assure the utmost in efficiency and longevity for each individual.

Among the more exciting frontiers today are oceanography, outer space and also the sciences more closely related to the health and happiness of mankind. And in promoting these sciences we find the primary career purpose for those of us in the American Public Health Association.

While moving very properly into new and promising areas of health service we must not neglect the old tested and proved essentials. A less narrow interpretation of Emerson's six programs and Hiscock's nine goals of 1956 is needed. Primary priority should be given to providing adequate local public health services for the 50 million people in our Nation still without them. Certainly our health department personnel must include and more actively promote mental and emotional health, better nutrition, fluoridation, community planning (including recreation and health and medical care), better training and education, family planning, occupation (including migrant) and traveling health, better housing, progressive patient care including rehabilitation, training and research, to name only a few.

We in public health must not feel alone in our attack on conditions which breed noneffectiveness.

Our voluntary health agencies provide a most useful service not duplicated elsewhere in the world. They have supported research, stimulated interest and service in neglected areas, and recruited voluntary and professional health workers. Perhaps a way can be found to decrease their fragmentation and increase coordination among public and voluntary agencies and save some funds expended in overhead or duplicated services.

One observes, in reading our association's presidential addresses, that occasionally some suggestions which were "made ahead of their time" or were otherwise shunted aside may later have become timely and appealing. We are still hoping for the day when mankind becomes willing to spend as much to save life as to destroy it. The pesticide menace would disappear if we could eradicate parasitism—one of the worst forms of which is human. Continuing population explosions emphasize the obvious necessity for effective family planning to assure each child a reasonable share in the opportunities for healthy development. When our No. 1 health problem—namely traffic killing and crippling—becomes as widely intolerable as the deaths and disability from filth diseases became 50 years ago, the traffic barbarity will begin to disappear even more speedily than the filth diseases were conquered.

There has been commendable public health pioneering in each of the 50 States. We honor the frontiersmen who have led out in these achievements. You will be reminded of your own State's public health progress as I list, by your indulgence, a few such advances in my native North Carolina.

We developed our first county health department (Guilford) in 1911, the first strictly rural in the United States (Robeson) in 1912 and since July 1949 have had full coverage for our 100 counties.

As an integral part of our maternal and child health program for saving mothers and babies we have had a planned parenthood program since March 1937.

Harnett County began the first county health department diabetes control program in June 1946, and in October 1958 that county medical society developed a medical review board to screen applicants and recipients for welfare funds based on disability in the two categories, aid to the permanently and totally disabled and aid to dependent children.

In North Carolina we are well along with our radiation protection program and are formally starting, by 1963 legislative action, the air pollution study and control work which has been in unofficial operation since 1957.

Our research triangle park of 5,000 acres, begun by former Governor, now Secretary of Commerce, Luther Hodges, is about equidistant (12 miles) from three great universities—Duke University and the University of North Carolina of Raleigh and of Chapel Hill.

The North Carolina Fund ($14 million), conceived by Governor Terry Sanford, was established July 1963 by the Ford, Reynolds, and Babcock Foundations as matching funds to break the cycle of poverty, school dropouts, disability and frustration.

Our university school of public health has been in the forefront of health progress in our State and its new and adequate building was dedicated April 1963 under the deanship of Dr. Edward G. McGavran.

Health careers for North Carolina, a 3-year $300,000 project, was launched early this year to work toward making available the many hundreds of additional personnel needed by health professions in the State.

While it is natural to invite attention to such progress in each of our States, it is sobering to consider some trends in public health which seem to violate the very spirit and example of the frontiersmen—trends that sap the strength which acceptance of personal responsibility develops in individuals and organizations.

Failure to adapt political representation in the States to shifts in population has caused municipalities to seek direct dealing with Washington. Recognition of this neglect has sensitized municipalities to develop a feeling of neglect in the health field even though our rural people in most States are still provided the least and poorest health services. The neglect of local and State responsibilities, and the usurping of main tax sources by Federal, and to some extent State governments, has led to overcentralization. Municipal leaders should see that in bypassing the States, their action can lead to inordinate confusion and complexity and eventually to further Federal domination. Health is much too personal to be administered from Washington. Its administration through local health departments is both democratic and effective.

I cannot agree with those who are attempting to discredit local health departments and consider them obsolete, even though there are many shortcomings to overcome. Half the States have not given local health organizations an adequate trial and have concentrated their major efforts on State administration and on meeting the pressing needs of their big cities. Their rural people feel that they have been forgotten.

Those who consider that the general hospital renders the local health department outmoded seem to overlook the fact that most hospitals lack even the first step toward extending their services out into the community through outpatient and mental patient services. It will be desirable to develop various organizational arrangements to determine the best ways of providing economically the quality health-medical-hospital services we need for all our people.

Frontiersmen in pubic health will need to reevaluate the trend to segment and fragment our services. Unfortunately, there has been a recent movement to assign new health services, or even to split off segments of operating health services, to more politically oriented, or at least more unified, agencies. Unless we in public health discharge our full responsibilities in health matters, other agencies not health oriented will be asked to assume our proper tasks. Welfare departments, schools and other agencies cover the full geographical area in each State and are ready to fill the gaps wherever there is incomplete or inadequate local health department coverage.

This fragmentation from the mainstream of public health is made easier since our group is made up of many disciplines, each public health worker according identification and loyalty to one of these disciplines. If we are to strengthen public health and assure the logical continuing assignment of public health responsibilities, every one of us in public health must give first organization loyalty to public health. And this is worth repeating by each of us to those not here.

A reasonable concern for the interests of others must not obscure our acceptance of individual responsibility. Getting and holding good jobs require skills, education, and good health and these must continue to depend, in some degree, on initiative, hard work, and responsibility. Even as individual initiative seems increasingly penalized it becomes more vitally needed. Boasting of past progress and hoping for the uniformly ideal as a result of the all-out effort of only a few is the downward road to decline and decadence.

It is unbecoming for us to continue with 33 of 96 affiliate presidents and secretaries who are neither fellows nor members of APHA. In the future we hope it will become more acceptable to expect that all officers of affiliates and branches should be fellows or members of APHA.

Let us turn now from these general aspects of the frontiers we face as public health workers, and toward a brief consideration of a few specific highlights of progress made during the past year in the programs of the American Public Health Association. And I suggest that for the future we invite our executive director or the chairman of our executive board to make the report on association highlights before a general session of our annual meetings.

Progress along a number of fronts has characterized the work of the American Public Health Association during 1963. There has been increased membership, a larger budget, the growth of special projects, vigorous activity in the regional branches, the establishment of the New England Public Health Association, added interest and achievement in the first year's operation of the association-sponsored National Commission on Community Health Services, and a general strengthening of the legislative base of public health through the enactment of National and State legislation. These and other areas of the work of the association will be presented in greater detail in papers before this annual meeting and in reports distributed here and after this meeting adjourns.

The association membership and fellowship has increased by 535 to 14,206 during the year ending September 1, 1963. The fastest growing of our 14 sections were mental health and food and nutrition.

Our total budget for the current year, as approved by the executive board, was just over a million and a half dollars—slightly over $100,000 more than expenses for 1962. Even with the growth in membership, programs, and particularly in special projects the basic APHA staff has not increased. The increasing costs, however, have led the executive committee to recommend for action at this meeting by the council an increase in membership and fellowship dues for next year. An increase in registration fees for nonmembers is needed and more support from sustaining and agency members will be sought.

If time permitted, I would wish to tell of the good work of the new membership committee; the excellent projects developed during the year; and the positive advances made by the western regional office in service projects, as well as the significant strides of our southern branch.

New England too has moved a step toward strengthening its two State affiliates (Massachusetts and Connecticut) and eventually a closer tie by the other four State groups with APHA.

The association contributed substantially to the important meeting of the Second National Conference on Public Health Training. Also, our association now has the opportunity to eliminate triplication, and expand its responsibilities in the field of accreditation for public health teaching.

Progress continues in our traditional fields as well. The revised diagnostic procedures and reagents may be inspected at our association booth. The diagnostic procedures for viral and rickettsial diseases revision will be published in 1964. John Gordon's committee promise the golden anniversary, 10th edition of "Communicable Diseases in Man" in 1965.

The National Commission on Community Health Services, conceived by this association and funded through our efforts, is jointly sponsored by the National Health Council. This extensive 4-year study is now in its first year of operation. See that your viewpoints are conveyed to this commission during its considerations and before its final report.

As usual, a great deal of time and effort has gone into the preparation of an outstanding program for this annual meeting. This involves, here at Kansas City, for APHA and the 36 related organizations the amazing number of 220 scientific sessions involving 700 program participants and a total of 435 individual sessions of one kind or another when we add in the organizational and other meetings over and above the scientific sessions. Our APHA staff under Berwyn Mattison's able leadership and the local committees deserve our special gratitude for their part in thus helping to provide convenient opportunities to extend our professional horizons and motivations.

An innovation this year is the first meeting of the new conference of radiologic health specialists.

The joint committee on study of education for public health is now in its third year under the able leadership of Bill Shepard. The new Health Laboratory Science Journal, developed by the laboratory section and beginning in 1964, will be noted with interest as one illustration of an expanding publication program of the association.

The Washington office of our association has had a busy year. Liaison has been maintained by the director of that office with the Public Health Service and Children's Bureau as well as with a number of congressional committees dealing with health matters. We can report with considerable satisfaction that several significant bills on which APHA testified favorably have been enacted into legislation.

Our association members have been interested in basic laws permitting and supporting health departments and their personnel and programs. State and local boards of health are responsible for regulations and policies. We have been most fortunate when Presidents, Members of Congress, State legislatures, and health board members have promoted health with ability and devotion.

We still have among deficiencies to be corrected by these faithful workers: 50 million Americans without, or with inadequate, local health departments; Federal matching formulas more favorable to welfare salvage operations than to more economical preventive health services; less strict accountability for tax funds spent in some areas than in others; and we need urgently passage of the companion bills which provide permissive flexibility for one-third of the categorical health grants according to the varying and changing needs of 50 States. I refer to S. 1051 and H.R. 6195 or similar bills.

Every public health worker, of official and voluntary agencies, should be informed on and support our national professional organization along with our branches and affiliates. Following the example of our teacher groups each of us in public health everywhere should give his primary professional loyalty, not to one or another in our confederation of the various professional discipline groups, but to his organization of public health workers in his State, his region and to APHA. Only when at least most of us do this shall our purposes and goals be reached. Only by this unity, in this highly organized world, can our modern pioneers advance most effectively along the many health frontiers.

FORTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF REPUBLIC OF LATVIA

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Daniels] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commemorate the 45th anniversary of the once-free Republic of Latvia and to accord due tribute to the noble ideals which the American Latvian Association here in the United States represents in a free world. Our Nation, which is founded upon the principles of free enterprise and equality for all men, takes a long and reverent look upon the Latvian loyalists whose courage strengthened them to escape from the repression, barbed wire, and machineguns which their countrymen now suffer under force and fear of reprisal. Yet even courage is a weak voice when met with violence and death. And for that reason we recognize the struggle of Latvia as the struggle of freemen everywhere and their cause one of distinguished merit in the name of humanity. In remembrance I would like to relate some of the historical facts which led up to their escape to freedom.

On November 18, 1918, the Latvian people succeeded in freeing themselves from the oppression of czarist Russia, declaring their devotion to a "self-governing, independent, democratic republic." For the next 22 years Latvia was free, and became a notable example of a progressive state. Illiteracy was almost eliminated, agricultural education increased the food supply, industry and shipping rapidly developed, and in the Latvian Parliament, the Saeima, representative government flourished. Latvia became a cultural, economic, partner of the West.

During this time, and increasingly after 1935, Latvia's progress was impeded by subversion and violence from the Latvian Communist Party and pressures by Soviet military might. Finally, in 1940, the rapacious nature of the Soviet Union reared its ugly head in full view as this beacon light of freedom on the Baltic was extinguished by the invasion of the Red army.

Luckily, despite barbed wire, machineguns, and every form of repression, many Latvian loyalists have escaped to the United States to tell their story. They remain here as members of the American Latvian Association, hoping and working for the eventual freedom of their country. They have a noble cause. We wish them the best of success.

FARM INCOME DECLINE NOTHING NEW

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture prediction that 1964 farm income will drop 5 percent has the earmarks of a scare tactic.

The growing cost-price squeeze on American farmers has been underway for more than a year. It is now the worst in over 20 years. It cannot be blamed on farmer rejection of the wheat certificate plan last May.

The USDA report indicates that most of the farm income decline will be in wheat, whereas payments for feed grains will be somewhat increased. As a matter of fact, wheat futures market is showing unexpected strength.

The estimate for 1964 and the short-range market outlook both ignore what is now the largest single factor in declining farm prices—the import of red meats from foreign countries.

Only now, and only reluctantly, is the Department admitting that imports are having an impact. The announcement attributes low beef prices to increased cattle numbers on U.S. farms with no mention of the fact that imports constitute more than 11 percent of our total production figure.

The Department also ignores the impact of reckless dumping of surplus corn, which indirectly induced lower meat prices. Under it, the price floor actually became the price ceiling.

CONGRESSIONAL STAFFING BREAKTHROUGH

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Schwengel] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, November 10, as I read the New York Herald Tribune, I followed my usual procedure of looking for Roscoe Drummond's column first. It was with great pleasure that I read his column entitled "Congressional Staffing Breakthrough."

The distinguished columnist of the New York Herald Tribune has written another hard-hitting nationally syndicated column concerning the glaring disparity of congressional committee staffing, and I feel it deserves the attention of my colleagues. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Record.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Nov. 10, 1963]

Congressional Staffing Breakthrough

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Washington.—The party line resistance of the Democrats to correcting the incredible imbalance against the minority in the professional staffing of congressional committees is beginning to crumble.

This imbalance isn't just slightly unfair. It is egregiously and cripplingly onesided. On most congressional committees, the Democratic Party has given itself an advantage in professional staff of more than 10 to 1—and in some instances the disproportion is worse.

No wonder most of the Democrats like it this way. Lack of qualified staff serving the Republicans means muting the minority party; it means reducing the creativity of the opposition; it makes it easier for the majority to have things their own way.

I am not talking about patronage or hiring "Republican experts" to help Republican committeemen. The way to correct the imbalance is not to hire more partisans on the committee staff but to allocate a fairer proportion of qualified experts to be selected by and responsible to the minority party.

I have never felt that the Democratic leaders of the House and Senate could refuse indefinitely to correct this injustice. The case is too strong. It is basically bipartisan because at stake is the effective functioning of any minority party—the present Republican minority or a future Democratic minority. Reform is needed to strengthen the functioning of Congress itself.

A break has come in the ranks of the Democratic opposition. The Republicans are no longer alone in supporting a reform.

The proposition of the Republican Senate-House Committee on Increased Minority Staffing headed by Senator Hugh Scott, of Pennsylvania, and of the Special House Conference Committee chairmanned by Representative Fred Schwengel, of Iowa, is that up to 40 percent of the professional staff of the congressional committees ought to be responsible to the minority.

Democratic Senator Joseph Clark, of Pennsylvania, and Democratic Congressman James Roosevelt, of California, have now substantially agreed.

Senator Clark has just written a letter to the Republicans announcing that, while he thinks the 60-to-40 ratio ought to be somewhat more flexible, he is prepared to support the substance of the minority proposal. A reasonable compromise might be that the ratio of staffing should, as far as practical, reflect the majority-minority ratios in both Houses, but not go below 33 percent.

Representative Roosevelt shows he is prepared to go further. With the knowledge of Speaker John McCormack and Chairman Adam Clayton Powell, of New York, he has drafted a resolution proposing a broad House inquiry through a Labor and Education Subcommittee into industrywide collective bargaining and how to reduce work stoppages which acutely affect the national interest.

Mr. Roosevelt would accept generous minority staffing. He proposes $28,000 for majority staff and $22,000 for minority staff, about a 56-to-44 ratio, no doubt on the ground that such an inquiry, to be useful, ought to be bipartisan.

This should be a welcome and significant precedent. It reflects growing Democratic awareness that the majority party cannot maintain such serious staffing injustice much longer.

Many Republicans have been slow to realize what a disadvantage they were accepting in tolerating it.

Now an important breakthrough is within reach. It ought to be seized. Mr. Roosevelt's inquiry may not be the best approach to surveying the problem of national industrywide strikes. But when a Democratic Representative from California and the Democratic Senator from Pennsylvania put themselves behind equity in congressional staffing, their initiative should be welcomed and supported.

LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY—NOVEMBER 18

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Short] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, November 18, 1918, is the day Latvia proclaimed its independence.

Liberty was not lightly won by this ancient people and vigorous nation. As in so many other countries of eastern Europe, Latvia for centuries was steeped in the blood of its patriots.

War after war swept over Europe, destroying the peace which Latvia for some time managed to preserve through the efforts of its dedicated statesmen and by using prudent foresight. As in many countries, the testing of the spirit and courage of the Latvians somehow made freedom all the more precious to them.

Latvia, a country rich in European culture, is one of a strip of three countries bordering on the Baltic, with Estonia to the north and Lithuania to the south. It forms a bridge between the Soviet Union and the west, and along with Estonia and Lithuania has been under constant threat from Soviet imperialism, as well as a prey to other countries who have wished to dominate and enslave the Latvian people.

Its 25,000 square miles in size is not a measure of its contribution to European culture. The early history of the Latvians extends back nearly 4,000 years, when the earliest Baltic peoples first occupied and gradually extended their settlements on the eastern shore of the Baltic Sea. It was raided by the Vikings, as well as by the Russians. Christianity first came to Latvia at the end of the 12th century, when missionaries sailed up the Daugava River. Then in 1215, Pope Innocent III granted to Latvia and Estonia the status of an ecclesiastical state, and called it Terra Mariana.

Then in the 13th century, swarms of Teutonic crusaders traveled across parts of Estonia, but the onslaughts of the Germans was resisted by the Latvians. Later Latvia became known as Livonia, when a small group of German overlords became their masters, and combined Latvia and Estonia into a portion of the Holy Roman Empire.

Somehow through centuries of Latvia being battered by first one strong neighbor and another, its peasants managed to maintain their national identity of tradition and folklore. Their spirit of freedom managed to flourish, even though at times it became dampened and almost quenched.

The whole history of Latvia is a fascinating one—and through all its tribulations—and down to this day—the people have remained proud and independent. From their feudal state, they gradually emerged with a full constitutional form of government. During World War II the gains they had made were set aside, and the Soviets—while promising to respect the social integrity and politics of the Baltic Republics—instead showed their true aims by throwing off any pretense of defending the Baltic countries against foreign aggression. Instead of protecting Latvia and the other Baltic nations, they actively became aggressors. On June 14, in 1940, after the fall of France, Stalin first presented Lithuania with an ultimatum demanding unopposed admission of unlimited Soviet armed forces and establishment of a new government "friendly" to the Soviet Union. The next day the Red army invaded Lithuania by force.

On June 16, similar demands were made of Latvia and Estonia, and both countries were occupied on June 17. All three states were now virtually prisoners of the Soviets, in every respect.

Controls were first placed on the press, radio and other means of communications by the Soviets. Supposed free elections were staged in all three Baltic Republics on July 14 and 15—with only one list of candidates—all Communists—offered to the citizens. Attempts by Latvian patriots to present the voters a list of independent candidates—as provided by law—were met by quick arrests and subsequent deportation. Red invaders intimidated the Latvian citizens by threats of reprisals. This met with passive resistance in many of the rural districts—by means of a boycott. However, this proved unavailing—since the Soviets had already decreed that 97.6 percent of the election results were to be in favor of a pro-Communist state.

The Latvians were told that any mention of their country joining the Soviet Union was an anti-Soviet plot. However, when puppet parliaments of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania convened on July 21, they immediately asked for admission of their respective Republics into the Soviet Union. Moscow made it clear that the Soviet Red Army and political police would not stand in the way of the three Republics if they wished to be annexed. This actually and legally was a violation of basic laws then existing in the Baltic countries—but the Moscow Supreme Soviet hastened to admit Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the Soviet Union on August 3-6, 1940.

The United States on July 23, 1940, issued a declaration through Sumner Welles, the Under Secretary of State, declining recognition—and was joined in this effort by most of the free Western democracies.

The usual steps followed—a Red Constitution was imposed on the nation of Latvia. Private property, and land, was nationalized. The standard of living dropped to low levels prevailing in the Soviet Union. Ruthless war was waged against the churches. A magazine called the Godless—Bezbozhnik—appeared on the newspaper stands of the city of Riga, immediately following marching in of the Soviet troops. Study of the Russian language, and the theory of Soviet communism was introduced as a compulsory subject in the schools. Communist youth league branches sprang up in factories, offices, and schools. Secret police threw a network all over the country, and superseded courts of law where political cases were concerned. Agrarian reform, which had many years before been carried out by the Latvians themselves, under their constitutional form of government, was again attempted—but in order to forestall desperate violence on the part of the Latvian farmers, Stalin promised there would be no collectivization in Latvia. This, however, was introduced after the war, in 1949.

Latvians remember the first year of Soviet occupation with horror, because of constant Red terror and the first mass deportation carried out by the Moscow regime shortly before the German invasion, in June 1941. Even prior to this, however, thousands of Latvian patriots, army officers, state officials, and even President Ulmanis and members of his Cabinet, had been arrested and deported to Russia. On June 14, however, 15,000 Latvian citizens—men, women, and children—were rounded up at night by the secret police—loaded into cattle trucks—and deported to slave labor in northeast Russia and Siberia. Thirty-four thousand Latvians were either arrested, deported, or killed during that year of Soviet occupation—and the same fate befell thousands of Estonians and Lithuanians.

On June 22, 1941, the German-Russian War broke out—but though the Baltic people thought at first the Germans were their liberators when they swept in 10 days later into Riga—their hope was shortlived. The Nazis very quickly suppressed attempts of the Baltic states to regain their independence and it became clear these countries could expect no more freedom and independence from them than they had gotten from the Communists. Instead they arrested, killed and deported thousands of Latvian citizens to forced labor in Germany, and exterminated the Jews as far as they were able.

All the Baltic people felt their only hope was migration to the Western democracies. About 125,000 left their homeland for Western Europe, after the German forces had withdrawn from the East. They migrated to the United States, to Canada, Great Britain and Australia. One group came to Minot, N. Dak., and are still there. Soviet troops returned to Latvia in 1944-45—and the old practices once again were renewed. As late as March 1949, Latvians claim that farmers who resisted collectivization by force were uprooted and freighted away like cattle. To this day, even after the de-Stalinization took place in Russia, the Soviets still maintain with vigor and impudence that the Baltic people voluntarily joined the Soviet Union.

Latvians remember the bitter experiences of the past. They wonder even now if those who dare correspond with families abroad and receive gift parcels are now being actually marked as victims of future reprisals and deportation.

Meanwhile, Western democracies continue to uphold the rights of nations, large and small, and the United States continues to maintain her policy of nonrecognition of the Soviet occupation of the Baltic States.

It is for this reason that we here today mark the anniversary of the proclamation of independence of Latvia—on November 18—and express our condemnation of Soviet plunder of the Baltic Republics.

We stand on firm and clear moral and legal grounds. We join the Latvians—and their sister states of Estonia and Lithuania—in the patient hope that the forces of freedom will prevail, and the sinister powers of communism will be destroyed. We believe that as long as the aggressive and totalitarian regime of Moscow, bent on universal conquest, controls the Baltic Sea—and holds these nations of Eastern Europe in abject subjection—no lasting peace can be possible either in Europe or the world.

The heady air of freedom, once breathed, can never be forgotten.

We salute the people of Latvia. We affirm our opposition to predatory activities, no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or by the threat of force. We will continue to stand by these principles because the American people believe that unless the doctrine in which these principles are inherent once again governs the relations between nations, the rule of reason, of justice, and of law—the basis of modern civilization itself—cannot be preserved.

LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusets [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on November 18 we celebrate the 45th anniversary of Latvian independence. For more than two sad and eventful decades Latvia's Independence Day has been celebrated in communities where Latvians are free to observe their national holiday, but in Latvia they are not free to do that. The reason for that is too well known. After proclaiming their freedom and national independence 45 years ago, and after living under the blessings of democracy in their historic homeland for 22 years, unhappy Latvians were drawn into the last war, much against their will, and lost most of their worldly possessions. They also lost their freedom, first to the Russians, then to the Nazis and before the end of that war, Russian Communists returned once more, imposing their intolerable and unrelaxing rule on Latvia.

Since those fateful days Latvia has become a large prison for its freedom-seeking and dauntless inhabitants. Though they have endured the heavy yoke of Communist totalitarian tyranny for over two decades, they still cling steadfastly to their ideals, love of freedom and national independence. And though alone they are unable to attain freedom, they still pray and hope that through some turn of events, and with some aid even from some unexpected quarters, they will be enabled to attain their national goal. The least and also the most we can do for the present is to join them on the 45th anniversary of their independence day in their prayer, wishing them fortitude and power in their struggle against their oppressors.

As one of the sponsors of legislation to set up a Special Committee on the Captive Nations, I am most anxious to have the proper committee begin hearings so that we may arrive at a solution to the Latvian problem and the problems of all unfortunate nations behind the Iron Curtain.

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL ORDERS

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on the following dates, November 25, 26, and 27, and December 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, and 12, following the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and special orders heretofore granted, that I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ABUSES UNDER AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINNEGAN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been often noted that a chance remark or statement can start a series of events or happenings far exceeding its seeming importance at the time. I believe I have a good case in point, and I would like to ask for the indulgence of my colleagues this afternoon to elaborate.

Some time ago, one of my constituents, who frequently voices concern over wasteful Government spending and practices, mentioned to me that he knew of many individuals who as representatives of U.S. trade associations took trips around and to all parts of the world at Government expense. Since the Members of this body are promptly and roundly excoriated for such trips invariably referred to as "junkets" no matter how much they may be in the public interest, I was more than routinely interested how they had escaped equal publicity and to know what purpose they served.

A cursory investigation dug up the fact that such trips are authorized by the Foreign Agricultural Service of the Department of Agriculture in conjunction with their various programs in market research development whose purpose is to promote the export and sale of U.S. agricultural commodities abroad for dollars.

As a Member of Congress from a completely urbanized area, I had no previous knowledge of this program nor of its wide-scale operation. My home State of Illinois is a great exporter. Chicago, my home city, is proud to house the great farm exchanges, and I became greatly interested in seeing to what degree our area participated in these programs and what benefit developed from them.

Now as to the market development program and its origin.

For the edification of those, like myself, who may have been or are unfamiliar with the program and its purposes, I would like briefly to explain it as it was explained to me in a letter from C. R. Eskildsen, Associate Administrator of the Foreign Agricultural Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. I quote from that letter:

> Under the authority of section 104(a) of Public Law 480 and the Department of Agriculture appropriation acts, the Foreign Agricultural Service enters into cooperative agreements with U.S. trade associations which have an interest in developing foreign markets for American agricultural commodities. Under these contractual agreements, the Government finances projects actively carried out overseas by these associations. In general, these projects are built around market research, sales promotion, public relations, exchange of visitors and similar types of activities designed to increase exports of American agricultural commodities.
>
> In addition to carrying on this work in partnership with the Government, the U.S. trade groups contribute funds of their own and solicit the cooperation of appropriate foreign associations of importers and processors.
>
> The Foreign Agricultural Service, in carrying out the program described above in partnership with American private trade has worked generally with associations of growers, processors and exporters and has not contributed funds to private individuals or companies.

The funds for these programs are supposed to come out of available counterpart funds or foreign currencies which we have received in payment for foreign aid. The legislative precedent for counterpart funds is rooted in the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, commonly known as the Marshall plan, and sections 550 and 402 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951. Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 and subsequent amendments have greatly increased the availability and use of foreign currencies and are to a large extent the source of funds employed in the various market development programs now in effect.

Under these laws, contractual agreements are made with countries receiving U.S. aid to set aside in its own currency any money received from the sale to its people of goods that the American taxpayer had paid for. These deposits, counterpart funds, are placed in special accounts in each country's central banks to be used by the depositing country to carry out mutual security objectives agreed to jointly with the United States. As part of the objectives envisioned under the bilateral agreements, the administrative expenses of the economic assistance program and other U.S. expenses in each country are debited against the special account. A special percentage is set aside for the U.S. account, originally 5 percent but now 10 percent in most cases. However, an important exception is the foreign currencies deposited in the U.S. Treasury from transactions under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, Public Law 480. These transactions consist of the orderly sale under agreements negotiated with other nations, of U.S. surplus agriculture products. All foreign currencies derived from sales of surplus commodities received under Public Law 480 accrue to and are owned by the United States as compared to only 5 to 10 percent under the other agreements.

This is a most important fact and a study made by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress states:

> From all signs it seems that in the years ahead the hoard of these various local currencies, as held by the U.S. Treasury, will continue to grow. Public Law 480 with its provisions for the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities will be operative and the proceeds will result in the equivalent of billions of dollars worth of foreign currencies.

My primary reason for bringing this to your attention today is to shed some light on how these funds are now being expended and to seriously question whether they are serving the purposes as originally intended. If they are not, and I believe that they are being squandered and wasted in many cases, I question what will happen to the equivalent of billions of dollars worth of foreign currencies developed under Public Law 480 in future years. I am sure that there are many worthwhile projects supported by these funds as detailed in Public Law 480, title I, section 104, sections A through S; but if these programs are as mismanaged as in the instances I shall shortly mention, the result can only be a tremendous loss to the American taxpayer.

In advance, I want it understood that I am wholeheartedly in favor of Public Law 480 and its broad aims including the development of foreign markets, but my rather superficial research has brought out such daring misuse and waste by contracting trade associations and their foreign cooperators that a more complete and thorough examination in depth is absolutely necessary.

In my earlier inquiries to the Foreign Agricultural Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, I received very little to assist me toward understanding the agriculture market development program and whether there was in fact good reason for further investigation on my part. I had written to the Department asking mainly for information covering participation by Chicago area trade associations or cooperators and received the following answer stating:

> During the period beginning January 1, 1961, cooperative agreements for foreign market promotion have been in effect between FAS and four American trade groups having headquarters in the Chicago area.
>
> They are:
>
> Institute of American Poultry Industries, 67 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
>
> National Renderers' Association, 30 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
>
> National Hide Association, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
>
> National Livestock & Meat Board, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
>
> Expenditures of FAS funds by these assosiations for the period July 1, 1961, through March 31, 1963, are as follows:

Institute of American Poultry Industries	$769, 705
National Renderers' Association	125, 780
National Hide Association	104, 428
National Livestock & Meat Board	1, 484

Now these are quite large sums even though they are counterpart funds. As I will bring out later in this speech, Congress is taken to task for spending these funds to the tune of $400,000 a year. Here I found trade associations based in Chicago spending at a higher rate and yet not only have not their spendings been criticized, to my knowledge, hardly a soul even knows they exist.

Subsequent investigations turned up 25 other U.S. trade and agriculture groups with which the Department of Agriculture had signed project agreements during fiscal year 1963. These are:

Cotton Council International.
Soybean Council of America, Inc.
Dairy Society International.
Holstein-Friesian Association of America.
American Guernsey Cattle Club.
California Prune Advisory Board.
Florida Citrus Commission.
Sunkist Growers, Inc.
Cranberry Institute.
Red Cherry Exports, Inc.
California Raisin Advisory Board.
Dried Fruit Association of California.
Great Plains Wheat, Inc.
Western Wheat Associates, U.S.A., Inc.
Millers' National Federation.
U.S. Feed Grains Council.
U.S. Rice Export Development Association, Inc.
National Dry Bean Council.
Texas Certified Seed Producers, Inc.
Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc.
Tanners' Council of America, Inc.
International Brangus Breeders Association.
Tobacco Associates, Inc.
Leaf Tobacco Exporters Association, Inc.
Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc.
Virginia Dark-Fire & Sun-Cured Tobacco Export Association, Inc.

The project agreements covered a wide range of activities including such things as market analysis, studies of consumer demand, merchandising clinics, exhibits, food processing, training schools, promotional contests, cooking demonstrations, tours by foreign groups of U.S. agricultural industries, advertising campaigns, and the production and distribution of various promotional and educational materials.

Inasmuch as my original aim concerned free worldwide trips at Government expense, I wanted to know how much money is expended for travel to whom, when, where and at what cost. Foreign Agricultural Service finally showed me a compilation of all individuals who had traveled during the past 4 years from January 1959, to January 1963, under the program authorized by section 104(a) of Public Law 480. It seemed very odd that the listings had only name, place of departure and return, time of trips, amount paid to the individual and abbreviated purpose of the trip but no mention of what trade association they were connected with. Of course, in a great number of them, I could make a good guess as to the sponsoring; but since the Foreign Agricultural Service had stressed that all traveling was done through associations, it was strange sponsors were not mentioned.

Then I tabulated the cost figures and found that there was a total of more than $1 million spent for transportation and expenses during this period alone, and this did not begin to approach the sums spent for market development which included salaries, expenses, rent, and so forth, of oversea offices both of the contractor associations and its foreign cooperators.

Since this total was only for transportation and per diem allowances, one could easily see that there has been a lot of trips to the four corners of the globe and back, and I naturally began to wonder what benefits were being developed in some of these exotic countries. I further found out that the results and facts concerning these trips were not available for the most part in this country but were contained in the records of the various contracting associations and American Embassy offices abroad and not subject to an independent audit. As you may well imagine upon learning this, I was incredulous to say the very least.

Can anyone picture a situation where public funds are allocated to private associations who make contracts with foreign cooperators and other associations with these foreign cooperators providing for the maintenance and expense of their mutual operation with these public funds and then because there is no privity of contract between the U.S. agency, FAS and the third party, the foreign cooperators in this instance, who refuse to allow an audit to anyone except the contracting American association?

Well, that is the situation now, and it is further complicated by the failure of many of the contracting American associations to even file their reports with the Agriculture Department in America but keep them locked up in their American paid for and maintained offices in foreign countries.

Because this situation was so unbelievable and alarming, I brought the whole matter to the attention of my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, Represenative DAWSON, the outstanding chairman of the Government Operations Committee of the House. Everyone knows Congressman DAWSON and his committee keep close tab on the worldwide government operations, and they do a tremendous job in face of the breadth and scope of our committments. Chairman DAWSON was a most attentive listener and became convinced that the information I had gathered was deserving of further investigation.

Of course, this is in line with his consistent policy to ferret out the misappropriation, mismanagement or theft of funds, but his reaction to my findings was especially appreciated since I am not a member of his committee and admittedly a novice in this particular field. He subsequently assigned his staff investigators to look into the matter, and they are even now somewhere overseas checking out the items and completing audits of those records unavailable to local investigation.

In general, before the Government Operations Committee investigations are completed for whatever further action is decided, we as Members of this great body charged with exposing chicanery and deceit in the use of Government funds should consider the obvious criticisms of the Public Law 480 programs, which fall roughly within three major areas.

First. The unconscionable misuse and waste of counterpart funds for what in many instances can only be termed as pleasure trips and junketing with the prevailing attitude of "the money is there why not spend it." This along with the public relation atmosphere that it can all be charged off to expenses so why not have the best is an attitude than can only undermine whatever good is now being realized from the program.

Second. The cost of the program in dollars which is currently running between $10 and $13 million a year. Since the purpose of the Market Development Program was to use counterpart funds available without the payment of dollars, I find it hard to believe that we are spending millions of dollars of hard currencies, which amounts to a direct subsidy, for market developers and public relation people to take trips abroad and to do all types of entertaining and traveling at Government expense. Especially this is true for those Western European countries where local currencies are in shortage and any purchase of them with American dollars, of course, contributes an equal amount of funds to that of the government. It will be shown that this is perhaps the biggest farce in connection with this program. In many instances, the contracting associations charged off as part of their contributions $100 each day for each person sent overseas even though all expenses were paid by FAS, or they count the cost of an ad insertion by a cooperator advertising an American product in a foreign newspaper.

Third. Contractual agreements which are even now being signed for years in advance tying us to programs which I have serious reservations should continue at all. There is much proof to show that the contracts between FAS and the American trade associations run for 4, 5, or 6 years committing Congress and the administration to future appropriations to continue the program.

I should like to cite a few cases in point, and I can assure my colleagues that there are a great number of similar cases.

First. The first example to come to mind is the case of a turkey carver who traveled the world over showing those less fortunate how to carve a turkey. On one 10-month trip this former Army cook was paid transportation and per diem, and a salary at the rate of $1,000 per month. Mr. Speaker, not only do I believe this to be a most extravagant and outrageous waste in paying a man such an amount of money for the singular purpose of demonstrating how to carve a turkey, but surely if we are going to try to promote the export and sale of turkeys we could find better ways to spend our money. It also should be noted that in this worldwide demonstration, he gave no training to the citizens of the visited countries but only lectured and demonstrated; and this included some countries where knives and forks are the real luxury.

Then another example of unconscionable spending concerns certain Foreign

Agricultural Service sponsored conferences which many times seem to be held in places convenient to the individual personal tastes of the association heads rather than where it would be most economical and best serve the purposes of the conference. As I understand it, these are paid for by the Foreign Agricultural Service many times without substantial contribution from the benefiting trade associations. One that has been brought to my attention was held in September of this year when 56 persons were brought to Rome with all expenses paid to attend a world conference of animal production for a 10-day period, and the cost $75,000. This was under the joint auspices of the United States Feed Grains Council, the Soybean Council of America, the European Association of Animal Production, and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. It was all paid, however, by Foreign Agricultural Service funds under section 104 although the trade associations were supposed to be contributing equally. I believe the records will show that many who attended had little to qualify them as participants, some going so far as to misrepresent to FAS their qualifications in order to justify the use of FAS funds. I believe the records also will show that the Soybean Council has been involved in many of these same type junkets and, in fact, spent for travel and per diem $300,000 in one 4-year period alone.

After the actual conference, an excursion to various points in Italy of interest to tourists occupied 3 additional days. Almost everyone attending the 5-day conference, lasting from September 2 through the 7th, appears to have received 10 days of expenses covering the conference, the excursion, and travel time, in addition to round-trip air transportation to the conference. There was also a reception included which cost in the neighborhood of $5,000. And, perhaps the records will show that the usual daily credit of $100 per person per day in attendance is credited as a contribution toward the association's share.

Impartial officials feel that the conference did not seem sufficiently related to market development to justify the expenditures and that many of the participants contributed nothing to the conference and were merely along for the ride.

I wholeheartedly agree with their assessment. The World Conference of Animal Production was a boondoggle if there ever was one. Whether all other such conferences are similarly wasteful and extravagant, I have no idea; and judging from the records of FAS, they do not either. I am sure, however, when all the facts are placed before Chairman DAWSON he will be able to ascertain if a full-scale investigation should be held. There is little doubt in my mind, however, of the necessity of a thorough airing of the market development program as I am convinced that the program in many instances has gone astray and has degenerated into little more than providing free trips around the world for various members of these trade associations.

The previously mentioned World Conference of Animal Production is a good example of this. Two of the participating associations were the Soybean Council of America, Inc., and the United States Feed Grains Council. The principal officer of the Soybean Council is Howard L. Roach of Waterloo, Iowa, who I understand, also was instrumental in the forming of the Feed Grain Council. Mr. Roach has accounted for at least seven trips to various parts of the world at a cost of over $20,000 in travel and per diem alone. This is from January 1959 to January 1963, and of course, does not include the Rome conference of this year or other junkets that he may have taken prior to January 1959, or since last January. Nor does it include his assistants or the other officers and members of this association who accounted for $300,000 in travel cost during a similar 4-year period. How much else was charged off by the officers of his associations in the various countries visited to expenses, entertainment, conferences, and so forth, is not known and is unavailable except in the respective association offices and embassies abroad.

What is particularly galling to me is that many of these associations represent so-called conservative interests and are uniform in their demand of less Government spending, less Government participation in private sectors of the economy and, in fact, less Government. Yet we find that, as so often is the case, a supposedly conservative group from one of the most conservative States, in this case, Iowa, whose Representatives are always carrying the conservative banner, especially concerning anything that smacks of foreign aid or just plain foreign in nature, have their snouts way down in the trough, wastefully if not criminally spending the Public Law 480 money just because it is there.

I have one more example of an incomprehensible and unjustifiable use of Government funds in connection with this program and then I will leave it to you whether there is indeed an urgent need for reevaluation in this area.

This is particularly relevant because we are shortly to be discussing and voting on the cotton bill. I am sure you are all aware of the annual Maid of Cotton Contest where a beautiful and attractive American girl is chosen to be the representative of King Cotton in exhibiting and demonstrating the many uses of our American product in the field of clothing apparel. For years now the Cotton Council International and its predecessor, the National Cotton Council, has used such a contest to widely publicize some of the great many uses of cotton and as a followup to the contest a much publicized tour is launched showing off the new Maid of Cotton and the limitless possibilties of cotton fiber. In previous years these tours were taken at the expense of the Cotton Council International or the National Cotton Council, but when Uncle Sam offered to help under the guise of FAS, of course, they were not turned down. Since 1956, I believe, there has been no matching of Government funds and the FAS has paid all expenses of the maid and her retinue. This largesse cost us $15,000 for a world trip in 1959.

Now, even this promotion could be justifiable if not carried to excess as it could be classified as legitimate promotion; but, in my mind, there is no way in this world to plausibly or legitimately rationalize the expenditures of this year. This includes purchase of what we all have grown to think were fairly inexpensive cotton fabrics fashioned into a relatively cheap wardrobe but which cost FAS nearly $1,000 a dress. How could a cotton dress which supposedly epitomizes the universality and inexpensiveness of dresses made from homegrown cotton cost such an exorbitant price? Well, it appears that someone felt that American designers were not expert enough to design a cotton dress for the cotton queen. In fact, it took no less than Christian Dior and John Cavanaugh, Ltd., of England, to fashion some of these dresses. And the cost was drastically increased by hundreds of dollars for air freight of the dresses back to the United States for fittings. Why did the appropriate agency approve such a throwaway—and will they do it again?

I think it is fairly obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the program envisioned under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, known as Public Law 480, has gone askew and to a certain degree has lost sight of its purpose. Public Law 480 states:

> It is the policy to use foreign currencies which accrue to the United States under this Act to expand international trade, to encourage economic development, to purchase strategic material to pay United States obligations abroad, to promote collective strength and to foster in other ways the foreign policy on the United States.

It also says under section 104(c) of the act that we should "give special consideration to utilizing the authority and funds provided by this act in order to develop and expand continuous market demand abroad for agricultural commodities with appropriate emphasis on underdeveloped and new market areas." This is a wonderful concept but the current abuses are undermining the whole program. Subsequent amendments to the act to finance for the interchange of persons under title II of the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 and financing trade fair participation and related activities have opened up a pandora's box for worldwide junkets whose purposes are couched in such general terms as to "observe market development programs and confer with officials of cooperating industry groups" in the countries visited.

Mr. Speaker, one of the Congress' most important prerogatives is to assure that its legislative intent is not being subverted or diverted whether willfully or unconsciously by those invested with the authority to carry out its acts. I think we need to check further into all aspects of the market development program, and I shall have more to say in the near future about the market development program under the auspices of the Foreign Agricultural Service of the Department of Agriculture with respect to other abuses and shenanigans that should be exposed.

In closing, I would like to quote from an editorial carried in the Chicago Daily News this last week severely critical of Members of Congress who make use of these counterpart funds while traveling in foreign countries in pursuance of their official duties:

> Counterpart funds are local currencies deposited in this country's account in repayment of loans made to a foreign country under the aid program. They must be spent within the country of origin, and are used to buy goods and services, such as salaries of local employees of U.S. offices abroad. They are also made available to junketing Congressmen, who spend what they need and return the balance (if any) to the U.S. Embassy when they leave the country.
>
> We do not know what kind of accounting is kept of these funds, but Congressmen alone have been known to tap them for upward of $400,000 in a single year. That sum can finance a considerable amount of junketing * * * and, contrary to some theories, the money does come from somewhere. It comes out of the hides of the taxpayers, who sweat for every nickel of it. It's their money and they deserve a careful accounting of it.

This is typical of the publicity given to trips taken by Congressmen no matter how much they may be in the public interest. I will be most interested to see whether these greater expenditures, by individual trade associations such as the Institute of American Poultry Industries and the Soybean Council of America, many of which are wholly unjustifiable and wasteful of the taxpayers' money will be treated with as much fanfare. These are cases of individuals not on Government business, extravagantly spending and misusing taxpayers' money for their own individual profit and gain or for the profit and gain of their employers.

I also add for clarification that Congressmen do have to justify their expenditures within 60 days of their return and they become records of the House of Representatives, whereas the details of the expenses of the associations and cooperators are buried in obscure file cabinets in every part of the world.

Finally, the equivalent of millions of dollars have been spent in the individual programs and many millions more are committed in the years ahead. The total sums to be eventually expended will run into the billions. Should not we and the American people be more concerned with these facts and the unanswered questions arising out of them, rather than the normal expenditure of foreign currencies by Congress and other Government officials as set up by law?

AN ECONOMIC GAIN IN WEST VIRGINIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the honor to join the families of those working at the Du Pont Co.'s Washington works near Parkersburg, W. Va., for a most illuminating tour of the plant. Located on the Ohio River near historic Blennerhassett Island, Du Pont's Washington works is this year celebrating its 15th year of commercial production. Under the able leadership of its manager, A. Gordon Custer, there has been assembled an administrative, technical, scientific, and engineering staff which has made this plant one of the brightest stars on West Virginia's economic horizon.

LARGEST PRODUCER OF PLASTICS

The Washington works of Du Pont has grown steadily in the past 15 years. In fact, there has been hardly a year in which major construction was not underway on the site. During this period, the Washington works has become the largest producer in bulk plastics materials in the United States. Its products, roughly in the order in which they were introduced at the plant, are:

> "Lucite" acrylic resin: This clear, highly colorable plastic, with many of the properties of glass, is used in automobile taillight lenses, signs and lighting fixtures, in all-weather paneling, and many other applications.
>
> "Zytel" nylon resin: Nylon molding powder sparked a design and engineering revolution in the plastics industry. For the first time the industry had a strong, tough material that could be molded into mechanical parts.
>
> "Tynex" nylon monofilament: Is used as a bristling material in paintbrushes, personal brushes, in the new nylon zippers, in wigs, toothbrushes, etc. A sister product, "Herox" nylon monofilament, is used in street sweep brushes and other industrial brushes.
>
> "Teflon" fluorocarbon resins: Unique plastic materials that withstand high temperatures and most chemicals. Almost nothing sticks to them. They are found in a wide variety of applications ranging from satellites to nonstick cooking utensils.
>
> "Butacite" polyvinyl butyral resin: The inner layer of the glass sandwich, known as safety glass and used in the windshields of automobiles, and certain other glass applications.
>
> "Delrin" acetal resin: A tough, springy engineering plastic introduced by Du Pont in 1960. It is already used in more than 5,000 applications.
>
> "Stren" fluorescent monofilament: Used in fishing lines and leaders. It has excellent tensile strength, limpness, knot strength and other properties prized by both salt and fresh water fishermen.
>
> "Dymetrol" continuous precision nylon: A strapping material used in industrial packaging, it is the most recent addition to the product mix of the Washington works.

WHY DU PONT CHOSE WEST VIRGINIA

A little over a century ago, my grandfather, George Hechler, enlisted in the Union Army at Parkersburg, W. Va., sailed down the Ohio and up the Kanawha River and before engaging in Civil War battles his regiment was encamped near Charleston where the Belle, W. Va., plant of Du Pont is now located. A. Gordon Custer, the Washington works manager, recently told me:

> An earlier experience at Belle had indicated generally that we could expect loyal, intelligent, and efficient performance from West Virginia men and women who would choose careers with Du Pont. This has been borne out.

Mr. Custer has listed several other factors in addition to the all-important value of West Virginia's human resources. He indicates that Du Pont's plant location near Parkersburg, W. Va., "has given good access to both markets and raw materials." He also cites the fact that there is "an abundant supply of water, and good transportation facilities." He notes that "all of these advantages influenced the decision to build in West Virginia."

Looking back over the past 15 years, what does hindsight reveal about Du Pont's decision to locate in West Virginia? Here is what Washington works manager Custer concludes:

> The years Du Pont has been in Parkersburg have been successful ones. The company's experience has supported the original decision to build a plastics plant in West Virgina.

TREMENDOUS INCREASE IN JOBS

During our recent tour of the Du Pont facilities, I was impressed by a huge display board which graphically illustrated the steady and vigorously healthy increase in the number of employees at the Washington works. In the 15 years which Du Pont has been operating, the payroll has risen from 400 men and women to almost 2,000 persons. This is a phenomenal increase in jobs. Some of these employees come across the river from Ohio, but the bulk of them are West Virginians.

At present, the payroll of the Washington works is running at about $13,225,000 a year. Since January 1948, the total paid to all employees through 1962 was $90,713,000. During this period, the average annual earnings of the plant's hourly paid employees has increased from $3,162 to $6,448—more than double what it was 15 years ago.

WHAT THIS MEANS TO THE PARKERSBURG AREA

To build the manufacturing units to produce such a wide range of products at the Washington works, Du Pont has invested many millions of dollars in highly complex tools and equipment. This investment runs approximately $37,000 per employee. It is amazing to reflect that this investment figure runs about four or five times the U.S. industrial average.

Much of the $90,713,000 cumulative 15-year payroll of the Washington works has been spent in Parkersburg and surrounding communities. Another contribution to the economy of the area are the purchases the plant makes locally. At the Washington works, purchases in the Parkersburg area are running at about $5,500,000 annually.

Still another measure of Du Pont's contribution would be the amount of taxes furnished. Figures are not available on individual taxes, but the record shows that from 1948 through 1962, the Washington works contributed $3,921,690 in local and State taxes. One need only pick up any newspaper, or listen to any news program, to realize the personal leadership and financial contributions made by Du Pont officials and employees to every united fund drive and scores of other church and charitable undertakings. The civic leadership of the Parkersburg area owes much to the personnel of the Washington works of Du Pont.

THE ANSWER TO AUTOMATION

Not long ago, Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz delivered an inspiring address to 300 representatives of combined technical societies in the Parkersburg area.

A large number of Du Pont personnel were present at this discussion. Taking a position somewhat different from that of AFL–CIO President George Meany, Secretary Wirtz outlined the challenge of automation and pointed to certain guidelines which might profitably be followed in attempting to make automation our servant rather than our inhuman master.

It gave me a great deal of pride to point out to my old friend, Secretary Wirtz, some of the striking accomplishments which have been scored at the Du Pont plant, while extending full protection to the individual worker and also increasing both the number of jobs and the individual payroll. I have already cited the fact that the payroll has risen from 400 to nearly 2,000 in 15 years, while average annual earnings of hourly paid employees have rocketed from $3,162 to $6,448. This has all been done while the Washington works was making use of such technological advances as electronic programing and automatic controls to increase productivity. As explained by Washington Works Manager Custer:

> It is the plant's record of productivity that encourages the investment of additional capital funds for expansion which, of course, leads to new jobs and higher pay.

THE ROLE OF COMPETITIVE FREE PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

When Secretary of Labor Wirtz came to Parkersburg, W. Va., recently, a questioner in the audience wanted to know if he felt that the solution to most problems was action by the Federal Government, which might induce the little lambs to trail along behind Mary. Without a moment's hesitation, Secretary Wirtz replied:

> I will answer you in poetry, too.

He then cited this couplet from Oliver Goldsmith:

> "How small of all that human hearts endure
> That part which laws or kings can cause or cure."

It must be constantly borne in mind that automation can neither be harnessed or directed by the Federal Government, nor can it be completely controlled within the confines of a single plant. It does not operate in a vacuum. The ultimate measure of the success of a plant is its ability to satisfy the demands of the marketplace. For the Washington works of Du Pont, or for any other plant, the effort to provide high quality products at reasonable prices is a day-to-day undertaking. The plant must also keep its manufacturing costs at levels that insure a reasonable return on the capital invested in its operation.

Obviously, the Washington works must use all of the fruits of advancing technology. If it fails to keep step with advancing technology, there are plenty of competitors waiting in the wings to try to win out through using that technology. And once the competitors step in with better methods, that would end the phenomenal growth in wages and employees which has marked the record of the Washington works.

When the average person thinks of Du Pont, he thinks of some big industry that has a monopolistic stranglehold on certain practices and products. I can certify that the opposite is true, and that Du Pont's competitors are breathing down their necks in many cases. This situation is economically healthy, for it spurs each plant and industry to strain at the leash and produce better products at lower cost, while attracting and keeping more and better paid employees.

Mr. Speaker, West Virginia and the Parkersburg area are proud of the tremendous contribution which the Washington works of Du Pont has made to the economy of the State and the entire mid-Ohio Valley area.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana (at the request of Mr. COOLEY), for November 18 through November 27, 1963, on account of being appointed official delegate to attend the 12th Biennial Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations meeting in Rome, Italy.

Mr. DUNCAN (at the request of Mr. COOLEY) for November 18 through November 27, 1963, on account of being appointed official delegate to attend the 12th Biennial Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations meeting in Rome, Italy.

Mr. NELSEN, for today (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), on account of illness in the family.

Mr. RANDALL (at the request of Mr. KARSTEN), for November 18, 19, and 20, on account of official business.

Mr. HOSMER (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today and tomorrow, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HECHLER, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana, for 15 minutes, on November 25, 26, 27, and December 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, and 12.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. EVINS.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. FINO and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. WILLIAMS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HARVEY of Michigan) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. ST. GEORGE.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. DOLE.

Mrs. MAY.

Mr. DEROUNIAN.

Mr. BEERMANN.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1561. An act to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 19, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1373. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of a list of the institutions or organizations whose properties were specifically exempted by special acts of Congress prior to the passage of the act of December 24, 1942, showing the purposes for which such properties were used during the calendar year 1962, pursuant to Public Law 846, 77th Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1374. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting copies of reports of every institution, organization, corporation, or association other than the U.S. Government, government of the District of Columbia, and foreign governments, owning property exempt pursuant to Public Law 846, 77th Congress, covering the calendar year 1962; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1375. A letter from the Acting Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Donald J. Kent"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1376. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to repeal and amend certain statutes fixing or prohibiting the collection of fees for certain services under the navigation laws"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1377. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill relating to the dutiable status of certain articles, including articles containing foreign materials, which come into the United States from its insular possessions"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1378. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the report of the Attorney General on the administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act, as amended, covering the calendar year 1962, pursuant to the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of November 14, 1963, the following bill was reported on November 15, 1963:

Mr. CANNON: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 9140. A bill making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 902). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted November 18, 1963]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 8527. A bill to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Kootenai Tribe or Band of Indians, Idaho; with amendment (Rept. No. 903). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 988. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the Graff House site for inclusion in Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 904). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 5345. A bill to change the name of the Andrew Johnson National Monument, to add certain historic property thereto, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 905). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 7458. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Carlsbad Caverns National Park in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 906). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of November 14, 1963, the following bill was introduced on November 15, 1963:

By Mr. CANNON:

H.R. 9140. A bill making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

[Introduced and referred Nov. 18, 1963]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 9141. A bill to establish a Farm Corps to assist the peoples of friendly foreign nations in the alleviation of agricultural difficulties; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 9142. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 9143. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to revise the pension program for World War I, World War II, and Korean conflict veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 9144. A bill to prohibit any guarantee by the Export-Import Bank or any other agency of the Government of payment of obligations of Communist countries; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 9145. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose additional duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year in excess of annual quotas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 9146. A bill to amend the provisions of section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for the exemption of certain terminal leases from penalties; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.J. Res. 804. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 568. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred pursuant to House Resolution 103; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 9147. A bill for the relief of Gertrude Payne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 9148. A bill for the relief of Joseph Aizig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 9149. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Cleve Crusinberry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 9150. A bill for the relief of Miss Leonor do Rozario de Medeiros (Leonor Medeiros); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUTEN:

H.R. 9151. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose Esther Benant, nee Rosenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 9152. A bill for the relief of William F. Kuhlman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

453. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Maurice R. Franks, Searcy, Ark., requesting congressional investigation of alleged illegal use by the so-called U.S. Committee for the United Nations of false, misleading, and controversial political propaganda on U.S. postage meter stamps, in violation of postal regulations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

454. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, General Delivery, Worland, Wyo., requesting a resolution calling for the publishing of a book to be entitled "Meet the Congressmen"; to the Committee on House Administration.

455. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, General Delivery, Worland, Wyo., requesting a study and review of the entire status of political parties in America; to the Committee on House Administration.

456. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, General Delivery, Worland, Wyo., requesting Congress to require and demand better elevator inspection in all U.S. national park Government contractors' facilities; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

457. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, General Delivery, Shoshoni, Wyo., relative to his approving of the junketeering U.S. House restaurant headwaiter's recent trip, and condoning the action by comparing the "cushy" jobs for Ivy Leaguers in the vast executive branch of the U.S. Government; to the Committee on House Administration.

458. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, General Delivery, Shoshoni, Wyo., requesting Congress to attempt to require all salary schedules to be geared solely to take-home pay, thus recognizing the fact that a person's real personal money is that left after governmental taxes have been deducted; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 1963

(Legislative day of Tuesday, October 22, 1963)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana.

Rev. Alexander Veinbergs, pastor, the Latvian Evangelical Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

For a small nation on the Baltic Sea, this is the day for thanksgiving and hope—thanksgiving for independence and freedom once possessed, hope for a new dawn of liberty, with the help of Thy almighty hand.

On this, Latvia's Independence Day, we thank Thee for the precious gift of liberty we all enjoy here. We pray Thee, Father, let Thine eternal light shine upon the Senate and let it shine from this place throughout the land and the world. Guide the minds and the hearts of the Senators, that they may find the right way, through all confusion, to stand for what is right and true and just. Renew for all of us, O Lord, the inspiration Abraham Lincoln gave to the world one dark November day 100 years ago, when he stood at the graveside of soldiers and spoke for all generations, all nationalities, all who unjustly suffer, and said: "that these dead shall not have died in vain."

There are brethren suffering and dying today. We ask Thee that these shall not suffer in vain, and like "this Nation under God" which has had "a new birth of freedom," so let the small Latvia and other captive nations have their new birth of freedom.

Only then we would witness the world where, speaking in the words of a prophet, "justice rolls down like waters, and righteousness like ever-flowing streams." Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., November 18, 1963.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. METCALF thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, November 15, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that Hon. CARL ALBERT, a Representative from the State of Oklahoma, had been elected Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

The message announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 912) approving a compromise and settlement agreement of the Navajo Tribe of Indians and authorizing the tribe to execute and the Secretary of the Interior to approve any oil and gas leases entered into pursuant to the agreement.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDER

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, it was ordered that there be a morning hour, with statements limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations.

The Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

THE SENATE AND ITS LEADERSHIP

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last week I was interviewed in my office by Mr. Jerry O'Leary, of the Washington Star; Mr. Richard Dudman, of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch; Mr. J. F. Ter Horst, of the Detroit News; and Mr. George R. Kentera, of the Newark News. A condensation of this interview, I assume, appeared in their Sunday papers. The condensation, which was necessitated by space limitations in the papers, was made by the interviewers. It is, in my judgment, faithful to the sense and tone of the interview, and it had my approval. But a condensation can never be the full story. And insofar as the Senate is concerned, it ought to have the full story. The reporters who conducted the interview were aware of and approved my intention of placing the full verbatim text in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD subsequent to the publication of the condensation.

I shall do so today. I want the record to be clear and complete as to my attitude on the questions which have been expressed of late on this Senate and its leadership. This interview may not be the last word which I shall have to say on the subject. But because the interview was wholly spontaneous and conducted by highly skilled reporters, it provides an authentic indication of what the Senator from Montana, the majority leader, thinks on subjects which are or ought to be of concern—of very deep concern—to every Member of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the verbatim transcript of the interview to be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERVIEW WITH HON. MIKE MANSFIELD, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF MONTANA, 2 P.M., WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1963, ROOM S-208, THE CAPITOL

PROCEEDINGS

Question. Senator MANSFIELD, there has been a lot said on the Senate floor and in the newspapers about the quality of leadership in the Senate. Since leadership is frequently measured by what is or is not accomplished, can you tell us how you view the record of the Senate under your leadership?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, as far as the analysis of the leadership or a leader is concerned, that is up to each individual to decide as to whether it is good, bad, or indifferent. But I think the final test is what the Senate has done.

I would say that the Senate, up to this time, has made a very respectable record, and for this the Senate should get credit. As far as the Congress is concerned, we have completed action on 43 pieces of legislation out of 128, including appropriations, asked for by the President this year.

In addition to that, 24 other measures, which have been recommended by the President, have passed the Senate. One measure has a conference report filed and will be brought up some time after the aid bill is out of the way.

There are four measures in conference between the two Houses. That brings us to a total of 72 items passed either by the Congress as a whole or by the Senate, or in conference. Out of a total of 128 Presidential recommendations this year, and that is the total of the Presidential recommendations, that would give us an average of 58 percent up to this moment.

Question. Senator, could you break those down as to whether they are major pieces or minor pieces, and what are some of the measures that have been passed by the Senate?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, there have been a number of important measures passed. For example, the Defense Appropriations Act is one. That amounted to about $47 to $48 billion. Equal pay for women, the feed grains bill, housing for the elderly, medical education aid, a mental health bill of tremendous importance; maternal and child health services, military construction, military pay, the nuclear test ban treaty, the public debt ceiling has been attended to twice, the difficult railroad labor dispute has been settled at least on a temporary basis until next March 1.

We have repealed the Silver Purchase Act; passed six treaties in addition to the nuclear test ban treaty. In conference we have the Pacific Northwest power bill, the vocational education bill, which is quite important. Out of conference and ready to come up we have the higher education bill, which is also of major significance.

All those bills, of course, are not major, but I would point out that in all the Presidential recommendations, as I see the picture now, there remain only three bills which could be considered of really major significance. They are, of course, the tax bill, the civil rights bill, and the health care for the aged bill.

Question. Senator, do you think it will be possible in the time that is left before Christmas to get action on either of those two big ones, the tax or civil rights?

Senator MANSFIELD. The best I can say at this time is that I am hopeful that one or the other will be brought up before Christmas.

Question. In the Senate?

Senator MANSFIELD. In the Senate.

Question. As the priority determines, Senator, the civil rights bill will probably have to be first?

Senator MANSFIELD. Whichever one is ready first we will take up.

Question. Senator DIRKSEN estimated yesterday it would be March 15 before the Finance Committee gets the tax bill out on the floor. Does it look that far away to you?

Senator MANSFIELD. Maybe Senator DIRKSEN is being a little too pessimistic. It is my understanding that the hearings will conclude on the tax bill on December 13.

I would assume they would take several weeks to mark up that bill, which would indicate that it might be available sometime after the first of the year for action on the Senate floor.

So I would hope that if we do not get a civil rights bill in between, that we would be ready to take up the tax bill shortly after New Year's.

Question. Senator, it has been generally said and understood that the Congress will probably adjourn on December 20. Do you anticipate the civil rights bill could come up before then? If so, wouldn't that prolong the session due to lengthy debate?

Senator MANSFIELD. No. If the civil rights bill does come up before then, we will take it up, but we will go out at the conclusion of business on December 20 and we will not come back until the day after New Year's.

I see no reason to keep the Senate in during the Christmas and New Year's holidays. After all, this is only the 1st session of the 88th Congress. We have another session. There is no breakoff. There is no final adjournment. We have the time to do the work which will have to be done.

Question. Senator, do you think from now on Congress, because of the growth of the country and so on, is going to be in session all year, or do you think they might do something that would shorten the sessions in the future?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, I would hope that they could shorten sessions or prepare themselves to operate on a year-round basis. But if they are going to shorten the sessions, they are going to have to bring about some reforms in the rules of the Senate pertaining to germaneness. They will have to do something about the fact that the Finance Committee in the Senate cannot take up a measure such as the tax bill, for example, until the House Ways and Means Committee is through with it and it has passed that body.

I believe the time taken on that bill in the other House was approximately 9 months this year. That applies to other bills out of the House Ways and Means Committee, too.

Question. The custom applies that to appropriations also, does it not?

Senator MANSFIELD. That is correct. Some people say that the House has a constitutional right. I think that is a debatable question. But I would think that a formula based on what Senator RUSSELL proposed some months ago, to the effect that consideration be given to half the bills originating in each House, is worthy of consideration, or at least that we could start hearings at the same time the other body does.

The same reasoning applies to bills out of the Ways and Means Committee because, unfortunately, the Senate is blamed all too often for delays when, as a matter of fact, we are unable to act in our committees until the opposite committees in the House have acted on the legislation under consideration.

Question. Except for those difficulties you have mentioned, are you generally satisfied with the pace of business in the Senate this year?

Senator MANSFIELD. Yes; I am satisfied. I think that the Senate as a whole has done a very creditable job. I think you only have to look at the calendar to find out that we are pretty well caught up.

If you will check with the individual committees, except for the Finance and the Appropriations Committees, and for reasons beyond their control, you will find that they have been on the ball pretty much all year. Contrary to popular reports, a good deal of really responsible legislation has been reported out of the committees, has been considered by the Senate, and has been passed.

Question. Senator, in view of that, you would think that most of the Members of the Senate would share your pride in what has been accomplished and wouldn't be indulging in some of the criticisms of other Members of the Senate that we had last week.

To what would you attribute this restlessness or backbiting, or whatever it can be described as?

Senator MANSFIELD. I think the Members are getting a little restless, a little edgy. It has been a long session. It hasn't been a dramatic or glamorous session. There are other responsibilities which impinge upon the activities of the Members of this body. But I would say that by and large, there are very few Members who would be willing to stand up and state that they are dissatisfied with the progress of the Senate.

I have heard a lot about these cloakroom rumors. I am afraid that most of these cloakroom rumors come out of the imaginations and the speculations of members of the press. I have yet to see one of these cloakroom commandos that they talk about, and if there are any I wish they would come to me and make their views known, and, as far as I am concerned, would get up on the Senate floor and do the same thing.

Question. Senator, it is frequently said that you believe in dealing with other Senators as one adult to another and that not all Members of the Senate are prepared for that treatment and really would like to have their arms twisted now and then.

Senator MANSFIELD. I would disagree completely. I think this is a body of mature men and women. They want to be treated as equals. They are. I expect to be treated by them as I treat them, and I am.

Question. Senator MANSFIELD, what are your feelings about the resolution introduced the other day by Senator PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin, that the leadership of both Houses should get together and try to expedite the business of the second session of this Congress.

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, I think that psychologically it may have some effect, but practically it would have none. After all, what power do the leaders have to force these committees, to twist their arms, to wheel and deal, and so forth and so on, to get them to rush things up or to speed their procedure?

The leaders in the Senate, at least, have no power delegated to them except on the basis of courtesy, accommodation, and a sense of responsibility. I see nothing to be gained by it. I see nothing to be lost by the introduction of that particular resolution.

Question. Sir, did I understand you to say that it wouldn't help if the committees decided not to go along? You did say there is nothing you can do about the committee pace; is that right?

Senator MANSFIELD. That is correct. We can ask the committees, and I have had four or five meetings this year with committee chairmen, for reports on their work. I have asked them to speed up their procedures on certain pieces of legislation.

They have been most cooperative. There has been no dilatoriness that I am aware of, and despite reports to the contrary I have seen no evidence of any delaying action on the part of the southerners; nor have I seen any evidence of delay on the part of Senator BYRD, whose committee is considering the tax bill at the moment. As a matter of fact, on at least three or four occasions over the past 5 or 6 months Senator BYRD has come to me and asked me to see if there wasn't some way the House could speed up the tax bill so that his committee could get started on it.

He also stated that he thought that they could finish their consideration of the bill in the vicinity of 6 weeks. That has been extended, but I would be the last one in the world to question HARRY BYRD's good faith as some have.

Question. That 6 or 8 weeks would be measured against 8 or 9 months in the House, wouldn't it?

Senator MANSFIELD. That is correct. A lot of people do not take that comparison into consideration.

Question. Senator, do you think the Magnuson plan would help in the future, of having two sessions a year?

Senator MANSFIELD. I certainly do. I have advocated it for a long time because what Senator MAGNUSON's proposal would do would be to have a legislative session and an appropriation session.

At the present time, what we do is to sandwich the appropriation bills, some of them, way up in the tens of billions of dollars between other legislative proposals. We do not give them the attention they deserve. Consequently, I think we are subject to the charge of hasty and ill-considered legislation, although I must admit in all honesty that we do depend upon committees to a large extent, and we are fairly certain that the committees go into the necessary details and we can take their reports and their recommendations with good heart.

Question. Senator, what would be necessary to bring this about?

Senator MANSFIELD. Just the passage of the Magnuson proposal, which I understand is in the Rules Committee, if it has been introduced this year. I am not certain.

Question. He told me the other day he was going to ask the Rules Committee to look into it in the coming session.

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, I would like to see it reported out. I would like to see it passed, because while tradition is a great thing in the Senate and I believe in it, I think that as times change the Senate has to change, too. This is one way that we could change.

I think we also ought to reduce the number necessary to invoke cloture from two-thirds of those present and voting to three-fifths. I think we ought to follow Senator PASTORE's idea of a rule of germaneness for the first 4 or 5 hours each day, and I think we ought to do something about the authority which each individual Senator has to object to unanimous-consent requests.

The times call for a change. Changes must be made without undermining the foundations of the Senate as an institution. But with the questions coming before us in this day and age I think that changes are mandatory, though I would not go as far as some of our Members would recommend.

Question. When you spoke of unanimous consent a while ago, did you mean to a committee meeting or unanimous consent on anything?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, I think we have to be a little selective. To committee meetings, for example. There is no reason why committee meetings cannot meet on many occasions while the Senate is in session. In that way, committee work could be speeded up and legislation could be brought to the floor that much more quickly and possibly as a result in the overall picture the Congress could adjourn that much sooner. But any Senator has the right to object to any kind of a unanimous consent request, and I think that that gives too much power to any one Senator in a 100-Member body.

Question. Senator, do you think a majority of the Senators feel this way about it, as you do, and that such a thing could be passed?

Senator MANSFIELD. I think at times they feel that way, depending on the circumstances. But I think it would be worth a test on the Senate floor and then we would see what the Senate would feel. No one could tell at the moment.

Question. In connection with the pace of the Senate and the matter of getting work done, in the last session, in the 87th, there was considerable criticism that the White House had been too heavyhanded on the Hill. This session some of us have heard comments from Members indicating that the President and his advisers have not been there when their help was needed.

How do you feel about this question of pressure or lack of it or coordination between the Senate and the White House?

Senator MANSFIELD. I have had nothing but the utmost in cooperation insofar as Senate-White House relations are concerned. They have never been heavyhanded. They have been understanding and they have realized that we have our responsibilities.

As far as I am concerned personally, I have nothing but words of praise for the relationship which exists between the White House and this body.

Question. One complaint we hear sometimes is that the scheduling of votes is so uncertain that Senators can't tell when it is safe to be out of town and miss a rollcall vote.

Do you consider that the responsibility of the leadership, to try to group these votes and make the schedule known in advance?

Senator MANSFIELD. Insofar as possible. I must say I have been at fault many times in that respect. But when you have people, colleagues, come to you two or three times a week and say, "Please don't bring up this bill on that day," "Please don't vote at this hour," "I have an engagement out home and I can't be here," it places the leadership in a very difficult position, because the leadership cannot tell a Member to stay on the floor. He can ask the Members to stay on the floor, but they can thumb their noses at him and they do it quite often.

As I said before, the leadership has no real power, none at all. He has to operate on the basis of persuasion, accommodation, understanding, but he has to expect something like that in return. But all too often Members have come to me, and on occasion some have even threatened me, that they didn't want votes at a certain time or on a certain day, that they had engagements back home or they wanted to go some place for some reason, and—very rarely—if I did not accommodate them, well, they would see that there was a lot of talk and no action would be taken on the floor and so forth and so on.

So the result is we have to try and get along with our colleagues on the best possible basis and do the best we can to keep the wheels of legislation running. Keep in mind the fact that there is always other legislation to be considered and that you need this vote, that vote and all these votes. It isn't easy. You are subject to criticism.

I have bent perhaps too often to extend favors of this nature to my colleagues. I have been criticized. The criticism is justified. But I do not know how else to operate if the Members themselves do not show a sense of maturity and recognize the fact that their job is here, to represent the people and their States, and that their engagements are of secondary importance.

Question. Is there too much absenteeism in the Senate?

Senator MANSFIELD. There is.

Question. Sir, it seems inevitable that if and when the civil rights bill comes up in the Senate there is going to be a filibuster of some kind. I think you are aware that in the past there has been some criticism of you on the grounds you haven't held people's feet to the fire, so to speak, and kept them up all night.

Senator MANSFIELD. I don't intend to. This is not a circus or a side show. We are not operating in a pit with spectators coming into the galleries late at night to see Senators of the Republic come out in bedroom slippers, without neckties, with hair uncombed, and pajama tops sticking out of their necks.

I believe there is a certain amount of dignity and decorum attached to this institution and to the position that each of us holds. Regardless of the consequences, as far as I am concerned, that dignity will be upheld and the best interests of this institution will be looked after as long as I happen to be the leader.

Question. You would rather see the rules modernized than go to an endurance contest?

Senator MANSFIELD. Of course. Who wins in an endurance contest? Not the older members, not those who may be under medical treatment. But the minority wins, because they are well disciplined, they know what they are doing. They operate on a 4-hour shift basis. Some of those who are always spouting off and talking about how much they are for civil rights, this, that or the other thing, where are they when you want them? When you want a quorum call? They are not around.

So as far as being a whipcracker or a coordinator for a Roman holiday, count me out.

Question. Senator, it sounds as though you are making a good case for the proposition that being a Senator is a full-time job.

Senator MANSFIELD. It is, and it is getting to be more and more of a full-time job. I wish my colleagues would all realize it. Most of them do, fortunately, but not all of them.

Question. Do you think, sir, that in light of the fact that you think it is a full-time job that the Senate should undertake, or the Congress should undertake, to establish some kind of code of ethics which it expects of the executive branch, so that Members will not have outside financial and business interests which might interfere with their duties here?

Senator MANSFIELD. That is a question which I do not feel that I am qualified to answer for the Senate. But I do feel I am qualified to answer personally. As far as I personally am concerned, yes.

Question. What would be the nature of such a code of ethics?

Senator MANSFIELD. As far as I am concerned, speaking personally, not for the Senate, I think it should list outside stockholdings and other business interests, as has been done by Senators CLARK, YOUNG of Ohio, SCOTT of Pennsylvania, and perhaps others.

I recall several years ago when Senator CLARK listed his outside interests. I listed mine. It was very easy. I had none.

Question. How difficult would it be to get Congress as a whole to require disclosure of that sort?

Senator MANSFIELD. That is something that the Congress, itself, should consider and I personally would not want to talk on it except as it affects me personally.

Question. Sir, do you think personally that this would increase the confidence of the voters of this country in their elected representatives?

Senator MANSFIELD. Not necessarily, because I think that there are those who, if their holdings were common knowledge, would be looked upon with suspicion every time they voted on a certain kind of measure.

As far as I am concerned, I think that the Senate is a very honest body. I think the individual Members of the Senate are honest representatives of the people. I would not want suspicion to be cast upon them, because after having observed them for several decades now I have nothing but the highest admiration for the membership of this body, not only today but as it existed down through the years that I have been here, and that applies to both Republicans and Democrats.

Question. But the Congress seems to point this suspicion toward people who are selected for executive jobs in the administration by its actions.

Senator MANSFIELD. That is correct. I have felt for a long time that the Congress has carried this idea of conflict of interest entirely too far as regards Presidential appointees. A nominee should not be considered dishonest because a particular administration wants him to undertake a particular job.

The result is we cast guilt on these people who appear before our committees in the process of nomination, unwittingly, of course. We make them strip themselves of their stocks which might come in conflict. I think it is very unfair. I think if a man is brought into Government he should be considered honest until proven otherwise. He should be looked into thoroughly before they are appointed, as I am sure they are, and I do not think they should get rid of their stocks nor do I think they should be subjected to the inquisition which many of them have to suffer on the basis of this conflict-of-interest proposal.

Question. At any rate, you would say what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander?

Senator MANSFIELD. As far as I am concerned personally, yes.

Question. Senator, in light of that, do you think that the Senate's decision to investigate the outside activities of its staff employees should be limited to those employees or should the investigation proceed to wherever the evidence leads it?

Senator MANSFIELD. It should be limited to those employees who are employees of the Senate as a whole. As far as the employees in a Senator's office are concerned, that is that particular Senator's direct responsibility.

As far as the Senators themselves are concerned, that is something which they themselves must face up to.

I would point out that there have been bills in the Rules Committee for well over a decade—I think the longest in time is Senator MORSE's and there have been bills introduced by Senators KEATING, JAVITS, CASE, NEUBERGER, and others—seeking to bring about this disclosure on the part of Senators.

These bills are lying fallow in the Rules Committee. I would hope that the Rules Committee in good time would take them up and report them out and bring them to the Senate floor for consideration and debate.

But getting back to your original question, I think the Williams resolution should be adhered to strictly, and that applies only to employees of the Senate. There are bills to take care of the Senators themselves. They should be taken up in due time by the Rules Committee.

Question. Not as a legal matter, but as a psychological matter, something that might affect the country, isn't there some weight to the argument of a Senate employee who might say, "Well, what is wrong if I have outside business interests, because my bosses do?"

Senator MANSFIELD. There is an argument there and a good one. I must say that as far as the outside interests of Senate employees are concerned, the fault primarily lies with the Senate, itself, because we have laid down no rules, regulations, or guidelines. Therefore, the employees of this body are free to do what they want to, within the limits of the law, and it is not up to us to point the finger at them because we haven't said nay nor have we laid out guidelines which they should follow.

There again I would say that basically the fault is the Senate's for not meeting its obligations and laying out rules and regulations.

Question. Do you think that the Senate will do that now, that is, issue such guidelines?

Senator MANSFIELD. I think that they will. As far as Senate employees who are directly or indirectly subject to the Democratic conference, that is being done at the present time.

Question. Do you think the disclosures about Robert Baker, the former majority secretary, have hurt the reputation of the Senate in the country?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, all I can say is this, that as far as Bobby Baker's work in the Senate was concerned, it was excellent and efficient. He did his job well. As for the rest of the question: yes.

Question. Senator MANSFIELD, do you ever find it frustrating to be leader of a group of 66 other men who range from Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey to Senator LAUSCHE of Ohio?

Senator MANSFIELD. I find it frustrating, exhilarating, and depressing.

Question. That is a good note to finish on.

Question. Sir, I just have one other question, Senator, if I may ask it.

You come from Montana and the West supposedly is beginning to look like Goldwater territory to a lot of Republicans and perhaps to many Democrats. How do you feel about your own chances for reelection next year and the chances of the Democratic Party doing a better job of picking up Western States they missed in 1960?

Senator MANSFIELD. First, I wouldn't give the Rocky Mountain West to GOLDWATER. I think it is just as much Kennedy country as it is Goldwater territory.

Second, as far as my own future is concerned, it is a little early for me to say anything. Montana is a two-party State. No one is invincible in this profession. No matter who runs for the Senate next year, he is going to have an extremely difficult job. Campaigns in Montana are tough, but I have been a pretty lucky man. I have been back here for 21 years, which is a long time. I have had the breaks, I have had the benefit of the doubt in the minds of lots of my people.

When we go into next year's campaign, I will either win or I will lose, and whichever way it comes out I will have no apologies and no regrets.

Question. You will have no regrets or no inhibitions about campaigning on the Kennedy ticket?

Senator MANSFIELD. None in the least. I am delighted to campaign on the Kennedy ticket and in behalf of President Kennedy and all the way.

The PRESS. Thank you very much, Senator.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Dr. Herbert Scoville, Jr., of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; and

Benson E. L. Timmons III, of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Haiti.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

A bill and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 2313. A bill to amend section 1552 of title 10 of the United States Code to provide that every applicant for correction of his military record shall be afforded an opportunity for a hearing; to require the appearance of certain members of the Armed Forces before the boards for the correction of such records; and to provide for judicial review of the decisions of such boards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S.J. Res. 133. Joint resolution to provide for the preparation of a long-range plan for the development of buildings and grounds within the area comprising the U.S. Capitol Grounds; to the Committee on Public Works.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NOS. 321, 322, 323, AND 324)

Mr. PROXMIRE submitted four amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 8747) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT submitted amendments (No. 325), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 8747, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PROHIBITION OF GUARANTEE BY EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF PAYMENT OF OBLIGATIONS OF COMMUNIST COUNTRIES—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 326)

Mr. MUNDT submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2310) to prohibit any guarantee by the Export-Import Bank or any other agency of the Government of payment of obligations of Communist countries, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 327)

Mr. PROXMIRE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 298) to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXTENSION OF PUBLIC LAWS 815 AND 874, RELATING TO ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOLS IN AREAS AFFECTED BY FEDERAL ACTIVITIES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of November 13, 1963, the names of Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. FONG, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MECHEM, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. PEARSON, and Mr. SIMPSON were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2304) to extend for 3 years Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, providing assistance for schools in areas affected by Federal activities, introduced by Mr. TOWER on November 13, 1963.

TRIBUTE TO A NOBLE PEOPLE—LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY, NOVEMBER 18

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the lot of small nations has never been an enviable one in a world dominated by aggressive and powerful states, and this has been particularly true in the case of the three small national groups who for several thousand years have made the eastern shores of the Baltic Sea their home. The Latvians constitute one of these three groups which, throughout their long history, whether as free and independent peoples, or as unwilling subjects of alien regimes, has managed to retain their distinct identity and their undying love of freedom.

Today, November 18, marks the 45th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the once free Republic of Latvia. We in this country, who declared our own independence, and who have been fortunate enough to maintain our freedom from oppression, should never forget the attempts which others have made to obtain that most precious of all commodities, freedom, which we so often take for granted. We should continually remind ourselves that others in this world had strived to obtain the same precious commodity, but have lost it by force. We who possess freedom have a responsibility to be ever alert for opportunities whereby we can assist other nations in obtaining a similar degree of freedom.

After suffering under Russia's czarist regimes for nearly 200 years, the Latvians regained their freedom at the end of the First World War, proclaimed their national independence, and established their own democratic Republic. This youthful and small state, at first weak and almost helpless, in time grew strong and prosperous, and, in the course of two decades during interwar years, became a real democratic force in the Baltics. Latvians were prepared to make the utmost sacrifice to defend their independence and freedom. But as the Second World War began, they realized that theirs was a hopeless case, and they could not stave off the threatening Soviet aggression. In mid-1940, the country was attacked and overrun by the Red army. Then it was annexed to the Soviet Union, thus putting an end to independent Latvia.

Since those fateful mid-1940's, Latvians have not known freedom in their homeland; and to this day they have been held down by Communist tyrants directed from the Kremlin. One of the tragedies of it all is that all true and trusted friends of the Latvian people cannot aid them today in their appalling suffering. On the 45th anniversary of their independence day, let us all hope and pray for their deliverance from Communist totalitarian tyranny.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on November 18, 1918, the people of Latvia, after centuries of struggle and domination by foreign powers, proclaimed their country an independent republic. In 1940 Latvia was invaded by the Soviet Union and forced to become the Communist state it remains today.

Although Latvian freedom was tragically short lived, a yearning for a rebirth of independence continues strong in that country and among its many representatives in the United States. This desire for freedom is eloquently voiced by the American Latvian Association.

Latvia, on the edge of the Baltic Sea, is a land of forests and swift-flowing rivers and farmland. We can associate it in basic spirit with the American frontier, even to the construction of some of its houses made of hand-cut rounded logs similar to those used by our own pioneers. We feel a special bond with the people of Latvia in their quest for liberty.

The United States has traditionally championed the cause of oppressed people, and I fully support the important concept that an appropriate observance of the 45th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the once-free Republic of Latvia take place on November 18, 1963.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute today to a gallant—and much put-upon—people. I refer, of course, to our friends in Latvia, one of the Eastern European captive nations overrun by the Soviets and since dominated under cruel and oppressive conditions.

For seven centuries prior to this date in 1918, Latvia had no political history it could call its own. The Latvians had been a subject people, buffeted by political fortunes not of their own making. Last of the foreign powers ruling the Latvian states was Russia. Dating from 1795 until proclamation of the republic on November 18, 1918, Russian rule prevailed in the 25,000-square-mile area.

Two years later—on February 2, 1920—Soviet Russia renounced "voluntarily and forever" all rights over these people. Yet a scant 20 years afterward the same Soviet Russia, in the face of that 1920 treaty, forcibly occupied Latvia, along with Estonia and Lithuania.

Prior to outbreak of war in 1939, Latvia made every reasonable effort to maintain neutrality. But this was not to be. By the beginning of June 1940, Russia demanded unlimited military occupation of the Baltic States. By mid-June, all of Latvia was in the hands of Soviet troops. Under the stern eye of Soviet

Russian military leaders, Latvia along with the other Baltic States elected a parliament with a Communist majority. From there it was a short step to petitioning for union with the U.S.S.R.

Despite this, a group of resistant patriots has maintained a free world alliance, pointing toward the day their homeland will again be freed from foreign tyranny.

On this 45th anniversary of short-lived Latvian independence, we renew our pledge never to abandon them to unending Soviet oppression. In October of 1961, the Assembly of Captive European Nations sent a message to their peoples to which I subscribe. Their main task, they said, has been to "voice your innermost aspirations" which they described as "the end to foreign domination and a free choice of the political, social and economic system under which you wish to live."

Can any free people, under God, aspire to less? I think not.

GRAIN SHIPMENTS TO HUNGARY ILLEGAL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today I have written to the Secretary of Commerce to challenge the legality of the recent action of the Maritime Administration in permitting grain shipments to Hungary to be transported entirely by foreign-flag vessels.

This decision is contrary to our national interests, to both law and custom. It hurts our balance-of-payments position. It deprives Americans of jobs they need.

All the legal precedents on this question indicate that at least 50 percent of any foreign shipments of American grain should be carried in American-flag vessels.

The Congress has repeatedly made this policy explicit and the pronouncements from the Maritime Administration have always been consistent with this policy. The present action by the Maritime Administration would seem to be completely in violation of all legal precedents.

Indeed, the Maritime Administration has consistently followed the policy of requiring at least 50 percent of cargo financed by an instrumentality of the Federal Government to be carried in American ships.

This policy has been enforced in shipments to countries that have had the warmest and friendliest relations with the United States. The Maritime Administration has insisted on this policy even when it is clear that the shipment of goods is to an ally who will stand with us against communism.

But now, in shipment to Communist countries—and Hungary has as black and brutal a Communist record of suppression of human liberty as any nation—the Maritime Administration seems to be abrogating the law and violating established custom to provide discriminating, preferred treatment to the Communist government of Hungary.

The Maritime Administration has apparently taken action, quietly and without public notice, to permit foreign vessels to carry all corn being shipped to Hungary under the recent agreement. Such a policy will undoubtedly constitute a precedent for similar decisions with other grain shipments to the Soviet Union.

I have been consistently opposed to these grain shipments, on the ground that they serve to strengthen the Soviet bloc economically relative to our own economy. I think the decision by the Maritime Administration accentuates and intensifies the relative benefits given to the Soviet bloc by these deals, and correspondingly hurts us in the cold war struggle.

The decision by the Maritime Administration also deprives American shippers of a fair share of this trade with a Communist country. Such trade was originally justified by the Administration on the ground that it would benefit the American economy. Yet foreign-flag vessels will receive all of the benefits from the shipments of products.

Our balance of payments is presently in serious deficit. The shipments of grain to the Soviet Union and its satellites have been justified on the ground that this will aid our balance of payments. Yet one of the principal positive factors in our balance of payments is shipping income. That shipping income is to be denied to Americans under the Maritime Administration actions.

P.R. 17, approved by the 73d Congress on March 26, 1934, states in part:

> That it is the sense of Congress that in any loans made by * * * any instrumentality of the Government to foster the exporting of agricultural or other products, provisions shall be made that such products shall be carried exclusively in vessels of the United States.

The Maritime Administration action is a clear violation of this congressional expression of policy.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my letter to the Secretary of Commerce.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. LUTHER HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I understand that in the recent sale of U.S. corn to Hungary, credit is being extended to Hungary over an 18-month period. I further understand that this credit is being financed by a New York bank and the Export-Import Bank is providing a 100-percent guarantee on the loans. My impression is that such a loan arrangement necessitates at least 50 percent of the corn being shipped to Hungary in American-flag vessels. Yet apparently the Maritime Administration has ruled that none of the grain needs to be carried in American vessels. If true, this decision is contrary to our national interests, to both law and custom. It hurts our balance-of-payments position. It deprives Americans of jobs they need.

All the legal precedents on this question indicate that at least 50 percent of any foreign shipments of American grain should be carried in American-flag vessels.

The Congress has repeatedly made this policy explicit and the pronouncements from the Maritime Administration have always been consistent with this policy. The present action by the Maritime Administration would seem to be completely in violation of all legal precedents.

The Maritime Administration has apparently taken action, quietly and without public notice, to permit foreign vessels to carry all corn being shipped to Hungary under the recent agreement. Such a policy will undoubtedly constitute a precedent for similar decisions with other grain shipments to the Soviet Union.

I have been consistently opposed to these grain shipments on the grounds that they serve to strengthen the Soviet bloc economically relative to our own economy. I think the decision by the Maritime Administration accentuates and intensifies the relative benefits given to the Soviet bloc by these deals and correspondingly hurts us in the cold war struggle.

The decision by the Maritime Administration also deprives American shippers of a fair share of this trade with a Communist country. Such trade was originally justified by the administration on the grounds that it would benefit the American economy. Yet foreign-flag vessels will receive all of the benefits from the shipments of products.

Our balance of payments is presently in serious deficit. The shipments of grain to the Soviet Union and its satellites have been justified on the grounds that this will aid our balance of payments. Yet one of the principal positive factors in our balance of payments is shipping income. That shipping income is to be denied to Americans under the Maritime Administration actions.

P.R. 17 approved by the 73d Congress on March 26, 1934, states in part: "That it is the sense of Congress that in any loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any other instrumentality of the Government to foster the exporting of agricultural or other products, provision shall be made that such products shall be carried exclusively in vessels of the United States, unless, as to any or all of such products, the Shipping Board Bureau, after investigation, shall certify to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any other instrumentality of the Government that vessels of the United States are not available in sufficient numbers, or in sufficient tonnage capacity, or on necessary sailing schedule, or at reasonable rates."

The Maritime Administration action is a clear violation of this congressional expression of policy.

On June 5, 1934, the Attorney General expressed the opinion that P.R. 17 was not to be regarded as mandatory in all cases. However, it is my understanding that, in fact, very few, if any, cases occurred until after World War II in which P.R. 17 was not followed.

On September 12, 1945, the then president of the Export-Import Bank wrote the Administrator of the Maritime Administration encouraging the Administration to waive the P.R. 17 rule in some cases. The reason for the requested waiver was that we were attempting to promote postwar reconstruction by extending grants and loans to various foreign countries and would be, under P.R. 17, taking away with one hand the dollars which were being made available with the other. This policy consideration, of course, is not germane at the present time, especially in view of our balance-of-payments difficulties.

In replying to the president of the Export-Import Bank, the Maritime Administrator stated in part: "The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 emphasizes the congressional policy that a substantial portion of foreign trade be carried in American bottoms. This has been generally construed to mean that at least 50 percent of our foreign commerce in each trade route should be carried in American bottoms.

* * * * *

"It is our thought that the operations of our respective agencies could be most effectively coordinated in this respect if you would insert in your loan agreements a standard clause, providing that all shipments be on flags of American vessels, as indicated by P.R. 17, except to the extent that exemptions from the resolution may be permitted by the Maritime Commission.

* * * * *

"The Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration would be prepared to police the above quoted contractual provision and report to you periodically as to the arrangement made in connection therewith. The Commission would insist in all cases upon 100 percent shipments in American bottoms unless the foreign government involved gave satisfactory assurances with respect to reasonable participation by American vessels in the transportation of imports to and exports from that country. As a rough guide in this connection a minimum of 50 percent participation would be used."

On April 21, 1952, the then Maritime Administrator wrote the Secretary of State further on the waiver policy. In that letter it was stated in part: "The Attorney General has held that P.R. 17, while not mandatory, is in itself the expression of the basic policy of the United States and serves as a protection against, and amelioration of, the damaging effects which result when exports purchased from the United States with proceeds of loans made by this Government are removed from the scope of normal commerce and their shipment controlled by the recipient of such loans.

"One consideration to the granting of such general waivers is that the recipient nation accords fair and nondiscriminatory treatment to U.S. registered vessels on a parity with its own vessels in the international trade. This includes attention to such features as charges on vessels, taxes, berthing facilities consular fees paid by shippers, and conversion of freight money, as well as the practice of the foreign nation toward efforts of U.S.-flag lines to compete and participate in cargo movements controlled within that country.

These quotations from earlier correspondence seem to me to establish appropriate guidelines for U.S. policy with respect to loans and foreign freight shipments. My understanding is that the policy of the Maritime Administration has never been to waive more than 50 percent of the U.S.-flag requirement under P.R. 17. Moreover, the waivers of up to 50 percent have only occurred in two types of situations, namely: (1) when the Maritime Arministration certifies that U.S.-flag vessels are not available in sufficient numbers, or tonnage capacity, as to sailing schedules or at reasonable rates, or (2) when so-called general participation waivers are authorized permitting the recipent nation vesels to share in the traffic. In fact, a 50 percent U.S.-flag minimum clause was indicated in specific foreign aid acts in 1948, 1949, and other years up to 1954, the so-called Cargo Preference Act.

Indeed the Maritime Administration has consistently followed the policy of requiring at least 50 percent of cargo financed by an instrumentality of the Federal Government to be carried in American ships.

This policy has been enforced in shipments to countries that have had the warmest and friendliest relations with the United States. The Maritime Administration has insisted on this policy even when it is clear that the shipment of goods is to an ally who will stand with us against communism.

But now, in shipment to Communist countries—and Hungary has as black and brutal a Communist record of suppression of human liberty as any nation—the Maritime Administration seems to be abroagating the law and violating established custom to provide discriminating, preferred treatment to the Communist Government of Hungary.

In view of this history, I would like to inquire as to the type of waiver which was provided in the case of the corn sales to Hungary. I recognize that this decision is made by the Maritime Administration which is under your general direction.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7431) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL REGISTER ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the motion which I made on April 26 to reconsider H.R. 2837, a bill to amend further section 11 of the Federal Register Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

H.R. 2837 will be transmitted to the House of Representatives.

THE BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS DEFICITS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I address myself today to the question of the U.S. balance-of-payments deficits and their effect upon our ability to lead the free world in its quest for security and peace.

It is well known that I have spent much time and thought on the question of military security. The burden of my advocacy in this area has been the development of balanced forces to give us flexibility and ample coverage of all eventualities threatening the military security of the United States and the Western World.

While the United States has been meeting the military threat successfully by the development of forces in being and the will to deter potential aggressors, in the economic field we may have allowed ourselves to drift into a situation where we are gradually losing freedom of action in our internal and external economic policies.

In any case we are losing both mobility and flexibility in responding with economic resources to the threat of Communist subversion as distinct from military confrontation; and, if the situation is allowed to continue, we could fall under the influence and policy dictation of other countries.

National power depends upon the combination of military and economic resources available and properly mobilized. What will it profit the United States in the long run to have succeeded in stopping the expansion of communism on the present boundaries of the Sino-Soviet system from Korea to Vietnam, Iran, Turkey, Greece, and central Europe if, in the meantime, we let our freedom of action slip away in the economic field, and are unable to respond adequately to threats of subversion in Africa, South America or the Far East?

This is the danger we run because of the continued balance-of-payments deficits which have built up so high cumulatively, that today, from a creditor nation a few years ago, we are fast becoming a debtor nation; and our creditors, mostly in Western Europe, could be acquiring the influence, if not the power, of dictation over us in the field of economic policy.

This is a complex subject. It will take more than one statement to present the Senate the major issues as I see them.

THE FACTS

Since World War II, the United States has spent, advanced, lent, or given away $46 billion for lend-lease and UNRRA, $100 billion for foreign aid and military assistance, and $36 billion for direct U.S. military expenditures abroad, a total of $182 billion, which is 60 percent of our national debt.

As late as 18 years after World War II, our expenditures for foreign aid and military presence abroad is still costing us some $8.5 billion a year, estimated as follows: $4 billion through mutual security legislation; $1½ to $2 billion through Public Law 480, agricultural disposal program; $3 billion plus on military expenditures.

This does not include contingent liabilities created by various insurance and guaranty programs undertaken by the Export-Import Bank and the AID in the field of exports, private investments and housing. Nor does it include contingent liabilities authorized, or to be authorized, as callable subscription to the capital of international financial institutions, such as the Inter-American Development Bank and the International Development Association, and as we know, additional commitments incident to the latter are being asked of the Congress now.

Nor does this figure of $8½ billion a year include the annual cost of interest on that portion of the public debt which is due to past foreign assistance and military expenditures. And even if you eliminate lend-lease as a wartime activity and UNRRA as a humanitarian undertaking the expenditures since 1945 of $136 billion for foreign aid and military purposes constitutes one-third of the national debt and one-third of the annual interest charge; that is, $3 billion a year.

Viewed in this light, the annual cost of past and present foreign aid and military activities abroad comes to $11½ billion a year, 2 percent of the gross national product, and not "less than 1 percent," which some would like us to believe in order to induce even greater appropriations for foreign aid.

This amount is, of course, exclusive of the costs of our own defense, and of the Atomic Energy Commission, and space activities appropriations, that total over $55 billion a year, and which are the bulwark of the free world defenses.

Up to 1950, because the United States was practically the sole supplier of needed materials and equipment in the reconstruction of Western Europe, we were able to meet this demand upon our resources, created by the foreign aid program, through a surplus of exports over imports. Beginning in 1950, however, this surplus was not enough to equalize our expenditures abroad and, therefore, we started running a balance-of-payments deficit.

From 1950 through 1956, the cumulative deficits amounted to $8.2 billion, or an annual average of between $1.1 and $1.2 billion.

In 1957, we had a surplus because of the Suez crisis, which increased the demand for U.S. supplies, fuel, and other necessities for Europe.

Beginning in 1958, however, we started running annual deficits of $3 to $4 billion a year; and in the 5 years between 1958 and 1962, the total cumulative deficits amounted to $17 billion.

Adding the deficits built up during the preceding period just mentioned—1950 to 1956, inclusive—the cumulative deficits from 1950 to 1962 amounted to over $25 billion. This was financed by the export of gold of $8 billion and the building up of current liabilities or debts of $17 billion.

The drain on our gold supply has pulled down our gold reserves from $24 billion in 1950 to less than $16 billion today.

A little less than $12 billion is needed as statutory reserves, leaving only $4 billion of free gold to pay demand liabilities of $27 to $28 billion, including our commitments to international institutions.

Another way of facing these facts is to say that of the $100 billion we spent on foreign assistance since 1945, and the $36 billion for military expenses, little better than 18 percent was not covered by current earnings through exports; and that this has been financed mainly by the willingness of other countries to extend the U.S. credit by leaving their reserves in bank deposits or in short-term U.S. Government and other securities.

Actually, therefore, we have been financing our foreign assistance operations and military expenses abroad by currently borrowing money from foreign governments and institutions abroad.

This is the net result over the 18-year period; but today, with deficits running between $3 and $4 billion, we might say that all of our foreign aid operations are undertaken on borrowed money; or, if we wish to include military expenses as well, 50 percent of the direct cost of foreign aid and military operations abroad is being financed by borrowed money.

Over $12 billion of our current liabilities are held by Western European countries, mainly those in the Common Market. Any one of those countries could embarrass us tomorrow by demanding gold in payment of their current claims upon us.

This is to some extent a Damoclean sword over the U.S. Government. I believe it explains some of the lack of success we have had in such fields as trade negotiations and agricultural policy, as experienced in our dealings with the Common Market. The bargaining power in the economic field has at least partially shifted from the United States in favor of Western Europe.

If such a result had been obtained in the field of U.S. military capability, most everyone in this body would be agitated. But in the economic field, it seems to me we may have allowed our power of independent action to be subjected to external pressures without an accurate analysis and confrontation of the causes so that immediate remedial action may be taken.

If it is true, as some assume, that continuance of the cold war in a period of peaceful coexistence means the erosion of U.S. economic power, and the subjugation of our sovereignty and freedom of action to foreign influences, then we must be careful that our own policies are not responsible for bringing about the attrition of U.S. economic independence.

In the next statement I shall analyze how we got into this position.

FIELD ARTILLERY ANNIVERSARY

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the U.S. Army Artillery celebrates its 188th anniversary this week. All of us have reason to be grateful to the brave men of the Artillery who have served as the primary supporting arm of the Infantry and one of the strongest elements of our national defense since the Continental Congress named Col. Henry Knox chief of artillery for Gen. George Washington on November 17, 1775.

The guns, mortars, and howitzers of colonial days were pulled by oxen or by men. Now, the Field Artillery arsenal includes a wide variety of mobile, flexible, and versatile arms. To the guns which could mass fire on one target in World War I to those which could quickly switch fire from one target to another in World War II, we have added surface-to-surface missiles and rockets. This year has seen the introduction of the new 175 mm. tube-type Artillery piece. The Army's Lance has come off the drawing board in 1963 and is in the engineering mockup stage of development.

The U.S. Army Artillery and Missile Center at Fort Sill, Okla., with Maj. Gen. L. S. Griffing in command, is the testing ground for new developments and the training school for the Nation's Artillery units. A few weeks ago, the men of Fort Sill's 2d Battalion, 44th Artillery, successfully fired five second-generation Pershing missiles 350 miles from the Black Mesa near Blanding, Utah, to the White Sands Missile Range.

Aviation has joined with ground guns in another system recently tested at Fort Sill called the visual airborne target locator system. Men in an aircraft select a target, then measure the angles to the target through a visual sighting device and then relay the material to a ground station. Artillerymen there plot the position of the aircraft, and in turn, the target.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record an article from the Fort Sill Cannoneer of Friday, November 15, and a tribute to artillerymen by General Griffing.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Fort Sill (Okla.) Cannoneer, Nov. 15, 1963]

Fort Sill Fills Major Role in History of Artillery—18th Anniversary Recalls Saga of Mortars, Missiles

The time was exactly 11:02 a.m. on a beautiful Indian summer day in late September, this year. The place was a windswept tract of land known as Black Mesa, near Blanding, Utah. The event was the first long-range overland firing of an Army missile, the latest milestone in the 188-year saga of the U.S. Army Artillery.

At that moment, the Army's second generation Pershing roared skyward, streaked to the edge of space, and 7 minutes later fell to the earth again some 350 miles away on White Sands Missile Range. It was the first of five successfully fired by the men of Fort Sill's 2d Batallion, 44th Artillery, from Black Mesa in the days that followed, marking the advent of increased firepower to fulfill the Artillery's vital mission as primary supporting arm of the Infantry and Armor.

The highly mobile and devastating punch of today's Artillery arsenal is a far cry from that of November 17, 1775, when the Continental Congress named Col. Henry Knox as Gen. George Washington's chief of artillery.

Colonel Knox's weapons consisted of an accumulation of guns, mortars and howitzers of every sort. The tubes were brass and the carriages wood. They were often pulled by oxen or manhandled into position. Yet Colonel Knox earned such a reputation with his small force that he soon was promoted to major general, and later became the United States first Secretary of War.

BIRTHDAY SUNDAY

Sunday the U.S. Army Artillery will observe its 188th anniversary. Since its colonial birth, the Artillery has advanced steadily. Many times over it has proven itself the devastating force in wartime.

By the beginning of the Civil War, artillery weapons had been improved but many weapons were still smooth-bore with short range. Rifled barrels, longer ranges, and the forerunners of modern firing techniques were introduced in the Civil War, but didn't come into general widespread use until World War I.

Weapons were much heavier by this time, although the United States had not manufactured enough for its rapidly expanding Army. The famous French 75 was the commonly used weapon of the day. Weaponry in general was more lethal. Tactics had changed too, to include the devastating technique of massing fires of many guns on one target. Military experts say the Artillery accounted for over 75 percent of the battlefield casualties in World War I.

It was during the 1930's that the U.S. Army Artillery earned its worldwide reputation with its revolutionary new techniques and tactics. Chief among these was the fire direction center. This permitted the momentary switching of the fire of a hundred or more guns from one target to another. The effectiveness of these innovations was proved in World War II.

HEAVIER WEAPONS

With the advent of World War II, the U.S. Army had begun replacing the French 75 with 105 mm., 155 mm., 240 mm. and 8-inch howitzers and the 155 mm. gun. Shooting these new and heavier weapons by fire direction techniques, U.S. artillerymen established themselves as the world's best.

At the war's conclusion, Gen. George S. Patton stated: "I do not have to tell you who won the war. You know. The artillery did."

Since World War II, the atomic capability and the Army's amazing array of surface-to-surface missiles and rockets have emerged. The artillery arsenal has been further enhanced by additions and improvements to the traditional tube-type cannon weaponry. Today, more than ever, the field artillery is recognized as one of the Army's most valuable elements, the greatest killer on the battlefield. The field artillery arms are so potent, mobile, flexible, and versatile that there is one to deliver the exact force needed in any present-day combat situation, either a limited or a general war.

The U.S. Army Artillery and Missile Center is the focal point of the artillery arm. It's the birthplace and schoolhouse of the Army's Field Artillery units and the testing ground for the never-ending program of development.

This year saw the introduction of the Army's first new tube-type artillery piece in a decade, the 175 mm. gun and the widespread proliferation of Fort Sill bred units employing the second generation Sergeant and Pershing missile systems. Looming on the horizon is the Army's Lance which came off the drawing board in 1963 and is in the engineering mockup stage of development.

Through all the Nation's wars, the artillery has earned a justified reputation, not only as the most deadly but also as one of the most dependable, respected, and progressive elements of the Army.

As Gen. L. L. Lemnitzer, Supreme Allied Commander of NATO forces, said recently "During the U.S. artillery's continuous existence since 1775 to the present day, its members have earned a reputation for distinguished service to country. Today, they continue to make a vital contribution to the security of our Nation."

[From the Fort Sill (Okla.) Cannoneer, Nov. 15, 1963]

GENERAL GRIFFING HAILS ARTILLERYMEN

Throughout its 188-year history, the U.S. Artillery has been recognized as one of the Army's most valuable elements—the greatest killer on the battlefield.

Since 1775 the mission of the Artillery has been the same—the decisive, timely and accurate fire support of the ground-gaining arms. In pursuit of this mission, artillerymen have constantly strived to increase their preparedness—seeking better weapons and techniques. As a result, the artillery has always been recognized as one of the most progressive branches of the Army.

Although weaponry has evolved from muzzle loaders to supersonic missiles, the key to success has remained the same. The quality soldier always has been, is, and will continue to be the basis of our effectiveness and strength.

As we observe the 188th anniversary of the U.S. Army Artillery, we at the Artillery and Missile Center are proud of our part in the defense of the free world—as home of the Army's greatest destructive force.—Maj. Gen. L. S. GRIFFING.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS UNTIL 1:30 P.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am about to make a unanimous-consent request, in which I hope my distinguished colleague, the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], will join.

I have endeavored to call up various pieces of proposed legislation available for consideration at the moment, but, for some reason or other, it is not possible to have Senators on the floor to direct consideration of the legislation.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 1:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection (at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the Senate took a recess until 1:30 o'clock p.m. the same day.

On the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. NELSON in the chair).

GEN. PAUL HARKINS, SENIOR U.S. MILITARY OFFICER IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am disturbed by reports in the press seemingly inspired which seem to have as their objective the removal of or the undermining of Gen. Paul Harkins in his post as the senior U.S. military officer in South Vietnam.

He is being charged with having sympathized with the regime of the late President Ngo Dinh Diem and it is alleged that some of the Vietnamese generals now in control of the new government feel that he will be out of sympathy with the aims of the new regime.

May I say that I am happy that President Kennedy and the Pentagon have announced their full support of General Harkins and have even extended his mission beyond his scheduled return next February. I approve this stand wholeheartedly.

General Harkins is a soldier in the best tradition of this country and it is his job to work with constituted authority, and he has done so in the past and will do so in the future. He has represented this country with distinction and ability and has proved himself to be a good man under extraordinarily difficult circumstances. I am happy to note that the multiplicity of authority which existed prior to Ambassador Lodge's posting to Saigon has now been done away with and that the Ambassador is fully recognized as the overall head of American activities in Vietnam and that in this capacity he will have unquestioned supervision of American missions there.

In my opinion, Ambassador Lodge and General Harkins make a good team and deserve our confidence and support, and not the carping criticism which seemed to have taken root in the case of General Harkins, but is now, I hope, effectively squelched.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Did the bells ring when the recess was concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They did not.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me briefly?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I would hope that the recess which has just been concluded will not be interpreted as dawdling or time wasting. Nor was it for the purpose of a long lunch at the Banker's Club.

The Senator from Montana and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] in their capacity as leaders, if you wish, were on the floor prepared to do business. But where was the business? Where were the Senators to do it? A quorum bell does not necessarily bring the same response in the Senate as the alarm bell brings in a firehouse.

The choices before the leadership in these circumstances are not inexhaustible. As a practical matter, there are two, and if anyone knows of any other I would be pleased to hear them. The choice is to recess or to invite some Member to deliver a speech on some subject or another, if the spirit so moves him.

The leadership chose to recess the Senate in the hope that the committees might move along with their work without interruption.

But I must say, Mr. President, if appearances were what mattered, the other alternative could have been chosen. I might even have persuaded myself, I suppose, that the echo of my voice in a largely empty Chamber still gives the appearance of a Senate more occupied than a Senate enveloped in the silence of a recess.

May I say that my remarks in no way are intended to reflect on the distinguished Senator from West Virginia who has been ready to start on his bill and who so courteously yielded to me. He is one of the hardest working members of this body, whose attention both to responsibilities in committee and on the floor exceptional in every respect.

I thank the Senator from West Virginia for yielding to me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, when the Senate recessed last week, the majority leader made it abundantly clear what the business would be when the Senate resumed this day, Monday. A variety of measures could have been considered. There was the bracero bill, or rather, concurrence in the House amendment to that bill. There was the legislative appropriation bill conference report. There were a number of bills on the calendar. Then there was the District of Columbia appropriation bill. Also ready was the independent offices appropriation bill.

I think it is a distressing situation, to say the least, that when the majority leader is ready and a token quorum call has been uttered to summon Members of the Senate to the floor, we could not find the Senators in charge of the respective bills that were announced as the order of business. I must concur in the feelings the majority leader has expressed on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I would like to exclude from that statement the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who was prepared, and who was on his way, but Senators were absent from the Chamber.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from West Virginia has probably been more diligent in pursuing the affairs of the District of Columbia, to keep them on even keel, than anyone I have known of in my time who has served either as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia or on the legislative committee. I served on the District of Columbia Committee in the House for 16 years, and I served as chairman for 2 years. I was assigned, in my first assignment on the Appropriations Committee, to the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia.

I know what a thankless task it is. I know it does not show up in the form of political profit back home, because people far removed from the District of Columbia are rather indifferent to the affairs of the District. Yet this is the Nation's Capital, and there are many problems to be carefully considered, so that reasonable and good answers to those problems can be found.

I salute the Senator from West Virginia for the valuable service he has rendered in connection with the pending bill. I was delighted that the Appropriations Committee, by a vote of 19 to 7, sustained his position.

The editorial which appeared in the Washington Star was richly deserved. Once more I compliment the Senator on the task he has performed on this appropriation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I concur wholeheartedly in what the Senator from Illinois has said.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I am grateful for the kind remarks that have been made by the distinguished majority leader and the equally distinguished minority leader.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7431) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the committee report which is on the desks of Senators presents a clear picture of the appropriations that are contained in H.R. 7431. Nevertheless, I shall attempt to explain, as briefly as possible the contents of the bill, because Senators who are not present may wish to read the RECORD. For their benefit, and for the benefit of the general public, I shall attempt to explain the appropriations contained in the bill.

The bill before the Senate contains an appropriation of $319,582,825. This, of course, takes into consideration the late passage of the bill, and makes pro rata reductions amounting to $3,393,478.

The appropriation is $35,296,025 over the House appropriation of $284,286,800. It is $23,930,861 over the appropriations of last year, but it is $9,141,175 under the budget estimate.

The appropriation can be broken down as follows:

For operating expenses, $263,011,025; for capital outlay items $51,582,000; for repayment of loans and interest, $4,989,800.

The total estimated revenues for fiscal 1964 amount to $337,308,000. This figure, of course, includes Federal payments in the amount of $47,868,000 to the general fund, water fund, and sanitary sewage works fund, and Treasury loans in the amount of $20,800,000 to the general fund and to the sanitary sewage works fund.

The estimated required expenditures amount to $328,747,000, thus leaving an overall surplus in all funds as of June 30, 1964, of $8,561,000. As to the general fund, the anticipated revenues will amount to $281,386,000.

This can be broken down as follows:

Federal payment, $45 million; Treasury loans, $12,800,000; revenue collection, $212,325,000; surplus carryover from June 30, 1963, $11,261,000.

The estimated expenditures from the general fund amount to $278,800,000.

That leaves an estimated surplus in the general fund as of the end of the present fiscal year of $2,586,000.

The Federal payment, as I have already indicated, amounts to $45 million. This is $15 million over the Federal payment of last year. It is $15 million over the House appropriation. It is $5 million under the budget estimate. It is $5 million under the authorization carried in Public Law 88-104, enacted by Congress on August 27, 1963.

The committee feels that the amount of $45 million is necessary because of the increased needs of the city. Considering the late passage of the bill, the committee did not feel it wise to appropriate the full authorization of $50 million. The committee also felt that the figure of $45 million would come nearer to receiving acceptance by the other body than would the full appropriation of $50 million at this time.

I point out that Federal grants in aid for the District of Columbia last year amounted to $54,853,442, which is $12,124,595 over the previous year.

Mr. President, I believe this briefly explains the picture as it pertains to appropriations, anticipated revenues, estimated surpluses, and fund requirements for the forthcoming fiscal year.

At this time I shall attempt to explain in brief the appropriations for four of the major departments, inasmuch as these are the departments which normally seem to be of the greatest interest to the general public.

I shall first discuss the Police Department. The bill appropriates $31,032,543, or $4.1 million over last year, for the Police Department. This amount is the full budget estimate. The committee did not reduce the budget estimate by a single penny. This will allow the appointment of 100 additional privates to the police force, permitting the Department to reach the full authorized level of 3,000 policemen. The bill provides money for 25 additional canine corps teams, thus enabling the department to have a total of 100 canine corps teams.

The bill provides money for walkie-talkie equipment in one additional precinct, and for an additional scout car in precinct 13, where the crime rate has more than doubled since 1957.

I believe those are the more important features of the bill as it pertains to the Police Department.

With regard to the schools of the District of Columbia, the bill provides $64,221,212. This is $7.4 million over last year's appropriations. It will allow for 189 additional elementary school teachers, or 44 over the budget request, thus enabling the Department of Education for the first time to reach the desired pupil-teacher ratio of 30 to 1 in grades 1 to 6, 18 to 1 in the basic classes, and 30 to 1 in the kindergarten classes.

The bill provides for 122 additional junior high school teachers, which will enable the Department to reach the desired standard of 25 to 1 in the academic classes, 18 to 1 in the basic and social adjustment classes, and 18 to 1 in shop and home economics classes.

The appropriation provides for 70 additional senior high school teachers, thus enabling the Department to reach the desired ratio of 25 to 1 in the academic classes and 18 to 1 in shop and home economics classes.

The appropriation also provides for 29 teachers for the severely mentally retarded children of the District of Columbia. The budget request was for 4 teachers, but the committee increased that number by 25 teachers.

This is a program for children who are noneducable in the usual sense, because their IQ's range from 35 to 55. The program was initiated in 1954, and by 1960, five teachers were teaching 40 severely mentally retarded children. Last spring there was a waiting list of 228 such children ranging in age from 7 to 16 years. The committee felt it was about time to eliminate this waiting list and provide teachers for the entire group. We did so, and also provided 17 supporting personnel and nine vehicles in which the children are to be transported to and from the rooms, which will be set up in various schools throughout the city. Moreover, $5,000 is included for simple books and materials to be used in the program of education of these children.

The bill provides a total appropriation of $1,054,721—or an increase of $247,423 over last year—for textbooks and supplies.

The bill provides an increase of $38,000 in funds needed to pay the tuition of handicapped children in outside institutions because the public schools do not have facilities for the special training required. These moneys will provide tuition for 20 additional severely handicapped children, over the 126 children whose tuition was provided for last year.

The bill provides $47,857 for an experimental program to deal with severely maladjusted pupils in the District of Columbia. It is estimated that about 80 of such pupils are in junior high schools and 40 in elementary schools. The desired pupil-teacher ratio being 10 to 1, the committee responded by recommending appropriations for 12 temporary teacher positions and 1 temporary counselor position, so that the so-called twilight program might get underway.

The bill provides money for 20 additional counselors, which, when added to the 68 counselors now in the public schools will make a total of 88 counselors. The request was for 41 counselors, but the committee felt that if 20 could be provided perhaps next year we could again give consideration to the matter of counselors.

In addition to these moneys, the committee recommended, in addition to the items allowed by the House, $9,365,000 for the construction of three junior high schools and one elementary school, and $30,000 for furniture and equipment in the elementary school to which I have just referred. It provided moneys for site purchases for one senior high school and two elementary schools, and preliminary planning moneys for one junior high school. It provided plans and specifications money for one elementary school, and plans and specifications and site purchase moneys for one elementary school and two junior high schools, making an overall total of $15,570,000 for the items I have just mentioned.

Also recommended is $114,600 for a continuation of the program for installing window guards in the windows of the schools of the District of Columbia. In the past fiscal year, 17,110 school windowpanes were broken.

The total program requires $300,000 over a period of 3 years. This is the second year. We hope next year to complete the programing of installing window guards in the schools.

As to the Department of Health, the bill carries an appropriation of $46,934,389, which is $4.1 million over last year's appropriation. This will permit a reorganization of the Department. It will also permit an increase in the rate for contract hospitals for in-patient care of $2 per day, raising the present figure from $32 to $34. For out-patient visits, the bill provides an increase of 75 cents, making a total of $5.75 rather than $5, as at present.

The bill also provides for the restoration of the two full-time chaplains' positions at District of Columbia General Hospital.

It provides $43,000 for the installation of a fence around District of Columbia General Hospital grounds, so as to reduce the present high rate of crimes against persons and personal property.

The committee recommends $2.2 million for the care of District of Columbia prisoners at St. Elizabeths Hospital, heretofore financed by the Federal Government.

The bill provides $23,796,973 for the Department of Welfare. This is $3.3 million over the appropriation of the previous year. It provides for a reorganization of the Department, which has been long overdue. It provides for the installation of automatic data processing equipment. It provides 20 additional social workers in the Public Assistance Division. This will enable the Department to acquire Federal matching moneys on a 75–25 basis for 44 percent of the caseload. At present, the Department is able to acquire Federal matching moneys on a 75–25 basis for 21 percent of the caseload. The goal is to acquire Federal matching moneys on this basis for 71 percent of the caseload.

The average caseload per social worker, by filed positions, has been reduced from 183 in September 1961, to 118 in August of this year. With the additional 20 social workers provided herewith, the overall average is expected to drop to 90 or below by the end of fiscal year 1964.

The bill provides 72 additional positions at Junior Village where three additional cottages are ready for staffing. This is the full amount requested. It will reduce the ratio of children to staff members from 2.5 to 2.2.

The bill provides for 60 additional positions in District of Columbia Village to staff new construction and to provide for the increased population there. It provides $248,000 for an additional cottage at Junior Village so as to initiate a replacement program at that institution.

The bill provides moneys to continue audit review of the aid to dependent children caseload, the general public assistance caseload, and the aid to the permanently and totally disabled caseload. It provides money for the investigation of 100 percent of cases at the point of intake, rather than 50 percent as at present.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the able Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. If I may continue, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia in a moment. I have almost completed my reference to this item.

Mr. TALMADGE. Certainly.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The bill would provide for a sample investigation of 1 percent of nonpublic assistance division surplus food cases. It would provide for a pilot reorganization of the surplus food distribution program. It would provide $21,400 for the installation of exterior fire escapes for Junior Village cottages.

The bill would provide the Department with 32 additional social workers and supporting clerical personnel in the Child Welfare Division. The Director of the Department indicated to the committee that if he had certain tools with which to work, he could reduce the population of Junior Village to a hard core of 500. When asked what the tools were, he stated that he needed additional social workers in the Child Welfare Division and an increase in the foster home rates for board and care.

The committee provided both tools, neither of which had been requested in the budget estimate. The budget request in connection with foster home care payments was that they be increased by $3, from $57 to $60.

The bill provides, and the appropriations will allow, for increases in foster home payments, as follows: $70 for infants up to 6 months, which is the present rate. The Director indicated that it was his opinion that no increase was necessary in this area.

But the Department will be able to pay $60 a month instead of $57, as at present, for children from 6 months through 5 years; $65 a month, instead of $57, as at present, for children 6 years through 11 years; $75 a month, instead of $57, as at present, for children 12 years and above; and $95 a month for institutional care, instead of $85, as at present.

So the committee has provided the Department with the tools which are said to be needed in order to reduce the population of Junior Village to the hard core. The population of Junior Village has been steadily increasing over the years, and it is felt that a very aggressive effort should be made to get children out of Junior Village and back into the homes of parents or relatives; and if this is impossible, to place them in foster homes.

For day care, $75,459 is appropriated over the House allowance of $55,900, to provide a total of $131,359 for the day care program. An increase of $5,000 is appropriated for Homemaker Service.

Mr. President, this completes my summarization of the facts as they pertain to appropriations, revenues, expenditures, and surpluses, and it completes my explanation of the appropriations for four major District of Columbia departments.

Mr. TALMADGE and Mr. SALTONSTALL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I shall yield first to the Senator from Georgia, inasmuch as he had asked me to yield earlier; then I shall yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. TALMADGE. First, I compliment the distinguished Senator from West Virginia on his presentation of the Senate committee version of the bill. I have been a Member of the Senate a relatively short time—not quite 7 years. The Senator from West Virginia has demonstrated the most complete knowledge of a complex, complicated bill that I have seen in any Senate presentation to date. He has stated scores of figures as they relate to individuals and to moneys, including dollars and cents, completely from memory, without reference to notes. The Senator has demonstrated the most remarkable competence and knowledge of a bill that I have seen in my short period of time as a Senator.

Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator made reference to the ADC situation in the District of Columbia. I recall reading in the press some months ago of a detailed investigation which the Senator had completed. There was evidence that a great many persons were on the rolls without being entitled to be on them.

In my own State of Georgia, we had surplus commodity programs in some of the counties. Investigation revealed that a number of persons who were receiving commodities were not entitled to receive them.

We have seen similar situations in many other cities and States in the Union, where some persons, even to the third generation, have made careers out of public welfare, because it seemed to be more attractive to them to do that than to earn their own living.

I shall appreciate it if the Senator from West Virginia will inform the Senate what that investigation was and what corrective action the Senator's committee took.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in the fall of 1961, the committee provided for an investigation of a sample of the ADC caseload. The investigation was begun in November 1961. It was joined in by the General Accounting Office, beginning in March 1962.

At the committee hearing last year, the Department, through its own investigators, and the General Accounting Office, through its investigators who had participated in the investigation, testified to the findings. The Comptroller General submitted to Congress two reports on the findings in the investigation of the Aid to Dependent Children category. One was a report submitted to the chairmen of the two Appropriations Subcommittees on the District of Columbia. One was a special report submitted to the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia. These reports showed that 59.7 percent of the cases investigated in that sample were ineligible, under the regulations. That was a scientific sample. It was not just an accidental sample; it was a scientific sample, and it constituted 5 percent of the cases in the ADC category, which at that time numbered 5,601. Not only were 59.7 percent of the cases found to be ineligible, but only 9.7 percent of the entire sample of 280 cases were found to involve no infractions whatsoever. Ninety-five cases, or 40.3 percent, were continued as eligible. But of the 95 cases that were continued as eligible, there were overpayments in 20 of these, and there were underpayments in 2.

The Comptroller General recommended that Congress, therefore, proceed to investigate the entire ADC caseload; and Congress made appropriations to carry out his recommendation. Since that date, the investigation has continued. Instead of 5,601 cases as of September 1961, and instead of 5,628 cases as of November 1961, when the investigation first got underway, there were only 3,823 cases in the ADC category as of October, a reduction of around 1,800 cases.

It was later decided to conduct a sample investigation of the General Public Assistance category. This was done, and the General Accounting Office was asked to participate in it, also. The reports came in; and it was found that 58.8 percent of the cases in the sample investigation were ineligible; and the Comptroller General recommended that this entire caseload be investigated, and the Congress so provided. The caseload in the GPA category has been reduced from 1,617 to 568 cases. These reductions are reflected in a drop in the overall caseload from 12,969, in September 1961, to 9,964 in October of this year—a reduction of 3,005 cases.

What have these savings amounted to? In only 2 years, from fiscal 1962 to fiscal 1964, the amount for total financial aid dropped from $16,376,563, in the fiscal year 1962, to an estimated $12,103,999 for the fiscal year 1964, a reduction in 2 years' time of over $4 million annually. We are now proceeding with an investigation of the APTD caseload because a sampling of that caseload indicated that ineligibility findings amounted to 39.3 percent.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the able Senator for his detailed response. I believe all of us have deep sympathy with those who are financially in need of welfare and assistance, whoever they may be, and wherever they may be. I believe that Congress should insist that the provisions of law pertaining to cases apply, in order that tax money might not be thrown to the four corners of the earth on people who prefer assistance to work.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator. I apologize for interrupting him. I did not realize that I was.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee for some 17 to 18 years, I have never found a Senator on that committee who has done a more thorough or a more conscientious job—and in some ways a more courageous job—than has the Senator from West Virginia. I wish to commend him for the work that he has done.

I wish to support him in the position he has taken. I believe he has gone into the situation with the utmost care.

I realize there is controversy in relation to a certain item of the budget on which a very distinguished former HEW Administrator does not agree with the Senator from West Virginia. But I point out to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and to other Senators who may be interested, that this budget, as I understand it, which has been gone into with such care by the Senator from West Virginia, includes 100 new policemen to provide a 3,000-man police force in the District of Columbia. It also provides for 25 additional Canine Corps man-dog teams, to allow a total of 100 man-dog teams. That provision is in connection with safety and security.

With regard to teachers, the bill provides for 462 additional teachers, of which 25 are for the mentally retarded. As I understand, that is an amount over and above the actual budget request for teachers.

In addition, the bill provides for 338 new institutional helpers in the Welfare Department, expanding those departments to provide 2,799 welfare workers. So while the Senator from West Virginia and the committee have not provided for a certain amount of funds for certain care, the budget goes forward with a great increase in the safety provisions for the District of Columbia, the educational provision for the District of Columbia, and in the welfare provision.

As a member of the committee I merely wish to put in my word, for whatever it is worth, in commendation of the work that the Senator from West Virginia has done, and in which the committee by a 19-to-7 vote on this controversial issue supported him. I, for one, appreciate the work that the Senator from West Virginia has done.

I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia whether the figures I have just given are not correct.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The increase in the number of elementary teachers is 412.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I meant 412, which included 25 for the mentally retarded.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc and that the bill as thus amended be regarded as original text for the purposed amendment, and that no points of order be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and the committee amendments are considered and agreed to en bloc, as requested.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, line 3, after the word "and", to strike out "$30,000,000" and insert "$45,000,000"; in line 24, after the word "appropriated", to strike out "$8,000,000" and insert "$20,800,000"; on page 3, line 2, after "(68 Stat. 101)", to strike out the word "and"; in line 3, after "(72 Stat. 183)", to insert "and the Act of August 27, 1963 (77 Stat. 130)", and in line 5, after the word "the", to strike out "sanitary sewage works fund" and insert "following funds: general fund, $12,800,000 and sanitary sewage works fund, $8,000,000".

On page 3, line 17, after the word "Commissioners", to strike out "$16,910,000" and insert "$18,156,384"; in line 18, after the word "which", to strike out "$350,000" and insert "$375,000"; in line 20, after the word "compensation", to insert "and $250,000 shall remain available until December 31, 1964, for the purpose of conducting the 1964 Presidential election in the District of Columbia"; in line 23, after the word "and", to strike out "$164,200" and insert "$201,695"; in line 25, after the word "account", to strike out "$23,900" and insert "$31,900", and on page 4, line 1, after the word "and", to strike out "$6,400" and insert "$14,400".

On page 4, line 14, after the word "Commissioners", to strike out "purchase of fifty-four passenger motor vehicles including forty-four for replacement only for police-type use without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year (but not in excess of $100 per vehicle above such limitation) and ten for other replacement purposes", and in lieu thereof, to insert "purchase of seventy-two passenger motor vehicles (including sixty-one for police-type use without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year but not in exces of $100 per vehicle above such limitation) of which seventy are for replacement purposes"; in line 24, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "$65,032,000" and insert "$66,074,353"; in the same line, after the word "which", to strike out "$109,700" and insert "$119,700"; on page 5, line 3, after the word "and", to strike out "$3,355,000" and insert "$3,369,695"; in line 5, after the word "account", to insert "$1,688 from the water fund, and $1,689 from the sanitary sewage works fund", and in line 13, after the word "Commissioners", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That the Fire Department is authorized to replace not to exceed five passengar-carrying vehicles annually whenever the cost of repair to any damaged vehicles exceeds three-fourths the cost of the replacement".

On page 5, line 18, after the word "including", to insert "purchase of sixteen passenger motor vehicles", and in line 22, after the word "amended", to strike out "$61,670,000" and insert "$64,221,212".

On page 6, line 11, after the word "Park", to strike out "$8,853,000" and insert "$9,076,881".

On page 6, line 19, after the word "Health", to strike out "$66,316,000" and insert "$71,203,242"; in line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$32" and insert "$34"; in line 23, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$5" and insert "$5.75", and on page 7, line 9, after the word "Columbia", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso "*Provided further*, That the authorization included under the heading "Department of Public Health," in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1961, for compensation of convalescent patients as an aid to their rehabilitation is hereby extended to the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation."

On page 7, line 16, after the word "including", to strike out "$72,550" and insert "$70,466"; in line 21, after the word "of", to strike out "fifty" and insert "sixty"; in line 22, after the word "only", to strike out "$12,138,000" and insert "$12,427,853"; at the beginning of line 23, to strike out "$8,365,000" and insert "$8,470,453", and in line 24, after the word "including", to strike out "$3,418,300" and insert "$2,804,300".

On page 8, line 6, after the word "only", to strike out "$21,205,000" and insert "$21,851,100"; in line 8, after the word "account", to strike out "$7,053,000" and insert "$7,220,300"; in line 9, after the word "fund", to strike out "$4,050,000" and insert "$4,165,990", and in line 10, after the word "and", to strike out "$6,200" and insert "$32,760".

On page 8, line 22, after the word "fund", to strike out "$148,900" and insert "$149,000", and in line 24, after the word "fund", to strike out the comma and "and $64,400 shall be payable from the metropolitan area sanitary sewage works fund".

On page 9, line 12, after the word "addition", to insert "new junior high school in the vicinity of 13th and Van Buren Streets Northwest, new junior high school in the vicinity of 16th and Irving Streets Northwest, new junior high school in the vicinity of Bruce and Robinson Streets Southeast, new elementary school in the vicinity of Wheeler Road and Mississippi Avenue Southeast, new elementary school in the vicinity of 7th and Webster Streets Northwest, West End Branch Library, School Building at the Junior Village, Washington Cottage addition at the Maple Glen School and Industrial Arts Building at the Youth Center;"; in line 23, after the word "Northeast", to insert "for conducting preliminary surveys for the construction of the Northwest Community and Mental Health Center, a juvenile facility, and the installation of a sprinkler system at the District of Columbia Jail"; on page 10, line 7, after the word "addition", to strike out "and a"; in line 8, after the word "Village" to insert "Rabaut Junior High School, North Dakota and Kansas Avenues Northwest, Roper Junior High School, 48th and Meade Streets Northeast, Hine Junior High School replacement, Bunker Hill Elementary School addition, Southwest Branch Library, Engine Company Number 18 replacement, Dog Pound replacement, a children's cottage at the Junior Village, street cleaning tool houses replacement"; in line 15, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "$358,000" and insert "$388,000"; in line 17, after the word "expended", to strike out "$27,173,000" and insert "$51,582,000"; at the beginning of line 18, to insert "$7,200,000 shall not become available for expenditure until July 1, 1964,"; in line 19, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "$10,737,500" and insert "$10,835,400"; in line 20, after the word "fund", to insert "including $80,000 for replacement of a school site,"; in line 21, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "$2,711,000" and insert "$2,970,000"; in line 22, after the word "and", to strike out "$10,052,000" and insert "$8,674,000"; at the beginning of line 24, to strike out "$257,000" and insert "$1,643,100", and on page 11, line 6, after the word "Grounds", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That $228,271 of funds heretofore appropriated under the heading 'Capital Outlay, Public Building Construction' in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1961, is hereby rescinded: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $49,000 of funds heretofore appropriated under the heading 'Capital Outlay, Washington Aqueduct,' in such Act shall be available for improvements at the Dalecarlia Plant".

On page 12, line 9, after the word "that", to strike out "one hundred and twenty-five" and insert "one hundred and seventy-one"; in line 10, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "fifty" and insert "seventy-eight", and in line 11, after the word "Welfare", to insert "and eighteen for venereal disease investigators in the Department of Public Health".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, in behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and myself, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 6, line 19, it is proposed to strike out "$71,203,214", and insert in lieu thereof "$71,509,879".

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 240 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Edmondson
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGOVERN in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I join the distinguished majority leader and distinguished minority leader, and the members of the Appropriations Committee, in lauding the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for his knowledge and his work on this most important appropriation bill. I join with other Senators in their expression of the high respect we bear for the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

I personally decry the attacks that have been made upon him, trying to paint him as a heartless individual who does not care for the unfortunate. I know this is not so. I well recall a most significant day that I spent in West Virginia with the distinguished Senator when I was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. I came to know the distinguished Senator and his concern and care for the unfortunate people, not only of West Virginia, but of the United States of America.

I also decry the idea that the distinguished Senator has done little for the District of Columbia. The gains in the entire field of welfare that are represented in this bill will always deserve the thanks of the people of the District of Columbia for what he has done, largely singlehandedly, with some help from others, in providing in this measure for more caseworkers, which is very laudatory.

In this measure he has also provided for expanded day care programs, which are also essential.

He has also made it possible to raise the amount of payments to foster home parents. This is absolutely essential. Therefore, Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has shown deep concern for the problems of the District.

I can understand the feeling, too, perhaps because his figures are so accurate, that we should question not one item of the appropriation. However, I believe it is in order for us to look at the bill, and, if we have serious doubts as to one part of the measure, to bring that issue up on the floor.

I too am concerned with the problems of welfare. That concern goes back to my duties as Governor of Connecticut. As I look around the floor, I see many men who have served as Governors of their States. I see the distinguished Senators from Wyoming, Oklahoma, Kansas, and Alaska. The Chamber is peopled with men who have served as Governors of their States.

I do not believe that during our term in public office, as we tried to take care of the problems of the people of our State, there was a problem which caused us as much concern and worry as the problem of welfare.

It cost a great deal of money. Legislatures were never happy. There was fraud. We always had the problem of a deficiency budget. It was an open-end appropriation. At the beginning of every legislative session we found ourselves having to go before the legislature to ask for many millions of dollars more.

After the President appointed me Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, I recall appearing before the Committee on Finance under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. During the colloquy that took place between the members of the Finance Committee and myself, I pointed out to the committee that one of my concerns as Secretary of that Department would be to try to bring a fresh, new approach to all the problems of welfare in the Nation.

I recognized that for 30 years, beginning in the 1930's, the United States had started on a program which was without imagination and without change. I realized that the nature of our country had changed and that the nature of our problems had changed. I promised the Committee on Finance that once the first legislative session was over, I would devote my time to trying to come up with a new program in the field of public welfare for the United States.

To that end I gathered together on a voluntary basis a group of leading citizens from across the land to help me devise and formulate a new program in this field.

This was most important, because in the United States today approximately 7 million persons are on relief. In the United States today we spend on all forms of assistance approximately $4,800 million. That is a staggering amount of money.

I recognized, as the Senator from West Virginia recognized, that there was fraud in public assistance programs, and that fraud must be closed off and fraud must be eliminated from the welfare programs.

I recognized that we were entering into a period in which there were in some instances three generations of one family on relief. That would never do.

I recognized that there had to be new changes. Some of those changes I could make administratively. There were two orders that we handed down administratively which did not require legislation. The first order I issued as Secretary was to the effect that every State in the Union had to provide a unit in its welfare department which would locate deserting husbands. One of the great burdens that came upon the States and the Federal Government was caused by husbands deserting their families and crossing State lines. We asked that every State cooperate with every other State to make sure that we could locate those deserting husbands, and make them pay for the obligation of supporting their children.

The second thing that was done administratively was to require every State in the Union to set up an effective fraud division within its own welfare department. In that division rules and regulations could be set up so that we would have an opportunity to discover fraud and root it out.

Following this, there was much that Congress had to do if we were to move the whole program of welfare off the track of a mere handout, and off the track of being merely a conduit between the State or Federal Treasury and the recipients of relief. We recognized what had to be done was a matter, first, of prevention; second, rehabilitation, if prevention was too late or impossible.

There was presented to Congress a new program in the entire field of welfare. In 1962, this program received the support of Congress. Both Houses overwhelmingly voted a new approach in the entire field of welfare.

Now we come to the District of Columbia.

I, for one, believe that we who are in the Senate have a deep obligation to the people of the District of Columbia. We are here practically 12 months a year. This year we will be here 12 months. We have homes in our States. My home in Connecticut remains unoccupied for almost 12 months. I have a home in the District of Columbia. I pay taxes in the District of Columbia. Other Members of the Senate live in the District of Columbia or in its environs. Their children go to school here. We have an obligation not only to the United States and to the people of our own States, but also to the people of the District.

The city of Washington should be the Nation's pride. Let us be frank with one another. The city of Washington, D.C., happens to be the Nation's shame. Year in and year out children of our constituents come to the city of Washington. Washington should be held up to them as an example of what a city should be like. It is the Nation's Capital. This is where the children come to learn and observe, so they can go home and follow the great history of the United States as they have observed it in the Capital of the Nation.

What do we send back to our 50 States? What is found in the District of Columbia? We find that the District of Columbia leaves some children hungry. We find that the District of Columbia can be indifferent. We allow the District of Columbia to be in a position where there could be written in today's Washington Daily News a story like this:

> Memorial to a Father of 11—His Death Was Economically Sound.

The article, written by Tom Kelly, reads, in part:

> You might say Sonny Cooper threw himself into the Anacostia River or you might say he was strangled by redtape.
>
> Last night the dead Mr. Cooper, 33, became a symbol.
>
> He never had a job making more than $70 a week and he seldom had one paying that. He had a wife and 11 children. He was a Washington Negro.
>
> The worst thing you could say about him was that he drank a lot and sometimes he beat his wife.
>
> The best thing you could say was that he loved his kids so much he ran away and left them.
>
> With Sonny at home the family got his wages, $35 a week, $70 a week or nothing a week.
>
> With Sonny away the family was eligible for welfare aid, $77 a week, every week.
>
> DEPARTURE
>
> So a couple of months ago Sonny took his clothes and left. And when he could find nowhere to put his clothes he threw them in the gutter. And when he could find nowhere to put himself he threw himself in the river.

Mr. President, it is sad, in the United States, when the 11 children of a man who drowns in a river can have aid, because the Government will provide for those children, but the same Government will not provide for those hungry children when the father is alive.

With some 5,600,000 in the United States unemployed, with many people having exhausted their unemployment compensation, we must do something for the children of unemployed parents who have exhausted their unemployment compensation.

We recognized in 1961 that a program was needed in the United States so that a father need not have to leave his family, need not have to stay away from home, so that his family could receive aid. We recognized that one of the needs of the country was to keep families together. Because we recognized this need Congress in 1961 enacted a new program, one which provided for aid to dependent children of an unemployed parent. That act provided that if a State adopted a program to provide for the children of an unemployed parent, the Federal Government would provide matching funds as it did when it provided aid in other cases of dependent children. As a result of that program, the following 15 States now have the program:

Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Kansas, Maryland, Massachusetts, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Utah, Washington, and West Virginia.

It is interesting to note that West Virginia and Connecticut, represented, respectively, by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and me, adopted this program. I say that what is good enough for West Virginia and good enough for Connecticut is good enough for the people of the District of Columbia.

But although only 15 States have adopted this program, 33 States have a general assistance program. That is, if there are children of unemployed parents who are hungry, under the general assistance programs of 33 States, the State, county, or city may then enter the picture and take care of the hungry children of unemployed parents.

So an overwhelming number of States in the Nation have a way of taking care of children who are hungry, even though their parents are employable but are without jobs. This is not true in the District of Columbia, because the District of Columbia not only provides no aid to dependent children of unemployed parents, neither does the District provide general assistance aid to the hungry children of unemployed parents.

As Senators, we have no right to pass laws to solve the problems of our own individual States while at the same time we exclude from the benefits of the program the people who live in the District of Columbia.

What does my amendment seek to do? First, the amendment I propose would raise the welfare appropriation in the District of Columbia appropriation bill by the sum of $306,637. I should tell the Senate that this sum would cover 6 months. The reason it covers 6 months is that only a little more than 6 months remain in the present fiscal year. I should say to the Senate, in all candor, that should the program be adopted for an entire year, the total cost, both local and Federal, would amount to some $2,500,000. Therefore, I do not wish to mislead the Senate by saying that the program would cost $306,000. It would cost $306,000 for the remaining 6 months; but we should recognize that were the program to be adopted for an entire year, the cost would be in the neighborhood of $2,500,000, including both local and Federal contributions.

The distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd] has made the point that the unemployment rate in the District of Columbia is low. He states that the unemployment rate in the District of Columbia is 3½ percent, and that we should not concern ourselves to provide assistance in a situation in which there is such a small percentage of people out of work.

A child who is hungry is just as hungry if only his father is unemployed in a city, as if 1,000 or 2,000 fathers or mothers were unemployed in a city.

While the distinguished Senator from West Virginia talks about a low rate of unemployment in the District of Columbia, we find the following situation: The program in the State of Kansas provides aid for only 34 families. Oklahoma has a program aiding only 28 families. Oregon has its program for 235 families. The State of Washington has its program for 740 families. If a program like this is good enough for the State of Washington, I do not know, for the life of me, why it should not be good enough for Washington, D.C.

We are confronted with the problem of the treatment of our youth. Are we concerned with hungry children? Do we feel that an obligation rests upon Congress to be concerned with youngsters in our own backyard? Are we concerned with families who surround the august Capitol of the United States? Or shall we pass on the other side of the street, wearing blinders, not recognizing the fact that hungry children live in Washington, the Nation's Capital, children who need our help and support?

The problem is even more serious. I am aware of the feeling that has been expressed by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia concerning the so-called man-in-the-house standard. But the amendment I propose would take care of some 490 families for 6 months, and of these 312 have women as heads of households, and only 178 have men as heads of households. So we are not concerned with just unemployed men.

What is the anomalous position in which the Senate finds itself if we accept the position of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia? Let me cite two examples: A woman is a prostitute and has three or four illegitimate children. She is not employable. Who knows how many more illegitimate children she may have? Under the present law in the District of Columbia, that woman can receive relief.

Suppose another case. A woman's husband is dead or is in jail or has deserted her. The woman is proud. Her children are not illegitimate. Her children are her own legitimate children. She wants to get off relief. So she gets a relative, perhaps her mother, to move in to take care of the children and she takes a training program and learns to be a seamstress or a typist. She secures employment as a seamstress in a store, or she works as a typist in an office. A time comes when she may lose her job. She has those mouths to feed back home. She is "employable." After 3 months, if she cannot obtain work, she and her children are hungry and destitute, and even with the improvement made in this bill, she and her children would be ineligible for relief.

What kind of system is it that enables a prostitute mother of illegitimate children, who has no self-respect, who is unwilling to do something for herself and her children, to receive aid from the money which Congress appropriates, but which says to a woman who wants to better herself, "Madam, you are employable. It is unfortunate that you learned to be a seamstress or a typist; but since you have a skill, even though you cannot find a job, it is too bad; we are going to cut you off from receiving aid, and you must shift for yourself."

If there is any way to encourage women to become prostitutes, it is under such a system as prevails in the District of Columbia. The conscience of the Nation cries out against it. The time has come for us as Senators to recognize our obligation to the children and the people of the District of Columbia. The time has come for the Senate to recognize that we have an obligation toward them.

Of course we must have hardheads—and I am all for that; and we must eliminate waste—and I am all for that: and we must make sure that there is no fraud in connection with these welfare programs—and I am all for that, and I commend the Senator from West Virginia for his leadership in regard to all these items—yet I cannot agree when the distinguished Senator from West Virginia advocates a program which would make it impossible for us to take care of a decent woman or a decent man who cannot find a job, but who wants a job, and under the regulations would be required to report to the U.S. Employment Service office and be required to make himself or herself available for a job.

I approve of the provision which reduces the number of cases which each caseworker will handle, for it makes it possible for the cases to be followed up, so that malingerers or fakers cannot take advantage of the program, and so that those who refuse to take the jobs offered them or found for them will be ineligible.

The time has come for us to face not only our obligations in West Virginia, Connecticut, and the other States of the Union, but also the obligation which each one of us owes every man, woman, and child in the District of Columbia.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. As Senators know, I have been the mayor of a fairly good sized city—Philadelphia—where, during my term of office, approximately the same welfare problems existed that the District of Columbia has.

For the past several years, I have been serving as chairman of the Manpower and Employment Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. At present, we are engaged in a massive study of the causes of unemployment and the question of whether the normal workings of the market, plus the legislation already enacted, are likely to curtail the number of unemployed.

I regretfully have come to the conclusion—although those hearings are not quite over—that in the United States unemployment is going to increase, not decrease, and that in the near future massive measures will be needed in order to bring unemployment back to anywhere near the level at which it should be.

When I was the mayor of Philadelphia, thousands of unemployed men and women, particularly men, were deserting their families because at that time if there was a man in the house who could be employed, the family could not obtain public assistance.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I believe the Senator from Pennsylvania will agree that it is better to have a father in the house, even though he is unemployed, than to have a family without a father, because the father has deserted his family.

Mr. CLARK. I do not believe such a contention could seriously be questioned. To me, it is extraordinary that there is opposition to this amendment.

In Pennsylvania—until the law was changed; it has since been changed—we found families that were breaking up because the father would leave the family, rather than have the children go without adequate food or clothing.

So I commend the Senator from Connecticut for the fight he is making in this regard, and I am happy to be a cosponsor of the amendment. I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

I am a member of the triumvirate of Senators who are sponsoring the amendment.

In the District of Columbia Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I offered the amendment, and in the full Appropriations Committee I supported the amendment when the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] offered it. I am happy to be a cosponsor of the amendment in the Senate Chamber.

In my opinion, everything the Senator from Connecticut has said in support of the amendment is eminently sound, and hardly needs be developed further.

I also agree with what the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has said about the desirability of maintaining stable family relationships. It seems to me that is an overriding consideration, and not only is one of humanity, but also is one of commonsense. It is highly desirable to maintain parents in the home, rather than somewhere else in order to qualify for relief. That is obviously most desirable.

As for the amount of tax funds required, certainly that will be less if the parents are maintained in the family home, rather than if we were to continue the man-in-the-house rule.

In that connection, I call attention to a study published by the Washington chapter of the National Association of Social Workers and the Commission on Human Resources. The study is entitled "Public Welfare Crisis in the Nation's Capital." In the report it is pointed out that the cost of maintaining a child in the Junior Village is $185 a month, and that all of that amount is paid with District of Columbia funds, and that the cost of maintaining a child in a foster home is $57 a month, for clothing and medical care. But the report shows that the cost of maintaining a child in a home receiving an ADC grant in October 1962 was $32.43, and that more than half of that is reimbursed with District of Columbia funds; but this amount is insufficient to maintain a child in his own home. However, a comparison of these figures makes clear the high cost to the taxpayers of having the Department handle dependent children in this category.

There is no argument, so far as I can determine, except one that the present arrangement is better than to encourage immorality—although I think the reverse is true, in the long run—or one based on a desire to make the District of Columbia unattractive to colored migrants from the South. I do not go along with either of those arguments.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey served on the subcommittee and heard the testimony. Although we talk about fraud and about "the man in the house," is it not true that the majority of cases involve households in which there is not a man, but in which the head of the household is an employable woman? So those cases do not involve a question of a man who comes to the back door at 11 p.m. These cases involve the problem of employable women whose husbands are dead or have deserted—employable women who are being excluded from assistance after 3 months.

The figures I have indicate that for the 6-month period, of 490 families, 312 have a woman as the head of the household. On an annual basis, of the 1,105 families involved, 700 have a woman as the head of the household, and 400 have a man as the head of the household.

So we are discussing a situation in which women who are self-respecting and who wish to work and who have trained themselves for jobs, cannot find jobs; and suddenly we find that we may actually be forcing those women to engage in prostitution in order to get bread or shoes for their children, because under the present situation in the District of Columbia, the children of such families are treated differently from the children in families in other parts of the United States.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut is quite correct. The "man-in-the-house" rule applies to both unemployed but employable women and unemployed but employable men.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I do not want to close these remarks without paying my sincere respects to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, I recognize that this year the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has gone far to straighten out some of the main problems in connection with the District of Columbia budget, to make it better for families with children, and to eliminate fraud. His actions have improved the care for children in foster homes, with the result that there will be more children living with families, instead of living at Junior Village. In addition, his action in reducing the number of cases per worker will make it easier to help families and also to check on abuses. In addition, his action to provide more help for day care would make it possible for women who wish to work to have a place for their children to stay while they were employed.

So it is with deep regret that I find that the distinguished Senator from West Virginia—who has done so much with this budget, and has been so constructive, and has done so much for the District of Columbia—has failed to take the further step which would make it possible to bring justice to the young children of unemployed men and women in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF].

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia obtained the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield briefly to me, so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Connecticut? I have been engaged in the TFX hearings.

I believe the welfare concept for which the Senator is contending is the right and necessary one, and I shall have the privilege of supporting his amendment.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield to the Senator from Iowa for that purpose.

Mr. MILLER. Do I correctly understand that the main thrust of the Senator's amendment is to provide for the situation which has been written up in the local newspapers as the "man-in-the-house" problem?

Mr. RIBICOFF. No, that is the least I seek to accomplish. This has been dramatized as the "man-in-the-house" rule and I am not proposing to eliminate this rule. What I am interested in is taking care of the problems of needy children. As I pointed out to the Senate, the majority of families involved here are families in which the head of the household is a woman who has been employable but is out of work. The "man-in-the-house" rule would not be changed as to her. Of course there would be a modification of the rule with respect to male heads of households, since children of unemployed fathers would be eligible, but that is only a part of the amendment and not the same thrust, since that applies to a minority of the cases.

There is a man-in-the-house rule in the State I represent, and there is no difficulty in having both the "man-in-the-house" rule and a program of aid to dependent children of unemployed parents. So that is not the main thrust of my amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Perhaps I did not make my question clear. Is the main thrust of the amendment directed at the problems which arise as a result of the man-in-the-house rule in the District of Columbia, without which rule the Senator from Connecticut would probably find it not necessary to offer his amendment?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Not at all. The main thrust of the amendment is to take care of the children of the employable mother or father, or both, who are unemployed for more than 3 months.

Mr. MILLER. Would the Senator say that even if the District of Columbia did not have the man-in-the-house rule, his amendment would still be offered?

Mr. RIBICOFF. It would most certainly be offered, because even without the "man-in-the-house" rule, there is a grave problem in the District of Columbia. A self-respecting mother might train for a job, and then find herself out of work. In that case the family cannot receive aid. My amendment would correct that situation without any change in the man-in-the-house rule. But in the same District of Columbia if we have a prostitute who is not trained for a job, her children would be paid.

Mr. MILLER. One final question: Is it the Senator's point that all the talk regarding the man-in-the-house rule in the District of Columbia has absolutely no bearing and no relevance whatsoever to the amendment?

Mr. RIBICOFF. The Senator has spoken of relevance. I cannot say it has no relevance. I would have offered the amendment even if we did not have the man-in-the-house rule. This has been dramatized as the man-in-the-house rule, and what I have sought to do is to set the record straight, to correct those who believe that what we are trying to do is to eliminate the man-in-the-house rule. If the Senator from

West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] would agree, I would be willing to alter the amendment to provide that the man-in-the-house rule still applies to these families and to extend aid only to those families in which there is no man in the house but where a woman is head of the household. We would not be bothered with the problem of the man-in-the-house rule at all.

However, I believe there is another question here. Sometimes there may be an unemployed man legitimately in the house. That would not be the case of a man who is not the legitimate father. I would also want to cover the children of an unemployed father living in the home.

Mr. MILLER. I share the concern of the Senator from Connecticut over what to do about the children, but at the same time I do not want to be a party to an amendment or to a law, which would be a vehicle for what many of us consider to be an immoral situation. I do not believe we have to have one or the other. Apparently there are some who would close their eyes to the question of the morality of a situation and say, "It is all right so long as the children are taken care of." I do not believe we have to be led into that conclusion at all. We should be in a position to do something about the morality of a situation, and at the same time take care of the children.

Mr. RIBICOFF. We can. It is my contention that what we are doing now in the District of Columbia leads more surely to immorality than failure to adopt the amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I should first like to ask the Senator from Connecticut, apropos his last statement, whether he would enlighten me as to how the Senator arrived at his last statement?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I shall be pleased to do so. I am sorry the Senator was not in the Chamber when I cited two examples.

Let us assume the case of the household of a woman who is a prostitute with four illegitimate children. They are living in that household together. She is not employable. Under District of Columbia procedure, her children would receive aid.

Let us now consider the case of a woman living in the District of Columbia with four legitimate children. Let us say that her mother is living with her. She brings the grandmother into the home to take care of the children, and the mother goes into a training program. She learns to be a typist or a seamstress. She goes to a department store and gets a job. She works 4, 5, or 6 months. The grandmother is taking care of the children. The mother brings in a week's pay. She then loses her job. She is out of work for 3 months and cannot find another job. If after 3 months she were still without work, she would receive no payment from the District of Columbia Welfare Department; whereas, under the same circumstances, a prostitute with four illegitimate children would receive assistance from the District of Columbia.

For the life of me, I do not believe that is fair.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator has cited the hypothetical case of a woman out of work for 3 months; and who would receive no welfare payment from the District of Columbia?

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is correct; after 3 months.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I point out that she can qualify for unemployment compensation.

Mr. RIBICOFF. But she may use up unemployment compensation. The Senator from West Virginia did provide in the bill that a woman out of work for 1 month would not be shut off. The Senator from West Virginia amended that provision to allow her to be on relief for 3 months, but later her unemployment compensation would be used up. She would receive her unemployment compensation, but if she could not find a job after the 34 weeks allowed—assuming she qualified for maximum benefits—she would receive no assistance. She has, therefore, only one other thing to do and that is to go out on the street and "hustle" for her money.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I appreciate the kind remarks which the distinguished Senator from Connecticut made during the presentation and explanation of his amendment. I am sorry that I must oppose the amendment. I recognize that the Senator was a distinguished Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare before he became a Senator. I can appreciate that he has great knowledge of the welfare programs. I recognize his leadership in the field of public welfare.

I have the same high admiration and respect for him as he has stated he possesses for me. I recognize also that he enjoyed a very distinguished career in the arena of politics before he became Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I know he was one of the most popular Governors of a great State.

I recognize that the Senator's support of the amendment naturally carries great weight, because I believe we all feel that the Senator is an authority on this subject. His service as Governor of the State of Connecticut exposed him, in a considerable degree, to the problems which confront welfare recipients.

I cannot say that I have been a Governor of a State. I cannot say that I have been a Secretary of one of our departments in the executive branch. But I come to the Senate not wholly unexposed to the subject of public welfare. I served as a member of the House of Delegates of West Virginia. I served as a member of the West Virginia Senate. I served on the finance committees of both houses in the West Virginia Legislature. I was in a position there to deal with public assistance matters.

I served in the House of Representatives of the United States.

I have held more legislative offices than any other individual in the history of my State, and, therefore, I, too, have had some exposure to the subject of public welfare, although I am quick to admit that I am not as deeply grounded in the subject as is the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. I recognize this fact, and I highly respect his opinions generally. However, we are dealing today with a bill making appropriations for the District of Columbia. As chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, I feel that I am fairly conversant with the subject as it pertains to the Federal city.

This is not a position for which I asked. It is not a chairmanship which I wanted. But I am doing with all my might the task that fell upon me.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. If the Senator will withhold for a little while, I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Very well.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I conducted an entire day of hearings on the proposed AFDC–UP program.

The subcommittee sat for 15 days. The record of the hearings is in three volumes, and contains 2,902 pages. One entire volume is on the Department of Welfare. So we do not lack information upon which to base our decision today.

I am as deeply concerned about hungry children as is any other Member of this body. I expect I know as much about being a hungry child as any other Member of this body knows, having been an orphan at the age of 10 months.

I recognize the emotional appeal which is embodied in this issue and in the amendment. I think the facts, however, appeal to the intelligence rather than only to the emotions, and I have sought to find the facts.

The issue was before the House of Representatives last year, and the House turned down the request. It was presented to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and the subcommittee turned down the request.

This proposal was presented again this year to the Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and the subcommittee turned it down. It was turned down by the Senate Committee on Appropriations by a vote of 19 to 7; and I had one proxy in my pocket which I did not use. Had I used the proxy, there would have been 20 votes against the amendment.

The great drive is on to push the amendment through. The House has already heard testimony on the A budget, but has not yet heard testimony on the B budget, so this item has not been presented to the House this year. An effort is being made to have the amendment adopted in the Senate, it evidently being the feeling that if the Senate adopts the amendment the battle will be won. Some Senators will vote today without having heard the debate. Some will vote for the amendment because of their having received telegrams and letters from organized groups within their own States, many of which know little or nothing about the facts regarding welfare in the District of Columbia.

The subject is perhaps not fully understood by any of us. As an example of what I mean, one of my colleagues who voted for the amendment in the subcommittee and in the full Committee on

Appropriations indicated that such a program was in effect in his State. I assured him it was not in effect in his State. He said it was. I said, "You had better inform the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, because the Department is unaware of it."

I saw him later. I said, "I have checked again. Your State does not participate in this program." He said, "Oh, yes; my State participates in the ADC program. We have an ADC program." I said, "Of course you have. The District of Columbia has an aid to dependent children program, but we are talking about aid to dependent children of unemployed parents."

The Senator cast his vote for the amendment, feeling that the program was in effect in his own State, whereas it was not. So there is a great deal of misunderstanding about this issue. Yet, everybody seems to want to get into the act. Labor organizations have contacted Senators, I am informed. Social worker organizations have been active in urging Senators to support the amendment. Some people have axes to grind; others simply imagine they are working in a righteous cause which, unlike a buckwheat cake, has only one side.

As I have said, the amendment has its appeal and it will be popular to vote for it, but like the buckwheat cake, the proposal has two sides and I shall now attempt to present my views in opposition to it.

The Senator from Connecticut, to my regret, referred to the story that was in the Washington Daily News of today. A similar story was in the press last week. It was the story about Sonny Cooper. I do not think it is apropos at all to the subject of this debate. I have thought about it over the weekend. I did not feel that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut would refer to this article in the newspaper, but, inasmuch as he has so referred, I, too, must deal with it briefly. The article states:

> The best thing you could say was that he loved his kids so much he ran away and left them.

He loved his kids so much he ran away and left them—in my judgment, that is an utterly ridiculous and preposterous and asinine statement. A man who loves his children is not going to run away and leave them.

The news story continues:

> With Sonny at home the family got his wages, $35 a week, $70 a week or nothing a week.

Why? Why did his family receive nothing a week while he was at home?

> With Sonny away the family was eligible for welfare aid, $77 a week, every week.
>
> So a couple of months ago Sonny took his clothes and left. And, when he could find nowhere to put his clothes, he threw them in the gutter. And when he could find nowhere to put himself, he threw himself in the river.

Men who feel a responsibility for their children do not throw themselves into the river.

The article continues:

> Last night they had a memorial service for Sonny at the Bethlehem Baptist Church, on Howard Road SE. It is a large, neat, new building with wall-to-wall carpeting and a middle-class Negro congregation.
>
> On the platform were nine well-dressed, well-educated men, seven Negro, two white. They were representatives of the church, civil rights groups, labor and a Southeast settlement house.
>
> Julius Hobson, of CORE, stood at the microphone and said that Sonny Cooper was a victim of his surroundings.
>
> "His story is the story of most American Negro males," he said.

Let me tell Senators a little about his story. Willie Cooper had been arrested 18 times. He was arrested in 1947 for being disorderly. He was arrested in 1951, for being drunk and disorderly. He was arrested in early 1953, for being drunk. He was arrested again in the fall of that same year for being drunk. He was arrested again in December for being drunk. He was arrested for an assault with a deadly weapon on Aaron Cooper.

I do not know who Aaron Cooper is. I do not know whether it was Sonny's brother or his father or one of his children, but Aaron Cooper was the complainant.

Sonny was arrested on May 12, 1954, for being disorderly in the house, and the complainant was his own wife, Virginia.

He was arrested in 1956 for being disorderly. He was arrested in early 1958, and charged with assault with a deadly weapon. The deadly weapon was a skillet, and the complainant was his wife. He was arrested again 3 months later for being drunk in the house, and the complainant was his wife.

The other complaints I shall not read.

I hold in my hand a police report, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> Investigation revealed that Willie Cooper, Negro, age 33 years, and Virginia Elizabeth Cooper, Negro, age 39 years, residing at 505 Florida Avenue NE., were married October 7, 1947, at 1113 Ninth Street NW., by Rev. B. J. Pogue. Marriage license number 315–532.
>
> Virginia Cooper stated that she was separated from her husband in June 1963, at the time they were evicted from premises 1120 Stevens Road SE. She stated that the cause of their separation was the eviction as her husband was a drunkard and refused to work. He last worked at 4400 Connecticut Avenue NW., as a laborer for the Thomas E. Clarke Plumbing Co., and he would only work 2 or 3 days out of a week. She believed this was in March 1963. When he worked she received from $35 to $40 a week.
>
> Virginia Cooper stated she last saw her husband in the early part of July 1963. She moved to the present address at the time of her eviction. She is presently receiving $353 a month. She has three bedrooms at the present address and the rent is $135 a month. This rent is paid to Kenneth Kennedy, 7th and Florida Avenue NE. She stated on this past Tuseday, November 12, 1963, the house was auctioned off and she did not know the name of the new owner. She was advised to stay there as the house was going to be renovated.
>
> Virginia Cooper gave the following information about her family. Her mother, Matilda Brandon, Negro, age 63 years, residing at 664 Kenilworth Terrace NE., is living with her daughter, Sarah Brandon, Negro, age 31 years, mother of seven children and single, are living at that address, all on public welfare. She has another sister, Mildred Howard, Negro, 37 years, 3726 Foote Street NE., residing at that address with her husband, George Howard. They both are on public welfare.
>
> Virginia Cooper has 11 children, ages running from 2 to 15 years, with one child age 11 years confined to District of Columbia General Hospital. The oldest daughter, Betty Cooper, age 15 years, is presently pregnant, by Fred Smith, Negro, age 14 years, who lives somewhere on Fourth Street SE.
>
> The caseworkers for this family is Mrs. Henry, Board of Public Welfare. Mrs. Cooper stated she was notified of the death of her husband on November 4, 1963, and she identified her husband by a scar on his face as he was decomposed. She stated that when she last saw him he was not despondent, but was an alcoholic.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I quote extracts from it:

> Virginia Cooper stated that she was separated from her husband in June 1963 at the time they were evicted from premises 1120 Stevens Road SE. She stated that the cause of their separation was the eviction as her husband was a drunkard and refused to work. He last worked at 4400 Connecticut Avenue NW., as a laborer for the Thomas E. Clarke Plumbing Co., and he would only work 2 or 3 days out of a week.

So, his wife stated that Sonny was a drunkard and refused to work. Is this the image of a man who was "a victim of his surroundings" or does it appear that he was the victim of himself? Is this the image of a man who loves his children, or is it the picture of a man who displayed little sense of responsibility toward them?

Here was a man who refused to work for his wife and children. Yet, it is said that he loved them so much that he left home, threw his clothes in the gutter and threw himself in the river.

Reading from the report:

> Virginia Cooper stated she last saw her husband in the early part of July 1963—

Five months ago—

> She is presently receiving $353 a month. Virginia Cooper gave the following information about her family. Her mother, Matilda Brandon, Negro, age 63, residing at 664 Kenilworth Terrace NE., is living with her daughter, Sarah Brandon, Negro, age 31, mother of seven childen and single, are living at that address, all on public welfare. She has another sister, Mildred Howard, Negro, 37 years, 3726 Foote Street NE., residing at that address with her husband, George Howard. They both are on public welfare.

The case worker was Mrs. Henry. Mrs. Cooper was notified of her husband's death on November 4, 1963. She identified him by a scar on his face, as he was decomposed. She stated that when she last saw him he was not despondent, but was an alcoholic.

So, there are the two sides to the story. One can take either side he chooses, depending upon his viewpoint. I am sorry to have to make any remarks about this case, but I did not inject it into the discussion.

The Senator from Connecticut said something that is often said by some people in the District of Columbia about the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee: What is good enough for West Virginia is good enough for the District of Columbia. The Senator from Connecticut said, "What is good enough for the State of West Virginia and the State of Connecticut is good enough for the District of Columbia." The critics do not always say that. They usually say: "What is good enough for West Virginia is good enough for the District of Columbia."

Let us see. West Virginia has a ceiling on ADC payments of $165 a month. Is what is good enough for West Virginia good enough for the District of Columbia? There is no ceiling in the District of Columbia on ADC payments. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a table showing the amounts of payments made to 102 families that receive the highest welfare payments in the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Data on 102 aid to dependent children families receiving highest grants during June 1963

Total persons in assistance unit	Number of children	Length of time on assistance continuously since most recent opening		Number of months on assistance prior to most recent opening	Amount of grant received in June 1963	Retail value of surplus food received in June 1963
		Yrs.	*Mos.*			
8	6	3	1	0	$564	$27.77
7	6	6	6	0	410	24.67
14	13	1	9	0	391	45.25
13	11	2	11	2	374	45.25
5	4		4	0	362	20.58
12	11	1	1	0	359	45.25
12	10	2	8	9	358	45.25
13	11		11	42	356	45.25
12	11	1	11	0	353	45.25
12	10	3	1	15	352	45.25
5	4		9	0	350	17.48
11	10	5	4	0	345	45.25
4	3	5	3	1	344	17.48
10	9	1	1	36	339	34.96
11	10	1	11	0	337	(1)
11	9		6	5	336	34.96
7	6	4	8	8	334	24.67
13	2	3		0	334	45.25
10	9	6	3	36	333	34.96
10	8	4	1	0	332	34.96
11	10	4	9	5	331	45.25
11	10	5		105	331	45.25
10	8	3		16	328	34.96
10	9	2	4	4	327	(2)
3	2	1	6	0	327	(3)
14	12	7	2	42	327	45.25
10	9	5	1	0	327	34.96
11	10	2	1	11	325	45.25
7	6	2		7	323	27.77
10	9	2	9	49	321	34.96
10	9	4	7	27	321	34.96
10	8	2	8	0	320	34.96
9	8	5	10	0	320	27.77
11	9	2	7	0	318	45.25
5	4	2	-------	8	318	17.48
10	9	5	9	34	315	34.96
10	9	5	1	34	315	34.96
10	8	9	10	49	315	34.96
10	8		11	0	314	34.96
11	9	3	6	0	313	45.25
9	7	3	1	25	310	34.96
10	9	3	-------	0	309	34.96
9	8	6	5	0	309	27.77
10	9	4	6	2	309	34.96
11	10	12	2	0	309	45.25
10	9	1	9	24	309	34.96
10	8	3	2	0	308	34.96
14	12	1	2	0	308	6.56
11	10		9	16	307	34.96
9	8	1	6	1	305	34.96
9	8	9	4	8	305	27.77
9	8	3	10	2	$305	$27.77
9	8	11	6	12	305	27.77
10	9	2	3	166	305	45.25
9	7	5		12	304	34.96
9	7	2	9	0	304	34.96
9	7	2	4	1	304	34.96
11	10	5	7	42	304	45.25
10	9	2	5	50	303	34.96
10	9		10	55	303	34.96
10	8	2	10	0	303	(1)
9	8	6	-------	0	303	34.96
10	9	1	9	18	303	34.96
10	8	2	8	0	302	34.96
4	3	2	10	0	302	(4)
11	10	3	2	0	301	(3)
10	8	1	9	19	299	34.96
9	8	7	7	44	299	34.96
10	9	1	4	44	299	(3)
10	9	1	4	0	298	34.96
9	7	1	9	0	298	34.96
9	7	----	6	68	298	34.96
10	9	1	7	0	297	34.96
10	9		3	0	297	34.96
10	9	8		0	297	34.96
9	8	5	3	7	296	34.96
10	8		9	24	296	(3)
11	10	4	9	0	294	(3)
6	5		6	47	294	24.67
10	9	1	7	0	293	34.96
9	8	2	6	52	293	27.77
9	8	9	4	0	293	34.96
9	8	5	1	0	293	34.96
9	7	1	2	6	292	(2)
8	6	2	1	15	292	34.96
9	7	----	11	4	292	(3)
10	9	2	11	15	291	34.96
10	9	1	3	0	291	34.96
9	8	3	6	0	291	34.96
11	10	1	2	0	290	(3)
11	9	3	1	0	290	45.25
9	7	4	11	0	289	27.77
8	7	2	1	92	289	24.67
9	8	16	8	0	288	27.77
8	6	5	8	0	288	24.67
5	4	4	2	0	288	17.48
9	8		14	0	287	27.77
9	8	3	5	1	287	27.77
9	8	4	4	0	287	34.96
9	8		4	0	287	34.96
10	9	8	11	25	287	34.96
7	6	4	6	11	287	27.77

---

[1] Not certified, failed to pick up food for 3 months.

[2] Unknown.

[3] Certified for June, but did not pick up food.

[4] Not certified, case closed in May.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The highest amount paid in June 1963 was $564. The next highest amount was $410. The next highest amount was $391. In addition, the families were eligible for surplus commodities.

In West Virginia the highest ADC payment can only be $165.

I wonder what the critics would say if I were to recommend the institution of a $165 ceiling on welfare payments in the District of Columbia on the theory that what is good enough for West Virginia is good enough for the District of Columbia.

The Senator from Connecticut said that the city of Washington is the Nation's shame, and that it should be the Nation's example.

It was the Nation's example 2 years ago, when 59.7 percent of the cases in the ADC category were ineligible. The Congress, on the recommendation of the Comptroller General, has tried to correct this situation.

The city of Washington will never be an example to this country so long as there are situations such as exist in the city now, situations in which paramours live in the homes of scores of recipients of ADC payments and enjoy the benefits of the ADC payments which are intended for the children.

All a mother has to do is to discontinue her continuing husband-and-wife relationship with that paramour, and she can qualify. She can tell him to get out and stay out; that she loves her children and wants to be a dutiful and responsible mother to them. If she does so, she can qualify. She can qualify even though she is employable, if she is needed in the home. This is a fact that is not generally known; at least it is not talked about. Employable mothers needed in the home can qualify for public assistance under the present regulations.

No; the critics want us to make the decision.

I say that the mother has the responsibility of making the decision. Let her tell the paramour to get out. Then the children can qualify if she is needed in the home. It is just that simple.

Reference was made to children who are hungry. There will always be hungry children. There are hungry children in West Virginia, a State which is participating in the program. There are hungry children in the State represented by my distinguished colleague the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], where the program is in effect. There are hungry children in States which do not participate in the program.

Jesus said that the poor will always be with us. There will always be hungry children. The fact that an ADC payment is going into the home of a recipient does not guarantee that the children are not going to be hungry. Many of the children for whom the benefits are intended in the District of Columbia are probably hungry. Why? Because the drink it up and spend the money on mother and the paramour love it up and themselves. The children never see it.

I daresay that there are no more hungry children in the District of Columbia, percentagewise, than there are in cities that participate in this program.

If children are hungry and neglected or mistreated, the Child Welfare Division, through the courts, can remove the children from the homes. The Women's Bureau of the Police Department can also remove such children. The children can be placed in homes of relatives or in foster homes. We have raised the foster home rates. Free school lunches and surplus commodities are provided to keep children from going hungry.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] seeks to have the city of Washington made an example for the country. The Committee on Appropriations is doing its best, under difficult circumstances, to improve the image of the city. It is attempting to use money where it will count most in making this city a good example. That is why we are recommending 44 additional elementary school teachers above the budget estimate.

One way to make this city a good example for the country is to educate its people. This will not be done in a year or a day. But I maintain that if the welfare caseload can be cleaned up and rid of the ineligibles, and if the money can be better used for schools, we shall be doing something to make Washington a better example for the country.

The Senator from Connecticut quoted me as saying that the unemployment rate in the district of Columbia is 3.5 percent. I did not say that. According to the Department of Labor, the unemployment rate, at the last reading, was 2.1 percent in the metropolitan area; and the District of Columbia, according to testimony given to our subcommittee, has about two-thirds of the unemployment in the metropolitan area. So presumably the unemployment rate in the District of Columbia is about 3.1 percent. The Department of Labor does not maintain statistics on unemployment in the District of Columbia. These have to be computed on the basis of metropolitan area unemployment and on the basis of the experience derived from the last previous census.

It is said that I have opposed this program because the unemployment rate is so low. What city in the United States has it any better? This is only one of the reasons why I oppose the program. I maintain not only that the unemployment rate is low, but that the general level of prosperity is high. On July 30 of this year, the Washington Evening Star published an article about economic conditions in the District of Columbia. In part, the article stated:

> Substantial gains in both Government and private payrolls and evidence of continued population growth were features of a midyear survey of the Washington metropolitan area.
>
> Year-to-year gains dominated all area statistics with few exceptions. Gains for the first 6 months of the year were slightly smaller than for the first 3 months, but this was due mainly to sharp improvement between the first and second quarters last year.
>
> Area payrolls for June were estimated at more than $395 million, including $211.8 million from private business and $155 million from the Federal Government.
>
> The payroll total was the largest for any June on record, with a gain of 5.2 percent from June last year and an impressive 45-percent increase from June 1958, just 5 years ago.

Mr. President, I repeat that the payroll total in the area increased 45 percent from what it was in June, 5 years ago, I continue to read:

> Net additions to electric customers, gas meters and telephones during the last year indicated steady growth of population. All of these totals for June 30 were records for that date.
>
> Reflecting expanding needs for homes and offices, a construction boom continued in the 6 months and piled up an area permit total of nearly $278.5 million. When Federal projects for June are added, the overall total will top $300 million.
>
> Department store sales and other indicators of retail buying moved comfortably ahead of a year ago to set new records. Sales of autos and appliances also rose, although hotel sales lagged behind as new construction increased capacity and competition.
>
> On the financial front, banks, savings and loan associations, and insurance companies all reported large gains from a year ago.
>
> EMPLOYMENT
>
> While the Federal Government continues as the largest single employer in the area, total private payrolls exceed the Federal outlay. Actually, private payrolls in the area have grown faster than Federal payrolls in the last 5 years.
>
> Private payrolls of $211,763,000 in June were up 4.6 percent from a year ago and 54.6 percent from 5 years ago. Private jobs totaling 505,400 in the month were up 2.3 percent from a year ago and 31 percent above 5 years earlier.
>
> Federal Government payrolls of $155,127,000 for June were 5.8 percent above a year earlier and 33.5 percent ahead of 5 years ago. They covered 267,000 jobs, a gain of 3.8 percent from a year ago and up 16 percent in 5 years.
>
> Total area payrolls of $395,446,000 were paid to 832,900 employees in June, compared with $375,886,000 for 809,300 persons in June last year, and $271,975,000 for 664,600 persons in June 1958.

At another point, the article states:

> Area bank deposits and invested capital of savings and loan associations both set new high marks at midyear.
>
> Bank deposits totaled $2,842,189,893, a gain of 12 percent from a year ago, while savings accounts in the associations expanded to $1,496,333,881, an increase of 12.6 percent.
>
> Bank loans totaling $980.6 million were up 11.7 percent and mortgage loans of the savings and loans reached $1,508,303,161, an increase of 9.8 percent.

These figures indicate that there is a high level of prosperity, not only in the metropolitan area, but also in the District of Columbia.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article, published in the Washington Evening Star, printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., July 30, 1963]

STAR BUSINESS BAROMETER—AREA PAYROLLS HIT NEW MIDYEAR TOP

(By Donald B. Hadley, Star financial editor)

Substantial gains in both Government and private payrolls and evidence of continued population growth were features of a midyear survey of the Washington metropolitan area.

Year-to-year gains dominated all area statistics with few exceptions. Gains for the first 6 months of the year were slightly smaller than for the first 3 months, but this was due mainly to sharp improvement between the first and second quarters last year.

Area payrolls for June were estimated at more than $395 million, including $211.8 million from private business and $155 million from the Federal Government.

The payroll total was the largest for any June on record, with a gain of 5.2 percent from June last year and an impressive 45 percent increase from June 1958, just 5 years ago.

Net additions to electric customers, gas meters, and telephones during the last year indicated steady growth of population. All of these totals for June 30 were records for that date.

Reflecting expanding needs for homes and offices, a construction boom continued in the 6 months and piled up an area permit total of nearly $278.5 million. When Federal projects for June are added, the overall total will top $300 million.

Department store sales and other indicators of retail buying moved comfortably ahead of a year ago to set new records. Sales of autos and appliances also rose, although hotel sales lagged behind as new construction increased capacity and competition.

On the financial front, banks, savings and loan associations, and insurance companies all reported large gains from a year ago.

EMPLOYMENT

While the Federal Government continues as the largest single employer in the area, total private payrolls exceed the Federal outlay. Actually, private payrolls in the area have grown faster than Federal payrolls in the last 5 years.

Private payrolls of $211,763,000 in June were up 4.6 percent from a year ago and 54.6 percent from 5 years ago. Private jobs totaling 505,400 in the month were up 2.3 percent from a year ago and 31 percent above 5 years earlier.

Federal Government payrolls of $155,127,000 for June were 5.8 percent above a year earlier and 33.5 percent ahead of 5 years ago. They covered 267,000 jobs, a gain of 3.8 percent from a year ago and up 16 percent in 5 years.

Total area payrolls of $395,446,000 were paid to 832,900 employees in June, compared with $375,886,000 for 809,300 persons in June last year, and $271,975,000 for 664,600 persons in June 1958.

Area estimates for June payrolls and jobs are compared below with a year earlier:

	Period	1963	1962	Percent change
Area employment	June	832,900	809,300	+2.9
Area payrolls	do	$395,446,000	$375,886,000	+5.2
U.S. Government jobs	do	267,000	257,300	+3.8
U.S. Government payrolls	do	$155,127,000	$146,661,000	+5.8
Private jobs	do	505,400	493,900	+2.3
Private payrolls	do	$211,763,000	$202,499,000	+4.6
Local-State government jobs	do	60,500	58,100	+4.1
Local-State government payrolls	do	$28,556,000	$26,726,000	+6.9
Area unemployment	do	26,300	24,900	+5.6
District of Columbia jobless payments	do	$1,069,544	$581,266	+84.3

PUBLIC UTILITIES

The Washington area had 545,140 electric customers, 425,147 gas meters, and 1,450,603 telephones on June 30; highest marks for that date on record.

Electric and gas sales in 6 months of 1963 exceeded a year earlier by 8.3 and 9.7 percent, respectively. The June average of originating local telephone calls also set a new high for the month with a jump of 12.5 percent from a year ago. Comparisons with a year earlier follow:

	Period	1963	1962	Change
				Percent
Area electric sales (kilowatt hours)	6 months	3, 397, 033, 387	3, 147, 540, 756	+8. 3
Electric customers	June 30	545, 140	529, 540	+2. 9
Area gas consumption (therms)	6 months	395, 047, 833	360, 283, 443	+9. 7
Gas meters	June 30	425, 147	413, 865	+2. 8
Area telephone calls (daily average)	June	6, 867, 423	6, 116, 534	+12. 5
Area telephones	June 30	1, 450, 603	1, 359, 670	+6. 7

CONSTRUCTION

Incomplete construction totals for 6 months of this year indicated an overall area total of more than $300 million when Federal contracts for June are finally reported.

Private permits in the 6 months aggregated $278,496,000, with a gain of 8.9 percent from a year ago. Residential permits of $179,879,000 were up 7.4 percent and nonresidential activity rose to $60,596,000, up 35 percent. However, new home units lagged slightly.

Six months' permit totals for the area are listed below with figures for a year ago.

	Period	1963	1962	Change
				Percent
Area non-Federal construction	6 months	$278, 496, 000	$255, 769, 000	+8. 9
Residential permits	do	179, 879, 000	167, 533, 000	+7. 4
Nonresident permits	do	81, 637, 000	60, 596, 000	+35. 0
New home units	do	17, 349	17, 428	−. 5
Area Federal construction	5 months	16, 209, 000	13, 464, 000	+20. 3

FINANCIAL INDICATORS

Area bank deposits and invested capital of savings and loan associations both set new high marks at midyear.

Bank deposits totaled $2,842,189,893, a gain of 12 percent from a year ago, while savings accounts in the associations expanded to $1,496,333,881, an increase of 12.6 percent.

Bank loans totaling $980.6 million were up 11.7 percent, and mortgage loans of the savings and loans reached $1,508,303,161, an increase of 9.8 percent.

Bank debits and clearings were ahead of a year ago by 7.5 and 3.2 percent, respectively. Sales of ordinary life insurance in the District of Columbia rose 9 percent while District postal receipts climbed 18.2 percent.

The latest figures are compared below with those for a year earlier.

	Period	1963	1962	Change
				Percent
Area bank deposits	June 29	$2, 842, 189, 893	$2, 537, 462, 422	+12. 0
District of Columbia bank deposits	do	1, 832, 089, 944	1, 693, 976, 512	+8. 1
Suburban deposits	do	1, 010, 099, 949	843, 449, 910	+19. 8
District of Columbia gross bank loans	do	980, 601, 000	877, 858, 000	+11. 7
District of Columbia bank debits	6 months	15, 793, 218, 000	14, 700, 916, 000	+7. 5
District of Columbia bank clearings	do	4, 524, 958, 955	4, 382, 859, 010	+3. 2
District of Columbia savings and loan savings	June 30	1, 496, 333, 881	1, 329, 197, 205	+12. 6
District of Columbia savings and loan loans	do	1, 508, 303, 161	1, 373, 201, 056	+9. 8
District of Columbia life insurance	6 months	128, 392, 000		+9. 0
District of Columbia postal receipts	do	22, 839, 215	19, 323, 151	+18. 2

SALES

Area department store sales increased 8 percent above a year ago in the first 6 months of this year. With downtown Washington stores only contributing a gain of 1 percent, most of the expansion was in suburban branches.

The Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond compiles these figures, but does not give dollar volumes.

Area new-car sales for 5 months of this year were 20.6 percent above a year ago. Six-month sales in the District alone were up 13.5 percent, while used-car sales rose 2.4 percent. District auto registrations on June 30 were 3.7 percent above a year ago after deduction of transfers.

District collections of sales and gross receipts taxes were 23.2 percent above a year ago in the 6 months. Television unit sales climbed 18.9 percent, while unit sales of radios gained 26.3 percent. Competition caused a 6.2-percent decline in hotel sales.

Six-month totals are given below with those for the same 1962 period:

	Period	1963	1962	Change
				Percent
Area department store sales	6 months			+8. 0
District of Columbia department store sales	do			+1. 0
Television unit sales	do	37, 688	31, 691	+18. 9
Radio unit sales	do	40, 426	32, 021	+26. 3
District of Columbia hotel sales	do			−6. 2
District of Columbia sales tax receipts	do	$34, 807, 000	$28, 308, 000	+23. 2
Area new vehicle titles	5 months	57, 053	47, 354	+20. 6
District of Columbia auto registrations	June 30	200, 777	193, 758	+3. 7
District of Columbia new-car titles	6 months	18, 131	15, 975	+13. 5
District of Columbia used-car sales	do	30, 809	30, 103	+2. 4
District of Columbia gasoline sales (gallons)	5 months	83, 344, 447	81, 790, 767	+1. 9

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Study Shows Negroes Get Better Deal in District of Columbia," written by Lee Cohn, and published in the Washington Sunday Star of June 30, 1963. I shall read the first two sentences:

> Negroes in Washington are better off—by the yardsticks of income, jobs, and schooling—than Negroes in other big eastern cities, the Labor Department reported yesterday.
>
> Moreover, the report indicated, Negroes here are ahead of whites in some of the other cities in the fields of employment and education.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., June 30, 1963]

STUDY SHOWS NEGROES GET BETTER DEAL IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(By Lee Cohn, Star staff writer)

Negroes in Washington are better off—by the yardsticks of income, jobs, and schooling—than Negroes in other big eastern cities, the Labor Department reported yesterday.

Moreover, the report indicated, Negroes here are ahead of whites in some of the other cities in the fields of employment and education.

But Washington Negroes lag behind whites here in income, jobs, and schooling.

The report is a special analysis of 1960 census data and was prepared by the Department's Bureau of Labor Statistics for President Kennedy's Committee on Youth Employment and for others interested in welfare, urban planning, employment, education, and market research.

Although the report is based on 1960 census figures, there is no reason to believe the general patterns indicated by the data have changed.

NATIONWIDE STUDY

It is one of 38 reports prepared or in process, analyzing major cities throughout the country on a neighborhood-by-neighborhood basis. The Washington report draws comparisons with six other eastern cities.

The median family income of Washington's total population in 1959, as reported in 1960, was $5,993. That was second only to New York's $6,091, and topped incomes of $5,782 in Philadelphia, $5,713 in Buffalo, $5,659 in Baltimore, $5,605 in Pittsburgh, and $5,454 in Newark, N.J.

Washington's nonwhite population, 98 percent of whom were Negroes, had a median family income of $4,800. That exceeded nonwhites' incomes of $4,437 in New York, $4,248 in Philadelphia, $4,149 in Buffalo, $4,123 in Baltimore, $3,833 in Pittsburgh, and $3,665 in Newark.

The unemployment rate for all Washington males 14 or older, was 4.4 percent in April 1960, and the rate for Washington Negro (nonwhite) males was 5.6 percent.

In the other cities, the total unemployment rates for males were 5 percent in New York, 6.4 percent in Philadelphia, 6.7 percent in Baltimore, 7 percent in Newark, 8.8 percent in Buffalo, and 9 percent in Pittsburgh.

EDUCATION STATISTICS

For nonwhites, the male unemployment rates were 6.9 percent in New York, 9.7 percent in Newark, 10.1 percent in Baltimore, 11.1 percent in Philadelphia, 16.3 percent in Buffalo, and 9 percent in Pittsburgh.

A recession increased unemployment in 1960. Washington was not hit as hard as other cities. The unemployment rate for Negroes in the other cities almost certainly still tops the Negro rate here.

Washingtonians over 25 had completed 11.7 years of school, as a median figure in 1960. The figure for Washington Negroes was 9.8 years.

Median educational attainment was reported at 10.1 years in New York and Pittsburgh, 9.6 years in Philadelphia and Buffalo, 9 years in Newark, and 8.9 years in Baltimore. For nonwhites, the figures were 9.5 years in New York, 9.1 in Pittsburgh, 9 in Philadelphia, 8.8 in Newark, 8.7 in Buffalo, and 8.4 in Baltimore.

Analysts divided Washington into 125 neighborhoods, on the basis of census tracts. As might be expected, neighborhoods with high unemployment rates were characterized by low levels of income and educational attainment. These also were the neighborhoods with high proportions of Negroes and many high school dropouts.

The report said neighborhoods suffering from "social and economic blight" are clustered mostly in the center of the city, roughly between Florida Avenue in the Northwest to the Anacostia River in the Southeast.

NEIGHBORHOODS RATED

Neighborhoods were ranged and grouped into four quarters, or quartiles, according to incomes. In the lowest quartile, with 158,000 residents, median family incomes ranged from $2,912 to $4,575 in 1959.

The average unemployment rate for males, 14 or over, was 6.8 percent, 87 percent were nonwhite, 4 percent were of foreign stock, and 10 percent had moved into the Washington area since 1955.

More than half the residents lived in neighborhoods where the median level of educational attainment was only 7.1 to 9.7 years of school, and only 82 percent of those 14 to 17 years old were in high school.

By contrast, the highest quartile had median family incomes of $7,896 to $10,000 or more. The male unemployment rate averaged 2.1 percent in the neighborhoods of this group, which had a population of 166,000.

LOW INCOME AREA

Of this population, 11 percent were nonwhite, 28 percent were of foreign stock, and 15 percent had moved into the area since 1955. Nearly three-fourths lived in neighborhoods where the median level of education attainment was 12.6 to 15.6 years of school. All those 14 to 17 were in high school.

The census tract with the lowest median family income, $2,912, was the area bounded by South Capitol Street on the east, the Anacostia River on the south, Canal Street SW., on the west, and M Street SW., on the north. Its population was 3,262, of whom 3,218 were Negroes and 42 were white.

The unemployment rate was only 4.5 percent of the 534 persons in the labor force—working or seeking jobs. The median educational attainment for those 25 or older was 8.5 years, and 96 percent of those 14 to 17 were in high school. Five percent of the population had moved into the Washington area since 1955, and 51 percent of them came from the South.

HIGH INCOME AREAS

Sixteen census tracts are listed with median family incomes of $10,000 or more without specific dollar figures. The one at the top of the list is the Northwest area bounded by Western Avenue, Wisconsin Avenue, Macomb Street, and Massachusetts Avenue.

Its population of 11,698 consisted of 11,554 whites, 49 Negroes, 16 Puerto Ricans, and the balance unspecified. There were 3,120 of foreign stock. The unemployment rate among the 3,206 persons in the labor force was 2.2 percent.

Those 25 or older had a median education of 13.5 years, and all those 14 to 17 were in high school. Twelve percent of the residents had moved here since 1955, and 29 percent of them came from the South.

The highest unemployment rate for males, 12.6 percent, was reported in two census tracts.

In the Northwest, one of the neighborhoods is bounded by New York Avenue on the north, 5th and 6th Streets on the east, the Mall on the south, and 15th Street on the west.

OTHER FACTS CITED

Its population was 1,489, of whom 896 were whites, 275 Negroes, and the balance of other races. There were 430 of foreign stock. The labor force totaled 676. Median family income was $4,786.

The other tract, with 12.6 percent unemployment, is in the Southeast, bounded by South Carolina Avenue, Pennsylvania Avenue, 11th Street, and Virginia Avenue. Its population of 5,973 included 1,822 whites and 4,114 Negroes. There were 279 of foreign stock. Median family income was $4,716. There were 1,420 persons in the labor force.

The lowest listed male unemployment rate, 0.7 percent of the 1,694-member labor force, was in a Northwest neighborhood. This tract is bounded by Massachusetts Avenue, Glover-Archbold Parkway, the Potomac River, Chain Bridge Road, and Nebraska Avenue.

Its population was 6,235, of whom 6.073 were whites, 109 Negroes, and the balance other races. There were 1,575 residents of foreign stock. Median family income was over $10,000.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table of information in regard to unemployment in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia for the years 1960–63.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Unemployment in metropolitan area and District of Columbia, fiscal years 1962, 1961, and 1960

[Thousands]

	Annual report data [1]		Projected [2]	
	Metropolitan area unemployment	Percent of metropolitan area labor force unemployed	District unemployment	Percent of District labor force unemployed
Fiscal year 1962:				
June	24.9	2.7	15.9	3.9
May	18.1	2.0	11.6	2.9
April	18.8	2.1	12.0	3.1
March	24.2	2.7	15.5	3.9
February	26.4	3.0	16.9	4.4
January	26.3	3.0	16.8	4.4
December	21.6	2.4	13.8	3.5
November	22.6	2.5	14.5	3.7
October	19.9	2.3	12.7	3.4
September	20.9	2.4	13.4	3.5
August	23.8	2.7	15.2	3.9
July	24.6	2.8	15.7	4.1
Fiscal year 1961:				
June	27.3	3.1	17.5	4.5
May	20.5	2.5	13.1	3.7
April	21.0	2.4	13.4	3.5
March	25.9	3.0	16.6	4.4
February	31.7	3.7	20.3	5.4
January	26.1	3.1	16.7	4.5
Fiscal 1961—Con.				
December	23.6	2.7	15.1	3.9
November	22.9	2.6	14.7	3.8
October	18.9	2.3	12.1	3.4
September	19.3	2.7	12.4	3.9
August	21.7	2.2	13.9	3.2
July	21.7	2.2	13.9	3.2
Fiscal year 1960:				
June	23.9	2.7	15.3	3.9
May	17.6	2.2	11.3	3.2
April	17.8	2.2	11.5	3.2
March	22.8	2.7	14.6	3.9
February	25.0	2.9	16.0	4.2
January	23.2	2.6	14.8	3.8
December	18.0	2.2	11.5	3.2
November	19.4	2.3	12.4	3.4
October	17.3	2.0	11.1	2.9
September	17.2	2.0	11.0	2.9
August	19.6	2.3	12.5	3.4
July	20.8	2.4	13.3	3.5

---

[1] The Labor Market News issued by the U.S. Employment Service for the District of Columbia. Revisions in the original published data have been incorporated.

[2] District of Columbia unemployment and labor force data are not normally collected except every 10 years during the U.S. census. Data collected for the District during the census (April 1960) has been used as a benchmark. The assumptions have been made that the same ratio of labor force for the District to the metropolitan area applied during fiscal year 1961–63 period. In the 1960 census, the District unemployed constituted 64 percent of the unemployed in the metropolitan area. This rate was applied to metropolitan area data to develop District unemployment.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

Unemployment in the District of Columbia and the Washington metropolitan area

Month and year	Washington metropolitan unemployment [1]		District of Columbia unemployment [2]		Month and year	Washington metropolitan unemployment [1]		District of Columbia unemployment [2]	
	Number unemployed (thousands)	Percent of labor force	Number unemployed (thousands)	Percent of labor force		Number unemployed (thousands)	Percent of labor force	Number unemployed (thousands)	Percent of labor force
1963:					1962:				
June	26.3	2.7	16.8	3.9	December	21.2	2.2	13.0	3.2
May	20.5	2.2	13.4	3.2	November	21.5	2.3	13.8	3.4
April	19.1	2.0	12.2	2.9	October	18.4	2.0	11.8	2.9
March	24.5	2.7	15.7	3.9	September	19.4	2.1	12.4	3.1
February	27.3	2.9	17.5	4.2	August	22.3	2.4	14.3	3.5
January	26.5	2.9	17.0	4.2	July	23.0	2.5	14.7	3.7

[1] Data obtained from U.S. Employment Service for the District of Columbia.

[2] Estimates. District of Columbia unemployment and labor force data are not normally collected except every 10 years during the U.S. census. Data collected for the District during the census (April 1960) has been used as a benchmark. The assumptions have been made that the same ratio of labor force for the District to the metropolitan area applied during the fiscal years 1961–63 period. In the 1960 census, the District unemployed constituted 64 percent of the unemployed in the metropolitan area. This rate was applied to metropolitan area data to develop District unemployment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that July unemployment in the Washington metropolitan area was 2.4, August was 2.4, September was 2.1, and the Labor Department informed my office this week that the figure was still 2.1 percent of the labor force. The Washington area is rated as a low-unemployment area by the Department of Labor. There is practically no seasonal variation. The impact of students is small.

With such an unprecedented level of prosperity and with unemployment rates considerably below the national average, the District does not appear to need a new and costly welfare program.

Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut has indicated that we should not wear blinders and be oblivious to conditions that exist so close to the Capitol. I submit that Congress has not been stingy in its appropriations for the Department of Welfare in the District of Columbia over the years. I ask consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table of public assistance grants for the fiscal years 1954 through 1963. The table indicates that Congress appropriated $2,878,929 for the local share in 1954; and in 1963, Congress appropriated $5,387,653 in local moneys for grants. Senators will note that when Federal moneys are added, the amounts have not been insignificant.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Public assistance grants, 1954–63

Item	Total	Old-age assistance	Aid to dependent children	Aid to the blind	Aid to the disabled	General public assistance
ACTUAL, 1954						
Average number of cases	7,546	2,801	2,144	249	1,651	701
Average number of persons	14,612	2,913	8,951	264	1,750	734
Average monthly grant per case		$52.59	$105.26	$55.78	$58.96	$59.71
Average monthly grant per person		$50.95	$25.21	$52.55	$55.63	$57.02
Total payments	$6,326,316	$1,781,161	$2,707,989	$166,509	$1,168,342	$502,315
Federal share	$3,447,387	$1,040,447	$1,658,526	$96,461	$651,953	
Local share	$2,878,929	$740,714	$1,049,463	$70,048	$516,389	$502,315
ACTUAL, 1955						
Average number of cases	8,302	3,030	2,335	255	2,136	546
Average number of persons	15,991	3,151	9,740	270	2,264	566
Average monthly grant per case		$53.20	$105.97	$58.66	$60.23	$61.39
Average monthly grant per person		$51.16	$25.41	$55.35	$56.81	$59.18
Total payments	$7,029,197	$1,934,786	$2,969,431	$179,338	$1,543,654	$401,988
Federal share	$3,873,840	$1,122,585	$1,803,862	$100,486	$846,907	
Local share	$3,155,357	$812,201	$1,165,569	$78,852	$696,747	$401,988
ACTUAL, 1956						
Average number of cases	8,230	3,069	2,081	255	2,252	573
Average number of persons	15,402	3,192	8,957	270	2,387	596
Average monthly grant per case		$53.49	$108.98	$60.05	$61.26	$62.97
Average monthly grant per person		$51.43	$25.32	$56.71	$57.78	$60.55
Total payments	$6,964,110	$1,970,307	$2,721,878	$183,746	$1,655,103	$433,076
Federal share	$3,787,699	$1,136,844	$1,653,717	$101,101	$896,037	
Local share	$3,176,411	$833,463	$1,061,861	$82,645	$759,066	$433,076
ACTUAL, 1957						
Average number of cases	8,542	3,005	2,241	261	2,408	627
Average number of persons	16,388	3,125	9,764	277	2,552	670
Average monthly grant per case		$54.39	$110.23	$62.35	$64.25	$64.56
Average monthly grant per person		$52,30	$25.29	$58.75	$60.63	$60.39
Total payments	$7,462,742	$1,961,388	$2,963,729	$196,295	$1,856,745	$485,585
Federal share	$4,224,417	$1,177,188	$1,898,729	$111,053	$1,037,447	
Local share	$3,238,325	$784,200	$1,065,000	$84,242	$819,298	$485,585
ACTUAL, 1958						
Average number of cases	9,532	3,100	2,834	243	2,454	901
Average number of persons	19,579	3,224	12,509	258	2,601	987
Average monthly grant per case		$56.13	$122.83	$64.06	$66.74	$67.71
Average monthly grant per person		$53.96	$27.83	$60.34	$62.97	$61.79
Total payments	$9,148,720	$2,087,555	$4,177,019	$186,810	$1,965,415	$731,921
Federal share	$4,955,682	$1,250,284	$2,523,454	$104,947	$1,076,997	
Local share	$4,193,038	$837,271	$1,653,565	$81,863	$888,418	$731,921
ACTUAL, 1959						
Average number of cases	10,680	3,115	3,530	235	2,474	1,317
Average number of persons	23,347	3,189	15,900	244	2,560	1,445
Average monthly grant per case		$59.32	$143.20	$67.78	$70.61	$71.63
Average monthly grant per person		$57.94	$31.87	$65.32	$68.00	$65.32
Total payments	$11,719,137	$2,217,170	$6,081,372	$191,271	$2,096,621	$1,132,703
Federal share	$6,442,495	$1,439,443	$3,692,990	$113,350	$1,196,712	
Local share	$5,276,642	$777,727	$2,388,382	$77,921	$899,909	$1,132,703

Public assistance grants, 1954–63—Continued

Item	Total	Old-age assistance	Aid to dependent children	Aid to the blind	Aid to the disabled	General public assistance
ACTUAL, 1960						
Average number of cases	11, 458	3, 012	4, 168	231	2, 623	1, 424
Average number of persons	26, 617	3, 136	18, 878	248	2, 781	1, 574
Average monthly grant per case		$59. 46	$148. 39	$69. 03	$72. 33	$73. 62
Average monthly grant per person		$57. 10	$32. 76	$64. 43	$68. 22	$66. 61
Total payments	$13, 297, 948	$2, 148, 921	$7, 422, 381	$191, 500	$2, 276, 804	$1, 258, 342
Federal share	$7, 431, 630	$1, 465, 142	$4, 543, 949	$116, 119	$1, 306, 420	
Local share	$5, 866, 318	$683, 779	$2, 878, 432	$75, 381	$970, 384	$1, 258, 342
ACTUAL, 1961						
Average number of cases	12, 497	2, 954	5, 069	216	2, 779	1, 479
Average number of persons	31, 105	3, 076	23, 240	229	2, 942	1, 618
Average monthly grant per case		$59. 49	$151. 07	$68. 29	$73. 19	$74. 47
Average monthly grant per person		$57. 13	$32. 95	$64. 58	$69. 13	$68. 05
Total payments	$15, 237, 496	$2, 108, 840	$9, 189, 222	$177, 209	$2, 440, 755	$1, 321, 470
Federal share	$8, 525, 517	$1, 445, 366	$5, 588, 479	$107, 690	$1, 383, 982	
Local share	$6, 711, 979	$663, 474	$3, 600, 743	$69, 519	$1, 056, 773	$1, 321, 470
ACTUAL, 1962						
Average number of cases	12, 706	2, 832, 839	5, 444	202	2, 712	1, 509
Average number of persons	32, 864	2, 958	25, 175	212	2, 880	1, 639
Average monthly grant per case		$59. 15	$51. 22	$68. 39	$73. 16	$75. 56
Average monthly grant per person		$56. 78	$32. 70	$65. 24	$68. 90	$69. 55
Total payments	$15, 809, 329	$2, 015, 344	$9, 878, 726	$165, 777	$2, 381, 219	$1, 368, 263
Federal share	$8, 971, 474	$1, 434, 238	$6, 067, 815	$102, 034	$1, 370, 387	
Local share	$6, 834, 855	$581, 106	$3, 810, 911	$63, 743	$1, 010, 832	$1, 368, 263
ACTUAL 1963						
Average number of cases	11, 067	2, 650	4, 373	190	2, 976	878
Average number of persons	27, 597	2, 759	20, 543	199	3, 151	946
Average monthly grant per case		$61. 47	$152. 19	$71. 03	$74. 79	$74. 94
Average monthly grant per person		$59. 04	$32. 39	$67. 99	$70. 64	$68. 64
Total payments	$13, 562, 327	$1, 954, 832	$7, 985, 217	$162, 162	$2, 670, 902	$789, 214
Federal share	$8, 174, 674	$1, 439, 289	$5, 009, 276	$103, 691	$1, 622, 418	
Local share	$5, 387, 653	$515, 543	$2, 975, 941	$58, 471	$1, 048, 484	$789, 214

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, let me proceed a little further on this point, to say that the Department of Welfare of the District of Columbia has fared better than have the other major departments of the District.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the total appropriations for every department of the District of Columbia government for which the appropriation amounted to $1 million or more for each of the years 1955 through 1963.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Name of agency	Total appropriation	Salary cost of authorized positions	Authorized positions
Department of Public Welfare:			
1955	$8, 765, 100	$3, 468, 300	1, 035
1963	$21, 256, 700	$9, 860, 100	2, 366
Actual change, 1955–63	$12, 491, 600	$6, 391, 800	1, 331
Percentage change, 1955–63	142. 5	184. 3	128. 6
Department of General Administration:			
1955	$2, 945, 500	$2, 396, 300	582
1963	$6, 761, 500	$4, 440, 600	712
Actual change, 1955–63	$3, 815, 800	$2, 044, 300	113
Percentage change, 1955–63	129. 5	85. 3	22. 3
National Zoological Park:			
1955	$645, 000	$466, 900	137
1963	$147, 200	$1, 120, 800	210
Actual change, 1955–63	$825, 200	$653, 900	73
Percentage change, 1955–63	127. 9	140. 1	53. 3
Metropolitan Police Department:			
1955	$12, 837, 500	$11, 635, 100	2, 473
1963	$26, 901, 900	$19, 509, 600	3, 132
Actual change, 1955–63	$14, 064, 400	$7, 874, 500	659
Percentage change, 1955–63	109. 6	67. 7	26. 6
Education:			
1955	$27, 626, 600	$23, 174, 400	5, 311
1963	$57, 248, 400	$42, 000, 100	6, 936
Actual change, 1955–63	$29, 621, 800	$18, 825, 700	1, 625
Percentage change, 1955–63	107. 2	81. 2	30. 6
Recreation Department:			
1955	$1, 641, 000	$808, 500	222
1963	$3, 348, 400	$1, 632, 600	283
Actual change, 1955–63	$1, 707, 400	$823, 800	61
Percentage change, 1955–63	104. 0	101. 9	27. 5
Regulatory agencies:			
1955	$918, 200	$847, 800	188
1963	$1, 862, 000	$1, 548, 300	240
Actual change, 1955–63	$943, 800	$700, 500	52
Percentage change, 1955–63	102. 8	82. 6	27. 7
Department of Licenses and Inspection:			
1955	$1, 378, 000	$1, 249, 800	296
1963	$2, 784, 000	$2, 408, 600	398
Actual change, 1955–63	$1, 406, 000	$1, 158, 800	102
Percentage change, 1955–63	102. 0	92. 7	34. 5
Fire Department:			
1955	$6, 266, 600	$5, 578, 400	1, 128
1963	$12, 595, 000	$8, 642, 400	1, 278
Actual change, 1955–63	$6, 328, 400	$3, 064. 000	150
Percentage change, 1955–63	101. 0	54. 9	13. 3
Courts:			
1955	$3, 163, 400	$1, 123, 200	234
1963	$6, 209, 400	$2, 344, 900	352
Actual change, 1955–63	$3, 046, 000	$1, 221, 700	118
Percentage change, 1955–63	96. 3	108. 8	50. 4
Public Library:			
1955	$1, 611, 000	$1, 202, 400	352
1963	$3, 140, 200	$2, 258, 600	436
Actual change, 1955–63	$1, 529, 200	$1, 056, 200	84
Percentage change, 1955–63	94. 9	87. 8	23. 9
Department of Public Health:			
1955	$22, 636, 000	$8, 997. 700	2, 759
1963	$43, 727, 800	$17, 864, 600	3, 689
Actual change, 1955–63	$21, 091, 800	$8, 866, 900	930
Percentage change, 1955–63	93. 2	98. 5	33. 7
Department of Sanitary Engineering:			
1955	$9, 732, 700	$8, 789, 800	2, 781
1963	$17, 897, 400	$14, 704, 200	3, 045
Actual change, 1955–63	$8, 164, 700	$5, 914, 400	264
Percentage change, 1955–63	83. 9	67. 3	9. 5
Department of Corrections:			
1955	$4, 374, 600	$2, 429, 200	603
1963	$7, 849, 500	$5, 270, 900	887
Actual change, 1955–63	$3, 474, 900	$2, 841, 700	284
Percentage change, 1955–63	79. 4	117. 0	47. 1
Department of Highways and Traffic:			
1955	$5, 768, 600	$3, 413, 700	939
1963	$9, 624, 500	$7, 981, 300	1, 449
Actual change, 1955–63	$3, 855, 900	$4, 567, 600	510
Percentage change, 1955–63	66. 8	133. 8	54. 3
Department of Buildings and Grounds:			
1955	$1, 675, 600	$946, 500	297
1963	$2, 654. 300	$1, 431. 500	297
Actual change, 1955–63	$978, 700	$485, 000	
Percentage change, 1955–63	58. 4	51. 2	
Department of Motor Vehicles:			
1955	$1, 003, 000	$704, 900	191
1963	$1, 588, 400	$1, 101, 700	219
Actual change, 1955–63	$585, 400	$396, 800	28
Percentage change, 1955–63	58. 4	35. 9	14. 7
National Capital Parks:			
1955	$2, 344, 000	$1, 773, 700	522
1963	$3, 541, 200	$3, 262, 000	602
Actual change, 1955–63	$1, 197, 200	$1, 488, 300	80
Percentage change, 1955–63	51. 1	83. 9	15. 3
Washington Aqueduct:			
1955	$2, 127, 000	$1, 526, 300	369
1963	$2, 863, 400	$1, 920, 500	336
Actual change, 1955–63	$736, 400	$394, 200	−33
Percentage change, 1955–63	48. 2	24. 7	−8. 9
Total for District of Columbia:			
1955	$129,529,000	$81,768,500	$20, 704
1963	$236,735,400	$151,654,000	$27, 253
Actual change, 1955–63	$107,206,400	$69,885,500	$6, 549
Percentage change, 1955–63	82. 8	85. 5	31. 6

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, this table shows that, in total appropriations, the increase for the Department of Public Welfare amounted to 142.5 percent over this period—which was a greater increase than that shown for any other department of the District of Columbia government receiving appropriations of at least $1 million a year.

The table also shows that, as regards salary costs of authorized positions, the Department of Welfare led all other District of Columbia departments during the period from 1955 through 1963. The increase in the salary costs of authorized positions for this Department was 184.3 percent; and the chart shows that in regard to the total number of authorized positions, the Department of Public Welfare again led all other District of Columbia government departments with an increase of 128.6 percent, whereas no other major department in the District of Columbia government showed an increase of as much as 100 percent. As I have stated, the table does not include the small departments for which the total annual appropriations amounted to less than $1 million.

I submit these figures in order to show that Congress has been more liberal in its appropriations for the District of Columbia Department of Welfare than for other departments over the recent years. I do not believe the facts justify creation of another welfare program which will require ever-increasing appropriations in the years ahead.

The Senator from Connecticut and other Senators who have joined him in sponsoring this amendment—and I say this with the utmost respect for them, for I do have great respect for the Senators who are sponsoring the amendment—attempt to make the point that the man-in-the-house rule is encouraging desertions. This point is often expressed, and seemingly it is never refuted. They maintain that the adoption of their amendment would reduce desertions inasmuch as it would result in the abolishment of the man-in-the-house rule in the District of Columbia.

However, I defy the Senator from Connecticut and the other sponsors of the amendment to prove to the Senate that the man-in-the house rule has resulted in an increase in the number of desertions of families in the District of Columbia.

I hold in my hand the annual reports for certain years for the District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare. They indicate for each year the number of ADC cases opened, and they also indicate the number of cases that have been opened because of the absence of a parent. These reports do not support the contention that the man-in-the-house rule is contributing to an increase in the number of desertions of families. Instead, they bear out precisely the opposite; namely, that since the man-in-the-house rule went into effect, the number of cases opened because of the absence of a parent has, percentagewise, decreased, rather than increased.

This rule, as we now have it, has been in existence since 1955; but no one ever said anything about it or shed any tears over it until 2 years ago, when the investigations showed that the regulation was not being enforced, along with many other regulations governing eligibility. So it became at that time a bad rule; that alleged change occurred overnight. And now it is said that it is contributing to the desertions of families by fathers.

Mr. President, I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a tabulation in regard to the number of ADC case openings in the District of Columbia taken from the annual reports for the years 1953 through 1963, together with the number of case openings based upon the absence of a parent.

In a small minority of cases the absence was due to the death of a parent. In a slightly greater number, the absence was due to the incarceration of a parent. But I am going to give the opposition the benefit of the doubt and include all of those cases in absences.

I should like to read the percentages. In 1950, openings based on the absence of a parent constituted 38 percent of the ADC cases that were open. In 1951—40 percent. In 1952—44 percent. At that time the man-in-the-house rule was not in effect, but the openings based on the absences were going up in those years. In 1953—42 percent. In 1954—43 percent. In 1955—50 percent. In 1956—53 percent. At that time the man-in-the-house rule was in effect. In 1957, the percentage begins to drop; here it was 51 percent. In 1958—47 percent. In 1959—46 percent. In 1960—39 percent. In 1961—34 percent. In 1962—31 percent. In 1963—30 percent.

So case openings, based on the absence of parents, are going down instead of up. It is not possible to make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. Nor is it possible to maintain, on the basis of these figures which come from the Department's own annual reports, that the man-in-the-house rule is driving husbands and fathers away from their homes, causing them to desert their children, so that the families may qualify for public welfare.

I ask unanimous consent that a table headed "Openings, Department of Public Welfare, District of Columbia, Office of the Director," may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Openings, Office of the Director, Department of Public Welfare, District of Columbia

Year	Total openings, ADC	Total absence factors [1]
1963	1,203	365
1962	1,853	582
1961	2,207	769
1960	2,142	848
1959	2,027	934
1958	1,838	881
1957	1,237	649
1956	1,002	527
1955	982	430
1954	1,095	476
1953	852	361
1952	737	320
1951	938	368
1950	1,048	403

[1] Includes death.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I should like to read into the RECORD some of the testimony which was given to the House Committee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia in its consideration of the appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1963. The testimony to which I allude was with regard to an AFDC–UP program for the District of Columbia. Commissioner Duncan said—and I am quoting him out of context:

> We have had a very good reason for not having attempted to adopt certain of these programs. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I am quick to say it has been money.

With regard to the presence of paramours, Commissioner Duncan said:

> I do not believe that any person who genuinely believes in good government would want to see the taxes of a people spent on a person who was in total violation of our laws, living in the home, sharing in the food, the rent, and even in some cases sharing in the funds going into that home.

I do not mean to imply that Commissioner Duncan is not supporting the program. He does support the program. He made the point then and there—18 months ago—that the District of Columbia had a money problem. It still has a money problem, and I do not believe that facts justify the inception of another costly welfare program.

Mr. Shea, in his testimony before Representative NATCHER, said:

> There are 15 States now participating in this type of program.

Mr. President, today, 18 months later, there are still 15 States participating in this program.

If it is so good, why have not more States begun to participate in it?

Mr. Shea indicated at that time that the total cost of grants and administration in the first year of the proposed program was estimated at $1,312,000. It is interesting to note a question which Representative NATCHER asked of Mr. Shea. Representative NATCHER said:

> Mr. Shea, this statement you make to the committee to the effect that a firmer estimate may result in different figures, how different could the figures be? Would they be different to the extent that instead of the District's portion being $1,312,000, that it is possible it would be $3 million?
>
> Mr. SHEA. Yes, it is possible, sir.

I make the point that there is no well-defined, clear, firm estimate of the costs of the program.

Last year before the House subcommittee Mr. Shea indicated that the program would cost $1.3 million. Then, in response to the chairman's question as to whether the cost might be as much as $3 million, Mr. Shea indicated in the affirmative, that it very well might be.

This year the Department was unable to present the committee with firm estimates.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the estimated cost of the program, as those estimates were presented to the subcommittee on the Saturday morning when we took testimony on this subject.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Total cases	Local cost per case	Federal share per case	Total cost per case	Total local cost	Total Federal cost	Total for financial aid
6-month period	490	$382.09	$317.86	$699.95	$187,224.10	$160,750.40	$347,975.50
9-month period	820	573.15	476.76	1,049.91	469,983.00	390,940.20	860,923.20
12-month period	1,105	764.18	635.73	1,399.91	844,414.00	702,494.00	1,546,908.00

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table of the estimates of costs which were presented by the Department that Saturday afternoon.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Summary of grants and gratuities—AFDC–UP[1] *program*

	Total cases	Local cost per case	Federal share per case	Total cost per case	Total local cost	Total Federal cost	Total financial aid
6-month plan	490	$515.22	$428.04	$943.26	$252,458	$209,740	$462,198
9-month plan	820	772.83	642.06	1.414.89	633,721	526,489	1,160,210
12-month plan	1,105	1,030.39	856.08	1,886.47	1,138,581	945,968	2,084,549

[1] Aid to families of dependent children—unemployed parents.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, these tables will show precisely what I meant when I said to one of the representatives of the Department:

> The figure you have just given represents only the grants, and this figure is already $537,641 higher than the estimate you came in with this morning, which represents quite a sizable miscalculation.

There was a miscalculation in the estimates for the program—a miscalculation that was brought out under questioning. That incident indicates that the Department is unprepared to give Congress a firm estimate of the cost of the program. Whereas last year Mr. Shea said the program would cost $1.3 million the first year, it is said now that the cost would be $2,577,271 for the first year, which is twice as much as the estimate last year. Yet the estimate this year was based upon the same sample survey conducted by the Department in July of last year and upon which it made its estimate at that time.

So, what are we to believe? Is the total cost to be $1.3 million the first year, or is it to be $2.5 million?

I do not propose to go into the program with my eyes shut. Moreover, Mr. President, the cost of such a program would be higher per recipient than that of the present ADC program.

The AFDC–UP program cost is $49.13 per person, whereas the average cost per person in the ADC category at present is $32.39.

I say to my friend from Connecticut that under his proposal we would be paying $17 more per person than we are now paying under the ADC program. And I have not yet been able to understand why.

I make the further point that the implementation of the AFDC–UP program in the District of Columbia would increase the caseload 28 percent. After 2 years of sweat, toil, effort, and expense the Welfare Department has been able to decrease the ADC caseload 32 percent, and now it is proposed to increase the caseload by 28 percent, according to the hearings testimony. I think there is no justification for a new program which will reverse the caseload trend.

I have already indicated that the implementation of the AFDC–UP program in the District of Columbia would abolish the man-in-the-house rule. As the Senator from Connecticut stated, contrary to the prevailing opinion in many quarters, a similar rule is in effect in at least 15 States throughout the Union.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter written to Mr. William Galvin, Chief, Investigations and Collections Division, District of Columbia, Department of Public Welfare, by John J. Hurley, Acting Director, Bureau of Family Services, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated August 28, 1953. The letter, which was included in the printed hearings, indicates the States which have certain eligibility provisions in public assistance programs similar to those regulations presently in existence in the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., August 28, 1963.

Mr. WILLIAM GALVIN,
Chief, Investigations and Collections Division, District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GALVIN: At the meeting of the Advisory Committee on Aid to Families With Dependent Children Eligibility Review on August 6, which you attended as a member, you requested some information about certain eligibility provisions in the State public assistance programs.

Enclosed are some data which were extracted from materials submitted by State public assistance agencies as a part of the nationwide AFDC review.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. HURLEY,
Acting Director.

STATE PLAN PROVISIONS REGARDING NONLEGAL MARITAL RELATIONSHIPS IN RELATION TO ELIGIBILITY FOR AFDC[1]

All States hold legal, adoptive and natural parents responsible to the extent of their ability for the support of minor children. States differ in the degree of responsibility assigned to stepparents.

The following States have special qualifications on the basis of the caretaker-relative's continuing association with another adult of the opposite sex:

ALABAMA

Death of father: If there is no able-bodied stepfather a child is considered deprived of parental support by reason of the father's death if there is no able-bodied father substitute who lives in the home and maintains a marital relationship with the mother, though unmarried to her and the natural or adoptive mother is unable to meet the child's needs according to agency standards.

Death of mother: If the legal father with whom the child lives is unable to meet child's needs according to agency standards and there is need for a caretaker, unless there is an able-bodied stepmother or other able-bodied mother substitute who lives in the home and maintains a marital relationship with the father, though unmarried to him.

Continued absence from the home: Provided there is no able-bodied stepparent or other parent substitute in the home.

Imprisonment, divorce, separation, desertion: There must also be reasonably clear evidence that mother and father have a completely broken relationship.

Unmarried status of parents: Provided also that any marital relationship between the child's natural or adoptive mother and father is broken. Father who continues to go in and out of home and lives with mother as man and wife is held responsible for support of his children only.

ARIZONA

If an unrelated male is living in the household, assistance will not be granted.

ARKANSAS

Stable nonlegal union: Where mother affords the privilege of a husband to a man and there is a continuing relationship, whether or not he is living continuously in the home, deprivation of parental support will not be established.

CONNECTICUT

In any case where it is found that a (nonrelated male) boarder is living in the home, the worker has the responsibility to advise the mother that she will be ineligible unless the boarder leaves her home immediately.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A child who has been deprived of parental support by reason of death, incapacity, or continued absence from the home becomes ineligible to receive ADC when his mother maintains a continuing relationship similar to that of husband and wife and the man has a relationship to the child similar to that of a father, whether or not he maintains an address elswhere and is not continuously in the home, unless the man is incapacitated and unable to support the family for that reason.

GEORGIA

Substitute father: Any man living in the home or cohabiting with the mother is held responsible for support of all children in the home. Georgia Department of Public Welfare construes that paramour(s) are substitute father(s) and in families where promiscuity or prostitution exists as a pattern of living, the family must look to substitute father for support. An applicant may apply with illegitimate children and, if otherwise eligible, receive AFDC. If after becoming a recipient, another illegitimate pregnancy occurs, the case shall be closed because of prima facie evidence of substitute father relationship, plus no change in pattern of living. The State DPW recognizes stability of relationship even though no legal marriage exists or can exist. Upon reapplication, the burden of proof is on the woman to establish the fact that pattern of living has changed and no substitute father relationship exists.

---

[1] Primary source: Methods used by State Public Assistance Agencies in Determining Eligibility (form FB–332) submitted by individual States, January 1963.

KENTUCKY

Child living with either parent and person unrelated by marriage in an established family relationship is considered as deprived of parental support only if incapacity exists. Plan lists 10 factors to be considered in determining the existence of such a relationship.

LOUISIANA

When parent is living in a nonlegal union, child is not considered deprived of parental support unless one parent is incapacitated.

MISSISSIPPI

In determining deprivation of parental support or care, the term "parents" includes not only natural parents but also an own parent and (1) an adoptive parent, (2) a stepparent, (3) a common-law parent, or (4) a man or woman who lives in the home and maintains a relationship with the child's own parent, even though not married to him or her. Child living in the home with two able-bodied parents is not eligible. (Policy revision in process provides for inclusion as eligible a case in which one or both parents are incapacitated providing other conditions of eligibility are met.)

MISSOURI

Children are not considered deprived of parental support when living with one natural parent who is able bodied who is living with an able-bodied adult in a legal or nonlegal relationship.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

An unrelated male is not permitted to live with an ADC family, whether in their home or his. An unrelated male, within the meaning of this provision, is a man 18 years of age or older who is not related by blood to the ADC parent or other female payee-relative. "Living with" or "in the home of" means that an unrelated male actually lives as a member of the family in the same household with the ADC family, and the personal relationship is one or is likely to become one in which he assumes the role of a husband to the ADC mother or other female payee-relative without benefit of marriage.

NEW MEXICO

Children are not considered to be deprived of parental support if the mother is living with her husband, or has established a relationship with a man similar to that of husband and wife and the mother, children, and man are living in a family setting, regardless of whether the man (or husband) is the father of the children.

NORTH CAROLINA

Unmarried status of parents: In any case where it is found that the mother with a child or children born out of wedlock is maintaining a relationship which amounts to a common-law relationship with a man to whom she is not married, the county board of public welfare may find that the family is not eligible for AFDC as long as the relationship continues.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Common-law relationship: If man and woman living together are considered as having established a common-law relationship it is necessary to clear all eligibility factors applicable to legal parents before children are considered deprived of parental support. Such relationship may be considered as established if (1) man lives in home; (2) man visits frequently for purpose of living with applicant; or (3) there is a pattern of mother having a series of relationships, resulting in children or not. (Where a child results from a casual attachment and no further contacts are had, it cannot be said that a common-law relationship exists.)

TENNESSEE

Unmarried status of parents: When evidence is available to establish a continuing common-law relationship assistance is not given. When a child is born out of wedlock and the alleged father has not had the birth legitimated, services shall be given to both parents of the child to help them function as responsible adults. If marriage is not planned, legitimation or bastardy proceedings may be taken to establish paternity.

TEXAS

Unmarried status of parents: Illegitimate children are eligible on the point of deprivation unless * * * the mother is maintaining a stable relationship with a man who presumably functions as the father or father-substitute in the home of the children.

Stable relationship: If mother of ADC children is cohabiting with a man, children are not deemed deprived of parental support.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I make the further point in opposition that implementation of the program would necessitate additional positions for the Department of Welfare. One example is that of more personnel in the Intake Review Service. This question was considered during the hearings, and a careful reading of the hearings will confirm the need for more positions in the Intake Review Service if the program goes into effect. There will also be a need for more positions in the Office of Investigations and Collections if the program goes into effect.

I make the point that additional opportunities for cheating would be made available, and another heavy administrative burden would be placed upon the Department if such a course were followed.

I believe it would be well for Senators who have not read the Comptroller General's reports submitted to the Committees on Appropriations last year, on the investigation of selected cases under the ADC and GP programs, to do so. I further submit that those who have already read the reports might well read them again, because it is easy to forget the facts.

The investigation showed that in only 28 percent of the cases would the man-in-the-house rule have played any part whatsoever, and that even in those cases if the investigators had obtained additional facts, there might have appeared additional findings as to ineligibility which, without the man-in-the-house rule, would have rendered the cases ineligible for assistance.

The investigation also showed that in 65 percent of cases involving the man-in-the-house rule the man was employed. If the man was employed, why should he not support the children? Why should he not provide for the mother and the children? I believe the Department has the right to assume that he can provide for them and is providing for them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the report on investigation of selected cases under the aid to dependent children program, Department of Public Welfare, District of Columbia government, by the Comptroller General of the United States, the report having been addressed to the chairmen of the Subcommittees on the District of Columbia, Senate and House Committees on Appropriations.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON INVESTIGATION OF SELECTED CASES UNDER THE AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN PROGRAM, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT, JUNE 1962

(By the Comptroller General of the United States, July 1962)

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
July 26, 1962.

To the CHAIRMEN, SUBCOMMITTEES ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND SENATE AND HOUSE COMMITTEES ON APPROPRIATIONS.

Herewith is our report on the investigation of selected cases under the aid to dependent children (ADC) program, administered by the Public Assistance Division (PAD), Department of Public Welfare, District of Columbia government, June 1962. We participated in the investigation pursuant to your request of March 6, 1962.

The investigation of 236 ADC cases disclosed that the recipients in 133, or 57 percent, of the cases were ineligible for financial assistance under the eligibility requirements and need standards as prescribed by the Board of Commissioners. The ineligibility of the recipients in 69 of the cases was directly related to the so-called man-in-the-house rule, although in 32 of the cases other ineligibility findings also existed.

The high incidence of ineligibility of the recipients in the 236 cases investigated leads to the conclusion (1) that the PAD, in its determinations and redeterminations of the recipients' eligibility, either had not completely verified facts represented by the recipints as entitling them to financial assistance or had not maintained sufficiently close contact with the recipients to be aware of changes in their conditions or circumstances affecting their continued entitlement to financial assistance, (2) that reliance cannot be placed on the caretaker-relatives (parents or other relatives of specified relationship) to inform the PAD of the actual conditions or circumstances which have a bearing on the recipients' eligibility for financial assistance, and (3) that the ADC cases not covered in the current investigation should be investigated to determine whether or not the recipients are eligible for the financial assistance they are receiving.

We believe that a continuing field investigation should be instituted with the objective of investigating ADC cases for the purpose of determining the eligibility of the recipients for financial assistance and the effectiveness of the PAD's prior verification of representations by the recipients. We believe also that such a continuing field investigation program should be conducted by an investigative unit organizationally placed outside the Public Assistance Division with a reporting responsibility not only to the PAD, but also to the Director, Department of Public Welfare. We believe further that procedures should be adopted to insure that the investigative findings are given adequate and proper consideration by the PAD in making its eligibility determinations.

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

REPORT

The General Accounting Office has participated with the Department of Public Welfare (DPW), District of Columbia government, in an investigation of selected cases administered by its Public Assistance Division (PAD) under the aid to dependent children (ADC) program. The purpose of the investigation was to determine the facts having a bearing on the eligibility of the recipients for financial assistance under the eligibility factors and need standards, as prescribed by the Board of Commissioners, and to establish whether, on the basis of the facts, the recipients are eligible for such assistance.

The Department of Public Welfare started its investigation of the ADC cases on November 13, 1961. The General Accounting Office participated in the factfinding phase of the investigation beginning on March 14, 1962, pursuant to a request on March 6, 1962, of the chairmen of the Subcommittees on District of Columbia, Senate and House Committees on Appropriations.

Summary of investigation findings and actions taken

The PAD office of research and statistics selected 280 ADC cases—about 5 percent of the caseload—for investigation. Subsequently, it was determined that 42 cases had been closed by the PAD prior to review by the investigative unit established to ascertain the factual information, that the caretaker-mother in one case was not investigated because she was in residence at the residential training center, and that the proper record had not been furnished to the investigative unit in another case. Therefore the investigation actually pertained to only 236 cases. The investigation of these cases resulted in eligibility determinations by the PAD, as follows:

	Number of cases	Percent of total cases
Recipients ineligible for financial assistance	141	59.8
Recipients eligible for continued financial assistance	95	40.2
Total	236	100.0

Upon the PAD's notifying the recipients in the 141 cases of their ineligibility for financial assistance, a number of the recipients gave notice of their intention to appeal the discontinuance of the assistance. By June 25, 1962, the PAD had informed us that the status of the 236 cases was as follows:

	Number of cases	Percent of total cases
Action based on investigative findings:		
Financial payments discontinued	127	
Financial payments continued based on appeal findings	3	
Appeals pending	3	
Total	133	56.3
Financial payments continued:		
No infractions of eligibility requirements or need standards	23	
Adjustments in payments based on existing need	20	
Miscellaneous administrative adjustments	52	
Total	95	40.3
Action based on events occurring subsequent to investigation:		
Financial payments discontinued	7	
Appeals pending	1	
Total	8	3.4
Grand total	236	100.0

Purpose of the aid to dependent children program

The purpose of the aid to dependent children program, as stated in the PAD manual, is "to encourage the care of dependent children in their own homes or in the homes of relatives through financial assistance and other social services to the needy dependent children, and to the parents or relatives with whom they are living, to help maintain and strengthen family life and to help parents or relatives to attain the maximum self-support and personal independence consistent with the maintenance of continuing parental care and protection." In aid to dependent children cases, the child is the recipient and payment is made to the parent or relative in his behalf.

The District of Columbia Aid to Dependent Children Act defines "dependent child" as a child who has been deprived of parental support or care by reason of death, continued absence from the home, or physical or mental incapacity of a parent. However, the PAD Manual requires that both "need" and "deprivation of parental support or care" exist in each case without regard to whether one condition results from the other.

The PAD manual provides that a needy children to be eligible for financial assistance (1) must be under the age of 16 or, if between the ages of 16 and 18, must be in regular attendance at school or be prevented therefrom by physical or mental disability, (2) must be living with a caretaker-relative—father, mother, or other relative of a specified degree of relationship—in a place of residence maintained by the relative as his own home and in which the relative exercises the primary responsibility for the care of the child, and (3) must meet the District of Columbia residence requirements.

The manual sets forth definitions of what constitutes deprivation of parental support by reason of death of a parent, incapacity of a parent to work, a mother's unavailability to work, and a parent's continued absence from the home.

The PAD manual defines "need" as that part of the subsistence requirements of an assistance unit (caretaker-relative and children) which cannot be met by available income and other resources. The manual provides that the requirements of an assistance unit shall be based on budget standards prescribed by the Board of Commissioners. The budget standards are stated to have been developed on the basis of the cost, obtained from studies made by the Department of Agriculture, of the subsistence requirements recognized as constituting the essentials of living. These requirements include basic personal requirements—food, clothing, and housekeeping necessities—and shelter requirements. The budget allowances prescribed for the items constituting the subsistence requirements vary according to the number of persons making up the "assistance unit" and their living and eating arrangements. The budget allowances for shelter requirements are the actual costs incurred but not in excess of prescribed maximum amounts which vary according to the number of persons in the assistance unit.

The manual contains detailed procedures, criteria, and instructions for (1) determining the eligibility of a child for financial assistance under many varying conditions, (2) applying the budget standards in determining the amount of an assistance unit's subsistence requirements under varying situations, and (3) determining the income and resources of any and all members of the assistance unit.

Reason for conducting the investigation

The Department of Public Welfare's investigation of the ADC cases was undertaken pursuant to a request of the Senate Committee on Appropriations in its report on House bill 8072,[1] a bill to provide appropriations for the District of Columbia for 1962. The committee stated, in part:

"Public assistance in the District of Columbia has been continually increasing over the past several years, particularly in the aid to dependent children and general public assistance categories. The committee is concerned over this upsurge in grants and recommends that the Department establish, within available funds, a pilot project composed of at least five investigators to ferret out any so-called freeloaders who may be benefiting under the public assistance program."

Planning and direction of the investigation

The Board of Commissioners, on October 5, 1961, approved the establishment of an investigative committee to plan and direct the investigation. The committee was made up of seven representatives of the District of Columbia government—four from the Department of Public Welfare, two from the Internal Audit Office, and one from the office of the Corporation Counsel—and a representative of the Public Welfare Advisory Council. The committee, in a meeting on November 6, 1961, decided that:

1. The investigation of the public welfare cases would be conducted by an independent investigative unit to be established in an office apart from the Public Assistance Division which has the responsibility for the administration of the various public welfare programs.

2. The investigative unit would be headed by the Chief, Resources and Investigation Division,[2] Department of Public Welfare, who would conduct the investigation under the supervision of the committee and the operational direction of the Deputy Director, Department of Public Welfare.

3. The investigation would be conducted in a manner that would avoid all possible implications that it was not entirely and completely objective both in its approach and in its findings.

The investigative committee adopted procedures for the conduct of the investigation. Generally they provided for:

1. The Office of Research and Statistics to make a scientific selection of ADC cases for investigation.

---

[1] S. Rept. 993, 87th Cong.

[2] Subsequently redesigned as the Office of Investigations and Collections.

2. The investigative unit to:

(a) Analyze each case and record on a case schedule the essential information and eligibility factors involved in the case.

(b) Make a field investigation of each case to determine the validity of the information and the eligibility factors.

(c) Submit a comprehensive report on the field investigation to the PAD for determining the eligibility of the recipient on the basis of the reported investigative findings.

3. The PAD to (a) review the field investigative report on each case and determine the eligibility or ineligibility of the recipient on the basis of the facts disclosed in the report and (b) notify the chief of the investigative unit of the determination and the action taken, if any.

4. The chief of the investigative unit to refer each case in which he does not concur in the PAD's determination of eligibility to the chairman of the investigative committee for consideration.

5. The investigative committee to review, summarize, and analyze investigative findings, and to make recommendations for further avenues of investigation, depending on the nature of the findings.

Conduct of the investigation

On November 13, 1961, the DPW established an investigative unit in the Bell School building, Second Street and Virginia Avenue SW.—with a staff of five investigators under the direct supervision of the Chief, Resources and Investigation Division—to undertake the investigation of the ADC cases that had been selected. Five more investigators were added to the staff in the early part of January 1962.

The General Accounting Office, on March 12, 1962, assigned 10 representatives to work with the DPW investigators, pursuant to the request of the chairmen, Senate and House Subcommittees on District of Columbia, in a joint letter dated March 6, 1962, that we participate in the investigation in order to accelerate its completion and to insure its independence.

At March 14, 1962, the investigative unit had completed its investigation of 115 of the 236 ADC cases. Also, the PAD had determined the eligibility status of the recipients for financial assistance in 82 of the 115 cases. Therefore, our direct participation in all phases of the field investigation was limited to 121 of the ADC cases.

The following comments pertain to the conduct of the investigation of the cases in which we participated. However, our review of the reports on the investigation of the cases that had been completed prior to our participation indicates that the same approach had been followed in respect to those cases.

The investigation generally was conducted in accordance with the adopted procedures as previously described. A minimum of four home visits were made in all cases except in those cases where ineligibility findings were disclosed by fewer visits. The initial visit was usually made at night or early Saturday or Sunday morning, at which time all members of the families would most likely be at home and available for interview. The initial home visit was made by two investigative teams, one to conduct the interview and the other to assure that no person left the home to avoid the disclosure of his presence. Each investigative team conducting a home visit comprised a DPW investigator and a GAO representative.

The initial home visit was made for the purpose of (1) verifying the facts related to the assistance unit (2) determining the identity and relationship to the household of any person present who was not a part of the assistance unit, (3) inspecting the living areas to ascertain whether they indicated that a male other than one included in the assistance unit actually was part of the household, and (4) inspecting the household facilities to ascertain whether they were indicative of unreported resources. Additional home visits and home surveillances were made at night and early Saturday and Sunday mornings to verify all information obtained during the initial home visit and to determine whether any unreported male actually resided in the home or had access thereto.

Collateral inquiries were also made which included (1) the checking of (a) vital statistics records to determine the identity and age of the children of the household and (b) school records to determine children's attendance, and (2) various other checks to determine (a) in the case of a person constituting part of the assistance unit, whether facts had been correctly reported relating to his relationship to the household, resources, and employability or whether he had been involved in any transaction or circumstances inconsistent with the case record information, (b) in the case of any other person residing in the home, his relation to the household and the extent of his contribution to the maintenance of the household, and (c) in the case of a male found in the home, but not a resident thereof, his relationship to the household, his regular place of abode, and his employment status. These latter checks involved contacting employers, utility companies, real estate companies, the Police Department, and the Department of Motor Vehicles, as well as other persons, and organizations.

Investigative findings

A summary of PAD's determinations of eligibility of the recipients for financial assistance in the 236 cases investigated and the actions taken or pending are presented beginning on page 2 of this report. Comments relating to the cases in which the recipients were considered to be either eligible or ineligible for financial assistance are contained in the following sections.

Recipients eligible for financial assistance

The investigation disclosed information indicating that the recipients in 95, or 40 percent, of the 236 cases investigated were eligible for continued financial assistance (see p. 2) but that an adjustment was necessary in the amount of the assistance payments in 20 cases and that some administrative action was necessary in 52 cases to bring them into conformity with manual requirements (see p. 3).

Recipients ineligible for financial assistance

As shown on page 3, the recipients in 141, or 60 percent, of the ADC cases investigated were determined by the PAD to be ineligible for financial assistance—in 133 cases, on the basis of ineligibility findings disclosed by the field investigation and, in 8 cases, on the basis of events that occurred subsequent to the completion of the field investigation.

In the following table the 133 cases are classified according to the investigative finding which, in our opinion, had the most significant bearing on the recipients' eligibility status. Only one ineligibility finding was disclosed in each of 72 cases, and an average of 2.2 ineligibility findings was disclosed in 61 cases. In appendix II, a further classification of the cases is presented to show the nature of the additional ineligibility findings that existed in the 61 cases.

Ineligibility finding	Number of cases—			
	Considered to be ineligible	Having a single ineligibility finding	Having additional ineligibility findings	Number of ineligibility findings
Man-in-the-house rule:				
Mother living in continuing relationship with a man who is her husband and/or father of her ADC children	31	21	10	44
Mother living in home with man other than her husband or father of her ADC children, in relationship similar to that of husband and wife	20	9	11	33
Man constituting an undeterminable resource	10	7	3	13
Subtotal	61	37	24	90
Other ineligibility findings:				
Resources undeterminable for other reasons	11	9	[1] 2	13
Living arrangements not clarified	11	4	[2] 7	22
Parent employed	3	1	2	5
Parent employable	29	13	[3] 16	49
No eligible child in home	4	3	1	5
Refusal to cooperate	8	2	[1] 6	16
Miscellaneous	6	3	3	9
Total	133	72	61	209

[1] Includes 2 cases involving "man constituting an undeterminable resource."
[2] Includes 1 case involving "man constituting an undeterminable resource."
[3] Includes 3 cases involving "man constituting an undeterminable resource."

Man-in-the-house rule

The foregoing table shows that the recipients in 61 of the 133 ADC cases were considered to be ineligible because of the involvement of a man in a situation related to the so-called man-in-the-house rule. We ascertained that in eight additional cases a man was involved but the cases were classified according to other investigative findings deemed to be more significant. Thus, the man-in-the-house rule was a factor in 69, or 51.9 percent, of the 133 cases, or 29.2 percent of the 236 cases investigated. However, in 32 of the 69 cases, other investigative findings were disclosed, any one of which, in our opinion, constituted sufficient reasons for considering the recipients to be ineligible. It is important to point out that, in the 37 cases where the sole finding related to the man-in-the-house rule, there is the possibility that other ineligibility factors also may have existed since the cases were not investigated beyond the point where it was definitely established that they were ineligible because of that rule.

Mother living in a continuing relationship with a man who is her husband and/or father of her ADC children

The investigation disclosed 31 ADS cases where the caretaker-mother was associating with her husband and/or the father of one or more of her children in a manner which negated the claim that the children were deprived of parental support by reason of the continued absence of the parent from the home. The PAD Manual, in section 243.132, states that:

> "A parent is considered to be continually absent from the home * * * if he is known to be residing away from the home under conditions which imply a definite dissociation from the normal marital relationship and from the normal exercise of parental custody and control of the children; this dissociation may exist whether or not the absent parent's whereabouts are known and whether or not he is making a financial contribution. Continued absence does not exist solely because the parent rents or has living quarters available at another address or is supporting by court order. If the parents are engaging in a marital relationship and the man has free access to the home, then that man is not to be considered as 'absent from the home.'
>
> * * * * *
>
> "Only in situations where strong, convincing evidence is submitted that a parent is no longer in the home and has discontinued his relationship, shall the factor of continued absence be established."

The manual, in section 243.134, g, states:

> "Children are ineligible whose mother associates with a man in a relationship similar to that of husband and wife and the man continues a relationship with the children similar to that of father and children regardless of whether such man lives in the home."

In each of the 31 cases there was no clear dissociation of relationship between the mother and her husband and/or the father of her children. In eight cases the relationship was between the mother and her husband, and in 23 cases the relationship was between the mother and the father of one or more of her children.

Mother living in home with a man other than her husband or father of her ADC children in relationship similar to that of husband and wife

The investigation disclosed 20 ADC cases where the caretaker-mother was living with a man other than her husband or the father of any of her children in a relationship similar to that of husband and wife.

The PAD Manual, in section 243, 134, states that:

> "Children are ineligible whose mother associates with a man in a relationship similar to that of husband and wife and the mother, her children, and such man live in a family setting regardless of whether such man is the father of the children."

The recipients were considered to be ineligible in 9 cases solely on the basis of the finding related to the foregoing regulation and in 11 cases on the basis of that finding and various other investigative findings.

Man constituting an undeterminable resource

The investigation disclosed 10 ADC cases where the recipients were deemed to be ineligible for financial assistance because of the presence in the home of a man or men whose relationship to the mother and/or the children and the extent of their contribution to the support of the mother and the children could not be determined. A similar situation existed in eight other cases where the recipients were considered to be ineligible because of other more significant investigative findings.

The PAD Manual, in section 243.134h, provides, in respect to the situations disclosed in the 18 cases, that a mother and her children may receive financial assistance even if the mother maintains a conjugal relationship with a man, provided the mother and her children are otherwise eligible and all resources available to the mother and the children are determined or clarified in establishing need.

The investigation disclosed that, in each of these cases, a man or men were present in the home but the nature of their relationship with the mother could not be established. Consequently, in none of these cases could the existence of need be established because the extent of the resources available to the mother and children that resulted from the presence of the man or men in the home could not be determined or clarified.

Other ineligibility findings—Resources undeterminable

The investigation disclosed that in 11 ADC cases there was evidence of resources available to the recipients but the extent of such resources could not be determined. The finding of undeterminable resources also was present in 39 additional cases which were classified as ineligible on the basis of more significant findings.

The existence of undisclosed resources was determined by admissions of the caretaker-relatives (parents or other relatives of a specified relationship) or by evidence that the family was living on a scale beyond that possible under the financial assistance being provided. In each case, the caretaker-relative was either unwilling or unable to satisfactorily explain the existing situation. Therefore, it was impossible to definitely establish that a need for financial assistance existed.

Living arrangements not clarified

The investigation disclosed that in 11 ADC cases the relationships between the parents of the children and various other persons living together in the same dwelling could not be determined. The same situation existed in 13 additional cases where the recipients were considered to be ineligible because of other investigative findings deemed to be more significant.

The questionable relationships which the parents of the children were unwilling to clarify were with landlords, relatives, and purported visitors. This failure to clarify the living arrangements made it impossible to determine either the extent of the available resources or that need for financial assistance existed.

Parents employed

The investigation disclosed three ADC cases in which the parents of the ADC children were employed full time. In two of these cases other findings were also present, and in two additional cases the parent was found to be employed but the cases were considered ineligible because of the existence of more significant findings.

The PAD Manual, in section 235.100, provides that assistance shall be denied in those cases where a parent is employed full time.

Parents employable

The investigation disclosed 29 ADC cases where the recipients were considered to be ineligible because the ADC parents were employable. Also, in eight additional cases the parents were employable, although the recipients were considered to be ineligible because of other more significant findings.

The PAD Manual, in section 243.121, states that it is generally expected that a mother without a husband will work to help support her children if she is not incapacitated and if there are relatives or other reliable persons available to care for her children. It also sets forth criteria for guidance in determining whether a mother is employable.

In 16 of the 29 cases, other investigative findings bearing on eligibility were also present.

No eligible child in home

The investigation disclosed four ADC cases where financial assistance payments were being made although no eligible children were in the homes. In two cases, the only child in the home was over 16 years of age but he did not meet the eligibility requirements for a child over that age because he was not attending school regularly. In one case, the child, in respect to which financial assistance had been granted, had not been living in the home since August 1961. In the remaining case, the only child in the home was not related to the caretaker within the required specified degree of relationship.

Refusal to cooperate

In eight ADC cases the recipients were considered to be ineligible because the caretaker-relatives refused to cooperate with the investigators in their attempt to determine facts substantiating that the children had been deprived of parental support or care, or to determine the extent of any existing need. In six of these cases other ineligibility findings were present. In five additional cases there also was a refusal to cooperate although the recipients were considered to be ineligible because of other reasons.

With respect to determining need, the PAD manual, in section 350.000, states:

> "The agency, therefore, needs factual and authentic information concerning an applicant's and recipient's income and resources in cash and in kind, in order to evaluate and measure them against the budget standard for the determination of the amount of the person's need.
>
> "(a) The worker must clearly explain to the client why the information is needed, and must help him to understand that he has three choices:
>
> "(1) Having his need determined by providing the required information, or authorizing the worker to obtain it;
>
> "(2) Withdrawing his application; or
>
> "(3) Being denied assistance since his need cannot be determined."
>
> * * * * *
>
> "An applicant or recipient who refuses to supply, obtain, or to authorize the worker to obtain information regarding his income and other resources, thereby makes himself ineligible for assistance because his need cannot be established."

The caretaker-relatives' refusal to cooperate with the investigators generally consisted of a refusal to admit the investigators into the home, a refusal to allow the investigators to inspect the interior of the home in order to determine living arrangements, or a refusal to supply information needed to establish the eligibility of a child or children for financial assistance or the extent of the need.

Miscellaneous

In six ADC cases the recipients were determined to be ineligible for financial assistance for the following reasons:

1. Failure of returned husband to register with the U.S. Employment Service (USES)—two cases.

2. Husband's absence only a separation of convenience.

3. Presence of coin-operated machines in home.

4. Absent husband willing but not permitted to return to home (absence not established).

5. Parent's purported incapacity to work not established.

With respect to reason 1, the PAD manual, in section 243.120, states, in effect, that the provisions set forth in sections 244.00 and 245.00, which relate to the general public assistance program, are applicable to the ADC program. Section 245.310 states that active registration with the USES, as a part of the recipient's effort to find work, is an eligibility requirement. In the two cases where the recipients were deemed ineligible for the reason of failure to register with USES, originally the children had been determined to be eligible on the basis of continued absence of the fathers who were committed to the Occoquan Workhouse. In both cases they had been released and were not employed but had not registered with USES.

With respect to the case under reason 2, the investigation disclosed that although the absent parent had dissociated himself from the normal family relationship the absence was primarily for the purpose of enabling the mother and children to obtain ADC aid. In this connection the PAD manual, section 243.132, states:

"Continued absence is not established when, in the judgment of the agency, a man or woman who have lived together make separate living arrangements for the purpose of establishing eligibility for assistance."

In regard to the case under reason 3, the investigation disclosed the presence in the home of several coin-operated machines constituting business activities. These machines consist of a telephone with a lock on it, two television sets, and a washing machine. In addition, there was evidence that the parent in this case may have been engaged in the illegal distillation of whiskey and in other business activities. The PAD Manual, in sections 352.470 and 352.500, states, in effect, that under such circumstances financial assistance cannot be granted in the absence of a clarification of resources in order to determine whether any need exists.

In the case under reason 4, the investigation disclosed that the absent husband was willing to return to his family but was prevented from doing so by his wife. The PAD Manual, in section 243.1348, provides that:

"If the woman bases her need for assistance on the reason of her unwillingness to live with her husband, or to permit him to live in the home, and he is willing to live with and support his family, they are not considered to be in need."

In the final case, an examination of the case record disclosed evidence that the recipients were ineligible because the father, who had been considered unemployable, had not complied with the regulation requiring periodic medical reports to be furnished in support of his claim of unemployability.

Voluntary withdrawals from program

During the investigation, 13 caretaker-mothers voluntarily signed statements expressing their desire to withdraw from the ADC program. In two cases, the ADC mothers refused to cooperate with the investigators by denying them permission to examine or inspect the living arrangements and chose to withdraw from the program instead. In each of the other cases the withdrawal request was made after the investigation had disclosed findings which adversely affected the eligibility of the recipients.

Effect of discontinuance of financial assistance

As shown on page 3, the PAD discontinued financial assistance payments in 134 cases of the 236 cases investigated. The discontinued monthly payments, aggregating $20,881, had been made on behalf of 511 children.

We have not attempted to estimate the savings that may accrue to the District as a result of the discontinuance of financial assistance in the 134 cases because of the probability that, in some instances, the caretaker-mother may effect changes in her living arrangements that would result in her children's becoming eligible for assistance and, in other instances, actions may be taken to clarify resources or living arrangements or to otherwise comply with the prescribed eligibility requirements and need standards.

Proposal to liberalize the aid to dependent children program

The Director, Department of Public Welfare, in hearings held on May 24, 1962, before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, presented for consideration a program for aid to dependent children of unemployed parents (see p. 1257 of the hearings) predicated on congressional passage of House bill 10606, an act providing for an extension through June 30, 1967, of Federal financial participation in aid to dependent children of unemployed parents. The Director, in response to a question by the chairman of the subcommittee as to what percentage of the ADC cases investigated would have been determined to be ineligible if there had been a change in eligibility requirements, stated:

"Assuming the policy on the man in the home were to be changed and if the District were to extend aid to the unemployed, I don't believe there would be a very large percentage, much beyond 17—maybe it would go to 25 percent. But the statistics that have been reported have indicated that most of the reasons given for the closing of the cases, or finding them ineligible has been related to the man-in-the-home policy."

The investigation was not directed toward ascertaining the employment status of the men involved in the 69 cases where the recipients were considered to be ineligible because of the man-in-the-house rule—in 37 cases solely because of that rule and in 32 cases because of that rule and other ineligibility findings. However, the fact that the men involved in 24 or 65 percent of the 37 cases and in 21 of the 32 cases were employed was disclosed through statements made by the mothers of the ADC children or by the men themselves, either to the investigators or to public utility or other companies when seeking service or credit, and verified by the investigators through interviews with the indicated employers. Therefore, since the ineligibility of the recipients was based solely on the man-in-the-house rule in only 37 cases and since the men involved in 24 of the cases were employed, it would appear that in only 13 of the cases would the recipients have been eligible for financial assistance if the proposed program and the man-in-the-house policy, as outlined on page 1254 of the hearings, had been in effect. Thus, instead of 133 ineligible cases, as shown on page 3 of the report, there would have been only 120, or 50.8 percent of the 236 cases investigated, unless the extent of the men's employment in the 24 cases did not meet the criteria set forth in the proposed program.

Conclusions

The high incidence of ineligibility of the recipients for financial assistance in the 236 ADC cases, as disclosed by the investigation and confirmed by the PAD, leads to the conclusion (1) that the PAD, in its determinations and redeterminations of the recipients' eligibility, either had not completely verified facts represented by the recipients as entitling them to financial assistance or had not maintained sufficiently close contact with the recipients to be aware of changes in their conditions or circumstances affecting their continued entitlement to financial assistance, (2) that reliance cannot be placed on the caretaker-relatives (parents or other relatives of specified relationship) to inform the PAD of the actual conditions or circumstances which have a bearing on the recipients' eligibility for financial assistance, and (3) that the ADC cases not covered in the current investigation should be investigated to determine whether or not the recipients are eligible for the financial assistance they are receiving.

We believe that a continuing field investigation program should be instituted with the objective of investigating ADC cases for the purpose of determining the eligibility of the recipients for financial assistance and the effectiveness of the PAD's prior verification of representations by the recipients. We believe also that such a continuing field investigation program should be conducted by an investigative unit organizationally placed outside the PAD with a reporting responsibility not only to the PAD, but also to the Director, Department of Public Welfare. We believe further that procedures should be adopted to insure that the investigative findings are given adequate and proper consideration by the PAD in making its eligibility determinations.

APPENDIX

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
March 6, 1962.

Hon. JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CAMPBELL: This will confirm our verbal request for your Office to furnish the investigative personnel that may be required to accelerate completion of the special public assistance investigation now being made by the Welfare Department of the District of Columbia government. As you know, this investigation was urged by our committees during the last session of Congress with a view to ferreting out any cases of violators on the welfare rolls. Since a sizable number of ineligibles have already been disclosed in the 280 selected cases, it is deemed important that all such cases be subjected to an independent review and report by your Office.

It is requested that your report include such additional pertinent information on the District welfare program as may be determined of interest to the committees.

Copies of communications with Commissioner Tobriner giving further details on the subject matter are enclosed.

With warm personal regards, we remain,
Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. BYRD,
Chairman of Subcommittee on District of Columbia Appropriations, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate.

WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
Chairman of Subcommittee on District of Columbia Appropriations, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

Aid to dependent children public assistance cases classified by ineligibility findings as disclosed by the investigation

Ineligibility finding	Total number of cases	Number of cases			Ineligibility findings										
		Having a single ineligibility finding	Having additional ineligibility findings		Total	Mother living in continuing relationship with a man who is her husband and/or father of her ADC children	Mother living with man other than her husband or father of her ADC children in relationship of husband and wife	Man constituting an undeterminable resource	Resources undeterminable for other reasons	Living arrangements not clarified	Parent employed	Parent employable	No eligible child in home	Refusal to cooperate	Other
			Number of cases	Number of additional findings											
Man-in-house rule:															
Mother living in continuing relationship with a man who is her husband and/or father of her ADC children	31	21	10	13	-------	-------	-------	-------	5	3	1	3	-------	1	-------
Mother living in home with man other than her husband or father of her ADC children in relationship similar to that of husband and wife	20	9	11	13	-------	-------	-------	-------	6	3	1	3	-------	-------	-------
Man constituting an undeterminable resource	10	7	3	3	-------	-------	-------	-------	3	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Other ineligibility findings:															
Resources undeterminable for other reasons	11	9	2	2	-------	-------	-------	2	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Living arrangements not clarified	11	4	7	11	-------	-------	-------	1	6	-------	-------	2	-------	1	1
Parent employed	3	1	2	2	-------	-------	-------	-------	1	-------	-------	-------	-------	1	-------
Parent employable	29	13	16	20	-------	-------	-------	3	12	3	-------	-------	-------	2	-------
No eligible child in home	4	3	1	1	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	1	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Refusal to cooperate	8	2	6	8	-------	-------	-------	2	4	2	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Other	6	3	3	3	-------	-------	-------	-------	2	1	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Total	133	72	61	76	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Additional ineligibility findings in cases having more than one finding	-------	-------	-------	-------	76	-------	-------	8	39	13	2	8	-------	5	1
Basic ineligibility findings in cases having a single finding	-------	-------	-------	-------	133	31	20	10	11	11	3	29	4	8	6
Total ineligibility findings	-------	-------	-------	-------	209	31	20	18	50	24	5	47	4	13	[1] 7

[1] 2 cases of failure to report to U.S. Employment Service; 1 case of separation of convenience; 1 case of incapacity for employment not established; 1 case of absence from home not established; 1 case of coin-operated machines in home; 1 case of forgery of qualifying documents.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have made reference to the fact that an additional welfare program would provide additional opportunities for cheating. I wish to refer to a few cases which make interesting reading.

> A mother of 4 children, who had been receiving ADC assistance payments for over 4 years was determined to have been living during the entire period, since September 1957, with a man whom she had reported to the PAD as being her brother but who actually was her paramour and the father of two of her children. The mother admitted to the investigator that the man was employed and earning $85 a week. She was receiving $154 a month in assistance payments at the time the assistance was discontinued.

The case involved a man-in-the-house who was working, while the mother was drawing welfare benefits.

> A married 27-year-old mother of six children told investigators that the man found in her home was her brother-in-law. The investigation disclosed that he was actually her husband and the father of her children, five of whom were included in the assistance unit, and that he was employed and earning about $65 a week. The mother had been receiving assistance payments since December 1960, and at the time they were discontinued they amounted to $191 a month.

These are cases of men living in the homes. They were employed. The fact of their employment was unknown to the Department of Public Welfare.

If we should initiate the proposed new program, although the men say that they will register with the USES and reregister every 30 days, who will know whether the men, the day after they register, are not working in common laborers' jobs? A man can turn in a different social security number. He can be employed under a different name than the name by which he registers at USES.

This proposal would merely provide another program in which the same cheating which has been discovered could be resorted to again. The man was employed in the case I have cited, and the woman was receiving payments. Why could he not be employed under a new proposal without its being discovered?

I will cite another case of an employed man in the home.

> A 24-year-old mother of four children, fathered by three different men, none of whom were her husband, successfully withheld from social workers the knowledge of the birth of her youngest child on March 11, 1961. The father of this child and of one of the other children was found hiding in the bathroom of the ADC mother's home at 6:10 a.m. on a Sunday morning. He admitted spending the night with the ADC mother. He admitted also that he was employed.

I wish to read what the Comptroller General says:

> We believe that some of the facts with respect to these and other cases in this category could have been disclosed with only a reasonable amount of effort on the part of social workers. In some of these cases it appears that the recipients were never eligible for financial assistance and that such a finding would have been apparent if the eligibility standards had been diligently applied at the time the applications were first received.

Mr. President, in a situation in which cheating and misrepresentation and deceit have been as rife as they have been found to be in the District of Columbia, we should be very careful about instituting a new program for the same element that has been cheating the taxpayer and cheating the deserving recipients in the past. If we start this program, it will never end in the District of Columbia, unless Congress decides to abolish the national program.

I make the further point that it would be virtually impossible to establish a feasible and practicable work program in the District of Columbia. This is a necessary component of the AFDC-UP program. Such a program, it was envisioned at the hearings, would require the assignment of workers to District of Columbia departments.

I asked the witness before the committee to explain the work program. He said that individuals would be assigned to jobs in various District of Columbia departments and "will perform services that regular employees are performing. They will perform them to a degree which will improve those services. They will also have to be supervised and trained by employees."

This is a program in which the proposal is being made to put recipients under the AFDC-UP program into the departments of the District of Columbia government to perform services that are being performed by employees already on the job.

In other words, where one man is mowing the grass, they are going to put two men to mowing the grass. Whereas one man has been waiting on the tables at Junior Village or District of Columbia

Village, they are going to put two men there.

The Commissioners, when they came before the committee, requested 1,501 additional positions for the District of Columbia. We can only assume that they requested all of the positions that they could justify in the light of the available revenues. But this program would bring in additional employees. It amounts to a back-door appropriation approach. The recipients under this program are to be put into the Health Department, the Highway Department, the Welfare Department, and the schools. Doing what? Performing services that other employees are already performing.

Do Senators think this would increase efficiency? Do they believe it would increase the morale in the departments? The supervisors would have to train and supervise these people. They would also have to be supervised and trained by other employees. So there would be the additional administrative problem of checking into these cases, seeing that they are trying to get work, and monitoring their actions to see that they are not actually employed. It would constitute an additional burden on the supervisor merely to keep attendance records on these people.

I daresay that many of these persons will not want to work, and they will show up one day and miss the next day or next week, or they will take sick leave and become hustlers. So it is proposed to set up a program whereby these people will be sharpening pencils, raking leaves, and standing in the way of other people who are already doing the job.

It is said that what is good enough for West Virginia is good enough for the District of Columbia. In West Virginia, the unemployed are put to work along the highways, cutting brush. They are put to work fighting forest fires. They are loaned to municipalities where they are put to work. They are loaned to county courts which put them to work in the counties. The District of Columbia cannot provide the possibilities for a feasible work program that will satisfy the needs of these people and, at the same time, be useful, practicable, and beneficial for the city.

If in 1967 Congress should refuse to extend this program and should abolish it, what would happen? The D.C. Department heads would say, "We have 150, or 175, or 200 employees in our departments. We want now to annualize these positions. Do not take them from us. They have been added to our departments under the AFDC-UP program. We cannot now do without them."

Congress will be implored by many officials to annualize those positions. I say it constitutes a back-door appropriations approach. I maintain that this is a substantial and valid objection to an AFDC-UP program in the District of Columbia.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Would it not also be true that, under this program as it went along, there would be a grave danger of these latter people displacing employees who had been steadily employed and who had had the confidence of the persons who employed them? So in the course of a year or two, we would actually find another bad result, that is, the displacing of those who are now employed, and then we would be in the position of having to provide some kind of help for the latter.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I think they could very well displace some of the persons who are already employed in jobs.

Mr. ALLOTT. Most of these persons are not in any kind of job that would be called a highly trained category. Therefore, presumably, once they were in the departments helping and learning the jobs, in a short time they would be able to do the jobs as well as anybody else. So, in the course of a year or two, they could easily displace employees who had been good employees and who had been reliable, because the District of Columbia could then let the regular employees go and use the people who had come into the departments under this program.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That would be entirely possible. If the jobs exist now, why do not persons who would qualify under the program get the jobs? We are going to displace persons, or we are going to waste the taxpayers' money, impair the morale of the departments, and contribute to inefficiency, by putting droves of people into the departments where they will literally stand in the way of regular employees.

I call attention to the fact that under this program, it is proposed to pay as high as $49.13 per person per month. Therefore, if an individual has 10 children, Senators can figure out for themselves what he will get under the program, whereas the man next door, who is a father and who is trying to find work and who is eligible for unemployment compensation, gets a maximum of $49 a week in the District of Columbia with which to feed his family regardless of the number of children.

Now, the argument is made that our position fosters illegitimacy. The Senator mentioned illegitimacy a moment ago. I maintain that the record cannot be made much worse than that which already exists. There were 14,896 children on the ADC rolls as in June of this year. Of that number, 6,181 were illegitimate. That is 41.5 percent.

Six mothers have 61 illegitimate children. Does this startle Senators?

Another 10 mothers have 90 illegitimate children—15 other mothers have 120 illegitimate children. There are 36 additional mothers who have 252 illegitimate children. In other words, there are 3 dozen mothers with 21 dozen illegitimate children—7 children for each mother.

Can the picture be made much worse? I did not make the regulations for the District of Columbia's Welfare Department. I only intend to see that they are enforced, so far as possible, by way of the appropriations method.

Fifty-seven families have been on the rolls for 15 years or more. Two families have been on the rolls for 21 years or more.

Now it is proposed to open up another program which would enable families to be on the rolls ad infinitum.

The Senator from Connecticut referred to the cost of welfare in the Nation. The appropriations for the welfare programs last year amounted to $4,859,064,000.

We argued for 3 weeks about a foreign aid program. We cut the authorization to considerably less than the figure I have quoted. I supported some of the cuts. There are those Senators—and I am included among them—who feel it is better to spend money at home than it is to spend it in foreign aid.

Yet welfare is costing $4.8 billion a year, and is growing. The day will come where the people of the United States will be writing letters from back home telling Members of Congress to revamp the program.

I make the additional objection that the AFDC-UP program, if initiated in the District of Columbia without a work program, would cause recipients to lose whatever incentive they ever had to be self-supporting, and that the program would thus tend to debilitate rather than rehabilitate the recipient. If initiated with a work program—the utter impossibility of providing this type of person with truly productive activity in connection with a District of Columbia work program has already been explored—the recipients would be inclined to be satisfied with the work obtained under this program, and their incentive to find other work would be impaired.

Mr. President, I have no objection to the extension of the unemployment compensation program to cover an additional period of weeks. We are dealing with a situation which should be treated by the unemployment compensation program. I believe that parents who are unemployed and employable, and who have exhausted their compensation payments, possibly should be considered for additional unemployment compensation over an extended number of weeks. I do not believe that this is the type of situation which should be included in public welfare because it will be a never-ending program and it will grow and grow and grow.

I have already stated that the AFDC-UP program would compound the city's already perplexing financial problem. Moneys needed for other worthwhile programs would be siphoned into this program.

Finally, I maintain that the AFDC-UP program in the District of Columbia—and I have already alluded to it—will attract to the city more of the same element which now constitutes a burden upon the taxpayer, and which, in reality, is driving the productive taxpayers out of the city into adjacent areas. This element also contributes to increasing crime costs, increasing health and hospital costs, decreasing property values, and a lower tax potential.

The Senator from New Jersey made reference to the coming of southern Negroes into this city. He may have implied that some of us who oppose the AFDC-UP program might be opposing it on the basis that it would encourage more of the southern Negroes to come into the city

I maintain that the element that is coming into the city is not only coming from the South, but from other States as well. There are southern Negroes here, but there are also northern Negroes. I hope the Senator does not mean to imply that those of us who oppose the program are opposing it simply on the basis that it would cause more southern Negroes to come into the city. Unquestionably, such a program would attract more of the same low-income, unskilled people, many of whom are here now. This is not an industrial city and efforts should be made to discourage a further migration of low-income, unschooled, and unskilled people into the Federal Capital. Whether they be white or Negro, of course I want to see them receive assistance if they qualify under the regulations. By the same token, whether they be white or Negro, I want to see them eliminated from the caseload if they are cheating.

The Senator from New Jersey has mentioned southern Negroes. I have been accused of being anti-Negro because I have attempted to clean up the welfare caseload. It is not my fault that that 91.5 percent of the entire welfare caseload is Negro or that 95.4 percent of the ADC caseload is Negro. Why am I trying to aid the schools, if I am anti-Negro? Eighty-five and seven-tenths percent of the school population in the District of Columbia is Negro—an increase of 2.3 percentage points over the previous year. Eighty-seven and six-tenths percent of the school population in the elementary schools is Negro. Seventy-two percent of the teachers last year were Negroes.

If I am so anti-Negro, why am I suggesting that $46.9 million be appropriated for the Department of Health? Eighty-four percent of the cases at District of Columbia General Hospital last year were Negro—93.6 percent of the venereal disease cases reported were Negro.

It is strange that one can be considered anti-Negro in connection with welfare who recommends the appropriation of money for more teachers than were recommended by the Commissioners, one of whom is a Negro—most of which teachers will be Negroes, probably, and who will teach in schools that are becoming increasingly Negro.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What amount did the Commissioners request? Does the Senator have that figure immediately available?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes. We are recommending the appropriation of $319,582,825, which is $35,296,025 above the House appropriation, $23,930,861 more than last year's appropriation, and $9,141,175 under the budget estimates.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it in excess of the amount the Commissioners requested?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The request was for 344 teachers, and we are recommending 412.

We are allowing 44 more elementary school teachers than were requested, and 25 more teachers for the severely mentally retarded children than were requested.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CASE. With further reference to the question asked by the Senator from Ohio, I had thought—perhaps I was in error—that his inquiry was as to the attitude of the Commissioners toward the man-in-the-house rule and to the appropriation which would be affected by the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, in which the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and I have joined. I think the answer to that point is that the Commissioners favor that amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator from Ohio did not ask that question. I can say, as I said a little earlier, that Commissioner Duncan is in favor of the amendment. He was in favor of it last year. The Commissioners submitted the request to Congress. I assume they are in favor of the proposal.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But by how much does the committee's recommendation exceed the amount allowed by the House? Did the Senator say?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. For welfare?

Mr. LAUSCHE. No; for the entire program.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. $35,296,025.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I wish, in closing, to emphasize that the committee recommended $29,000, which will be used for the employment of two social workers and for a clerical position. These persons are being added to aid employable mothers in their efforts to obtain jobs. We are also providing grants and gratuities, included in the $29,000, to enable employable mothers to have an adjustment period of 3 months rather than 1 month. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] has already referred to this.

But the committee feels that if there are employable mothers who are not needed in the home, who have adequate day-care plans, and who cannot obtain jobs, we ought to provide assistance to them in securing employment. This is why we are recommending the additional $29,000.

I believe the committee has been generous. I have stated my opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut. I shall desist from a further discussion of it at this time.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I support the distinguished Senator from West Virginia in his opposition to the amendment. I concurred with 18 other Senators in the Committee on Appropriations in opposition to the amendment when it was offered there.

I attempted to have the distinguished Senator from West Virginia yield to me when he first started to speak this afternoon, because I thought he was entirely too modest in his own self-appraisal of what he knows, and what others may know, about this problem. For 2 or 3 years, I had the honor to be a member of the subcommittee of which the distinguished Senator from West Virginia is now the chairman. Later, I was transferred from that subcommittee to another subcommittee, but I was a member of the subcommittee during the year and a half when the Senator first began his investigation in an effort to cure the situation which existed in the District of Columbia.

I sat with him, not day after day, but week after week, and sometimes the investigation continued month after month. Other members of the committee did not sit with us. I know that others were critical, perhaps, of the diligence, the patience, and the perseverance shown by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia when he started his investigation, because he had no support. The cry of the bleeding hearts was raised again and again. But gradually the picture was developed, and the General Accounting Office report confirms it in every detail. In fact, in its cold logic, the report makes the picture look even worse than the Senator from West Virginia has described it this afternoon.

As the Senator developed the picture, he gradually drew support to his side. It is not a popular picture. All one has to do is to talk about one child who is hungry, and, of course, people's hearts go out to that hungry child.

I was sorry that the Senator from Connecticut used the illustration he did. I think it was a poor one, and ineptly conceived, because there are women who are unemployable who are not prostitutes. So the case he cited really falls because of the fact that he has used as an illustration a hypothetical woman who is a prostitute and can draw ADC payments. But surely such a case is not illustrative of the general situation.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have yielded to the able Senator from Colorado. Will he permit me to make a comment at this point?

Mr. ALLOTT. Certainly.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator from Connecticut gave as an example of women who can get relief under the present regulations a woman who is a prostitute and has three or four children. But that hypothetical situation could not exist if the woman were a prostitute, for she would not receive welfare funds. Instead, the Child Welfare Division would ask—or should ask—the court to remove the children from that home, since the home would be unsuitable. So if such a woman were a prostitute, she could not qualify; and if the fact that she was a prostitute were known to the Child Welfare Division, that Division would have the responsibility of going into court and getting the court to remove the children from that home for placement in Junior Village or in a foster home or in the home of a relative.

But let us consider what could happen. The Senator indicated that in that hypothetical situation she would be a prostitute and would have had four children by four different men. The same woman could live with one of the four fathers of those children who was unemployed, and all of them could obtain assistance, under the Senator's amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I think the Senator from West Virginia is entirely correct, and he states this point better than anyone else could.

Since the Senator began his subcommittee hearings, some 2 or 3 years ago, he has shown that the caseload in the District of Columbia has been reduced by 32 percent. Of course, in view of the small amount which anyone of us individually contributes to the payments which are made in an individual case, we are prone to overlook such payments. But we cannot overlook the fact that such a situation amounts to cheating and fraud and stealing, just as much as if a person endorsed Secretary Dillon's name on a Treasury check.

We are aware that such bad situations exist under the ADC program; and certainly it is to the eternal shame of Congress that in the approximately 20 years, at least, during which these laws have been in existence in this general form, Congress has not provided legislation which would cure this situation.

The Senator from West Virginia has referred to the fact that the caseload was decreased by 32 percent after his investigation, and that if the pending amendment were to be adopted, 28 percent of those persons would immediately go back on the caseload. Of course, the reason for this decrease is that the Senator from West Virginia was able to have enforced for the first time—and the failure to enforce it theretofore is to the disgrace of the administration of the public welfare program in the District of Columbia—the man-in-the-house rule, which, as he has said, has been in effect since 1955.

Does this amendment involve an attempt to gain sympathy? Or, as I maintain, is this a question of having Congress face its responsibility?

If we continue, as we have, with the ADC system, and if we do not correct the laws and regulations, certainly we shall be the ones at fault. But if we were to do away with the man-in-the-house rule—which the Senator from West Virginia has done so much to have enforced—we would then indeed be the most foolish of mortals and the most foolish people in the world to be entrusted with the expenditure of such funds.

Mr. President, I have voted, I believe, two or three times for an extension of the unemployment compensation law. In each instance, when it was requested, I voted for it; and if again I thought it necessary, I would vote for it.

But, Mr. President, when will we begin to face the existing problems and begin to apply the legislative processes to the existing problems, instead of appropriating additional funds "all over the lot" in the hope that the expenditure of additional money and the institution of a new program somehow will help these people?

I shudder to think of the proportion of the money appropriated for aid to dependent children—even though it may have taken away the pangs of hunger from many—that has been spent in booze parlors. The General Accounting Office turned up innumerable examples, as did the Senator's subcommittee.

If it is necessary to extend the unemployment compensation law, let us do so in a straightforward manner. But let us stop trying to dream up fanciful programs which do not apply specifically to the existing problem—merely to be able to say to some people, somewhere, "This is my program."

The Senator from West Virginia has rendered a great service; and I do not believe we shall increase employment or shall put men who are temporarily unemployed into employment by providing ADC payments for children. If the impetus does not exist for the unemployed man to provide for his wife and his children, certainly it will not exist if we further subsidize unemployment, as we have done time and time again.

I congratulate the Senator from West Virginia, and I support him wholeheartedly in his opposition to this amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, before I proceed in my own time, I wish to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

What would he suggest as an alternative for the employable woman with three legitimate children, to tide her over, beginning with the 91st day?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have already suggested my alternative. I have already made the point that in the District of Columbia there is an unemployment compensation program which will pay up to a maximum of 34 weeks, and that we propose three additional positions in the Department; and the Director has indicated that he thinks three additional positions will be enough to aid these employable women to obtain jobs. I have already made the point that employable mothers who are needed in the home can qualify under the present regulations. They do not have to be needed in the home to take care of their children; they can be needed in the home to take care of an aged person or an ill person—whether the ill person be an adult or a child. To aid employable mothers who have adequate day-care plans and who are not needed in the home, the committee has already provided an alternative.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Under the Unemployment Compensation Act for the District of Columbia, an unemployed kitchen worker receives a maximum of $130 a month. Assuming that she is a mother with four children, does the Senator from West Virginia believe that mother with four children can live on $130 a month?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I can remember a time when there was no such thing as public assistance and there was no such thing as unemployment compensation. I grew up in the home of a coal miner prior to and during the depression years when there was no such legislation as that which provides for these programs; yet, people lived then, although many were out of work then. I say that we cannot provide a program which will meet every possible situation which one can conjure up, unless we intend to usher in the welfare state in full bloom and without further ado; and, Mr. President, I do not intend to go down that road.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Neither do I. But does the Senator from West Virginia advocate that the unemployment compensation laws be eliminated?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I have not advocated that.

Mr. RIBICOFF. But the Senator implied that when he said there was a day when there was no unemployment compensation law. However, that day has gone forever, and I do not know of anyone who advocates repeal of the existing unemployment compensation legislation.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am not going to let the Senator put words in my mouth. I did not imply that the program should be abolished. I merely said there was a time in this country when there was no such program. We have it now. People were then able to earn bread by the sweat of their brow, and they can do so now.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I still would like to know how we would take care of that unemployed woman with four small children, a grandmother taking care of the children, and the mother who cannot get a job, beginning with the 91st day.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. If she qualifies for unemployment compensation, perhaps this is the answer. If she has not been working, so as to qualify for unemployment compensation, perhaps there is a concealed income or unrevealed resources, because I note that she has four small children, according to the hypothetical details you have outlined, and an employed paramour or husband may be in the picture. If she is untrained for employment, perhaps she could enroll at the Public Welfare Training Center—at least the suggestion would be worthy of exploration. The children should not starve. As I have already stated, there are surplus commodities and free school lunches. There are private charitable organizations in the city which may help. Assistance should be given to the mother in locating a job, and this is why the committee is recommending an appropriation of $29,000 for the creation of a job-finding unit. Perhaps there are relatives with whom the children could be placed at least temporarily.

Mr. RIBICOFF. If there are relatives who can handle the situation. I can well understand why the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Colorado feel uncomfortable about the article concerning Mr. Sonny Cooper. The fact remains that before he died there were no payments from the District of Columbia, but after he died there were payments from the District of Columbia. That is a fact to recognize in the article published in the Daily News.

When we talk about what is good for the State of West Virginia and what is good for the State of Connecticut, I believe it is important that we also ask what is good for the District of Columbia. We are talking about an annual program of $2½ million for the District of Columbia. Let me point out——

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator indicated that I was uncomfortable because he had referred to the story in the press about Sonny Cooper.

Will the Senator repeat what he said, to the effect that prior to the death of Mr. Cooper there were no payments and subsequent to his death there were payments.

Mr. RIBICOFF. While Sonny Cooper was in the home and alive, under the rules of the District of Columbia Sonny Cooper's family and the children did not receive assistance. Once Sonny Cooper was dead, his family—his widowed wife and 11 children—became eligible.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. May I quote to the Senator something which I know he would wish to have corrected in the RECORD. He said, I believe, that when Sonny Cooper was alive his family did not qualify.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Except when he was in jail.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Except when he was in jail.

Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield further.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I have a report which was supplied to me by the Welfare Department of the District of Columbia on November 15. This is a summary of the case of Willie and Virginia Cooper.

The first assistance payment was authorized for October 1, 1959. The mother was pregnant and the father was unemployable due to a sprained ankle. He was not in jail.

Mr. RIBICOFF. When the father is absent or incapacitated, the children are eligible for assistance.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Let me continue to set the facts straight for the Senator from Connecticut. A series of checks with Mrs. Cooper began with the birth of twins on February 15, 1960. That necessitated Mr. Cooper remaining at home to care for the children. Assistance was terminated in August 1960. At this time the family was receiving $345 a month. Reapplication was made August 16, 1962, and terminated as Mr. Cooper was employable. Assistance was received from October 1, 1962 through November 30, 1962, when Mr. Cooper was in jail. The family received $380 at the time of closing.

Reapplication was made on June 24 of this year.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator from West Virginia kindly inform me what the payment was? I did not hear it.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Three hundred and forty-five dollars a month. Reapplication was made June 24, 1963, and on July 2, emergency assistance was authorized. The last assistance payment for the month of November 1963 was in the amount of $353, and the case is still open.

So I say that the Senator is in error when he indicates to the Senate that the mother only qualified for assistance while her husband was in jail, and that, otherwise, prior to his death she could not qualify and only subsequent to his death were they able to qualify.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Once he was incapacitated or in jail he could receive assistance. But out of jail and not incapacitated, he was ineligible.

I appreciate that the Senator from West Virginia has done a masterly job generally with the budget. It is all right to say how generous we have been in the Senate for the District of Columbia, but I do not want the Senate to forget that we are talking about 490 families who are hungry and not receiving aid. I can appreciate what the Senator has said he has done for education. That is wonderful. But I still believe that a hungry child without any food in his stomach is not a pupil who can learn and be a good pupil in school.

Let us look again at what is good for the State of Connecticut, what is good for the State of West Virginia, and what is good for the District of Columbia. I believe I have some interesting figures on this point. Under the program that we are advocating the State of Connecticut spent in the fiscal year 1963, $4,801,000. The Federal share was 44.4 percent of that. In the year 1963 the State of West Virginia spent $20,672,000 for these purposes. The Federal share to the State of West Virginia was 74.9 percent. In my figures are correct, about $15,504,000 was contributed by the Federal Government to the State of West Virginia for this program.

If the Federal Government can pay the State of West Virginia $15½ million, for a program like this, I do not see why the Federal Government cannot, for a full fiscal year, spend $2½ million for the District of Columbia.

We are faced with the principle that what is good for the State of West Virginia and the State of Connecticut is still good for the District of Columbia. It is important for us to realize that. I do not believe that the Senator is advocating repeal of aid to dependent children of the unemployed in the 15 States, including the State of West Virginia and the State of Connecticut.

The Senator has talked about work programs. He talks about what we could do in the State of West Virginia and what we could not do in the city of Washington. The Senator has spoken about work on roads and clearing brush.

The Senator from Colorado and myself were delegates to the Interparliamentary Union Conference in Belgrade, a Communist country. I do not know whether the Senator observed, but I recall returning about midnight from a meeting and a late dinner, and my eyes goggled when I saw that all through Belgrade men were hosing down the streets of Belgrade. The parks in Belgrade were manicured. It was something one could be proud of.

This is the Nation's Capital. Are we proud of the way the city of Washington looks? I am not talking about the manicuring job that is done in front of the Lincoln Memorial. We talk about what to do with people when their jobs are taken away. On a proper work program we could use them to keep the streets and the parks of Washington clean. We can make the city of Washington the most beautiful city in the world, which it should be as the Nation's Capital, an example for the Nation to follow and for all the world to see.

Those of us who visit the other capitals of the world see what they do in those world capitals; yet we allow our capital city to look slovenly and unkempt. We could take these work programs and make these people useful. We would have people to do that type of job.

The Senator talks about how much of the welfare money is going for booze. It is true that some of this money goes for booze. In 1962, when Congress passed the new welfare program, we provided in that program for protective payments; so, therefore, at the present time, if a family on aid has a mother or father who are drinking up the money, the welfare worker has the right to make those payments on a protective basis to a third person, to make sure that the children are being provided for.

We come down to the question of whether we are going to take care of the problems of the District of Columbia. It is not a question of how generous we have been with the District of Columbia. The question comes down to whether we are going to do for the District of Columbia what we make possible for our 50 States.

The question comes down to a sense of fairness. Shall we do for the District of Columbia what the Senator and I wish to do for West Virginia and for Connecticut, and what we make potentially possible for the other States, if they so desire?

We are not making it possible for the District of Columbia to be in exactly the same position as the other States, including the Senator's State and mine, otherwise.

By the amendment, all I ask is that we accord the same sense of justice, sense of fairness, and sense of equality to the District of Columbia as we afford to all the States.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article which was published in the Point Pleasant Register of November 14, 1963, which indicates that the State's welfare caseload shows its first decrease in the history of the Welfare Department of West Virginia.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE'S WELFARE CASELOAD SHOWS FIRST DECREASE

CHARLESTON, W. VA.—State Welfare Commissioner W. Bernard Smith said the State's welfare caseload has been cut by 9,576 in the last 2 years—the first time a decrease has been recorded in the department's history.

Smith told the Kanawha Welfare Council that "no administration has ever before shown a decrease in caseload. In fact the caseload increased by 5,000 cases from 1956 to 1960," he said.

The commissioner said, "without fear of contradiction," West Virginia has a fewer percentage of ineligibles on its caseload than at any point in its administration of welfare programs.

Referring to the reports that West Virginia is among States with high ineligibility rates, Smith said, "We have reduced our caseload during the past 2 years without changing any eligibility factors."

Smith also announced a plan that may hike salaries of some county directors, based on the caseload in each county. Each county director presently receives the same salary.

Smith said he has asked the State Civil Service Commission to allow him to set up the new program, noting that obtaining directors for the large counties has been a problem because of the salary.

No pay cuts would be necessitated, he said, if the plan is approved, there would be substantial increases. A director's starting pay is $410 a month.

Under the new plan, Kanawha County would offer the highest salary, starting at $540 a month and increasing to $705.

"This plan is based on the realization we're not able to recruit county directors" for larger counties "at the salary we now pay," Smith said. He noted there were vacancies now in at least three of the State's larger counties, including Kanawha.

Smith also praised a study conducted earlier by his department and the Kanawha County Medical Society which helped pinpoint ineligibility and effects of the "disease of idleness."

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Charleston Gazette of November 15, 1963, entitled "Welfare Said Taking Cash Needed To Curb Other Problems."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELFARE SAID TAKING CASH NEEDED TO CURB OTHER PROBLEMS

(By George Lawless)

A "continually increasing drain of our State's financial resources into various welfare programs" is curbing the solution of other major West Virginia problems, House Speaker Julius T. Singelton, Jr., declared here Thursday.

Singleton told the third annual West Virginia Retailers Association conference:

"I make these remarks concerning the welfare program to point up my meaning when I say that these programs are a continually increasing drain on our State revenue and resources and that moneys expended in these programs could be much more advantageously spent in the field of education, the lack of which among our citizens is a large contributing factor, if not the most important one, in the creation of the need of State welfare."

Singleton also castigated special-interest groups and organizations which, without proposing alternative programs or solutions to problems, sit back and criticize the political agencies of government. Notable exceptions to this attitude, he added, are labor organizations and the West Virginia Chamber of Commerce.

"Too many representative groups or associations," he said, "particularly in the business field, seldom if ever have a program or propose solutions to any of the problems facing State government."

Coincidentally, the West Virginia Retailers Association earlier had unanimously adopted a strongly worded policy resolution declaring that West Virginia retailers "are entering the political arena on local, county, State, and National levels."

R. G. Guter, chairman of the West Virginia Retailers Association's legislative committee, told the group, representing 250 companies in 23 West Virginia cities:

"The political atmosphere in West Virginia is not conducive to good community living, profitable enterprise, and progressive development of the State's assets."

In adopting the resolution, the West Virginia Retailers Association pledged financial and personnel resources to a political action program involving:

Screening of potential candidates; urging more business leaders to seek public office; political education and registration drives among associations and employees.

Charles Hopkins, executive secretary of the group, emphasized that West Virginia Retailers Association will retain its major role as a service organization to retailers, but pointed to past legislative actions detrimental to the business community passed through default.

"In making this decision" the resolution read, "retailers note past failures in accepting opportunities to participate in political decisions.

"They recognize that laws affecting both the retailer and the consumer have either passed or failed in legislative bodies without a proper expression of this great business segment of the State."

A free-wheeling exception was the Sunday Closing Act passed by the 1963 legislature, and later declared procedurally unconstitutional by the State supreme court. State retailers pushed hard for the legislation, and in so doing realized the power of organized action, Hopkins said.

The group has petitioned Governor Barron to include a Sunday blue law proposal in his call to the 30-day budget session in January. Unless it is, or an overwhelming majority of lawmakers vote to consider it, the legislation cannot be acted on until 1965.

Singleton held the door open slightly for blue law legislation in January with this remark:

"In my opinion, we should consider more items in the budget session. It seems to me a waste of time to bring the legislature here for 30 days and consider only the budget when other things can be considered."

He described these other things as "items of importance and interest and issues that should be resolved."

Singleton congratulated the retailers in noting, "Regardless of the merits of the Sunday Closing Act, you have taken a stand—too many groups have not."

The lanky Morgantown lawyer took a swing as voter apathy and urged the group to scrutinize closely the men it helps to elect to public office.

"Your opinions here might be formed by what these gentlemen have said, who supports them, and their past experiences in life."

He urged the selection of better qualified and intelligent choice of the people who "will be given the job of working for you for a better West Virginia." Noting that the suggestion is basic, he added: "The fact remains that West Virginia citizens do not indicate at election time that they are interested in their State government. Or, for that matter, in their local government."

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I trust the Senator from Connecticut will not feel that I have said anything today in a spirit of rancor. I have not.

I recognize that there is a tendency to point to the State of West Virginia merely because I happen to have the good fortune to represent that great State in the Senate, along with my colleague [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Today the Senate is not appropriating money for the State of West Virginia. We should keep our attention focused on precisely the issue before us. The Congress is asked to appropriate money for the District of Columbia, not for the State of Connecticut, and not for the Mountain State of West Virginia.

We have difficulty in West Virginia in obtaining appropriations for this program. Our legislature has a difficult time finding money for the program.

I am unalterably opposed at this time to the inception of a new program, because I believe it is not needed, and the District of Columbia government, like West Virginia, will have difficulty in finding money for this program when so many other worthwhile programs and departments are in need of additional finances.

There may come a time when I would join with others in saying that the program is needed, but I do not feel the facts justify the program today.

I am ready to vote on the amendment. I trust that Senators will vote it down.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, no rancor was intended on either side. My respect for the Senator from West Virginia, which was always high, is even higher today.

Like other Senators, I have the highest respect for the Senator's knowledge and his depth of interest in this subject matter. Frankly, I consider it an experience I shall value to engage in the debate with the Senator from West Virginia.

What impressed me the most during the debate was the silence in the Senate, and the attention being paid. The Presiding Officer did not have to rap his gavel for attention and order.

I believe we have started the discussion of the problem today. The amendment, which I expect will be defeated, at least gives us an awareness of the other side of the problem.

Irrespective of the result of the vote today, I say with utmost seriousness that I hope during the coming year the Senator from West Virginia and I will give careful thought and consideration to the many problems which beset the people of this District. Much can be done. The problems here are unique.

I know the Senator from West Virginia shares my pride in the Nation's Capital. I know what the Senator's intentions have been and what he has accomplished, as I indicated previously in the debate. The Senator has made many constructive additions. I believe that Washington, D.C., will be a better city to live in after the adoption of the budget proposed, because of the constructive suggestions which have been made by the Senator from West Virginia.

To a great extent the Senator from West Virginia is the most important individual in respect to the future of Washington, D.C., so upon his shoulders really rests a heavy burden.

I know how complicated are the welfare problems, and how impatient we can be about them. The entire Nation is impatient. Along with the impatience and the problems, there are people who are hungry. I believe the Senator from West Virginia shares with all of us a desire to make sure that there are no people who are hungry in an affluent society such as that of the United States.

I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his courtesy. Again I say I consider it a great privilege to be able to engage in this debate with the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Connecticut for his kind words. I reciprocate by saying that I have enjoyed our discussion of this matter today, and I commend the able Senator for his continuing interest in public welfare.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a report on progress made during the past year by the District of Columbia Welfare Department.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Last Year's Progress Report for District of Columbia Welfare Department

1. The cleanup of the ADC and GPA caseload has continued to go forward as recommended by the General Accounting Office and by the Congress.

2. The overall caseload has been reduced from what it was when the investigations began in November 1961, by 23 percent.

The overall caseload has been reduced from a total of 12,969 cases in September 1961, to a total of 9,964 in October 1963.

The ADC caseload has been reduced from 5,601 cases in September 1961 to 3,823 cases in October 1963, or a reduction of 32 percent.

The GPA caseload has been reduced from 1,617 cases in September 1961, to 563 cases in October 1963, or a reduction of 65 percent.

3. A reduction in the annual amount of money for grants has been effected. In just 2 years, from fiscal year 1962 to 1964, the amount for total financial aid has dropped from $16,376,563 in fiscal year 1962 to an estimated $12,103,999 for fiscal year 1964.

In local moneys, the reduction has been from $7,396,311 in fiscal year 1962 to $4,638,935, estimate for fiscal year 1964.

The Federal share has been reduced from $8,920,252 in fiscal year 1962 to an estimated $7,465,064 for fiscal year 1964.

4. A random sample of the aid to the permanently and totally disabled caseload has been conducted at this committee's request and the results have shown that 39.3 percent of the caseload is ineligible.

An audit review of the entire caseload has been initiated and is now in progress.

5. The PAD manual has been simplified at the committee's request and brought up to date. This was submitted earlier in the hearings. The manual contains approximately 150 pages and replaces 3 cumbersome manuals which consisted of several hundred pages of materials that were, to a certain extent, obsolete, repetitious, superfluous, and ambiguous.

6. Regulations concerning overpayments have been tightened so as to allow for collections of overpayments which, under the old policies, were forgiven, forgotten, and written off.

7. Collections of overpayments have increased.

8. The position of Controller, which was created on the recommendation of this committee, has been filled.

9. The Office of Investigations and Collections, which performs many duties other than that of investigating welfare cases, has been greatly strengthened by the addition of 63 investigators and 48 clerical and administrative positions. The recruitment was successfully effectuated over the past year.

10. Twenty-one GS–9 social worker positions were added by this committee last year to the PAD. These additional positions, together with the elimination of ineligibles from the caseload, brought about a reduction in the average caseload per social worker.

The average has now been reduced to that of 107 cases per social worker position.

11. Thirteen unit clerks and four dictaphone operator positions were added in PAD by this committee last year for the purpose of relieving social workers of clerical chores.

This has permitted social workers to have some additional time for visting the homes of recipients.

12. Whereas heretofore, social workers in PAD were limited to GS–5 and GS–7 positions, this committee last year provided for 21 grade reallocations to GS–9 and GS–11 so as to provide incentive to and improve the morale of social workers. Three supervisory positions were reallocated from grade 9 to garde 11 and these reallocations have now been made.

13. Three additional cottages were provided for Junior Village through an appropriation of $557,000 and these are now ready for occupancy.

14. The Congress added funds last year in the amount of $224,603 to provide for passing on to the OA, AB, and APTD recipients increased Federal moneys. Recipients in these categories have been benefiting from the increased payments.

15. The Congress provided three GS–10 social workers in the Child Welfare Division last year for the purpose of accelerating the location of foster homes. Partially as a result of this, in recent months, the discharges from homes have almost equaled admissions at Junior Village. Additionally, five GS–5 homefinding workers, a supervisor, and two recruiters, plus supporting clerical personnel were added in the Child Welfare Division, and these positions have been functioning.

16. An appropriation of $369,000 last year provided an increase in board rates for foster home care from $53 to $57 and for institutional care from $70 to $85, and these increases have been put into effect.

17. The Congress provided for a management team survey of the Welfare Department and the survey is still underway. The General Accounting Office participated in the survey.

18. The MAA was implemented in the District of Columbia during the past year.

19. A rearrangement of caseloads has been effectuated so as to permit the assignment of social workers by category. This contributes to a higher degree of specialization and efficiency in dealing with cases.

20. Unobligated and unexpended moneys in the amount of $553,664, or about 2½ percent of the total amount authorized, were returned by the Department to the Treasury at the end of fiscal year 1963.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a special report to the Senate Subcommittee on District of Columbia, Committee on Appropriations, by the Comptroller General of the United States, dated July 1962.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Comptroller General of the
United States,
Washington, July 30, 1962.

Hon. Robert C. Byrd,
Chairman, Subcommittee on District of Columbia, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate

Dear Mr. Chairman: Herewith is our special report on the investigation of selected cases under the aid to dependent children program administered by the Public Assistance Division of the Department of Public Welfare, District of Columbia government, June 1962.

This report, which is being submitted pursuant to your request of June 18, 1962, contains certain information in respect to the investigated cases in addition to that contained in the report submitted to you on July 26, 1962.

Because of the nature of the investigation, many of the statements contained in the report are necessarily based on conclusions arrived at after a reasonable evaluation of facts disclosed through observations, interviews, and admissions and through examination of public and business records.

Sincerely yours,

Joseph Campbell,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Special Report on Investigation of Selected Cases Under the Aid to Dependent Children Program, Department of Public Welfare, District of Columbia Government, June 1962

The General Accounting Office submitted a report to the chairmen, Subcommittees on District of Columbia, Senate and House Committee on Appropriations, on the investigation of selected cases under the aid to dependent children (ADC) program, Department of Public Welfare (DPW), District of Columbia government, on July 26, 1962. This report contains certain additional information in respect to the cases investigated, as requested by letter dated June 18, 1962. (See app. IX.)

CASES INVESTIGATED AND ACTIONS TAKEN

The aforementioned report pointed out that of 280 cases selected by the Public Assistance Division (PAD), Department of Public Welfare, for investigation, 42 cases had been closed prior to review by the investigative unit established by the DPW and that 2 cases were not investigated. The report showed that for the 236 ADC cases investigated, the PAD had informed us by June 25, 1962, that the status of the cases was as follows:

	Number of cases	Percent of total cases
Action based on investigative findings:		
Financial payments discontinued	127	
Financial payments continued based on appeal findings	3	
Appeal pending	3	
Total	133	56.3
Financial payments continued:		
No infractions of eligibility requirements or need standards	23	
Adjustments in payments based on existing need	20	
Miscellaneous administrative adjustments	52	
Total	95	40.3
Action based on events occurring subsequent to investigation:		
Financial payments discontinued	7	
Appeal pending	1	
Total	8	3.4
Grand total	236	100.0

In appendixes I through VIII of this report the 280 cases selected by the PAD for investigation are listed to show (1) the 42 cases that had been closed prior to review by the investigative unit, (2) the 2 cases not investigated, and (3) the 236 cases that were investigated. Those in the latter group have been classified according to their eligibility or ineligibility status. Comments pertaining to the cases in each of the foregoing categories are contained in the following sections of this report.

CASES CLOSED PRIOR TO INVESTIGATION

Shown as appendix I are the 42 cases in this category. We reviewed 28 of these cases for the purpose of evaluating the propriety of the actions taken. We believe that the actions were proper in view of the circumstances involved in each case.

CASES NOT INVESTIGATED

Listed as appendix II are the two active cases which were not investigated. In one of these cases the mother of the ADC children was a resident of the DPW's Residential Training Center, and an investigation of the case was deemed to be inexpedient. In the other case, the PAD inadvertently furnished the investigators a case record pertaining to a previous award which had been discontinued, and the fact that the assistance payments had been reinstated did not become known until after the field investigation work had been completed.

RECIPIENTS ELIGIBLE FOR CONTINUED ASSISTANCE

No infractions

Listed as appendix III are the 23 cases in which no infractions of PAD Manual requirements were disclosed by the investigation. Of the 23 cases, 10 had been investigated prior to our participation in the investigation. However, our review of the investigation reports on these cases indicated no reason for disagreeing with the PAD's conclusions.

The amount of the assistance payments in the 23 cases ranged from $62 to $292 a month, the number of children receiving aid ranged from 1 to 7, and the commencing date of the payments ranged from January 1953 to September 1961. The cases in which assistance had been granted more recently involved the greatest number of children and the largest monthly payments.

The monthly assistance payment in one case was reduced $33 because of the death of a child which occurred during the period of the investigation.

The fact that the investigation disclosed no irregularities in only 23 cases, or in only 9.7 percent of the cases investigated, is most significant and indicates a very serious weakness in the administration of the ADC program.

Adjustment of assistance payments

Listed as appendix IV [not printed in Record] are the 20 cases in which the recipients were considered eligible for continued assistance but circumstances existed which required the monthly assistance payments to be adjusted.

In 15 cases, the monthly payments were reduced by amounts ranging from $12 to $72. In four of these cases, the monthly payments for 1, 2, or 3 months were further reduced in varying amounts to compensate for income which had been received in prior months but not reported. In three cases, similar deductions were made although the rate of the regular monthly payment was not changed.

In one case the monthly payment was increased by $6 because the recipients were required to move to more suitable quarters.

We participated in the field investigation of 5 of the 20 cases. While the investigation of the other 15 cases had been completed prior to our participation in the investigation, our review of 2 of these cases indicated no basis or disagreeing either with the adequacy of the investigation conducted or with the propriety of the actions taken.

ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUSTMENTS NEEDED

Appendix V [not printed in Record] lists the 52 cases in which the recipients were determined to be eligible for continued assistance but which required some administrative action. In some cases, the administrative action to be taken was dependent on actions required to be taken by the caretaker-relatives (parents or other relatives of specified relationship).

Examples of the types of actions required follow.

1. Refer to Office of Investigations and Collections (OIC) for recovery of overpayments.
2. Require unemployable parent to obtain an overdue medical examination report.
3. Require mother to take certain required action to locate missing husband.
4. Correct records to show change of address and recompute rental needs.
5. Consider the feasibility of referring children to the Child Welfare Division (CWD).
6. Correct records relating to birth dates of children.
7. Revise rental needs because of change in number of persons occupying a dwelling with members of an assistance unit (caretaker-relative and children).

We participated in the investigation of 24 of the 52 cases. Also, we reviewed 3 of the 28 cases which had been investigated prior to our participation in the investigation and found no reason for disagreeing either with the investigative findings or with the actions necessary to comply with normal requirements.

In 1 of the 24 cases which we investigated jointly with the PAD, the recipients appeared to be ineligible on the basis of findings indicating that both the ADC mother and father were employable. The PAD subsequently obtained medical information which indicated that the father was capable of part-time work only and made arrangements for him to receive medical treatment. Also, the PAD directed the mother to register with the U.S. Employment Service (USES) and to report weekly on her efforts to find employment.

Although the recipients in each of the 52 cases were determined by the PAD to be eligible for continued assistance, the fact that, in some cases, they were required to take certain actions to completely meet the eligibility requirements and that the failure to do so could result in their becoming ineligible for continued financial assistance is a further illustration of a weakness in the PAD's administration of the program.

RECIPIENTS INELIGIBLE FOR CONTINUED ASSISTANCE

The PAD determined that 141 of the 236 cases investigated were ineligible for financial assistance—133 cases on the basis of the investigative findings and 8 cases on the basis of events occurring subsequent to the investigation. Assistance payments were later reinstated in 3 of the 133 cases on the basis of appeal findings. Appeals are pending in 1 of the 133 cases and in 1 of the 8 cases.

The 133 cases are classified in the following table according to the investigative finding which, in our opinion, had the most significant bearing on the recipients' eligibility status. Only 1 ineligibility finding was disclosed in each of 72 cases, and an average of 2.1 ineligibility findings was disclosed in 61 cases.

We participated in the investigation of 79 of the 141 cases. We reviewed the investigation reports in the remaining 62 cases to determine the adequacy of the investigation conducted and the propriety of the PAD's determination of ineligibility in each case. Our review disclosed no reason to disagree with the action taken by the PAD except in one case. (See p. 31.)

Ineligibility finding	Number of cases—			Number of ineligibility findings
	Considered to be ineligible	Having a single ineligibility finding	Having additional ineligibility findings	
Man-in-the-house rule:				
Mother living in continuing relationship with a man who is her husband and/or father of her ADC children	31	21	10	44
Mother living in home with man other than her husband or father of her ADC children in relationship similar to that of husband and wife	20	9	11	33
Man constituting an undeterminable resource	10	7	3	13
Total	61	37	24	90
Other ineligibility findings:				
Resources undeterminable for other reasons	11	9	2	13
Living arrangements not clarified	11	4	7	22
Parent employed	3	1	2	5
Parent employable	29	13	16	49
No eligible child in home	4	3	1	5
Refusal to cooperate	8	2	6	16
Miscellaneous	6	3	3	9
Grand total	133	72	61	209

A listing of the cases in each of the foregoing classifications is presented as appendixes VI and VII of this report not printed in the Record. Comments concerning the cases in each of the classifications follow.

MAN-IN-THE-HOUSE RULE

Mother living in continuing relationship with a man who is her husband and/or the father of her ADC children

As shown in appendix VI the investigation disclosed 31 cases where the ADC mother was associating with her husband and/or the father of her ADC children in a manner which negated the claim that the children were deprived of parental support or care by reason of the continued absence of the parent from the home. No distinction is made as to whether the relationship was carried on inside or outside the home.

In 21 of the cases the "lack of clear dissociation" was the only finding of ineligibility disclosed, but in 10 cases other ineligibility findings existed, any one of which, in our opinion, was a sufficient reason for considering the recipients to be ineligible.

In 8 of the cases the relationship of the mother was with her husband and in 23 cases the relationship was with a man not her husband although he was the father of one or more of her ADC children. In one of the latter cases the recipient appealed the PAD's determination of ineligibility, and the case remains open pending the outcome of the appeal.

In 18 of the 31 cases the man involved was employed; in 12 cases he was not employed but was apparently employable since there was no evidence of incapacity, either in the form of obvious physical disability or in the form of medical evidence; and in 1 case he was retired and receiving a pension.

Some of the more flagrant cases of abuses of the right to receive assistance under the ADC program are presented below.

1. A mother of four children, who had been receiving ADC assistance payments for

over 4 years was determined to have been living during the entire period, since September 1957, with a man whom she had represented to the PAD as being her brother but who actually was her paramour and the father of two of her children. The mother admitted to the investigator that the man was employed and earning $85 a week. She was receiving $154 a month in assistance payments at the time the assistance was discontinued.

2. A 36-year-old mother, who was receiving assistance payments on behalf of herself and four of her six children had received such assistance during most of the period since April 1953. The father of three of the four children, although not their mother's husband, was found by the investigators to be in the mother's home at 6:30 a.m. on a Sunday morning, barefoot and naked to the waist, and hiding under a bed. When asked if he was employed he said that he was a "gambler." The mother had been receiving assistance payments continuously since November 1959, and at the time the payments were discontinued they amounted to $143 a month.

3. A married 27-year-old mother of six children told investigators that the man found in her home was her brother-in-law. The investigation disclosed that he was actually her husband and the father of her children, five of whom were included in the assistance unit, and that he was employed and earning about $65 a week. The mother had been receiving assistance payments since December 1960, and at the time they were discontinued they amounted to $191 a month. She subsequently admitted to the investigators that the man was her husband and stated that she wished to withdraw from the ADC program rather than have the investigation continued.

4. A married 35-year-old mother and her four children had been determined to be eligible for assistance on the basis of her claim that her husband had deserted her and that his whereabouts was unknown. The investigators located the husband and obtained his signed statement asserting that his wife had forced him to leave the home by threats and abuse so that she could obtain public assistance, that his wife had always known his whereabouts, that he had given his wife at least $50 a month since January 1962, that he is presently employed, and that he wants to return to the home and support his family. The mother had received assistance payments since September 1961, the latest payments being $169 a month.

5. A 41-year-old mother of six children, all of whom are included in the assistance unit, represented to the PAD that she was living rent free in the attic of her sister's home. She requested the PAD not to probe into the manner in which her sister had obtained her home. She also represented that another woman living in the home, who was a recipient of aid under the aid to the permanently and totally disabled (APTD) program, was only a roomer.

The investigation disclosed that the APTD recipient, who was receiving $83 a month and who had been represented as a widow without relatives, was actually the mother of the ADC mother and was the lessee of the dwelling along with a man who was listed in the lease agreement as her husband. This man, who was found in the home, was determined to be employed full time and earning $1.25 an hour. The ADC mother, instead of living in this home as she had represented, was found to be living at another address with her children and her husband who was the father of her children. The father had been continuously employed with one firm since 1954 except for one period of 120 days in the early part of 1961 when he was in jail. He had claimed seven dependents on his tax withholding exemption certificate, which is the same as the number of persons in the assistance unit. The ADC mother had been receiving assistance payments since September 1959, with the latest payments amounting to $149 a month.

6. A 24-year-old mother of four children, fathered by three different men, none of whom were her husband, successfully withheld from the social workers the knowledge of the birth of her youngest child on March 11, 1961. The father of this child and of one of the other children was found hiding in the bathroom of the ADC mother's home at 6:10 a.m. on a Sunday morning. He admitted spending the night with the ADC mother. He admitted also that he was employed. The ADC mother said that this man had been living with her since the birth of her youngest child. The mother had been receiving assistance payments since February 1959, the latest payments amounting to $109 a month.

We believe that some of the facts with respect to these and other cases in this category could have been disclosed with only a reasonable amount of effort on the part of the social workers. In some of these cases it appears that the recipients were never eligible for financial assistance and that such a finding would have become apparent if the eligibility standards had been diligently applied at the time the applications were first received.

Mother living in home with man who is not her husband or the father of her ADC children in a relationship similar to that of husband and wife

This ineligibility finding was disclosed in 20 cases listed in appendix VI [not printed in RECORD]. In 11 of the cases, additional ineligibility findings existed.

The men involved in 15 of the cases were employed and in the other 5 cases were unemployed but appeared to be employable. In one of the 15 cases where the men involved was employed, the ADC mother was also employed to the extent that this fact alone would cause the recipients to be ineligible. In three cases, the ADC mother was employable under the prescribed standards for determining employability.

The ADC mothers in 3 of the 20 cases voluntarily withdrew from the program.

Cases illustrating this type of investigative finding follow:

1. A man found in the home of an ADC mother of four children who had received assistance payments since February 1956—the latest payments amounting to $153 a month—was represented to the investigators as being merely a visitor. The address given by this man as his residence proved to be false, and later both he and the ADC mother admitted that they had been living together but neither would state how long the relationship had existed. The man was employed. The ADC mother admitted that she was also employed, but she would not furnish information as to her employer, length of employment, or earnings. She signed a voluntary statement requesting withdrawal from the program.

2. A 22-year-old mother, who had received assistance payments since September 1961 for herself and three children admitted during the investigation that she had been supported by a man by whom she was again pregnant. It was determined that this man was employed. The mother signed a voluntary statement requesting withdrawal from the program. When contacted by a social worker subsequent to the investigation, she stated that she had signed the statement because she felt "the jig was up." At the time the assistance payments were discontinued they amounted to $148 a month.

3. A 26-year-old mother of six illegitimate children, fathered by three different men, was again pregnant by a man whom she did not identify. Her condition was known to the PAD in November 1961. She had been receiving assistance payments since April 1960, and as of March 1962 these payments were at the rate of $79 a month. The April 1962 assistance payment was suspended pending further inquiry into the matters disclosed by the investigation including (a) birth of a child in February 1962, (b) relationship with a man who, she admitted, spent nights with her "too often to mention" and who provided her with money in excess of $100 a month, (c) presence of another man, his wife, and three children in an apartment in the dwelling, (d) an unidentified sick child in the home, and (e) squalid, overcrowded, and rat-infested premises.

4. A man found in the home of a 27-year-old ADC mother was addressed as "Daddy" by one of the mother's three illegitimate children. The children had been represented to the PAD has having been fathered by two different men, neither of whom was the ADC mother's husband or the man found in the home by the investigators. An informant told the investigators that this man was the ADC mother's current paramour and that a former paramour still frequents the home and creates disturbances. Both of these men are reported to have threatened to kill the other. The man found in the home refused to provide any information concerning his employment status or his relationship to the family. During a visit by a social worker subsequent to the investigation, the ADC mother denied that any serious or intimate relationship existed between her and the man found in the home and said that she would rather be "self-supporting" than to continue to receive public assistance. The monthly assistance payment of $154 was thereupon discontinued. She had been receiving assistance payments since April 1958.

Man constituting a resource the extent of which is undeterminable

Appendix VI lists 10 cases where the recipients were considered ineligible because a man was involved in the family unit but the extent of his contributions to the support of the assistance unit could not be determined. In each case, the man's relationship with the mother was not determined to be similar to that of husband and wife, nor was his relationship with the children determined to be that of a father. While the investigation disclosed that the man in each of these cases provided some assistance to the family unit, neither the mother nor the man would divulge information as to the extent of the contribution. Therefore, the need for assistance could not be established and the recipients were considered to be ineligible for assistance. In 3 of the 10 cases, additional ineligibility findings were found to exist. The involvement of a man in the family unit was disclosed also in eight other cases which have been classified by other ineligibility findings deemed to be more significant.

The men involved in 12 of the 18 cases were employed, in 4 of the cases the men were unemployed but no evidence was disclosed to indicate that they were not employable, and in 2 of the cases no determinations were made of the men's employment status because of the number of men involved and the undeterminable status of their relationship to the family unit. In one of these latter two cases the recipients appealed PAD's determination of ineligibility and were reinstated for continued assistance after the appeal hearing.

The following examples illustrate the situations found to exist in the cases included in this category.

1. The ADC mother who had three illegitimate children and expected another child in 2 or 3 months, which fact was unknown to the PAD, had been receiving assistance payments since June 1961, the latest payments being $154 a month. Information provided by the mother concerning the father of her last-born child and that of the ex-

pected child was unverifiable because of her conflicting statements. This ADC mother formerly lived with her mother in a house leased in the name of a man who was not a member of the assistance unit. She moved from that house upon being informed that assistance payments were to be discontinued since her mother could care for her children and she was considered to be employable. Both this man and the ADC mother separately admitted a conjugal relationship over the past 2 years and that the man contributed to the family support. The man is married and living with his wife who stated that she has no respect for him because of his promiscuity and that he is the alleged father of "many" illegitimate children.

2. A 34-year-old mother of seven children fathered by three different men had concealed the birth of the seventh child from the PAD for 3 years through fear of being removed from the ADC program. The father of the seventh child had been living with the ADC mother until the time of the investigators' first visit to the home, although the ADC mother had professed to have terminated the relationship in September 1961 when he got into trouble with the police. The ADC mother stated to the investigators that she realized that she had violated agency regulations. She stated further that the man involved presumably had returned to his wife's home after the investigation of this case had commenced. This ADC mother had been receiving assistance payments since May 1957 for herself and five of her seven children. These payments amounted to $221 a month at the time they were discontinued. One of these five children, who was 16 years old, was not in regular school attendance having been absent 29 days between January 29 and April 11, 1962.

3. A 28-year-old mother of five children told the investigators that she wished to withdraw from the ADC program, upon being found with a man in her bedroom. The investigators did not accept her offer of withdrawal since it was made during distress occasioned by being found in an embarrassing situation. The investigators, during the next few days after the first home visit, observed different men entering the home. The mother, during a subsequent visit by the investigators, repeated her request to withdraw from the program. Her request was accepted, and the investigation was terminated. She had been receiving assistance payments since January 1960, and at the time of their discontinuance the payments were at the rate of $197 a month.

Cases ineligible for other reasons

Resources Undeterminable

Appendix VII to this report lists 11 cases where the recipients were considered to be ineligible because the caretaker-relative either was unable or was unwilling to divulge information relating to income and other resources that apparently were available to the assistance unit. In two of the cases, an additional ineligibility finding was disclosed; namely, the presence of a man in the home whose relationship to the family could not be definitely established but who constituted an available resource. Final determination of eligibility has been withheld in two cases pending the outcome of appeal hearings.

In each of 39 additional cases, the resources available to the assistance unit also could not be determined. These cases have been classified by other ineligibility findings considered to be more significant reasons for considering the recipients to be ineligible for assistance. Thus, the finding of undeterminable resources was disclosed in 50 cases.

Details of illustrative cases in which this finding was disclosed follow:

1. A 44-year-old ADC mother of four children, two of whom were fathered by men other than her husband, had been receiving monthly assistance payments since January 1956, the latest payments being $205 a month. The mother had represented to the PAD and to the investigators that she had no other resources. However, the investigation disclosed that she had earnings of about $20 a week from caring for children and had received about $10 a week from a "boy friend" during the period from September 1959 to July 1960 for the purchase of a television set which cost $419.90. When appraised of these findings, she acknowledged that they were correct. The investigation also disclosed some evidence of other earnings from laundry work, caring for a woman convalescing from a hospitalization, and caring for other children.

2. A 25-year-old ADC mother had been receiving assistance payments since December 1959 for herself and two of her three children to augment payments of $65 a month which she was supposed to receive from her absent husband. The latest of these payments amounted to $76 a month. Notwithstanding the lack of regular support from her husband, as evidenced by a court order of commitment for back payments, totaling $465, in September 1961 and by court records showing payments to her of only $450 during the period from March 1961 through April 1962, she was living in a two-bedroom, well-furnished apartment. The furnishings included a three-speed record player, a cabinet model television set, two telephones, a typewriter, and a radio. Evidence was obtained that she had received contributions from various members of her family which had not been reported to the PAD.

3. A 32-year-old ADC mother of six children, five of whom were included in the assistance unit, telephoned the PAD to state that the investigators had been to her home and that she wished to withdraw from the ADC program. She had previously represented to the PAD that her husband was the father of four of her six children and that the other two children had been fathered by two other men.

The investigation disclosed that she was again pregnant. She told the investigators that a fourth man was the father of the expected child. The investigation also disclosed that she received irregular contributions for the support of the children from two of the three fathers. When pressed for information concerning the amounts of the contributions and the identity of the fourth man, she announced her intention to withdraw from the ADC program. Therefore no further inquiry was made to develop information as to the resources apparently available to her, or as to her employment, evidence of which was also present.

This ADC mother had been receiving assistance payments since December 1960, the latest payments being $109 a month.

Living arrangements not clarified

Appendix VII to this report lists 11 cases where the recipients were considered to be ineligible for financial assistance because the existing living arrangements could not be clarified. In seven of the cases other ineligibility findings also were disclosed. In 13 other cases the living arrangements could not be clarified but the cases have been classified by other ineligibility findings which constituted more significant reasons for considering the recipients to be ineligible for assistance.

The cases included in this category are those where the basic or most significant finding disclosed was the presence in the home of persons whose relationship with the recipients could not be clearly established because of the caretaker-relative's conflicting or misleading statements to the investigators. The term "relationship" as here used includes relationships involving economic as well as personal and legal aspects. In one of the 11 cases the recipient was reinstated for continued assistance after appeal.

Details of cases illustrating situations constituting this type of ineligibility finding follow:

1. An ADC mother who had been receiving assistance payments for herself and one child since December 1960, was occupying the first floor of a dwelling in which the landlord was also living, without any definite separation of the living quarters and with the personal effects of the ADC mother intermingled with those of the landlord. Although the landlord claimed that his common-law wife lived with him, he would not furnish any corroborating information in support of that claim. He stated that he did not know where she worked or when she could be interviewed in the home. The rental receipts exhibited by the ADC mother appeared to be false since the pertinent information shown thereon differed from statements by the ADC mother and from statements by the landlord. The authenticity of the rental receipts could not be verified since the signatures thereon were purported to be those of the landlord's legal wife who has been absent from the home since December 1960. The lease agreement between the landlord and the rental agency dated December 8, 1961, shows that the landlord claimed the occupants of the dwelling to be himself, his wife, and two children, although he has no children of his own living in the home. The assistance payments to this ADC mother amounted to $118 a month at the time they were discontinued.

2. An ADC mother who had been receiving $145 a month on behalf of herself and four children had been receiving assistance since July 1953. Living with her in the home were her four adult children with their children, a living arrangement apparently unknown to the PAD. The adult children appeared to be employable and, to some extent, were employed. Efforts to clarify the living arrangements and to determine the extent to which her adult children were contributing to the support of the household were nullified by the conflicting statements of the ADC mother; her refusal to answer some questions; her differing answers to other questions; and, in some instances, her misrepresentation of facts. Also, it appeared that the mother may be employable since all her minor children were in regular attendance at school.

ADC parent employed

Appendix VII lists three cases in which the ADC mother was determined to be employed full time and to have an adequate child care plan.

Illustrative of these cases is one where the mother of three illegitimate children, whose application for financial assistance was approved in August 1961, had been receiving assistance payments of $119 a month. At the time she applied for assistance, she was considered to be unemployable because she supposedly lacked an adequate child care plan. Although she had indicated on her application that she had been employed, the extent of her employment apparently had not been determined by the social worker. The investigation disclosed that she had been working full time as a domestic for the same employer continuously since 1959, except for 1 month in August 1961, when her youngest child was born. Since her mother, her 18-year-old brother, and her 14-year-old sister lived with her and she had been employed, it was apparent that she was not in lack of an adequate child care plan.

ADC parent employable

Appendix VII lists 29 cases where the ADC mother or, in some cases, the ADC father, who was supposedly incapacitated, was considered to be employable under the criteria set forth in the PAD Manual. In one of these cases the recipient appealed the ineligibility determination and was reinstated after a hearing on the appeal.

The following cases illustrate the findings leading to the conclusion in these cases.

1. A 45-year-old mother had been receiving assistance payments since August 1961 for the benefit of herself and three children. The investigation disclosed that there was no evidence that the mother was incapacitated and therefore unemployable. Also, she apparently had an adequate child care plan since an unmarried daughter who lived with her was unemployed, was not a member of the assistance unit, and who made no contribution to the maintenance of the household, was available to provide child care. At the time her assistance payments were discontinued she was receiving $172 a month.

2. A 37-year-old mother of three children had been receiving assistance payments of $105 a month, although she appeared to be employable under the PAD standards, and had been earning $12.50 a week in part-time employment. She stated to the investigators that she was doing all right on welfare relief and would not return to full-time employment unless she could make big money. She also had been receiving undeterminable amounts from a boy friend with whom she admitted to have been carrying on a conjugal relationship. The boy friend admitted to helping the family by providing food and personal services and a new hi-fi record player. The investigation further disclosed that on applications for credit he has shown the ADC mother to be his wife. Hospital records show that at various times the ADC mother has stated her address to be that of the boy friend. She had been receiving assistance payments since March 1954.

3. An ADC mother of eight children, four of whom were fathered by two men other than her husband, had been receiving assistance payments since July 1960, although she apparently is employable since she had been employed part time and, for short periods, full time. She informed the investigators that it would be foolish for her to work because she would lose the welfare payment and that it would be too hard for her to work outside the home and also do the work in the home. Her latest assistance payments amounted to $255 a month.

This ADC mother, before being approved by the PAD as eligible for ADC assistance, had been receiving assistance from the Volunteers of America. This assistance was discontinued when it became known that she was living with a man other than her husband. The investigation disclosed that she has been employed for varying periods as a telephone operator, PBX operator, waitress, and collector. In the latter employment she earned about $40 a week during December 1961. Her employer stated that if she obtained a driver's license she could be employed full time and become self-supporting. The mother admitted that she had two firm job offers during 1962 which she declined for the reasons stated above.

4. A 26-year-old ADC mother of five children had been receiving assistance payments since March 1960 for herself and three of her children; her other two children are under custody of the Child Welfare Division because of her claim that she is too "weak" to care for five children. She appeared to be physically able to work and admitted that she is. Also, it appeared that the lack of a child care plan should not prevent her from working inasmuch as it had not precluded her from being away from her home for entire nights at which times she either had had her children cared for by a neighbor or had left them unattended. She apparently has undisclosed resources as evidenced by the fact that she lives beyond the means afforded through her assistance payments. She acknowledged that she had relations with a man but contended that such relations were indulged in outside the home with a certain man whom she identified. The investigators, after three home visits and four other visits when they either were not admitted or could not interview the ADC mother because she was absent, and after a surveillance of the home at seven different times to detect arrivals and departures of persons, on being admitted early on a Sunday morning found a man in the ADC mother's bed. The ADC mother represented the man to be her brother but eventually admitted that he was the man she had previously acknowledged as having had relations with. The man was determined to be an employee of the Department of Public Welfare. At the time the assistance payments were discontinued they amounted to $132 a month.

5. A 25-year-old mother of four children, two of whom were fathered by two men other than her husband, had been receiving assistance payments since October 1956, the latest being $181 a month. Upon the investigator's first visit to the home, the mother admitted that she was employable, stated that she did not want investigators coming to her home, and voluntarily signed a statement requesting withdrawal from the ADC assistance program. After she signed the withdrawal statement she said: "Now I can have all the men I want in my home and you men can't do a thing about it."

No eligible child in the home

In appendix VII, four cases are listed where no eligible child was found in the home. Also, in one of the cases it was impossible to clarify the living arrangements.

The following cases illustrate the situations in which this finding was disclosed.

1. An ADC mother with one minor child had been receiving assistance pay since December 1948, the latest payments being $88 a month. However, it was determined that the child was over 16 years of age and was no longer eligible for assistance since she had been officially removed from the rolls of the school she was supposedly attending.

Also living in the ADC mother's home was another daughter and her five children and a man who was the father of the youngest of these children. This daughter had also been receiving ADC assistance payments on behalf of herself and the five children. Although the case was not one of the cases included in the investigation sample, the recipients also were determined by the PAD to be ineligible for assistance on the basis of information disclosed during the investigation.

2. An ADC mother of one child had been receiving assistance payments since September 1953, the latest payments being $118 a month. Since August 1961, the child has been living and attending school in New York.

Refusal to cooperate

Listed in appendix VII (not printed in the Record) are eight cases where the recipients were considered to be ineligible because the ADC mothers refused to cooperate with the investigators in their efforts to determine the facts with respect to the recipients' deprivation of parental support or care or with respect to the need for financial assistance. In six of the eight cases, additional ineligibility findings were present. In five additional cases, a refusal to cooperate was present but the recipients were considered to be ineligible for other reasons deemed to be more significant. Thus, the finding of refusal to cooperate existed in 13 cases.

Illustrative cases are:

1. An ADC mother of three children had been receiving assistance payments since November 1959. During the investigation of her case she submitted a statement in which she indicated her wish to withdraw from the public assistance program because she did not want investigators coming to her home nor want to answer any questions about her business or household arrangements.

Prior to the time she submitted that statement, the investigators had disclosed certain facts which apparently were unknown to the PAD. These facts are:

(a) The mother of the ADC mother was living in the home.

(b) The ADC mother was paying $100 a month rent as opposed to $65 which she formerly had been paying at another address, but was receiving $50 a month from a tenant.

(c) Numerous articles of men's clothing were found in a hall closet opposite the ADC mother's bedroom.

(d) The ADC mother was working 4 days a week as opposed to the 2 days a week she had represented to PAD.

(e) Her "absent" husband lives directly across the street from her home.

The ADC mother failed to give satisfactory explanations concerning the articles of men's clothing found in her home, or the manner of acquiring two TV sets and two refrigerators also found in the home.

The PAD has determined that overpayments of $1,400 have been made and has referred the case to the Office of Investigations and Collections for recovery of the overpayments. At the time the assistance payments were discontinued, they amounted to $108 a month.

2. An ADC mother who had been receiving assistance payments since December 1958 on behalf of herself and two children admitted to investigators that she had been carrying on an affair with a man who she has known for about 20 years and hopes to marry. Despite the frequency of her relationships with this man, which she states occurs about every weekend, she claimed she was unable to provide any information concerning him which would enable investigators to determine the extent of resources available through him. The assistance payments amounted to $142 a month at the time they were discontinued.

Miscellaneous

Listed in appendix VII (not printed in the Record) are six cases which were considered to be ineligible because of findings other than those discussed hereinbefore.

These findings are:

1. A separation of convenience to enable the ADC mother to obtain assistance, rather than a real dissociation of the husband from the family and deprivation of the children of parental support.

2. The presence of coin-operated machines in the home as a source of income, the amount of which could not be ascertained.

3. An employable husband willing to return to the home but not permitted to do so by the ADC mother.

4. The unemployability of ADC mother's husband not established.

5. The failure of a returned husband of an ADC mother to register with the U.S. Employment Service.

Cases closed on the basis of findings disclosed subsequent to the investigation

Attached as appendix VIII (not printed in Record) is a list of eight cases in which the PAD determined that the recipients were ineligible, although the investigation of these cases did not disclose any information indicating ineligibility. However, the records pertaining to seven of these cases show that PAD's determination of ineligibility was based on events occurring subsequent to the investigation and that the determinations were proper under the circumstances involved in each case. The remaining case on this list was determined by PAD to be ineligible on the basis of findings disclosed by the investigation which in our opinion did not conclusively demonstrate ineligibility. However, we are not in a position to say the action was improper since a judgment factor was involved.

POLICE RECORDS OF ADULTS INVOLVED IN CASES INVESTIGATED

Incident to the investigation of the eligibility of recipients of financial assistance under the ADC program, we requested the Metropolitan Police Department, District of Columbia government, to conduct a name file search of the police records to ascertain the police record, if any, of the adult persons involved in 130 of the cases determined by the PAD to be ineligible. The information on four cases was not requested through inadvertence.

Following is a summary of the results of this record search, classifying the males involved into two categories: one, those men whose names appeared on case records as the husbands of the ADC mothers and the other, those men otherwise identified with the cases:

ADC mothers:	
Has an arrest record	31
Has no arrest record	99
No record check made through inadvertence	4
Total	134
Males:	
Husbands of ADC mothers:	
Has an arrest record	42
Has no arrest record	11
Total	53
Other than husbands of ADC mothers:	
Has an arrest record	40
Has no arrest record	18
Information insufficient to obtain record	7
Total	65
Total	118

The records furnished by the Metropolitan Police Department show that, of the 31 mothers who have police records, 21 had been arrested once, 8 had been arrested twice, 1 had been arrested 3 times, and 1 had been arrested 6 times. The charges included having an unleashed dog, drunkenness, disorderliness, stealing Government checks, and assault with a deadly weapon.

The records showed that 42 of the ADC mothers' husbands had been arrested a total of 358 times. Of the 42 men, 14 had a single arrest, 1 had 2 arrests, 3 had 3 arrests, 2 had 4 arrests, and 22 had 5 or more arrests with 3 of this group each having from 31 to 41 arrests. The records for the 40 other males involved in the cases showed a total of 247 arrests. Of these 40 men, 7 had a single arrest, 4 had 2 arrests, 2 had 3 arrests, 4 had 4 arrests, and 23 had 5 or more arrests with 1 of this group having 29 arrests. The charges in the cases of both groups of men included drunkenness, disorderliness, housebreaking, robbery, grand larceny, assault with a deadly weapon, manslaughter, and homicide.

PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN IN JUNIOR VILLAGE RESULTING FROM CASES CLOSED SUBSEQUENT TO INVESTIGATION

At our request the DPW made a check of the child welfare division (CWD) files to determine the number of children that had been placed in Junior Village because of the discontinuance of financial assistance as a result of the ineligibility determinations.

The Director, DPW, informed us by letter dated June 13, 1962, that, while the CWD had given attention to the children in 28 of the cases investigated, in only 4 of the cases had any children been placed in Junior Village as a result of the investigation. He stated that, in the other 24 cases, some children had been committed to the DPW as delinquents and had been placed by the CWD in Junior Village, private institutions, or foster homes but that such actions were not attributable to the investigation. The data submitted with the Director's letter showed that as of June 1, 1962, 16 children were involved in the four cases, that in two of the cases involving 5 children a question exists as to whether the family is actually destitute, and that further investigation by the Office of Investigations and Collections is warranted. Data pertaining to the four cases, as reported to us by the Director, is itemized below:

Case 1 from CWD records

Case opened on May 16, 1962, as the family was destitute. Woman's Bureau placed two of the children in Junior Village on May 15, 1962, and CWD placed the other child in Junior Village on May 16, 1962. All three children remain there.

Case 2 from CWD records

Case opened on May 10, 1962, by request of the mother who was referred by the Woman's Bureau because the mother was homeless. Two children were placed in Junior Village on May 16, 1962. All three there.

Case 3 from PAD records

Three children were placed in Junior Village on May 1, 1962, as homeless. Referral was made by the Women's Bureau. All these children remain there.

Case 4 from CWD records

Case opened on March 15, 1962, by request of the mother who was referred by the PAD. Six children were placed in Junior Village on March 16, 1962. Two children were placed in Junior Village on March 19, 1962. All eight children remain there.

In case 1 above the recipients were considered ineligible because the ADC mother was found to have been employed for the past 3 years. She was initially determined as qualified for assistance for the reason that she lacked a child care plan, notwithstanding the fact that she had worked for the same employer since 1959. Apparently this employment record was concealed from the social worker, as was the whereabouts of the father of her two youngest children.

In case 2 above the ADC mother was considered to be ineligible because she was continuing a relationship with the father of her children. It was determined that he was unemployed. Although she had received a surplus food certificate, she had not picked up any surplus food since December 1961.

In case 3 above the ADC mother was determined to be living with a man in relationship similar to that of husband and wife. The man was unemployed and evidence was that he did not contribute to the household upkeep. The mother was 3 months in arrears in her rent and said she had no intention of paying it, althought she first displayed what proved to be spurious rent receipts. The children were placed in Junior Village after the mother had been arrested for fighting in the street. They had been found unattended in the home on two different occasions by investigators.

In case 4 above the recipients were considered ineligible because the absence of the father of five of the children was one of convenience and not a clear dissociation from the family. This man is being sought by the police as a suspect in a holdup, having been identified by the victim. This fact may account for his absence since he was determined to have been in the home a few days before the initial visit by investigators.

EVIDENCE OF BAD FAITH ON PART OF ADC MOTHERS

The investigation definitely disclosed that reliance cannot be placed on the ADC mothers to reveal the actual conditions or circumstances which have a bearing on the recipients' eligibility for financial assistance. A specific review was made of 85 of the cases closed by the PAD subsequent to the investigation to determine the number of instances in those cases where the mothers had misrepresented facts or attempted to conceal existing conditions or situations. The review disclosed (1) 11 cases where a man was found hiding in the ADC mother's house—in the bedroom, sometimes under the bed; in a closet; or in the bathroom—or attempting to flee by the back door to evade questioning by investigators and (2) 8 cases of gross misrepresentation of information vital to determining the recipients' eligibility. Illustrative of the type of misrepresentation in these cases are: four cases where the ADC mother falsely identified the man found in the house as a relative or gave information concerning the man which further investigation proved to be false, and four cases where the ADC mother supplied rent receipts or other documents which proved to contain false information. In several of the latter cases there appeared to be collusion on the part of others to assist the ADC mother in her attempts to misrepresent her actual living conditions or circumstances.

We believe that the foregoing instances evidence that ADC mothers are obtaining and attempting to continue to obtain financial assistance for recipients when they are aware that disclosure of actual living conditions or circumstances to the PAD would reveal that they are not entitled to receive further financial assistance.

USE BY PAD OF CODE REASONS FOR CLOSING CASES

We have reviewed the "code reasons for closing cases" which have been assigned by the PAD to the 127 cases closed as of June 25, 1962, on the basis of ineligibility findings disclosed by the investigation. In our opinion the stated code reasons do not always reflect the actual reasons for terminating assistance and distort any statistical data which is based thereon.

Section 624.500 of the PAD Manual provides that the "classification of reasons for closing cases should reflect events that lead to ineligibility with respect to need and the resulting discontinuance of assistance" and states that the codes used are "in conformity with the classification" issued by the Social Security Administration. These reasons classify cases into major groups as follows:

1. Those closed because of death.
2. Those no longer eligible with respect to need.
3. Those no longer meeting eligibility requirements other than need.
4. Those transferred to other assistance programs.
5. Those closed for other reasons.

Code No. 00 is to be assigned to cases closed because of death, 01 to 54 to cases no longer eligible with respect to need, 71 to 79 to cases no longer meeting eligibility requirements other than need, and 90 to 94 to cases transferred to other welfare programs. Code Nos. 54, 79, and 94 are assigned to the general classification of "other" within the second, third, and fourth major groups. Where more than one reason exists for closing a case, the primary code reason is to be assigned.

Our review disclosed that, in 75 of the 127 cases closed, the assigned code reasons for closing the cases were not compatible with what we considered to be the primary reasons for ineligibility. For example, code 79 is required to be used when a case is closed because an eligibility requirement other than need, which is not specifically listed in codes 71–78, is no longer met. The PAD classified 62 of the 127 cases under code 79, whereas, in our opinion, only 23 should have been so classified. A more meaningful classification in the remaining 39 cases would have been as follows:

Code:	*Number of cases*
04: ADC mother employed	1
11: Return of absent employed father	10
74: Return of absent employable father	7
73: Parent no longer incapacitated	9
72: Refusal to comply with eligibility requirements	3
94: Unable to determine resources—extent of need undeterminable	9
Total	39

On the other hand, five cases classified under other codes, in our opinion, should have been classified under code 79.

Another example of this situation relates to nine cases which PAD classified under code 90 (voluntary withdrawal when reason for such withdrawal is not known) whereas a more meaningful classification would have placed them in code classifications as follows:

Code:	*Number of cases*
11: Return of absent employed father	1
74: Return of absent employable father	1
73: Parent no longer incapacitated	1
72: Refusal to comply with eligibility requirements	1
79: No continued absence established	2
94: Other—unable to determine resources—extent of need undeterminable	3

It is significant to note that no code reason is prescribed for those cases closed because a recipient was improperly receiving aid. The code reasons provided imply that the changed circumstances in the recipients' situations arose at a time coincident with the closing of the case. We believe that a code reason should be provided for use in those cases that are closed because the recipient had been improperly receiving assistance. In this way, the cases closed because of improper receipt of assistance could be distinguished from those closed because of changes in recipients' conditions or circumstances.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a September 1962 special report to the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, by the Comptroller General of the United States.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL REPORT TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, U.S. SENATE

INVESTIGATION OF SELECTED CASES UNDER THE GENERAL PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT, AUGUST 1962

(By the Comptroller General of the United States, September 1962)

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, September 6, 1962.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
Chairman, Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Herewith is our report on the investigation of selected cases under the general public assistance (GPA) program, administered by the Public Assistance Division (PAD), Department of Public Welfare, District of Columbia government, August 1962. We participated in the investigation pursuant to your request of May 3, 1962.

The investigation of 68 GPA cases disclosed that, on the basis of the eligibility requirements and need standards prescribed by the Board of Commissioners, the recipients in 53, or 78 percent, of the cases were ineligible for financial assistance under the GPA program, but that in 13 of the 53 cases the recipients were eligible for assistance under the aid to the permanently and totally disabled program.

The results of the investigation lead to the conclusions (1) that the PAD had not taken the required actions necessary to determine whether or not recipients of financial assistance are eligible for continued assistance under the GPA program or are eligible for assistance under another public welfare program, (2) that reliance cannot be placed on recipients to inform the PAD of actual conditions or circumstances which have a bearing on their eligibility for financial assistance, and (3) the GPA cases not covered in the current investigation should be investigated to determine whether or not the recipients are eligible for the financial assistance they are receiving under the GPA program or are eligible for financial assistance under another public welfare program.

We believe, as stated in our earlier report to you on the investigation of selected cases under the aid to dependent children program, that there is a definite need for instituting a continuing field investigation program to determine the eligibility of the recipients of financial assistance under the GPA program for such assistance and the effectiveness of the PAD's administration of the program.

Sincerely yours,
JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

SPECIAL REPORT ON INVESTIGATION OF SELECTED CASES UNDER THE GENERAL PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT, AUGUST 1962

The General Accounting Office has participated with the Department of Public Welfare (DPW), District of Columbia government, in an investigation of selected cases administered by its Public Assistance Division (PAD) under the general public assistance (GPA) program to determine the facts having a bearing on the eligibility of the recipients for assistance under the eligibility factors and need standards, as prescribed by the Board of Commissioners, and to establish whether, on the basis of the facts, the recipients are eligible for such assistance. The General Accounting Office participated in the factfinding phase of the investigation pursuant to the request on May 3, 1962, of the chairman, Subcommittee on District of Columbia, Senate Committee on Appropriations.

The purpose of the general public assistance program, as indicated in departmental regulations and the PAD Manual, is to provide assistance to needy persons who are unemployable, but who are not eligible for assistance under a program in which the Federal Government participates financially, and to help them, as far as possible, to become self-supporting. The program is conducted under authority contained in appropriation acts for the District of Columbia which provide for the relief and rehabilitation of indigent residents.

The PAD Manual provides that an unemployable person to be eligible for assistance (1) must be between the ages of 16 and 65, (2) must have been a resident of the District of Columbia for at least 1 year, and (3) must lack income or other resources sufficient to meet his subsistence requirements determined on the basis of budget standards prescribed by the Board of Commissioners. The manual defines an unemployable person as one who has a physical or mental disability which precludes him from working full time, that is, 40 hours a week, in competitive employment. The manual specifically provides that assistance shall be denied to a person who is eligible for benefits under a program but who does not apply for such benefits or who refuses recommended treatment (other than surgery) or rehabilitation services which may aid him in regaining or increasing his earning capacity. The manual contains detailed procedures, criteria, and instructions for determining the eligibility of a person for public assistance and the amount of the assistance.

The Department of Public Welfare investigation of the GPA cases in which we participated was undertaken pursuant to a request of the Senate Committee on Appropriations in its report on H.R. 8072,[1] a bill to provide appropriations for the District of Columbia for 1962. That request pertained also to an investigation of aid to dependent children (ADC) cases in which we participated and submitted a report (B-25435) on July 26, 1962, to the chairman, Subcommittees on the District of Columbia, Senate and House Committees on Appropriations, pursuant to a request on March 6, 1962. The planning, direction, and conduct of the investigation of the GPA cases were carried out generally along the same lines as those set forth in the aforementioned report on the investigation of the ADC cases.

INVESTIGATIVE FINDINGS AND ACTIONS TAKEN

The PAD Office of Research and Statistics selected for investigation—on a random sampling basis—80 cases from the March 1962 GPA welfare rolls exclusive of cases involving incompetents, persons in foster or nursing homes, and Cuban refugees, which cases were specifically exempted from the scope of the requested investigation. Of these cases, nine had been closed prior to the commencement in June 1962 of the investigation and three cases were not investigated—two cases because the recipients were incompetent and one case because the recipient lived outside the District of Columbia. Therefore, the investigation actually pertained to 68 cases—approximately 5 percent of the GPA caseload exclusive of cases exempted from the scope of the investigation.

By August 21, 1962, the PAD had informed us that their eligibility determinations, based on the investigative findings and certain events occurring subsequent to the investigation, had resulted in the following actions with respect to the 68 cases investigated:

	Number of cases	Percent of total cases
Financial payments continued under the GPA program but adjustments considered necessary:		
Adjustments in payments based on existing need	6	----------
Miscellaneous administrative adjustments	7	----------
Total	13	19
Financial payments discontinued under the GPA program:		
Ineligible for public assistance	40	----------
Eligible for public assistance but under the aid to the permanently and totally disabled program	13	----------
Total	53	78
Financial payments suspended under the GPA program pending:		
Submission of medical information	1	----------
Definite determination of resources	1	----------
Total	2	3
Grand total	68	100

---

[1] S. Rept. 993, 87th Cong.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS CONTINUED UNDER THE GPA PROGRAM

The investigation disclosed information which resulted in the PAD's determining that the recipients in 13, or 19 percent, of the 68 cases investigated are eligible for continued financial assistance. However, adjustments in the amount of the assistance payments were necessary in six cases and some administrative action was required in seven cases to bring them into conformity with the PAD Manual requirements.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS DISCONTINUED UNDER THE GPA PROGRAM

The PAD determined that in 53 cases the recipients were ineligible for financial assistance under the GPA program—in 51 cases on the basis of investigative findings and in two cases on the basis of events occurring subsequent to the investigation, but that in 13 of the 53 cases the receipients were eligible for assistance under the aid to the permanently and totally disabled (APTD) program. The investigation disclosed that these 13 cases either had not been referred to the medical review team (MRT) for a determination of eligibility under the APTD program or had not been transferred to the APTD program upon the MRT's determination of eligibility under that program.

The 38 cases in which the recipients were determined by the PAD to be ineligible for financial assistance under the GPA program on the basis of the investigative findings are classified in the following table according to the investigative finding which, in our opinion, had the most significant bearing on the recipient's eligibility.

Recipients	*Number of cases*
Employed	12
Employable	6
Resources undeterminable and/or unreported	12
In District hospitals	3
Failure to cooperate	4
Failure to meet resident requirement	1
Total	38

RECIPIENTS EMPLOYED

The investigation disclosed that the recipients of financial assistance in 12 cases were employed—in 5 cases full time and in 7 cases part time. The earnings of two recipients who were employed part time were equal to, or in excess of, their subsistence requirements computed on the basis of the prescribed standards. The earnings of the other five recipients who were employed part time could not be determined.

The PAD Manual, in section 352.321, provides that a recipient who is able to work part time and who is engaged in an occupation where it is not possible to obtain accurate, reliable information concerning the amount of his earnings shall be ineligible for assistance. The Manual, in section 350.000, provides also that a recipient who refuses to, or does not, clarify the extent of his earnings shall be ineligible for assistance.

The PAD determined, on the basis of the investigative findings, that the 12 recipients were ineligible for continued financial assistance—in 5 cases because the recipients were employed full time, in 2 cases where the recipients were employed part time because there was no need for assistance, and in 5 cases where the recipients were employed part time because the need for assistance could not be established.

RECIPIENTS EMPLOYABLE

The investigation disclosed five cases where the recipients were receiving financial assistance and one case where the financial assistance payments to the recipient had been temporarily suspended although the case files contained no evidence that their eligibility for such assistance had been reestablished as required by the PAD Manual. The Manual, in section 245.130, requires that the eligibility of a recipient for financial assistance under the GPA program must be reestablished periodically on the basis of a medical determination of unemployability.

The PAD subsequently obtained current medical reports for the six recipients and on the basis of an evaluation of the reports determined that they were employable and no longer eligible for financial assistance. The payments were thereupon discontinued.

RECIPIENTS' RESOURCES UNDETERMINABLE AND/OR UNREPORTED

The investigation disclosed evidence in 12 cases where the recipients had available resources that had not been reported to the PAD. Also, the extent of such resources could not be determined. The recipients in two cases had obtained part-time employment in performing odd jobs, in two cases either were receiving or were eligible to receive statutory benefits equal to the amount of their assistance payments, and in the remaining eight cases either were living on a scale beyond that possible under the financial assistance being provided, were obtaining assistance from relatives or friends, or had other resources.

In each of these cases, the recipients were either unwilling or unable to clarify their resources. Therefore it was impossible to definitely establish that a need for financial assistance existed. The PAD Manual, in section 350.000, specifically provides that in such situations assistance shall be denied to recipients.

RECIPIENTS IN DISTRICT HOSPITALS

The investigation disclosed three cases that had not been closed although the recipients had been admitted to a public institution for an indefinite or indeterminate period—two to the Glenn Dale Hospital and one to the District of Columbia General Hospital.

RECIPIENTS' FAILURE TO COOPERATE

The investigation disclosed four cases where the facts clearly showed that the recipients were ineligible for continued financial assistance under the GPA program because they had not kept the PAD informed of their whereabouts and/or refused to accept rehabilitation services. A synopsis of these four cases follows:

1. The investigation disclosed that since December 1961 the recipient had not lived at the address of record in the case file to which the monthly assistance payment checks had been mailed up to May 1962 when payments were suspended pending a redetermination of eligibility for continued assistance. As a result of the investigative finding, the PAD discontinued assistance on the basis of "loss of contact." Since December 1960, the date of the last PAD approval of the recipient's eligibility for financial assistance, the recipient had been arrested 12 times for drunkenness, disorderly conduct, or other charges, the latest arrest for drunkenness, which occurred during the period of the investigation, resulting in his being sentenced to the Occoquan Workhouse for 30 days.

2. The investigation resulted in locating the recipient's husband and in the recommendation to the PAD that he be contacted with regard to supporting his wife. The investigation disclosed also certain questionable circumstances surrounding the recipient's relationship with another man. The PAD attempted to follow up on these investigative leads but was unable to establish contact with the recipient either at her home or, as requested, at the PAD office. The PAD therefore closed the case on the basis that a determination of continued need could not be established.

3. The investigation disclosed that the recipient did not live at the address of record in the case file and that he had been employed under a different name for a 2-week period at a rate of $45 a week but had quit the job because of the low rate of pay. Subsequently he was arrested for attempting to set the house in which he lived on fire and sentenced to confinement in the District of Columbia jail for 90 days. The PAD closed the case on the basis that the recipient had refused reasonable employment.

4. The recipient in this case was a known alcoholic, and the assistance payments were made to a vendor payee on his behalf. The vendor payee improperly retained and cashed assistance checks while the recipient was confined in jail for drunkenness. The designation of the vendor payee as a responsible person to act for the recipient is questionable since, aside from his improper retention and cashing of assistance payment checks, he has been arrested twice for keeping and selling liquor. The recipient has a record of 184 arrests—136 arrests for drunkenness including 4 arrests since August 1961 when he was determined by the PAD to be eligible for financial assistance. The medical review team had determined that the recipient is employable on a full-time basis in a job where he would be potentially dangerous neither to himself nor to others. However, the PAD had not referred the recipient either to the U.S. Employment Service for possible employment or to the District Department of Vocational Rehabilitation for rehabilitative services. He refused to accept a referral to the Municipal Lodging House for a "drying out" period. The PAD closed the case on July 31, 1962, on the basis that the whereabouts of the recipient was unknown since his release from jail on July 23, 1962.

RECIPIENT'S FAILURE TO MEET RESIDENCE REQUIREMENT

The investigation disclosed one case where the recipient of financial assistance under the GPA program was not eligible for such assistance at the time he applied for the assistance because he had not lived in the District for 1 year immediately preceding his application for assistance, an eligibility requirement prescribed in section 231.135 of the PAD Manual. The Investigative Unit immediately notified the PAD that the recipient had not met the residence requirement. However, the PAD reinstated financial payments to the recipient for an adjustment period of 1 month following his discharge from the hospital on June 22, 1962, as employable, solely on the basis of the recipient's statement that he had been out of the District for only 2 or 3 weeks during the year preceding his application for assistance. The investigative unit did not concur with this action and furnished the PAD with additional proof that the recipient had been employed in Norfolk, Va., during the year in which he had claimed to have resided in the District. Thereupon, the PAD determined that the entire amount of financial assistance that had been provided to the recipient during the period from January 1962, when he was initially determined to have been eligible for assistance, through July 1962, when the assistance payments were discontinued, should be recovered on the basis that the assistance had been fraudulently obtained.

DELAYS IN TAKING REQUIRED ACTIONS

The investigation disclosed that the PAD had not required some recipients under the GPA program to submit medical reports and had not referred the cases to the medical review team for determination of the recipients' unemployability or for consideration of their eligibility for financial assistance under the aid to the permanently and totally disabled program as required by the PAD Manual.

The manual states, in section 245.130, that: "General public assistance is considered primarily as assistance to individuals whose unemployability will be of short duration. When, in making redeterminations of continuing eligibility, the worker has received two or more medical reports indicating that unemployability still exists, and assistance has been continued for as long as 6 months, the case must be referred to the review team for recommendations and/or consideration of eligibility for APTD."

In section 244.135, that: "The worker is responsible for setting his controls in such a way that he will be reminded of the case in time to obtain a new medical report and to prepare a revised social information report in time for whatever review date the team had set for the next team evaluation of the case."

In section 244.134, that: "The social worker is responsible for seeing that all recommendations of the review team are carried out promptly, i.e., within 30 days after the action was recommended."

The 53 cases where financial assistance payments were discontinued under the GPA program, as a result of the investigation, include: 13 cases that had not been referred to the MRT, after the recipients had received assistance for 6 months, for periods from 2 to 20 months beyond the required referral dates; 9 cases that had not been resubmitted to the MRT for periods ranging from 1 to 19 months beyond the specified resubmission dates; 7 cases where action recommended by MRT had not been taken for periods ranging from 2 to 5 months.

Of these 29 cases, the PAD determined (1) on the basis of investigative findings, that the recipients in 15 cases were ineligible for any financial assistance, (2) on the basis of referrals that were made to MRT following notification by the investigative unit, that the recipients in 13 cases were not eligible for assistance under the GPA program but were eligible for assistance under the APTD program, and (3) on the basis of events occurring subsequent to the investigation, that the recipient in 1 case was not eligible for assistance. The referral of GPA cases to MRT within the prescribed time requirements and the prompt taking of the recommended action would have undoubtedly resulted in an earlier transfer of the 13 cases to the APTD program and an earlier discontinuance of payments in the 7 cases where the recipients were determined to be employable. The ineligibility of the recipients for assistance in the remaining 8 cases was ascertainable only by field investigation.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of the investigation of the 68 GPA cases lead to conclusions similar to those set forth in our report on investigation of selected cases under the ADC program, referred to on page 3 of this report; namely, (1) that the PAD had not taken the required actions necessary to determine whether or not recipients of financial assistance are eligible for continued assistance under the GPA program or are eligible for assistance under another public welfare program, (2) that reliance cannot be placed on recipients to inform the PAD of actual conditions or circumstances which have a bearing on their eligibility for financial assistance, and (3) the GPA cases not covered in the current investigation should be investigated to determine whether or not the recipients are eligible for the financial assistance they are receiving under the GPA program or are eligible for financial assistance under another public welfare program.

We believe, as stated in the aforementioned report, that there is a definite need for instituting a continuing field investigation program with the objective of investigating GPA cases for the purpose of determining the eligibility of the recipients for financial assistance and the effectiveness of the PAD's administration of the GPA program.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the ADC monthly caseload trend for the fiscal years 1960 through 1963 and extending through the first 4 months of fiscal year 1964.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADC MONTHLY CASELOAD TREND

Monthly caseload trend, ADC, fiscal years 1960–62

1959 (fiscal year 1960):	
July	3,860
August	3,874
September	3,884
October	3,955
November	3,992
December	4,091
January	4,158
February	4,288
March	4,406
April	4,433
May	4,501
June	4,578
1960 (fiscal year 1961):	
July	4,650
August	4,762
September	4,809
October	4,884
November	4,955
December	5,003
January	5,078
February	5,166
March	5,285
April	5,323
May	5,431
June	5,481
1961 (fiscal year 1962):	
July	5,530
August	5,597
September	5,601
October	5,607
November [1]	5,628
December	5,611
January	5,553
February	5,471
March [2]	5,392
April	5,251
May [3]	5,111
June	4,976
1962 (fiscal year 1963):	
July	4,849
August	4,757
September	4,615
October	4,491
November	4,396
December	4,353
January	4,262
February	4,184
March	4,189
April	4,157
May	4,155
June	4,062
1963 (fiscal year 1964):	
July	4,063
August	3,949
September	3,857
October	3,823

[1] Special investigation ADC began Nov. 13, 1961.

[2] General Accounting Office entered ADC investigation Mar. 14, 1962.

[3] ADC investigation completed May 1, 1962.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a summary of the families receiving AFDC assistance for specified periods of time, as of June 1963.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LISTING OF FAMILIES RECEIVING AFDC IN JUNE 1963, BY LENGTH OF TIME RECEIVING ASSISTANCE CONTINUOUSLY

Summary of AFDC families receiving assistance for specified periods of time, as of June 1963

Length of time receiving assistance	Number of cases	Amount received			Number of persons in assistance unit			
		Total	Federal	Local	Total persons	Adults	Children	
							Total	Illegitimate
Total	3,998	$609,438	$422,310.50	$187,127.50	18,783	3,887	14,896	6,181
Less than 1 year	716	99,806	71,219.50	28,586.50	3,284	738	2,546	844
1 year, less than 2	632	93,098	65.026.50	28,071.50	2,942	620	2,322	942
2 years, less than 3	667	103,901	71,986.50	31,914.50	3,217	664	2,553	1,121
3 years, less than 4	541	86,011	59,460.50	26,550.50	2,638	523	2,115	880
4 years, less than 5	417	65,039	45,107.00	19,932.00	2,009	393	1,616	704
5 years, less than 6	353	57.344	38,955.50	18,388.50	1,706	320	1,386	609
6 years, less than 7	207	34,665	23,626.50	11,038.50	1,029	203	826	379
7 years, less than 8	111	16,509	11,150.00	5,359.00	476	98	378	139
8 years, less than 9	79	12,097	7,998.00	4,099.00	329	74	255	114
9 years, less than 10	68	10,840	7,342.00	3,498.00	309	66	243	102
10 years, less than 11	55	7,868	5,482.50	2,385.50	238	54	184	82
11 years, less than 12	20	2,750	1,879.50	870.50	81	18	63	22
12 years, less than 13	22	3,255	2,251.50	1,003.50	90	20	70	42
13 years, less than 14	20	2,925	1,861.50	1,063.50	72	17	55	35
14 years, less than 15	33	5,177	3,421.50	1,755.50	136	28	108	50
15 years, less than 16	20	2,485	1,736.50	748.50	73	16	57	33
16 years, less than 17	15	2,420	1,641.50	778.50	68	14	54	41
17 years, less than 18	11	1,517	1,068.00	449.00	45	10	35	20
18 years, less than 19	7	1,140	718.50	421.50	27	7	20	15
19 years, less than 20	1	140	102.50	37.50	5	1	4	4
20 years, less than 21	1	208	131.50	76.50	5	1	4	1
21 years, less than 22	2	243	143.50	99.50	4	2	2	2

Receiving assistance less than 1 year

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit: Total persons	Adults	Children: Total	Children: Illegitimate
$154	$99.00	$55.00	4	1	3	2
$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2
$142	123.00	19.00	6	1	5	5
$95	82.00	13.00	4	1	3	3
$132	88.00	44.00	4	1	3	3
$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	0
$105	82.00	23.00	4	1	3	2
$252	170.00	82.00	8	2	6	6
$125	79.00	46.00	3	1	2	2
$134	123.00	11.00	6	1	5	4
$224	205.00	19.00	10	2	8	0
$99	60.50	38.50	2	0	2	2
$165	110.00	55.00	5	1	4	1
$146	102.50	43.50	5	1	4	1
$263	184.50	78.50	9	1	8	2
$100	61.00	39.00	2	1	1	0
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
$143	93.50	49.50	4	1	3	3
$127	123.00	4.00	6	1	5	0
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	1
$164	109.50	54.50	5	1	4	0
$91	62.00	29.00	3	1	2	2
$110	71.50	38.50	3	1	2	2
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
$18	18.00	0	3	1	2	2
$161	143.50	17.50	7	1	6	6
$132	82.50	49.50	3	1	2	2
$211	138.50	72.50	6	1	5	0
$86	86.00	0	5	1	4	1
$174	143.50	30.50	7	1	6	1
$112	102.50	9.50	5	1	4	4
$79	79.00	0	4	1	3	3
$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	0
$130	81.50	48.50	3	1	2	1
$82	82.00	0	4	1	3	0
$128	86.00	42.00	4	2	2	0
$138	102.50	35.50	5	1	4	4
$152	103.50	48.50	5	1	4	2
$123	78.00	45.00	3	1	2	0
$127	85.50	41.50	4	1	3	3
$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	0
$53	32.00	21.00	1	0	1	1
$90	56.00	34.00	2	1	1	1
$73	61.50	11.50	3	1	2	0
$105	69.00	36.00	3	1	2	0
$246	167.00	79.00	8	2	6	1
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	1
$149	102.50	46.50	5	1	4	4
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	0
$115	115.00	0	6	1	5	5
$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	0
$155	99.50	55.50	4	1	3	3
$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	0
$70	70.00	0	4	2	2	0
$187	184.50	2.50	9	1	8	0
$110	110.00	0	9	1	8	0
$105	68.00	37.00	3	1	2	2
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	0
$27	27.00	0	4	1	3	1
$59	35.00	24.00	1	0	1	0
$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	1
$139	139.00	0	9	1	8	1
$214	214.00	0	1	1	12	1
$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	0
$109	109.00	0	6	1	5	1
$78	78.00	0	6	1	5	0
$111	102.50	8.50	5	1	4	4
$115	74.00	41.00	3	1	2	0
$117	102.50	14.50	5	1	4	1
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
$174	123.00	51.00	6	1	5	0
$149	143.50	5.50	7	1	6	6
$148	90.50	57.50	3	2	1	0
$57	41.00	16.00	2	1	1	1
$67	61.50	5.50	3	0	3	2
$97	82.00	15.00	4	0	4	0
$223	150.00	73.00	7	1	6	1
$67	67.00	0	5	1	4	4
$173	108.50	64.50	4	2	2	2
$142	93.00	49.00	4	1	3	0
$150	97.00	53.00	4	1	3	1
$222	149.50	72.50	7	1	6	2
$150	97.00	53.00	4	1	3	3
$103	103.00	0	7	1	6	0
$138	138.00	0	7	1	6	6
$77	77.00	0	4	1	3	0
$186	126.00	60.00	6	2	4	0
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	1
$241	159.00	82.00	7	1	6	0
$52	52.00	0	5	1	4	1
$141	92.50	48.50	4	1	3	3
$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	1
$226	146.00	80.00	6	1	4	0
$116	74.50	41.50	3	1	2	0
$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	3
$15	15.00	0	2	1	1	1

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit: Total persons	Adults	Children: Total	Children: Illegitimate
$134	$83.50	$50.50	3	1	2	0
$87	54.50	32.50	2	1	1	1
$77	77.00	0	4	1	3	0
$66	61.50	4.50	3	1	2	2
$126	85.00	41.00	4	1	3	1
$125	123.00	2.00	6	1	5	0
$52	41.00	11.00	2	1	1	1
$84	82.00	2.00	4	0	4	0
$53	32.00	21.00	1	0	1	0
$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	2
$192	143.50	48.50	7	1	6	0
$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2
$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	0
$64	43.00	21.00	2	0	2	0
$214	164.00	50.00	8	1	7	3
$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	0
$142	93.00	49.00	4	1	3	3
$239	158.00	81.00	7	1	6	0
$253	170.50	82.50	8	1	7	0
$54	32.50	21.50	1	0	1	0
$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	3
$282	157.50	124.50	3	1	2	1
$241	164.50	76.50	8	1	7	7
$170	123.00	47.00	6	2	4	0
$163	109.00	54.00	5	1	4	4
$71	41.00	30.00	1	0	1	0
$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	1
$86	54.00	32.00	2	1	1	1
$158	106.50	51.50	5	1	4	0
$197	115.00	82.00	3	1	2	0
$115	82.00	33.00	4	1	3	3
$99	99.00	0	5	2	3	0
$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	0
$142	93.00	49.00	4	1	3	0
$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1
$143	93.50	49.50	4	1	3	3
$72	41.50	30.50	1	0	1	1
$131	82.00	49.00	3	1	2	2
$116	116.00	0	6	1	5	0
$157	123.00	34.00	6	2	4	4
$78	61.50	16.50	3	1	2	0
$155	105.00	50.00	5	1	4	0
$106	64.00	42.00	2	1	1	1
$113	73.00	40.00	3	1	2	2
$104	104.00	0	7	1	6	6
$175	123.00	52.00	6	2	4	0
$140	92.00	48.00	4	1	3	0
$171	107.50	63.50	4	1	3	0
$66	44.00	22.00	2	1	1	0
$126	102.50	23.50	5	1	4	1
$280	189.50	90.50	9	2	7	0
$179	117.00	62.00	5	1	4	4
$98	65.50	32.50	3	1	2	0
$183	119.00	64.00	5	2	3	0
$184	143.50	40.50	7	2	5	0
$214	145.50	68.50	7	1	6	0
$87	87.00	0	7	1	6	0
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
$75	61.50	13.50	3	2	1	0
$184	119.50	64.50	5	2	3	0
$16	16.00	0	4	2	2	0
$147	90.00	57.00	3	2	1	1
$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	0
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	0
$195	125.00	70.00	5	2	3	0
$58	41.00	17.00	2	0	2	2
$120	76.50	43.50	3	1	2	0
$109	71.00	38.00	3	1	2	2
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	0
$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	0
$234	164.00	70.00	8	1	7	0
$107	82.00	25.00	4	1	3	2
$94	63.50	30.50	3	2	1	0
$109	65.50	43.50	2	1	1	1
$179	111.50	67.50	4	2	2	0
$46	46.00	0	6	2	4	4
$157	100.50	56.50	4	1	3	0
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	1
$92	57.00	35.00	2	1	1	0
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
$147	95.50	51.50	4	1	3	3
$111	82.00	29.00	4	1	3	0
$143	102.50	40.50	5	1	4	0
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	0
$73	61.50	11.50	3	1	2	0
$66	61.50	4.50	3	0	3	3
$48	29.50	18.50	1	0	1	1
$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	0
$178	123.00	55.00	6	1	5	4
$254	171.00	83.00	8	0	8	3
$80	51.00	29.00	2	0	2	0
$82	82.00	0	4	1	3	1
$141	87.00	54.00	3	2	1	0
$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	0
$141	87.00	54.00	3	2	1	0
$83	61.50	21.50	3	1	2	0
$54	32.50	21.50	1	0	1	1

Receiving assistance less than 1 year—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate
$107	$64.50	$42.50	2	1	1	1
$81	61.50	19.50	3	1	2	2
$92	57.00	35.00	2	1	1	1
$173	123.00	50.00	6	2	4	0
$240	158.50	81.50	7	2	5	0
$120	76.50	43.50	3	1	2	0
$66	61.50	4.50	3	1	2	0
$45	41.00	4.00	2	1	1	1
$297	205.00	92.00	10	1	9	0
$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	3
$41	41.00	0	6	1	5	0
$154	93.50	60.50	3	2	1	0
$154	104.50	49.50	5	1	4	0
$247	167.50	79.50	8	1	7	0
$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	0
$88	55.00	33.00	2	1	1	1
$200	143.50	56.50	7	2	5	0
$113	73.00	40.00	3	1	2	0
$98	65.50	32.50	3	1	2	1
$91	91.00	0	6	1	5	0
$63	42.00	21.00	2	0	2	2
$91	91.00	0	5	1	4	0
$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	5
$52	52.00	0	4	1	3	0
$52	52.00	0	4	1	3	0
$241	164.50	76.50	8	2	6	0
$151	97.50	53.50	4	1	3	1
$34	34.00	0	2	1	1	1
$78	78.00	0	6	2	4	1
$32	32.00	0	4	1	3	2
$77	61.50	15.50	3	1	2	1
$69	40.00	29.00	1	0	1	1
$108	108.00	0	7	2	5	0
$81	61.50	19.50	3	1	2	2
$64	43.00	21.00	2	1	1	0
$223	150.00	73.00	7	1	6	6
$96	82.00	14.00	4	1	3	3
$98	65.50	32.50	3	1	2	0
$81	61.50	19.50	3	1	2	0
$196	125.50	70.50	5	2	3	0
$61	61.00	0	4	1	3	1
$248	162.00	85.50	7	1	6	0
$33	33.00	0	4	2	2	0
$74	61.50	12.50	3	2	1	0
$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	0
$155	97.00	58.00	4	2	2	0
$94	94.00	0	5	1	4	0
$101	67.00	34.00	3	2	1	0
$29	29.00	0	3	1	2	2
$21	21.00	0	1	0	1	1
$65	61.50	3.50	3	1	2	1
$58	34.50	23.50	1	0	1	1
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	1
$27	27.00	0	3	1	2	2
$99	60.50	38.50	2	1	1	1
$49	49.00	0	4	1	3	0
$120	102.50	17.50	5	1	4	4
$113	102.50	10.50	5	1	4	0
$83	83.00	0	5	0	5	0
$73	47.50	25.50	2	1	1	0
$55	41.00	14.00	2	1	1	0
$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	1
$65	38.00	27.00	1	0	1	1
$142	93.00	49.00	4	1	3	0
$106	64.00	42.00	2	1	1	1
$58	41.00	17.00	2	0	2	1
$190	122.50	67.50	5	2	3	0
$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	1
$327	218.50	108.50	10	1	9	0
$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	5
$152	123.00	29.00	6	1	5	2
$208	137.00	71.00	6	2	4	4
$66	61.50	4.50	3	0	3	3
$144	123.00	21.00	6	1	5	1
$89	61.50	27.50	3	1	2	2
$105	102.50	2.50	5	1	4	0
$112	82.00	30.00	4	2	2	2
$101	101.00	0	6	1	5	0
$139	123.00	16.00	6	1	5	4
$196	131.00	65.00	6	2	4	4
$65	61.50	3.50	3	1	2	0
$147	95.50	51.50	4	1	3	1
$111	102.50	8.50	5	1	4	4
$53	53.00	0	3	1	2	2
$143	93.50	49.50	4	1	3	1
$214	140.00	74.00	6	2	4	0
$107	70.00	37.00	3	1	2	0
$187	110.00	77.00	3	1	2	0
$8	8.00	0	4	1	3	0
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
$132	88.00	44.00	4	1	3	2
$218	147.50	70.50	7	1	6	0
$279	205.00	74.00	10	1	9	1
$78	50.00	28.00	2	0	2	2
$251	153.00	98.00	5	1	4	0
$238	157.50	80.50	7	1	6	0
$185	114.50	70.50	4	1	3	0
$136	90.00	46.00	4	1	3	0
$138	91.00	47.00	4	1	3	0
$94	36.00	58.00	0	2	2	0
$118	$70.00	$48.00	2	1	1	1
$292	195.50	96.50	9	2	7	1
$128	86.00	42.00	4	1	3	0
$185	125.50	59.50	6	1	5	0
$137	102.50	34.50	5	1	4	0
$102	102.00	0	7	2	5	0
$24	20.50	3.50	1	0	1	1
$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	0
$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	0
$49	41.00	8.00	2	1	1	0
$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	0
$58	58.00	0	3	1	2	0
$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	2
$55	41.00	14.00	2	1	1	1
$139	123.00	16.00	6	1	5	2
$142	142.00	0	7	1	6	0
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
$158	123.00	35.00	6	1	5	3
$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	4
$131	82.00	49.00	3	1	2	2
$60	41.00	19.00	2	1	1	1
$155	99.50	55.50	4	2	2	1
$97	59.50	37.50	2	1	1	1
$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	1
$93	57.50	35.50	2	0	2	0
$302	200.50	101.50	9	2	7	0
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
$31	31.00	0	5	1	4	1
$259	173.50	85.50	8	1	7	7
$144	94.00	50.00	4	0	4	0
$275	187.00	88.00	9	2	7	0
$162	162.00	0	9	2	7	0
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
$82	61.50	20.50	3	0	3	2
$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	0
$133	102.50	30.50	5	1	4	0
$57	41.00	16.00	2	1	1	0
$59	59.00	0	3	1	2	0
$239	184.50	54.50	9	1	8	4
$106	69.50	36.50	3	1	2	2
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	0
$167	111.00	56.00	5	1	4	0
$65	65.00	0	4	1	3	3
$117	82.00	35.00	4	1	3	3
$298	205.00	93.00	10	1	9	0
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	0
$241	159.00	82.00	7	1	6	0
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	0
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	0
$24	20.50	3.50	1	0	1	1
$50	41.00	9.00	2	0	2	0
$105	102.50	2.50	5	1	4	0
$152	103.50	48.50	5	1	4	3
$24	20.50	3.50	1	0	1	1
$94	94.00	0	5	1	4	0
$200	127.50	72.50	5	1	4	0
$215	146.00	69.00	7	1	6	0
$100	66.50	33.50	3	1	2	2
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	1
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
$82	52.00	30.00	2	0	2	0
$148	90.50	57.50	3	2	1	0
$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1
$137	90.50	46.50	4	1	3	3
$71	46.50	24.50	2	1	1	0
$160	102.00	58.00	3	1	2	0
$133	83.00	50.00	3	1	2	1
$103	62.50	40.50	2	1	1	1
$230	142.50	87.50	5	0	5	4
$44	44.00	0	3	1	2	2
$191	123.00	68.00	5	0	5	0
$247	167.50	79.50	8	1	7	0
$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1
$103	62.50	40.50	2	1	1	1
$182	124.00	58.00	6	1	5	3
$66	44.00	22.00	2	1	1	1
$107	64.50	42.50	2	1	1	1
$199	199.00	0	11	2	9	0
$69	69.00	0	6	1	5	0
$124	78.50	45.50	3	1	2	2
$47	47.00	0	3	2	1	0
$113	73.00	40.00	3	1	2	0
$222	144.00	78.00	6	2	4	3
$73	61.50	11.50	3	1	2	0
$87	82.00	5.00	4	1	3	3
$181	181.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	0
$78	50.00	28.00	2	1	1	1
$116	74.50	41.50	3	1	2	1
$125	84.50	40.50	4	1	3	3
$95	64.00	31.00	3	1	2	2
$133	133.00	0	8	1	7	0
$90	82.00	8.00	4	0	4	4
$223	150.00	72.00	7	1	6	0
$105	102.50	2.50	5	0	4	1
$52	52.00	0	3	1	2	2
$141	87.00	54.00	3	2	1	1
$165	99.00	66.00	3	1	2	2
$191	128.50	62.50	6	2	4	1
$87	54.50	32.50	2	1	1	0

Receiving assistance less than 1 year—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate
$127	$85.50	$41.50	4	1	3	1
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
$84	84.00	0	5	1	4	4
$164	98.50	65.50	3	1	2	0
$24	20.50	3.50	1	0	1	1
$46	28.50	17.50	1	0	1	1
$36	23.50	12.50	1	0	1	1
$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	0
$253	170.50	82.50	8	1	7	0
$93	82.00	11.00	4	1	3	0
$145	89.00	56.00	3	1	2	0
$350	202.50	147.50	5	1	4	0
$40	40 00	0	3	1	2	0
$314	212.00	102.00	10	2	8	1
$64	37.50	26.50	1	0	1	0
$105	69.00	36.00	3	0	3	0
$211	144.00	67.00	7	1	6	3
$146	89.50	56.50	3	1	2	0
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
$120	120.00	0	8	1	7	4
$193	143.50	49.50	7	1	6	0
$24	20.50	3.50	1	0	1	1
$92	57.00	35.00	2	1	1	0
$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	2
$125	84.50	40.50	4	1	3	3
$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	0
$127	74.50	52.50	2	1	1	1
$154	104.50	49.50	5	1	4	0
$127	102.50	24.50	5	1	4	4
$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	4
$43	43.00	0	3	1	2	0
$269	184.50	84.50	9	1	8	0
$144	143.50	50.50	7	1	6	0
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	0
$38	38.00	0	4	1	3	0
$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	0
$40	25.50	14.50	1	0	1	1
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
$121	82.50	38.50	4	1	3	1
$77	77.00	0	4	1	3	1
$65	38.00	27.00	1	0	1	0
$60	41.00	19.00	2	1	1	0
$127	74.50	52.50	2	1	1	1
$31	21.00	10.00	1	0	1	1
$104	102.50	1.50	5	1	4	0
$97	59.50	37.50	2	1	1	0
$165	164.00	1.00	8	1	7	0
$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	0
$58	41.00	17.00	2	0	2	2
$89	82.00	7.00	4	1	3	3
$183	164.00	19.00	8	2	6	0
$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	0
$136	79.00	57.00	2	1	1	0
$178	116.50	61.50	5	1	4	4
$84	82.00	2.00	4	0	4	1
$82	82.00	0	5	1	4	4
$37	24.00	13.00	1	0	1	0
$67	61.50	5.50	3	2	1	0
$362	208.50	153.50	5	1	4	0
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	1
$214	140.00	74.00	6	2	4	0
$170	112.50	57.50	5	2	3	0
$68	45.00	23.00	2	1	1	1
$220	143.00	77.00	6	2	4	0
$105	102.50	2.50	5	1	4	0
$184	119.50	64.50	5	2	3	0
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
$50	30.50	19.50	1	0	1	0
$72	47.00	25.00	2	1	1	1
$57	34.00	23.00	1	0	1	1
$139	123.00	16.00	6	1	5	0
$180	123.00	57.00	6	1	5	0
$60	41.00	19.00	2	1	1	1
$87	82.00	5.00	4	1	3	0
$111	72.00	39.00	3	1	2	2
$82	52.00	30.00	2	0	2	2
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0
$191	143.50	47.50	7	2	5	0
$44	41.00	3.00	2	0	2	0
$236	164.00	72.00	8	1	7	0
$282	190.50	91.50	9	1	8	0
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
$196	131.00	65.00	6	2	4	0
$94	94.00	0	5	1	4	0
$287	193.00	94.00	9	1	8	0
$208	131.50	76.50	5	2	3	3
$84	82.00	2.00	4	2	2	0
$132	132.00	0	7	1	6	4
$200	133.00	67.00	6	1	5	0
$117	82.00	35.00	4	2	2	0
$161	123.00	38.00	6	1	5	0
$98	82.00	16.00	4	1	3	3
$122	77.50	44.50	3	1	2	2
$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	5
$157	143.50	13.50	7	1	6	0
$219	148.00	71.00	7	1	6	0
$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2
$45	28.00	17.00	1	0	1	1
$169	123.00	46.00	6	1	5	5
$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	2
$240	$158.50	$81.50	7	2	5	3
$230	153.50	76.50	7	1	6	1
$220	205.00	15.00	10	1	9	2
$105	82.00	23.00	4	1	3	2
$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	0
$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4
$111	102.50	8.50	5	1	4	1
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	0
$87	61.50	25.50	3	1	2	0
$158	106.50	51.50	5	1	4	4
$228	152.50	75.50	7	1	6	2
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
$112	67.00	45.00	2	1	1	0
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	0
$117	102.50	14.50	5	1	4	0
$220	143.00	77.00	6	2	4	4
$223	205.00	18.00	10	1	9	1
$93	93.00	0	5	1	4	1
$296	205.00	91.00	10	2	8	0
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
$232	164.00	68.00	8	1	7	1
$132	82.50	49.50	3	2	1	1
$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	2
$133	83.00	50.00	3	1	2	2
$96	59.00	37.00	2	0	2	2
$54	41.00	13.00	2	1	1	1
$204	143.50	60.50	7	1	6	0
$190	128.00	62.00	6	2	4	4
$66	66.00	0	8	1	7	1
$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	0
$208	137.00	71.00	6	2	4	1
$185	120.00	65.00	5	1	4	1
$124	102.50	21.50	5	1	4	2
$180	180.00	0	9	2	7	2
$68	61.50	6.50	3	1	2	0
$148	143.50	4.50	7	2	5	0
$105	102.50	2.50	5	1	4	4
$208	137.00	71.00	6	2	4	0
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	0
$54	54.00	0	8	1	7	2
$155	123.00	32.00	6	1	5	0
$128	86.00	42.00	4	0	4	0
$158	101.00	57.00	4	1	3	2
$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	0
$40	40.00	0	4	1	3	1
$99	60.50	38.50	2	0	2	0
$206	136.00	70.00	6	1	5	5
$86	86.00	0	5	1	4	2
$265	176.50	88.50	8	1	7	1
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	0
$55	41.00	14.00	2	1	1	0
$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	1
$228	152.50	75.50	7	1	6	0
$194	130.00	64.00	6	1	5	5
$208	137.00	71.00	6	2	4	0
$169	106.50	62.50	4	1	3	2
$199	184.50	14.50	9	1	8	3
$93	57.50	35.50	2	1	1	1
$212	144.50	67.50	7	1	6	6
$42	26.50	15.50	1	0	1	0
$165	110.00	55.00	5	1	4	4
$158	101.00	57.00	4	1	3	3
$72	72.00	0	5	1	4	1
$124	84.00	40.00	4	1	3	3
$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	3
$63	42.50	20.50	2	1	1	1
$130	87.00	43.00	4	1	3	0
$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	0
$247	162.00	85.00	7	1	6	6
$95	58.50	36.50	2	1	1	1
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0
$173	143.50	29.50	7	1	6	6
$175	123.00	52.00	6	1	5	5
$168	168.00	0	9	1	8	0
$135	135.00	0	7	1	6	6
$104	63.00	41.00	2	1	1	1
$223	150.00	73.00	7	1	6	6
$187	126.50	60.50	6	1	5	0
$100	100.00	0	5	1	4	1
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
$259	173.50	85.50	8	1	7	0
$110	110.00	0	6	1	5	0
$172	113.50	58.50	5	1	4	2
$95	58.50	26.50	2	0	2	2
$95	58.50	36.50	2	1	1	1
$119	119.00	0	6	1	5	1
$303	206.50	96.50	10	1	9	3
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	0
$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	2
$132	88.00	44.00	4	1	3	3
$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	3
$24	20.50	3.50	1	0	1	1
$100	100.00	0	5	1	4	0
$148	143.50	4.50	7	1	6	0
$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	1
$217	147.00	70.00	7	1	6	1
$165	110.00	55.00	5	1	4	4
$221	143.50	77.50	6	1	5	0
$145	89.00	56.00	3	1	2	0

Receiving assistance less than 1 year—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
$154	$99.00	$55.00	4	1	3	1	$294	$180.00	$114.00	6	1	5	0
$356	266.50	89.50	13	2	11	0	$58	58.00	0	6	1	5	5
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0	$89	89.00	0	8	2	6	0
$159	101.50	57.50	4	1	3	0	$208	164.00	44.00	8	1	7	0
$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1	$205	130.00	75.00	5	1	4	0
$162	103.00	59.00	4	1	3	1	$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2
$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	0	$105	105.00	0	9	1	8	0
$170	112.50	57.50	5	1	4	0	$147	95.50	51.50	4	1	3	0
$172	113.50	58.50	5	1	4	0	$163	163.00	0	9	2	7	0
$67	67.00	0	8	1	7	0	$115	115.00	0	7	1	6	2
$123	102.50	20.50	5	1	4	0	$200	127.50	72.50	5	0	5	0
$135	135.00	0	7	1	6	4	$65	43.50	21.50	2	1	1	1
$62	42.00	20.00	2	1	1	1	$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	1
$336	228.50	107.50	11	2	9	0	$246	225.50	20.50	11	2	9	5
$100	100.00	0	5	1	4	0	$117	82.00	35.00	4	1	3	3
$162	123.00	39.00	6	1	5	2	$154	104.50	49.50	5	1	4	0
$101	101.00	0	7	1	6	1	$45	41.00	4.00	2	1	1	1
$54	54.00	0	5	1	4	0	$224	184.00	40.00	9	2	7	0
$172	123.00	49.00	6	1	5	3	$133	102.50	30.50	5	1	4	3
$98	98.00	0	5	1	4	4	$207	136.50	70.50	6	1	5	3
$223	150.00	73.00	7	1	6	1	$105	69.00	36.00	3	1	2	1
$277	182.50	94.50	8	1	7	2	$167	123.00	44.00	6	1	5	1
$85	85.00	0	5	1	4	3	$132	132.00	0	7	1	6	3
$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	0	$187	126.50	60.50	6	1	5	5
$66	44.00	22.00	2	1	1	0	$75	75.00	0	6	1	5	0
$116	74.50	41.50	3	1	2	2	$90	82.00	8.00	4	1	3	0
$38	24.50	13.50	1	0	1	1	$70	70.00	0	5	1	4	4
$105	63.50	41.50	2	0	2	0	$165	123.00	42.00	6	1	5	1
$87	54.50	32.50	2	1	1	0	$240	158.50	81.50	7	2	5	4
$298	198.50	99.50	9	2	7	0	$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	0
$136	102.50	33.50	5	1	4	0	$107	64.50	42.50	2	1	1	0
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	3	$195	143.50	51.50	7	1	6	1
$228	147.00	81.00	6	1	5	5	$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	1
$64	43.00	21.00	2	1	1	1	$156	123.00	33.00	6	1	5	0
$318	186.50	131.50	5	1	4	0	$167	111.00	56.00	5	1	4	4
$249	184.50	64.50	9	2	7	2	$143	123.00	20.00	6	1	5	2
$136	90.00	46.00	4	1	3	1	$79	79.00	0	5	1	4	0
$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	0	$114	102.50	11.50	5	1	4	2
$66	44.00	22.00	2	1	1	0	$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4
$283	185.50	97.50	8	1	7	0	$189	127.50	61.50	6	1	5	1
$59	41.00	18.00	2	1	1	1	$66	61.50	4.50	3	0	3	0
$182	107.50	74.50	3	1	2	2	$96	82.00	14.00	4	1	3	3
$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	1	$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	0
$147	90.00	57.00	3	1	2	2	$223	144.50	78.50	6	1	5	5
$66	61.50	4.50	3	1	2	1	$161	108.00	53.00	5	1	4	2
$190	190.00	0	11	2	9	0	$161	102.50	58.50	4	2	2	2
$50	50.00	0	4	1	3	3	$292	195.50	96.50	9	2	7	0
$66	66.00	0	4	1	3	3	$216	146.50	69.50	7	1	6	0
$185	125.50	59.50	6	1	5	1	$212	139.00	73.00	6	1	5	5
$50	30.50	19.50	1	0	1	0	$127	74.50	52.50	2	1	1	1
$79	50.50	28.50	2	0	2	0	$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	0
$107	82.00	25.00	4	1	3	1	$58	41.00	17.00	2	0	2	2
$164	164.00	0	9	2	7	0	$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3	$129	129.00	0	8	1	7	1
$63	37.00	26.00	1	0	1	0	$123	102.50	20.50	5	1	4	4
$287	182.00	105.00	7	1	6	2	$114	102.50	11.50	5	2	3	0
$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	0	$180	164.00	16.00	8	2	6	0
$147	60.00	57.00	3	1	2	1	$155	143.50	11.50	7	1	6	0
$172	143.50	28.50	7	1	6	0	$57	41.00	16.00	2	1	1	1
$85	53.50	31.50	2	1	1	1	$339	224.50	114.50	10	1	9	0

Receiving assistance for 1 year, but less than 2 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
$60	$60.00	0	6	1	5	0	$134	$83.50	$50.50	3	1	2	2
$187	121.00	$66.00	5	2	3	0	$208	131.50	76.50	5	2	3	0
$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2	$134	89.00	45.00	4	1	3	3
$215	146.00	69.00	7	2	5	0	$97	65.00	32.00	3	1	2	2
$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	1	$142	93.00	49.00	4	1	3	0
$121	71.50	49.50	2	1	1	1	$226	151.50	74.50	7	1	6	0
$128	80.50	47.50	3	1	2	0	$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	4
$118	118.00	0	8	1	7	5	$87	82.00	5.00	4	1	3	3
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	1	$120	82.00	38.00	4	1	3	3
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3	$149	102.50	46.50	5	1	4	1
$121	71.50	49.50	2	1	1	1	$137	85.00	52.00	3	1	2	0
$66	44.00	22.00	2	1	1	1	$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
$154	123.00	31.00	6	1	5	5	$109	65.50	43.50	2	1	1	1
$94	94.00	0	5	1	4	0	$197	137.00	60.00	7	1	6	2
$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	0	$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	4
$150	97.00	53.00	4	1	3	3	$187	126.50	60.50	6	1	5	0
$111	111.00	0	6	1	5	0	$61	61.00	0	5	1	4	4
$273	186.00	87.00	9	1	8	0	$82	82.00	0	6	2	4	0
$99	99.00	0	6	1	5	5	$126	102.50	23.50	5	1	4	4
$139	86.00	53.00	3	1	2	1	$113	113.00	0	7	1	6	0
$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	3	$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1
$92	92.00	0	6	1	5	5	$253	170.50	82.50	8	1	7	0
$112	72.50	39.50	3	1	2	0	$179	117.00	62.00	5	1	4	4
$226	146.00	80.00	6	2	4	0	$253	165.00	88.00	7	1	6	0
$52	52.00	0	4	1	3	0	$96	96.00	0	7	1	6	6
$160	123.00	37.00	6	1	5	3	$197	126.00	71.00	5	1	4	3
$127	85.50	41.50	4	1	3	0	$147	90.00	57.00	3	1	2	0

Receiving assistance for 1 year, but less than 2 years—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
$175	$115.00	$60.00	5	1	4	2	$44	$44.00	0	3	0	3	3
$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	1	$99	82.00	$17.00	4	1	3	0
$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	0	$223	150.00	73.00	7	1	6	0
$191	164.00	27.00	8	2	6	0	$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	0
$259	184.50	74.50	9	1	8	0	$31	21.00	10.00	1	0	1	1
$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	0	$142	142.00	0	9	1	8	0
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3	$133	133.00	0	8	1	7	0
$83	82.00	1.00	4	1	3	1	$132	88.00	44.00	4	1	3	3
$118	118.00	0	9	1	8	3	$137	137.00	0	9	1	8	0
$130	130.00	0	7	2	5	4	$196	131.00	65.00	6	1	5	0
$128	102.50	25.50	5	1	4	0	$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	1
$65	43.50	21.50	2	1	1	1	$126	79.50	46.50	3	1	2	0
$189	122.00	67 00	5	1	4	0	$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	1	$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	0
$63	63.00	0	4	1	3	3	$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
$111	82.00	29.00	4	1	3	3	$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	0
$293	205.00	88.00	10	1	9	0	$327	230.00	97.00	3	1	2	0
$297	205.00	92.00	10	1	9	9	$75	43.00	32.00	1	0	1	0
$141	87.00	54.00	3	2	1	0	$74	48.00	26.00	2	0	2	0
$143	93.50	49.50	4	1	3	3	$106	64.00	42.00	2	0	2	2
$150	97.00	53.00	4	1	3	1	$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
$92	57.00	35.00	2	0	2	0	$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2
$159	123.00	36.00	6	1	5	5	$100	82.00	18.00	4	1	3	1
$72	47.00	25.00	2	1	1	0	$222	164.00	58.00	8	1	7	0
$93	82.00	11.00	4	1	3	0	$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0
$157	95.00	62.00	3	1	2	2	$98	65.50	32.50	3	1	2	2
$155	143.50	11.50	7	1	6	0	$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	0
$307	225.50	81.50	11	1	10	10	$49	30.00	19.00	1	0	1	0
$191	191.00	0	10	1	9	0	$87	87.00	0	5	1	4	0
$93	82.00	11.00	4	0	4	0	$275	187.00	88.00	9	1	8	0
$240	158.50	81.50	7	1	6	6	$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	0
$136	90.00	46.00	4	1	3	0	$276	187.50	88.50	9	1	8	0
$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	3	$128	80.50	47.50	3	1	2	2
$291	173.00	118.00	5	1	4	1	$88	88.00	0	6	0	6	3
$147	90.00	57.00	3	1	2	1	$170	123.00	47.00	6	1	5	4
$115	68.50	46.50	2	1	1	0	$337	229.00	108.00	11	1	10	1
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	0	$138	102.50	35.50	5	1	4	1
$223	150.00	73.00	7	1	6	0	$94	94.00	0	8	1	7	1
$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	5	$105	105.00	0	8	1	7	0
$92	57.00	35.00	2	0	2	0	$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3	$197	149.50	47.50	6	1	5	0
$87	54.50	32.50	2	1	1	0	$227	164.00	63.00	8	1	7	0
$229	153.00	76.00	7	1	6	4	$132	123.00	9.00	6	1	5	0
$105	63.50	41.50	2	1	1	0	$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	0
$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	1	$122	83.00	39.00	4	1	3	3
$103	68.00	35.00	3	1	2	2	$111	102.50	8.50	5	1	4	0
$119	102.50	16.50	5	1	4	4	$287	193.00	94.00	9	1	8	0
$103	82.00	21.00	4	1	3	3	$173	143.50	29.50	7	2	5	0
$102	67.50	34.50	3	1	2	1	$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	4	$247	167.50	79.50	8	1	7	0
$213	164.00	49.00	8	1	7	6	$217	147.00	70.00	7	1	6	2
$226	146.00	80.00	6	2	4	1	$228	184.50	43.50	9	1	8	5
$216	141.00	75.00	6	1	5	5	$118	75.50	42.50	3	1	2	2
$235	164.00	71.00	8	1	7	4	$94	82.00	12.00	4	1	3	0
$214	140.00	74.00	6	2	4	0	$121	82.50	38.50	4	1	3	0
$211	144.00	67.00	7	1	6	0	$353	246.00	107.00	12	1	11	0
$94	63.50	30.50	3	1	2	0	$23	23.00	0	2	1	1	1
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3	$148	123.00	25.00	6	1	5	0
$226	151.50	74.50	7	1	6	2	$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	4
$98	60.00	38.00	2	0	2	0	$230	164.00	66.00	8	1	7	0
$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	3	$100	61.00	39.00	2	1	1	1
$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	4	$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	2
$174	123.00	51.00	6	1	5	3	$147	95.50	51.50	4	1	3	3
$87	82.00	5.00	4	1	3	0	$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	0
$29	29.00	0	7	2	5	0	$122	122.00	0	6	1	5	0
$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1	$5	5.00	0	3	1	2	2
$131	102.50	28.50	5	1	4	2	$128	128.00	0	9	2	7	0
$246	205.00	41.00	10	1	9	0	$46	41.00	5.00	2	1	1	1
$109	102.50	6.50	5	1	4	4	$157	95.00	62.00	3	1	2	2
$190	122.50	67.50	5	2	3	3	$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	3
$223	150.00	73.00	7	1	6	0	$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
$39	25.00	14.00	1	0	1	1	$114	68.00	46.00	2	1	1	1
$184	119.50	64.50	5	1	4	4	$145	102.50	42.50	5	1	4	0
$98	98.00	0	8	1	7	2	$127	85.50	41.50	4	1	3	3
$165	110.00	55.00	5	1	4	3	$164	109.50	54.50	5	1	4	2
$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	0	$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	0
$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1	$127	80.00	47.00	3	1	2	0
$204	143.50	60.50	7	1	6	1	$171	143.00	28.00	7	1	6	5
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	1	$71	46.50	24.50	2	1	1	0
$114	68.00	46.00	2	1	1	1	$133	83.00	50.00	3	1	2	0
$46	41.00	5.00	2	0	2	0	$239	164.00	75.00	8	1	7	0
$129	102.50	26.50	5	1	4	4	$143	93.50	49.50	4	1	3	0
$202	134.00	68.00	6	2	4	0	$63	37.00	26.00	1	0	1	1
$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	1	$143	93.50	49.50	4	1	3	3
$179	123.00	56.00	6	1	5	5	$48	41.00	7.00	2	0	2	2
$193	184.50	8.50	9	1	8	7	$88	55.00	33.00	2	1	1	1
$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	0	$94	94.00	0	5	1	4	4
$178	123.00	55.00	6	1	5	5	$91	56.50	34.50	2	0	2	3
$83	52.50	30.50	2	0	2	2	$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2
$215	146.00	69.00	7	2	5	2	$129	81.00	48.00	3	1	2	2
$65	38.00	27.00	1	0	1	1	$108	70.50	37.50	3	1	2	0
$78	61.50	16.50	3	0	3	0	$168	123.00	45.00	6	1	5	5
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2	$87	87.00	0	6	1	5	2
$57	41.00	16.00	2	0	2	2	$108	82.00	26.00	4	1	3	3
$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	3	$118	82.00	36.00	4	1	3	3
$150	97.00	53.00	4	1	3	3	$147	95.50	51.50	4	1	3	3
$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	1	$157	95.00	62.00	3	1	2	0
$43	27.00	16.00	1	0	1	0	$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
$110	71.50	38.50	3	1	2	2	$59	59.00	0	3	1	2	0

Receiving assistance for 1 year, but less than 2 years—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate
$172	$97.00	$75.00	2	1	1	1
$57	41.00	16.00	2	0	2	0
$134	102.50	31.50	5	1	4	2
$92	92.00	0	8	1	7	0
$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
$52	31.50	20.50	1	0	1	1
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	0
$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2
$74	48.00	26.00	2	0	2	0
$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	0
$157	95.00	62.00	3	1	2	1
$54	32.50	21.50	1	0	1	1
$171	107.50	63.50	4	1	3	1
$73	47.50	25.50	2	0	2	2
$161	108.00	53.00	5	1	4	4
$202	134.00	68.00	6	2	4	0
$87	82.00	5.00	4	1	3	0
$264	176.00	88.00	8	2	6	5
$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2
$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	0
$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	0
$138	102.50	35.50	5	1	4	4
$76	61.50	14.50	3	1	2	2
$222	149.50	72.50	7	1	6	0
$61	61.00	0	3	1	2	0
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1
$34	22.50	11.50	1	0	1	1
$178	116.50	61.50	5	2	3	0
$143	93.50	49.50	4	1	3	0
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
$231	164.00	67.00	8	2	6	0
$75	75.00	0	5	2	3	3
$127	74.50	52.50	2	1	1	1
$107	102.50	4.50	5	1	4	4
$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	0
$41	26.00	15.00	1	0	1	1
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
$252	164.50	87.50	7	2	5	0
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	0
$134	102.50	31.50	5	1	4	4
$176	123.00	53.00	6	1	5	1
$147	95.50	51.50	4	1	3	1
$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	1
$102	102.00	0	6	1	5	5
$208	131.50	76.50	5	2	3	0
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	1
$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	3
$305	202.00	103.00	9	1	8	0
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4
$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	0
$129	81.00	48.00	3	1	2	1
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
$189	122.00	67.00	5	1	4	4
$391	287.00	104.00	14	1	13	0
$98	60.00	38.00	3	1	2	0
$128	80.50	47.50	3	1	2	2
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
$38	24.50	13.50	1	0	1	1
$114	68.00	46.00	2	1	1	0
$73	61.50	11.50	3	1	2	2
$202	128.50	73.50	5	2	3	0
$90	90.00	0	5	1	4	1
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	0
$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0
$208	137.00	71.00	6	2	4	0
$247	148.00	99.00	7	1	6	0
$59	59.00	0	5	1	4	2
$259	173.50	85.50	8	1	7	0
$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4
$97	97.00	0	5	1	4	1
$96	64.50	31.50	3	0	3	2
$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	5
$146	95.00	51.00	4	1	3	2
$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	1
$78	50.00	28.00	2	1	1	1
$49	49.00	0	3	2	1	1
$148	102.50	45.50	5	2	3	0
$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1
$205	135.50	69.50	6	1	5	5
$37	24.00	13.00	1	0	1	1
$80	80.00	0	4	1	3	3
$24	20.50	3.50	1	0	1	1
$105	63.50	41.50	2	1	1	1
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	0
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0
$24	20.50	3.50	1	0	1	1
$144	88.50	55.50	3	1	2	2
$217	147.00	70.00	7	1	6	1
$113	73.00	40.00	3	1	2	0
$85	61.50	23.50	3	1	2	0
$95	64.00	31.00	3	1	2	0
$95	64.00	31.00	3	1	2	0

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate
$133	$83.00	$50.00	3	1	2	0
$89	55.50	33.50	2	0	2	0
$156	94.50	61.50	3	1	2	0
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	1
$137	90.50	46.50	4	1	3	0
$116	102.50	13.50	5	1	4	2
$201	133.50	67.50	6	2	4	1
$188	121.50	66.50	5	0	5	0
$36	36.00	0	2	1	1	0
$38	24.50	13.50	1	0	1	1
$234	164.00	70.00	8	2	6	0
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	1
$63	37.00	26.00	1	0	1	1
$107	64.50	42.50	2	1	1	1
$95	82.00	13.00	4	1	3	3
$157	95.00	62.00	3	1	2	1
$168	106.00	62.00	4	1	3	2
$197	126.00	71.00	5	2	3	0
$120	120.00	0	6	1	5	0
$47	29.00	18.00	1	0	1	1
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	1
$73	61.50	11.50	3	1	2	2
$146	89.50	56.50	3	2	1	0
$73	47.50	25.50	2	1	1	0
$23	20.50	2.50	1	0	1	0
$44	44.00	0	4	1	3	0
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	1
$125	79.00	46.00	3	1	2	2
$88	88.00	0	5	1	4	1
$253	170.50	82.50	8	1	7	0
$87	82.00	5.00	4	1	3	0
$63	37.00	26.00	1	0	1	0
$220	143.00	77.00	6	2	4	0
$100	61.00	39.00	2	1	1	0
$158	101.00	57.00	4	1	3	1
$192	164.00	28.00	8	1	7	0
$42	26.50	15.50	1	0	1	1
$202	134.00	68.00	6	2	4	0
$269	178.50	90.50	8	1	7	0
$106	69.50	36.50	3	1	2	1
$195	130.50	64.50	6	1	5	4
$97	59.50	37.50	2	0	2	0
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	0
$67	67.00	0	4	1	3	0
$24	20.50	3.50	1	0	1	1
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1
$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	0
$148	90.50	57.50	3	2	1	0
$65	38.00	27.00	1	0	1	0
$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1
$308	287.00	21.00	14	2	12	0
$118	75.00	43.00	3	1	2	2
$228	152.50	75.50	7	2	5	1
$189	127.50	61.50	6	1	5	0
$51	31.00	20.00	1	0	1	0
$221	143.50	77.50	6	1	5	1
$145	102.50	42.50	5	1	4	1
$133	83.00	50.00	3	1	2	0
$178	116.50	61.50	5	2	3	0
$40	25.50	14.50	1	0	1	1
$359	246.00	113.00	12	1	11	11
$153	98.50	54.50	4	1	3	3
$290	225.50	64.50	11	1	10	2
$131	82.00	49.00	3	1	2	1
$31	31.00	0	2	0	2	0
$113	82.00	31.00	4	1	3	0
$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	0
$158	106.50	51.50	4	2	2	0
$231	164.00	67.00	8	1	7	0
$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	0
$154	123.00	31.00	6	1	5	4
$85	53.50	31.50	2	1	1	1
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
$105	69.00	36.00	3	1	2	0
$59	35.00	24.00	1	0	1	1
$284	191.50	92.50	9	1	8	0
$164	104.00	60.00	4	1	3	0
$97	59.50	37.50	2	1	1	0
$101	101.00	0	6	1	5	1
$183	119.00	64.00	5	1	4	0
$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	2
$234	164.00	70.00	8	1	7	4
$212	133.50	78.50	5	2	3	0
$211	144.00	67.00	7	1	6	0
$175	123.00	52.00	6	1	5	0
$299	205.00	94.00	10	1	9	0
$97	65.00	32.00	3	1	2	1
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	4
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
$122	77.50	44.50	3	1	2	0
$102	67.50	34.50	3	1	2	2
$40	40.00	0	2	0	2	2
$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	5
$143	93.50	49.50	4	1	3	0
$147	123.00	24.00	6	1	5	4
$275	187.00	88.00	9	2	7	3
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	1

Receiving assistance for 1 year, but less than 2 years—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children: Total	Children: Illegitimate
$181	$128.50	$52.50	6	1	5	2
$241	159.00	82.00	7	1	6	3
$170	164.00	6.00	8	1	7	7
$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
$87	54.50	32.50	2	0	2	0
$97	59.50	37.50	2	1	1	1
$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	0
$92	57.00	35.00	2	0	2	0
$112	112.00	0	9	1	8	1
$47	47.00	0	5	1	4	4
$88	88.00	0	5	1	4	0
$89	61.50	27.50	3	1	2	1
$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	4
$138	85.50	52.50	3	1	2	0
$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	2
$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	0
$198	143.50	54.50	7	1	6	1
$127	80.00	47.00	3	0	3	3
$155	99.50	55.50	4	2	2	1
$112	72.50	39.50	3	0	3	3
$65	38.00	27.00	1	0	1	1
$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	1
$151	103.00	48.00	5	1	4	4
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	2
$143	93.50	49.50	4	1	3	3
$190	122.50	67.50	5	2	3	0
$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	0
$110	66.00	44.00	2	1	1	1
$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	0
$106	64.00	42.00	2	0	2	2
$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	4
$143	88.00	55.00	3	1	2	2
$144	143.50	0.50	7	1	6	6
$57	57.00	0	5	2	3	0
$62	62.00	0	7	2	5	0
$78	61.50	16.50	3	0	3	0
$210	164.00	46.00	8	1	7	4
$78	50.00	28.00	2	0	2	0
$107	64.50	42.50	2	1	1	1
$145	89.00	56.00	3	1	2	0
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	1
$98	65.50	32.50	3	1	2	2
$84	61.50	22.50	3	0	3	1
$58	34.50	23.50	1	0	1	1
$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	3
$291	205.00	86.00	10	1	9	0
$299	205.00	94.00	10	2	8	0
$150	102.50	47.50	5	1	4	2
$177	116.00	61.00	5	1	4	0
$91	91.00	0	5	1	4	1
$234	184.50	49.50	9	1	8	4
$278	225.50	52.50	11	1	10	0
$100	82.00	18.00	4	1	3	3
$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	2
$208	131.50	76.50	5	2	3	0
$235	156.00	79.00	7	1	6	0
$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	1
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	2
$166	110.50	55.50	5	1	4	4
$72	47.00	25.00	2	1	1	0
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	1
$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	4
$136	123.00	13.00	6	1	5	1
$167	167.00	0	10	1	9	1
$118	82.00	36.00	4	1	3	3
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	1
$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	0
$58	41.00	17.00	2	1	1	0
$173	143.50	29.50	7	1	6	4
$36	36.00	0	4	2	2	0
$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	0
$152	98.00	54.00	4	1	3	1
$217	147.00	70.00	7	1	6	1
$82	52.00	30.00	2	1	1	0
$185	125.50	59.50	6	1	5	5
$132	88.00	44.00	4	1	3	2
$96	64.50	31.50	3	1	2	0
$54	54.00	0	5	1	4	0
$163	163.00	0	8	1	7	2
$135	84.00	51.00	3	2	1	0
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
$220	148.50	71.50	7	1	6	6
$204	129.50	74.40	5	1	4	0
$47	47.00	0	3	2	1	0
$77	49.50	27.50	2	0	2	2
$84	82.00	2.00	4	2	2	0
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
$190	164.00	26.00	8	1	7	0
$200	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	5
$193	$124.00	$69.00	5	1	4	1
$121	121.00	0	6	1	5	1
$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	0
$111	82.00	29.00	4	1	3	3
$201	143.50	57.50	7	1	6	2
$65	38.00	27.00	1	0	1	1
$283	205.00	78.00	10	1	9	9
$67	61.50	5.50	3	1	2	1
$201	143.50	57.50	7	1	6	0
$137	85.00	52.00	3	1	2	2
$229	164.00	65.00	8	1	7	0
$104	63.00	41.00	2	0	2	2
$109	109.00	0	9	1	8	8
$219	164.00	55.00	8	1	7	7
$159	101.50	57.50	4	1	3	0
$139	86.00	53.00	3	1	2	1
$26	26.00	0	6	1	5	5
$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	1
$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	0
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	4
$309	209.50	99.50	10	1	9	1
$119	76.00	43.00	3	1	2	2
$120	102.50	17.50	5	1	4	1
$136	102.50	33.50	5	1	4	0
$273	180.50	92.50	8	1	7	1
$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	0
$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	2
$58	34.50	23.50	1	0	1	0
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
$137	137.00	0	7	2	5	0
$237	164.00	73.00	8	2	6	0
$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	0
$194	164.00	30.00	8	1	7	5
$107	107.00	0	8	2	6	5
$64	64.00	0	5	1	4	4
$87	82.00	5.00	4	1	3	3
$234	155.50	78.50	7	2	5	0
$124	78.50	45.50	3	1	2	2
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	0
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
$125	79.00	46.00	3	0	3	0
$67	61.50	5.50	3	1	2	1
$271	179.50	91.50	8	1	7	0
$138	102.50	35.50	5	1	4	1
$155	105.00	50.00	5	1	4	2
$195	143.50	51.50	7	1	6	6
$234	144.50	89.50	5	1	4	2
$108	108.00	0	6	1	5	0
$123	83.50	39.50	4	1	3	3
$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	0
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	1
$58	41.00	17.00	2	0	2	0
$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	3
$247	162.00	85.00	7	2	5	0
$205	135.50	69.50	6	1	5	5
$280	189.50	90.50	9	2	7	5
$112	72.50	39.50	3	1	2	1
$30	30.00	0	2	1	1	0
$194	130.00	64.00	6	1	5	5
$57	41.00	16.00	2	1	1	1
$233	155.00	78.00	7	1	6	2
$210	143.50	66.50	7	1	6	0
$148	123.00	25.00	6	1	5	5
$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	3
$80	61.50	18.50	3	1	2	1
$172	123.00	49.00	6	1	5	0
$124	123.00	1.00	6	1	5	2
$174	109.00	65.00	4	1	3	3
$167	143.50	23.50	7	1	6	0
$178	111.00	67.00	4	0	4	4
$141	92.50	48.50	4	1	3	3
$31	21.00	10.00	1	0	1	1
$219	164.00	55.00	8	1	7	6
$103	62.50	40.50	2	1	1	1
$112	102.50	9.50	5	1	4	4
$129	102.50	26.50	5	1	4	0
$129	102.50	26.50	5	1	4	4
$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	2
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	4
$144	94.00	50.00	4	1	3	3
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	0
$57	34.00	23.00	1	0	1	1
$181	112.50	68.50	4	1	3	0
$155	155.00	0	11	2	9	0
$31	21.00	10.00	1	0	1	1
$119	70.50	48.50	2	1	1	1
$187	143.50	43.50	7	1	6	4
$123	78.00	45.00	3	1	2	0
$177	116.00	61.00	5	1	4	4
$248	146.00	102.00	4	1	3	0
$210	184.50	25.50	9	1	8	3

Receiving assistance for 2 years, but less than 3 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
$144	$102.50	$41.50	5	1	4	0	$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
$117	82.00	35.00	4	1	3	3	$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	2
$140	86.50	53.50	3	1	2	2	$163	143.50	19.50	7	1	6	0
$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	5	$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	0
$208	131.50	76.50	5	2	3	0	$150	97.00	53.00	4	1	3	0
$116	74.50	41.50	3	1	2	2	$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	0
$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	2	$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	0
$120	76.50	43.50	3	1	2	0	$58	41.00	17.00	2	0	2	0
$105	69.00	36.00	3	1	2	0	$75	75.00	0	5	1	4	2
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0	$153	98.50	54.50	4	1	3	2
$107	102.50	4.50	5	1	4	0	$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	0
$247	167.50	79.50	8	1	7	7	$181	123.50	57.50	6	1	5	0
$128	128.00	0	11	1	10	0	$225	164.00	61.00	8	1	7	7
$320	215.00	105.00	10	2	8	0	$171	113.00	58.00	5	1	4	1
$229	153.00	76.00	7	1	6	6	$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	1
$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	0	$302	173.00	129.00	4	1	3	0
$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	0	$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1
$203	129.00	74.00	5	1	4	0	$139	86.00	53.00	3	1	2	2
$140	92.00	48.00	4	1	3	1	$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	0
$257	172.50	84.50	8	1	7	0	$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	4
$89	82.00	7.00	4	1	3	0	$145	94.50	50.50	4	1	3	0
$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2	$73	61.50	11.50	3	1	2	2
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	1	$109	109.00	0	7	1	6	6
$123	78.00	45.00	3	1	2	2	$99	82.00	17.00	4	1	3	3
$172	113.50	58.50	5	1	4	4	$155	99.50	55.50	4	1	3	0
$137	90.50	46.50	4	1	3	0	$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1
$144	102.50	41.50	5	1	4	4	$101	61.50	39.50	2	0	2	2
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	2	$171	123.00	48.00	6	1	5	1
$269	184.50	84.50	9	1	8	0	$112	82.00	30.00	4	1	3	0
$149	123.00	26.00	6	1	5	0	$202	134.00	68.00	6	2	4	0
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0	$164	143.50	20.50	7	1	6	2
$194	130.00	64.00	6	1	5	3	$102	82.00	20.00	4	1	3	2
$117	82.00	35.00	4	1	3	1	$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0
$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	2	$77	77.00	0	4	1	3	3
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	1	$31	21.00	10.00	1	0	1	1
$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	5	$123	123.00	0	9	1	8	2
$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	1	$38	24.50	13.50	1	0	1	0
$223	150.00	73.00	7	1	6	3	$34	22.50	11.50	1	0	1	1
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0	$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	0
$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	1	$183	143.50	39.50	7	1	6	0
$173	108.50	64.50	4	2	2	2	$152	103.50	48.50	5	1	4	2
$139	123.00	16.00	6	1	5	0	$197	143.50	53.50	7	1	6	4
$140	86.50	53.50	3	1	2	2	$245	155.50	89.50	6	1	5	5
$111	72.00	39.00	3	1	2	2	$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
$165	110.00	55.00	5	0	5	5	$140	102.50	37.50	5	1	4	4
$137	102.50	34.50	5	1	4	4	$180	143.50	36.50	7	1	6	5
$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	0	$26	20.50	5.50	1	0	1	1
$122	83.00	39.00	4	1	3	0	$105	63.50	41.50	2	0	1	1
$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	4	$177	177.00	0	9	2	7	0
$147	95.50	51.50	4	1	3	0	$152	123.00	29.00	6	1	5	0
$170	112.50	57.50	5	1	4	4	$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	0
$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2	$142	93.00	49.00	4	2	2	2
$226	146.00	80.00	6	2	4	0	$76	76.00	0	7	1	6	0
$171	123.00	48.00	6	1	5	0	$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
$126	79.50	46.50	3	1	2	2	$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	0
$159	123.00	36.00	6	1	5	0	$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2	$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	0
$160	107.50	52.50	5	1	4	0	$271	179.50	91.50	8	1	7	0
$78	61.50	16.50	3	1	2	1	$38	24.50	13.50	1	0	1	0
$186	120.50	65.50	5	1	4	0	$76	61.50	14.50	3	1	2	1
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0	$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2
$135	102.50	32.50	5	1	4	3	$164	109.50	54.50	5	1	4	3
$118	82.00	36.00	4	1	3	2	$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	1
$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1	$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	0
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	0	$87	87.00	0	6	1	5	5
$118	75.50	42.50	3	1	2	0	$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	4
$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2	$304	201.50	102.50	9	2	7	0
$97	59.50	37.50	2	1	1	1	$147	90.00	57.00	3	1	2	2
$172	143.50	28.50	7	1	6	4	$155	99.50	55.50	4	2	2	0
$148	90.50	57.50	3	2	1	0	$302	206.00	96.00	10	2	8	0
$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1	$91	91.00	0	5	1	4	2
$73	61.50	11.50	3	1	2	2	$40	25.50	14.50	1	1	1	1
$89	55.50	33.50	2	1	1	0	$86	86.00	0	5	1	4	2
$83	52.50	30.50	2	1	1	1	$133	77.50	55.50	2	1	1	1
$114	68.00	46.00	2	1	1	1	$148	123.00	25.00	6	1	5	1
$152	98.00	54.00	4	1	3	3	$217	147.00	70.00	7	1	6	6
$162	108.50	53.50	5	2	3	0	$121	77.00	44.00	3	1	2	2
$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2	$146	143.50	2.50	7	1	6	0
$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	0	$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	2
$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	1	$240	158.50	81.50	7	0	7	0
$291	205.00	86.00	10	1	9	0	$188	143.50	44.50	7	1	6	6
$118	75.50	42.50	3	1	2	2	$134	102.50	31.50	5	1	4	0
$130	123.00	7.00	6	2	4	4	$91	56.50	34.50	2	1	1	0
$107	64.50	42.50	2	1	1	0	$171	113.00	58.00	5	1	4	4
$161	108.00	53.00	5	1	4	1	$111	102.50	8.50	5	1	4	1
$235	156.00	79.00	7	1	6	2	$156	123.00	33.00	6	1	5	0
$116	102.50	13.50	5	1	4	0	$171	143.50	27.50	7	1	6	6
$151	97.50	53.50	4	0	4	0	$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0
$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	0	$155	105.00	50.00	5	1	4	1
$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	4	$139	91.50	47.50	4	1	3	3
$191	184.50	6.50	6	1	5	0	$125	79.00	46.00	3	1	2	0
$122	77.50	44.50	3	1	2	2	$247	162.00	85.00	7	1	6	0
$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	4	$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	0	$199	143.50	55.50	7	1	6	6
$105	69.00	36.00	3	1	2	2	$176	123.00	53.00	6	1	5	5
$151	103.00	48.00	5	1	4	4	$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	0
$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	0	$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	0
$105	69.00	36.00	3	1	2	1	$303	206.50	96.50	10	2	8	0
$202	134.00	68.00	6	2	4	0							

Receiving assistance for 2 years, but less than 3 years—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate
$187	$121.50	$65.50	5	1	4	0
$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	0
$138	85.50	52.50	3	1	2	0
$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1
$37	37.00	0	2	1	1	1
$13	13.00	0	6	1	5	0
$229	205.00	24.00	10	2	8	8
$143	88.00	55.00	3	1	2	0
$253	165.00	88.00	7	1	6	0
$190	143.50	46.50	7	1	6	1
$186	126.00	60.00	6	1	5	0
$70	70.00	0	4	0	4	3
$105	82.00	23.00	4	1	3	3
$100	61.00	39.00	2	1	1	0
$153	98.50	54.50	4	1	3	0
$88	88.00	0	5	1	4	1
$170	112.50	57.50	5	1	4	1
$80	80.00	0	9	1	8	5
$156	100.00	56.00	4	1	3	0
$88	61.50	26.50	3	1	2	0
$183	119.00	64.00	5	1	4	2
$273	186.00	87.00	9	1	8	0
$101	82.00	19.00	4	1	3	1
$109	82.00	27.00	4	1	3	3
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
$161	143.50	17.50	7	1	6	0
$105	82.00	23.00	4	1	3	0
$81	51.50	29.50	2	1	1	1
$141	87.00	54.00	3	0	3	3
$247	167.50	79.50	8	1	7	6
$104	68.50	35.50	3	1	2	2
$155	105.00	50.00	5	1	4	0
$166	110.50	55.50	5	1	4	0
$180	180.00	0	10	2	8	0
$110	82.00	28.00	4	1	3	3
$93	93.00	0	6	1	5	1
$149	102.50	46.50	5	1	4	4
$31	21.00	10.00	1	0	1	1
$150	123.00	27.00	6	1	5	3
$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1
$110	110.00	0	6	1	5	5
$113	102.50	10.50	5	1	4	1
$318	225.50	92.50	11	2	9	0
$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	0
$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	0
$98	65.50	32.50	3	1	2	2
$89	55.50	33.50	2	1	1	0
$157	95.00	62.00	3	1	2	0
$192	143.50	48.50	7	1	6	6
$269	184.50	84.50	9	1	8	0
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
$112	67.00	45.00	2	1	1	0
$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	0
$47	29.00	18.00	1	0	1	1
$155	105.00	50.00	5	1	4	4
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1
$129	75.50	53.50	2	1	1	0
$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	0
$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	4
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
$138	91.00	47.00	4	1	3	3
$231	154.00	77.00	7	2	5	1
$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	5
$160	143.50	16.50	7	1	6	6
$157	100.50	56.50	4	2	2	1
$39	25.00	14.00	1	0	1	1
$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	2
$304	201.50	102.50	9	2	7	0
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	1
$134	89.00	45.00	4	1	3	0
$145	94.50	50.50	4	1	3	3
$214	140.00	74.00	6	2	4	0
$84	53.00	31.00	2	0	2	0
$185	125.50	59.50	6	1	5	0
$121	121.00	0	10	2	8	0
$191	123.00	68.00	5	1	4	4
$235	156.00	79.00	7	1	6	0
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0
$130	130.00	0	7	1	6	6
$87	54.50	32.50	2	1	1	0
$281	190.00	91.00	9	1	8	0
$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2
$91	56.50	34.50	2	1	1	0
$220	148.50	71.50	7	1	6	6
$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	1
$203	184.50	18.50	9	1	8	0
$140	102.50	37.50	5	1	4	0
$159	101.50	57.50	4	1	3	0
$111	82.00	29.00	4	1	3	3
$166	110.50	55.50	5	1	4	0
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	1
$63	37.00	26.00	1	0	1	1
$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	1
$183	164.00	19.00	8	1	7	7
$157	95.00	62.00	3	1	2	2
$123	78.00	45.00	3	1	2	1
$154	$93.50	$60.50	3	1	2	0
$70	46.00	24.00	2	1	1	1
$94	94.00	0	5	1	4	0
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	0
$282	185.00	97.00	8	2	6	0
$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2
$135	89.50	45.50	4	1	3	3
$142	123.00	19.00	6	1	5	5
$54	32.50	21.50	1	0	1	1
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0
$136	84.50	51.50	3	1	2	0
$29	20.50	8.50	1	0	1	1
$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	1
$29	20.50	8.50	1	0	1	0
$123	78.00	45.00	3	1	2	2
$116	74.50	41.50	3	1	2	1
$112	102.50	9.50	5	0	5	5
$94	58.00	36.00	2	0	2	2
$129	81.00	48.00	3	1	2	2
$197	164.00	33.00	8	1	7	2
$96	64.50	31.50	3	1	2	2
$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	2
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
$258	167.50	90.50	7	2	5	0
$91	91.00	0	5	1	4	4
$79	79.00	0	4	1	3	0
$166	105,00	61.00	4	1	3	0
$104	63.00	41.00	2	1	1	0
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0
$127	74.50	52.50	2	1	1	0
$195	125.00	70.00	5	0	5	0
$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	5
$162	103.00	59.00	4	1	3	2
$123	83.50	39.50	4	2	2	0
$116	74.50	41.50	3	1	2	2
$59	35.00	24.00	1	0	1	1
$130	87.00	43.00	4	1	3	2
$110	71.50	38.50	3	1	2	2
$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	0
$129	102.50	26.50	5	1	4	4
$51	31.00	20.00	1	0	1	0
$141	102.50	38.50	5	1	4	4
$113	82.00	31.00	4	1	3	1
$78	50.00	28.00	2	0	2	2
$150	91.50	58.50	3	1	2	2
$124	78.50	45.50	3	1	2	0
$206	184.50	21.50	9	1	8	7
$176	143.50	32.50	7	1	6	0
$64	43.00	21.00	2	0	2	2
$105	105.00	0	7	1	6	4
$148	90.50	57.50	3	2	1	0
$309	209.50	99.50	10	1	9	9
$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	0
$129	123.00	6.00	6	1	5	4
$89	89.00	0	7	1	6	3
$87	82.00	5.00	4	1	3	3
$115	74.00	41.00	3	1	2	2
$134	83.50	50.50	3	0	3	0
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
$122	77.50	44.50	3	1	2	0
$180	123.00	57.00	6	1	5	3
$122	102.50	19.50	5	1	4	4
$143	93.50	49.50	4	1	3	3
$212	144.50	67.50	7	1	6	6
$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1
$325	225.50	99.50	11	1	10	6
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0
$217	147.00	70.00	7	1	6	0
$242	165.00	77.00	8	1	7	0
$211	133.00	78.00	5	1	4	0
$31	21.00	10.00	1	0	1	1
$131	76.50	54.50	2	1	1	0
$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2
$221	143.50	77.50	6	1	5	5
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
$66	38.50	27.50	1	0	1	1
$137	102.50	34.50	5	1	4	1
$286	192.50	93.50	9	2	7	0
$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	1
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	3
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	0
$127	85.50	41.50	4	1	3	3
$164	143.50	20.50	7	1	6	0
$270	179.00	91.00	8	2	6	0
$139	91.50	47.50	4	1	3	3
$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1
$47	47.00	0	6	1	5	0
$93	57.50	35.50	2	0	2	2
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
$257	184.50	72.50	9	1	8	0
$113	73.00	40.00	3	1	2	2
$154	123.00	31.00	6	1	5	4
$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	0
$231	184.50	46.50	9	1	8	2
$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2
$92	57.00	35.00	2	0	2	0

Receiving assistance for 2 years, but less than 3 years—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate
$125	$102.50	$22.50	5	1	4	2
$235	156.00	79.00	7	1	6	0
$135	89.50	45.50	4	1	3	3
$140	92.00	48.00	4	1	3	3
$88	55.00	33.00	2	1	1	0
$154	93.50	60.50	3	2	1	0
$60	60.00	0	5	1	4	0
$94	82.00	12.00	4	1	3	3
$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	0
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0
$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	0
$176	176.00	0	11	2	9	0
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
$166	110.50	55.50	5	1	4	0
$56	33.50	22.50	1	0	1	0
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
$140	86.50	53.50	3	1	2	2
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
$192	129.00	63.00	6	1	5	0
$223	150.00	73.00	7	1	6	1
$298	198.50	99.50	9	2	7	0
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	2
$108	82.00	26.00	4	0	4	0
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	1
$45	45.00	0	4	1	3	0
$98	60.00	38.00	2	1	1	1
$183	119.00	64.00	5	1	4	1
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
$123	78.00	45.00	3	1	2	2
$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2
$128	86.00	42.00	4	1	3	3
$72	72.00	0	4	1	3	0
$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	0
$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1
$127	74.50	52.50	2	1	1	1
$133	133.00	0	10	1	9	9
$182	113.60	68.50	5	1	4	4
$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	1
$192	112.50	79.50	3	1	2	0
$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	0
$208	143.50	64.50	7	1	6	6
$99	60.50	38.50	2	1	1	1
$256	184.50	71.50	9	1	8	1
$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	0
$92	82.00	10.00	4	1	3	3
$258	173.00	85.00	8	2	6	0
$265	176.50	88.50	8	1	7	7
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
$142	102.50	39.50	5	1	4	4
$305	207.50	97.50	10	1	9	9
$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1
$57	41.00	16.00	2	1	1	1
$228	184.50	43.50	9	1	8	0
$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4
$117	117.00	0	6	1	5	3
$79	50.50	28.50	2	1	1	1
$111	111.00	0	7	1	6	0
$128	128.00	0	8	1	7	5
$177	116.00	61.00	5	1	4	4
$186	126.00	60.00	6	1	5	2
$252	170.00	82.00	8	2	6	6
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	2
$229	153.00	76.00	7	1	6	0
$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	1
$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2
$129	123.00	6.00	6	1	5	0
$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	4
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
$127	127.00	0	7	1	6	1
$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1
$84	61.50	22.50	3	0	3	3
$232	184.50	47.50	9	1	8	8
$186	143.50	42.50	7	1	6	6
$283	185.50	97.50	8	1	7	0
$225	151.00	74.00	7	1	6	0
$217	147.00	70.00	7	1	6	5
$272	185.50	86.50	9	1	8	0
$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	5
$131	102.50	28.50	5	1	4	3
$183	143.50	39.50	7	1	6	1
$236	184.50	51.50	9	1	8	8
$97	65.00	32.00	3	1	2	2
$143	143.00	0	7	1	6	6
$201	133.50	67.50	6	1	5	0
$247	162.00	85.00	7	1	6	6
$155	105.00	50.00	5	1	4	3
$161	108.00	53.00	5	1	4	4
$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	5
$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	5
$199	132.50	66.50	6	1	5	0
$231	154.00	77.00	7	1	6	2
$217	147.00	70.00	7	1	6	2
$153	104.00	49.00	5	1	4	0
$154	123.00	31.00	6	1	5	1
$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1
$105	63.50	41.50	2	1	1	0
$184	114.00	70.00	4	1	3	0
$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	3
$147	$102.50	$44.50	5	1	4	0
$163	123.00	40.00	6	1	5	0
$40	40.00	0	4	1	3	1
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	0
$104	82.00	22.00	4	1	3	3
$162	123.00	39.00	6	1	5	3
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	4
$192	129.00	63.00	6	1	5	3
$115	82.00	33.00	4	1	3	2
$235	164.00	71.00	8	1	7	7
$179	111.50	67.50	4	2	2	0
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
$167	164.00	3.00	8	1	7	4
$142	142.00	0	7	1	6	3
$132	102.50	29.50	5	1	4	4
$233	149.50	83.50	6	1	5	0
$253	170.50	82.50	8	1	7	0
$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	0
$160	123.00	37.00	6	1	5	2
$183	119.00	64.00	5	1	4	0
$246	167.00	79.00	8	2	6	2
$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2
$120	82.00	38.00	4	1	3	0
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
$184	125.00	59.00	6	1	5	2
$358	246.00	112.00	12	2	10	0
$217	147.00	70.00	7	1	6	0
$321	215.50	105.50	10	1	9	1
$134	89.00	45.00	4	1	3	3
$154	123.00	31.00	6	1	5	5
$97	97.00	0	5	1	4	2
$135	89.50	45.50	4	1	3	0
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
$112	82.00	30.00	4	1	3	0
$205	130.00	75.00	5	1	4	4
$183	119.00	64.00	5	1	4	0
$264	159.50	104.50	5	1	4	0
$146	95.00	51.00	4	1	3	3
$80	51.00	29.00	2	0	2	0
$124	73.00	51.00	2	1	1	1
$87	87.00	0	5	1	4	4
$266	184.50	81.50	9	1	8	1
$176	123.00	53.00	6	1	5	0
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	1
$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	0
$63	47.50	15.50	2	0	2	2
$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1
$56	41.00	15.00	2	1	1	1
$200	143.50	56.50	7	1	6	0
$55	41.00	14.00	2	1	1	0
$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	5
$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	4
$222	205.00	17.00	10	1	9	4
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0
$328	219.00	109.00	10	2	8	0
$54	54.00	0	5	1	4	1
$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	5
$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	0
$158	123.00	35.00	6	1	5	1
$65	65.00	0	4	1	3	3
$31	21.00	10.00	1	0	1	1
$91	62.00	29.00	3	1	2	2
$132	123.00	9.00	6	1	5	2
$213	139.50	73.50	6	1	5	4
$83	52.50	30.50	2	0	2	2
$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	0
$274	186.50	87.50	9	2	7	0
$247	162.00	85.00	7	1	6	6
$229	153.00	76.00	7	1	6	6
$277	182.50	94.50	8	1	7	2
$54	54.00	0	6	1	5	0
$74	74.00	0	7	1	6	1
$174	103.50	70.50	3	1	2	2
$174	143.50	30.50	7	1	6	3
$293	196.00	97.00	9	1	8	4
$152	98.00	54.00	4	1	3	3
$151	103.00	48.00	5	1	4	1
$128	80.50	47.50	3	1	2	2
$50	41.00	9.00	2	1	1	0
$144	88.50	55.50	3	1	2	2
$137	137.00	0	7	1	6	3
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
$181	123.50	57.50	6	1	5	1
$189	127.50	61.50	6	1	5	1
$132	82.50	49.50	3	2	1	1
$31	21.00	10.00	1	0	1	1
$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	1
$117	102.50	14.50	5	1	4	4
$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	0
$108	70.50	37.50	3	1	2	1
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
$87	54.50	32.50	2	1	1	1
$123	102.50	20.50	5	1	4	4
$140	123.00	17.00	6	1	5	1
$181	143.50	37.50	7	1	6	1
$133	83.00	50.00	3	1	2	2

Receiving assistance for 2 years, but less than 3 years—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate
$148	$96.00	$52.00	4	1	3	3
$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	1
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	0
$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	5
$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	0
$157	100.50	56.50	4	0	4	0
$257	167.00	90.00	7	1	6	0
$90	90.00	0	5	1	4	0
$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2
$53	53.00	0	4	1	3	0
$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	0
$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	0
$94	82.00	12.00	4	1	3	1
$61	61.00	0	5	1	4	0
$303	206.50	96.50	10	1	9	0
$148	102.50	45.50	5	1	4	0
$112	67.00	45.00	2	1	1	1
$75	61.50	13.50	3	0	3	0
$229	147.50	81.50	6	2	4	0
$115	102.50	12.50	5	1	4	0
$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	4
$107	102.50	4.50	5	1	4	0
$177	123.00	54.00	6	1	5	5
$203	123.50	79.50	4	1	3	0
$108	102.50	5.50	5	1	4	2
$237	164.00	73.00	8	1	7	2
$123	78.00	45.00	3	1	2	2
$247	162.00	85.00	7	1	6	0
$214	134.50	79.50	5	1	4	0
$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	0
$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	0
$93	93.00	0	6	1	5	1
$162	108.50	53.50	5	1	4	4
$292	190.00	102.00	8	2	6	0
$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	0
$150	102.50	47.50	5	1	4	1
$229	153.00	76.00	7	1	6	3
$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	5
$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	2
$156	94.50	61.50	3	0	3	0
$130	$87.00	$43.00	4	1	3	3
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0
$85	53.50	31.50	2	1	1	1
$100	66.50	33.50	3	1	2	2
$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	0
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
$199	132.50	66.50	6	1	5	5
$235	176.00	59.00	7	1	6	0
$75	48.50	26.50	2	0	2	2
$239	158.00	81.00	7	1	6	0
$188	143.50	44.50	7	1	6	4
$259	173.50	85.50	8	1	7	7
$122	83.00	39.00	4	1	3	3
$112	67.00	45.00	2	0	2	2
$151	97.50	53.50	4	1	3	3
$159	96.00	63.00	3	1	2	2
$273	205.00	68.00	10	1	9	2
$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1
$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	5
$230	164.00	66.00	8	1	7	7
$188	143.50	44.50	7	1	6	6
$165	110.00	55.00	5	1	4	4
$184	114.00	70.00	4	1	3	0
$227	164.00	63.00	8	1	7	7
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4
$142	102.50	39.50	5	1	4	4
$113	73.00	40.00	3	1	2	1
$111	72.00	39.00	3	1	2	2
$374	266.50	107.50	13	2	11	1
$88	61.50	26.50	3	1	2	1
$85	85.00	0	6	1	5	5
$117	102.50	14.05	5	1	4	0
$81	81.00	0	4	1	3	0
$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	5
$128	86.00	42.00	4	1	3	3
$143	93.50	49.50	4	1	3	3
$119	70.50	48.50	2	1	1	0
$184	114.00	70.00	4	1	3	0

Receiving assistance for 3 years, but less than 4 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate
$62	$62.00	0	5	1	4	2
$101	82.00	$19.00	4	1	3	3
$62	61.50	.50	3	2	1	1
$564	326.00	238.00	8	2	6	0
$323	200.00	123.00	7	1	6	1
$150	102.50	47.50	5	1	4	0
$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4
$241	159.00	82.00	7	1	6	6
$267	184.05	82.50	9	1	8	4
$38	24.50	13.50	1	0	1	0
$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	2
$155	105.00	50.00	5	1	4	0
$114	68.00	46.00	2	1	1	1
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	0
$102	62.00	40.00	2	0	2	0
$157	106.00	51.00	5	1	4	2
$152	92.50	59.50	3	1	2	0
$112	67.00	45.00	2	1	1	1
$105	82.00	23.00	4	1	3	0
$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1
$170	107.00	63.00	4	1	3	3
$140	102.50	37.50	5	1	4	4
$144	102.50	41.50	5	1	4	2
$210	164.00	46.00	8	2	6	6
$94	58.00	36.00	2	0	2	2
$33	33.00	0	3	2	1	1
$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	0
$68	68.00	0	4	1	3	0
$87	61.50	25.50	3	1	2	2
$165	104.50	60.50	4	1	3	0
$126	85.00	41.00	4	1	3	1
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0
$186	109.50	76.50	3	1	2	2
$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	0
$135	102.50	32.50	5	1	4	3
$137	90.50	46.50	4	1	3	0
$72	41.50	30.50	1	0	1	0
$59	35.00	24.00	1	0	1	0
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	1
$223	150.00	73.00	7	1	6	5
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
$163	123.00	40.00	6	1	5	5
$175	$123.00	$52.00	6	1	5	0
$141	141.00	0	8	1	7	2
$233	205.00	28.00	10	2	8	0
$177	99.50	77.50	2	1	1	0
$44	44.00	0	3	1	2	2
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	1
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	0
$148	90.50	57.50	3	2	1	0
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	0
$334	266.50	67.50	13	1	12	2
$38	38.00	0	8	1	7	5
$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	5
$135	102.50	32.50	5	1	4	4
$228	164.00	64.00	8	1	7	0
$130	102.50	27.50	5	1	4	2
$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	0
$138	91.00	47.00	4	1	3	3
$123	102.50	20.50	5	1	4	4
$215	146.00	69.00	7	1	6	0
$218	164.00	54.00	8	1	7	3
$173	123.00	50.00	6	1	5	1
$200	184.50	15.50	9	1	8	6
$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1
$166	164.00	2.00	8	1	7	3
$138	85.50	52.50	3	0	3	3
$116	102.50	13.50	5	1	4	4
$118	102.50	15.50	5	1	4	1
$102	62.00	40.00	2	1	1	1
$130	87.00	43.00	4	1	3	3
$154	88.00	66.00	2	1	1	1
$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	0
$138	102.50	35.50	5	1	4	4
$113	78.50	34.50	4	1	3	3
$146	89.50	56.50	3	1	2	0
$110	71.50	38.50	3	0	3	3
$237	151.50	85.50	6	2	4	4
$97	97.00	0	5	2	3	0
$277	182.50	94.50	8	1	7	0
$162	103.00	59.00	4	1	3	1
$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	1
$270	179.00	91.00	8	1	7	0
$174	143.50	30.50	7	2	5	0

Receiving assistance for 3 years, but less than 4 years—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
$31	$21.00	$10.00	1	0	1	1	$62	$36.50	$25.50	1	0	1	1
$165	104.50	60.50	4	1	3	1	$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
$184	125.00	59.00	6	1	5	0	$176	164.00	12.00	8	1	7	1
$221	143.50	77.50	6	1	5	0	$159	107.00	52.00	5	1	4	4
$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	0	$125	84.50	40.50	4	1	3	0
$154	104.50	49.50	5	1	4	0	$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	0
$157	106.00	51.00	5	1	4	4	$134	102.50	31.50	5	1	4	4
$91	56.50	34.50	2	0	2	2	$117	102.50	14.50	5	1	4	2
$127	74.50	52.50	2	1	1	0	$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1
$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2	$189	143.50	45.50	7	2	5	0
$43	41.00	2.00	2	1	1	1	$119	102.50	16.50	5	0	5	0
$64	43.00	21.00	2	0	2	0	$184	119.50	64.50	5	1	4	1
$160	123.00	37.00	6	1	5	2	$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	0
$169	106.50	62.50	4	1	3	0	$219	142.50	76.50	6	1	5	0
$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	4	$40	40.00	0	2	1	1	1
$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	3	$191	123.00	68.00	5	1	4	1
$115	74.00	41.00	3	1	2	2	$121	77.00	44.00	3	0	3	1
$236	164.00	72.00	8	1	7	4	$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	0	$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	0
$118	70.00	48.00	2	0	2	0	$97	97.00	0	6	1	5	0
$171	123.00	48.00	6	1	5	4	$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	3
$96	59.00	37.00	2	1	1	1	$116	74.50	41.50	3	1	2	1
$290	225.50	64.50	11	2	9	0	$89	55.50	33.50	2	1	1	1
$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	5	$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	0
$106	64.00	42.00	2	0	2	2	$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	0
$99	60.50	38.50	2	0	2	2	$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	0
$139	123.00	16.00	6	1	5	2	$138	102.50	35.50	5	1	4	4
$140	123.00	17.00	6	1	5	0	$191	123.00	68.00	5	1	4	1
$56	33.50	22.50	1	0	1	1	$120	102.50	17.50	5	1	4	4
$160	102.00	58.00	1	1	3	0	$301	225.00	76.00	11	1	10	10
$315	162.50	152.50	10	1	9	1	$95	95.00	0	6	1	5	2
$145	89.00	56.00	3	1	2	1	$133	102.50	30.50	5	1	4	0
$94	58.00	36.00	2	0	2	2	$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2
$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	0	$127	102.50	24.50	5	1	4	1
$70	40.50	29.50	1	0	1	0	$108	82.00	26.00	4	0	4	0
$178	116.50	61.50	5	1	4	0	$286	192.50	93.50	9	2	7	0
$114	68.00	46.00	2	1	1	1	$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
$235	156.00	79.00	7	1	6	3	$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	3
$84	61.50	22.50	3	0	3	1	$154	93.50	60.50	3	2	1	1
$219	148.00	71.00	7	1	6	3	$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3	$49	30.00	19.00	1	0	1	1
$281	190.00	91.00	9	1	8	8	$52	52.00	0	8	2	6	0
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3	$184	114.00	70.00	4	1	3	0
$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1	$152	92.50	59.50	3	1	2	0
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3	$143	93.50	49.50	4	1	3	0
$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	5	$140	140.00	0	8	1	7	7
$102	102.00	0	5	2	3	0	$56	56.00	0	4	1	3	0
$149	123.00	26.00	6	1	5	1	$41	41.00	0	6	2	4	0
$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	2	$109	65.50	43.50	2	0	2	0
$129	86.50	42.50	4	1	3	0	$129	81.00	48.00	3	1	2	2
$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	0	$168	143.50	24.50	7	1	6	1
$71	61.50	9.50	3	1	2	1	$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	0	$225	151.00	74.00	7	1	6	0
$41	41.00	0	2	1	1	1	$72	47.00	25.00	2	1	1	1
$79	50.50	28.50	2	0	2	0	$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	4
$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4	$184	114.00	70.00	4	1	3	0
$139	102.50	36.50	5	1	4	4	$205	135.50	69.50	6	1	5	2
$217	147.00	70.00	7	1	6	0	$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	0
$235	156.00	79.00	7	1	6	4	$85	53.50	31.50	2	1	1	1
$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2	$179	123.00	56.00	6	1	5	2
$229	164.00	65.00	8	1	7	0	$173	143.50	29.50	7	1	6	3
$116	102.50	13.50	5	1	4	4	$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	0
$263	170.00	93.00	7	1	6	2	$186	126.00	60.00	6	1	5	0
$221	149.00	72.00	7	1	6	0	$213	139.50	73.50	6	1	5	2
$160	123.00	37.00	6	1	5	5	$241	159.00	82.00	7	1	6	5
$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	0	$247	162.00	85.00	7	1	6	0
$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	0	$212	139.00	73.00	6	1	5	3
$141	141.00	0	7	1	6	0	$199	132.50	66.50	6	2	4	1
$128	123.00	5.00	6	0	6	4	$287	193.00	94.00	9	1	8	2
$81	81.00	0	4	1	3	3	$223	144.50	78.50	6	2	4	4
$133	83.00	50.00	3	0	3	3	$190	164.00	26.00	8	1	7	1
$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	5	$170	112.50	57.50	5	1	4	0
$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	0	$172	113.50	58.50	5	1	4	0
$222	149.50	72.50	7	1	6	6	$152	92.50	59.50	3	1	2	0
$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1	$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	4
$197	164.00	33.00	8	1	7	4	$235	156.00	79.00	7	1	6	4
$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	5	$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3	$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	0
$99	60.50	38.50	2	0	2	0	$116	102.50	13.50	5	1	4	3
$144	88.50	55.50	3	2	1	0	$15	15.00	0	2	1	1	0
$143	88.00	55.00	3	1	2	2	$105	102.50	2.50	3	1	2	0
$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	0	$310	204.50	105.50	9	2	7	0
$138	91.00	47.00	4	1	3	1	$63	42.50	20.50	3	1	2	0
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0	$202	143.50	58.50	7	1	6	0
$242	154.00	88.00	6	0	6	1	$145	143.50	1.50	7	1	6	0
$122	122.00	0	7	1	6	1	$161	102.50	58.50	4	1	3	0
$215	164.00	51.00	8	1	7	0	$179	143.50	35.50	7	1	6	5
$263	175.50	87.50	8	1	7	0	$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	0
$101	61.50	39.50	2	1	1	1	$112	82.00	30.00	4	1	3	3
$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4	$141	92.50	48.50	4	1	3	0
$108	82.00	26.00	4	0	4	0	$131	102.50	28.50	5	1	4	0
$159	101.50	57.50	4	1	3	1	$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	0
$154	104.50	49.50	5	1	4	4	$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	4
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0	$161	108.00	53.00	5	1	4	4
$285	192.00	93.00	9	1	8	0	$305	202.00	103.00	9	1	8	0
$60	41.00	19.00	2	1	1	0	$174	143.50	30.50	7	1	6	0
$352	246.00	106.00	12	2	10	0	$303	206.50	96.50	10	1	9	0
$122	83.00	39.00	4	1	3	3	$155	143.50	11.50	7	1	6	6

Receiving assistance for 3 years, but less than 4 years—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate
$171	$113.00	$58.00	5	0	5	5
$31	21.00	10.00	1	0	1	1
$102	82.00	20.00	4	1	3	1
$115	68.50	46.50	2	1	1	1
$173	123.00	50.00	6	1	5	2
$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1
$123	83.50	39.50	4	1	3	0
$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1
$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	0
$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2
$138	102.50	35.50	5	1	4	4
$172	113.50	58.50	5	1	4	4
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	2
$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	0
$100	66.50	33.50	3	1	2	0
$112	72.50	39.50	3	1	2	1
$135	123.00	12.00	6	1	5	0
$251	184.50	66.50	9	1	8	1
$189	127.50	61.50	6	1	5	1
$71	46.50	24.50	2	1	1	1
$109	82.00	27.00	4	1	3	1
$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	0
$121	102.50	18.50	5	1	4	4
$285	192.50	92.50	9	1	8	2
$146	102.50	43.50	5	2	3	2
$121	71.50	49.50	2	0	2	0
$146	95.00	51.00	4	1	3	3
$112	72.50	39.50	3	0	3	0
$86	61.50	24.50	3	0	3	0
$236	164.00	72.00	8	1	7	7
$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	0
$231	164.00	67.00	8	1	7	7
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	0
$38	24.50	13.50	1	0	1	1
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	0
$106	64.00	42.00	2	0	2	0
$132	82.50	49.50	3	1	2	1
$138	102.50	35.50	5	1	4	2
$134	102.50	31.50	5	1	4	4
$277	182.50	94.50	8	1	7	0
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
$133	88.50	44.50	4	1	3	3
$261	184.50	76.50	9	1	8	0
$134	134.00	0	11	1	10	0
$139	102.50	36.50	5	1	4	4
$153	98.00	55.00	4	1	3	0
$291	195.00	96.00	9	1	8	0
$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	2
$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2
$235	156.00	79.00	7	1	6	5
$152	123.00	29.00	6	1	5	2
$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	2
$103	103.00	0	6	1	5	5
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
$223	150.00	73.00	7	1	6	6
$119	70.50	48.50	2	1	1	0
$49	41.00	8.00	2	1	1	1
$253	170.50	82.50	8	1	7	1
$149	143.50	5.50	7	1	6	0
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0
$313	225.00	87.50	11	2	9	0
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0
$124	78.50	45.50	3	1	2	2
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
$75	75.00	0	8	1	7	0
$167	167.00	0	11	2	9	0
$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	4
$125	74.50	50.50	4	1	3	0
$180	143.50	36.50	7	1	6	3
$81	81.00	0	8	1	7	2
$241	159.00	82.00	7	1	6	0
$271	179.50	91.50	8	1	7	0
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	1
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
$132	102.50	29.50	5	1	4	0
$130	81.50	48.50	3	1	2	2
$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	4
$150	102.50	47.50	5	1	4	4
$143	93.50	49.50	4	1	3	1
$53	32.00	21.00	1	0	1	1
$233	149.50	83.50	6	1	5	0
$223	150.00	73.00	7	1	6	0
$149	102.50	46.50	5	1	4	2
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	0
$125	123.00	2.00	6	1	5	0
$204	164.00	40.00	8	1	7	1
$24	20.50	3.50	1	0	1	1
$123	123.00	0	6	1	5	2
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	2
$120	120.00	0	7	1	6	0
$177	123.00	54.00	6	1	5	0
$61	36.00	25.00	1	0	1	1
$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	0
$193	143.50	49.50	7	1	6	2
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	1
$112	67.00	45.00	2	0	2	0
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate
$182	$124.00	$58.00	6	1	5	0
$74	48.00	26.00	2	1	1	1
$265	176.50	88.50	8	1	7	0
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	0
$156	123.00	33.00	6	1	5	1
$146	102.50	43.50	5	1	4	4
$99	60.50	38.50	2	0	2	1
$146	89.50	56.50	3	1	2	0
$226	129.50	96.50	3	1	2	2
$173	123.00	50.00	6	1	5	5
$217	147.00	70.00	7	1	6	3
$236	164.00	72.00	8	1	7	0
$182	113.00	69.00	4	1	3	0
$228	152.50	75.50	7	2	5	1
$24	20.50	3.50	1	0	1	1
$155	99.50	55.50	4	2	2	0
$181	123.50	57.50	6	1	5	5
$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	3
$156	143.50	12.50	7	1	6	3
$208	131.50	76.50	5	2	3	2
$210	164.00	46.00	8	1	7	2
$154	143.50	10.50	7	1	6	6
$113	102.50	10.50	5	1	4	4
$270	179.00	91.00	8	2	6	0
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
$195	164.00	31.00	8	1	7	2
$171	123.00	48.00	6	1	5	5
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0
$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	5
$129	75.50	53.50	2	1	1	0
$252	170.00	82.00	8	2	6	0
$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	0
$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	5
$271	179.50	91.50	8	1	7	2
$160	160.00	0	8	1	7	7
$247	167.50	79.50	8	1	7	7
$234	155.50	78.50	7	2	5	0
$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	0
$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	0
$214	134.50	79.50	5	2	3	0
$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	0
$44	41.00	3.00	2	0	2	2
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
$117	82.00	35.00	4	1	3	0
$117	102.50	14.50	5	1	4	2
$155	143.50	11.50	7	1	6	1
$149	96.50	52.50	4	1	3	0
$172	143.50	28.50	7	1	6	0
$127	123.00	4.00	6	1	5	2
$221	149.00	72.00	7	1	6	1
$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	0
$148	90.50	57.50	3	2	1	1
$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	0
$286	192.50	93.50	9	1	8	0
$111	82.00	29.00	4	1	3	2
$127	74.50	52.50	2	1	1	1
$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2
$114	68.00	46.00	2	1	1	1
$180	143.50	36.50	7	1	6	6
$137	123.00	14.00	6	1	5	1
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
$85	53.50	31.50	2	0	2	1
$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	0
$93	82.00	11.00	4	1	3	3
$74	74.00	0	5	1	4	4
$157	106.00	51.00	5	1	4	0
$224	164.00	60.00	8	1	7	0
$104	63.00	41.00	2	1	1	0
$279	189.00	90.00	9	1	8	0
$109	71.00	38.00	3	1	2	2
$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	0
$265	184.50	80.50	9	1	8	8
$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4
$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	2
$158	106.50	51.50	5	1	4	0
$205	143.50	61.50	7	1	6	6
$174	114.50	59.50	5	1	4	2
$209	143.50	65.50	7	1	6	6
$151	103.00	48.00	5	1	4	0
$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	0
$99	66.00	33.00	3	0	3	0
$55	33.00	22.00	1	0	1	0
$282	190.50	91.50	9	1	8	2
$101	101.00	0	6	1	5	2
$275	181.59	93.50	8	1	7	0
$244	160.50	83.50	7	1	6	0
$206	136.00	70.00	6	1	5	0
$165	110.00	55.00	5	1	4	4
$121	82.50	38.50	4	1	3	2
$141	123.00	18.00	6	1	5	5
$84	61.50	22.50	3	0	3	0
$154	123.00	31.00	6	1	5	5
$226	164.00	62.00	8	1	7	7
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	0
$198	143.50	54.50	7	1	6	6
$171	112.50	58.50	5	1	4	3
$180	123.00	57.00	6	1	5	1

Receiving assistance for 3 years, but less than 4 years—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
$273	$246.00	$27.00	12	2	10	7	$164	$98.50	$65.50	3	1	2	2
$96	59.00	37.00	2	0	2	2	$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	0
$62	61.50	.50	3	1	2	2	$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	0
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	2	$162	108.50	53.50	5	1	4	2
$101	67.00	34.00	2	0	2	0	$147	102.50	44.50	5	1	4	4
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3	$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	0
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	2	$168	111.50	56.60	5	1	4	0
$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	3	$116	74.50	41.50	3	0	3	3
$150	102.50	47.50	5	1	4	0	$116	74.50	41.50	3	1	2	0
$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	0	$247	167.50	79.50	8	1	7	0
$139	86.00	53.00	3	1	2	2	$137	123.00	14.00	6	1	5	5
$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	0	$88	55.00	33.00	2	0	2	2
$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1	$93	63.00	30.00	3	1	2	0
$202	128.50	73.50	5	2	3	0	$246	167.00	79.00	8	2	6	0
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0	$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	0
$132	88.00	44.00	4	2	2	2	$64	43.00	21.00	2	0	2	0
$75	48.50	26.50	2	0	2	2	$125	84.50	40.50	4	1	3	3
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	1	$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	1
$244	138.50	105.50	3	3	0	0	$99	60.50	38.50	2	1	1	0
$57	41.00	16.00	2	1	1	1	$199	132.50	66.50	6	1	5	3
$228	228.00	0	12	2	10	0	$308	209.00	99.00	10	2	8	0
$79	50.50	28.50	2	0	2	2	$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
$85	85.00	0	7	1	6	2	$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	0
$189	143.50	45.50	7	1	6	3	$124	78.50	45.50	3	1	2	2
$31	21.00	10.00	1	0	1	1	$180	123.00	57.00	6	1	5	5
$155	94.00	61.00	3	0	3	1	$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	5
$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	3	$151	103.00	48.00	5	1	4	4
$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	2	$122	102.50	19.50	5	1	4	4
$126	79.50	46.50	3	1	2	2	$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0
$155	105.00	50.00	5	0	5	5	$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	0
$69	40.00	29.00	1	0	1	1	$91	56.60	34.50	2	1	1	1
$163	103.50	59.50	4	1	3	0							

Receiving assistance for 4 years, but less than 5 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
$208	$137.00	$71.00	6	1	4	0	$121	$77.50	$43.50	4	1	3	0
$171	107.50	63.50	4	1	3	0	$211	138.50	72.50	6	1	5	2
$169	123.00	46.00	6	1	5	3	$27	27.00	0	5	1	4	0
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2	$54	41.00	13.00	2		2	0
$49	30.00	19.00	1	0	1	1	$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4
$147	147.00	0	10	1	9	0	$188	121.50	66.50	5	1	4	0
$271	179.50	91.50	8	1	7	0	$179	117.00	62.00	5	1	4	0
$157	100.50	56.50	4	1	3	0	$90	61.50	28.50	3	0	3	0
$94	82.00	12.00	4	1	3	1	$197	143.50	53.50	7	1	6	3
$48	29.50	18.50	1	0	1	1	$172	113.50	58.50	5	1	4	4
$243	160.00	83.00	7	1	6	0	$124	102.50	21.50	5	1	4	1
$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	0	$101	61.50	39.50	2	1	1	1
$207	164.00	43.00	8	1	7	3	$155	94.00	61.00	3	1	2	0
$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	0	$126	85.00	41.00	4	1	3	0
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	2	$39	39.00	0	6	1	5	1
$80	80.00	0	4	1	3	3	$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	1
$113	113.00	0	6	1	5	0	$169	106.50	62.50	4	0	4	3
$136	123.00	13.00	6	1	5	3	$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
$74	48.00	26.00	2	0	2	0	$105	82.00	23.00	4	1	3	3
$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	6	0	$248	184.50	63.50	9	1	8	8
$216	146.50	69.60	7	1	6	0	$115	68.50	46.50	2	1	1	0
$172	123.00	49.00	7	1	6	0	$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	0
$111	111.00	0	7	1	6	0	$52	52.00	0	4	1	3	3
$130	87.00	43.00	4	1	3	3	$156	156.00	0	10	1	9	6
$144	102.50	41.50	5	1	4	1	$78	61.50	16.50	3	1	2	0
$143	143.00	0	7	1	6	2	$95	58.50	36.50	2	0	2	2
$139	123.00	16.00	6	1	5	1	$132	82.50	49.50	3	1	2	2
$179	179.00	0	9	1	8	4	$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	0
$247	167.50	79.50	8	1	7	3	$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
$55	55.00	0	4	1	3	0	$87	82.00	5.00	4	1	3	1
$294	225.50	68.50	11	1	10	0	$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	2
$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2	$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
$127	85.50	41.50	4	1	3	3	$130	87.00	43.00	4	1	3	0
$229	153.00	76.00	7	1	6	0	$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	3
$133	123.00	10.00	6	1	5	4	$283	180.00	103.00	7	1	6	0
$79	79.00	0	5	1	4	0	$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	5
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3	$265	184.50	80.50	9	1	8	6
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	0	$257	161.50	95.50	6	2	4	0
$315	212.50	102.50	10	1	9	0	$48	48.00	0	4	1	3	0
$147	90.00	57.00	3	1	2	1	$145	94.50	50.50	4	1	3	3
$202	128.50	73.50	5	1	4	0	$51	31.00	20.00	1	0	1	1
$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	1	$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	0
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	2	$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	1
$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	2	$31	21.00	10.00	1	0	1	1
$98	98.00	0	6	1	5	5	$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	0
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3	$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1
$113	82.00	31.00	4	1	3	0	$195	143.50	51.50	7	1	6	2
$97	59.50	37.50	2	1	1	0	$269	184.50	84.50	9	2	7	0
$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	0	$234	155.50	78.50	7	1	6	0
$239	164.00	75.00	8	1	7	7	$128	102.50	25.50	5	1	4	0
$150	143.50	6.50	7	2	5	0	$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1
$141	92.50	48.50	4	1	3	0	$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3

Receiving assistance for 4 years, but less than 5 years—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
$87	$61.50	$25.50	3	0	3	0	$127	$80.00	$47.00	3	0	3	3
$126	102.50	23.50	5	1	4	0	$220	143.00	77.00	6	1	5	3
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3	$218	184.50	33.50	9	1	8	8
$103	102.50	.50	5	1	4	0	$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	1
$51	41.00	10.00	2	1	1	1	$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0	$150	123.00	27.00	6	1	5	5
$153	98.50	54.50	4	2	2	0	$161	97.00	64.00	3	0	3	0
$229	153.00	76.00	7	1	6	0	$117	102.50	14.50	5	1	4	4
$51	41.00	10.00	2	0	2	2	$57	41.00	16.00	2	1	1	1
$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	1	$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	0
$140	86.50	53.50	3	1	2	2	$151	103.00	48.00	5	1	4	4
$331	226.00	105.00	11	1	10	9	$253	165.00	88.00	7	1	6	0
$82	82.00	0	4	1	3	3	$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	0
$162	103.00	59.00	4	1	3	0	$117	69.50	47.50	2	0	2	0
$128	102.50	25.50	5	1	4	4	$211	184.50	26.50	9	1	8	0
$213	184.50	28.50	9	2	7	5	$38	24.50	13.50	1	0	1	0
$210	143.50	66.50	7	1	6	0	$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	1
$67	67.00	0	4	1	3	0	$178	116.50	61.50	5	1	4	0
$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	4	$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	0
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3	$158	143.50	14.50	7	1	6	2
$68	68.00	0	4	1	3	2	$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	1
$247	162.00	85.00	7	1	6	0	$76	76.00	0	4	1	3	3
$213	139.50	73.50	6	1	5	0	$61	41.50	19.50	2	0	2	0
$265	176.50	88.50	8	1	7	7	$138	91.00	47.00	4	1	3	0
$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1	$100	61.00	39.00	2	1	1	1
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	1	$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1
$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	0	$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	0
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	1	$116	116.00	0	9	1	8	4
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3	$104	68.50	35.50	3	1	2	0
$102	67.50	34.50	3	1	2	2	$151	92.00	59.00	3	1	2	2
$147	90.00	57.00	3	1	2	1	$139	91.50	47.50	4	1	3	3
$289	194.00	95.00	9	2	7	0	$156	105.50	50.50	5	1	4	4
$162	108.50	53.50	5	1	4	4	$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	1
$269	184.50	84.50	9	1	8	0	$231	154.00	77.00	7	2	5	0
$157	95.00	62.00	3	1	2	2	$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	1
$258	167.50	90.50	7	1	6	0	$288	171.50	116.50	5	1	4	4
$177	123.00	54.00	6	1	5	0	$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	0
$64	64.00	0	4	1	3	1	$109	82.00	27.00	4	1	3	3
$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	5	$207	143.50	63.50	7	1	6	6
$184	143.50	40.50	7	1	6	6	$187	187.00	0	11	1	10	1
$126	85.00	41.00	4	1	3	0	$139	102.50	36.50	5	1	4	2
$183	124.50	58.50	6	1	5	0	$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	4
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	2	$124	73.00	51.00	2	0	2	0
$47	29.00	18.00	1	0	1	1	$265	176.50	88.50	8	1	7	2
$220	143.00	77.00	6	1	5	3	$64	64.00	0	4	1	3	2
$157	157.00	0	10	1	9	9	$154	104.50	49.50	4	1	3	3
$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	0	$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	4
$209	143.50	65.50	7	1	6	6	$282	185.00	97.00	8	2	6	0
$209	132.00	77.00	5	1	4	0	$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0
$139	86.00	53.00	3	0	3	1	$101	101.00	0	6	1	5	0
$239	158.00	81.00	7	2	5	0	$173	108.50	64.50	4	1	3	3
$58	40.00	18.00	2	0	2	0	$234	164.00	70.00	8	1	7	7
$253	165.00	88.00	7	1	6	0	$188	184.50	3.50	9	2	7	0
$131	82.00	49.00	3	1	2	0	$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4
$253	165.00	88.00	7	1	6	1	$80	61.50	18.50	3	1	2	1
$265	176.50	88.50	8	1	7	0	$214	134.50	79.50	5	1	4	1
$131	123.00	8.00	6	1	5	5	$180	117.50	62.50	5	1	4	2
$253	225.50	27.50	11	1	10	10	$199	132.50	66.50	6	1	5	2
$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	2	$159	123.00	36.00	6	1	5	5
$200	143.50	56.50	7	0	7	3	$88	55.00	33.00	2	0	2	2
$235	156.00	79.00	7	1	6	6	$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	1
$60	60.00	0	3	1	2	2	$45	41.00	4.00	2	1	1	0
$105	105.00	0	7	1	6	1	$108	65.00	43.00	2	1	1	0
$219	156.50	62.50	6	1	5	5	$112	82.00	30.00	4	1	3	3
$113	82.00	31.00	4	1	3	3	$272	163.50	108.50	5	1	4	0
$207	164.00	43.00	8	1	7	6	$98	98.00	0	8	1	7	0
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	0	$218	147.50	70.50	7	1	6	4
$185	143.50	41.50	7	1	6	2	$287	193.00	94.00	9	1	8	5
$131	82.00	49.00	3	1	2	2	$334	205.50	128.50	7	2	5	0
$118	118.00	0	6	1	5	0	$74	42.50	31.50	1	0	1	0
$42	41.00	1	2	1	1	1	$127	102.50	24.50	5	1	4	4
$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2	$165	123.00	42.00	6	1	5	0
$135	102.50	32.50	5	1	4	4	$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	0
$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	0	$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1
$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	2	$184	119.50	64.50	5	1	4	4
$97	59.50	37.50	2	1	1	1	$187	121.00	66.50	5	1	4	0
$268	172.50	95.50	7	2	5	5	$113	73.00	40.00	3	1	2	2
$208	131.50	76.50	5	1	4	0	$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
$89	55.50	33.50	2	1	1	1	$138	102.50	35.50	5	1	4	4
$124	73.00	51.00	2	0	2	0	$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	5
$81	51.50	29.50	2	0	2	2	$235	156.00	79.00	7	1	6	6
$175	123.00	52.00	6	1	5	5	$87	87.00	0	7	1	6	2
$111	72.00	39.00	3	1	2	2	$162	103.00	59.00	4	1	3	0
$84	84.00	0	7	2	5	0	$172	113.50	58.50	5	1	4	4
$243	165.50	77.50	8	1	7	4	$178	116.50	61.50	5	1	4	4
$114	82.00	32.00	4	1	3	3	$103	68.00	35.00	3	0	3	3
$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1	$44	41.00	3.00	2	0	2	2
$129	102.50	26.50	5	1	4	4	$251	205.00	46.00	10	1	9	2
$80	51.00	29.00	2	1	1	0	$71	71.00	0	4	0	4	4
$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	0	$265	176.50	88.50	8	1	7	0
$260	205.00	55.00	10	1	9	9	$69	61.50	7.50	3	1	2	0
$126	79.50	46.50	3	1	2	1	$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	1
$155	94.00	61.00	3	2	1	0	$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1
$42	26.50	15.50	1	0	1	1	$173	114.00	59.00	5	1	4	3
$68	45.00	23.00	2	0	2	1	$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
$96	96.00	0	7	1	6	0	$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	0
$108	70.50	37.50	3	1	2	0	$155	123.00	32.00	6	1	5	4
$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1	$54	54.00	0	3	1	2	0
$144	123.00	21.00	6	1	5	5	$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	0

Receiving assistance for 4 years, but less than 5 years—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate
$79	$50.50	$28.50	2	1	1	1
$149	91.00	58.00	3	1	2	0
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	1
$67	44.50	22.50	2	1	1	0
$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	0
$253	165.00	88.00	7	1	6	6
$154	99.00	55.00	4	0	4	0
$111	102.50	8.50	5	1	4	4
$111	72.00	39.00	3	1	2	1
$176	123.00	53.00	6	1	5	5
$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	1
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	2
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0
$198	143.50	54.50	7	1	6	6
$117	102.50	14.50	5	1	4	4
$132	82.50	49.50	3	1	2	1
$168	106.00	62.00	4	1	3	1
$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	5
$96	59.00	37.00	2	0	2	0
$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2
$220	148.50	71.50	7	1	6	1
$277	182.50	94.50	8	1	7	0
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
$183	124.50	58.50	6	1	5	5
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
$80	61.50	18.50	3	1	2	0
$94	63.50	30.50	3	1	2	0
$137	85.00	52.00	3	1	2	2
$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	4
$120	76.50	43.50	3	1	2	2
$253	165.00	88.00	7	1	6	0
$143	88.00	55.00	3	1	2	1
$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	4
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
$218	147.50	70.50	7	1	6	1
$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1
$250	163.50	86.50	7	1	6	0
$97	59.50	37.50	2	0	2	2
$169	106.50	62.50	4	1	3	2
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	2
$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	1
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	1
$63	37.00	26.00	1	0	1	0
$257	167.00	90.00	7	1	6	6
$109	71.00	38.00	3	1	2	0
$151	103.00	48.00	5	1	4	4
$78	50.00	28.00	2	1	1	0
$136	84.50	51.50	3	1	2	2
$309	209.50	99.50	10	1	9	8
$198	143.50	54.50	7	1	6	0
$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	5
$148	143.50	4.50	7	1	6	0
$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	5
$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	1
$211	144.00	67.00	7	2	5	0
$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	4
$158	101.00	57.00	4	1	3	3
$145	89.00	56.00	3	1	2	0
$240	$158.00	$81.50	7	2	5	0
$156	105.50	50.50	5	1	4	3
$132	102.50	29.50	5	1	4	3
$85	48.00	37.00	1	0	1	0
$170	112.50	57.50	5	1	4	4
$216	146.50	69.50	7	1	6	1
$93	68.50	24.50	4	1	3	2
$133	123.00	10.00	6	1	5	1
$187	164.00	23.00	8	1	7	0
$178	116.50	61.50	5	1	4	0
$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	0
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
$321	215.50	105.50	10	1	9	0
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
$152	103.50	48.50	5	1	4	0
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
$99	99.00	0	6	1	5	0
$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	2
$150	97.00	53.00	4	1	3	0
$208	143.50	64.50	7	1	6	5
$259	173.50	85.50	8	1	7	4
$64	37.50	26.50	1	0	1	1
$134	89.00	45.00	4	1	3	0
$151	103.00	48.00	5	1	4	4
$96	59.00	37.00	2	0	2	0
$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	0
$197	126.00	71.00	5	1	4	0
$106	102.50	3.50	5	1	4	0
$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	3
$180	164.00	16.00	8	1	7	4
$156	94.50	61.50	3	2	1	0
$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	0
$180	123.00	57.00	6	1	5	1
$211	144.00	67.00	7	1	6	0
$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	0
$95	64.00	31.00	3	1	2	2
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	1
$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	0
$86	54.00	32.00	2	1	1	1
$48	48.00	0	4	1	3	0
$75	75.00	0	7	1	6	1
$58	34.50	23.50	1	0	1	1
$165	104.50	60.50	4	1	3	0
$171	143.50	27.50	7	1	6	1
$147	123.00	24.00	6	1	5	0
$85	61.50	23.50	3	1	2	2
$64	43.00	21.00	2	1	1	1
$138	123.00	15.00	6	1	5	5
$233	164.00	69.00	8	1	7	0
$38	24.50	13.50	1	0	1	0
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0
$124	102.50	21.50	5	0	5	0
$56	33.50	22.50	1	0	1	0
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
$74	48.00	26.00	2	1	1	0
$219	164.00	55.00	8	1	7	0

Receiving assistance for 5 years, but less than 6 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate
$114	$68.00	$46.00	2	1	1	1
$145	94.50	50.50	4	1	3	0
$267	184.50	82.50	9	1	8	2
$79	45.00	34.00	1	0	1	0
$72	52.50	19.50	3	0	3	0
$259	173.50	85.50	8	1	7	7
$332	221.00	111.00	10	2	8	0
$64	43.00	21.00	2	0	2	0
$152	102.50	49.50	5	1	4	1
$145	94.00	51.00	3	0	3	2
$194	124.50	69.50	5	0	5	5
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	0
$207	136.50	70.50	6	1	5	1
$245	161.00	84.00	7	1	6	0
$187	120.50	66.50	5	1	4	0
$75	48.50	26.50	2	0	2	2
$155	99.50	55.50	4	1	3	1
$140	86.50	53.50	3	1	2	2
$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2
$133	77.50	55.50	2	1	1	1
$24	20.50	3.50	1	0	1	1
$92	57.00	35.00	2	1	1	1
$171	113.00	58.00	5	0	5	0
$263	205.00	58.00	10	1	9	9
$174	123.00	51.00	6	1	5	1
$34	22.50	11.50	1	0	1	0
$232	$184.50	$47.50	9	1	8	0
$159	107.00	52.00	5	0	5	2
$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	3
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
$114	82.00	32.00	4	0	4	4
$74	48.00	26.00	2	1	1	1
$247	184.50	62.50	9	1	8	0
$304	201.50	102.50	9	2	7	0
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	1
$205	130.00	75.00	5	1	4	0
$113	102.50	10.50	5	1	4	4
$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	3
$113	82.00	31.00	4	1	3	3
$195	130.50	64.50	6	1	5	0
$130	81.50	48.50	3	1	2	2
$258	167.50	90.50	7	2	5	0
$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	0
$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	5
$136	90.00	46.00	4	1	3	3
$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4
$193	134.00	69.00	5	1	4	4
$141	102.50	38.50	5	1	4	4
$171	123.00	48.00	6	1	5	3
$82	52.00	30.00	2	1	1	0
$163	123.00	40.00	6	1	5	5
$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	0

Receiving assistance for 5 years, but less than 6 years—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate
$64	$43.00	$21.00	2	0	2	2
$109	65.50	43.50	2	1	1	1
$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	0
$180	143.50	36.50	7	1	6	6
$234	184.50	49.50	9	1	8	8
$269	178.50	90.50	8	1	7	0
$179	123.00	56.00	6	1	5	5
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	1
$137	90.50	46.50	4	0	4	0
$200	184.50	15.50	9	2	7	2
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1
$320	209.50	110.50	9	1	8	0
$253	165.00	88.00	7	1	6	3
$172	123.00	49.00	6	1	5	5
$165	104.50	60.50	4	1	3	0
$116	82.00	34.00	4	1	3	0
$182	118.50	63.50	5	1	4	0
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0
$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	5
$296	197.50	98.50	9	1	8	1
$93	57.50	35.50	2	1	1	1
$211	138.50	72.50	6	1	5	5
$184	114.00	70.00	4	1	3	3
$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	5
$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	0
$271	179.50	91.50	8	1	7	7
$247	184.50	62.50	9	1	8	4
$259	205.00	54.00	10	2	8	3
$128	80.50	47.50	3	1	2	2
$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4
$141	102.50	38.50	5	1	4	0
$247	167.50	79.50	8	1	7	0
$183	119.00	64.00	5	1	4	1
$253	165.00	88.00	7	1	6	6
$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2
$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2
$178	116.50	61.50	5	1	4	4
$62	62.00	0	6	1	5	2
$96	59.00	37.00	2	0	2	0
$128	86.00	42.00	4	1	3	3
$200	133.00	67.00	6	1	5	5
$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	0
$184	119.50	64.50	5	0	5	0
$64	43.00	21.00	2	0	2	2
$242	159.50	82.50	7	1	6	6
$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	3
$146	102.50	43.50	5	1	4	0
$65	65.00	0	7	1	6	0
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0
$214	145.50	68.50	7	1	6	0
$256	166.50	89.50	7	1	6	0
$187	126.50	60.50	6	2	4	0
$283	185.50	97.50	8	1	7	0
$57	41.00	16.00	2	0	2	2
$82	52.00	30.00	2	1	1	1
$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	2
$160	160.00	0	9	2	7	0
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	0
$147	90.00	57.00	3	1	2	2
$178	123.00	55.00	6	1	5	0
$102	102.00	0	6	1	5	5
$165	104.50	60.50	4	0	4	4
$98	60.00	38.00	2	1	1	1
$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	2
$172	123.00	49.00	6	1	5	3
$105	63.50	41.50	2	1	1	1
$178	116.50	61.50	5	1	4	0
$259	173.50	85.50	8	1	7	0
$47	29.00	18.00	1	0	1	0
$265	184.50	80.50	9	1	8	0
$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	1
$96	96.00	0	6	1	5	0
$145	102.50	42.50	5	1	4	4
$129	86.50	42.50	4	1	3	0
$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	4
$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	2
$135	123.00	12.00	6	1	5	4
$217	147.00	70.00	7	1	6	0
$184	119.50	64.50	5	1	4	1
$73	61.50	11.50	3	1	2	2
$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	4
$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	0
$178	164.00	14.00	8	1	7	1
$156	94.50	61.50	3	1	2	0
$159	173.50	85.50	8	1	7	4
$135	102.50	32.50	5	1	4	4
$150	102.50	47.50	5	1	4	0
$144	102.50	41.50	5	1	4	4
$206	143.50	62.50	7	1	6	4
$197	164.00	33.00	8	1	7	7
$237	164.00	74.00	8	1	7	7
$222	184.50	37.50	9	1	8	3
$120	76.50	43.50	3	1	2	0
$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	0
$174	109.00	65.00	4	1	3	0
$24	24.00	0	3	1	2	0
$150	$97.00	$53.00	4	0	4	0
$114	73.50	40.50	3	0	3	0
$331	226.00	105.00	11	1	10	0
$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	0
$229	164.00	65.00	8	1	7	1
$262	184.50	77.50	9	1	8	2
$160	162.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
$127	102.50	24.50	5	1	4	0
$139	139.00	0	8	1	7	0
$327	218.50	108.50	10	1	9	2
$126	79.50	46.50	3	1	2	1
$184	119.50	64.50	5	1	4	4
$128	86.00	42.00	4	1	3	3
$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	2
$304	225.50	78.50	11	1	10	5
$259	173.50	85.50	8	1	7	0
$157	106.00	51.00	5	1	4	4
$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	1
$99	60.50	38.50	2	1	1	1
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
$271	179.50	91.50	8	1	7	0
$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	4
$120	76.50	43.50	3	1	2	0
$165	110.00	55.00	5	1	4	4
$150	102.50	47.50	5	1	4	0
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	2
$256	205.00	51.00	10	1	9	5
$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4
$193	164.00	29.00	8	2	6	0
$213	213.00	0	11	1	10	3
$156	105.50	50.50	5	1	4	3
$109	65.50	43.50	2	1	1	1
$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	0
$213	145.00	68.00	7	1	6	6
$157	100.50	56.50	4	1	3	0
$112	112.00	0	6	1	5	0
$276	182.00	94.00	8	2	6	0
$105	63.50	41.50	2	1	1	1
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	0
$111	72.00	39.00	3	1	2	2
$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	0
$24	20.50	3.50	1	0	1	1
$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	0
$35	35.00	0	3	1	2	2
$139	86.00	53.00	3	1	2	0
$129	102.50	26.50	5	1	4	4
$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	0
$144	94.00	50.00	4	1	3	1
$163	98.00	65.00	3	1	2	2
$164	143.50	20.50	7	1	6	2
$221	143.50	77.50	6	1	5	0
$160	123.00	37.00	6	2	4	0
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
$166	110.50	55.50	5	1	4	4
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
$105	69.00	36.00	3	1	2	1
$288	188.00	100.00	8	2	6	0
$233	155.00	78.00	7	1	6	2
$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	0
$85	82.00	3.00	4	1	3	0
$229	153.00	76.00	7	1	6	1
$47	29.00	18.00	1	0	1	1
$149	91.00	58.00	3	1	2	1
$110	66.00	44.00	2	1	1	1
$344	194.00	150.00	4	1	3	0
$157	106.00	51.00	5	1	4	4
$132	77.00	55.00	2	1	1	1
$124	84.00	40.00	4	1	3	3
$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1
$149	96.50	52.50	4	1	3	2
$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	0
$279	225.50	53.50	11	1	10	10
$138	123.00	15.00	6	1	5	5
$175	143.50	31.50	7	1	6	1
$229	153.00	76.00	7	1	6	0
$345	233.00	112.00	11	1	10	0
$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	0
$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
$177	123.00	54.00	6	1	5	1
$41	26.00	15.00	1	0	1	1
$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	4
$138	96.50	41.50	5	1	4	0
$216	205.00	11.00	10	1	9	4
$128	80.50	47.50	3	1	2	2
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
$184	125.00	59.00	6	1	5	5
$138	91.00	47.00	4	1	3	3
$124	73.00	51.00	2	0	2	0
$84	61.50	22.50	3	0	3	3
$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	0
$104	63.00	41.00	2	1	1	1
$196	125.50	70.50	5	1	4	4
$146	102.50	43.50	5	1	4	1
$123	102.50	20.50	5	1	4	4
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0
$228	147.00	81.00	6	1	5	0
$145	102.50	42.50	5	1	4	0
$80	80.00	0	5	1	4	1

Receiving assistance for 5 years, but less than 6 years—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
$181	$118.00	$63.00	5	1	4	0	$159	$101.50	$57.50	4	1	3	1
$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1	$46	28.50	17.50	1	0	1	1
$101	61.50	39.50	2	0	2	2	$111	66.50	41.50	2	1	1	1
$43	27.00	16.00	1	0	1	1	$211	133.00	78.00	5	1	4	1
$204	143.50	60.50	7	1	6	0	$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1	$102	62.00	40.00	2	0	2	0
$211	133.00	78.00	5	1	4	0	$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	5
$241	164.50	76.50	8	1	7	1	$156	94.50	61.50	3	1	2	2
$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	0	$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	1
$223	150.00	73.00	7	1	6	0	$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1
$257	172.50	84.50	8	1	7	7	$116	74.50	41.50	3	1	2	1
$120	82.00	38.00	4	0	4	4	$86	86.00	0	5	1	4	2
$99	66.00	33.00	3	1	2	0	$231	154.00	77.00	7	1	6	1
$41	26.00	15.00	1	0	1	0	$228	147.00	81.00	6	0	6	0
$133	88.50	44.50	4	1	3	0	$103	68.00	35.00	3	1	2	2
$226	146.00	80.00	6	2	4	0	$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	2
$235	156.00	79.00	7	1	6	3	$160	123.00	37.00	6	1	5	5
$99	60.50	38.50	2	1	1	1	$217	141.50	75.50	6	2	4	0
$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	0	$150	102.50	47.50	5	1	4	3
$112	67.00	45.00	2	0	2	0	$189	127.50	61.50	6	1	5	5
$200	133.00	67.00	6	1	5	3	$297	205.00	92.00	10	1	9	3
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0	$121	71.50	49.50	2	1	1	0
$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4.	0	$134	89.00	45.00	4	1	3	3
$182	124.00	58.00	6	1	5	1	$259	173.50	85.50	8	1	7	0
$104	63.00	41.00	2	0	2	0	$168	123.00	45.00	6	1	5	1
$129	81.00	48.00	3	1	2	2	$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	2
$205	143.50	61.50	7	1	6	6	$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	0
$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	5	$38	24.50	13.50	1	0	1	1
$203	104.50	98.50	6	1	5	5	$67	39.00	28.00	1	0	1	1
$26	20.50	5.50	1	0	1	1	$101	67.00	34.00	3	1	2	0
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3	$56	56.00	0	3	1	2	0
$165	104.50	60.50	4	1	3	3	$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	5
$75	75.00	0	4	1	3	0	$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	0	$149	102.50	46.50	5	1	4	0
$58	41.00	17.00	2	0	2	0	$153	143.50	9.50	7	2	5	0
$119	119.00	0	6	1	5	0	$133	83.00	50.00	3	0	3	3
$152	98.00	54.00	4	1	3	2	$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
$114	82.00	32.00	4	1	3	1	$145	89.00	56.00	3	0	3	3
$75	75.00	0	7	2	5	0	$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	4
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3	$89	55.50	33.50	2	1	1	1
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0	$88	61.50	26.50	3	1	2	2
$212	164.00	48.00	8	1	7	1	$293	196.00	97.00	9	1	8	8
$31	21.00	10.00	1	0	1	0	$31	21.00	10.00	1	0	1	1
$66	66.00	0	4	1	3	0	$205	130.00	75.00	5	1	4	0
$72	72.00	0	5	1	4	4	$186	120.50	65.50	5	0	5	0
$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	0	$183	119.00	64.00	5	1	4	4
$277	182.50	94.50	8	1	7	0	$116	74.50	41.50	3	0	3	3
$130	81.50	48.50	3	1	2	2	$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	0
$72	61.50	10.50	7	1	6	2	$203	143.50	59.50	7	1	6	0
$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	2	$70	46.00	24.00	2	0	2	0
$104	63.00	41.00	2	0	2	2	$168	106.00	62.00	4	1	3	1
$64	43.00	21.00	2	0	2	2	$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	0

Receiving assistance for 6 years, but less than 7 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
$170	$170.00	$63.00	4	1	3	2	$303	$201.00	$102.00	9	1	8	0
$217	164.00	53.00	8	1	7	2	$162	108.50	53.50	5	1	4	4
$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	3	$221	143.50	77.50	6	1	5	0
$252	170.00	82.00	8	2	6	5	$102	82.00	20.00	4	1	3	0
$101	82.00	19.00	4	1	3	1	$200	164.00	36.00	8	1	7	8
$97	65.00	32.00	3	1	2	2	$236	184.50	51.50	9	1	8	0
$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	3	$273	186.00	87.00	9	1	8	0
$32	32.00	0	5	1	4	4	$172	123.00	49.00	6	2	4	0
$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	5	$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	3	$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	4
$221	143.50	77.50	6	1	5	1	$265	176.50	88.50	8	1	7	1
$132	82.50	49.50	3	0	3	3	$122	72.00	50.00	2	1	1	0
$218	218.00	0	12	2	10	1	$122	83.00	39.00	4	1	3	3
$138	102.50	35.50	5	1	4	4	$222	164.00	58.00	8	1	7	2
$154	123.00	31.00	6	1	5	2	$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4
$205	130.00	75.00	5	1	4	0	$137	85.00	52.00	3	1	2	2
$259	173.50	85.50	8	1	7	7	$65	38.00	27.00	1	0	1	1
$181	123.50	57.50	6	1	5	4	$239	158.00	81.00	7	1	6	6
$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	0	$166	150.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	0	$257	167.00	90.00	7	1	6	6
$211	184.50	26.50	9	1	8	0	$157	123.00	34.00	6	1	5	5
$185	120.00	65.00	5	1	4	2	$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	0
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3	$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	5
$109	65.50	43.50	2	1	1	1	$243	165.50	77.50	8	2	6	0
$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	0	$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1
$118	82.00	36.00	4	1	3	0	$163	98.00	65.00	3	1	2	2
$155	143.50	11.50	7	1	6	4	$314	206.50	107.50	9	1	8	0
$89	55.50	33.50	2	0	2	2	$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	4
$201	133.50	67.50	6	1	5	1	$231	148.50	82.50	6	1	5	0
$203	143.50	59.50	7	1	6	5	$117	102.50	14.50	5	0	5	1
$82	52.00	30.00	2	1	1	0	$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	1

Receiving assistance for 6 years, but less than 7 years—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate
$167	$111.00	$56.00	5	1	4	2
$253	165.00	88.00	7	1	6	6
$156	100.00	56.00	5	1	4	2
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	1
$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2
$271	185.00	86.00	9	1	8	8
$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	1
$141	141.00	0	7	1	6	1
$116	74.50	41.50	3	1	2	2
$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	0
$200	164.00	36.00	8	1	7	2
$206	184.50	21.50	9	1	8	0
$327	287.00	40.00	14	2	12	1
$129	102.50	26.50	5	1	4	0
$277	182.50	94.50	8	1	7	5
$238	164.00	74.00	8	1	7	0
$63	37.00	26.00	1	0	1	1
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0
$113	67.50	45.50	2	1	1	0
$90	56.00	34.00	2	1	1	0
$221	143.50	77.50	6	1	5	0
$187	126.50	60.50	6	1	5	0
$97	59.50	37.50	2	1	1	1
$253	165.00	88.00	7	1	6	0
$30	30.00	0	6	1	5	0
$117	82.00	35.00	4	1	3	0
$209	143.50	65.50	7	1	6	3
$203	129.00	74.00	5	1	4	3
$102	62.00	40.00	2	0	2	0
$184	119.50	64.50	5	1	4	2
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0
$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	5
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	4
$173	114.00	59.00	5	1	4	0
$245	161.00	84.00	7	1	6	4
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
$278	172.00	106.00	6	1	5	1
$177	123.00	54.00	6	1	5	4
$190	128.00	62.00	6	1	5	0
$241	159.00	82.00	7	1	6	3
$131	87.50	43.50	4	1	3	3
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0
$90	56.00	34.00	2	0	2	2
$149	96.50	52.50	4	1	3	3
$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	0
$114	68.00	46.00	2	1	1	1
$184	164.00	20.00	8	1	7	0
$152	92.50	59.50	3	1	2	2
$125	79.00	46.00	3	1	2	0
$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	0
$144	88.50	55.50	3	1	2	0
$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	2
$177	116.00	61.00	5	1	4	0
$185	164.00	21.00	8	1	7	0
$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	0
$98	82.00	16.00	4	1	3	0
$184	114.00	70.00	4	1	3	0
$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1
$126	85.00	41.00	4	1	3	0
$100	61.00	39.00	2	1	1	0
$10	10.00	0	2	1	1	0
$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4
$26	26.00	0	4	1	3	0
$95	58.50	36.50	2	1	1	0
$229	164.00	65.00	8	1	7	1
$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	0
$71	46.50	24.50	2	1	1	1
$183	124.50	58.50	6	1	5	5
$124	102.50	21.50	5	0	5	5
$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	2
$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2
$110	$86.00	$44.00	2	0	2	2
$100	61.00	39.00	2	1	1	0
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	2
$121	71.50	49.50	2	1	1	1
$146	102.50	43.50	5	1	4	4
$240	164.00	76.00	8	1	7	7
$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	0
$102	67.50	34.50	3	1	2	2
$95	82.00	13.00	4	2	2	2
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	4
$145	94.50	50.50	4	1	3	0
$264	184.50	79.50	9	1	8	0
$289	188.50	100.50	8	1	7	7
$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2
$137	102.50	34.50	5	1	4	4
$163	123.00	40.00	6	1	5	5
$259	168.00	91.00	7	1	6	0
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	2
$184	114.00	70.00	4	1	3	3
$105	63.50	41.50	2	0	2	0
$309	204.00	105.00	9	2	7	0
$145	94.50	50.50	4	2	2	0
$132	102.50	29.50	5	1	4	4
$285	192.00	93.00	9	1	8	0
$148	143.50	4.50	7	1	6	3
$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	2
$265	184.50	80.50	9	1	8	1
$116	82.00	34.00	4	1	3	0
$217	136.00	81.00	5	1	4	0
$131	87.50	43.50	4	1	3	3
$120	82.00	38.00	4	1	3	0
$99	60.50	38.50	2	1	1	0
$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	2
$157	95.00	62.00	3	2	1	0
$130	81.50	48.50	3	1	2	2
$104	68.50	35.50	3	1	2	2
$144	88.50	55.50	3	1	2	2
$134	89.00	45.00	4	1	3	3
$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2
$107	64.50	42.50	2	0	2	2
$234	184.50	49.50	9	1	8	1
$72	61.50	10.50	3	0	3	3
$17	17.00	0	5	1	4	0
$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
$151	123.00	28.00	6	1	5	5
$108	82.00	26.00	4	1	3	2
$251	184.50	66.50	9	1	8	8
$205	130.00	75.00	5	1	4	1
$133	83.00	50.00	3	1	2	2
$121	77.00	44.00	3	1	2	2
$129	102.50	26.50	5	1	4	4
$277	182.50	94.50	8	1	7	2
$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	1
$209	164.00	45.00	8	1	7	0
$95	58.50	36.50	2	0	2	2
$82	52.00	30.00	2	1	1	0
$104	102.50	1.50	5	1	4	0
$187	115.50	71.50	4	1	3	3
$94	94.00	0	6	1	5	0
$194	138.50	55.50	5	1	4	0
$333	221.50	111.50	10	1	9	9
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	0
$162	103.00	59.00	4	1	3	0
$133	83.00	50.00	3	1	2	2
$231	154.00	77.00	7	1	6	0
$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	0
$253	165.00	88.00	7	1	6	0
$138	138.00	0	7	1	6	6
$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	0

Receiving assistance for 7 years, but less than 8 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate
$178	$111.00	$67.00	4	1	3	1
$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	0
$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1
$195	125.00	70.00	5	0	5	0
$107	82.00	25.00	4	1	3	3
$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	0
$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2
$48	48.00	0	4	1	3	1
$253	165.00	88.00	7	1	6	0
$66	38.50	27.50	1	0	1	1
$116	82.00	34.00	4	1	3	0
$92	57.00	35.00	2	1	1	1
$171	123.00	48.00	6	1	5	1
$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1
$172	$108.00	$64.00	4	1	3	3
$131	102.50	28.50	5	1	4	4
$120	82.00	38.00	4	0	4	2
$38	38.00	0	3	1	2	0
$187	126.50	60.50	6	1	5	4
$221	143.50	77.50	6	1	5	0
$247	162.00	85.00	7	1	6	0
$38	24.50	13.50	1	0	1	1
$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
$108	102.50	5.50	5	1	4	0
$136	136.00	0	8	1	7	7
$220	143.00	77.00	6	2	4	1
$129	102.50	26.50	5	1	4	4
$168	111.50	56.50	5	1	4	4

Receiving assistance for 7 years, but less than 8 years—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
$124	$84.00	$40.00	4	1	3	1	$205	$130.00	$75.00	5	1	4	4
$57	57.00	0	3	1	2	0	$71	46.50	24.50	2	1	1	0
$164	98.50	65.50	3	1	2	0	$205	130.00	75.00	5	1	4	1
$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	0	$154	94.50	59.50	3	1	2	0
$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	0	$53	32.00	21.00	1	0	1	1
$93	63.00	30.00	3	1	2	2	$125	123.00	2.00	6	1	5	5
$128	102.50	25.50	5	1	4	0	$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	5
$70	46.00	24.00	2	1	1	0	$247	162.00	85.00	7	1	6	1
$86	54.00	32.00	2	0	2	1	$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	0	0
$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	2	$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1
$95	64.00	31.00	3	1	2	0	$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	0
$179	143.50	35.50	7	1	6	0	$241	159.00	82.00	7	1	6	1
$149	102.50	46.50	5	1	4	1	$42	26.50	15.50	1	0	1	1
$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	2	$254	160.00	94.00	6	2	4	0
$140	86.50	53.50	3	0	3	3	$127	80.00	47.00	3	1	2	2
$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	4	$197	115.00	82.00	3	1	2	1
$64	37.50	26.50	1	0	1	0	$101	82.00	19.00	4	1	3	2
$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	0	$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	1
$140	85.50	53.50	3	1	2	0	$219	148.00	71.00	7	1	6	3
$195	125.00	70.00	5	1	4	2	$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	0
$78	44.50	33.50	1	0	1	1	$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	2
$213	145.00	68.00	7	1	6	0	$133	83.00	50.00	3	1	2	1
$190	122.50	67.50	5	1	4	0	$12	12.00	0	4	0	4	0
$69	40.00	29.00	1	0	1	0	$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	5
$208	131.50	76.50	5	2	3	0	$132	132.00	0	7	1	6	2
$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	0	$125	79.00	46.00	3	1	2	2
$110	110.00	0	7	1	6	0	$221	143.50	77.50	6	1	5	0
$97	65.00	32.00	3	0	3	0	$299	199.00	100.00	9	1	8	2
$72	61.50	10.50	3	0	3	0	$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
$57	48.00	9.00	1	0	1	1	$280	184.00	96.00	8	1	7	1
$259	173.50	85.50	8	1	7	1	$38	24.50	13.50	1	0	1	0
$235	156.00	79.00	7	1	6	1	$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
$164	109.50	54.50	5	1	4	0	$162	103.00	59.00	4	1	3	0
$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	5	$88	82.00	6.00	4	1	3	3
$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	0	$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4
$98	98.00	0	8	1	7	0	$142	123.00	19.00	6	1	5	0
$90	61.50	28.50	3	0	3	1	$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0
$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4	$88	61.50	26.50	3	1	2	0
$93	93.00	0	5	2	3	0	$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	0
$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1	$221	143.50	77.50	6	1	5	0
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	1	$58	58.00	0	4	1	3	3
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	1							

Receiving assistance for 8 years, but less than 9 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
$181	$123.50	$57.50	6	1	5	5	$109	$102.50	$6.50	5	1	4	0
$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	0	$142	87.50	54.50	3	1	2	2
$160	91.50	68.50	3	1	2	2	$106	64.00	42.00	2	1	1	0
$111	66.50	44.50	2	0	2	2	$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	0
$126	79.50	46.50	3	1	2	0	$46	41.00	5.00	2	1	1	0
$221	143.50	77.50	6	1	5	5	$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	3
$195	125.00	70.00	5	1	4	4	$195	125.00	70.00	5	1	4	1
$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	0	$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
$287	205.00	82.00	10	1	9	1	$30	20.50	9.50	1	0	1	0
$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	3	$89	61.50	27.50	3	1	2	2
$124	78.50	45.50	3	1	2	0	$180	117.50	62.50	5	1	4	0
$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	0	$229	153.00	76.00	7	1	6	2
$100	71.00	29.00	2	1	1	1	$252	170.00	82.00	8	1	7	0
$235	156.00	79.00	7	1	6	6	$241	159.00	82.00	7	1	6	0
$79	45.00	34.00	1	0	1	0	$150	97.00	53.00	4	1	3	3
$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	3	$125	102.50	22.50	5	1	4	1
$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	2	$156	94.50	61.50	3	1	2	0
$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1	$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	3
$232	154.50	77.50	7	1	6	1	$64	43.00	21.00	2	0	2	2
$138	80.00	58.00	2	1	1	0	$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	0
$109	65.50	43.50	2	1	1	0	$95	58.50	36.50	2	1	1	1
$106	69.50	36.50	3	1	2	0	$116	74.50	41.50	3	1	2	1
$133	83.00	50.00	3	1	2	0	$154	94.50	59.50	3	1	2	2
$31	21.00	10.00	1	0	1	1	$99	65.50	33.50	2	0	2	0
$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	1	$171	107.50	63.50	4	1	3	0
$166	123.00	43.00	6	1	5	5	$137	85.00	52.00	3	1	2	2
$186	125.50	60.50	5	1	4	0	$184	114.00	70.00	4	1	3	0
$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	3	$145	94.50	50.50	4	1	3	1
$110	66.00	44.00	2	1	1	0	$121	121.00	0	8	1	7	7
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3	$205	130.00	75.00	5	1	4	0
$78	61.50	16.50	3	1	2	0	$53	41.00	12.00	2	1	1	1
$264	176.00	88.00	8	1	7	1	$96	59.00	37.00	2	1	1	1
$115	82.00	33.00	4	1	3	0	$40	40.00	0	4	1	3	3
$220	143.00	77.00	6	1	5	3	$121	71.50	49.50	2	1	1	1
$135	84.00	51.00	3	1	2	0	$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4
$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	0	$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4
$119	119.00	0	6	2	4	0	$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4
$154	123.00	31.00	6	1	5	5	$241	159.00	82.00	7	1	6	2
$262	184.50	77.50	9	1	8	0	$196	131.00	65.00	6	1	5	0
$162	103.00	59.00	4	1	3	0							

Receiving assistance for 9 years, but less than 10 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate
$169	$123.00	$46.00	6	1	5	5
$268	172.50	95.50	7	1	6	6
$252	225.50	26.50	11	2	9	0
$157	106.00	51.00	5	1	4	4
$162	103.00	59.00	4	1	3	3
$267	172.00	95.00	7	1	6	3
$60	41.00	19.00	2	1	1	0
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0
$101	82.00	19.00	4	1	3	3
$233	149.50	83.50	6	1	5	1
$180	112.00	68.00	4	1	3	0
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	1
$213	145.00	68.00	7	1	6	0
$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	0
$95	82.00	13.00	4	1	3	0
$75	75.00	0	4	1	3	0
$120	82.00	38.00	4	1	3	1
$75	53.50	21.50	2	1	1	1
$154	123.00	31.00	6	1	5	0
$54	41.00	13.00	2	1	1	1
$106	69.50	36.50	3	2	1	0
$147	102.50	44.50	5	1	4	2
$210	164.00	46.00	8	1	7	3
$100	66.50	33.50	3	1	2	0
$305	202.00	103.00	9	1	8	2
$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	1
$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1
$99	65.50	33.50	2	0	2	2
$137	85.00	52.00	3	1	2	0
$136	84.50	51.50	3	0	3	1
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
$58	41.00	17.00	2	0	2	2
$126	79.50	46.50	3	1	2	0
$133	83.00	50.00	3	1	2	0
$239	$158.00	$81.00	7	1	6	0
$246	205.00	41.00	10	1	9	9
$168	111.00	57.00	5	1	4	2
$138	91.00	47.00	4	1	3	1
$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2
$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	0
$146	89.50	56.50	3	1	2	0
$90	56.00	34.00	2	1	1	0
$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	4
$253	165.00	88.00	7	1	6	0
$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1
$65	38.00	27.00	1	0	1	1
$78	50.00	28.00	2	1	1	0
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
$109	65.50	43.50	2	0	2	0
$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	0
$110	102.50	7.50	5	1	4	0
$105	73.50	31.50	2	1	1	1
$267	177.50	89.50	8	1	7	7
$131	102.50	28.50	5	1	4	0
$315	212.50	102.50	10	2	8	0
$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	2
$203	129.00	74.00	5	1	4	2
$211	133.00	78.00	5	1	4	0
$293	196.00	97.00	9	1	8	6
$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1
$141	102.50	38.50	5	1	4	0
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
$151	123.00	28.00	6	1	5	0
$178	116.50	61.50	5	1	4	4
$253	165.00	88.00	7	1	6	2
$57	57.00	0	3	1	2	1
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	1
$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3

Receiving assistance for 10 years, but less than 11 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate
$105	$73.50	$31.50	2	1	1	1
$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	0
$62	41.50	20.50	1	0	1	0
$109	82.00	27.00	4	1	3	3
$120	82.00	38.00	4	0	4	0
$132	102.50	29.50	5	1	4	3
$68	61.50	6.50	3	1	2	0
$222	144.00	78.00	6	1	5	0
$252	170.00	82.00	8	2	6	0
$143	143.00	0	7	1	6	0
$55	55.00	0	4	1	3	2
$94	58.00	36.00	2	0	2	2
$145	94.50	50.50	4	1	3	3
$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	0
$58	41.00	17.00	2	0	2	0
$179	117.00	62.00	5	1	4	1
$130	102.50	27.50	5	2	3	0
$142	93.00	49.00	4	1	3	2
$162	103.00	59.00	4	1	3	3
$239	164.00	75.00	8	1	7	7
$61	36.00	25.00	1	0	1	0
$192	123.50	68.50	5	1	4	4
$63	37.00	26.00	1	0	1	1
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	2
$208	131.50	76.50	5	1	4	0
$82	61.50	20.50	3	1	2	0
$93	63.00	30.00	3	1	2	0
$169	$123.00	$46.00	6	1	5	5
$268	178.00	90.00	8	2	6	0
$99	65.50	33.50	2	1	1	0
$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
$71	71.00	0	5	2	3	0
$201	133.50	67.50	6	1	5	5
$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1
$111	82.00	29.00	4	1	3	1
$276	182.00	94.00	8	2	6	0
$167	167.00	0	9	1	8	3
$106	74.00	32.00	2	1	1	0
$89	89.00	0	5	1	4	0
$211	138.50	72.50	6	1	5	4
$158	158.00	0	9	1	8	3
$255	171.50	83.50	8	1	7	0
$88	55.00	33.00	2	1	1	1
$96	59.00	37.00	2	1	1	1
$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	5
$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	1
$156	156.00	0	9	1	8	1
$122	72.00	50.00	2	1	1	0
$112	67.00	45.00	2	1	1	1
$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1
$95	64.00	31.00	3	1	2	0
$117	69.50	47.50	2	1	1	0
$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	5
$174	123.00	51.00	6	1	5	4

Receiving assistance for 11 years, but less than 12 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate
$106	$64.00	$42.00	2	1	1	1
$103	82.00	21.00	4	1	3	0
$120	76.50	43.50	3	1	2	0
$167	164.00	3.00	8	1	7	0
$105	63.50	41.50	2	1	1	0
$136	84.50	51.50	3	1	2	2
$176	110.00	66.00	4	1	3	1
$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1
$165	90.00	75.00	5	0	5	0
$156	105.50	50.50	5	1	4	0
$77	$77.00	0	4	1	3	0
$165	104.50	$60.50	4	1	3	3
$130	87.00	43.00	4	1	3	3
$305	202.00	103.00	9	1	8	1
$69	69.00	0	4	1	3	1
$96	69.50	26.50	3	1	2	0
$246	95.00	51.00	4	1	3	1
$69	40.00	29.00	1	0	1	0
$168	106.00	62.00	4	1	3	3
$166	116.00	50.00	6	1	5	5

Receiving assistance for 12 years, but less than 13 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
$115	$102.50	$12.50	5	2	3	0	$132	$82.50	$49.50	3	1	2	2
$54	32.50	21.50	1	0	1	1	$167	105.50	61.50	4	0	4	0
$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	4	$178	116.50	61.50	5	1	4	4
$29	29.00	0	2	1	1	0	$213	139.50	73.50	6	1	5	2
$136	84.50	51.50	3	0	3	3	$154	123.50	30.50	3	1	2	2
$167	123.00	44.00	6	1	5	1	$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	0
$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	0	$154	123.50	30.50	3	1	2	1
$179	111.50	67.50	4	1	3	0	$41	41.00	0	5	1	4	0
$38	38.00	0	2	1	1	0	$309	225.50	83.50	11	1	10	10
$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	3	$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	3
$184	119.50	64.50	5	1	4	4	$154	123.50	30.50	3	1	2	2

Receiving assistance for 13 years, but less than 14 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
$147	$90.00	$57.00	3	1	2	0	$147	$105.50	$41.50	4	1	3	3
$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	0	$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	1
$205	130.00	75.00	5	1	4	4	$75	48.50	26.50	2	1	1	0
$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1	$192	129.00	63.00	6	1	5	2
$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	3	$150	102.50	47.50	5	1	4	3
$184	114.00	70.00	4	1	3	0	$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	0
$113	67.50	45.50	2	0	2	2	$24	20.50	3.50	1	0	1	1
$42	26.50	15.50	1	0	1	1	$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	3
$247	152.00	95.00	7	1	6	6	$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	3
$176	115.50	60.50	5	1	4	2	$104	68.50	35.50	3	1	2	0

Receiving assistance for 14 years, but less than 15 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
$184	$114.00	$70.00	4	1	3	0	$63	$37.00	$26.00	1	0	1	1
$243	143.50	99.50	4	1	3	1	$155	94.00	61.00	3	1	2	1
$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	2	$196	196.00	0	10	1	9	0
$70	41.00	29.00	2	0	2	2	$127	94.50	32.50	2	1	1	1
$211	133.00	78.00	5	1	4	4	$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	0
$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	4	$109	82.00	27.00	4	0	4	2
$105	63.50	41.50	2	0	2	2	$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	3
$54	54.00	0	3	0	3	1	$253	184.50	68.50	9	1	8	0
$212	144.50	67.50	7	1	6	4	$263	175.50	87.50	8	1	7	0
$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	0	$233	149.50	83.50	6	1	5	5
$118	82.00	36.00	4	1	3	0	$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1
$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2	$110	71.50	38.50	3	1	2	0
$117	82.00	35.00	4	1	3	3	$123	83.50	39.50	4	1	3	0
$149	96.50	52.50	4	1	3	0	$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	2
$149	91.00	58.00	3	1	2	0	$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	3
$143	93.50	49.50	4	1	3	3	$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	0
$157	95.00	62.00	3	1	2	3							

Receiving assistance for 15 years, but less than 16 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total person	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
$69	$45.50	$23.50	2	0	2	2	$117	$102.50	$14.50	5	1	4	0
$90	56.00	34.00	2	1	1	1	$43	41.00	2.00	2	0	2	0
$68	61.50	6.50	3	1	2	1	$88	88.00	0	5	2	3	0
$242	165.00	77.00	8	1	7	7	$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	3
$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2	$133	83.00	50.00	3	1	2	0
$112	67.00	45.00	2	0	2	2	$63	42.50	20.50	2	0	2	1
$71	71.00	0	4	1	3	0	$209	143.50	65.50	7	1	6	6
$108	82.00	26.00	4	0	4	4	$94	58.00	36.00	2	1	1	1
$127	94.50	32.50	2	1	1	1	$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1
$195	130.50	64.50	6	1	5	0	$205	130.00	75.00	5	1	4	1

Receiving assistance for 16 years, but less than 17 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
$288	$193.50	$94.50	9	1	8	8	$91	$62.00	$29.00	3	1	2	0
$43	27.00	16.00	1	0	1	1	$154	123.50	30.50	3	1	2	1
$81	51.50	29.50	2	1	1	1	$86	54.00	32.00	2	1	1	1
$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	4	$105	102.50	2.50	5	1	4	4
$146	95.00	51.00	4	1	3	3	$410	243.50	166.50	7	1	6	2
$105	63.50	41.50	2	1	1	1	$211	138.50	72.50	6	1	5	4
$150	97.00	53.00	4	1	3	3	$98	98.00	0	8	1	7	2
$253	165.00	88.00	7	1	6	6							

Receiving assistance for 17 years, but less than 18 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
$172	$108,00	$64.00	4	1	3	3	$250	$225.50	$24.50	11	1	10	0
$104	82.00	22.00	4	1	3	3	$170	107.00	63.00	4	1	3	3
$116	69.00	47.00	2	1	1	1	$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1
$140	102.50	37.50	5	1	4	4	$172	108,00	64.00	4	1	3	3
$34	34.00	0	2	1	1	0	$206	130.50	75.50	5	1	4	0
$28	28.00	0	2	0	2	2							

Receiving assistance for 18 years, but less than 19 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
$195	$125.00	$70.00	5	1	4	4	$193	$124.00	$69.00	5	1	4	2
$127	80.00	47.00	3	1	2	2	$162	163.00	59.00	4	1	3	3
$184	114.00	70.00	4	1	3	3	$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	0
$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1							

Receiving assistance for 19 years, but less than 20 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate
$140	$102.50	$37.50	5	1	4	4

Receiving assistance for 20 years, but less than 21 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate
$208	$131.50	$76.50	5	1	4	1

Receiving assistance for 21 years, but less than 22 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate
$125	$73.50	$51.50	2	1	1	1
$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an explanation of the man-in-the-house rule by Mr. William R. Galvin, chief of the office of investigations, Department of Public Welfare, District of Columbia government, as his testimony appeared in the Senate subcommittee hearings.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator BYRD. Mr. Galvin, explain the man-in-the-house rule.

Mr. GALVIN. This falls under PAD manual section 243, 134. It states and I quote—

"Children living in the home with their mother and a man other than the husband: Children are ineligible because mother associates with a man in a relationship similar to that of husband and wife, and the mother, her children and such man live in a family relationship, regardless of whether such men or such man is the father of the children.

"If the parties contend that the man's presence in the home results from some type of business arrangement, they will be expected to show that the business arrangement is such justification for his being there. For example, a man who claims to be a boarder should be able to establish that he actually pays board and pays an amount sufficient for the mother to realize some profit. While boarding among people of low income does not always include the arrangement for a separate room for the sole use of the boarder, the absence of this arrangement in combination with inadequate evidence that the man pays board or pays sufficient board for the mother to realize a profit would tend to increase the doubt that the supposed business arrangement is the only reason for the man's being in the home."

And under section G of the same manual reference:

"Children living in the home with their mother when there is no clear disassociation from the normal family relationship: Children are ineligible whose mother associates with a man in a relationship similar to that of husband and wife, and the man continues a relationship with the children similar to that of father and child, regardless of whether such men live in the home. Such cases include separation of convenience, and separation for the purpose of becoming eligible for public assistance. The latter may exist because of the departmental rule against supplementing full-time earnings."

The third section is section H:

"Children whose mother maintains a conjugal relationship with a man who is not living in the home. When there is a clear disassociation from the normal family relationship, the mother and/or the child shall if otherwise eligible receive aid to dependent children."

In other words, the relationship of the man in the home must be that of husband to the recipient and father to the children, and it must be beyond a reasonable doubt.

INVESTIGATION CASES CLOSED UNDER MAN-IN-THE-HOUSE RULES

Senator Byrd. In other words, if you merely found a man in the home at the time of your investigation, or if the social worker finds a man in the home at the time of her visit, this in itself does not make the recipient ineligible?

Mr. Galvin. No, sir. In the 232 field investigations 111 men were found in the home of the recipients. There were only 69 cases closed because of the man-in-the-home rule.

Senator Byrd. You found men in 111 homes out of the 232?

Mr. Galvin. We found 111 men in the 232 homes.

Senator Byrd. And how many men did you find in the homes of the 141 cases closed subsequent to investigation?

Mr. Galvin. We found 87 in those.

Senator Byrd. Eighty-seven in the one hundred forty-one homes?

Mr. Galvin. That is right, sir.

Senator Byrd. You found men in 87 of the 141 homes?

Mr. Galvin. We found 87 men in the 141 homes.

Senator Byrd. Were some of the 87 legally constituted fathers and husbands?

Mr. Galvin. Nine were husbands by ceremony, 20 were common law husbands, 9 were landlords living in the same house as the client under questionable living arrangements——

Senator Byrd. Pardon me. You would class those nine as what, as paramours, or what?

Mr. Galvin. The nine landlords?

Senator Byrd. Yes.

Mr. Galvin. Some of these were paramours. And 49 were friends, paramours, relatives, and roomers. It depends on the living arrangement whether we would classify the landlord as a paramour or not.

Senator Byrd. But a portion of the 49 were relatives?

Mr. Galvin. That is right, sir.

Senator Byrd. Not paramours?

Mr. Galvin. That is right.

Senator Byrd. Do you know how many?

Mr. Galvin. We do not have that breakdown

Since only 69 cases were closed for that reason, there would be 18 that did not fall under the rule.

Senator Byrd. Sixty-nine were closed because of what?

Mr. Galvin. Because of the man-in-the-house rule, the continuing absence or no clear disassociation rule, 69 cases were closed. There were 87 men found in the various homes. So 18 of the men that we found were not in this relationship.

Senator Byrd. Were not paramours?

Mr. Galvin. That is right, sir.

Senator Byrd. They were either husbands, common law husbands, or husbands by ceremony?

Mr. Galvin. No, sir. The 69 includes some of the husbands and the 20 common law husbands also. The 18 would include friends, relatives, visitors, those that did not have a relationship similar to that of husband and wife.

PARAMOURS IN CLOSED CASES

Senator Byrd. So in the 89 instances in which there were men involved—87, I believe you said—in the 87 instances, how many were strictly paramours? Can you give us that figure? How many of these were closed on the basis that they were not legal husbands, but that they were paramours?

Mr. Galvin. There were 9 husbands by legal ceremony, 20 by common law, for a total of 29. This would mean that 40 would be paramours in the closed cases.

Senator Byrd. Aren't some of the remaining number relatives, and so on?

Mr. Galvin. That would be in the 18 left over.

Senator Byrd. I see. So you would have 40 paramours out of 89?

Mr. Galvin. Eighty-seven. Forty out of the eighty-seven were paramours.

Senator Byrd. Now, percentagewise what is this?

Mr. Galvin. Forty-six percent.

Senator Byrd. Forty-six percent of what, now?

Mr. Galvin. Forty-six percent of the 87 men found in the home were paramours. And in 58 percent of the cases closed for men in the home, which was 69 cases, the men were paramours.

HOUSE HEARINGS

Senator Byrd. Mr. Shea, how do you square these figures with what you said when you appeared before the House subcommittee? On page 1262 of the House hearings you stated to the subcommittee these words:

"It is our estimate that if there were a change in this policy, and if the District were to extend the aid to the unemployed, there would be approximately 17 percent of the cases of the 285 found ineligible rather than the present percentage of 58 percent."

You go on to say:

"This 17 percent is not in any sense a firm figure, but the reason given for closing as reflected in the investigators report seemed to indicate that somewhere between 17 and 20 percent of the cases would be found ineligible for reasons other than the man-in-the-home policy or the unemployed person or the employed person in the household."

So in two sentences you come up with two different statements, in one you say 17 percent, and in the next one you say somewhere between 17 and 20.

And then on page 1264, two pages beyond, you say: "Our best estimate is 17 to 20 percent."

And then at the bottom of the page in your next statement you say—

"Assuming the policy on the man in the home were to be changed, and if the District were to extend aid to the unemployed, I don't believe there would be a very large percentage much beyond 17. Maybe it would go to 25 percent."

So you increase your prognostication by almost 50 percent when you go from 17 to 25 percent.

PERCENT OF INELIGIBLES NOT FALLING UNDER MAN-IN-THE-HOUSE RULE

Now, according to your figures there, Mr. Galvin, what percent of the total ineligibles do not fall under the man-in-the-house rule?

Mr. Galvin. Forty-eight percent do not fall under the rule if we use 69, subtract 69 from 1932, which is the closed cases at the moment. We have 63 cases, 63 cases over 132 is 48 percent that could not come under the man-in-the-house rule.

OTHER INELIGIBILITY FACTORS

Senator Byrd. Before I get back to you, Mr. Shea, what percent of the cases disqualified in the report by reason of the man-in-the-house rule would have been disqualified notwithstanding the man-in-the-house rule, because other eligibility factors were found which in themselves would have disqualified the recipient?

Mr. Galvin. I have no figures on that.

Senator Byrd. Mr. Lang, do you have them?

Mr. Lang. We have a breakdown in a slightly different category, since we are basing it on 133 cases where we determined that some ineligibility findings existed. Now, in those 133 cases there were 69 cases in which a man-in-the-house situation was one of the ineligibility factors. Of those 69 cases, 37 were considered to be ineligible solely on that basis, leaving 32 which investigation disclosed involved other ineligibility factors besides the one involving the man-in-the-house rule.

Now, of the 37 cases which were considered ineligible solely because of that finding, we determined that in 24 they were employed, the men were employed. In 32 of the 69 there were ineligibility factors other than the man-in-the-house rule.

Senator Byrd. You are saying that of the 69 cases that were disqualified under the man-in-the-house rule—is that what you are saying——

Mr. Lang. Yes, sir.

Senator Byrd. That of the 69, 32 cases could very well have been disqualified on the basis of other eligibility factors which came to light during the investigation?

Mr. Lang. That is right.

CASES CLOSED SOLELY ON MAN-IN-THE-HOUSE RULE

Senator Byrd. So that we have this hard core—let's get down to the hard core—of how many ineligible cases based on the man-in-the-house rule?

Mr. Lang. That would be 37 cases.

Senator Byrd. Thirty-seven out of the one hundred and what?

Mr. Lang. 133.

Senator Byrd. Now, that is the hard core. What percentage is that?

Mr. Lang. Approximately 28 percent.

Senator Byrd. So approximately 28 percent come under the hard core man-in-the-house rule. You are saying that 72 percent of these, even if no man-in-the-house rule were in existence in the District of Columbia, would still have been ineligible; is that what you are saying?

Mr. Lang. That is right.

Senator Byrd. And do you say to us that in any consideration of the man-in-the-house rule, one must eliminate those cases which could be found ineligible because of other reasons?

INELIGIBLES FOR OTHER THAN MAN-IN-THE-HOUSE RULE

In other words, if the man-in-the-house rule were nonexistent, many of the same cases——

Mr. Lang. A total of 78 percent.

Senator Byrd. Seventy-eight percent would be ineligible on the basis of other factors?

Mr. Shea. Yes, sir.

Mr. Lang. Pardon me, that was 72 percent rather than 78 percent.

Senator Byrd. Seventy-two percent.

RECAPITULATION OF INELIGIBILITY FACTORS

Would you like to recapitulate for the record, Mr. Lang, now that you have made that correction?

Mr. Lang. There were 69 cases out of the 133 which we determined to contain ineligibility factors. Sixty-nine were based on the application of the man-in-the-house rule. In 32 of these 69 cases there were other factors also present, any one of which was sufficient to have determined the recipients ineligible, leaving 37 which contained only the one factor, that being the one relating to the man-in-the-house rule. The 37 percent amounts to 27——

Senator Byrd. You mean the 37 cases.

Mr. Lang. The 37 cases amounts to approximately 28 percent of the total number which were found to be ineligible.

Senator Byrd. On the basis of the man-in-the-house rule?

Mr. Lang. It is 28 percent of the total number which were found to be ineligible.

Senator Byrd. On the basis of the man-in-the-house rule?

Mr. Lang. On all factors, 28 percent was on the basis of the man-in-the-house rule; yes sir.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record certain statements made by Mr. Bernard Scholz, who was the Chief of the Public Assistance Division of the Department of Welfare at the time we held the hearings last year.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Comments by Mr. Scholz

Senator Byrd. All right.

Now, Mr. Scholz, I think that you are in the best position to indicate to us what should be done to put this department on its proper course, weed out the ineligibles, provide for the needy, cut out the red tape and the paperwork, and thus permit the Department to go forward with a well-charted program which will earn for it the respect and high regard, not only of those people who are being served by it, but also of the people who help support it with their tax dollars.

Now could you in a somewhat brief fashion let us have your advice and counsel on this matter before we recess?

Mr. Scholz. Yes, sir.

Now?

Senator Byrd. Yes.

Mr. Scholz. All right.

SOCIAL SERVICE STAFF NOT EQUIPPED FOR INVESTIGATION

I believe that what we have learned from this painful experience is that our social service staff is not equipped to do the investigative job that needs to be done with today's caseload.

Senator Byrd. Now you may have to speak just a little louder. There seems to be some difficulty in hearing you.

Mr. Scholz. All right.

I believe that we have learned from the painful experience of the past few months that our social service staff is not equipped to do the job it is expected to do with today's caseload. We are operating with social workers, and when we hire caseworkers all our specifications are written that way, all our instructions are written that way, we expect them to do the old type of social work which is a helping relationship. We tried to create a public image that the social worker is not a snoop who looks under the bed and in the closet, but is as one well-known training film put it, a friend at the door. And as a result of relationship has been built up which is not realistic, where the social workers, as the Social Security Administration puts it, uses the clients, the applicant, as the primary source of information. And we find this information is not reliable.

CHANGES IN CHARACTER OF CLIENTS

This may all have been true at the time when the program started, when we had the so-called nice people on relief, the widows and orphans who have been siphoned off since then by the survivors benefits program and when we had the families that were unbroken, where the man was disabled and except for the financial assistance they would not have been able to manage. They have been siphoned off by the disability insurance program. And what we are having now is the bottom of the barrel, without wanting to cast any aspersions on the worthwhile people we have on assistance. Most of them, as our investigation now has shown, are problem cases. They are, as Mr. Lang pointed out, people with problems of alcoholism, drug addiction, with criminal records, and are not the type of people whom social workers are trained to deal with.

EDUCATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS

In addition, when we are talking about trained social workers, we are deluding ourselves and the public, because these people have not gone through the school of social work. A recent survey by the Social Security Administration showed that of, I think it is, 25,000 public assistance workers in the country, only 1.2 percent have a school of social work education. The others are trained by the apprenticeship method that I mentioned. They go through an 8-week training course and then are let loose on a caseload which in our instance amounts to 180 cases, and where a worker with an apprenticeship training of 8 weeks is responsible for dispensing $17,000 monthly of the taxpayers' money. And that is an impossible situation. I think we are putting a responsibility on these young people that they are simply not able to carry.

So what we are doing in effect is the same as if we were taking medical corpsmen and saying to them, "now take over this hospital and perform brain surgery." And the results are what we have found them to be. We know that similar results would be found anywhere—am shocked at the extent of them—similar lacking in effectiveness as we now find in the method of control, the method of review we have used. We have had in the beginning of the program an audit undertaken by auditors that was found inadequate because they were not trained in eligibility determination. So since 1941 the Social Security Administration has instituted what they call an administrative review made by social work technicians. They have come to our agency time and again and reviewed a sample of our caseload and have always confirmed that we were doing a fine job, that we had an unusually low number of ineligibles. In fact, there have been two investigative staffs appointed by congressional committees—I think it was the House Appropriations Committee—who have reviewed our cases and again came up with the same findings.

PAPERWORK REVIEW

Senator Byrd. But again was this not a paperwork operation?

Mr. Scholz. It was a paperwork review. Still thinking in paperwork terms, in 1959 at my request the agency instituted this sample case review by which unit supervisors review a sample of 5 percent of the cases against a very detailed form to find out where our weaknesses are, where our procedures or policies should be tightened up, and again this seems a fine thing. Again we got laudatory remarks from the Federal agency.

Then the special investigation project came, and we suddenly stood before the shambles of what we had thought was a sound, valid caseload. So that what we know today is that we have to have a method of spot reviewing out in the field so we really know what is going on.

This is where we are in social service. We should, I believe, use social service workers after the validity of a caseload has been established, to work with these families, to try to educate them, motivate them, rehabilitate them, which is what they are equipped to do—more or less.

RESPONSIBILITY IN DETERMINING GRANTS

Senator Byrd. So you are saying the social worker should not have the responsibility of determining the eligibility and the amount of grant?

Mr. Scholz. I think they have signally failed in doing that. I hate to admit it, but those are the facts.

Senator Byrd. But you say this should not be the responsibility of the social worker?

INVESTIGATION SERVICE

Mr. Scholz. That is right.

Now when the Investigation Service came in in 1955, their assignment was quite different from what it is today. They were again to be a helpful arm of our social administration. They were to help find the fugitive fathers, so that the mothers could go to court and file a complaint for nonsupport. And they have been outstandingly successful. I believe, the average number of men located is still over 90 percent. Is that correct, Mr. Galvin?

Mr. Galvin. Yes, sir.

SHIFT OF WORK TO SERVICE

Mr. Scholz. But in the process of finding these missing fathers, they found some of these "missing" fathers were not missing at all, but they turned up in the homes which they supposedly had deserted. So, gradually, the emphasis has shifted and more and more the Investigation Service has been used to investigate the home itself. Has this "deserted" mother been deserted or have these "abandoned" children been abandoned? And naturally with a new service they had to learn their lesson, too.

As you know from the reports that the special investigation project brought in, in many instances the Investigation Service had made an earlier investigation. Every case where the mother claims she has been deserted, at the time of application is routinely referred to the Investigation Service. Every case where the worker has evidence, or has a complaint, that there is a man in the house, is referred to the Investigation Service. In many instances the Investigation Service gave the case a clean bill of health, only to find to their own dismay under the special investigation project that they, too, had not found the true facts. So they have developed, we believe, under the procedures of the special investigation project a new approach to investigation which seems to be much more realistic, much more successful, than anything that had been developed before.

CHANGE IN METHOD OF APPLICATION

And seeing how successful they have been, I would say that it would be the wrong thing if we continued our present procedure where social workers, with inadequate means and methods, put a family on assistance, and then we get the Investigation Service to ferret out the ineligibles. I think a much more logical procedure would be to have people make application to our social workers, who determine whether or not they seem to fall within the scope of our program at all, and at that point we refer them to the Investigation Service. And we would make it clear to the applicant that the Investigation Service will establish whether or not there is eligibility. So that at least at the point where we open the case, we are reasonably assured of eligibility. And I have suggested this type of procedure to Mr. Shea.

PRESENT METHOD OF INVESTIGATION UNIT WORK

Now at present the investigation service works only on cases referred by the social workers, and there is no check on them, which has made for a morale problem. Because when the investigators did not find the man in the house no one gave them a black eye, but if they did find the man in the house, the social service had the black eye for not having found this before. So that perhaps jsut as we are trying to set up a method of control, it may be necessary to set up a control of the controllers. That is something Mr. Galvin will have to decide, and I am sure he is fully capable of doing that. So that is one, perhaps, radical departure——

Senator Byrd. Let me make one comment. I do not think the Comptroller General in his three reports—and if I am incorrect please point out my mistake—took this position you have just taken regarding the need for controlling the investigators.

Mr. Scholz. It may have been our own feeling that every case in which the investigation found something, where we have been on the case for several years and had not found it, that this was a failure, this was a black mark on our record.

Senator Byrd. But you are not implying that that in itself would be an indictment of the investigative service?

Mr. Scholz. Good heavens, no. No.

CONTINUOUS CASELOAD

And there is the other problem that the caseload is not standing still. It is a fantastically dynamic caseload. People are moving by the thousands each year. And I do not know what kind of method we would be able to develop so that the investigation service could continue to keep tabs on the facts of eligibility.

At present caseworkers are expected to make an annual review. If we had enough of an investigative staff I would prefer to see the case transferred once a year to the investigation service and again have them go and take a hard look at the facts of the situation and recertify that this case is eligible. I realize that we cannot put surveillance on every case, and that 1 month after we have found a case eligible, the situation may change.

MISREPRESENTATION BY CLAIMANTS

Senator Byrd. And you would also say that with the degree of misrepresentation being what it has been found to be by the Comptroller General, to say nothing of your own people, it makes it extremely difficult for even the best social worker and best investigator to find these situations and keep the record clean?

Mr. Scholz. That is true. I mean, we do know we have second and third generation recipients who know our procedures much better than our young social workers and who elude us with the greatest skill. And as the special investigation project has shown, in some cases only intensive surveillance of a type that is entirely beyond the scope we had ever undertaken, will uncover this type of situation.

HUNGRY CHILDREN HEARINGS

Now what I suggested will still not entirely solve our problems because, as Mr. Shea pointed out, we have staff shortages, and our program responsibilities have constantly increased over the past few years without the increases in staff keeping step with them. I need only remind the chairman that when I came in 1956 to the agency, the first thing that happened were the so-called hungry children hearings, and all of a sudden a special emergency food order program was ordered, the staff was drawn off their regular duties and worked day, and in some instances until 10 o'clock at night, on those special assignments.

And as you know with the heavy caseload we have, it means that there was need for a lot of reviews, there was need for a lot of actions which it is almost impossible ever to catch up with again.

INCREASE IN AVERAGE PAYMENTS

On July 1 the new procedure came into effect—I speak of 1957—where the Juvenile Court would pay the support payments into the Treasury, and where our staff would have to give the full amount of assistance. This had the dual effect that the average assistance grant went up and that many cases became eligible which under the order procedure would not have been. At the same time the $200 ceiling was lifted and again that made a new caseload eligible and increased the average payments.

There was tremendous community pressure for us to speed up our intake process. At that time we had waiting lists of as long as 6 weeks. The community agencies resented that they had to pay the support of families who were under the regulations eligible for public assistance. So an emergency assistance procedure was initiated and presumptive eligibility became permissible, which means again people became eligible who under the old regulations would never have been reached. A person who came out of the hospital and had a convalescence period of 4 or 6 weeks would never have been reached during the time when we had a waiting period, and now he appeared on our assistance rolls. So again the number of assistance cases went up.

NEED FOR INCREASED STAFF

Senator Byrd. Now, Mr. Scholz, I do not want us to go afield. If what you are saying is basically your recommendations, that is fine, but I am just wondering if you are still telling us what should be done to deal with this situation.

Now we have talked 2 weeks about what has happened and I am not critical of what you are saying, but I think our objective now is to not look back so much but to look ahead at this point. Let us know what further suggestions and recommendations you have.

Mr. Scholz. Yes, sir. I am leading directly up to this. And that is the point, that under community pressures to speed up the application process we were given more application workers. We were not given more caseworkers. So that really what has happened is what we all do not want: We are speeding up the buildup of the caseloads without having enough staff to keep control of the caseloads. We asked for more workers on various occasions and, as you know, the staff was denied. In 1959 we asked for 20 assistant unit clerks to keep down the amount of paperwork the workers had to do, and they were denied.

We had surveys. We requested a survey in 1958. We had a survey by the Management Office, a survey by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. We have had since then two surveys by two task forces. Each survey takes up time, a great deal of staff time.

APPLICATION OF SURVEYS

Senator Byrd. At that point, do you think you are having too many surveys and not enough application of the findings?

Mr. Scholz. If I may speak frankly for the feeling of my staff, we feel we have been surveyed to death but not enough has come out of it.

Senator Byrd. I see.

NEW PROCESSING SYSTEMS

Mr. Scholz. Recommendations have been made for the installation of IBM equipment, for the installation of the addressograph system. But the addressograph system has been crippled. We have the machines to make the plates, and we have the plates, but we do not have the addressograph machine for mass-runs of the plates, which is an essential part of the total plan. IBM has been held up because the District is planning a large overall computer system, so everyone has been holding their breath, and in the meantime we have been left without the necessary equipment.

On several occasions this committee has asked for information which theoretically we should have at our fingertips. We have made out social data cards, but we have no equipment to evaluate them by IBM and make the information instantly available. We have installed controls trying to assure that prompt action is taken on cases, but again the control has to be hand operated.

We have finally been able to establish a position—you may call it a production manager but it is called program analysis—which produces for use figures on: how many hours does each worker spend in the field, how many visits does he make, how many cases does he receive, how many transfers, and so on. All this tabulation, again, has to be done by hand.

We feel that our agency is still in the horse-and-buggy stage as far as modern business methods are concerned, and with a program of $16 million we are big business, and I think we should be able to function like big business.

So we are pleading for help, not through surveys, but through application of what we know will be needed in order to enable us to function effectively.

CENTRALIZING SERVICES

I have briefly touched on the difficulty of the somewhat diffused responsibility on the part of the division chief, which is something that maybe is districtwide, that certain functions have been taken out of the various departments and have been centralized, so that the statistical service is in one place, the financial service in another place, and so on. I have no control over this. And when I need information, they may need their staff for child welfare or for some other operation, and I am faced again with having the workers furnish urgent and needed information by saying "stop everything and count cases." This is the picture, sir.

Senator Byrd. I think that is a fine summary, Mr. Scholz, and very articulately presented.

Mr. Scholz. I thank you, sir.

Senator Byrd. I would assume that you have benefited from these hearings and the testimony that has been adduced, just as we on the subcommittee have increased our knowledge by it. Is that correct?

Mr. Scholz. Yes, sir.

JUSTIFICATION OF SPECIAL INVESTIGATION PROJECTS

Senator BYRD. I will ask this one final question of you. Do you feel that the special investigation project was justified?

Mr. SCHOLZ. Obviously; yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. Thank you, Mr. Scholz.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table on foster home board rates in the surrounding counties of Maryland and Virginia.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Board rates—Surrounding counties of Maryland and Virginia

[County supplements State standards]

	State	County	September 1961
(1) Montgomery County:			
Regular board rate:			
Infants to 6 years	$36.50	$42.50	Approximate number of foster homes: 178: number of children in foster homes: 400.
6 to 12 years	44.00	48.00	
12 and over	53.00	54.00	
Allowance for clothing, school supplies, and recreation:			
Infants to 6 years	8.50	--------	
6 to 12 years	13.00	--------	
12 and over	16.00	--------	
Special care rate (regardless of age (emotionally and physically handicapped children)).	75.00	--------	
Residential institution rate (department of education supplements this rate by $50).	150.00	--------	
Basic clothing outfit issued	--------	--------	
(2) Prince Georges County:			
Regular board rate:			
Infants to 6 years	45.00	--------	Number of foster homes: 118; number of children in foster homes: 300.
6 to 12 years	57.00	--------	
12 and over	60.00	--------	
Preadoptive care rate:			
Infants to 6 years	58.50	--------	
6 to 12 years	63.00	--------	
12 and over	69.00	--------	
Special care rate: [1]			
Infants to 6 years (board, $75 plus clothing, $8.50 or $2.50 per diem).	83.50	--------	
6 to 12 years	88.00	--------	
12 and over	91.00	--------	
(3) Fairfax County:			
Basic foster care rate (all ages)	$50.00	--------	Approximate number of foster homes September 1961: 100; number of children in foster homes: 314.
Clothing allowances:			
1 to 5 years	--------	$5.00	
6 to 9 years	--------	6.00	
10 to 12 years	--------	7.00	
Over 12	--------	10.00	
School supplies (a month for all children of school age).	--------	.60	
Spending money:			
1st to 3d grade	--------	.75	
4th to 5th	--------	1.00	
6th to 7th	--------	1.25	
8th through high school	--------	1.50	
Special care rate [2] (plus allowance as shown).	60.00	--------	
(4) Arlington County:			
Regular board rate:			
Infants to 1 year	--------	53.00	Approximate number of foster homes September 1961: 75; number of children in foster homes: 142.
1 to 12 years	--------	50.00	
12 to 21 years	--------	56.00	
Allowances:			
4 to 6 years	--------	1.00	
6 to 8 years	--------	1.50	
8 to 10 years	--------	2.50	
10 to 12 years	--------	3.50	
12 to 18 years	--------	5.00	
Special care rates [3]	None	--------	

[1] Purchase of care on as paid basis for children in residential treatment centers—not to exceed $150 a month (department of education supplements this by $50). Basic clothing outfit issued.

[2] County is now trying to establish group homes for teenagers—offering subsidy of $10 a month, $60 board plus allowances.

[3] Clothing is requisitioned by worker and authorized by agency.

Board rates for foster care in Alexandria, Va., as of December 1962

Age group of child	Room and board	Clothing	Personal care	Allowances	School supplies	Total
Infants	$45	$1.50	$1.50	--------	--------	$48
1 to 5 years	45	5.50	1.50	$1	--------	53
6 to 13 years	$45	$6.00	$1.50	$2	$0.50	$55
14 years and over	45	9.00	2.50	2	.50	59

NOTE.—Basic clothing outfit issued. Foster parent supplements from clothing allowance. Shoes provided from a private fund.

Rates for foster care of children in Baltimore, Md.; St. Louis, Mo.; New York, N.Y.; and Philadelphia, Pa.

Kind of care	Board		Monthly clothing	Preadded totals, monthly
	Monthly	Per diem [1]		
Regular care (local department and purchase of care):				
Infant up to 2	$50	$1.65	$8.50	$58.50
2 up to 6	40	1.35	8.50	48.50
6 up to 12	44	1.45	14.00	58.00
12 and over	53	1.75	18.00	71.00
Preadoptive care (local department):				
Infant up to 6	$50	$1.65	$8.50	$58.50
6 up to 12	50	1.65	14.00	64.00
12 and over	53	1.75	18.00	71.00
Special care (local department):				
Infant up to 6	75	2.50	8.50	83.50
6 up to 12	75	2.50	14.00	89.00
12 and over	75	2.50	18.00	93.00

[1] 1/30 monthly rate rounded to nearest 0.05.

	Board		Monthly clothing [2]
	Monthly as paid not to exceed—	Per diem [1] as paid not to exceed—	
Special care (purchase of care)	$150	$5.00	--------
Emergency care (local department)	75	2.50	--------

[1] 1/30 monthly rate rounded to nearest 0.05.

[2] Initial clothing as needed see schedule C.

Standard for determining the cost of clothing including clothing upkeep, personal care, and school supplies

Age group	Regular monthly amount	Initial clothing "as needed," total amount not to exceed amounts specified below
Infant up to 6	$8.50	$44
6 up to 12	14.00	57
12 and over	18.00	72

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the daily average population of institutions in the District of Columbia for the fiscal years 1959 through 1963; and a study of 50 families terminated or ineligible for public assistance, entitled "The Ineligibles," plus testimony adduced during the hearings pertaining to this study.

There being no objection, the information was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

Daily average population of institutions and population at end of year by race and by sex, fiscal years 1959–63

Institution	Daily average population	Total under care at end of year [1]			
		Race		Sex	
		White	Non-white	Male	Female
1959					
Maple Glen School	190	22	198	220	----------
Cedar Knoll School	408	62	425	310	177
District Training School	843	591	792	808	575
Junior Village	349	57	307	225	139
Receiving Home	76	18	80	81	17
District of Columbia Village	615	300	329	346	283
Municipal Lodging House	39	25	19	44	----------
Temporary Home for Soldiers and Sailors	32	37	----------	37	----------
1960					
Maple Glen School	224	33	207	240	----------
Cedar Knoll School	456	54	470	356	168
District Training School	898	618	936	907	647
Junior Village	423	65	399	258	206
Receiving Home	104	12	90	81	21
District of Columbia Village	599	284	345	318	311
Municipal Lodging House	39	18	14	32	----------
Temporary Home for Soldiers and Sailors	35	17	1	28	----------
1961					
Maple Glen School	215	42	199	238	3
Cedar Knoll School	470	51	416	310	157
District Training School	1,002	631	998	946	683
Junior Village	489	66	373	251	188
Receiving Home	105	10	95	84	21
1961—Continued					
District of Columbia Village	638	308	371	360	319
Municipal Lodging House	35	15	12	27	----------
Temporary Home for Soldiers and Sailors	36	40	2	42	----------
1962					
Maple Glen School	223	34	173	204	3
Cedar Knoll School	420	38	382	296	124
District Training School	1,062	644	1,061	980	725
Junior Village	519	54	545	343	256
Receiving Home	110	15	126	109	32
District of Columbia Village	668	307	375	361	321
Municipal Lodging House	33	16	14	30	----------
Temporary Home for Soldiers and Sailors	41	43	3	46	----------
1963					
Maple Glen School	211	24	196	216	4
Cedar Knoll School	454	37	447	336	148
District Training School	1,111	657	1,125	1,025	757
Junior Village	693	60	609	437	322
Receiving Home	122	21	77	80	18
District of Columbia Village	674	307	381	372	316
Municipal Lodging House	31	10	11	21	----------
Temporary Home for Soldiers and Sailors	43	46	3	40	----------

[1] Includes residents not currently in but under care of the institution.

THE INELIGIBLES—A STUDY OF 50 FAMILIES TERMINATED OR INELIGIBLE FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

(Submitted to Health and Welfare Council of the National Capital Area, Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., Washington, D.C., August 1963)

BUREAU OF SOCIAL SCIENCE
RESEARCH, INC.,
Washington, D.C., August 6, 1963.

Mr. ISADORE SEEMAN,
Director, Health and Welfare Council of the National Capital Area, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SEEMAN: I am pleased to submit the final report on our study of Washington families whose welfare benefits have been terminated, and to express the bureau's appreciation of the Health and Welfare Council's assistance in carrying out the work. Abraham Makofsky's cooperation in arranging the participation of private welfare agencies was particularly important.

Several private groups—Hospitality House, Catholic Charities, the Salvation Army, the Neighborhood Service Project, and Family and Child Services—guided us to some of the cases included in the study and interviewers were provided by three of these agencies: Mayor Eupha Gibson (Salvation Army), Edward Yates (Neighborhood Service Project), and Erna Koranyi (Family and Child Services). Bureau interviewers included James Fair, Rosa Greene, Lorenzo McCormick, Melvin Moore, Isaac Rowland, Charles Talley, Theodore Trabue, and Herman Williams. Ann Richardson of the bureau staff directed the study.

We are indebted to the Eugene and Agnes E. Meyer Foundation for partial support of the project through a fund previously granted to the bureau for research on behalf of local eleemosynary organizations.

Respectfully,

ROBERT T. BOWER.

INTRODUCTION

The present study was undertaken at the request of the Health and Welfare Council of the National Capital Area for the purpose of ascertaining some of consequences of termination of welfare grants to public welfare recipients. The investigation was designed to reveal the ways in which terminated families were better or worse off at the time of the interviews than they were when they were receiving public assistance. As the evidence was gradually assembled and analyzed, it became apparent that the termination of public assistance did in general constitute a crisis for these facilities. At the same time, the study disclosed a pattern of existence or style of life which seems to be characteristic of this segment of the poor, in which the crisis precipitated by termination of public assistance was another event, another deprivation in a series of ups and downs which characterizes their lives in general. The following report is essentially comprised of two elements: a delineation of some of the effects of termination and a general description of the manner in which 50 poor families meet some of the problems of day-to-day existence.

The people who contributed information for this analysis were 50 women who (with one exception) had, sometime between September 1961 and April 1963, been terminated or suspended from the public assistance rolls (41 people) or had applied for public assistance and been refused (9 people).[1]

Ideally, the 50 cases would have been selected at random from a list of all terminated welfare recipients. Since the welfare records were not made available, it was necessary to choose respondents by several different methods. Eighteen of them were people who had recently applied for help from one of five private welfare agencies. The remainder were located by a variety of techniques: interviews were assigned to a door-to-door canvass of certain blocks in three census tracts with high public assistance rates in 1960; one interviewer canvassed all 577 units of a public housing project; other interviewers were instructed to ask respondents and others they met whether they knew of anyone who would fit the study criteria and to attempt to interview them. This "sampling" plan, which might best be described as accidental, and the small number of cases, impose limitations on the interpretation of findings and the extent to which generalizations can be made that would apply to all terminated welfare cases in the District. It is certain that applicants to private agencies are overrepresented and these could either be the more needy and desperate families or those who were more resourceful than others in seeking solutions to their plight. It is equally certain that the nets missed families who had left the scene—split up to live with relatives or left town. The procedures also tend to miss the geographically and socially isolated cases. It is probable, therefore, that the 50 families included in the study are more stable than a true sample would have been.

Time and cost considerations permitted only a relatively short interview with each respondent in which the investigator used a structured interview form. A more intensive case-study approach, following the family through a considerable period of time after the termination of assistance, would have been far preferable, in allowing for the collection of more detailed information and in permitting a closer account of the stages of adjustment to the new situation which the families faced. This constitutes another limitation to the current study.

---

[1] At the time of the interview, 4 of the terminees had just been reinstated; the other 46 were without public assistance.

The "typical" respondent in our sample is a 30-year-old Negro woman with 9 years of formal education. She has lived in Washington for 22 years, is married but separated from her husband. She lives in a four-room-and-bath apartment with her five children, more than half of them being of preschool age. She is not employed. Welfare payments were terminated about 8 months ago. These features vary widely among the 50 families, as do the adjustments they have made to the termination of public welfare. In the report that follows, we have attempted to describe some patterns in the lives and responses to welfare termination among the 50 cases. The reader is cautioned against assuming uniformity among the cases, given the great variation that exists. Generalizing about all terminated cases is also dangerous because of the possible biases produced by methods of sampling.

POSTTERMINATION ADJUSTMENT

The sequence of posttermination events: In examining the data, one can find a fairly coherent configuration of posttermination events. Immediately after termination of public assistance, income drops almost to zero for some time, followed by a gradual recovery, until, about 8 months later, the family income seems to be about two-thirds of its original level. This period appears to be one of gradual partial recovery, during which short-term help patterns may be established, and money or noncash contributions from friends or relatives may be obtained. Meanwhile, payments for such things as rent and utilities are deferred in order to provide food. If all goes well, the family is not evicted, and is able to establish a precarious survival system. It appears that the indebtedness established during the early period following termination probably stays at about the same level with the specific creditors varying. A good illustration of the early part of the adjustment period is afforded by respondent No. 41. Her public assistance grant was terminated in March of 1963. In April she received food from two private agencies. In May she also got help from two private agencies, one of them the same as the previous month, the other a new one. She had let her rent and gas bills go unpaid. Her cash income at the time of the interview was about a third lower than it had been when she was under public welfare. This case also illustrates one of the most important differences between the public assistance period and the nonpublic assistance period. Cash income may have been only 33-percent higher before, but it was regular and came from a reliable source. Current income, on the other hand, is gathered pretty much from day to day, and depends almost entirely on whether the family can make arrangements to get help from a private agency, or can find someone who is willing temporarily to help.

The poverty status: To establish the relative economic position of these families, data on their income were compared with two income measures of "poverty," one based on estimates compiled for New York City, which has a cost of living similar to Washington, and the second based on regional figures (including rural and urban areas) with, naturally, a lower cost of living calculation. It will be seen in table 1 that by either measure, these families would be classed as poor.

TABLE 1.—*Relationship between estimates of income requirements and income, per month (ex-recipients only)*

	Average need	Average current income	Percent of need	Average public assistance period income	Percent of need
Estimate No. 1[1]	$372	....	30	....	44
Estimate No. 2[2]	$205	$113	55	$163	80

[1] Calculated on the basis of estimates of the cost of living "used by private agencies in New York City to determine eligibility for assistance and free medical care." It takes into account the employment status of the head of household and other adults, the ages of children, and the number of people living in the housing unit. From James N. Morgan et al. "Income and Welfare in the United States."

[2] Calculated on the basis of "the monthly budget considered necessary for ADC families." It takes into account size of family, race, and area of residence. The figures in the table are slight underestimates of requirements for the area which includes the District of Columbia. From M. Elaine Burgess and Daniel O. Price, "An American Dependency Challenge."

NOTE.—There have been, of course, several other estimates of the income which divides the "poor" from the "less poor." For example, according to Robert Lampman's criteria, used in his "The Low Income Population and Economic Growth," these families would each require an average of about $300 per month to avoid being poor. The Morgan et al., and Burgess and Price estimates were used here because they take into account some of the characteristics of this particular group.

There is considerable variation among the families in their income relative to estimates of need. According to the Morgan estimates, two ex-recipient families have current cash incomes about equal to their estimated needs. Using the lower regional estimates of Burgess and Price, 10 of the families have incomes above minimal requirements. On the other hand, five respondents said that at the time of the interview they had no cash income at all. The range for the bulk of the families is from 50 to 70 percent below requirements on the first estimate and between 30 to 60 percent below on the second.

MODES OF ADAPTATION

The interviews developed only limited data on the ways in which people cope with poverty. They do provide grounds for preliminary description, however, at least at an impressionistic and anecdotal level.

The attempts of the families to fill the gap between their income and the requirements of their families vary from a rather active and energetic search for new sources of support to what appears to be a passive resignation to disaster. On the more active level, 14 respondents found part-time or full-time jobs (and more sought employment unsuccessfully following termination of public assistance). This relatively low rate of employment is probably partially explained by the wages these women are able to earn. Judging from their current and past employment, most of them are able to find work only as domestic, counter girls, and in similar unskilled occupations with low rates of pay. Indeed, 10 of the ex-public assistance respondents who went to work following termination showed a monthly income below that of the public assistance period.

Another important factor here is the age of the respondents' children. Almost three-fourths of the children are under 10 years of age. A minority of them are of school age, and most must somehow be cared for during the mother's working hours. However, the cost of regular child care often approaches or surpasses income from low-paying employment. To be sure, some respondents who live with parents or other nonemployed adults might be able to arrange for free child care, but these are in the minority.

A second kind of active response, and one which seems to be used frequently, is the appeal for occasional help to private welfare agencies. Fifty-eight percent of the respondents applied for help to at least one private agency, and 46 percent received aid of various kinds, including clothing, food, emergency rent payments to avoid eviction, intercession with landlords to put off eviction, short-term housing, advice and referral, toys and Christmas bundles, etc. These figures, of course, are probably inflated beyond what one would expect for terminated public welfare cases as a whole, since so many of the families included in the study (about a third of the total) were discovered through the rolls of private agencies.

Some respondents find it necessary to enter into dependence relationships of various types in order to sustain themselves and their children, although they frequently consider the relationship undesirable. A few examples will illustrate the point:

A mother of four is living with her husband and sister. Her husband, who is a construction worker, voluntarily works only sporadically, she says, drinks heavily, and fails to support the family adequately. She says she would like to leave him, but is afraid that she cannot qualify for public assistance or other help if she does, so will stay where she is.

A mother, finding herself without food and without money, assented when a man offered to buy her $10 worth of food and pay half the overdue rent if he could move in. He left a few weeks later, and the only source of support she can see is to find another man to move in.

The pregnant mother of children 1 and 3 years old is living entirely on the generosity of an older woman friend, who provides living space and food for the family. The friend's major (perhaps sole) source of income is the illegal sale of liquor.

A woman with six children is completely dependent on the income of her husband who deserted her several years ago and is living with another woman. The husband visits the respondent periodically to bring the family food and sometimes helps to pay the bills. The respondent says that he will not give her this help unless she will grant him sexual privileges. She is now expecting her seventh child.

In many cases the demands of poverty are met by a series of undirected, generally fortuitous, adjustments contrived on a day-to-day basis, if contrived at all. For instance, one method of dealing with the situation seems to be to define it out of existence. The definition of what constitutes a "debt," for example, places outside the realm of "real" demand money owed which is judged to be uncollectible.[3] Allied to this response is a myopic view of the real problems that lie ahead. One respondent told of having as her only source of income her unemployment compensation check. When she was asked what she thought she would do when it was discontinued (in 8 or 10 weeks, she thought, but was not sure) she convinced the interviewer that she simply did not know.

Another rather typical response found among the 50 families is analogous to the "borrowing from Peter to pay Paul" pattern. It is exemplified by the respondent who confronted this situation on the day of the interview; her electricity had long since been turned off, her rent was about 2 weeks' overdue, she owed another utilities bill, and she was due to make two time payments. The previous day a man had come to turn off still another utility, she said, and she had had to pay her back bill to him in order to stop the action. She stated that this came out of the money she was trying to gather to pay the rent, and she was thus set back farther. In other words, the pattern seems to be to meet immediate demands, if possible, and to hope to be able to put the less insistent ones off temporarily. Then, when other demands increase, the hope is that the satisfied or partially satisfied ones will be pacified long enough to spread the resources around. This is not so much a matter of slowly catching up on debts, but rather permanent debt delinquency, in which a small amount of money is juggled to meet shifts in the locus of demand from time to time.

---

[3] See p. 17.

This pattern, of course, cannot always be followed. It fails when there are no resources to meet the demands, or when too many demands of the same urgency come at once. Then certain elements of the demand system may be eliminated (as when a family is evicted), and the pattern may resume with one less immediate pressure. One respondent without utilities for a year ran a wire for lighting under the wall to a neighbor's wall socket. She and her children cannot eat hot food unless they are invited to a grown daughter's home, but neither do they have pressure from utilities companies for payment.

There is also the approach of just letting things go—simply not paying the bills. This can work for a time—primarily in the early attempts to get by without public assistance. Obviously, it is a remedy which cannot be maintained for long. To illustrate, respondent No. 36 said that she and her eight children were living on $60 usual monthly cash income. When her interview schedule was examined closely, it was found that she had in the 3 months since her termination not paid the rent or the utilities bills, and had not incurred any other new obligations.

THE LIVES OF THE RESPONDENT FAMILIES

Several specific aspects of the lives of these families were explored, including their housing, food, clothing, and medical care. For each, the respondent was asked to describe the current situation and changes which might have occurred since termination of public assistance.

Most of the families live in the type of housing frequently found to be characteristic of low-income populations, according to the comments of the interviewers. Frequent observation was made of ratholes, roach infestation, needs for structural repairs, and so forth. Although there was no systematic classification made of condition of housing, the assessments by the fieldworkers suggest that most of these dwellings would be classified as substandard.

An index of crowding (number of persons per room) showed that, by normal minimal standards, these families are somewhat overcrowded. There were an average of 1.27 persons per room. (A rate of one person per room is usually taken as the starting point for overcrowding.) However, this figure disguises some important variations from the average, such as the case of the respondent, her seven children and her sister who sleep in one room, or the mother and five children who sleep together in a room.

Among the 50 families studied, housing was not very heavily affected by termination from public assistance, as measured by whether the respondent had moved since she stopped receiving help. Only six persons (15 percent of the terminees) reported that they had moved. Of the movers, two thought they were worse off and more crowded than before, while the rest said their housing was about the same or better. Real rates of geographic mobility are undoubtedly higher among the whole group of terminated welfare cases, since the process by which our families were selected would tend to lose the harder to find families who had moved. For example, several potential respondents on agency lists were lost to the study because they had moved and left no forwarding address. A few additional respondents said that they expected to be evicted within a short time unless they could find some money for rent.

Food seems to be a big problem, and one which was aggravated by the termination of public assistance. Only 10 people reported no food problems. Fifty-four percent of all respondents reported that they "often" have to "give up important things so that there will be enough food in the house." These "important things" include clothing, shoes, laundry soap, amenities such as cigarettes and soft drinks, as well as food for adult members of the family. Even so, 35 people said that giving up such things did not always insure sufficient food.

Surplus food has a role here. Just under half of those reporting food problems receive surplus food. The importance of this food in the eyes of the respondent ranged from "we couldn't make it without it" to "it isn't enough." A major factor aggravating the food situation was the frequent discontinuance of surplus food allotments along with the cutoff of public assistance. The respondents were almost never aware that they could reapply for it; there is widespread belief that surplus food and public assistance are part of the same program, and that ineligibility for the latter inevitably rules out the former.

In spite of these problems of providing food for the family, however, the interviewers did not uncover literal starvation. One respondent, however, said that her son was suffering from malnutrition, and several mentioned problems of frequent colds during the winter because of inadequate nourishment. One particularly dramatic case is that of the woman who had had to feed herself and her six children on nothing but oatmeal for over a month. She said that her eldest son was thin and did not eat much, because he was tired of oatmeal. There is no doubt that quantity is a problem, and that families eat on a reduced schedule. Several respondents reported, for example, that their children had gone to school that morning without breakfast, and others said that they had had to keep their children out of school at times because they had not eaten and did not receive free school lunches. But while they apparently are not in danger of death from starvation, an important characteristic of these people's food problems is that of its quality. Several people reported that they could not feed themselves or their children the diets prescribed by a doctor because the foods were too expensive, "But you eat what you can pay for."

The procedures of the study did not permit a medical assessment of the state of health of the members of these families before and after they received public assistance. How and whether changes in diet, clothing, lack of heat, anxiety, etc., materially affected their health, both in the short and long run, are not known. The respondents themselves often did not see conditions which the outside observer would consider injurious to health (e.g., a diet of potatoes, beans, and rice for the children), as constituting a health problem. Although some neglect of family health needs was reported to be associated with termination of public assistance (such as glasses for a junior high school daughter, proper diet or medicine for diabetes), 62 percent of the respondents reported no problems in health care, or at least none which were different after termination than before. One health matter that could be assessed explicitly was the availability and use of professional medical care. Free care provided for low-income families in District medical facilities did much to mitigate medical care problems for these families. A major difficulty in using these free facilities, however, centers around the lack of carfare to visit the clinic, or to keep the clinic card current. For instance, one respondent said that, although she would be eligible for the services of a specialist to treat her daughter's physically and psychologically damaging bladder problem, the busy doctor needed to make appointments far ahead, and she was never sure of having enough carfare on the day of the appointment.

Of the 328 individuals involved in this analysis, 70 (21 percent) were said to have had at least one illness of a week or more within the past 2 years (this does not include those who suffer from chronic illnesses or who were in the hospital for delivery of a baby). There were 15 people who were reported to have had at least one bout of more or less serious mental illness during that time. Some of these required hospitalization; others seemed to be continuing problems with nerves or hypertension, often said to be associated with anxiety over money matters.

Two children died during the period asked about, one from spinal meningitis, and the other from pneumonia (said to have been due to lack of sufficient heat in the apartment during the winter). As mentioned above, five cases of malnutrition or abnormally low resistence to virus due to lack of adequate food were reported.

Many respondents described chronic disease or disability in their families, including defective vision, nervous rashes, mental retardation, diabetes, chronic anemia, heart defects, bone ailments, tuberculosis, asthma, and epilepsy. (Five of the six children of one respondent are epileptics, and she says that all but one of them have seizures more than once a month.)

Clothing problems seem to be only somewhat less acute than food problems. Clothing is one of the "important things" which respondents say they have to give up in order to have enough food in the house; indeed, it seems to be one of the first things to go. The respondents describe several consequences of this sacrifice. They are psychological as well as physical. The daughter of one respondent stayed out of school because she was ashamed to wear the same dress for a week. Lack of warm clothing and shoes in the winter seems to lead to frequent trouble with colds and winter-associated illnesses, with time lost from school and/or work.

These lacks are not only those of satisfactory clothing ("I can't buy my [17-year-old] son the clothes he needs like his friends"; "I haven't had a new dress in 2 years"; "* * * my [14-year-old] daughter has never had a new dress"). There was an absolute lack of adequate clothing reported by many, as well, and there were numerous cases of children being kept out of school for periods of time because of this lack.

In one sense, clothing, unlike food, is not a problem experienced as an absolute emergency by most of these people. Used clothing is acquired in several different ways and sometimes with sufficient ease to offset emergencies.

The effects of termination on the family's stability are more difficult to ascertain directly from the interview data, although some indications are available. In general, it appears that, at least in the first several months after termination, there was relatively little family disorganization which was not present before. Previous desertion of the respondent by her spouse(s) [3] was commonly reported, and it was said that few of these spouses help in support of the family. But no single instance of desertion since termination was reported. In fact, one respondent said that one positive result of termination has been that it is now possible to have "a man in the house" who contributes to the support of the family.

---

[3] Defined to include legal husbands, common-law husbands, and fathers of illegitimate children.

The few indicators of disorganization which did seem to be associated with termination included sending the children to Junior Village[4] (two cases), one high school student who dropped out to search for work, a few cases of lack of discipline among children. On the whole, however, there seemed to be rather little incidence of these kinds of problems among our particular group; however, as mentioned above, the sampling methods of the study would have tended to select the more stable families.

Respondents were asked to list their debts by type (e.g., rent, furniture) and amount due.[5] Interestingly enough, 26 percent of the people said that they had no debts at all. This appears to be due largely to difficulties in obtaining credit because of their low-sporadic-income status. The other 72 percent of the group (one respondent did not answer the question) is in debt for a total of more than $6,400, or an average of more than $178 per family.

There are several things which influence the data in the direction of underestimating the indebtedness of the group. First, some respondents simply did not know how much they owed to certain of their creditors, and it was not possible to find out from other sources. Second, the definition of "debt" used in the questionnaire did not include current unpaid bills, even though the respondent stated that she would not be able to pay them. A third influence toward understatement of indebtedness is the respondent's definition of what constitutes money owed. The statements of a few respondents led to the suspicion that money is not considered as owed unless the creditor can be expected to demand it. For example, one woman listed her debts and then, when asked if there were others, stated that she owed money to a retail trade establishment, but that they did not know her current address, and she no longer considered it a debt. Just how much financial obligation is disguised by this definition is not known, but there is no doubt that this factor is operating. Thus, it is more accurate to say that the families who are in debt owe an average of at least $178 each.

OTHER SOURCES OF INCOME

Of course, cash income is not the whole picture. Important parts of any respondent's income are in noncash forms. In order to describe accurately the lives of these people, it is necessary to examine some of the ways in which the gaps between requirements and cash income are at least partially filled.

When food is lacking, even after other requirements have been put aside, these people resort to a variety of sources, which include borrowing food from friends or relatives, begging from neighbors, or eating meals with relatives or friends. Private welfare agencies and church organizations are of help here, too, in providing food. Also, as described above, surplus food helps to close the gap.

A major difficulty in using surplus food is its inaccessibility. Many respondents reported that, although they were eligible to receive surplus food, getting it posed barriers. This was usually because of lack of carfare or because they could pick up only a portion of the allotment, since they had to carry it for as many as 40 blocks. Several people expressed a desire for some delivery system.

An additional source of help with shortages of food is the free school lunch for elementary schoolchildren. Many of the children receive lunch at school at no cost (which enables some respondents to send the children to school even though they can have no breakfast). Several respondents said that they had applied for this program, but had been rejected because the children live close enough to go home at noon, or because there was no space in the program for additional children.

Clothing comes from a wide variety of sources. Most important are friends, neighbors, and relatives. Second are inexpensive new clothing stores, followed by private welfare agencies, and second-hand clothing stores. Of all clothing sources named, 21 percent were those for new clothing, while 52 percent were for used clothing (the rest were undetermined). It appears that for most of the respondents and their children, new clothing is rarely a part of the wardrobe. (Some of the clothes received from friends and relatives are probably new, but the best guess is that most of them are hand-me-downs.)

When rent money is not available, several things can happen. A few respondents reported that their landlords had either suspended rent altogether or had allowed the rent to run in arrears over a period of time. Others reported that they had gotten emergency help from private welfare agencies, friends, or relatives in making one or two payments. One respondent's rental payments have been taken over by her sister. In the case of public housing residents, rents are reduced when a tenant goes off a public assistance status (if the tenant applies for the reduction).

Despite these leniencies, evictions do occur.[6] Some respondents moved in with relatives for short periods of time until finding a new place to live, or were able to stay for a short while in emergency quarters provided by private agencies. Finding a new place to live presents problems not only of having rent money available, but of acceptability as a tenant. Real estate offices are reluctant to rent to unattached women with children, especially when their incomes are low and uncertain. One way around this is to have the rental made by someone who is more acceptable (e.g., an employed male). When these various techniques failed or were not applicable, one respondent and her six children spent 11 months living in cars, in a store-front church, in the home of a "winehead" for about 2 days, and finally in the rooms of a private welfare agency. Recently, with the help of that agency, she has found living space in a semidetached house.

Needs for gas, electricity, and water are not so easily met, except by doing without. Several cases were reported of families who were living without lights or gas (telephones are almost unknown among this group). One woman whose gas had been turned off was using a hot plate to cook on. It is not always necessary to do without, however, since relatives and friends sometimes help by making payments of overdue utilities bills to prevent their being cut off.

As discussed above, needs for medical attention are met in very large part by the provisions of free medical care. This seems to represent an important source of noncash income to these respondents.

CONCLUSION

The major role that public assistance appears to have played in the lives of these 50 families was to provide them with a rare element of financial stability in a generally unstable pattern of life. Public assistance, when they had it, did not raise them economically above a subsistence level or provide them with a new way of living. When they lost the assistance, they had more problems, but not problems of a quantitatively different nature than those with which they had been dealing before. The termination of assistance led to a series of ad hoc, impermanent solutions through which most of the families studied were thus far able to keep the children together and a roof over their heads. There was little reduction of dependency, if the term is broadly defined, but rather a shift in dependency from the public to the private sector. Though a few of the women found economically productive work, the majority had to depend on relief from private agencies or handouts from friends or relatives, on illicit activities, or on the unintended largess of the business community in permitting the accumulation of debts. The price the families paid so far was an increase in the precariousness of their stratagems for dealing with poverty and a decrease in their ability to plan their lives rationally. The data do not tell us, but one wonders what will happen to these women and their children when the limited resources of private agencies can no longer be tapped and when the possibility of debt manipulation comes to an end.

Perhaps more striking than those more or less consistent patterns that emerge among the families included in the study is the variation they display in their ability to weather the blow of welfare termination. Some of this variation can be seen in the body of the report. It comes out more clearly in a reading of the case histories which are appended. One can find in these 50 cases a family or two that appears better off than it was when getting the relief payment, the improvement not necessarily a result of welfare termination, but also not impeded by it. At the other end, one can find families apparently quite unable to cope with their situation, in danger of impaired health and of disintegration entirely as a family unit. The responses to the new situation vary from doing something (applying to a private agency, seeking a job, forming a liaison with a man who would bring in some food or a few dollars), to doing nothing (letting the bills accumulate and hoping for the best).

It would appear that the family's ability to adjust to welfare termination depends upon varying emotional and social factors as well as on the economic opportunities which their environment offers.

This study was not undertaken to help solve the District's welfare problems from the scanty data in hand. There is an implication for welfare operations, however, to be found in the varying ability of the families under study to cope with public assistance termination; the strict application of the existing eligibility rules has apparently not succeeded in separating those families who are able to go it on their own from those who are not. Even though our study concentrated on a relatively stable group of terminated cases, only a handful were able to get back to a subsistence level. Most were left worse off than before and still dependent on the community.

In the following pages, the interviews have been summarized as brief case histories.

---

[4] It should be noted that several additional respondents said that they had been advised to send their children to Junior Village, at least temporarily, but that they had refused, desiring to keep the family together as long as possible.

[5] Permission to verify the debts was requested from each respondent, but only after they had been listed. No creditors' names were written down until and unless this permission had been gotten by the interviewer. Hence, any tendency to understate or leave out debts which might have been due to fear of contact with creditors was minimized. There are factors operating to understate indebtedness (see text below), but this is not one of them.

[6] Since these cases were located by residence, they were people who managed to find a roof of some sort. Institutionalized families, squatters, and homeless derelicts would not have been located.

FIFTY CASE HISTORIES

Mrs. T, a 36-year-old mother of four children was cut off assistance in June 1962 because she was said to be employable. Surplus food was also terminated at this time. She has been back to the Department twice to try to get reinstated but each time she has been told that she has "no business being on welfare." For the 10 months she was receiving public assistance, the family received $200 a month. Since she has been on her own, her income has varied between $150 and $200 a month. She receives a varying amount from her husband from whom she is separated. Usually it is around $100 a month, but it varies enough so that she is unable to count on and plan for specific amounts. She supplements this income by domestic work, which she does on an irregular, part-time basis. This, too, varies, but she estimates that her work brings in about $25 per week. Her income in April was $175.

Since she has been off of public assistance, Mrs. T has trouble paying the rent for her three-bedroom public housing apartment. She has kept the apartment neat and has tried to be careful of her wornout furniture, but she has no money to replace or repair old furnishings, and no money to fix the place up the way she would like to. She has also had to stop the insurance policy which she had for herself and her children which she was able to carry while she had a secure income from public assistance. Mrs. T has managed to make her food budget stretch and her four children are all receiving free lunches at school. One child stayed out of school, however, for a full week, because she was embarrassed to wear the same dress every day. Friends and the children's school have been responsible for donating what clothing the family does have.

Mrs. T was born in a large city and moved to Washington when she was 7 years old. She finished the ninth grade and was 21 years old when she had her first child. Her children range in age from 9 to 15 and she has been separated from her husband for several years.

Although her income was more dependable when she was getting public assistance, Mrs. T is relieved that she does not have to have anything more to do with welfare investigators: "When the investigators come to your house you are supposed to immediately open your door—no matter how you are dressed. This is day or night. If you are slow in letting them in, you stand a very good chance of being cut off. I have had them come to my house at 2 and 3 o'clock in the morning, shining flashlights all over the house, looking in closets, under the bed, everywhere * * *. Because a person is on welfare, I don't think they should have to go through things like this."

Mrs. P who is 33 years old, has lived with her four children, ages 2 to 10, in a two-bedroom public housing apartment for the past 3 years. Until September of 1962 she had been receiving $176 a month from the Department of Public Welfare. Her assistance was reinstated in May 1963. During the 8 months in between, Mrs. P a chronic asthmatic, supported herself and her family by doing domestic work about twice a month and by finding occasional help from private welfare agencies. Her family also helped some by paying her rent.

During this period, getting enough food was often a problem, and the older children often had to give up some of their food so that the younger ones could eat better, although the two school-age children were able to get free lunches at school. The family also receives surplus food orders, which were "the only thing that kept us going" when there was no public assistance. On the day of the interview, the family had white beans and cornbread for the main meal.

Mrs. P was born on a farm and moved to Washington, D.C., when she was 10 years old; she has completed 12 years of school.

Mrs. M and her four children started receiving public assistance in New York 9 years ago after her husband was convicted of a felony and sentenced to prison. Five years ago, after her 11-year-old daughter was raped, Mrs. M decided that life would be better in Washington and she moved here. For the first year she lived here she was supported by her church. After her year's residence was up, she began receiving monthly public assistance of $205, which she received until June 1962, at which time she was told to go find a job.

Immediately after termination of public assistance, Mrs. M found a job as a mail clerk. It is irregular full-time work. When she is needed full time, she earns as much as $46 per week. Her job, however, is not steady, and she cannot count on the $46. When she is laid off, she receives $20 from a private agency. The Welfare Department located her husband at the time of termination, and he has promised to send her $40 a month. April's income, including help from her husband, was $150.

Mrs. M is 42 years old. She was born and grew up in New York City, where she finished 1 year of college. She had her first child when she was 25 years old.

After termination, Mrs. M sent her oldest child to live with an aunt in order to cut down on her expenses. Against her wishes, her 17-year-old son has quit school and has tried unsuccessfully to find a job to help support the family. Lately he has been associating with friends whom Mrs. M thinks are an unhealthy influence on him and he has been staying out very late at night. She feels that he is drifting away from the family and she feels her influence over him, especially when she is working full time, is limited.

Most of the family's clothing has been donated by private social agencies. The family frequently goes without food. While she was getting financial assistance, Mrs. M was also getting surplus food. Since ADC has been terminated, however, she believes, as do many others, that she is ineligible for surplus food.

One of her most serious problems is her mentally retarded child. Since she has had to be working to support her family, she has been unable to give the child the special care needed. The child attends regular school, but is five grades behind.

Mrs. M, a veteran of 9 years of public assistance, feels that the welfare program places too much emphasis on financial assistance and not enough on preparation for self-sufficiency. She would have appreciated job training. She also feels that regulations are too stringently applied, especially the man-in-the-house rule. "You don't stop being a woman just because you are on relief."

Mrs. E, 34, lives with her eight children and one grandchild in a three-room dilapidated apartment where they share a bath with other tenants. She moved to Washington 11 years ago. She has had 1 year of schooling. Mrs. E's youngest child is 6 months old, and the eldest is 15 years old. Until November 1962 the family was receiving $216 a month from the Welfare Department. Public assistance was terminated when Mrs. E refused to stop allowing the father of her three youngest children to visit her home, because he contributes $30 every 2 weeks to the family budget.

In addition to the $60 a month that Mrs. E receives from her three youngest's father, the family has income from Mrs. E's part-time employment as a domestic, which varies between $60 and $95 a month. Even in a good month, the money income doesn't come to three-quarters of the public assistance allotment. Although she applied for reinstatement at the Department of Public Welfare in February, she was refused additional help.

Mrs. E does get some help from members of her family. Her sister sometimes buys food for the family, and her mother pays for a telephone. Also, she was able to get help 1 month from a private welfare agency to pay her rent, and her surplus food allotment was recently reinstated, after it had been stopped at the same time as public assistance.

Mrs. E has had trouble supporting her family since last winter. She is 4 months in arrears in her rent, and, although her landlord has been lenient about this, she expects to be evicted before too much longer. Two days before the interview, she had had to give $30 from her food account to the landlord. Mrs. E was also behind in her utilities bills, and expected the gas to be turned off at the end of the month.

Even though most of Mrs. E's income goes to buy food, and even though the family often has to give up important things to have enough food, about once a week they don't have enough to eat. The day of the interview, the family had no food but potatoes in the house. Mrs. E is under the impression that, because she receives surplus food, her children are not eligible for free school lunches, and she has not applied for the program.

While lack of food has not kept the children out of school, all five school-age children have missed a week or more of school at a time because they had no shoes. Mrs. E's 15-year-old daughter has also missed a good deal of school because she often had to stay home and babysit while Mrs. E was at work. However, this is no longer such a problem, because the girl dropped out of school when she had a baby 11 months ago.

Mrs. E's chronic high blood pressure, and her frequent lack of carfare, often prevent her from taking her children to receive medical care. Her 6-month-old daughter has had bronchitis since birth, her 9-year-old daughter has something wrong with her eyes, ears, and throat. These complaints usually go untreated, since Mrs. E is not always able to keep her appointments at the clinic.

Mrs. E's state of affairs is beginning to get her down. She has started taking drinks occasionally, when they are offered to her, in order to sleep at night, and several times she has left the house with the intention of not returning, so that the children could be cared for by an agency. But each time she has stayed away only 2 or 3 hours, and then returned because the children have no one but her to care for them. She feels constantly depressed and fears she is losing her mind.

Mrs. L and her four children had no income at all during March and April. There is no source of income on which she can count. In early May a private agency gave her an emergency $10 food order.

Mrs. L, who is 25, grew up on a farm and finished 11th grade. She married when she was 19 and moved to Washington the same year. She had her first child when she was 20 and is momentarily expecting her fifth child. Mrs. L and her husband separated in 1962, and he moved to another jurisdiction. Even when they were living together, he only gave her sporadic help and only when he felt like it. He has not given her any help since February. She applied for public assistance in 1961 while she was still living with her husband, but was turned down because of the man-in-the-house rule. In November 1962, after the separation, she again applied for help and was given an emergency check for $159. Regular cash assistance has been refused her.

Mrs. L received surplus food from October 1962 until April 1963, when she lost her eligibility because she did not have the carfare to go pick up the food and it was too far to walk.

Mrs. L owes $159 for 3 months' back rent and $17 for utilities. She and her four, soon to be five, children live in a minimally furnished one-bedroom apartment. The four children sleep in the one bedroom and she sleeps in the room which is used for cooking, eating, and living. She could use another bedroom, especially after the baby is born. Everyone in the family needs clothes. She has not been able to buy any since last November, when she was cut off assistance. Occasionally neighbors give her handouts, but this is nothing on which she can plan. Shoes are her greatest problem.

Her children are all preschool age and, although she would prefer working to receiving assistance, she cannot solve her child-care problems in such a way that she would have any money left over from her work after she paid for babysitters. Mrs. L has been buying food whenever anyone gives her a dollar. Nobody gives her money regularly, but when she is desperate, she manages to borrow food or money here and there.

Mrs. L realizes that her husband should be supporting her, but since he isn't, she is puzzled that the Welfare Department won't. She is bewildered by big city life. Her mother, who still lives in the town where Mrs. L grew up, is receiving assistance, and Mrs. L thinks that her mother has had an easier time than she has demonstrating that she is in need of help. Mrs. L blamed many of her present problems on living in a big city away from the rest of her family.

Mrs. F moved to Washington from Oklahoma 11 years ago. She, her children (1 to 5 years old) and her common-law husband live together in a five-room apartment. The apartment is not as satisfactory as it might be, partly because it is infested with termites, rats, and roaches. However, because her husband is satisfied with the living arrangements, and since Mrs. F has no other source of income, she doesn't feel very hopeful about being able to move.

In October 1961, Mrs. F applied for public assistance when her husband deserted her. But an investigator found the husband in the apartment during a visit, and the application was denied. Mrs. F feels that the Welfare Department was justified in the denial. Shortly after this, her husband returned to live with the family, and is usually able to provide them with about $240 a month from his job as a truckdriver. She had not asked for help from any private welfare agencies, nor has she sought aid from her relatives in Oklahoma.

The family has difficulty finding enough food once in a while. Even when they do give up important things to have enough food, it isn't always successful. When they do eat, the food is cooked on a hotplate since the gas has been disconnected. Clothing is often a problem, and Mrs. F has to rely on the generosity of friends who give her used clothing. She sometimes has to beg them or her husband for money to buy shoes. With the exception of her husband's "hypertension," Mrs. F's family seems to enjoy good health most of the time.

Mrs. F has no bills besides the one for gas, because she cannot obtain credit anywhere.

Mrs. F, who is 30 years old, wants to leave Washington and return with her children to her family in Oklahoma. She says she is unhappy having to depend on her husband, who she fears is likely to desert her again, leaving her destitute.

Mrs. T had an April income of $50 for her family of five. In addition to this, her monthly rent of $33 was paid by her uncle, who has been paying it since her public assistance was cut off in September.

Until assistance was terminated in September, Mrs. T had, for 2½ years, received monthly public assistance of $132. She says she always had enough food while she was receiving assistance, but now she runs out about twice a week and has to borrow from her neighbors.

She was told last September that she must find and bring the father of her baby down to the Welfare Department and have him sign a support statement. She has not seen this man for over 2 years and although she has looked, she has been unable to find him. She applied for reinstatement in December and again in March, but was refused help because she had not yet located the baby's father.

Mrs. T, who is 27, grew up in a small town where she finished 10th grade. When she was 16, she moved to Washington. She was 17 when she had her first child. Her children range in age from 17 months to 10 years. For the past 2 years, she has been living in a minimally furnished, but well-maintained three-bedroom public housing unit.

Mrs. T has continued to receive surplus food since financial assistance was cut off. But even with surplus food and free lunches for her two school-age children, she does not have enough food or enough money to keep her family from going hungry. She reports that her two older children frequently have to be kept home from school because there has been no food for breakfast.

The family has not bought any clothing since September. She is given secondhand clothes by her neighbors for the two younger children, but the older school-age children are in critical need of clothes and she has no source of supply of secondhand clothes for them. They had to stay home from school during the coldest part of the winter because they had no warm clothes and no boots.

Mrs. T has not tried to find a job because she cannot make adequate child-care arrangements which would not cost her as much as she earned. She hopes that her uncle and her mother will go on paying her rent until she gets reestablished with the Welfare Department. In the meantime, she must convince the Department that her continued search for her baby's father is fruitless.

Mrs. J, a 49-year-old native of Washington, lives with her 15-year-old son, her 18-year-old daughter, the daughter's 15-month-old daughter, and the five children of another daughter, ranging from 8 months to 8 years, in a three room apartment.

Several years ago, Mrs. J took over the responsibility of the care of her daughter's children, gathering them from different foster homes. She was receiving $209 a month public assistance until February 1963, paid to her because the daughter was too young to care adequately for the children. In February, the daughter was judged to be able to support the children herself, and assistance was terminated. The children's mother has not taken over their full care, and they still live with Mrs. J.

Mrs. J depends on her grown children for all of her income. She receives $60 a month from her daughter, who is employed as a cleaner in a hospital, as well as weekly food contributions. A grown son is also able to help sometimes.

Mrs. J's surplus food allotment was discontinued in February, but she says she doesn't have too much trouble getting enough food most of the time, what with her daughter's help and the generosity of a local grocer, who has let her run up a grocery bill of $120. None of the three school-age children in the household receives free lunches at school. Mrs. J has also been able to keep from running behind on her $65 rent.

The family sometimes has trouble getting enough adequate clothing to wear, particularly in wet or cold weather. The children have had to stay home from school a day or two on occasion during the winter because their shoes had worn thin. Aside from winter colds, which Mrs. J feels are more frequent because of lack of warm clothing, the family has not had any medical trouble recently.

Mrs. P's March income for her family of seven was $65. This was larger than usual because her brother gave her $20 for rent. She received $15 emergency financial aid from a private agency. The remaining $30 came from the father of her three oldest childen. This $30 is the only monthly income upon which she can count.

Mrs. P, who is 25, grew up in a small town and finished ninth grade. She began living with her common law husband when she was 15 and had her first child. She separated from him 5 years ago and 3 years ago she moved to the District. She began living with the father of her three youngest children in 1959, but he left her and went to another State when she was pregnant with her youngest child. In October 1961 she began receiving public assistance of $191 per month. In November 1962, the father of the three youngest children came back to pay his one and only visit. During the course of this half-hour visit, a Welfare Department investigator arrived and found him in her living room. The father promised the investigator that he would support the children and agreed to come around to the Department to sign a support agreement, but he again disappeared. Mrs. P has never seen him again nor has she received any help from him. In December, Mrs. P was told by her caseworker that assistance to her would be discontinued unless she could produce the man for an interview. When she said she wouldn't know where to look, she was told that it was up to her to find him and that the Welfare Department had to stick by its regulations. Mrs. P's assistance ended in December. She has been looking for the father of these three children since December, but has exhausted all her leads and has had no success in finding him.

In order to support her family when assistance was terminated, she immediately took a job as a domestic. She took her 10-year-old daughter out of school to care for the three young children and her mother while she was working. At the end of January, because she had inadequate clothing, Mrs. P caught the flu and lost her job. Since then she has only been able to find work 1 day every other week and on the days she works, the 10-year-old daughter stays home to care for the family. Mrs. P is reluctant to have this child miss school, but other babysitting arrangements are not as satisfactory and she must bring in some income.

She owes $126 in back rent for February and March and, since she could not pay in April, she was evicted. Her new apartment consists of a kitchen and one room in which seven people eat and sleep. The family shares a bath with others. Mrs. P says this apartment is worse and more crowded than the one from which she was evicted.

Since January, Mrs. P has received two monthly food orders from a private agency. Although she has been eligible for surplus food since February, she has lacked the carfare to get her full allotment. She has been carrying about one-third of what the family is allowed on the 25-minute walk from the center to her house. Mrs. P says she runs completely out of food about twice a month and her two older children frequently go to school without any breakfast. These two children do get free lunches at school and so she feeds breakfast only to her younger children and her mother when she is short.

Mrs. P has bought no clothing in the last 5 months and she has no money to wash the clothes she has. She has had to keep the children out of school because they had no clean clothes and she lacked the money for a bar of soap. "Before I was cut off assistance, I washed three tubs of clothing a week and also used the dryer. I spent $1.80 a week for the washer and dryer and

65 cents for detergent. Since February, I have only been able to wash by hand and only the most necessary things. I have three trash cans and several boxes of dirty clothes in our room, which I intend to wash when I get my public assistance check again."

In addition to the $126 Mrs. P owes in back rent, she owes $35 to her aunt. She is trying to get back on public assistance because she has exhausted her search for the father of her three youngest children and she is now in "a miserable position." She cannot expect her brother to go on paying her rent. Her mother, who has had a stroke, has diabetes, and failing eyesight, needs medical attention which she cannot get for lack of carfare.

Mrs. W lived the early part of her life in a small town. Following her graduation from high school, she moved to the District of Columbia where she has resided for the past 19 years. Now 35 years old, Mrs. W has seven children, six of whom live with her in a sparsely furnished apartment. Her oldest son, 17, lives with her brother. She is expecting another child in July.

Mrs. W received public assistance from 1961 to July 1962. Her need of assistance arose from the fact that she was deserted by her husband in 1959. According to the respondent, her welfare grant was terminated because of her latest pregnancy; she does not resent the discontinuation of her grant: "I think it was fair in a way * * * when they cut me off after I got pregnant."

The grant which Mrs. W received as a welfare recipient amounted to $203 per month. She also received a parcel of surplus food every other week. Since her welfare payments were stopped, some of the family's monthly bills have been paid by the husband, but there is rarely any ready cash. Mrs. W now has debts amounting to $219.50, including $162.50 for 2 months' rent. She believes that she and her children will be evicted unless the rent is paid quickly. The husband, who has been living with another woman for some time now, also brings food into the apartment on occasion, but these donations are sporadic and inadequate. Mrs. W finds it necessary to solicit extra food from her neighbors and from her church, but there is still almost never enough. Three of the children get free lunches at school; the other school-age child is "too embarrassed" to accept them. The school, neighbors, and relatives are also sources of secondhand clothing. It is hard to find shoes, however, and the lack of shoes has sometimes kept the children home from school. Mrs. W's own wardrobe consists of two dresses.

Two of the children suffer from chronic disorders, but medical care for the family has been suspended since last summer. Mrs. W herself is anemic and indicates that she has had no prenatal care. She expressed the hope that she might undergo a sterilization operation following her forthcoming delivery.

Mrs. S is separated from her husband. She lives with her five younger children in a two-room apartment consisting of bathroom, kitchen, and one room that serves as a living room-bedroom. The family sleeps on one bed and one cot. There is no bathtub and no stove. The gas and electricity have been turned off for several months because Mrs. S is unable to pay the utility companies.

Mrs. S is a woman of 43 who finished 1 year of college. She came to Washington 12 years ago with her husband. Since they have been separated, he has returned to the small town in which they both grew up.

Mrs. S received public assistance from 1959 until early in 1961, when the Welfare Department deemed her employable and told her husband, who is an alcoholic, to support the family. At this time, she had already separated from her husband and her youngest child was only 4 years old. When her welfare checks ceased, Mrs. S moved to her present apartment for which she pays $65 a month, including utilities. She is more crowded than she was before, but the rent is lower. Her husband is supposed to be paying her $40 per week in support. Up until the time of the interview he had only paid her $34 for the entire year.

Until January of this year, Mrs. S was employed as a fountain clerk, earning $30 per week, out of which she had babysitter costs in addition to rent, food, utilities, and clothes. Since she lost her job she has been receiving unemployment compensation of $108 per month. She has another few weeks to go on this. In April, a private agency helped her substantially by paying her rent for her. When she was evicted from her former apartment, Mrs. S had to leave her furniture behind. Although she still owes the furniture company for it, she does not intend to pay for it. Her present apartment is furnished with one bed, one cot, three chairs, and a table. She is dependent on one of her married daughters for the children's clothes and even though the children feel ashamed that they do not have new clothes and that their clothes are shabby, she says that they love school so much that they would never stay home. They do not receive free lunches at school and due to a mixup, Mrs. S has not been able to receive surplus food. She hopes that everything will be straightened out so that she can begin receiving it again.

Since assistance has been terminated, the family has regularly gone without food, clothing, lights, and hot food. In the winter, they went for long periods of time with no heat. One daughter suffers from asthma, which requires frequent medical attention for which Mrs. S sometimes does not have the carfare, although she is entitled to free care. Mrs. S suffers from a nervous rash, which is under treatment, as well as an infected arm.

When her unemployment runs out, she does not know what she will do. She would like to work, but can only find jobs which pay her about $30 per week. Out of this she cannot afford adequate child care and she is unwilling to let her children roam the streets of her neighborhood, which she thinks is an undesirable one.

In March, Mrs. H and her five children had an income of $35, which was mostly from family. April's income up until the time of the interview on the 26th, had been $15 and a pair of shoes from a private social agency. Emergency assistance was refused her at three other private agencies. When there are enough clothes, two of her children can go to school and get free lunches. Her 5-year-old child has not yet started school because there are not enough clothes for him. Mrs. H hopes she will receive enough clothing handouts by next September to send this child to first grade.

This summer Mrs. H will have her sixth child and her 17-year-old daughter will have her first. If she can manage to pay $53 she owes in back rent and to keep current, eight people will be living in a three-bedroom public housing unit, which is minimally furnished and poorly kept up. The father of Mrs. H's baby who lives in another State does not know that she is pregnant and she does not expect that he will give her any help. The father of her daughter's child has promised to support it but has no plans for moving her and the child out of Mrs. H's apartment.

Mrs. H, who is 34, was born on a farm and completed 4 years of school. She has lived in the District since 1954. She began living with her common law husband when she had her first child at 17. She lived with him for 12 years. In 1958, when she was 29 and pregnant with her fifth child, he deserted her. She has not heard from him since and she does not know his whereabouts. At the time her fifth child was born, she began to receive monthly public assistance of $209.

Mrs. H's welfare payments were terminated in October when an investigator reported that she was employed. At that time, Mrs. H was working without pay for a friend of her brother in order to repay a debt to him. When assistance stopped, Mrs. H said, "When I had no money and my relatives had left the city, I went to Junior Village to try to get my children in. They wouldn't take them and I cried."

Mrs. H has had clothing, food, and occasional money handouts from her family since October. Her brother's friend, for whom she was working also helped. Now her family and her brother's friend have all moved away and she has been unable to pay the rent for her five-room public housing apartment since March. She has received an eviction notice and she owes $225 for rent, food, and utilities. On the day of the interview, the refrigerator had only a bottle of water in it and there was no food in the house. She has applied for reinstatement with the Welfare Department and is expecting an investigator any day.

Mrs. H said, "I don't understand it. When I really need help I cannot get it. Junior Village would not even take my children when I had to face eviction before." If she can't get an extension of rent credit this time and if she does not get back on public assistance she will have to try again to get Junior Village to take her children.

Mrs. N pays $75 a month for her five-room apartment where she lives with her 23-year-old grandson and her 45-year-old mentally retarded son, for whom she must care. April's income for this family was $100, which was more than usual; $40 came from her grandson who works seasonally as a construction worker and $60 from social security. Mrs. N is 74 years old and in good health, but her son requires attention and has great difficulty in finding employment.

Mrs. N first applied for public assistance in 1956 when her husband died. She was rejected because the Welfare Department told her that her eight adult children should support her. This they have never been able to do because they have their own families to care for. In 1962 she again applied for assistance but was told by the Welfare Department that her $60 social security check was sufficient for her own needs and the needs of her mentally retarded son.

Mrs. N has been threatened with eviction but was helped by a church group with money toward her rent. This group also gives her carfare so that she may go to the distribution center and get her surplus food. Her rent is $75 per month, and she is 3 months in arrears in paying it. Utilities are not included in the rent, and she has been without heat for several months. She owes $72 in utility bills. Clothing is donated by the same church group that helped her with her rent and gives her carfare to get surplus food.

Mrs. N came to Washington from a small southern town 19 years ago with her husband, to whom she was married for over 50 years. Since his death several years ago, she has been dependent on her social security check and the occasional employment of her son and grandson. Her son would like to work and has, in the past, worked. But finding a job is difficult and he has been looking for one unsuccessfully for the past 9 months. Mrs. N still hopes that the Welfare Department will give her aid, since $60 is insufficient income to support both her and her son.

Mrs. K, who is 33, was born in Washington, where she finished 9 years of school. Shortly after she left school, her first child was born. She now has seven children, ranging in age from 18 months to 16 years. Six of the children, all boys, live with her in her four-room public housing apartment. Mrs. K has sent her 18-month-old daughter to live with a relative, because she isn't able to provide enough food, clothing, or care for the baby.

The family usually has about $120 income each month. Half of this comes from Mrs. K's estranged husband, and the rest from the father of her two youngest sons. Mrs. K is doing just about as well in terms of money income as she was when she was receiving public assistance, which was terminated in December 1961. But her surplus food allotment was stopped at the same time, and the family often has to give up clothing and let the bills go in order to have enough to eat.

Mrs. K has a few debts, for clothing and groceries, but has managed to keep her rent and utilities bills paid up.

Both Mrs. K and her 2-year-old son suffer from chronic asthma, and Mrs. K also suffers from a nervous condition. Otherwise, the family is usually in good health.

Although Mrs. K has tried twice to get help from private agencies, she has been unsuccessful. She must rely entirely on the support of the fathers of her children and the generosity of her sister-in-law.

Mrs. H, who is a 38-year-old mother of four children, was refused public assistance because she was deemed employable. Mrs. H reported that, at the time of an interview with the Welfare Department 4 years ago, it was "* * * embarrassing and heartbreaking to be in need and to have to go to these people. They talk to you as if you were dirt and as if whatever they have to do for you comes out of their own pockets." Her more recent interviews, in applying for retraining, were more polite. Mrs. H does not like to be dependent, but her husband, who is the father of her two older children, has been in prison for the past 5 years and the father of her two younger children gives her $80 per month for their support.

Until last January, Mrs. H supported her family by working the night shift as a nurse's aid. For this she received $130 every 2 weeks and, because she sews everyone's clothes, the family got along. Last January, however, she had an accident while she was on the job. While she was under medical attention for the accident, she discoverd that she had a heart condition and the doctors told her that she should not be doing such strenuous work.

Since January she has not worked and has fallen in debt. She owes a total of $438. She is 3 months behind in her rent, which is $100 per month. Her gas bill is $99 and the gas has been turned off for the past 2 months. Mrs. H has pawned some jewelry and cashed two savings bonds since January in order to buy food. She has applied for surplus food but has not yet received it. Private agencies have given her emergency relief but her main hope lies in being accepted for the rehabilitation program so that she may find less strenuous work and once again become self-sufficient.

Mrs. C and her four children live in a five-room apartment on the second floor of a rat- and roach-ridden dilapidated building. The children range from 3 to 8 years old.

Mrs. C applied for public assistance after her husband left her to live with another woman, but was told she was ineligible. She sent three of the children to be cared for by her mother in another State for a year, because she was unable to do so herself. In the meantime, she found a job in a restaurant, and took her husband to court to arrange for some financial help from him.

After she brought the children back to live with her in Washington, Mrs. C suffered a slipped disk on the job. She had to quit working and spend much of her time in bed. She tried to go back to work as a countergirl, but had to give it up 3 weeks ago because of the constant pain in her back. She went to a doctor for treatment, and he gave her a prescription for relief of the pain, but Mrs. C could not afford to buy the medicine, and has not been back to the doctor, because she can't pay him.

Now Mrs. C depends on the $80 a month from her husband, and whatever occasional help she can get from friends. She is hoping for a settlement from workmen's compensation soon, but isn't sure what the current status of the claim is.

While the C family is waiting for some more stable source of income, they are having a hard time getting enough to eat and wear. They frequently run out of food, and Mrs. C believes that surplus food is available only to public assistance recipients. Neither of the school-age children get free lunches at school.

The C's sometimes have to give up things in order to have enough clothing, although Mrs. C has had the occasional help of her sister and a friend, and rarely has to buy used clothes. But Mrs. C's 8-year-old daughter missed 2 weeks of school last winter because she didn't have enough warm clothing and shoes.

Mrs. C is 26 years old, and moved to the District 5 years ago. She grew up in a small town, where she had 10 years of school.

Mrs. H and her four children, aged 2 to 7 years, her mother, four brothers and two sisters, live in a rundown row house with six rooms. Mrs. H and her children all sleep in one room. Mrs. H was receiving public assistance until May 1962, when investigators found the father of her youngest daughter visiting. Although he said that he was not living there, Mrs. H was not successful in preventing termination of her welfare grant.

Mrs. H is able to bring in about $60 a month by doing babysitting at home for a neighbor. Two of her brothers are old enough to hold jobs, one as a newspaper deliverer, and the other as a window washer, and her mother receives social security payments. Mrs. H gets only sporadic help from the father of her 4-year-old daughter.

Although Mrs. H receives surplus food, they often run out, and Mrs. H's mother must buy most of the food for the family, which eats together. When they run short, Mrs. H goes without in order to give the children more. Mrs. H is dependent on her mother and her aunt to buy clothing for herself and the children. Most of the clothing they can buy is used. Her school-age son has had to stay out of school sometimes because he did not have any shoes. Mrs. H did get a slip for clothing from a visiting nurse, but lost it.

The family has not had severe health problems recently although the children frequently catch cold for lack of warm clothing. Mrs. H's 9-month-old son died of spinal meningitis last summer.

Mrs. H has debts amounting to $195 for furniture, appliances, and clothing. The rent and utilities are taken care of by her mother and older brothers. Mrs. H is concerned that she may have to move into a place of her own, because building inspectors who visited recently said that repairs to the walk, floors, and ceilings of the house would have to be made or the building would be condemned.

Mrs. C and her 3- and 1-year-old children are being supported by her landlady who gives them, out of sympathy, one room in her house. Mrs. C is expecting her third child this summer. Mrs. C's landlady is undependable in her support, however; occasionally she gets drunk and locks Mrs. C and her children out and refuses to give them any food. When this happens, Mrs. C has to go begging in the neighborhood for food and shelter. Mrs. C and her children frequently have to go without food and they are dependent on Mrs. C's sister for hand-me-down clothes.

Mrs. C was born in Washington into a family of seven girls deserted by the father. She finished ninth grade. She is now 20 and she had her first child when she was 17. Three different fathers have been involved in her three pregnancies. She has twice been refused help at the Welfare Department because she cannot locate two of the fathers and the other one refuses to come to the Department and agree to support her.

Although some of Mrs. C's needs are being met by her landlady's generosity, they are being met on a noncash basis and it is not possible to calculate the amount.

She has been living in her present room for the last 2 months. The landlady, when sober, has been extremely kind to her, even giving her money for carfare so that she can get prenatal care. The landlady's drinking, however, makes Mrs. C's source of support capricious. She owes no money because neither credit nor money is available to her; she has no income whatsoever.

Six months ago Mrs. L and her five children, the oldest 11 years old, moved into their two-room apartment; they share a bath and are able to use the kitchen downstairs. Not long after the family moved, a sixth child was born. Things get pretty crowded for the family—the four daughters sleep in one bed, and Mrs. L takes her two sons in with her. She has applied for public housing but hasn't heard yet whether she can move in.

Mrs. L was receiving $151 a month from the Welfare until March 1963. Since the aid was terminated, she has had to rely almost entirely on private welfare agencies, family, and friends for her support. Mrs. L's mother has helped with food occasionally. Her brother can sometimes help, too, but he has a family of his own to support. Mrs. L sometimes has trouble getting enough food, and has to give up such things as clothing, haircuts, and cigarettes then. The family gets surplus food regularly, but even with that and the help from Mrs. L's mother, they are often short of food. The four schoolchildren don't eat breakfast, but rely on their free lunches at school. On the day of the interview, there was no food in the house. Mrs. L's 3-year-old son asked for a sandwich, but there was no bread, and no money to buy it with. Mrs. L has gotten help with cash and food from three private agencies since her termination.

Occasionally, the L children have had to stay out of school because they didn't have enough clothing to wear. Most of the family's clothing comes from a private welfare agency and is used.

Mrs. L thinks that so far things have not been too much different than they were when she was receiving public assistance, except that her food problems have been aggravated. However, she has not paid her rent since her termination, and owes a $46 utilities bill. As soon as Mrs. L can find someone to care for her children, she plans to look for a job. Mrs. L was born in the District 28 years ago, and finished 8 years of school.

Since October, when assistance was cut off and her husband ordered to support her family, Mrs. H has not known how much real income her family has. Mr. H was ordered by the Welfare Department to give his wife and 11 children $46 per week. Mr. H agreed only on condition that he be allowed to move back in with his family from whom he had been separated for 2 years. His return to the family has represented real hardship for all of them: the children dislike him and have been made extremely upset by his presence in the home. When he drinks, which is frequent, Mr. H beats up his wife. This spring she spent 1 month in St. Elizabeths for a mental disorder which she attributes directly to the strain of living with her husband.

Although Mr. H is supposed to pay her $46 per week, Mrs. H thinks that he gives her considerably less. He pays the rent and buys food daily, not what she asks for but what he thinks the family ought to have. Occasionally he gives her $2 or $3, but this is all she sees each month.

The family has grown used to eating no breakfasts. All 11 children are school age and receive free lunches. Dinners lack variety, but they seldom go without dinner. Mrs. H still gets surplus food.

Mrs. H, who is now 37, grew up in Washington where she finished seventh grade. She married her husband when he was about 17. A year later she had her first child. Her husband is the father of all 11 children. Mr. and Mrs. H separated in June 1960. The strain of living with him had caused Mrs. H to seek psychiatric help since 1957, which she still continues to need. She has had to have periodic institutionalization for her nervous disorders, most of which she blames on him.

In June 1960, when she first separated from her husband, Mrs. H had to put her children in Junior Village. She managed to take them out again at the end of July. In September of 1960 she was evicted from her public housing apartment for nonpayment of rent and she was forced to put the children in Junior Village again, this time until March 1961.

During the 2 years she was separated from her husband, Mrs. H received assistance from private agencies and from the Welfare Department. All of this aid was of an emergency type: from January until October of 1962, for example, her welfare payments varied beween $199 and $36. From month to month she had no certain sum upon which she could rely and base her family budget.

The family is now living in a substandard six-room apartment in which the stove, the refrigerator, and the lights have been turned off because they owe $150 in back utilities. Mrs. H must go next door in order to cook and use her neighbor's refrigerator. Mrs. H never knows from one day to the next whether or not her husband will pay their bills.

Most of the children's clothes are left over from their last stay at Junior Village. Occasionally neighbors and relatives give them hand-me-downs. At times the children have had to stay home from school because of lack of shoes, and shoes have always been a problem for this family. The H family's poverty has been exacerbated by the tension between the husband and wife and the father and children. According to Mrs. H, the older girls have become upset by their father's return home; they have lost their jobs and they dislike asking him for carfare so that they can look for new jobs.

Mrs. H would definitely prefer living apart from her husband but public assistance has been refused her and he will not support her unless he lives with his family. She is too nervous, and has been for the past 5 years, to hold down a job herself.

Mrs. K was born in Washington 40 years ago, and has lived here all her life. She has had eight children, the first born when she was about 20, about 2 years after she left school. Five of the children, ages 2 to 10, still live at home with Mrs. K and her common-law husband. The family of seven has lived for 2 years in two rooms on the second floor of a dilapidated building where the stairs are broken, the halls are unlighted, and most of the plaster has fallen off the walls. They share a bath with other tenants. Mrs. K's other three children, who are 20, 17, and 15, have lived with an aunt for the last 2 years because there is not enough room for them at home.

Things are pretty hard for Mrs. K much of the time; she has a full-time job as a domestic, but it only brings in $28 a week. Her husband works part time and irregularly as a caddie. If he has a good month, the family may have as much as $300 to spend. When things are not so good, Mrs. K can sometimes get help from her children's aunt and from her 20-year-old son. Otherwise, she often has to beg friends and neighbors for food and clothing for the children. The three schoolchildren do not get free lunches.

Although she is glad to have a job that brings in at least some money regularly, Mrs. K worries about the effects of this on the children. She must work in the evenings, and, although her husband is supposed to care for the children, he can't always be counted on. He sometimes disappears for as much as a week at a time. When this happens, the children must be cared for by Mrs. K's 10-year-old daughter.

Mrs. K was receiving about $160 each month from the Public Welfare until May 1962, when her caseworker, on the only visit to the home, chanced on Mrs. K's husband as he was visiting to bring the family some money. She has not been back to Welfare to ask for reinstatement. At one point, when she needed money to pay her rent, Mrs. K sought help from a private welfare agency, but was turned down. She was able to get an advance on her wages from her employer, but this, of course, only led later on to food shortages.

Mrs. D is expecting her seventh child in September. She lives in two rooms of substandard housing with her six children who range in age from 11 months to 9 years. From March until June 1962 she received $223 a month in public assistance. She continues to receive surplus food, but she says it is inadequate to keep her family from being hungry almost constantly. Public assistance was terminated at the time her sixth child was born because the father of this child would not sign an affidavit of inability to support her.

Since assistance was terminated, Mrs. D has been receiving $28 per month from the father of her third, fourth, and fifth children. Her total income for April was $140. She would not tell the interviewer what the main source of her income was.

Mrs. D is 28 years old. She has lived in the District all her life. She finished ninth grade and had her first child when she was 19 years old. She is separated from her husband.

Mrs. D was evicted from her former apartment in September because she could not pay the rent. At present she owes $74 to the gas company and the gas has been turned off for about 3 months. She has been cooking and heating water for baths on a hotplate. At the time of the interview two of her children were in the hospital severely burned from an overturned pot of hot water which was heating on the hotplate. During the winter one child was hospitalized with pneumonia, which Mrs. D believes was caused by the coldness of the apartment. The entire family suffers from frequent colds because of lack of heat and poor nutrition. The children do not get free lunches at school. Clothing is handed down from child to child, with occasional handouts of used clothing from neighbors and relatives. Mrs. D has not been able to buy any clothing for the family for a year, since termination of assistance. During the winter, the children were frequently kept home from school because of inadequate clothing. Mrs. D had to wear rubber boots with no shoes inside them during the coldest part of the winter.

Mrs. J, a 31-year-old native of Washington, lives with her 11 children, her sister, her sister's son, and her mother in a six-room row house which, though rundown, is basically in fairly good shape. Things get pretty crowded in the house, and as many as five children must sleep in one bed, but Mrs. J has nowhere else to go since she and her husband were separated. The family gets along on the earnings of Mrs. J's mother, a domestic, and occasional contributions from Mr. J. When everything goes well, these sources bring in about $270 a month. Mrs. J has no money to give her children, who are from 1 to 15 years old, but some of them earn pennies by selling wine bottles and rags. Mrs. J used to contribute $30 a month toward the rent, which is paid by her mother, but she hasn't been able to do this since her public assistance was terminated.

Mrs. J had been receiving $250 a month in public assistance, but this was discontinued in August 1962 which her husband failed to turn up for an interview at the Department of Public Welfare. Since then, she has applied for reinstatement, but was told that she was not eligible, again because her husband did not come in. She is frustrated and discouraged because she has no control over her husband. And her caseworker doesn't seem to be influenced by being told that Mrs. J's children are hungry.

Getting enough food for the family is often a problem, especially since Mrs. J's surplus food allotment was terminated at the same time as her public assistance. Six of the school-age children get free lunches at school, but the 15-year-old son does not, and he sometimes has to stay home from school if Mrs. J has no money to pay for his lunch.

Although she had no clothing or food problems when she was receiving public assistance, Mrs. J must now take money which might go for clothes in order to buy food. Even though she can occasionally afford to buy clothes at a rummage sale, at least one child has to stay out of school just about every week for lack of clothes or shoes, since almost all of her husband's $35 a week (when it comes) goes for food.

Mrs. J is worried because she can't afford to take the children to the clinic when they need to go. The boys sometimes cut themselves on the wine bottles they gather and need stitches, and the 1-year-old daughter has had a discharge from her ear for 2 weeks, but Mrs. J can't get them to the doctor because she has no carfare.

Mrs. J has become depressed and discouraged by her state of affairs and just doesn't feel like doing anything. She used to enjoy dressing and sending the children off to school and keeping tabs on them. Now the children are pretty much on their own, and the older boys have been getting into trouble for petty theft since Mrs. J stopped giving them money. She feels that the family is disintegrating, but doesn't know what to do about it.

Mrs. R lives with her eight children in a five-room substandard house, which is infested with rats and roaches. The children range in age from 4 months to 12 years. From 1958 until September 1962 she received $198 in monthly public assistance plus surplus food. Assistance was terminated when she became pregnant with her eighth child. In January after the child was born, she reapplied for assistance and was accepted. In March, several welfare investigators came to her home at a time when the father of the three youngest children had come on a visit to bring food. Although the investigators were told that the sole purpose of the visit was to see his children and to bring them food, Mrs. R's assistance was again terminated on the grounds that she had violated the man-in-the-house rule.

Since termination of public assistance Mrs. R's cash income has been $60 per month, given her by the father of her three youngest children. She has had to leave unpaid her rent and utility bills and at the time of the interview had been given 2 days to pay her rent or face eviction. Gas and electricity have been turned off for 2 months. Her sister has helped her by paying 1 month's rent and she is hopeful that her sister can come up with the rent money again and save her from eviction.

Mrs. R is 27 years old. She was born on a farm and came to the District when she was 19 years old. She dropped out of school after the sixth grade and had her first child when she was 15 years old.

Most of the children's clothing comes from private social agencies, from teachers, and from neighbors. The children lack adequate and sufficient clothing and have, at times, had to stay home from school. The family never eats breakfast in order to cut down on food bills. The four older children get free lunches at school.

Her only constant source of income is the $60 she receives from the father of her three younger children. On this income, debts are beginning to pile up and the family does not have enough money to feed or clothe itself.

When 24-year-old Mrs. P's public assistance was terminated, she didn't need it any more—her husband had returned from the mental hospital and was able to go back to his job as a porter. Now the P's don't have to rely on anyone else for help, which is just as well, since Mr. P doesn't like to have to do this. Mr. and Mrs. P have about $300 a month to support themselves and their five children, whose ages range between 10 months and 7 years.

The P's live in five rooms on the first floor of an alley dwelling on a one-block street. They have problems with rats, and the plumbing doesn't always work right. They have applied for public housing, but will have to stay where they are unless the application is accepted because they can't afford more rent than they now pay.

Food and clothing don't often pose problems for the P family. They are able to buy enough potatoes, beans, and rice to fill up on, and they haven't had to ask for reinstatement in the surplus food program, which was terminated at the same time as public assistance. And although the children's clothing is worn, it is suitable for school wear. Except for Mr. P's 3 months in the hospital, the family has not had any health problems. Mrs. P is able to take the children for free medical attention to the run-of-the-mill diseases of the children, and she herself is in good health.

Mrs. I lives with her seven children in a six-room, substandard framehouse. Also, sharing the house are her mother and father, 4 brothers, 2 sisters, and 3 nieces—or a total of 19 people. Mrs. I sleeps in one room with her seven children and one of her sisters. She has lived in this crowded house for 6 years. Mrs. I received monthly public assistance of $129 from 1957 until January 1963, when it was reported to her caseworker that she had been seen with one of the fathers of her children. During this period, she also received support payments from one of the fathers of $34 monthly. She continues to receive three bags of surplus food a month. During the time she was receiving assistance, her total monthly income was $163.

Since termination she has been working part time as a kitchen helper in a drugstore, earning $25 per week. She was only able to start this job in April, however, because in February she had her seventh child. In April, when she worked at her job, her income was $138, including her $34 support payment. Her father and one brother work irregularly as day laborers, earning, when they are able to find work, $12 per day. The salaries from these irregularly employed 3 people are used to support the 19 people in the household.

Although they receive surplus food, the family frequently goes without meals. The four school-age children receive free lunches at school. They are dependent on private social agencies for clothing handouts.

One of the children has an endocrine disturbance which requires medical attention. Mrs. I frequently lacks the carfare to take this child to clinic. More serious, however, is her father's heart condition, which he is afraid to report to his employer for fear of losing his job.

Mrs. I is 25 years old. She has lived in the District all her life. She finished 8 years of school and had her first child when she was 14 years old. She has been separated from her husband, who is the father of her two oldest children, since she was 17 years old.

Mrs. R and her children have lived with her parents, her sister, and her grandmother since her husband deserted her about 3 years ago. The family lives in an eight-room brick row house.

Mrs. R has six children between 1 month and 8 years of age. Only five of them live with her, though, since her 6-year-old is in a TB sanitorium in another State.

Mrs. R received public assistance from the time her husband deserted her until February 1963, when her youngest child was born. The father of the youngest, who has never seen the baby, refuses to go to the welfare for an interview, and gave Mrs. R an incorrect address from which mail is consistently returned undelivered. Since she stopped receiving public assistance, Mrs. R is completely dependent on the earnings of her father, a construction worker, and her mother, a domestic, although her grandmother's Aid to the Disabled check helps also. Mrs. R herself had no money income in March, which is the usual state of affairs.

Mrs. R has trouble getting enough food for her baby, and often has to beg money from friends and neighbors to buy milk for the children. Although she receives surplus food, Mrs. R must walk the 20 blocks each way to get it, since she lacks carfare. The school-age daughter receives free lunch at school when a regular recipient is absent, but lives too close to home to get it regularly. Although some of Mrs. R's friends and her mother's employer help out with used clothing, the baby has nothing to wear, and the other children's clothing is ragged and dirty.

Mrs. R's family has been plagued with health problems. Although Mrs. R herself is usually in good health, her 3-year-old daughter was in the hospital with TB for a year, and her 6-year-old son is presently there for the same reason. Her 8-year-old daughter is in need of glasses, and her 15-month-old son should have surgery to correct a defective eye muscle. Her grandmother recently returned from 5 months in the hospital with a cardiac disorder.

Mrs. R is planning to file a nonsupport action against the father of her youngest child, but is discouraged in general about her situation, and her parents are starting to complain about her total dependence on them.

Mrs. R is 26 years old. She moved to Washington about 22 years ago, and completed 11 years of school.

Mrs. A and nine of her children live in a four-bedroom public housing apartment. She became eligible for this apartment 6 years ago when the house she had been living in in Southwest was demolished for urban renewal. Mrs. A prefers the Southwest house because there was more neighborliness and she felt her children were safer. The maintenance of her present apartment is very poor and all winter long there is not enough heat. In fact, in the fall of 1962 her baby died of pneumonia which she thinks he caught because she could not get enough heat in the apartment.

Mrs. A has been receiving public assistance on and off for the past 10 years. Each termination has coincided with a pregnancy. While she was receiving assistance, she got a check for $249 a month. Mrs. A has made no attempt to get back on public assistance since her last termination for violating the man-in-the-house rule; she says she is "tired of being pushed around." Prior to the last termination Mrs. A says she was continually harassed by investigators parking near her house every night and paying visits at late hours, when they would search the closets and under the beds to "check her children." She felt that if she refused to admit an investigator or was even slow in answering the door, she would be risking her check. At the time of her last termination she was told by a judge that she was a poor mother who put her own pleasure above the welfare of her children.

Mrs. A was born in Washington 36 years ago. She finished eighth grade. She was married when she was 16 but was separated from her husband 5 months later. Her first common law husband is the father of her seven oldest children; her present common law husband is the father of her three youngest children.

Since February, when she was cut off assistance, Mrs. A's common law husband has been coming around openly and trying to support her. He earns $12 a day when he is able to work as a day laborer. Although his job is affected by weather, he was able to furnish the family $200 last month. All of the children as well as Mrs. A are fond of him and are pleased to have him around. Mrs. A has also received help with her rent, clothing, and food from private agencies and from her church since termination.

Mrs. A was receiving surplus food until last September when she was unable to find the carfare to go pick it up and the distribution agency cut her off. She has reapplied for surplus food and expected to be reinstated soon. Finding enough food is a major problem for this family. Occasionally she has had to keep her oldest daughter out of school because she could not feed her breakfast and she did not have the 37 cents needed for lunch. The other five school-age children have only recently been able to get free lunches.

Mrs. A tries to stretch her budget to pay for clothes, but she may have to keep her 4-year-old twins out of school next year because she doesn't have enough clothing for them. Medically, this family has had a variety of problems. In March 1962, Mrs. A spent 3 weeks in the psychiatric ward of District of Columbia General Hospital. She blames this illness on pressure by public assistance investigators. Last winter she also had, in addition to a hysterectomy, a kidney ailment which still requires medical attention, and three bouts of flu. One child was hospitalized for 3 weeks for a bladder ailment and still needs medical attention. The baby's death last fall caused shock in her 14-year-old daughter, and she had to be sent to live for 2 months with her grandmother. Other medical problems which her children have include headaches, undependable legs due to suspected rheumatic heart, heart murmur, trancelike states, and week eye muscles causing unbalanced vision. Medical attention is sought only when carfare is available to get to a free clinic.

Mrs. C has just started receiving monthly public assistance checks again, after being without them since September 1962. She and her six children, ranging in age from 7 to 16 years, have been living in a two-bedroom apartment for almost 4 years, for which they pay $68 a month, not counting utilities.

For the first 3 months after her public assistance was discontinued, Mrs. C managed to pay the rent and keep her utilities bills paid by working full time as a domestic. However, her income from this employment was about $75 less a month, and Mrs. C began to fall behind. Her electricity was cut off in late December or January, and she went without heat for a week. She avoided having the gas cut off by locking the door and hiding whenever anyone came to turn it off. The landlady suspended the rent, on the agreement that Mrs. C would pay it a little at a time when she could find the money. Altogether, the debt ran to $340, the only money Mrs. C owes.

During this period, Mrs. C's three daughters received free lunches at school, but her sons did not. The family continued to receive surplus food except for a short period after public assistance was terminated, until Mrs. C could reestablish her eligibility. They were able to get food from a private welfare agency once in a while, and a friend helped out by sharing food from meal to meal. Even so, the family ate nothing but oatmeal three times a day for more than a month at one point.

The children have often had to stay out of school because of lack of clothing, especially shoes and coats during the winter; the 11-year-old son had to wear a coat and shoes belonging to the 14-year-old daughter for a time until public assistance was reinstated. They have also missed school because there was no soap for washing. Mrs. C managed to keep all the children at home during this period, except when they went to stay with a friend during Mrs. C's 4-week recovery from an operation for fibroid tumors.

Mrs. C was born in a large southern city, where she finished about 4 years of school. She came to Washington when she was about 19.

Last fall, the Welfare Department told Mrs. T to get a job and that they would no longer send her the $175 per month she had been receiving. Mrs. T, her five children, and her granddaughter moved into her sister's four-room apartment which is in a substandard alley building. A kerosene stove is used for cooking. The public assistance check of $87 which her sister receives is the sole cash income of these eight people. Mrs. T has reapplied for assistance and although she received an emergency relief check in March for $175, she has received nothing since and she has not yet heard whether she will be reinstated.

Mrs. T is about 40 years old. She grew up in a small town and can neither read nor write. She last worked about 14 years ago as a hotel maid. She has never married and the fathers of her older children live in other jurisdictions and cannot be located and ordered to help support. The father of her youngest children was killed a year ago but while he was alive, he was helping her. She has, in addition to the five children at home, three children who have their own homes.

On the day of the interview the refrigerator contained only a bottle of water; there was no food in the house. Mrs. T said that this is a frequent occurrence. She has been promised surplus food, but so far, no coupons have come. Her sister receives only a few items of surplus food. The children are not participating in the free lunch program; in fact, one of their teachers has told Mrs. T that they must come home for lunch. On the day of the interview the children were sent to school with no breakfast and Mrs. T considered herself fortunate to have found some cabbage for their lunch. The children had to stay home for nearly 2 months this winter because they had no shoes and no warm clothing. When she received an assistance check in March, Mrs. T used a good part of it to buy her children shoes so that they could return to school.

Mrs. H has been doing pretty well since her public assistance was terminated a year and a half ago. Mrs. H had a difficult time for about 2 months after she was terminated. She was able to get help with her rent and in finding a job from a private agency, though, and her family and friends helped out. Now she has a full-time job as a domestic which brings in $140 a month, slightly more than she was receiving from welfare. Mrs. H is happier now that she is on her own, because she has more privacy and she hopes she won't have to depend on public assistance again.

The family usually has enough to eat; Mrs. H has not applied for surplus food, because she would have to take time out from work to pick up her allotment. Her 9-year-old son does not get lunch at school because Mrs. H prefers that he come home at noon. Mrs. H and her children are all in good health, and have had no medical problems recently.

Mrs. H is 23 years old. She grew up in the District and finished 7 years of school. She had her first child when she was about 14 years old. The family has lived in a five-room public housing apartment for the past 4 years. The apartment is in need of paint and some repairs to the walls, and the roof leaks when there is a heavy rain.

Mrs. B and two of her children, aged 13 and 8, eat, cook, sleep and live in one room. The room for which Mrs. B pays $60 per month plus utilities, contains two beds, a couch, two chairs and a table. Everything and everyone is quite crowded. Mrs. B has two older sons who do not live with her. Her 30-year-old son has been in St. Elizabeths for several years; the 32-year-old supports his own family but has nothing left over with which to help his mother.

Mrs. B is about 50 years old. She was born in a small town where she finished 8 years of education. She moved to Washington when she was about 30 and she has been separated from her husband for the past several years.

Through the Welfare Department, Mrs. B receives about $8 per week from her absent husband. The Department, in addition to the $32 given her by her husband, gives her $124 per month. She also gets surplus food.

Mrs. B was temporarily cut off assistance in March and April when the Department decided she should get a job. In May she was reinstated. During the time she was cut off, a private agency gave her emergency relief, but refused to give her permanent relief because they felt, as did the Welfare Department, that she should earn her own money. Mrs. B is a diabetic and for medical reasons cannot do the heavy work demanded of domestics. She does not think she could get any kind of job that would not require physical labor beyond her strength.

During March and April she could not pay her rent and she begged food from her neighbors. For these 2 months she had no income at all. Her landlady has been very understanding but now that Mrs. B is again receiving assistance, she owes her landlady $140 for back rent and utilities and, of course, the Welfare Department did not give her the $312 of missing income for March and April (including support payments from her husband) when she was reinstated. Her debts will have to be made up from her current monthly income of $156.

Mrs. B has only one dress. Whatever money she can save for clothing after she has paid for rent and food, goes for her children's clothes. Her children receive free lunch at school but at home she frequently has to omit meals because she is constantly running through her food budget before the end of the week.

Mrs. G has lived in Washington all her life. She and her five children, who range from 10 months to 6 years old, live in a four-room apartment where the floor is warped and has holes in it, and the wallpaper and plaster have begun to fall off the walls. The family has lived there for about 2 years.

Until March 1962, Mrs. G had been receiving public assistance, but it was stopped after her caseworker discovered that she was pregnant. Shortly after, Mrs. G got behind in her rent, and asked for help from two private agencies. Neither of them was able to help. Since then, the family has gotten along on money sent by Mrs. G's husband, from whom she is separated, and by the father of the baby. When these contributions come on schedule, and they sometimes don't, Mrs. G has about $160 a month to spend. With this money she has been able to keep the rent up, but for the last year, the family has had no electricity or gas. Both were cut off when she was unable to pay the $112 she owes the utilities companies.

The G family often has to give up things in order to have enough food. They are short on clothing, the children need shoes, and three of the boys have gone for 6 months without haircuts. Mrs. G receives surplus food, and her 6-year-old daughter gets free lunch at school, but even so once in a while they don't have enough to eat. Since public assistance was terminated, Mrs. G hasn't been able to buy enough clothing or shoes—"it's always giving up one for the other—food for clothes, clothes for food. When I was getting ADC there were times that I could squeeze out something to buy clothes, but now I can get nothing.

Mrs. V lives in a four-room apartment with her two children, 6 and 5, in a very old building which is, nevertheless, well maintained. She supports her family on her $106 salary which she earns as a drugstore counter girl.

Mrs. V, who is 26, was born in Washington. She finished 11th grade. Her first child was born when she was 20, the second a year later. She has never married.

She received monthly public assistance and surplus food from 1959 until August 1962. At that time, the Welfare Department wanted her to take a training course for an unskilled occupation. Mrs. V wanted to take a training course to become a nurse's aid or a typist in order to make enough money to pay for babysitting. When she refused to take the course offered her by the Welfare Department, her assistance was cut off. Mrs. V feels resentful that the Welfare Department would not allow her to train for some occupation other than an unskilled one.

During the 3 years she received public assistance, Mrs. V lived on a monthly check of $134 plus surplus food. Her surplus food allotment was terminated at the same time financial assistance ended. Mrs. V is humiliated when she has to ask friends and neighbors for food and clothing. After Mrs. V pays her rent of $67.50, she has $38.50 left over to pay for utilities and to buy clothing and food for her family of three. She has managed to keep out of debt, but occasionally she has to get emergency relief from private social agencies or beg for food and used clothes from people she knows. The school-age child is not officially on the free lunch program; however, she frequently gets free food at school because of absences of children who are on the program.

Mrs. V will not reapply for assistance because she is still adamant in not wanting to be trained for unskilled work. She feels she has the intelligence to do unskilled work without training, but would welcome training for a better job so that she could make more money and become self-sufficient.

Last January Mrs. B was forced to quit her job as a maid in a dress shop in order to have her third child. After the baby was born, Mrs. B applied for public assistance until she could get back on her feet, but was refused. Since she had no money saved, she had to ask her sister for help in paying the rent and buying food for the family. Mrs. B's sister is employed as a domestic in the school system, and just where the money will come from when the schools close for the summer is not clear to Mrs. B. The father of the baby has not offered her any help since he gave her $25 several months ago, which went to help pay the doctor.

Mrs. B lives in a five-room public housing apartment with two of her children. An 8-year-old son has been living since he was a baby with Mrs. B's aunt, who has taken over all the responsibility for bringing him up.

Two or three times a week, Mrs. B runs out of food, and her 10-year-old daughter is almost always hungry. The family does not receive surplus food, nor does the daughter get free lunch at school. Since Mrs. B had to quit her job, there is never enough money to buy food, even though her sister helps out when she can. Most of the family's clothing comes from relatives, and, with the exception of shoes, the family doesn't lack what clothes they need. Mrs. B can't afford to buy the eyeglasses her daughter needs, though.

Except for some money she owes to the doctor for her delivery, Mrs. B has managed to keep from running any debts. She hopes to be able to get back to work before her sister's money runs out or the bills pile up too deeply.

Mrs. B, who is 30, grew up on a farm and finished 9 years of school. She moved to Washington 7 years ago.

Life for Mrs. E has been looking up. In May, after a year of no income, Mrs. E's $214 assistance payments began coming again. When her check came, she and her six children, including her month-old baby, were able to move into a 6-room frame house. Inside, the paper is peeling off the walls, there are ratholes, and she complains of roaches. Her children are covered with bedbug bites but she is working hard to rid her home of these pests. All of her furniture, belongings, and clothing were destroyed in a truck which caught fire. She is slowly acquiring replacements.

A year ago May, while Mrs. E was receiving public assistance, a Welfare investigator found a man in her apartment. This man, whom Mrs. E described as "a drunken nuisance—a midget who is about 60 years old," was called Mrs. E's boy friend by the Welfare Department, although she says he is not even a close friend.

When her checks ceased, Mrs. E had no income at all. In June she was forced to place her children in Junior Village. After 2 weeks she began to feel that they would be placed in foster homes, so she took them out. She went to work as a domestic for a brief time during the summer of 1962. Her five older children are all epileptics. All but the oldest have frequent seizures and require competent care. The month-old baby has shown no signs of the disorder so far.

From May until December Mrs. E's family survived by means of emergency help of food, clothing, and occasional cash from a private agency and a citizens' group. None of this aid was on a regular basis and their total income each month averaged far below what it was when they were receiving public assistance. By December Mrs. E's pregnancy was beginning to be obvious and she was embarrassed to ask for more help. What food the family had was begged from neighbors.

In February, then 7 months pregnant, she was evicted with her five children. She owed $150 in back rent and $25 for utilities. The family had had no heat or hot food during the early part of the winter because the gas had been turned off. When she was evicted, a friend offered Mrs. E the use of his truck to transport her clothes and furnishings. It was at this point that Mrs. E's belongings were destroyed by fire.

Mrs. E and her family, with only the clothes on their backs, had nowhere to go. A church group offered to let them sleep in the church for the first three nights. While they stayed there, they had to be locked in and had to wait each morning until 10 a.m. until the caretaker arrived to let them out. The next two nights they spent sleeping on the floor of the home of an alcoholic acquaintance of Mrs. E. After this, until the end of April, the family slept in unlocked cars. So great was the family's concern with surviving the cold, getting food, and finding a place to get warm that the two school-age children hardly attended school at all this year. Mrs. E has been eligible for surplus food but, lacking carfare and a place to store and cook it, she has only recently been able to take advantage of her eligibility. During the winter, the family frequently went for 2 or 3 days without any food at all—only water. Mrs. E's pregnancy inhibited her from applying to a private agency for help during this time.

Perhaps the only steady source of help for this family has come from the male acquaintance of Mrs. E's who offered the use of his truck for transporting her belongings when she was evicted. The toll of this help is high, however. Mrs E's 12-year-old daughter has submitted to being "fondled" by him so that the family can gain by his presents to her. Mrs. E does not approve and has asked him not to return for fear of jeopardizing her relief status by violating the man-in-the-house rule, but evidently the man is more persistent than she is persuasive, for he keeps returning.

Mrs. E is 26 years old. She grew up in a small town and has lived in Washington on and off for 10 years. Although she had her first child when she was 14 years old, she finished 11th grade. Her husband, who is the father of her five older children, is an epileptic. They have been separated for about 3 years. Mrs. E receives $5 per week from him. These support payments started in April, a month before she was reinstated. From May last year until April of this year Mrs. E had no regular income. Survival for 11 months was based solely on emergency aid on an irregular basis from private agencies and from her daughter's self-appointed "godfather."

Now her income is $234 including her husband's payments and it is coming in regularly. Although she has debts of $175 which concern her, she is only hoping that she can continue on this level. Because it is humiliating, Mrs. E wishes that she did not have to receive public assistance. When she was applying for reinstatement one welfare worker said to her, "I just don't believe that you don't have a job—you look too clean * * * or else you must be selling yourself."

Mrs. S and her five preschool children have managed to get along without any regular income since her public assistance was terminated in September 1962, because they have a landlady on whom they can be virtually completely dependent. Mrs. S had been receiving $169 a month from the Welfare since her husband was sent to prison in 1961; since September 1962 the only cash income she has had is that which she has been able to borrow from the landlady, and one contribution from her church.

The family lives in a three-room basement apartment in the landlady's private home and shares a bath on the first floor. When Mrs. S could afford to, she paid $75 a month plus utilities for these rooms. Now the landlady has allowed the rent to run about 7 months behind. Mrs. S hasn't been able to keep up the utilities, either, and her gas has been turned off.

Mrs. S who is 22 years old, came to Washington 3 years ago. She grew up in a large city, where she finished high school.

The S family often has to give up such things as clothing and laundry soap in order to have enough food to eat, even though they receive surplus food. They were able to get food from a private welfare agency twice during the winter, but were refused the last time they went back. Important help comes from the landlady, who often feeds the family—these are the only hot meals the S's ever have. Clothing, too, comes primarily from the landlady, if at all. In fact, "Without the help of [the landlady], I would probably starve."

Mrs. S has reapplied for public assistance, but has been waiting for 6 or 7 months for a decision. "The waiting to get on has been unbearable. However, I can understand them for wanting to be sure a person is qualified."

Mrs. I lives in a five-room basement apartment with her four children. She moved to this apartment 6 months ago when her public assistance was terminated and she was evicted from her former apartment. The rent, which is $65 a month, is higher than before, but her landlady is very lenient with her. She owes $200 in back rent and $97 for utilities. The landlady has paid her electricity bill so that it could be turned back on. She has been without heat for 4 months.

Mrs. I received $165 a month in public assistance until she was asked to bring in the fathers of her children last September. She gave her caseworker their addresses. To her surprise, she had her assistance terminated with no explanation or promise that the fathers would help support her. She has received no financial assistance or help from the fathers since September. When assistance was terminated and she was evicted last fall, Mrs. I didn't know where to turn. The family was constantly hungry and was dependent on friends for handouts of food and clothing. When she found her present apartment, which is substandard, rat infested, and lacks refrigeration, she again applied for assistance, but was refused. With the debts accumulating, she took a job as a domestic earning $160 per month, which is about what she got while on public assistance before; however, she did not have to pay a babysitter as she does now while she works.

Mrs. I does not have enough money every month to pay the babysitter, buy food, and pay the rent and utilities. She buys no clothing. The oldest child was out of school frequently this winter because she lacked shoes, boots, and warm clothing. Mrs. I's employer gives her secondhand clothing occasionally. When she can scrape up the carfare, Mrs. I can pick up her surplus food. Before the distribution of surplus food was decentralized, she could count on surplus food each month. Now she never knows if she will have the 50 cents she needs to ride the bus and pick it up. The family runs completely out of food about once a week. She buys all the food she can once a week, after she has paid the babysitter, but there is never enough food and there is never enough money.

Mrs. I is very bitter about the Welfare Department. She feels that she complied with their wishes by supplying the names and addresses of the children's fathers and that she was cut off with no explanation and no substitution for the income she had been receiving. When she was refused after she reapplied in February, she was told that the fathers should support the children and her but she has no way that she knows about to make them do so and the Welfare Department has evidently not made her aware of the means by which she can get support. Unless she can make less expensive child-care arrangements, her future will be a continuation of the present—increasing debts and constant hunger.

Mrs. T is a 19-year-old mother who, with her 13-month baby and her husband, lives with her brother- and sister-in-law and their three children in a five-room apartment. Mr. T and his brother both work to support the eight people in their family. Mr. and Mrs. T's income last month, which was about average, was $260.

The family does not go hungry and purchases new clothes. The apartment, which belongs to the brother- and sister-in-law, however, is overcrowded, rat and roach infested. The floors and ceilings were in urgent need of repair and the furniture was dilapidated and soiled.

Mrs. T was born and raised in Washington where she finished eighth grade. Her baby was born when she was 18 and she married her husband when the baby was about 8 months old. Mrs. T was receiving public assistance after her baby was born up until last September when her caseworker discovered that she had plans to be married. Assistance was terminated immediately although the marriage did not and could not take place immediately.

Mr. and Mrs. T would like to have an apartment of their own but, from the appearance of the furniture and the clothing worn by Mrs. T and the baby, the interviewer surmised that Mr. T who was present during the interview, spent a good part of his income outside the home.

Mrs. A and her 18-year-old daughter live in a three-room public housing apartment.

Mrs. A who is 37 years old, was born in Washington and finished 8 years of school here. She has about $95 a month income, usually, but it is not clear just where the money comes from. Mrs. A had a part-time job as a domestic until December 1962, but has not worked since.

Mrs. A, who has never been married, has three other children who are living elsewhere; two are married and her 16-year-old son lives with an aunt.

Right after she stopped working, Mrs. A spent 2 months in the hospital, suffering from hypertension. Her health is generally poor. During February after she returned home, it was necessary for her to seek help from a private welfare agency in order to have food to eat. When she can afford them, Mrs. A's clothes are bought in second-hand stores. Since she stopped working, Mrs. A has bought no clothing at all. She owes the National Capital Housing Authority approximately $90 in back rent.

Mrs. A feels that the Welfare Department is helpful, but she is bothered about being questioned repeatedly about the same things.

Mrs. L received $100 per month in public assistance from March 1960 until July 1962 for herself and her three children. They have been living with her parents and her brother in a seven-room house for the last 12 years. The Welfare Department ruled that her brother and her father were both employable males living in the home and that she was no longer eligible for assistance.

Mrs. L, who is 27, grew up in a small town and moved to Washington when she was 15. Here she finished 12th grade. She had her first child when she was 17 years old. Her third and youngest daughter is 4. The father of this child gives her $15 per month in support. The fathers of the other two children cannot be found and they do not contribute to the support of their children.

Mrs. L works full time as a waitress, earning $37 per week plus tips. Her brother also brings income into the home from his job as a roofer. He is seasonally employed, but when he works he earns $10 per day. In April, Mrs. L's income from her job and from the father of her youngest daughter was $163. While her situation since she has gone to work has improved, she still does not have sufficient resources for her family's needs.

The family manages to keep from going hungry by giving up clothing. The school-age child does not receive free lunches, but neither hunger nor lack of clothing has kept this child out of school. By pooling resources this family is managing to get by although the house they live in is rat infested and run down.

Mrs. J has lived with her four children in a five-room public housing apartment for the past 3 years. Until November 1962, the family was receiving $187 a month from the Department of Public Welfare. Then, when investigators found her estranged husband in the house, her public assistance was terminated. Between November and March, Mrs. J was dependent for rent money and food on a private welfare agency. In March, Mrs. J found a job which pays her $165 a month. But she and the children are less well off than when they were receiving public assistance, because Mrs. J must pay $36 a month for transportation to her job, as well as fees to someone to care for the children, who range in age between 4 and 9 years. Mrs. J estimates that she needs at least $40 a month more for food than she currently has.

The J family often has to give up clothing and shoes in order to have enough food (their surplus food allotment was recently terminated without explanation, and Mrs. J. hasn't had time to straighten out the matter); and they haven't been able to start replacing their furniture, which was repossessed. Because money for clothing must be spent on food, the three school-age children often have to stay out of school because they don't have enough clothes (missing their free school lunches). The children were out of school the week of the interview because they needed shoes, and Mrs. J had no money to buy them. She is in trouble with school authorities because the children miss so much school.

Both Mrs. J and her 9-year-old son currently consult a psychiatrist, although neither has been hospitalized. Mrs. J says that the "nerves" of herself and her son are traceable to the difficulties of maintaining the family and to the strains involved in Mr. J's desertion.

Mrs. J, who is 30 years old, is a native of Washington and finished 11 years of school.

Mrs. P is 22 years old and lives with her six children, her mother, her brother, and three roomers in an eight-room house. One bathroom serves all 11 members of this household. While the house is in fair condition, there are ratholes, roaches, and Mrs. P complains of bedbugs. Last winter they used coal and wood to heat the house and at times they went without heat. The family is in arrears with their light and gas bills; the telephone has been disconnected.

Mrs. P works 1 day a week as a domestic, which, last month, gave her an income of $40. This is her usual income. Her mother is irregularly employed as a domestic, and although Mrs. P could not estimate her mother's income, it is clear that her mother's wages plus the rent from the three boarders bring in most of the income this family has. Her brother suffered a multiple leg fracture in January and is still recuperating and unable to work.

Mrs. P was born in Washington and finished ninth grade. When she was 16, she had her first child. Her six children range from 2 months to 6 years, and they have been fathered by four men. Neither Mrs. P nor her mother has ever married; in fact, Mrs. P has never met her own father. Of the four fathers of her children, only one gives Mrs. P any help and this is sporadic and undependable. She does not know the whereabouts of the other three men.

Mrs. P applied for public assistance in December of 1962. She was told that in order to qualify she must bring the fathers of her children into the Welfare Department. She has not been able to locate them and she has given up the idea of public assistance. She thinks the burden of finding the fathers and bringing them into the Department is impossible and if this is the only way in which she can qualify for help, she will have to do without it.

She received surplus food from 1958 until December 1962. When the distribution point was moved to Southwest, she found the 40-block walk too far and she did not have the carfare to go pick it up. Getting enough food is a serious problem. The family manages to get one meal a day, but the school-age child had gone to school without any breakfast on the day of the interview. A donation of canned meat by a friend meant that the child would have some lunch; otherwise he would have had to wait until dinner to eat. Clothing has been donated by a church group, but the schoolchild had to stay home for a week this winter when he had no shoes.

Mrs. P faces eviction because of overcrowding. She has been warned by the owner of the building several times but another building inspection is pending and this time she thinks she will have to comply. She is very worried about this because, without sharing space with her mother and brother and the three roomers, she does not know how she will manage to pay her rent.

Mrs. A's public assistance was terminated in June 1962, when it was established that her husband, who had deserted her in 1950, had returned to live with Mrs. A and their 17-year-old son in their two-bedroom apartment. Mr. A had received a lump-sum disability retirement payment, which the family calculated would last them for about a year. But Mr. A spent the money in half that time, and with a usual monthly income of $63, the family has had to rely on help from a few of the 10 children who have grown up and moved away. Neither Mr. nor Mrs. A, who is 52 years old, are able to work. Mrs. A last worked 8 years ago, when she developed a disabling heart condition.

The A's don't always have enough food in the house. When this happens they have to ask their children for help. In April, they received $10 worth of food from relatives; also, sometimes the A's can eat a meal with relatives. The family receives surplus food, but it is sometimes hard to get it. Mr. A's disability makes it impossible to grasp objects, and Mrs. A sometimes find it hard to walk to the surplus food depot, although she is usually able to take the bus back home.

One of the A's grown sons pays for their medicine, and a daughter takes care of Mrs. A's doctor bills. Mrs. A has been going to a private doctor for a year, and feels that she is improving, although she is totally disabled. However, even with the help from their children, the A's have been unable to buy some of the medicines they need or to get to the doctor and clinic as often as they should.

The A's have few clothing problems, since their relatives are able to help out here, too. The 17-year-old son is not able to get haircuts frequently, nor to keep up on clothing styles like his friends, but the family does not have to give up important things to have enough clothing, and the son has not missed school because of lack of clothes.

With the help of their children, the A's have managed to keep their rent and other bills current; their only debt is one for $23 for a household appliance.

Mrs. S. has been refused public assistance on four separate occasions because she cannot get the father of her three youngest children to come to the Welfare Department for an interview. He occasionally gives her money for the children, but it varies from about $20 to $12, which he gave her in April. The father of her 12-year-old daughter does not contribute anything at all and he cannot be found. The father of her three youngest is a gambler and is undependable. He is under no court order to support her.

Mrs. S lives in a four-room apartment with her mother, father, and four children. The apartment is crowded, rat and roach infested, and needs replastering and reflooring. A sheet of plastic covers the broken upper half of the front door, and the windows are broken and cracked. The gas has been turned off in the apartment for several months. There is no heat or hot water, and they use a two-burner oil stove for cooking. They heated the apartment in the winter by using the fireplace and foraging for coal in the neighborhood. The broken windows are filled with newspaper.

Mrs. S, who is 29, grew up in Washington and finished fourth grade. She was 17 years old when she had her first child. Her younger three children, all fathered by the same man, began appearing about 8 years later. She has never married.

Mrs. S is supported by her father who is seasonally employed as a construction worker. If he works a full week, he is paid about $60 and this money supports seven people.

The family does not seem to go hungry, although the school-age child does not receive free lunch unless a regular recipient is absent. This child and Mrs. S were both hospitalized, over a year each, for tuberculosis. The grandmother has diabetes. All three of these members of the family require continuing medical care and special diets which they are unable to afford.

Mrs. M, who is 43 years old, lives alone in a four-room house. She has lived there for about a year. Mrs. M was born in a large city, and came to Washington 31 years ago. She has three children, all of whom are grown and live in another city. She has had no education.

Between October 1962 and April 1963, Mrs. M received $83 a month from the Department of Public Welfare. She had just spent a month in the hospital recovering from surgery for gallstones and ulcers, which had forced her to leave her job as a domestic. Mrs. M also suffers from a lung ailment, for which she had an operation in 1961, when she spent 4 months in the hospital. Now her only source of income is sewing dresses for small girls, which brings in as much as $3 to $4 some weeks. Her children are able to help with a little food now and then, but have their own families to support. Mrs. M used to get some help, about $10 a week, from a friend who has since been sent to a mental institution.

Mrs. M is a month behind in her rent. She expects to be evicted soon unless she can find the rent, but doesn't know where to look for it. She has had to take part of the rent money to buy food, but still has a problem getting enough to eat. Besides that, she often feels ill, because she cannot afford to buy the foods for the ulcer diet prescribed by her doctor following the last operation. Mrs. M received surplus food until her public assistance was terminated. She believes that she is not eligible for the allotment since she does not receive welfare aid.

For several years until March 1962, Mrs. V received $212 per month public assistance for herself and her six children. She is presently pregnant with her seventh child. She has been married for 8 years, but her husband does not live continuously with her, although he is the father of all her children. In March 1962, her husband told the Welfare Department that he would support his family. He has not been willing to do this on a sustained basis. He has spent his money on his own needs and has given his wife and children only sporadic support. Mrs. V thinks that he is currently in jail. Mrs. V has been dependent on private social agencies for emergency relief since her public assistance was terminated. In April her income was $70.

Mrs. V lives in a three-bedroom, minimally furnished public housing unit. She was fortunate enough to get into the project while she was still receiving assistance. Now she has trouble meeting her lowered rent payments of $33. She is also $40 behind in her utility payments and she says that the heat has frequently been turned off since she had been off assistance. Mrs. V's family occasionally has to go without food. She is eligible for surplus food but she does not have the carfare to get it and it is too far to walk to the distribution center.

Mrs. V is 29 years old. She was born in Washington and she finished ninth grade. She had her first child when she was 20.

Her three older children receive free lunches at school but there are times during the winter when they cannot go to school because they do not have sufficient clothing and lack shoes.

Mrs. V does not know from week to week where she will find help and money to buy the things she needs. She hopes to get back on public assistance but first she must locate her husband and be investigated. In the meantime, she is pregnant and unable to work.

Mrs. Q lives with her sister, her husband, and their four children in a somewhat rundown six-room house. They have lived there for about 4 years. Between March and September of 1962, Mrs. Q received $220 a month in public assistance while Mr. Q was disabled with a broken ankle. Since he has been out of his cast, Mr. Q has been able to work only sporadically at his job as a construction laborer. Although in a good month the family has slightly more income than they did from public assistance, Mr. Q's inability to work some days often cuts into the budget. Mrs. Q is reluctant to try to find work, because she feels that her children, aged 9 to 12 years, need her supervision and guidance as they grow up even more than when they were younger. Last winter, Mrs. Q tried to get help from two private agencies, but was unsuccessful. Her brother has been able to help out with some money occasionally.

The family receives surplus food, and the children get free lunches. But, although the Q's seldom go without food, they often are unable to eat the kinds of things they want. Getting clothing is a greater problem. The family frequently needs shoes, but there isn't always enough money around to buy them. The children have had to stay out of school once in a while because they lacked shoes.

The family has several bills they have been unable to pay. They are about 2 weeks behind in the rent, and Mrs. Q had to take part of the rent money to pay an overdue utilities bill, so that the service would not be turned off. They owe $30 for another utility, and their electricity has been cut off. The Q's are paying off debts for furniture and clothing a little at a time.

The Q family has had a series of accidents, but has been able to have them cared for in free medical facilities. Besides Mr. Q's broken ankle, there have been the 10-year-old daughter's broken knee and Mrs. Q's broken arm and the sprained ankle she had at the time of the interview. In 1959, Mrs. Q spent 8 months in the hospital with a nervous breakdown. Mrs. Q was able to get her daughter's eyes examined while she was receiving public assistance, but before she could get the glasses, assistance was terminated, and now she can't afford the glasses.

Mrs. Q would like to leave her husband, because he drinks heavily and doesn't support the family reliably. But she is afraid that she could not qualify for public assistance, and doesn't want to leave the children alone while she works. She feels unhappy about her situation, but doesn't know what to do to solve it.

In October 1962, Mrs. E received from the Welfare Department the following "notice of ineligibility":

"On the basis of information available to us, we find that you are no longer eligible to receive assistance because:

"On September 21, 1962, your son * * * said he would give you $15 per month starting September 26, 1962. You say he has given you nothing. He will have to come with you to the office to discuss this if he cannot give it to you.

"With your $64 a month from social security and his $15 it is sufficient to meet your needs according to agency standards."

With this notice, Mrs. E's monthly income dropped from $144 to $64. Her son, because he has a family of his own to support, has been unable to give her the monthly $15 ordered by the Welfare Department.

Among the hardships she endures is living in a third-floor room of a boarding house. She moved to this room after assistance was terminated in order to reduce her rent. She is eligible for surplus food but complains that the Department sometimes sends her the card too late for her to go pick it up. It is very difficult for her to carry her allotment home and she frequently lacks the carfare to go get it.

Mrs. E has lived all her life in the District. She finished the eighth grade and was widowed after a long marriage in 1959. She went on public assistance after her husband died because he had left no provision for her other than social security and her children all have families of their own to support. She has not bought any clothing since her husband died.

Mrs. D, her common law husband, and her 3- and 10-year-old children live in a private home. They have two rooms of their own and share the bath and kitchen. Mrs. D was receiving $141 a month in public assistance until September 1962. She had been asked to find a job and given time to do so; then her welfare grant was terminated. Now the family does well, with Mrs. D's $140 a month income from domestic work, and her husband's $240 from his job as a stock clerk in a Government agency.

The D's have no particular problems getting enough to eat or enough clothing to wear. They are able to buy their clothes in new clothing stores. The family does not have any bills, and their rent and utilities are paid up. None of the family has been ill recently.

Mrs. D grew up on a farm and came to Washington 8 years ago. She had 8 years of school.

COMMENTS OF SOCIAL SECURITY STUDY

Senator BYRD. Mr. Galvin, I would like to have your comments on this.

Mr. GALVIN. This is a study, according to the Bureau of Social Science Research who made the study, based on persons selected by an accidental sampling method. In other words, it isn't a random sampling. It isn't a judgment sampling. It is merely an accidental sampling, and as such in my opinion, and I think Mr. Lajewski could speak better to that, it cannot be projected and is not valid except for the 50 cases in the study. It is not a projection of all of the ineligibles. It is no projection of any part of the ineligibles except the 50 cases in the study.

Mr. Lajewski, would you——

Senator BYRD. Would you like to accommodate us?

Mr. GALVIN. From the statistical point of view?

Mr. LAJEWSKI. I would only comment to the effect that this study is simply a descriptive study of the situation of families who were involved either in having their cases closed or applications for public assistance rejected. This would be the limit of my comments on this particular study at this time.

CONCLUSIONS OF STUDY

Senator BYRD. Would you consider it a scientific random sample from which certain conclusions could be reached by way of projection of the figures? In other words, could you reach conclusions concerning the overall caseload or the overall number of cases which have been rejected by virtue of their having been found ineligible?

Mr. LAJEWSKI. With properly designed studies you could make general conclusions.

Senator BYRD. That is not the question I asked you.

Mr. LAJEWSKI. I do not consider that this is a random sample. The study actually states that this is not a random sample; it also indicates that any conclusions to be drawn are severely limited. I think that the persons who wrote this report were taking a sound precaution when they stated this in their report.

Senator BYRD. You did not consider this to be a properly designed study from which conclusions could be drawn and from which projections could be made.

Mr. LAJEWSKI. I want to be careful——

Senator BYRD. Except as to the 50 families.

Mr. LAJEWSKI. Except as to the 50 families, no general conclusions can be drawn about families whose cases were closed or whose applications were rejected.

Senator BYRD. Yes.

EXCERPT FROM REPORT OF STUDY

Mr. GALVIN. If I could make a comment about it, Mr. Chairman, on page 3 of their report the Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., states:

"The reader is cautioned against assuming uniformity among the cases, given the great variation that exists. Generalizing about all terminated cases is also dangerous because of the possible biases produced by methods of sampling."

This study is of 50 families, which, I believe, are families that were found ineligible over a period of the last 2 to 3 years. I don't have the exact dates. I didn't analyze it for that. But I believe that some cases were terminated as early as 1960 or 1961 and the study I believe was made around April or May of 1963. To the best of my knowledge, the 50 families include 2 in the OA category, 44 in the ADC category, 1 in the GPA category, and 3 that were unknown.

Senator Byrd. What method was used for selecting the 50 cases, Mr. Galvin? I had started to read this report and had done some underlining, as you can see, but I never completed it.

Mr. Galvin. On page 2 of the report they state:

"Eighteen were people who had recently applied for help from one of five private welfare agencies. The remainder were located by a variety of techniques: Interviewers were assigned to a door-to-door canvass of certain blocks in three census tracts with high public assistance rates in 1960; one interviewer canvassed all 577 units of a public housing project; other interviewers were instructed to ask respondents and others they met whether they knew of anyone who would fit the study criteria and to attempt to interview them.

"This sampling plan, which might best be described as accidental, and the small number of cases, impose limitations on the interpretation of findings and the extent to which generalizations can be made that would apply to all terminated cases in the District."

Eighteen of the 50, which is 36 percent, is quite high in relation to the number of families that other studies have shown apply to public welfare agencies. I think there was a recent report, if I remember correctly, on the public welfare crisis in the District of Columbia which showed by their check that about 6 percent had applied to private agencies for assistance of the cases terminated or rejected for the period July–October 1962.

NUMBER OF 50 FAMILIES BACK ON ROLLS

Another interesting point about these 50 ineligibles is that 12 of them are back on the assistance and 6 of them have applications pending.

Senator Byrd. Twelve of the 50?

Mr. Galvin. As of June 20, 1963, 12 of the 50 are back on assistance and 6 of them have applications pending.

Senator Byrd. In other words, as I understand it, this group of cases was selected by accidental means. A portion of them was selected by going to the various private agencies and possibly inquiring from those agencies as to persons who were being aided and who were former public assistance recipients. Some of these, of course, were, as you have pointed out, recipients of public assistance many, many months before the study was conducted and had been dropped from the caseload many months before. Would one not expect to really get the worst of all the cases by pursuing this method?

Mr. Galvin. Well, as I said, before, 18 of the 50 were from private welfare agencies and the public welfare crisis report on page 39 states, and I quote:

"It was reported that 53 families with 233 children who had been cut off or rejected by ADC applied to voluntary agenices other than the Salvation Army in the period July–October 1962."

Now, according to their report on page 38, the number of terminations of assistance during this period was 867 and the number of rejections of applications were 1,163, or a total of 2,030. So only 53 out of 2,030 families applied to voluntary agencies other than the Salvation Army, and yet this "ineligible" study is based on 18 out of 50. So there is a possible bias due to the method of selection.

RESORT TO PRIVATE AGENCIES

Senator Byrd. In other words, I suppose normally one would expect those families that are most desperate to go to the private agencies. Of course, in some instances as this report points out, those who are more resourceful than others in seeking solutions to their plight may have gone to the private agencies.

Mr. Galvin. Well, I am curious about whether the persons who go to private agencies are also receiving assistance but I would have to look deeper into the cases to check that point. I think that there is cooperation between private and public agencies to attempt to prevent this happening.

Mr. Brewer. Private agencies do not give any direct assistance until all cases are cleared with our file.

Mr. Galvin. Every one?

Mr. Brewer. Yes.

Senator Byrd. What is this?

Mr. Brewer. Before a private agency gives any assistance, it is cleared with our central file to determine the status.

RECIPIENTS WITH SOME EMPLOYMENT

Senator Byrd. Some of your recipients are employed elsewhere. The have income elsewhere, too, but they are getting assistance from you.

Mr. Brewer. Yes.

Senator Byrd. And so the private agency may have called you about that particular person. So he may be getting income elsewhere, income from you, and go to the private agency also.

Mr. Brewer. I do not believe that they are getting income from the private agency and from me because the private agencies have limited resources and before they give any direct assistance, they do clear with our files which is—I am not saying that there are not many recipients that do not go and apply.

Senator Byrd. Yes.

Mr. Galvin. I think the basic question here is, as I stated at the beginning, whether the study results can be projected and as the researchers themselves say, they cannot be.

Senator Byrd. Yes. Well, they would not likely get aid from all three, yourselves and the private agencies plus outside——

Mr. Brewer. I think that would be most unlikely.

Senator Byrd. Yes.

SOURCES OF SOCIAL SERVICE STUDY INFORMATION

Well now, was it not true, Mr. Galvin, also that the study of the 50 ineligibles was based in considerable measure on the information that was procured from the individuals themselves?

Mr. Galvin. I believe they state somewhere in the report—I don't have it annotated for that—that the research agency could not make the study in the depth that they would have desired, and that most of it is an interview type of study.

Senator Byrd. At the bottom of page 2 I see these words:

"Time and cost considerations permitted only a relatively short interview with each respondent in which the investigator used a structured interview form."

If I recall correctly, the Comptroller General in his report to the Congress made a statement with reference to the credibility of information secured from recipients. He questioned the credibility of their statements. And I assume that a good bit of the information in this report on the ineligibles is based on information that was acquired from the recipients.

ESTIMATE OF REPORT

Mr. Galvin. I think this study was designed not to be projected but rather as a study on what does happen to some of the families who are ineligible, and as such, I think it is an interesting document and well worth the time and effort that has been spent on it. I do believe that possibly some people reading it might try to say that this is what happens to all families. This wouldn't be true; the researchers do not state that, and I don't think that the Health and Welfare Council has said anything like that.

Senator Byrd. Some of the 50 could still have been on public assistance, is that correct?

Mr. Galvin. I didn't analyze it for that factor. In fact, it is impossible to analyze it for that factor, whether they were on or not on assistance at the time the study was made, because I don't know when this study was made.

Senator Byrd. They could have been reinstated though, couldn't they?

Mr. Galvin. Well, we do know that on June 20, 1963, 12 were on assistance and 6 had applications pending. But the report does not show the date that the study was made.

Senator Byrd. Some of the 50 could have been on assistance, I suppose at the time the report was published.

Mr. Brewer. At the time it was published, whether they were on at the time of the interview or not we have no way of knowing. We cannot identify the descriptive description with the case.

Mr. Galvin. We have no way of telling.

Senator Byrd. Nor does the study reveal whether or not all cases had actually been closed at the time of the survey.

Mr. Galvin. As Mr. Brewer said, you cannot relate the descriptions or the case summaries, back to a PAD case.

Mr. Brewer. In June we cleared for the agencies a list of 50 families. Presumably these 50 families. And we advised them of the status of those families in regard to public assistance as of that date of clearance.

Senator Byrd. Does the report indicate the reasons for ineligibility on the part of the 50?

Mr. Brewer. No.

Senator Byrd. It does not.

Mr. Brewer. Except in the descriptive language of the summaries.

Senator Byrd. Does it indicate the average time that was spent on each interview?

Mr. Galvin. No. Just the statement on page 2 which is that time and cost considerations permitted only a relatively short interview with each respondent, and the relatively short can mean 5 minutes or all day. It depends on what is meant by "relatively" and what is meant by "short."

CASE OF MRS. THOMAS

Senator Byrd. On page 24 a case is cited. The woman made the statement to the persons who interviewed her in connection with this report that the investigators had visited her home at 2 and 3 o'clock in the morning, shining flashlights all over the house, looking in closets, under the bed, everywhere.

What comment do you have on this?

Mr. Galvin. Well, we have heard this statement 10 to 15 times in the last 2 or 3 years. The investigators do not make visits in the middle of the night. Our ordinary visits to the home of the recipient are between the hours of 8:15 in the morning and 10 p.m. at night. All home visits are made by two investigators, never by one. Due to particular circumstances or some special situation, we do make home visits as early as 6 a.m. and we make visits as late as 11 p.m. But only in certain cases in which we have a very strong suspicion that the father of the children or the husband is in the home.

Senator Byrd. So, as to the recipients with paramours, whether it is 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning or 10 o'clock at night, they are not likely to want the investigators to find them around, are they?

Mr. Galvin. No, they don't.

Senator **Byrd**. The same woman said this: "When the investigators come to your house you are supposed to immediately open your door—no matter how you are dressed. This is day or night."

What do you have to say about this?

Mr. **Galvin**. This is not true. We knock on the door. We identify ourselves. We ask permission to go in. We ask permission to examine the premises.

Senator **Byrd**. Suppose the woman says you can't come in.

Mr. **Galvin**. We would like some reasonable answer on why we can't come in. If she says, I am dressing, and this happens often, particularly in the morning, we wait, but in waiting we have learned from experience—and I must say it has been a disillusioning experience, that we have to have someone in the rear exit to be sure we catch the man as he goes out.

Senator **Byrd**. But your investigators don't demand that the woman immediately open the door even though she isn't dressed.

CASES OF DECEPTION DISCUSSED

Mr. **Galvin**. No. We have patiently waited for 2 hours for a woman to get dressed. That time she had the man well hidden, but he was found. He was in a closet hanging on the rod with woman's clothes all around him.

If I may I would like to relate another experience we had in relation to finding men in the home. This man was found hanging under a bed. He had his shoes off and he was hanging on the bed springs with his toes and his hands. He was known to be in the home. He had been seen going in and had not come out 2 hours later. The investigators searched the home the first time and they didn't find him.

The supervisor who had been waiting outside said, you must search again. The woman, of course, had denied he was in there before any search was made. We wouldn't make the search if the woman refuses to allow it, produces the man, or if the man identifies himself. The second time they searched they found in an upper bedroom that when they pushed the bed to go by to look in the closet the bed pushed back. He was found hanging under the bed holding onto the bedsprings with his toes and hands.

REACTION OF RECIPIENTS TO DEPARTMENT'S ACTION

Senator **Byrd**. Do you believe that there are case histories referred to in this report that could be cited as proof that the regulations are good and that it is not the fault of the Welfare Department but rather that of the client as to the difficulties that the client was experiencing?

Mr. **Galvin**. I would say that there are. I haven't read the report for possibly 3 weeks, but, as I remember, I found some cases in which even the ex-recipients said that the Welfare Department was perfectly right in cutting them off. There are others—and I am only quoting from memory now. There was one, as I remember, where the woman was on assistance, and she had two or three children from the time her case was approved until she was cut off. Each time she had promised not to do it again. Since she has been cut off, she has had another one. All of them were by the husband. She was pregnant, as I remember, in July of last year when she was cut off, and the report states she is again expecting a child.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the **Record** a table showing the number of applications received, disposed of, approved, and percent of approvals for all categories of assistance, for fiscal years 1959 through 1963, by quarters.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the **Record**, as follows:

Number of applications received, disposed of, approved, and percent of approvals for all categories of assistance, fiscal years 1957 and 1958 by quarters

Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved		Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved	
			Number	Percent				Number	Percent
1957—1st quarter	1,890	1,762	798	45.3	1958—1st quarter	3,188	2,890	1,112	38.5
2d quarter	2,146	2,195	863	39.3	2d quarter	2,852	2,605	1,246	47.8
3d quarter	2,929	2,564	920	35.9	3d quarter	3,266	3,088	1,161	37.6
4th quarter	3,039	3,130	1,059	33.8	4th quarter	3,073	3,096	1,260	40.7
Fiscal year total	10,004	9,651	3,640	37.7	Fiscal year total	12,379	11,679	4,779	40.9

Number of applications received, disposed of, approved, and percent of approvals for all categories of assistance, fiscal years 1959–63 by quarters

Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved		Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved	
			Number	Percent				Number	Percent
1959—1st quarter	3,292	2,860	1,187	41.5	1962—1st quarter	2,935	2,961	1,326	44.8
2d quarter	3,026	3,194	1,382	43.3	2d quarter	2,673	2,751	1,205	43.8
3d quarter	3,100	3,144	1,409	44.8	3d quarter	2,636	2,511	1,099	43.8
4th quarter	2,666	2,809	1,200	42.7	4th quarter	2,528	2,649	1,337	50.5
Fiscal year total	12,084	12,007	5,178	43.1	Fiscal year total	10,772	10,872	4,967	45.7
1960—1st quarter	3,021	2,604	1,094	42.0	1963—1st quarter	2,675	2,586	991	38.3
2d quarter	3,051	2,775	1,193	43.0	2d quarter	2,210	2,117	855	40.4
3d quarter	3,362	3,410	1,395	40.9	3d quarter	2,292	2,191	841	38.4
4th quarter	2,837	3,089	1,351	43.7	4th quarter	2,252	2,239	876	39.1
Fiscal year total	12,271	11,878	5,033	42.4	Fiscal year total	9,429	9,133	3,563	39.0
1961—1st quarter	3,050	2,929	1,337	45.6					
2d quarter	2,865	2,696	1,224	54.4					
3d quarter	3,151	2,999	1,281	42.7					
4th quarter	2,917	2,830	1,268	44.8					
Fiscal year total	11,983	11,454	5,110	44.6					

Number of applications received, disposed of, approved, and percent of approvals for aid to dependent children for fiscal years 1957 and 1958, by quarters

Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved		Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved	
			Number	Percent				Number	Percent
1957—1st quarter	725	687	256	37.3	1958—1st quarter	1,414	1,260	453	35.9
2d quarter	841	833	301	36.1	2d quarter	1,271	1,171	464	39.6
3d quarter	1,150	1,064	315	29.6	3d quarter	1,574	1,442	470	32.6
4th quarter	1,248	1,236	365	29.5	4th quarter	1,251	1,364	451	33.1
Fiscal year total	3,964	3,820	1,237	32.4	Fiscal year total	5,510	5,237	1,838	35.1

Number of applications received, disposed of, approved, and percent of approvals in aid to dependent children for fiscal years 1959–63 by quarters

Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved		Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved	
			Number	Percent				Number	Percent
1959—1st quarter	1,554	1,314	457	34.7	1962—1st quarter	1,426	1,464	609	41.5
2d quarter	1,422	1,497	579	38.6	2d quarter	1,281	1,304	499	38.2
3d quarter	1,404	1,452	554	38.1	3d quarter	1,150	1,127	403	35.8
4th quarter	1,207	1,250	437	34.9	4th quarter	961	1,039	344	33.1
Fiscal year total	5,587	5,513	2,027	36.7	Fiscal year total	4,818	4,934	1,855	37.6
1960—1st quarter	1,509	1,256	452	35.9	1963—1st quarter	1,282	1,220	307	25.2
2d quarter	1,533	1,390	521	37.4	2d quarter	1,026	972	275	28.3
3d quarter	1,660	1,734	610	35.1	3d quarter	1,043	857	278	29.0
4th quarter	1,322	1,425	559	39.2	4th quarter	1,011	1,044	340	32.6
Fiscal year total	6,024	5,805	2,142	36.8	Fiscal year total	4,362	4,093	1,200	29.3
1961—1st quarter	1,450	1,386	542	39.1					
2d quarter	1,358	1,276	488	38.2					
3d quarter	1,664	1,553	575	37.0					
4th quarter	1,466	1,429	602	42.1					
Fiscal year total	5,938	5,644	2,207	39.1					

Number of applications received, disposed of, approved, and percent of approvals in aid to the disabled, fiscal years 1957 and 1958, by quarters

Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved		Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved	
			Number	Percent				Number	Percent
1957—1st quarter	314	325	234	72.0	1958—1st quarter	294	264	222	84.1
2d quarter	254	316	206	65.2	2d quarter	318	286	236	82.5
3d quarter	299	262	189	72.1	3d quarter	213	219	178	81.3
4th quarter	292	307	246	80.1	4th quarter	303	252	204	80.9
Fiscal year total	1,159	1,210	875	72.3	Fiscal year total	1,128	1,021	840	82.3

Number of applications, received, disposed of, approved, and percent of approvals, in aid to the disabled, fiscal years 1959–63, by quarters

Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved		Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved	
			Number	Percent				Number	Percent
1959—1st quarter	251	238	212	89.0	1962—1st quarter	167	165	143	86.6
2d quarter	266	289	191	66.0	2d quarter	210	253	232	91.6
3d quarter	292	279	239	85.6	3d quarter	349	206	184	83.3
4th quarter	367	371	292	78.7	4th quarter	537	614	593	96.6
Fiscal year total	1,176	1,177	934	79.3	Fiscal year total	1,263	1,238	1,152	93.1
1960—1st quarter	272	270	223	82.5	1963—1st quarter	313	347	326	93.9
2d quarter	238	251	202	80.4	2d quarter	264	254	243	95.7
3d quarter	357	361	286	79.2	3d quarter	286	281	268	95.4
4th quarter	399	393	306	77.8	4th quarter	286	267	217	81.3
Fiscal year total	1,266	1,275	1,017	79.7	Fiscal year total	1,149	1,149	1,054	91.7
1961—1st quarter	364	378	286	75.6					
2d quarter	276	250	210	84.0					
3d quarter	129	231	208	90.0					
4th quarter	160	189	151	79.8					
Fiscal year total	929	1,048	855	81.5					

Number of applications received, disposed of, approved, and percent of approvals for aid to the blind for fiscal year 1957 and 1958, by quarters

Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved		Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved	
			Number	Percent				Number	Percent
1957—1st quarter	13	18	12	66.7	1958—1st quarter	13	13	7	53.8
2d quarter	8	20	10	50.0	2d quarter	16	11	9	81.8
3d quarter	26	14	7	50.0	3d quarter	16	15	5	33.3
4th quarter	16	24	10	41.7	4th quarter	14	15	10	66.7
Fiscal year total	63	76	39	51.3	Fiscal year total	59	54	31	57.4

Number of applications received, disposed of, approved, and percent of approvals in aid to the blind, fiscal years 1959–63, by quarters

Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved		Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved	
			Number	Percent				Number	Percent
1959—1st quarter	19	15	7	46.6	1962—1st quarter	14	15	8	53.3
2d quarter	17	23	15	65.2	2d quarter	10	9	3	33.3
3d quarter	15	15	8	53.3	3d quarter	10	9	6	66.7
4th quarter	16	11	6	54.5	4th quarter	7	10	6	60.0
Fiscal year total	67	64	36	56.2	Fiscal year total	41	43	23	53.5
1960—1st quarter	20	16	9	56.2	1963-1st quarter	10	9	7	77.8
2d quarter	16	17	7	41.1	2d quarter	8	7	6	85.7
3d quarter	13	21	6	28.5	3d quarter	9	9	5	55.6
4th quarter	13	12	6	50.0	4th quarter	11	10	7	70.0
Fiscal year total	62	66	28	42.4	Fiscal year total	38	35	25	71.4
1961—1st quarter	12	12	7	58.3					
2d quarter	10	10	6	60.0					
3d quarter	15	10	5	50.0					
4th quarter	15	17	8	47.0					
Fiscal year total	52	49	26	53.0					

Number of applications received, disposed of, approved and percent of approvals in general public assistance, fiscal years 1957–58, by quarters

Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved		Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved	
			Number	Percent				Number	Percent
1957—1st quarter	454	380	167	43.9	1958—1st quarter	889	837	276	32.9
2d quarter	663	613	195	31.8	2d quarter	819	714	354	49.6
3d quarter	922	785	249	31.7	3d quarter	988	967	342	35.4
4th quarter	925	972	242	24.9	4th quarter	962	1,002	431	43.0
Fiscal year total	2,964	2,750	853	31.0	Fiscal year total	3,658	3,520	1,403	39.9

Number of applications received, disposed of, approved, and percent of approvals in general public assistance, fiscal years 1959–63, by quarters

Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved		Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved	
			Number	Percent				Number	Percent
1959—1st quarter	966	843	340	40.3	1962—1st quarter	1,015	1,022	451	44.1
2d quarter	868	928	405	43.6	2d quarter	839	849	322	37.9
3d quarter	992	993	445	44.8	3d quarter	869	880	386	43.9
4th quarter	767	794	326	41.0	4th quarter	780	758	298	39.3
Fiscal year total	3,593	3,558	1,516	42.6	Fiscal year total	3,503	3,509	1,457	41.5
1960—1st quarter	890	756	294	38.8	1963—1st quarter	748	727	241	33.1
2d quarter	901	791	349	44.1	2d quarter	715	647	234	36.2
3d quarter	961	896	358	39.9	3d quarter	746	767	242	31.6
4th quarter	727	876	334	38.1	4th quarter	698	681	221	32.5
Fiscal year total	3,479	3,319	1,335	40.2	Fiscal year total	2,907	2,822	938	33.2
1961—1st quarter	854	811	348	42.9					
2d quarter	886	832	385	46.2					
3d quarter	1,053	922	400	43.3					
4th quarter	949	885	396	44.7					
Fiscal year total	3,742	3,450	1,529	44.3					

Number of applications received, disposed of, approved, and percent of approvals for old-age assistance, fiscal years 1957 and 1958 by quarters

Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved		Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved	
			Number	Percent				Number	Percent
1957—1st quarter	384	352	129	36.6	1958—1st quarter	578	516	154	29.8
2d quarter	380	413	151	36.6	2d quarter	428	423	183	43.3
3d quarter	532	439	160	36.4	3d quarter	475	445	166	37.3
4th quarter	558	591	196	33.2	4th quarter	543	463	164	35.4
Fiscal year total	1,854	1,795	636	35.4	Fiscal year total	2,024	1,847	667	36.1

Number of applications received, disposed of, approved, and percent of approvals in old-age assistance, fiscal years 1959–63, by quarters

Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved	
			Number	Percent
1959—1st quarter	502	450	171	38.0
2d quarter	453	457	192	42.0
3d quarter	397	405	163	40.2
4th quarter	309	383	139	36.2
Fiscal year total	**1,661**	**1,695**	**665**	**39.2**
1960—1st quarter	330	306	116	37.9
2d quarter	363	326	114	34.9
3d quarter	371	398	135	33.9
4th quarter	376	383	146	38.1
Fiscal year total	**1,440**	**1,413**	**511**	**36.1**
1961—1st quarter	370	342	154	45.0
2d quarter	335	328	135	41.1
3d quarter	290	283	93	32.8
4th quarter	327	310	111	35.8
Fiscal year total	1,322	1,263	493	39.0
1962—1st quarter	313	295	115	38.9
2d quarter	333	336	149	44.3
3d quarter	258	289	120	41.5
4th quarter	243	228	96	42.1
Fiscal year total	**1,147**	**1,148**	**480**	**41.8**
1963—1st quarter	322	283	110	38.9
2d quarter	197	237	97	40.9
3d quarter	208	177	48	27.1
4th quarter	246	237	91	38.4
Fiscal year total	**973**	**934**	**346**	**37.0**

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point two resurveys of the ADC random sample and testimony, adduced during the hearings, interpreting and evaluating the resurveys.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESURVEY OF ADC RANDOM SAMPLE

Senator BYRD. This would probably be a good place, Mr. Brewer and Mr. Galvin, to comment on the resurvey of the ADC random sample. Now, we have just put into the record the survey of 50 cases which were not selected in a scientific manner but which were selected rather accidentally, and by hit-or-miss methods, I suppose. You have now conducted a resurvey, not just of a portion of the cases that were removed following the special investigation, but you have resurveyed all of the cases that were removed; is that correct?

Mr. GALVIN. That is correct.

Senator BYRD. So you have a 100-percent resurvey of the cases that were removed.

Mr. GALVIN. This could be projected for the whole caseload as it existed at the time of the sample selection. These are the 141 cases that were closed in the investigation of the random sample of the whole ADC caseload at that time. The results of the resurvey show as of the date of the survey, what would happen to that group of ineligibles that were in the caseload at the time the sample was selected.

Senator BYRD. Now, at the time of the last hearing you presented the survey of a few of these families, I believe.

Mr. GALVIN. It was 23.

Senator BYRD. All right; 23, let us say. At that time, I suggested that you conduct a resurvey of the same 23 families and be prepared to present the results of the resurvey at the hearing this year. Now, you did better than this. You went beyond the 23 and you did a resurvey of 100 percent. You did a resurvey of the 141 cases, which is more than the committee asked for, but it certainly is pleasing to hear that you have resurveyed the entire group.

FINDINGS BASED ON RESURVEY

Now, what are your findings based on this resurvey? You already have addressed yourself to the findings with reference to the appeals. What are the additional findings?

Mr. GALVIN. Seventy-seven, or fifty-four percent, of the cases the clients were still living at the same address; 64 had moved to a new address. Of the 133 cases closed, 44—35 percent—had reapplied for assistance; 16—or 12 percent—of these applications were approved; 25—or 19 percent—were rejected; and 5 or 4 percent were pending agency decision as of March 27. It was ascertained that rent had been paid for the month of January by 66 of the families, including 8 families whose cases had not been closed, and 13 who had reapplied and been approved for assistance. The January rent, and this was conducted in January, had not been paid by all—by 47 of the families. The rent situation in eight cases could not be determined. This is a bad photocopy. That is "86" instead of "66." The rent had been paid for the current month.

Senator BYRD. For the month in which——

Mr. GALVIN. For the month of the survey, the rents had been paid.

In the three families who had reapplied and been approved, two were delinquent only for the current month or the month of January, and the third was delinquent for 3 months. However, this client had been in arrears $271 at the time of the prior investigation in December 1961, and is currently in arrears only $222.50.

In the other 44 cases in which the rent is delinquent, the situation is as follows: 1 week or less—this is the delinquent rent—1 week or less, 4 families; 2 weeks or less, 2 families; 3 weeks, 1 family; 1 month, 24 families; 5 weeks, 1 family; 6 weeks, 2 families; 7 weeks, 1 family; 2 months, 5 families; 3 months, 4 families.

To recap that, 33, or 70 percent of the 47 who were delinquent in the rent, were in arrears only for the current month or for part of the current month; 65, or 56 percent of the 117 families not currently receiving assistance, were paid up to date on their rent; and 31, or 26 percent, were 1 month or less in arrears; 9, or 8 percent, were in arrears for 5 weeks to 2 months; 4, or 3 percent, in arrears for 3 months. And the rental situation could not be ascertained in 8, or 7 percent, of the cases.

CHILDREN IN JUNIOR VILLAGE

A complete list was obtained from the Child Welfare Division of all children placed at Junior Village between November 1961 and January 25, 1963. This list of 45 children with 14 families contains names of children whose placement in Junior Village is not as a direct result of the social worker's decision to close the case based on the investigative report.

For example, 2 children turned over to the Department, because the grantee relative no longer wanted to care for them: At the time of this report in January, 23 children were still at Junior Village. There are 2 cases in addition to the 141 which were continued on assistance, but the children were placed in Junior Village. In one of these cases, three children were placed in March 1962 and are still there. In the other case, two children were placed in September of 1962, and were later placed in foster homes where they still are.

Fifty of the 141 families are receiving surplus food. Only 31, or 26 percent, of the 117 cases not currently receiving public assistance are receiving surplus food. Of the 31, 21 families live at the same address, and 10 have moved; 86 not currently receiving public assistance are also not receiving surplus food; 41 of these families live at the same address, and 45 have moved.

(The information referred to follows:)

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE, OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS AND COLLECTIONS,

March 27, 1963.

Memorandum to: Mr. Donald D. Brewer, Acting Director of Public Welfare.

Subject: Survey ADC random sample.

A survey was made in January 1963 to determine the status of 141 cases reported closed by Public Assistance Division of the cases investigated in the ADC random sample. According to a check made at registration and files, field administrative office in January 1963, 11 of these cases have not been closed. All other cases were closed no later than July 1962. A check with Public Assistance Division disclosed that 3 of these 11 should have been closed.

One had not been closed because the closing notice had not been sent to registration and files; however, no payment had been authorized since June 1962. One case had not been recorded as closed by registration and files although the closing notice had been sent there. The third case had been recorded as closed but incorrect information had been furnished OIC on the case status, due probably to the fact that the client had reapplied for assistance in September 1962 and is currently an active case.

Of the eight cases never closed, six were reinstated as a result of the appeal decision and two were not closed because of changes in the living situation of the clients.

It was ascertained that in 77 (54 percent) of the cases the clients were still living at the same address, including 5 of those cases which were never closed and 10 of the reapproved cases. Sixty-four had moved to a new address, including three of those never closed and six of the reapproved cases. The families that moved included six who moved out of town, one who is in prison, and two who are in the Department of Public Welfare Residential Training Center.

Of the 133 cases closed, 46 (35 percent) have reapplied for assistance; 16 (12 percent) of those applications were approved, 25 (19 percent) rejected and 5 (4 percent) are pending agency decision.

It was ascertained that rent had been paid for the month of January by 86 of the families, including 8 families whose cases have not been closed; on 13 who had reapplied and been approved for assistance. The January rent had not been paid by 47 of the families, including 3 who had reapplied and been approved for assistance. The rent situation in eight cases could not be determined.

In the three families who had reapplied and been approved, two were delinquent only for the current month and the third was delinquent for 3 months. This client had been in arrears $271 at the time of the prior investigation in December 1961 and is currently in arrears $222.50.

In the other 44 cases in which the rent is delinquent, the situation is as follows:

One week or less: Four families, including one owing a week's rent when the family moved out of the District and whose present address is unknown.

Two weeks: Two families.
Three weeks: One family.
One month: Fourteen families.
Five weeks: One family.
Six weeks: Two families.
Seven weeks: One family.
Two months: Five families, including one who moved out of the District in June 1962.

Three months: Four families, including one who moved out of the District in October 1962 and another who was in arrears at the time of the move. Neither of the present addresses are known.

Thirty-three (70 percent) of the 47 who were delinquent in the rent were in arrears only for the current month or for a part of the current month.

Sixty-five (56 percent) of the 117 families not currently receiving assistance were paid up to date on their rent and 31 (26 percent) were 1 month or less in arrears. Nine (8 percent) were in arrears for 5 weeks to 2 months, four (3 percent) in arrears for 3 months, and the rental situation could not be ascertained in eight (7 percent) cases.

A complete list was obtained from the Child Welfare Division of all children placed in Junior Village between November 1961 and January 25, 1963, whose cases were closed in the ADC random sample investigation. This list of 45 children from 14 families which is attached as schedule A, contains names of children whose placement in Junior Village is not as a direct result of the social worker's decision to close the case based on the investigation report; e.g., two children turned over to the Department because the grantee relative no longer wanted to care for them. Twenty-three children are still at Junior Village.

There are two cases in the ADC random sample investigation which were continued on assistance but the children were placed in Junior Village. In one of the cases, three children were placed in March 1962 and are still there. In the other case, two children were placed in September 1962 and were later placed in foster homes where they still are.

Fifty of the 141 families are receiving surplus food. Included in this group are: Six of the eight families whose cases were never closed; 13 of the 16 reapproved cases; one of the five pending applications.

Only 31 (26 percent) of the 117 cases not currently receiving public assistance are receiving surplus food. Of the 31, 21 families live at the same address and 10 have moved. Eighty-six not currently receiving public assistance are also not receiving surplus food. Forty-one of these families live at the same address and 45 have moved.

William R. Galvin,
Investigations and Collections Officer.

ATTACHMENT A

Children placed in Junior Village whose cases were closed in ADC random sample investigation

Date of last check	Date case closed	Date placed in Junior Village	Number of children placed	Data released and to whom	Still at Junior Village	Remarks
Dec. 1, 1961	Feb. 6, 1962	Dec. 6, 1962	2	1 to District Training School on May 24, 1962.	1	Case closed but not as a result of special investigation project (SIP) report. Grantee relative no longer wanted to care for children and turned them over to Department.
Do	do	Mar. 7, 1962	2	May 1, 1962 to F.N	0	Former recipient is currently employed and is not receiving surplus food. Her rent is 1 week ($7) in arrears.
Feb. 1, 1962	Apr. 18, 1961	Mar. 16, 1962 Mar. 19, 1962	6 2		8	Mother was pregnant when she placed the children with Child Welfare Division. Mother has 3 children with her. She is living with paramour and father of several children. Recipient is not receiving surplus food. She has moved and the rent is paid up to date.
Apr. 2, 1962	May 8, 1962	June 6, 1962	6	1 on Dec. 14, 1962, to mother	5	Mother reapplied for assistance and was rejected on Oct. 31, 1962. Recipient is not receiving surplus food and is living rent free in her new address.
Mar. 1, 1962	Mar. 20, 1962	May 15, 1962 May 16, 1962	2 1	3 on Sept. 28, 1962, to mother	0	Mother has been employed several years without notifying agency. Mother reapplied for assistance on May 28, 1962, but was rejected. Recipient is not receiving surplus food. She has moved to a different address where her rent is currently paid up. She is currently employed.
Jan. 1, 1962	Apr. 16, 1962	May 10, 1962	2		2	Reapplied for assistance. Rejected twice, May 23, 1962, and Oct. 10, 1962. Reapplied and was approved on Nov. 29, 1963. She was at the Department of Public Welfare Residential Training Center.
Feb. 1, 1962	Mar. 6, 1962	June 11, 1962	3	1 on Oct. 7, 1962, to mother; 2 on Dec. 23, 1962, to mother.	0	Reapplied for assistance, and was rejected on Sept. 18, 1962. Recipient not receiving surplus food. She has moved and her rent is paid up to date.
May 1, 1962	June 1, 1962	June 20, 1962	4	4 on July 13, 1962, to mother	0	Reapplied for assistance on July 2, 1962, and approved on July 5, 1962.
Apr. 1, 1962	May 7, 1962	July 18, 1962	5	5 on Aug. 3, 1962, to mother	0	Reapplied and was rejected on Dec. 21, 1962. Recipient is receiving surplus food. Has moved to a new address and is 1 month in arrears in her rent.
May 1, 1962	May 31, 1962	July 30, 1962	3	1 on Oct. 22, 1962, to mother	2	Recipient is not receiving surplus food and lives rent free with relatives. She is currently employed.
	May 3, 1962	Sept. 22, 1962	1	1 on Nov. 1, 1962, to mother	0	Reapplied and was rejected on July 23, 1962; Aug. 27, 1962; and Sept. 28, 1962. Recipient is receiving surplus food. She has moved to a new address and her rent is paid up to date.
Feb. 1, 1962	Mar. 26, 1962	Oct. 24, 1962	2		2	Reapplied and was rejected Dec. 6, 1962. Recipient is not receiving surplus food.
Apr. 1, 1962	Apr. 19, 1962	Jan. 7, 1963	1	1 on Jan. 29, 1963, to Central Union Mission.	0	Recipient is not receiving surplus food. Has moved to a new address. Her rent is in arrears 1 month. She is living with a man at the new address.
June 1, 1962	May 4, 1962	Jan. 17, 1963	3		3	Reapplied and was rejected on Nov. 4, 1962. Recipient currently receiving surplus food. She is living at a new address and is 3 months in arrears in her rent.

Senator **Byrd**. Did you cover the resurvey, Mr. Galvin?

Mr. **Galvin**. No. That was the January report.

RESURVEY, SEPTEMBER 1963

Now, the resurvey report dated September 24, 1963, was made during the month of August 1963. The status of the cases is as follows: 9, or 6.3 percent, were never closed and were continued on assistance; 101, or 71.7 percent, were closed and never reopened. One or 0.7 percent was closed but was reopened prior to December 31, 1962, and again closed prior to December 1, 1962. Five cases, or 3.6 percent, were closed, reopened prior to December 31, 1962, and again closed after December 31, 1962.

Ten cases, or 7.1 percent, were closed at the time of the special investigation and were reopened prior to December 31, 1962, and are still active.

Fifteen cases, or 10.6 percent, were closed, then were reopened after December 31, 1962, and still active. So, of the 141, there are currently on assistance 34 cases.

I also have code reasons for closing, which I will supply for the record.

(The material referred to follows:)

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE, OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS AND COLLECTIONS,
September 24, 1963.

Memorandum to: Mr. Donald D. Brewer, Acting Director of Public Welfare.

Subject: Resurvey ADC random sample.

Reference is made to survey made in January 1963 of the status of 141 cases as reported closed in the ADC random sample, as reported to you by letter March 27, 1963.

A resurvey of the 141 cases of the ADC random sample reported closed as a result of the special investigation project to determine their current status was made August 1963. Results are as follows:

Status of cases

	Number of cases	Percent
Never closed, continued on assistance	9	6.3
Closed, never reopened	101	71.7
Closed, reopened prior to Dec. 31, 1962, and again closed prior to Dec. 31, 1962	1	.7
Closed, reopened prior to Dec. 31, 1962, and again closed after Dec. 31, 1962	5	3.6
Closed prior to Dec. 31, 1962, reopened prior to Dec. 31, 1962, still active	10	7.1
Closed prior to Dec. 31, 1962, reopened after Dec. 31, 1962, still active	15	10.6

Code reasons for closing

Of the 132 cases closed, code reasons for initial closing are as follows:

Code:	Number of cases
01	1
03	1
04	6
11	2
12	1
21	1
22	1
33	1
35	2
37	1
41	1
53	1
54	2
71	1
72	6
73	12
74	5
76	5
79	52
90	8
92	1
93	1
94	19
Subtotal	131
None	1
Total	132

NOTE.—Not closed in registration and files.

Of the 101 cases closed never reopened, code reasons for closing were as follows:

Code:	Number of cases
01	1
04	6
11	1
12	1
21	1
22	1
33	1
35	2
37	1
41	1
53	1
54	2
71	1
72	5
73	9
74	4
76	4
79	39
90	6
92	1
94	12
Total	101

Code reasons for closing, six cases closed, reopened, and again closed.

Number of cases	Code, original closing	Code, 2d closing
1	03	73
1	74	11
3	79	04, 79, 94
1	94	79

Code reason for closing 25 cases originally closed, again reopened, and still active:

Code:	Number of cases
11	1
72	1
73	3
76	1
79	10
90	2
93	1
94	6

Appeal hearings

Thirty-one (22 percent) of the 141 cases requested appear hearings, with results as follows:

	Number of cases
Agency sustained:	
Never closed	1
Closed, never reopened	10
Closed and reopened prior to Dec. 31, 1962, still active	1
Closed prior to Dec. 31, 1962, reopened after Dec. 31, 1962, still active	1
Total (41.9 percent of 31)	13
Agency action not sustained:	
Never closed, still on assistance	5
Continued on assistance, closed prior to Dec. 31, 1962	1
Continued on assistance, closed prior to Dec. 31, 1962, again approved, and again closed after Dec. 31, 1962	1
Total (22.6 percent of 31)	7
Withdrawals:	
Closed, never reopened	2
Closed and reopened prior to December 1962, currently active	5
Closed prior to December 1962, reopened after December 1962, still active	1
Closed prior to December 1962, reopened prior to December 1962, and closed prior to December 1962	1
Total (29 percent of 31)	9
Failed to appear:	
Closed prior to December 1962, never reopened	1
Closed prior to December 1962, reopened prior to December 1962, still active	1
Total (6.5 percent of 31)	2

Reapplications

Of the 132 cases closed, 59 recipients (44.4 percent) made 88 reapplications as follows:

	1 time	2 times	3 times	4 times	Total applicants	Total number of reapplications	Pending
Never reopened	20	6	1	1	28	39	3
Reopened after	15	4	4	1	24	43	
Closed, reopened after reapplication, again closed	6				6	6	
Total	41	10	5	2	58	88	3

Children admitted to Junior Village

Case	Date admitted	Number	Date discharged	Number	Discharged to—	Still at Junior Village
Parent still on assistance:						
1	December 1961	2	May 24, 1962	1	DTS	0
			Apr. 25, 1963	1	F.H	
2	January 1963	3				3
3	September 1962	1	November 1962	1	Mother	0
4	May 1962	2	March 1963	2	W.T.C	0
5	July 1962	5	August 1962	5	Mother	0
6	June 1962	4		4	T.C	0
Total		17		14		3
Parent not on assistance:						
1	January 1963	3				3
2	June 1962	3	January 1962	1	F.H	0
			February 1962	2	Mother	
3	March 1962	2	May 1962	2	F.H	0
4	do	8	March 1963	8	Mother	0
5	January 1963	1	January 1963	1	C.U. Mission	0
6	July 1962	3	January 1962	1		
			February 1963	1	Mother	0
			July 1963	1		
7	June 1962	6	December 1962	1	Mother	4
			June 1963	1		
8	October 1962	2	March 1963	2	Mother	0
9	May 1962	3	September 1962	3	do	0
10	March 1963	3				3
11	February 1963	4				4
Total		38		24		14
Not part of 141:						
1	September 1962	2	December 1962	2	F.H	0
2	March 1962	3		1	CCH NH Tng	2
Total		5		3		2

Residence and rental

Of the 141 cases, 67 (47.1 percent) are still residing at the same address, 73 (51.4 percent) have changed their addresses, and one is deceased. Residence and rental information is as follows:

		Number of cases
On assistance, same address (12.9 percent)		18
Rent payments, current		17
Delinquent (2½ months)		1
Average	$67.50	
Smallest	45.00	
Largest	115.00	
On assistance, new address (11.5 percent)		16
Rent payments, current		9
Delinquent (½ month, 1 month, 2 months)		3
Average rental unknown (hospital)		1
Rent free		3
Average	$69.80	
Smallest	60.00	
Largest	100.00	
Not on assistance, same address (34.5 percent)		49
Rent payments, current (77.6 percent)		38
Delinquent (1 and 2 months) (18.3 percent)		9
Rent free (4.1 percent)		2
Average	$55.85	
Smallest	31.00	
Largest	110.00	
Not on assistance, new address (40.2 percent)		57
Rent payments, current (50.9 percent)		29
Delinquent (12.3 percent)		7
Rent free (10.5 percent)		6
Loss of contact (26.3 percent)		15
Average	$68.30	
Smallest	33.00	
Largest	135.00	
Deceased (0.7 percent)		1

Rental ranges

Figures available on 112 of 141 cases:

On assistance, same address, 18 of 18.

On assistance, new address, 12 of 16 (3 rent free, 1 unknown).

No longer on assistance, same address, 47 of 49 (2 rent free).

No longer on assistance, new address, 35 of 58 (16 unknown, 6 rent free, 1 deceased).

All	Active same address	Active new address	Closed same address	Closed new address	Total
30 to 40			14	4	18
41 to 50	2		5	4	11
51 to 60	3	2	8	8	21
61 to 70	7	8	10	5	30
71 to 80	4		6	5	15
81 to 90	1	1	2	2	6
91 to 100		1	1	4	6
101 to 110			1	1	2
111 to 120	1			1	2
121 to 130					
131 to 140				1	1
Total	18	12	47	35	112

Living arrangements

	Number
Living with husband or paramour:	
On assistance	**4**
Off assistance	**28**
Living alone:	
On assistance	**22**
Off assistance	**39**
With friends or relative:	
On assistance	**6**
Off assistance	**25**
Unknown:	
On assistance	**0**
Off assistance	**14**
Hospital:	
On assistance	**1**
Off assistance	**1**
Deceased	**1**
Total	**141**

Employment

Employed:	
On assistance	**3**
Not on assistance	**51**
Subtotal	**54**
Unemployed:	
On assistance	**28**
Not on assistance	**42**
Subtotal	**70**
Unknown, could not be determined at time of survey:	
On assistance	**4**
Not on assistance	**13**
Subtotal	**17**
Total	**106**

Recap

	Number of children		
	To Junior Village	Discharged from Junior Village	Still at Junior Village
Parent still on assistance	17	14	3
Parent off assistance	38	24	14
Not part of 141	5	3	2
Total	60	41	19

Free lunch program

Total families with school age children living in Washington	**107**
Number of families on assistance, participating	**11**
Number of families on assistance, not participating	**15**
Subtotal	**26**
Number of families, off assistance, participating	**16**
Number of families off assistance, not participating	**15**
Subtotal	**81**

No information could be obtained at time of resurvey as to ages of children, or participation in program on seven of the families on assistance and eight families off assistance. Remaining families either not in Washington or have no school age children.

Surplus foods

Certified for surplus food:	
On assistance	19
Off assistance	21
Total	40
Not certified for surplus food:	
On assistance	15
Off assistance	86
Total	101
86 of the recipients now off assistance rolls, not currently certified for surplus food, but previously certified	84
Never certified	2
Total	86

William R. Galvin,
Investigations and Collections Officer.

Mr. Galvin. On appeals——

Senator Byrd. Pardon me. Of the 141, how many are currently on assistance?

Mr. Galvin. Nine plus ten plus fifteen, thirty-four.

Senator Byrd. Of which 25 were closed.

Mr. Galvin. Yes, sir.

Senator Byrd. And reopened later.

Mr. Galvin. And have been reopened.

APPEALS

There were 31 appeals, or 22 percent, of the 141 closed cases which requested appeal hearings with results as follows.

Senator Byrd. Did we not have these already given?

Mr. Galvin. This is bringing it up to date for August 1963. The other report was for January 1963.

Senator Byrd. That was not September?

Mr. Brewer. I believe I was reading from the January report. The one I handed to the chairman.

Mr. Galvin. Yes. This is the September report.

Senator Byrd. All right.

Mr. Galvin. Agency sustained in 13 or 41.9 percent. Agency action not sustained in seven or 22.6 percent. Withdrawals after they had requested the appeal, nine or 29 percent. Failed to appear, two or 6.5 percent.

DISPOSITION OF CLOSED CASES

Of the 141 cases that were reported closed at the end of the random sample, 9 had been reported as closed but never were closed. Of the 132 actually closed, 59 recipients or 44.4 percent have reapplied, resulting in, as of the time of this report, 25 being put back on assistance.

Senator Byrd. That is the same 25 we earlier——

Mr. Galvin. That is the same 25 we earlier referred to.

Senator Byrd. In other words, they took action to remove the elements of ineligibility. Is that right?

Mr. Galvin. It is always possible on public assistance, that the circumstances do change and that the cause for which they became ineligible has been removed or the situation has so changed that they are apparently eligible for assistance.

Sixty-seven or 47.1 percent are still residing at the same address. Seventy-three or 51.4 percent have changed their address. And one is deceased.

RENTAL SITUATION PER CASES

Eighteen or 12.9 percent are on assistance and living at the same address.

In 17 of these the rent payments are completely up to date and in 1 they are in arrears. Sixteen or 11.5 percent are on assistance and are now at a new address; of these nine have current rent payments; three are delinquent; one, the rental is unknown, and three are living rent free with relatives.

Of the 49 or 39.5 percent not on assistance and living at the same address, 38 are current in their rental payments.

Senator Byrd. Or 77.6 percent.

Mr. Galvin. Or 77.6 percent. Nine, or 18.3 percent, are delinquent. Two, or 4.1 percent, are rent free.

Senator Byrd. Nine are delinquent from 1 to 2 months.

Mr. Galvin. That is right.

Of the 57 or 40.2 percent not on assistance and living at a new address, 29, or 50.9 percent, are current in their rental payments. Seven, or 12.6 percent, are delinquent. Six, or 10.5 percent, are living rent free. And with 15, or 26.3 percent, there is no contact. And one, or 0.7 percent, is deceased.

CHECKS ON EMPLOYMENT

On employment, as far as we could verify employment, of the 106 not on assistance, 51 or 48.1 percent are employed, 42 or 39.2 percent are unemployed, and 13 or 12.3 percent employment cannot be determined.

Of the 35 on assistance, employed were 3 or 8.6 percent and this is part-time employment. Unemployed were 28 or 80 percent.

Employment could not be determined in four cases, or 11.4 percent.

FAMILIES ON SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

On the elementary school free lunch program, the total families with school-age children living in Washington are 107. Eleven of these families on assistance are participating and 15 families on assistance are not participating in the free lunch program. Sixteen of the families that are not receiving assistance are participating and 65 are not participating in the free lunch program.

We couldn't obtain information at the time of our resurvey as to the ages of the children or participation in program of seven of the families on assistance and eight families off of assistance.

FAMILIES RECEIVING SURPLUS FOOD

On surplus food, 19 or 13.5 percent on assistance were certified for surplus food and 21 or 14.9 percent not on assistance were certified.

Fifteen or 10.6 percent on assistance were not certified for surplus food and 86 or 61 percent not receiving assistance were not certified for surplus food, making a total of 141.

Senator Byrd. The followthrough study was made in August, was it, Mr. Galvin?

Mr. Galvin. Yes, sir. The first one was made in July 1962. The second one in January 1963, and the third one, from which I just read, was made in August 1963.

Senator Byrd. Can you summarize in a general way what these surveys and resurveys show as far as the 141 families are concerned, Mr. Galvin?

Mr. Galvin. It shows that the economic situation does change in some of the families to the degree that they become eligible again for public assistance after a year or so. This was the situation for 25 of the families. Of the remaining 107, most of them have economic resources which we didn't go into too deeply because this would have required a much longer investigation. Most of them have economic resources and are able to pay their rent.

I made a statement at the last hearing about surplus food that I wouldn't like to make now because the fact that they do not get surplus food to me no longer indicates that they are not eligible for it. It could be that they are not aware that they could receive it.

JUNIOR VILLAGE SITUATION

The Junior Village situation also proves that the economic situation has not deteriorated. The number at Junior Village is decreasing rather than increasing.

The first economic indicator based on my experience with the Department that shows deterioration of the economic situation is in rent. This they allow to go delinquent and use the money for other needs, until they are forced to move or are evicted. The rental situation I think is particularly important in terms of showing that the economic situation is not severe in most closed cases.

Now, as we found in our first survey, as we have found in each one of the surveys, there are cases that you do run into that very definitely should be back on public assistance or need the help of a social welfare agency.

Senator Byrd. I suppose they are reflected in the 25.

Mr. Galvin. These are reflected in the 25.

Senator Byrd. That went back?

Mr. Galvin. That is right.

AVERAGE TIME PER CASE IN INVESTIGATION

Senator Byrd. What is the average time spent on the investigation of a case?

Mr. Galvin. This varies from case to case. Thirty-one for adult review, and we had estimated 30 for intake. We found that intake takes a little bit longer, average 33 hours. The reason that it takes a little bit longer in intake is that the applicants are very much aware that they are going to be investigated within the first month or two.

Senator Byrd. What would the 33 hours mean in terms of dollars and cents, Mr. Galvin?

Mr. Galvin. Our average investigator is a GS–7. This is a pay scale of $5,540 a year, and I would have to divide that to see how many hours this would take. I can do that in a couple of minutes.

In terms of investigative time, it is $88.11.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a statement to the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, by Mr. Joseph Meyers, of the Social Security Administration, during hearings last year on the fiscal year 1963 appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Social Security Administration

(Statement of Joseph Meyers, Deputy Commissioner, Social Security Administration)

CLOSED CASES IN 1960

Mr. Meyers. My name is Joseph Meyers, and I am Deputy Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Senator Byrd. Referring further to the reasons for closing cases in fiscal year 1960, I would like to ask you this question:

Three hundred and eighty-two ADC cases were closed because of employment or increased earnings.

Would such closings be in violation of a Federal statute?

Mr. Meyers. No, sir. As a matter of fact, if there are adequate earnings and adequate income in the family, the Federal act requires that the cases be closed.

Senator Byrd. All right.

Ninety cases were closed because of support by relatives.

Would closing a case on this basis be in violation of a Federal statute?

Mr. Meyers. No, sir. Assuming actual support was coming from relatives, there would be no problem there.

Senator Byrd. Thirty cases were closed because of service-connected income.

Would any Federal statute have been violated in the course of closing these cases for this reason?

Mr. Meyers. No, sir. The possession of adequate income from whatever source would not——

Senator Byrd. Would you repeat that, please?

Mr. Meyers. The possession of adequate income from any source would be an appropriate basis for closing a case under the Federal requirements.

Senator Byrd. Fifty-three cases were closed because of acquisition of other resources.

Would any Federal statute have been violated because of the closing of ADC cases, on this basis?

Mr Meyers. No, sir.

Senator Byrd. Thirty-three cases were closed in the ADC category because of the remarriage of the parent.

Was any Federal statute violated because of these cases having been closed for this reason?

Mr. Meyers. I think not. If I understand the category, the case is closed and is ineligible on the basis of the fact that there is a husband and wife and, presumably, the husband is employable.

The District of Columbia eligibility does not extend to families with employable male heads. If that is the basis for the closing I would say that it does not run into any problem in terms of the Federal requirement.

Senator Byrd. Mr. Shea, do you have any comment?

Mr. Shea. No, sir.

Senator Byrd. Mr. Galvin?

Mr. Galvin. I think this would fall under the provisions that Mr. Meyers just stated, that he presumed correctly that this is a mother who has remarried and, therefore, there is an employable male person in the home.

Senator Byrd. One case was closed on the basis of admittance to an institution.

Would this be in violation of any Federal statute, Mr. Meyers?

Mr. Meyers. No, sir.

Senator Byrd. Fifteen cases were closed on the basis of the recipients' having moved out of the District.

Would this be in conflict with any Federal statute?

Mr. Meyers. I would have to answer that under ordinary circumstances, "No, sir."

There are certain residence requirements in the Federal law which would require under certain circumstances people who have moved, but who had not really lost their residence, to have assistance continued.

But assuming that they had given up their residence, that would present no problem.

Senator Byrd. Is Mr. Meyers correct in his assumption, Mr. Shea?

Mr. Shea. Yes, sir.

Senator Byrd. Mr. Galvin?

Mr. Galvin. He is correct in his assumption, and this is provided for in the departmental regulations.

These will fall under those requirements.

Senator Byrd. 116 cases were closed because of loss of contact.

Mr. Meyers, was any Federal statute violated thereby?

Mr. Meyers. I think I need a little more explanation of what is meant by that.

MEANING OF PHRASE "LOSS OF CONTACT"

Senator Byrd. Mr. Shea, would you care to give an explanation of what is meant by "loss of contact," either you or Mr. Galvin?

Mr. Shea. Mr. Galvin will, I believe.

Mr. Galvin. "Loss of contact" means that the person or the whereabouts of the person is no longer known to the Department. There is a 60-day limit before they close the cases in this situation.

Mr. Scholz would know the exact requirements on this.

Senator Byrd. Mr. Scholz, would you care to state the exact requirements?

Mr. Scholz. It means, sir, that the check of the client has been returned with a notation that he is not at the address where we believed him to be and that he has a 2-month period before the case is closed.

We do not know where to get in touch with him.

Senator Byrd. Mr. Meyers, now would you care to comment?

Was any Federal statute violated?

Mr. Meyers. No, sir. We would expect the District or any department, in cases where they are unable to determine the whereabouts of the person who has been on assistance, to hold up the assistance until such time as they could determine where the person was.

FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH AGENCY POLICY

Senator Byrd. Forty-one cases were removed from the ADC category because of refusal to comply with agency policy.

Mr. Meyers, was any Federal statute violated because of the removal of cases for this reason?

Mr. Meyers. It is pretty difficult to tell, Mr. Chairman.

Certainly a failure to comply with agency policy, which would mean that the person did not meet some requirement, would not cause any problem.

It would be necessary, of course, in order to give a complete answer, to know what the policies were, because as to whether the policies themselves, which were violated, would create a problem, I could not say.

But as to a policy which in and of itself is all right, a failure to comply with it on the part of a recipient would certainly be adequate reason as far as the Federal Government is concerned for closing a case.

CLARIFICATION OF CASE CLOSING

Senator Byrd. Mr. Shea, would you or Mr. Galvin clarify the meaning of this basis for closing a case, "refusal or failure to comply with agency policy"?

Mr. Shea. Could we have Mr. Scholz speak on that?

Senator Byrd. I will ask Mr. Galvin first.

Mr. Galvin. "Refusal to comply with agency policy?"

The agency's policies are written procedures. They are submitted to HEW by letter so that HEW is thoroughly familiar with what our policies are.

Failure to cooperate means refusal to give information that is necessary to make a determination on resources or eligibility. Under this would fall refusal to take a medical examination to determine employability, refusal to clarify resources, or refusal to permit investigation into a bank account that is known to the agency.

Senator Byrd. Mr. Scholz, would you care to elaborate further?

Mr. Scholz. There is nothing I could add, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Byrd. Thank you.

Now, Mr. Meyers, would you care to comment further?

Mr. Meyers. Closing for failure to comply with a policy on all of the illustrations given by Mr. Galvin, in my mind, would not raise a question.

CASES CLOSED ON BASIS OF EMPLOYABILITY

Senator Byrd. All right. Fifty-one cases were closed on the basis of employability.

What do we mean by this, Mr. Shea?

Mr. Shea. That the person is able to work.

Senator Byrd. Which person?

Mr. Shea. The head of the houshold is able to work.

Senator Byrd. Is this the woman or the man?

Mr. Shea. Yes.

Senator Byrd. Either case?

Mr. Galvin?

Mr. Galvin. And in ADC we have the provision that there must be an adequate and satisfactory child-care plan.

Senator Byrd. Before the case can be closed?

Mr. Galvin. Before the case can be closed.

Senator Byrd. For reasons of employability?

Mr. Galvin. Yes, sir.

Senator Byrd. Mr. Meyers, was any Federal statute violated as a result of 51 ADC cases having been closed, on this basis?

Mr. Meyers. My understanding is that our Department has approved and accepted the District of Columbia plan under which cases, where there are employable people, are not eligible; we have accepted that, as I understand the present arrangement.

VOLUNTARY WITHDRAWALS

Senator Byrd. Mr. Meyers, you have with you Mr. Yourman. At any time, if you care to ask him further questions you may feel free to do so.

Eighty-three cases were eliminated from the ADC category on the basis of voluntary withdrawal.

Mr. Meyers, do you see any conflict with Federal statutes in the action taken?

Mr. Meyers. Not as such. Certainly, we would all have to recognize that any individual has the right, and must have the right, to truly, on a voluntary basis, decide that he does not want to be an applicant for or a recipient of assistance.

So there is no problem certainly from our point with anyone who voluntarily withdraws his application for assistance.

Senator Byrd. Sixty-four cases were withdrawn for reasons of the recipient's being no longer incapacitated. "No longer incapacitated."

Before we ask Mr. Meyers to comment on this, Mr. Shea, would you explain what is meant here?

Mr. Shea. This would mean that a person had been found incapacitated by a medical team after the medical review, in all probability, and would have been on the aid-to-the-disabled category after or—or it could, temporarily, on the GPA category.

This person could, by rehabilitative efforts on the part of, for example, the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation or general hospitals, have eliminated the incapacitative factor, whatever it might have been, and, therefore, was no longer incapacitated and, therefore, was able to carry on, maybe not necessarily the same type of work at which he previously had been employed but, at least, was employable later.

ELABORATION OF TERM "NO LONGER INCAPACITATED"

Senator Byrd. Mr. Galvin, the reason here is expressed thusly: "No longer incapacitated."

Would you care to elaborate beyond what Mr. Shea elaborated?

Mr. Galvin. As he mentioned, this incapacitation is in all categories.

In the ADC category you have an applicant who may be approved for ADC because of absence, death, or incapacitation of the parent.

In these cases incapacitation was the original reason for approval and now this condition no longer exists and they are now employable.

Therefore, since the reason has been removed, they are no longer eligible for assistance.

Senator Byrd. Mr. Meyers, now would you care to comment as to whether or not the 64 ADC cases, which were removed in fiscal year 1960, on the basis of the parents being no longer incapacitated were removed in violation of the Federal statute?

Mr. Meyers. No, sir; there is no question, if a case is made eligible by reason of a physical condition—that is the incapacity according to the State definition—and they determine that that condition no longer exists or has been sufficiently improved to take them out of the category, there is no problem.

Senator Byrd. One hundred and forty-six cases were removed because the absent father returned and employable. I suppose it should be "and was employable."

The reason given is "absent father returned and employable." Perhaps you are referring to two different groupings.

CLARIFICATION OF TERM "ABSENT FATHER RETURNED AND EMPLOYABLE"

Mr Shea, would you clarify what is meant by "absent father returned and employable"? Or you can call on anybody else you want to.

Mr. Shea. This situation could be illustrated: A man could have been incarcerated. The period of his imprisonment has been completed and he returned home and he is able to work.

The District of Columbia does not aid the unemployed. He may actually be unemployed but employable and, therefore, he would be ineligible.

A man may have been, by the cooperative efforts of the Public Welfare Department, in two cities, together with the counterpart of the Corporation Counsel's Office, in another city and the man returns to this jurisdiction, came back into the family situation.

Previously he may not have been supporting the family. And now he is back in the jurisdiction. He is with his family. He is able to work.

He has returned to the situation and, therefore, his absence obviously is no longer the reason for the case having been opened.

Senator Byrd. Mr. Galvin, would you care to elaborate further?

I will read it again: "Absent father returned and employable."

Mr. Galvin. The original reason for approval was absence of the father. The father has now returned to the home situation.

So the absence question has been removed. The fact that he is employable removes the incapacity question and, therefore, under the District's rules he is no longer eligible.

Senator Byrd. Mr. Meyers, were the 146 cases, for this reason, removed from the ADC category in violation of the Federal statute?

Mr. Meyers. Again, Mr. Chairman, I cannot speak to the particular facts, but on the basis of the reasons given, that type of eligibility condition and closing because of it does not cause any Federal problem.

Senator Byrd. Included in these 146 cases were 64 cases in which continued absence of the man was not established.

What is meant by this, Mr. Shea?

Mr. Shea. "Continued absence of the man?"

In other words, after the Department's investigating force began to make its surveillance and investigation into the situation it was ascertained, rather that the man being continuously absent, he may have been actually continuously present.

So, in other words, his absence—the absence factor has been discredited and he, therefore, was present and, therefore, the case was not eligible.

ABSENCE OF MAN AS FACTOR

Senator Byrd. Mr. Galvin, there were 64 cases in the group of 146 in which continued absence of a man was not established.

Will you explain what is meant?

Mr. Galvin. The original approval was based on absence of the parent. This is no longer true and so the case is no longer eligible.

Senator Byrd. What is no longer true?

Mr. Galvin. That the parent is absent. The parent has returned to the home.

Senator Byrd. Mr. Meyers, was the removal of 64 cases, included in this category, removed because of continued absence of the man not being established, in violation of Federal statutes?

Mr. Meyers. I would have no question about closing a case on the basis of credible evidence that the man was not actually absent.

Senator Byrd. Thirty-nine cases were removed from the ADC category because the child reached the maximum age.

Mr. Shea, what is the maximum age?

Mr. Shea. The maximum age, if the child is in school, is 18. If the child has been dropped from school it is 16.

Senator Byrd. Mr. Meyers, was a Federal statute violated as a result of 39 cases having been removed from the ADC category on this basis?

Mr. Meyers. No, sir.

Senator Byrd. Twenty-seven cases were closed because the child was placed in foster care.

Would this be in conflict with the Federal statute, Mr. Meyers?

Mr. Meyers. No, sir. The child would, in that case, no longer be living with the relative which would establish eligibility under the ADC category, and that would be an appropriate closing.

Senator Byrd. Ninety-four cases were closed because the child was not deprived of parental support.

What is meant here by that, Mr. Shea?

Mr. Shea. In other words, this means that there is income coming into the family situation, so that the needs of the family are provided for by the regular income of the man from employment.

Senator Byrd. Anything further you would add, Mr. Galvin?

Mr. Galvin. No, sir.

The three grounds for approval are absence, death, and incapacitation.

Here no one is deprived. So, therefore, he would not be eligible.

FURTHER QUESTION OF CONFLICT WITH FEDERAL STATUTE

Senator Byrd. Mr. Meyers, do you find anything here to be in conflict with the Federal statutes?

Mr. Meyers. No question is raised in the closing of any case on the basis of the existence of adequate resources to meet the needs of the family.

Senator Byrd. Do you find, Mr. Meyers, that the removal of the cases because the child was not deprived of parental support, was in violation of the Federal statutes?

Mr. Meyers. If the removal was, as stated by the two District witnesses, on the basis of resources, actual support being furnished, there would be no question; no, sir.

Senator Byrd. Mr. Galvin, would you care to comment further?

Mr. Galvin. The question of resources does not enter the picture here.

The District provides that absence, death, or incapacitation of the parent may approve a child for ADC.

Conversely, the presence of or the employability of the parent, makes the child ineligible for approval under District of Columbia regulations. The question of resources or whether or not the man is employed does not enter into this picture.

If a case——

Senator Byrd. Pardon me, but you do not mean that, do you, "whether or not he is employed"?

Mr. Galvin. If a man is employable, the question of whether or not he is employed does not enter into the picture.

Senator Byrd. Yes, excuse me.

Mr. Galvin. If we have a case, for example, where the man is incapacitated, regardless of his marital status if he was the supporting factor in the case—for example, he could be a common law husband or paramour or a legal husband or anything—if he were incapacitated and in the family group he could be considered in the assistance group and assistance granted.

Conversely, if he becomes employable, similar to the employable husband, the family then would no longer be eligible.

So the question of resources was not true.

Senator Byrd. So once again "the child was not deprived of parental support."

VIOLATION OF FEDERAL STATUTE

Mr. Meyers, did the District of Columbia act in violation of a Federal statute in removing cases from the ADC category for this reason?

Mr. Meyers. Again, I have some confusion in my mind about the differences in some of these categories as they were explained.

If again we are talking about the actual presence in the home of someone who has assumed this parental role, this is one thing, and I see no problem with it.

I think the reason I have a problem and why I equated it with "resources" immediately was that I do not understand the difference between this category of closing and the one where the parent is continuously present or where he isn't absent.

If it is on the basis of absence, then I do not know what the different flavor is to this particular closing.

Senator Byrd. Can you distinguish between the two, Mr. Galvin?

Mr. Galvin. Under Department of Health, Education, and Welfare regulations, statistically, cases are grouped into two sections:

One is the requirement of need, and the other is a no-need requirement, and we are really talking about, in the first group that we mentioned, that they fall under the need group and, in the second group, they fall under the no-need group.

Mr. Lajewski is thoroughly familiar with this, and I think he could explain this much more thoroughly than I could.

Senator Byrd. Well, it may have been explained now to Mr. Meyers' satisfaction.

If it has not been, I would like to ask Mr. Lajewski to comment further, Mr. Meyers.

Mr. Meyers. Well, I must confess that I am not exactly clear on what is contained in this particular subitem as the basis for closing.

Senator Byrd. Mr. Lajewski, can you help us?

Mr. Lajewski. I think that the dilemma that Mr. Meyers finds himself in is a correct one.

Since that report was prepared—this is 1960—we have included these cases under the continued absence policy.

Senator Byrd. I see. Does that help?

Mr. Meyers. That does help, and if these are presence and absence cases they present no problem.

Senator Byrd. All right.

CATEGORY IDENTIFIED AS "OTHER"

Now, Mr. Shea, the only remaining category of case closings is under the word "other." Will you explain what is included in this category?

Mr. Shea. I will have to call on Mr. Lajewski again on this "other" word.

Senator Byrd. All right.

Mr. Lajewski. Mr. Chairman, you might find me in a dilemma here because I have the report for 1962, and all of the categories that you have been referring to are clearcut in here, but I also have a remainder of "other," reasons. Thirty-three cases were closed for this reason in 1962.

I cannot clarify "other" reasons at this time. These are very miscellaneous reasons, and this would be difficult without analyzing the individual cases to see what the specific reason is.

Senator Byrd. Could you give us an example?

Could you give an example of one which des not fall within the categories already enumerated?

Mr. Lajewski. I am not prepared for that, sir.

Senator Byrd. Mr. Shea or Mr. Galvin, can you?

Mr. Galvin. I think if he would enumerate his 33 in 1962, this would help us.

Senator Byrd. Well, we are going to come along with 1961 in a few minutes.

Mr. Galvin. I mean, as far as reasons are concerned. He said he had the reasons.

Mr. Lajewski. I think that Mr. Galvin misunderstood.

At the end of this listing I have "other reasons," which are not enumerated, and, as I stated, I am not prepared to indicate what those specific reasons are.

We would have to make an analysis of those particular cases.

Senator Byrd. Mr. Scholz, can you help us?

We obviously cannot expect Mr. Meyers to comment on this category if we cannot reveal to him what is meant by "other reasons."

Mr. Scholz?

Mr. Scholz. I am afraid not, sir.

Senator Byrd. Mr. Galvin?

Mr. Galvin. Perhaps I can help. Under "other" are any cases which do not fall within the groups you have previously outlined in detail, and it does not include any case closed because of unsuitability.

Perhaps that would help.

Senator Byrd. Mr. Meyers, does this help to the point that you can comment on this category?

Mr. Meyers. Well, I think not. It helps to the extent that Mr. Galvin says that it does not include any case which would involve a question of suitability or unsuitability.

As to what the others are, we do not know, and I think I really cannot comment.

Senator Byrd. Yes.

Mr. Shea, can we find some way of clarifying this today?

Mr. Shea. Yes, sir. We will look into some kind of a sample of the closings and get it.

Senator Byrd. Give us a number of examples, if you can, in the afternoon.

This is the only remaining category that I find which needs clarification in the table for fiscal 1960.

POSSIBLE CONFLICT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REGULATIONS WITH FEDERAL STATUTES

Now let's go to fiscal year 1961. This is a laborious, time-consuming procedure, but I think it is highly important, because we are about to appropriate money for the next fiscal year, which has already begun, of course, and if the District of Columbia regulations are in conflict with the Federal statutes, this would obviously mean that there would have to be some revisions of budget estimates.

So it is important to have a determination of whether or not they are in violation, and if they are not, then we can proceed to appropriate on the basis of the estimates that have been presented.

Now, in fiscal year 1961, table 5 on pages 6 and 7 of the Annual Report of Fiscal Year 1961, Department of Public Welfare, District of Columbia, we find these reasons for closing cases.

I will insert the table at this point in the record.

(The table referred to appears on p. 2471.)

REASONS FOR CLOSING CASES IN 1961

Senator Byrd. First of all, let me state that the total number of ADC cases closed was 1,371. We will go through the same procedure, Mr. Meyers, although you have already answered the questions, I think, but lets leave nothing in doubt and nothing to chance.

Transferred to another assistance program were 18 cases.

Was any Federal statute violated here?

Mr. Meyers. As a requirement, that is unobjectionable.

Senator Byrd. One case was closed because of death; 201 cases were closed because there was a material change in the income or resources, specifically because of the employment or the increased earnings of the ADC father.

Mr. Meyers, would you have any objection to this?

Mr. Meyers. No; if it is established that additional income adequate to meet the needs under the District's standard exists, there is no problem.

Senator Byrd. 212 cases were closed because of the employment, or because of increased earnings of the ADC mother.

Mr. Meyers, do you have any objection to this reason for closing?

Mr. Meyers. I think my answer to the previous question would be equally applicable to that, sir.

Senator Byrd. Two cases were closed because of the employment or increased earnings of the ADC child.

Was this in conflict with a Federal statute?

Mr. Meyers. No, I would—I think it would be helpful, though, if we would know the basis in the District—I am not familiar with it—for taking into account income of the particular family members.

If we assume that the policy is that income of any of the family members, including the child and everyone else, is lumped into a standard budget, and you figure the needs and resources of all, this certainly would be an appropriate basis for closing a case.

Senator Byrd. Would be an appropriate basis?

Mr. Meyers. Would be an appropriate basis.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Shea?

Mr. SHEA. Yes, sir. Mr. Meyers has made the correct assumption with respect to the District policy.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Galvin?

Mr. GALVIN. I agree with Mr. Shea.

OTHER PERSON PARTICIPATION

Senator BYRD. Two cases were closed because of the employment or increased earnings of other person.

Mr. Shea, would you care to explain what is meant by other person?

Mr. SHEA. This could be bringing into the family constellation a brother of the ADC mother who was employed, living in the family picture, and his income was available to the total situation.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Galvin, do you have any further comment?

Mr. GALVIN. Or any other relative.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, was the action taken in conflict with the Federal statutes?

Mr. MEYERS. No; if a person actually is a member of the family unit, and makes his income available to the family, then it is perfectly appropriate, and it should be taken into account.

Senator BYRD. 107 cases were closed because of the absent parent's return.

Mr. Meyers?

Mr. MEYERS. In a situation where the parent is actually in the home, under the District policy which is acceptable, there would be no eligibility because there is no absence.

Senator BYRD. Do you mean that when you say he is actually in the home?

It says "absent parent's return."

Does he have to be in the home?

Mr. MEYERS. Well, maybe you might have one of the District of Columbia witnesses explain what is meant.

I assumed when it said he returned, that it meant that he had returned and was in the home.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Galvin?

Mr. GALVIN. That is what this particular category means. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. All right. Then you find no fault with that?

Mr. MEYERS. No, sir.

REMARRIAGE OF PARENT

Senator BYRD. Thirty-five cases were closed because of remarriage of the parent.

Mr. Meyers, is there any objection to this reason for closing?

Mr. MEYERS. I think this one we went over before, and again if I remember correctly, the answer was that this is remarriage, and so that you have, in the home, an employable person who is the head of the family, and under District rules this is a ground for ineligibility, and that creates no problem under the Federal rule.

Senator BYRD. Does this reason——

Mr. MEYERS. We would have no question about the closure of the case which is based on resources in the family which were actually available as apparently is the case here.

Senator BYRD. You have no objection to the closing of these cases on this basis?

Mr. MEYERS. No, sir.

Senator BYRD. Seven cases were closed because of the receipt of support or the increase in support from another person outside the home.

Mr. MEYERS. Receipt of support and income, from whatever source, should be taken into account, and this would not create a problem.

CASES RECEIVING BENEFITS UNDER OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE PROGRAM

Senator BYRD. Sixty-seven cases were closed because of the receipt or increase in benefits or pension under the old-age and survivors insurance program.

Mr. MEYERS. Yes, sir. Old-age and survivors insurance benefits which are made available to people, who otherwise need public assistance to supplement that income, are supposed to be taken into account.

Senator BYRD. Eighteen cases were closed because of the receipt or the increase in benefits or pension under other Federal programs.

Mr. MEYERS. I think the answer would be the same. I might check just a minute with Mr. Yourman.

Do you know whether there any special exemptions that might apply to any Federal benefits? I know of none.

Senator BYRD. Yes; Mr. Yourman?

Mr. YOURMAN. I know of none.

Senator BYRD. What is the answer?

Mr. YOURMAN. I know of no exemptions.

Senator BYRD. Now, four cases were closed because of the receipt of or increase in benefits or pension under State or local programs.

Mr. MEYERS. No question.

Senator BYRD. Five cases were closed because of the receipt of or increase in the benefits or pensions under a nongovernmental program.

Mr. MEYERS. I think the answer would be the same there, sir, that the source of the income is not material.

Senator BYRD. Fourteen cases were closed because of other material change in income or resources.

Mr. MEYERS. I really do not know what that one means or what is encompassed in it.

Senator BYRD. I suppose you mean other material changes?

Mr. SHEA. Yes, sir.

Mr. MEYERS. But if we assume that it is simply the existence of income which changed the picture to change the needs pattern, why, this again would raise no question.

Senator BYRD. In 10 cases, there was no material change in the income or resources, but there was a decreased need for medical care, in which no cases were closed and in which there was a decreased need for other requirements.

What does this mean, Mr. Shea?

Mr. SHEA. If the child left the home, would be one example.

A person—a child, for example—could have been committed to an institution either as a delinquent or a retarded child.

It may be in one case for as much as a year or 18 months and, in another case, for an extended period.

I believe this is a good example.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Galvin, can you think of other examples?

Mr. GALVIN. The child could have reached 18 or be over 16 and not attending school, or the child could have died.

The family could have moved to another home with cheaper rent and, therefore, the total resources available could have been more than the basic requirements would be, and they would have been no longer eligible.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, do you find any objections here?

Mr. MEYERS. No; under none of these illustrations do I find any objection to this basis for closing.

Senator BYRD. Thirty-six cases were removed because of the refusal, after acceptance, to comply with eligibility requirements.

Mr. Meyers, would there be any objection on this point?

Mr. MEYERS. I think——

Senator BYRD. Would you like some further clarification?

Mr. MEYERS. Yes; some.

If we assume that this is similar to one that was discussed in the former year, where I think I made the statement that, without talking to what the particular eligibility requirements were, certainly a recipient is required to comply with policies and regulations of the District Department, and if they fail to do so, that would be an adequate ground for cutting them off.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Shea, do you have any comment?

Mr. SHEA. I think this is basically the same situation as we described before.

REMOVAL OF BASIS FOR ELIGIBILITY

Senator BYRD. All right. Sixty-five cases were removed because a recipient was no longer incapacitated.

Mr. Meyers?

Mr. MEYERS. The same answer. If the basis for the eligibility is removed, it is perfectly appropriate to remove them, and they should be removed from the category.

Senator BYRD. Seventy-three cases were removed because the ADC parent returned.

What do you mean by this, Mr. Shea?

Mr. SHEA. The person who had been out of the home returned into the home.

I think this describes or is illustrative again of the man who may have been hospitalized, or in prison, or in another jurisdiction, who returned home or in the same jurisdiction and was encouraged by efforts of the agency to come back into the family constellation.

So, in other words, the man is in the home. He is a resource. He is employable.

And the need of the family no longer exists.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers?

Mr. MEYERS. I have no question about closing this type of case.

Senator BYRD. Six cases were closed because the ADC parent remarried.

Mr. Shea, would you give us a comment?

Mr. SHEA. In this type of situation, a person who has remarried is presumed to have remarried a person who is employable or employed, and, therefore, has a resource continuously and, therefore, would not be eligible for ADC.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, do you have any comment?

Mr. MEYERS. If we assume one thing further, that they are remarried and living together in the same home so that there was no absence, I see no question in this type of case.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Galvin, or Mr. Shea, is this a proper assumption?

Mr. SHEA. Yes.

Mr GALVIN In this category; yes.

Senator BYRD. Eighty-one cases were closed because there was no eligible child in the home.

Mr. Meyers, do you have any comment?

Mr. MEYERS. No eligible child in the home?

Senator BYRD. Yes.

Mr. MEYERS. No. Then there would not be actually a basis for eligibility and they should be closed.

Senator BYRD. Four cases were closed because of admittance to an institution.

Do you care to comment, Mr. Shea, before Mr. Meyers responds?

Mr. SHEA. This is the type of case in which a person could be admitted, for example, to the District training school or an institution for a retarded individual.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, do you have any objection to this?

Mr. MEYERS. No, sir.

LOSS OF RESIDENCE

Senator BYRD. Twenty-seven cases were closed because of the loss of residence.

What is meant here, Mr. Shea?

Mr. SHEA. The person moved out of the jurisdiction and had not established—and had established residence elsewhere than the District of Columbia.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, is there any objection to this reason?

Mr. MEYERS. No, sir.

Senator BYRD. Now, under this broad category, of the recipients no longer meeting eligibility requirements other than need, there were 152 cases closed because of "other reasons."

Can you give us any example of what you mean by "other reasons" here, Mr. Shea?

This is under the broad category, as stated here, "no longer meets eligibility requirement other than need." And in that category we talk about those who refused, after acceptance, to comply with eligibility requirements, about those who are no longer incapacitated, about the ADC parent's return, about the ADC parent having remarried, and about the eligible child's no longer being in the home.

Mr. SHEA. The reasons for closing are listed or have been listed here in this—is this the same type of situation we had before in the previous year?

Senator BYRD. There is another "other."

Mr. SHEA. Another "other"?

Senator BYRD. You might like to look at this. It is almost at the bottom.

Mr. SHEA. These reasons that Mr. Lajewski gave me, to answer this question in part, but not in totality, first is a continued absence not established, mother employable, voluntary withdrawal, loss of contact, and cannot be located.

There are still others that still have to be identified and this is what we are trying to do back at the agency now.

So I think we will probably be able to clarify this at the next session because we will have looked into the cases and we can find what the "other" means.

Senator BYRD. All right.

On the basis of the explanation thus far, Mr. Meyers, would you have any objection to the closing of these cases?

Mr. MEYERS. No sir. On the basis of those illustrations I think they all fall within the categories and within the explanation that we previously discussed when we went down the list.

Senator BYRD. Now, Mr. Scholz, did you have something further?

Mr. SCHOLZ. I just remembered that the largest number of cases that were under the "other" ones was where the caretaker relative is no longer available.

In other words, where the mother is the payee and the mother deserts the child or is hospitalized or is declared mentally incompetent and, therefore, we can no longer make a payment to her, and there is no other relative payable.

Senator BYRD. What do you do about the children in those cases?

Mr. SCHOLZ. We would have to put them on GPA until we find a person who is willing to take care of them.

Senator BYRD. What about their——

Mr. SHEA. Or institutionalize the children.

Senator BYRD. What about that, Mr. Galvin?

Mr. GALVIN. That is right.

Mr. SHEA. Or a foster home.

Senator BYRD. It has not been made clear to me, Mr. Meyers.

Has it been made clear to you, the reason injected by Mr. Scholz?

Mr. MEYERS. I think I understand it, sir, because presumably the District operates under the same rules as the Federal category in terms of what we will pay for.

In other words, before financial participation is available, with respect to an aid to dependent children case, you have to find that the child is living with certain enumerated relatives and so if there is no relative with whom that child can be living, the case would not be eligible for payment under the Federal category.

Senator BYRD. So you would find no fault with this reason for closing?

Mr. MEYERS. No, sir.

Senator BYRD. Well, that gets us through this category.

We still have the one category remaining in the fiscal year 1961 denominated "other."

And 196 cases were closed for "other reasons" not explained here.

So this will be in need of further explanation, as was the same category in the previous table.

Mr. SHEA. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. Do you think you might be able to give us these this afternoon, Mr. Shea?

Mr. SHEA. We are working on it now, sir.

Senator BYRD. Fine. Now, Mr. Lajewski, do you have a comparable table for 1962?

Mr. LAJEWSKI. Yes, sir, I do.

Senator BYRD. Let me have that.

Mr. LAJEWSKI. Surely.

ADC CASES CLOSED IN 1962

Senator BYRD. In fiscal year 1962, under the ADC category, a total of 2,265 cases were closed.

Forty-one, or many of these, Mr. Meyers, are going to be under the same categories.

I think possibly we can speed it up a little here, but I think we ought to go through them all.

Forty-one were closed because of transfer to other aid.

Is there any objection?

Mr. MEYERS. Same answer.

Senator BYRD. And what is the same answer?

Mr. MEYERS. The same answer is that there is no objection.

Senator BYRD. For the record, I think you will have to say that.

Mr. MEYERS. All right, sir.

Senator BYRD. 174 cases were closed because of a material change in the income or resources.

This is specifically because of employment or increased earnings of the ADC father in the home.

Mr. MEYERS. No question on closing on this basis.

Senator BYRD. 362 were closed for the same reason, but, in this instance, the ADC mother is involved.

Mr. MEYERS. No question for closing on that basis.

Senator BYRD. Five cases were closed for the same reason but the ADC child was involved.

Mr. MEYERS. No question on that type of closing.

Senator BYRD. Six cases were closed because of the same reason, another person being involved.

Mr. MEYERS. No question.

Senator BYRD. 168 cases were closed because of the absent parent's return.

Mr. MEYERS. No question on that on the same basis of the previous answer, that we assume the person is in the home, living in the home, and, therefore, the absence is not established.

Senator BYRD. And he is employable or employed?

Mr. MEYERS. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. Forty-four cases were closed because of the remarriage of the parent.

Mr. MEYERS. On the same basis, no question about that one.

We assume again that the two are living together in a home and so there is no absent parent.

Senator BYRD. Forty-seven cases were closed because of the receipt of or the increase in support from the absent ADC father.

Mr. MEYERS. No question.

Senator BYRD. Ten, because of the receipt of or increase in support from another person outside the home.

Mr. MEYERS. No question.

Senator BYRD. 111 cases were closed because of receipt of or increase in benefits or pensions under the OASDI program.

Mr. MEYERS. No question.

Senator BYRD. Twenty-three because of the receipt of or increase in benefits or pensions under other Federal programs.

Mr. MEYERS. No question.

Senator BYRD. Four cases because of the receipt of or increase in benefits or pensions under State or local programs.

Mr. MEYERS. No question.

Senator BYRD. Seven, for the same under governmental programs.

Mr. MEYERS. No question.

Senator BYRD. Twenty-seven were closed because of other material changes, income or resources.

Mr. MEYERS. No question.

We assume here that their income or resources have been discovered and as ascertained, that you could not establish the continuing need of the family. No question.

Senator BYRD. One case was closed because of the decreased need for medical care.

CASE CLOSED BY DECREASED NEED IN MEDICAL CARE

What is meant here by this, Mr. Shea, "decreased need for medical care?"

Mr. SHEA. May I ask Mr. Scholz that, please?

Senator BYRD. Yes. Mr. Scholz?

Mr. SCHOLZ. The only assumption I could make, sir, is that there might have been some item going into the home for a specific medical need which was terminated and, therefore, that specific incidental item is referred to in the budget as being no longer necessary, maybe.

In other words, the illness or whatever the disease was, was terminated and the person no longer needed this special device or this special medicine or whatever it might have been.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Lajewski, do you have anything on this point?

Mr. LAJEWSKI. I would not be able to elaborate on what Mr. Shea said.

Senator BYRD. Would you be able to comment on this, Mr. Meyers?

Mr. MEYERS. I think so.

If we assume that the case was eligible, that the medical need was brought about or what was brought about the eligibility and that medical need was removed or reduced so that the need would not be there, I see no question about this type of a case at all, sir.

DECREASED NEED FOR "OTHER REQUIREMENTS"

Senator BYRD. And four cases were removed because of a decreased need for other requirements, "other requirements" being what, Mr. Galvin?

Mr. GALVIN. It could be housekeeper services that the mother was temporarily ill and needed homemaker services.

This could be that.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Shea, anything further?

Mr. SHEA. That is it.

Senator BYRD. The reason again is that there was a decreased need for "other requirements."

Four cases were closed here.

Mr. Meyers?

Mr. MEYERS. I see no question about this type of case closing, sir.

Senator BYRD. Sixteen were closed because of other reasons under this category, the category being "No material change in income or resources."

Mr. SHEA. Mr. Lajewski, on that second page, sir, may have answered that question under ADC only.

Again, it is the same reason I gave you before, continued absence not established.

Maybe I had better ask Mr. Lajewski if he has anything further on that.

Senator BYRD. All right. It is on page 1.

Mr. LAJEWSKI. Yes, I have page 1.

This I could not answer, sir. We would have to clarify this particular category also.

CASES CLOSED FOR OTHER REASONS

Senator BYRD. Sixteen other cases were closed for other reasons.

A moment ago, I think when we were discussing the fiscal year 1961, you were able to explain this category because Mr. Meyers indicated no disapproval of the closing of five cases under "Other."

Mr. Meyers, can you answer this?

Mr. MEYERS. I believe that—at least, as far as I can tell, sir, we still are in the position of having "Other" not really clarified sufficiently to base an answer on it.

Senator BYRD. All right.

Mr. LAJEWSKI. Mr. Chairman, may I add to this?

These are individuals who have been found to be no longer in need so that they would be ineligible because they are no longer in need.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers.

Mr. MEYERS. The absence of need is always an appropriate basis for closing a case, Mr. Chairman.

Senator BYRD. All right.

Eighty-two were closed because of the recipients' refusal, after acceptance, to comply with eligibility requirements.

Mr. Meyers?

Mr. MEYERS. No question about a condition which requires a recipient to comply with eligible conditions specified under the State plan.

Senator BYRD. 105 were closed because the recipient was no longer incapacitated.

I assume this is the parent, of course.

Mr. SHEA. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. No longer incapacitated.

Mr. MEYERS. There are no questions about closings on this basis.

Senator BYRD. Ninety-nine were closed because the ADC parent returned.

Mr. MEYERS. Again, if these are cases where we find the parent in the home, actually in the home so that there is no absence, no question is raised by this type of closing.

Senator BYRD. Nine cases were closed because the ADC parent remarried.

Mr. MEYERS. Again, I think we should qualify this, as we have the other cases, that we assume that both parents are living in the home so that absence is not established.

In such a case there would be no question.

Senator BYRD. Is this a correct assumption?

Mr. SHEA. Yes, sir. Employability or unemployability is the factor in the District of Columbia, but again this is the reason for closing.

Senator BYRD. Ninety-seven were closed because there were no eligible children in the home.

Mr. MEYERS. No question.

RESIDENCE REQUIREMENT

Senator BYRD. One was closed because of loss of residence.

Again, Mr. Shea, what is the explanation?

Mr. SHEA. No longer meeting the residence requirements of the District of Columbia and moved out of the District into this jurisdiction, moved to another jurisdiction.

Senator BYRD. And having established residence there.

Is that correct?

Mr. SHEA. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, do you have any comment on this point?

Mr. MEYERS. This presents no question, sir.

Senator BYRD. Twenty-nine were closed because of—no, actually, 1 was closed because of admittance to an institution and 29 were closed because of a loss of residence.

We have already covered "loss of residence."

One was closed because of admittance to an institution.

Mr. MEYERS. No question.

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS OTHER THAN NEED

Senator BYRD. Three were closed because of a change in State law or agency policy, relating to eligibility requirements other than need.

What is meant here, Mr. Shea?

Mr. SHEA. I think this could refer or does refer to the change in policy under the unemployment compensation law, which would enable the person to realize from that source adequate income to render them ineligible for public assistance.

Mr. MEYERS. If these closings were on the basis of the existence of income, which reduced the need or eliminated the need, there would be no question.

Senator BYRD. Is that it?

Mr. SHEA. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. Does the closing in each instance here meet that qualification, Mr. Shea?

Mr. SHEA. Yes.

CASES CLOSED IN "OTHER REASONS"

Senator BYRD. And 489 were closed because of "Other reasons" in this category, the category being that eligibility requirements, other than need, were no longer met.

Mr. SHEA. The reasons given here, as were given before, were the continued absence not established, the mother employable, voluntary withdrawal, loss of contact, or cannot be located.

This accounts for the vast majority of that number of 489.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, can you comment on this?

Mr. MEYERS. All of these reasons, when established, form an appropriate basis for closing a case.

Senator BYRD. However, there were 33 in this category which were closed for other reasons, Mr. Shea.

Now, we want to clarify this.

Mr. SHEA. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. And 301 cases overall were closed for other reasons.

What are the "other reasons"?

Mr. GALVIN. Sir, if I may interrupt, the 301 and the 489 are both included in the ones outlined by Mr. Shea.

They are both marked with an asterisk and and these, for ADC only, come to a total of 790.

These have been explained and also agreed to by Mr. Meyers, and the only thing that is left over is that in the 790 there are 33 that are still to be explained.

Senator BYRD. I see. Then, for the record, of the 790 cases closed for "other reasons" these reasons are as set forth at the bottom of page 2, namely, they are continued absence not established, mother was employable, there was a voluntary withdrawal, there was loss of contact, and there was an inability to locate.

Mr. SHEA. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. That explains all——

Mr. SHEA. But the 33.

Senator BYRD (continuing). But the 33? And we will have to have an explanation of those 33.

Mr. SHEA. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. As far as the 757 are concerned, I suppose, Mr. Meyers, you would have no objection?

Mr. MEYERS. No, sir. As I stated before, I think that when you establish these facts on these bases no question is presented.

Senator BYRD. All right. With the exception of this category or of the category that has been denominated "Other" we have covered all categories for closing of an aid-to-dependent-children case in fiscal year 1960, fiscal year 1961, and fiscal year 1962—the past 3 years.

POSSIBLE VIOLATIONS OF FEDERAL STATUTE

Thus far, Mr. Meyers, have we found any instance in which the District of Columbia has acted in violation of a Federal statute in removing cases from the aid-to-dependent-children category?

Mr. MEYERS. I do not think I am able to state that quite categorically, Mr. Chairman.

If I may, I think I should make a little explanation or preliminary statement.

I personally, of course, am not in a position to know what the facts are in a particular case and whether the evidence is there to support the finding or anything of the sort.

Nor am I in a position to make an adjudication in a particular case as to whether it is or it is not eligible.

I can speak as an official of the Department who is familiar with our rules as to what type of situation as a basis for a closing would be appropriate or not. And on the basis of the explanations, as we have gone down these lists, and as qualified and based on the understandings that we have, I would say that nothing that we have talked about this morning, in terms of a requirement or a basis for closing, would raise a question under the Federal act.

Senator BYRD. You would have to make the same statement with the same reservations even though we were talking about any State, would you not?

Mr. MEYERS. That is correct, sir.

Senator BYRD. Unless you were personally in on the case, in other words, and knew all the facts, you naturally could not make a categorical reply to that question?

Mr. MEYERS. That is correct.

Senator BYRD. But on the basis of the reasons enumerated, whether it be the District of Columbia or any other State, the regulations of that State being what the regulations are in the District of Columbia, you find no instance, as explained here, in which the District of Columbia has acted in contravention of Federal statute?

Mr. MEYERS. None of the reasons that we have discussed this morning would be in conflict with any Federal requirement.

Senator BYRD. Speaking of the Federal statute as amended.

Mr. MEYERS. That is right, sir.

Senator BYRD. All right.

Mr. Shea, in the afternoon then, let's try to have an explanation of these "other" cases.

Mr. SHEA. Yes, sir.

NEED FOR CLARIFYING REGULATIONS

Senator BYRD. And I suppose the only question that need be asked at this point would be this: Do you feel, Mr. Shea—and I asked the question earlier—do you feel that the regulations are entirely clear so as to assure the Department, in the application of the regulations, that they are not in conflict with the governing Federal statute, as amended?

Mr. SHEA. The regulations today, sir, I do not believe are in conflict with the Federal statute but, as I indicated before, I feel that all of the regulations, as exemplified in our Public Assistance Manual need to be clarified to some extent.

To a greater extent, I cannot say, but this is my opinion.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, do you feel that the District of Columbia regulations, governing the eligibility of recipients and governing the removal of recipients from public assistance, need further clarification?

CLARIFICATION NEEDED

Mr. MEYERS. On the basis of my quick look at those regulations and those handbook provisions, Mr. Chairman, I would say that they do need clarification so that we can be certain that they state, as the witnesses have testified, what their intention is, because some of them are sufficiently ambiguous as to lead you to another conclusion.

Now, I would say that just from my quick look that they do need clarification.

Senator BYRD. You are saying that, if the regulations are eminently clear, so as to provide assurance that removals from public assistance will fall into the categories that have been explained, the District will not be acting in contravention of the Federal statute, as amended?

Mr. MEYERS. I would say that if they were clarified, so that we both were satisfied, that none of the bases for eligibility or removal would be the conditions of the home, and the fact of the conduct of the parents, and in applications it was carried out this way, there would be no problem.

Senator BYRD. You saw no instance thus far, in our recapitulation of the reasons for closing, in which the conduct of the parents or the unsuitability of the home were the reasons for closing?

Mr. MEYERS. None of the reasons that we have gone over this morning, as expliained and clarified, in my opinion, fell within that category.

Senator BYRD. All right.

"OTHER" CATEGORY

Mr. Shea, this afternoon let's have an explanation of the category "other" and following that, I would suggest that your Department, working with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, go over the regulations which are ambiguous, the regulations in question at this point, and that you effect a clarification of those regulations so as to assure Congress, and so as to assure the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, that you will not be acting in conflict with the governing Federal statute.

Understand that the subcommittee is appropriating, or preparing to appropriate, the money on the basis of the regulations, as they are understood to be and as they have been explained.

We are not expecting to appropriate money on the basis of changed regulations unless the current regulations are found to be in violation of the Federal statute.

If the regulations are in violation of the Federal statute, and if you have been enforcing them in violation of the Federal statute, thus we have had no indication that you have been enforcing them in violation of the Federal statute—but if, in your categorization of cases in these groups, we find that you have violated the Federal statute this would naturally mean that there would have to be some revision in your estimates of needs for the forthcoming year.

Consequently, that regulation would have to be changed because it is obvious that we cannot fly in the face of the Federal statutes.

But if we find no conflict with the governing Federal statute, as amended, we are going to make our appropriations on the basis of the budget estimate that you presented here.

CLARIFICATION OF REGULATIONS EXPECTED

In summation, I am saying this, that we expect the regulations to be clarified. If they are not in violation of the Federal statute at this point we are not expecting you to change the regulations so as to liberalize or so as to make more conservative the program.

We are only expecting that the regulations be rewritten so as to make them eminently clear to those people who have to enforce them.

Now, do we have any misunderstanding at this point?

Mr. SHEA. No, sir.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, have I, in your judgment and to your satisfaction, appropriately stated the situation where we find ourselves at this moment?

Mr. MEYERS. I think so, sir.

We, in the Department, look forward to working with the District people in trying to help them in a revision of the controlling policies which will satisfy both of us that we are meeting our legal responsibilities.

Senator BYRD. Yes. It is not the desire or objective of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to dictate to the District of Columbia or to any other jurisdiction in this country as to whether or not its program should be liberalized or made more conservative——

Mr. MEYERS. That is correct, sir.

Senator BYRD (continuing). As long as the regulations, governing the eligibility of the recipients, are not in conflict with the governing Federal statute as amended?

Mr. MEYERS. That is correct, sir.

ANTICIPATED CLARIFICATION DATE

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, there is a further question:

What would be a reasonable time in which we could expect to have this clarification effectuated, keeping in mind that it is not my intention to mark up this bill until the regulations are clarified?

Mr. MEYERS. Is this question addressed to me, Senator?

* * * * *

[Afternoon session, 2:30 p.m., Friday, September 7, 1962]

"OTHER" CATEGORY

Senator BYRD. The subcommittee will resume its hearing.

Mr. Shea, do you have now the information that we were wanting earlier, with reference to the category enumerated as "Other"?

Mr. SHEA. Yes, sir. Since the recess of the session, Mr. Lajewski has additional information.

Senator BYRD. All right, Mr. Lajewski.

Mr. LAJEWSKI. Mr. Chairman, in 19 of these 33 instances the case was closed because the children were committed to the Department of Public Welfare for care. A referral had been made to child welfare, and it was found that conditions were such that a commitment by the juvenile court was requested, and the children were committed to the Department of Welfare. These were the cases which were originally ineligible.

Senator BYRD. Pardon me, now. Let's talk about those you have just named.

Mr. LAJEWSKI. All right.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, would there be any objection that could be made to the closing of these cases?

Mr. MEYERS. No, sir.

Mr. LAJEWSKI. In seven instances it was found that the families were originally ineligible, and continue to be ineligible for ADC.

Senator BYRD. So they never were eligible, at any time?

Mr. LAJEWSKI. That is right, sir.

Senator BYRD. There obviously would be no objection here.

Mr. MEYERS. No. I don't know what the grounds for the ineligibility would be, but assuming the appropriate grounds, no question would be raised about that either, Mr. Chairman.

Senator BYRD. All right.

Mr. LAJEWSKI. In two cases the mother died. We don't know just what happened to the children in this particular instance, with the mother deceased.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, do you have any response to that?

Mr. MEYERS. We assume that in that case there was no remaining relative with whom the child could live and qualify. This would raise no question under the Federal requirements.

Senator BYRD. Is that in accord with your position, Mr. Shea?

Mr. SHEA. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Lajewski.

ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSING

Mr. LAJEWSKI. In two instances, the closing of the case was related to an administrative procedure. That is, there were four cases which could have been consolidated into two. So this was sort of an administrative closing. This was to make more efficient the administration of the public assistance program.

Senator BYRD. Is this clear to you, Mr. Meyers?

Mr. MEYERS. Not too clear.

Mr. LAJEWSKI. Well, take, for instance, we find a situation in which a mother receives a grant for her children, and a grandmother in the same home also receives assistance for minor children of her own. Thus, instead of having this as two ADC cases, we combine these into one case.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers.

Mr. MEYERS. I understand. In other words, you consider this as a single group, and meet the needs of the whole group as one case.

Mr. LAJEWSKI. That is right.

Mr. MEYERS. There seems to be no difficulty with that one, Mr. Chairman.

Senator BYRD. Thank you.

Mr. Lajewski?

Mr. LAJEWSKI. In one case, there was the incarceration of the mother, and the children were committed to the Department of Welfare. Now, this case could have been included in that first group, but I learned the specifics of this particular case. The mother was incarcerated. Her sentence was for 2 years. And, in this instance, the children had been referred to the Child Welfare Division for care.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers.

Mr. MEYERS. Perfectly appropriate.

Mr. LAJEWSKI. In another instance, the case was closed because of temporary hospitalization of the mother at District of Columbia General Hospital for mental observation.

The case was closed.

In this particular instance, the two children were taken by a grandmother, another child was taken by a father.

The father subsequently died, and the grandmother took responsibility for all three children, and this grandmother has an active application for ADC at the present time.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers.

Mr. MEYERS. It seems to be all right under those circumstances.

Mr. LAJEWSKI. In the last instance, the case was found ineligible because the recipient had not declared resources which were available to her.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers.

Mr. MEYERS. On the question of resources which are available and which have not been disclosed, we have no question that that is grounds for ineligibility.

CASES NOT IN VIOLATION OF FEDERAL REQUIREMENT

Senator BYRD. Mr. Lajewski, do you think this fairly well covers all reasons for which the cases were closed under this grouping?

Mr. LAJEWSKI. I do, sir.

Senator BYRD. Do you think there might still be two or three, or a half dozen which you have not elaborated upon at this time?

Mr. LAJEWSKI. There might be one, two, or three, sir. I could not say at this time. But they would not be significant.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, this narrows it down to a remainder of cases amounting to almost nil. I believe that your statement of this morning is probably still a valid one, with reference to these additional reasons that have been expressed here today. However, I would like for you to have the opportunity to comment as to whether or not this is true.

Mr. MEYERS. It would be my view that closing of cases for any of the reasons just discussed, in the "other" group would not in any way violate any Federal requirement.

Going one step further, as to the remaining, I don't know how many there are, but as you say, a handful—certainly even if we would assume, for discussion purposes, that those other cases, three or four out of these thousands, were cases that may have been improperly closed, this, in and of itself, would not be a sufficient ground for withholding Federal funds, because it would not have been significant enough or substantial enough to have raised a problem of conformity with Federal requirements.

Senator BYRD. I suppose that in any State—there might be a case occasionally which might fall into such a category.

Mr. MEYERS. That is right.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to in-

clude at this point in the RECORD a copy of a report by Raymond F. Clapp, showing the population change anticipated in the District of Columbia and Metropolitan Washington during the decade 1960–70.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POPULATION CHANGE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND IN METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON, 1960–70

(By Raymond F. Clapp)

[For simplification of presentation, population numbers have been rounded, usually to the nearest thousands, and percentages usually to the nearest unit. Consequently, the tables, both internally and between tables, contain slight inconsistencies]

Publication of 1960 census data combined with appropriate counts of births and deaths have made it possible to project to 1970 the population of the District of Columbia and the Washington metropolitan area separately by sex, color, and broad age groups. This has been done by calculating the components of population change in the District of Columbia and Metropolitan Washington for the intercensal decade 1950–60, and comparing these with like calculations for the decades 1940–50 and 1930–40, to indicate trends in births, deaths, and migration. These trends have then been projected to 1970.

Metropolitan Washington in this report consists of the U.S. census standard metropolitan statistical area, or SMSA. It includes the District of Columbia; Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties in Maryland; Arlington and Fairfax Counties, and Alexandria and Falls Church cities in Virginia. The projections indicate the following changes in population composition. The net growth of the SMSA was 498,000 in the 1940's and 529,000 in the 1950's (table 1). This growth is projected at 575,000 for the 1960's.

TABLE 1.—*Total population* [1]

	1940		1950		1960		1970 [2]	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Standard metropolitan statistical area	975,000	100.0	1,473,000	100.0	2,002,000	100.0	2,577,000	100.0
District of Columbia	688,000	68.5	808,000	54.6	764,000	38.2	818,000	31.7
Suburbs	307,000	31.5	665,000	45.4	1,238,000	61.8	1,759,000	68.3

[1] All census data for 1930, 1940, and 1950 have been corrected for underenumeration of children under age 5. Therefore they are slightly higher than the officially published census figures.

[2] Projection 1, discussed later.

The District lost 44,000 population in the 1950's. It is projected to gain about 54,000, or about 7 percent, in the 1960's. This increase must be accommodated by one or more of the following conditions:

1. New residential construction in excess of that lost by conversion to nonresidential use, such as highways and commercial.
2. Construction of increased residential capacity, such as replacing row houses with apartment houses, and conversion of empty or nonresidential land to residential land.
3. Increased occupancy of existing units.

The suburbs are expected to increase over 40 percent in the coming decade. Table 1 shows that by 1970 the population balance between District and suburbs is expected to be reversed from 1940—from 68 percent of the standard metropolitan statistical area in the District of Columbia in 1940, to 68 percent in the suburbs in 1970.

COMPONENTS OF POPULATION CHANGE

The components of population change are shown in table 2.

In the 1950's there was a dramatic decline of migration as a source of growth, in contrast to natural increase, and this is expected to continue in the 1960's. Natural increase represented 37 percent of the standard metropolitan statistical area population growth in 1940's, and 61 percent in the 1950's. It is projected to 74 percent in the 1960's. To an increasing extent, the youth coming into our labor force, and creating new families, will have grown up in the Washington area, with the advantages and disadvantages that they find here.

TABLE 2.—*Components of population change*

	Total net growth	Net migration (inmigration minus outmigration)	Natural increase (births minus deaths)	
			Number	Percent of total net growth
Standard metropolitan statistical area:				
1940–50	499,000	316,000	183,000	37
1950–60	529,000	205,000	324,000	61
1960–70	575,000	147,000	428,000	74
District of Columbia:				
1940–50	141,000	51,000	90,000	64
1950–60	−44,000	−157,000	113,000	(2)
1960–70 [1]	54,000	−79,000	133,000	(2)
Suburbs:				
1940–50	358,000	265,000	93,000	26
1950–60	573,000	362,000	211,000	37
1960–70 [1]	521,000	227,000	294,000	56

[1] Based on projection 1, discussed later.

[2] Not calculated because total net growth is an algebraic sum of the loss due to net outmigration and a gain due to natural increase.

COLOR

The distribution of the population by color is summarized in tables 3A and 3B. Additional detail is shown in tables 4A and 4B. As far back as 1920, nonwhites constituted about one-fourth of the total population of the standard metropolitan statistical area, and this proportion has remained virtually unchanged since then. The figure projected for 1970 is about 27 percent.

There has, however, been a great increase in proportion of nonwhites in the District of Columbia, and a substantial decrease in the suburbs. Table 3A shows two projections to 1970, based on alternative assumptions about migration within the standard metropolitan statistical area. These assumptions are discussed below. The first projection, 64 percent nonwhite in the District of Columbia and 10 percent in the suburbs, is based on a decreased rate of white migration and an increased volume of nonwhite migration from the District of Columbia to the suburbs than has occurred in the past decade. The second projection, 72 percent nonwhite in the District of Columbia and 6 percent in the suburbs is based on the continuation of current trends.

TABLE 3A.—*Proportional distribution of whites and nonwhites in the standard metropolitan statistical area, District of Columbia, and suburbs, 1940–60, with 2 projections to 1970*

[In percent]

	Total	White	Nonwhite
Standard metropolitan statistical area:			
1940	100	75.9	24.1
1950	100	76.5	23.5
1960	100	75.7	24.3
1970: [1]			
1	100	72.8	27.2
2	100	72.8	27.2
District of Columbia:			
1940	100	71.2	28.8
1950	100	64.4	35.6
1960	100	45.2	54.8
1970: [1]			
1	100-	36.4	63.6
2	100	28.3	71.7
Suburbs:			
1940	100	82.0	18.0
1950	100	91.4	8.6
1960	100	93.5	6.5
1970: [1]			
1	100	89.8	10.2
2	100	93.9	6.1

[1] Bases of projections 1 and 2 are explained in test section on migration and projections.

TABLE 3B.—*Population in 1950 and 1960 as a percentage of the preceding decade, by color and area, with 2 projections to 1970*

[All figures are in percent]

	1950 / 1940	1960 / 1950	Project 1	1970 / 1960 Project 2
Standard metropolitan statistical area:				
Total	151	136	129	129
White	152	133	125	125
Nonwhite	147	145	140	140
District of Columbia:				
Total	121	95	107	109
White	109	66	86	68
Nonwhite	150	145	124	142
Suburbs:				
Total	217	186	142	141
White	230	290	136	142
Nonwhite	135	138	222	131

The data may be seen in a slightly different way in table 3B. During the 1950's, in the District the white population decreased about 34 percent, while the nonwhite increased about 45 percent. In the suburbs whites increased nearly threefold, while nonwhites increased about 38 percent. The last two columns show the currently expected changes during the 1960's based on the two projections. A comparison of tables 3A and 3B indicates that the decreased proportion of nonwhites in the suburbs is due primarily to the large inmigration of whites, for the actual number of nonwhites in the suburbs is also increasing.

AGE

From table 3B we see that the District's total population is expected to increase between 7 and 9 percent. However, from table 4A we may calculate that its aged, those 65 years and over, and its youngsters, those under 15 years, will increase about 12 percent while those in the productive groups, 30 to 64 years, are expected to decrease between 7 and 11 percent. As a result, the proportion of the young and the old in the population may go up from about 34 percent in 1960 to about 40 percent in 1970, while those in the most productive years may decline from about 44 percent of the total population in 1960 to about 37 percent in 1970.

The implications are clear. The young and the old in general are the most dependent on family and community for essential services. School, recreation, and welfare services are bound to increase. At the same time, these will rest on a proportionally smaller base of productive workers. The quality of community life can only improve if the income and economic status of these adult productive age groups is improved.

Table 3B indicates that the suburban population may be expected to increase greatly, about 40 percent. However, from table 4B we may calculate that the age shifts will be much less dramatic than in the District. The young and old may increase about 40 percent while the most productive range, 30 to 64 years, may increase about 30 percent. Thus, the proportion that each group is of the total population will not be markedly different from what it is today. While the continued population increase will also require continued great expansion of community services, the income and productive base upon which these services must rest can be expected to increase correspondingly without requiring the serious acceleration that seems necessary in the District.

TABLE 4A.—*District of Columbia population by color and age groups, 1960 and projected to 1970 on alternative migration assumptions*

Age	White						Nonwhite					
	1960 census [1]		1970 [2]				1960 census [1]		1970 [2]			
			Project 1		Project 2				Project 1		Project 2	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	345,000	100	298,000	100	235,000	100	419,000	100	520,000	100	594,000	100
14 and under	53,000	15	46,000	15	34,000	14	140,000	33	180,000	34	219,000	36
15 to 29	77,000	22	70,000	24	54,000	23	88,000	21	123,000	24	138,000	23
30 to 44	65,000	19	51,000	17	34,000	15	96,000	23	94,000	18	105,000	18
45 to 64	102,000	30	75,000	25	64,000	27	74,000	18	92,000	18	98,000	16
65 and over	49,000	14	56,000	19	49,000	21	20,000	5	31,000	6	34,000	7

[1] As enumerated, unadjusted for completeness.

[2] Projections 1 and 2 explained in section on migration and projections.

TABLE 4B.—*Washington suburban population by color and age groups, 1960 and projected to 1970 on alternative migration assumptions*

Age	White						Nonwhite					
	1960 census [1]		1970 [2]				1960 census [1]		1970 [2]			
			Project 1		Project 2				Project 1		Project 2	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	1,157,000	100	1,579,000	100	1,642,000	100	81,000	100	180,000	100	106,000	100
14 and under	396,000	34	517,000	33	530,000	32	30,000	37	77,000	43	38,000	36
15 to 29	230,000	20	375,000	24	389,000	24	18,000	22	40,000	22	27,000	25
30 to 44	286,000	25	283,000	18	300,000	18	17,000	21	30,000	17	19,000	18
45 to 64	193,000	17	319,000	20	330,000	20	13,000	16	25,000	14	17,000	16
65 and over	52,000	4	85,000	5	93,000	6	3,000	4	8,000	4	5,000	5

[1] As enumerated, unadjusted for completeness.

[2] Projections 1 and 2 explained in section on migration and projections.

MIGRATION AND THE TWO PROJECTIONS

Migration data are summarized in tables 2 and 5. Net migration figures by age, sex, and color for each decade since 1900 for the District of Columbia and since 1930 for the metropolitan area have been calculated and studied. There has been a consistent concentration of net inmigrants into the metropolitan area by the young adult ages, particularly in those aged 10–20 at the first of the decade, and 20–30 at its close. For the total population there has been a net migration into the metropolitan area. In the 1940's the net inmigration was about three-fourths white, declining to about 71 percent in the 1950's. It is projected at about 61 percent in the 1960's. The total net inmigration declined from an estimated 316,000 in the 1940's to about 205,000 in the 1950's. The decline has occurred among both whites and nonwhites and among both males and females.

Projections in general depend on assumptions about both natural increase and migration, for whites and nonwhites separately. For the standard metropolitan statistical area as a whole, a single projection has been made—i.e., a single projection of net increase and net migration, for whites and nonwhites separately. This projection is based on the following assumptions (a) a decrease in net migration into the standard metropolitan statistical area; and (b) no change in present fertility rates. These assumptions are considered moderate. Consequently, the projections presented for the standard metropolitan statistical area as a whole are neither very high nor very low.

Within the standard metropolitan statistical area two projections have been developed for the District of Columbia. Since the suburban projections are merely subtractions of the District of Columbia from the standard metropolitan statistical area, this has produced two projections for the suburbs. These projections relate to the probable trends in migration. It was felt necessary to prepare alternate projections for the District of Columbia because of its special nature as the central city, and its historic role as the main recipient of the nonwhite migration to the standard metropolitan statistical area.

TABLE 5.—*Net migration in District of Columbia, suburbs, and standard metropolitan statistical area for the years 1940–70, by color*

	1940–50	1950–60	1960–70			1940–50	1950–60	1960–70	
			Projection 1	Projection 2				Projection 1	Projection 2
White:					Nonwhite:				
District of Columbia	−12,000	−209,000	−67,000	−121,000	District of Columbia	63,000	52,000	−12,000	53,000
Suburbs	256,000	355,000	158,000	212,000	Suburbs	9,000	7,000	69,000	4,000
Standard metropolitan statistical area	244,000	146,000	91,000	91,000	Standard metropolitan statistical area	72,000	59,000	57,000	57,000

For whites the two projections assume the same natural increase; similarly for nonwhites. The two projections are based on different assumptions about migration into and out of the District of Columbia, for whites and nonwhites, separately.

Whites: The District of Columbia white net outmigration rose from about 12,000 in the forties to about 209,000 in the fifties.

Assumption A: This high net outmigration will continue in the sixties.

Assumption B: The net outmigration from the District of Columbia will be between the figures for the forties and the fifties.

Nonwhites: There was a moderate net migration into the District of Columbia both in the forties and the fifties, decreasing somewhat in the later decade.

TABLE 6.—*Alternate population projections for the District of Columbia*

Nonwhites	Whites	
	Assumption A (235,000)	Assumption B (298,000)
Assumption C (594,000)	928,000	892,000
Assumption D (520,000)	755,000	818,000

Assumption C: This moderate trend will continue.

Assumption D: A balanced migration for the District of Columbia; i.e., the migration of nonwhites out of the District of Columbia will be approximately, although not exactly, equal to their inmigration.

As shown in table 6, these alternative assumptions produce four possible projections of total population for the District of Columbia, ranging from 755,000 to 892,000. In order to accommodate the extreme high projection, an enormous and most unlikely increase in the housing inventory would be necessary. In order to drop to the extreme low projection, a relatively massive and unlikely migration of nonwhites into the suburbs would be necessary coupled with a simultaneous high outmigration of whites. The confluence of these events seems most unlikely. For these reasons the extreme high and low projections are not considered in this report—although, of course, all things are possible. This report accepts the more reasonable projection range of about 818,000–829,000 population, which can be attained by either one of the two possible assumptions, combinations AC or BD.

Projection 1: White moderate net migration out of the District of Columbia, and nonwhite balanced migration for the District of Columbia; i.e., assumption combination BD.

Projection 2: White high net migration out of the District of Columbia, and nonwhite net moderate migration into the District of Columbia; i.e., assumption combination AC.

The outmigration of whites has been very heavy in the past decade. Furthermore, urban renewal will be an accelerating program in the coming decade. Therefore, it is reasonable to conjecture that the pace of white outmigration may slacken in the sixties. Also, the increasing pressure of the growing middle class nonwhite population to find better homes, together with the increasing concentration of community efforts in the same direction, makes it reasonable to conjecture that there may be a moderate flow of nonwhites into the suburbs in the sixties. These conjectures produce projection 1, in which, as table 3A indicated, nonwhites will make up about 64 percent of the District of Columbia population and about 10 percent of the suburban population in 1970.

Projection 2 is equivalent to a continuation of present trends, as shown in table 3A. This will produce population in the District of Columbia about 72 percent nonwhite, even though, as shown in table 5, the actual net inmigration of nonwhites will be fairly small. The heavy preponderance of nonwhites will result from the high net outmigration of whites and the differential birth rates of whites and nonwhites. Fertility rates of nonwhites are somewhat, although not markedly, higher than those of whites. However, the different birth rates of whites and nonwhites in the District of Columbia are due primarily to the increasing number of nonwhite adults in the childbearing ages, and the relative shift of whites to the older nonchildbearing ages and to nonfamily types (single persons, widows, etc.).

Population 1950 projected to 1970, District of Columbia

ALL CLASSES

[Projection 1. Whites median outmigration; nonwhites balanced migration]

Age, 1960	Age, 1970	Population, Apr. 1, 1960	Births, 1960-70	Deaths, 1960-70	Net migration, 1960-70	Population, Apr. 1, 1970	Rounded
	All ages	763,956	218,400	85,397	−79,365	817,594	818,000
Born Apr. 1, 1965, to Mar. 31, 1970	Under 5		113,400	3,375	−19,930	90,095	90,000
Born Apr. 1, 1960, to Mar. 31, 1965	5 to 9		105,000	3,397	−27,960	73,643	74,000
Under 5	10 to 14	78,095		533	−15,395	62,167	62,000
5 to 9	15 to 19	63,350		327	−2,000	61,023	61,000
10 to 14	20 to 24	52,227		391	16,160	67,996	68,000
15 to 19	25 to 29	49,382		575	15,130	63,937	64,000
20 to 24	30 to 34	59,769		882	−4,950	53,937	54,000
25 to 29	35 to 39	55,198		1,226	−8,500	45,472	45,000
30 to 34	40 to 44	54,253		1,966	−6,850	45,437	45,000
35 to 39	45 to 49	55,359		2,963	−6,940	45,456	45,000
40 to 44	50 to 54	51,224		4,029	−4,320	42,875	43,000
45 to 49	55 to 59	51,512		5,783	−3,750	41,979	42,000
50 to 54	60 to 64	48,440		7,169	−4,880	36,391	36,000
55 to 59	65 to 69	41,558		8,571	−1,290	31,697	32,000
60 to 64	70 to 74	34,446		9,521	−1,660	23,265	23,000
65 and over	75 and over	69,143		34,689	−2,230	32,224	32,000
WHITE MALE							
	All ages	158,124	32,300	22,205	−34,275	133,944	134,000
Born Apr. 1, 1965, to Mar. 31, 1970	Under 5		16,000	360	−5,420	10,220	10,000
Born Apr. 1, 1960, to Mar. 31, 1965	5 to 9		16,300	400	−8,560	7,340	7,000
Under 5	10 to 14	10,751		51	−4,725	5,975	6,000
5 to 9	15 to 19	8,129		45	−260	7,824	8,000
10 to 14	20 to 24	7,920		81	4,480	12,319	13,000
15 to 19	25 to 29	10,583		130	2,600	13,053	13,000
20 to 24	30 to 34	15,066		170	−4,030	10,866	11,000
25 to 29	35 to 39	12,995		177	−5,120	7,698	8,000
30 to 34	40 to 44	10,978		275	−3,620	7,083	7,000
35 to 39	45 to 49	10,156		458	−2,340	7,358	7,000
40 to 44	50 to 54	9,686		724	−1,510	7,452	8,000
45 to 49	55 to 59	10,784		1,246	−1,470	8,068	8,000
50 to 54	60 to 64	11,731		1,970	−1,580	8,181	8,000
55 to 59	65 to 69	10,993		2,622	−1,010	7,361	7,000
60 to 64	70 to 74	9,942		3,178	−1,030	5,734	6,000
65 and over	75 and over	18,410		10,318	−680	7,412	7,000
WHITE FEMALE							
	All ages	187,139	31,100	21,899	−32,690	163,650	164,000
Born Apr. 1, 1965, to Mar. 31, 1970	Under 5		15,400	265	−5,260	9,875	10,000
Born Apr. 1, 1960, to Mar. 31, 1965	5 to 9		15,700	297	−8,100	7,303	7,000
Under 5	10 to 14	10,637		45	−4,400	6,192	6,000
5 to 9	15 to 19	7,913		24	310	8,199	8,000
10 to 14	20 to 24	8,113		36	4,600	12,677	13,000
15 to 19	25 to 29	12,433		89	2,540	14,884	15,000
20 to 24	30 to 34	15,176		105	−4,000	11,071	11,000
25 to 29	35 to 39	10,308		94	−3,440	6,774	7,000
30 to 34	40 to 44	10,020		166	−2,500	7,354	7,000
35 to 39	45 to 49	11,520		282	−2,140	9,098	9,000
40 to 44	50 to 54	12,558		445	−1,690	10,423	11,000
45 to 49	55 to 59	14,607		926	−1,770	11,911	12,000
50 to 54	60 to 64	15,738		1,188	−2,340	12,210	12,000
55 to 59	65 to 69	14,372		1,626	−1,410	11,336	11,000
60 to 64	70 to 74	13,418		2,367	−1,520	9,531	10,000
65 and over	75 and over	30,326		13,944	−1,570	14,812	15,000

Population 1960 projected to 1970, District of Columbia—Continued

NONWHITE MALE

[Projection I. Whites median out-migration; nonwhites balanced migration]

Age, 1960	Age, 1970	Population, Apr. 1, 1960	Births, 1960-70	Deaths, 1960-70	Net migration, 1960-70	Population, Apr. 1, 1970	Rounded
	All ages	200,047	78,600	22,177	−5,470	251,000	251,000
Born Apr. 1, 1965, to Mar. 31, 1970	Under 5		41,600	1,500	−5,800	34,300	34,000
Born Apr. 1, 1960, to Mar. 31, 1965	5 to 9		37,000	1,500	−5,900	29,600	30,000
Under 5	10 to 14	28,503		253	−3,450	24,800	25,000
5 to 9	15 to 19	23,545		165	−1,380	22,000	22,000
10 to 14	20 to 24	17,843		173	2,730	20,400	20,000
15 to 19	25 to 29	12,260		200	4,940	17,000	17,000
20 to 24	30 to 34	13,175		315	2,340	15,200	15,000
25 to 29	35 to 39	15,143		533	590	15,200	15,000
30 to 34	40 to 44	15,593		853	160	14,900	15,000
35 to 39	45 to 49	15,792		1,262	−530	14,000	14,000
40 to 44	50 to 54	13,474		1,614	−160	11,700	12,000
45 to 49	55 to 50	12,502		2,002	200	10,700	11,000
50 to 54	60 to 64	10,194		2,244	−350	7,600	8,000
55 to 59	65 to 69	7,973		2,473	600	6,100	6,000
60 to 64	70 to 74	5,217		2,137	420	3,500	3,000
65 and over	75 and over	8,833		4,953	120	4,000	4,000

NONWHITE FEMALE

Age, 1960	Age, 1970	Population, Apr. 1, 1960	Births, 1960-70	Deaths, 1960-70	Net migration, 1960-70	Population, Apr. 1, 1970	Rounded
	All ages	218,646	76,400	19,116	−6,930	269,000	269,000
Born Apr. 1, 1965, to Mar. 31, 1970	Under 5		40,400	1,250	−3,450	35,700	36,000
Born Apr. 1, 1960, to Mar. 31, 1965	5 to 9		36,000	1,200	−5,400	29,400	29,000
Under 5	10 to 14	28,204		184	−2,820	25,200	25,000
5 to 9	15 to 19	23,763		93	−670	23,000	23,000
10 to 14	20 to 24	18,351		101	4,350	22,600	23,000
15 to 19	25 to 29	14,106		156	5,050	19,000	19,000
20 to 24	30 to 34	16,352		292	740	16,800	17,000
25 to 20	35 to 39	16,752		422	−530	15,800	16,000
30 to 34	40 to 44	17,662		672	−890	16,100	16,000
35 to 39	45 to 49	17,891		961	−1,930	15,000	15,000
40 to 44	50 to 54	15,506		1,246	−960	13,300	13,000
45 to 49	55 to 59	13,619		1,609	−710	11,300	11,000
50 to 54	60 to 64	10,777		1,767	−610	8,400	8,000
55 to 59	65 to 69	8,220		1,850	530	6,900	7,000
60 to 64	70 to 74	5,869		1,839	470	4,500	4,000
65 and over	75 and over	11,574		5,474	−100	6,000	6,000

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD a copy of a report, which was referred to in the hearings of last year as the Andrews Report. The report, dated February 1959, was also mentioned in this year's hearings.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Population, 1960 projected to 1970, District of Columbia—Nonwhite male

[Projection I. Whites median outmigration: nonwhites balanced migration]

Age, 1960	Age, 1970	Population, Apr. 1, 1960	Births, 1960-70	Deaths, 1960-70	Net migration, 1960-70	Population, Apr. 1, 1970	Rounded
	All ages	200,047	78,600	22,177	−5,470	251,000	251,000
Born Apr. 1, 1965, to Mar. 31, 1970.	Under 5		41,600	1,500	−5,800	34,300	34,000
Born Apr. 1, 1960, to Mar. 31, 1965.	5 to 9		37,000	1,500	−5,900	29,600	30,000
Under 5	10 to 14	28,503		253	−3,450	24,800	25,000
5 to 9	15 to 19	23,545		165	−1,380	22,000	22,000
10 to 14	20 to 24	17,843		173	2,730	20,400	20,000
15 to 19	25 to 29	12,260		200	4,940	17,000	17,000
20 to 24	30 to 34	13,175		315	2,340	15,200	15,000
25 to 29	35 to 39	15,143		533	590	15,200	15,000
30 to 34	40 to 44	15,593		853	160	14,900	15,000
35 to 39	45 to 49	15,792		1,262	−530	14,000	14,000
40 to 44	50 to 54	13,474		1,614	−160	11,700	12,000
45 to 49	55 to 59	12,502		2,002	200	10,700	11,000
50 to 54	60 to 64	10,194		2,244	−350	7,600	8,000
55 to 59	65 to 69	7,973		2,473	600	6,100	6,000
60 to 64	70 to 74	5,217		2,137	420	3,500	3,000
65 and over	75 and over	8,833		4,953	120	4,000	4,000

STUDY OF FOLLOWUP BY PUBLIC ASSISTANCE DIVISION SOCIAL SERVICE ON INVESTIGATION SERVICE FINDINGS: GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE PUBLIC ASSISTANCE DIVISION, FEBRUARY 1959

OUTLINE

Purpose of the Study.

Plan of the Study.

Background.

Part 1: What Elements Are Responsible for the Frequent Disagreement in Interpretation of Investigation Service Findings Which Results in Investigation Service Submitting What Appears to Them Conclusive Evidence of Ineligibility, and Social Service Deciding That Assistance Should, Nevertheless, Be Continued.

(a) Analysis of the 49 Cases in Which Investigation Service Reported Evidence of Access or Provided Other Information and the Assistance Payment Was Continued.

1. Reason for Referral.

2. Was Referral to I.S. Justified?

3. Was Continued Assistance Justified?

4. Twenty-six Cases Where Investigation Service Reports "Evidence Found" of Access in the Home.

5. Action Taken on Information Provided by Investigation Service.

6. Community Complaints.

7. Basic Element of Disagreement Related to Policy of Continued Absence.

a. Husband Willing To Live With and Support Family.

b. Eligibility Requirement Other Than Need Not Met.

c. Women in Control.

8. Information Supplied by Investigation Service Not Always Helpful.

(b) Comparison of 29 Cases Submitted by Investigation Service With Findings of Study.

1. Review of Eight Cases Submitted in Which Evidence Appears To Indicate Assistance Should Be Discontinued.

2. Review of 21 Cases Investigation Service Believes Should Have Been Re-referred.

(c) Summary of findings.

(d) Attachments:

No. 1: Report on investigation service.

No. 2: Forms No. 122—July, August, September 1958.

No. 3: Request by social worker for information relating to the presence in the home of husband, paramour or other person.

No. 4: Schedule for study of ADC cases in which investigation service believes to have made a positive report on "access" to the home yet assistance was continued.

No. 5: Examples of difficult situations and attitudes with which the investigation service and social service must work.

No. 6: Action taken by social worker on information provided by investigation service.

No. 7: Examples of preference of mothers for assistance rather than support from husband.

STUDY OF FOLLOWUP BY PUBLIC ASSISTANCE DIVISION SOCIAL SERVICE ON INVESTIGATION SERVICE FINDINGS

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The Investigation Service questioned the continuation of assistance in cases where the investigation revealed what appeared to be conclusive evidence that eligibility no longer existed because of the presence in the home or access to the home of a husband, paramour or other person, yet the Social Service staff decided that assistance should, nevertheless, be continued. The Investigation Service questioned the failure of the Social Service to act on the information supplied, and the frequent re-referrals of cases on which information had been supplied previously.

The purpose of the study was to make a detailed analysis and evaluation of a group of cases and to find answers to the following questions:

1. What elements are responsible for the frequent disagreement in interpretation of Investigation Service findings which results in Investigation Service submitting what appears to them conclusive evidence of ineligibility, and Social Service deciding that assistance should, nevertheless, be continued.

2. What elements are responsible for frequent re-referrals of cases to Investigation Service on which what appears to be a conclusive finding has been made as a result of the original referral.

3. What elements are responsible for the wide variation in the number of referrals between workers or between units.

It is expected that the results of the study will be used as a basis for a review of the policies relating to the use of the Investigation Service, referral procedures, and clarification of division of responsibility for investigations between Investigation Service and Social Service.[1]

PLAN OF THE STUDY

The questions raised by Investigation Service and the proposed study were discussed in conference on October 27, 1958, attended by the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, District Supervisors, Statistician, Chief, Investigation Service, and Standards Specialist.

There was discussion as to questions which might be answered by the study, including the following:

1. Why was the case referred to Investigation Service?

2. Was the referral justified?

(a) What attempt did the social worker make to obtain information before referral?

(b) Could action have been taken on the basis of information already available?

3. Should re-referral have been made?

4. What were Investigation Service's findings?

5. What action did social service take on the Investigation Service report, and when?

6. Were the findings as conclusive as Investigation Service believed them to be?

The question as to what elements are responsible for the wide variation in the number of referrals between workers, units, and districts was also discussed. It was decided that this question could be answered only by a study of each caseload, and would not be a part of this phase of the study.

The following decisions were made:

1. The study would not be limited to cases on which Investigation Service had raised question, but, to give proper prospective, would include statistics on all cases referred during a specified period.

2. The basis of the study would be form No. 122, "Report of Investigation Service," for the months of July, August, and September 1958. See attachment No. 1.

Form No. 122, "Report of Investigation" serves as the basis for continuing study and evaluation of Investigation Service. Page 1 is completed by Investigation Service and attached to the investigator's written report to the social worker. The form shows the information requested by the social worker and the information furnished by Investigation Service. It also shows other information developed by Investigation Service. For example—Investigation Service is requested to determine if a paramour, John Smith, has access to the home. If John Smith is found in the home, a check is entered under "Evidence found." However, if Robert Brown, father of the client's expected child, is found living in the home, a check would be placed under "No evidence" as to John Smith's access, but the information as to Robert Brown's presence in the home would be entered by Investigation Service under item No. 11-F. Entry would be made in the same manner if the client were found to be employed full time. After the social worker acts on the Investigation Service report, or in any event within 60 days from receipt of the report, he completes page 2 showing action taken and returns the form to Investigation Service. The form is signed by both the worker and the unit supervisor. The forms are submitted quarterly by Investigation Service to Research and Statistics for tabulation.

3. A detailed study of case records would be made in cases where Investigation Service believes a positive report has been made on "access", yet assistance is continued.

4. A schedule would be developed and the cases read against this schedule.

5. Findings of the study, unrelated to Investigation Service, would be submitted to the Agency for consideration and appropriate action.

The cases were read during November and December 1958 and a first draft of the study prepared during January and submitted January 22, 1959.

On February 5, 1959, there was a second meeting with the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, Statistician, Chief, Investigation Service, and Standards Specialist. Comments on the draft submitted by the Superintendent on January 28, 1959, were discussed.

It was decided that the study would consist of three parts related to the purpose of the study.

Part I: What elements are responsible for the frequent disagreement in interpretation of Investigation Service findings which results in Investigation Service submitting what appears to them conclusive evidence of ineligibility, and Social Service deciding that assistance should, nevertheless, be continued?

It was agreed on February 5, 1959, that Investigation Service would submit a list of cases where it was believed conclusive evidence of ineligibility had been submitted.

Part II: What elements are responsible for frequent re-referrals of cases to Investigation Service on which what appears to be a conclusive finding has been made as a result of the original referral?

It was agreed on February 5, 1959, that Investigation Service would submit a list of cases which they believed should not have been re-referred.

Part III: What elements are responsible for the wide variation in the number of referrals between workers or between units?

Part I is to be completed first.

Part II is to be completed when the list of cases submitted by Investigation Service has been studied.

Part III is to be completed at a later date, when plans can be made for a study of aid to dependent children caseloads.

BACKGROUND

The Investigation Service was established in October 1955 as the result of a recommendation by the Interdepartment Committee for the Enforcement of the Nonsupport Laws for the District of Columbia. This Committee recommended the establishment in the Public Assistance Division of a specialized unit of trained investigators for the purpose of determining eligibility of applicants who request assistance because of the absence of a parent. The unit was to concentrate on locating absent parents. Less than a year later, in July 1956, after operating on this limited basis, it was decided that the services of the investigators were also needed urgently in establishing other factors of eligibility. In December 1957, the types of cases to be referred were reconsidered and redefined. Currently, the following situations are to be referred:

Cases to be referred:

1. Clarification of bank accounts, postal savings accounts, and building and loan accounts, stocks or bonds, civil service, railroad and other types of retirement, disability and veterans' benefits, workmen's compensation, inheritances, accident claims, small businesses, vehicles including taxicabs, licenses, ownership, and income.

2. Any case (ADC, GPA, AB, ATD, OAA) in which there is reason to believe that client is not eligible for assistance or that there are factors in the case affecting eligibility which cannot be proved by the social worker.

3. A person who reapplies for public assistance whose case had previously been closed and assistance terminated due to misrepresentation or fraud by the applicant, location of husband or other man in the home, or concealed resources. This type of case should be marked "Rush."

4. Any ADC case in which the client claims that a mother, husband, or father of her or his child or children included in the grant is missing, any case in which a relative or spouse is missing whose location will benefit PAD.

A person is considered "missing" if:

(a) Presumed to be in District of Columbia, exact address or place of employment unknown;

(b) Presumed to be outside of District of Columbia, exact address or place of employment unknown;

(c) Presumed to be deceased, no proof available.

A person is considered "not missing" if:

(a) Social worker knows exact home address or place of employment;

(b) Currently paying under court order or court agreement.

5. Any active ADC case in which the recipient becomes pregnant and the father is allegedly absent from the home.

6. Any case in which it appears that the recipient is living in a manner, or has use of material possessions, which does not appear compatible with the known resources of the family, and which the social worker has been unable to prove or disprove, such as concealed income, employment, illegal activity, etc.

7. Any case in which the social worker has reasonable suspicion that the man involved—either the husband, father or one or more of the children, or some other male person—is present in the home or has free access to the home, if the social worker has been unable to obtain sufficient evidence to arrive at a reasonable conclusion as to the presence or absence.

8. Any complaint or denunciation—anonymous or otherwise—of a man living in, or having free access to, the home of a recipient, is to be referred immediately for investigation of the validity of such a complaint. The social worker will not discuss the complaint or denunciation with the recipient prior to the first visit by the investigator. Experience has proved that this procedure is required to protect the best interests of PAD.

9. Any complaint or denunciation concerning other factors of eligibility after the social

---

[1] Informational Bulletin No. 24-58, dated Oct. 29, 1958.

worker has been unable to prove or disprove the assertion and feels Investigation Service can provide the proof more expeditiously.

10. All cases except OAA and AB in which the landlord lives in the same premises as recipient, or recipient's home is rented in another person's name, unless the landlord is a relative of the recipient or is a recipient.

11. All cases except OAA and AB in which the recipient shares the rent of a home or an apartment with another family, who are not relatives or recipients, and has lived with the same family at a previous address.

12. Any case in which the recipient has a roomer of the opposite sex.

13. An active or closed case when there is a hearing pending, and the social worker needs additional information for the hearing.

Cases not to be referred:

1. To determine only the home address of persons who are "not missing". These include situations where:

(a) The social worker knows person's exact home address or place of employment.

(b) The person is currently paying under court order or court agreement (father who is and has been supporting regularly through court order, but has otherwise been completely out of touch with the children and their mother).

(c) Paternity proceeding against putative father was dismissed by court, even though client still asserts he is the father.

2. To determine home address of paramours or suspected paramours who are neither fathers of ADC children nor financially responsible for support in other categories.

3. To locate a father previously located when it has been determined that he is a derelict, or permanently incapacitated, has never supported himself, much less anybody else, and that any interest on his part in the children or their mother would be distinctly undesirable.

Action on cases does not originate with the Investigation Service. Investigation is made only on cases referred by the social service staff. The responsibility of the Investigation Service is confined to factfinding and reporting the results of investigations. The social service staff is responsible for deciding which cases are to be referred, requesting specific information, evaluating the findings reported by Investigation Service, determining the effect of the findings on the original or continuing eligibility, and for taking action required by agency policy.

As Investigation Service reviewed the entries made on form No. 122 by the social service staff as to action taken on information supplied, it was found that the action taken did not appear to be consistent with agency policy. It was this concern, expressed by Investigation Service, which led to the study.

Part I: What elements are responsible for the frequent disagreement in interpretation of Investigation Service findings which results in Investigation Service submitting what appears to them conclusive evidence of ineligibility, and social service deciding that assistance should, nevertheless, be continued.

As a means of finding answers to this question, a total of 531 forms No. 122 for the months of July, August, and September 1958, were reviewed. One hundred and seventy-two of these represented requests for the location of a husband, paramour or other person. Twenty-nine were requests for information on resources or other information. Three hundred and thirty requested information as to the presence in the home of a husband, paramour or other person. See attachment No. 2.

A summary statistical report only was made for the cases where information was requested as to "location" or "resources".

A review was made of the 330 cases where Investigation Service was requested to provide information as to the presence in the home of a husband, paramour or other person. See attachment No. 3.

A summary statistical report only was made for the following cases:

1. Investigation Service reports evidence of "access," and the application was held pending or denied, or the case closed.

2. Investigation Service reports no evidence found.

3. Cases withdrawn by the social worker or withdrawn from the study by I.S.

4. Cases in categories other than ADC.

Of the 330 cases requesting information as to presence in the home, I.S. reported "no evidence found" in 133 of the cases. One hundred and sixteen cases were closed or the application denied prior to the study. Of these, 17 of the applications terminated and 36 of the 65 cases closed, or a total of 53 were in relation to the eligibility factor of absence.

Eighty-one cases were not closed. Of these 81 cases not closed, I.S. reported evidence found in 45. In 27 cases no evidence was found on the specific reasons for referral, but other information was submitted which I.S. believed would have a bearing on the case situation. This information was supplied on form No. 122 by an entry in red under item 11–F: "Incidental Information Developed by I.S." Cases withdrawn by I.S. or by the social worker were eliminated. Cases in categories other than ADC were also eliminated. This brought the total of cases included in the study to 49.

A detailed analysis was made of the 49 cases in which I.S. reported evidence found of access to the home or which no evidence was found on the specific reason for referral but other information was submitted by I.S. and the assistance payment continued. From the point of view of the agency, there was no need to distinguish between these two groups of cases in the study.

A schedule was developed, with the assistance of the statistician, and the 49 cases read against this schedule. See attachment No. 4.

To complete the schedules, it was necessary to read each case carefully and completely. Without this complete reading, the questions on the schedule could not be answered, particularly those as to whether referral I.S. was justified and whether the continuation of assistance was justified.

A. Analysis of the 49 cases in which I.S. reported evidence of access or provided other information and the assistance payment was continued.

1. Reason for referral: The 49 cases showed a variety of reasons for referral. In 13 cases referral was made for the purpose of obtaining new information. Fourteen cases were referred to request I.S. to confirm absence or presence where not clearly shown. Two cases were referred to confirm absence or presence when this was clearly shown in the case record. Two cases were referred to request I.S. to investigate the current situation where the cases had been closed previously because absence was not established. In 15 cases, I.S. was asked to investigate the current situation in cases where previous I.S. report or the case record indicated the man has access to the home. Two cases were referred for a combination of reasons, and one referral was made to locate the man named as the father of a child and to determine whether he, or any man, had access to the home.

2. Was referral to Investigation Service justified?

In 33 of the 49 cases, the study showed that the social worker was justified in referring the case to Investigation Service. In 16 the referral was not justified. In 13 of the 16 cases, there appeared to be adequate information in the case record on which to base a decision as to ineligibility. In one case the man was mentally incapacitated and was, therefore, no resource; in one case a followup on a previous Investigation Service report would have shown continued absence; and in one case the reason for referral was not clear.

Case No. 44 is an example of situations where referral to Investigation Service was not justified because there was adequate information in the case record on which action could be taken.

When Miss S applied for assistance in September 1952, she was described as "meek and retiring." She had two children and was pregnant by Mr. H, who had brought her to the District of Columbia, and who was seen in February 1953. He seemed unconcerned and the worker notes that he "apparently only came to see me in order to keep his troubles regarding the situation at a minimum." Miss S said in 1954 she did not know where he was. On July 20, 1955, the worker found a report showing that Miss S had given birth to a child on February 4, 1955. She said at first she had given the child away, then became confused and said she still had the child, whose father was Mr. P. When interviewed on July 26, 1955, Mr. P doubted he was the father, and said Miss S had relations with and received money from other men. On December 27, 1955, Mr. P said Miss S had "ordered him not to come there any more." He thought this was because she was interested in another man whom he thought lived with her. On January 23, 1956, Mr. P told of seeing a man there three or four times, and at 5 a.m. In April "a very fancy two-wheel bicycle, tricycle, and other expensive toys" were noted. Miss S's aunt said Mr. H stops by in the evening to see the children. On September 17, 1958, Miss S said Mr. H usually comes on Sundays. Miss S was described as "very arrogant and refused to give information very readily to worker."

Another example is case No. 24 in which a followup of previous Investigation Service reports would have shown continued absence did not exist.

3. Was continued assistance justified?

Of the 49 cases reviewed, it was found that the continuation of assistance was justified in 21 cases and not justified in 28 cases. In 18 of these 28 cases, the I.S. reported "No evidence found," on the specific reasons for referral, but other information was submitted. These cases included some of the most flagrant examples of situations where it was found the continuation of assistance was not justified.

The finding that the continuation of assistance was or was not justified was based in many instances on information contained in the case record rather than on I.S. findings.

In case No. 1, for example, there had been no real investigation of eligibility. The agency policy regarding the requirement that the fathers of the children be interviewed when possible was ignored. The application for assistance in 1953 was terminated because Mrs. A had not made any effort to get support from the fathers of her children. Yet, when she applied in 1958, EA was authorized and the grant continued without any substantial effort to talk with either the two fathers or with Mrs. A's husband. The following entry is made on Form No. 258—"Deprived of Parental Support—ADC," in regard to an attempt to reach one father by telephone: "I was told that he lives at this address, works at night and sleeps during the day. Hence he did not wish to be disturbed." There is no record of any attempt to disturb him. There is repeated reference to Mrs. A's confusion and to conflicting information given by her. She was referred under one name and the case carried under another. This was never cleared nor her marriage verified. Although "it appears Mrs. A could not even remember half the time what she says," and "gave repeated conflicting information," her statement that the man found in the home by

I.S. is "a mere friend who lives in a different apartment," is accepted without verification.

In case No. 11, I.S. reports "No evidence found," as to the specific request by the social worker, with the following incidental information added: "May be pregnant." In the space under "Action and Results on I.S. Report," the worker entered "No action taken: Form No. 29 was returned indicating no pregnancy." However, the record contains convincing evidence that continued absence was not established from the time of application in 1956. On 5–7–58 the record says: "Worker was admitted and was told by one of the children that his daddy was at home." The worker saw a man in bed, whom Miss D said "was only a fellow she had asked to spend the night with her because she had been annoyed by men looking for the girls who lived in the apartment before her." Miss D refused to let the worker speak with the man or to give his last name. "Worker also wondered if the man in the home was willing to support the family and he answered in a loud voice from the bedroom that he would. Miss D stated that she knows he would not and wondered if worker could overlook what she had seen; that is, the man in the bedroom. Miss D was told that agency would grant one more check in an attempt to help her plan for her family, however, we would have to talk with her and the man in the home before it could be clearly planned." On 5–12–58 Miss D told worker Mr. J had returned to his home in Virginia. The worker recommended that assistance be terminated and the case closed. However, the case was not closed. During June, July, and August Miss D kept calling the agency, and a telephone call was received from Mr. J who would not come to the office. "Mr. J said that he was interested in Miss D's family receiving assistance, but he has nothing to do with her family and what PAD will do for them." Assistance was not granted during June, July, and August according to Payroll Control. On August 8, 1958, Miss D talked with the supervisor and gave Mr. J's address. "She was told that assistance would continue if it can be verified that he lives at this address." I.S. reported on September 9, 1958, that Mr. J's address had been verified. Assistance was authorized and has continued.

In case No. 13, I.S. reports on form No. 122 "No evidence found" and I.S. reports gave no evidence of "access."

The record revealed at least four pregnancies by one man. No record was found of discussion of absence policy. No effort was made to communicate with the father, although both address and name of employer were known.

In most instances the decision that worker was not justified in withholding assistance without further followup could not be made with confidence. The decision was made in recognition of the problems for the agency, particularly in situations where the woman's relationships were casual ones, with many different men most of whom seemed to feel no responsibility for the woman or for their children.

An illustration is case No. 4. Mrs. B was born in 1932. At least 6 different men are the fathers of her 10 children. Five of these children are with Mrs. B., two are with an aunt who is receiving assistance, two are with Mrs. B's mother who received assistance over a long period and one is with another aunt. When Mrs. B's promiscuous behavior was discussed, she was described as "nonchalant and passive." On February 21, 1956, Mrs. B claimed not to know the whereabouts of the fathers of her children, including Mr. L, the father of Marjorie. A review of the case of the aunt with whom Marjorie is living (case No. 15, also included in the study), showed that Marjorie's father, Mr. L, has had frequent contacts with the agency. He came to the office of his own volition in April 1958. He came because he was aroused about the care Marjorie was receiving in her aunt's home. He said the home was no place for any young child because men were lounging around all the time and several had already made advances to Marjorie. He said Mrs. B had always known where he was. He said that when Mrs. B became pregnant with Marjorie they had planned to marry and he and Mrs. B had arranged for her to do some babysitting. Mr. L said Mrs. B's mother and her aunt "had been strongly against this, saying they did not want Mrs. B to work, they never had, but had been on assistance all their lives and they thought this was the best place for D too." According to the record, not only Mrs. B's mother but her grandmother had received assistance. Mr. L aroused considerable community interest in this situation and a joint agency conference was held on July 25, 1958, including the Public Health Nurse and representatives of the C.W.D., Women's Bureau, and PAD. Referral was made to I.S. on June 20, 1958 to determine whether a family relationship existed between Mrs. B and Mr. L or anyone else and to determine whether Mr. J or any other man has access to the client's home. Mr. J is the father of Mrs. B's youngest child. In July 1958, I.S. reported that Mrs. B was dressed up and preparing to go out with Mr. J who was waiting for her. Mr. J accosted the investigators, became noisily belligerent and was arrested for disorderly conduct. The referral to I.S. states, "She does not seem to have any concept of right and wrong and the case record indicates incest in the entire family." This was referred to a higher supervisory level for a decision as to what action the agency should take in dealing with this situation. It is for this reason only that the continuing assistance was justified. It is noted with concern that Mrs. B's case and that of her sister continue to be handled by different workers, the worker handling Mrs. B's case being unaware of the continuing agency contact with the father of one of Mr. B's children living in the home of an aunt. See also case No. 26, cited under section 8.

The decision that the worker was not justified in withholding assistance was also made in recognition of the problems and attitudes with which both the social worker and I.S. must work. The records contain copious evidence of evasion, deception, fabrication, and falsification. For examples of difficult situations and attitudes, see attachment No. 5.

4. Twenty-six cases where I.S. reports "Evidence Found" of access in the home.

It was found that the continuation of assistance was not justified in 12 of these cases. In 14, it was believed that the continuation of assistance was justified. In 12 cases, continued absence was not clearly established, but the worker was not justified in withholding assistance without further followup. In only two cases was it believed that the continued assistance was justified without further followup.

In one of these two cases, No. 38, Mr. N told the worker on August 13, 1958, that "his wife refused to take him back because she could get more from PAD." The entry on form No. 122 shows "Family given 3 months (October, November, and December) for Mr. N to find employment."

In the other case, No. 34, the notation on form No. 122 says, "Assistance continued because Mr. L was committed to the hospital for observation." The record shows that Mr. L was a patient at a New York mental hospital in 1939 and at St. Elizabeths in 1953. No medical or psychiatric reports were found in the record and Mr. L has never been seen.

5. Action taken on information provided by Investigation Service.

The fact that 116 applications were terminated and cases closed prior to the study would indicate that the social worker took prompt action on information supplied by I.S.

In 24 of the 49 cases studied, the record showed that the I.S. report was discussed with the recipient. In 13 cases no action is recorded in the case record. However, in 3 of these 13 cases, the entry on form No. 122 indicates there was discussion, although the discussion was not recorded. In seven cases, no action was required. See attachment No. 6.

A few instances were found where the I.S. report is misquoted.

In case No. 22, an entry is made on June 11, 1958, "Interim report from I.S. that absence has been established." The I.S. report did not say this.

In case No. 44, Mrs. S had been untruthful and unreliable in her relations with the agency since her application in 1952. In May 1958, I.S. was asked to visit the home after 10 p.m. to learn who was frequenting the home. The investigation was inadequate and visits were not made as requested. The entry by the social worker on form No. 122 says: "Report shows no man in the home or frequenting the home. Grant continues." The I.S. report does not show this.

In other instances both agency policy and I.S. reports are ignored.

In case No. 42, referral was made to I.S. to determine the absence of Mr. S from the home and to locate two fathers. No effort was made to locate Mr. S, either by the worker or by request to I.S., although his address and place of past employment are recorded. Investigation Service located both fathers in South Carolina, but the social worker made no attempt to communicate with them. Investigation Service reported that Mrs. S was pregnant and found another man in the home. The following entry is made on form No. 122, "Mrs. S admits being pregnant and it has been confirmed by medical report. Since man in home was determined to be living at another address, which was verified, there is nothing we would question in this case and the grant continues." The review date is July 31, 1959.

The following cases are other examples of situations where questionable use is made of information supplied by I.S.

In case No. 46, when Mrs. W reapplied for assistance in July 1958, she said she had a friend, Mr. C. Referral was made to I.S. to determine if Mrs. W's husband or Mr. C had access to the home. (Mr. W had said, when Mrs. W previously received assistance, that he would like to live with his family.) Mr. C was found in the home on two occasions in August and September. The following entry, dated October 24, 1958, is made on form No. 122. "Assistance is being continued pending an interview with Mrs. W and Mr. C and also verification of Mr. C's actual residence at the Dunbar Hotel."

In case No. 3, I.S. furnished the address of the husband, but no effort was made to communicate with him.

In case No. 24, the recorded entry, dated August 25, 1958, says: "Worker told Mrs. G that if the report indicated that Mr. P was in the home, her assistance would be discontinued as there was no continued absence." Investigation Service report showed that Mr. P was in the home, but the grant was continued.

Case No. 20 was closed in 1952 because Miss H was arrested on a narcotics charge and engaged in an unlawful business. She applied in 1955 after her release from Occoquan. In March and June 1958, referrals were made to I.S. to determine if Mr. B had free access to the home. The record contains a newspaper clipping dated March 22, 1956, where the judge of the juvenile court questions Miss B's eligibility for assistance.

The following reports were received from I.S.:

April 2, 1958—Four men found in home at 10 a.m. Sunday.

April 3, 1958—Two men found in home at 9:05 p.m.

April 4, 1958—Two men and one woman found drinking at 9:45 p.m.

April 4, 1958—An undetermined number of men and women found at 2 p.m.

August 19, 1958—Four men found at 7:45 p.m.—"all showed signs of extreme intoxication."

I.S. noted on form No. 122 "Four men found constantly in home."

The following entry is made in the case record:

"September 10, 1958—a final report was received from I.S. dated 8-19-58 indicates that Mr. B does not have a free access to the home; however, several men were found in the home on several visits except the last. This appears that Miss H is trying to improve her mode of living. * * *" The following entry is made on form No. 122—"No action taken because I.S. report did not indicate Miss H has a man living in the home or having free access."

6. Community complaints: In a number of cases complaints were received as to the behavior of recipients. With few exceptions, these complaints were made by responsible members of the community. There were frequent complaints by fathers concerning care given to children by their mothers.

Procedures require the immediate referral to I.S. of complaints and denunciations of a man living in, or having free access to, the home of a recipient. Referral is also required of complaints and denunciations concerning other factors of eligibility after the social worker has been unable to prove or disprove the assertion, and feels I.S. can provide the proof more expeditiously.

In only one case was it found that immediate referral was made to I.S.

Case No. 22. In September 1958 an informer reported that Mrs. H's behavior was "a disgrace to the neighborhood."

Case No. 23. In April 1958 the landlord criticized the agency for granting assistance. He said Mrs. H knew where her husband was, that men frequented the home, Mrs. H neglected the children, was employed and that she was pregnant by a Mr. W. Immediate referral was made to I.S. to determine whether Mrs. H was having relations with Mr. W or any other man and if she was working. Investigation Service reported no employment or access.

Case No. 39. An anonymous letter was sent to the Director of Public Welfare complaining that Mrs. P drinks, lives with a Mr. H, who spends the PAD grant and beats the children.

Case No. 6. The parole officer reported in 1943 that he did not think conditions in the home were all they should be, and mentioned the number of men in and entering the home. In 1944 a neighbor complained that Mrs. B and her company came into the yard only half clad. There were three reports from neighbors complaining of Mrs. B's conduct and conditions in her home. These reports said she kept a disorderly house, gave improper care to the children, was working, had a telephone, and kept the house filled with men every night. These letters were not of a malicious nature but pleaded with the agency to "see to this woman." The writer of one of the letters suggested contacting property owners in the neighborhood for information but the record does not show that this was done. The most recent complaint was a letter received in August 1958 describing Mrs. B as a "menace," and told of her drinking, having men living with her and of her having "drank so much wine and stuff until she is not herself any more." The writer of the letter suggested that the taxpayers' money could be put to better use. Referral to I.S. was not made until September 1958.

Case No. 20. Mrs. Hayes of Fides House reported drinking, foul language, and abuse of the children. Referral to CWD was suggested.

Case No. 14. Mrs. E was evicted by NCHA because she had been a problem and a disturbance over a period of years.

Case No. 17. The agency received complaints from responsible individuals concerning "wild parties, cursing and cavorting in public, a man living in the home, etc."

Case No. 49. Mrs. W's mother complained about her "running the streets and making no plans for the children's care." She was evicted from the Dunbar Hotel because of her behavior.

Case No. 18. The landlord reported that Miss G left her children for periods as long as 1 week.

7. Basic element of disagreement to policy of continued absence.

The basic element responsible for disagreement between findings by I.S. and actions by the social worker was found to be in relation to the agency policy of continued absence.

The agency recognizes that the eligibility factor of continued absence is most complex and difficult. A great deal of staff thought and time was invested in the development of the section of the Manual relating to continued absence, which reads in part as follows:

"Continued absence does not exist solely because the parent rents or has living quarters available at another address or is supporting by court order. If the parents are engaging in a marital relationship and the man has free access to the home, then that man is not to be considered as 'absent from the home.'

"Continued absence is not established when, in the judgment of the agency, a man or woman who have lived together make separate living arrangements for the purpose of establishing eligibility for assistance.

"Only in situations where strong, convincing evidence is submitted that a parent is no longer in the home and has discontinued his relationship, shall the factor of continued absence be established. The burden of proof rests with the applicant and must be substantiated, if possible, by statements of other persons in a position to know the facts and by any other available evidence.

"There must be proof that a parent is absent from the home; there must be evidence that the absence is 'continued' and that the child is deprived of support or care because of this absence. Absence from the home is recognized as being 'continued' when reliable evidence shows that the absence has a degree of permanency in contrast to a temporary absence. There must be a logical and responsible account as to the severing of the relationship, the reason for its being broken, and the time at which the relationship ceased.

"When a parent or other relative applies for ADC, it must be understood that specific circumstances relating to deprivation of parental support must be verified, regardless of where the father is living. The applicant needs to understand and accept the fact that no parent is ever relieved of his legal responsibility in relation to his children, regardless of his feeling toward the children or their mother. It should be explained that both parents have a part in the application, if this is possible, and participate in plans for the children. It should be explained that the absent parent will be interviewed unless it is obviously impossible or inappropriate to do so. The purpose of this interview with the father is to give him an opportunity to tell his side of the story, to express his interest in and plans for his children, to provide verified information as to his income and to decide what action he wishes to take regarding support.

"If the mother or other relative applying indicates that the absent parent is not interested in taking part in planning for the child, or that it would be inadvisable or impossible for him to do so, the Agency requires the person applying to produce some evidence of this fact.

"The applicant is responsible for supplying information concerning the absent parent, and for making every effort in good faith to locate him and to have him take a responsible part in the application. If the applicant refuses to supply information concerning the absent parent, and to make efforts to locate him, eligibility cannot be established.

"The requirement of seeking support from the absent parent must be met continuously and shall be a part of every reconsideration and review.

"The eligibility factor of continuous absence is established by the mother's statement and corroborating evidence. The most satisfactory corroboration or supporting evidence is to have knowledge of the whereabouts of the father who is absent and to find out by talking with him his version of the nature of the existing relationship between the parents and his ability and willingness to support the child and the mother. Such information should cover the past, present, and future in order to make a proper appraisal of the child's situation in relation to the degree of support and care he can expect from his parents and the extent to which the agency must supplement or substitute for the responsibility of the parents.

"If it is impossible for the mother to have the father come to the office to talk with the social worker, the social worker shall make every reasonable effort to get in touch with him concerning support and care for his family.

"In all active cases in which the basis for assistance is 'continued absence' of the father from the home and the agency has a reasonable basis for believing that a parent is in the home, assistance shall be discontinued.

"If there is reason to believe that unreported contributions are being made to the support of the home, assistance shall be discontinued until information is supplied to or obtained by the agency to enable it to determine the facts in the case.

"All resources available to the mother of the children born of a previous marriage or relationship must be determined or clarified before need can be established." [2]

Agency staff has been and continues to be deeply concerned because public funds are supporting, through the agency, situations where absence does not in fact exist, where the agency is deceived and provides money to supplement the income of fathers who are not absent, but who manage not to be in the home when I.S. or the worker is there.

It was primarily to deal with this most difficult and troublesome factor of eligibility that I.S. was established.

In a few of the cases read, the agency policy is carefully explained and recorded at the point of intake, and the requirement that the father be seen is carried out. In an alarming number, the policy is disregarded completely.

Case No. 18 is perhaps the worst example: When Miss G applied in 1946 she gave the address of Mr. E who was responsible for her pregnancy, but he was not seen until 1958, 12 years later. Assistance has continued, except for a brief period in 1950.

On May 8, 1958, referral was made to I.S. to determine if Miss G has roomers and to determine whether any man has access to the home. The referral says that on two occasions the worker observed her giving hand signals to men who were about to enter her home. On May 26, 1958, I.S. reported Mr. E in the home. Miss G said that Mr. E "just happened to be there." On June 5, 1958, Mr. E was seen by the social worker for the first time. This interview is recorded in seven lines and this mostly of a discussion of employment and his address. The entry on form No. 122 under "Action and Results on I.S. Report," "None—we obtained proof that Mr. E was not living in the home."

---

[2] Manual 111—202.12.

In case No. 13, Miss E was 20 years of age when she applied for assistance in July 1957. Mr. B was the father of her unborn child and had been responsible for two pregnancies resulting in miscarriages. She said she "broke off with him" the previous month. The intake worker recorded: "She understood that the area worker would want to talk with Mr. B" After termination due to loss of contact, Miss E applied again in July 1958. She had given birth to another child by Mr. B, and gave his address and the name of his employer. His address is also shown on form No. 258. Assistance continues without any request that he come to the office or any attempt to get in touch with him. Referral was made to I.S. in July 1958 to determine if Mr. B "has free access to the home and is maintaining a continuing relationship." On September 29, 1958, I.S. reported no indication of access.

This record contains a seven page report, undated and unsigned, which seems to have been a part of an unmarried mothers study, and which gives intimate information as to Miss E's sexual experiences. She tells of her belief that it is all right to have sexual relations "with fellows outside of marriage if you are going with them," that all her friends do it, and that, in relation to Mr. B, she "just couldn't pull herself away from him."

Case No. 42. There is no record of any effort either by the worker or by referral to I.S. to locate Mr. S, who is said to have deserted, although his address and place of employment are recorded. I.S. located two fathers, but no effort was made by the worker to communicate with them. On August 15, 1958, I.S. reported that Mrs. S said she was pregnant by her husband. Emergency assistance was authorized July 21, 1958, and the review date is set for July 31, 1959. The entry on form No. 122, dated November 4, 1958, reads: "Mrs. S admits being pregnant and it has been confirmed by medical report. Since man in home was determined to be living at another address, which you verified, there is nothing we would question at this time and the grant continues."

A review of what is found in this record gives a sense of knowing almost nothing whatever about Mrs. S.

There was evidence that the Agency is not able to cope with the complex situations and the deep-seated problems in some of the ADC cases, to hold to Agency policies and requirements, or to keep track of and evaluate the information already in records.

There is evidence in the cases read that the problems are too complex and complicated for the staff to grasp or to deal with effectively. The information already available is not always noted or evaluated; threads in the investigation are dropped and never picked up again.

Another important fact stands out in the relationship of the Agency to fathers: After the recipient or the I.S. or the social worker succeeds in locating a husband or father, and he comes in for an interview, the Agency has failed to give the worker help in working with him. This is illustrated in case No. 18, where the grant has continued almost without interruption from 1946. When the father of the children was seen in 1958, the interview is recorded in seven lines and consists of a discussion of his employment and address. There is frequently a sense of anticlimax, as though the interview with the fathers was of less importance than all that had preceded it. This is apparent when records are read in their entirety; and when the efforts of the Agency to talk with fathers indicates that it has had little meaning for the father or for the child.

It also seems apparent from the records read that many fathers are stronger and more effective persons than the mothers. These fathers frequently show a strong early interest in and concern for their children. As the mothers continue to receive assistance this interest seems to fade away, or, if the interest of the father does continue, the Agency is not aware of it.

a. Husband willing to live with and support family: It is not the intent of the Agency to provide assistance in behalf of children when this responsibility can be assumed by their father. When there is evidence that a father out of the home is willing to live with and support his family and when it is believed that this offer will benefit the children, the mother is not eligible for assistance because of her unwillingness to permit the husband to return to the home. This policy grew out of long experience of the Agency with mothers who claimed their husbands were out of the home and unwilling to support, when this was found not to be true.

Eleven cases were found where the Agency had failed to communicate with the husband, or to determine his willingness to provide for his family.

Case No. 11. Miss D was 19 when she applied for assistance in October 1956. She said she had been married to Mr. S in May, but he did not want her to use his name. There was no discussion of her relationship with Mr. S. Mr. W, who Miss D said was the father of her two children was interviewed promptly concerning his plans and ability to support. On November 26, 1956, Mr. S called and came to the office the following day. "He stated he could not understand why Agency would be considering an assistance plan with his wife since he is employed and is willing to provide a home and support her and his stepchildren to whom he is quite devoted." Mr. S, who was 55, said Miss D left him soon after their marriage. He objected to her keeping late hours. He assured worker of his desire to support his family and of his ability to do this. She had refused a reconciliation. After further interview with Miss D and her husband, the application was terminated.

When Miss D reapplied in December 1957, she said her sister and her mother could not continue supporting her and the children. The only references to her husband are the following: "Miss D states that her husband offered support to her and the children during December 1956. She states there has been no contact with him since their telephone conversation during that month * * *. "She stated that she found it impossible to get along with her husband because he quarreled all the time because people told him she was going with another man. She stated that her husband had never caught her with another man although she was going steady with Mr. H. from 1953 until October 1957 * * *." There is no other reference to Mr. S although he was located by I.S.

Cases No. 14 and No. 17 illustrate situations in which the father is willing to live with and support his family, but the grant is continued. For summary of these cases, see Attachment No. 7.

One of the purposes of the ADC program is to help maintain and strengthen family life and to help parents to attain the maximum self-support and personal independence consistent with the maintenance of continuing parental care and protection.

There is evidence in the records read that this purpose is not always carried out; that family life is often weakened rather than strengthened, and that recipients are not helped in a responsible way to attain the maximum self-support and independence, that the mothers and the fathers expect the agency to lift the burden of support from their shoulders, and that the agency does this.

b. Eligibility requirements other than need not met. While financial need is the basic requirement for assistance, it is only one requirement, and Agency policy does not permit the authorization of assistance on that basis alone. There is evidence in the records read that payments are made because the workers are convinced that need exists, without recognition that all people in need are not entitled to assistance.

Cases Nos. 25, 40, 17 and 42 are examples of assistance being authorized in disregard of policy.

Case No. 25. When Mrs. J. applied on June 13, 1958 she said she had no child care plan. She had received an allotment from Mr. J. until his discharge May 1, 1958. Two years ago she began a relationship with a Mr. C., she said, which ended in May 1958. She wants to work but felt that an effective child care plan should be worked out. There was no discussion of care by Mrs. J's. mother, although when a home visit was made on July 9, 1958, the older child was in the grandmother's home and when a visit was made October 2, 1958, the grandmother was in Mrs. J's home. On October 2, 1958, Mrs. J. said her mother would stay with the children and this would be better than depending on assistance. Mrs. J. said she refused to accompany her husband to Louisiana where he was stationed when in the service. She said he had returned to the District of Columbia and she saw him frequently but claimed not to know his address. I.S. located Mr. J. on August 12, 1958. Letters were written to him on August 27 and September 12 but no other action taken. I.S. reported that Mrs. J. was "never home." A child care plan seemed to be available. The husband and father is employed in the District but has never been interviewed. The entry on form No. 122 dated September 18, 1958 is "Case will be referred to I.S. at a later date."

Case No. 40. Miss S applied March 21, 1958, because of pregnancy. She said the father of her two children was Mr. I with whom she had lived from 1954 to 1956. The father of her unborn child was Mr. L. She said her relationship with him began in July 1957 and ended December 1957. He was a tenant at the same address. On May 2, 1958, Miss S said she planned to return to work. An entry on April 30, 1958, says it was decided to talk with Mr. L before approval of application. There is no dictation after May 2, 1958. I.S. reports that when they were in the home Mr. L was bringing in the trash can. Miss S, pretending not to know who he was, asked him his name. On form No. 122, under "Action and Result of I.S. Report" the following entry, dated September 10, 1958, is made: "Assistance continued pending interview with Mr. L."

In Case No. 17, Mrs. J's statements that her husband was responsible for her pregnancy were disproved but assistance was continued in August 1958 "because she was so greatly in need."

In Case No. 42, assistance was authorized and continued with no effort to contact the husband or the other fathers of the children.

c. Women in control: It was noted in a number of cases that the mothers seemed to be in control, not only of their family situations, without participation by the husbands, but were able to control the Agency as well and to receive assistance on their own terms. This control is accomplished in many ways; by temper, by arrogance, by the ability to make the Agency uncertain and uncomfortable, and by sheer persistence. Perhaps these mothers are seeking in the Agency some individual who can be firm and whom they are not able to control. They seem constantly to be exploring and testing the Agency, seeking limits they cannot control.

The ability of women to control the Agency and to receive assistance on their own terms seems more true when the mothers are very young and when they are described as "dull" or "limited."

Cases Nos. 14, 16, 17, 29, and 47 illustrate the unwillingness of mothers to relinquish the assistance grant after their husbands are released from hospitals or institutions or are willing to return to the home. When application is made, the woman frequently tells the Agency that her husband worked regularly and supported adequately. This story is often changed and the Agency is told that she does not want her husband back, and that he never supported adequately.

Case No. 29. When Miss B applied on December 30, 1949, she said her baby was ill and she could not work because the landlord was no longer able to care for the children. She was reported to be an excellent worker. The father of both children was given as Mr. J, who was in a VA hospital in Virginia. Miss B said that Mr. M was the father of her child born in 1950. On January 16, 1951, Mr. M telephoned. He said he was a cook, was married and could not support regularly. The case was closed in March 1951 because Miss B received a lump sum from VA. She applied again in May 1951 saying the money was all gone. On March 25, 1952, Miss B and her youngest daughter, born January 11, 1952, were in the office. She said she "was not ashamed of the fact that her children were born out of wedlock as it could happen to any woman unless she kept to herself." She said that Corporal H was the father of her youngest child. However, on July 10, 1953, he was found by juvenile court "not guilty." Miss B had told the Agency on October 27, 1952, that Corporal H had denied the paternity and had said he would not contribute unless she continued to have relations with him. On May 28, 1954, a rent receipt was noted in the name of Mary L. She said this was the name of her boyfriend, Frederick L, who was in the Armed Forces. Miss B was married to Mr. L on November 12, 1954, and the case was closed. On May 15, 1956, she reapplied, saying that Mr. L had left her. Mr. L told the Agency on June 18, 1956, that he had left at Mrs. L's insistence and would return. They agreed to go back together. On June 25, 1956, Mr. L was in the office. He said that Mrs. L. would rather receive assistance than to have him return. The application was terminated because of no continued absence. Mrs. L came in on January 18, 1957, to say that her husband had been absent since August 1956. On February 12, 1957, she said he drank, wouldn't support, and she locked him out. On February 18, 1957, Mr. L said she had locked him out. She is never satisfied with what he does for her. When they were together and he came home, she was either out or getting ready to go out. She told him she could do better without him. On one occasion when he protested, she struck him with an iron pipe. Mr. L said she had a friend named George, and he had seen him in the home. Mrs. L said later he was only a "family friend." No further contact was made with Mr. L. On May 21, 1957, Mrs. L complained that the Agency had too many restrictions. When asked what she meant by this, she said, "You can't do this and you can't do that and the Welfare always wants to know all about your business." She said she "likes to be independent and do as she pleases, not having to explain things to anyone." She said she was "through with men." An explanation of Agency policy regarding absence was recorded for the first time. On March 18, 1958, Mrs. L said she was pregnant and that Mr. E was the father of the unborn child. She used to meet him at tourist homes, but the relationship has been discontinued.

Referral was made to I.S. July 16, 1958, to determine whether a family relationship exists between the client and Mr. E.

On July 24, 1958, I.S. reported that Mrs. L was pregnant and on September 3 that no man was seen in the home.

The following notation is made by the social worker on form No. 122, "Since no evidence was found of paramour, assistance was continued. We were aware of Mrs. L's. pregnancy."

See also cases Nos. 14 and 17 summarized in attachment No. 7.

8. Information supplied by investigation service not always helpful.

There were instances in which information supplied by I.S. was not of value to the worker.

For example, in case No. 21, the worker was concerned about the continuing relationship between Miss H and Mr. B who is the father of two children and who, according to Miss H, had asked her to marry him. She said Mr. B "knows better than to visit her in her home, and gave as the reason that Agency would not allow her to have male visitors." She said she sees him at his apartment when she visits her sister who lives two doors from Mr. B. On June 30, 1958, I.S. was asked to determine the extent of Miss H. and Mr. B's relationship and to determine if Miss H had access to Mr. B's apartment. The investigation was terminated with no information supplied as to Miss H's visits to Mr. B's apartment.

In case No. 46, Mrs. W's friend was seen in the home asleep. I.S. did not awaken the man or check his address as is usually done.

In case No. 44, I.S. was asked to visit after 10 p.m. to see who was frequenting the home. The investigation was inadequate and visits were not made as requested.

In other cases, I.S. interim reports clearly show that a man has access to the home, yet the final report is that no evidence is found.

Case No. 18 is an example of this. Mr. E was the father of several of Mrs. G's children. I.S. found him in the home on May 26, 1958, yet the final report of July 17, 1958, says, "No man has access" and form No. 122 is checked, "No evidence found."

In case No. 7, I.S. was asked to locate Mr. A, with whom Miss B said she had been having marital relations, and to determine if a family relationship existed with Mr. A or any man. On September 16, 1958, I.S. reported on form No. 197 that Mr. A had been located at the Marine Base in Camp Lejeune, N.C. Form No. 122 was checked to show that evidence was found of a paramour's presence in the home.

In case No. 29, the I.S. reported September 3, 1958, that no man was found in the home. Form No. 122 was checked "No evidence found." These reports have little meaning in cases such as this, where Mrs. L has had 6 illegitimate pregnancies by 4 different men while receiving assistance.

B. Comparison of 29 cases submitted by investigation service with findings of study.

1. Review of eight cases submitted by I.S. February 9, 1958, in which evidence appeared to indicate assistance should be discontinued.

On February 9, 1959, I.S. submitted a list of eight cases "in which evidence appears to indicate that assistance should be discontinued," and a list of 21 cases "in which evidence appears to indicate that if assistance was not discontinued, cases should have been referred to I.S. giving specific requests for followup action." Investigation Service noted that this second group consists of two categories: One, where the social worker talks with the recipient and believes her story that absence exists and, two, the social worker cannot make a definite finding on the information furnished by I.S. or contained in the record. Investigation Service believed such cases should be re-referred by the social worker, with a request for specific information needed for a definite finding.

The eight cases in which I.S. believed assistance should be discontinued were reviewed and compared with the findings of the study as to whether or not the continuation of assistance was justified. In four of these cases, the findings of the study were the same as that by I.S.—that the continuation of assistance was not justified. In one of the four other cases where the finding of the study was that the continuation of assistance was justified, assistance was to continue only for a 3-month period and then the case was to be closed because absence no longer existed. In the second case, case No. 19, the study showed that the continuation of assistance was justified, not on the basis of absence, but because of physical incapacity. The third case was case No. 4, a most difficult situation cited elsewhere in the study where it was decided that the continuation of assistance was justified because of the problems in the case and because the case had been referred to a higher supervisory level for a decision. In the fourth case, No. 26, the decision on the basis of the study was that the continuation of assistance was justified although continued absence was not clearly established, but the worker was not justified in discontinuing assistance without followup. In this case, application for assistance was not made until June 1958. Mrs. K said she had lived with her husband until April 1958 when they were forced to move and she had rented an apartment in her own name and Mr. K had gone to live with his mother. Referral was made to I.S. on June 20, 1958, to determine if Mr. K had free access to the home. On August 7, 1958, I.S. reported that a Mr. Y had been found in the home. Mrs. K told the investigators that her children go to Mr. K's place each morning for breakfast. On August 12, 1958, I.S. reported that they visited the home on Sunday at 10 a.m. and had been told by a woman who was looking after the baby that Mrs. K and the children were at their grandmother's. The investigation was closed as evidence indicated that the recipient is in regular contact with Mr. K. Mr. K had told the agency that Mrs. K has a friend who plays the role of father to his children. He said Mrs. K drinks and cares little for the children. Mr. K's mother said neither parent cares for the children properly. When the worker talked with Mrs. K about the relationship between Mr. K and his children, she said there were close family ties. There would appear to be real question that continued absence exists when the children are in such close contact with the father and when the mother also has contacts with the father. In finding that the continuation of assistance was justified, it was believed that re-referral should be made to I.S. and that the relationship with Mr. K and Mr. Y be cleared. It is noted that in July 1958 the agency pointed out to Mr. and Mrs. K that the agency cannot assume support of children when their parents are able to do so, yet the agency has continued to do this. This may well be a separation of convenience.

2. Review of 21 cases Investigation Service believes should have been re-referred.

The 21 cases where I.S. believed evidence appeared to indicate that if assistance was not discontinued, the cases should have been referred back to I.S., were compared with the findings of the study. Of these 21 cases, the study showed—

Continuation of assistance not justified	13
Continuation of assistance justified	8

Of the eight cases, the study showed that continued absence was not clearly established, and further follow-up was needed. In only one was re-referral made to I.S. In the remaining seven, the study showed re-referral should have been made.

From this comparison of I.S. recommendations and the findings of the study, it was found that the two are in substantial agreement.

C. Summary of findings:

1. Attention is directed to the fact that the cases read in this study represent only 49 out of a total caseload of 3,589 cases active in December 1958, or less than 1.4 percent.

2. No "frequent" disagreement was found between Investigation Service findings and the action taken by the social-service staff. Of the 531 cases included in the study, I.S. questioned only 29.

3. The basic element of disagreement was found to be in relation to the continuation of assistance in cases where I.S. believed the eligibility requirement of continued absence did not exist.

4. Information provided by Investigation Service has been used by staff in determining both eligibility and ineligibility. Of the 330 cases in which information had been requested as to presence in the home, no evidence was found in 133 cases. One hundred and sixteen cases were closed or the application denied prior to the study, 53 of them because absence was not found to exist.

5. In more than half of the 49 cases, it was believed that the continuation of assistance was not justified. In only two cases was it believed that the continuation of assistance was justified without further follow-up.

6. The decision to terminate an investigation seems to be made in most cases by I.S. alone without any communication or discussion with the social worker as to whether he wishes the investigation to be continued.

7. The manual provides for a conference to be arranged with appropriate persons, "when questions arise in the process of an investigation." No record was found of such conferences, although it is possible that they were held and were not recorded.

8. In at least six cases, the I.S. reports were not found in the case records. In instances of "current" and "retired" case records, I.S. reports were sometimes in the "current" record, sometimes in the "retired" record, and sometimes scattered between the two records.

9. In most cases the procedure established for referral to and reporting by I.S. were followed.

10. In a number of cases referral was made to I.S. before action was taken on information already available.

11. Assistance was frequently continued where absence was not clearly established and no re-referral to I.S. was made.

12. There was indication in the records read that clients are aware of I.S.'s. method of working, time of visiting, etc., and visit with men in the men's living quarters or elsewhere.

13. Mothers are able to make the Agency uncomfortable and uncertain and to receive assistance on their own terms.

14. It is difficult for the staff to cope with the complex problems in some of the ADC cases, to hold themselves and the client's to Agency policies.

15. It is difficult for the staff to carry adequately responsibility for evaluating the information already in case records or supplied by I.S.

16. Some cases show complete disregard of information supplied by I.S., as well as of Agency policy. This was found to be true when referral was made to a higher level for decision, as well as in other cases.

17. The staff is caught between conflicting pressures to provide assistance promptly to persons in need and of making a determination that need exists. Assistance is frequently authorized before any real effort is made, either by the client or the Agency, to locate the fathers who are supposed to be "absent."

18. The staff needs help in working with both mothers and fathers around the eligibility factor of continued absence, so that the interest of the fathers in their children is rekindled or sustained, and does not decline as assistance continued.

19. There is evidence that, once assistance is granted, the mothers prefer this and go to any lengths to see that it continues. The records indicate that—

a. The amount of the assistance payment is greater than husbands or paramours are able to earn,

b. The payment is more regular than the money received from husbands or paramours,

c. The mothers have complete control over the way the payment is spent, in contrast to earnings supplied by husband or paramour.

d. The mothers make every effort to convince the Agency of their continuing eligibility and, at the same time, continue the relationships which, if known to the Agency, would make them ineligible.

e. Advantage is gained from both the assistance payments and the earnings of husbands or paramours.

20. Many records show frequent moving from place to place and nearly always at increased cost. In almost no instance did the record show why the recipient moved, how moving costs or the new rent were paid, or that the new address and living arrangements were verified in accordance with Agency policy.

21. Clients are permitted to move from the home of relatives without contact by the Agency with the relative to verify that the client is required to move or why. This seems to be particularly true where the clients are very young and where supervision of their behavior is indicated.

22. The clients' statements and explanations are often accepted at face value, in spite of repeated evidence of falsification and deception.

23. The procedures established for seeking support from fathers in the Armed Forces are not followed.

24. The records reveal surprising evidence of well-being. There were references to the fact that children were well dressed, to expensive appliances and televisions, to the purchase of clothing and furniture in amounts of several hundreds of dollars, and to bicycles and "other expensive toys." There were also references to "good" meals being prepared by the recipients when visits were made.

PAD No. 122
Rev. 12/58

ATTACHMENT No. 1

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE,

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE DIVISION

Report on Investigation Service

I.S. No. ----------
☐ Appl ☐ Active case

Name of client ---------- Category and case No. ---------- Race: W N O

I. Request by social worker	II. Information furnished by I.S.			
A. Locate—	A.	Located	Withdrawn by S.W.	Not located
1. Husband		☐	☐	☐
2. Paramour ---------- (number)		☐	☐	☐
3. Mother		☐	☐	☐
4. Other: Specify ----------		☐	☐	☐
B. Information on presence in the home of—	B.	Evidence found	Withdrawn by S.W.	No evidence found
1. Husband		☐	☐	☐
2. Paramour ----------		☐	☐	☐
3. Male visitors		☐	☐	☐
4. Other: Specify ----------		☐	☐	☐
C. Information on resources—	C.	Evidence found	Withdrawn by S.W.	No evidence found
1. Real estate ownership		☐	☐	☐
2. Car ownership		☐	☐	☐
3. Employment		☐	☐	☐
4. Business activity		☐	☐	☐
5. Illegal activity		☐	☐	☐
6. Roomers		☐	☐	☐
7. Other: Specify ----------		☐	☐	☐
D. Other service requested (specify)	D.			
----------	----------			

II. E. Refusal to sign PAD No. 77: Reason ----------

II. F. Incidental information developed by I.S. ----------

Social worker ----------
Date S.W. memo ----------
Date of receipt of S.W. memo ----------
Investigator ----------

122 Partial ---------- Final ----------

Date I.S. report	To S.W.
----------	----------
----------	----------
----------	----------
----------	----------
----------	----------
----------	----------

Return 122 to Chief, I.S., by

II. ACTION TAKEN BY SOCIAL WORKER

A. Application:

1. Approved: ----------; amount $----------.

2. Denied ----------; code reason for denial ----------; date ----------.

3. Still pending ----------.

B. Case:

1. Assistance continued unchanged, amount $----------.

2. Assistance increased; date ----------; from $---------- to $----------.

3. Assistance decreased: date ----------; from $---------- to $----------.

4. Assistance suspended: Case not closed, amount $----------, date suspended ----------; date case last opened ----------.

5. Assistance suspended: Code reason for closing ----------; amount $----------. Date suspended ----------; date case last opened ----------.

6. Assistance reinstated ----------; amount $----------.

ACTION AND RESULTS ON NONSUPPORT

Inapplicable because—
0. No man involved.
1. Man already supporting.
2. Man's whereabouts unknown.
3. Time for filing complaint expired.
4. Case closed or application denied.
5. Other: specify ----------
6. Voluntary agreement signed: date ---------- ----------; amount $----------.
7. Referral to juvenile court: date ----------
a. Support ordered: amount $----------
b. Bench warrant issued.
c. Other action: specify ----------
8. Referral to district attorney: specify action ----------
9. Action by PAD staff pending: note reason ----------

Action and results on I.S. report:

ATTACHMENT 2.—*Forms 122—July, August, September, 1958*

Location of person	172
Information on location only	140
Other information submitted	32
Case closed or application denied	19
Case not closed	13
Resources and other requests	29
Closed or suspended	12
No evidence found	11
Evidence found—not closed	6
Presence in the home	330
No evidence found	133
Closed or application denied	116
Cases not closed	81
Total	531

ATTACHMENT 3.—*Request by social worker for information relating to the presence in the home of husband, paramour, or other person*

No evidence found	133
Case closed or application denied	116
Cases not closed	81
Withdrawn by social worker	7
Withdrawn by I.S	2
Evidence found	45
Grant suspended	11
Application held pending	4
Grant continued	30
OAA	2
GPA	1
ADC	27
Record not located	1
No evidence found on specific reason for referral but other information submitted	27
Grant suspended	2
Grant continued	25
ATD	1
GPA	1
ADC	23
Records read and schedules prepared:	
Evidence found	26
Evidence not found on specific reason for referral but other information submitted	23
Subtotal	49
Total	330

ATTACHMENT 4—SCHEDULE FOR STUDY OF ADC CASES IN WHICH INVESTIGATION SERVICE BELIEVES TO HAVE MADE A POSITIVE REPORT ON ACCESS TO THE HOME YET ASSISTANCE WAS CONTINUED—NOVEMBER 1958

Case name ------ case number ------.

A. Date of referral to I.S. ----------------.

Raco: W–N–O.

B. Reason for referral:

1. To obtain new information.

2. To confirm absence or presence where not clearly shown.

3. To confirm absence or presence although clearly shown.

4. To investigate current situation in cases previously closed because absence was not established.

5. To investigate current situation in cases where previous I.S. report or case record indicates man had access to home.

6. Other (specify) ---------------.

C. Relationship to woman of man found in home:

1. Husband: paramour.

2. Father of one or more children.

3. Father of none.

4. Other (specify) ----------------.

D. Date of report by I.S. requiring action by social worker ---------------.

E. Action by social worker:

1. Discussion of I.S. report with woman and/or man—date -----------------.

2. Referred to unit and/or District supervisor for decision—date -----------------.

3. Re-referred to I.S.—date --------------.

4. Other (specify) ---------------.

F. Recorded reason assistance was continued; denied of relationship by recipient:

1. Re-referral not indicated. Re-referral seems indicated.

2. Referral made.

3. Referral not made. Change in recipient's situation concurrent with I.S. Report:

4. Man in jail or hospital.

5. Man left District of Columbia.

6. Mother out of home—change in grantee relative.

7. Man's unemployability verified.

8. Other (specify) ------------------------.

Report returned to I.S. before final action has been taken.

9. Referred to higher supervisory level.

10. Other (specify) ----------------------.

11. Inapplicable because man a relative or other person not connected with family.

G. Was referral to I.S. justified?

Yes—.

1. Continued absence not clearly established

2. Other (specify) ---------------------.

No—.

3. Adequate information for decision in case record ineligible under Agency policy before referral

4. No continued absence

Eligibility not affected by "Access"

5. Man physically or mentally incapacitated

6. Other (specify) ----------------------.

7. Other (specify) ----------------------.

H. Was continuation of assistance justified?

Yes—.

1. Explanation by recipient and followup by worker clearly establish continued absence

2. Continued absence not clearly established, but worker not justified in discontinuing assistance without further followup

3. Eligibility not affected by access

4. Incidental information provided by I.S. does not affect eligibility after followup by social worker

No—.

Continued absence not established

1. Man's intimate relationship with woman clearly established

2. Man found in home 2 or more times

3. Record gives evidence of unconvincing explanations by client

4. Other (specify) ----------------------.

1. Other action indicated related to continued absence

1. Effort to locate or communicate with husband

2. Re-referral to I.S.

3. Other (specify) --.

Remarks:

ATTACHMENT 5—EXAMPLES OF DIFFICULT SITUATIONS AND ATTITUDES WITH WHICH THE INVESTIGATION SERVICE AND SOCIAL SERVICE MUST WORK

CASE NO. 28

August 24, 1953: Mrs. L applied for herself and two children. She said her allotment had stopped because her husband was AWOL. She was pregnant by Robert J, who was interviewed September 1, 1953 and agreed to support. There was no discussion recorded of a continuing relationship or of agency policy. When Mr. L was interviewed, he said he would support. He said he had no plans to live with his wife. He said his wife had purchased a 1947 Cadillac. Mrs. L said she had permitted Mr. Y to buy a car in her name.

December 7, 1953: Mrs. L's mother, who had been known to the agency under several different names, said Mrs. L is continuing her relationship with Mr. J and that she spends the grant foolishly.

March 10, 1955: Mrs. L said she was pregnant by Mr. J and that her relationship with him has continued. When Mr. J was interviewed, he said he felt sorry for Mrs. L. He does not want his child on relief. He said the Agency had no right to question his relationship with Mrs. L as this was a personal matter.

April 22, 1955: Mrs. L was told she was no longer eligible for assistance and the case was closed.

January 1956: Mrs. L reapplied. She said that Mr. J had died, she has no boy friend and she does not intend to have any more children.

February 24, 1958: Mrs. L is pregnant by Mr. W. She said she had been seeing him for a year. Mrs. L readily accepted the fact when it was explained that her March check would probably "be her last check." Case is discussed with supervisor: "Free access of the man from the home cannot be established since Mr. W is stationed at Bolling Field in Washington. Therefore absence cannot be established and assistance will be discontinued."

April 1, 1959: Check canceled. However, the April 1 check was reinstated with no reason given and the grant continued.

June 12, 1958: Mrs. L wanted "to know her limits." She also wanted to know how long I.S. would be visiting.

May 1958: Referral was made to I.S. regarding Mr. W, but a Mr. R was found in the home. The address he gave was found to be an empty house. There is no further mention in the record of Mr. W. There is no record of an interview with him.

In 1957 there is an entry in the record that Mr. L is the paramour of another ADC mother who has had three children by him.

Case No. 47. In this case, which is 76 pages long, the Agency learned on October 17, 1951, that Mrs. W. had given birth to a child on October 3, 1951. (Mrs. W. had been seen on September 25, 1951, and employment discussed. There was no mention of pregnancy.) Mr. T. was named as the father. An entry, dated December 5, 1951, said the check was released with the understanding that Mrs. W. would have Mr. T. come to the office. He was not seen until December 1952. There is no record of any discussion with him then, except support.

In 1955, Mrs. W. named Mr. D as the father of her child born September 10, 1955. In October 1955, the worker recorded—"I also asked Mrs. W. if she were continuing her relationship with Mr. D., and she said she really did not know * * *."

A letter was received from Mrs. W., saying she had broken off with Mr. D. and had nothing else to do with him. On December 2, 1955, Mr. D. was seen. He said he was disgusted with Mrs. W. for not wanting to keep his child that he had stopped seeing her in January or February and there has been no relationship between them since that time. "They both promised to contact us if they decided to resume their relationship."

In October 1956 a furniture company reported that Mrs. W. had bought $516.00 worth of furniture, increased the debt to $560.00, and had made monthly payments of $30.00 until July 1955. (The worker noted that Mr. T. came into Mrs. W's life in 1955—and that she had said the furniture belonged to her mother.) On April 13, 1957, the worker notes that a man has been seen in Mrs. W's home several times, whom Mrs. W. said was her uncle.

In May 1957, the case was closed because Mrs. W. went to work. She reapplied in August 1958 and referral was made to I.S. to determine that Mr. D. is continuously absent. On September 18, 1958, I.S. reported finding

Mr. D. in the home. The following entry, dated November 5, 1958, is made on form No. 122: "Assistance continued pending interview with Mrs. W. and Mr. D."

Case No. 48. Mrs. W had received assistance since 1949. In August 1953 the Agency learned she was pregnant by Mr. L. He was seen in October 1953 and agreed to give Mrs. W. $6.00 each week.

In 1954 a department store reported that Mrs. W. had purchased clothing amounting to $140.95. The store was informed that "We took no responsibility for what our recipients did." Mrs. W. moved frequently, no questions were raised as to how moving costs or rent were paid, and living arrangements were not satisfactorily verified.

In January 1956, the Agency learned that Mrs. W had given birth to a male infant. When Mrs. W and Mr. I were seen in February 1956, Mr. I said he planned to marry someone else and would be unable to provide for the children. He said later he would support and that the Agency had no right to know his business. In March the case was closed. Mrs. W appealed and the action of the Agency was sustained. Mrs. W said had she known that by bringing Mr. L to the Agency she was not eligible for further assistance, she would have brought some other man and said he was the father. In May she applied again, and both she and Mr. L said their relationship was continuing. However, he was seen in the home in June, and the application was terminated. In September 1956, Mrs. W was referred to CWD, became pregnant again by Mr. L and the case was again closed in March 1958. Her last application was in May 1958. She denied any further relationship with Mr. L. Referral was made to Investigation Service on June 6, 1958, to determine if Mr. L is absent from the home. On July 8, 1958, Investigation Service reported that Mrs. W said she had never heard of Mr. L. "When it was pointed out that this was not true, recipient readily admitted this, but stated she felt it was not necessary to tell investigators things that don't concern them. Recipient then began speaking in a loud belligerent voice and would not be interrupted in her harangue." Investigation Service suggested that the social worker should interview Mrs. W with the investigator present, and that unless she cooperated, no purpose would be served by further home visits. On August 6, 1958, Investigation Service reported that Mrs. W was not at home when visited. The final report, dated August 18, 1958, points out that Mrs. W has not given correct information as to persons living in the household and that "this closes investigation by Investigation Service." No information was obtained concerning Mr. L's presence or absence in the home.

CASE NO. 49

When Mrs. W applied for assistance in 1955 she was 18 years old and had three children. She was 15 when she married Mr. W, he was 17. She said Mr. W had deserted. In 1956 Mrs. W's mother complained that she was "running the streets," sometimes stayed out all night, and made no plans for care of the children. In May 1956, Mr. W, who was not yet 20, was interviewed at the jail. He said he had not deserted. His wife and children had gone to her mother's home when he was out of work, and he had refused to go there. He said he had supported himself since he was 14 and could do several kinds of work. He had been a ward of CWD. He said he planned to return to his family. In May 1956, Mrs. W's behavior and drinking were discussed. She said she felt her behavior was due to Mr. W's incarceration and that she "just can't wait" for him to be released. Mr. W was released and returned to his family. He was made payee, which made Mrs. W angry. In August 1956, Mr. W obtained work. Both Mr. and Mrs. W assured the worker they did not consider themselves separated, and the case was closed.

In May 1957, Mrs. W. reapplied, saying Mr. W. had deserted. She talked "loudly and snappily" with worker, and paid little attention to the worker's explanation regarding efforts to locate Mr. W. and to obtain support. The record says Mr. W. has "a history of irresponsibility, incarceration and failure to support" but the record does not bear this out. On September 22, 1957, Mrs. W. called to ask that her case be closed because she was working. The agency learned later that she began working July 18, 1957.

In March 1958, Mrs. W applied again. She said she was laid off at HEW. It was learned that she had lost her job because of too frequent absences due to illness and her work was not satisfactory. She said she had been separated from Mr. W. for a year and had been going with a Mr. B. She was demanding and controlling. The worker notes in referral to I.S. Mrs. W. is very unpleasant. "I believe she is mentally disturbed." In May 1958, a man from the realty company called to say that Mrs. W. had moved in the middle of the night, that a man helped her move, and that he thinks the man stayed all night.

In June 1957, referral was made to locate Mr. W. Investigation Service reported they could not locate Mrs. W. Referral to I.S. was made May 26, 1958, to determine whether a family relationship existed with any man. Investigation Service reported they were not admitted to the home, that Mrs. W. was not at home on the last two visits and that no evidence was found of male access. On form No. 122, I.S. noted: "Possible neglect of children." The form was returned to I.S. with no notation by the social worker, except that the grant continued unchanged.

CASE NO. 15

Mrs. E. told the Agency in 1951 that Mr. E. had deserted 6 years before. In 1956 (after Mrs. E.'s fifth application since 1933) I.S. reported that Mr. E. was employed, that his address was the same as Mrs. E.'s and that he claimed five dependents for income tax purposes. Mr. and Mrs. E. denied living together and the grant continued.

In 1958 Mrs. E. was forced to move from NCHA because of the illegal sale of alcohol. (The father of one of her children had told the agency in 1956 that Mrs. E. did not need assistance, that Mrs. E. was selling liquor and numbers.) In September 1958, I.S. reported no evidence of liquor sale or access.

Case No. 16: Mrs. F told the Agency on August 7, 1953, that if her husband was able to work and to return home, she would be pleased to have him, since he had always supported and worked regularly. In 1957, on two occasions, she said he had never supported adequately. Mr. F claimed his wife did not want him back because she was interested in someone else.

Case No. 31: Investigation Service found Mr. M in Miss L's home. She said he was her cousin, not her boyfriend. She admitted later that he was her boyfriend and that she had tried to conceal this information from the Agency.

Case No. 37: Referral was made to I.S. to determine the relationship of Mrs. M and Mr. A. When I.S. visited in September 1958 Mr. A answered the door. Mrs. M said Mr. A visited every day because she was in arrears with her rent, and he had rented the house for her. New men's suits were found in the closet. The grant continues, with the notation on form No. 122 that I.S. report did not reveal conclusive evidence of Mr. A's having free access to the client's home. Mrs. M showed worker that she had altered the new suits to fit her young sons.

Attachment 6—Action Taken by Social Worker on Information Provided by Investigation Service

Report discussed with client	24
In less than 1 month	15
In less than 2 months	6
In less than 3 months	1
In less than 4 months	1
Date not recorded, but record mentions discussion	1
Letters written to arrange interview	4
Action taken prior to I.S. report	1
No action required	7
No action recorded	13
Total	49

Attachment 7—Examples of Preference of Mothers for Assistance Rather Than Support From Husband

Case No. 14: Mrs. E., age 23, applied for assistance for herself and four children in July 1952, saying Mr. E. had been incarcerated for non-support. She said Mr. E. had been fairly reliable until about 3 years ago when he started drinking and staying out nights. They were married in April 1947; the oldest child was born in January 1947. Mrs. E's. fifth child was born in 1953. She said she was not going to permit her husband to live with her again after his release. On May 8, 1953, Mr. E. was visited at the District jail. He said he was anxious to return to his family and support them, but Mrs. E. had written him of her desire for a divorce. After Mr. E. was released, Mr. and Mrs. E. were seen at the office May 19, 1953. Mr. E. felt that his children should not receive assistance, as long as he was ablebodied and can work and care for them He accused Mrs. E. of running the streets all hours of the night and not looking after the children as a mother should. He gave the car license number of the car belonging to a man she was "running around with." Mrs. E. said the car belonged to Mr. A., a friend of hers. On a visit to the home on February 10, 1953, worker had seen an elderly man mopping the kitchen floor. In June 1953, Mr. E. obtained employment. He complained about Mrs. E.'s behavior, her care of the children, and her threat to put him back in jail, and how difficult Mrs. E. makes it for him to see the children. The worker talked with Mrs. E. in July about giving Mr. E. "an opportunity to prove himself," but she was unwilling. In November 1953, when a visit was made, an "old gentleman" was sitting in the kitchen with the children. Mrs. E. was dressed to go out and a young man came in, and was introduced as Mr. O. The worker again talked about permitting Mr. E. to return. The worker remarked that "sometimes it might be easier to depend on the Agency rather than to give her husband an oppornity to prove that she could depend on him." Mr. and Mrs. E were again seen together at the office. Mr. E. said he is making $82.72 every 2 weeks, that he loved his wife and children and wanted to support them. He worked steadily and tried to show his wife that he had changed. He said he could support the family on his salary "if she would listen to reason and let him come home." He thought it would be possible to reason with Mrs. E. "if she did not feel so independent of him." He said he could not understand why his wife and children needed assistance, when he was willing to return and give the family advantage of all his earnings. He said "as long as his wife could get public assistance she wouldn't listen to anything he had to say." After conference with the supervisor, the worker told Mrs. E. she was not eligible for continued assistance, because of Mr. E.'s offer to support in the home. In December Mr. E. said he had thought about it and did not want to return home. "He thinks they could not get along and thinks he might end up in jail." The grant continued. In February 1954, Mrs. E. said Mr. E was picked up on his job for nonsupport and lost his job because of being held in jail. In March 1954 Mrs. E. was pregnant by Mr. A., lost the baby, and said she was still "keeping company" with Mr. A. During the interview, Mr. A. came to visit Mrs. E. Mr. A. said he would take care of any children born to them. In March 1955, Mrs. E. said she had no further relationship with Mr. A. In May 1956, a Mr. R. came to complain about Mrs. E.'s neglect of the children, and spending money she gets from the Agency on herself. Mr. R. said Mrs. E. is pregnant by him. He has stayed with Mrs. E.

He has offered to marry her and care for the children, "but she wants to be free to run the streets." He said she drinks heavily. Mrs. E denied any relationship with Mr. R or pregnancy. In September there was a discussion with Mrs. E as to her behavior, parties, etc. She said she was "ready to settle down and plan for her children and stop running around." In October Mrs. E was evicted by NCHA. Although her back rent was paid by "some men," she had been a problem and disturbance over a period of years. A Mr. Y was seen in the home in October 1956 and January 1957. In January and March, Investigation Service reported finding a Mr. J in the home. In April 1957 and again in January 1958, Mrs. E was told that a relationship with a man similar to that of husband and wife might jeopardize the grant. She said she was well aware of this policy.

In April 1958 Investigation Service located Mr. E. In August 1958, Mr. E came to the office on his own accord. He signed a voluntary support agreement. He again said he would like to make a home for his family, but "would not want to return to the home unless Mrs. E accepted him on her own." On August 13, 1958, Information Service found Mr. B in the home, and a Mr. L staggered in from the street. Mr. L had come staggering in on a previous Information Service visit. On August 18, 1958, Mrs. E said Mr. B was a friend she hadn't seen for 6 years. She would not consider going back with Mr. E. He would leave her and take trips with other women, and stay away from home drunk. On October 6, 1958, Mrs. E said that he had moved and her rent had been increased to $65 plus heating oil and utilities. She was reminded of the Agency maximum of $64 for all shelter costs, and she said she could manage.

CASE NO. 17

When Mrs. J applied for assistance in 1955 she was not quite 19. Her husband had been incarcerated for robbery and Mrs. J's stepfather said he could not continue to provide for her and the two children. She had never worked and her mother was not willing to care for the children. Her mother and stepfather rented quarters for her, provided furniture and a television, and assistance was authorized.

In August 1956 an anonymous telephone call was received saying that Mrs. J did not live at the address she had given, but was living with a man in Northeast.

In January 1957 a man was seen in the home. Mrs. J said he was her stepbrother, Mr. C, but when the social worker addressed him as Mr. C, he did not respond. Mrs. J interrupted and introduced him as her cousin and said she had been confused. The young man said he was not Mr. C and was not related to Mrs. J, but was a friend of her brother who had just stopped by because it was a rainy day and he had nothing to do.

Mr. J was paroled and came to the Agency in October 1957. He said he loved Mrs. J and wanted to provide a home for her but she was not interested because she was living with a Mr. W who had told him to stay away. Mrs. J denied living with a man, or that she was working, as her husband had said. She said Mr. J was good to her and provided well for her prior to his incarceration, "but she just didn't want him anymore." It was explained that assistance could not be continued since Mr. J had offered to provide for his family. Mrs. J said she "would see him put in jail" at which time she would "be back to see us."

In April 1958 Mrs. J reapplied. She said her mother and stepfather had been helping her and that she had no intention of going back to Mr. J. When Mr. J was reached by telephone he said he was out of work and did not want to live with Mrs. J. In May 1958, Mr. J said he was working and was willing to establish a home, but Mrs. J did not want him. He said she had done everything she could to make trouble for him. Mrs. J made it clear that "she felt the children were exclusively hers" and refused to let Mr. J come to see the children. She had not looked for work. A child care plan was arranged by the Agency with another mother who was receiving assistance, and Mrs. J was told that she would not receive assistance after July 31, 1958.

Referral was made to the Investigation Service on May 23, 1958, to determine if the man Mr. J said was living with Mrs. J, or any other man, had free access to the home, or if she has a husband-wife relationship with any man. The Investigation Service was also asked to determine if Mrs. J was or had been employed. On June 3, 1958, Investigation Service reported that Mrs. J was pregnant and that she had been employed under another name.

On June 2, 1958, a neighbor told the agency of Mrs. J's pregnancy, of her running with a fast, rough crowd, drinking heavily and "cursing and cavorting in public."

Mrs. J insisted that Mr. J was responsible for her pregnancy, but he denied this. He said his wife had been pregnant while he was in prison, but that he was not responsible for either that pregnancy or this one. Mr. J's manager was contacted. He said he had seen the man Mrs. J was living with in the home and told of evidences of a "wild party" with couples sleeping in various parts of the house. Mr. J's probation officer said he was in Mrs. J's home in November 1957 and there was a man living with her then. He said "It was apparent to him that Mrs. J was trying to have Mr. J readmitted to prison."

On July 28, 1958, Mrs. J came to the office saying the agency would have to help her now because Mr. J was incarcerated. She was told that she was still ineligible for assistance because she had failed to establish the paternity of her unborn child. Mrs. J saw the District Supervisor, who decided the grant should be continued, with continued efforts to locate the father of her child.

On October 6, 1958, Mrs. J admitted that a Mr. Y, not Mr. J was responsible for her pregnancy. She said she had withheld this information for fear of jeopardizing her assistance. She said she and Mr. Y were not resuming their relationship. On October 15, 1958, Mr. Y said he never expects to live with Mrs. J again. He said he was ill and was advised to undergo surgery. On October 22, 1958, Mrs. J discussed plans to marry Mr. Y. Since they plan to marry as soon as they obtain divorces, "she felt it would be all right for them to live together as husband and wife." On November 19, 1958, she told I.S. she did not have any intention of seeing Mr. Y again.

The grant continues with the review date set for April 1, 1959.

What Elements Are Responsible for Frequent Re-referrals of Cases to Investigation Service on Which What Appears To Be a Conclusive Finding Has Been Made as a Result of the Original Referral

At a meeting on February 5, 1959, of the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, Statistician, Chief, Investigation Service, and the Standards Specialist, it was decided that Investigation Service would submit a list of the cases which Investigation Service believed should not have been re-referred.

On February 16, 1959, the Chief of the Investigation Service submitted a list of 8 cases selected from the 127 cases re-referred to Investigation Service by the field staff during July, August and September 1958. Five of these cases were closed and three were active.

Only one case (case B) was among the 49 cases on which part I of the study was based. This case was identified in part I as case No. 20 and was cited to illustrate action taken on information supplied by Investigation Service and community complaints.

These 8 cases were read during the last week in February 1959. They were divided by category as follows:

Aid to dependent children	6
Old age assistance	1
Aid to the disabled	1

A. Findings on case situations and re-referrals:

1. Elements responsible for re-referrals:

From a review of the eight cases, it appears that the following elements are responsible for re-referrals:

(a) Reluctance of staff to make decisions to deny assistance.

(b) Vehement denial by recipients of relationships.

(c) Care in weighing information received in relation to source and clients' statements.

(d) Need for support by I.S. findings before finding client ineligible.

(e) Conflicting information received.

(f) Change in worker.

2. Summary of findings:

(a) Investigation Service questioned the re-referrals of only 8 of the 127 cases re-referred in July, August and September 1958.

(b) The study showed that in 6 cases there was enough information in the I.S. reports or in the case records on which to base a decision.

(c) In one case there was sufficient reason for re-referral.

(d) In one case acceptance of the case was questioned, but since this was done, Agency policy required re-referral.

B. Case summaries: See attachment II–1.

Attachment II–1

CASE A—OAA

1. Investigation Service reason for believing re-referral should not have been made.

Investigation Service believed this case should not have been re-referred because I.S. had furnished enough information on original investigation for social service staff to make a decision.

2. Information in case record: Mrs. C applied in 1956. She had been living with Mr. G, in what appeared to be a common law relationship, but said he could not continue keeping her. In January 1958, after a report was received that Mrs. C had a man and a child living with her, referral was made to I.S. to determine this. On February 5, 1958, I.S. reported finding Mr. G hiding in a closet, and his grandchild in the home. The janitor confirmed the living arrangements. Mr. G and Mrs. C both denied that he lived there. Calls were received from Mrs. C's landlady, Mr. G's landlady and from the child's mother saying Mr. G and the child were not in Mrs. C's home. In his re-referral to I.S. on Sep-

tember 9, 1958, the worker says he was informed by neighbors that Mr. G had returned home, but Mrs. C said he was in Virginia. On September 15, 1958, I.S. reported finding Mr. G in bed in Mr. C's home feigning sleep. The case was closed in October 1958.

3. Elements responsible for re-referral: It appears that the case was re-referred because information was received from three presumably reliable persons that Mr. G and his grandchild were no longer in the home, after I.S. had found them there, yet neighbors had reported Mr. G had returned. A change in worker may also have had something to do with re-referral.

4. Findings: In view of the conflicting information the worker had received from persons presumed to be reliable, re-referral was justified.

CASE B—ADC

1. Investigation Service reason for believing re-referral should not have been made.

Investigation Service believed this case should not have been re-referred because:

(a) I.S. had furnished enough information on original investigation for social service to make a decision.

(b) Reason for re-referral is inconsistent with information previously submitted by I.S.

2. Information in case record: This is the case of a 54-year-old woman whose child was born in 1943.

In 1952 she was arrested on a narcotics charge and sentenced to Occoquan. The child was committed to CWD on two occasions. In March 1956 the judge of the juvenile court questioned Miss H's eligibility for continued assistance. A memorandum, dated March 29, 1956, from the Assistant Superintendent to the Deputy Director of Public Welfare describes Miss H as a "pathetic piece of human wreckage * * *" who is "apparently not too bright." In 1956 CWD noted report that Miss H had "reverted to the same pattern of living she had at the time of her arrest on the narcotics charge."

Mr. B, father of Miss H's child, was seen in 1948 and in 1957. The record does not indicate any continuing relationship. CWD record indicated he was living with another woman.

3. Elements responsible for re-referral:

On March 19, 1958, referral was made to I.S. to determine if Mr. B had free access to Miss H's home. I.S. submitted five reports. Many men and also women, were found drinking in the home. The final report dated April 4, 1958 notes that in discussion with the supervisor, "it was decided that I.S. should close its investigation, because of conditions found."

On June 24, 1958, the case was re-referred to I.S. to determine if Mr. B has free access to Miss H's home. In an entry dated June 4, 1958, the record says, "Since I.S. was unable to make a determination on our previous referral because of the living arrangements of the home on L Street, the case is being re-referred to the unit at this time."

In August 1958, I.S. reported numerous visits had been made to the home, that Mr. B had never been seen, but that on all visits except the last, several men had been seen in the apartment. "These men have all shown signs of extreme intoxication, on the otherhand there has not been any indication these men were more than friends or acquaintances who had dropped by to visit and drink."

On form No. 122 I.S. noted, "Four men found constantly in home."

3. Elements responsible for re-referral: The elements responsible for re-referral are not clear, since the record showed no indication of a continuing relationship.

4. Findings: Re-referral was not justified, since there is no indication, either in the record or in previous I.S. report, of a continuing relationship with Mr. B.

CASE C—ADC

1. Investigation Service reason for believing re-referral should not have been made.

Investigation Service believed this case should not have been re-referred because I.S. had furnished enough information on original investigation for the social service staff to make a decision.

2. Information in case record:

Mrs. H applied May 25, 1953. She said she could not continue working because she had no child-care plan. Mr. H deserted in North Carolina in 1951. She came to the District of Columbia in 1952. Her father had helped her. On May 4, 1954, MAD reported that Mrs. H was pregnant. She said Mr. G was responsible for her pregnancy but changed her story and said Mr. W was responsible. She said Mr W. was in Japan. He denied paternity. On October 5, 1954, Mrs. H said she could return to her mother in North Carolina. On April 9, 1956, referral was made to IS to locate Mr. H and Mr. W. In 1956 IS located Mr. H, husband and father of three children in South Carolina. Mrs. H sent him a registered letter but received no reply. No action since 1956 to locate Mr. H except referral to RES in 1958, who found not at 1956 address.

March 1, 1957: Complaint received from a former recipient about people hanging around the house playing cards. She said a man was involved. On June 6, 1957, landlady complained about Mrs. H, saying she should not have help. She said Mr. H had been in town around Christmas time. Mrs. H denied this. On January 20, 1958, IS reported Mr. G found under the porch. On February 6, 1958, IS reported Mr. G in home second time and at the social worker's verbal request IS case was closed. Mrs. H was told she was no longer eligible for assistance. She wanted to talk with the supervisor and a conference was arranged on February 21, 1958, and the case was kept open. She was asked to bring Mr. G to the office which she did on February 24, 1958. He said he was only a casual friend and assumed no responsibility for Mrs. H or her children. On July 8, 1958, another referral was made to IS to determine whether Mr. G lives in the home or whether he or any other man frequents the home. On July 30, 1958, IS reports Mr. G in the home conducting himself like the master of the home. Mrs. H was out and he was caring for the children. The case was closed August 27, 1958, because the man was found living in the home. On October 23, 1958, Mrs. H reapplied. She denied a continuing relationship with Mr. G. Her application was accepted and she was told her case would be assigned to the area worker and that it would be necessary that the area worker interview Mr. G. The record says, "No re-referral was made to FIS due to recent report submitted by FIS re Mr. G." This is contrary to agency policy regarding re-referrals in manual 303.4–3.

No dictation after November 1958.

3. Elements responsible for re-referral: After IS had found Mr. G in the home on two occasions, she denied that he frequents her home and said it was just by coincidence he was found there. It was for this reason re-referral was made to determine again whether Mr. G live in the home or whether he or any other man frequents the home.

4. Findings: In view of Mrs. H's unconvincing explanations, it is believed that IS had furnished enough information on which to base a decision.

CASE D—ATD

1. Investigation Service reason for believing re-referral should not have been made.

Investigation Service believed this case should not have been re-referred because:

(a) I.S. had furnished enough information on original investigation for Social Service to make a decision.

(b) Information in case record.

2. Information in case record: Mrs. H is blind and an alcoholic. Record of arrest and drinking, under several different names, date back to 1933. She has received assistance almost continuously since 1942. Care at DCV suggested in 1942. Child born 1948 was committed to CWD because Mrs. H was not capable of providing care. On almost every page of the record there is a change of address. On April 23, 1956, two men were seen in the home. On December 15, 1956, report received that Mrs. H was living with a man. On January 7, 1957 referral was made to I.S. to determine whether a man lives in the home. January 16, 1957 I.S. reports three men found in home and February 11, 1957 two men found. On February 18, 1957 worker found two men in home. Mrs. H admitted having lived with Mr. D for 7 or 8 years. Mr. D was found eligible for assistance until his death April 3, 1958. On June 4, 1958 worker found a man in Mrs. H's room, and told her the grant could not continue "unless she moved to a room and board arrangement because she appears to be an easy victim for worthless men to take advantage of her." Room and board arrangements were made by worker with a Mrs. W, who telephoned June 5, 1958 to say she could not allow Mrs. H to remain because she had too many men friends visiting her. Goodwill Industries had also reported men frequenting the home. August 1, 1958 check canceled because Mrs. H's whereabouts were unknown. On September 17, 1958, referral was made to I.S. to determine whether there was a man living in the home or having free access. On September 22, 1958, I.S. reported finding two men. They and Mrs. H were drunk. The landlady said one of the men was always there. A large quantity of food was found. The case was closed in September.

3. Elements responsible for referral: The man I.S. found to be living with Mrs. D in 1957 died in April 1958. This may have been why the case was re-referred. The worker may have referred to substantiate reports received in June 1958 of frequent male visitors, although she herself had found a man in the home.

4. Findings: Re-referral was not justified since the worker had obtain enough information on which to base a decision.

CASE E—ADC

1. Investigation Service reason for believing re-referral should not have been made.

Investigation Service believed this case should not have been re-referred because:

(a) I.S. had furnished enough information on original investigation for social service staff to make a decision.

(b) Information in case record.

2. Information in case record: Miss K. has received assistance continuously since 1952 when the grant was made on a "temporary" basis. She lived with her family, rent free, until 1955 when she moved to NCHA. Reports concerning Miss K's. behavior have come to the Agency since August 1953. The first report of her relationship with Mr. S. was received in May 1956. In August they both said the relationship was being discontinued so that the grant would continue. In November 1956, referral was made to I.S. to determine whether or not Mr. S. or any man was in or visiting the home and to locate Mr. B., father of Miss K's. two oldest children. I.S. located Mr. B. and found Mr. S. in the home. The record is 62 pages in length, composed for the most part of reports concerning Miss K's. behavior, her

denials, and page after page of Agency explanation of policy in relation to continued absence. No action was taken and no referral made. Numerous reports were received from the NCHA Manager who reported from time to time that Mr. S. was living in the home. For example, on July 23, 1957, I.S. reported that the manager of Stanton Dwellings said he had "positive information" that Miss K is being supported by Mr. S. The manager also said that Miss K. was writing numbers and that several "persons in the neighborhood act as lookout for Miss K." so that Miss K. can be warned to "clear house." This warning service also extends through the entire Stanton Dwelling area for the benefit of other recipients. Miss K. told NCHA whatever she did was her business. On page 56 of the case record (undated), there were reports of illegal activities, writing numbers, sale of liquor, "large parties" and that Mr. S. was in the home. The worker points out that "the reports were not conclusive enough to warrant withholding of assistance." On September 9, 1957, NCHA again reported that Miss K. has a paramour. Both Miss K. and Mr. S. again denied any continuing relationship. In spite of Agency policy that complaints are to be referred immediately to I.S., more than 10 months elapsed until May 7, 1958, when the case was again referred to I.S. to establish whether Miss K. has resources from illegal activities and whether Mr. S. or any man was residing in the home. On May 15, 1958, I.S. reported Mr. S.'s car parked in front of the home. On June 30, 1958, I.S. reported Mr. S. found in the home. On July 29, 1958, I.S. reported Mr. S. in the home on June 30 and July 28, 1958. On August 26 the case was closed because of Miss K.'s continued relationship with Mr. S. Form No. 11, notice of discontinuance, also notes that Mr. S. and Miss K. were married.

3. Elements responsible for referral: The elements responsible for referral were not clear since there appeared to be ample evidence in the record and from I.S. reports that Miss K was continuing her relationship with Mr. S.

4. Findings: Re-referral was not justified. Reports concerning Miss K's ineligibility came to the agency as early as 1953 and have continued. Miss K seems to have been clearly ineligible for assistance at least since 1956.

CASE F—ADC

1. Investigation service reason for believing re-referral should not have been made.

Investigation service believed this case should not have been re-referred because:

(a) I.S. had furnished enough information on original investigation for social service to make a decision.

(b) Application should not have been accepted since landlord is paramour and case was closed previously due to I.S. finding him in home.

2. Information in case record: In old protective service record of Miss S's mother, Miss S is described by her teacher as "a well-behaved child who is unable to learn anything at school." A note in the case record, dated January 26, 1959, says her I.Q. is 53.

Miss S applied in 1954 because her paramour and the father of her three youngest children had died. Received assistance and continued to live with mother, with whom she had always lived. In 1957 Mr. B was found in home by I.S. Miss S said he was her uncle. Said she wanted to move from her mother's home. She was told there was no objection to this. The case was closed in March 1958 because Mr. S and Mr. W had access to the home. It was noted that Miss S describes all men found in her home as "uncles."

3. Elements responsible for referral: Miss S reapplied again in June 1958 and after conference with the supervisor, referral was made to I.S. July 17, 1958, to determine whether Mr. S had access and Miss S's relationship to him. The referral noted that the apartment was rented in Mr. S's name. On August 26, 1958, I.S. reported the apartment was rented in Mr. S's name, that he was still paying the rent and terminated the investigation because of the continued access of Mr. S. On August 12, 1958, before I.S. report was received, the application was prepared for termination. However, on August 22, 1958, Miss S and Mr. S were in the office. He denied any relationship to Miss S. On September 17, 1958, the case was again submitted for termination, but in supervisory conference September 29, 1958, it was decided to ask Miss S and Mr. S to come to the office again. There were two failed appointments and the application was finally terminated due to loss of contact.

At the time of Miss S's last application, December 17, 1958, she again said the house was rented in the name of an uncle.

4. Findings: Since case was accepted, re-referral was justified on basis of policy covering cases to be referred. However, acceptance of the application is seriously questioned.

CASE G—ADC

1. Investigation service reason for believing re-referral should not have been made.

Investigation Service believed this case should not have been re-referred because: I.S. had furnished enough information on original investigation for social service staff to make a decision.

2. Information in case record: Mrs. S applied for assistance in February 1956. She had three children and was pregnant. She said Mr. S had deserted, that he was a poor provider and drank. On May 22, 1956, the Woman's Bureau's record was read. Mr. S reported that Mrs. S had left him periodically and that on several occasions he had found her in bed with a man at the Dunbar Hotel. He asked the Woman's Bureau to take the children. The last recorded Woman's Bureau contact was in October 1955 when both Mr. and Mrs. S were found at home watching television and Mrs. S. said she had returned and decided not to separate from her husband. In June 1956, the application was terminated because continued absence was not established. Mrs. S reapplied in November 1956. In January 1957, referral was made to I.S. to locate Mr. S. In October 1957, I.S. reported they had located Mr. S in Baltimore. A letter was written to him and returned marked "Unknown." In December 1957, a careful explanation of Agency policy is recorded. Mrs. S. said she was not participating in such a relationship. On July 29, 1958, referral was made to I.S. to determine whether Mrs. S. was participating in a relationship with any man. It was pointed out in the referral that on a recent visit a man was seen who was introduced as a cousin. On August 11, 1958, I.S. reported Mrs. S unclad in an unlighted living room with a man she identified as John L., who ran out the back door. On August 21, 1958, I.S. reported that Mrs. S. had said the man found in the home was not John L but Ralph H. Mrs. S was pregnant and said that the father of her new baby was Mr. L. Mrs. S and the man seen at the time of the previous visit were engaging in sexual intercourse at time of I.S. visit. On August 19, 1958, pregnancy was discussed. She said a close relationship had existed for 6 or 7 months prior to Mr. L's disappearance about 2 months ago. On August 21, 1958, Mrs. S. said she could not obtain any information about Mr. L. or Mr. H. She "was advised that the information which she had provided the Agency is not logical and is definitely insufficient grounds for continuing assistance to her and the children." "The client was advised if she is willing a request would be made to our I.S. regarding locating Mr. L. She was told that this would be a 'rush referral' and that assistance would continue to be suspended pending the report. At first Mrs. S did not reply as to whether she was willing or not for this investigation, but said that she does not feel that it is necessary for the investigators to again come snooping around her house when there is nothing to find." On August 29 a re-referral was submitted to I.S. to determine whether Mrs. S. is participating in a family relationship with any man and to locate Mr. L. On September 4, 1958, Mr. S called to know why she had not received her check. It was explained that she would need to bring the father of her expected child to the office and she replied she did not intend to do this. She said it was OK to close the case. On September 22, 1958, I.S. reported that Mrs. S had refused to admit them because she said her case was closed for failure to bring in the man discovered leaving her apartment on August 7, 1958. On October 6, 1958, the case was closed because continued absence was not established.

3. Elements responsible for re-referral: It appears from the case record re-referral was made because of Mrs. S's vehement denial in the interview of August 21, 1958.

4. Findings: Re-referral was not justified because I.S. had furnished enough information to justify a decision of ineligibility.

CASE H—ADC

1. Investigation Service reason for believing re-referral should not have been made. Investigation Service believed this case should not have been re-referred because:

(a) Investigation Service had furnished enough information on original investigation for social service staff to make a decision.

(b) Information in case record.

2. Information in case record: When Miss T applied in May 1957 she was employed as a nurse's aid at Doctor's Hospital but said she had no child care plan. She said she lived with Mr. J, father of the two children who were with her, from 1952 until 1954 and irregularly until June 1956. Referral was made to I.S. to locate Mr. J. On February 19, 1958, I.S. reported they had located Mr. J in Miami. Miss T was referred to RES but the case could not be accepted because paternity had not been adjudicated or established under oath. In March 1958 a report was received from the resident manager of the apartment that Mr. P stays at Miss T's apartment nights at a time and helps her to buy expensive food. She said Mr. P and another male tenant have dinner with Miss T every evening; that Miss T is cruel to her children and is not a fit mother. On March 28, a referral was made to I.S. to determine Miss T's relationship with Mr. P, whether she has boarders and whether she is employed. On April 23, 1958, I.S. reported finding Mr. P in Miss T's apartment. Miss T said he was her girl friend's husband but he told I.S. later he did not know why she had said this. On May 13, 1958, I.S. reported finding Miss T in Mr. P's apartment.

On May 8, 1958, the I.S. report was discussed with Miss T., who denied any relationship whatsoever with Mr. P. On May 13, 1958, Mr. P. telephoned. He also denied any relationship. The record says, "I let him know that assistance would be withheld for Miss T. until he did come in to talk with us." Mr. P. said he did not care whether or not Miss T. received assistance and he did not come to the office. On May 27, 1958, it was decided in supervisory conference that the I.S. report did not contain sufficient evidence for a family relationship between Miss T. and Mr. P. Assistance was continued. On June 17, 1958, further reports were received from the resident manager, whose attitude showed considerable malice toward Miss T.

On July 30, 1958, reports were received from another individual that Miss T. had been visiting in the apartment of Mr. P. for the past three nights and that since Miss T. had moved she has been to Mr. P's. apartment every weekend. She said she is cooking for Mr. P. and does not need assistance because Mr. P. is taking care of her. On August 18, 1958, re-referral was made to I.S. to ascertain if a family relationship existed with Mr. P. On September 16, 1958, Miss T. telephoned to say she is going to work at Doctor's Hospital. "She was quite upset and said she could not continue to live as she had been and be haunted and live like a hermit, not being able to have visitors and being followed wherever she goes. * * * She said Mr. P. is her boyfriend and she has been going with him 2 or 3 months. * * *" On September 26, 1958, I.S. reported finding Miss T. in Mr. P's apartment. The case was closed November 19, 1958, because Miss T. was employed.

3. Elements responsible for re-referral: The element responsible for re-referral seems to have been the decision at supervisory conference that the I.S. report did not contain sufficient evidence of a family relationship. The animosity of the resident manager toward Miss T. may also have been a factor. However, prior to the re-referral on August 18, 1958, an additional report had been received.

4. Findings: A re-referral was not justified on the basis of I.S. reports and other information in the case record.

PART III. WHAT ELEMENTS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE WIDE VARIATION IN THE NUMBER OF REFERRALS BETWEEN SOCIAL WORKERS OR BETWEEN UNITS?

At a meeting on March 2, 1959, with the superintendent, assistant superintendent, statistician, chief, investigation service, and the standards specialist, it was decided that part III would be developed by a study of two caseloads: the one carried by the worker making the fewest number of referrals to investigation service and the caseload carried by the worker making the largest number of referrals to investigation service, during the period October 1955 through September 1958. These caseloads were No. 152 and No. 223 respectively.

It was decided that a schedule would not be developed for reading these cases. Instead, a chart would be used showing, for the "minimum" caseload, the cases which should have been referred and the reason and date referral should have been made. For the "maximum" caseload the chart would show the reason referrals were made and dates.

The reading was to begin with the caseload No. 152. The assistant superintendent explained to the district supervisor, the supervisor and the worker that the cases would be read and the purpose of the reading.

On March 3, 1959, the chief, registration and files, prepared a list of cases in caseload No. 152 as of February 28, 1959. A copy of this list was sent to the chief of investigation service, who prepared a list of cases referred to I.S. and the action taken.

A. Caseload of social worker making fewest referrals to I.S.

1. Summary of findings:

(a) Cases read: Seventy-four cases from a caseload of 124 were read.

In 40, or 54.1 percent of the 74 cases referred to I.S. by this social worker was not indicated. Fifteen of these forty cases had been referred previously, two by the present worker, and thirteen by intake or by the previous worker. Twenty-five had not been referred.

In approximately 24 cases, referral was not indicated because of the case situation. In most of these situations there was no question of access as the children were living in the home of a relative other than the parent, or both parents were living in the home. In the other 16 cases, referral was not indicated for a number of reasons. In two cases, the worker initiated action. In the other 14, action on the basis of information already at hand rather than referral to I.S. was indicated, or the action indicated was not referral or re-referral, but the closing of the case. See case illustrations, attachment A.

In 32 cases, or 43.2 percent, of the 74, referral or re-referral to I.S. should have been made, as each case record included information that should have been followed up or clarified to eliminate any question of eligibility. Of these 32 cases, 14 had never been referred to I.S.; 18 had been referred previously but should have been re-referred.

In two cases, case No. 1 and case No. 59, there was not enough information in the record on which the reviewer could base a decision, as to whether or not there should have been referral to I.S. In both of these cases the father was incarcerated when application was made. The records were read several months after the sentences were to have been completed. The records did not show what had happened in relation to the fathers since their release.

(b) Cases which should have been referred:

Of the 32 cases which should have been referred, referral should have been made for the following reasons listed in the manual, part III–303.4—Cases to be referred.

Reason cases should have been referred to I.S. and number of cases

Cases in which there is reason to believe that client is not eligible for assistance or that there are factors in the case affecting eligibility which cannot be proved by the social worker	5
A person who reapplies for public assistance whose case had previously been closed and assistance terminated due to misrepresentation or fraud by the applicant, location of husband or other man in the home, or concealed resources. This type of case should be marked "rush"	4
Any ADC case in which the client claims that a mother, husband, or father of her or his child or children included in the grant is missing; any case in which a relative or spouse is missing whose location will benefit PAD	7
Any case in which the social worker has reasonable suspicion that the man involved is present in the home or has free access to the home, if the social worker has been unable to obtain sufficient evidence to arrive at a reasonable conclusion as to presence or absence	8
Any complaint or denunciation—anonymous or otherwise—of a man living in, or having free access to, the home of a recipient	1
Any complaint or denunciation concerning other factors of eligibility after the social worker has been unable to prove or disprove the assertion and feels Investigation Service can provide the proof more expeditiously	1
All cases except OAA and AB in which the recipient shares the rent of a home or an apartment with another family, who are not relatives or recipients, and has lived with the same family at a previous address	1
Combination of reasons	5
Total	32

(c) Elements responsible for failure to refer to Investigation Service.

From the reading of 74 cases in this caseload it appears that the following elements are responsible for failure to refer to Investigation Service:

(1) Failure to carry out Agency policies in relation to the eligibility requirements:

(a) Acceptance of client's statements without verification.

(b) Too ready assumption by Agency of support of children when this support should be carried by parents.

(1) Husband or other men located by Investigation Service or address known but not seen nor appropriate action taken: In 13 cases the address of the husband or father was known, but appropriate action was not taken. In a number of instances the husband or father had been seen when assistance was granted previously, and the case may have been closed because absence was not established. When the most recent application was made, no effort was made to communicate with him. See case illustrations, attachment A.

(2) No effort made by mother to locate husband or fathers: In approximately 18 cases, no effort was made by the mother to locate the husband or father, although she may have been held to this requirement when previous applications were made. See case illustration, attachment A.

(3) Child care plan seems to be available: In approximately 13 cases a child care plan seemed to be available. These cases included only those where the mother had work experience, and had made arrangements for care of the chillren in the past, where several relatives were receiving ADC, and it would appear reasonable to expect that at least one mother could work, or those where other relatives were living reasonably close to the mother. See case illustrations, attachment A.

(c) Failure to carry out agency policies in relation to continued absence.

(d) Too much emphasis on establishing a placid and reassuring relationship with the client and too little emphasis on eligibility factors in spite of repeated evidence of falsification and deception.

Eligibility not clearly established: In approximately 22 cases, eligibility did not appear to be clearly established. In nearly all instances this finding was related to c-1-(b) above. For example, in case No. 4, Mrs. D's statements that her husband was absent were found on two previous occasions to be untrue and the case closed, yet when she applied again, assistance was authorized, and the grant continues with no effort to talk with him or to learn the true facts. See case illustrations, attachment A.

(e) No action taken on cases transferred into the caseload until a review is due.

Inadequate agency controls to assure that the agency knows what is happening and what is not happening in cases and that policies are understood and carried out.

2. Description of area: The worker has carried her caseload in essentially the same area since June 1956. The area is composed of census tracts 49–B and 52–A. It includes the odd side of Massachusetts Avenue NW. to the even side of S Street NW. and from 10th to 16th Street NW. Most of the clients live between 10th and 12th and between M and P Streets NW. The houses in this area were described by the worker as being very old, rat and vermin infested. The houses are for the most part three stories, cut up into apartments. Some floors are made into two apartments so that, including the basement, houses in which one family used to live now house eight families. Some are used as rooming houses, housing eight roomers. The worker estimated that 99 percent of the clients in her area are Negro. Although the worker has carried cases in this area since June 1956, the boundaries of the area have changed somewhat to adjust the caseload with that of the worker in the adjoining area

carrying caseload No. 151. This has resulted in the transfer of cases between these two workers.

3. Basis for decisions as to referral:

It was not always possible to determine when a case was transferred to the present worker. The date of the first recorded entry was usually used to determine this date. When there was no recording by the present worker, but other documents were in the record, the dates on these were used. For example, in one case there was no recorded entry, but there was a memorandum dated December 16, 1958, addressed to the worker by R & F. That date was used.

In deciding whether or not referral to I.S. was indicated, continuous reference was made by the reviewer to Agency policy explaining situations which are to be referred. This policy is in section 111-303.4 of the Agency Manual and is included in part I of this study.

The reviewer's decision in each case was made on the basis of information found in the case record.

The decision by the reviewer as to whether or not referral should be made to I.S. was not an easy one. In some instances there is not enough information in the record on which to base a decision.

In others the recording was not up to date.

The status of the recording by the present worker was as follows:

Date of last recorded entry and number of cases

1957	5
January–June 1958	16
July–December 1958	24
1959	14
No entry by present worker	14
Undetermined	1
Total	74

In most cases referral to I.S. and the reason for referral are recorded. In most cases, too, reports from I.S. and the action taken as a result of the information furnished are also recorded. In a few cases, however, there is no entry concerning referral or I.S. reports, nor of action taken, although the case was referred and I.S. reports were in the record.

Another factor which made the reviewer's decision as to referral difficult was the method of recording. The forms used for recording and the narrative were not complete or up to date, or missing. Information for the study was found for the most part in narrative recording which is now filed in "Retired" records.

B. Caseload of social worker making greatest number of referrals to Investigation Service.

1. Summary of findings:

(a) Cases read:

Forty-one cases from a caseload of 165 were read. Ten, or 24.4 percent of the 41 cases had been referred to Investigation Service by the social worker responsible for the caseload. Of these 10 cases, only 1 had been previously referred. Of the 41 cases, 15 had been referred by previous workers. In 9 of the 10 cases referred, the review showed that the referral was justified on the basis of Agency policy. One referral was made which should not have been made. See case illustrations, attachment B.

In seven cases, referral should have been made and was not made, because each of the case records included information that should have been followed up or clarified. Of these seven cases, two had been referred by the previous workers and should have been re-referred and two were referred by the subsequent workers. See case illustrations, attachment B.

(b) Cases referred to Investigation Service: The 10 cases were referred for the following reasons listed in the manual, part III-303.4, cases to be referred.

Report on number of cases:

Clarification of resources, such as bank accounts, civil service and other types of retirement, veterans' benefits, etc	3
Reapplication by a person whose case had been closed previously and assistance terminated due to misrepresentation or fraud by the applicant, location of husband or other man in the home, or concealed resources	1
Any ADC case in which the client claims that a mother, husband, or father of her or his child or children included in the grant is missing; any case in which a relative or spouse is missing whose location would benefit PAD	1
Any case in which the social worker has reasonable suspicion that the man involved is present in the home or has free access to the home, if a social worker has been unable to obtain sufficient evidence to arrive at a reasonable conclusion as to presence or absence	2
Combination of reasons	3
Total	10

(c) Cases which should have been re-referred: The seven cases where the review showed a referral should have been made were carried only briefly by the worker whose caseload is under study and who carried more than twice the normal number of cases. One case was carried by the worker from June 1958 to February 1959, and one from November 1958 to February 1959. In five of the cases, the length of time carried could not be determined.

(d) Other findings: As the cases were read, the following additional findings were made.

(1) Husband or other man located by I. S. or address known but not seen nor appropriate action taken: In approximately seven cases the address of the husband or father was known, but appropriate action was not taken.

(2) No effort made by mother to locate husband or fathers: In approximately four cases, no effort was made by the mother to locate the husband or father, although she may have been held to this requirement when previous applications were made.

(3) Child care plan seems to be available: In approximately nine cases a child care plan seemed to be available. These cases included only those where the mother had work experience, and had made arrangements for care of the children in the past or those where other relatives were living reasonably close to the mother.

(4) Eligibility not clearly established: In approximately eight cases, eligibility did not appear to be clearly established. In nearly all instances this finding was related to (1), (2), and (3) above.

2. Description of area and caseload: The cases in this caseload are located in census tracts 73, 74.3, and 74.4. The area is at the southern tip of the District, for the most part east of South Capitol Street. It includes the area north of D.C. Village and around Bolling Field and St. Elizabeth's Hospital, over to the Maryland line. This is a large and diversified area including private homes, apartments, and four NCHA dwellings. The residents of the area are for the most part white, with the exception of two NCHA dwellings. Twenty-nine or 70.7 percent live in NCHA dwellings.

The worker carried the caseload in this area for about 5 years until February 1959. However, in 17 of the records read there was no recording by this worker. It appears that in late 1958, a large number of cases were transferred into this caseload and the worker had no contact with the clients by the time he left the caseload in February 1959. The length of time the cases read were carried by this worker was as follows:

4 years	1
3 years	1
2 years	6
9 months	1
8 months	1
7 months	1
6 months	2
5 months	5
4 months	2
3 months	2
2 months	1
Less than 1 month	1
Undetermined (recent transfer)	17
Total	41

Whenever possible the date of the first recorded entry was used to determine when the case was transferred into the caseload. Even when there was an entry in the case record it was not always possible to determine when the case was received by the worker. For example, in one case there was only a one-line entry by the worker dated October 1, 1958 which read as follows: "Review completed on form 55. For budget computation, see form 58." The form 55 was unsigned and undated. The authorization on form 58 by the worker, effective from July 1, 1958, to September 30, 1958, was signed but undated. In this instance, the date of July 1958 was used as the date the worker became responsible for the case.

With four exceptions, the dictation on the cases read was up to date, entries having been made by the workers to whom the cases were assigned after February 1959.

(c) Elements responsible for variation in the number of cases referred to I.S.:

From the review of cases in the two caseloads, it appears that the basic element responsible for the wide variation in the number of cases referred to I.S. is the wide variation in the understanding, acceptance, and use of agency policy.

The worker making the highest number of referrals (caseload 223) should actually have referred 17.3 percent more of the cases read, but was prevented from doing so by the fact that the cases were assigned to him for such a brief period of time. Of the cases he did refer to I.S., only one case was found where an unnecessary referral was made when conclusive evidence for action was available without referral.

The worker making the fewest number of referrals (caseload 152) should have referred 43.2 percent more of the cases read.

The decision to refer or not to refer seems to have been made on the basis of the judgment of the individual worker, rather than on the basis of policy established by the Agency.

Although the worker carrying caseload No. 152 had been responsible for her caseload since June 1956 and the worker carrying caseload No. 223 had been responsible for his caseload 2½ years, some of the cases read were carried by these workers for only brief periods. For details as to length of time cases were carried by present workers see attachment C.

In caseload No. 152 there were 14 cases with no recording by the worker, and in caseload No. 223 there were 17 such cases. The records read were, for the most part, also carried by other workers in the Agency. These records showed that the effect of lack of consistency in the use of Agency policy extends beyond the two workers whose caseloads were reviewed and beyond referral or failure to refer to Investigation Service.

In the cases read, there was evidence that the eligibility requirements and the responsibilities to which clients were held and the granting or denial of assistance depended upon the worker to whom the case was assigned. The concept of the worker as a representative of the Agency, in contrast to the worker as an individual, is not clear to staff.

Another element responsible for the variation in the number of cases referred to Investigation Service is the lack of controls established by the Agency to assure that policies are understood and followed by each worker. Under present policy, the supervisor is in no way involved in referrals to Investigation Service.

It is hoped that one of the values of the administrative case review to be undertaken by the Agency in September 1959 will be to determine the validity of actions taken by the staff. In the last analysis, it is always the worker and the worker alone who either expresses or defeats the intent of the Agency.

ATTACHMENT A—CASE ILLUSTRATIONS

CASE SHOULD BE REFERRED—ELIGIBILITY NOT CLEARLY ESTABLISHED

Case No. 24: Miss G, age 18, applied for assistance February 26, 1956 having been referred by Family and Child Services. She said she did not get along with her mother who complained that Miss G sees the mother's boyfriend when the mother is away. Miss G said she wanted to demonstrate she could care for her children. The father of the oldest child lives with his family at an address given by Miss G. He contributed $15 every 2 weeks. The father of the second child is at Fort Belvoir. On May 23, 1956, Miss G's probation officer told of her conviction for assault. She has a juvenile court record for housebreaking, shoplifting, disorderly conduct, and assault. She was also known to the woman's bureau through prostitution and committed to B.P. She was given a mental evaluation and was found not to be psychotic—"just unable to take care of herself—has many ways of a girl about 4 years old, is considered promiscuous." It was said she regards her children as a child would a doll. When she gets tired of them she wants to throw them away. It was felt that the mother and grandmother, not Miss G, should be responsible for the two children. An entry, dated July 2, 1956, says "the Agency did not plan to approve assistance because Miss G had not met all requirements in having the fathers of the children come to the office." The application was terminated because absence was not established. On January 28, 1958, referral was made by CWD. Shirley was placed in Junior Village because Miss G had beaten her with an electric light cord. The neighbors had called the police. CWD referral said Miss G had expressed a desire to establish a home of her own if eligible for assistance. The mother and grandmother have been helping. On February 24, 1958, the Woman's Bureau said they had known Miss G since 1948. Since 1954 there had been frequent reports about the neglect of the children. On April 2, 1958, information was received that Miss G was pregnant. The father was given as Mr. C. In the CWD referral Mr. C was said to be the father of Miss G's second child and his address is unknown. Assistance has continued to Miss G in spite of the report from the probation officer in May 1956, without referral to I.S. to determine access, and without any effort on Miss G's part to locate the fathers. There was no record of the Woman's Bureau or the CWD records having been read or of any interview with the mother or grandmother, although Miss G was told at the time of her application in 1956 that this would have to be done.

ACTION BY WORKER SEEMS INDICATED RATHER THAN RE-REFERRAL TO I.S. ELIGIBILITY NOT CLEARLY ESTABLISHED

Case No. 48: Mrs. M's first application for assistance was in November 1951 for herself and 4 children. She said Mr. M had deserted in July and that his sister has helped her. In June 1952, Mr. M was to pay $15.00 a week through J.C. On April 13, 1953, Mr. M called. He had arranged with Mrs. M. to take two of the children to enable her to go to work. He was to assist with the care of the two children remaining with her. "When he went to get the children she raved and said she was not going to work as long as she could get a check and his help too." On November 17, 1953 it was learned that Mrs. M was pregnant. She said William G was the father of the child born November 20, 1953. On November 30, 1953, Mr. G. was seen in the home. They planned to continue their relationship. Mrs. M and the baby were not included in the code. In 1954 Mr. M went into the service, made an allotment to his family and the case was closed. On September 27, 1955 Mrs. M reapplied. She said her husband had been discharged from the service and the allotment ceased. Her relationship with Mr. G continues and the application was terminated because absence was not established. She reapplied November 30, 1955. Another baby by Mr. G was born in January 1955. This application was also terminated because absence was not established. She has received assistance continuously since her last application in January 1956. She wanted CWD to place two of the boys and this was done. On February 15, 1956, Mr. G in the office in response to a letter. He said he had had no contact with Mrs. M since last fall. He gave his address, the name of his employer and signed an agreement to pay $5.00 a week. On February 16, 1956 Mrs. M was told she must try to locate her husband before assistance could be given. She said she could not locate him. However, on March 7, 1956, he came to the office. He gave his address and his employer. He said he had been employed at the same place since 1951. He would like his sister to have the two boys since Mrs. M. is not able to give proper care and supervision. In 1955 he filed for a divorce on the grounds of adultery. He said he intended to seek custody of all the children. He has no interest in Mrs. M and said Mr. G broke up his home. On March 12, 1956 CWD expressed the opinion that Mrs. M should have the children. On March 16, 1956 Mr. M's sister was seen. The girls are living with her and she would also take the boys. When the girls first came to her, they were quite vulgar and talked about things they had seen their mother do. The girls said their mother slept with Mr. G and they slept on the floor. She said the girls refused to visit their mother overnight. She said the boys need not have been placed by CWD as she would have taken them. She mentioned a sister in South Carolina who would be glad to have the boys with her. The worker recorded she was impressed with Mrs. E, Mr. M's sister. In March 1956 the boys were in Mrs. E's home, placement having been arranged by CWD. Temporary assistance was authorized for Mrs. M and the baby until she could get work, the worker to follow the case closely regarding employment. In May Mrs. M said she could not seek employment because her child was ill. In March 1957 the record says assistance was granted on a temporary basis because of the verified illness of the child. On August 3, 1957 Mrs. M was arrested for larceny. She was released after 30 days, although this was her second offense. Assistance continued on a temporary basis. On January 10, 1958 it was learned that a female child had been born on December 19, 1957. William H was named as the father. On January 24, 1958 referral was made to I.S. to determine the access of Mr. M. On January 28, 1958 Mr. M was found by I.S. in the home and was found not to be living at the address given. On February 4, 1958 Mrs. M denied that Mr. M lived in her home and said the relationship had been discontinued. On February 19, 1958 Mr. M was in the office. He "seemed sincere." He said Mrs. M used to visit him in his apartment but that the relationship had ended.

The entry on Form No. 22, dated March 27, 1958 says Mr. G and Mrs. M "claim their relationship was a casual one" and that "referral is being made again to verify this * * *." No re-referral was made, and the grant continues.

REFERRAL NOT INDICATED ACTION SHOULD BE TAKEN BY WORKER—ELIGIBILITY QUESTIONED

Case No. 63: Mrs. S, age 18, applied for assistance September 17, 1958, because of her pregnancy. She said she came to the District in 1957 from North Carolina, because she was not getting along with her husband. She said she had received help from an uncle and aunt and from her boyfriend, Joseph T, from whom she had "broken" off. In an entry on form No. 246, Mrs. S said her husband had never contributed toward her support. She has two other children supported by his parents in North Carolina. She had lived with a Mr. T from April to August 1958 when she left him because he became abusive because of information given by his sister that Mrs. S was having "other affairs and accepting money from other men." She denied this. She said she was an "A" student in North Carolina and left school at 14 to marry because she was pregnant. Emergency assistance was authorized and the grant has continued. There is no discussion recorded as to who is the father of her coming baby. There is no record of any discussion with the aunt and uncle with whom Mrs. S is living. Form No. 258 says Mrs. S is living with her aunt rent free. However, Payroll Control says the grant is $109, which seems to include shelter. Support was taken over by the Agency without question, with no investigation and no communication with the husband or father of the expected child.

CASE SHOULD NOT BE REFERRED—ACTION SHOULD BE TAKEN BY WORKER

Case No. 60: Mrs. S applied for assistance December 20, 1957. She said Mr. S is under court order to pay $22 a week. Form No. 258, "Living Arrangements," says the apartment is rented in the name of a friend, David L, who works at the Sanitation Department. There is no recorded information concerning Mrs. S's separation from her husband and no request that he be interviewed, although his address is known.

ELIGIBILITY NOT CLEARLY ESTABLISHED—REFERRAL NOT INDICATED

Case No. 31: Miss H applied October 12, 1950, saying she had one child and was pregnant by Mr. S. She has been working and has never taken Mr. S to court. He came to the office with Miss H and agreed to give $20 a month. In January 1962 Miss H called to say that she was working and asked that her case be closed. She reapplied May 8, 1958, saying that she was ill and could not continue employment. Referral was made to I.S. to locate Mr. S but no report has been received from I.S. A medical report dated May 12, 1958, gives Miss H's prognosis as "good." Entry on form No. 246 says Miss H will continue to work 3 days a week. There is no current medical information.

ACTION INDICATED BY SOCIAL WORKER RATHER THAN RE-REFERRAL TO I.S. ELIGIBILITY NOT CLEARLY ESTABLISHED

Case No. 8: When Miss C applied for assistance in 1947 she was 17 years old and had two children. Since 1947 Miss C. has had six additional children. When a home visit was made on January 3, 1952, a 14-year-old cousin appeared to be part of the family. This child was pregnant by Mr. Harry E., who is the brother of Blondell E., the father of one of Miss C's children. In May 1952 a report was received concerning a 16-year-old girl with two children living with Miss C. The report also revealed that Miss C. and the 16-year-old girl are both pregnant. The father of Miss C.'s expected child was given as Clarence J. Mr. J was seen on a number of occasions but his continuing relationship with Miss C was not discussed or at least not recorded. He said he had three other children born out of wedlock and contributes toward their support. On April 6, 1955, another ADC client reported that her daughter had moved out of her home and had gone to live with Miss C.

When this was discussed with Miss C., she said the girl was no longer in her home. She said the girl goes with her brother, Clyde C. In an undated entry on page 41, a young man ran out of the home when the worker visited. Miss C identified him as Nathaniel M, her boy friend, and said she had been keeping company with him for about 5 months. She said he gave her approximately $25 a month. This was later verified by talking with Mr. M. Both admitted their intimate relationship. She said she usually goes to Mr. M.'s house, leaving the children with a neighbor's daughter. . On September 7, 1955, worker told Miss C that no further assistance could be authorized until the purchase of a television could be cleared. She had said previously that her brother had bought the set for her, paying $99 cash for it. On October 3, 1955, it was verified that Miss C.'s brother had purchased the television set for $299. On October 10, 1955, Miss C said Mr. M had been helping her. She said she had been seeing him about four times a week. She thinks this relationship should not affect her eligibility for assistance. She was told that "we would have to consider her case in every detail before we could make a decision as to her continued eligibility for assistance." It appeared she was not eligible for assistance.

On October 14, 1955, another ADC recipient told of staying temporarily in Miss C's home and that her brother Clyde and his girl friend were also there. Miss C denied this but later admitted they were there. On October 20, 1955, the NCHA project manager called. Miss C. had told him that her uncle and his wife from North Carolina were visiting her. The worker remarks in the record: "It seems as if Miss C finds it as difficult to tell other people the truth as much as she does us." On January 19, 1956, referral was made to I.S. to establish where Mr. M is actually living. I.S. reported that Mr. M lives with his brother. Mr. M admitted that he is still Miss C's boy friend. On February 20, 1956, Miss C said Mr. M was very much interested in marrying her. She said she "could not make up her mind as to whether she wanted to continue to receive public assistance for the children or depend upon Mr. M for the support of them. I told her that it seemed as if she would prefer to have her independence and choose to be supported by a husband rather than by an agency. She agreed with me but said that as long as she had received assistance she had gotten used to the idea and thought of it as something on which she could depend." The case was closed March 1956. On October 23, 1957, Miss C reapplied. Reference is made to form No. 25 for details but this form was not found in the record. When the worker talked with Miss C about her relationship with Mr. M she hesitated before answering. "In the meantime Patricia said that Mr. M has been to visit and he used to live with them at the present apartment. Miss C told Patricia to close her mouth because I was talking to her.

Miss C then told me that Mr. M had been to visit but did not remain overnight. She said she was not going to let him live in her home again. Referral had been made to I.S. by Intake on October 24, 1957, to establish whether Mr. M was living in or frequenting the home. On November 27, 1957, I.S. reported not finding Mr. M. On one of the three visits, Miss C had gone to a movie. On December 23, 1957, I.S. reported Miss C was not at home when a visit was made on December 13, 1957, at 10 p.m. On November 19, 1957, it was decided that since Mr. M was not found in the home assistance would be authorized. The references in the record to I.S. reports indicate only that Mr. M was not found there. There is no mention of Miss C's absences from the home. The last entry in the record dated November 21, 1958, says that Miss C has told the worker she has given up her relationship with Mr. M and the Agency's policy was emphasized again.

At the time of Miss C's last application for assistance, no mention is made of her youngest child, Nathaniel, born August 2, 1956, except that his name appears on the form No. 108 and he is mentioned in the October 24, 1957, referral to I.S. In an entry dated October 1, 1958, Miss C said she was keeping four of her brother's children. Miss C's situation when her application was accepted in October 1957 seemed no different from the situation when her case was closed in 1956. The three reports concerning the young pregnant girls in Miss C's home were apparently unquestioned and no referral was made to the Woman's Bureau to see what was going on in this home. Assistance was authorized and has continued without any effort to communicate with Mr. M.

REFERRAL NOT INDICATED—MOTHER SEEMS TO BE EMPLOYABLE—ELIGIBILITY QUESTIONED

Case No. 32: Mrs. H has made seven applications and has received assistance continuously since 1950. In 1943 Mrs. H said her husband had deserted. The case was closed after a neighbor reported that Mr. H had been in the home all the time and was employed. The neighbor complained of the family's unclean habits and drunken behavior, saying, "When the relief checks come the entire family become intoxicated." In 1947 and 1948 complaints were received regarding the care of the children, drinking, sale of "smoke," Mr. H's employment and the need for a careful investigation. In 1948 referral was made to Protective Services and the case was closed. In June 1950 CWD referred Mrs. H because her three daughters, born 1937, 1940, and 1942, were to be returned to her. In 1952 a complaint was received as to Mrs. H's drinking and failure to buy food for the children. When the worker visited Mrs. H was found "dead drunk." The record refers to many discussions as to employment, beginning in 1954. In 1955 she was to be given 3 months in which to find work and held to this. In March 1956 she was again given 3 months in which to find work, and in June 1956, the record says assistance was to be discontinued as of July 1, 1956. When nothing was heard from Mrs. H, a home visit was made and it was learned she had been sick. The last medical report for Mrs. H is dated August 11, 1956. No prognosis was given, the disability could be corrected or reduced and it is suggested that we inquire in 3 months as to when she will be able to work.

In 1957 there were only two daughters in the home, B and G. B had a baby by a 19-year-old boy and G was said to have a heart condition.

An entry dated May 1957, page 77, reads: "Mrs. H, 43 years old, is small, youthful appearing, and very neat. She is now employable and was actually seeking work when Gladys' illness became known. Now Gladys has to have long periods of bed rest and Mrs. H feels she is needed in the home to care for her child." The last recorded entry is dated December 18, 1957. "Mrs. H said she is in fairly good health herself and that she has been discharged from the clinic. She said further she has not sought any employment because of her need to care for Gladys." No medical information was found in relation to Gladys' illness.

CHILD-CARE PLAN SHOULD BE AVAILABLE

Case No. 52: Mrs. O applied for assistance September 27, 1955, saying she had no child-care plan for her 6-month-old baby and was therefore, unemployable. She gave up her job at Mack's Waffle Shop because of pregnancy and had been collecting UCB benefits of $19 a week. Her brother and his wife and her father lived at the same address. Many other relatives were listed in the District of Columbia. She said the father of her child, Lester K works at the Washington Post and that there is no continuing relationship. Intake explained the need for her to get Mr. K's address and for the Agency to talk with him. On October 7, 1955, she gave Mr. K's home address. She said she would ask him to come to the office on October 12, 1955. Apparently he did not keep this appointment because the application was terminated on November 14, 1955. Mrs. O reapplied October 22, 1956, for herself and two children. She said Lester K. was the father of the baby born March 1956. She was living with her father, her brother, his wife, and two children in an apartment described as "spacious."

From the record there would appear to be no reason why Mrs. O could not have accepted employment and made a child-care arrangement. Employment was discussed with her on a number of occasions. On October 22, 1956, she said she would like to work but could not make enough to pay for a child-care plan. On four other occasions employment was discussed. A child-care plan seemed to be available either with the sister-in-law or with one of Mr. K's relatives, none of whom was contacted.

CASE SHOULD BE RE-REFERRED—CHILD-CARE PLAN SEEMS TO BE AVAILABLE

Case No. 19: Mrs. F applied in June 1958 saying she had been separated from Mr. F for 1 month. On July 2, 1958, referral was made by Intake to determine if Mr. F had access. An entry on form No. 246 says, "Mrs. F.'s relatives are well known to PAD. See 249." From form No. 252 it was learned that Mrs. F's mother receives GPA and three sisters receive ADC. These relatives all live close to her and it would appear they would be available to provide care for the children. Employment was discussed with Mrs. F who gave a number of excuses for not working. On August 27, 1958, Mr. K was found in the home. He said "he believes neighbors refer to him as Mrs. F's husband because Mr. F sometimes visits Mrs. F to see the children." On June 26, 1958, referral was made to IS to determine access of Mr. F or any man. On July 10, 1958, IS reported Mrs. F was not at the address given. Another referral was made on July 14, 1958, giving the new address. This address was also found to be incorrect and IS closed its case in September 1958. Re-referral was made on October 27, 1958, to determine access. This referral was made after the social worker had found a man in the home. On December 8, 1958, IS reported an accurate check could not be made because of the locked front door. IS also reported that Mrs. F appeared to be pregnant. A re-referral should have been made to determine access.

EXAMPLE OF CASE REFERRED FOR LOCATION—SHOULD BE REFERRED FOR ACCESS

Case No. 69: The "Retired" record could not be found for reading. According to the information on form No. 246, Mrs. W applied December 1949 because her "husband had been incarcerated for cutting." The case was closed after his release. She reapplied in August 1950 because Mr. W was "again in jail for fighting her." The case was closed when he returned to the home. Her next application was September 26, 1952. She said she was separated and living with a Mr. Thomas M and had just given birth to his child. The application was terminated when Mr. W was interviewed and agreed to support. She reapplied in October 1957 saying she had been employed since 1953 but had to give up her employment to look after her children. The case was closed in September 1958 when it was learned she had given birth to another child and had work. She reapplied in November 25, 1958, saying she had to give up her job because her earnings were insufficient and she was no longer intimate with the baby's father. According to the entry on form No. 247, Family Group Sheet, Mrs. W has eight children; three with relatives out of the home and five with her. Mr. W is the father of two children; Mr. M, who is now in Lorton, is the father of two and Mr. John K, with whom she is no longer intimate, is the father of the youngest child.

Referral was made to IS in November 1957 to locate Mr. W. On December 9, 1957, IS reported that Mr. W was located. On December 15, 1958, re-referral was made to locate Mr. W. Form No. 122, prepared by caseworker No. 152, says, "Case closed. Request to locate Mr. K withdrawn by previous worker because Mr. K agreed to support voluntarily and signed form No. 57 on December 20, 1958." This entry is confusing because there was no referral to IS to locate Mr. K. Referral should have been made to determine access.

CASES WHICH SHOULD HAVE BEEN REFERRED BECAUSE OF BEHAVIOR

Case No. 27: Miss G was 33 years old when she applied for assistance in September 1956. She had received a disciplinary discharge from District of Columbia General Hospital, TB ward, because she failed to return after Labor Day weekend. She was approved for ATD in October 1956. She lived in what has been described by a member of the Woman's Bureau as the "red light district." Her residence was established by taverns and bars. On March 17, 1958, notice was received from R. & F. that Miss G had given birth to an infant on March 8, 1958. It was at this point that referral should have been made to IS to determine access. On April 8, 1958, the Woman's Bureau record was read. Their case opened in 1936 when eight children of Miss G's mother were removed after the fatal shooting of the husband. The mother was acquitted after relating a story of abject poverty and abuse. There were many other contacts with Miss G's mother regarding neglect of the children and disorderly conduct. Miss G's adult record at WB began in 1948. There was 12 arrests for drunken and disorderly conduct and 1 for assault. Miss G and her sister were involved with men and alcohol from a very early age. The brother's children were committed to DPW and his daughter accused him of attempted incest.

CASE SHOULD HAVE BEEN REFERRED BECAUSE OF COMPLAINTS AND BEHAVIOR

Case No. 18: On October 15, 1958, Mrs. D applied for assistance saying she had to stop work because her husband has stopped supporting. She also said she was needed in the home to care for her mother. In 1954 the family moved to Mr. D's home in Cleveland. She remained there, except for visits to her mother, until October 1957 when she came back to be with her mother who was ill. She planned to return to her husband but he did not send enough money at any one time for her to make the trip. She said she had learned from friends in Cleveland that he had been "running around with another woman." She does not want to return to him. On November 17, 1958, a letter was written to the DPW in Cleveland. That agency replied on December 4, 1958. Mr. D told the agency he tried to furnish a home for Mrs. D and the children in Cleveland but she kept "running back home to see her relatives all the time," which was expensive. He said he had written to Mrs. D telling her he felt they should get a divorce. On December 4, 1958, a letter was received from Mr. D. He said he and his wife were forced into marriage by someone much older than they. He thought he would fall in love with his wife but she made it impossible by not conducting herself as a wife should. She was unclean about her person and she "went out at night and came back drunk with the baby in her arms." While Mr. D was hospitalized she went out with other men. When he tried to talk with her she would "get mad and pack her clothes and leave me." He told of trying unsuccessfully to get his wife to come back to him. He said he was "fed up with her" and could not "stand any more." He said he would like to send money for his children to the agency instead of Mrs. D. He enclosed a letter written to him concerning Mrs. D who was "running wild" and "running crazy." She was described as staying away from her children all night and coming home drunk. She is also described as "about to run her mother crazy." She was said to have gone to Altantic City with a man for a weekend. The money Mr. D sent was not spent on the children. It was suggested that Mr. D come and see for himself on Friday nights about 10:00 or 10:30. Mr. D requested an answer to his letter but there is no copy of a reply in the record.

No referral was made to I.S. There is no verification of age or relationship for the younger child, Don. Form No. 248: Living Arrangements, says that Mrs. D is living with her mother rent free. In the record there is a rent receipt for $55.00 in Mrs. D's name dated February 3, 1959.

CASE SHOULD BE REFERRED BECAUSE OF BEHAVIOR

Case No. 73 and case No. 74: Mrs. Y had received assistance intermittently since 1934 and continuously since 1950. Prior to 1934 she was assisted by the Associated Charities. Mrs. Y seemed always to live beyond her income and there were two instances of overpayment; one in 1953 and one in 1956. Mrs. Y moved constantly without advising the agency. It was usually learned that she had moved only when a home visit was made or when checks were returned. In May 1956, there was discussion of employment. In the worker's opinion, there were enough adults in the home so that a plan could be worked out whereby Mrs. Y would not need assistance. As Mrs. Y's three daughters entered their teens each became pregnant. The case of one daughter, V, is also part of caseload No. 152. According to form No. 257, the mother, two children, and a brother are all receiving assistance. Mrs. Y is said to take the pregnancy of her daughters casually. According to an entry dated September 27, 1957, when she learned another daughter, P was pregnant, Mrs. Y was "not aware nor upset." She said she expected this daughter's marital relations with the father, who is still in school, to continue. The daughter, V, case No. 74, was 20 years old when she applied for assistance in March 1957. There are two references, March 26, 1957, and February 24, 1958, of referral to Information Service to locate Mr. B the father of Miss Y's youngest child. Information Service has no record of the referral and no copy was found in the record. The reviewer's decision was that little was to be gained by referral to Information Service of the mother's case but that referral should have been made in the daughter's case because of behavior and to locate the fathers of her children, even though the daughter had made no effort to do so.

REFERRAL SHOULD BE MADE ON BASIS OF BEHAVIOR

Case No. 33: When Mrs. H applied in June 1954 she said Charles L did not support his 3-months-old child and was awaiting grand jury action on a narcotics charge. She said she had three children by her husband, who had deserted her in Texas. This was found later to be untrue. These three children are in Alabama with her mother who is also keeping Mrs. H's 19-month-old child by Mr. L. Mrs. H said the whole family was moving to District of Columbia soon, which they did. The application was terminated because Mrs. H's needs were being met by her brother. She reapplied in September 1954 for herself and five children. She said Mr. H had deserted in Alabama 3 years ago and Mr. L was in prison on a narcotics charge. On October 6, 1954, she said she met Mr. L when he was in the Armed Forces in Alabama and did not know he was married until she came to the District of Columbia. An entry dated April 7, 1955, says Mr. L's wife, Sylvia, is receiving ADC, case No. 518–332.0.

On August 19, 1955, a letter was received from the Department of Public Welfare in Athens, Tex., enclosing a letter Mrs. H had written to Mr. H's mother. (In an interview April 7, 1955, Mrs. H had said Mr. H's mother was dead.) In the letter to Mr. H's mother, Mrs. H explained the "lies" she had told the agency in order to get assistance. On February 14, 1958, Mrs. H bitterly attacked the agency because she was not able to have boyfriends and because of the lack of privacy. In May 1958 a portable phonograph was seen which Mrs. H said was a gift and she said an uncle wished to provide a telephone and a television.

REFERRAL SHOULD BE MADE ON BASIS OF BEHAVIOR

Case No. 23: Miss G has received assistance continuously since 1948. When she applied in May 1948 she had one child and was pregnant. She now has seven children.

She said she was not married to Mr. G but had lived with him since 1945. She applied because he was ill. He was admitted to Glenn Dale in 1950 and died in March 1951.

On February 5, 1951, a new baby was seen. Miss G said she had not reported this because the father of the baby was taking care of it. The worker asked Miss G to have the father of the baby come to the office to discuss his intentions to support her and the baby. This was not done and the case was closed. However, the check was continued in error. In June 1951 Miss G said that Comer B. was the father of her child. On May 20, 1952, there was a telephone conversation with Mr. B who said he was temporarily unemployed. He gave his address and said that he was giving Miss G $4 a week.

On July 9, 1952, the birth of a new baby by Mr. B was discussed. She said, "Oh yes, I did not think you would hold my check, the children need food." The worker reminded her that in an interview on May 20, 1952, she had denied pregnancy. Miss G's reply was "We all tell little white lies once in a while."

March 15, 1954—Miss G is again pregnant by Mr. B who came to the office and said that he lives with his wife and five children.

NOTE: Mr. B has a long police record dating back to 1927 when he gave his age as 20.

On July 5, 1954, Miss G gave birth to her third child by Mr. B. In September 1956 Miss G was again pregnant and was reminded that she had said she had not seen or heard from Mr. B. Meanwhile, Mr. B has been incarcerated several times. In December 1956 she was told that when Mr. B was released she would receive no further assistance and that he would be expected to assume support for the entire family. An entry dated February 25, 1957, says that Mr. B was released and she was told her case would be closed. On April 8, 1957, Mr. B was held for murder and page 39 of the record says that he is in St. Elizabeths.

Referral was made to I.S. in 1955, 1956, and 1957 to locate Mr. B. The 1957 referral was withdrawn after Mr. B's arrest for murder.

In view of Miss G's. past record and behavior, re-referral should be made to I.S. to determine access.

CASE SHOULD BE REFERRED—NO EFFORT MADE BY MOTHER TO LOCATE FATHER—CHILD CARE PLAN SEEMS TO BE AVAILABLE—ELIGIBILITY NOT CLEARLY ESTABLISHED—ASSISTANCE GRANTED ON A TEMPORARY BASIS, BUT CONTINUED

Case No. 64: Miss S applied for assistance on July 1, 1953. She said she had to stop work due to pregnancy and requested only temporary assistance. She said Mr. S deserted 6 weeks ago. She said she thought he was in Brooklyn working as a saxophone player. On July 6, 1953, Miss S telephoned to say that her husband had returned home and the application was terminated. On April 9, 1954, Mrs. S reapplied saying she was pregnant and her husband was in jail for selling narcotics. She said she has been selling insurance and hoped to make this her career. On April 16, 1954, she said she was living in the home with her mother and aunt and that the aunt is willing to provide shelter for her. On May 4, 1954, the aunt verified that she is willing for Mrs. S to remain in the home rent free.

On April 21, 1955, Mrs. S said she is no longer interested in selling insurance. "It seemed very hard for Mrs. S to accept the fact that a mother takes over part of the support whenever possible if the husband is not available. I pointed out to Mrs. S that when she applied for assistance she merely asked for assistance until her baby was born." She said she planned to live with Mr. S when he was released. On November 17, 1955, the worker pointed out that Mrs. S did not appear to have done very much about securing employment and wondered if she really wants to work. When the worker visited on April 16, 1956, she noted that Mrs. S and the children were still in bed when the worker arrived at 10 a.m. Mrs. S said they never get up before 10 in the morning because they are up late at night and the children take naps. On September 25, 1958, Mrs. S's mother-in-law came to the office to say that the Agency should be interested in knowing how Mrs. S had been using the money she receives from the Agency. She wanted to tell this some time ago but felt that Mrs. S would improve. Since Mrs. S had done nothing to try to do better she felt it was her place to notify the Agency so that an investigation could be made. She told of Mrs. S going with a Louis P and remaining with him for as long as 3 or 4 days. Mr. P is a musician and does not get off from work until early in the morning. At 2 or 3 a.m. Mrs. S goes to his home. The children are left with Mrs. S's mother who cannot properly care for them because of her paralytic condition. She said she "just could not stand it any longer with her son coming home from prison to someone like Mrs. S." Mrs. S misuses the money she receives from the Agency. She said that Mrs. S had been working for her as an agent during the summer selling merchandise. She believes Mrs. S is a call girl at a house on T Street, across from the Howard Theater and is of the opinion that Mrs. S uses dope. At times she has smelled whisky on Mrs. S's breath. She said Mrs. S manages to get back home about the time she thinks the worker will visit. Mrs. S's check was held and on October 5, 1956, a visit was made and there was a long discussion with Mrs. S. The workers told her of reports she stays with a boyfriend for 2 or 3 days. Mrs. S "wondered just why she could not have a boyfriend when her husband has been in prison for almost 3 years. Any woman would want a man." She admitted having a boyfriend but refused to give his name. She refused to discuss the matter of whether she goes to her boyfriend's for 2 or 3 days at a time. When asked about frequently going to the T Street address, she jumped up and screamed that a lie had been told.

On October 11, 1956, the Woman's Bureau telephoned. The Woman's Bureau felt there was something wrong in this situation. Mrs. S's mother admitted that Mrs. S drinks and stays away from home 2 or 3 nights at a time. The worker explained to Mrs. S that assistance would be discontinued because she was not willing to give information nor to have a further investigation made. After the worker explained to Mrs. S that assistance would be discontinued, she notes that the case was discussed with the supervisor and it was decided that the case should not be closed at this time but that a letter should be written giving her an office appointment. On October 16, 1956, Mrs. S was interviewed by the supervisor and had decided after discussion with her mother and her aunt that "she would not go through with receiving public assistance." The supervisor pointed out the need for the investigation of all resources. Mrs. S said her husband would be released about January 25, 1957, and she felt she would be able to support the two children from her employment until that time. On April 4, 1958, Mrs. S reapplied for assistance. She had given birth to a child on March 20, 1958, and was unable to work. She is still living with her aunt, her mother, and three cousins. She said Mr. S had deserted in February 1957 after she had asked him to leave her mother's home. She said Rudy W was the father of her last baby. Mr. W is a musician who travels and did not know of her pregnancy. The baby is now with a family who want to adopt him. Mrs. S was told that referral would be made to I.S. to locate her husband. Referral was made to I.S. April 11, 1958, by the Intake worker to locate Mr. S. and to determine access. On July 17, 1958, I.S. reported no man was found present in the home after several visits.

An entry dated May 22, 1958, said that the shelter costs were prorated although the aunt had said on several occasions she would not charge any rent. There is no record of any recent discussion with the aunt. The ADC policy concerning access to the home was discussed. Mrs. S said she had "done a great deal of growing up in the past year."

CASE SHOULD BE REFERRED—MAN LOCATED—NO ACTION TAKEN—NO EFFORT MADE BY MOTHER TO LOCATE FATHERS—CHILD CARE PLAN SHOULD BE AVAILABLE—ELIGIBILITY NOT CLEARLY ESTABLISHED

Case No. 38: Miss J's applications for assistance in 1948 and 1949 were terminated because she was employed or employable. When she reapplied May 25, 1950, she said she was pregnant and could not continue to work. She was told that no assistance could be authorized until she made efforts to locate the father of her unborn child. The application was terminated. She reapplied in December 1950. She gave the last name and address of the man responsible for her last pregnancy. She said she had lived with Frank S. Miss J was told by Intake that we would need to see the fathers of her children before assistance could be continued. The case was closed in May 1951 after the landlord reported that a man had helped Miss J move and her address was unknown. Miss J reapplied July 23, 1951. She was told by Intake it would be necessary for the Agency to see Mr. M, the father of her older child; Mr. T, the father of her younger child and Mr. S with whom she had been living. The application was terminated in August. On August 28, 1951, she applied again. She said she could not bring the two fathers to the office. No mention was made of Mr. S at this time and he is not mentioned again in the record. After conference with the supervisor, it was decided Miss J had made efforts to locate the fathers and a grant was authorized. In April 1952, when Miss J inquired about renting an apartment, she asked about the privilege of entertaining men. Also in April 1952, child care arrangements were discussed and Miss J said she preferred to remain on assistance. The record shows that child care plans and employment were discussed in May 1953 and June 1954. At the time of the June 23, 1954, visit, the worker noted that Miss J was just getting up at the time of the visit which was at 1 p.m. On July 30, 1954, a report was received that Miss J and the children were being supported by Mr. G, "who gives her everything she wants." In August 1954 this report was discussed with Miss J and the need to have Mr. G come to the office. "Miss J said she was not going to do this because she did not want to have anything to do with him and if we wanted to withhold assistance, that would be all right with her." She came in later "to tell me she had done all she intended to do and wanted her check for September 1954." Under date of September 24, 1954, the following entry is made: "Mr. G in office, said they are no longer friends but she has another man. Knows where father of both children are." On September 27, 1954, Miss J brought Mr. G to the office. He said he had known Miss J only a short while. "He stated that he met her one day while sitting in the park and that she told him of her plight and he felt sorry for her and loaned her $20. * * * He emphatically stated that he was not her boyfriend and had nothing to do with Miss J."

There was no reference in this interview to Mr. G's statement on August 24 that Miss J "has another man." On December 16, 1954, employment was discussed and the worker explained that assistance was being put on a temporary basis so that she could put forth efforts to locate work and locate the fathers of her children. On June 23, 1955, it was noted that Miss J appeared to be pregnant. She denied this. There was also discussion regarding Mr. M and Mr. T, the fathers of Miss J's two children. She said she did not know where they were. The worker also noticed a comparatively new 21-inch television. Miss J said this had been purchased by her sister-in-law's husband. "Miss J became very upset. She stated that if she had to secure all that information concerning the television she did not see any need of going on accepting assistance. She stated that Public Assistance has been worrying her about different things for the past 4 years and she was tired of them 'heckling' about everything. She further stated that there was no need to drill on her about the television. She was not going to make any effort to secure any information concerning the television. Miss J explained that she was not coming to the office to bring information or to do anything further. We could withdraw aid. She did not know how she would manage but she was just tired of being worried to death by PAD." The worker explained that Miss J would be given until July 15, 1955, to bring in information concerning the fathers of her children and the television. Miss J said we could set any date we desired, she was not coming to the office and she wanted assistance discontinued. It was recommended that assistance be discontinued but it would appear that the case was not closed. During July 1955, Miss J was in the office several times to discuss her continued eligibility for assistance. In August the case was closed because Miss J refused to comply with the Agency's policy concerning the television, to clarify her present living arrangements, and to have the fathers of the children visit the office concerning plans for the care and support of the children.

Six other reapplications were terminated during 1956 and 1958. On November 10, 1958, Miss J made her 13th application for assistance. She said that she was physically unable to work more than 1 day a week. She had been meeting her needs mainly through her paramour, Charles A. An entry on form No. 258, "Deprivation of parental support—ADC," says that Mr. M's address is unknown. She said that Ernest T is under court order to pay $6 a week. His address is also unknown. She said both men are married. On form No. 252, Charles A is listed as a paramour, address unknown. Miss J was referred to DCGH November 10, 1958, but there is no medical information in the record. Miss J. said that Mr. A was a "shellshocked drunkard." She said she did not know how to begin looking for him and was afraid to continue any association with him. Emergency assistance was authorized and referral to I.S. made by Intake to locate Mr. T and to determine if any man has access to the home. On January 8, 1959, I.S. located Mr. T in D.C. I.S. report of February 5, 1959, was not found in the case record. In this report no man was found in the home but the circumstances were suspicious and re-referral was suggested.

The Agency's requirements to which Miss J had been held at the time of her previous 12 applications were disregarded and the emergency assistance was authorized. The review date was set for October 31, 1959. In the recorded interview December 17, 1958, the reviewer sensed that Miss J was "settling down on assistance." Nothing was required of her and she said she was glad that she was able to establish eligibility for assistance again, and believed things would be better for her and the children from now on. She added that she believed that she could keep her eligibility clear by cooperating with Agency and maintaining a satisfactory home for her children.

NO EFFORT MADE BY MOTHER TO LOCATE FATHERS—CHILD CARE PLAN SEEMED AVAILABLE—SHOULD BE REFERRED TO DETERMINE ACCESS—ELIGIBILITY NOT CLEARLY ESTABLISHED

Case No. 12 and case No. 13: Miss J. D. and Miss E. D. are sisters, both receiving assistance. Their mother is also receiving assistance. The three assistance payments for March 1959 totaled $517.00. The mother's case is not a part of caseload No. 152 and was not read. The CWD record on Miss J. D. was read.

Miss J. D., age nineteen, applied in May 1957. She had one child, was pregnant and lived with her parents who were receiving ADC. The need to talk with the fathers of her children was explained. She failed to provide information and the application was terminated. She reapplied in November 1957. Her sister, E., was receiving assistance for her four children and Miss D. said the mother wanted the daughters to move away. No discussion regarding need to talk with the fathers is recorded. Assistance was authorized. In January 1958 the J.C. reported a finding of "not guilty" because Miss D.'s testimony indicated a pattern of promiscuity. She admitted relations with 2 men prior to and during both pregnancies.

In February 1958 assistance was continued on a temporary basis while Miss D. looked for work. She seemed to make no effort to find employment and the case was closed in June 1958, since both her mother and sister were in the home. She reapplied in December 1958, saying her mother was planning to go to work and her sister had moved away. An EA grant was authorized, and no discussion recorded as to need to talk with fathers. No address was shown on the application form and no information found as to living arrangements. The finding of the reviewer was that referral to I.S. did not appear to be indicated at this time since Miss D. had not been required to make any effort to locate the fathers and since it would seem that either the mother or the sister receiving assistance could be expected to care for the children while Miss D. worked.

The CWD record, No. T15673, was read. Miss D. was committed in 1954 for "revoke of probation." She was placed in probation following a period of truancy. She was disorderly and belligerent in school. The case was in court in November 1955. Miss D. was disorderly in a grill and had been drinking and cursing. She ran away from B.P. in April 1954 and was "lost to the Agency until October 1955." She said when she ran away she had been "right at home." (Presumably in the home of her mother receiving ADC.) The CWD record made no mention of the mother receiving assistance. The CWD record mentions a Mr. O. Miss D. said she had known him for a long time and stayed frequently with him at his address. She said he visited her in her home most of the time and she would probably continue going with him. CWD decided J. should return to her home. In August 1956 there was another complaint of drunk and disorderly at 2:30 a.m.

Miss E. D. applied for assistance in June 1955. (She was not yet nineteen. She had two children. When the record was read in March 1959 she had four children and was pregnant.) The children were with relatives. The application was terminated and she was advised to look for work. "The applicant seemed to resent such a suggestion and said she had never worked."

She applied again in December 1955 saying she was pregnant by Mr. S, the father of her two children. Mr. S was incarcerated. The application was terminated since he was to be released in about 2 weeks. She reapplied in May 1957 for herself and four children. The father of all the children, Mr. S, was in prison for nonsupport. "Mrs. S is aware of Mr. S' family by Miss D and both mothers are applying for ADC at this time. Miss D said Mr. S keeps regularly employed but finds it impossible to support two growing families. * * * Miss D seems to be competing with Mrs. S. and wants to believe he will divorce his wife and marry her. She refers to him as her husband and did not deny that their relationship will be resumed upon his release." She said her relationship with Mr. S began when she was 14 and he was 18. Mr. S was already married, but made repeated promises to get a divorce and marry her. Miss D said her life at home had not been good. "In addition, she said Mrs. D was so preoccupied in her own love affairs that they had to make their own decisions and grow up as best they could." It was decided in conference with the supervisor and District Supervisor "that putting another grant into the D's household would not help our applicant." Mr. S was to be released soon and it was felt that Miss D should seek employment, and try to acquire some skill. Before the case was closed in June 1957, "Miss D. talked with me at some length about how she perhaps would not find herself in this predicament if she had had the benefit of some guidance. She was not bitter toward her mother but said that her mother had not had the benefit of guidance either since her family had begun when she was 14 years old." Miss D. reapplied December 23, 1957. She said she wanted to move out of her mother's home. She said she no longer sees Mr. S. She is pregnant by Mr. R, who came to the office and gave his employer and address. He agreed to support "their children voluntarily." He plans to reunite with his legal family. In view of Miss D's past behavior, referral to I.S. should have been made to determine access. Mr. S was never seen.

CASE SHOULD BE REFERRED—HUSBAND'S ADDRESS KNOWN BUT NO ACTION TAKEN—NO EFFORTS BY MOTHER TO LOCATE THE FATHER—ELIGIBILITY NOT CLEARLY ESTABLISHED

Case No. 14: At the time of Mrs. D's first application October 20, 1954, she had three children and was pregnant. She asked assistance to supplement the court order of $10 a week from her husband. She said that the nurse in the clinic suggested she apply for ADC and stay in the home with her children. She was employed and decided that she would be better off to continue work and find someone to care for her children. She moved leaving no address and the application was terminated due to loss of contact. She reapplied in July 1957, saying that her husband had been out of the home for 5 months. The aunt, in whose home she lives, has helped her. She received $2,000 from her father's estate and said she put $800 down on a home. Her husband did not pay the notes on the property but paid on a car instead. She had also been doing some work. On July 19, 1957, Mrs. D said that Mr. D was actually her common law husband. He lived with her for 10 years until February 1957 when he left the family. She gave the name of his employer. "She said that she was at her wit's end, that she has tried everything, she has tried to have something, to own a piece of property, to make a future for her children, and her husband had just seemed to do everything he could possibly do to destroy all the good that has come out of her efforts." She has made up her mind that he cannot return to the home.

He likes to run around and show off and take no responsibility. On July 29, 1957, when the worker visited the home, Mr. D was there. He said he was not aware of his wife's application for assistance or that the family had been threatened with eviction. When Mrs. D had made her application she said he had deserted the family in February 1957 and she did not know where he lived. Mrs. D's aunt, Mrs. E, was also present during the interview and she and Mr. D "hurled accusations at each other." Mrs. D had made a downpayment on the home from an inheritance left by her father. The aunt and uncle moved in supposedly on a temporary basis. They were supposed to share shelter expenses, but Mr. E was out of work. Mr. D grew tired of supporting the E family. After the foreclosure, the house was rented to the E's and Mrs. E told Mr. D to get out. He left the home in April 1957 and asked Mrs. D and the children to come with him to a house he had rented. She refused to move with him because she said she thought he might have another woman living there. He said he visits the home three or four times a week, makes repairs, cuts the boys' hair. Mrs. D spent the night with him in his rooms one night the previous week. He said he was trying to get Mrs. D away from her relatives. He has brought food each week. He said Mrs. D had told him he was too old for her. Mrs. D said she thought she should stay with her aunt so that she could care for the children while Mrs. D worked. Mr. D wanted to rent an apartment for the family. On July 31, 1957, Mr. D said that Mrs. D had decided to remain in the aunt's home so that she could work and Mrs. E could look after the children. He thinks Mrs. D may be interested in a younger man she has permitted to come there. He thinks someone has told Mrs. D that she could work, obtain support from him, and also receive assistance. The application was terminated in August 1957. Mr. D was to continue to provide food, clothing, and incidentals for the family and a share of the shelter expenses. On January 21, 1958, the aunt's employer telephoned to say that Mr. D had deserted. On February 20, 1958, Mrs. D reapplied. She said that Mr. D separated from the family and was not supporting except for occasional small amounts of food. They were evicted and forced to move with Mrs. E. Emergency assistance was authorized "due to emergency need" and the Intake worker noted on form No. 246 that Mr. D's absence was to be confirmed through I.S. and that Mr. D was to be seen regarding support. An undated entry on form No. 246 reads: "Interview with Mr. D established that absence did not exist. Family was split by eviction. Mr. D supporting family to the best of his ability. Mrs. D never able to come in with Mr. D but admits that Mr. D not absent at first but does not want him now." Mrs. D refused her husband's offer of a home. The case was recommended for closing under code 8—"Originally ineligible under State plan."

On May 26, 1958, CWD referred Mrs. D and the children. The referral states that Mr. D had deserted in February 1958 and that Mrs. D and the children were sheltered temporarily by Mrs. E. The referral said that Mr. D's whereabouts were unknown and she did not intend to resume her common law relationship with him. Mrs. D impressed CWD as a mother who is sincerely interested in her children, who are in Junior Village. On June 9, 1958, Mrs. D reapplied, saying she wanted to reestablish a home for the children. She is working but said she would need to stop work and stay home with the children. She said she would not consider going back with Mr. D. Mrs. D was told that the Agency can assist her when she has a place large enough to accommodate the family. After a conference with CWD on August 12, 1958, emergency assistance was authorized. The following entry is made on Form No. 246. "Deprivation of parental support exists because of continued absence. Mr. D, common law husband of Mrs. D and father of all children denied paternity at J.C. on June 23, 1958, and case was referred to Corporation Counsel. See form No. 241. Hearing to be held on August 14, 1958."

An entry on form 259 reads in part as follows: "Contacts we have had with the father gives picture of sincere intent and acknowledgement of responsibility * * *. Was seen in PAD on February 25 after Mrs. D. received EA * * *. He contends children need and want him. He says neglect of children, if any, due to mother's unconcern and desire for immorality."

Although Mrs. D's statements were found to be untrue on two previous applications, emergency assistance was again authorized and no attempt made to talk with Mr. D. Mrs. D's grant of $203.00 continues with a review date set for June 30, 1959. There is no dictation by the present worker and no report on the J.C. hearing set for August 14, 1958. This case was accepted without any attempt to talk with Mr. D, whose address is known and his previous statements concerning support and interest in the children were known. Since the case was accepted, policy requires referral to I.S. No referral was made.

CASE SHOULD BE RE-REFERRED—ELIGIBILITY NOT CLEARLY ESTABLISHED—FATHER NOT SEEN ALTHOUGH ADDRESS KNOWN—NO EFFORT MADE BY MOTHER TO HAVE FATHER COME TO OFFICE

Case No. 26: Miss H was 23 years old when she applied in May 1955 for herself and four children. She said that the children's father, Mr. D, with whom she had been living had left the home. Miss H knew where he was working and in view of his availability and employability, the application was terminated. She reapplied again in May 1955. She said she could not find Mr. D and then later said she thought she could find him. This application was terminated due to failure to obtain support. In July 1955 she came in again to apply for ADC. She was pregnant and said that Mr. D was not the father of the expected child. This application was terminated because of failure to obtain support from the father of the children. She reapplied in September 1955. The two oldest children were in Junior Village. She named Frank H as the father of her unborn child. She said she sees him twice a week but has no marital relations with him, because he said he would not be responsible for anyone in her present condition. The location of Mr. D was explained as a condition of eligibility. Mr. H. was seen. He has a wife and three children and was planning to live again with his wife. He said he had not been intimate with Miss H since September 1955. He confirmed her statements that their intimacies always took place at his home. He was undecided as to continuing his relationship with Miss H and said he would let the worker know on October 10 what he planned to do about this. On October 21, 1955, Miss H told a weird story about not knowing who the father of her second child was because she had "a few drinks" and had been dragged into an alley by five men, all of whom were intimate with her. On October 27, 1955, the worker read the Women's Bureau record. Miss H was known to them for drunk and disorderly conduct and was brought in five times from 1953 to 1955. On November 4, 1955, Mr. H came to the office and said he planned to live with his wife in North Carolina. On December 6, 1955, a visit was made to Mrs. C, who said Miss H was her adopted daughter. Mrs. C said that when Miss H was young she refused to mind and was placed in a home. "Since she had been discharged from the home she has been having children regularly." Mrs. C's son sees Mr. D every day. On December 8, 1955, a visit was made to the home of Mrs. C's son. "He said he did not think Miss H could ever be a good mother and that whether she got on the welfare or not would not make any difference in her behavior because she likes to live around from hand to mouth and have babies."

It seemed to him that Miss H. did not want to work. He thought the children are better off away from Miss H. On December 8, 1955, a conference was held with CWD. "Much discussion went on concerning Miss H.'s behavior as a mother and meeting public assistance requirements. Conclusion: CWD is willing to have the children returned to the home with supervision from their agency provided public assistance is granted." On January 11, 1956 Mr. D. was seen in the Juvenile Court worker's office. He denied paternity of all but two children. "Mr. D. explained that he would love to live with Miss H. again in order that the whole family could be together even though he knows R. and D. are not his children. This makes no difference to him. He stated he could overlook Miss H's. faults because he really loved Miss H." He said Miss H. had known where he was and has seen him constantly. He visits at least once a week. He said the father of the coming baby could be anyone because Miss H. was constantly out in the street.

On January 13 and 18, 1956, there were long interviews with Miss H. and Mr. D. It was pointed out that the agency did not consider them to be separated. Mr. D. tried to live with Miss H. and wanted to accept all the children but she did not act toward him as a wife should and he was not going to live with her. His decision was accepted and a grant authorized. Later it was decided that the assistance payment could not be approved because Miss H. had not demonstrated that she could be a responsible mother. CWD was notified that the grant was not approved as planned. On March 13, 1956, Miss H. was again in office and there was a long discussion regarding her behavior. She admitted that she had left the children on different occasions. She feels she can be a good mother. She said she had left the children to obtain money for food and rent. She had gone to gambling houses because she knew Mr. D. could be found there and she had on occasions tried her own luck. Her drinking began when she became angry visit was paid to Mrs. C., Miss H.'s adoptive visit was paid to Mrs. C., Miss H's. adoptive mother. Miss H. had recently been in her home but she had to ask her to move. She took Miss H. in because of her pregnancy. Miss H. allowed Mr. D. to come there. Miss H. expected Mrs. C. to stay home with the children while she ran the streets. Miss H. left the children twice and did not return until morning. She doesn't feel that Miss H. will change as long as she hangs with that group of girls on 7th Street, they only want to drink and stay with one man after another for one meal and later end up with children they cannot support. Mrs. C. doubts that Miss H. really wants her children. She feels that Miss H. should not have her 8 year old daughter because of the men Miss H. has coming and going in the home. She believes that this child was attacked by a man when she was left alone. She does not believe Miss H. will stay in the home and care for her children properly. She has always had trouble with Miss H. and that is the reason why she had her committed to CWD some time back. She believes if she works she would not have time to run the streets. She has never worked since she has been grown. She merely drags the children from place to place. On March 21, 1956, there was another conference with CWD who believed that Miss H. has never had a chance to see what she could do if she had financial support. On March 23, 1956, the worker and supervisor decided to approve Miss H's. grant for a 2-week period with both CWD and PAD watching the situation very closely to determine Miss H's. adequacy as a parent. This was explained carefully to Miss H. on March 26, 1956. On April 19, 1956, notation is made that the case is being referred to I.S. so that Miss H.'s home will be under surveillance night and day to determine whether she is following through on the advice given. It was planned with CWD to have Miss H's. three children returned to the home with close supervision. Assistance was authorized on a monthly basis because of Miss H.'s promiscuous behavior and evidence of being a weak parent.

In June 1956 the case was transferred to another worker. An entry dated June 8, 1956, refers to a referral to I.S. to locate Mr. D, but the request to I.S. does not mention this. On July 12, 1956, the Woman's Bureau telephoned to say that Miss H had left the children alone at 2 a.m. Miss H said she had gone out to find Mr. D. She was told by PAD that another such report would mean referral to CWD. On September 17, 1956, I.S. reported no man seen in the home. On October 3, 1956 Mr. D. was in the office. He told of living with Miss H. and of their frequent separations. He said their last separation was because Miss H. would go out "and stay until the wee hours of morning." He said he has tried hard to provide a home and has begged Miss H. to change. He said she drinks excessively. He talked about how much he loved Miss H. On October 4, 1956, worker told Miss H. of the interview with Mr. D. She said she sees him often as he is fond of the children and comes to see them. He has proved himself to be an irresponsible person who does not care whether the family has food or not when he gambles. "She told the worker a great deal about the underworld, about gambling, homosexuality and prostitution. She wanted worker to know though that she had no part in any of these but that she had lived in the environment of people who indulged in all of them. She talked about her many incarcerations and what her life had been like inside of Woman's Bureau and jails. She said she knew she had many weaknesses but felt she could work them out herself." On October 15, 1956, the landlady called to complain about the rent and Miss H.'s neglect of the children. On October 23, 1956, the Woman's Bureau called to say that Miss H. was placed in jail, charged with being drunk and disorderly. This information was given to CWD and the children were placed in Junior Village. The case was closed in January 1957. CWD felt that Miss H. was not ready to have the children returned to her. Miss H. reapplied August 14, 1958, having been referred by CWD. An entry on form No. 25–8 says Miss H. is employed as a dishwasher at Normandy Farms and will have to give up her employment when the children are returned home. An entry on form No. 246, dated August 21, 1958, says that Miss H. has an infant son born February 15, 1958, and that she is again separated from Mr. D. On August 26, 1958, referral was made by intake to I.S. to establish the absence of Mr. D. Miss H. said she has severed her relationship with her undesirable companions and will try to work toward greater responsibility in regard to the care and supervision of her children. Emergency assistance was authorized with the review date set for September 30, 1959. There is no record of any attempt since the last application to talk with Mr. D., whose relationship with Miss H. began in 1945 and has continued. His address is given on form No. 252–A. I.S. report dated September 22, 1958, says: "On September 22, 1958, I was advised by Miss Jones, social worker, that we had no authority to investigate this case and that it should not have been referred as Miss H. is not receiving a grant until October 1, 1958, and that child care arrangements have been arranged and that Miss H.'s children will not be returned to the home until all arrangements have been completed. In view of the above I.S. is closing the investigation." The entry on form No. 122, dated November 5, 1958, reads: "Request is withdrawn, knew of employment. Children being returned October 1, 1958. New request will be sent for information as to whether any man has free access to the home." There is no record of rereferral.

CASES REFERRED FOR ONE REASON SHOULD BE REFERRED FOR ANOTHER—NO EFFORT MADE BY MOTHER TO LOCATE FATHERS—ELIGIBILITY NOT CLEARLY ESTABLISHED

Case No. 61: Mrs. S. was 23 when she applied for assistance in July 1950. (At the time of application she had 2 children. She has had 3 other children since that time.) She said she had separated from her husband 6 months ago.

Then she said she and her husband had never lived together since their marriage, "because of his failure to find a place for themselves." She is living with her mother and Mr. S is living with his mother in the same block of O Street. This has continued since their marriage. Mrs. S had two children at the time of application, one by Mr. S and the older one by Samuel B, who had disappeared. Mrs. S's mother said Mrs. S and the children could remain in the home without paying shelter costs. The worker talked with Mr. S's mother by telephone and she said she did not know where her son was living. On February 8, 1951, Mrs. S told worker she had given birth to a son on January 4, 1951. The father of the child was Henry D. She said he "lives in the home with her mother" and has "several other children in the neighborhood." The worker talked with him by telephone on January 19, 1951, regarding support he was giving to another ADC recipient for the support of her two children. He buys milk and clothing for his child by Mrs. S. On October 17, 1952, and July 12, 1953, Mr. S was arrested for violation of ABC regulations. On March 29, 1954, Mrs. S's mother telephoned to say she had to give up her home and is living with a friend. On August 11, 1954, Mr. and Mrs. S were in the office. At first he said he would be willing to live with his family. "Mr. S said he sees his child and Mrs. S very often and when worker said that Mrs. S had advised she had not seen him and that she had no idea where he was living, he just looked at her." "After Mr. S said he would be willing to go back and live with Mrs. S she spoke up and said, 'you know you have a girlfriend and I have a boyfriend,' and they asked the worker if it would be all right if they talked a little bit alone. So the worker left the booth for a few minutes. After I returned to the booth Mrs. S said she did not wish to go back to live with her husband. We then advised her that there was very little doubt that we could continue giving her assistance since her husband said he would be willing to live with her." She said her boyfriend is Robert H and that he comes to see her two or three times a week and usually each weekend. Mr. H called the worker the following day and said in an angry tone that he is not responsible for the support of Mrs. S and her children and he did not think it was any of our business to inquire as to his circumstances and that he only helps her out when she runs short. Mrs. S said she expected a job and had found a woman to look after the children. The case was closed. Mrs. S reapplied November 15, 1954 and November 18, 1954. These applications were terminated because Mrs. S was employable. The Notice of Ineligibility, form No. 12, dated November 15, 1954, contains the following paragraph: "If you should reapply for assistance it would be necessary for us to have some contact from Mr. Robert H as to his plans for the family, if any, and some effort would have to be made to try to locate and obtain support from Mr. B and Mr. D."

On August 22, 1958, Mrs. S re-applied for assistance. She has been working but had to stop because the children have been sick. She said she planned to return to work when her children are well again. Since her case was closed, two more children have been born. She named Robert H as the father. Referral to I.S. was made by intake October 22, 1958, to locate Mr. S and Samuel B. An entry on form No. 258—Deprivation of Parental Support—ADC, says there is no continuing relationship with any of the fathers of her children. She gave Robert H's address. She said he had not seen Mr. B for several years and did not know his whereabouts. She said she has not seen Mr. S in 3 or 4 years. Mr. D, she said, was under court order to pay for the support of his child. According to longhand notes in the record, dated November 4, 1958, she said she did not know where Mr. S is living except "in the 2000 block of 14th Street NW." She said his child visits him and she will give him a card asking him to telephone for an interview. "As to the other fathers, Mrs. S claims no knowledge of their whereabouts. Mr. H is now said to be in New York City." It was noted that on March 29, 1954, Mrs. S's mother had said she was forced to give up her home and was living with a friend.

However, her address at the time of this application was given as 936 O Street where she had lived with Mr. S and had been offered rent free.

The referral by intake to IS was for the location of Mr. S and Mr. B. There was no referral for the location of Henry D. Robert H's address is given on form No. 258. Referral should have been made to IS to determine access. No effort was required by Mrs. S to have any of the fathers come to the office.

SHOULD HAVE BEEN REFERRED BECAUSE OF DENUNCIATION, TO LOCATE FATHERS, AND TO DETERMINE ACCESS—NO REAL EFFORT BY MOTHER TO LOCATE FATHERS—ELIGIBILITY NOT CLEARLY ESTABLISHED

Case No. 55: Mrs. R applied for assistance in April 1948 for herself and two children. There have been four other pregnancies since she has been receiving assistance. She lived with her mother, Amanda Newman, who was receiving GPA. She worked until she became ill and her mother cared for the children. She returned to work and the application was terminated. She applied again in January 1949 because of pregnancy. She said Laddim B, the father of the expected child, has been helping her. He lives with his wife. She gave Mr. R's address in Cleveland and said he was contributing through the D.A.'s office. She gave Mr. B's Washington address and assistance was authorized with the understanding that she would contact Mr. B and have him come to the office. The worker talked with Mrs. N, who was identified as Mrs. R's grandmother. She described Mrs. R as irresponsible and unappreciative of the efforts Mrs. N had made in caring for the children. She described Mr. B as "no good." The Public Health Nurse said Mrs. N had "hinted that Mrs. R was promiscuous." On February 15, 1951, when the worker talked with Mrs. R concerning employment, she said she was expecting a child in April. She named Mr. John S as the father and was told that we would like to talk with him. She said at the time of this interview that Mr. B lives now in North Carolina. On March 5, 1951, Mr. S telephoned to say that he would give $10 a week. He came in in April to say that he was not working. In an undated entry on page 13 of the record the worker discussed plans for returning to work and Mrs. R said she had none. "In discussing the situation of the family, it was to be noted that Mrs. R participated very little in saying anything and even started reading the newspaper, apparently ignoring worker during the interview * * *. Worker has attempted to impress upon Mrs. R that the Agency will not be able to go along with her unless she attempts to show some cooperation and ambition in assisting her total family picture." "Mrs. N told worker she was very upset at Mrs. R's history of illegitimate children." She told of friends who used to be kind to her and give her gifts, avoiding her because she lived with Mrs. R and withholding gifts which they felt would benefit Mrs. R. On March 6, 1952, Mrs. N telephoned and worker learned that Mrs. R had had a miscarriage in February. Mr. S was responsible. Mrs. R came to the office on March 10, 1952, and was told that assistance could no longer be continued because absence could not be established. Mrs. R kept the two youngest children with her and the older two remained with Mrs. N, who received ADC for them. Mrs. R reapplied for assistance in September 1952 saying she was again pregnant by Mr. S. On October 7, 1952, "Mrs. R was advised that we definitely had to see Mr. S and we left the responsibility to her to secure his cooperation in coming into the office."

On September 11, 1953, worker expressed the opinion that Mrs. R had "made no considerable effort toward locating Mr. S." In an undated entry on page 29 the worker told Mrs. R that she would be expected to find employment and care for the children and that the Agency would not go along with her previous type of behavior. On December 1, 1955, the landlady telephoned to say that a Mr. James H was living with Mrs. R. She said that Mrs. R had requested that Mr. H be allowed to stay a little longer and she had refused. She said she felt that Mrs. R was going to move in order to continue living with Mr. H. The landlady's statements were discussed with Mrs. R on December 5, 1955, and she denied that Mr. H was her boy friend. She said she had not seen Mr. H but would try and get in touch with him. On December 14, 1955, Mr. H came to the office. He described the landlady as "crazy." He said he had helped Mrs. R to move and that he had no interest in her. On December 16, 1955, referral was made to R.I.U. to locate Mr. B and Mr. S. Investigation Service located Mr. B in South Carolina and Mr. S in District of Columbia General Hospital. On February 29, 1956, Mr. S was seen in District of Columbia General Hospital. He said he had not seen Mrs. R for over 2 years. "Mr. S stated that back in 1953, or whenever they were together, he caught her with a fellow. He stated that it surprised him as this was the fellow that she had gone with before. However, he thought they had discontinued their relationship. He stated that as the result, he sometimes wondered if the children were his. Mr. S stated that he does not see Mrs. R and does not plan to because of her conduct when they were together." On May 17, 1956, a letter was received from Mr. R in Cleveland, Ohio. He said he had not seen Mrs. R since 1953 or lived with her since 1942. There is no record that this letter was acknowledged. On March 26, 1957, a memorandum was received from the Investigation Service saying a report had been received that a man was living with Mrs. R. This report was not discussed with Mrs. R until May 3, 1957. "Mrs. R received this information jubilantly, laughed and said no man did not live in the home with her * * *." On December 12, 1958, a discussion of the ADC policy is recorded. No referral was made to Investigation Service in spite of the many complaints of Mrs. R's behavior.

CASES SHOULD BE RE-REFERRED—NO ACTION AFTER LOCATION

Case No. 66: Miss T, age 23, applied November 1, 1951. The father of her expected child was Charles H. She gave his District of Columbia address and said that he worked in Baltimore. She said he stopped seeing her when he learned she was pregnant. In January 1953, the case was closed after it was learned that she was again pregnant by Mr. H. Miss T requested an appeal and in March 1953 it was decided to accept another application. She said she had not seen Mr. H since December 1952 but that she made a child care plan and was looking for work. The application was terminated when she failed to provide information needed to establish eligibility. She reapplied March 18, 1954, saying she was pregnant by Johnny C. She gave his address and social security number. She was told on March 23, 1954, that the Agency "would be interested" in talking with Mr. H as to his plans for his children. She was "informed that the Agency would also have to talk to Mr. C before any further consideration could be given to her application." In August 1954 she said she wanted help until she could get work. Assistance was authorized on a temporary basis and on July 29, 1955, she was told again that Mr. H and Mr. C must be seen. On December 21, 1955, referral was made to Investigation Service to establish the presence or absence of Mr. C and Mr. H. On December 29, 1955, Investigation Service reported they had located both Mr. C and Mr. H. Mr. C was advised by Investigation Service that the social worker would contact him and that Mr. H would contact the social worker on February 23, 1956. Both these men have police records. Entries dated September 17, 1958, on forms 247 and 248 say that Mr. C was found not guilty of paternity. The record also contains a voluntary support agreement, form No. 57, dated February 1959 which could not be read but on which the name appeared to be Thomas S.

The Agency has had no contact with either Mr. H or Mr. C in spite of repeated statements to Miss T that this was necessary. There was no referral to Investigation Service regarding access.

CASES WHICH SHOULD BE RE-REFERRED

Case No. 37: Miss S applied for assistance March 22, 1957. She was 23. She said she had lived with the father of her children, Mr. E., for 3 years but that he had deserted and left town. She was told by the intake worker that she must make efforts to locate Mr. E and to support the children. She seemed reluctant to seek employment saying she did not think she could make enough money to support the children and arrange for their care. Referral was made to IS by intake April 29, 1957, to locate Mr. E and on March 18, 1958, he was found by IS to be living in the District of Columbia. The record is not clear as to what action was taken in regard to Mr. E but there is no record of his having been seen. In July 1957 Mr. E bought a television set giving his wife's name as that of Miss S. According to a April 1, 1959, entry, Miss S has another television. This record indicates that re-referral should be made to locate Mr. E and also to determine access.

SHOULD BE REFERRED TO DETERMINE ACCESS—NO ACTION AFTER LOCATION

Case No. 53: Mrs. P has received assistance continuously since 1948. Her husband was drowned in August 1948. He was the father of two of her three children. Three more children have been born since 1948. On March 6, 1950, the worked learned that Mrs. P had given birth to a child on November 2, 1949. A visit had been made on September 4, 1949, but Mrs. P's pregnancy was not noticed or at least not mentioned. William H was the father of this child and of a child born in 1951. The grant continued with no discussion of the need to see Mr. H nor of Mrs. P's continued relationship with him. On June 29, 1953, the landlord told the agency that Mrs. P is planning to be married, that her boyfriend had "hit the numbers." On July 14, 1953, Mr. Joe W was in the office saying that he has no intention of marrying Mrs. P since he already has a wife. There was no discussion recorded of any continuing relationship. On January 20, 1954, a new baby is seen. Mrs. P named Joseph W as the father and said she did not tell the agency because her assistance would be stopped. The worker explained the need to talk to Mr. W and he came to the office January 25, 1954. He said he would support the baby. There was no discussion of a continuing relationship. On November 21, 1956, referral was made to I.S. to locate Mr. H and Mr. W. Mr. W was located in District of Columbia jail in April 1947 and in July 1947 Mr. H was located in District of Columbia. Although located by I.S., Mr. H was never seen. Referral should have been made to determine access.

CASES REFERRED FOR ONE REASON BUT SHOULD HAVE BEEN RE-REFERRED FOR ANOTHER REASON—NO ACTION TAKEN AFTER LOCATED

Case No. 70: Miss W received assistance from 1947 until 1951 when an attorney called regarding arrangements to purchase a home by a Mr. T and Miss W who gave her name as Dorothy T. The case was closed because need could not be established. She reapplied for assistance July 24, 1951. Another child was born in December 1951 and she has received assistance continuously since that time. Mr. T died in October 1951. In July 1956, it was learned that she was pregnant by Mr. P. She said she had known him for 4 years and he had visited "as a regular friend for 1 year." Mr. P was seen on October 18, 1956. He said he had five children and a mother to support. He said he was not intimate with Miss W at present and did not "intend to have any more transactions with her." Miss W's mother is also receiving assistance and there is difficulty in verifying shelter costs and living arrangements. Miss W moves constantly and she and her mother live together and then apart. A man always rents the house for them. Referral to IS on January 25, 1957, was made by the previous worker to determine resources or roomers and to locate Mr. W. On August 29, 1958, Mr. W was located in the District of Columbia but no action was taken to get in touch with him. The fact that he was located was not mentioned in the dictation. This case should have been re-referred to IS to determine access.

CASES WHICH SHOULD HAVE BEEN RE-REFERRED—ELIGIBILITY NOT CLEARLY ESTABLISHED

Case No. 56: Mrs. R made two applications in 1954, two in 1955, two in 1956, and one in 1957. Each of these applications were terminated because she had done nothing to get support from her paramour, John W, because Mr. W was able to work or absence of Mr. W from the home was not established. When she applied for the eighth time on February 13, 1958, she was again pregnant by Mr. W. She said he had not had regular work for several months so she asked him to leave the home. Emergency assistance was authorized. She said she had lived with Mr. W since 1953 and that he was the father of her two children and the unborn child. She said she and her husband separated in 1953 "because Mr. W was living in the home and he would not support all of them." Referral was made to I.S. March 10, 1958, to determine if Mr. W had access to the home. On April 29, 1958, I.S. reported no sign of a man at the time of visits. However, Mr. W gave Mrs. R's address as recently as February 28, 1958, when he was arrested for being drunk. IS suggested rereferral after 3 months but this was not done. Eligibility in this case was not clearly established. From Mrs. R's statements it would appear that either absence does not exist or, if Mr. W is absent, the separation is one of convenience for assistance purposes. Mrs. R. appeared to be no more eligible at the time of the eighth application than when the previous seven applications were made. Since the case was accepted, re-referral should have been made to determine access.

SHOULD HAVE BEEN RE-REFERRED

Case No. 3: Mrs. B, age 24, applied for assistance in May 1956. She had four children by four different fathers. Referral to I.S. was made in September 1956 to locate the father of one of the children and to determine access. On November 20, 1956, I.S. reported they had located Mr. M. His address and employer were given. The case was closed in April 1957 after Mrs. B had given false information as to the whereabouts of two of her children. She reapplied May 2, 1957. She said she had never lived with any of the fathers of her children, although when one of them was seen on September 4, 1956, he said he had lived with Mrs. B for the past 2 years. Referral should have been made to I.S. at that time to determine access. Referral was made to determine access. This was done after the paternal grandmother of one of the children had telephoned to say that Mrs. B was living with a Mr. A, spending nights at his quarters and had a child by him this past summer. On October 9, 1958, I.S. reported two men in the home. On October 28, 1958, the investigators were admitted by the same man who had opened the door at the time of the previous visit. Mrs. B cursed violently and threw an object at the investigator. On February 19, 1959, I.S. reported that no men were seen in the apartment but that Mrs. B appears to have a new baby. On February 2, 1959, I.S. reported a baby was born September 16, 1958, and that the house was rented by Joseph A, whose place of employment showed his address as the same as Mrs. B's and who claimed a wife and two children for tax purposes.

On February 20, 1959, a letter was written to Mrs. B saying assistance could not be continued until her living arrangements were clarified. She was seen in February and March 1959. At first she denied having had a child and then said she had given the infant away on the hospital steps to a person whose name she did not know.

Form No. 122, dated February 25, 1959, said the grant continued unchanged as Mrs. B continued to deny the birth of the baby. A check with Payroll Control revealed that the March 1, 1959, check was canceled. This case should have been re-referred for access at the time of reapplication in May 1957.

EXAMPLE OF CASE WHERE REFERRAL TO I.S. WAS JUSTIFIED—NO ACTION TAKEN ON INFORMATION SUPPLIED BY I.S.—ELIGIBILITY QUESTIONED

Case No. 204: When Mrs. B. applied for assistance on February 6, 1951, at the age of 20, she had one child and was pregnant. She said she only wanted assistance until her child was born and she can return to work. She said she had been separated from Mr. B. for 4 years. She named Mr. F. as the father of her child and said that Mr. Lloyd T. was the father of her unborn child. The case was closed in December 1951 when Mrs. B. obtained employment. She reapplied in July 1953 saying she was pregnant by Mr. Samuel T., who was the brother of the father of her last child. The application was terminated because Mrs. B. had made no effort to obtain support from the fathers of her children. When she reapplied in November 1953 she was again pregnant by Samuel T. Mrs. B. said she was really not sure who was the father of her oldest child. She went with Mr. F. and then became intimate with Mr. Lloyd T. Mr. Lloyd T. denied paternity and the court upheld this. He admitted paternity of the child born in 1951 and was under court order.

He had not paid regularly as he became angry with her when she began a relationship with his brother, Mr. Samuel T. Mrs. B. was told in November and December that it would be necessary for Mr. B., her husband, and Mr. Lloyd T., to contact the Agency. Mr. Lloyd T. telephoned on February 16, 1954 to say that he was making the payment ordered by the court but his payments were in arrears. "He doubted paternity to the child saying he had been caught and Mrs. B. did not know who actual father is." He said he is married and lived with his family and that his brother, Mr. Samuel T., is also "happily married". On December 17, 1954 Mrs. B. said that she was 7 months pregnant. She said that Mr. F. is also the father of this child. "It was decided that Mrs. B. would receive no further assistance until resource in Mr. F., putative father, was cleared and efforts to secure support from Mr. Samuel T. cleared." Mr. F., father of 2 of Mrs. B.'s children, was in the office on January 21, 1955. He said his relationship with Mrs. B. was "merely a passing fancy", and that "he considers her as a girl to take to one of the motels or out night clubbing." He said he has a family of his own. Later in the interview, he said he has a common-law wife with whom he has been in a close relationship since 1949 and with whom he spends the night whenever he desires. On April 12, 1955, Mr. Lloyd T. was in the office. He said he was under order to pay Mrs. B. $6 a week. He said he has a wife and 4 children and that he and his wife had tried to help Mrs. B. in 1953 by keeping the children.

He said he and Mrs. B. were friends during schooldays. He planned at one time to marry her but decided against this because of her relationship with his brother. He said that "she will be intimate with any man that comes along. He states that he knows from her previous behavior that she will have another child next year if she meets another man. He has tried to talk to her about her relationship with so many men but it does not seem to help. He was her regular boyfriend for over 4 years." On May 18, 1955, Mr. B. was seen. He said he does not feel any responsibility toward Mrs. B., who left him in 1948 because he was unemployed. He is unable to obtain a divorce because of his religion but considers himself separated. He said he is not willing to do anything for Mrs. B. "because of her unfaithfulness and being a person no one can trust". He saw Mrs. B. 2 weeks ago and there was a boyfriend in the home at that time.

He said another reason he is not willing to help Mrs. B. was because she had her boyfriend forge his name to a loan. He said he had tried to live with Mrs. B. and make a go of it but it seemed to be impossible. He gave his address. In an interview in September 1955, Mrs. B. said she had "no male interests as she is disgusted with men." She said she was not pregnant. On October 21, 1955, a report was received from Mrs. B.'s landlady that she was pregnant. Mrs. B. was reported to have said that she had denied her pregnancy to her worker and had "decided what she would say when her pregnancy is discovered by her worker". On October 26 she denied that she was pregnant. On November 23, 1955, she admitted her pregnancy and said that Mr. F., whose address she gave, is the father of her expected child. (This is Mrs. B.'s third child by Mr. F., who told the Agency on January 21, 1955, that his relationship with Mrs. B. was "merely a passing fancy.") On November 25, 1955, Mrs. B. and Mr. F. were seen.

Mr F said he could not support two families. They were informed that no further assistance could be issued. Mrs. B. appealed and a hearing was arranged on January 5, 1956. The action of the Agency was sustained. On December 30, 1955, referral was made to I.S. to determine if Mr. F. was absent from the home. On January 5, 1956, a five-page report was received from I.S. saying that the relationship continues. The I.S. report expressed the opinion that Mrs B. was untruthful but has the ability of creating the impression that she is telling the truth. The case was closed in January 1956. She reapplied in July 1956 for herself and six children. She said that she was evicted and four of her children were placed in Junior Village. She has been working and continued to work at the Willard Hotel. On August 28, 1956 a telephone call was received from a CWD worker who said that Mrs. B.'s case was new to the Agency but had been known to CWD for sometime. Child Welfare Division recommended that the mother give up her work and apply for assistance so that she could make a home for the children. The CWD worker said later that the case had been known to the Agency and the case had been closed "because of policy 7 but that all of this had been taken care of and the mother had gone to court with all of the fathers available and bench warrants had been issued for the rest of them and that her Agency was aware of the circumstances and knew that there was no continuing relationship between the mother and any of the four fathers involved." In an interview with Mrs. B. August 30, 1956, she said she was not having any relations with the fathers of her children. She talked in length about her church attendance, the teachings of the Holy Bible and her plans "to make a change in her life."

The Agency policy concerning absence was discussed and she said she understood it fully. She said she did not want to reapply for assistance but was told by CWD that she must do this. On February 1, 1957, she said "I wish I could place these children somewhere so I wouldn't have to be bothered with them. You just don't know how tiresome it is to have to stay at home with these children all the time and not be able to get out." Mrs. B. mentioned a soldier stationed at Fort Belvoir in whom she is interested. On March 3, 1958, the worker discussed with Mrs. B. a report which had been received that she was pregnant. Agency policy was again discussed and she said she was fully aware of it. She emphatically denied that she was pregnant. On March 17, 1958, form 29 was received saying that Mrs. B. had had an incomplete abortion.

This case was carried by the worker in caseload 223 from September 1958 to February 1959. On September 22, 1958 referral was made to I.S. to determine if Mr. B., or any of the fathers, or any men had access. On October 6, 1958, a report was received that Mrs. B. may be pregnant and on November 17, 1958 I.S. reported that a Mr. K. was found in the home and that Mr. B. came in while the investigators were there. No action was taken on this report. On April 29, 1959, a letter was received from Mrs. K. saying that her husband is keeping company with Mrs. B. On May 12, 1959, I.S. reported a report had been received that Mr. K. lives in Mrs. B.'s home as her paramour. On May 29, 1959, rereferral was made to I.S. by the present worker to establish whether a husband-and-wife relationship exists between Mrs. B. and Mr. K. and whether he has free access to her home.

REFERRAL JUSTIFIED—NO ACTION TAKEN ON I.S. INFORMATION

Case No. 232: This case was carried by the worker from July 1958 to February 1959. Mrs. R. applied in April 1950 for herself and one child. She said her common-law husband had died in March. She worked as an elevator operator for 5 years and employment was discussed in 1954 and 1956. In February 1956 she said she had a "steady boyfriend, Francis A." She said he had been her boyfriend for the past 3 years. In November 1956 Mr. A. said he had stopped seeing Mrs. R. In September 1957 Mrs. R said she was no longer seeing Mr. A. Referral to I.S. was made in September 1958 to determine access. On October 17, 1958, I.S. found Mr. A in the home. On November 13, 1958, I.S. reported Mrs. R. said she had not seen Mr. A. since November 3, 1958. The record shows no discussion with Mrs. R. of I.S. report and no action taken.

REFERRAL JUSTIFIED—ELIGIBILITY QUESTIONED

Case No. 229: Miss P. applied in August 1954 when she was 18 years of age. Prior to her 18th birthday, she had been included in her mother's grant. She had one child and was pregnant. The father of her 3-year-old child was James J. She gave the father of her unborn child as William B., an ATD recipient. In February 1955 she said her relationship with Mr. B continued and would continue. Her pregnancy was described by her as just "one of those things." In April 1955 Miss P's. mother complained of her neglect of the children. She sometimes stayed out all night and left the baby all day without food. In April 1955 Mr. B. was seen. He also said his relationship with Miss P. was a continuing one. In May 1955 another man, a barber, rented an apartment for Miss P. In January 1956 she said her relationship with Mr. B. continued and she is again pregnant. In February 1956 Mr. B. used the same expression Miss P. had used in describing her pregnancy—"it was just one of those things." Mr. B. died in July 1956. In September 1956 referral was made to I.S. by the previous worker to locate Mr. J., father of Miss P's. oldest child. I.S. located him and he was interviewed in October 1956. He said he loved Miss P. and wanted to marry her but her mother does not want him to. He said he did not think Miss P. is a decent mother. He said she drinks. He told of seeing her on 4th Street SW. at 1:30 a.m. He said he would like to have the children. She told Mr. J. she was planning to be married but she denied this in an interview dated October 29, 1956. She had on a "set of wedding rings" which she said came from the 10-cent store. She giggled over this. In June 1957 Miss P. was again pregnant, this time by a Carl S. On August 13, 1958, referral was made to I.S. because of an anonymous complaint of neglect. I.S. was also asked to identify any man involved and to locate Mr. S. On September 4, 1958, a partial report from I.S. told of serious neglect of the children. They were found alone on four night visits. There was no further report from I.S. in the record and no current dictation.

REFERRAL JUSTIFIED

Case No. 224: Mr. and Mrs. M. applied in January 1958. The application was terminated because Mr. M. was employable. She reapplied in September 1958. Referral was made to I.S. to locate Mr. M. and to ascertain if Mrs. M. is seeing any man other than her husband. This referral was made because of reports that Mrs. M. was having relations with other men. In May, I.S. found a man hiding under the bed and located Mr. M. The check for June 1959 was held.

CASE REFERRED WHICH SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN REFERRED—ELIGIBILITY QUESTIONED

Case No. 208: According to the entry on form No. 246, dated August 15, 1958, Mrs. C. said she had been separated from her husband for a year. On September 8, 1958, she said she had been assisted by John M. who had advanced $240 toward her divorce. She was told that the agency would have to talk with Mr. M. since the conversation indicated they were cohabitating and that she was not eligible because of her continuing relationship with Mr. M. She promised to have Mr. M. get in touch with the agency but he failed to do this. The grant was authorized and continued in spite of Mrs. C.'s admitted relationship with Mr. M. Referral to I.S. was made in November 1958 to locate Mr. C. and to determine access of Mr. M. Referral did not appear to be justified because no effort had been made by Mrs. C. or the agency to locate Mr. C., and because Mrs. C. had admitted her relationship with Mr. M. Eligibility was questioned for the above reasons and also because there was no medical report to indicate the need for Mrs. C. to stay at home and care for the child she said was not enjoying good health.

CASES WHICH SHOULD HAVE BEEN REFERRED

Case No. 237: Mrs. S. applied November 6, 1952, for herself and two children, saying she was not able to make child-care arrangements. She said she had been divorced from Mr. S. for 14 years and for the past 6 years had lived with Mr. C., the father of her youngest child. The father of the older child was dead. She asked for assistance until she could make child-care arrangements. She had worked as a domestic for the past 6 years. The worker talked with Mr. C. by telephone who said he was fond of Mrs. S. and would be willing for her to return and to continue his relationship with her but he could not get along with her. In August 1954 Mrs. S. was offered a job as headwaitress at the Cosmos Club, but could not accept it because she said she had no child-care plan. In January 1957 Mr. C. was again contacted by telephone and said he had no continuing relationship with Mrs. S. In May 1957 a television was seen which Mrs. S. said had been given to her by John P., a casual friend. There is no indication as to how long this record was carried by the worker whose caseload was under study.

CASES WHICH SHOULD HAVE BEEN REFERRED—CHILD-CARE PLAN SEEMED AVAILABLE

Case No. 212: Mrs. F., age 19, applied in December 1956. Mr. F. was in jail for nonsupport. She said they had been separated before he was sentenced. Mr. F. was seen in August 1957 and said he planned a divorce from Mrs. F., who left him in June 1955. Mrs. F. had a child by another man. Mrs. F. admitted this and said the father was James M. She gave Mr. M's. address and employer and said his mother was going to take the baby. In August 1957 she said she did not want to take Mr. M. to court. She said she was working evenings for her uncle and her mother was looking after the children. (On January 9, 1957, Mrs. F. had said she had no relatives other than an aunt.) The case was closed in 1957 because Mrs. F. refused to take Mr. M. to court. She reapplied in December 1957 saying she was willing to go to court and was not continuing her relationship with Mr. M. A baby was born on September 21, 1958. She said the father was Emanuel D. and she had no idea where he was. Referral was made to I.S. in May 1958 by a previous worker to locate Mr. F. On December 17, 1958, Mrs. F. said Mr. F. lives with her mother. On January 6, 1959, referral was made by the subsequent worker to locate Mr. D. Referral should have been made to determine access. There is nothing to indicate how long this case was carried by the worker whose caseload is under study. Child-care arrangement seemed available.

CASES WHICH SHOULD HAVE BEEN REFERRED—CHILD-CARE PLAN SEEMED AVAILABLE

Case No. 219: Mrs. J., age 22, pregnant, applied in July 1956 for herself and two children. Mr. J. has not supported and she has been to J.C. The father of the oldest child was George H. In August 1956, Mrs. J's. mother telephoned to say that one of the children was with her and another one with the paternal grandmother. On August 21, 1956, Mrs. J. said she had not seen Mr. J. since July 1956. On August 29, 1956, the landlady told the worker that Mr. J. was living in the apartment with Mrs. J. and that he was there at the time of the worker's last visit but was hiding in the bathroom. On September 4 the landlady said various men and women frequent the apartment and stay until 4 or 5 a.m. She thinks they "rent out the bed." Later, Mrs. J. said that Mr. J. was not there but had "been coming to see her almost every day." "She was told we would have to see Mr. J. and that he 'will have to prove his absence before another check can be issued.'" In September and October 1956, the landlord telephoned to say that Mr. J. was in the home. In June 1957, Mr. J. was sentenced to 8 years on a narcotics charge—release date March 1963.

This case was carried by the worker whose caseload was reviewed, from June 1958 to February 1959. Referral should have been made to locate the father of the oldest child and, in view of Mrs. J.'s past behavior, referral should have been made to determine access.

CASES WHICH SHOULD HAVE BEEN REFERRED—HUSBAND NOT CONTACTED ALTHOUGH ADDRESS KNOWN—NO EFFORT BY MOTHER TO LOCATE FATHER

Case No. 241: Mrs. Y., age 21, applied in April 1956. She said Mr. Y. had left the home 3 days ago. The application was terminated because she had not made sufficient effort to locate him. She reapplied in January 1957 saying Mr. Y. had deserted. He is not the father of either of her children. The father of the oldest child was James M., whose address she gave. The father of the younger child is Robert L., who is believed to be living with his mother. Mrs. Y. failed to keep her appointment and the application was terminated. She reapplied in November 1957. The dictation under date of January 30, 1958, says, "Once again 15 or 20 men were lounging in various rooms on the first floor." A 21-inch television was seen which she said her husband had purchased. On March 24, 1958, referral was made to Investigation Service to located Mr. L. and Mr. M. On May 13, 1958, Investigation Service reported Robert S., a "cousin" in the home. The address he gave proved to be fictitious. The length of time this record was carried by the worker could not be determined. The March 1958 referral was not made by him. Referral should have been made to determine access. It is also noted that no effort was made to locate Mr. Y., whose address was known and Mrs. Y. made not effort to locate him or the fathers of her children.

CASE WHICH SHOULD HAVE BEEN REFERRED—FATHER NOT SEEN ALTHOUGH ADDRESS KNOWN—CHILD CARE PLAN SEEMS AVAILABLE—ELIGIBILITY QUESTIONED

Case No. 240: When Miss W. applied for assistance August 1, 1957, she had one child and was pregnant. She said she had been employed until July 1957 when her employer moved out of town. According to the information on form No. 108 she had done day work from 1953 to 1956, had worked as a maid in a hotel from March 1956 to February 1957 and worked as a nursemaid from March 1957 until July 1957. She said she felt she would need assistance until around November 1957 when her coming baby would be approximately 2 months old. There is no discussion in the record as to the child-care arrangement she made for her child born in 1954 when previously employed.

Miss W. said that Percy D. was the father of her unborn child. She gave his address and said he was employed at the Soldiers' Home. She said Espoy T. was the father of Barbara, born in 1954. She gave his address and was referred to J.C. An entry dated January 22, 1958, says that form No. 241 was received, saying that Mr. T. had not supported within the past year, that the child was beyond the age limit and therefore the case was not accepted. Miss W. was asked to contact Mr. T. and to have him come to the agency. She was also advised to bring Mr. D. to the agency. Mr. D. telephoned April 3, 1958, making an appointment for April 5, 1958, which he did not keep.

On March 24, 1958, the worker records: "During the interview I asked Miss W. what she had done to return to work since she indicated at the time of her application she only wanted assistance for such time as to have her baby and then return to work. She seemed very much taken back by this and it was obvious that she had not considered this at all. I explained to her that we considered employability as a potential resource. She stated that she has felt that perhaps she could make a child-care plan and then go back to work. She was asked to advise me of this."

In an entry dated July 24, 1958, it was reported that Mr. D. had said he lived with Miss W. in the NCHA project. They were both given an appointment for July 30, 1958, but Mr. D. failed to come. She was told July 24, 1958, that the August check could not be mailed until we talked with them. She was told on July 30, 1958, that we need to discuss with Mr. D. plans for their child as well as their plan regarding their relationship. On August 9, 1958, Miss W. and Mr. D. were in the office by appointment. He said he was under court order to pay $12 a week for the support of his child. The only recorded discussion regarding his relationship with Miss W. is as follows: "No relation with Miss W." The last entry in the record was dated October 13, 1958. It was suggested that Miss W. take some action toward seeking employment. "Miss W. stated that she would begin to look for work after she received her 11–1 check." The worker pointed out that she would be expected to resume work as soon as possible and to work out a child-care plan. "It was further pointed out that living in the project where there were so many mothers, it should not be hard to get someone to look after the children while she is employed."

The entry dated October 13, 1958, says the case was transferred to the worker in C.T. 73.5. There is no dictation since that date. The last authorization is from December 1, 1958 to October 31, 1959.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point tables which indicate the growth of the population at Junior Village for the fiscal years 1956–62.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

Admissions, discharges, and average daily population at Junior Village, fiscal years 1956 and 1957

	1956	1957
Admissions	742	872
Discharges	768	778
Daily average population	240	272

Population at Junior Village, fiscal years 1958–62

Item	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962
Admissions	936	1,103	1,137	1,130	1,110
Discharges	932	1,056	1,037	1,101	1,004
Total under care end of year	317	364	464	493	599

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the population for 1952 was 130; for 1953, was 146; for 1954, was 192; and for 1955, was 225.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD testimony from the hearings indicating the savings for the Welfare Department which were brought about in fiscal year 1963 as a result of the work of the Office of Investigations and Collections.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAVINGS FOR WELFARE DEPARTMENT

Senator BYRD. Now, Mr. Galvin, how much have you saved for the Department during fiscal year 1963 including grant deductions, and collections, and I am speaking of local money only.

Mr. GALVIN. I have computed that once, but with the new figures, I will have to do it again.

Senator BYRD. All right. Would you like for us to go on and then come back to this later.

Mr. GALVIN. Fine.

Senator BYRD. Then we will pass that over and come back to it.

Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. GALVIN. I have that. It would be between, and I will explain the reason for these two figures, $1,786,621 and $2,478,241.

Now, the way we estimate the $2,478,241 is as follows: we have $558,096 savings from differences in grants resulting from new investigation programs.

We get that estimate by taking the total difference in grants in intake, EPA audit and the AFDC audit closed cases and multiply it by 12 for the year, for annualization, by the difference in collections over last year of $43,041, by reduction in grants reflected in last year's alternate budget, of $1,637,807; unused OIC funds including transfers of $89,427; and unused grant money for fiscal year 1963 of $149,870; this figure was supplied to me by Mr. Cohen.

And then we have to assume, since I don't have the figures on the difference in grants in closed cases of complaints and locations sections, that they would be the same as last year.

Mr. Lajewski said, when I talked to him about it, that he has submitted a report for last year but I have not received it yet.

So, this would total up to $2,478,241.

METHOD OF ARRIVING AT SMALLER SUM

The way that we get the smaller figure of $1,786,621 is:

Instead of annualizing the difference in grants for the three programs, since they started in January and they went through June, we multiplied by 3 instead of 12 and came up with the figure of $139,524. We use a smaller figure in collections, taking into consideration that last year we had a one-time collection of a bond transfer in the DTS trust fund and we add the bonds to last year's collection and using this figure we have a deficit of $5,404. We take out from reductions in grants for fiscal year 1963, $224,603, which was the increase in the OA, AB, and ATD of $4.20 per case. This leaves grant reductions as $1,413,204. There is no change in the other savings previously given. With these changes, we come up with $1,786,621.

Senator BYRD. You are speaking of local moneys only?

Mr. GALVIN. Local moneys only.

OVERALL LOCAL FUNDS SAVINGS

Senator BYRD. Would you like to submit for the record a statement as to the overall savings?

Mr. GALVIN. I would like to do that.

Senator BYRD. Locally, I mean.

Mr. GALVIN. Yes; because I have done this calculation very rapidly, and I would like to be sure that the figures are accurate.

Senator BYRD. Yes, sir; and why don't you do that and give us a statement?

Mr. GALVIN. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. That will show the savings locally, and you may add footnotes if you care to.

Mr. GALVIN. Yes, sir.

(The statement referred to follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, OFFICE
OF INVESTIGATIONS AND COLLECTIONS,
September 30, 1963.

Overall savings in local money resulting from OIC operations

	Maximum savings	Minimum savings
From unused OIC budget funds	[1] $24,427	[1] $24,427
From transfers out of OIC budget funds	65,000	65,000
Unused grants	59,870	59,870
Grants transferred out	90,000	90,000
Reduction in grants, fiscal year 1963	1,637,807	[2] 1,413,204
Difference in grants resulting from new investigation programs	[3] 558,096	[3] 139,524
From collections	43,041	[4] (5,404)
Total savings	2,478,241	1,786,621

[1] Schedule A.

[2] See the following:

Reduction in grants, fiscal year 1964	$1,637,807
Increase of $4.20 per case (OA, AB, ATD)	224,603
Total	1,413,204

[3] Schedule B.

[4] See the following:

Increase in collections, fiscal year 1963 over fiscal year 1962	43,041
Deduct one time DTS fund collection, fiscal year 1962	48,445
Total	(5,404)

NOTE.—No figures available as yet on results of investigations of complaints referrals or locations for fiscal year 1962 or fiscal year 1963. We assume the differences in grants are the same.

WILLIAM R. GALVIN,
Investigations and Collections Officer.

Savings, OIC, fiscal year 1963

SCHEDULE A

Appropriated by Congress	$500,000
Transferred in	15,706
Total	515,706
Transferred out to FAO	27,846
Total	487,860
Transferred out	65,000
Total	422,860
Expended	398,433
Unused OIC budget funds	24,427

Total difference in grants per month

SCHEDULE B

OIC program:	
Intake review	$22,793
GPA audit review	22,638
AFDC audit review	1,077
Total	46,508
Annualized	558,096
Approximate average, January–June 1963	139,524

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD a table of Federal grants-in-aid to the District of Columbia for the years 1959 through 1963.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Federal grants-in-aid to the District of Columbia

District agency and/or program	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	Year of origin
1. Public schools:						
(a) Veterans	$2,380	$7,771	$7,771	$5,220	$4,745	1959
(b) Vocational education (George-Barden)	126,027	129,814	138,653	130,481	120,338	(1)
(c) National defense education	37,361	234,767	201,401	221,563	136,182	1959
(d) Civilian defense adult education				7,603	31,112	1962
(e) Capitol Page School	61,915	62,500	64,100	67,900	68,365	(2)
Total, public schools	227,683	434,852	411,925	432,767	360,742	

See footnotes at end of table.

Federal grants-in-aid to the District of Columbia—Continued

District agency and/or program	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	Year of origin
2. Public health:						
(a) Tuberculosis control	36, 280	37, 101	37, 405	32, 948	30, 863	1945
(b) Cancer control	9, 740	9, 657	26, 022	26, 354	26, 514	1948
(c) Mental health control	25, 871	40, 981	41, 021	66, 507	66, 796	1948
(d) Mental health planning					50, 000	1963
(e) General health	51, 269	51, 046	57, 163	42, 603	42, 105	1936
(f) Chronically ill				40, 000	65, 899	1962
(g) Maternal and child health	256, 114	229, 618	241, 713	321, 539	289, 795	1942
(h) Crippled children	184, 357	198, 402	241, 217	291, 840	263, 656	1942
(i) Venereal disease	77, 746	54, 817	46, 127	45, 240	60, 824	1950
(j) Hospital construction		369, 580	25, 920			1948
(k) Water pollution	24, 188	24, 081	26, 403	39, 731	35, 750	1950
(l) Heart disease	16, 597	32, 779	34, 181	47, 041	69, 115	1950
(m) Tuberculosis control project					22, 107	1963
(n) Mouth guard program					4, 000	1963
(o) Physical therapy demonstration					19, 262	1963
(p) Psychological training					9, 270	1962
(q) Mental health		55, 000	55, 000	55, 000		1960
(r) Old age assistance, medical care			31, 550	126, 267	158, 567	1961
(s) Medical assistance for the aged					37, 725	1963
Total, public health	682, 162	1, 103, 062	863, 722	1, 135, 160	1, 252, 248	
3. Public welfare:						
(a) Old age assistance	$1, 736, 041	$1, 552, 301	$1, 716, 236	$1, 956, 976	$1, 995, 642	1936
(b) Aid to families with dependent children	4, 133, 073	4, 839, 759	6, 091, 602	6, 716, 427	5, 190, 348	1936
(c) Aid to the blind	116, 143	122, 011	121, 088	102, 368	144, 203	1936
(d) Aid to the permanently and totally disabled	1, 276, 712	1, 381, 304	1, 539, 763	1, 494, 862	1, 803, 672	1950
(e) Medical assistance for the aged					100, 000	1963
(f) Assistance to repatriates			196	4, 575	1, 550	1961
(g) Aid to Cuban refugees				1, 573	19, 141	1962
Total, public welfare	7. 261, 969	7, 895, 375	9, 468, 885	10, 276, 781	9, 254, 556	
4. Vocational rehabilitation:						
(a) Support of vocational rehabilitation services	235, 974	229, 328	227, 958	223, 802	303, 535	1954
(b) Residential training project			20, 600	22, 463	56, 270	1961
(c) Disability determinations (OASI)	54, 373	55, 081	71, 785	90, 102	103, 960	1955
(d) Study of closed cases			3, 750			1961
(e) Study of fiscal accounting and statistical methods of operation				2, 625		1962
(f) Implementation of fiscal accounting study					1, 942	1962
(g) Publicity and information program					4, 500	1963
(h) Employee development program				4, 000	5, 833	1961
Total, vocational rehabilitation	290, 347	284, 409	324, 093	342, 992	476, 040	
5. Highways and traffic:						
(a) Primary, secondary, and urban highways	7, 525, 158	5, 303, 515	5, 057, 506	4, 520, 198	4, 876, 206	1938
(b) Interstate System	13, 687, 500	24, 651, 125	17, 659, 620	21, 461, 344	34, 412, 400	1957
Total, highways and traffic	21, 212, 658	29, 954, 640	22, 717, 126	25, 981, 542	39, 288, 606	
6. Civil defense:						
(a) Personnel and administration			21, 458	68, 355	76, 108	1961
(b) Equipment	32, 153	4, 971		15, 317	5, 404	1952
Total, civil defense	32, 153	4, 971	21, 458	83, 672	81, 512	
7. Sanitary engineering:						
(a) Waste treatment works construction	249, 200	332, 046	384, 579	117, 447	606, 295	1956
(b) Potomac interceptor system			2, 700, 000		300, 000	1961
Total, sanitary engineering	249, 200	332, 046	3, 084, 579	117, 447	906, 295	
8. Juvenile delinquency control					100, 767	1963
9. Downtown internal transit circulation study					32, 000	1963
10. While House Conference on Aging		30, 000				1960
11. Manpower development and training					816, 944	1963
12. Urban renewal:						
(a) Community renewal program					101, 660	1963
(b) Adams-Morgan 314 demonstration project	50, 000	44, 663	8, 273	9, 672	5, 000	1959
Subtotal, urban renewal	50, 000	44, 663	8, 273	9, 672	106, 660	
Relocation grant (amounts drawn by District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency from HHFA) [3]	351, 298	178, 983	221, 844	195, 472	49, 072	1958
Federal capital grant (amounts drawn by District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency against Federal ⅔ share of net project costs) [4]	10, 527, 507	517, 768	1, 158, 959	4, 153, 342	2, 128, 000	1955
Total, urban renewal	10, 928, 805	741, 415	1, 389, 066	4, 358, 486	2, 283, 732	
Grand total	40, 884, 977	40, 780, 770	38, 280, 854	42, 728, 847	54, 853, 442	

---

[1] Prior to 1940.

[2] Prior to 1949.

[3] The relocation grant is made directly to RLA to offset expenses incurred in relocating families displaced by urban renewal action.

[4] There are 5 urban renewal projects in execution in the District of Columbia (southwest area B, southwest area C, southwest area C-1, Columbia Plaza, northeast, 1). The Federal Government is responsible by contract for ⅔ of the new project costs of the local urban renewal program. The amounts shown above are advances made by NNFA to RLA against this ⅔ obligation. These amounts received will be subtracted from the ⅔ net project costs at project completion.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point a legislative report on the aid to dependent children program in New Jersey.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE REPORT ON THE AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN PROGRAM IN NEW JERSEY

THE AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN PROGRAM IN NEW JERSEY

A report on the administration of the aid to dependent children program in New Jersey by the Welfare Investigating Committee of the New Jersey Legislature constituted pursuant to senate concurrent resolution No. 25, laws of 1959; reconstituted under senate concurrent resolution No. 5, laws of 1960, and senate concurrent resolution No. 1, laws of 1962.

Senator ANTHONY J. GROSSI,
Chairman.
Senator CHARLES W. SANDMAN, JR.,
Senator RICHARD R. STOUT,
Assemblyman MAURICE V. BRADY,
GROVER C. RICHMAN,
Counsel.
LEONARD A. COYLE,
Secretary.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The committee wishes to express, however inadequate this form may be, its deep appreciation to the various governmental agencies throughout the State, including judges, prosecutors, probation departments, county and municipal welfare directors and their respective staffs, for their unstinted cooperation and deep sympathetic understanding of the problems of the unfortunate and the objectives of the committee.

The cooperation of the staff of investigators assigned by and under the direction of Maj. Francis W. Halley, Division of C.I.S.

of the State police deserves especial commendation.

His staff, under the supervision of Lt. L. J. Wert proved to be dedicated, highly skilled, and courteous often under trying conditions.

The committee is aware that without the teamwork displayed by our office staff, the State house stenographers, and the private investigators, its task would have been almost hopeless.

We wish to express our gratitude also to the citizens and the newspapers of New Jersey. It was their collective wrath, following committee disclosures that forced changes in administration at the New Lisbon Colony for the mentally retarded.

Subsequently it was the support of the public and the press that assured the passage of the institutions and agencies bond referendum, which is making it possible to rebuild and revamp the New Lisbon Colony, already underway.

The committee also considers itself fortunate in having as counsel the distinguished former attorney general of New Jersey, the Honorable Grover C. Richman who developed most of the testimony adduced before the committee.

As to Leonard Coyle, the secretary to the committee, we will let this report stand as a testimonial to his painstaking research and assistance in putting this document together.

To our fellow members of the New Jersey Legislature, we feel a deep and profound gratitude for their confidence in our prior work which they expressed by their unanimous vote in the passage of the 12 bills introduced by the committee as a result of its hearings and recommendations.

Our sentiments are probably best expressed by an excerpt from an editorial in the Bergen Evening Record in May 1962 that the legislature, "was responsible for as fine a set of reform bills as the State has seen in years."

Finally, we would be remiss if we didn't recognize the contribution to society by Gov. Richard J. Hughes who readily approved appropriations for the committee, and who displayed a deep sense of social awareness by his prompt signature to the bills.

THE COMMITTEE.

> "The lessons of history * * * show conclusively that continued dependency upon relief induces a spiritual and moral disintegration fundamentally destructive to the national fiber. To dole out relief * * * is to administer a narcotic, a subtle destroyer of the human spirit * * *. The Federal Government must and shall quit this business of relief."—FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, 1935.

FOREWORD

As sympathetic as the President was to the needs of the poor and needy, he was also keenly aware that we must not ignore the lessons of history and the facts of the present day.

With this thought in mind the committee submits its last and final report on welfare in New Jersey. Two interim reports have already been submitted to the legislature; the first on child welfare in New Jersey; the second on the State colony at New Lisbon for feebleminded males.

This report deals with New Jersey's aid to dependent children program, formerly known as home life assistance. More familiarly known as ADC, its purpose is to assist needy children who have been deprived of parental support through cash assistance and services designed to maintain and strengthen the family life and unity of the children involved.

This committee was created because of the ever-increasing burden upon the taxpayers who are called upon to support this program. By far ADC is the largest and most expensive public assistance program in New Jersey, accounting for almost half of all relief expenditures annually.

We have always accepted as a public responsibility the ever-increasing costs of providing for the needs of families who for reasons, often beyond their control, must look to the public for help and assistance. But in the light of almost daily reports of flagrant and wanton abuses in our ADC program, public acceptance of it has been replaced by public indignation. Editors and journalists, clergymen and police officials, responsible people from all walks of life, our courts, judges, and grand juries have presented indictments of our ADC program, often pinpointing revolting abuses shocking the public conscience. These abuses have subverted the legitimate objectives of ADC. They cannot be ignored. The problem goes deeper than dollars. It affects the lives of innocent children often blighting their entire future by depriving them of their heritage and right to live in surroundings free from great moral harm and risks.

Many ADC families are living in hovels where mothers maintain illicit relationships with men of shadowy existence. They beget illegitimate child after child without remorse or apparent guilt.

The purpose of ADC is the humanitarian goal of helping needy children and their mothers maintain a safe and protected home environment. This committee does not question the humanitarian purposes of ADC. But we must question the continued amoral existence of many ADC recipients. The committee has approached the task of appraising our ADC program objectively, but keenly aware of its complexities. We have sought to discover the cause of the ever-increasing burden of relief expenditures with a view toward strengthening existing services while eliminating those found unnecessary.

Nearly 70 percent of all cases receiving aid through ADC were occasioned by deserting fathers, and mothers with illegitimate children. Much of the committee's investigations focused on these two causes, and it is apparent that if we are ever to reduce child dependency in New Jersey, more emphasis must be given to the prevention and elimination of the basic causes of family breakdown which give rise to desertions and illegitimacy.

The fact that many cases enumerated in this report highlight circumstances of immorality, and sometimes flagrant fraud, should not be construed as a condemnation of the ADC program. We propose this report serve as a guide in isolating such practices with a view toward their prevention in the future.

Senator ANTHONY J. GROSSI
(For the Committee).

A HISTORY

The care of the poor and the impoverished was recognized by New Jersey as a public obligation during its early days of settlement while under the colonial rule of England. Shortly after the initial settlement of New Jersey the influence of the English became predominant, with a preponderately English population carrying with it the customs, institutions and laws of the English people. Thus, the foundations of relief as known in New Jersey today derived from the early Elizabethan poor laws which developed in the year 1601.[1]

Though primitive in concept the first Elizabethan poor law represented a radical departure from the previous concepts of individual relief, in that it recognized as a public responsibility, the care of the poor by government, paid out of public funds.

The administration of these early programs was left to the local governments with relief given only to those in dire need after all other sources of personal and private aid were exhausted. This meant that all such persons were required to meet a means test as a prerequisite to the receipt of public aid.

Much of the prevailing attitude and philosophy of today's public relief programs are carryovers from this original concept of public relief by government first initiated in England under the Elizabethan poor laws and later adopted in the colonial period of New Jersey. Even today, a means test is required for most public aid.

From the earliest times, assistance programs were dominated by a desire to discourage any disposition to look to the government for support. Public relief was made less attractive by providing a standard of subsistence lower than the lowest standard of living in the community. Every effort was made to confine public relief to the smallest area possible, its primary objective being the repression of poverty.

The earliest legislation relating to public poor relief was passed in New Jersey in 1681 providing for the case of orphans at public expense.[2] In 1704, the legislature allocated certain fines for the care of the poor, but the most important relief legislation did not pass until 1709 when the legislature provided that every township select overseers of the poor and poor assessors. The overseers had direct responsibility for the care of the town poor while the assessors levied the necessary poor atte leaving its responsibility of collection to the overseer of the poor. This early legislation required the overseer "to take care that all poor were supplied with necessary maintenance and not suffered to wander abroad." [3]

As far back as 1666 there was fear expressed concerning the influx of strangers from outside the community who would eventually require public relief, and measures were taken to guard against this eventuality.[4]

During the 18th century aid to the poor was supplied in their own homes or foster homes. This type of assistance gradually became the principal form of relief in New Jersey.

The belief that able-bodied pauperism resulted from individual laziness and indolence attributed to an intermingling of penology with poor relief. While the aged and the needy young or the victims of disease or sickness received assistance in their own homes, the vagrant or beggar was often confined in a jail or workhouse for short periods of time, after which they were ordered out of town. While institutional confinement was restricted to this one class of people, as the population increased, the number of indigents increased proportionally giving rise to the construction and maintenance of public institutions for the care of the poor.

In lieu of institutional care, dependent children were often indentured out extending until the child was 18 years old. The person to whom the child was indentured had responsibility for the child's care and elementary educational training. If the child could work the person caring for him would profit from his labor.

Toward the middle of the 18th century the increased number of poor in the various towns created the need for more comprehensive legislative regulation. In particular, the problem of legal settlement had become especially troublesome. Whenever a needy person failed to meet settlement requirements in a local municipality he was often banished or ejected from the community. On returning to the town of his previous residence, the banished pauper often found he had lost his settlement there. Soon, there became a growing number of unsettled poor roaming the State. Thus the present day statutory requirements concerning legal settlement of the poor was initially created by the legislature in 1740 and provided for a series of conditions which constituted legal settlement in any town or municipality.[5] Generally, settlement included natives of a town or people who had lived for at least 1 year's residence in the town on land owned or leased, or had worked or served an apprenticeship for at least 1 year. Other conditions included family residence in the town for a year, the holding of a public office for a year, or the payment of the tax for poor relief for 1 year. This legislation was the first in a series of similar legislation designed to provide a uniform settlement requirement of 1 year's residence for all individuals except native born citizens.

---

[1] 43 Elizabeth I L .3.

[2] A. Leaming and J. Spicer "The Grants, Concessions and Original Constitutions of the Province of New Jersey, 1758."

[3] Ibid., p. 8.

[4] "Records of the Town of Newark, 1666 to 1836."

The original act of 1740 also required that any destitute person failing to meet the requirements of legal settlement when in need of public assistance, or upon application for public assistance was required to return to the town of his legal settlement either on a voluntary basis or by action of the town constable. However, legislation could not possibly cover all types of administrative questions affecting settlement in individual cases. In 1758, after noting the many failures of the 1740 statute, the legislature reenacted its provisions, adding the requirement that all persons coming to reside in any municipality must give notice to the overseers of the poor within 10 days.[6] This applied to any persons bringing in apprentices or indentured servants. If any persons were likely to become public charges before obtaining legal settlement, they were to be rturned to the place of their last legal settlement.

More extensive regulation of local relief practices were included in the comprehensive poor relief act of 1774.[7] This provided for a broad statutory framework for a slowly expanding system of poor relief. Overseers, not exceeding four in number, were to be chosen at town meetings to be placed in charge of town relief activities. Parents, grandparents, children, and grandchildren severally and individually of all poor persons were held responsible for their care, and the overseer was required to exhaust these resources before granting an individual public relief. In addition to other sections affecting legal settlement, the act incorporated the first permissive legislation for the building of almshouses by municipalities to care for their poor.

Despite these early attempts to provide for the poor, their numbers continued to grow. At the end of the 18th century, the foundations of public assistance in New Jersey were firmly established by local usage and general law. Care of the destitute was fully recognized as a public obligation. As a function of government, it was financed and administered by the localities.[8] This period evidenced the first tendency to separate the operation of jails and workhouses from the poor relief administration and in the Workhouse Act of 1799 legislative groundwork was laid for the administration of penal institutions separate and apart from the poor laws.[9] Outdoor relief—the boarding of the poor in private homes by individual contract, or the indenture of neglected or orphaned children—had become the prevailing method of public assistance. The building of institutional almshouses to care for the poor in each municipality failed to achieve any measurable effect principally because the costs of construction and maintenance of such institutions was beyond the financial ability of most municipalities.

In 1798, the legislature granted authority to the counties individually or jointly to build county poorhouses. Here, a county which established a poorhouse was required to commit the poor in the various towns to that institution to maintain them there at county expense.[10] The costs for the maintenance of the institution were to be financed out of general county taxes. Thus the way was open for the transfer of public responsibility of the poor from the town and municipality to the county. Almshouse care became the prevailing method of poor relief in the more populous areas of the State where a large volume of relief services were required. However, in rural areas, the towns either sent their destitute to a county almshouse, a nearby municipal almshouse, or cared for them by the traditional method of outdoor relief. Though the almshouse became the principal medium of relief, it was still necessary to provide some outdoor relief to persons temporarily in need, leading to the practice of distinguishing between the permanent and temporary poor. Gradually the counties became direct participants in relief administration, both financially and administratively, resulting in a diffusion of administrative responsibilities and a complexity of organization which has continued unchecked to the present day.

The development of public assistance in New Jersey was essentially a reaction to the changing needs and conditions of social pressure. The almshouse care of the 19th century arose primarily because the original forms of outdoor relief proved inadequate to meet the needs of expanding relief demands. The administration of public almshouses soon deteriorated. Shocking discoveries of abuse eventually turned the tide of public opinion against indoor relief methods. It was inevitable that the process of herding all classes of the poor together in an almshouse, in unsanitary living conditions, and in a morally degrading atmosphere, would eventually be condemned and eliminated.[11]

In 1898, a special legislative commission, after investigating the provisions for child welfare in New Jersey, severely criticized existing practices and recommended that the State government assume some administrative responsibility for child dependency relief. Almshouse care for children, said the commission, "has absolutely no advocates or apologists, and is universally regarded as being thoroughly disgraceful. The men and women in an almshouse are society's wrecks and failures. To rear children under their influence is a sure method of making paupers."[12]

In 1899, following a second report by the same legislative commission, the legislature created the State board of childrens' guardians, vesting in it supervisory powers over certain classes of dependent children.[13] Under the terms of the statute, children in the public almshouses were to be placed under State guardianship, and later transferred by the board to private foster homes. Thereafter all children committed by local relief authorities to public almshouses became wards of the board, and were placed by this agency in foster homes. Supervision of the program was conducted solely by the administrative agents of the board, with administrative expenses paid by the State. However, the actual cost of maintaining children in foster homes was paid for by the counties and municipalities.

Child welfare and child dependency: The major steps of the subsequent growth of the State child welfare program may be summarized. In a few years, the board had succeeded in removing the children from the almshouses, and for a time their work was limited solely to children whom the local overseers would ordinarily have sent to the almshouse.[14] In 1913, however, State participation was greatly expanded with the passage of mothers' pension legislation authorizing the care of dependent children in their own homes under specified conditions and subject to regulation by the board.[15] This act provided cash relief to widows with dependent children under 16 years of age upon order to the county court. The board was required to present information to the court regarding the legal residence and conditions of need of the applicant. If these findings indicated aid was necessary to insure the proper care of the mother's children, the court authorized a grant at monthly rates specified by the statute. All such court orders were paid from county and municipal funds.

Further expansion of State participation in child dependency relief occurred in 1915 when the legislature authorized county courts and the juvenile courts to commit children to the custody of the State board of children's guardians upon a finding of parental neglect, abuse, or desertion.[16] This legislation made it possible for the State to assume control over many child dependency cases which hitherto had been maintained on outdoor relief under the exclusive jurisdiction of the local overseers of the poor.

Expanding State relief services: In 1932, following a series of reports by the pension survey commission, the legislature extended mothers' aid to include cases where the husband was alive but had either deserted his family or was unable because of illness or imprisonment to provide for his family, and to cases where the mother was dead or missing but someone was standing in loco parentis.[17]

This legislation also provided for court determination in all cases of child dependency relief. All applications for categorical relief for a dependent child were presented to a county court where, after investigation and report by the State board of childrens' guardians, decision was made as to eligibility for relief, and if allowed, the terms and conditions of such assistance. The financing of child dependency relief, however, still remained a local responsibility. The State continued to pay only the administrative expenses incurred by the State board of children's guardians. The success of the child welfare program stimulated further development of categorical relief services set apart from the poor laws and operated under State supervision and control.

Unprecedented demands for public relief during the depression of the early 1930's fell with tremendous force upon the existing structure of public assistance in New Jersey. Prior to the depression, relief as it was known in New Jersey made no adequate provision for the adult, able-bodied poor. As a result New Jersey was unprepared and ill equipped to meet the problem of large-scale unemployment arising out of the depression. Unprecedented relief demands totally collapsed the poor law system of relief then in existence. This eventually led to the combined efforts of the State and Federal Governments to bring some order out of the chaos which followed. The most significant development during this turbulent period of readjustment of relief was the expansion of direct State responsibility for the local administration of relief and recognition by the Federal Government that relief and public welfare were a national responsibility requiring Federal regulation, control, and uniformity.

---

[5] Samuel Allinson, "Acts of the General Assembly of the Province of New Jersey, 1702–1776."

[6] Ibid.

[7] Ibid.

[8] Stafford, "Government and the Needy" at 43 (1941).

[9] Revised statutes of New Jersey, 1821.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Stafford, op. cit. supra 71–72 (note 8).

[12] First report of the New Jersey Commission on Defective, Delinquent and Dependent Children (1898).

[13] Second report of the New Jersey Commission on Defective, Delinquent and Dependent Children (1899).

[14] Stafford, op. cit., supra 83–85 (note 8).

[15] Public Laws of New Jersey, 1913, ch. 281.

[16] Public Laws of New Jersey, 1915, ch. 246.

[17] Public Laws of New Jersey, 1932, ch. 263–267.

The Social Security Act of 1935: With the recognition by Congress of a national responsibility to provide for the health and welfare of the people during periods of economic distress, Congress enacted the Social Security Act on August 14, 1935, providing services covering public assistance, pensions, social insurance, health services, and child welfare services. Perhaps the most significant piece of legislation ever passed by Congress in the field of child welfare, the Social Security Act is today the most controlling legislation affecting the administration of child welfare and child dependency assistance in the States and their political subdivisions. While the act is not mandatory on any State government, in order to qualify for Federal grants-in-aid under the act, New Jersey made the necessary changes in its categorical relief laws, thereby bringing the entire program of relief in New Jersey under Federal supervision.[18] At this time, the mandatory process of a court hearing for all cases involving mothers' assistance was abandoned, and the responsibility for the determination of relief grants for mothers with children was transferred to the county welfare boards.

As originally enacted the preamble to the Social Security Act is as follows: "An act to provide for the general welfare by establishing a system of Federal old age benefits, and by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for aged persons, blind persons, dependent and crippled children, maternal and child welfare, public health, and the administration of their unemployment compensation laws; to establish a social security board; to raise revenue; and for other purposes."

The most recent amendments were made by Congress and enacted into law on July 25, 1962.

Title 4 of the act provides for grants to States for aid to dependent children, and services to needy families with children. It provides appropriations for the purpose of encouraging the care of dependent children in their own homes, or in the homes of relatives by enabling the State to give financial assistance, rehabilitation, and other services to dependent children and their parents or relatives with whom they are living, and to help the parents or relatives to attain or retain capability for the maximum self-support and personal independence consistent with the maintenance of continuing parental care and protection. To achieve these aims Congress appropriates each year a sum sufficient to carry out the purposes of this act, and such sums are made available to the States which have submitted and had approved by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare a State plan capable of rendering these services.

In order for a State plan to qualify for Federal aid under this program, the plan must contain the following provisions:

1. Plan must be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State and if administered by them, must be mandatory upon them.

2. It must provide for financial participation by the State.

3. There must be a single State agency designated by the State to administer the plan.

4. It must provide an opportunity for a fair hearing before the State agency to any individual whose claim is denied or not acted upon within a reasonable time.

5. In determining need the plan must take into consideration all income and resources of any child or relative claiming aid to families with dependent children as well as any expenses reasonably attributable to the earning of such income; except that in making such determination, the State may, subject to limitations prescribed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, permit all or any portion of the earned income or other income to be set aside for future identifiable needs of a dependent child.

6. An opportunity must be given to all individuals wishing to make application for aid under the program, and suitable safeguards must be set up to restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with the administration of the ADC program.

7. Upon the furnishing of aid to families with dependent children who have been deserted or abandoned by a parent, prompt notice must be given to appropriate law enforcement officials.

Other provisions are required relating to the establishment of a merit system for personnel employed to administer the program, the making of appropriate reports by the State agency and a description of services made available by the State to maintain and strengthen family life for children.

Residency requirements: Presently there is no statutory residency requirement limiting eligibility for assistance under the ADC program in New Jersey.[19]

The commissioner of the department of institutions and agencies is empowered by statute to promulgate all rules and regulations necessary for the proper administration of the ADC program in order to comply with and receive maximum Federal grants-in-aid under the Social Security Act.[20] However, in order to comply with the Federal residency requirement, no limitation may be placed upon any dependent child applying for aid who has resided in the State for at least 1 year prior to the application for aid, or who was born within 1 year immediately preceding the application if the parent or relative with whom the child is living has resided in New Jersey for at least 1 year preceding the child's birth. While it is not mandatory upon the State, the Federal Government has suggested and recommends that all residency requirement restrictions affecting applicants for ADC be eliminated.

Termination of Federal aid:[21] After reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing to the State agency Federal funds can be withheld if:

1. The provisions of the plan have been so changed that they no longer comply with the requirements of the act, or in the administration of the plan there is a substantial failure to comply with its provisions or,

2. Where the plan has been changed so as to impose a residency requirement prohibited by the act, and such prohibited residency requirement is imposed with knowledge of the State agency administering the plan.

However, where a State statute prohibits or denies aid to a dependent child, Federal aid will not be withheld if an analogous statute makes adequate provision for the necessary care and assistance with respect to such dependent child.

Payments to be used for the benefit of the child: Whenever there is reason to believe that payments of aid to families with dependent children are not being used in the best interest of the child, counseling and guidance may be provided, if advisable, to assure use of the payments in the best interest of the child. Where counseling and guidance is refused, or is unsuccessful, a guardian or legal representative may be appointed for such child and the State may impose by statute criminal or civil penalties. However, money payments not used for the benefit of the child by any relative receiving such payment must be determined by a court of competent jurisdiction.

DEFINITIONS[22]

"Aid to dependent children" means money payments in behalf of medical care or any type of remedial care to a dependent child or dependent children.

A "dependent child" is a needy child under the age of 18 deprived of parental support or care by reason of the death, continued absence from the home, or physical or mental incapacity of the parent, who is living with a parent or some other legally recognized relative. Aid to dependent children also includes foster care in behalf of a child eligible for care in the foster home of any individual or to a public or nonprofit child placement or child care agency, or in a child care institution.

A "child care institution" is a nonprofit, private child care institution which is licensed by the State or which has been approved by the State agency responsible for licensing or approval as meeting the standards necessary for such licensing or approval.

Federal responsibility:[23] The responsibilities of administering grants for the ADC program under the Social Security Act is discharged through the Bureau of Public Assistance in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Its responsibilities are carried out by the following devices:

1. Developing program policies and standards interpreting the language and intent of the Federal law.

2. Taking action on State plans and amendments.

3. Certifying Federal grants to States.

4. Reviewing and evaluating State operations.

5. Providing technical assistance to States.

6. Collecting and interpreting statistical and other data.

7. Furnishing information about the public assistance programs.

8. Participating in the formulation of recommendations to the Congress for desirable changes in Federal legislation.

State responsibility:[24] Under the Social Security Act, the State has the primary responsibility for the initiation and development of the public assistance programs. The public assistance titles of the Federal act are enabling legislation; the decision to operate a program with Federal participation in accordance with the Social Security Act rests with the State. The relationship between the Federal Government and the State government is established voluntarily by a State and on its own initiative. Once established, this relationship is a continuing one; as long as a State has an approved State plan and is operating in compliance with it, the State is eligible to receive Federal funds.

---

[18] Public Laws of New Jersey, 1936, ch. 29–33.

[19] N.J.S.A. 30:5–5 repealed 1959.

[20] N.J.S.A. 44:10–3.

[21] "Handbook of U.S. Public Assistance Administration (1962)."

[22] Ibid.

[23] Ibid., (pt. I, 4000–4300)—"Federal Responsibility."

[24] Ibid., (pt. I, 5000–5999)—"The State Responsibility," Nov. 29, 1955.

STATE ADMINISTRATION OF ADC

When Congress passed the Social Security Act in 1935, New Jersey had already provided, through State legislation, programs to provide assistance to needy and dependent children through what has been previously referred to as mothers' pensions and the home life program, as administered by the State board of children's guardians. However, to insure uniformity of administration, Congress required as a condition precedent to State eligibility for grants-in-aid under the program, that each State enact laws that are statewide, and if administered by its political subdivisions, are made mandatory upon them.

In January of 1960 the administration of the ADC program was transferred to the counties and in accord with this provision each county administers the program identically with all others.[25] No one county may elect to reject or discontinue ADC without risking loss of Federal aid to the entire State. This applies to the eligibility factors of needs as adopted by Congress and the Bureau of Assistance in New Jersey's Department of Welfare, which by statute is the supervisory agency on the State level.

As assurance of State compliance with the act, the attorney general must certify that all counties are administering the plan in accordance with the rules and regulations of the department of institutions and agencies, bureau of assistance, and that such rules and regulations are mandatory on all counties. This certification includes a statement setting forth all administrative and legal measures available to the department of institutions and agencies whenever it would be necessary to enforce compliance by the counties with the rules and regulations as promulgated by the department.

State department of institutions and agencies: By statute the Governor has authority to designate the State administrative agency to carry out the purposes of the Federal law including its administration or the suspension of administration.[26] The department of institutions and agencies or such other State agency as designated by the Governor must be the sole agency for carrying out such purposes, and the department of institutions and agencies is designated and empowered to act as the sole agency in New Jersey to carry out the administration of this plan.

Acting pursuant to such designation, the department is authorized to submit to the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service (HEW) applications for funds to carry out the purpose of any such Federal law, and to accept and receive as custodian any and all grants and money awarded for assistance in New Jersey. All moneys so received are deposited by the department in a special fund used exclusively for the purposes of the Federal law, and such funds are expended in the same manner as other funds of the State—upon vouchers certified or approved by the department as provided by Federal law.

Statutory procedure for ADC administration:[27] Those entitled to assistance under ADC are needy dependent children living in New Jersey and the parent or parents or relative or relatives with whom they are living. Financial assistance and other services must be given by the county welfare boards and administered in accordance with all rules, regulations, conditions, and limitations as imposed by law.

Rules and regulations: The commissioner of the State department of institutions and agencies under the general policies of the State board of control is authorized by statute to issue all appropriate department orders and cause to be done all other acts necessary to obtain for New Jersey the maximum Federal participation available in respect to the program.

While this statutory provision provides administrative discretion in the promulgation of such rules and regulations as to accomplish the necessary and desired end of the ADC program, to comply with the Federal Social Security Act, the State statute enumerates the following provisions mandatory upon the State board and the commissioner in the promulgation of its rules and regulations:

1. The program must be in effect in all counties.

2. All individuals making applications for aid must be given an opportunity to do so and that assistance will be furnished in a reasonable and prompt manner.

3. In determining need, all resources and other income of the applicant must be taken into consideration, including resources of the dependent child and its parents or relatives with whom the child is living.

4. To provide for adequate safeguards regarding the disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients.

5. Prompt notice must be given to law enforcement officials of the furnishing of assistance to a child who has been deserted or abandoned by a parent.

6. Where assistance is given, an assurance that no other income is received by the recipient by any other agency of the State or from any of its political subdivisions.

7. To prescribe the services which will be available by or utilized by the county welfare boards for the purpose of maintaining and strengthening family life for children.

8. That all such grants made under the program will be terminated promptly and other arrangements made for the care of such child or children in any case where it is determined that the payments made to a parent or relative are failing to secure for the child or children a standard of maintenance, care, and family life consistent with the adequate protection and care of such child or children.[28]

Reimbursement provisions: County welfare boards are empowered to secure from parents or relatives with whom a child is living and receiving aid under the ADC program a written promise to repay all assistance granted. Where such parents, relatives, or the estate of any child refuses to make repayment in accordance with their written promise the county welfare board may take all necessary steps and proper action under the laws of the State to enforce such promise, and the granting of assistance is deemed due consideration for the promise to repay.

Where a child dies prior to his 21st birthday and has received assistance under the ADC program, and leaves an estate, the total amount of assistance paid with respect to such child is a valid and enforceable claim against such estate, with priority over all other unsecured claims except reasonable funeral expenses and terminal medical and hospital expenses. The county welfare board is empowered to take all necessary and proper action under the laws of the State to enforce such claim, however the county welfare board may, with the consent and approval of the bureau of assistance, compromise and settle any claim for repayment of assistance granted.[29]

Payments to county welfare boards: Each county welfare board receives from the State the full amount of any funds received by the State from the Federal Government with respect to expenditures made by the county welfare boards for assistance to dependent children, plus an additional amount equal to 50 percent of the balance of such expenditures after deducting the amount of the Federal participation. In addition, the State pays to the county welfare boards any funds received from the Federal Government with respect to the cost of administration of the program by such county welfare boards.[30]

County welfare boards: The board of chosen freeholders in each county is responsible for establishing the county welfare board which, when created is a separate corporate entity with power to sue and be sued and to make bylaws. Five members are appointed to the board, at least two of whom must be women. A county adjustor, if not acting as director of welfare, and two members of the board of chosen freeholders, act as ex officio members of the board. The five citizen members hold their offices for 5 years, and vacancies are filled for the unexpired term only. Such boards must meet regularly once a month and at such other times as may be necessary. Members serve without compensation, but are reimbursed for necessary expenses.

County welfare boards receive and act upon all applications for assistance, and are charged with carrying out the administration of assistance programs in accordance with the rules and regulations promulgated by the State bureau of assistance.

Each board appoints a director of welfare or a county adjustor who when qualified may be appointed to the office of the director of welfare. Directors of welfare, when appointed serve a probationary period of 6 to 12 months, and thereafter usually serve for a term of 5 years. The welfare director is the chief executive officer and approval officer of the county welfare board. In addition, he acts as clerk to the county welfare board with out additional compensation. To become eligible for appointment to such position, he must have an adequate knowledge of the law pertaining to assistance, be a trained and qualified expert in the field of welfare with administrative experience, a citizen of New Jersey, and of the United States.[31]

Applications for assistance: When the county welfare board receives an application for assistance an investigation and record is made to ascertain the facts supporting the application, and assistance must be furnished within a reasonable time, usually construed to be not more than 30 days, to all eligible individuals. All applications for assistance together with the subsequent investigations, reports and decisions pertaining to such application must be reported to the State bureau of assistance. Where an application has been denied, not acted upon, or where the grant made is deemed inadequate by either the State agency or the applicant, such decision may be reviewed either by the State agency at its discretion or by the individual applicant through appeal to the State agency, at which time such applicant is provided with a fair hearing and a complete review of his circumstances.

Legally responsible relatives: According to law the director of welfare of the county welfare board is empowered to compel reimbursement by legally responsible relatives of a recipient receiving assistance, and in the event that such relatives fail or refuse to enter into an agreement for the support of the applicant, he may compel their appearance before the county court or the court of juvenile and domestic relations. The court, upon hearing may order and adjudge the legally responsible relatives to pay such sums as determined by the court and to deliver to the director of welfare such other pledges or guarantees as the court may require in its discretion. Upon failure of a legally responsible relative to comply with such order the legally responsible relative may be held in contempt. Any applicant or other person who knowingly gives false information to the director of welfare as relating to the application for assistance for the purpose of securing assistance payments shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. By statute, grandparents, their children, and grandchildren are all legally responsible relatives.[32]

---

[25] N.J.S.A. 44:10–1 et seq.

[26] N.J.S.A. 30:1–20 et seq.

[27] N.J.S.A. 44:10–1 et seq.

[28] N.J.S.A. 44:10–2.

[29] N.J.S.A. 44:10–4

[30] N.J.S.A. 44:10–5

[31] N.J.S.A. 44:7–7

CHARACTERISTICS OF FAMILIES RECEIVING ADC

To satisfy the requirements of the Federal Bureau of Public Assistance a study is made biennially of the characteristics of families receiving aid under the aid to dependent children program. The latest study was made in December of 1961 and is referred to as the "Biennial Statistical Report on Characteristics of Families Receiving Aid to Dependent Children." This study shows the number of families and children and their peculiar characteristics for the month in which the study is made. All statistics contained in the biennial survey are tabulated on a monthly basis and are applicable for the month of December 1961.[33]

Families on ADC: In December 1961 there were 19,844 families in New Jersey receiving aid to dependent children. These families included 52,532 children, all under 18 years of age. In 17,185 of the families there was a responsible adult—usually the mother—who was also included in the grant.[34]

The Census Bureau estimates that there are about 2,010,150 children in New Jersey under 18 years of age. In New Jersey, children on ADC represent about 2.61 percent of all these children. Over the Nation as a whole, 3.3 percent of all children receive aid.[35]

Total grants to ADC families in December 1961 amounted to $3,277,591. This amounted to an average of $165.16 per family, or $62.38 per child each month (includes adult grant, average per child grant, approximately $47 per month).[36]

Of the total grants to recipients in December 1961, the Federal Government paid 44 percent, the State paid 28 percent, and the counties collectively paid 28 percent.[37]

Racial characteristics: In December of 1961, 6,924 (approximately 35 percent) of the ADC families were white; 12,870 (approximately 65 percent), were nonwhite; while according to the population census, 91.3 percent of the population of the State was white; and 8.7 percent was nonwhite.[38]

Place of residence: The ADC families of December 1961 were distributed as follows according to area and type of place lived in:

Number of families and children—Place of residence by race [39]

	Total		White		Nonwhite	
	Family	Children	Family	Children	Family	Children
Total	19,844	52,532	6,924	17,536	12,920	34,996
Urban:						
City of 250,000 to 499,999	7,953	20,847	1,681	4,641	6,272	16,106
City less than 250,000	7,752	19,944	2,584	5,971	5,168	13,973
Urban fringe	778	2,183	602	1,656	176	527
Other urban	677	1,982	426	1,129	251	853
Rural:						
Nonfarm	226	878	151	401	75	477
Farm	25	50	25	50		
Not in standard metropolitan statistical area:						
Urban	2,207	5,845	1,304	3,271	903	2,634
Rural: Nonfarm	226	803	151	477	75	326

[39] Ibid.

There appears to be no significant difference in size of families receiving assistance in rural and urban areas.

The father of the children: To be eligible for ADC a child must be in financial need and deprived of the care and support of a parent because of the parent's death, disability, or continued absence from the home. In actual fact it is the lack of support from the father which, in the great majority of cases, gives rise to the need for financial help for the children. Therefore, the status of the fathers with respect to the children's eligibility for ADC gives some indication of the immediate cause of the child dependency in New Jersey.

Deserting fathers make up more than one-third or 35.6 percent of all cases; the next largest group was 33.2 percent of the total families with children in need because they never had a legal father; 8.5 percent were separated without legal decree; 6.4 percent were fathers who were incapacitated; 6.1 percent were fathers who were imprisoned; 4.7 percent families were divorced or legally separated; others for miscellaneous reasons amounted to 0.5 percent.

Status of father—December 1961 [40]

	Families	Children	Amount
Total	19,844	52,532	$3,277,591
Dead	1,204	3,487	178,243
Incapacitated	1,280	4,164	269,108
Divorced or separated	928	2,308	117,859
Separated without court decree	1,681	4,867	236,972
Desertions	7,075	21,249	1,327,905
Not married to mother	6,573	13,773	960,982
Imprisoned	1,003	2,408	166,703
Absent for other reasons	75	226	14,149
Other status	25	50	5,670

[40] Ibid.

Number of families and children by race and status of father [41]

	Total		White		Nonwhite	
	Families	Children	Families	Children	Families	Children
Total	19,844	52,532	6,924	17,536	12,920	34,996
Dead	1,204	3,484	602	1,405	602	2,082
Incapacitated	1,280	4,164	703	2,106	577	2,058
Divorced or legally separated	928	2,308	702	1,706	226	602
Separated without court decree	1,681	4,867	552	1,405	1,129	3,462
Desertions	7,075	21,249	2,835	7,802	4,240	13,447
Not married to mother	6,573	13,773	1,054	1,957	5,519	11,816
Imprisoned	1,003	2,408	426	1,054	577	1,354
Other	100	276	50	101	50	175

[41] Ibid.

Status of father by race, 1948–61 [42]

[Number of cases per month shown]

Status of father	March 1948		November 1953		March 1956		November 1958		December 1961	
	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite
Total families	340	179	2,601	2,264	2,840	3,590	4,039	5,568	6,924	12,920
Dead	144	55	628	369	415	360	628	425	602	602
Incapacitated	79	22	571	171	550	270	739	435	703	577
Divorced or legally separated	15	1	88	21	70	30	192	61	702	226
Separated without court decree	([42a])	([42a])	42	31	60	70		31	552	1,129
Desertions	54	56	763	722	1,060	1,030	1,488	1,964	2,835	4,240
Not married to mother	15	29	234	685	270	1,420	617	2,187	1,054	5,519
Imprisoned	([42b])	([42b])	182	218	220	280	365	445	426	577
Other	33	16	93	47	160	130	10	20	50	50

[42] Biennial Statistical Report on Characteristics of Families Receiving ADC, March 1948 through December 1961, Department of Institutions and Agencies.

[42a] Included with desertions.

[42b] Unknown.

---

[32] N.J.S.A. 44:7–19.

[33] Biennial Statistical Report on Characteristics of Families Receiving Aid to Dependent Children (December 1961), hereafter referred to as 1961 biennial report.

[34] Ibid.

[35] 1960 Census of Population, Advance Reports, Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce.

[36] 1961 biennial report.

[37] Summary of Selected Statistics Covering the Aid to Dependent Children Assistance Program (Dec. 12, 1962), New Jersey Department of Institutions and Agencies, Bureau of Assistance.

[38] 1961 biennial report.

Of the total number of families receiving assistance (19,844) under ADC 6,924 are white families responsible for 17,536 white children; nonwhite families receiving ADC assistance totaled 12,920 and are responsible for 34,996 children dependent upon this assistance. By far the largest groups creating need for assistance to needy children result from desertions and the birth of illegitimate children which amount to approximately 68.8 percent of all cases receiving aid under this program. Since these groups constitute the greatest problem to efficient relief administration they are treated separately in the following chapter of this report.

The growth of ADC: In order to comprehend the magnitude and complexity of ADC in New Jersey, it is necessary that some mention be made of the relative growth of this program during the past years. It cannot be denied that while the greatest increase for assistance results from desertions and illegitimacy, the most startling explosion has taken place among the growth in the nonwhite illegitimate child. There is every reason to believe that this trend will continue unless present methods dealing with this problem are greatly revamped.

Equally impressive in reviewing the overall pattern of family units receiving ADC assistance is the voluminous mushrooming not only of families on ADC but the number of children involved which has grown proportionally with caseloads. While the total number of families receiving assistance in November of 1953 amounted to 4,865, by December of 1961 this figure increased to 19,844.[43]

In November 1953 the number of children receiving aid was 12,393, but in December of 1961 this figure increased to 52,532. In a short period of 8 years, New Jersey was required to meet the increasing demands of an additional 14,979 families, with a corresponding increase of 40,139 additional children.[44] These increases in both cases and number of children are reflected in the costs of annual net assistance which in 1953 was $6,495,780 and in 1961 reached a total of $39,357,141, an increase of $32,861,361.[45] The following schedule is indicative of this growth for the period March 1948 to December 1961.

For review purposes the committee referred to annual expenditures for this program made by the Federal Government, and the matching contributions by the State and county governments, for a period of 20 years. The chart on the following page indicates such expenditures in both dollars and percent of contribution. It will be noted that expenditures for the fiscal period 1960–61 were $31,925,466, while expenditures for the fiscal year 1961–62 increased to $39,357,141, representing last year's annual increase of almost $8 million. Costs mushroomed since the fiscal period 1956–57, increasing by $2 million; 1957–58 by $3 million; 1958–59 $4 million; 1959–60 $6 million; 1960–61 $8 million and 1961–62 $8 million.

Division by families and children on ADC, by race, 1948–61 [46]*—Total annual ADC expenditures*

Number and division of families	March 1948	November 1953	March 1956	November 1958	December 1961
Total number of families	519	4, 865	6, 430	9, 607	19, 844
Total number of children	1, 292	12, 393	16, 610	23, 384	52, 532
White families	340	2, 601	2, 840	4, 039	6, 924
White children	858	6, 360	7, 170	9, 566	17, 536
Nonwhite families	179	2, 264	3, 590	5, 568	12, 920
Nonwhite children	434	6, 033	9, 140	13, 818	34, 996
Annual net assistance	$4, 414, 404	$6, 495, 780	$8, 955, 718	$17, 617, 360	$39, 357, 141

[46] Biennial Statistical Reports, 1948–61, op. cit., supra note 42.

Summary of selected statistics covering the aid to dependent children assistance program for the fiscal years 1942–43 through 1961–62 (December 12, 1962)

[State of New Jersey, Department of Institutions and Agencies, Division of Welfare—Bureau of Assistance]

Fiscal year	Net assistance	Federal share		State share		County share	
		Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
1942–43	$2, 582, 347	$1, 182, 525	45. 8	$503. 008	19. 5	$896, 814	34. 7
1943–44	2, 066, 573	732, 241	35. 4	667, 225	32. 3	667, 107	32. 3
1944–45	2, 274, 813	677, 953	29. 8	798, 693	35. 1	798, 167	35. 1
1945–46	2, 574, 011	678, 611	26. 4	948, 210	36. 8	947, 190	36. 8
1946–47	3, 337, 882	1, 077, 984	32. 3	1, 064, 543	31. 9	1, 195, 355	35. 8
1947–48	4, 414, 404	1, 405, 354	31. 8	1, 402, 835	31. 8	1, 606, 215	36. 4
1948–49	4, 992, 094	1, 876, 260	37. 6	1, 358, 496	27. 2	1, 757, 338	35. 2
1949–50	5, 632, 684	2, 126, 307	37. 7	1, 514, 019	26. 9	1, 992, 358	35. 4
1950–51	6, 040, 271	2, 649, 333	43. 9	1, 398, 380	23. 1	1, 992, 558	33. 0
1951–52	6, 178, 940	2, 756, 338	44. 6	1, 407, 031	22. 8	2, 015, 571	32. 6
1952–53	6, 495, 780	3, 119, 157	48. 0	1, 281, 005	19. 7	2, 095, 618	32. 3
1953–54	6, 580, 846	3, 265, 717	49. 6	1, 210, 158	18. 4	2, 104, 971	32. 0
1954–55	7, 768, 113	3, 678, 187	47. 4	1, 548, 001	19. 9	2, 541, 925	32. 7
1955–56	8, 955, 718	4, 126, 164	46. 1	1, 859, 870	20. 8	2, 969, 684	33. 1
1956–57	10, 809, 591	4, 992, 892	46. 2	2, 190, 421	20. 3	3, 626, 278	33. 5
1957–58	13, 640, 749	6, 222, 418	45. 6	2, 828, 305	20. 7	4, 590, 026	33. 7
1958–59	17, 617, 360	7, 906, 279	44. 9	3, 791, 763	21. 5	5, 919, 318	33. 6
July 1,1959–Dec. 31, 1959	11, 018, 441	4, 799, 964	43. 5	2, 478, 200	22. 5	3, 740, 277	34. 0
Jan. 1, 1960–June 30, 1960	12, 778, 832	5, 750, 517	45. 0	3, 514, 163	27. 5	3, 514, 152	27. 5
1960–61	31, 925, 466	14, 106, 972	44. 2	8, 909, 247	27. 9	8, 909, 247	27. 9
1961–62	39, 357, 141	17, 304, 117	44. 0	11, 026, 512	28. 0	11, 026, 512	28. 0

Total costs for all welfare programs in New Jersey are expected to reach a new high in 1962–63 of approximately $88 million with about half of this expenditure budgeted for the ADC program. This means an approximate increase from 1961–62 expenditures of another $8 million bringing the total expenditures for ADC for 1962–63 to approximately $45 million.

At the present time, no end to these increases is in sight. The upward spiral of welfare costs will continue to rise unless an effective program is adopted by the State to combat the social and economic evils which give rise to dependency and relief. In 1960–61 total welfare expenditures were $72 million; in 1961–62, $79 million; in 1962–63 $88 million and increases in the aid to dependent children program account for practically all such increases.

A direct relationship to the average amount of grants made under the program to the families receiving aid reveals another dynamic factor responsible for overall increases of Federal, State, and county expenditures.

Average ADC monthly grant [47]

	Average per family or case aided	Average per person aided
1952	$100. 74	$30. 16
1953	109. 17	32. 45
1954	110. 23	32. 69
1955	116. 06	34. 76
1956	119. 87	35. 87
1957	130. 66	39. 34
1958	141. 04	42. 22
1959	149. 03	45. 01
1960	157. 08	45. 93
1961	160. 02	45. 18

[47] Division of Welfare, State Department of Institutions and Agencies (July 26, 1961).

A comparison of grants paid during the month of November of 1958 and December of 1961 according to size of family and grant reveals areas of greatest increase.

Average approximate amount of grant for months shown [48]

	November 1958	December 1961
Number in family:		
1	$47	$56
2	114	133
3	158	182
4	192	217
5	233	259
6	260	292
7	303	355
8	311	371
9	370	388
10	358	505

[48] Biennial Statistical Reports (1958 and 1961).

It must be emphasized that the above schedule reflects only average size grants for all families having 1 to 10 or more children. Actual cases, as corroborated by the committee's investigations show that in many cases grants to individual families far exceed the above indicated average monthly grant of $505. Such cases, of course, present varied problems which go to the very heart of relief assistance in New Jersey. The question arises whether such large grants are inimical to family self-help and rehabilitation and whether the size of the grant itself militates against the presence of personal motivation, vital to any program whose legitimate aims and objectives are primarily designed to aid family unity and reconciliation to relieve the dependent person from an atmosphere of dependency to independence.

DESERTIONS

Desertion, when spoken in reference to the ADC program necessarily implies the abandonment of children by a parent, usually the father. Of the 52,532 children on ADC in December 1961, 21,249 had been abandoned by a parent. These children came from 7,075 families residing in New Jersey, and they account for more than one-third of all children receiving aid.

By law, desertion is a criminal act punishable by both fines and imprisonment.[49] Yet, in spite of criminal penalties prescribed by statute, desertion ranks highest as the primary cause of child dependency in New Jersey.

---

[43] Ibid.

[44] Ibid.

[45] Summary of Selected Statistics, op. cit., supra note 37.

[49] N.J.S.A. 9:6–3.

Abandonment of a child consists in any of the following acts by one having lawful custody or control of a child: (a) willfully forsaking a child, (b) failure to protect such child, thereby exposing the child to physical or moral risks, and (c) failure to maintain a child so that such child becomes liable for maintenance and support at public expense, or by child-caring societies or private persons not legally responsible for the child's care.[50]

Any parent, guardian, or person having the care, custody, or control of any child who abuses, abandons, or neglects such child is deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction may be fined not more than $500, or be imprisoned with or without hard labor as the court may direct for a term not exceeding 3 years or both.[51]

Where fines are imposed, the court may direct that the fines be paid in whole or in part to the wife, guardian, custodian, or trustee of the minor child. The court may also in the best interest of the child place it in temporary care or custody of a child-caring society. Under such circumstances where a child is placed in the care of an agency or society, the court may postpone sentence on the father or person standing in loco parentis and require such person to pay the stipulated sum for the maintenance of such child. Failure to make payments as directed by the court can result in the arrest and arraignment and imposition of the fine and penalties as prescribed by statute.[52]

Desertion is usually an impulsive and unplanned action in which the father disappears, in most cases leaving the mother alone to plan for herself and the children on a day-to-day basis. Quite often these mothers continue to bear children for their husbands while receiving ADC benefits, and their eligibility for the continuance of such payments based on the alleged desertion and abandonment by the father is rarely ever questioned. Payments are merely increased with the addition of each new child in the family.

Many such mothers while on ADC consort with paramours—the illicit relationship often resulting in the birth of an illegitimate child who becomes part of the family on public assistance.

The effects of desertion upon a mother and her children are devastating and often of long duration. Yet each year the number of children deserted by a parent who requires public assistance climbs in a dizzying spiral. In May of 1948 there were 112 such families on ADC; in December of 1961, this figure jumped to 7,075.[53]

The committee believes from evidence uncovered by its investigations that the incidence of ADC encouraging fathers to desert is probably very small. But this suppository problem loses most of its probative value, and is inconsequential, when we consider the direct effect ADC has on family reconciliation especially when the deserting father returns from his wanderings. Evidence indicates that quite often he does return. Here the committee has found all too frequently that if ADC does not encourage the abandonment of children by their fathers, once the desertion has occurred, it does not encourage reunion. The plain fact is that money payments made through ADC often far exceed the earning power of the allegedly deserting father. Without exception, witnesses testified that if the husband desired to return and resume his role as breadwinner for the family, his return would be discouraged, if not resisted by outright rejection.

Competent witnesses in public welfare and others closely allied to it have testified to the deleterious effects of excessive ADC payments upon family reconciliations; of continued family dependency upon ADC; of its fatal effect upon illegitimacy by deterring marriages which might have otherwise taken place between putative fathers of illegitimate children and their unmarried mothers had there been no ADC benefits forthcoming or assured.

The following testimony of John Kabala, Deputy Director of Welfare of Atlantic County, points out this deficiency and describes its impact on both those on relief and the caseworker employed to service these families.

BY SENATOR GROSSI

Question. "Well, again I would like to ask you if there are any suggestions you have in addition to those you have already made."

Answer. "Well, * * * another thing that bothers me and bothers the caseworkers—you have a husband, wife, and three children living together. That man would go out to work every day and bring home $45 a week. They were living off that money for 1, 2, 3 years. They become incompatible, let's say, or he deserts, or he separates for some reason, and the grant is jumped over and above what that man could normally make at his job. The mother, the recipient, knows that she gets more money by having this man out of the house and therefore, she does not want him back in the house and there is no chance of a reconciliation. If the grant were cut down or compatible with the going rate in the community of a man or average family, making that money so much that they can live off of it—because we provide them with all medical care * * * and, to the average family man today, that is worth at least $25 a month * * *."

Question. "You find that the amount of money given under the ADC program is far greater in many instances than the amount of money a man"—

Answer. "Yes, than what the man can bring into the family. In fact * * * I find that if I separated from my wife and go down to the probation office and sign a consent order of so much money she'd be taking home $75 a month more than I'm working and making for the family now * * * it's a serious problem with our caseworkers who have to sit down and write out a budget for a (ADC) family comparable to their (own) family, and that (ADC) family is taking home more money than they are making actually in salaries."

Question. "You may be interetsed in knowing that Atlantic County is not alone in that situation. We have found that to be more or less a pattern throughout the State, and not in one instance have we gotten a "yes" answer when we asked the relief recipient whether they would like to have their husband back—not one case. And most of those cases have fallen in the category we have just discussed."[54]

One case investigated by the committee involved a husband and wife who applied for ADC, but were turned down because they were both living together as man and wife in the same household. Under the provisions of the Social Security Act, ADC benefits are paid only for the care of children who are deprived of parental support, and benefits are not paid where children live with both parents and neither are incapacitated. Shortly thereafter this couple went to the probation officer and signed a voluntary separation affidavit charging mutual incompatibility, although there appeared to be no marital differences between them at the time of their first application for ADC. This made the family eligible for benefits under the program, and they now recive $249 per month from the welfare board and $134 a month from the father under a voluntary support agreement, which includes rights of visitation.

While this case may be easily distinguished from other cases of desertion, it is almost impossible to ascertain whether or not any collusion exists, or whether any fraud has been perpetrated by allegedly deserting fathers for the sole purpose of becoming eligible for ADC benefits.

Two typical family cases investigated by the committee involved families receiving ADC benefits due to the alleged desertion of the fathers:

The father of the family was ordered by the Passaic County Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court to pay weekly support for his family in the amount of $40. Since that time he has made one payment in the amount of $24, and at the time of this investigation was $2,101 in arrears.

His wife and five children receive $231 per month. When questioned about the whereabouts of her husband, she said that she has not seen her husband for approximately 1 year, and that he did not contribute to the support of the family.

An automobile registration check revealed the husband to be the owner of a late-model car which was later found parked in front of this client's house. The information was turned over to the proper authorities for further investigation.

In another case: When interviewed by this committee, the mother stated she had no idea of her husband's whereabouts. The committee found he was attending college in Washington, D.C. When investigated again during the summer, the father was found living next door to his family and was employed by a local concern. Faced with this evidence, the client admitted she knew the whereabouts of her husband, and voluntarily signed a statement to this effect. Though legal action was recommended, it was never taken, and as of December 13, 1962, neither this person nor her husband have been prosecuted.

To add to the committee's disillusionment in this case it was learned that upon graduation from college, this husband secured a divorce.

Perhaps part of the difficulty here lies in the fact that New Jersey, unlike many States, has no statutory limit to the amount of grants made under ADC. In practice the amount paid is determined by a budget based on individual needs as promulgated by the State Department of Institutions and Agencies. Since there is no limit to the size of the grant, grants naturally are higher when there are more children. As each child reaches an older age bracket, these grants are increased. Thus, a large number of families surveyed by the committee with 8, 9, and 10 children receive grants in excess of $400 and $500 monthly. It does not require a lively imagination to believe that such grants are far in excess of attainable family income through regular employment.

However, grants under the ADC program may be reduced by the county welfare board whenever the circumstances of the recipient change. The county welfare board may also discontinue a grant entirely whenever the father of a child returns to the home and resumes its support.

In its endeavor to get to the root of the problem that exists in New Jersey on welfare, and always looking for expert assistance, the committee turned to the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey, and asked the chief justice to assign members of the judiciary who have had experience in handling welfare cases to testify before the committee. On the matter of deserting fathers, and the practicability of reconciliations, the following testimony by Judge Harry W.

---

[50] N.J.S.A. 9:6–1.

[51] N.J.S.A. 9:6–3.

[52] N.J.S.A. 9:6–3.

[53] Schedule on Status of Father by Race, biennial reports (1948–61).

[54] 5th Public Hearing, vol. 1 (June 21, 1962), Atlantic City, N.J.

Lindeman of the Essex County juvenile and domestic relations court, is pertinent:

"Then again I have taken the position under ADC that it is not exactly proper for ADC simply to work out how much a defaulting father needs to live on and then and only then if there is any excess, that goes toward support of the out-of-wedlock children or the normal children. Many a father has supported families that live together on far less than ADC would grant. I do not think then that we should make the separate families in a better economic position than they have had before when they were living together in perfect harmony. Otherwise we are getting certainly into the welfare state. So in those instances where, say a father is making $75 and the children are on relief under the ADC setup and the family needs $45, I make an order for $45. And the man says, 'But I can't live on $25 or $30 a week.' I say, 'Well, do you work Saturdays?' and invariably they say 'No.' 'How about Sundays?' Invariably, 'No.' I say, 'What do you do on Saturdays?' Then comes the blank expression, 'Why nothing, Judge.' This is routine, but I am sincere about it, that thousands upon thousands of honest people who don't want their families on relief, who want some of the better things in life, a car, a television, or a summer's trip, they work on Saturdays, some of them I know, on Sundays. Some of them have second jobs. And if there is no law that prevents honest citizens from keeping their children off relief by working at second jobs, I have no fear in telling these men that if they can't live on the balance of $25 or $30 they must find a second job. The hard core, those who are repeaters and who drink and who come back again, and eventually, if the Probation Department thinks they are not making the effort and the welfare is supporting them—then I get a figure and I commit them to an institution until they partially pay the money. It is most interesting that we do not keep many in jail for long * * * Thousands upon thousands of dollars in Essex County, which is a big county, have come in by virtue of using the power which the court exercises for the benefit of the taxpayers."

BY SENATOR GROSSI

Question. "You make reference to the words 'welfare state' and I know those words are very much abused and used sometimes to indicate anything that has to do with welfare. I thought that I would make reference to the remark that you made because it seems to me that that would be a good definition of what would constitute the welfare state. You pointed out that in a case where a family is living together with the husband, after the husband leaves, that family is now better off on welfare than they were when they were together. That seemed to me to be a perfect definition of what we would have to fear with respect to a welfare state."

Answer. "Not only that, but I very recently, when hearing a case, turned to the welfare representative, and I outlined something like this to him, and I said, 'Is this what you mean, that as soon as a man leaves his family for good reason or for no good reason and you compute that the family gets a certain amount of money, and never in their entire life while they lived together did they get that much money—do you mean to say that this is the position you are taking?' He said, 'The law makes us do this.' That was his answer to me. He said, 'Yes.' So in the United States of America if this were a general law, every person with five, six, seven, or eight children—all they would have to do to get additional moneys would be to leave the family and the family would be much better off. As a matter of fact, when a welfare worker found a man back with his wife and family, he said to them, 'We will now have to stop your relief. But if the man will leave and board somewhere else and pay you $10 a week, we will supply the difference.' So the man left. I said, 'Oh, that cannot be.' But the man and his wife were there, I examined them in open court and each confirmed that the welfare worker had said 'If you leave and pay $10—.' So he paid $10. I asked them if there was any difference between them. They said, 'No.' I said, 'Today you return to your home and under the law you are entitled if you are not working to go to the local relief and get some help until you find a job.' Well, they didn't know that * * * but under the county schedule they can get more money than they can at the municipal level. I checked back through the social worker and I was informed that that is what the social worker did. But it was a little bit misinterpreted. The worker did say, 'While you are living together, we can't do it.' But he did not admit he said to get out and then we can pay you your money." [55]

The committee believes that a paucity of effort has been expended under the ADC program in locating missing fathers who have abandoned their family responsibilities. More than sufficient evidence has been adduced to indicate that in the absence of such effort, the ADC program has, if anything, discouraged reconciliations, and at best, allowed to drift in a negligent and sometimes wanton manner a family disruption which compels long-term chronic dependency. We believe that a diligent pursuit of such delinquent and absconding fathers, followed if necessary by prosecution and jail confinement would go a long way in curtailing this major cause of child dependency in New Jersey.

Locating fathers who allegedly deserted their families eventually to end up on ADC rolls proved, in a majority of cases to be comparatively easy. Evidently, little effort need be expended to attain this worthwhile goal. In many cases missing fathers were located by the simple process of checking motor vehicle registrations. The same information is attainable and accessible through the Bureau of Social Security, and quite often the Division of Employment Security. Yet no exchange of information exists between these agencies and ADC officials. Consider the case of this father, who although under court order to support his children, disappeared and discontinued payments. A bench warrant was issued for his arrest, but he still remains at large, unapprehended, shirking both court order and family responsibilities.

On November 25, 1959, this father was ordered to pay $20 per week for the support of his family by order by the Passaic County Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court. His last payment of $20 was made on September 25, 1961. At present he is $2,810 in arrears, and is classified as an absconder. His wife and two children currently receive $203 per month from ADC.

Investigation revealed he was employed by a delivery service in Bloomfield, N.J., and has worked there for over a year. His present salary is between $85 and $95 a week. Circumstances indicate this father still retains some devotion toward his wife and children, as he continues to claim them as dependents for income tax purposes even though they are being supported at public expense.

Greater resources than those presently existing must be made available on both the State and county levels to assist probation departments, caseworkers and the courts in locating fathers of abandoned children. The testimony of Joseph Greene, director of welfare in Passaic County, provides sound reasons why delay in this area might have disastrous results.

"An indictment is brought in for desertion; it is referred to the prosecutor's office or in some counties to the sheriff's office for serving a subpena and bringing in the deserter if possible. Have you ever checked, and I think it would be well for the committee to do that, on your prosecutors' offices in the State of New Jersey to find out how many indictments, how many times they have assigned men and detectives to try to find these deserters.

"I also might make another recommendation, and it will go far in savings of thousands of dollars: Right now, in cases of desertion and neglected children, complaints are made, they are heard in court, and the judge will say, 'All right, you are put on probation and have to pay $30 a week'. * * * Unfortunately, the general public does not recognize the value of good organization so far as probation is concerned. * * * One does not sit down and analyze that if we were to appoint, or the courts rather, would appoint one or two probation officers, whose sole responsibility would be to follow through all persons put on probation and ordered to pay—I think it would be of interest to you folks if you would go into a probation office and ask them how much is outstanding—hundreds of thousands of dollars. It is not only the dollars and cents that are involved. The persons who have been brought into court and ordered to pay are in contempt of court, and what is the net result? He misses one, two, or three payments and nothing is done. You are not only losing that money, you are losing the respect that the court should command." [56]

The causes of desertions are both varied and complex. The committee recognizes that many social ills contribute to this major source of family breakdown. On its face, it is evident that preventive casework can offer no solution for these families that come to the attention of public agencies and county welfare departments sometimes long after the desertion has occurred. But we believe much can be accomplished by way of locating these errant fathers, providing in the process a means by which future family reconciliations can be made possible.

We do not feel that unrealistic monthly benefits exceeding past maximum income earned through employment promotes conditions favorable to the attainment of this goal. Undoubtedly, benefits must be construed on a more practical basis to meet the basic needs of the family unit, but not to a point where ADC becomes a way of life wholly unknown to the family prior to the father's desertion.

Fathers who elect to leave their children to public support while maintaining a residence separate and apart from their family should be required to turn over all but a small portion of earned income to their family for their support. There is no logic to a system which allows fathers to leave their families while they earn a net income of $100 a week or more and pay only $20 a week toward their children's support while the public pays the difference. No one will deny that such bizarre circumstances rewards the wayward father with a penchant for desertion or separation, and tends to encourage, rather than discourage, a free and easy life devoid of all familial responsibility.

COLLECTIONS AND PROBATION DEPARTMENTS

It is not surprising that considerable confusion and conflict exists affecting the apprehension of fathers who desert or abandon their children. Much of the public laws controlling child abandonment were enacted in the early 1900's and date back as far as the 1930's without alteration or amendment.

Most are obsolete when applied to today's problems of child dependency. When the present laws governing child abandonment were enacted, public assistance as administered under ADC had not yet come into existence. Prior to 1935, and the enactment of the Social Security Act by Congress creating the ADC program, cases of desertions and child abandonment coming before the courts were relatively few, resulting in early and quick disposition of complaints.

---

[55] Ibid.

[56] 2d public hearing (Jan. 5, 1961), Paterson, N.J.

Today, under ADC alone, as previously pointed out, 21,249 children receive public assistance because of desertion and abandonment. Yet our courts, probation departments, and welfare administrators still rely on an antiquated system, largely created prior to the depression of the 1930's to counteract and control a burgeoning cause of child dependency vitally affecting the public welfare. Millions of dollars are spent each year, not for the prevention or arrest of family breakdowns caused by deserting fathers, but for the support of mothers and children victimized by the alleged desertions of footloose and irresponsible fathers.

As late as June of 1962, there existed considerable confusion as to who had the responsibility of making complaints against deserting fathers when their families applied for ADC assistance. This resulted in many families being eligible for ADC support without any complaints ever filed against the offending fathers. Consequently many fathers had been permitted by mere acts of omission by responsible officials, to leave their families without any means of support free from legal deterrents of apprehension through warrants for their arrest. Even now there exists no compulsory public law whereby complaints must be made against deserting fathers or putative fathers as a condition precedent to receipt of ADC benefits. Filing of such complaints usually rests within the discretion of county welfare directors who rely principally on written reports submitted by field social workers who investigate applications and family conditions of the applicant.

When complaints are made to the juvenile and domestic relations court, an investigation may be made through its probation department into the financial condition of the parents or legally responsible relatives of the child, the conditions surrounding the home of the parents or relatives as well as any other facts which will assist the court in determining the case, and a full report in writing must be filed with the court.[57]

In practice, however, the courts usually rely on investigations and written reports of caseworkers charged with supervision of such families under authority of local county welfare boards. Where it is evident that children are abused or neglected they may be removed from the home and placed in care, custody or guardianship as the court may direct.[58] Usually care, custody and guardianship is vested in the State board of child welfare which, by law, is charged with providing foster home placement or other permanent or temporary shelter according to the needs of the child.

However, where prior conviction of a parent, guardian or person having custody and control of a minor child has occurred on grounds of abandonment, neglect, abuse or cruelty, most municipal officials, a probation officer, or guardian ad litem, may file a record of the case when such conviction was before the court with the juvenile and domestic relations court and apply to the court for relief.[59]

Although demands upon the courts and probation departments have pyramided, most probation departments still retain a skeleton staff ungeared and incapable of handling the increased burdens of locating and bringing before the court for reexamination defaulting fathers of abandoned children. Bench warrants for the arrests of deserting fathers are not pursued. Absconding parents, under court order, to pay just nominal amounts for the support of their children, often fail to pay. Investigations to locate contumacious parents seldom occur with the result that working and easily located family deserters go unapprehended, undermining both respect for the courts, our judicial process, the public laws, not to mention their own moral and social obligation of providing for their children.

Clearly the need for a more comprehensive, effective system is needed to confine abuses of deserting parents, usually the father, and to force compliance with court orders for the support of their families, especially when such desertions mean dependence by the family on public assistance and public relief.

Some idea of the costs involved in our failure to enforce mandatory court orders for the support of dependent children on ADC are reflected in the following schedule of arrearages reported by county probation offices:

Total arrears of delinquent accounts of relief recipient cases involving persons under mandatory court order

County	Number of cases	Amount of arrears
Atlantic	54	$110,665
Bergen	65	94,677
Burlington	45	41,438
Camden	129	99,543
Cape May	30	79,727
Cumberland	33	64,444
Essex	524	961,907
Gloucester	67	84,300
Hudson	43	85,663
Hunterdon	21	42,026
Mercer	62	87,078
Middlesex	90	194,026
Monmouth	46	64,675
Morris	71	149,954
Ocean	20	34,046
Passaic	258	574,405
Salem	15	60,317
Somerset	43	70,741
Sussex	31	41,342
Union	160	121,738
Warren	54	92,826
Total	1,861	3,155,538

The balance of $3,155,538.00 represents amounts due from currently active cases on ADC resulting from the breach of mandatory orders of support. No arrearages are included resulting from consent orders or voluntary support agreements. For instance in Camden County, an additional $141,776 is outstanding on consent orders in addition to the above amount of $99,543 owing from mandatory court orders. This represents income due from another 161 cases on ADC in Camden County.

In Monmouth County voluntary support agreements for families receiving ADC have resulted in an additional delinquency of $144,327.

Since no updated figures are kept by county welfare departments on delinquent accounts due for support from deserting fathers or legally responsible relatives of children on ADC, no audit was made by the committee to ascertain the exact amounts due, but a fairly safe estimate of an approximate $10 million delinquency or more probably exists from all outstanding agreements; court orders and consent agreements.

Juvenile and domestic relations courts and our probation officers are overtaxed with the result they are often unable to bring persons in default of payments before the court for examination. Presently, probation officers must be college graduates, but the committee sees no reason why the collection of arrearages must be the responsibility of a probation officer. The courts could just as easily appoint a referee with power to issue subpenas, take testimony, and administer oaths for the taking of testimony and the transcription of testimony with recommendations to the court as to the disposition of those cases brought before it for rehearing. The probation department could appoint collection investigators who are graduates of high school to investigate arrearages of payments resulting from court orders, consent orders, and voluntary agreements of deserting, legally separated, or putative fathers with children on ADC, or of such children who might become charges on ADC.

Confusion also exists between courts and judges as to the amounts fathers should be charged for the support of their children upon divorce, legal separation, or from parents located and apprehended for the desertion and abandonment of their families. Here the committee concerned itself only to those cases which have come under its purvue due to the receipt of public assistance, or the possible future need of public assistance through ADC. Where a child or children are, or are likely to become public charges due to the divorce or separation of their parents, this committee sees no reason why a goodly portion of all earned net income of such fathers should not be committed by mandatory statutory provisions for the support of such child or children until such time as they are no longer in need of public assistance. Minimum support orders create an easy license to establish a separate maintenance free from all familial responsibilities and family care, and contribute to the spiraling costs of ADC.

No estimate can safely be made as to the numbers of ADC families currently on assistance who might never have been in need had parents been compelled to support their children commensurately to their maximum earning capacity. As long as such conditions prevail we can expect an ever increasing burden to fall upon ADC for the support of neglected and abandoned children.

ILLEGITIMACY AND ADC

Next to desertions, illegitimacy ranks a close second as the next greatest cause of child dependency in New Jersey. Behind the veil of illegitimacy lies the more basic, but less spectacular problem of family breakdown affecting not only individuals, but whole groups of people. Entire families are blighted. Here we find the lowest level of parental responsibility—a social disease as lethal as any contagious disease, often passed on from one generation to the next.

The real problem of illegitimacy is not the offending parents of the illegitimate child. The insoluble problem is how to provide for the illegitimate child. Even more disturbing are the number of mothers who, in flagrant and ostentatious disregard of marriage and social custom, continue to bear illegitimate child after child without social or moral remorse as to the consequences to the children or their impact on society. The cost of supporting these women and their illegitimate children is staggering. The cost to the children and the perpetuation of those social evils begetting illegitimacy cannot be calculated.

Statistics on illegitimacy and ADC in New Jersey need not be distinguished from other States. They tell their own dramatic story. In New Jersey there were 6,573 families receiving assistance in December 1961 due to the birth of illegitimate children, the aggregate number of such children amounted to 13,773.[60] Equal to desertions as a cause for dependency, illegitimacy in New Jersey shows every indication of soon becoming the primary cause of child dependency in the ADC program.

In some cases illegitimacy resulted from a continuing relationship with one man who had never performed the legal formalities of marriage, but a greater number of these mothers have had as many as four, five, and six children born out of wedlock with the same number of different putative fathers involved. Apparently, this increase in illegitimacy occurs among females for whom an illegitimate child does not create great social or emotional risks. In the majority of cases reviewed by the committee these mothers came from the lowest economic strata of our society; where housing is overcrowded, employment opportunities limited, and family relationships unstable.

---

[57] N.J.S.A. 9:6–10.

[58] N.J.S.A. 9:6–11.

[59] N.J.S.A. 9:6–9

[60] 1961 biennial report.

Many of these women disclosed a complete lack of moral values, having little regard for the illegitimate status of their children, or the fact that the children were aware of their mother's immoral behavior. Reviewing these cases, one would believe that New Jersey had failed to enact statutory laws prohibiting fornication and adultery. Even more surprising is the fact that few of these women and their paramours have ever been brought before a court for filiation proceedings or prosecution.

The fact that a woman has an illegitimate child which is likely to become a public charge and where filiation proceedings have been instituted, such proceedings cannot, under present law, be considered a condition precedent nor a deterrent to the granting of assistance or relief.[61] According to Federal interpretation of the Social Security Act, a State may not deny assistance to any child because of some condition incidental to its birth. However, where filiation proceedings are instituted, upon trial or appeal to a county court, the mother of an illegitimate child can be compelled to disclose the name of the father, and upon refusal to do so may be adjudged in contempt of court.[62] When a court finds that a person is the father of an illegitimate child, it may specify a sum to be paid weekly by the father or otherwise for the child's support, as well as the manner of payment.[63] When adjudged to be the father he is compelled to give bond to the State of New Jersey in an amount determined by the court with sufficient surety or cash security conditioned that he will obey and comply with the order of filiation. Compliance means the indemnification of the State and every county and municipality which may have incurred or may thereafter incur any expense for the support of the illegitimate child.[64] Such bond when recorded has the force and effect of a recognizance, and becomes a lien on all property of the reputed father until canceled. Failure to pay the sum ordered is a breach of the conditions of the bond, and the money collected on the bond must be paid to the State, county, or municipality which may have incurred expenses in supporting the illegitimate child or the mother during her confinement.[65]

As regards filiation proceedings and support agreements, the experience of our judges of the juvenile and domestic relations courts concisely describe typical situations uncovered by the committee. The following testimony of Judge Martin Kole of the Bergen County Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court on illegitimacy cases is illustrative:

"I can recall cases in my court of mothers of illegitimate children who are doing a fairly decent job in raising them. On the other hand, I can recall situations where the mother was obviously a bad influence for the children and should have been separated from them. I am aware of cases in my court where even in the case of legitimate children, the mother wanted the father breadwinner out of the house because she obtained more by ADC. And I also have had paternity cases before me where it seemed fairly clear that the pattern of illegitimate births established by the woman had at least not been discouraged by the prospect of receiving ADC. I had one case involving one mother, three illegitimate children, and three separate putative fathers.

"Illegitimate children are, of course, a social, and moral problem much broader than the ADC program. However, there is no doubt that illegitimate children do create a substantial financial burden on the problem in our county—Bergen County. In Bergen County, illegitimacy ranks second as a cause of dependency under the program, second only to desertion of a parent. Of the 483 families on the rolls in 1961, 193 were dependent because of the desertion of a parent, 162 because of illegitimacy. This compares with 76 illegitimate children and 35 unwed mothers in 1960. The approximate cost of supporting the 162 illegitimate children and 52 unwed mothers in 1961 was $12,500 per month."[66]

More disturbing to the committee than any other facet of its investigation into relief was the impact of illegitimacy on ADC. Benefits paid through ADC grants in excess of $400 and $500 per month to women who have had 8, 9, and 10 illegitimate children with as many different putative fathers arouses public indignation, and validates public criticisms of ADC. Illegitimacy permeates the whole fabric of the ADC program and tends to corrupt, subvert, and defeat its very purposes.

It is not reasonable to expect the average person of normal sensibilities to sit idly by while public moneys are used to subsidize the immorality of a relatively small minority of our population.

A brief review of some typical family groups in this category indicates the seriousness of the problem as well as the unwholesome environment in which these unfortunate illegitimate children must live.

Miss A. is an illegitimate child. She has had eight illegitimate children by seven different men. Her oldest daughter has an illegitimate child. Their home is dirty and infested. She and her children and grandchild all receive ADC payments. Her income amounts to $218 from ADC, and $87 from private domestic work. She also receives income from the putative father of two of her children. She currently has a new boyfriend who also supplies her with money which is not known to the social case worker.

Mrs. B.'s husband deserted about 7 years ago, and she has been on relief since then. She had had seven children, three of which are illegitimate by three different putative fathers. Her mother was also on relief, and her brother is the father of an illegitimate child. Both mother and child are also collecting ADC. Mrs. B.'s monthly grant is $294.

Miss C. has four illegitimate children fathered by two different putative fathers. She is an admitted prostitute and habitual shoplifter, and despite the fact that her record indicates that the case worker recommends the children be removed, she still retains their custody and receives a monthly grant of $149.

Miss D. has three illegitimate children fathered by two different putative fathers. One of whom is also the father of three more illegitimate children by another woman also on ADC in the same city. Miss D.'s father has two wives, one with eight children receiving ADC in one county, and the other with two children also on ADC in another county. Her sister is also receiving ADC as a result of the birth of an illegitimate child.

Mrs. E. was deserted by her husband who left her with three children. She subsequently had seven illegitimate children. Now, four of her daughters have a total of eight illegitimate children. This family received over $14,000 in ADC benefits over a period of 17 months.

Miss F. has four illegitimate children fathered by four different putative fathers. She has a police record for shoplifting and neglect of her children.

Many women on ADC have accepted illegitimacy as a way of life with no thought or intention of ever establishing a family home influenced by the guidance and support of a husband. And such conditions prevail without any apparent fear of social or legal retribution. Some, when threatened with the loss of custody of their legitimate or illegitimate offspring couldn't care less, but their concern was soon evident when realization took place that loss of the children also meant loss of all ADC income.

Typical of such cases was Miss G whose background and testimony follows:

"Miss G has 14 illegitimate children by 8 different putative fathers. Five children are in foster homes. One is deceased and three are supported by their fathers. She has a police record, and four of the eight putative fathers of her children also have police records. She lives in a four-room apartment and pays $60 a month rent.

"Her parents came to New Jersey from Virginia in 1927, and went on relief in 1933. Her first child was born when she was 12 years old, and she has been on welfare most of her life. Her minor child, now living with her had an illegitimate child also at age of 12, and is now pregnant with another illegitimate child. The putative father of this illegitimate grandchild is in the State prison. Miss G's budget will be increased shortly to provide for the new illegitimate grandchild after it is born. From February 1, 1943, to February 1, 1961, Miss G. has received total relief payments of $62,650.70. Miss G, her illegitimate children and grandchildren are still on relief, and there appears no possibility that this family can ever be rehabilitated."

Miss G. was questioned by the committee as to her reasons for having one illegitimate child after another. As often happened before the committee when mothers of illegitimate children were asked this question, the committee received no response, or when answers were given they were consistently irresponsible. Almost in every case, and with few exceptions, the witnesses showed no remorse for the results of their immorality, and seemed to care little about the impact of illegitimate children on society, and upon the child itself.

BY MR. RICHMAN

Question. "Tell me, you've had 14 children, starting in 1935, and your last child was born in July of 1959. At no time during this period have you had any money or any prospect of getting any money to support these children, have you?"

Answer. "Well, every time—I could always get a job, I mean, days work or something like that, but I just don't have no one I can depend on to leave the children with."

Question. "That is exactly what I mean. I mean at all times you knew that you were unable to work; you knew that you had no money, but you went right on having these illegitimate children, is that right?"

Answer. "Yes."

Question. "How do you account for that?"

Answer. (No response.)

Question. "Do you think there is anything wrong about it or do you think it was fair to the taxpayer to support all of these illegitimate children here?"

Answer. "No. I don't think it was fair."

Question. "But you have been doing it for 24 years; right?"

Answer. (No response.)

Question. "You went to jail for neglect of some of your children, is that so?"

Answer. "Yes."

Question. "How long did you stay in jail?"

Answer. "Eighteen months, I believe."

---

[61] NJSA 9:17-2.

[62] NJSA 9:17-11.

[63] NJSA 9:17-12.

[64] NJSA 9:17-14.

[65] NJSA 9:17-17-18.

[66] Fifth public hearing, vol. 2 (June 22, 1962) Atlantic City, N.J.

Question. "You had a child while you were in jail?"

Answer. "That's right."

Question. "Do you think that there is anything wrong morally for you to have child after child without being married?"

Answer. (No response.)

Question. "How do you feel about that, or doesn't it bother you?"

Answer. "Sure it worries me."

Question. "Why is that nowhere along the line did you marry any of these men who fathered your children?"

Answer. "Well, I could have been married one time, but I figured it wouldn't be any getting along because it wasn't the father of the kids, the father of my children. So I didn't get married."

Question. "Did you have these children deliberately? Did you try to get yourself pregnant because that would mean more money to you by way of relief?"

Answer. "No, because I worked up until I—you know, I just wasn't making enough money to support the kids, but I had worked. I have done days work. I was doing them even when they put me on the State * * * and I was on relief, I was working.[67]"

All circumstances involved with this family would indicate that the chain of dependency cannot be broken except by the removal of the children, and especially the removal of new-born infants at the earliest possible time.

It is obvious that the circumstances surrounding these children are such as to provide an immoral environment which directly contributes to the continued delinquency, demoralization and dependency of this group as a family unit. For the best interests of the children involved, plans should be made for their immediate removal so that they, although illegitimate, will at least have an opportunity to rise above the stigma of illegitimacy, and become responsible, independent and contributing members of society.

Another case investigated by the committee is illustrative of this chain of illegitimacy and continued dependency from one generation to the next:

Mrs. H lives with four of her nine children in a large urban community. She and two of her children are receiving ADC. Also living with her are seven grandchildren, also receiving ADC. Two other daughters and their children who are not living with Mrs. H also receive ADC relief. Five of Mrs. H's children are illegitimate. All 14 of her grandchildren are illegitimate. One daughter has eight illegitimate children, another has two, and another, four. Today there is a total of 22 living children. Fifteen of these children have been born outside the State of New Jersey. Case files reveal a list of at least 10 putative fathers, 6 of whom were never in New Jersey, 3 of whom are dead, with the fathers of 2 children listed as unknown, and the whereabouts of 2 are unknown.

At the time of the committee's investigation, this family was receiving a total of $949 per month; $876 from the county welfare department, and an additional $93 as social security benefits. Mrs. H states she can't do with the money she gets, and that the welfare board is going to put two additional younger children on the welfare rolls. She pays $120 a month for a six-room apartment and supplies her own heat and utilities.

Born in St. Augustine, Fla., in 1905, at the time of this investigation she was 55 years old. Formerly a resident of Georgia, she moved to New Jersey in 1951.

Total expenditures from all agencies for this family for the period commencing 1954 through 1960 totals $42,525.40, including county welfare grants for the first 3 months of 1961, but not including social security benefits of $93 a month.

This family of three generations gives every indication that unless the children are removed, we will be called upon to provide ADC for a fourth generation of illegitimate children.

These families represent more than mere cases of immorality and incorrigibility. They concern the welfare and future character of children raised in homes where normal standards of morality and family responsibility are absent. The concern of the committee is not only the waste of public funds, but the protection of these children from their irresponsible parents and the unwholesome environment in which they are living at public expense.

To protect both innocent children born out of wedlock from the flagrancy and iniquity of their home environs, and the interests of the general public is a duty of paramount concern to all responsible people. Regardless of increased costs of institutional care or foster home care, these children cry aloud for help to escape their wicked environment. Their immediate removal must be expedited if we are ever to break the chain effect of illegitimacy and future child-family dependency on ADC.

Striking in its denunciation of such relief practices was the recent report of the juvenile and domestic relations court of Essex County addressed to the freeholders of that county:

"It is costing Essex County taxpayers millions of dollars for welfare relief. Most of the recipients come within the category of deserving recipients. However, hundreds of thousands of dollars are being handed out each year to mothers who, in no sense of the word, are deserving. The out-of-wedlock children of those mothers, to be sure, must be fed, clothed, and housed, but day after day, in the domestic relations court, unblushing, unmarried mothers admit they are getting welfare relief for anywhere up to 8, 9, and even 10 out-of-wedlock children. One such mother is getting $464 a month—this totals $5,568 a year. This is more than many married men, working for the county, are being paid.

"The situation mentioned is brought into sharp focus when the county welfare board tracks down the fathers of these out-of-wedlock children and files complaints against them for support, seeking court order in sufficient amount to take the children off the relief rolls.

"Many outrageous facts are disclosed at the court hearings. Welfare recipients with children by four or five different men. Fathers who have several broods on welfare relief. Fathers married and not supporting their legitimate wife and children. Fathers who shrug their shoulders in disdain of the whole proceedings and in effect say—'I am not making enough money to support them—let the taxpayers do it'."[68]

The cases under discussion represent illegitimacy in ADC at its worst. For the most part these are hard core, chronic cases which will continue to beget more illegitimate children at public expense unless some new methods are developed to combat and contain this group, with emphasis on legal punitive measures in addition to psychiatric and psychological counseling. In seeking some answers to this complex problem, the committee heard testimony from Judge Harry W. Lindeman, coauthor of the above-cited report and Judge of the Essex County Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court.

BY MR. RICHMAN

Question. "Judge, we just wanted to hear your views on what, if anything, can be done about this situation. We have run into cases of women with 7, 8, 9, and as high as 10 illegitimate children by 6, 7, or 8 different fathers, some known and some unknown. From your experience, what is wrong with this program, if anything? What can we do with it?"

Answer. "I have a definite opinion that the mother of every out-of-wedlock child should register with an agency, either a private agency or a public agency, for the purpose of getting some social help on the basic proposition that out-of-wedlock children generally are bad for any community and particularly bad for the child. So in the first instance, I think they should register and social services should be made available to them.

"Then, I think, if there should be a second out-of-wedlock child, that there should be some provision that that mother and father—let me say that rather definitely too—that the mother and father be brought into court. Then the court with an investigation by the probation department or some other agency that may have had the case determines whether or not that mother should be in such an institution as Clinton Reformatory where they have a splendid program for out-of-wedlock mothers or should be maybe in the county penitentiary where they also have a program, or, if it is a younger person, perhaps the State home for girls if it is a younger teenager so that they can get some social help because I presume Judge Kole told you of cases where there are 4, 5, 6, 7, 8—I have had them as many as 9—receiving up to $500 a month, receiving in support more than some of the county employees get. No child, illegitimate or otherwise should be denied food, clothing, or shelter. But many mothers of these children actually in my opinion are not deserving of the help they get because through inadequacy or otherwise they don't comprehend what is going on. They sit in court with one, two, or three different fathers for their several children and they say they are getting public support and that is as far as it goes, with no conscious desire, at least expressed not to have a fifth, sixth, seventh, or eighth.

I have definitely warned everyone with multiple out-of-wedlock children and I put it in the record, that if they have an additional one, I am going to direct the probation department or some other agency to file a complaint for neglect against that mother on the grounds that every additional child is neglecting the children they already have and under R.S. 9: 6–1, and so forth, which is the welfare statute, it says that one of the basis for neglect is where a child is or is likely to become a public charge by reason of the conduct of the parent. While that might seem to be technical, it is not technical when you consider the total social impact of three, four, five out-of-wedlock children and nothing done to acquaint that mother with her social responsibilities and with the tremendous impact of illegitimacy on the child itself who among its peers as it grows up in school has a terrifically hard time to live down that there is no father in the picture.

"I have worked out a form[69] whereby * * * many fathers are brought into court sign this form where they admit paternity * * * which is filed with the central bureau of statistics at Trenton, available only to * * * welfare department people, or those who have an interest in it. This is in the nature of prima facie evidence of paternity * * *.

---

[67] Third private hearing, Aug. 8, 1961, Newark, N.J.

[68] Lindeman and Bellfatto, J. "Problems Presented in the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court" (1961).

[69] See appendix, this report.

"I would say that in Essex County the vast majority of the people who come there for relief are entitled to it. But those are not the kind who come before me. * * * We don't want to deny in Essex County a person relief and proper and adequate relief. But there is a certain core where taxpayers' money is used where I think that there is a special obligation, not only to see that it is spent wisely, but I am advocating that there is an obligation to go into that home to see that the money that goes there, which is taxpayers' money, is also spent for the benefit of the family. I get too many cases where numbers of mothers of illegitimate children spend the first few days after the money comes in spending it. I advocate that no relief be given to those where the check is endorsed at a tavern. * * * Somebody has to suffer because it is a relief budget so somebody is bound to suffer. It is my opinion that there is one of the loopholes that ought to be looked into." [70]

Of all the recommendations and suggestions made to this committee regarding illegitimate children of mothers on relief, none have been more uniform and cogent than those advocated by every county welfare director who had opportunity to testify before the committee. Typical of this testimony is that of Raymond Dougherty, director of the Mercer County Welfare Board.

BY SENATOR GROSSI

Question. "One of the things the committee has under consideration as a possible recommendation—and we'd like to have your expert opinion as to whether you think that this would act as a deterrent—is that a separate organization be set up within the prosecutor's office whose staff would have nothing eles to do except to follow through on deserting fathers and pressing complaints against putative fathers in order to force them to support the children or bring them back to justice, that if that were done, that might be a curb on the men, at least."

Answer. "I would like to see that."

Question. "Of course, the other is that shelters be set up. And I think you made mention of the fact that in some instances you recommend that the children be taken away and put out in foster homes."

Answer. "That's right."

Question. "So those two things together—would that in your opinion act as an effective curb on this condition?"

Answer. "I think that's a very good plan and I think that we would work wholeheartedly with the prosecutor's office, which we do now. But as I pointed out, there are so many of these desertions and absentee fathers, that they just can't handle them all and it's quite a job. They don't have the staff." [71]

Again, similar means were advocated by welfare director, Joseph Greene of Passaic County:

"Some steps should be taken and instead of penalizing the children, there should be legislation permitting welfare boards to allocate shelters on a private basis whereby if we have a family or a woman having one, two, three, four, and five * * * well, whereby welfare boards, in cases of that kind where there is misconduct and the morale of the house is very low, be permitted to take these children out of the home temporarily and place them in private shelters and pay them a fee worthwhile for them to go into the business themselves.

"Unfortunately, I might add this also, at present that type of case under your present regulations and law you should refer to the State board of child welfare which has charge of care and foster care. Well, you know the situation, and I am not blaming them. They have their hands full. We get 4 or 5 kids or 10 families for placement in foster homes. They can't do it. It is humanly impossible, but if the law were amended and regulations made whereby county welfare boards might open these places—

"But with this type of shelter, they can go to school and they are associating with other children. The important factor is that in this home, instead of four walls for an institutional program they have somewhat of a home life and there is a possibility that the kindness of the person running this place might be instilled in that kid, so that by the time he gets home he will at least know what it is to be in surroundings that a child is entitled to.

"We cannot do that now, for, if we were to establish that on a county level, we would have to bear the freight; I again say 'we' meaning the county. I think that that will answer the problem a great deal, and, if the State would share on that cost, we could turn around when we appear in court in a case of that kind and point out or recommend to the court that the mother be sent away for 30 or 60 days and we will provide for the children. I mean temporarily only. I don't want to take any child away from a parent, no matter how bad the conditions are at home—a child is still a child and the love of the parent always exists." [72]

That the public has become acutely aware and concerned by the danger of continued illegitimacy and the wanton abandonment of moral values by mothers on relief is illustrated by the following editorial appearing in the Newark Evening News on August 11, 1961, immediately following disclosures made by this committee after one of its hearings on illegitimacy in Essex County:

"Deeper than dollars—

"The legislature's investigation of New Jersey welfare policies is turning up disquieting facts about the aid to dependent children program. Senator Grossi of Passaic, chairman of the investigating committee, reports that one Essex County woman and her 14 illegitimate children, sired by 10 different fathers, have cost public welfare agencies nearly $62,000 in the last 18 years.

"Another case involves three generations with 23 children, 15 of them illegitimate, which has received more than $42,000 in 7 years. The family currently receives $876 in welfare grants, plus $93 in social security benefits.

"Presented here is the perennial dilemma that incorrigibility presents to compassion. The question goes deeper than dollars. It concerns the welfare and the future character of children being reared in homes where normal standards of morality and family responsibility are absent.

"Society has always asserted the right to remove children from the custody of unfit parents. But the ADC program as it must be administered under existing law reverses this policy and perpetuates unwholesome environments for the young.

"As the chairman of the Essex County Welfare Board says, the legislative investigation is in the public interest because it is 'bringing to light problems the public generally does not realize have existed * * * the way you get things corrected is with public interest.'

"Clearly here is an area where correction is needed, not primarily to prevent waste of public money, but to protect children from irresponsible parents."

There are good reasons for such alarm. This committee has been deluged by similar editorials and other news articles published throughout the entire State demanding reforms in the present administration of the ADC program in New Jersey.

Those who advocate the virtues of the ADC program, must also admonish it for the large number of illegitimate children bred in unwholesome environments sustained solely on income from ADC benefits. These children, thrust into sinful environments from birth through their most formative and impressive years, soon learn to adapt to the amoral environment of their home, adopting the ways and attitudes of their mother. Sooner or later, these children themselves, will present the same and other problems to society.

Caseworkers and those involved in the administration of ADC sincerely believe that the best and most satisfactory place for a child is with its mother, where at least some token of natural parental love and affection may be provided. The committee does not desire to refute this laudable objective, but many times in their desire to maintain these often unstable and unsatisfying mother-child relationships, they lose sight of the child's inherent rights as a human being to grow in a world free from great moral risks and harm. We believe that continued and repeated cases of illegitimate births is prima facie and conclusive evidence of a mother's unfitness to provide proper care for her family, and such children should be removed for their own protection and for the protection of society.

New Jersey has long recognized the rights of the child as the dominant factor in determining the custody and care of children, and the rights of parents to their children's custody cannot prevail if it imperils the personal safety, morals, health or happiness of the children. The welfare of the children is the paramount consideration, and to this principle even parental rights must yield.

These family situations demand remedial care far beyond the framework of continued ADC casework within the home. These mothers must be remanded to a public institution for as much time as may be required for their rehabilitation and further evaluation as to their fitness to resume a future home environment for their children. We must be willing to assume the added costs of caring for these children, at least temporarily, with foster care or institutional care as compared to home life assistance under ADC. We must also recognize that complete removal of children from their mothers will not be enough. To merely remove the children will give a greater freedom to the mother than she had perhaps ever known since the birth of her first illegitimate child and subsequent dependency on ADC. In short, termination of parental relationships must not act as a reward, or incentive to carry on further illicit relationships with foreknowledge that the results of such relationships will be borne as a public responsibility.

One alternative may be the establishment of child care centers where children may be given care for temporary periods of 60 to 90 days during which time the mother can be committed to jail as a repressive measure and as an opportunity of isolating both mother and children for a temporary period to permit psychological and psychiatric counselling. Release of the mother should be conditioned on terms determined by the court to provide for adequate care of the children when the fusal to carry out conditions imposed by the mother returns to maintain her home. Recourt should result in a permanent removal ment sufficient to deter repeated future of the children, and a sentence of commitviolations.

---

[70] Fifth public hearing (June 22, 1962) vol. 2, Atlantic City, N.J.

[71] Fourth public hearing (Feb. 2, 1962), Trenton, N.J.

[72] Second public hearing (Jan. 5, 1961), Paterson, N.J.

We feel these steps are necessary because the immorality which surrounds the conception of additional illegitimate children cannot be ignored; not as to its effect upon the children, their future welfare, their concept of family life, their evaluation of what is normal and abnormal, nor the damaging impression that ADC is a way of life which provides freedom from all care while the public endlessly provides for their every need.

RESIDENCY

In May of 1959, the ADC program as we know it today was transferred from State administration to the county welfare boards through appropriate legislation.

On January 1, 1960, this legislation became effective. The 1 year residency requirement formerly in effect for eligibility for ADC was abolished. This legislation was motivated by a humanitarian desire to provide immediate aid to children and their mothers when found in need, regardless of their circumstances or how long they had resided or had settlement in the State of New Jersey. The removal of all residency requirements for ADC, though laudable, has proven economically unsound and impractical.

Its impracticality arises from the fact that there is no uniformity in the amount of grants paid under ADC throughout the various States. Another important factor is that the majority of all other States maintain strict residency requirements before eligibility for ADC can be established. Many States, even after eligibility for ADC has been established, limit the amount of grants to statutory maximums far below grants received by families of comparable size on ADC in New Jersey. For instance, Florida has a maximum statutory limitation of only $81 per month per family; Delaware has a maximum statutory limitation of $150 per month regardless of the size of families or relative need. Other States have set maximum grants by regulation rather than statute. Tennessee pays a monthly maximum of $96; South Carolina, $99; Arkansas, $105; Alabama, $124; Georgia, $124; Louisiana, $141; West Virginia, $165; New Mexico, $170; Arizona, $173; Wyoming, $180; Oklahoma, $197; Maine, $225; Washington, $275.[73]

New Jersey has no maximum on monthly grants paid through ADC, but the September 1962 average family monthly grant was $175.16. The individual grant averaged $47.56 per person. But those States which have placed maximum grants such as Maine with $225 per month and Washington with $275 per month had average monthly grants per family of $104.93 and $154.01 per month, respectively. New Jersey is a leading State according to average size of family grants, exceeded only by New York at $183.92 and Illinois at $198.12. However, in average grant per recipient, New Jersey leads all other States.[74]

When the factors of easy eligibility, generous benefits, and complete absence of residency requirements are considered together with the fact that mass ecological changes have occurred from migrations of people from the Southern States to the more populous and industrial urban centers of the Northeast, the effects on our ADC and other assistance programs have not been minimized.

Today, transportation from one State to another is both inexpensive and easy to accomplish contributing to the influx of new families and individuals into New Jersey looking for better employment opportunities and living conditions not always available in less industrialized States. Most of these people are laborers and itinerant migratory farm and domestic workers. They consist of the unskilled labor force which always feels the immediate effects of any economic recession, large or small, often becoming dependent on public welfare for assistance, usually for entire families. These groups represent families with the most difficult problems of adjustment which may result in long-term chronic dependency involving casework far beyond the capabilities of our present existing resources.

Of further significance is the fact that Federal participation in aid under ADC in New Jersey is far less percentagewise than similar participation made under ADC programs to other States. For instance of the total grants made to recipients in Alabama, the Federal Government paid 82.3 percent, the State paid 17.6 percent, and local funds paid 0.1 percent.[75]

Comparatively, New Jersey receives approximately 44.1 percent from the Federal Government, with the State and counties equally contributing 56 percent.

This relatively smaller amount of Federal participation received by New Jersey under the ADC program is more reason why New Jersey should not be placed in a position of caring for needy families that should be the responsibility of the State from which they have migrated.

---

[73] U.S. Department of HEW payments to recipients by States (Nov. 8, 1962).

[74] U.S. Department of HEW Social Security Administration payments to recipients by States (Nov. 8. 1962).

[75] U.S. Department of HEW Social Security Administration expenditures by source of funds (May 18, 1962).

NOTE.—Includes medical vendor payments.

See also complete table by States.

Aid to dependent children: Expenditures for assistance to recipients, by source of funds, calendar year ended Dec. 31, 1961

[Amounts in thousands]

State	Total assistance, including vendor payments for medical care	Total, including vendor payments for medical care					
		Federal funds		State funds		Local funds	
		Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Total	$1,228,222	$713,375	58.1	$390,932	31.8	$123,915	10.1
Alabama	10,464	8,608	82.3	1,846	17.6	9	.1
Alaska	1,657	1,011	61.0	646	39.0		
Arizona	12,531	9,438	75.3	3,093	24.7		
Arkansas	5,058	4,145	82.0	913	18.0		
California	173,872	75,023	43.1	68,936	39.6	29,913	17.2
Colorado	12,529	7,842	62.6	2,208	17.6	2,479	19.8
Connecticut	18,222	7,825	42.9	10,397	57.1		
Delaware	2,113	1,583	74.9	265	12.5	265	12.5
District of Columbia	9,897	6,032	60.9	3,865	39.1		
Florida	17.714	14,588	82.4	3,126	17.6		
Georgia	16,824	13,055	77.6	3,096	18.4	673	4.0
Guam	131	66	50.0	66	50.0		
Hawaii	4,279	2,538	59.3	1,740	40.7		
Idaho	4,297	2,357	54.9	1,940	45.1		
Illinois	94,976	46,394	48.8	48,582	51.2		
Indiana	15,251	10,629	69.7	2,773	18.2		
Iowa	15,392	9,514	61.8	2,939	19.1	2,939	19.1
Kansas	11,072	6,514	58.8	2,193	19.8	2,365	21.4
Kentucky	22,269	17,211	77.3	5,058	22.7		
Louisiana	25,565	19,798	77.4	5,767	22.6		
Maine	6,823	5,170	75.8	800	11.7	853	12.
Maryland	15,509	10,599	68.3	4,122	26.6	788	5.1
Massachusetts	31,397	13,762	43.8	10,466	33.3	7,169	22.8
Michigan	47,416	25,893	54.6	19,703	41.6	1,819	3.8
Minnesota	20,322	9,684	47.7	5,421	26.7	5,217	25.7
Mississippi	8,893	7,321	82.3	1,572	17.7		
Missouri	$29,434	$21,730	73.8	$7,703	26.2		
Montana	2,953	1,843	62.4	839	28.4	$272	9.2
Nebraska	4,423	3,165	71.6	1,236	27.9	22	.5
Nevada	1,568	1,081	68.9	488	31.1		
New Hampshire	2,100	1,100	52.4	1,000	47.6		
New Jersey	36,015	15,871	44.1	10,072	28.0	10,072	28.0
New Mexico	11,737	8,198	69.8	3,539	30.2		
New York	164,831	77,857	47.2	43,933	26.7	43,042	26.1
North Carolina	27,356	21,712	79.4	3,113	11.4	2,531	9.3
North Dakota	3,415	1,895	55.5	1,212	35.5	308	9.0
Ohio	44,956	30,144	67.1	11,346	25.2	3,466	7.7
Oklahoma	27,490	18,639	67.8	8,851	32.2		
Oregon	12,637	6.199	49.1	4,507	35.7	1,931	15.3
Pennsylvania	94,883	62,604	66.0	32,279	34.0		
Puerto Rico	10,334	[1] 4,783	46.3	5,551	53.7		
Rhode Island	8,882	4,716	53.1	4,166	46.9		
South Carolina	6,393	5,265	82.4	1,128	17.6		
South Dakota	3,970	2,888	72.7	1,082	27.3		
Tennessee	18,860	15,229	80.7	2,904	15.4	726	3.9
Texas	17,530	14,138	80.7	3,392	19.3		
Utah	6,638	3,986	60.1	2,651	39.9		
Vermont	1,693	1,238	73.1	305	18.0	150	8.9
Virgin Islands	190	94	49.6	96	50.4		
Virginia	12,185	9,320	76.5	1,703	14.0	1,162	9.5
Washington	25,025	11,914	47.6	13,112	52.4		
West Virginia	28,398	21,683	76.4	6,713	23.6	3	(2)
Wisconsin	18,533	8,771	47.3	6,183	33.4	3,579	19.3
Wyoming	1,322	713	53.9	297	22.5	313	23.5

[1] Amount less than 50 percent because for the fiscal year 1961 half of the total expenditures exceeded the statutory limitation on the aggregate amount of Federal funds for all programs that can be made available for a fiscal year under present legislation; accordingly expenditures from Federal funds comprised less than half the total for the period January–June 1961.

[2] Less than 0.05 percent.

Aid to families with dependent children: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, September 1962[1] *(includes vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments)*

State	Number of families	Number of recipients		Payments to recipients		
		Total [2]	Children	Total amount	Average per— Family	Average per— Recipient
Total [3,4]	925,179	3,633,155	2,810,053	$114,373,330	$123.62	$31.48
Alabama	21,832	88,507	69,588	987,032	45.21	11.14
Alaska	1,226	4,257	3,214	133,888	109.21	31.45
Arizona	9,169	37,923	29,339	1,128,151	123.04	29.75
Arkansas	6,092	23,322	17,954	378,697	62.16	16.24
California [4]	86,183	325,391	250,278	14,263,843	165.51	43.84
Colorado	8,908	34,655	27,329	1,220,104	136.97	35.21
Connecticut [3]	11,142	40,795	30,916	1,898,060	170.35	46.53
Delaware [3]	1,907	8,048	6,309	173,761	91.12	21.59
District of Columbia	4,615	21,264	17,025	700,040	151.69	32.92
Florida	26,871	100,419	80,327	1,675,603	62.36	16.69
Georgia	16,282	60,988	47,398	1,411,573	86.70	23.15
Guam	175	922	765	11,259	64.34	12.21
Hawaii [3]	3,074	12,645	10,100	459,440	149.46	36.33
Idaho	2,448	9,353	6,948	387,822	158.42	41.46
Illinois [3,4]	58,597	254,815	199,635	11,608,974	198.12	45.56
Indiana [4]	12,306	46,827	35,678	1,326,436	107.79	28.33
Iowa	10,232	38,473	29,170	1,484,993	145.13	38.60
Kansas	6,636	25,781	20,542	971,552	146.41	37.68
Kentucky	21,535	77,410	58,192	1,952,370	90.66	25.22
Louisiana [4]	21,844	89,705	69,966	2,166,554	99.18	24.15
Maine	5,956	21,336	15,859	624,964	104.93	29.29
Maryland [3,4]	12,180	51,723	40,934	1,633,116	134.08	31.57
Massachusetts [3]	19,230	67,242	50,648	3,124,404	162.48	46.47
Michigan	33,104	119,619	88,288	4,586,083	138.54	38.34
Minnesota	11,327	39,861	31,310	1,878,170	165.81	47.12
Mississippi	20,299	79,890	62,829	726,863	35.81	9.10
Missouri	26,552	104,024	79,572	$2,533,746	$95.43	$24.36
Montana	1,846	7,170	5,599	244,287	132.33	34.07
Nebraska	3,211	12,771	9,904	376,677	117.31	29.49
Nevada	1,215	4,440	3,563	131,381	108.13	29.59
New Hampshire	983	3,930	3,020	162,120	164.92	41.25
New Jersey	21,527	79,277	60,489	3,770,759	175.16	47.56
New Mexico [4]	7,358	29,031	22,459	913,045	124.09	31.45
New York [3]	86,380	358,294	275,816	15,887,353	183.92	44.34
North Carolina [3,4]	26,857	106,152	82,313	2,352,877	87.61	22.17
North Dakota	1,743	6,610	5,189	270,558	155.23	40.93
Ohio	35,578	141,843	108,705	4,145,592	116.52	29.23
Oklahoma [3,4]	18,752	68,871	52,707	2,326,429	124.06	33.78
Oregon [3,4]	7,303	26,940	20,553	1,024,011	140.22	38.01
Pennsylvania [3]	69,027	280,367	214,488	9,008,266	130.50	32.13
Puerto Rico	57,044	228,604	184,021	837,707	14.69	3.66
Rhode Island [3]	5,027	19,090	14,567	774,948	154.16	40.59
South Carolina	8,328	33,406	26,696	480,396	57.68	14.38
South Dakota	2,828	10,045	7,662	314,066	111.06	31.27
Tennessee	21,921	82,843	63,280	1,534,681	70.01	18.53
Texas	19,328	80,336	61,312	1,529,533	79.14	19.04
Utah [3,4]	3,963	15,264	11,677	523,975	132.22	34.33
Vermont	1,327	4,776	3,580	144,529	108.91	30.26
Virgin Islands	314	1,079	907	17,583	56.00	16.30
Virginia [4]	10,396	42,599	33,501	1,031,074	99.18	24.20
Washington	11,150	39,682	30,518	1,717,182	154.01	43.27
West Virginia [3]	30,442	120,949	93,920	3,441,888	113.06	28.46
Wisconsin [4]	10,827	40,490	31,146	1,853,423	171.19	45.77
Wyoming	782	3,011	2,348	111,492	142.57	37.03

[1] For definition of terms see the Bulletin, October 1957, p. 18. All data subject to revision.

[2] Includes as recipients the children and 1 parent or other adult relative in families in which the requirements of at least 1 such adult were considered in determining the amount of assistance.

[3] Includes data on aid to families with dependent children, unemployed parent segment; see table 6.

[4] Includes data on foster-family care; see table 7.

But it is virtually impossible to ascertain with any degree of certainty or accuracy the impact on ADC of these disparities which exist between the several States. However, the majority of witnesses testifying before the committee indicated a preference for the reestablishment of residency requirements as well as some period of permanent employment in New Jersey prior to eligibility being granted for any form of public assistance. The following testimony by Mr. Sidney Adlman, director of public welfare for the city of Paterson, N.J., is illustrative:

BY MR. RICHMAN

Question. "Now, when does the field investigation start?"

Answer. "After the eligibility of the applicant is established, it is turned over to the investigator for a home visit."

Question. "When do the payments start?"

Answer. "Under the statute, it is supposed to start immediately. Our department is supposed to give, and investigate after. We are the only program that must give immediately without investigation."

Question. "Do you think that's a good policy?"

Answer. "Definitely not."

Question. "What would you suggest in place of it?"

Answer. "I would suggest that in order not to be in conflict with the bureau's plan with the Government, we have a plan filed which has been accepted by the social security administration. It is a matchable program. There should be a 30-day work record to indicate that the man has worked at least 30 days before he is eligible for relief, before his application is accepted, because there has been a tremendous amount of criticism by the public about the people who come here and get off a bus or a plane and walk into the relief department and demand relief immediately and you have to give it to them because the statute says that any person who is found to be in need must receive immediate aid. That statute should be revised, studied, or simplified * * *. As a member of the mayor's review committee, established in 1959, we went through all this and in 1960 the welfare directors of the six largest cities in the State seemed to be in accord with that opinion.

"Under the statute as it is now, the eligibility for relief is very simple, but it gives the commissioner of the department of institutions the authority under the statute to interpret how that statute shall be best applied, with the methods of procedures that are laid down by the commissioner who has the authority to lay down policy, and he may do it by policy."

Question. "What are the present standards of eligibility?"

Answer. "Well, a person must be in need and he must be examined as to whether or not he has any resources—any future resources or present resources. We also interview or contact relatives who under the statute are responsible relatives who could help the family."

Question. "That's all done after he's declared eligible?"

Answer. "He is eligible the minute he declares he's in need. He comes in the office and he says, 'I have no food, my children have no milk, you've got to take care of it.' Immediately you've got to put the fire out."

Question. "Have you during your tenure come across any cases that have come into Paterson from other States in the Union where it has developed that they came here specifically for the purpose of getting on relief?"

Answer. "Oh, yes. I had a woman here about 4 or 5 months ago. She went down South to one State down there and she brought up her daughter with four or five children, and I sent for this woman and I said, 'You brought your daughter up here for the purpose of getting relief.' She took her in her home—she was on relief herself, the mother. I said, 'You're going to go back, and if you don't go back I'm going to make a complaint against you.' Well, they haggled for about a week or 10 days, and she finally said, 'All right, we'll go back,' and we gave her $25 for gas and oil and food and they went back.

Question. "Did it develop that they came to Paterson because Paterson was a so-called easy city to get relief out of?"

Answer. "That's right. Our relief program is considered one of the most generous programs in New Jersey. Down South they get $7 a child and up here they get $30 a child. It makes quite a difference. I have had them tell me that. They don't get enough down there. That's why I suggested the work program, and you'll find you will cut down the applications for relief from other States and they won't be bouncing in here so frequently."

Question. "Have you ever developed in questioning or interviewing a relief applicant that they came here to Paterson or New Jersey, as the case may be, because they were told down South, or wherever they came from that they could get more money on relief up here than they could down there?"

Answer. "Only from the person who made the application. I asked him, 'Why did you come here? They have a relief department down there too. They have to take care of you.' 'Well, down there, they only give you $7.' The applicant told me that.[78]"

Until such time as some degree of uniformity has been achieved between the various States in size of grants and eligibility standards for relief assistance this committee believes that residency requirements must be reenacted by the legislature, not to deprive legitimate families found in need of assistance, but for the simple reason of self-protection against discriminating practices of other States which too often tend to encourage migration to States where welfare services and grants are more attractive. In the first 9 months following abolition of our residency requirements for ADC, 177 new cases were added who had less than 1 year residence in New Jersey. These cases become permanent relief cases and their number will grow each year.

---

[78] Second public hearing (Jan. 5, 1961) Paterson, N.J.

HOUSING AND RENTS

Living conditions under which the average ADC recipient family lives were found inadequate and often lacking even elementary sanitation and health protection. Rents paid by ADC grants are unlimited and excessive. Evidence gathered by the committee substantially corroborates the fact that no control in rental payments exists, and that supervision and inspection of facilities rented by ADC recipients is almost nonexistent.

Many such facilities can best be described as hovels where rents are charged on a weekly basis, often exceeding $100 per month.[77] Landlords consistently refuse to maintain minimum standards of decency and health. Unquestionably some specialize in buying slum properties at cheap prices and rent them exclusively to welfare clients at exorbitant rates. Local health inspectors try to enforce minimum housing standards, but are often overwhelmed by the sheer inertia of both landlord and tenants. Only the most flagrant violations are corrected, and then after periodic warnings and repeated threats of prosecution. Typical of these conditions is the testimony of a Passaic County detective who investigated some apartments rented by ADC clients and photographed the premises at the committee's request.[78]

BY MR. RICHMAN

Question. "Detective DiSimone, what is your position?"

Answer. "County detective, county of Passaic."

Question. "Now in your capacity as a detective did you investigate the premises (under discussion with the last witness)?"

Answer. "Yes, sir."

Question. "Will you tell us the results of your investigations and * * * the condition of the inside of the apartment?"

Answer. "It was in an extremely overcrowded, filthy condition. The kitchen—completely overcrowded. There was a gas burner that supplied the heat. The walls were in a state of disrepair. There was no covering on the floor. It appeared it hadn't been painted in many, many years. The one bedroom was cluttered up with furniture so that there was only about a 3-foot space running down the center of the room.

Question. "In your opinion, Detective, is this apartment fit for human habitation?"

Answer. "Definitely not." [79]

Another landlord who claimed to be the owner of a realty corporation in Mercer County admitted to the ownership of 18 or more different properties which with few exceptions were rented exclusively to ADC clients. One frame duplex building located in a slum area contained seven families who paid the following rents:

Two rooms and bath—$80 month.

Two room and bath—$70 month (kitchen shared with another tenant).

Four rooms and bath—$110 month (kitchen shared with another tenant).

Two rooms and bath—$110 month.

Two rooms and bath—$60 month.

Two rooms—$60 month (bath and kitchen shared with another tenant).

One room—$15 week (bath and kitchen shared with another tenant).

All of these apartments are occupied by ADC families. The cost of this building was approximately $20,000. The landlord pays annual taxes of almost $300. His gross income here is $6,600 annually, and after all expenses, he admits to a net return of approximately $4,560; a net return of approximately 20 percent on his investment. In 4½ years, this landlord received enough net income to completely amortize the entire cost of his original investment of $20,000. When questioned about these rentals, he gave the following testimony:

BY MR. RICHMAN

Question. "Hasn't anybody from the Welfare Department ever suggested to you that these rentals are too high and that they should be reduced?"

Answer. "Upon trying to rent the apartments, yes, they have."

Question. "But you have not made any reductions?"

Answer. "No, I don't think I have."

Question. "Of course, the tenants are not interested because they are not paying the rent anyway; isn't that so?"

Answer. "Right."

Question. "You haven't had too much controversy with the Welfare Department about how much these rentals should be, have you?"

Answer. "No."

Question. "Now, in fixing these rentals, did you take into account the fact that due to this grade condition (below ground) some of these properties are flooded during rainy periods, and also did you take into account the fact that the heating equipment was antiquated and the baths and kitchens were shared * * * Was that all taken into account in fixing these rentals."

Answer. "In one instance, yes."

Question. "And even in view of all these facts, it is your opinion that these are fair rental prices for these properties?"

Answer. "According to my investment, yes, I feel that way." [80]

In order to ascertain the condition of these properties, a staff investigator inspected the premises, and his testimony is sufficiently descriptive in this regard:

BY MR. RICHMAN

Question. "Can you describe to me the nature and condition of these properties and tell me when you were there?"

Answer. "I was there last year during the summer and the condition of the properties was very dirty. They were stinking. In one of the downstairs apartments especially it was so bad that every time you tried to talk the flies would fly all around your mouth, very bad."

Question. "What was the condition of the paint and the upkeep of the properties?"

Answer. "Dirty."

Question. "Did it look to you like these properties have been painted once a year?"

Answer. "No, sir."

Question. "What was the condition of the screens, if any?"

Answer. "There were none."

Question. "There were none?"

Question. "What was the condition of the bathrooms?"

Answer. "Very dirty."

Question. "What kind of fixtures, modern, old?"

Answer. "No, they were old fixtures."

Question. "How about the kitchens?"

Answer. "The kitchens were running true to form with the rest of the apartments."

Question. "How about the equipment in the kitchens, was it old or new?"

Answer. "Well, the people more or less had to share what was in the apartments with each other and what they had wasn't much for what they were paying."

Question. "Did you have any occasion to observe any flooding or any water in any of these apartments?"

Answer. "There was no flooding when we were there. I talked to the clients who were living at the places and they complained of it and in one downstairs apartment I was advised that about a week before I got there, somebody from the Board of Health had come there and advised them to take the wiring from along the floor board and put it up along the ceiling on account of shocks going across the floor." [81]

Although rents for these properties are often exorbitant, and the property is run down and deteriorated, the entire blame cannot be placed on the landlords alone. Frequently ADC tenants fail to adhere to even minimal housekeeping standards of sanitation and cleanliness. They take little interest in their surroundings.[82] The fact that rents are paid by ADC does not provide sufficient incentive to conserve and maintain the property with even minimal housekeeping standards. Families become destructive. They abuse the property, necessitating constant repairs and costly maintenance. Yet no supervision or control is exercised by welfare officials to minimize these conditions, nor to negotiate for more reasonable and equitable rent payments. The testimony of Mr. Sidney Adlman, Director of Municipal Welfare in Paterson, N.J., reflects these conditions:

BY SENATOR GROSSI

Question. "So the only variable thing is the rent?"

Answer. "Yes. The rent is variable because in New Jersey—to me, it's an awful hard thing to understand, how a tenant can go out and obligate a welfare department, without the consent of the welfare department, without them even knowing about it, to pay any rental that they see fit."

Question. "In other words, a prospective relief client—if they come in and tell you that their rent is $125 a month, even if that were a hovel, you would pay it?"

Answer. "You have to pay it under the present rules and regulations, but in Pennsylvania they have a schedule and they budget rent the same as they do food. They put it down. I have interrogated the Pennsylvania Department, and I have here their printed manual. Here it is. In Pennsylvania they have a maximum rent of about $57 a month for five or more people, and I maintain that if we budget our rent in New Jersey, the same as they do in Pennsylvania and many other States, these landlords that rent the rat holes will take the $57 if they know they can't get any more."

Question. "In your opinion, much of the rent you are paying on the basis of $25, $30, or $35 a week is exorbitant and unwarranted?"

Answer. "It is way out of line. When I was State chairman of the board of control in this city in 1955 and 1956 these places were getting $18 and $20 a month."

Question. "For the same places today you are paying as much as $25 a week or $100 a month."

Answer. "It's more than $100. It's four weeks and a third. That's $108 a month, without utilities. These are cold water flats and they are in the most dilapidated condition and they'd be glad to take $57 a month."

Question. "Some of these families that are on relief, do any of them receive household aid? By that I mean, does the relief department send somebody there to take care of the house, clean the house, etc."

Answer. "No, the relief department doesn't do that. There is a monthly visit. The statute provides that there shall be one visit a month in the home and the investigators have been instructed, if they see the place in filthy and unkept, to talk to them and persuade them in a kindly way to see that the place is kept clean for the benefit of their children and themselves, and in some instances there is some improvement." [83]

---

[77] See plate no. I.

[78] See plate No. II.

[79] Second public hearing (Jan. 5, 1961), Paterson, N.J.

[80] Fourth Public Hearing (Feb. 2, 1962), Trenton, N.J.

[81] Ibid.

[82] See plates III and IV.

[83] Second public hearing (Jan. 5, 1961), Paterson, N.J.

Presently there is no statutory limit on rents applicable to people on relief, nor are there any regulations pertaining to, or controlling rental payments in New Jersey. Also a review of current law in our State does not indicate that any implied power exists on the part of the commissioner to promulgate rules or regulations in this respect, and county welfare directors are completely devoid of any powers sufficient to exert control and regulation over landlords and their ADC tenants. The need for a clearly expressed public policy in this area is apparent. Statutory limits similar to those in effect in other States for rental of housing facilities should be enacted. This committee can see no reason why recipients of public assistance should be given carte blanche freedom to spend public funds without restraint.

In many cases it may be more feasible to purchase facilities for ADC clients. Where an equitable ownership already exists in property when a client becomes eligible, mortgage payments are usually continued and the committee feels this practice should be continued. However, statutory lien provisions must be provided to safeguard the repayment of ADC grants whenever the client is able to do so in the future, or in the event the property is sold.

Each county welfare director should be empowered by law to utilize liens on both real and personal property on all cases where grants are made under any program of relief in New Jersey. Also, the usual means of enforcing and collecting any moneys due, from agreements or otherwise, should be made available including wage attachments and garnishments.

In addition to poor housing conditions and high rents, many ADC families are victimized by unscrupulous purveyors who offer goods and merchandise, not without awareness that these people are on relief, but in spite of it, offering an almost endless and unlimited credit on "easy" weekly or monthly terms. Without exception, every case investigated by this committee owned relatively new, and often expensive, television sets, and other appliances. Many had private telephone lines, often the latest model princess telephone in colors, while others, in addition to their private telephones, had extension phones, all totally unnecessary to their maintenance and the care of their children.

The incongruity of such apparent luxury in the midst of living conditions which can at best be described as bodering on poverty is difficult to explain and leads the committee to believe that more can be demanded by way of money management and prudence than has been evidenced by the facts uncovered by this committee.

FRAUDS

Fraud is defined as trickery and deceit characterized by the cheat and imposter. Legally, it is an intentional perversion of the truth achieved by deception, guile, subtlety, craftiness, and shams obtaining from another that which rightfully belongs to another. The incidence of fraud in ADC, while not easily ascertainable, is of sufficient proportion that it cannot go unnoticed.

Of greatest frequency are mothers cohabiting with men, sometimes their legal husbands, more often itinerant paramours. If cash income is received from these male members of the household, and not reported to the welfare authorities, it is a clear case of fraud. However, unless ADC benefits are received because a husband is unable to work or other special reason, under the conditions of ADC, a man should not be part of the household. This is another form of fraud, and it must be questioned that if the man is not contributing to the support of the family, is ADC contributing to the support of the man?

Other cases of frauds involve mothers working while the children are cared for by babysitters or other women in the neighborhood; mothers collecting income while on ADC from unemployment compensation or other insurance benefits not known to the caseworker; and still others receiving income from their allegedly deserting husbands whose whereabouts are supposedly unknown. Some mothers have been found to be known prostitutes with police records dating back several years, yet they manage to retain custody of their illegitimate children and remain eligible for ADC payments. But, by far, the two greatest abuses center on unlawful cohabitation of mothers on ADC with boyfriends or paramours, and intentional failure to report earned income from working while supposedly at home caring for their children.

Large urban areas account for a greater frequency of fraud cases than usually found in more rural areas, but this is easily understood when we consider that most ADC recipients are clustered in the larger industrial towns and municipalities.

Many cases of fraud were practiced openly and flagrantly. This committee believes that the high incidence of fraud among ADC cases can be effectively curtailed, and in most cases eliminated; but this responsibility cannot be left to the caseworker alone and combined with his or her many other basic responsibilities. The practice of fraud is a criminal act, necessitating police intervention, investigation and eventual prosecution. In this regard, the ADC program has been completely devoid of police investigatory procedures. Decisions as to whether such clients should be prosecuted are often left to the discretion of the county welfare director, who may or may not report the clients to the county prosecutor for investigation and court litigation. It is clear that some system must be developed whereby separate investigations can be conducted independent and apart from the usual routine work of the social caseworker and where suspected cases of fraud can be uncovered and properly reported for legal disposition. Statutory provisions must be enacted to provide a clear legislative mandate to all State agencies servicing ADC and other relief clients for an exchange of information and review of all files pertaining to clients under investigation. This will facilitate discovery and evaluation of all known facts regarding all ADC and other families and individuals receiving relief, whether such relief is from the State or county.

Consider the following case uncovered by this committee which is typical of the many conditions under which fraud is practiced, sometimes openly, and other times with cunning and deceit.

This man was arrested by police for causing a disturbance in the home of a relief client who later turned out to be his wife. When arrested he gave a sworn statement to the police as follows:

"I am willing to take care of my wife. I come over and visit her every Friday, and I give her $25 to $35 every week. Sometimes Fridays she comes to see me (at my home) for the money. In fact she is supposed to come see me tonight, but instead I saw her last night, February 1, 1962, and at her house I found a man with some wine bottles and a fight started and the man * * * got cut. I heard that this man is my wife's boy friend. I am willing to take my children and wife to Ocean City to support them. I make $1.75 an hour and my job is year round. I told my wife this and she stated that she would think about it. She told me the reason she didn't want to come was because she was getting more from State aid. We have been in Atlantic City for 4 years. Five children were born in Florence, S.C., and three children were born here."

This man's wife and eight children have been receiving $350 a month in addition to $35 a week allegedly contributed by the husband. The county welfare board had no knowledge of the $35 per week contribution, and when confronted with this information, the client denied ever receiving it. The husband had two eyewitnesses to confirm his statement, and the fact that she had been seen in his company in Ocean City. When this client was asked by the committee if she had ever seen her husband, she denied it, saying that she would not be allowed to collect her welfare check if she had seen him. At that time she also denied being pregnant with another child. However, in December of 1962, another investigation of this client revealed she had given birth to another child fathered by her boyfriend from Philadelphia. Her grant had been increased to $371 per month.

Mothers on ADC have a duty and obligation to care for their children as the sole purpose of ADC grants is to enable the mother to provide exclusively for the care and custody of her children. In fact, payment made to these mothers for the care of their children creates a fiduciary relationship in which the mother acts not only as custodian of the children, but also as a custodian of public funds. Where a pregnancy occurs, it must be assumed that only one of two things could have happened—the mother either abandoned the home and children to cohabit with a man outside the home, or she invited the man to cohabit with her in her home and the home of the children.

Every witness interviewed by this committee had clear and certain knowledge that resumption of family life with her husband or spouse would result in termination of their monthly checks. Without exception witnesses testified that they would report their husbands to the welfare board if they tried to return to their family, and it was clear that their sole reason for so testifying was their fear of losing their ADC grant.

However, they seemed to believe that cohabitation with others even though resulting in the birth of a child was within the rules of the game. Again and again witnesses testified openly and freely of their affairs and their paramours without apparent fear that their illicit relationships would jeopardize their ADC benefits. Apparently these women believe that as long as a man does not remain in the house on a permanent basis as a member of the household, his transitory presence is permitted. The results of this fraud are reflected in the following illegitimacy schedule which indicates the status of the mother when the child was born and whether such child was legitimate or illegitimate.

Number of children by legitimacy status[81] *and by ADC status of mother when child was born*

	Total children	ADC status of mother when child was born		
		Mothers receiving ADC	Mothers not receiving ADC	Unknown
Total	52, 507	5, 544	46, 461	502
Legitimate	33, 216	2, 258	30, 556	402
Illegitimate	19, 116	3, 261	15, 755	100
Unknown	175	25	150	--------

[81] 1961 Biennial Statistical Report, revised June 1962.

Even the above figures may be misleading as many children, though classified as "legitimate" were probably conceived illegitimately, their conception having taken place after the legal husband had deserted the family, but these children are given a presumption of legitimacy.

Construing these figures in the most favorable light, more mothers while receiving ADC gave birth to illegitimate children than mothers who gave birth to legitimate children.

There is sufficient indicia here alone to indicate 3,261 incidents of illegal cohabitation with intent to deceive and defraud.

In the case files of another client there appeared a letter written by the mother to the children's grandmother describing her trip to Georgia in September 1961. Her testimony is a sordid tale of gambling, floating card games, drinking, and prostitution. The letter tells of her travels through the South, and particularly through Georgia, and how much money she has made. She also states that she will return home prior to the time her ADC check is mailed, but that she wants to return to the South as soon as possible to make more money. This client had been arrested for shoplifting on several occasions and convicted, paying fines of $25 to $100. There is some evidence that this client is also a user of narcotics. Although this woman has been consistently on relief on ADC since the birth of her four illegitimate children, she has never reported any earned income to the welfare board. Nor has she ever reported that she constantly consorts with various other men who assist her in the support of her children.

Typical of the more flagrant cases of fraud, but by no means an isolated case, was that of the woman with four illegitimate children by four different putative fathers who received a grant of $221 a month while supposedly at home caring for her illegitimate children. Her testimony admits not only the receipt of ADC relief, but the fact that she was working concurrently while receiving these relief payments, and when not working also collected unemployment compensation. She has a past police record for shoplifting, and had been confined in the New Jersey State Home for Girls.

The cases of fraud enumerated in this report are typical of many cases found throughout the State during the committee's investigations. The incidence of fraud has been found to be fairly substantial, but varies in both kind and degree. It cannot be expected that some degree of fraud will not always exist in a public program involving the expenditures of many millions of dollars each year, but there has been a breakdown in investigative procedures, as well as followups on prosecutions to the extent that in many cases fraud has been practiced openly and flagrantly. Oftentimes when fraud is uncovered or suspected, welfare officials show a tendency to prefer working with the mothers in the hope that they will change their habits rather than refer such matters to the prosecutor's office for action. As a result, fraudulent practices have persisted, where more coercive action may have curtailed them. The committee recommends a greater use of law-enforcement procedures by social workers and welfare officials when fraud is suspected or uncovered.

Another factor bearing heavily on fraud is the nearly complete absence of any requirement for field surveillance of recipients to ascertain their continued eligibility for ADC. Since 1941, the Federal agency (HEW) which supervises the program has only required States and localities to carry out its own approved administrative review procedure amounting to no more than an office paper check on eligibility.

This was dramatically pointed out by recent investigations conducted by Senator ROBERT C. BYRD of West Virginia in the District of Columbia which uncovered an incidence of fraud making ineligible for ADC payments approximately 60 percent of all recipients of ADC in the District. In later hearings, Bernard W. Scholz, Chief of the District Public Assistance Division admitted that the system of checking on eligibility needs to be revised drastically, and that the findings "have amply demonstrated that the various review procedures both on our level and on the Federal level which rely on the case record are inadequate * * * You cannot determine from the desk what the actual situation is * * * we will need a field investigation to back up what we find in the record."[55]

Of particular significance to New Jersey is the fact that between December of 1956 and December of 1961, the total number of ADC recipients on a national basis increased by approximately 47 percent, while in New Jersey this increase amounted to 214 percent; the highest increase in ADC recorded for any State in the Union, followed by the District of Columbia with 170 percent increase. The following chart indicates percentage increase or decrease during this period.

PERCENTAGE INCREASE (OR DECREASE) IN THE NUMBER GETTING AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN—DECEMBER 1956 AND DECEMBER 1961[56]

State:	*Percent change*
Alabama	10
Alaska	—8
Arizona	89
Arkansas	—11
California	81
Colorado	43
Connecticut	47
Delaware	47
District of Columbia	170
Florida	19
Georgia	17
Hawaii	—16
Idaho	47
Illinois	95
Indiana	44
Iowa	43
Kansas	47
Kentucky	15
Louisiana	16
Maine	37
Maryland	70
Massachusetts	43
Michigan	64
Minnesota	40
Mississippi	75
Missouri	43
Montana	1
Nebraska	22
Nevada	145
New Hampshire	26
New Jersey	214
New Mexico	26
New York	43
North Carolina	47
North Dakota	16
Ohio	97
Oklahoma	31
Oregon	126
Pennsylvania	93
Rhode Island	42
South Carolina	17
South Dakota	14
Tennessee	23
Texas	—13
Utah	36
Vermont	32
Virginia	27
Washington	8
West Virginia	16
Wisconsin	40
Wyoming	30
United States	47

CASEWORKERS

More than any other individual involved in the administration of our ADC program, the caseworker represents the pivotal point whereby success and failure may be accurately measured.

The Federal Government recommends that caseworkers be assigned to no more than 60 family cases. This estimate is based on maximum efficiency of the caseworker's ability to deal effectively with the personal problems of families with children deprived of parental support.

To assist such families and promote their daily routines into constructive and socially acceptable patterns, the caseworker must deal with a host of varied problems which may include housing, education, health needs, sanitation, child delinquency, abnormal child behavioral patterns, and illiteracy. They must simultaneously contend with the immoral attitude of mothers; their illicit relations with putative fathers who exist at best as shadowy figures hovering somewhere near the family circle; and the birth of illegitimate children giving rise to a whole set of new and often antagonistic emotional problems causing upset to an already unstable family relationship in groups where the word "family" retains only vestigial residuary meaning.

In addition, she is called upon to ferret out the frauds and the cheats whose cunning and craftiness have qualified them for ADC benefits rather than a measure of need for the protection of abandoned children.

She is expected to do all this between the hours of 8 to 4:30 from Monday through Friday, week in and week out.

Successes are seldom acclaimed. Failures receive publicity. In spite of all this we manage to retain a group of dedicated and loyal people who often receive less in pay than some of their clients receive from their monthly ADC relief grants.

The story of good casework needs to be told for the elementary facts are that we in New Jersey have accorded the caseworker neither the respect they rightfully earn, nor the monetary incentives for which they are qualified. It is not surprising therefore to find that public welfare has become the training ground for young college graduates who soon disappear into the ranks of private welfare agencies where pay is much higher and the rewards of working with more promising families both fruitful and satisfying.

There need be established statewide a minimum beginning salary with regular increments and promotions for all social caseworkers employed in public welfare.

Caseloads per worker must be decreased more in line with the Federal recommendation of 60 per worker.

Leadership must be exerted to effect an affirmative and positive program which has reasonable means of reaching and retaining qualified caseworkers by providing attractive salaries with workable caseloads and such leadership can best be exemplified by our legislature itself, providing the means and wherewithal to achieve these desired objectives.

The most regrettable experience with which this committee was confronted was a petition signed by every caseworker in one of our major counties outlining a whole list of complaints from low salaries to other inadequacies of major import. Investigation of these complaints corroborated their truth. An example of such conditions is illustrated by salaries and caseloads of workers employed in Atlantic County.

ATLANTIC COUNTY

Temporary caseworkers

Services to Apr. 1, 1962:	*Salary*
2 years, 2 months	$3, 120
2 years	3, 120
11 years, 4 months	3, 420
2 years, 3 months	3, 120
2 years, 3 months	3, 120
2 years	3, 120
2 years, 3 months	3, 120
2 years, 3 months	3, 120

---

[55] U.S. Senate budget hearings, Aug. 8, 1952.

[56] Computations based on data in Social Security Bulletin, Annual Statistical Supplement, 1956, table 38, p. 68, and the same, April 1962, table 24, p. 42.

NOTE.—Calculations excluded data on the temporary program of ADC for unemployed parents.

Permanent caseworkers

11 months	$3,120
4 years, 11 months	3,240
5 months	3,120
4 years, 9 months	3,240
1 month	3,120
3 years, 3 months	3,240
28 years, 9 months	4,080
21 years	3,540
17 years, 3 months	3,420
7 years, 7 months	3,420
5 years	3,120

Special worker on property and resources supervisors

2 years, 3 months	$3,840
19 years, 3 months	4,200
15 years, 9 months	4,080
3 years, 7 months	4,080

Just as surprising is the fact that rural counties having less relief caseloads than usually found in the urban industrial counties usually pay more than the urban county where need is greatest.

What must be realized by the public, our news media, and our legislators at both State and county levels and all other responsible citizens who are concerned with rising relief costs is that good casework, at manageable levels is not a cost expenditure, but an investment, which, properly applied, will result in the savings of thousands of dollars, not to mention the savings which accrue from the reconstruction and salvaging of whole families often comprising the lives of many individuals.

A recent survey of county facilities and social casework programs reveals no positive efforts are in effect to accomplish family stability and familial rehabilitation. To date we have merely supplied money grants to families afflicted by breakdowns substituting for assistance a form of paternalism which in the absence of adequate supervision, has often aided and encouraged the very evils we hope to obviate through ADC.

Much is needed by way of rehabilitation, more intensive casework, education, training, and the development of individual and family traits leading toward self-dependency and self-pride, which is altogether lacking in today's administration of ADC in New Jersey.

The committee believes that a balanced program, operating with sufficient legal and social deterrents commingled with policies of planned rehabilitation and guidance, utilizing all community resources, can achieve that end which we all seek through the administration of public relief in New Jersey, namely; that no person truly in need must suffer from want.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A reading of the foregoing report will indicate that suggestions for change and improvement are self-evident, and it is not the intention of the committee to reiterate at this point those suggestions.

A careful consideration of the evidence produced before it, both verbal and documentary, and consideration of the existing law, leads the committee to recommend the following legislative enactments:

1. That the residency requirements abolished by the act transferring the ADC program to the counties in 1959 be reenacted so as to provide a minimum period of 1 year residency for ADC and all other programs of relief in New Jersey. Temporary relief should be available immediately through the general assistance programs, which should be limited to 30-day periods which may be renewed at the discretion of county and municipal welfare directors.

Current settlement and residency requirements are outmoded and consist of a patchwork of public laws which are conflicting and ambiguous. The committee recommends that title 44 covering poor relief laws and other statutes affecting residency and settlement requirements be completely revised by the Law Revision Committee so that some uniformity and clarity can be accomplished in this area.

2. Statutory maximum should be enacted for all recipients of ADC and those maximums should apply regardless of the size of the family involved. The committee is of the opinion that the sum of $300 per month is an adequate and proper maximum.

3. County welfare directors should be required and empowered to attach all real property of each recipient and his or her legally responsible relatives, whenever the total amount paid to any recipient exceeds $500.

4. County welfare directors should be required and empowered to attach all personal property of each recipient and his or her legally responsible relatives, whenever the total amount paid to any recipient exceeds $500, except where such attachment would affect and diminish the ability of the person affected to earn his or her livelihood, or would otherwise result in undue hardship.

5. Voluntary agreements for support should be given the effect of law or be eliminated altogether in favor of consent orders signed by a judge of a court of competent jurisdiction.

6. A referee should be appointed by the assignment judge in each county to examine and reexamine all cases of support orders and support agreements. An investigator should be assigned to assist the referee for purposes of making investigations and preparing necessary reports on the basis of such investigations as directed by the referee.

7. A separate staff should be established in each prosecutor's office whose principal purpose would be locating deserting fathers and putative fathers; the pressing of complaints whenever appropriate and the collection of all delinquent accounts resulting from breach of support orders and agreements.

8. Each recipient should be required to furnish, at the commencement of payment, and at each 6-month interval thereafter, a statement setting forth all income, earned or received, and the source thereof. The failure to furnish such a statement, or the falsification of any material fact contained therein, either by commission or omission, should be declared to be a misdemeanor.

9. Whenever, in the judgment of county welfare directors, a recipient of relief has:

(a) So conducted herself as to demonstrate an inability to budget and manage her affairs so as to regularly feed and properly care for her child or children; or,

(b) On one or more occasions absented herself from her child or children for periods of 12 hours or more without providing for their adequate care or supervision; or,

(c) Given birth to an illegitimate child; or,

(d) Unreasonably obligated herself by pledging her credit; or,

(e) Habitually frequenting establishments where alcoholic beverages are sold, or,

(f) Habitually indulge in the use of alcoholic beverages or narcotics, or,

(g) Conducted herself in a dissolute and immoral manner, no sums in excess of $25 per month shall be paid to such recipient.

In lieu of such suspended payments, the county welfare director shall issue to such recipient vouchers of an equal or lesser dollar value as he may determine in such denominations as he may deem advisable, which may be used for the purpose of food, medicine, clothing and fuel for home heating, lighting and cooking, and shall be redeemed in cash by the county welfare director upon presentation to him by any bona fide merchant who regularly supplies food, medicine, clothing, or such fuel. Such vouchers shall not be valid for purchase of alcoholic beverages, electrical appliances, radio or television sets, automobiles or automotive parts or equipment, or any other item which cannot be clearly classified as food, medicine, clothing, or fuel for home heating, lighting, and cooking.

The committee recognizes that such individuals would be disqualified for participation in the Federal categorical assistance program of aid-to-dependent children with subsequent loss of funds through Federal participation. However, we believe that some reasonable degree of control must be maintained on the State and county level for the supervision of those individuals who flagrantly violate their legal and moral responsibilities in the care of their children. Such reclassification should not be construed to mean that these individuals may not qualify for future benefits under the ADC program when there is shown a reasonable capability and willingness to comply with the minimum requirements of the ADC program.

10. Whenever the atmosphere of a recipient's home or place of residence has deteriorated morally as evidenced by the birth of illegitimate children to either the recipient or any member of her household, then the child or children of such recipient should, in the discretion of the county welfare director, be forthwith removed from her care and all payments terminated.

Permissive legislation should be enacted vesting authority to the county welfare directors to locate, supervise, and maintain concurrently and in conjunction with the State board of child welfare foster home facilities for the placement of such child or children who may be removed from the care of ADC recipients as provided herein.

11. Whenever a landlord enters into any leasing arrangement with a recipient of aid, knowing such person to be in receipt of such aid, he shall by entering into such arrangement, be deemed to have consented to and, therefore, agreed to abide by the following determinations to be made by the county welfare director:

(a) The determination of a fair rental value;

(b) The necessity for and the accomplishment of such repairs as the director may require so as to render the premises sanitary, safe, and habitable.

Any landlord who, under the circumstances described above, charges a recipient or attempts to obtain from any recipient of aid, rental in excess of that determined by the county welfare director, will be guilty of a misdemeanor.

If the landlord is aggrieved by any determination of the director, he shall be entitled to appeal such determination to a court of competent jurisdiction.

12. When the father of an illegitimate child has been determined by the order or judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction, such child shall be treated the same as though he were the legitimate child of such father so that such child and his issue may inherit and take from such father, and such father from the child and his issue. This will satisfy requirements of Federal law and qualify such children for Social Security benefits based on the father's earnings providing a new resource available for the child's support.

13. In the administration of public assistance numerous persons are encountered who, although in need and otherwise eligible, are subject to a mental, physical or emotional handicap which makes them incapable of receiving and utilizing public assistance payments for their best interests. The only way these people can be helped is to designate a competent person to receive and expend the assistance payments on their behalf. In such cases no Federal matching

funds can be received unless the assistance payments on behalf of the needy individual are made to a person who has been appointed by judicial order under existing statutes.

At the present time the only available procedures for such judicial appointment are provided by the general guardianship statutes. When the function of the designee is to handle public assistance payments, the appointment of a general guardian involves an unduly complex and costly process. It is recommended that where, upon complaint properly made to a court of competent jurisdiction, a recipient of aid is found to be functionally incompetent to receive such aid, such court should be permitted to designate a "representative payee" who should be personally liable for the proper expenditure of all payments of aid on behalf of such recipient. The purpose of this recommendation is to provide summary and simplified judicial proceedings under which a representative payee could be appointed solely for the purpose of receiving and administering public assistance payments on behalf of an individual requiring this protection.

The foregoing constitutes the legislative recommendations of the committee.

In order that the administration of the ADC program may be properly conducted, it is essential that the heavy caseload borne by the caseworkers should be substantially reduced to a maximum average of approximately 60. The salaries of caseworkers are low and if maximum efficiency is to be obtained and the program properly administered and policed, those salaries must be substantially increased.

STATEMENT OF MARTIN J. KOLE, JUDGE, BERGEN COUNTY JUVENILE AND DOMESTIC RELATIONS COURT

I wish to thank the committee for the opportunity to speak on this most important and vexing social problem.

At the outset, I should like to point out the need for perspective in this field, as in any area of social endeavor. True, there are abuses of the ADC welfare program—some of them very serious. But, unfortunately, there always appears to be people who are chiselers, who take unfair advantage of any government or social program, and who thereby in effect subvert the purpose of the program.

Assistance to the needy, as a public measure, has a very long history. I read recently that the progenitors of our public assistance programs may be found in the Poor Laws enacted in the Elizabethan era of over 3½ centuries ago, and that within 100 years after their inception in England, they were already the subject of sweeping condemnation. Thus, one writer quotes from a source published in 1686 which stated as to their Poor Laws:

"Not occasioned by any dearth or scarcity of necessity, there being never a greater plenty; nor for want of employment, there being never more, nor thru smallness of wages, that being never so great. But by Idleness, Profuse Expenses, the ill bringing up of children and the younger sort".

And here we are with complaints and evidence of abuses similar in nature to those which were condemned 300 years ago.

As I understand ADC, one of its primary functions is to benefit young children by affording financial aid so that their mothers may remain at home to care for and supervise them. Basically, I believe that this is a sound objective: my experience in the juvenile court has indicated that, often there appears to be a direct relationship between the mother who works while her children are at home and the delinquency of one or more of the children in the family. Lack of maternal care and supervision, lack of a mother figure to talk over school and other problems that are bursting to be told as soon as a child gets home from school—can be tantamount in some cases to the neglect of children that can spell trouble. To the extent, therefore that ADC serves the function of keeping a mother at home properly to supervise and take care of her children, to that extent it would apear to be a worthwhile program which should be continued—if only as a means of preserving the cohesiveness and unity of the mother and children and as a juvenile delinquency preventive.

But what about the mother of an illegitimate child or illegitimate children who is obtaining ADC. Should she be encouraged by financial aid to stay at home to take care of and supervise her illegitimate child or children? Does the financial assistance she gets actually encourage the begetting of further illegitimate children by her either deliberately or wantonly, knowing the economic wants of the child will be taken care of by governmental relief?

These are very complex questions not subject to an easy answer. It would seem to me that no flat rule can be established which would cover all illegitimate children and their mothers. The problem, it seems to me, must be handled on an individual case-to-case basis under certain guiding general principles.

I can recall cases in my court of mothers of illegitimate children who are doing a fairly decent job in raising them. On the other hand, I can recall situations where the mother was obviously a bad influence for the children and should have been separated from them. I am aware of cases in my court where even in the case of legitimate children, the mother wanted the father breadwinner out of the house because she obtained more by ADC. And I also have had paternity cases before me where it seemed fairly clear that the pattern of illegitimate births established by the woman had at least not been discouraged by the prospect of receiving ADC. I had one case about a year ago where we spent two afternoons in a paternity case involving one mother, two illegitimate children, and three separate putative fathers.

Illegitimate children are, of course, a social and moral problem much broader than the ADC program. However, there is no doubt that illegitimate children do create a substantial financial burden on the program in our county—Bergen County. In Bergen County, illegitimacy ranks second as a cause of dependency under the program, second only to desertion of a parent. Of the 483 families on the rolls in 1961, 193 were dependent because of the desertion of a parent; 162 illegitimate children of 52 unwed mothers received ADC from our county welfare board. This compares with 76 illegitimate children and 35 unwed mothers in 1960. The approximate cost of supporting the 162 illegitimate children and 52 unwed mothers in 1961 was $12,500 per month.

What can be done to lighten the cost to the program of illegitimacy and to prevent the program from being misused by mothers who continue to have illegitimate births? I wish, as I am sure you all do, I knew the answer. But the best I can do is offer some suggestions that have occurred to me:

1. More extensive and vigorous prosecution of paternity proceedings in both the municipal and county juvenile and domestic relations courts is one way to reduce the public relief rolls. Placing the father under an order of support and compelling him to comply therewith would, of course, remove some illegitimate children from ADC. But paternity is a difficult thing to prove, particularly where the mother is sexually promiscuous. The answer here, it seems to me, is to equip the county welfare boards with an attorney whose function it will be to investigate, properly prepare and vigorously present these cases to the municipal and county courts. We cannot rely solely on the woman's presentation of the case and, of course, the court, in all fairness to the defendant, cannot assume the role of attorney for the woman. Another difficulty in the paternity suit arises from the lack of means or desire to support on the part of the putative fathers. Some are married and endeavoring to support existing families—an adequate order for the illegitimate child might be enough to throw his family on relief; and many are of the shiftless, irresponsible variety, whose earning capacity is low. The courts can endeavor to compel them by order to assume their responsibility by working two jobs. If they do not, the alternative is a jail term, during which time they obviously cannot support and, in turn, they, as well as the illegitimate child, are being supported by the county.

Despite the difficulties of determining paternity, entering an adequate support order and enforcing the order, I do feel that this is where the courts can assist in reducing the burden of the cost of illegitimacy on the ADC program, provided the appropriate prosecuting tools are made available to the welfare boards. In our county, vigorous enforcement along these lines is attempted by our welfare board, but more legal and investigative assistance is needed.

In our county at present, the situation regarding paternity suits as reflected in the records of our probation office is as follows:

Municipal Division: 60 fathers paying for support of 74 illegitimate children.

Juvenile Division: Three girls with illegitimate children.

Domestic Relations Division: 42 fathers paying for support of 54 illegitimate children.

Criminal Division: One father paying for support of two illegitimate children.

2. Consideration should be given to placing the mother of an illegitimate child who seeks ADC under active supervision of a social caseworker—either a probation officer of the probation office or a smilar person employed by the county welfare board. To make this suggestion meaningful would require small caseloads and active case supervision by skilled personnel. Many of the women are inadequate and will need almost day-to-day guidance in being good, moral, and responsible parents; many need instruction and education in the danger of promiscuity and the moral and legal implications of illicit intercourse and having illegitimate children, including knowledge that they may be subject to criminal prosecution and their children may be taken away from them if they continue their immoral course of conduct. Our probation office informs me that in certain instances where they have had a juvenile or other young woman on probation by reason of such illegitimate child being born, she has been actively assisted by such supervision and no additional illegitimate children have been born to her.

3. In our county we have a family counselor attached to the juvenile and domestic relations court. His primary function to date has been to endeavor to keep legitimate families together. His staff is being increased with a view toward assisting families receiving ADC in reestablising themselves as a family unit with the husband and father working and supporting. He may also be asked—on an experimental basis—to work with unwed mothers on ADC to determine whether such a service can help reduce illegitimacy. The results of this experiment, if undertaken, may prove of some value to the committee.

4. Where there is more than one illegitimate child, the mother who gets ADC relief might well be brought to the juvenile and domestic relations or municipal court, either in a proceeding for that purpose instituted by the Welfare Board, or in connection with a paternity proceeding, and placed on probation with the Probation Office. In either event, it would appear that legislation would have to be adopted authorizing placing the woman on probation and authorizing her commitment for the sole purpose of rehabilitation to an appropriate institution in the event of violation of probation. The statute,

it is suggested, should not be punitive in nature, should only cover the woman who has more than one child out of wedlock who requires ADC assistance for support, and who has clearly demonstrated that counseling and supervision in the community have failed as to her.

Custody proceedings might also be instituted in serious cases in the juvenile and domestic relations court under R.S. 9:2-9 to take custody away from such a mother on the ground that her immoral behavior is harmful to the children's welfare.

Of course, either of the foregoing suggestions would create the problem of where to place the children, and they will undoubtedly have to be supported—at least for a while—at public expense. However, from the standpoint of their future welfare, it would seem that they would be better off away from the mother who has been found to be a serious violator.

5. Consideration might also be given to legislation permitting the counties to establish day care centers so that able-bodied mothers of illegitimate children getting ADC relief could work during the day and have their children properly cared for while they work. This would permit the mother to assume part of the financial responsibility of raising the child and help to keep her out of further trouble. Part of the cost of day care might be paid by the mother from her earnings. A warning is in order here, however. There may be cases where it is better for the children—particularly where the mother is basically a good mother—for the mother not to work. So that requiring all such mothers to work may not be desirable. A case-to-case approach in this connection I believe would be the wisest course.

The problem I have been discussing is, as I have indicated, not an easy one of solution. I have tried to point to some possible approaches to minimize the harmful impact of illegitimacy on the ADC program and the possible adverse effect of the ADC program in promoting an increase in illegitimacy. The answer is not to cut off aid to illegitimate children. They need assistance and protection certainly to the same extent as legitimate children. In many respects they need greater and more active protection from society for a condition not of their own making. The latter consideration—their welfare—should be the prime consideration in adopting any plan designed to modify the existing ADC program.

CONDENSED SCHEDULES OF ALLOWANCES

Combined schedules XI–A and XI–B

TOTAL WEEKLY ALLOWANCES FOR PERSONAL AND HOUSEHOLD NEEDS

	Family size					
	1	2	3	4	5 to 6	7 and over
Birth to 3 years	----------	$8.01	$7.29	$6.55	$6.37	$6.18
Child 4 to 9 years	----------	9.81	8.98	8.12	7.94	7.75
Child 10 to 12 years	----------	12.07	11.08	10.04	9.85	9.67
Girl 13 to 18 years	----------	13.11	12.07	11.01	10.82	10.64
Boy 13 to 18 years	----------	14.45	13.27	12.07	11.88	11.70
Adult 18 or over	$15.55	12.99	12.05	11.10	10.92	10.73

NOTE.—Add for employed adult $7.15 weekly for personal expenses of employment.

Schedule IX

TOTAL WEEKLY ALLOWANCES FOR HOUSEHOLD NEEDS ITEMS

	Family size					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Cooking	$0.52	$0.53	$0.69	$0.69	$0.69	$0.83
Water heating	.50	.51	.83	.83	.83	1.11
Light and electric appliance	.69	.69	.90	.90	.90	1.04
Refrigeration	.35	.35	.35	.35	.35	.35
Fuel for heat	1.38	1.85	2.33	2.77	3.23	3.74
Total for family	3.44	3.93	5.10	5.54	6.00	7.07

1. Family size refers to the number of people for whom marketing and food preparation is done in common.
2. For purposes of budgeting, the age of the child means the age at his nearest birthday.
3. The above schedules are to be used in computing the capacity of parents to support their children.

JUVENILE AND DOMESTIC RELATIONS COURT OF
ESSEX COUNTY, NEWARK, N.J.

(Date)

Re admission of paternity.

Being duly sworn, I ----------------------
(Putative father)
acknowledge in open court I am the father of --
(O/W child or children)
----
born to ------------------------------------
(Mother)
---------------- born in ----------------
(Date of birth) (Municipality
(O/W child) and State)
---------------- born in ----------------
---------------- born in ----------------
---------------- born in ----------------

(Defendant's present address)

(Signature)

COURT'S DISPOSITION

(Date)

Appeared before me this date ------------
(Putative father)
who admitted in open court he is the father of the above-named child ------------ and I ordered as follows:

$------------ week direct for support of child ----------------.

$------------ week pay through probation for support of child ----------------.

$------------ week for support of child ---------------- and placed him on probation for a period of -------- year ----------

Remarks: ----------------------------------

(Judge)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAYH (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. CHURCH (when his name was called. On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. INOUYE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. SYMINGTON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. DIRKSEN (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were privileged to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent due to illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea" and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea" and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea" and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] and the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] are detained on official business.

The pair of the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] has been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota would vote "nay" and the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 42, as follows:

[No. 241 Leg.]

YEAS—35

Aiken
Beall
Bible
Burdick
Cannon
Case
Clark
Dodd
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Humphrey
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy
Kuchel
McCarthy
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Scott
Smith
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—42

Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bennett
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dominick
Ervin
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Hruska
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
Mansfield
McClellan
Mechem
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Randolph
Russell
Saltonstall
Simpson
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Walters
Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—23

Bayh
Brewster
Church
Dirksen
Douglas
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Engle
Holland
Inouye
Keating
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McGee
Morse
Neuberger
Pastore
Robertson
Smathers
Symington
Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. Ribicoff's amendment was rejected.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

THE KERR-MILLS MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, last month the Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly of the Special Senate Committee on Aging issued its third annual report evaluating the performance of the Kerr-Mills medical assistance for the aged program.

The report of the Health Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, was objectively critical of the manner in which Kerr-Mills medical assistance for the aged has been operating, and listed seven basic defects of the program.

This report has received widespread and largely favorable attention in the Nation's press—both editorially and in news stories.

This indicates to me that the issue of hospital insurance for the elderly—although it has been on the legislative "back burner" for some time—is still a very potent issue.

I am confident that this 88th Congress—before it concludes its work next year—will approve a program of medical care for the elderly along the lines recommended by President Kennedy.

A necessary preliminary to this action begins today when a committee of the other body begins public hearings on legislative proposals in this area.

In view of this renewed attention to this most important public responsibility, I ask unanimous consent that a selection of editorials commenting on the subcommittee report on the Kerr-Mills program be placed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times,
Nov. 5, 1963]

SHORTCHANGING THE AGED

Three years after its adoption the Kerr-Mills program of medical assistance for the aged is proving a meager answer to financing care for elderly persons too poor to pay their own hospital and medical bills.

The report of a Senate subcommittee indicates that only 2 percent of the Nation's 18 million aged received aid under the program in any part of the last fiscal year. Even this tiny proportion is an exaggeration, since many thousands were persons who had received care under public relief programs before the Federal system of matching grants for the medically indigent was enacted.

Only 28 States have yet put plans in operation; the duration and types of benefits vary widely; stringent eligibility tests and the humiliating means test discourage participation, and the great bulk of the funds go to the wealthiest States. Administrative costs eat up much of the Federal allocation, partly because of the newness of the program but even more because of the complexity of the rules governing enforcement.

The concept that a combination of Kerr-Mills and private health insurance will give America's older citizens adequate protection against the economic hazards of ill health is plainly an illusion. Until the Kennedy administration makes a real fight for its program of hospital care for the aged under the social security system, tens of thousands of the elderly will lack the safeguards they need and should have. This has become one of the great forgotten issues of 1963. It cannot stay forgotten in 1964.

[From the Camden (N.J.) Courier Post, Nov.
8, 1963]

KERR-MILLS FAILURE

Its advocates may be right in saying that so far the Kerr-Mills law for medical aid to the aged has not had a fair test. But so far it definitely has not been a success on a national scale.

About half the States, New Jersey included, have put plans into effect to implement the Federal law. (This State's plan was effective July 1.) But a Senate subcommittee now reports that only 2 percent of the 18 million aged citizens in the Nation received any benefit from Kerr-Mills during the last fiscal year. And many of them were simply persons who were transferred to Kerr-Mills benefits from the relief rolls.

Apparently Kerr-Mills is not even serving as an effective stopgap for elderly persons until enactment of a more comprehensive medicare program. Medicare under the social security system was supposedly one of the prime objectives of the Kennedy administration for 1963, but now has been shunted aside until 1964, at least. Unless the administration puts up more of a fight for it then than it did this year, its 1964 hopes are dim.

[From the Newark (N.J.) News, Oct. 31, 1963]

REISSUED FOR 1964

This month marks the third anniversary of the Kerr-Mills program for medical aid to indigent elderly persons. But the sharply critical report on the program issued by the Democratic majority on the Senate Subcommittee on Aging is hardly fitting in celebrating a birthday.

The Democratic Senators declared the program "degrading" and "ineffective." The report further charged that five of the wealthiest States thus far had received 88 percent of all Federal funds under the program, although they have but 32 percent of the eligible elderly.

Perhaps the attack is premature. After all, the program is only 3 years old and maybe not all the evidence is in. Yet there is justification for some of the criticism.

Participation by the 18 million of the Nation's aged has been limited because of the strict means tests imposed on applicants for help. Some States apparently have taken advantage of the law to shift impoverished aged persons from welfare rolls to the programs. Furthermore, the implication of welfare undoubtedly has prevented many qualifying for aid from seeking it.

The Kerr-Mills program certainly is not nationwide, only 28 States, including New Jersey, participating. Among States not joining, cost has been a decisive factor.

The program definitely is not a substitute for health insurance under social security. A significant point brought out by the report is that only 140,000 are receiving benefits from the program out of the 10 million medically indigent it was designed to protect.

About 8 million other elderly persons who are not eligible because of the means tests are, of course, excluded altogether. In this State, for example, of the estimated 500,000 persons of 65 and over, only 8,000, or about 1.5 percent, are eligible under the Kerr-Mills law.

Weaknesses in the program have been fairly well advertised since its enactment in 1960. Why the subcommittee majority should take the occasion of the third birthday to rehash the old arguments isn't altogether clear. But one thing is certain: the health of the elderly, which started out as a social concern, is now in politics to stay.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Post, Oct. 30,
1963]

CRITICS WITHOUT A PROGRAM

Senator Hickenlooper, one of the GOP Senate leaders, has called this "one of the slowest and most ineffective Congresses we have ever had," and blamed the administration for failing to provide strong leadership.

But if there has been a leadership vacuum, why haven't Hickenlooper and his GOP colleagues rushed in to fill with programs of their own? For example, there is the problem of medical aid for the elderly. Why didn't they try to do something about it?

Last February the President renewed his request for a hospital insurance program for the elderly to be financed through social security.

But the GOP said "No, give the existing Kerr-Mills measure a chance." This program enacted in 1960 provides Federal matching funds to States for the care of medically indigent old people.

Now a Senate subcommittee discloses anew that Kerr-Mills isn't working—that after 3 years it is still not a national program, that means tests have severely restricted participation, that administrative costs are too high, and that, generally speaking, the program has proved ineffective.

What is the GOP answer to this indictment? It is not to rush in with a program to meet the needs thus documented. This is a "premature judgment based on inadequate evidence," it laconically comments. And it says no more.

[From the Trainman News, Nov. 4, 1963]

BACK H.R. 3920

The King-Anderson bill (H.R. 3920), which would provide hospital insurance for the Nation's elderly citizens under the social security and railroad retirement systems, must be enacted if the oldtimers are to receive the adequate assistance that is due them.

A poor job of directing medical care aid to the aged folks is being done by the 1960 Kerr-Mills Act, with its program in the various States.

Bolstering previous facts made known to the public since the Kerr-Mills program got under way, the Senate Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly recently released a report hitting the plan as being "ineffective."

Senator PAT McNAMARA, Democrat, of Michigan, chairman of the subcommittee, declared that the report confirms his "longstanding belief that only through the universal approach of a social security-financed program can the basic health needs of our senior citizens be effectively met."

Other Democrats on the subcommittee joined McNAMARA in noting that the report, which is an evaluation of medical assistance for the aged—the Kerr-Mills program 1960–63, is proof that the Kerr-Mills plan cannot assure "millions of older people * * * economic access to adequate medical care on a decent, self-respecting basis."

Even by the end of 1964, the report points out, there will be 10 to 15 States without the Kerr-Mills program under way.

The program is now in operation in 28 States and the annual rate of Kerr-Mills MAA expenditures was approximately $350 million as of August of this year.

Despite the fact that they have only 32 percent of the oldtimers 65 and over, New York, California, Massachusetts, Michigan, and Pennsylvania received 88 percent of the funds up to December 31, 1962.

Said John W. Edelman, acting president of the National Council of Senior Citizens, Inc.: "The Senate unit's report offers abundant evidence that the strained financial resources of many States make the well-intentioned aims of Kerr-Mills MAA law impossible of realization as a national program. While Kerr-Mills has been proving its inadequacy for 3 years, Congress has failed to enact the vitally necessary program to provide hospital insurance for older Americans through the time-tested social security system."

The House Ways and Means Committee is scheduled to begin hearings November 18 on the King-Anderson bill (H.R. 3920), backed by the Kennedy administration and organized labor, and other related matters. They will continue for 9 days.

Letters and wires to our congressmen at this time, urging enactment of H.R. 3920, could play an important part in getting the measure on the way to enactment.

The effort is well worth a try.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, Nov. 4, 1963]

KERR-MILLS AFTER 3 YEARS MOCKS NEEDS OF THE AGED

The Kerr-Mills program, which supposedly would enable elderly people of limited means to meet their medical expenses in the self-respecting American way, was 3 years old in October. Senator PAT McNAMARA's subcommittee on the health of the elderly has issued an anniversary report analyzing the achievements of the program up through last August.

The figures are illuminating. They will confirm the fears of those who never could generate much faith in the Kerr-Mills approach and arouse the protests of those who, like Senator GOLDWATER and two other dissenting Republicans on the subcommittee, feel that the plan hasn't had time to prove itself in 3 years.

The total expenditure of Federal and State money through August of this year was $580 million. The annual cost is now around $350 million. But these sums are being spent in only 28 States and four jurisdictions; although all State legislatures have now had an opportunity to consider matching legislation, 22 have either not done so or have not completed their plans.

A MEAGER TOTAL

Furthermore, out of the 7,610,000 elderly people with incomes of $2,000 on down in this country, a meager 148,000 were receiving benefits in July of this year, a majority of these being from five States: California, New York, Massachusetts, Michigan, and Pennsylvania. These States, with only 32 percent of the Nation's elderly, received 88 percent of all Federal funds for medical assistance and New York, with only 10 percent of the aged, collected 42 percent of the money.

This figure of 148,000, moreover, is misleading in its implications. It must be remembered that the primary intent of the Kerr-Mills Act was to establish a new category of public assistance, but one which would not carry to its potential beneficiaries the dreaded stigma of "relief." It offered the States a chance to obtain matching Federal grants in order to help elderly people not on relief to meet pressing medical expenses.

What has actually happened is that many States, unable in the first place to meet the pressing relief needs of their needy, put in token programs or made the financial restrictions so severe that self-respecting elderly people withdrew applications rather than liquidate their small savings or have their relatives pressured for aid. "There are at least 14 States," according to the subcommittee report, "in which the means test for medical assistance would eliminate many of the aged people who have qualified for other relief programs."

THE DIMENSION OF FAILURE

Because of the few people who have applied or who qualify; because, also, of the comparative generosity of Federal Kerr-Mills grants compared to other shared programs, nearly 100,000 of those receiving medical assistance were already being aided by the States under another relief category. The States, in other words, have transferred elderly people with health problems, whom they were already caring for anyway, to this newer program and thereby relieved some of their own financial burdens.

One cannot blame the States for doing so, and they are certainly neither evading nor stretching the law. But the fact remains that a program which the AMA still says is meeting the health needs of the Nation's elderly, which both candidates in Kentucky's Governor election have endorsed in preference to a social security approach to the problem, is reaching almost none of the people it is intended to reach.

One objection to social security medical care (which is favored by the majority of the McNAMARA subcommittee) invariably raised by AMA spokesmen is that it would set up a "bureaucracy", which would enmesh doctor and patient in its toils. Apart from the patent inaccuracy of the charge (the social security plan would not pay doctors and would apply only to hospital and nursing home care) the Kerr-Mills plan has set up an impressive bureaucracy of its own. Administrative costs nationally run to 6.2 percent and fluctuate widely among the States. Tennessee spends 59 percent of its direct grants on administration. Kentucky spends 29 percent. Four other States spend more than 25 cents of the dollar on administration.

The foregoing summarizes only the major points on which the Kerr-Mills Act has failed to meet the very need it was specifically aimed at. Elderly people in desperate need of medical care have shunned a program which pries into their lives and those of their children, which brings them at last to the very fate they have struggled a lifetime to avert—that of being "dependent." Other aged persons, less fortunate or less strong willed, have simply been shunted from one category to another so that the money may be claimed.

One is compelled to ask: If all States qualified for matching funds; if all of them liberalized income limits and ceased to make mendicants of applicants, how much money in direct taxation would Kerr-Mills be likely to cost and how much would have to be spent on its expanding bureaucracy?

Compared to this, health payments to the elderly, financed through a small increase in social security taxes, would cut overhead to almost nothing, would require no demeaning inquiries and pledges from applicants, and would put no proliferating burden on the general taxpayer. Which plan sounds more like the "American way of life," which more like the ultimate extension of the welfare state?

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Nov. 12, 1963]

THIS, TOO, SHALL NOT PASS

(By John Herling)

What's going to happen in 1963 to the administration's legislation on hospital care for the aging? Apparently, nothing.

Two years ago, the late Senator Robert Kerr, Democrat, of Oklahoma, holding the Senate machinery in his sophisticated hands, played brinkmanship with a similar bill and then killed it by pushing it off Capitol Hill. It teetered at the edge by a narrow four-vote margin. For Mr. Kerr and colleagues, the administration's bill had been found guilty by association with the social security system and was marked for death.

At any rate, the latest version of the bill is being slowly trotted out of the stables of the Ways and Means Committee. This once proud legislative steed, still sporting the Kennedy silks, seems to have been relegated to the "not now, Buster" category. If this condition continues without vigorous protest from Democratic leaders, then organized labor and lots of other folks have a major gripe with this administration.

In Philadelphia last week, President Kennedy received additional confirmation of the strong hold this issue retains on voters of all ages. He got his biggest hand there—unexpectedly to those concentrating on Washington's tactical capers—when he banged home the importance of social security-related hospital care: "We intend to see to it that no American is forgotten, ill-treated or cast off * * * in old age."

The explanation being offered for the legislation's poor prospects currently is that WILBUR MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, is against it. What's more, because he had joined forces with Senator Kerr, Mr. MILLS has a vested legislative and prestige interest in the Kerr-Mills Act which was passed as an alternative to the kind of bill proposed by liberal forces.

The most Mr. MILLS consents to do now is to hold hearings for a couple of weeks, starting next Monday. But he has made it clear that this is as far as he will go, so there is little chance for action by his committee this year. Apparently his labors on the tax-cut bill have tired him out. Or maybe this is all he cares to do about something which goes against the grain.

Meantime, Senator Pat McNamara, Democrat, of Michigan, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Health for the Elderly, has just issued a blasting analysis of the Kerr-Mills program, known as Medical Assistance for the Aged, or MAA. In reply, Republican Senators Dirksen, of Illinois, Goldwater, of Arizona, and Carlson, of Kansas, defend MAA, and make the special point that, in addition to MAA, voluntary health insurance has proved an important method of financing the costs of medical care for persons over 65.

In its analysis, Senator McNamara's subcommittee spells out the inadequacies of MAA in various States, especially Connecticut. To which the Dirksen-Goldwater group replied triumphantly that such a harsh judgment fails to reckon that "85 percent of that State's 65-plus population has voluntary coverage," and does not qualify for MAA since it requires a "means" test to prove financial distress.

Unfortunately for the Senate minority's argument, evidence of serious financial shortcomings in Connecticut's "voluntary insurance" plan has cropped up in the last few weeks. There the "Connecticut 65" group—a multibillion interagency organization of nearly all insurance companies—had offered comprehensive medical and hospital insurance to State residents over 65, advertising it on a "minimum-cost, nonprofit basis."

In this as in other States, the Nation's leading insurance companies had put on a concerted drive to move into the aging field, as a countermaneuver to the proposed old age medical care legislation. They thus gave the opponents of social security-financed hospital care legislation a plausible, even virtuous, argument. After all, they said, why deprive the old folks of their right to choose their own type of insurance, voluntary and cheap?

Persuasively, the insurance companies offered attractively low rates. In this way they hoped to overcome the arguments to the social security advocates who contend that the burdens of financing medical care ought not to be loaded on people after 65, or on their families which might have to pay the insurance bills.

Now the sad fact is that the period of bargain rates is over. The insurance companies now announce they must raise their charge by 20 percent. The State insurance department will hold hearings on the request. Thus, the old folks now find themselves caught in the middle. Their "voluntary" plan has suddenly turned compulsory, they must pay a higher rate to keep their policies, or the insurance companies will cut back on medical services—or cut out of the picture.

In these significant, related developments, Senator McNamara sees new and urgent reasons for finding that the "Kerr-Mills MAA cannot do the job of providing adequate medical care on a decent, self-respecting basis for our senior citizens."

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette, Nov. 11, 1963]

Medical Care for the Aged Hot Again; Hearings Soon

(By George Zielke)

Washington.—As the 1st session of the 88th Congress wound up its 10th month, lawmakers finally got around to a subject destined to be an issue again in the 1964 elections—medical care for the aged.

The House Ways and Means Committee, where such legislation must originate, announced hearings on the subject to begin November 18.

The announcement from Committee Chairman Wilbur Mills, Democrat, of Arkansas, listed as the first term: "The adequacy of medical programs under existing law (Kerr-Mills Act)."

After that, Mr. Mills listed "the extent and adequacy of coverage under private or nongovernmental health insurance programs"; President Kennedy's medicare proposal and "proposed alternatives."

The Mills part of the title of the Kerr-Mills Act refers to its coauthor, Chairman Mills.

The Kerr-Mills Act has been on the books 3 years. It was enacted in the 1960 post-convention session after the Senate rejected the approach of Senator John F. Kennedy—which was, and is, addition of medical care to the social security pension system, with a boost in the contribution rate levied on workers' wages.

Under the Kerr-Mills law, the Federal Government offers grants to the States, under a matching formula, if they arrange programs to cover medical expenses of "aged individuals who are not recipients of old-age assistance (i.e., relief) but whose income and resources are insufficient to meet the costs of necessary medical expenses."

The dispute over effectiveness of the law reflects the basic differences of opinion.

A Senate Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly, headed by Senator Patrick V. McNamara, Democrat, of Michigan, came out 2 weeks ago with a sharp report declaring the program ineffective.

The subcommittee said that in July 1963, "Only 148,000 people received MAA (medical assistance for the aged) assistance—or less than 1 percent of the Nation's older citizens."

The subcommittee report listed seven major defects of the program.

"After 3 years it is still not a national program, and there is no reason to expect that it will become one in the foreseeable future."

"Stringent eligibility tests, lien type recovery provisions and responsible relative provisions have severely limited participation in those jurisdictions."

"Except for those four States having comprehensive programs (Hawaii, Massachusetts, New York and North Dakota) benefits are nominal, nonexistent or inadequate."

"Administrative costs of MAA programs remain too high in most jurisdictions."

"The distribution of Federal matching funds under MAA has been grossly disproportionate, with a few wealthy States, best able to finance their phase of the program, getting a lion's share of the funds. Five States, California, New York, Massachusetts, Michigan, and Pennsylvania, for example, received 88 percent of all Federal MAA funds distributed from the start of the program through December 31, 1962 (that is, 88 percent of $189 million), although those five States have only 32 percent of the Nation's elderly people."

"The congressional intent to extend assistance to a new type of medically indigent person through MAA has been frustrated by the practice of several States in transferring 100,000 persons already on other welfare programs * * * to the Kerr-Mills program. The States have done this to take advantage of the higher matching grant provisions of Kerr-Mills, saving millions of dollars in State costs, but diverting money meant for other purposes."

"The welfare aspects of the MAA program, including cumbersome investigations of eligibility, plus the requirement in most States that resources of an older person must be depleted to a point of near-dependency, have further reduced participation."

The subcommittee report carried a dissent by three Republicans, Senators Everett M. Dirksen, of Illinois; Barry Goldwater, of Arizona; and Frank Carlson, of Kansas. They differed with every conclusion of the majority and said 55 percent of the people past 65 had voluntary health insurance coverage as of the end of 1961 and added: "Nor is there substantiation for the claim, oft repeated that those persons without health insurance are unable to pay for it."

Thus the battle lines are being drawn for a resumption of large-scale debate on this long-debated issue.

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, Nov. 1, 1963]

Kerr-Mills Bill Fails To Meet Health Needs

The Kerr-Mills bill was enacted by Congress in 1960 as the American Medical Association's answer to the Kennedy administration's proposal to provide hospital care for the aged through social security.

In many respects the Kerr-Mills program is undesirable, especially in that it requires oldsters practically to take a pauper's oath in order to receive aid. And in some States, though not in California, persons getting benefits must give liens on their homes to the Government.

Yet these objections become more or less academic in the light of a congressional report showing the program simply is not meeting the needs of the senior citizens.

The majority membership of the House Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly reported that as late as August fewer than 1 percent of the Nation's old folk were receiving Kerr-Mills benefits.

Said the report: "Except for four States having comprehensive programs (Hawaii, Massachusetts, New York, and North Dakota), benefits are nominal, nonexistent or inadequate."

Up to the close of last year 88 percent of the disbursements of Federal funds under the program had gone to five States—California, New York, Massachusetts, Michigan, and Pennsylvania—which meant the other 45 States got only 12 percent, certainly far from enough to provide more than a drop in the bucket in relation to the needs of the people.

Thus it should be more than obvious the Kerr-Mills program is not an answer but a denial.

If there is to be coverage on a universal and a dignified basis it should be done through prepaid social security. Even the pending program is little enough but it plainly would be superior to a system of handouts which reached only 148,000 elderly people in August, 1963.

And it is a cause for shame that, because of pressure from self-serving groups, Congress has deferred action on this necessary legislation for at least another year. For many people who could be benefited by the program, a year from now will be too late.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader what the schedule will be for the remainder of today and tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the leadership had hoped to get a little more work done, but, unfortunately, because of circumstances beyond our control, we shall be fortunate to dispose of the District of Columbia appropriation bill at this late "Wall Street" hour.

Following the disposition of the pending bill, it is the intention of the leadership to take up Calendar No. 620, H.R. 8747, the independent offices appropriation bill, in order to lay it before the Senate and make it the pending business.

It is anticipated that some time after the disposition of that bill the following measures will be called up:

Calendar No. 614, H.R. 6001, the Waukegan bill; Calendar No. 615, S. 432, and Calendar No. 616, H.R. 6518, the air pollution bills; Calendar No. 617, S. 298, and Calendar No. 618, S. 1309, the small business bills; and Calendar No. 622, Senate Joint Resolution 129, to amend the Housing Act of 1954.

They will be taken up, but not in that order. It is also anticipated that on Wednesday the Senate will consider the so-called bracero bill, and the conference report on the legislative appropriation bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I wish to state that I made an unintentional misstatement when I indicated that possibly on Wednesday next the conference report on the legislative appropriation will be taken up. I now wish to inform the Senate that I do not know when it will be taken up, but it will be sometime after Wednesday.

That is about the best I can say at the moment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Do I correctly understand that most of tomorrow will be devoted to the consideration of the independent offices appropriation bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That bill and some other bills, I hope.

CAPITAL ISSUES COMMITTEE WOULD DO THE JOB

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call to the attention of Senators an important editorial in this morning's New York Times entitled, "Controls for the Dollar." Noting the dramatic improvement in our balance of payments in the third quarter, the editorial takes strong exception to the administration's interest equalization tax proposal, and instead, should capital outflow continue at a disturbing rate, it recommends the establishment of a capital issues committee. I fully agree.

As I have stated at least on two occasions in the past the interest equalization tax would not be an effective instrument in dealing with the problem of capital outflows. The decline in capital outflows in the third quarter, in my view, is largely due to the uncertainty created by the pending measure rather than the tax that would be placed on capital exports, should the measure become law. There were other key factors that contributed to the improved third-quarter figures, namely an increase in the rediscount rate and the improved competitive position of U.S. exports, resulting from stable U.S. prices while Western Europe is suffering from inflation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the New York Times editorial dated November 18, 1963, as well as recent articles from the Wall Street Journal and the New York Times offering further evidence that what may well be the basic reasons for the recent improvement in the balance of payments.

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 18, 1963]

Controls for the Dollar

Things are finally looking up in the battle for the dollar. The third-quarter results show a dramatic improvement over the dismal figures for the first half, when the outflow of dollars reached record proportions. A good part of the reduction of the drain is attributable to the administration's proposed tax on American purchases of foreign stocks and bonds, which has a retroactive provision. On the surface, at least, it can be argued that passage of the tax would bring a permanent improvement.

But other factors helped to stem the outflow. The Federal Reserve's increase in the discount rate served to cut down on the short-term capital drain. And American manufacturers seem to be doing better because they have maintained stable prices while Europeans are facing inflationary pressures.

The proposed tax cannot bring as lasting an improvement as a further bettering of basic economic forces that will enhance our competitive position in world markets and attract capital from abroad. It has probably hit the peak of its effectiveness already, because prospective foreign borrowers have been marking time, waiting to see just what restrictions will be written into the bill. If it passes, it will invite a renewed seepage through loopholes that always accompany any new tax.

With competitive forces running in our favor, the administration might get by without any specific instruments to stem a capital outflow. It could rely, for instance, solely on indirect control by another boost in interest rates. But tightening credit might hurt domestic activity and could trigger a rise in foreign rates. France has just raised its discount rate to counter inflation, so that the danger of a general escalation in rates, which might stifle investment, cannot be ignored.

If controls over capital movements are deemed necessary, it would be far more effective to employ direct controls through the establishment of a capital-issues committee to pass on borrowings. This would avoid the creation of new loopholes; it would be temporary and it would not set up an artificial two-price system for funds. Most of all, they could do the job. Controls over capital are as distasteful as any other barrier to liberalized trade, but if they are to be used in the battle to defend the dollar, there should be no doubt about their ability to work.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 18, 1963]

An Economic Feint?—Mere Threat of Bill Cuts Payment Gap; It May Not Work in Case of Tax Cut

(By M. J. Rossant)

The Kennedy administration is enjoying considerable success in hitting upon a novel technique for influencing business without getting congressional approval of proposed changes in the tax structure. The new method can be termed the psychological approach to economic policy.

It may not have been the administration's intention to rely on this technique, but it is apparently impressed with the way it has been working on both the domestic and foreign fronts.

Take the proposed across-the-board reduction of $11 billion in personal and corporate income taxes. According to administration sources, the anticipation of tax relief is important in causing the high level of business activity.

They say that businessmen and consumers—as well as investors on Wall Street—are acting as if the Senate Finance Committee had already approved the tax cuts.

DEFICIT PARED

Although it can be argued that the promise of tax relief has had little to do with the rise in business activity, there is no doubt that the proposed interest-equalization tax on American purchases of foreign stocks and bonds worked wonders in reducing the country's balance-of-payments deficit during the third quarter.

In this case, the psychological approach is all that the administration has had to depend on. The proposed tax has not cleared even the House Ways and Means Committee, yet it brought a sharp reduction in the flow of dollars out of the country ticketed for purchases of foreign securities.

The balance of payments is the relationship between payments to foreigners and receipts from foreigners.

During the third quarter, purchases of new foreign issues amounted to $175 million, or far below the $520 million that flowed out in the preceding quarter. There is usually a decline from the second to third quarter, but on a seasonally adjusted basis the reduction was still a significant one.

The decline in net purchases of outstanding foreign securities was equally dramatic. According to the Commerce Department, the flowout in this area was "nearly zero," which compares with a drain of $52 million in the second quarter and $48 million in the first.

Whatever the merits of the proposed tax, these results cannot be denied. The proposal may be a gimmick, but it is a gimmick that works.

In fact, the results would have been even better if the proposed tax had been introduced earlier in the third quarter. Mr. Kennedy did not propose it until mid-July, and its retroactive provision was not supposed to take effect before mid-August, so that its impact covered only half of the period.

Unless Congress speeds its timetable, the proposed tax will have a full opportunity to show what it can do in the fourth quarter. If it remains a mere proposal, the prospect is that the flowout will be reduced to an inconsequential trickle.

Treasury officials are said to be against any delay in passing the proposed tax. But their eagerness for action is open to question, because the present uncertainty surrounding the proposal is much more effective in stemming the long-term capital flow than any tax could hope to be.

IMAGE CAST BY NOTHING

The proposed tax resembles the fable about the emperor's new clothes. They didn't exist, but almost no one would challenge the image.

If the proposed tax becomes law, foreign borrowers and American lenders will no longer be in the dark. They will be able to take advantage of loopholes that are sure to be devised.

There is no telling how much money will then go into foreign securities in one way or another, but it is bound to be more than the present neglible flow.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 11, 1963]

Europe's Lure Dims—Fewer Yankee Dollars Cross Atlantic To Build Factories in Old World—Economic Growth in France, Germany Now Trails United States; Profit Rise Slows Sharply—Aiding Balance of Payments?

(By Alfred L. Malabre, Jr.)

The great fever to invest in Europe has cooled.

Behind the cooling is a little-noticed pattern of very basic economic fact. The much-publicized business expansion in most West European countries now lags behind growth in the United States. And corporate profits in Europe are rising much less swiftly than in America.

"Nowadays, when a company asks us how best to tap the European market, we're much slower to advise setting up oversea production than we were a few years ago," says a Chase Manhattan Bank officer whose job is to assist Chase customers wishing to sell their products overseas. His go-slow advice is fairly typical of the counsel many business consultants are giving Europe-minded customers.

The outpouring of investment funds to build plants in Europe long has worried administration officials concerned over the Nation's nagging balance-of-payments deficit. These funds make up roughly half of America's total direct investment outflow. They constitute a major part of the payments deficit, which occurs because Americans spend more abroad than foreigners do in the United States.

DIRECT INVESTMENTS DROP

The latest Government statistics indicate many businessmen may indeed be adopting a go-slow attitude to new European investments. At last report in the second quarter, U.S. direct investments in Western Europe totaled $137 million, only a third of the first quarter outflow and only half as high as in the comparable 1962 period. The latest figure, in fact, is lower than in any 3-month period since early 1961.

Talks with plant location consultants also point to a recent slowdown. "The inquiries we're getting from American companies wishing to set up facilities in Europe are running about 20 percent behind a year ago," reports Leonard C. Yaseen, senior partner of Fantus Co., a New York-based location consultant with offices in Europe. "This is in contrast to our domestic business, which is up sharply from 1962."

It's too soon, of course, to ascertain whether the recent slowdown signals the start of a prolonged decline of U.S. investment in Europe. A renewed spurt of Europe's economic growth could trigger a fresh flow of U.S. funds across the Atlantic. So could failure of United States-European efforts to pare trade restrictions; with high tariff walls to hurdle, many U.S. exporters would be forced to set up production overseas or abandon the European market.

Most economists who keep close tabs on foreign investments, however, doubt the showdown is merely temporary. "Some of the great attractions European production once held for U.S. companies are fast being wiped out," says a Commerce Department analyst. "With these gone, there's bound to be a letup in the investment flow."

SLOWER EUROPEAN EXPANSION

Among the foremost of these attractions has been the fast economic growth of Western Europe, relative to expansion in the United States. But now, the record clearly shows, most European lands are actually expanding more slowly than America.

The table below traces the economic growth of major European countries and the United States since the start of 1962. Industrial production—an economic index based largely on physical measures and therefore not easily distorted by inflation—is the yardstick used.

Output gain

	Percent
Italy	12
Belgium	11
United States	10
Germany	9
France	9
Spain	9
Netherlands	6
Britain	5
Austria	5
Sweden	3

Of the nine European countries listed, only Italy and Belgium have recently expanded faster than the United States, the table shows. And even in these two countries, the output rise has slowed markedly in the last few months. Says an economist for a large New York bank: "Who would have dreamed several years ago that the United States would soon be growing faster than nations like West Germany and France?"

Other attractions Europe has held for many U.S. corporations are relatively low production costs and high profits. But these lures also are fading rapidly, talks with businessmen and other observers indicate.

THE GAP IS CLOSING

"When we began producing in Europe some years ago, the cost of turning out a given item over there was only about 75 percent as high as in the United States," recalls Henry F. Brockschmidt, a vice president of Perkin-Elmer Corp., a scientific instrument maker. "Now, it costs at least 90 percent as much and the gap is closing."

Labor is the chief cause of Europe's climbing production costs, most analysts agree. Unlike the United States where labor expense per unit of production has actually declined 3 percentage points in 3 years, Europe's hourly wage levels are rising far faster than the hourly output, or productivity, of European workers.

In Germany, for instance, labor costs per unit of output have swelled about 25 percent since 1959. In the Netherlands and Italy, the rise amounts to approximately 20 percent. In France and Britain, it is nearly 15 percent.

The spiral of European labor costs will probably continue, most observers predict. They reason that labor shortages overseas will surely become more acute as the 1960's unfold. Studies by Bela Belassa, who teaches economics at Yale, forecast the size of Germany's labor supply will be no larger in 1970 than at present. This is because the postwar birth rate in war-ravaged Germany was extraordinarily low, unlike the postwar rate in America.

The labor picture emerging elsewhere in Western Europe is not very different from the German situation, says Mr. Belassa. He predicts the yearly growth of the entire area's labor force between now and 1970 will be less than 1 percent, or only half the projected annual rise in the United States.

"The increasing strains on Europe's labor supply are bound to hurt the area's investment appeal," concludes Mr. Belassa.

Adding to Europe's labor woes is the fact that strikes abound, despite the spiraling wage levels. Example: Some 2 million French public utility workers recently marched off their jobs in a 1-day warning strike to demand higher pay; the walkout left most of Paris without electricity.

FEWER U.S. STRIKES

Labor-management relations in the United States, by comparison, are becoming more tranquil. In the first half of this year, only 540,000 U.S. workers were involved in strikes, reports the Labor Department. That's fewer than in any like period since World War II.

Climbing costs are squeezing the profits of many European operations, reports indicate. "A few years ago, our profits amounted to as much as 10 percent of sales at our European production facilities," says Perkin-Elmer's Mr. Brockschmidt. "Currently, our margins abroad are down in the 5 to 7 percent range." He adds, "Labor shortages are a big problem."

A recent survey by Fortune suggest the pressure on profits abroad. In 1962, the magazine reports, aggregate after-tax profits of the 100 largest foreign industrial concerns, mostly West European, were less than 1 percent higher than those of the top 100 a year earlier. This near plateau of profits occurred despite an 11-percent sales increase, the survey states.

CLIMBING U.S. PROFITS

The profit picture in America is markedly different. After-tax corporate earnings in the United States reached a record $24.6 billion in 1962, some 13 percent higher than in 1961, and recent reports show the rise is continuing. At the same time, U.S. profit margins are climbing sharply; the latest Government figures show second quarter profits of American manufacturers amounted to 5 percent of sales, up from 3.5 percent as recently as early 1961.

Though the chief cause of the investment slowdown is hard economics, other considerations also are involved, many analysts contend. For example, some companies apparently are betting trade barriers between Europe and the United States ultimately will be hauled down. Also, economists say, recently toughened rules on taxation of some Europe-based operations may discourage would-be investors.

Another deterrent is simply the vast size of the stake U.S. companies already have in Western Europe. Their European plant facilities are now worth nearly $10 billion, up from $4 billion as recently as 1957. The current stake is nearly as large as U.S. companies' worldwide direct investments abroad only a dozen years ago.

LESS WELCOME ABROAD?

"Many American corporations that should logically set up production in Europe have already done so; now, they're able to support further oversea projects with funds earned abroad," says an officer of New York's First National City Bank. "In addition, there are areas in Europe where the U.S. interest has grown so large that the foreign nations concerned are becoming less welcoming hosts to new investments."

Just as Europe's economic problems appear to discourage some new investments from the United States, so America's rising business strength may eventually prompt more European concerns to build plants in the United States, some economists forecast.

There's little in the record, however, to indicate a marked increase of direct investments from Europe is already underway. In the second quarter, West European concerns put $27 million into U.S. facilities, up from their first quarter investment but slightly less than in the like 1962 period, and far below the $137 million second quarter flow from U.S. companies to Europe.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 11, 1963]

TRADING DEFICIT RISES IN EUROPE—COMMON MARKET REPORTS AN EXCESS OF IMPORTS

(By Edward T. O'Toole)

BRUSSELS, November 10.—The deficit in the European Common Market's balance of trade—the excess of imports over exports—for the first 9 months of 1963 will be about $900 million greater than in the 1962 period.

This could mean balance-of-payments trouble for the trade bloc in the future.

An anlysis released here over the weekend by the executive commission of the European Community added that the 9-month trade deficit trend had continued into the autumn months.

"The expansion of exports to nonmember countries slackened somewhat," the study said, "while on the import side the autumn recovery proved relatively vigorous."

Unless capital imports compensate for the net outflow of funds caused by the trade deficit, balance-of-payments problems can be expected to develop.

The rising trade deficit of the Common Market six—West Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg—comes at a time when capital imports are increasing owing to the Kennedy administration's dollar defense program introduced last summer.

Taken together, these two trends could spell stormy weather for the Community unless countermeasures are adopted.

One such measure normally expected would be an increase in interest rates here to attract new capital imports. But the Common Market has a gentleman's agreement with the United States that it will not offset, by increasing its interest rates here, the rise in U.S. interest rates that the Kennedy administration put into effect last summer.

The chief reason for the community's 1963 trade deficit has been increased imports by France. Unlike a similar increase in West Germany, the rise in French imports was not accompanied by a compensating increase in exports.

With internal prices also pushing upward as a result of inflationary pressures, France will be hard put to expand her imports in the future without some drastic form of price controls. Such action could disturb the balance of trade of the other Common Market members, with corresponding disturbing effects on their economies.

OVERSEA INVESTMENTS UP

U.S. companies with heavy investments in oversea operations are continuing to add to those investments at a rapid rate, according to a survey released today by McKinsey & Co., Inc.

The international management consultant found in its survey of 100 major industrial companies, that oversea assets had risen by 18 percent in 1962. At the same time, the domestic assets of these companies increased by only 6 percent.

There were, however, some signs that the returns on oversea investment, which had been accelerating far more rapidly than returns on domestic investment, were leveling off.

FOREIGN SALES RISE

The 100 companies, which had aggregate sales of about $60 billion last year, have increased their foreign sales 275 percent since 1950. At the same time, their domestic volume has risen by 40 percent, according to the McKinsey report.

Last year, however, their oversea sales increased 9 percent, while their domestic revenue rose by 10 percent.

Concurrently, the profits on foreign investments have been dropping back closer to the margin on domestic business. The return on foreign direct investments dropped to 14 percent last year from a high of 18 percent in 1955.

The return is still larger than that on domestic operations, but the margin of difference is growing smaller. Domestic profits increased by 15 percent last year, while oversea profits rose an average of 8 percent.

SUBSIDIARIES INCREASE

One of the more revealing findings of the McKinsey report is that the U.S. companies are pressing the conversion of their foreign sales from exports to sales made by oversea subsidiaries.

Since 1950, the 100 companies increased the production of their oversea plants by 420 percent. Last year, foreign production rose 19 percent while export volume grew by 8 percent.

The companies surveyed, McKinsey acknowledged, are those with exceptionally high interests in the international arena and not representative of all U.S. industry.

However, Gilber H. Clee, director of the consulting concern's oversea activities, noted that "the fact that these companies have continued—and in many cases even increased—the pace of their expansion overseas is evidence that the full-scale participation in the world economy has become part of their long-term strategic planning. This means that more and more U.S. companies are becoming true world enterprises."

[From the New York Times, Nov. 10, 1963]

GE INCREASING ITS EXPORT SALES—CUSTOM SERVICE IS STRESSED FOR BIG TRANSFORMERS

(By Philip Shabecoff)

"It costs a little more but the quality is worth it."

This kind of slogan is familiar in advertising of consumer products such as coffee or cigarettes, but it would hardly seem to be a suitable merchandising approach for huge electric power machinery.

Yet it is with exactly this technique that the transformer division of the General Electric Co. has increased its export sales nearly 80 percent in the last 3 years.

Despite prices that are slightly higher than those of its competitors in England, Germany and Switzerland, GE's transformer division has raised its export sales by well over $7 million in 3 years and has taken more than 19 percent of the free world market for power converters.

It has done so by stressing custom service and quick delivery to its customers in the developing countries of Africa, Asia and South America.

Transformers are giant devices, costing as much as several hundred thousand dollars each, that convert electricity from one voltage to another. Most European manufacturers, who until recently controlled 90 percent of the world export market for them, manufacture these transformers according to standard specifications, Donald Sampson, export director for GE's transformer division, said.

However, mechanization of GE's transformer plants at Pittsfield, Mass., Rome, Ga., and Hickory, N.C., together with the use of computers in designing the devices, has enabled the division to design transformers efficiently and quickly to the customer's specifications, Mr. Sampson said.

"With our computers, one of our engineers can ask for 15 new transformer designs in the morning and have them on his desk by lunch," the GE executive declared.

With this versatility, the division was able to go after small specialized jobs wherever they appeared. It found customers throughout the world who were willing to pay a little extra for a transformer built to meet their specialized needs or who wanted quick delivery.

A GE official asserted that the division is able to fill orders within 2 to 7 months, whereas European suppliers take from 12 to 15 months to deliver an order.

UNUSUAL PROBLEMS

GE's flexibility has enabled it to cope with some bizarre problems. In India, the division's biggest customer this year, many railway tunnels are narrow and dome shaped. They were originally built to convey British troops and presented an effective roadblock for the huge transformers.

GE engineers devised a simple answer to this problem. They shipped the transformers in narrow, dome-shaped packages.

For some areas, where power station sites are inaccessible by road or rail, the division has provided transformers broken down into small packages that can be carried on a man's back. These packages are accompanied by do-it-yourself assembly instructions.

The acceleration of the transformer division's export sales came at a time when extra sales were badly needed. By 1959, the U.S. electrical industry was confronted with a severe excess capacity. Because of this overproduction and also because of antitrust litigation, transformer prices were plunging.

At the same time, competition from European imports was getting stiffer. At one point in the 1950's, European exports accounted for 12 percent of transformer sales in the domestic market.

POSITION IMPROVED

However, the excess capacity and the falling prices put U.S. transformers in a better competitive position vis-a-vis the European products.

With their improved competitive position, therefore, GE, Westinghouse, and other U.S. manufacturers were able to recapture the initiative in the domestic market. European products now account for only about 2 percent of sales in the United States.

Mr. Sampson said that it was unlikely that GE would be able to make a significant dent in the European market, which is tightly controlled by domestic industries there. Except for some sales in Italy, GE makes virtually no shipments of transformers to Western Europe.

However, GE is sanguine about future export possibilities in the developing countries of the world. It believes it will continue to improve its competitive position in world trade as European production costs rise.

The transformer division hopes to double its export sales within the next 4 years.

A SUMMARY REPORT ON THE NINTH ANNUAL PLENARY SESSION OF THE NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS CONFERENCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, because I had to preside over the Economic Committee as Chairman on 2 days of its meeting, November 4 and 5, I was the only Member of the Senate to attend the Ninth Annual Plenary Session of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference held in Paris on November 4–8. I shall try to give a brief summary of the deliberations which took place. For the information of my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, at this point, the report of the Economic Committee, including its five recommendations which were adopted at the plenary session on November 8.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE, NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS' CONFERENCE

The Economic Committee, having met on July 12 jointly with the Working Party on Latin America, met again during the week of the annual session of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference.

As a result of its work, the Committee is submitting five recommendations to the Conference, which were adopted unanimously by the Committee.

PREPARATORY WORK

This satisfactory result was made possible largely through the preliminary meeting of the Committee and the essential staff work undertaken in the period between the eighth and ninth annual conferences.

Country-by-country reviews were submitted by the following countries: Belgium, France, the German Federal Republic, the United States of America, and Canada.

Staff papers were also submitted by officers and members of the Committee. The Committee notes especially in this connection the following papers:

"Problems of the Transport Sector," by Senator J. van Buggenhout.

"The Economic Implications of Outer Space," prepared according to the instructions of Senator JACOB K. JAVITS.

"The Problem of Primary Commodities," report presented by Senator JACOB K. JAVITS.

"Multilateral Investment Guarantees," submitted by Senator JACOB K. JAVITS.

"The International Monetary System and World Economic Growth," submitted by Senator JACOB K. JAVITS.

"An East-West Trade Code," submitted by Senator JACOB K. JAVITS.

"Proposals for German Emergency Legislation in Connection with Civil Emergency Planning, With Special Reference to Power Supply Problems," submitted by Prof. F. Burgbacher.

"The Problem of Atlantic Trade," by Dr. Kurt Birrenbach.

"Report on Action Implementing Economic Committee Recommendation III (The Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America (ADELA))."

Comments by member governments on Committee papers were also presented by Senator John J. Connelly, of Canada, and Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, of the United States.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The first recommendation recognizes the success of the Conference in sponsoring the ADELA project and requests that the Working Party be authorized to continue its efforts in pursuing the objectives of an ADELA Investment Company until such time as it acquires legal status; thereupon invites the OECD, IADB, and OAS to assume responsibility for the continuation of the policy which led to this initiative; and calls for the continuance of the Working Party and for it to report to the President of the Conference on the fulfillment of its initial terms of reference when the organization of the ADELA Investment Company has been provided for.

The second recommendation reiterates the importance of achieving implementation of the recommendation I of the eighth annual Conference. This deals with the question of trade with the Soviet bloc and harmonization of policies in respect of it.

The third recommendation draws attention to the manner in which nontariff barriers inhibit international trade. It covers such matters as quotas, discriminatory regulations, customs evaluation and nomenclature, and other regulations and practices which act as barriers to trade. The recommendation emphasizes the importance of these restrictions on trade during a period when the Kennedy round of trade negotiations is about to take place.

The fourth recommendation, perhaps, the most important of all, urges member Governments to give their support to a solution to the problem of the temporary imbalance of payments of major countries in the Alliance. This problem, if left unsolved, will continue to affect not only the rate of growth of the developed countries but the living standards of the peoples of the underdeveloped free world.

The fifth recommendation requests authority to set up a Working Party to study and make recommendations of measures to accelerate the development of the less developed countries in the Alliance; no expenditure is called for in connection with such authority.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

The following were unanimously reelected: Chairman, Senator Jacob K. Javits (United States of America); Vice Chairman, Prof. Fritz Burgbacher (Federal Republic of Germany); Rapporteur, Mr. Anthony Kershaw, Member of Parliament (United Kingdom).

Recommendation I

The Conference, noting the report on the work of the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America (ADELA), as carried out under the NATO Parliamentarians' Working Party in implementation of Economic Committee recommendation III, approved by the eighth plenary session, November 16, 1962; approving of the actions recorded in the aforementioned report; expressing appreciation for the efforts undertaken by the Secretary General of the OECD, the President of the IADB, the Secretary General of the OAS, the Members of the NATO Parliamentarians' Economic Committee and Working Party, and the personnel of ADELA, and for the cooperation of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, who acted with Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, as U.S. cosponsor of the ADELA program, and of other officials, both public and private, in member nations of the OECD and Latin America; declaring that the cooperative efforts to prepare an action program to meet the economic, social, and educational requirements for Latin American progress in freedom are expected to continue with the support and assistance of the OECD, IADB, and OAS; recommends:

1. that the Working Party be authorized to continue its efforts for 6 months with respect to the ADELA project; and
2. the Working Party be authorized to invite the OECD, IADB, and OAS to take over its responsibilities as soon as possible; and
3. upon consummation of steps 1 and 2, the Working Party to submit its closing report concerning completion of its mission to the President of the Conference.

Recommendation II

The Conference, recognizing that its recommendation No. I adopted by the plenary session of the eighth annual Conference in 1962 on the subject of trade with the Soviet bloc has not been adequately implemented, and recognizing further that developments since the eighth Conference make it even more essential in the interests of free world economic strength to harmonize if possible the trade policies of the member countries with respect to the Soviet bloc including such policies as credit terms, patents and copyrights, status of traders, arbitration of disputes, and trade practices; recommends:

That member governments and the North Atlantic Council be called upon to implement recommendation No. I on East-West Trade adopted at the eighth annual Conference and to advise the Conference as to such implementation.

Recommendation III

The Conference recognizing the need to strengthen the economies of the developing and developed free world countries by providing opportunities for trade and recognizing that nontariff barriers to trade continue to inhibit trade, and recognizing that important negotiations to reduce barriers to trade and to expand trade will take place in 1964; recommends:

That nontariff barriers to trade be considered especially by the member countries and the North Atlantic Council with a view to reducing the burden of such nontariff barriers upon trade and that such nontariff barriers be a prime object of trade and tariff negotiations to be undertaken among the members of the GATT at Geneva in 1964 and of the United Nations Trade and Development Conference in that year.

Recommendation IV

The Conference, while welcoming the development in international techniques designed to deal with temporary monetary imbalances, states its conviction that the problem of the balance of payments is of the highest importance to the prosperity of the free world and especially the living standards of the people of the undeveloped countries and further, that the failure to provide adequate international liquidity impairs the defense effort of the nations of NATO; urges the NATO Council to give further consideration to its recommendation VI adopted by the plenary session of the Eighth Annual Conference; calls upon the member governments to lend every support to the active consideration of this problem by the International Monetary Fund and the Paris Club in their impending study, and by other international agencies and institutions, and for concrete recommendations on how best to deal with the problem of international liquidity and imbalances in international payments in the interests of freedom and free world economic prosperity.

Recommendation V

The Conference recognizing the success of the Conference in the ADELA project, is encouraged in seeking a similar initiative in the NATO area and therefore calls for the designation by the Chairman, subject to the approval of the President of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, of a Working Party to be appointed by leaders of the respective delegations acting in an official capacity, to include Greece, Turkey, Portugal, Iceland, United Kingdom, United States, Germany, the Netherlands, and Canada; to study and make recommendations of action which should be taken to accelerate the development of the less developed countries within the NATO Alliance itself.

Mr. JAVITS. A number of reports were submitted by members of the Economic Committee itself. From the U.S. point of view, I would say that the reports and recommendations dealing with East-West trade and the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America—ADELA—are of prime interest. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have these reports inserted at this point of the proceedings.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN EAST-WEST TRADE CODE

(Submitted by Senator JACOB K. JAVITS)

The question of East-West trade, which has been a significant element of the East-West policy confrontation since the Second World War, has taken on new importance within the past year for two reasons: first, its volume is expanding, and second, there is evidence that the Soviet Union attaches new importance to possible liberalization of the prevailing restraints which the West, and particularly the United States, has applied to such trade.

In the last 10 years, the trade exchange (imports and exports) between the free world countries and the Soviet bloc has grown from slightly more than $3 billion in 1952 to over $10 billion in 1962. This volume is still, of course, a very small percentage of total world trade, and the U.S. share has been so small as to be insignificant by any quantitative standard. U.S. exports to the Soviet Union in 1962 were only $20 million, while the exports of other free world industrialized countries amounted to $1.2 billion. U.S. exports to the Eastern European satellite countries in 1962 amounted to $105 million ($95 million to Poland), while exports from all free world industrialized countries were valued at $1.7 billion.

In aggregate terms, this trade is of minor significance to the Soviet bloc. Total imports from nonbloc sources represent less than 1 percent of Soviet gross national product. Imports from the industrialized nonbloc countries, which would provide machinery and equipment of principal value to the Soviet economy, represent only one-half of 1 percent of Soviet GNP.

This trade obviously could not appreciably affect the Soviet Union's military capability or long-term economic growth. Soviet military capability is based on its own advanced weapons technology. The Soviet Union would be no more likely to become dependent upon Western sources for military designs and production than the United States would be inclined to rely on Soviet sources for American military development.

This leaves the question of whether the total denial of Western exports to the Soviet Union might appreciably affect Soviet economic growth. It seems highly unlikely that this would be possible because Soviet industry is broadly based on domestic materials and resources for which the Soviets are not dependent upon imports from the West. As far as its agricultural sector is concerned, Soviet difficulties there are basically the result of institutional defects which are so ingrained in the Communist system that it is difficult to visualize how they could be cured short of abandoning the Communist system of economic organization itself. This in fact is what has happened in the Communist countries which have made progress in agriculture. In Poland and Yugoslavia agricultural production has been placed on an almost completely free and individual basis, and this is a development we certainly should welcome. In the Soviet Union problems of inadequate incentives, ineffective procurement and distribution, and the inefficiencies inherent in collectivized or state farming are the governing factors, rather than specific import requirements from the West.

For all these reasons, the denial of Western exports to the Soviet Union might at most have a short-term disruptive effect on Soviet economic planning at a given time, if a ban were imposed for reasons growing out of serious new East-West tensions. Trade with the West as a general matter, however, must necessarily be a marginal factor in the performance and potentialities of the Soviet economy.

There is, of course, a qualitative factor which enters the equation. The Soviet bloc countries find it cheaper in terms of the disposition of their resources in some instances to add to capacity through imports of modern plants and technology than to build all the additional facilities foreseen in their long-range planning themselves. At the same time, the ability of the Soviet Union and the other Soviet bloc countries to import from the industrialized West has been sharply limited by sparse export capabilities, although the bloc has continued to use appreciable amounts of scarce foreign exchange to purchase foodstuffs and industrial materials of a purely expendible nature as contrasted with capital equipment or prototypes. In 1962, for example, the Soviet Union used $4 million of foreign exchange to purchase tallow in the United States.

The fact that East-West trade is of marginal importance in aggregate terms either to the East or to the West does not erase the fact that this marginal contribution is viewed as having a certain economic importance by both sides. Resort to imports involves a timesaving factor for the bloc which facilitates adherence to production schedules and realization of plan targets. Trade with the West is thus of sufficient importance to the Soviets that they would prefer to continue to rely upon this marginal adjustment mechanism of importing from the industrialized countries if it can conveniently be arranged, particularly if credit can be used to cover the capital equipment component of such trade. For the major trading countries of the West, the record is quite clear that they regard orders from the Soviet bloc as having commercial and political importance from their own standpoint, especially in industries subject to underemployment.

Apart from the economic and strategic factors summarized above, the political and psychological importance to the Soviet bloc of Western controls is substantial. This sensitivity on the part of the Soviet bloc countries to what they regard as discriminatory treatment by the West suggests the utility of East-West trade relationships as a possible bargaining area under certain circumstances.

In analyzing the problem of East-West trade from the standpoint of the national interest over the years since the Second World War, the United States has viewed that interest as being involved in four particular areas:

First, the possible strategic contribution of exports to the bloc; second, the use by the bloc of trade and related long-term credits as a means of penetrating the less-developed countries in ways that may threaten the growth of independent regimes; third, the potentialities available to the bloc to disrupt world markets; and, fourth, the possibility that certain of the Western Allies may become unduly dependent upon Soviet bloc supplies or markets.

A variety of actions and programs have been undertaken over the years to minimize these risks. The multilateral Coordinating Committee (Cocom) program has placed agreed restraints on strategic exports and on the control of transshipments. The foreign assistance program in collaboration with the foreign aid programs of other Western countries has been used as flexibly as possible to counter Soviet penetration in less developed countries and to augment Western influence. The new and uncommitted countries have been encouraged to associate themselves with the multilateral trade and financial institutions and the Western system of international trade and payments. Joint Western efforts have been made to deal with such special problems of trade vulnerability as those involving Greece or Turkey. Soviet activities in international commodity markets such as oil or tin have been the subject of Western collaboration. Efforts have been made through international commodity studies or agreements to meet the marketing problems of less developed countries and reduce their vulnerability to Soviet bilateral trade machinations.

The Western response to the problems of trade with the Soviet bloc must continue to be both varied and flexible. There is no single solution to the problem of protecting the national interest in this field. One channel of action, which has been increasingly discussed in recent years, might be the development of a code of trading practices which would have the effect of limiting the scope for disruptive activities by the Soviet bloc and at the same time prescribing a more satisfactory basis for commercial dealings between market economy and state trading countries. Such a code need not try to cover all questions at issue in East-West trade. It should, however, serve as a guide and as a unifying influence for free world countries in their bilateral trade relations with bloc countries. It might evolve into a concrete set of proposals that could be presented for agreement to the bloc countries. It would be advisable to explore such a proposal first with the countries alined in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization since they include most of the principal trading countries having important trading relationships with the bloc.

In addition to reaching agreements among Western countries on a common trade code to be proposed to the Soviet bloc, Western countries should also harmonize their policies on extending credits to the bloc. Their aim should be to limit the terms of such credits so as not to allow the U.S.S.R. and other Soviet bloc countries undue flexibility in continuing essential hard currency imports despite balance-of-payments problems. The effect of longer term credits to the bloc would be to permit the bloc countries to defer the surrender of gold, foreign assets, or hard currency exports and thus to have a very free hand in planning their allocation of internal resources. It would be well nigh ludicrous for the NATO countries to be giving the Soviets better credit terms than are permitted to less developed countries of the free world.

A proposed code follows:

"CODE OF FAIR PRACTICES IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE

"1. FACILITATING ACCESS TO MARKETS

"Each government shall permit the entry into and residence and travel within its territory of bona fide foreign commercial representatives and salesmen, for the purpose of the normal conduct of their business, including, inter alia:

"(a) Opportunity to procure suitable facilities such as office space, warehouse space, space for the public display of merchandise, and facilitation for the post-sales maintenance and servicing of their products.

"(b) Access to importing and exporting interests, banks, insurance companies, publicity and advertising media, and postal and other communications facilities.

"(c) Freedom to bring in advertising material and samples, and to disseminate the same within the national territory.

"(d) Freedom to bring in or employ locally interpreters, translators, secretaries, accountants, technical experts, and legal counsel.

"2. PUBLICATION OF LAWS, REGULATIONS, AND STATISTICS

"Each government shall publish promptly all laws, regulations, judicial decisions and administrative decisions affecting foreign trade, and adequately detailed statistics regarding foreign trade, in such a manner as to enable governments and traders to become acquainted with them.

"3. PATENT AND COPYRIGHT PROTECTION

"Each country shall observe equitable standards of patent and copyright protection, and shall maintain procedures so that foreign nationals are able in practice to obtain adequate, prompt, and effective compensation for the use of their industrial and intellectual property.

"4. RULES ON STATE TRADING

"In a country which maintains any state enterprise with exclusive, or special privileges regarding purchases or sales (other than purchases purely for governmental use) such enterprises shall make any purchases and sales involving imports or exports solely in accordance with commercial considerations, such as price, quality, availability, marketability, transportation costs and other conditions, and foreign enterprises shall be afforded adequate opportunity to compete on an equal basis in State purchases and sales abroad. Such State enterprises shall not claim sovereign immunity with respect to their commercial operations.

"5. SWITCHING OF PROCUREMENT

"Each government shall insure that its agencies or state trading enterprises shall not arbitrarily change sources of imports for purely political reasons in such a manner as to disrupt the normal marketing arrangements of supplying countries.

"6. REEXPORTATION

"Each Government shall insure that its agencies or state trading enterprises do not reexport a commodity imported from another country at a price lower than that at which it was originally exported, and do not make reexports contrary to the laws and regulations of the country of origin.

"7. DUMPING AND MARKET DISRUPTION

"Each government shall establish or maintain procedures to insure that its agencies or state trading enterprises do not introduce products into the commerce of another country at such prices, in such quantities, or at such a rate as to cause or threaten serious injury to an established industry in the latter country.

"8. SETTLEMENT OF COMMERCIAL DISPUTES

"Each government shall facilitate the use of arbitration in the settlement of disputes that arise in the course of international commerce. To that end, each government shall avoid taking any action to prevent the inclusion in agreements of provisions for settlement of such disputes in third countries or for the appointment of arbitrators who are nationals of third countries.

"9. CONSULTATION

"Each government shall accord sympathetic consideration to, and shall afford adequate opportunity for, consultation regarding such representations as may be made by another government with respect to any matter affecting the operation of this code."

REPORT ON ACTION IMPLEMENTING ECONOMIC COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION III—THE ATLANTIC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GROUP FOR LATIN AMERICA (ADELA)

At the September 1962 meeting of the NATO Parliamentarians Economic Committee, Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Chairman, presented a preliminary report on Western European participation in Latin American development. In discussion of this report, it was decided to have a more complete presentation prepared for the Economic Committee meeting in November 1962 and on this basis to submit recommendations for action by the plenary session.

The November 1962 report, "The Role of the OECD in the Economic Development of Latin America" (Doc. E. 129), and recommendation III of the Economic Committee were adopted by the plenary session on November 16, 1962. To implement this recommendation, that the "private and public sectors of the member nations of the OECD" be enlisted in an accelerated development program for Latin America in coordination with the Alliance for Progress, a Working Party was appointed at the plenary session. Under the chairmanship of Mr. JAVITS, the members of the Working Party are: M. Lucien Radoux (Belgium); M. Claude Roux (France); Dr. Kurt Birrenbach (Germany); Mr. Giuseppe Vedovato (Italy); Miss W. van Stoetwegen (Netherlands); Mr. Anthony Kershaw (United Kingdom); Mr. John Hall (alternate):

Subsequently, four additional members were appointed to the Working Party: Mr. Herb Gray (Canada); Mr. Helland (Norway); M. Tavares (Portugal); M. Gulek (Turkey).

The Working Party convened for its first meeting on April 5, 1963, in Paris. Present were: Mr. Hall, Mr. Javits, Dr. Aurelio Peccei (for Mr. Vedovato), M. Roux, and Dr. Hellmuth Wagner (for Dr. Birrenbach).[1] M. Radoux came personally to Paris on April 7, was informed by Dr. Peccei of the actions taken, and concurred. All regular and alternate members subsequently received a report from the Chairman.

In accordance with the discussion at this Working Party meeting, the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America (ADELA) was organized the following day—April 6. Headquartered in Paris, ADELA has as Executive Directors Dr. Aurelio Peccei for Europe, Dr. Julio Gonzales del Solar (European representative of the Inter-American Development Bank) for Latin America, and Mr. Warren Wilhelm for the United States. Serving as advisers to ADELA are Prof. Milton Katz (Harvard University), and Dr. Felipe Herrera (President, Inter-American Development Bank). Mr. Herbert J. Blitz is Executive Secretary to ADELA. An advisory committee from business, banking, the foundations, and universities, serves in the United States (principals: George Moore, Emilio Collado). Modest financing has been provided by Ford Foundation and U.S. business, in order to support the office and other staff functions of ADELA.

Continuing liaison has been established by ADELA with the Inter-American Development Bank, the Organization of American States, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Finance Corporation, and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), as well as the following institutions and organizations, among others: The Development Assistance Committee to the OECD; the Business and Industry Advisory Committee to the OECD; the Atlantic Institute; and the Committee for European Cooperation with Latin America (CECAL), established on the recommendation of the International Christian Union of Business Executives (UNIAPAC) Forum.

In June of 1963, the Chairman of the Economic Committee submitted a report—F.51EC(63)4—on ADELA to the Standing Committee of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference.

On July 12, 1963, a joint meeting of the NATO Parliamentarians' Economic Committee and the Working Party on Latin America was held at NATO headquarters in Paris. At this meeting the Executive Directors and the Executive Secretary of ADELA attended in order to present an interim progress report. The meeting approved the work done up to that date, including the proposals for the establishment of a multinational investment company and for efforts to bring European, Canadian, and U.S. technical and managerial skills into Latin America. A document drawn up on September 16, 1963, outlines the ADELA Investment Co. proposal and is available as an Economic Committee document.

The joint meeting also adopted a resolution that ADELA "call a conference on November 8 to 10, to consider the recommendations of ADELA as authorized by the Working Party of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference"; and "that the Executive Directors of ADELA be directed to coordinate their activities with a member of the Working Party in each country." Although ADELA's work has been proceeding at a pace more rapid then contemplated and is achieving concrete results, circumstances beyond ADELA's control necessitate a delay in holding the Conference until mid-December 1963.

It is expected that the structure of the proposed multinational investment company, described in the background documents referred to above, will be set up in a few months. At the mid-December Conference, it is hoped to form an organizing company which would draw up the charter of the investment company and find suitable management for its operation. It is expected that the investment company itself will become operational during the spring of 1964. The Conference will be held under the auspices of ADELA and would place the formation of the organizing company within the broad framework of the original ADELA objectives, approved by the Working Party; i.e., the preparation of recommendations and an action plan designed to harness increased private and public sector participation of OECD member nations to programs meeting the economic, social and educational requirements for Latin American progress in freedom. The proposed investment company, if successfully organized, would represent a concrete achievement in accordance with the original objectives of ADELA.

It is expected, with the formation of the organizing company as the hard core around which the ADELA program can be built, that support and assistance for ADELA activities can be assumed by the OECD, IADB, and OAS. This result would implement the intent of the Ecomonic Committee Recommendation III (approved November 16, 1962), to the effect that the Secretary General of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and the President of the Inter-American Development Bank, in coordination with the Secretary General of the Organization of American States * * * enlist the private and public sectors of the member nations of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development in an accelerated development program in Latin America * * *." Thus, the direct adivsory responsibility of the NATO Parliamentarians' Working Party would be transferred to the above organizations, with the nonprofit ADELA group acting as liaison with the organizing company and, later, the investment company.

In accordance with this transfer of responsibilities, the Chairman of the Economic Committee and the Working Party has received communications from the principal officers of the IADB and OAS. Pertinent excerpts follow:

President Felipe Herrera (communication dated October 17, 1963): "After the very fruitful conversations that I had the pleasure of having during the last few weeks with you, with the Executive Directors of ADELA, and with groups of businessmen and financiers from Europe, the United States, and Latin America, I believe it is useful for me to reiterate to you some of my viewpoints on your valuable initiative of fostering closer links between European and Latin American private interests.

* * * * *

"I think that the formula proposed by the Executive Directors of ADELA of creating a multilateral private investment company to operate in Latin America could constitute a valuable contribution toward attaining the goals which are being sought. This formula could very well complement other formulas falling within the wider concept of strengthening the overall economic and financial relationships of Europe and Latin America. Within this wider approach, the Inter-American Development Bank has been working in several concrete directions, including placing of bond issues in European markets, selling to European bankers participations in its loans, using its facilities to undertake the administration of trust funds, and arranging financial operations parallel to IADB loans in Latin American countries.

"I understand that important progress has been made on the basic idea. I believe that after this first stage, that is, once expressions of interest by an important group of financiers and businessmen to create a financial institution of the type suggested have been clearly obtained, it would be appropriate to enter into a more detailed analysis of the formal structure of the financial institution to be established, as well as of its position vis-a-vis inter-American regional organizations like ours, and vis-a-vis other international financial organizations.

"As to the formal definition of the relationships between the Bank and the institution that might be created, I wish to reiterate that we are completely open to exploring the several alternatives that could be presented. We know that two criteria have already been defined. On the one hand, there are those who consider that an institution of the nature of ADELA should be completely independent of any intergovernmental organization. On the other hand, there are those that rather believe that an initiative of this kind should have originated from the Inter-American Development Bank, taking for granted that changes have to be made in our institutional framework to enable us to fulfill the main objective of ADELA; that is, investing in equity capital.

---

[1] NOTE.—Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY is working jointly with Senator JAVITS in this effort in the bipartisan tradition of U.S. foreign policy (represented also by Dr. John E. Rielly of his staff) and continues to be actively engaged in it.

"Whatever formula is ultimately adopted, I believe that the Bank's current activities, which are confined to granting loans, directly or indirectly, to private enterprises operating in Latin America, can be expanded and facilitated through association with the type of operations that can be undertaken by means of a mechanism such as the one proposed.

"FELIPE HERRERA."

Assistant Secretary General William Sanders (communication dated Oct. 29, 1963) in the absence of Secretary General Jose Mora:

"In the absence of the Secretary General I should like to acknowledge the communication recently received concerning the date for the ADELA meeting in Paris. It is the intention of the Secretary General, as communicated to you earlier, to attend that meeting.

"I believe it would be appropriate for us at this time to indicate to you the importance that we attach to this particular initiative. We agree that one of the most effective means for strengthening the private sector in Latin America is to obtain assistance from the private sector in countries outside the region such as United States, Western Europe, Canada, and Japan.

"It has been a privilege for the Secretariat to be associated in the discussions and preparatory work which have taken place. It is our hope and intention to continue to collaborate in this important new venture and to provide all the assistance possible.

"WILLIAM SANDERS."

Also, the Chairman and ADELA have been assured of the interest and personal cooperation of the Secretary General of the OECD, Dr. Thorkil Kristensen.

Mr. JAVITS. With respect to the recommendations on East-West trade, I wish to make reference to the recommendation on the same subject which was adopted at the eighth plenary session in 1962. Since no report was made by the North Atlantic Council on that recommendation of 1962, the point of this year's recommendation is that action should be taken on last year's. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the text of last year's recommendation on East-West trade.

There being no objection, the recommendation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION I

The Conference of NATO Parliamentarians recognizing that some member countries as well as uncommitted countries may derive substantial benefits from trade with the Soviet bloc conducted along the lines of normal commercial practices; recognizing further that it may be contrary to the interests of free world economic strength and development to ask such countries to forgo any or all of the benefits derived from such trade; recommends:

(1) That the North Atlantic Council review existing arrangements for the coordination of the policies of the member countries of the Alliance on East-West Trade and on the Soviet economic aid and trade offensive, in order to determine the adequacy of their policies to meet the objectives of NATO.

(2) That member governments should seek uniformity in respect of items listed as strategic materials to be embargoed in East-West trade and that provisions should be made for an agency to determine exceptions for member governments which believe that they must nonetheless carry on such trade.

(3) That member governments should consult together in the NATO Council to review their policies on and to coordinate action within the framework of NATO with regard to East-West trade in nonstrategic goods and to determine what steps should be taken to insure that member countries are not vitally dependent on their trade with the Communist countries.

(4) That member governments should consult together in the NATO Council to develop an administrative means by which to coordinate their policies and programs to deal with economic warfare by the Communist countries; to provide compensation, where this may be required, in matters of East-West economic warfare; to pursue coordinated policies toward developing countries in the light of economic warfare; and to make specific recommendations to member countries on specific commodities and articles involved in economic warfare.

(5) That member countries are urged to avoid allowing excessive dependence on imports of oil from the Communist countries and toward that end should report to the NATO Council what they consider a safe maximum percentage of their requirements to be drawn from the Communist countries. Member countries are also urged to diversify sources of supply; to cooperate in the maintenance of reserve tanker tonnage in excess of day-to-day requirements; to seek safeguards from possible future interruption in supply by aiming at greater self-sufficiency and the maintenance of stockpiles of not less than 90 days of civilian requirements; to improve the techniques of energy forecasting; and to deploy the necessary scientific and technical effort to enable them to avail themselves of the benefits of nuclear power as soon as practicable.

(6) That member governments should be invited to reexamine their systems of taxation and their regulations in the energy field with a view of keeping the cost of energy low and affording a free choice to the consumer.

Mr. JAVITS. In the context of reevaluation of the political and economic impact of trade with the Soviet bloc—a reevaluation which is now proceeding at governmental and private levels in the United States and among most of the NATO allies—the ordered approach advocated by the 1962 recommendation takes on added significance. Furthermore, the rough draft on a possible Trade Practices Code in East-West trade contained in the report submited to the Economic Committee this year deserves careful study.

With respect to the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America, I very much hope that before the end of this session I shall be able to make a further report to the Senate on the actions taken to implement this important initiative. Undoubtedly, with the difficult situation in certain parts of Latin America, our interest in successfully enlisting our NATO partners and Japan in a program to strengthen the private enterprise and investment sector in Latin America takes on great urgency.

My inability to be present during the concluding 3 days of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference of necessity limits the scope of my report on the plenary session. However, I am convinced from the proceedings I attended over the first 2 days of the plenary session and subsequent reports that the Conference is taking on a growingly important role in the destinies of the great NATO Alliance. It is most encouraging that in speaking from own national perspectives—both in committee and plenary sessions—the NATO Parliamentarians maintain a profound awareness of the need for a unified Alliance and for the measures necessary to maintain such unity. I ask for unanimous consent that all recommendations adopted by the Ninth Plenary Session of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS' CONFERENCE

STANDING COMMITTEE

Recommendation I

Whereas the Conference considers that it must be regarded as a matter of great importance for its activities that it is informed in good time before the next meeting about the results of the recommendations adopted by it; is of the opinion that it is also of importance to learn whether those recommendations have been passed on to the relevant authorities with or without comment or additions—and in the former case also to be informed of the contents thereof; therefore it recommends:

That this information should be supplied to the Rapporteurs of its Committees within 8 months of the end of the Conference.

Recommendation II

The Conference, having noted the report of the Special Committee of the Conference charged with the study of its institutionalization; expresses its appreciation of the work done by that committee in preparing its report; having also noted the recommendation of the Political Committee that the Conference holds two sessions annually, preferably one in North America and one in Europe; recommends:

The members of this Conference to draw the attention of the competent authorities to this recommendation and to report back to next year's Conference with a view to its implementation in 1966; decides that the staff of the International Secretariat shall be increased so as to be able to provide more effective assistance to Committee Rapporteurs; recommends:

That the budget for 1965 be increased to permit the implementation of this decision and recommendation.

CULTURAL AND INFORMATION COMMITTEE

Recommendation I

The conference, realizing that an ever-increasing number of students from the developing countries are getting their education at schools and universities in the Western World; realizing also the importance of giving these students a real understanding not only of the political system in our part of the world and the motives for political and military cooperation between the NATO countries, but also of the basic values of our Western civilization which this cooperation ultimately tends to protect; considering also the Communist propaganda efforts directed particularly toward this group; urges the member states as well as responsible voluntary organizations concerned with the future of our Western civilization, to be explicitly aware of their responsibility for bringing students from the developing countries in contact with Western life and thought, especially with the idea of human responsibility and fellowship underlying our whole cultural tradition.

Guided by the same considerations, receives with pleasure the proposal of the Federal German authorities and the West Berlin Senate to hold conferences periodically in West Berlin to be attended by students, especially from the Afro-Asian countries, and to set up a center for collating and diffusing objective information about the free world as compared with Eastern Europe; decides to refer for study to the NATO Cultural Affairs and Information Committee action designed to promote this initiative.

Recommendation II

The Conference recognizes that one of NATO's essential tasks is to disseminate information on the Atlantic Alliance and its objects; having read and discussed the very detailed reports of the Director of the Information Service, is convinced that the funds at present allocated to the Information Service are too small to allow it to fulfill the increasing need to spread information on the subject of NATO.

Bearing in mind, however, the high aims and important tasks of the Atlantic community, every available means should be employed, without prejudice to the information activities carried out in the various member countries, to insure that the political and military endeavors of NATO are brought before the public as far as possible by the Information Service of NATO itself, recommends:

That the budget of the Information Service be increased, partly to enable it to provide more information and partly because there has been a considerable rise in the operational costs during the past year. In view of the very limited budget of the Information Service, the committee would regard as reasonable an increase of 50 percent.

Recommendation III

The NATO Council is invited to encourage the project for an International Youth Festival prepared by the Association Diffusion Culturelle Atlantique under the auspices of the Atlantic Treaty Association.

POLITICAL COMMITTEE

Recommendation I

The Conference notes the report of the Special Subcommittee and agrees that for the present the Conference can best serve to promote Atlantic unity if it is given the means to become a more effective link between NATO and the national parliaments involved, and therefore recommends, following the suggestions of the Special Subcommittee:

(1) That Committee Chairmen should, unless already members of the Standing Committee, become members of the Standing Committee in an advisory capacity.

(2) That the Conference shall meet twice a year: once in the autumn as at present, and once at the time of Committee meetings in the spring. The meetings of the Conference shall take place preferably alternately in Europe and North America, as from January 1, 1965.

(3) That a Rapporteur General be appointed to keep the Conference and all Committees of the Conference continually informed of the work in progress and to prepare an annual summary and report of the work of the Conference and of all the problems concerning NATO itself, and that such summary or report should contain a study of NATO policy in the light of the resources available to the alliance.

(4) That the Executive Secretary be empowered to recruit two additional assistants and two additional secretaries, and any other ancillary staff which may be needed to assist in carrying out the above reforms.

Recommendation II

The Conference, recognizing that no problem before the NATO alliance has proven more difficult than that of devising a unified NATO defense strategy, including a system of common control of nuclear weapons; declaring its belief that any solution to the problem of a unified strategy is rooted in the fact that responsibility is inseparable from power; recommends:

(1) That there be developed within NATO under the NATO Council a unified strategic planning system aimed at the development of a full strategic consensus among the members of the Alliance in order to establish an effective basis for discussions regarding the use of both nuclear and nonnuclear forces.

(2) That to this end NATO governments undertake consultations toward the elevation of the NATO Council into a high level allied forum for unified strategic planning, the membership of such a revised NATO Council to be drawn from the highest levels of government.

(3) That such a revised NATO Council should engage in worldwide strategic planning in the broadest sense: political as well as military planning on questions affecting war and peace.

Recommendation III

The Conference, considering the question of devolving control of nuclear weapons is primarily political, and considering this question bears on the problem of developing a global defensive strategy; recommends:

That proposals for the multilateralization of the control and use of nuclear weapons be debated next year by the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference and hopes that in the meantime they will be subjected to parliamentary debate in member countries.

Recommendation IV

Considering the recent incidents on the highway linking Berlin to the free world, the Political Committee recommends:

That the attention of the NATO governments be once more drawn to the need for maintaining in their entirety the fundamental rights and obligations of the powers responsible for the international agreement on the status of Berlin.

ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

Recommendation I

The Conference, noting the report on the work of the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America (ADELA), as carried out under the NATO Parliamentarians Working Party in implementation of Economic Committee Recommendation III, approved by the Eighth Plenary Session, November 16, 1962; approving of the actions recorded in the aforementioned report; expressing appreciation for the efforts undertaken by the Secretary General of the OECD, the President of the IADB, the Secretary General of the OAS, the members of the NATO Parliamentarians Economic Committee and Working Party, and the personnel of ADELA, and for the cooperation of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, who acted with Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, as U.S. cosponsor of the ADELA program, and of other officials, both public and private, in member nations of the OECD and Latin America; declaring that the cooperative efforts to prepare an action program to meet the economic, social, and educational requirements for Latin American progress in freedom are expected to continue with the support and assistance of the OECD, IADB, and OAS; recommends:

1. That the Working Party be authorized to continue its efforts for 6 months only with respect to the ADELA project; and

2. The Working Party be authorized to invite the OECD, IADB, and OAS to take over its responsibilities as soon as possible; and

3. Upon consummation of steps 1 and 2, the Working Party to submit its closing report concerning completion of its mission to the President of the Conference.

Recommendation II

The Conference, recognizing that its recommendation No. 1 adopted by the Plenary Session of the Eighth Annual Conference in 1962 on the subject of trade with the Soviet bloc has not been adequately implemented, and recognizing further that developments since the Eighth Conference make it even more essential in the interests of free world economic strength to harmonize if possible the trade policies of the member countries with respect to the Soviet bloc, including such policies as credit terms, patents and copyrights, status of traders, arbitration of disputes and trade practices, recommends:

That member governments and the North Atlantic Council be called upon to implement recommendation No. 1 on East-West Trade adopted at the 8th Annual Conference and to advise the Conference as to such implementation.

Recommendation III

The Conference, recognizing the need to strengthen the economies of the developing and developed free world countries by providing opportunities for trade and recognizing that nontariff barriers to trade continue to inhibit trade, and recognizing that important negotiations to reduce barriers to trade and to expand trade will take place in 1964, recommends:

That nontariff barriers to trade be considered especially by the member countries and the North Atlantic Council with a view to reducing the burden of such nontariff barriers upon trade and that such nontariff barriers be a prime object of trade and tariff negotiations to be undertaken among the members of the GATT at Geneva in 1964 and of the United Nations Trade and Development Conference in that year.

Recommendation IV

The Conference, while welcoming the development in international techniques designed to deal with temporary monetary imbalances, states its conviction that the problem of the balance of payments is of the highest importance to the prosperity of the free world and especially the living standards of the people of the undeveloped countries and further, that the failure to provide adequate international liquidity impairs the defense effort of the nations of NATO, urges the NATO Council to give further consideration to its recommendation VI adopted by the plenary session of the Eighth Annual Conference; calls upon the member governments to lend every support to the active consideration of this problem by the International Monetary Fund and the Paris Club in their impending study, and by other international agencies and institutions, and for concrete recommendations on how best to deal with the problem of international liquidity and imbalances in international payments in the interests of freedom and free world economic prosperity.

Recommendation V

The Conference, recognizing the success of the Conference in the ADELA project, is encouraged in seeking a similar initiative in the NATO area and, therefore, calls for the designation by the Chairman, subject to the approval of the President of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, of a working party to be appointed by leaders of the respective delegation acting in an official capacity, to include Greece, Turkey, Portugal, Iceland, United Kingdom, United States, Germany, the Netherlands, and Canada, to study and make recommendations of action which should be taken to accelerate the development of the less developed countries within the NATO Alliance itself.

MILITARY COMMITTEE

Recommendation I

The Conference considers that the control of nuclear weapons is a political problem; is of the opinion that, from a military point of view, the coordination and modernization of existing nuclear resources is as important as a numerical increase in such resources; considers that the Alliance should concentrate its efforts on evolving a system of joint political control over the existing nuclear weapons within the Alliance; therefore it welcomes the decisions taken at Ottawa; Recommends:

That these proposals be further developed to enable all member nations to have a real participation in the full strategy of the Alliance, covering both nuclear and conventional forces; urges that the nuclear resources at the disposal of Saceur be increased by the assignment of existing resources, increased coordination at operational level, and the exchange of information.

Recommendation II

The Conference, recognizing that research, development, and production of new weapons and equipment are becoming increasingly expensive, so that in the future individual countries will be unable to bear the cost alone; recognizing that for individual countries to undertake research and development of new weapons results in a waste of time and manpower; believing that only close cooperation by the NATO members in this field can prevent the financial burden of the defense efforts becoming too heavy; believing that failure to cooperate will result in an insufficiently defended NATO territory; believing that cooperation can facilitate acceleration of the necessary standardization in many fields, including that of logistics; recognizing that certain progress has been made in joint development and production, e.g., Starfighter, Hawk, Sidewinder, Transall, and Breguet Atlantic, and that new projects are being studied; recommends:

That the alliance take all possible steps to increase still further coordination of research, development, and production within the framework of NATO, and to organize an integrated logistics system.

Recommendation III

The Conference, recalling the fifth recommendation of the Eighth Conference's Military Committee on the subject of civil defense; recognizing that progress has been made in the direction indicated by the recommendation aforementioned; noting that, nevertheless, civil emergency planning is still lagging behind the military effort within the alliance; considering that the vital importance of a civil emergency planning scheme, which is properly coordinated with the military defense system, should be stressed again; recommends:

That civil emergency planning as conceived, stimulated and/or coordinated by the Secretary General of NATO receive a sufficiently high degree of attention from the national authorities concerned so that the various psychological, financial, and organizational difficulties, which so far have caused civil emergency planning to lag behind military defense planning, will be speedily removed.

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Recommendation I

The Conference, noting that the recent advances in desalination of sea water are currently reaching an acceptable economic level; recognizing the immediate and urgent fresh water needs of several NATO countries, especially Turkey, for alimentary as well as for agricultural and industrial purposes; recommends:

That the members of NATO assist such countries in researching into, and developing suitable saline water conversion facilities, as a further contribution toward the efforts already being made in this direction by UNESCO, OECD, and other international organizations.

Recommendation II

The Conference, noting that the North Atlantic Council in 1962 released the report of its working group which unanimously agreed as to the feasibility and desirability of establishing an International Institute of Science and Technology; reiterates its strong support for this proposal; regrets the failure to take effective action on this proposal; welcomes the interest demonstrated in the project by the United States and certain European countries, particularly the suggestion that a group of technical universities should undertake the initiative to establish an interdisciplinary center in earth sciences; noting that several countries have offered sites for the location of such an international institute; urges that the North Atlantic Council take up as a matter of urgency the proposal to establish that Institute; recommends:

That all the other NATO nations consider joining the group; and that NATO nations and agencies assist, insofar as practicable, the efforts already begun by this group.

Recommendation III

The conference, recognizing that the recent stringent curbs on potentially toxic drugs are tending to hamper the international interchange of pharmaceutical products and useful scientific data; recommends:

That the NATO countries cooperate with the World Health Organization in endeavoring to avoid adopting a "negative" attitude, and also that they insure the prompt interchange of new scientific data and beneficial pharmaceutical products without, however, ceasing to maintain strict control over their possible toxicity.

Recommendation IV

The Conference, aware that air and water pollution are constituting increasingly serious hazards to public health and hygiene; recognizing that certain NATO countries have made some technological progress toward dealing with such hazards; recommends:

That NATO cooperate with OECD and other international bodies to promote the interchange of technical information on measures taken to combat such pollution.

Recommendation V

The Conference, having noted the very interesting studies in oceanographic research being carried out under NATO sponsorship; strongly supports this research as an excellent example of international scientific cooperation both because of its fundamental scientific value and its relevance to NATO's interests; and strongly urges NATO to give continued and increasing support to this scientific work.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7431) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, for myself, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 5, line 22, it is proposed to strike out "$64,221,212" and insert in lieu thereof "$64,226,172."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to provide $4,960 for the position of a Supervisory Director of Library Services for District schools for the 6 months from December through June.

This position is presently filled and is paid for from private funds. However, these funds, which have been available since January 1962, have now been expended. The Board of Education considers this one of the wisest steps that could be taken in providing more adequate library facilities for the District of Columbia. So that the District may have the continued services of a Director of Library Services, I ask that these funds be made available.

The chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking Republican member of the committee support the amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Senator's understanding, as he expressed it, is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, while I have the floor, I wish to take a moment to say again publicly what I have said privately, in the subcommittee, and in the full committee; that is, that the District of Columbia is very fortunate to have as the chairman of the Subcommittee on District of Columbia Appropriations, the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. I am sure every Senator realizes today what a tremendous effort the Senator from West Virginia has put into this work—work that does not yield any political dividends back home. He has performed faithful and loyal public service. I compliment him upon rendering outstanding service particularly for our institutions of education, health, and welfare. The Senator from West Virginia has helped to build these programs into much more effective and, I think, just and fair programs.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I express appreciation also for the strong support he has given me in my work on the subcommittee and for the keen interest he has manifested many times in the various programs for which we are recommending appropriations today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD telegrams and messages I have received relating to the amendment just adopted.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
November 16, 1963.

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Council sincerely request you use your influence to restore supervising director of District of Columbia public school libraries position in fiscal year 1964 budget. As you know we are doing our best to correct situation by direct action but entire District school system urgently needs this position if we are going to make positive headway.

PAUL BEATLEY,
President, Capitol Hill Community Council.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
November 16, 1963.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We earnestly entreat you to present to the Senate an amendment to the District of Columbia budget (fiscal 1964) to restore and finance the position supervising director of District of Columbia public school library.

Wave ELAINE CULVER,
Chairman, Action Committee for District of Columbia School Library.

EVANSVILLE, IND.,
November 16, 1963.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Request you introduce and support amendment to the District of Columbia school budget bill restoring position of Supervisory Director of School Libraries.

KENNETH G. ALEXANDER.

EVANSVILLE, IND.,
November 16, 1963.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Request you introduce amendment to the District of Columbia school budget bill restoring position of Supervising Director of School Libraries.

CLYDE T. BAUGH.

WASHINGTON, D.C.
November 16, 1963.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Last-ditch appeal. Will you make amendment from floor to restore position Supervising Director, District of Columbia School Libraries to consolidate and continue beginning made in vital professional skills in book selection for school programs?

BARBARA NOLEN,
Cornwall, Conn.

WASHINGTON, D.C.
November 16, 1963.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge you make amendment from floor to restore position Supervising Director, District of Columbia school libraries to 1964 budget as necessary beginning of much needed school library program.

HAZEL WILSON,
Chevy Chase, Md.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *November 16, 1963.*

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urgently request your assistance in restoring the position of Supervisory Director of the District of Columbia Public School Library to the District of Columbia appropriation for 1964. This position essential if the school library program so long neglected in the Capitol is to have any direction, coordination, or development.

RUTH FINE,
President, Executive Board, District of Columbia Library Association Chapter of the American Library Association.

RALEIGH, N.C., *November 17, 1963.*

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Urge you to initiate amendment to District of Columbia School budget bill which will reinstate appropriations for the Office of Director of School Library for District of Columbia schools.

CORA PAUL BOMAR,
Past President, American Association of School Librarians and Supervisor of School Library, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *November 18, 1963.*

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The District of Columbia Congress of Parents and Teachers, representing 48,000 members, appeal to you to make every effort to have restored to the 1964 District of Columbia Appropriations bill, funds for the positions of Supervising Director of Library Science and librarians in the Amidon and Goding Elementary Schools.

MRS. ARTHUR M. BLACKLOW,
President, District of Columbia Congress of Parents and Teachers, Grant School, 22d and G Streets NW.

JOLIET, ILL., *November 15, 1963.*

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Request you introduce amendment to District of Columbia school budget bill restoring position of Supervisory Director of School Libraries.

MARGARET WHEELOCK,
GRACE GISHWILL.

ACTION COMMITTEE FOR
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOOL LIBRARIES
Washington, D.C., November 15, 1963.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HUMPHREY: We have just learned that the Senate District Committee has deleted from the school budget for fiscal 1964 the request for the position of Supervising Director of School Libraries. The salary for this position has been provided for 2 years by the Junior League of Washington, and it will terminate this month.

We hope that, after you have reviewed the following list of accomplishments of the incumbent during this 2-year period, you will be persuaded to submit an amendment to the school budget bill, when it comes before the Senate, to restore the position of Supervising Director of School Libraries.

1. Screening of books from the mammoth Washington Post book drive early in 1962, and from the dead letter office project plus countless smaller contributions of books from the citizens of this area. Screening gifts of this type requires a high degree of professional skill.

2. Scores of parent volunteers were given a 6-week course in rudimentary library techniques by the supervising director.

3. Professional advice on selecting and buying books from private as well as appropriated funds is constantly given by the supervising director.

4. Supervision of the 13 temporary junior high school librarians, each serving two large schools, is a major responsibility of the supervising director.

5. Consultation service is given to senior high librarians, vocational high schools, school administrators, and the District Budget Office.

As instruments to accomplish the above tasks, and many more, the supervising director has written, produced and distributed the following documents:

A written statement of "Book Selection Policy."

A manual, "What To Do Until the Librarian Comes."

"Buying Guide for Elementary School Libraries," an extensive list of recommended books.

"Goals and Standards for D.C. School Libraries," a 5-year plan.

Very truly yours,

WAVE CULVER,
Chairman, Action Committee for District of Columbia School Libraries.

PROJECT APOLLO

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Project Apollo: Giant Scientific Stride or $20 Billion Moondoggle?" published in the Sunday magazine of the Toledo Blade of November 3, 1963. The article was written by Ray Bruner, Blade science editor.

We believe this article, which deals with the subject of placing a man on the moon, approaches the subject with an effectiveness that is astounding. It points out the dangers of failure, the impact upon the economy, and the number of persons who are employed on the project.

The article states that Houston, according to Lloyd's of London, may, by the year 2000, become the largest city in the world because of the centralization of the work in that community. The article is so effective that I suggest that it be read by Senators if they desire to have a capsule presentation of this important subject.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. This is a most important article. I hope that all Senators will not only read it but will send copies of the RECORD containing it to their constituencies.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MASSIVE SCIENTIFIC STRIDE OR $20 BILLION MOONDOGGLE?

(By Ray Bruner)

Never in the history of human enterprise has anyone witnessed an undertaking comparable to the U.S. lunar project.

Its extent and growth are almost beyond comprehension. Even the idea of sending three men to the moon in Project Apollo, sometime in the current decade, seems slight by comparison.

In 1945, after the first atom bomb went off—a product of the huge Manhattan engineer project—President Harry S. Truman announced: "We have spent $2 billion on the greatest scientific gamble in history." We, at the time, thought that was gigantic. But Project Apollo is estimated to cost at least $20 billion. The price may be much larger than that. It might run to $100 billion.

Some critics believe it may turn out to be a big moondoggle. There is no indication of a letup, however, until the moon blast occurs.

Only 6 years ago, when an expenditure of $2 billion seemed huge, a majority of U.S. citizens were casually interested in the idea of a U.S. astronaut landing on the moon.

Even the word "astronaut" was an uncommon term. Many people believed the idea of a spaceship from earth landing on the moon was a little farfetched. To some scientists the idea of a rocket leaving the earth and even going into orbit was impossible.

The U.S. Navy, however, was working on its Vanguard satellites and the U.S. Army on its Redstone.

The Vanguards were widely advertised. They were to show the rest of the world that the United States by being first in space, was superior technologically to any other country. Work on the Redstone was going ahead with a minimum of fanfare.

Most of the work of the Army and Navy was hush-hush. We did not want the Russians in on our secrets. Only a few U.S. scientists were permitted to share them.

Then, in October 1957 the U.S.S.R. put Sputnik I into orbit. And the much-belittled Redstone launched Explorer I.

Sputnik I was the blastoff. The space race was on. We had to get ahead of the Russians. The moon was the major target.

Congress and the people of the United States had to be convinced of the urgency. T. Keith Glennan, president of Case Institute of Technology and former member of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, was named Administrator of the newly formed National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Mr. Glennan, a fabulous money raiser who has caused new buildings to materialize on the Case campus in Cleveland like toadstools on a humus pile, began working on Congress and the public. It was a multibillion-dollar proposition. Congress and the public were eager to listen.

The big selling points were advancement of science, good of mankind, and U.S. prestige. The idea of being awarded Government contracts for the development and manufacture of space hardware was also not unattractive to manufacturers, workers, and chambers of commerce.

Since then Congress and the public have listened favorably to almost an endless number of ideas for space ventures—communication, weather, and navigation satellites, orbiting solar, atmospheric, and astronomical observatories, Moon and Venus probes, and numerous others. Manned flight, however, was foremost. The imaginative brains of H. G. Wells, Jules Verne, and other science-fiction writers, as well as the Russians, must all be outdistanced by U.S. achievement in space enterprises.

With the orbiting of hardware in great variety, U.S. prestige started climbing. There were some setbacks, however. The United States slipped when the U.S.S.R. landed a lunik (unmanned) on the moon and used another lunik to circle the moon and photograph the side of it hidden from the earth.

But the space race was well underway. More billions came from Congress. The U.S.S.R., however, put the first man into space.

The United States soon followed with its man in suborbital trajectory. Then both nations with orbiting astronauts or cosmonauts. Astronaut Gordon Cooper made six orbits, but soon afterward a Russian man and a Russian woman went farther.

At intervals during the space race some scientists have argued that it would gain more for science if we concentrated on exploring the moon with unmanned ships and robots. At least, they contended, we should send a trained scientist if we were to have manned lunar flights.

For the time being at least, these suggestions seem to be secondary. In urging that men on the moon be made a national goal, President Kennedy said, 2 years ago, that "no single space project will be more exciting, more impressive, or more important, and none so difficult, or expensive to accomplish."

Today, it's full speed ahead. Of course, the Russians might get there first. That could happen any day, so speed with a capital "S" is urgent.

Mr. Kennedy's pressure for a speedup has brought changes in NASA's original timetable for lunar exploration. The schedule now calls for manned circumnavigation of the moon only 5 years from now. This would be followed by a landing in 1970.

But these dates may be pushed ahead. At least some space scientists and engineers think so. Scientists at the Northrup Corp., Beverly Hills, Calif., an important space and weapons subcontractor, have visualized a "Cape Canaveral in the sky"—an orbital rendezvous base which would make possible a lunar landing in 1966 or 1967.

Although it is practically impossible to visualize the extent of preparations for manned flight to the moon, one estimate is that 20,000 industrial firms—prime contractors and subcontractors—will be involved by 1964 with about 500,000 employees.

Sir Charles P. Snow, British scientist and novelist recently estimated that "in 5 years 20 percent of all American scientists will devote their time to getting a man on the moon." The U.S. scientific community embraces an estimated 2.5 million scientists, engineers, and technologists.

NASA, organized in 1958, has spread its ramifications throughout the Nation. It has 79 departments and nearly 20,000 employees. This is in addition to the National Space Council, headed by Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON and set up to advise the President regarding space policies and activities.

Heart of the activity is the huge Manned Spacecraft Center, 22 miles south of Houston, Tex. The big springboard will be Cape Canaveral.

NASA's field operations include 11 centers. They are the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala.; Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, Calif.; Flight Research Center, Edwards, Calif.; Lewis Research Center, Cleveland; Goddard Special Flight Center, Greenbelt, Md.; Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, Calif.; Wallops Station, Wallops, Va.; Langley Research Center, Langley Field, Va.; Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Tex.; Western Operations Center, Santa Monica, Calif., and the Pacific Launch Operations Center, Mugu, Calif. Not all these are directly involved in Project Apollo or manned flight—some not at all and some indirectly.

For fiscal 1964, NASA may receive as much as $5.1 billion for its operations. This year it is spending $1.8 billion. When confronted with reminders of such staggering figures, NASA officials reply that 95 percent of each year's budget is returned to local communities—industries and educational institutions.

During the current year it is spending $80 million in the Nation's universities for training and research.

Many of the contracting companies, working on space vehicles and other hardware, have enormous research and development operations, depending almost entirely upon peacetime or military space programs.

During the current year the Federal Government is expected to enter into contract commitments for $14.7 billion with private companies for research and development. Part of this is for space and part for military developments. This figure does not include the amounts private companies spend out of their own money.

Among the larger prime contractors are the General Dynamics Corp., New York; Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif.; the Boeing Co., Seattle; McDonnell Aircraft Corp., St. Louis; and North American Aviation, Inc., Los Angeles.

Total facilities and manpower of these companies, plus subcontractors, are huge, involving thousands of scientists, engineers, and technologists for research, development, and testing; hundreds of buildings and thousands of acres of land.

Dwarfing any of these private facilities, however, will be complex 39 at Cape Canaveral and the Manned Spacecraft Center's facilities at Clear Lake, Tex., 22 miles south of Downtown Houston.

NASA's activities have made the "space crescent" along the Gulf of Mexico, in seven Southern States, one of the liveliest regions in the Nation. The "space crescent" comprises Florida, Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Georgia.

Complex 39, in Florida, the giant springboard for lunar flight, will be directed from the Project Apollo headquarters at the Manned Spacecraft Center.

Chiefly because of the lunar boom, Houston, according to Lloyd's of London, may become the largest city in the world by A.D. 2000. Its population passed the million mark in 1960, outranking Baltimore as the Nation's sixth largest city. Houston now calls itself "Space Center, U.S.A."

For months, on more than 1,600 acres at Clear Lake, bulldozers, construction machinery and construction workers have been bringing to reality the new Manned Spacecraft Center complex, costing an estimated $150 million.

Into Houston, NASA alone has brought more than 3,000 employees. More than 75 aerospace companies have set up offices there. The Houston metropolitan area is being crowded with new industries preparing hardware for spaceflight.

When completed, the Spacecraft Center will have more than 15 major facilities. One of the largest will be the nine-story Project Management Building. Of comparable size will be the research and development offices and laboratories. The Spacecraft Research Building will contain special laboratories for spacecraft design, navigational equipment, model mockups of spacecraft and launch vehicles, as well as computer equipment.

Among the facilities will be a flight acceleration centrifuge, a one-armed rotating device for determining the effects of high gravity on men and equipment. The arm of the centrifuge will be about 50 feet long with a load capacity of 3,000 pounds.

Another large building will house the space environment simulation chamber. To test the durability of spacecraft as well as occupants, this facility will consist of two chambers—one 65 feet in diameter and 120 feet high and the other 35 feet in diameter and 43 feet high. The chambers will simulate the high vacuum of outer space and extremely high and low temperatures.

An integration Mission Control Center will house the operational facilities related to direct and indirect rendezvous flights of Projects Gemini and Apollo.

The facility will monitor such items as prelaunch checkouts of launch vehicles and spacecraft, perform engineering analyses, deal in problems likely to affect operations, monitor spacecraft telemetry, maintain voice and high and low speed data links with all of NASA's remote sites for tracking and guidance, keep track of space craft and astronauts in flight and provide play-by-play information to news media.

These are only a few examples to indicate the scope of the Manned Spacecraft Center.

Work on the center has created thousands of new jobs in the Houston area in addition to the 3,000 new employees of NASA. The NASA employees, drawing a total of $20 million a year in pay, are expected to occupy $20 million worth of housing. In Houston

NASA is now renting more than 300,000 square feet of office space in 13 different buildings.

On the eastern border of the Space Crescent, at Cape Canaveral, bulldozers, pile drivers and other machinery have been knocking down trees in one of the most productive orange groves in the country, leveling land and preparing more than 87,000 acres for fabulous new space flight facilities.

Most of the work is concentrated on Merritt Island, across the Banana River from the cape.

Merritt Island will be the future site of complex 39, the launching complex for the giant Saturn boosters that will blast the lunar astronauts into their great venture.

More than 5,000 construction workers are on the job. In another year there will be 9,000. To make way for the bulldozers, more than 400 homeowners are being displaced.

The Government has paid an estimated $55 million for the land. The cost of the launching complex is expected to amount to a total of $1.7 billion. Framework of some of the buildings has already been erected.

The launch facility will use an entirely new concept of sending vehicles into space. The boosters and spacecraft will be assembled in a large building 2 miles from the launching pad.

Complex 39 is situated far enough from any human habitation to minimize the roar of blast offs.

The assembly building on Merritt Island will be a giant among the world's great structures.

It will tower 525 feet—nearly the height of the Washington Monument. It will be almost as wide as it is tall. Its 130 million cubic feet will be greater than the volume of the Empire State Building in New York City.

Its massive doors, to receive the giant lunar vehicles for final assembling, mating, and testing, will be as high as a 45-story building. The assembled vehicles, rolled out by moving towers, will stand nearly the height of the Owens-Illinois Building in Toledo.

The assembly building of complex 39, designed by a New York group of architects, is to be constructed for NASA under supervision of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Not too long ago the site of complex 39 was a peaceful segment of Brevard County. The quiet was broken occasionally by an airplane flight to Patrick Air Force Base and the Atlantic missile range at the cape. The launching of the first rocket—a Matador—from the cape was an occasion for great excitement.

Then, with the dawn of the space age, excitement was intensified by Project Mercury, with the huge crowds of spectators clogging the roads with their cars.

Brevard County, between 1950 and 1960 became the fastest growing community, percentagewise, in the Nation. The population increased to more than 111,000. During the decade, total property values increased from $22.7 to $435 million. Today the population is estimated at 153,000, with growth expected to continue to accelerate.

Another giant NASA facility in the space crescent is the $50 million Michoud Ordnance Plant at New Orleans, where the Chrysler Corp. and the Boeing Co. will assemble the powerful Saturn-Apollo boosters. Michoud is one of the largest factories in the Nation. It has 1.8 million square feet of floorspace under one roof.

NASA spent $10 million to get the plant in shape for its assembly role and another $20 million for tooling and equipment. The 4,500 employees at Michoud have an annual payroll of more than $40 million.

NASA has also allocated $13.5 million for the purchase or lease of 141,850 acres of forest land in Hancock County, Miss., for construction of huge test stands for ground testing of the Saturns. In this area 3,000 construction workers are to be employed to erect the testing facility.

The Marshall Space Flight Center at Huntsville, Ala., will direct the work at Michoud and Hancock County. The MSFC today is the largest of all NASA installations. It is the guiding point for the expenditure by NASA for research and development of rockets. During the last 12 years, Huntsville, a onetime cotton town, has increased in population from 16,000 to 85,000. The boom at Huntsville has taken up the slack in Alabama's steel, textile, lumber, and mining industries, which, for several years, had been going downhill.

While Cape Canaveral is the springboard into outer space, the Gulf of Mexico is the springboard to the cape. The two giant Saturns, launched in test flights in 1961 and last year, traveled by specially constructed barge through inland waters from Huntsville to the Mississippi River, the gulf, and around the Florida Peninsula to the cape.

More navigable waterways are now being dug, to transport future boosters. One waterway extends from Tulsa, Okla., along the Verdigris and Arkansas Rivers to the Mississippi. The barges will transport Saturn boosters from the Rocketdyne division of North American Aviation, Inc.

Meanwhile, many industrial plants, designed, constructed and staffed to meet the demands of the space age, are deep in activity—visualizing, researching, developing and testing an amazingly complex variety of materials ranging from the giant Saturns that will provide 6 million pounds or more of takeoff thrust to the tiniest transistors used for instrumentation.

At the American Potash & Chemical Co., Henderson, Nev., scores of steel drums loaded with salt compounds to energize rocket fuels stand under the desert sun to await shipment to rocket-engine manufacturers.

In Kansas and Missouri mines, zinc and lead are being brought from the earth to become components of electric batteries manufactured by the Eagle-Picher Co., Joplin, Mo., for use in Project Apollo's reentry into the earth's atmosphere.

At the Bell Aerosystems, N.Y., a huge tank made of plexiglass is being used to test Bell-developed Apollo expulsion bladders.

At Cox Instruments, Detroit, instruments are being assembled and tested to weigh liquid hydrogen and oxygen in Apollo's superficial gas storage systems.

At the Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co., Minneapolis, Minn., scientists are trying out special instruments to be used in manual controls for Apollo spacecraft.

Special tools are being used at the Kaufman Glass Co., Wilmington, Del., to make precise measurements of the qualities of chemically stable glass to be used to protect the lunar astronauts in space modules that will take them to the moon and back.

At the Korry Co., Seattle, delicate wiring is being prepared for keyboards to be installed in Apollo's instrument panel.

Successful flight depends upon precise measurement of the flow of liquid propellants in the massive Saturn engines. The measurements will be made by a special flowmeter being developed at the Potter Aeronautical Corp., Union, N.J.

At Marion, Ohio, the Marion Power Shovel Co. has been awarded at $12 million contract to produce the giant crawler trucks to carry the Saturns to and from the assembly building on Merritt Island.

Reynolds Metals, Louisville, Ky., is working with extremely fine aluminum powder to increase the burning rate of Apollo's escape rockets.

At Northrup Corp.'s Ventura division, El Paso, Tex., women have been stitching thousands of yards of multicolored nylon to lower the astronauts in their Apollo earth landing module back to terra firma.

These activities must be multiplied several thousand times before anyone begins to grasp the scope of the vast backup for the three astronauts.

The three astronauts will be launched by a three-stage Saturn. The first stage, a Saturn S-1C, with its 7.5-million-pound thrust, will have five F-1 engines. The Saturn-II second stage will develop a 1-million-pound thrust from five J-2 engines. And a single J-2 engine, in the Saturn I VB stage, will provide a 200,000-pound thrust to place the 80,000-pound spacecraft into trajectory, designed to carry it to an orbit around the moon.

The spacecraft, with a total length of 75 feet, will have 3 major elements. They are the command, service and lunar excursion modules.

The command module will carry all three men. It will also contain the guidance, communications and life-support systems.

The service modules will contain propulsion systems for mid-course maneuvers, plus a means of firing retrorockets to slow the spacecraft down as it approaches the moon, and goes into lunar orbit. The lunar excursion module, or bug, will land the astronauts on the moon.

If the three astronauts get to the moon ahead of the Russians, they will have the distinction of being the first human beings to see the moon's hidden surface.

Prime contractors for the Saturns are the Boeing Co. for the first stage; North American Aviation's Space and Information Systems Division, Downey, Calif., for the second, and the Douglas Aircraft Co., Santa Monica, Calif., for the third.

Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp., Bethpage, N.Y., has the contract for the lunar excursion module, and North American for the command and service modules.

The command module, conical in shape, will be built like a fortress, to guard the three occupants and their instruments against any force foreseen and unforeseen, they may encounter on their round trip of more than a half million miles. It will weigh 5 tons.

The service module with its propulsion systems for midcourse maneuvers will weigh 21 tons.

To provide subsystems and assemblies for the two modules North American has enlisted the aid of more than a score of subcontractors in 21 States, including Ohio.

The Lewis Center in Cleveland and its facility in Plum Brook, near Sandusky, will have charge of the experimental work and testing of the lunar excursion module, which will cost approximately $500 million. Other NASA centers will make similar contributions toward the development of the other modules.

The Martin Co.'s space systems division, Baltimore, has developed a model of the lunar landing module to simulate all phases of lunar landing missions. It will simulate "realistic motion," physical "docking" with a mother spacecraft in parking orbit around the moon.

The Martin flight simulator, constructed in full size, is connected with an electronic computer which automatically solves complex equations involved in motion. Solutions of the equations are reflected on a panel visible to the occupants.

In some of the tests, occupants have been confined within the simulated spacecraft for periods up to 7 days. The tests, simulating a flight to the moon, with emphasis on the critical final phases involved in landing and taking off from the lunar surface, are conducted in a sound-proofed, darkened room.

The simulator rests in a cradle that permits several degrees of motion on three axes—roll, pitch, and yaw.

The simulator also faces a wall in which a starfield is shown through a closed-circuit TV channel. A blinking light, first appearing at a distance and gradually moving closer, represents the orbiting spacecraft, with which the landing module must make contact in a rendezvous.

As the pilot inside the simulator swings his chair and looks through a porthole, the mother ship, represented by a conical shell on a crane, appears in view. Using reaction jet controls, the pilot docks the two craft.

The Martin Co., with the Black & Decker Co., as the subcontractor, is developing tools the astronauts may use to make emergency repairs on space vehicles. One tool is a "zero reaction" wrench which operates under weightless conditions. If the astronaut, weightless in space, tried to use an ordinary monkey wrench he himself would turn instead of the nut or bolt he was trying to tighten.

In developing a system to control the life sustaining environment inside a space ship, the AiResearch Manufacturing Division, the Garrett Corp., at Los Angeles, is conducting numerous tests at its new space laboratory.

The tests will simulate conditions that will exist prior to launching, during the blast off, ascent, orbiting, and reentry of the earth's atmosphere. Equipment at the laboratory includes a complex data processing setup to determine conditions at more than 200 different combinations of temperature and pressure. The information will be recorded on magnetic tape and analyzed by an electronic computer.

While research and development for production of hardware for Project Apollo is vast and complicated enough, much more involved is research applied to humans.

We know a great deal about how an individual with a certain degree of mental and physical fitness can perform on the stable and solid earth. There is also elaborate data on the performance of the U.S. astronauts in Project Mercury. And we know how Lt. Col. Valery Bykovsky, the Russian cosmonaut, made out in his 81-orbit, 2-million-mile flight around the earth last July.

Traveling to the moon and back is another matter. The U.S. astronauts and Russian cosmonauts went into orbit at a speed of 18,000 miles an hour, but the Apollo astronauts will have to attain a speed of 25,000 miles an hour to leave the earth's gravitational field.

Scientists have a rather fair idea of the elements that may prove hazardous in the space between the earth and the moon. This information, however, is, by no means complete.

Life as we know it has adapted to the earth and its environment. Nothing is known how adaptable any form of life, including human, can be outside.

Consequently, one of the most critical jobs in the entire preparation for Project Apollo is that assigned to scientists in the department of biotechnology and human research, NASA office of advanced research and technology.

One important center under NASA direction for studying man's reactions to his unusual environment as he journeys to the moon is the Space Research Laboratory in the department of psychology at the University of Maryland.

One of the subjects of this study is 35-year-old Whilden P. Breen, Jr., who has volunteered to live inside an experimental chamber consisting of three soundproof rooms—one room 12 feet square and two small alcoves. He started his confinement last November.

His activities are programed. He has had to perform specific tasks according to instruction. Doors connecting the main room and alcoves are fastened with electrical locks, controlled from the outside to assure his conformity to specific routines of performance.

One room contains a toilet, shower and washstand. He is assigned such tasks as obtaining clean clothes, taking a shower, using a sunlamp, sleeping, working, obtaining food and cigarettes. His tasks have ranged from those that are highly regimented in a temporarily determined environment, to a relaxed, slow-paced existence.

Initially Mr. Breen had no clock. He had no way of knowing the time of day.

In some instances he stayed awake more that 30 hours at a stretch, but made no comment that he was tired from lack of sleep.

After the 49th day of the experiment, he was given an electric clock, set at the correct time. After that, his periods of sleeping and wakefulness became more regular.

He was able to pursue two hobbies—painting in oils and writing a novel. His changes in mood were not unlike those of most individuals living under normal conditions, although somewhat more pronounced.

From latest reports he appeared to be in good physical and mental condition. He lost some weight at first, but after several weeks it became stabilized at 185 pounds.

Mr. Breen's unusual ordeal in confinement is in anticipation of the psychological and physical stresses that could decrease the efficiency of the lunar astronauts and fog their minds. The astronauts go through many additional trials such as effects of weightlessness.

What and how the astronauts will eat during their space trips is another important consideration, which the U.S. Army Quartermaster Corps is working on.

Army scientists, after a study, have suggested a breakfast of scrambled eggs, bacon and cereal, and that other meals should include one meat entree, one vegetable and a dessert at each meal.

Each food item would be precooked and freeze-dried. Each meal would be individually packaged, with the necessary water to rehydrate it. The food would be warmed to serving temperature within 10 to 15 minutes by a special electric heating device.

More critical, of course, is how to keep the astronauts alive inside their vehicles, as they transfer from one vehicle to another and as they land on the moon's surface. This also has been assigned to a number of investigators by the NASA director of biotechnology and human research.

United Aircraft Corp. scientists are working on the development of an Apollo space suit and a portable life-sustaining apparatus to be strapped to the astronaut's back.

In the use of this equipment, with human life at stake, in the moon's hostile environment, 240,000 miles from the earth, there must be no margin of error. The equipment must supply oxygen, under controlled temperatures, and humidity, free from contamination.

Inside a space vehicle carbon dioxide which the astronauts will exhale must be removed from the atmosphere and replaced by oxygen.

Canisters containing minerals to absorb carbon dioxide and release it into the vacuum of outer space have been successfully tested for 30 days of flight. Prototypes are now in the hands of the Air Force and NASA for evaluation.

The United Aircraft experimenters are also working on the idea of breaking down carbon dioxide into carbon and oxygen. In one experiment carbon dioxide is passed over molten salt, heated by electricity to 1,000° Fahrenheit. The carbon remains as a black crust on the electrodes while oxygen is released for rebreathing.

During 24 hours a man will exhale more than 2 pounds of carbon dioxide, and a half pound of carbon would be left in the separator.

The United Aircraft scientists are experimenting with the recovery of drinkable water by the distillation of urine, without contaminating the water with such toxic byproducts as methane, carbon monoxide and ammonia.

Martin Co. scientists at Denver are cultivating a special blue-green algae, found in hot springs at Yellowstone National Park that would absorb water and carbon dioxide and release oxygen as the plants carry on their process of photosynthesis.

At the Illinois Institute of Technology Research Institute, Chicago, scientists are trying to devise an artificial photosynthetic process for the same purpose. They are working with isolated chloroplasts from spinach leaves.

The International Latex Corp., Dover, Del., is experimenting with pressure suits to protect the wearer against the moon's punishing temperature changes—220° above zero Fahrenheit to 240° below.

The astronaut would be protected by two garments, one worn over the other. The inner suit would be a pressure garment, made of nylon-reinforced Neoprene and it would have rubbery bellowslike folds at the joints, for ready mobility. The outer garment would consist of multiple layers of plastic film, each layer coated with aluminum, an effective heat radiator.

Another problem, related to the style of suit an up-to-date astronaut should wear is the problem of protecting a spacecraft and its crew inside from the hazards of outer space.

It is necessary to be sure that space crew is protected against several radiation sources—the sun, stars and the Van Allen radiation belts. These were not a significant hazard in the Project Mercury flights. The highest points in the Mercury orbits were well below the Van Allen belt. The earth's magnetic field also protected them against deadly ionized radiation from solar flares.

Before flight to the moon is attempted the extent and intensity of these hazards must be known. Lack of such knowledge could result in paying a great price in unnecessary shielding or risking injurious or lethal exposure.

Under investigation is the feasibility of chemical and biological means of counteracting any harmful radiation the astronauts may encounter.

There is also another danger—puncture of the space craft by meteorites. These outer space projectiles travel at a rate of about 25 miles a second. On the earth, we are protected from most of them because they vaporize and burn up as they enter the earth's atmosphere. In the vacuum of space there would be nothing to cushion their impact.

One of the industries working on this problem is the Martin Co. Under study is a spacecraft model with a double wall. The outer wall would act as a sort of bumper. Space between the walls would contain vinyl plastic bags about 4 feet square.

Each bag would be punctured to permit all the air they contained to escape into empty space. And, during flight, if even the tiniest meteorite were to penetrate the inner wall, air would escape into the bags and tend to reinflate them.

The bags would be equipped with electronic sensors, connected with signal lights inside the cabin. The signal could tell when and where a leak has occurred.

Because of the high vaccum outside, air from the interior might rush rapidly through even the smallest puncture. No scientist has yet been able to create such a high vacuum. Our atmosphere at sea level contains quintillions and quadrillions of air molecules per cubic inch. Space, however, contains only about 10 atoms in the same volume.

After all space hardware for Project Apollo is completed, and the astronauts are ready for the final countdown for the flight to the moon, the next question is: How do they get there?

If the moon were a stationary target on the side of a barn it would not be hard to hit. But the moon, with an average distance from the earth of 239,000 miles, is always on the move.

The moon and the earth may be considered, in some respects a double planet, although the earth is 7,900 miles in diameter, while the diameter of the moon is 2,160. Its distance is equal to about 10 earth orbits of a Mercury astronaut.

It makes one revolution around the earth in 27.3 days—a speed with respect to the earth's surface of about 800 miles an hour. Strictly speaking, the earth and the moon revolve around a common center of gravity which is situated several miles below the earth's surface.

At the same time the moon is traveling around the earth, the earth is rotating on its axis at the latitude of Cape Canaveral at a speed of about 600 miles an hour.

It would be a fairly simple thing to shoot the Apollo spacecraft on a beeline to the moon, if both stood still. At a speed of 25,000 miles an hour a rocket could hit the moon in less than 10 hours. Neither the earth nor the moon is sufficiently accommodating to let the moon be that much of a sitting duck for the NASA people.

Consequently the relative motions of the earth and the moon must be taken into consideration. The lunar orbit is not perfectly circular. It is, to a small extent, an ellipse. All this has to be taken into account. There is also the density of the earth's atmosphere to be considered, which will offer resistance to the space vehicle.

These and a great many more factors call for the assistance of electronic computers to work out the proper trajectory.

The most obvious approach would be to shoot to the moon directly from Cape Canaveral. But to land the astronauts on the lunar surface, the space vehicle has to be slowed down on the approach.

Direct flight would be the simplest way to go. But it would require an immense booster, larger than the Saturn cluster now being prepared. This would mean greater cost and more delay.

After some debate, NASA officials decided to shoot the astronauts into earth orbit, orbit around the moon, and then land two men from the lunar orbit.

At countdown the 3 astronauts will roost 350 feet above ground inside the spacecraft.

The first-stage booster will fire and the vehicle will lift off. As the first stage burns out it will drop away and the second stage will fire. This will place the men into the earth orbit at 18,000 miles an hour.

They may make a number of orbits before the third stage is fired. The third stage will place the men into a lunar trajectory at 25,000 miles an hour.

As it approaches the moon, the spacecraft will about-face and release a retrorocket to slow it down and place it in lunar orbit. It will then release two of the astronauts inside the lunar excursion module or bug. The third astronaut will remain in orbit.

The bug will fire a rocket moonward for a soft landing on the moon's surface.

After the two men fulfill their mission on the moon, they will blast off in the bug and rejoin their orbiting companion. After entering the command module, all three will head for home.

As they approach the earth they will turn the command module around, open the drogue parachute for deploy and reentry into the earth's atmosphere. They will then open the main parachute and land.

The whole trip is expected to take about 3 days. The command module will contain all three astronauts except during the bug operation.

The service module, containing the propulsion system needed for getting the spacecraft in and out of lunar orbit, can also be used for aborting the spacecraft back to the earth in the event something goes wrong at blast off from the earth. There will be airlocks between the bug and the command module when the passageway between the two is opened and closed in transferring the two men from one to the other.

The bug most likely will have long spidery legs to help it land on the moon's surface. The surface may be covered with dust of unknown depth and fineness. The consistency of the dust has not been too well visualized. Some astronomers have suggested, because the moon has no atmosphere, or at least a very small amount, the dust may flow like water.

Others have suggested that it is solid. At least the astronauts, when they land, will not kick up a dust cloud.

Before the Project Apollo flight is attempted, the lunar surface is expected to be explored by spacecraft in NASA's Project Surveyor—an unmanned instrumented vehicle—to gain as much information regarding the lunar surface as possible.

All the vehicles landing on the moon and the astronauts' space suits and other equipment are expected to be thoroughly sterilized, because, if there is any form of life on the lunar surface it must not be contaminated by organisms brought from the earth. Any degree of contamination would nullify forever any scientific observations of life in outer space, insofar as the moon is concerned.

Landing will probably take place in the area of the Sea of Tranquillity, a short distance from the lunar equator.

The astronauts will have about 2 minutes to decide whether to land or continue with the orbiting command module. When they land, the astronauts, dressed in their protective suits, will start walking. They will feel they are almost capable of flying under their own power because the pull of gravity on the moon is about one-sixth of that on the earth. Carrying a TV camera in communication with the earth, the astronauts will enable us to share some of their visual sensations—the barren mountains and craters, the dark sky, the brilliant stars and sunlight, and the green and blue earth with its white clouds.

They will gather samples of rock and other material and plant seismographic equipment able to register any tremors that occur on the moon and send the records back to earth. Only one will leave the bug at a time.

When they are ready to depart the bug's engine will be fired, pushing the bug at 5,500 miles an hour away from the moon. The planned return trip will take an estimated 60 hours.

The spacecraft will approach the earth at 25,000 miles an hour. As it enters the atmosphere, at an altitude of about 80 miles, the temperature of the heat shield will reach an estimated 5,000° Fahrenheit. The spacecraft pilot will be able to start gliding the vehicle from as far away as 5,000 miles from the earth's surface.

As with the Project Mercury astronauts, the Apollo crew will have a great abundance of facilities on the earth to help in guidance and a safe landing. The Apollo crew will have a much larger and more complex tracking network around the world than the Project Mercury astronauts. The Houston center will be in control.

Primary landing sites will be on land, but the command module is being designed to land safely on water as well.

Details of the lunar surface are expected to be obtained by unmanned vehicles in the Ranger and Surveyor projects. About 13 flights of these vehicles are planned for the next 2 years.

With the help of these vehicles, mapmakers hope to show objects on the moon as small as 4 or 6 feet in diameter. The landing area will have to be pinpointed to a diameter of about 150 feet.

Before Project Apollo is attempted, NASA expects to send a logistics vehicle to the moon to test the feasibility of a lunar landing not only by astronauts but also by such material as life-support and survival equipment and shelters to protect the crew.

Project Apollo will be preceded by Project Gemini, with two astronauts in a capsule blasted off from Canaveral by a giant Titan II. Although Titan II has made 16 successful launchings, there has been some question as to its safety because of vibrations it develops.

Thirty astronauts have been selected as possible candidates for the trip and are now in training for Project Gemini and Project Apollo. The 30 were selected from among more than 250 applicants.

The three astronauts who make the flight will have to know a great deal more about space flight than the Project Mercury astronauts. Navigation will present a complexity of unusual problems.

Mapping of the moon's surface in fine detail will be necessary before manned lunar flight is attempted. Because the two astronauts who land will need to find an area where the slope is 120° or less, the new lunar map, now being prepared by the Geological Survey, U.S. Department of Interior, will have to indicate this area.

Dust on the landing area must be no deeper than 20 inches. If the slope is deeper, the men may not be able to move around.

The Project Gemini is for the purpose of training astronauts to achieve rendezvous, and docking, or hooking together of separate spacecraft during orbital flights around the earth.

Some NASA officials have been apprehensive that the U.S.S.R. may launch two spacecraft to achieve docking and rendezvous before the U.S. Project Gemini is now more than a year behind schedule, and it is possible the Russians may already be ahead of us in this regard. The U.S.S.R. is now believed to have the capability of launching a space ship carrying more than one man. This has caused some observers to wonder whether the United States has not already lost the fabulously expensive moon race, in which rendezvous and docking maneuvers are so critical.

A year ago two Russian cosmonauts maneuvered their spacecraft within 3 miles of one another.

Although Project Gemini may be a year behind schedule, NASA officials believe the United States, with its massive nationwide effort, can gain ground.

Before his recent resignation as director of the NASA office of manned space flight in Washington, D. Brainerd Holmes insisted the United States can send three men to the moon 2 years ahead of schedule.

He admitted the Russians "may very well beat us." For one thing, he said, we do not know much of what the Russians are doing.

It would be "a bitter pill," he said, if the Russians get there first. The real tragedy, to his way of thinking, "would be for us not to go into the race as hard as we can and use the race to operate in space."

The space race, insofar as the United States is concerned, has aroused a growing number of critics.

Former President Eisenhower has called the moon project a "stunt" and a "cosmic boondoggle." One physicist has suggested that if a means could be found to weld together 20 billion silver dollars, edge to edge, an astronaut could walk to the moon.

One noted U.S. scientist, Dr. Barry Commoner of Washington University, St. Louis, said the lunar project will be a serious drain on the Nation's scientific talent, away from projects where there is a much more urgent need.

U.S. Senator Kenneth Keating, Republican, of New York, said there are now 9,821 scientists working on various space projects as compared with 1,316 on mental disorders, cancer and heart disease at the National Institutes of Health. Senator William Fulbright, Democrat, of Arkansas, has stated that urban renewal and education should have priority over landing a man on the moon.

In a recent issue of the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, Dr. Warren Weaver, noted mathematician and former president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, said $30 billion spent on space by 1970 would build 10 medical schools costing $200 million each, endow 200 small colleges with $10 million apiece, finance the education of 50,000 scientists through graduate school, create three new Rockefeller Foundations worth $500 million each, build and endow complete universities for 53 foreign countries, and give every teacher in the United States a 10-percent raise for 10 years.

Dr. Philip H. Abelson, editor of the journal, Science, and noted chemist, recently wrote in the journal that landing on the moon would be a notable event. Nevertheless when the excitement wears off, boredom is inevitable.

One of the leading foreign critics of the U.S. space effort, Sir Bernard Lovell, director of the Jodrell Bank Observatory in England, has reported that the Soviet Academy of Science is not so sure that getting a man to the moon would be worthwhile. Sir John Cockcroft, British Nobel Prize winner in nuclear physics, has stated he believed it more worth while to invest in "making a better go" of things on the earth before landing men on the moon.

Some scientists, such as Fred Hoyle, a leading British astrophysicist, has warned of the possibility of catastrophic failure of the lunar project. After all, NASA has failed so far in landing an unmanned Ranger on the moon to explore its surface.

Other scientists, in urging that we concentrate our lunar effort on landing instruments on the moon, insist that instruments could achieve a great variety of exploration at about 1 percent of the cost of manned lunar flight, which would add comparatively little to our knowledge of the moon and its structure.

Suggestions by scientists that NASA train at least one scientist to take part in the lunar landing have been largely ignored by the agency.

A number of leading biologists have expressed the fear that Project Apollo may be merely a stunt to stir up excitement and impress other nations. If it does turn out to be that sort of a venture, they are fearful of the consequences with regard to what they consider the most important subject of space exploration—the forms of life, if any, that may exist in outer space. Contamination of the moon with organisms from the earth would make that portion of space research a failure insofar as the moon is involved.

Space enthusiasts, on the other hand, believe lunar exploration will add a great deal to our store of scientific knowledge that will be of benefit to all mankind. Nevertheless, there is a question of whether the amount of information that must be obtained on the earth before a lunar flight is attempted will far outweigh anything gained by Project Apollo for other purposes.

What, for example, will knowledge of the effect of weightlessness on an astronaut during a lunar flight, add to current knowledge of human biology to improve medical care or the prevention of illness?

Dr. Edward Teller, commonly known as the moon. This, he believes, would aid in favor of lunar flight as a means of establishing a large and independent colony on the Moon. This, he believes, would aid in national security. Also, he testified in a congressional hearing, a nuclear reactor should be developed on the moon eventually to provide power and extract water from the moon's rocks and soil.

Scientists are now doing research with such ideas in mind. At North American Aviation, Inc., scientists have visualized a dome-shaped factory for acquiring minerals and water from beneath the moon's surface. Volcanic rock on the moon, they estimate, contains 1 gallon of water per cubic foot. After the water is extracted, the rock residue could be used as cement for construction purposes.

The North American scientists have also visualized an underground life center with living quarters, a medical center, recreation areas, and shop facilities.

Whether the United States lunar boom turns out to be a triumph or a catastrophe remains to be seen.

PLANNING FOR TECHNOLOGICAL UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on November 5, 1963, the Christian Science Monitor did an unusual thing on its editorial page. It devoted its entire editorial columns to one subject: job displacement through automation. It agrees with the judgment that "automation is a more serious threat to employment than was the industrial revolution."

The seriousness is uniquely highlighted in one statistic: there are 40,000 displaced workers per week from automation. Jobs must be found for these in addition to all of the new workers coming on the labor market from other sources. There is a staggering human problem here. Some of that is detailed in the editorial development. Theoretically technology makes new jobs as fast as it destroys old ones. That assertion is not only in contention, but further the new jobs are not always or often for the people displaced.

It is not a new problem. Of the situation in the Cumberland mining country it is noted that "three generations of living on handouts resulted in a whipped and dispirited community."

The editorial is not without hope. It cites mainly the hope of education and rehabilitation, and pilot programs which show what this can do.

Mainly, however, the editorial stresses the need for hard thinking, planning, and doing something about it in these United States.

I share the concern and the urgency. I intend to have more to say in the development of the subject. For the moment, I wish to bring this editorial to the attention of Senators. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Automation and the Disinherited—Technology Makes More Jobs, It Is True, but Not Always, or Often, for the People Who Are Displaced

"There is general agreement that automation is a more serious threat to employment than was the industrial revolution." In this striking statement, Richard L. Worsnop, of Editorial Research Reports, speaks the views of some businessmen as well as of labor leaders and Government authorities.

John I. Snyder, Jr., board chairman of U.S. Industries, Inc., a company that makes automatic machinery, admits, "We're using sophisticated machines to destroy jobs." His company is financing a foundation, cosponsored with the International Association of Machinists, to study problems of technological displacement.

John F. Henning, Under Secretary of Labor, estimates that 2.2 million jobs a year are eliminated in the United States by increased output per man hour due largely to technological progress. This means that new jobs need to be found for 40,000 displaced workers a week besides new workers.

The classical contention has been that invention creates new jobs as it wipes out old ones. But as applied to automation, or cybernetics, Mr. Snyder declares this is a myth. And Mr. Worsnop sums up the evidence thus:

"Ideally, displaced workers should be the first to share in the benefits of automation. So far, just the opposite has been true. Workers who have managed to hold on to their jobs in automated factories find working conditions and fringe benefits improved. Many of those who have lost their jobs to machines are likely to remain unemployed, or employed only part time, for the remainder of their lives."

MINERS: FROM PAYROLLS TO DANGEROUS "DOG HOLES"

One of the regions where displacement of this sort has taken a most heavy toll is described by Homer Bigart in the New York Times. In the Cumberland Mountains of eastern Kentucky tens of thousands of idle miners, replaced by coal-cutting machines, face a winter of grinding poverty. "Three generations of living on handouts," he reports, has eroded their self-respect and "resulted in a whipped, dispirited community."

In one county even Government surplus foods are not available because the county has no funds to fetch and distribute them. Able-bodied men, barred from the relief rolls, leave their families so the women can qualify for aid to dependent children (ADC).

These, as described by A. H. Raskin in the Saturday Evening Post, are "the once-proud men whose high wages and industry-financed pensions made them the soot-smudged aristocrats of American labor only a dozen years ago." Today some of them "scratch out a perilous subsistence" in played-out pits or "dogholes" where the coal seam is too thin for effective mechanization.

All this takes place while Department of Commerce statistics show that the gross national product for the country at large has risen to an annual rate of more than $588 billion and disposable personal income is at a new high of more than $400 billion annually.

ARE AMERICANS LIVING IN TWO COMPARTMENTS?

Several months ago the traveling interviewer, Samuel Lubell, observed that while older workers in stable industries were doing well, many younger workers "have been virtually walled out * * * by seniority rights and high fringe benefits."

Does this mean that, unless steps are taken to prevent it, a situation described by Prof. Andrew Hacker of Cornell University is taking shape? To the American Political Science Association, September 6, Dr. Hacker said, "It may well be that two Americas are emerging, one a society protected by the corporate umbrella and the other a society whose members have failed to affiliate themselves with the dominant institutions."

If such a situation is to be avoided there will have to be some hard thinking, planning, and doing about it in the United States. There are remedies but they are not automatic. Congress and State legislatures have hardly caught up with the age of the typewriter, let alone the computer.

Some remedies are nonpolitical. For example, does all research have to be directed toward using mineral and other inorganic resources? Why not more research and development toward devising industries that can utilize relatively unskilled or semiskilled hands? Ingenuity has found use for once waste materials from bones and sawdust to cinders and bagasse; why not for surplus human resources? Industry already does vast amounts of training and retraining; but a company can afford this only where there is a prospect of use within its own organization.

Much of the need in an age of rising technology is for a spread of elementary education, then for more and better vocational education, and finally for retraining programs where an obsolete skill must be replaced by a current one.

HOPE IN EDUCATION AND REHABILITATION

This calls for more schools such as one in New Haven, Conn., described in the October Reader's Digest by Lester Velie—an elementary school that has made itself a 16-hour-a-day community center in a slum neighborhood and sparks an interest in learning among Negro families hitherto without hope.

It calls also for such initiative as has been displayed in Chicago, where the Cook County Welfare and Rehabilitation Service last year placed in jobs 12,000 persons formerly on the relief rolls. It did this by a basic literacy program and evening vocational or high school courses which welfare recipients were required to take. In addition, 5,000 relief clients were put on work projects for the city, county, or State.

The problem of idle human resources is complicated by the fact that in some States compensation is being paid to persons in fairly comfortable circumstances while in others the compensation payments have been exhausted by workers whose families are hungry and for whom the prospect of reemployment is remote if not nonexistent.

Among workers with displaced skills, such as notably the coal miners, one of two needs exists. Either new industry must be brought to them or they must be retrained and enabled to move where employment is assured. The latter course involves some kind of sustenance payments.

LABOR-INDUSTRY FUNDS ONLY PARTLY SUCCESSFUL

Automation, through its economies, does create new market demands and ultimately new jobs—but they are not generally for the same people, or even the sons and daughters of the same people, unless a great deal of human relations engineering is introduced into the process.

Efforts of unions and industries to cushion the effect of technological change by special funds for this purpose have been only partly successful. One of the first, in the packinghouse industry, produced only 8 retrained persons out of 431 laid off. The Pacific Maritime Association, in agreement with the longshoremen's union, has set up a fund by which profits from greater efficiency stabilize weekly earnings and sweeten retirement pay.

Unquestionably, technological advancement can introduce new jobs as it obliterates old ones. Prof. Walter Buckingham, a labor mediator, says most of the jobs held by workers in the United States today "would not exist if it were not for technology."

Yet, to return to Mr. Snyder, this seller of automation believes that in time machines will do most of the work of humans. "People—living, breathing, feeling, and thinking people" he says, "somehow will have to learn to do nothing in a constructive way." Many of them already have found enriching uses for their leisure.

Will machines further shorten the work week and leave even the employed with time on their hands? Will a few be busier than ever correlating the functions of the machines? And will some unhappy thousands, even millions, find themselves left out of such an economy altogether? To avoid this last possibility, the President's Committee on Labor-Management Policy says, "Achievement of technological progress without sacrifice of human values requires a combination of private and government action consonant with the principles of a free society."

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7431) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed, at this point in the RECORD, a report by the Comptroller General of the United States, under date of August 8, 1963, relating to selected District of Columbia government employees who are licensed to drive taxicabs in the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
August 8, 1963.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
Chairman, Subcommittee on District of Columbia, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In accordance with your request of July 20, 1963, herewith for use by your subcommittee are the initial results of our limited tests of the attendance to official duties of selected District of Columbia government employees who are licensed to drive taxicabs in the District of Columbia. Our tests related to the 4-week period March 31 to April 27, 1963.

Our review of the records maintained by the Public Vehicles Bureau, Metropolitan Police Department, disclosed that 82 of 2,282 employees of the Departments of Sanitary Engineering and Highways and Traffic included in our tests were licensed hackers. Regulations of the District's Public Utilities Commission require that hackers maintain a daily record of trips (manifests) and that the manifests be kept on file at the residence of the driver and be available for inspection for a period of 1 year. With the assistance of officials of the Metropolitan Police Department, the 82 hackers were requested to submit their manifests covering the 4-week test period. Following is a table showing the responses to this request.

Response and number of employees	
Furnished 1 or more manifests	47
Stated that they had not hacked for 9 months or more	13
Stated that they did not hack during the period involved	12
Stated that the manifests were lost or destroyed	6
Responded but did not furnish manifests	3
No response	1
Total	82

Our comparison of information on the manifests, submitted by the employees, with the time and leave records maintained by the District for these employees disclosed that only 11 employees submitted manifests which showed adequate time data and indicated no discrepancies. We noted discrepancies relating to the attendance to duty of 19 employees. In addition, some of the manifests submitted by 11 of these 19 employees and all the manifests submitted by the remaining 17 employees did not contain sufficient data on the time that trips were made to enable identification of possible discrepancies. District Public Utilities Commission regulations require that the manifests show the time each tour of duty begins and ends and the time of commencement of each trip during the tour.

A tabulation of the discrepancies disclosed by the comparison follows:

	Number of employees [1]
Hacked while in an official duty status	14
Hacked while on sick leave—during work hours	4
Hacked on days for which sick leave was charged—after regular duty hours	2
Hacked on days for which sick leave was charged—time of trips not shown	4

[1] Several employees are included in more than one category.

The data was obtained from manifests submitted by the 47 employees; we did not attempt to verify whether these employees submitted a manifest for each day they actually hacked during the test period.

We noted, in addition to the above discrepancies and in addition to the failure of certain hackers to retain their manifests, that the personnel records for 19 of the 47 hackers who submitted manifests indicated that 5 employees had not obtained approval to engage in such part-time work, although such approval is required by District personnel regulations.

Enclosed is a listing showing details on responses of the 82 hackers to requests for submission of manifests and on our comparison of time and leave records with manifests of the 47 employees who did submit them.

Our tests indicate a serious lack of supervision over the employees involved. However, the information contained in this report has not been discussed with the employees involved nor have the results of our tests been brought to the attention of District officials. Accordingly, our findings should be considered tentative and subject to consideration of further information or explanations which may be forthcoming.

We believe that the information in this report should be promptly brought to the attention of District officials for further investigation so that, if our tentative findings are confirmed, timely action can be taken to correct the deficiencies. It is our understanding that your subcommittee will advise District officials of the results of our tests.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Details Pertaining to Tests of Attendance to Official Duties of Selected District of Columbia Government Employees Who Are Licensed To Drive Taxicabs in the District of Columbia—4-Week Period March 31 to April 27, 1963

Employees who submitted manifests (47).

Employees whose manifests show discrepancies (19).

NATURE OF DISCREPANCY

Employee 1 (regular tour of duty 7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.):

Time records show employee on sick leave 8 hours on April 15. Manifest shows trips from 7:35 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. on this date.

Time records show 8 hours regular duty April 23. Manifest shows trips from 7:35 a.m. to 3:35 p.m. on this date.

Time records show 8 hours regular duty April 23. Manifest shows trips from 7:25 a.m. to 2:50 p.m. on this date.

Employee 2 (regular tour of duty, 7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.):

Time records show 8 hours regular duty on April 2. Manifest shows trips from 7:15 to 10:45 on this date. However, the manifest contains conflicting time data.

Time records show 8 hours regular duty on April 5. Manifest shows trips from 6:45 to 12:07. However, the manifest contains conflicting time data.

Time records show 8 hours regular duty on April 8. Manifest shows trips from 3:25 p.m. to 4 p.m. on this date.

Time records show 8 hours regular duty on April 16. Manifest shows trips from 11:30 to 3:55. However, the manifest contains conflicting time data.

Time records show 8 hours regular duty on April 18. Manifest shows trips from 7:20 to 11:15. However, the manifest contains conflicting time data.

Time records show 8 hours regular duty on April 22. Manifest shows trips from 7:45 to 10:15 and from 1:30 to 9:40 on this date. The manifest contains conflicting time data; however, there is a discrepancy regardless of whether trips were in a.m. or p.m.

Employee 3:

Time records show regular duty between 11:25 p.m. on April 8 and 8:07 a.m. on April 9. Manifest shows trips between 12:55 a.m. and 2:55 a.m. on April 9.

Time records show regular duty between 5:51 a.m. and 1:34 p.m. on April 10. Manifest shows trips between 10 a.m. and 12:45 p.m. on this date.

Time records show regular duty between 3:13 p.m. and 12 midnight on April 13. Manifest shows trips between 9:07 p.m. and 12:20 on this date.

Time records show 8 hours of sick leave on April 24, 25, and 26. Manifest shows trips between 12:06 a.m. and 2:26 a.m. on April 26.

Employee 4 (regular tour of duty 7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.):

Time records show 4 hours regular duty from 7:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. on April 1. Manifest shows trips from 6:45 a.m. to 10:40 a.m. on this date.

Time records show 8 hours regular duty on April 19. Manifest shows trips between 3 p.m. and 4 p.m. on this date.

Employee 5 (regular tour of duty 10 p.m. to 6 a.m.): Time records show 8 hours regular duty from 10 p.m. on April 18 to 6 a.m. on April 19. Manifest shows trips from 5:35 a.m. to 6 a.m. on April 19.

Time records show 8 hours regular duty from 10 p.m. on April 21 to 6 a.m. on April 22. Manifest shows trips from 2:30 a.m. to 4:45 a.m. on April 22.

Time records show 8 hours regular duty from 10 p.m. on April 22 to 6 a.m. on April 23. Manifest shows trips from 1 a.m. to 1:55 a.m. on April 23.

Employee 6: Time records show 8 hours regular duty from 7:22 a.m. to 4:49 p.m. on April 24. Manifest shows trips from 3:17 p.m. to 4:39 p.m. on this date.

Employee 7 (regular tour of duty 6 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.):

Time records indicate regular duty from 6:15 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. on April 5. Manifest shows trips from 2:10 to 8:25 on this date with no indication whether a.m. or p.m.; however, there is a discrepancy regardless of whether a.m. or p.m.

Time records show 8 hours sick leave on April 8. Manifest shows trips from 3:15 to 8:50 on this date with no indication whether a.m. or p.m.

Time records indicate regular duty from 6:21 a.m. to 2:26 p.m. on April 22. Manifest shows trips from 2:10 to 7:25 on this date with no indication whether a.m. or p.m.; however, there is a discrepancy regardless of whether a.m. or p.m.

Time records indicate regular duty from 6:17 a.m. to 2:07 p.m. on April 25. Manifest shows trips from 2:10 to 8 on this date with no indication whether a.m. or p.m.

Employee 8 (regular tour of duty 7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.): Time records indicate 8 hours sick leave on April 24. Manifest indicates trips from 1:45 p.m. to 6:01 p.m. on this date.

Employee 9 (regular tour of duty 7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.):

Time records indicate 8 hours sick leave on April 17. Manifest shows trips from 7:45 to 8 on this date with no indication whether a.m. or p.m.

Time records indicate 8 hours sick leave on April 19. Manifest shows trips from 9:40 a.m. to 3:05 p.m. and from 9 p.m. through midnight on this date.

Time records indicate that the employee worked his regular tour of duty on April 1, 10, 24, and 26. Manifests for these dates show trips made but do not indicate whether a.m. or p.m., as follows: April 1, 7 to 9:30; April 10, 7:30 to 8:45; April 24, 7:10 to 8:20; April 26, 7:35 to 10:10.

Employee 10 (regular tour of duty 7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.):

Time records indicate that employee was on 8 hours sick leave on April 26. Manifest shows trips from 7:45 to 2:30 on this date but does not indicate whether a.m. or p.m.

Time records indicate that the employee worked his regular tour of duty on April 1, 5, 9, 11, 12, 17, 18, 19, and 25. Manifests for these dates show trips made but do not indicate whether a.m. or p.m., as follows: April 1, 7 to 10:16; April 5, 7:05 to 10:45; April 9, 6:45 to 9:50; April 11, 7:50 to 11; April 12, 10 to 2:20; April 17, 6:55 to 8:55; April 18, 6:25 to 9:15; April 19, 7:50 to 2:51; April 25, 4:15 to 9:26.

Employee 11 (regular tour of duty, 7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.):

Time records indicate that employee was on sick leave for 40 hours from April 1 through April 5. Manifests show 4 trips on April 2 beginning at 6:20 p.m. and 7 trips on April 4 with no indication of time.

Time records indicate 8 hours regular duty on April 15. Manifest shows 5 trips (p.m.) on this date; however, no times are indicated.

Employee 12 (regular tour of duty, 8:15 a.m. to 4:45 p.m.)

Time records indicate that employee worked his regular tour of duty on April 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 12, 16, 17, and 19. Manifests for these dates show trips made but do not indicate whether a.m. or p.m., as follows: April 1, 6:30 to 10:50; April 2, 7:50 to 9:20; April 4, 7:35 to 11:25; April 5, 6:30 to 12:10; April 9, 7 to 11:45; April 12, 6:20 to 2:20; April 16, 6:35 to 11:05; April 17, 6:35 to 11; April 19, 6:40 to 12:45.

Time records indicate employee worked 6 hours overtime from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. on April 20. Manifest shows trips from 6:45 to 12:45 for this date but does not indicate a.m. or p.m.

Time records indicate that employee was on 8 hours sick leave on April 26. Manifest shows trips form 3:15 p.m. through midnight on this date.

Employee 13: Time records indicate 8 hours regular duty from 5:56 a.m. to 1:50 p.m. on April 19. Manifest shows two trips from 8:30 a.m. to 8:45 a.m. on this date.

Employee 14 (regular tour of duty 7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.): Time records indicate that employee worked 8 hours regular duty plus 2 hours overtime from 4 p.m. to 6 p.m. on April 3. Manifest shows 4 trips apparently beginning at 4:30 p.m. on this date with no termination time shown.

Employee 15: Time records indicate 8 hours regular duty from 6:11 a.m. to 4:47 p.m. on April 3. Manifest shows trips from 8 a.m. to about 8:45 a.m. and from 2:35 p.m. to about 7:20 p.m. on this date.

Time records indicate 8 hours regular duty from 6:40 a.m. to 4:51 p.m. on April 5. Manifest shows trips from 2 a.m. to about 7:10 a.m. on this date.

Time records indicate employee worked 8 hours overtime from 7:15 a.m. to 4:58 p.m. on April 6. Manifest shows trips made from 7 to about 10:15 on this date but does not indicate whether a.m. or p.m.

Time records indicate 8 hours regular duty from 6:05 a.m. to 4:48 p.m. on April 10. Manifest shows trips from 6:45 a.m. to about 8 a.m. on this date.

Time records indicate 8 hours regular duty from 6:22 a.m. to 5:06 p.m. on April 12. Manifest shows trips from 10:30 a.m. to about 11:30 a.m. and from 3:15 p.m. to about 7:05 p.m. on this date.

Time records indicate employee worked 8 hours regular duty, as follows: April 19, 7:30 a.m. to 4:51 p.m.; April 24, 12 midnight to 8:09 a.m.; April 26, 8:22 a.m. to 5:34 p.m.

Manifests for these dates show trips made but do not indicate whether a.m. or p.m., as follows: April 19, 12:35 to about 7; April 24, 11 to about 4:35; April 26, 5:20 to about 11:45.

Employee 16: Time records indicate employee worked 8 hours regular duty from 5:54 a.m. to 1:46 p.m. on April 16. Manifest shows trips made from 9:38 a.m. to 9:56 a.m. on this date.

Time records indicate 8 hours regular duty from 5:42 a.m. to 2:17 p.m. on April 19. Manifest shows trips from 7:53 to 11:55 on this date with no indication whether a.m. or p.m.

Time records indicate 8 hours regular duty from 5:50 a.m to 2:13 p.m. on April 23. Manifest shows trips from 8:15 to 9:33 on this date with no indication whether a.m. or p.m.

Employee 17 (regular tour of duty 7 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.): Time records indicate employee worked his regular tour of duty plus 1 hour overtime from 3:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. on April 10 and 12. Manifests for these dates show trips made but do not indicate whether a.m. or p.m., as follows: April 10, 3:35 to about 6:25; April 12, 4:20 to about 8:10.

Time records indicate 8 hours regular duty plus 1 hour overtime, from 3:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. on April 18. Manifest for this date shows trips from 3:35 to 8:15 but does not indicate whether a.m. or p.m.; however, there is a discrepancy regardless of whether a.m. or p.m.

Employee 18 (regular tour of duty, 4 p.m. to midnight):

Time records indicate employee worked his regular tour of duty on April 15. Manifest for this date shows trips from 9:30 to 12:25 and from 7:40 to 1 but does not indicate whether a.m. or p.m.; however, there is a discrepancy regardless of whether a.m. or p.m.

Time records indicate employee worked his regular tour of duty on April 18, 19, 20, and 22. Manifests for these dates show trips

made but do not indicate whether a.m. or p.m., as follows: April 18, 8:15 to 1:13; April 19, 8:10 to about 12:55; April 20, 8:55 to 11:10; April 22, 7:30 to 12.

Employee 19 (regular tour of duty, 7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.):

Time records indicate employee worked 8 hours regular duty on April 3. Manifest for this date shows trips from 8:40 a.m. to 10:03 a.m. on this date.

Time records indicate 8 hours regular duty on April 2, 16, 19, and 24. Manifests for these dates show trips made but do not indicate whether a.m. or p.m., as follows: April 2, 7:06 to 11; April 16, 5:50 to 8:05; April 19, 7:01 to 11:58; April 24, 6:45 to 8:40.

Employees whose manifests do not show adequate time data (17):

	Date	Hours worked for District, per time and attendance records	Hours worked hacking, per manifests (a.m. or p.m. not indicated)
Employee 20	Apr. 2	6 a.m. to 2:50 p.m.	10:30 to 2:55.
	Apr. 3	6:08 a.m. to 10:12 a.m.	8:10 to 9:40.
	Apr. 5	6:07 a.m. to 2:36 p.m.	3:15 to 7:45.
	Apr. 8	6:01 a.m. to 2:39 p.m.	8:15 to 3.
	Apr. 11	6:05 a.m. to 2:31 p.m.	6:50 to 10:05.
Employee 21 [1]	Apr. 19	7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.	11:35 to 5:40.
	do.	do.	6:05 to 8:35.
Employee 22	Apr. 22	6 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.	2 to 3:31.
	Apr. 23	do.	1:50 to 2:20.
	Apr. 24	6 a.m. to 10 a.m.	6:15 to 8:40.
	Apr. 25	6 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.	1:30 to 3:45.
Employee 23	Apr. 3	9:15 a.m. to 6:05 p.m.	10:50 to 12:20.
	Apr. 5	9:26 a.m. to 6 p.m.	12:45 to 1. 4:30 to 4:45.
	Apr. 10	9:24 a.m. to 6 p.m.	5:30 to 6:10.
	Apr. 11	9:25 a.m. to 7:24 p.m.	12 to 1:20. 5:40 to 6:45.
	Apr. 24	9:20 a.m. to 7:17 p.m.	4 to 6:30.
Employee 24	Apr. 2	7:20 a.m. to 4 p.m.	7:36 to 9:05.
	Apr. 3	7:22 a.m. to 4 p.m.	7:50 to 10:23.
	Apr. 4	7:23 a.m. to 4 p.m.	7:59 to 9:42.
	Apr. 5	7:18 a.m. to 4 p.m.	7:07 to 11:40.
	Apr. 8	7:07 a.m. to 4 p.m.	7:52 to 10:15.
	Apr. 10	7:22 a.m. to 4 p.m.	1:30 to 7:42.
	Apr. 12	7:20 a.m. to 4:01 p.m.	6:13 to 1:04.
	Apr. 17	7:19 a.m. to 4 p.m.	8:10 to 10:26.
	Apr. 18	7:22 a.m. to 4 p.m.	7:20 to 9:45.
	Apr. 19	7:18 a.m. to 4 p.m.	7:12 to 1:16.
	Apr. 23	7:21 a.m. to 4 p.m.	7:30 to 9:35.
	Apr. 26	7:24 a.m. to 4 p.m.	7:25 to 12:25.
Employee 25	Apr. 1	7:16 a.m. to 4:07 p.m.	10:10 to 12:50.
	Apr. 15	7:08 a.m. to 4:03 p.m.	7:15 to 9:01. 11:50 to 1:50.
	Apr. 24	7:11 a.m. to 4:05 p.m.	9:10 to 11:45. 1:55 to 2:07.
Employee 26	Mar. 31	2:19 p.m. to 11:02 p.m.	9:15 to about 1:10.
	Apr. 7	2:20 p.m. to 11 p.m.	10 to 12:50.
	Apr. 8	2:13 p.m. to 11:01 p.m.	9:05 to 12:35.
	Apr. 13	2:07 p.m. to 11:01 p.m.	10 to 12:15.
	Apr. 14	2:17 p.m. to 11:02 p.m.	9:35 to about 12.
	Apr. 20	2:14 p.m. to 11 p.m.	9:40 to 12:10.
	Apr. 21	2:19 p.m. to 11:02 p.m.	9:45 to 12:40.
	Apr. 22	2:09 p.m. to 11:02 p.m.	9:05 to 12:20.
	Apr. 27	2:11 p.m. to 11:01 p.m.	8:50 to 12:18.
Employee 27	Apr. 3	7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.	2:05 to 2:20.
	Apr. 15	do.	12:20 to 2:30.
	Apr. 18	do.	10:25 to about 11:01.
Employee 28	Apr. 4	7:17 a.m. to 4:05 a.m.	8:20 to 10:45.
	Apr. 5	7:13 a.m. to 4:01 p.m.	8:30 to 11:10.
	Apr. 11	7:20 a.m. to 4 p.m.	8:05 to 10.
	Apr. 12	7:15 a.m. to 4:03 p.m.	7:20 to 8:50.
	Apr. 15	7:23 a.m. to 4:01 p.m.	8 to 10.
	Apr. 19	7:25 a.m. to 4 p.m.	11 to 11:10. 1:15 to 1:55
	Apr. 22	7:11 a.m. to 4 p.m.	8:05 to 10.
Employee 29	Apr. 1	8:03 a.m. to 4:47 p.m.	11 to 12:30.
	Apr. 2	8:07 a.m. to 4:51 p.m.	6:10 to 10:10.
	Apr. 3	8:12 a.m. to 4:45 p.m.	5:15 to 11:15.
	Apr. 15	7:45 a.m. to 4:42 p.m.	9:30 to 10:10.
	Apr. 16	7:55 a.m. to 5:18 p.m.	6:10 to 9:35.
	Apr. 17	7:51 a.m. to 4:31 p.m.	5:45 to 9:30.
Employee 30	Apr. 15	6:28 a.m. to 3:01 p.m.	1:20 to 1:35.
	Apr. 22	6:28 a.m. to 3 p.m.	6:31 to about 8:20.
	Apr. 25	6:29 a.m. to 3:04 p.m.	6 to 9:05.
Employee 31	Apr. 5	7:12 a.m. to 4:32 p.m.	4:35 to 11:18.
	Apr. 8	7:19 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.	4:22 to 6:22. 7:59 to 8:40.
	Apr. 10	7:15 a.m. to 4:33 p.m.	4:28 to 6:18. 8:22 to about 8:35.
	Apr. 12	7:21 a.m. to 4:32 p.m.	4:30 to about 5:50. 8:40 to about 10:30.
	Apr. 15	7:14 a.m. to 4:31 p.m.	7:05 to 10.
	Apr. 17	7:25 a.m. to 4:28 p.m.	4:25 to about 5:41. 8:10 to 9:20.
	Apr. 20	7:16 a.m. to 4:01 p.m.	9:32 to 9:40.
	Apr. 22	7:18 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.	9:30 to about 10:40.
	Apr. 24	7:26 a.m. to 4:33 p.m.	4:20 to 6:20. 8:05 to 8:35.
Employee 32	Apr. 4	6:30 a.m. to 3 p.m.	3:35 to 9.
	Apr. 22	6:30 a.m. to 3 p.m.	3:25 to 7:45.
Employee 33	Apr. 3	7:24 a.m. to 4:01 p.m.	10:15 to 11:35.
	Apr. 4	7:27 a.m. to 4:08 p.m.	12 to 12:20. 4:15 to 5:17. 7:05 to 11:05.
	Apr. 5	7:46 a.m. to 4 p.m.	9:15 to 12:05.
	Apr. 8	8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.	8:51 to 9:36.
	Apr. 15	7:38 a.m. to 4:02 p.m.	12:30 to 2:41.
	Apr. 18	7:12 a.m. to 4:04 p.m.	7:35 to 8:30.

	Date	Hours worked for District, per time and attendance records	Number of trips (no time indicated)
Employee 34	Apr. 6	7:23 a.m. to 4:27 p.m.	6
Employee 35 [2]	Apr. 3	7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.	3
	Apr. 12	do.	14
	Apr. 16	do.	10
	Apr. 23	do.	13
	Apr. 25	do.	6
Employee 36	Apr. 18	6:46 a.m. to 3:11 p.m.	12
	Apr. 26	6:51 a.m. to 3:23 p.m.	5

Employees whose manifests show adequate time data—no discrepancies indicated (11)—employees 37 through 47.

Employees who did not submit manifests (35); stated that they did not hack during 4-week test period (12)—employees 48 through 59.

Stated that they had not hacked for 9 months or more (13)—employees 60 through 72.

Stated that manifests were destroyed or lost (6)—employees 73 through 78.

Responded but did not furnish manifests (3)—employees 79 through 81.

No response (1)—employee 82.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 7431) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. Walters in the chair) appointed Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bible, Mr. Case, Mr. Cotton, and Mr. Saltonstall conferees on the part of the Senate.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 620, House bill 8747, and that it be made the pending business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 8747) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Morgan, Mr. Zablocki, Mr. Hays, Mr. Adair, and Mr. Frelinghuysen were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

---

[1] Submitted 2 manifests on Apr. 19, 1963.

[2] Hacker indicated that he hacks between midnight and 8 a.m.

PROSPECTIVE DECLINES IN NET FARM INCOME

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post carries a story, based on farm outlook studies which have just been completed by the Department of Agriculture, forecasting a cumulative drop of $1 billion in net farm income in 1963 and 1964.

Realized net farm income this year is expected to total $12.2 billion, compared to $12.6 billion in 1962. A decline of 5 percent in net farm income is foreseen in 1964, or about $600 millions.

Much of the decline in total net farm income this year is due to declining livestock prices. The anticipated decline next year is almost entirely attributable to the prospect of a drop in wheat prices from $2 per bushel to $1.25 per bushel. This necessarily assumes that Congress will not enact a new wheat program before the 1964 crop goes to market.

Mr. President, it is unnecessary to describe to the Senate the economic effect of such a considerable reduction in net farm income. It is primary producer income. It is money that is used by farmers to buy farm equipment, to meet family living needs, to pay interest and retire loans, and to compensate lawyers, doctors, engineers, soil conservation contractors and others for their services.

The $1 billion decline in net farm income, means a much more sizable decline in gross national product. It will have a substantial effect, not only in agriculture, but in our total economy.

The agricultural income outlook, which will be analyzed very completely this week at the annual Outlook Conference conducted by the Department of Agriculture, emphasizes the urgency of two types of action which are necessary to forestall the decline.

First, it is time to work out limitations on the importation of meat into the United States. Cattle prices have fallen seriously in the past few months. A part of that decline is a result of the fact that domestic cattle feeders put too many steers into feedlots last spring and early summer, and fed cattle marketings are running considerably ahead of the previous year. But a part of that drop is a result of 11 percent of our total beef supply coming into the country as imports—a far larger proportion than is justifiable either on the basis of historic import records or on a basis of providing reasonable protection to domestic producers.

I understand that the Department of Agriculture is moving to establish import quotas, or higher tariffs. It should be done just as quickly as possible.

The second action that needs to be taken is adoption of a new wheat program applicable to the 1964 crop. Unless new legislation is passed, the support price on wheat is scheduled to drop to $1.25 per bushel next July 1. It will mean economic disaster in a score of our States where the economy is heavily dependent on wheat income. It will mean lesser but serious economic difficulty for the entire Nation.

There is now before the Congress several proposals for a wheat program for 1964, including a voluntary certificate plan which I introduced on July 29. I am gratified to report that the voluntary certificate plan is being endorsed by farm groups throughout the Western States at annual meetings now in progress.

The Missouri Farmers Association, Kansas Wheat Growers, Washington Wheat Growers, Nebraska Wheat Growers and the Directors of the Oregon Wheat Growers Association have all recommended such a voluntary certificate program and others appear likely to follow.

If enacted, the voluntary wheat certificate plan would maintain wheat income near this year's levels and avert the serious decline in farm income now foreseen without increased costs to the Treasury.

There are other wheat proposals pending by the distinguished assistant majority leader, the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. HUMPHREY, by Senator MUNDT, my senior colleague from South Dakota, by Congressman QUIE, by the American Farm Bureau, and by others. Comparative analyses of these various plans increase my conviction that the voluntary certificate plan will get the best results of any of them. But I do not want to argue the merits of the proposals at this time, Mr. President.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the article from this morning's Washington Post, reporting on the anticipated billion dollar drop in farm income, to emphasize the necessity of early action on the cattle import and wheat price support problems.

I shall be content to let the Committees on Agriculture judge the merits of the various wheat proposals after hearings. The House Wheat Subcommittee is planning hearings in December. I expect to request the chairman of our Senate Committee on Agriculture to schedule consideration of the wheat problem at an early date.

A program, effective as to the 1964 wheat crop, is urgent and it must be enacted early in the next session of Congress if the billion dollar decline in farm income, and its serious consequences to the whole Nation, are to be averted.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article referred to printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM INCOME DROP OF $1 BILLION SEEN

The Agriculture Department had some bad news for farmers yesterday that undoubtedly will hurt President Kennedy and other Democrats in the 1964 campaign.

Department economists estimated that net farm income will decline by nearly $400 million this year and may go down by as much as another $600 million next year.

This would mean a total reduction of $1 billion in net farm income over a 2-year period and obviously would give Republicans a telling political issue in rural areas.

In the Midwest and the West farmers generally vote Republican, but in the South they usually support Democrats.

Net farm income was at its height in 1947 when it reached $17.3 billion. During the Eisenhower administration the figure reached a low of little more than $11 billion in 1957. By 1960 the figure had climbed back almost to $12 billion.

The 1963 estimate is now $12.2 billion. A 5-percent reduction next year, which Department economists say is possible would place the figure at $11.6 billion.

The farm income forecasts were made by the Department's Economic Research Service. The annual Agricultural Outlook Conference begins today.

The 1964 outlook issue of the Department's quarterly publication, Farm Income Situation, attributes the 1963 decline in net income "to production expenses rising faster than realized gross farm income."

Much of the 1964 income drop, the publication continued, will probably be the result of lower wheat prices.

Last May wheat farmers rejected in a referendum a program that would have guaranteed them high prices but would have sharply restricted their production. As a result, wheat prices may drop from their current level of $2 a bushel to as low as $1.25 a bushel next year. More than half of the Nation's farmers grow wheat.

The reduction in farm income this year will probably mean no decrease in income per farm, however, because of the continued decline in the number of farms.

Current estimates place the number of farms at 3.5 million, compared with the 3.7 million during the last farm census in 1959.

Per farm income was at a record high of $3,414 last year and is expected to be about the same this year.

NUCLEAR KILOWATTS WITH SUBSIDIES VERSUS FOSSIL KILOWATTS WITHOUT SUBSIDIES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, during the past several years I have observed with interest and a growing concern the continuing efforts being made by the Atomic Energy Commission to bring about the development of a civilian nuclear power industry. I have no doubt that the development of such an industry is inevitable, but the methods and the thrust supplied by our Government without parity for other affected segments of the economy are reasons for an increasing degree of alarm.

I am a Senator representing the State with the largest bituminous coal production in the Nation. Thousands of our people are gainfully employed in the production and transportation of coal, and the economy of many towns and counties throughout West Virginia—as in parts of our neighboring States—are tied to the economic health of the industry.

Electric utilities provide by far the largest market for coal. In 1963, more than 200 million tons of coal from West Virginia and other States will be supplied to generate 67 percent of all the steam produced electricity being used this year in the Nation.

This is the growth market for coal. By 1980, consumption of electric power is expected to be 300,000 billion kilowatts. There is every reason to believe that under normal circumstances and conditions, where free competitive enterprise prevails, coal would continue to be the fuel that would generate a major portion of this vastly expanded power requirement.

But programs of the Atomic Energy Commission are distorting this picture. The Government has involved itself with subsidy grants to electric utilities building new commercial nuclear powerplants instead of so-called conventional fossil fuel electric generating facilities.

A variety of direct and indirect subsidies are being used in an effort to develop and build plants that can produce nuclear power competitive with that produced in coal- and oil-fired plants.

I make clear, Mr. President, that I am not referring to the purely experimental work on reactors which the AEC has conducted and is continuing to conduct as a part of the valid national research effort.

Objection is made to the AEC program of subsidizing the construction and operation of large, nonexperimental identical nuclear powerplants which will compete with coal-generated electricity in the marketplace. The development of new prototype reactors apparently has taken second status to the all-out effort by the AEC to bring into being a lusty and thriving nuclear power industry that will compete with coal and other fossil fuels. This is being done regardless of the cost to the taxpayers and the economic dislocation and unemployment in adversely affected regions of the country.

It is important that the Congress should begin at once an especially careful look at the civilian nuclear power program.

According to Dr. Glenn Seaborg, AEC Chairman, the objective of the program no longer seems to be to bring about the development of nuclear powerplants which private utilities could then build if such plants were economic and competitive. The fact is that Dr. Seaborg declared in testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy earlier this year that the objective is:

> The demonstration of competitiveness of nuclear powerplants by assuring the construction of such plants rather than the development of such plants as did our 10-year program.

Yes, Dr. Seaborg said "assuring the construction," and I emphasize the words "assuring" and "construction," of such plants "rather than their development." The AEC—or at least its Chairman—is not content with the Government helping to develop nuclear powerplants. It—or at least its Chairman—is determined that Government shall help construct them, if necessary.

That, Mr. President, is Government going too far—and too fast—to build one industry and tear down other long-established ones.

There can be no doubt that the AEC is serious in its intention to see that these large nonexperimental plants are built. It proposes, according to Dr. Seaborg, to "stimulate and support" the utility industry in the building of the plants. The "stimulation and support" of the utility industry will take the form of subsidies of one type or another—and from the Federal Treasury. If the present subsidy program proves to be inadequate, Dr. Seaborg has stated that "more attractive forms of incentives will be offered."

In other words, Mr. President, the implication is that there is no ceiling on the subsidies proposed and others to be proposed—unless Congress refuses to be stampeded, and I hope this will be the reaction.

Dr. Seaborg and others who are advocating this program of huge Government subsidies are quick to assure the coal industry that it has nothing to worry about. So much electricity will be consumed by the turn of the century, they predict—and it is only hypothecation—that the Nation will be hard-pressed to produce enough coal, oil and gas to generate the power likely to be required by the year 2000.

Although I appreciate Dr. Seaborg's concern for the welfare of the coal industry, I am more concerned about what is going to happen next year—and in the succeeding 5 to 10 years—than I am about what will be the situation at the turn of the century.

If Dr. Seaborg and associates prevail and the 12 additional large nonexperimental nuclear powerplants proposed by the AEC should be built, they would displace, during their lifetime, the equivalent of 280 million tons of coal. And these plants would be in full operation long before the turn of the century. Is there assurance that they will be constructed only in areas where coal is not available or available only at extremely high cost? There is none.

Also, one form of the subsidies currently being used to stimulate and support the construction of nuclear plants will have a profound effect on future coal markets well in advance of the new century. I refer to the Government financing of nuclear fuel for these utilities.

The AEC and other experts predict that by 1980 as much as 20 percent of the Nation's power needs will originate in nuclear generating plants.

Other authorities, including Dr. Theodore Baumeister, Stevens professor of mechanical engineering at Columbia University, have stated that if Government financing is discontinued and private utilities are then to go into the commercial money market to obtain funds for owning, processing, and reprocessing their own fuel, the rate of growth of nuclear power would be slowed dramatically and the nuclear power share of the market would be no more than 2 percent.

By 1980, generation of 20 percent of the electricity market would require the equivalent of 192 million tons of coal. Two percent would amount to only 19 million tons of coal equivalent. Thus, this one subsidy alone, in the opinion of qualified experts, is threatening markets for 173 million tons of coal by the year 1980—not by the turn of the century.

I believe the coal producing companies, the coal mine machinery manufacturers and machinery service establishments, the men who mine coal and service the industry's equipment, and the railroads which transport coal to the markets and the export docks are worried. They have a right to be concerned and so do the hundreds of thousands of families depending on coal and coal-carrying railroads for livelihood. I join them in being disturbed by the scope and the direction of the civilian nuclear power program being directed and financed by the Government in substantial part.

The coal industry and allied industries for producing and transporting this fuel have invested more than $32 billion in plants and facilities and provide gainful employment for more than 2.5 million Americans.

The AEC program of subsidies for building large plants could ultimately have the effect of wiping out this great American industry. There is no assurance that this will not happen, and if it should happen it certainly would be detrimental to the national economy and security.

There should not be a continuation or expansion of the subsidy portion of the civilian nuclear power program. The AEC—the Commission itself—has made it clear that without Government subsidies, both for construction and operation, these plants would not be built nor would the electricity they produce come anywhere near being competitive with coal-produced electricity, even in the so-called high fuel cost areas. Government subsidies make the difference.

The Government already has spent $1.25 billion and, according to testimony of AEC officials, it would spend another $1.5 billion, not only in developing the technology but also in helping to finance—through subsidies—actual large-scale nonexperimental plants to produce nuclear power economically.

Is this program, on such a vast scale, a necessity? Can the continued subsidization of nonexperimental nuclear powerplants be justified?

These are questions which, I believe, must be carefully reviewed and realistically and accurately answered.

I have not seen any persuasive evidence that the country is running the risk of a shortage of electric power unless nuclear power can be made competitive with fossil fuel-generated electricity—by subsidy or otherwise. There is evidence that nuclear power—if subsidized heavily by the Government—can be advantageous to certain select areas of the country. And, Mr. President, they are not the really depressed areas of the Nation. In fact, they are, for the most part, the already federally impacted and federally favored—defense, space, and installations—regions. There are some few exceptions even within the so-called "favored" regions. I would not deny them such special advantages as would accrue from nuclear power.

The United States is blessed with ample coal reserves—more than 200 billion tons recoverable under present mining technology and at current prices, plus another 600 billion tons minable with improved techniques which will surely come as the need develops. The technology of both the production and transportation of coal is constantly improving. This clearly indicates that not only will additional coal reserves become recoverable in the future but that the downward trend in the delivered price will continue in the future.

There will be a plentiful supply of coal available at reasonably level prices to meet the power needs of the Nation. Therefore, I see no justification for a continuation of the subsidized nuclear power program on the order of the present scope and size.

Perhaps the nuclear powerplants will be needed. They may even now be competitive, as some spokesmen for the electric utility industry insist. If they are needed, and if they are competitive, these are all the more reasons why the subsidies should be ended.

I do not believe reasonable citizens can object to the Atomic Energy Commission continuing its program of developing and improving the technology of reactor prototypes. This certainly is not a target of my objection. I object to the continued spending of public funds to subsidize utilities to take this Government-developed technology and build large, commercial-size plants—not experimental plants, but large facilities to produce electricity for the commercial market. Other legislators join in this feeling.

We are encouraged, however, by what appears to be a growing awareness on the part of members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that, perhaps, the present program may not be entirely in the public interest in all of its aspects.

At the request of the joint committee, AEC has delayed for at least a year another invitation under the present round of projects for the construction of even larger plants, in the 600,000-kilowatt range.

If I understand the joint committee position accurately, it is that under existing criteria it appeared certain that a water-type reactor would, of necessity, be the only type to be qualified as proven. In fact, the water-type reactor is proven, according to AEC reports.

In other words, what AEC proposed to do was to offer Government financial assistance in building what would be merely a larger version of plants already approved for construction with Government subsidy. This, of course, would make such plants more economically feasible and commercially more attractive, more useful, and more efficient. This has been proven in conventional-type electricity generation.

In its wisdom, the Joint Committee seems to have decided that building another larger plant would not advance the technology of civilian nuclear power. It requested the AEC to delay—and wisely so, in my opinion—further commitments until new and different reactors could be evaluated.

Because there are so many unanswerable or extremely difficult to answer questions about this civilian nuclear power program, I believe it should be leveled off until the Joint Committee has completed its evaluation.

When the fiscal year 1964 appropriation recommendations for the Atomic Energy Commission come to the Senate, the amount of money for the waiver of fuel use charges and for plant design assistance should be restricted to that amount necessary to cover contracts already signed by AEC and approved by the Joint Committee for construction. Such restrictions would not delay any project already approved; it would delay only until an evaluation by the Joint Committee is completed the issuance of invitations by the AEC for further bids from utility companies for the construction of additional large, nonexperimental reactors. But I am convinced that subsidies for these should be stopped.

Mr. President, earlier today, I dispatched a letter to the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations in which I expand on these views and discuss other aspects of the subject which I hope will have the attention of the committee. I also make certain suggestions for the committee's consideration. I ask unanimous consent to have my communication to the Appropriations Committee chairman printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, November 18, 1963.

The Honorable CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives has reported the public works appropriations bill for fiscal year 1964. Under title III—independent offices—are the recommended appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission.

It is my understanding that a special subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations will conduct a closed hearing under security conditions tomorrow morning on Atomic Energy Commission budget estimates.

I have only general comments to make on the classified AEC items; namely, to express the hope that the Appropriations Committee of this body can and will find appropriate ways, without endangering security, to recommend more substantial reductions in funds for nuclear weaponry and special materials than did the Appropriations Committee of the House. In fact, the committee of the other body did not recommend any reduction in the $783 milion AEC estimate for nuclear weapons, and recommended a cut of slightly under $5.5 million from the AEC estimate of $480,471,000 for special nuclear materials.

In addition to reductions in foreign aid for which I voted during action on the authorization bill, it has been my hope that there would develop in this session considerable savings in the areas of defense, space, and atomic energy so that vital domestic program needs would not have to bear the brunt of economy chopping to accommodate a tax cut.

We failed to shave the funding for defense below the level of the last fiscal year. It remains to be seen what the action will be with respect to the space and atomic energy programs. But it is my view that we must try harder in these areas so as not to place the bulk of the economy burden on the tools of foreign policy administration and on the programs to meet human and community needs in the United States.

We will soon be confronting our responsibilities and our opportunities in the matter of appropriating for the atomic energy program. I have made observations concerning the special nuclear materials and weapons items of the AEC budget. Those two, together with the reactor development items, account for almost $1,794 million of the total AEC budget estimate of $2,423,500,000 for fiscal 1964.

I am not an advocate of shortchanging research in any field, including that of atomic energy. I hope the House Appropriations Committee, in recommending a $33.5 million reduction from estimates for nuclear reactor development, a cut of almost $27 million for physical research, and another of approximately $8.3 million for biology and medicine AEC programs, did not endanger research progress in vital areas.

But I commend for favorable consideration the language in the House committee's report in which it expresses the opinion that continuation of the subsidy program (of development and design assistance to utilities) is no longer necessary to stimulate the construction of power reactors, since it has been demonstrated that they are now producing electric power at competitive costs, at least in those areas of high conventional fuel costs.

It continues to be disturbing to those of us from conventional fuel producing regions—especially coal economy areas—to be informed that something in the neighborhood of $200 million remain in the House committee recommendations, and more than that in the AEC budget estimates now before the Senate committee, for grants to utilities under the reactor development program of the AEC.

Mr. Chairman, huge subsidies have been paid to utilities to aid in nuclear power development to make such power competitive with that generated by coal-burning and oil-burning plants. But I know of none having been paid or pledged to progressive investor-owned utilities making very large investments in new plants in the coalfields to generate extra high voltage electricity for transmission to the load centers where energy requirements are increasing.

The subsidies to utilities to aid them in nuclear power development are both shocking and inequitable when compared with the small amounts of coal research subsidized by the same Government which is aiding utilities to find ways to substitute nuclear energy for coal and other conventional fuels. Here, then, is Government assistance for an effort to destroy coal markets without a compensatory degree of aid and effort to help research and develop new uses and new markets for coal. There must be parity. This is simple justice. Nothing less will suffice. If an amount on the order of $200 million annually is subscribed in research and development and design assistance to further the progress of nuclear power, why should coal research and development not be accorded a similar amount in Government subsidies? We must give profound consideration to the fact that the electric power market is coal's major existing outlet—indeed, its last frontier until some radical breakthrough in coal research creates a vast new horizon.

In light of these factors, it should be understandable that the current activity of the Atomic Energy Commission which, more than any other, is of the greatest concern to the conventional fuel industries—particularly coal—is that of subsidizing construction of large, nonexperimental commercial nuclear electric plants embodying the pressurized water or boiling water reactors.

I am aware that section 110(c) of Public Law 87-701 (AEC authorizations for fiscal year 1963) authorized the Commission to furnish funds for design assistance to utilities, notwithstanding the no subsidy provisions of section 169 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. This, in my judgment, was a mistake and it should have been corrected.

It is difficult to understand how the Government subsidization of these large commercial plants—conveniently termed "demonstration plants"—can be justified. Nevertheless, the AEC is in the process of working out contractual arrangements for the construction of three such plants in the 400,000- to 500,000-kilowatt range. The plants and the amounts of direct AEC subsidy involved are as follows:

	Fuel waiver subsidy	Design subsidy
Southern California Edison	$6,500,000	$6,522,960
Connecticut Yankee Atomic	7,145,000	6,050,000
Los Angeles Department of Water	8,200,000	8,000,000
Total	21,845,000	20,572,960
Grand total	42,467,960	

I hope it will be the consensus of the Appropriations Committee of this body that, as the House committee has stated in its report, "continuation of this subsidy program is no longer necessary to stimulate construction of power reactors, since it has been demonstrated that they are now producing electric power at competitive cost, at least in those areas of high conventional fuel costs."

In fact, I feel there is justification for suggesting that there be provided in the fiscal 1964 appropriations for the AEC a prohibition against the use of any such funds, under the civilian nuclear power program, for construction of additional water reactors or any type of reactor which has been proven.

There should be no arguing the fact that the water reactor concept is thoroughly proven.

(A reactor concept is considered by AEC to be proven when it has developed to the stage where engineering feasibility has been established or where reactor experiment or prototype experience has demonstrated confidence in reactor reliability for the general size contemplated.)

Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, the AEC Chairman, has stated that the pressurized water and boiling water reactors are examples of proven concepts.

In its report to the President of the United States on civilian nuclear power, November 20, 1962, the Atomic Energy Commission declared that water reactors "have definitely arrived." To this assertion the AEC report added: "They are reliable and safe. It is believed that large reactors of this type could now be built and operated in high cost fuel areas with a lifetime promise of greater economy than conventional plants."

This being the case, why should the Government continue to subsidize utilities for any water reactor installation or design assistance? And why should the Government subsidize their supply of generating materials? Let the nuclear-minded utilities finance their own capital expansions and fuel requirements, as do utilities using conventional fuels in their generating processes.

And for those who do not recognize the pace of nuclear power development, or who possibly wish to cover up the facts, attention is called to appraisals by utility executives who declare that "nuclear kilowatts" are on the threshold of being competitive with "fossil kilowatts"—and mainly because of the impetus given to the development by the Government, much of it at the direct expense of long-established conventional fuels industries. Please note the following:

John V. Cleary, senior vice president of the Consolidated Edison Co., in defending his company's investment in a 275,000-kilowatt nuclear power plant with a proven water reactor, declared: "The Indian Point station is one of the company's production plants, essential to the production of electricity to meet our present load requirements. In fact, it is classified as a base load plant." He added that his company plans to install an even larger nuclear power plant with the same type of water reactor in the Borough of Queens, New York City, and one major consideration for the decision to build this plant (Ravenswood) is that, "from a cost standpoint, it will be competitive with our latest so-called conventional plant."

Louis H. Roddis, Jr., president of the Pennsylvania Electric Co., has stated that two of the large nuclear power plants listed to be built on the east coast and west coast with Government subsidies of over $12 million each for design assistance and fuel waiver, "will produce electricity at a lower unit cost than fossil fuel plants in the same location." He added that on a "nonsubsidized basis nuclear kilowatts will be competitive with fossil kilowatts in approximately one-half of the United States" by the time these nuclear power plants go into operation in 1967–68.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, we have it on the authority of the Atomic Energy Commission and of spokesmen for the investor-owned electric utilities that we are not dealing with experimental plants in these large water reactors. They are of proven concept, and, according to authoritative and highly-placed utility executives, they can compete with coal-fired plants in some sections of the Nation today on a nonsubsidized basis.

Westinghouse and General Electric, I am informed, are commercially producing and selling the water reactors to private utilities. I am told that one atomic expert has said that "these reactors have become so pedestrian that you can just about walk in and buy one off the shelf."

The question arises, then, as to why continued Government subsidy is necessary to encourage the construction of proven, commercial nuclear plants.

Although Consolidated Edison has announced it will not seek a design subsidy or waiver of fuel use charges for the first 5 years of its intended Ravenswood operations (Queens, New York City), as will be provided the Southern California Edison, Connecticut Yankee Atomic, and Los Angeles Department of Water plants at a cost of more than $42 million in taxpayers' dollars, we know these Government-provided benefits will accrue to Consolidated Edison:

Use of Government-owned nuclear fuel at Government interest rates instead of the much higher private financing rates; also, $500 million in indemnity insurance from the Government at significantly less cost than private insurance; and the sale to the Government at a fixed price of $10 per gram of the plutonium manufactured in burning the Government-owned fuel.

Mr. Chairman, in the case of the three plants—two in California and Connecticut Yankee—scheduled for construction in the immediate future with subsidies which probably will exceed $42 million, we recognize that contracts already are signed and that payments will be made from appropriations provided AEC in prior years.

But it seems to me that there is a clear-cut need for the Congress to insure that no Government funds are pledged to the subsidization of additional large, commercial nuclear power plants which use the proven pressurized water or boiling water reactor. I hope that there will not be appropriations made for such purposes and, indeed, that there be prohibitions against using appropriated monies for any new utilization in this area.

Perhaps the long range solution to the problem lies in amending the Atomic Energy Act to make more explicit the procedure the AEC must follow in licensing plants of proven design as commercial installations, rather than as experimental or demonstration plants.

Respectfully submitted.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

LIFE BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, this fall Mr. Edwin McDowell, editorial writer for the Arizona Republic toured the Eastern Europe satellite nations and Russia and relayed his observations in a series of articles for his newspaper. This is an extremely perceptive series on life behind the Iron Curtain and I recommend it to my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WALL OF SHAME—IRON CURTAIN STILL MOCKS LIBERTY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Edwin McDowell of the Republic's editorial writing staff, a thorough reporter and a long-time student of communism, has just completed a 6-week European news-gathering tour. With satellite communism as his main objective, he spent much of his time in that bank of unfortunate countries which were forced into communism at the end of World War II, and are the worse for it. He also dipped briefly into the Communist fountainhead, Russia itself. This is the first of 12 dispatches reporting on his trip.)

(By Edwin McDowell)

WEST BERLIN.—"Something there is that doesn't love a wall * * *." I thought of those words, the opening line from Robert Frost's "Mending Wall," as I stood today at Checkpoint Charlie in West Berlin and looked at the forbidding wall of shame that separates East and West Berlin.

I am not the first to be reminded of that poem by the sight of the naked, brutal face of communism.

Just last year, before a hundred Muscovites, Frost himself created an international stir when he recited his poem, later saying its selection was mere circumstance, that the wall alluded to is somewhere in New England.

Perhaps.

But the poem was not lost on the Muscovites. Nor was it lost on the millions in this divided city to whom the wall is a living reminder of the totalitarian way of life.

Especially the verse which says:

"Before I built a wall
I'd ask to know
What I was walling in or walling out,
And to whom I was likely to give offense."

What the Communist hierarchy walled in, without asking to know whom it was likely to offend, were the hopes of an estimated 17 million men, women, and children of Germany's Soviet zone, 1.1 million of them in East Berlin.

And no wonder. For until the Communists erected the wall on August 13, 1961, more than 3.5 million Germans, including the cream of the Eastern Zone's professional and working classes, fled westward, severely crippling the East German economy.

Viewing the wall, as I did early this morning before journeying into East Berlin, I was struck by the thoroughness with which the Communists carried out their task of erecting a memorial to man's inhumanity to man.

Across the top of the 9 miles of wall runs 6,000 miles of barbed wire and countless pieces of jagged glass, cemented in place.

A total of 193 main and side roads have been affected by the closure.

A strip of soil, barren except for scattered land mines, separates the wall from another wall of barbed wire.

Dozens of doors and windows of houses on the eastern side of the border have been bricked up by the Communists.

Barbed wire and tripwires for alarms are strung along the rooftops.

On this side of the Spree River, East German guards, their rifles and submachineguns at the ready, lurk behind barricades in seemingly abandoned houses, ready to shoot any refugees fortunate enough to get through the barbed wire on the other bank.

And even a cemetery adjoining the border has been walled in, as though to remind the world that not even the dead can rest in peace in a Communist garrison state.

The wall has cost an estimated $25 million, or just about $1.50 for every remaining East German—a telling commentary about the value communism places on the lives of its subjects.

Yet, although the Communists have doubled their guards since the erection of the wall, still the refugees come.

More than 13,000 have made their way to freedom during the past 2 years, through tunnels, by crashing locomotives or armored buses through barriers, by swimming icy streams.

But most refugees today are Communist border guards. Defections continue despite two-man guard units, so that each guard can watch the other, and despite no soldier knowing ahead of time who will be his partner during the next 8-hour tour of duty.

Three days ago two border guards, aged 20 and 21, climbed across barbed-wire obstacles near Brunswick and fled into West Germany, saying, "We can't stand conditions in East Germany any longer."

But not all who try to defect make it.

That same day, travelers at the autobahn checkpoint at Marienborn watched East German guards murder a would-be refugee who tried to crash the barrier in an army ambulance.

The man crashed through the first barrier pole of the checkpoint, but Communist border guards and customs officials sealed the compound and began firing at the ambulance with submachine guns and pistols.

The vehicle finally stopped when its tires were burst by steel spikes mounted on lattices. The refugee jumped out and tried to run across the border. But he was shot a few more times, collapsed, and finally was carried away by the Communists.

Everywhere along sidewalks near the wall in West Berlin—on Bernauer, Sebastian, and Treptower Streets—are makeshift memorials to those who were killed trying to escape to freedom.

Crosses, freshly decorated with flowers and barbed-wire wreaths, mark points where refugees were shot while trying to swim the Spree.

Rough stakes with nameplates below rooftops and sealed windows commemorate the spot where an old woman jumped to her death in West Berlin, rather than remain in the Communist sector, where a 20-year-old student died from a rooftop plunge after he panicked while being chased by East German police (Vopos) and jumped to his death after misjudging a fireman's net awaiting him four stories below.

Always visitors to the wall can see the watching, waiting East German police, sometimes stoical, sometimes smiling broadly across the no man's land that separates two ways of life, oftentimes training field glasses on camera-wielding spectators, but always on the alert, always ready to challenge a wayward move, an untoward gesture.

Yet even those West Berliners who are most vehement in their denunciation of Vopos who kill their own brothers for the sake of some vague, future worker's paradise, admit that many Vopos hate communism as badly as do those in the West.

It would have been impossible, they say, for so many refugees to have made it to freedom if some of the Vopos had not suddenly acquired poor marksmanship.

Nevertheless, for all practical purposes the wall has put an end to the flow of refugees. For whereas stone walls may not make a prison of the human spirit, this formidable stone wall has undeniably made a prison of East Berlin.

Gazing down on the wall from a platform on the West Berlin side I thought of what a friend, a U.S. correspondent to a Mediterranean nation, told me recently—that the Iron Curtain no longer exists, that it stopped existing sometime during the past 10 years.

It is true that the phrase "Iron Curtain" is largely due to the rhetoric of Winston Churchill, who coined it during a postwar speech in Fulton, Mo.

But it is also an accurate description of the nations of the Red empire which are enclosed behind 2,000 miles of electrified barbed wire fence which divides the Communist and non-Communist world from the Baltic to the Black Sea.

True, between Austria and Communist Yugoslavia, for example, the Iron Curtain is largely nonexistent. The barbed-wire, armed patrols, and minefields simply do not exist.

But there are deadly minefields elsewhere along the East-West border and Communist border police still carry live ammunition in their guns.

Furthermore, if the sight of the tangled mass of barbed wire, of concrete, of jagged glass lining the Berlin wall does not prove that an Iron Curtain does in fact exist, a visit to the West Berlin museum just yards from Checkpoint Charlie should do so.

There are hundreds of photographs of a dying Peter Fechter being carried away by four Vopos after being allowed to bleed for hours at the foot of the wall.

Pictures of the crumpled bodies of children, some less than 10 years old, who were shot trying to escape to the West from a tyranny they were not yet old enough to understand.

Photographs of an East German father dropping his child from the fourth floor of a building into the outstretched net of West German rescuers below.

And pictures of a young West German bride tossing a bouquet to her tearful mother imprisoned on the Communist side of the wall.

Yes, the Iron Curtain still exists, embodied in this wall of shame.

And standing at Friedrichstrasse, alongside Checkpoint Charlie, it is clear who and what that "something there is that doesn't love a wall."

It is the millions of refugees who gave up everything they owned for the opportunity to live in freedom and with dignity.

Similarly, it is the unfortunate millions still behind the wall, those who were not lucky enough to escape, but who have not yet stopped hoping.

(Editor's Note.—Since this report was written, two more East German border guards escaped to West Berlin while on patrol. The two, 22 and 21, jumped across barbed wire fences last Wednesday night, leaving their weapons behind and asking for asylum.)

EAST BERLIN LIFELESS AND DRAB—COMMUNIST WONDERLAND BREATHES DECAY

(Editor's Note.—Here is the second of a series of articles on satellite communism by one of the editorial writers of the Arizona Republic who has just completed a 6-week trip through Europe and Russia. Today's installment takes you behind that infamous wall.)

(By Edwin McDowell)

East Berlin.—"The wall erected by the German Democratic Republic is a precaution for keeping out Western spies and provocateurs," intoned the young East German guide without the slightest trace of embarrassment.

As he droned on, pointing out the accomplishments of his socialistic fatherland, I had difficulty following him.

For I wondered what in fact he was describing—some far-away Elysium, some worker's paradise of the future, or the East Germany whose streets and byways I was viewing even then.

As I write this, I have been in East Germany less than 2 hours. Thus far, however, I have been unable to rid myself of the feeling of depression, of malaise at having viewed communism first hand.

For East Berlin is supposedly a showcase of communism, a model of Communist efficiency and ingenuity designed to surpass, or at least equal, the wirtschaftswunder (economic miracle) which West Germany has attained under a democratic government, a government which has no need for walls and barbed wire.

To hear our guide describe it, one would think it truly was a showcase, something just this side of heaven, or whatever other location would please a doctrinaire Communist.

In reality, however, East Berlin is an appendage, a useless part of a larger and more vital body—in this case West Berlin, a city whose heart, and more important, soul, is on the other side of the wall of shame.

It is a lifeless city comprised of drab stores and solemn, unsmiling people who, when they look at tourists at all, stare at them through disbelieving (or, perhaps more accurately, uncomprehending) eyes, as though they were from some other world.

I say this realizing that it is an elementary truth of the psychology of perception that what one sees depends often upon his beliefs and expectations.

As Prof. Sidney Hook has observed, the stronger the beliefs the more they function like a priori notions whose validity is beyond the tests of experience.

Nevertheless, the above description of East Berlin is accurate; the differences between East and West Berlin are both startling and depressing.

CONTRAST TO WEST

Only a few days earlier I sat among the patrons of the picturesque sidewalk cafes of Paris, and watched bustling, lively French men and women parade along the Champs Elysees, the Rue de la Paix.

There was a bounce in their step, their conversations were animated, and there was an air of excitement and verve in their comings and goings, the same air of excitement and verve one finds on all the main avenues of major cities in the democratic West.

But today there was no excitement, no bustle, no life in either the eyes or the measured steps of the scattered few who strolled aimlessly along Karl Marx Allee.

"You know, I was last here in 1936," a middleaged Austrian confided, waving his arm up the deserted East Berlin Street. "At that time this street was mobbed with people, and there were lots of gay cafes. Now look at it. You can't believe it's the same place * * * I just can't make myself believe it."

His incredulity was understandable. It must have been difficult to remember this largely deserted main street as a former beehive of excitement.

STREETS DESERTED

There were no window shoppers except tourists. Yet just a few miles beyond the wall, in West Berlin, thousands of strollers were gazing in store windows, stopping to sit at sidewalk cafes, or just walking, happy to be out in the sunshine.

The only ones who seemed to be enjoying today's sunshine in East Berlin were the teams of armed patrols roaming the city and the lonely old men in shirtsleeves leaning out of far away windows.

Only once, when we passed a small park, did I see strollers who exhibited even a flicker of enjoyment.

But even there, few young people were to be seen.

That is what first caught my attention and what bothered me most—the lack of young people anywhere in East Berlin.

Once I caught a glimpse of a small boy on a bicycle; another time of a young mother walking her two children toward the church.

And, as I said, our guide was a relative youngster, effortlessly repeating by rote all the cliches he had been taught by his Communist employers.

CITY FOR AGING

But by and large, East Berlin struck me as being a city for the aged or aging:

For the superannuated, who no longer dreamed of anything better, and therefore accepted whatever befell them.

For those who had been too poor, infirm, or weary to leave when they had the opportunity.

For those whom a lifetime of drifting with the prevailing political or ideological currents taught to believe they could coexist with anything.

And, of course, for those opportunists who found in communism the opportunity they wanted to exercise authority, to attain status; persons who believe, as Milton's Lucifer, that "to reign is worth ambition though in hell; better to reign in hell than serve in heaven."

It was depressing to see faded signs advertising beer that had been sold in rathskellers and pubs before the regime decided that any but state-owned brews and alehouses were indications of capitalistic decadence.

BOLD POSTERS

Those poignant reminders of things that uesd to be, but never more will be, are being replaced by bold propaganda posters, by bright billboards heralding the worker's circus soon to arrive in town (but where will the children come from to laugh at the Communist version of Emmet Kelly?) and signs announcing the latest drama at the state-run Maxim Gorky Theater.

Rubble from the last war dots every section of the city, and each time we passed another scene of wreckage the guide dutifully explained that the regime was planning—the date was unspecified—to build a new hospital, a new library, new workers' apartments, a park, or some other new welfare measure for the toilers in the vineyards of communism.

Nor did the guide stammer when he pointed out the Adion Hotel, a rundown establishment which in earlier times, before the Nazis and before the Communists, rang with shouts of laughter at the sad-faced mim in baggy pants, Charley Chaplin, and which resounded with kudos for the lovely, talented, enigmatic Garbo.

HITLER DIED HERE

Near the Adion is the bunker marking the spot where Adolf Hitler, the principal totalitarian fanatic of another era, committed suicide when his megalomaniacal dreams of grandeur were shattered by Allied bombs. I managed to suppress a smile momentarily when I thought how fitting it was that Hitler should be entombed on this side of the wall.

Viewed from this perspective, the contrast between East and West, between communism and noncommunism, between freedom and slavery, is the contrast of drabness and decay with freshness and vigor.

It is the contrast between the bustling Champs Élysées and the clear steady gaze of those who stroll along the Friedrichstrasse, and the dreariness of Karl Marx Alee and the empty gaze of those inmates of East Berlin, upon whose backs rest the burdens of the world, and who look with unresponsive, mournful eyes on visitors from the West.

It is the contrast between the freedom of the West and the arbitrary, capricious Red tape of the East which kept us waiting 2 hours before we could gain admission to the Red wonderland.

It is the contrast between the freedom of democracy and the insolence of office inherent under a despotism which requires brick walls, barbed wire, and guards to enforce its will.

Czech Communism Disguised—But Regimentation Takes Its Toll

(Editor's Note.—Before the Communist coup d'etat in 1948, Czechoslovakia was well on the road to economic prosperity and political freedom. This on-the-scene report from Prague, by Republic Editorial Writer Edwin McDowell, describes the Czech capital as it is now.)

Prague, Czechoslovakia.—Communism has left an indelible mark on this old city.

It is not the mark of barbed wire fences, minefields, and border guards carrying submachineguns, although the barbed wire fence seperating the western border of Czechoslovakia from Austria and from West Germany makes use of all three methods of discouraging escape.

By and large, the overt signs of totalitarianism, at least as we in the West conceive of them, are missing from Prague.

The soldiers—it would be inaccurate to describe them as troops—one sees throughout the city are not booted, spit-and-polish servants of communism.

Rather, they impress outsiders as being every bit like young men elsewhere in the world when caught up in a nationwide compulsory draft—young men like those you knew a decade earlier in your own country, fulfilling, as best they are able, an obligation that is at best tolerable but most often loathsome.

This is not to say that no Czech believes in communism.

Many do. Both our guides, for example—one a 45-year-old woman, the other a nervous young college student—spoke of the glories of Czechoslovak socialism (although it was obvious the young student was far from convinced).

And Czechoslovakia boasts the highest percentage of Communist Party membership of any country in the world—roughly 1.6 million of a total population of 14 million.

But communism here is far more subtle than in East Germany.

There, the bearded puppet, President Walter Ulbricht scowls down on the masses from every public office (and every office in East Germany is a public office) and every way station.

Here, one has to make a conscious effort to find a picture of Czech President Antonin Novotny, the former hard-line Stalinist.

Novotny's apparent shyness may be attributable to the fact that he played a prominent role in the conviction of Rudolf Slansky, former secretary general of the Communist Party, who was hanged in 1952 on charges of espionage and high treason.

FALSELY ACCUSED

For just recently, the party finally admitted that Slansky had been falsely accused (an endearing sentiment of questionable value to Slansky), and Novotny will be unlikely, at least in the immediate future, to mitigate his part in the affair.

(Editor's Note.—Since this report was received, Novotny ousted Premier Viliam Siroky, two deputy premiers and several ministers. The official charge was for shortcomings in their work and "certain mistakes in past political activity." Inasmuch as Siroky also played a prominent part in the Slansky purge, the move is thought to be an effort by President Novotny to divert blame from himself.)

Thus, with "big brother" keeping discreetly in the background, and no Russian troops to be seen anywhere (except for a delegation at the airport, welcome to Prague with innumerable hugs and many flowers), the brutal face of communism is well disguised.

But Communist regimentation has taken its toll on the Czechs in other ways.

One who queues up to eat in a worker's automat (a drab, dirty version of Horn & Hardart's) can't help but notice the men without socks, the poorly clothed old women, and the bland food.

TOURIST FOOD GOOD

Good food is available in Czechoslovakia, of course. But that is reserved for the tourist, at a cost comparable to an evening spent at Manhattan's swank Four Seasons restaurant.

What is good and plentiful is the pastry. Apparently even communism has not yet discovered a way to render it tasteless and unappetizing.

Regrettably, for a city which once boasted luxurious restaurants and fashionable shops, Prague today is a city which has completely divested itself of originality and fashion for the Communist promises for the future.

There is no private enterprise, as is apparent from a sojourn down Prague's main street.

State-owned shops offer few worthwhile goods, and those only at prices far beyond the means of the average Czechoslovakian (whose living standard, incidentally, is said to be the highest of any Communist nation).

Alcoholism is said to be a major problem (perhaps because Communist malt does more than Milton—or Marx—can to justify God's ways to man).

MECHANICAL ACTIONS

And every action seems to be mechanical, perfunctory, as though it were being performed by automatons instead of humans.

Last night, for example, we attended a nightclub at our hotel (whose name, the Yalta, is significant in the history of Communist expansion).

We were amazed to watch the mechanical manner in which the musicians went through their paces, playing "Tenderly" and "On the Street Where You Live" in almost the same rhythm, at almost the same speed. (I thought it appropriate when the group—comprised of deviationists, no doubt—struck up "Don't Get Around Much Anymore." I think its composer, Duke Ellington, would have been less pleased, for it too resembled each preceding song.)

But what seemed most significant was the fact that regardless of what the musicians played—and the repertoire of musicians in this Red nation seems decidedly circumscribed by the boundaries of capitalism's Tin Pan Alley—nobody, absolutely no one, applauded. Not even to be polite.

And yet, I remembered, why should anyone? After all, the musicians were employed by the State, were playing state-owned instruments in a state-owned nightclub in a state-owned hotel, and were responsible solely to the state.

TWIST BRINGS LIFE

So why then should anyone applaud—any more than one applauded the driver of the snowplow that cleared your street on a snowy winter morning, or any more than a postman received applause for performing that duty for which the Government hired him.

Only when the combo struck up a twist number (which they did precisely every 25 minutes, in accordance with God-knows-what regulation of the Ministry of Music) did the jaded atmosphere disappear.

After that, during "Cocktails for Two" (somehow reminiscent of the old Spike Jones version of what is ordinarily a beautiful song) and "Fascination," it was back to the same old tempo, the same old lackluster mechanical performance, the same blase audience reaction.

The cold war is being waged in Czechoslovakia, but on a minor scale.

Western newspapers and books are banned in Czechoslovakia, as—insofar as it is possible—are Western ideas.

Our student guide confided that he was permitted to listen to "propaganda broadcasts" from the Voice of America and, furthermore, that he was subjected to Western authors in literature courses at the university.

CUBANS IN PRAGUE

In a rare sarcastic moment, I said I was sure he was, and further said I imagined he meant Theodore Dreiser, Jack London, Mark Twain, Langston Hughes, Charles Dickens.

He smiled, nervously I thought, and said, yes, that was true—that they didn't have time to study every Western writer, therefore they concentrated on the representative ones.

I tried gently to explain that while each of the above was a major writer, taken as a totality they were hardly representative of the whole of Western literature.

Somehow I felt he didn't believe me. And when he began reciting a poem by Langston Hughes—something about how Negroes were forced to eat in the kitchen whenever whites were around—I knew we were talking about entirely different subjects altogether.

There are many Cubans in Czechoslovakia, but their numbers, I am told, are being reduced.

We saw them often—in the hotel lobby, on trolleys, at the airport, on the street. They are here to train in industrial plants and on Czechoslovak farms.

(Thousands of Communists from all over the world are here to study in special labor schools. In addition, some 3,000 Communist and non-Communist students from 80 nations also are studying in Czechoslovakia.)

CZECHS IN CUBA

Approximately 2,000 Czech technical experts are reported to be in Cuba, working to bolster Castro's faltering economy.

Czechoslovak aid to Cuba in 1962 amounted to $100 million, up more than 800 percent from 1960. Included in this were tools and heavy industrial goods, as well as foodstuffs, bicycles, and auto parts.

Czechoslovakia is being systematically exploited by its Communist masters to aid communism elsewhere.

On a per capita basis, Czechoslovakia gives more aid to underdeveloped Red nations than does even Soviet Russia—$48 per capita up to the end of 1960, compared with about $16 per capita by Soviet Russia.

Apparently the Red brain trust stands the drain, inasmuch as this nation of one-half of 1 percent of the world's population accounts for almost 2 percent of the world's industrial output.

But the economy of this beautiful country is far from rosy. Last year the Government decided to abandon its current 5-year economic plan only 2 years after its inception; it hopes to undertake a more ambitious 7-year program beginning next year.

As always, weighty statistics don't begin to tell the story of communism in Czechoslovakia or elsewhere.

LACK OF FREEDOMS

They tell nothing about the lack of freedom to change jobs; the endless lines and queues for foodstuffs; the empty and drab store windows; the sameness of the state-owned restaurants; the absence of any but Communist news, movies, and literature.

They tell nothing of the sad-faced old women and men who go about their humdrum routines, hoping that they can get through another day without offending their Communist bosses.

They tell nothing of the memories of those who knew freedom and prosperity before the Second World War, and again briefly before the government of President Eduard Benes fell to communism with a worldwide crash in a lightning coup d'etat on February 25, 1948.

For most Czechoslovakians, life, if it is not happy, is at least predictable.

There is enough to eat, at least by Iron Curtain standards. And if the individual Czech's reach is not allowed to exceed his grasp, his Communist masters have a ready explanation.

For communism, its propagandists never tire of reminding the populace—through newspapers, on the radio, in the cinema, and on billboards—is the wave of the future, not a promise of the good life here and now.

And so the Czechs wait, and hope, and (although religion in Czechoslovakia is today largely a remnant barely tolerated by the state) perhaps even pray.

(Editor's Note.—The day after this report was received, a 37-year-old Czechoslovak anesthesiologist, Dr. Jaroslav Kremel, defected from a 25-member group of medical men touring the United States. He gave as his reason the fact that "spiritual terror reaches into all areas of public and private life" in his Red homeland. He said further that he had seen in the United States that "people do live in such a free atmosphere as the majority of the Czechoslovak people can no longer imagine.")

Mindszenty Reminder of Revolt—Despite Defeat, Budapest Is Alive, Inviting

(Editor's Note.—Memories of the abortive 1956 revolution remain vivid to both Hungarians and their Red rulers. The effect of that revolution is reported by Edwin McDowell, Republic editorial writer who recently completed an extensive tour of the Communist satellite nations.)

(By Edwin McDowell)

Budapest, Hungary.—On the sidewalk outside the U.S. Legation here, small privately owned flower stands, similar to those seen on most street corners in this picturesque city, add to the beauty that is Budapest.

Inside the Legation, where he has been a refugee for almost 7 years, Josef Cardinal Mindszenty puts in another day of prayer and of taking occasional strolls in the courtyard.

No two incidents more accurately show the contrasting faces of Hungary:

To a Westerner getting his first look, Budapest is everything that East Berlin and Prague are not—alive, gay, and inviting.

But to Cardinal Mindszenty, a servant of God in a nation ruled by godless men, and to others who oppose the Communist rule which was forced upon this nation in 1949, Budapest is the imprisoned capital of a captive nation.

Perhaps more than anything or anyone else, Cardinal Mindszenty is a haunting reminder of those fateful days in late 1956 when, for one brief moment, it appeared that a revolution against overwhelming odds, the might of the Soviet Union, just might succeed.

He is a reminder of those first few glorious days of the fighting, when the warm breath of victory was in the air—days reminiscent of the early days of the French Revolution, about which Wordsworth was to write:

> "Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive,
> But to be young was very Heaven."

And, sadly, Mindszenty is also a tragic reminder of the failure of that revolution, and with it the final crushing of the independent spirit of Hungary. Small wonder that Hungary's Red government would like to see him leave the country, and is reportedly petitioning the Vatican for just such an arrangement.

It is perhaps too harsh a judgment to say that the independent spirit of Hungary has been finally crushed, in the sense that finally implies irredeemably.

DEFEAT NOT TOTAL

For while the brave Hungarians lost the battle, and perhaps, at least for the foreseeable future, the war, their defeat was not total. They won something in the process: The right to live their lives with a larger degree of freedom than their neighbors in East Germany and Czechoslovakia.

Those two nations were drab. But Hungary is abuzz with excitement, heightened by the dozens of colorful shops run by private individuals who incur official Communist displeasure. (Unofficially, the regime pretends not to notice the flourishing private enterprises.)

Unlike Czechoslovakia, where religion exists solely at the sufferance of the Communist Party and where the clergy is paid by the Government, Hungary remains proudly, at times disdainfully, religious.

And while religion appears to be losing its appeal to the young, churches still are crowded on Sundays and holy days. Catholic schools exist, and the Catholic Church even maintains a college where Marxism-Leninism and the principles of dialectical materialism give way to the teaching of Augustine, Aquinas, and to other less temporal studies.

RED PRESSURE SUBTLE

Furthermore, even though the ubiquitous Red star shines forth from the tops of many buildings, and even though posters exhort workers to give their all for Marx, Engels, and the promise of a worker's paradise, most Communist pressures are far more subtle than one might expect.

Nowhere, for example, do visitors see pictures of Janos Kadar, the figurehead Premier installed in power by the Russians during the 1956 revolution.

Nor does one see any trace of Soviet troops, although an estimated 50,000 to 60,000 remain in Hungary.

"Yes, there are Russian troops here," the guide replied in answer to my question. "But not in Budapest. They're stationed outside the city."

"Where?"

"Who knows?" He shrugged his shoulders, as though he wished he could be done with the question. "We Hungarians really aren't interested enough in the Russian troops to go looking for them."

In fact, despite this relative measure of freedom from the Communist iron grip, the result of Kadar's badly wanting respectability in the eyes of the West in order to court Western trade, the dominant impression left with visitors is that Hungarian youths really aren't interested in much of anything.

YOUTH INSULATED

What perhaps has insulated Hungarian youth against the larger questions of freedom and oppression is the realization that during Hungary's moment of decision in 1956, the West could offer no response other than to watch and debate while Soviet troops and tanks rolled over the revolutionaries.

Conversations with these youths leave the impression, valid or not, that the major concern of most Hungarians is how to exist with a minimum of trouble and a maximum of enjoyment.

In the July issue of Encounter, Arthur Koestler, himself a former native of Hungary and a onetime devoted Communist, noted that the new Europe is neither Huxley's brave new world nor Orwell's 1984.

Ideologies, he said, are on the wane; poverty is on the way out. The new shape of society is one of managers, technocrats, official planning, chromium, motels, and motorways.

But the new European youth, Koestler observed, seem "to have no aspirations except getting on in their professions, marrying early, and going on holidays in the family car. Thus, this superhistorical age has produced a generation which seems to live outside history. Under the parabolic orbits of intercontinental missiles they have peacefully settled down to cultivate their little gardens."

IDEOLOGY DOMINANT

This is largely hyperbole; ideologies may be on the wane elsewhere in Europe, but they still dominate the thinking of those who hold the Iron Curtain countries, including Hungary, in bondage.

If Hungary does not precisely resemble Orwell's 1984 (and superficially it does not), it is not because its rulers have abandoned the idea of depicting truth as falsehood, good as evil, war as peace.

It is largely because for one brief, shining hour, in a dawn which now seems ages ago, today's blase Hungarian youth cared enough about those larger questions—cared about more than merely cultivating their little gardens—to strike a blow that was heard round the world.

Some observers here feel that if and when the end of ideology, specifically the ideology of freedom, is crowded out by the younger generation's hedonistic search for pleasure, Hungary truly will be lost.

What worries the Communists of this nation of 10 million is that in the meantime they may be losing the cold war battle by default.

NO ACTIVE REVOLT

Not that the awesome power of communism is any less. With 50,000 Soviet troops only minutes from Budapest and countless Red divisions only an hour or so away, no one, not even the most hardened anti-Communist, has any illusions on that score.

But the Hungarian response to Communist importunity has been what military top sergeants accurately label "silent contempt," the sullen expression of silent hatred or resentment even while obeying orders.

Nowhere is this more apparent than in the Hungarian reaction to propaganda—Communist newspapers, periodicals, and books (the only publications allowed).

Rarely, it seems, does anyone bother reading them. Only the true believer takes Red doctrine with anything less than a truckload of salt. And true believers, in a nation which experienced what this nation did just 7 short years ago, are hard to come by.

Our guide, of course, was a Communist. And it is even possible that he believed in that "true communism" he extolled at irregular intervals.

RED FAULTS ADMITTED

But even he admitted that East Germany is one vast prison camp, that the Soviet path to economic and industrial progress has been watered with the blood of millions of innocents, that free elections are nonexistent in Hungary, and that a barbed wire fence and armed guards still patrol the border between Austria and Hungary (although restrictions against travel, to Communist and non-Communist countries alike, have been eased during the last year).

His only justification was that someday Hungary, and what he termed the "other Socialist states," will evolve in the direction of freedom, a direction I gently reminded him the Western democracies have long traveled with some degree of success without the need for pogroms and repression.

Despite Hungary's ordeal, however, her exterior remains independent and seemingly carefree.

From the moment we stepped off the plane and were greeted at the airport with a Muzak version of "Autumn Leaves," we were never far from music.

OMNIPRESENT MUSIC

On the radio, which, unfortunately, relies heavily on that unique American contribution to the arts, rock-'n'-roll, and in cafes and restaurants, music accompanies the Hungarian day and night.

Even though the nomadic gypsies who survived Communist purges have been assimilated into the mainstream of national life, having abandoned their wanderlust and fortunetelling (a risky business at best in a Communist nation), the lachrymose gypsy violin and the haunting gypsy music remain fixtures of Budapest.

The visitor preparing to leave here can do so only with a deep feeling of sadness for its people, a sadness occasioned by wondering what the coming days will bring.

Another revolution appears unlikely, at least in the foreseeable future, for always there is the grim reminder of those 50,000 Russian troops.

Yet I say this realizing that a brief stay does not give any but the very foolish the right to predict anything about any country, and especially about a country so volatile as Hungary.

I say it also realizing what Spengler meant when he said, "An earthquake reveals only the pressures that have built up in many years under the earth's surface."

For if revolution appears out of the question, so too, remembering the history of the Hungarian people, does complete acquiescence.

Somehow it is difficult to imagine that the descendants of the fiery patriot Lajos Kossuth and of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters of 1956 ever will be content merely to settle down peacefully to cultivate their little gardens while the Red grip remains tightened around their Hungarian nation.

POLES DEFIANT OF RED OVERLORDS—NATIONAL SPIRIT LINKED WITH FREE WEST

(Throughout history, the Poles have shown an independent spirit toward despots and dictators. Today's Poles are no different. Although the Polish nation is ruled by a Communist government, the Polish people are often openly disdainful of their Red captors. Here is another in a series of reports from behind the Iron Curtain by a Republic editorial writer.)

(By Edwin McDowell)

WARSAW, POLAND.—The body of Poland is bound to the Soviet Union by the Warsaw pact, signed here in 1955 at the Radziwill Palace.

But the heart, the mind, and the spirit of Poland remain linked to that spirit of freedom associated with the West.

For even while Poland is ruled by the Communist government of Wladyslaw Gomulka, and even while two Russian divisions are encamped in western Poland, few Poles have a kind word to say about communism.

No Red stars shine down on the Poles from the tops of Warsaw buildings.

No propaganda posters or banners strung across streets exhort workers to meet monthly quotas.

And religion flourishes among Poland's 30 million people, 95 percent of whom are Roman Catholics.

The defiant spirit of the Poles, whose heads are bloody but still unbowed after 16 years of total Communist control, was apparent from almost the opening remarks of the guide who met us at the airport.

"See that monstrosity," he said as we neared the city limits, indicating the tallest skyscraper in Poland. "That is the Palace of Culture and Science, designed by Soviet architects and built by the Russians in the years 1952–55. It was supposed to be a gift, but"—and here he smiled sardonically—"we had to pay, of course."

A short distance later, he spoke glowingly of the "great October" of 1956, that time when the balky Poles demanded, and were given, assurances of more liberal rule.

It was on this wave of liberalism that Gomulka, postwar Polish Communist leader who was ousted by Moscow in 1948, was swept into office. It was agreed that the long-time harassment against the church would be ended, that secret police would be called off, and that private enterprise would be allowed to flourish on the farm.

PROMISES SHORT LIVED

But, Poland is discovering Communist promises are short lived.

The secret police terror, according to informed Western sources here, still does not exist as it once did. But deviationists are regularly summoned to some anonymous bureau or agency, given a stern lecture, and warned to toe the Marx.

Poland's farms (about 85 percent privately owned) remain the only ones in all the satellite nations not yet collectivized.

Yet it is the church which remains the principal bete noir of the Red government. And despite its promises of 1956, the regime systematically has continued to crack down on it.

It has clamped new restrictions on the movements of the clergy. It has banned parochial schools and religious instruction in public schools. And it has instigated a whole series of harassments—confiscatory taxes on church property, building restrictions, etc.—to curb religion in Poland.

Undoubtedly the Communists would have been far more successful with their antireligious vendetta were it not for Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, the Primate of Poland.

Again and again Cardinal Wyszynski, who was imprisoned by the Communists from 1953 to 1956, has denounced the Red government of Poland.

CHURCH DEFIES REDS

Two years ago, he decried the Communist persecution of the church and said Catholicism would not bow to the Red "Caesars."

In a series of Lenten sermons last year, Cardinal Wyszynski again asserted publicly that there was no religious freedom in Poland, and once more vigorously attacked the Communist atheistic propaganda.

And when Gomulka recently accused Polish bishops of opposing the philosophy of coexistence enunciated by the late Pope John in his encyclical Pacem in Terris, Wyszynski, just days before my arrival in Poland, and before an audience of more than 50,000 persons, challenged the Polish Communist regime to live up to that encyclical they so much profess to believe.

Thus the war continues, becoming more and more bitter, causing increasing concern among Western officials and those in the West who have championed Poland's independence from Moscow.

It is agreed that sooner or later the deep cleavage between church and state must be resolved, and as of now it appears that when it is, the government is likely to win.

Despite increasing restrictions, however, and despite inspection of outgoing and incoming mail, Poland still retains a degree of freedom found nowhere else behind the Iron Curtain (with the exception of Yugoslavia, which is not really an Iron Curtain country.)

Non-Communist literature from the West is generally obtainable at libraries and occasional newsstands.

PRESS CRITICAL

The Polish press now and then criticizes the government (although lately the regime has demanded closer obedience to the party line).

Abstract art, which has so enraged Khrushchev, abounds in Warsaw, and is displayed in semiofficial art galleries.

Furthermore, Warsaw coffee houses serve as meeting places for dissidents critical of the regime.

One such coffee house, Novy Swiat (New World), resembling a long, narrow hallway, was crowded as usual after work yesterday. And, amid coffee, beer, wine, and ice cream, it was alive with conversation.

At the far end of the room sat an intense young piano player, which perhaps is not unusual in the city of Paderewski and Chopin (whose heart, incidentally, is contained in an urn in Holy Church).

What does strike first-time visitors as unusual, however, is that he was playing modern jazz, interpretive versions of "Lullaby of Birdland" and "Love Walked In" in a style that sounded somewhere between Erroll Garner and Ahmad Jamal.

This 700-year-old city has undergone a major transformation since prewar years. It is no exaggeration to say that it has risen Phoenix-like from the ashes, inasmuch as it was largely reduced to rubble by the Nazis during the occupation.

The causes of Nazi displeasure were the effective, courageous Polish underground, which sometimes seemed almost to make captives of the captors, and the large-scale Polish uprising against the Nazis during the last days of the war, which greatly offended the high command of the Third Reich.

(This uprising, interestingly enough, affords a prime example of Communist duplicity. For the Soviets knew that an effective Polish underground would seriously hamper Red post-war plans for Poland. Therefore, in order to crush that resistance beforehand, the Red army, which earlier had arrived at the gates of Warsaw, broadcast an appeal to the Polish patriots telling them the time had come to join their Russian brothers in a final assault against the Nazis.

(When the resistance forces came out into the open to battle the mighty Nazi Army, the Red army sat passively across the Vistula River and watched the ensuing carnage. When they finally occupied Warsaw, the Soviets arrested the remaining resistance leaders and deported them to Russia for trial. Others disappeared without even the semblance of a trial.)

Thus the rebuilding of Warsaw continues. But not fast enough. Apartments remain scarce, and this scarcity has been aided, as in Budapest, by a wholesale migration from the farms and countryside.

The result is that today there is an estimated 5-year wait for a new apartment. And it is literally true that newlyweds oftentimes are required to live apart for as long as 2 years, awaiting living quarters.

Last winter's severe cold, among the worst in European history, took its toll in a widespread crop failure, repercussions of which in the form of food shortages, are being felt even today.

A drought this summer and the doubling of fuel and electric prices this spring already has presaged conditions which many believe will lead to a winter of severe discontent in Poland.

But it is generally thought the Poles will survive as they always have survived, and none expects last winter's sporadic strikes (indicating unhappiness with food shortages) to become widespread.

In other words, Red Poland (containing 1.4 million Communists, an indeterminable but large number of whom are mere opportunists) is expected to continue along its quasi-independent path.

And for most Poles, that is enough for the present time.

But not for all of them.

SOME STILL ESCAPE

For it was just a couple of months ago, many will remember, that a major in the Polish Air Force escaped with his wife and two children to West Germany in his jet plane.

His reason? To some it may sound strange, especially to those who consider that the Poles have it relatively good (what with generally enough to eat and an unprecedented measure of freedom for an Iron Curtain country) and that the pilot had a position of no small consequence as a major in the air force.

But he felt otherwise. His reason was that despite his relative well-being, that intangible ingredient called "freedom" was missing in his homeland, freedom, that concept with Aneurin Bevan described as the right to go to Waterloo Station, plunk down his money, and buy a ticket to wherever he bloody well pleased.

That kind of freedom is missing in Poland. And, sad to report, most observers here believe it will be a long, long time before it is rediscovered.

Rumania Ruled With Iron Hand—Hapless People Dream of Travel to West

(Rumania has been a longtime faithful Soviet ally. But in recent months, her leaders have expressed unhappiness with the role assigned to the country by Russia in the Communist-bloc economic union. The Republic's Edwin McDowell, who has just completed a trip through the Communist satellite nations, explains why Rumania is unhappy.)

(By Edwin McDowell)

Bucharest.—When World War II ended, there were fewer than 1,000 Communists among Rumania's 16 million people.

Today, in a population exceeding 18 million, Rumania boasts more than 1 million Communists.

And the country's Red dictator, Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej, has been in power since 1952, longer than any leader in the Iron Curtain nations.

"It is difficult to become a Communist in Rumania," our guide, a member of the Young Communists (UTM-ISTI), told us. "You must belong to the UTM-ISTI until you are 26. Then you have a 2-year trial period, after which you are given a rigid examination. Only those who pass are then eligible to become full party members.

"The principal requirements for party membership are two: You must be hardworking, ready to make any sacrifice for the party. For example, you must be prepared to volunteer to work on your days off and at night, if your services are needed.

"And second you must have class conscience, an understanding and love of people."

No one can doubt that Rumania's Communists are anything but hardworking. Whether or not they have class conscience depends upon whether one views them through the pink-tinged glasses of Marxism.

For while this nation has achieved a 3-year industrial growth rate of just slightly less than 16 percent, highest among the satellite nations, its workers are said to be the poorest in the Soviet bloc (a reported per capita income of less than $140).

More importantly, unlike neighboring Hungary and nearby Poland, Rumania's Red leaders have shown no indication that they intend to relax their repressive rule.

"I hope to travel to the other Socialist (i.e., Communist) nations in the next year or two," the guide said. "I just can't imagine a life without travel."

She may not be able to imagine it, but her superiors in the Communist Party can. And ever since the party came to power after the rigged elections of 1946, party officials have seen to it that none but trusted Communists have ventured abroad.

That attitude still holds. But, as a simple matter of dollars and cents, the regime has decided to court increased trade and tourism with the West.

And she is courting both, using techniques employed by Madison Avenue men in gray flannel suits.

TRAVEL AGENTS HERE

Last night at the hotel we talked briefly with a group of travel agents from England, brought here as a good-will gesture by the Rumanian Government.

And there are more than passing indications that Bucharest is prepared to settle some outstanding political problems with the United States (specifically, Rumanian treatment of certain American citizens) as part of an inducement to Yankee tourists.

Within the past few weeks two of President Kennedy's sisters, Mrs. Stephen Smith and Mrs. Peter Lawford, enjoyed brief holidays here, a fact considered to be of more than passing significance.

Furthermore, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman recently visited Bucharest, marking the first time an American of cabinet rank has done so.

Every Rumanian thus far has gone out of his way to be friendly. And this includes workers and ordinary citizens not actively engaged in courting Yankee dollars.

But it will take more than mere friendliness to convince the average American traveler that this is a vacation wonderland, especially when he discovers that the finest hotels here do not supply soap, nor do they keep it on hand.

A combination of pleading, demanding, and finally, the equivalent of 35 cents in U.S. money produced a bar of foul-smelling soap from a nearby store.

Or when he discovers that elevators have a penchant for being out of order during the operator's lunch hour.

TRADE WITH WEST

As of now, there is less than a million dollars worth of trade a year in each direction between Rumania and the United States. But Red officials from here are out beating the bush for heavy machinery from the United States, and as of now Western technicians outnumber Russian technicians in the land.

There is a decided Soviet influence here, of course, which is not surprising inasmuch as Rumania was "liberated" by the Soviets on August 23, 1944. To commemorate that heroic assistance, the regime thoughfully designated its modern 80,000-seat football (soccer) stadium and surrounding grounds as "Park of the 23d of August."

The facts are less romantic than Communist mythology admits. When Rumania broke with the Axis on August 23, 1944, a coup d'etat was staged by the two non-Communist parties which had been the main political bodies before the installation of the Fascist dictatorship.

But with the aid of the Red army, and by the imposition of the "war criminals law" which was administered by a Communist, and used as a weapon for eliminating persons deemed undesirable by the Communists, the Reds formed a terrorist force which enabled them, through a "national democratic front," to gain control of the coalition.

After a Communist power play failed, Andrei Vishinsky arrived here and demanded an immediate change of government. The king stalled, but Vishinsky changed his mind by arranging for a display of Soviet military might. Thus the Communist Groza government was installed.

Then came the rigged elections, followed by mass arrests and persecution said to have exceeded anything ever witnessed in the brutal history of Rumanian politics.

Although the Soviets are no longer here, the hammer and sickle is everywhere evident. Today, emblazoned across a trolley carbarn in the Rumanian countryside, was a sign boldly proclaiming, "Proletari Din Toate Tarile Uniti-Va." Or, as Marx proclaimed in the opening line of "Das Kapital," "Workers of the world, unite."

The Red star is not confined merely to buildings, parks, and workers' apartments, however.

Last night the circus from Russia was in town. And, along with Rumanians from all walks of life as well as the inevitable visiting firemen from Kansas City, I was in the audience.

The endless string of acrobats, strongmen, balancers, and acts in the juggler vein proved that the Russians can be every bit as boring as the Ed Sullivan show.

PROPAGATE COMMUNISM

But the circus was important from another viewpoint: It showed how the Soviets wisely take advantage of every opportunity to propagate communism.

One act depicted Russian space dogs (muttniks, presumably). On another occasion the master of ceremonies released dozens of white doves of friendship.

And at the end there were endless toasts of friendship and good will between the Soviets and their Rumanian brothers.

Inevitably, from high above the big top (in reality, a modern indoor auditorium), the hammer and sickle was in full view as a constant reminder.

Non-Communist literature is verboten in Rumania. And the local press (translated and placed in hotels for anyone who might like to read a tome with his morning coffee) is so boring and so patently tendentious that it makes the writing in the Worker appear, by comparison, absolutely scintillating.

Occasionally a Western movie manages to get its nose under this country's tent. Across the street from our hotel Brigitte Bardot is appearing in "Babette Pleaca La Razboi," which, if memory serves, is approximately 2 years old and is titled "Babette Goes to War."

I have no idea of the social message conveyed in the film, although, since it features la Bardot, I can guess. But I can be sure the local minister of culture has no reason to believe it will have a baneful, corrupting influence on Communist faith.

When "The Apartment," with Jack Lemmon and Shirley MacLaine, played here last year, the party distributed leaflets explaining that the movie was really about decadence in New York City. It would be interesting to know what impressed the Rumanian audience more, decadence in New York City or the apartment, sumptuous by Communist standards, of an ordinary New Yorker.

Western influence has made its mark with the twist and U.S. music. During the past few minutes the big, brassy band six floors below, in the outdoor restaurant, has given forth with "Blue Skies" and "Hernando's Hideaway."

The only signs of private enterprise are the few remaining repair shops (for shoes, watches, etc.) which one finds scattered along side streets near the downtown area. But these, our guide told us with satisfaction becoming a good Communist, are heavily taxed and therefore are gradually disappearing.

UNIFORMLY DRAB

When they do, it is safe to predict that Bucharest streets will become uniform, and uniformly drab, like the city's eight workers' districts (containing apartments, schools, clinics, a cinema, and stores) of which our Communist guide was so proud.

As in Czechoslovakia, the church (here mainly Greek Orothodox) is dependent on the state, from which the clergy draws a portion of its salary. Although the regime permits worship, it has so discouraged religious attendance that only the very old, the very foolhardy, and the very devout dare risk party opprobrium by attending church regularly.

"Few young people believe in God any more," a sophomore at the University of Bucharest said omnisciently. "After all, we learn in school that religion is merely a superstition. But there are always those who feel better when they can pray to a Supreme Being, with a beard and all that. You know."

Indeed I did. Yet I wondered how she reconciled her boastful atheism with her penchant for religious symbols, specifically, a Turkish pendant she wore around her neck, on which (according to her earlier translation) was inscribed "God Bless You."

It would be unwise to expect any serious changes in Rumania's relationship with the Soviet Union. But there have been strains and stresses in the past which, for a time at least, gave reason for hope.

Principal among these was Rumania's role in Comecon, the Council of Mutual Economic Association established by Moscow in 1949 as communism's answer to the Marshall Plan.

Last year Khrushchev, hoping to reinvigorate Comecon invited Outer Mongolia to join Russia, Rumania, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, East Germany, and Albania in the supposedly integrated economic union, whose partners would concentrate on producing what each can produce most efficiently.

RAW MATERIALS WANTED

This meant that Rumania (together with Hungary and Poland) was to supply raw materials and goods to the other Red nations.

But Rumania was already engaged in steel and petroleum production of her own, and therefore was reluctant to abandon her longstanding plans to become what Red boss Gheorghiu-Dej called a "garden for the Socialist countries."

Furthermore, Rumanian party leaders were irked at Czechoslovakia (which, along with Russia and East Germany, was supposed to concentrate on heavy industry and production of heavy machinery) for allegedly pawning off goods of inferior quality to her Comecon partners, while selling the quality goods in the West.

Therefore Rumania balked, and decided to develop her own natural resources. At the same time she began making ostentatious overtures to Red China and Albania.

Now, apparently, all is harmonious once again between Bucharest and Moscow, at least until a denouement is reached over the Comecon feud.

And peace, Communist style, once more reigns in this isolated and largely ignored land.

IN RUSSIA IT'S 46 ATGOSR—NIKITA SCRAPPED THE STALIN REIGN OF TERROR

(Russia's regimented society in no way resembles the democratic societies of the West. Nevertheless, the reign of terror associated with the Stalin era has been scrapped by Khrushchev, at least for the time being. Republic's Edwin McDowell explains why.)

(By Edwin McDowell)

Moscow.—In most nations of the world, years are designated either B.C. or A.D.

In Russia, years are measured from either before or after the "great October Socialist Revolution."

If a visitor hears that expression once he hears it a hundred times during the course of an ordinary tour in Russia.

"This part of the river used to be dirty and polluted, and often overflowed its banks," our guide explained, indicating the Moscow River over which we were driving. "But after the great October Socialist Revolution, Soviet engineers began work on it. Today it is perfectly sanitary and it no longer overflows."

"This is our trade union building," the same guide explained later that afternoon, pointing to a large and rather plain structure not far from Red Square. "Before the great October Socialist Revolution it was owned by Russian nobility."

"There was 76 percent illiteracy in Russia before the great October Socialist Revolution," the guide informed us in the midst of a discussion about Soviet schools. "Today there is no illiteracy."

And so it goes, until by the end of a day's tour one's head is reeling from trying to keep two sets of facts and figures clear in his mind. A day or so later they will mean nothing to most visitors. But they will have served their intended purpose of impressing upon visitors how much Russia has progressed since that great October Socialist Revolution almost 46 years ago.

Statistics on the number of new apartments for workers; on the number of new buildings in Moscow; on the number of industries in Russia; on the total labor force; on improvement in living conditions; on increased steel production; on the number of books published and read.

The only thing that keeps this statistical saturation from being totally boring is the reminder that you have heard it all before, in much the same manner, in those priceless Lichty "Grin and Bear It" cartoons.

MOSCOW IMPRESSIVE

But for all the pride of its Communist spokesmen, for all their boastfulness and chauvinism, Moscow is truly impressive.

It is spacious, it is modern, and it is clean, particularly so for a city which ranks in population only behind Tokyo, London, New York, and Shanghai.

It has numerous parks and public squares.

And yet despite its size and the number of buildings (already I've forgotten how many), it is possible in this city, which Maxim Gorky described as the heart and brain of Russia, to feel as far removed from the nexus of urban civilization as one feels while strolling on a deserted South Jersey beach on a morning in late September.

The Communists are undeniably proud of their showcase. "Since there is no private ownership of land," an official brochure boasts, "it is possible to reconstruct and build up Moscow according to a rational over-all plan."

But—forgive me if I sound hypercritical—somehow, despite the parks, despite the public squares, despite the spaciousness, despite the incongruous beauty of Red Square and the formidable Kremlin walls and grounds, their 70 acres dotted with spirals and towers, despite all this, something is missing.

There is a sameness about Moscow which lulls the senses into an esthetic limbo, into a kind of numbness, so that the first-time visitor is convinced that whatever slums exist in Moscow are also uniform, rundown according to some overall plan drawn up after the great October Socialist revolution.

PEOPLE A DELIGHT

What makes this city a delight are its people. Russia, as many Americans forget, is made up of 15 republics (hardly "independent republics" as official propaganda proclaims) boasting more than 100 nationalities.

Many of these people can be seen walking through town in their colorful native dress, and it requires effort to remember that this is Moscow, not Culver City, and that these are authentic costumes, not Hollywood reproductions of how the Mongols and Tatars dressed centuries ago.

For just as New York is a mecca for tourists from all over the United States, Moscow is a mecca for Russian tourists, as well as for Communists from around the world who come, like pilgrims to Jerusulem, to pay homage to the memory of their gods.

And just as Broadway and Times Square are the principal first-time tourist attractions of New York, Red Square and Lenin's tomb are the main attractions here.

This morning, promptly at 10:45, viewers began the steady procession past Lenin's body. Two hours later they were still streaming by, and the line extended down the street as far as the eye could see.

LENIN REMEMBERED

Lenin, of course, remains the spiritual godfather of communism and tributes to him can be found everywhere throughout the city: There is the Lenin Library, with its more than 22 million publications; the Central Lenin Museum; Lenin Hills; and the 103,000-seat Lenin Central Stadium.

But the laurel wreaths of communism wither quickly, and it is not surprising therefore that another spiritual godfather has not come off so well in Communist hagiography:

One never hears anything about Josef Stalin, no buildings or streets are named after him (even Stalingrad is now called

Volgograd) and his bust was conspicuously missing from a row of busts within the Kremlin yards commemorating important Communist leaders of the past.

Even the loquacious guide admitted that, "Yes, Stalin was guilty of grave sins with his cult of personality," before resuming her statistical analysis.

One thing virtually all knowledgeable westerners agree on is that the reign of terror in Moscow is ended. This usually means different things to different people, but generally it means that the sense of oppression and terror that was so common during the Stalin era has faded, to a marked degree.

THOUGHT VASSALIZED

At one time, after returning from the Soviet Union, Andre Gide was to write, "I doubt whether in any country of the world, even Hitler's Germany, is thought less free, more bowed down, more terrorized, more vassalized."

Today in Moscow, as throughout Russia, thought is still not free. Prof. Philip E. Mosely, director of studies of the Council on Foreign Relations, has pointed out that clashing viewpoints in the fields of literature and education signify only the hope by contending factions that in time Khrushchev will back their proposals against those of competitors.

The secret police are still active, Mosely says, still watching and writing things down in case Khrushchev decides to restore the atmosphere of terror.

And neighborhood or block meetings are still held in Russia, in which unproductive members can be expelled from their dwellings on order to remain away from home, a subtle reminder of what Lenin meant when in 1937 he wrote:

"In a country where the sole employer is the state, opposition means death by slow starvation. The old principle: who does not work shall not eat, has been replaced by a new one: who does not obey shall not eat."

Granting all this, however, the fact remains that Khrushchev, somewhere along the line, decided to replace the stick with the carrot.

A GLORIOUS FUTURE

He is still willing to resort to the cudgel whenever he deems it necessary, as the Soviet performance in Budapest in 1956 proved. But until it becomes absolutely necessary, from his point of view, Khrushchev seems content to relax internal pressures and make the Russians want to join him in building a "glorious future."

His lifting of the reign of terror has produced results which 5 or 6 years ago would have been thought impossible.

"When I first came here in 1958, you would meet a Russian in a restaurant or in the hotel and he would be scared to talk to you," said the Belgian businessman sharing my table at dinner. "He would look at you, see you were a foreigner, and get away fast."

"Since then the Russians are completely changed," he said. They are allowed to talk with foreigners and they want to talk with them, to ask how much a suit you are wearing cost, ask what it is like outside Russia. Today they are encouraged to talk and there is a world of difference."

Furthermore, suspicion of foreigners on the part of the Government is disappearing. A Western newsman who knows Russia well remarked that it is unusual today for suitcases and belongings to be searched in hotels, whereas a half dozen years ago that procedure was commonplace.

FREEDOM TO TRAVEL

Another visitor from the United States, a noted anti-Communist journalist who speaks Russian fluently, spent a month traveling through Russia recently and said he was never followed nor interfered with in any way.

Westerners I've talked with attribute this condition to the fact that Khrushchev, no matter what his final goals may be, and no one I've spoken with doubts that his ultimate goals are any different from Stalin's, desperately wants to appear to the world as a man of peace.

And of course the decades-long reign of terror under Stalin so conditioned the Soviet people to obey automatically while eliminating those free spirits disinclined to do so, that Khrushchev can afford, for the time being at least, to relax the Communist grip without fear of losing control of the people.

As for Communist Russia's treatment of visitors, even visitors from the decadent capitalistic nations of the West, it is above reproach.

For this is the age of the thaw as far as the outward face of Russian communism is concerned. It is the age of the spirit of Camp David, the spirit of Geneva, the spirit of the nuclear test ban, all rolled up into one.

And Khrushchev, the master conductor, is leading his Red performers in a symphony of sweetness, an overture of conciliation, hoping to convince his foes in the West, and within the Red bloc as well, that beneath the ursine appearance of the man on the podium beats the heart of a gentle person, a man who in the year 46 ATGOSR (after the great October socialist revolution) desires only peace and friendship.

RUSS PROPAGANDA EVERYWHERE—SOFIA NOT ALLOWED TO FORGET RED ARMY

(Bulgaria's Communist rulers continue to crack the Red whip over their subjects. Communist propaganda is everywhere. And Bulgaria is as regimented as any Communist nation in Europe. In this report, Republic Editorial Writer Edwin McDowell, who recently returned from a visit to the satellite nations, describes conditions in the Bulgarian capital.)

(By Edwin McDowell)

SOFIA, BULGARIA.—There no longer are Soviet troops in Sofia.

But the ruling Bulgarian Communist Party has taken pains to insure that, while the Russians are out of sight, they are not out of mind.

Near the center of this lovely city is a park in which is prominently displayed the monument to the Soviet army.

The monument is inscribed: "To the Soviet army, our liberator, from the grateful Bulgarian people."

Communist propaganda is everywhere.

From almost every store window glares forth pictures of the two latest Soviet cosmonauts, Valentina Tereshkova and Valeri Bikovski, who rode to fame in Vostok capsules last June.

Strung along the road leading from Sofia to the nearby Vistosha Mountains are colorful banners proclaiming, "Long live peace and friendship between nations."

Over the entrance to a large building project is the slogan, "The fatherland front is fighting for peaceful building of our system."

And written across the passageway of a new apartment complex for workers is simply, "Peace—Labor—Socialism."

Furthermore, although we arrived too late to witness Bulgaria's major holiday, September 9, windows are still filled with posters reminding Sofians to be properly festive. And across each major street are still strung reminders of the celebration, red, green, and white pennants, the national colors of Bulgaria.

"You should have been here for the September 9 celebration," our guide enthused. "Everyone was drinking; the men were embracing girls and women in the street and in the park. It was wild, but it was a fine time."

I agreed that I should have been there—partly, I suspect, because I always felt I missed something not being in Times Square or downtown San Francisco to celebrate the end of World War II.

For the 8 million inhabitants of this Iron Curtain country, there is no letup from the endless propaganda.

RUNS TIGHT SHIP

Its Red ruler, Todor Zhivkov, runs what in the navy would be called a "tight ship," meaning that he is a virtual dictator.

He has made some recent concessions, such as allowing some private enterprise on the nation's farms (more than 96 percent collectivized). But this was aimed largely at stimulating farm production which is floundering around prewar levels.

The major concession granted by Zhivkov (who, it is said, catches cold whenever Khrushchev sneezes) has been his purge of Stalinists in the Bulgarian Government.

Furthermore, in return for the privilege of opening a trade promotion office in New York, the regime not long ago agreed to a $3.5 million settlement in conflicting commercial claims.

Sofia is also seeking to entice tourists from the West. And although visitors are not flocking to Bulgaria, and although the sight of a tourist's camera still brings numerous interested glances and stares, tourism is increasing.

The government is trying to provide facilities. The Rila Hotel, for example, was built only last year especially for the tourist trade. But already it is in a state of disrepair beyond belief for a building so new.

RUN DOWN, DIRTY

Despite charwomen who seemed to be everywhere dusting and scrubbing, the hotel (which one guest mockingly dubbed the "Comrade Hilton") was as run down and dirty as a hotel 20 years older.

Furthermore, the plumbing didn't work, shelves were pulled out of the walls, and this afternoon, from 12:30 to 2:30, the hotel was without water. This, I learned from the telephone operator, is a daily occurrence for reasons which thus far have been inexplicable.

"Yes, we have private homes and apartments," our guide explained in response to my inquiry. "In fact, it is possible to borrow money from the government to build a dwelling, with repayment over 20 years."

Later in the day I discovered from non-Communist sources, that the statement was true for the most part. The regime does permit private ownership of apartments (mostly cooperatives) and a few houses. And it occasionally has funds available for such purposes. But the waiting period is usually unduly long, and is complicated by a staggering amount of redtape.

This situation, apparently unique in a Communist country, probably has two causes: The regime has been unable to provide sufficient dwellings of its own. And because of a typically Bulgarian attitude reflected in a local proverb: "Give a Turk money and he will buy a wife. Give a Bulgarian money and he will buy a house."

PROPAGANDA ABOUNDS

(As one Western diplomat wisely remarked, the Bulgarian way is probably wiser inasmuch as anyone with a house in these parts can just about be assured of getting a wife.)

Earlier this morning I dropped in to a party bookstore and purchased an elementary English reader to sample Communist propaganda. I wasn't disappointed.

On the very first page appears "The International," the Communist call to arms, with its militant opening lines:

> "Arise, ye pris'ners of starvation,
> Arise, ye wretched of the earth,
> For justice thunders condemnation—
> A better world's in birth."

An excerpt from George Eliot's "The Mill on the Floss" is said to depict the tragedy "of every family ruined by the merciless law of capitalism."

A selection from "Pride and Prejudice" is preceded by an editor's note explaining: "The satire on bourgeois notions of marriage and patronage, trying to destroy the healthy impulses of life, attains the excellence of a classic."

EYES ON CHILDREN

And the reader contained a touching story, "Loyal Miss Ferch," about a 30-year employee of a U.S. Government bureau. One day the Idaho-born Margaret Ferch disappears without a trace, after a fellow employee tells the authorities that Miss Ferch once asked "I wonder if Russia is as bad as she is painted?"

The schoolbooks of Bulgarian children undoubtedly follow a similar line, for the Communist Party maintains an active interest in the young. All over the city children up to age 10 wear blue neckties, the marks of the Tshavdarche, a young organization named after a revolutionary who fought against the Turks.

From 10 to 15, students belong to the Dimitrov Pioneer Organization, named after another noted Bulgarian Communist.

At age 15, progressive and responsive students are eligible to enter the Youth Communist League.

Bulgaria's trouble with communism began when she withdrew from her alliance with Germany and the war August 26, 1944.

Soon afterward the Soviet Union declared war and Bulgaria immediately asked for an armistice. Three days later the Soviets invaded. In the following days they installed a leftwing coalition government (the Fatherland Front), and on the 5th day accepted the armistice.

RIVALS DESTROYED

During the next 14 months, until the election November 18, 1945, the Communists within the coalition used their control of all but six ministries (including control of the police and courts) to destroy the rival parties while keeping them officially in the government coalition.

Andrei Vishinsky was dispatched to Sofia after the election, in which the unopposed Communists polled 86 percent of the registered vote.

He tried to get the opposition to accept two cabinet posts, hoping to give some semblance of legitimacy to the Red takover. But opposition leader Nicola Petkov refused.

The next year, after the opposition polled one-third of the votes in the 1956 election, Petkov was arrested and hanged. Soon afterward, the principal opposition party was dissolved, all other fragments of parties were absorbed, and a Soviet-style constitution was adopted.

Since then there has been no opposition to Communist rule, and no indication that there soon will be.

REDS BUCKLE DOWN

Having thus established their rule, legitimate only by Communist standards, the Reds have buckled down to the humdrum task of trying to make a success of a system which Prof. Leonard Schapiro of the London School of Economics terms "essentially absurd."

"We are building for the future," a local Communist told me—self-defensively, I thought—when he learned that I was from the United States. "We are prepared to make necessary sacrifices today for a better tomorrow."

The average Bulgarian, one not imbued with Marxist-Leninist visions of the future, must fervently be praying for just such a better tomorrow * * * one vastly different from all his arduous yesterdays.

The Ultimate Price—A Firsthand View of Communism

(Communist guides boast of the low cost of goods and services in Soviet Russia. Edwin McDowell, Republic editorial writer, maintains in this dispatch from Moscow that the low cost is an illusion * * * that the Soviet populace has paid the ultimate price, many times over.)

(By Edwin McDowell)

Moscow.—The those who want to understand communism, a special committee of the American Bar Association counseled, "We prescribe, not a 15-day trip to Russia, but 15 days in a library studying the Communist conspiracy."

And of course the ABA is right.

For, try as he might, the average visitor—to Moscow, Milan, or Miami—is almost sure to interpret what he sees and hears within the framework of that which he was sure he know before he arrived.

Valuable though the days spent studying in a library are, however, a trip to Russia can be valuable also—especially for anyone interested in a firsthand view of rationale of communism.

For example, when I asked the Communist guide whether there were any opposition political parties in Russia, knowing full well the answer, she replied, "No, there is no need for more than one political party. The Communist Party in Russia represents all the people."

When I reminded her that all one-party systems claim to represent all the people, as for example the Government of Spain, she had a ready explanation of the differences between Khrushchev's Communist Party and Franco's Falange Party:

"Our government is democratic, Franco's is a dictatorship."

Having thus clarified that question she moved on to a further recitation of those numerous statistics Russian guides come well equipped with.

Later in the day she dutifully recited what I had read earlier in a propaganda brochure conspicuously placed on our hotel table—that "the U.S.S.R. is the readingest country in the world." And in her best actuarial manner, she proceeded to rattle off facts and figures to support her boast.

That's when I asked her opinion of Boris Pasternak as an author and poet.

"Pasternak was sometimes good, but not always," she replied reluctantly. "Sometimes his works did not reflect reality."

"Which of his works do you feel most lacked reality?" I inquired, again knowing in advance what her answer would be.

She hesitated a moment, trying to decide, I thought, whether or not to continue with the subject of Pasternak. Then she answered. "Dr. Zhivago."

"In what respect did Dr. Zhivago lack reality?"

"In many respects."

"In his belief that life is more than a lump of raw material to be processed and molded by other men?"

(The exact passage, I discovered later, when I returned to my room, reads: "When I hear people speak of reshaping life, it makes me lose my self-control * * * Reshaping life. People who can say that have never understood a thing about life. They look on it as a lump of raw material that needs to be processed by them * * * But life is never a material, a substance to be molded.")

"That and much more. Nowhere did it represent life as it is."

"Is that why the book was never published in your country?"

"Yes. You must remember that we can't possibly publish everything."

I decided not to remind her of her boast, just minutes before, that one-quarter of all the books of the world are published in the U.S.S.R., "the 'readingest' country in the world." Instead, I asked, "Who determines whether a book reflects reality?"

"In Russia the people, through specialists, decide what reflects reality."

"Is it possible that the judgments of the people, through these specialists, might be wrong?"

"Perhaps. But not often enough for us to worry about it."

"Pasternak was awarded the Nobel Prize for Dr. Zhivago, I'm sure you realize. Is it possible those judges could have been correct in their assessment of Zhivago as a major work of literature?"

She chose not to answer directly. "As you know, the Nobel prize is given to much that is not literature."

I did not know, to be honest. For at that moment I couldn't recall a single author who had been awarded the Nobel prize. Inexplicably, the names of Camus, Eliot, Hemingway, and Faulkner had completely slipped my mind.

But it was obvious she was uncomfortable with the subject and much preferred to return to her statistical analysis. So I merely smiled and, grudgingly, decided to let the subject die.

We hadn't driven more than half a block when I was tempted to ask her whether "One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovitch," the novel published a year or so ago in Russia, about slave camps during the time of Stalin, reflected reality. But I let that question go by also, and feigned interest in the endless statistics she was quoting.

Still my thoughts wandered back to Pasternak, the late free spirit in a regimented society, who scored his Communist masters' view of the future by saying:

"Man is born to live, not to prepare for life. Life itself, the phenomenon of life, the gift of life, is so breathtakingly serious. So why substitute this childish harlequinade of immature fantasies, these schoolboy escapades?"

But there semed to be little point in continuing the discussion further along those lines. And before long I thought of another tour through Russia not unlike the one I was being taken on.

That was when Grigor Potemkin, Catherine the Great's favorite, conducted the Tsarina on a tour of the Crimea he had captured for Russia in 1783. There they were met by happy, smiling peasants who waved from the banks of the Dnieper as the royal party sailed by.

When Catherine returned to St. Petersburg, after visiting the model villages and sights so carefully arranged for her by Potemkin, she was convinced that her Russia was the happy, prosperous nation she had been led to believe * * * never knowing the poverty and misery so carefully concealed by the wily Potemkin.

Today's "Potemkin tours" of Russia are far more subtle. But even here the accent is on the positive.

Great stress is placed on education in the Soviet Union. "All of it free of charge," the visitor is constantly reminded—from grade schools, to Moscow University, to the Patrice Lumumba University of Friendship of the Peoples, where, our guide reminded us, "Young men and women from Asia, Africa, and Latin America study free of charge."

What our guide, didn't mention is that in order to qualify for admission to a university, students first must work for 2 years in a factory or a collective farm.

This requirement sometimes is waived for medical, engineering and science students. But those who wish to study history, social sciences, law, and journalism—areas of "ideological sensitivity"—must undergo the 2 years.

The purpose of this, the guide acknowledged when pressed further about admissions requirements, "is to give our young people proper respect for the value of labor, even though they may in the future become professionals and not have to labor."

One feature of Soviet life the guides are sure to accent is the low cost of goods and services. The fact that education is completely free is spoken of with awe. And, they boast, "All Soviet citizens will have free rent and free drugs and medicines by 1980."

I was tempted, on more than one occasion, to remind our guide that Soviet citizens have many times over paid for their "free" schooling and for the "free" housing and drugs the future promises. But it was obvious she wouldn't have understood what I was talking about.

What I would have meant, of course, is that ever since the Communists came to power in Russia they have exacted a brutal price from the Soviet citizens.

And although the system of terror has abated since the days of Stalin, they still are paying: In the lack of opposition political parties * * * in the pressures massed against organized religion * * * in having to accept uncomplainingly the few shoddy products the Soviet planners make available to them.

They are paying the price of not being allowed to read any but the official Communist viewpoint. ("The reason we don't sell non-Communist newspapers or magazines on the newsstands," the guide explained, "is because no one wants to read them.")

And they are paying the price of not being allowed to travel or move, except when their loyalty can be assured—most often by the threat of retaliation against family or friends.

Even then it is impossible to guarantee 100 percent loyalty.

Two years ago in Caen, France, for example, a 46-year-old Soviet writer, Vsevelod Kravchenko, jumped to his death from a fourth-floor window. A letter he left behind gives some insight into the hold the Communist system has even on those who contemplate suicide:

"I have never done anything against my country. I am ending my life to avoid unjust accusations and useless suffering. I am accused by my personal 'friends' for certain words which may be interpreted in a hostile manner * * *

"At the end I will say to you one thing: I have served my country honorably with the forces of my talent and energies and never, anywhere, have I betrayed her interest. It is the truth and I countersign it with my blood. I beg my country to believe me and not to avenge itself upon my family and dear ones who are not responsible for anything."

Soviet officials who claimed Kravchenko's body would not, of course, add anything to his reasons for jumping. But those who live in freedom can only guess how awful the terror must be to cause one to take his own life merely because of "certain words which may be interpreted in a hostile manner."

We can only wonder about a system so tyrannical that one bent on self-destruction would find it necessary to beg the rulers of that system not to avenge themselves upon his family and dear ones.

It would have been difficult, if not impossible, for our guide to understand this * * * or for any Communist, dedicated to the proposition that noble ends justify ignoble means, to understand.

What saddens the non-Communist visitors to Russia is the knowledge that when tyranny, or oppression, or regimentation become a way of life, concepts such as freedom or the dignity of man all but lose their meaning.

Even Soviet Writer Alexander Solzhenitsyn, currently a Russian favorite, recognized as much when he said about the ordeal of his fictional Ivan Denisovich, a captive in a world he never made:

"He didn't know any longer himself whether he wanted freedom or not. At first he'd wanted it very much and every day he added up how long he still had to go.

"But then he got fed up with this. And as time went on he understood that they might let you out but they never let you go home. And he didn't really know where he'd be better off. At home or in here."

To some, our Communist guide for example, freedom was far less important than the triumph of communism, the wave of the future.

But to Boris Pasternak, Vsevelod Kravchenko, and millions like them who perished while seeking to prevent the buildup of that Red wave, freedom was something more * * * something, in fact, worth dying for.

HOPE DEEP DOWN FOR COMMUNISTS—THAT MAN HAS RIGHT TO LIVE FOR HIS OWN SAKE

(This report by Republic Editorial Writer Edwin McDowell is his first since emerging from Soviet Russia and from her Communist satellites. It is the 10th in a series.)

(By Edwin McDowell)

ATHENS.—It was mere circumstances that brought me to Athens after emerging from behind the Iron Curtain. I had not consciously planned it that way.

And yet perhaps it was more than coincidence that my journey from nations where freedom is a hollow word * * * where individual man counts as nothing * * * should bring me to the spot where, more than 2,000 years ago, the idea of freedom was born.

For it was in Greece, as Oxford scholar Sir Maurice Bowra reminded us, that politics was first founded on the conviction that "men have a right to live for their own sake and not for the sake of some exalted individual or supernatural system."

It was in Greece, especially in Athens, that democracy was based on the belief that individual man could be depended upon to seek virtue * * * where was born the ideal of spiritually and politically free individuals unified by a spontaneous service to the common life.

Such beliefs are the very antithesis of those which inspire the governments of the Iron Curtain countries.

In none of the satellite nations is man thought to be the measure of all things. In each—under the Communist doctrine advocated by Ulbricht, Gomulka, Kadar, or Khrushchev—he is mere clay to be molded and shaped by the ineluctable laws of science, as revealed to Marx and Engels.

Although it was early in the sixth century B.C., that Solon laid the foundation for the first democracy in the world, in the 20th century A.D., the Iron Curtain governments (as well as many governments outside the Iron Curtain) rule as though Athenian democracy never existed.

"A slave is he who cannot speak his thought," commented the Athenian poet Euripedes. Yet even today, millions of people behind the Iron Curtain are not free to speak their thoughts.

WINTER TENNIS

"A people ruling," commented the Greek historian Herodotus, "—the very name of it is so beautiful." Yet it is not the people who rule behind the Iron Curtain, but a handful of cruel and fanatical men who are determined to make the world over in the Communist image.

If, in fact, the Communist world borrowed any example from the experience of Greece, it would seem to be from the city state of Sparta.

"The idea that underlay the young Spartans' training," noted Edith Hamilton, "was their obligation to maintain the power of the state and ignore everything that did not directly contribute to it.

"The goal of human aspiration and achievement was to uphold the fatherland. Only what helped the state was good; only what harmed it was bad. A Spartan was not an individual but a part of a well-functioning machine which assumed all responsibility for him, exacted absolute submission from him, molded his character and mind."

Sparta, of course, was defeated at the battle of Leuctra in 371 B.C., and disappeared not long afterward. But before its demise it destroyed Athens, and with it the glory that was Greece.

Perhaps there are parallels to be drawn even today between a political system which values individual freedom and a system whose spiritual leader, Lenin, looked on freedom as a bourgeoise prejudice.

And here in Athens it will be possible to think about those parallels once the numbness of having spent time behind the Iron Curtain wears off.

WHO TO BLAME?

For it is a numbness which overtakes visitors from the West when in Communist country after Communist country they encountered the same regimentation, the same assaults against the mind and the spirit, the same relentless pressures to put truth to rout.

Boris Pasternak noted, "What has for centuries raised man above the beast is not the cudgel but an inward music; the irresistible power of unarmed truth, the powerful attraction of its example."

And, predictably, Pasternak was rewarded for his candor the way all critics of communism are rewarded in Communist nations—he was made a prisoner of the system he criticized.

Perhaps the most disheartening, frustrating thing about communism, at least to this observer, is that like all large, bureaucratic systems, it is virtually impossible to assess blame or responsibility.

For where would one begin, and whom would he direct his anger toward?

Toward the kindly, bumbling Communist official of the Bulgarian embassy in Paris who reminded you of the most inept clerk you ever saw?

Toward the guides, mostly college students, who never have been allowed to read or listen to the arguments in defense of democracy or freedom?

TRUE BELIEVERS

Toward the kindly old men and women of the Iron Curtain countries who are living on memories and burnt-out dreams?

Toward the functionaries, shopkeepers, and ticket takers who, like the rest of us, are strangers and afraid in a world they never made?

Toward the Communist soldier who, in the streets of Budapest in 1956 or in Cuba in 1963, merely obeyed orders he most likely neither understood nor cared very much about?

Other than Khrushchev and members of the Presidium, just exactly who is to blame for the specter of communism now hovering over the world?

This, I think, is the most awful problem democracies must face in dealing with hostile, dangerous ideologies.

Perhaps the principal lesson to be learned from Hannah Arendt's recent "Eichmann in Jerusalem" is the fact that it is not necessarily monsters who commit evil in pursuit of what they believe to be a higher good.

Often, perhaps most often, it is quite ordinary men—men possessed by fanaticism; true believers convinced that their way

is the only way—who are able to justify the most monstrous wrongs, the most egregious actions.

NOT INDIVIDUAL

It is the person epitomized by Shakespeare's Isabella when she laments:

> **"But man, proud man,**
> **Drest in a little brief authority,**
> **Most ignorant of what he's most assured,**
> **Plays such fantastic tricks before high heaven**
> **As make the angels weep."**

If there is any value in a visit to totalitarian nations, especially to Communist totalitarian nations, which have been uniquely successful in enlisting the minds of otherwise intelligent people, it is reinforcement of the knowledge that it is not the individual who is different.

What distinguishes the Nazi from the Democrat is not, as some popular writers have contended, an endemic flaw in the German makeup.

What distinguishes the Communist from the Democrat is not, as an occasional writer or lecturer maintains, some inherent flaw in the Russian or Chinese character.

The differences arise from the different gods men choose to worship, from the ideals they cherish, from the beliefs they defend.

JUSTIFICATION EASY

If one is convinced, as were the Nazis, that Dachau and Buchenwald are merely regrettable but necessary way stations on the road toward insuring the dominance of the master race.

If one is convinced, as Communists are, that the laws of history condone forced labor camps, the torture chamber of the Lubianka, state-decreed mass starvations.

If one is convinced of all this, it then becomes a relatively easy matter to justify Schrecklichkeit, that soul-corroding policy of terror which, perhaps clearer than anything else, demonstrates the depths to which man is capable of falling.

Yet despite a general notion that all Communists believe with the same fanatical, inexorable fervor, there is evidence which indicates otherwise:

The apostasy of an Imre Nagy or a Milovan Djilas at a crucial moment for communism.

The slow, painful defection from the labyrinth of communism of a Whittaker Chambers.

Uprisings in Budapest or Poznan, actively supported by those intellectuals and students deemed most trustworthy.

And discussions with those behind the Iron Curtain whose allegiance to Marxism-Leninism is more opportunistic than evangelical.

And why?

SCRAP OF SOUL

It may be because, as Whittaker Chambers expressed it, "in the end there persists in every man, however he may deny it, a scrap of soul."

Or because, as Faulkner expressed it, man has endured through courage and honor and hope and pride and compassion and pity—virtues which not even communism can expunge entirely.

Or perhaps because even Communist man is capable of hearing the inward music Patternak wrote about, of discovering the irresistible power of unarmed truth and the powerful attraction of its example.

Whatever the reason, it provides grounds, if not for optimism, at least for hope, hope that the Communists one day will discover what was discovered here in Athens more than 20 centuries ago—that man has a right to live for his own sake, in search of the virtuous life.

Focal Point on Red Ideology—Soviet Production Held Secondary Factor

(By Edwin McDowell)

It would be easy to ridicule the generally shoddy products for sale in the Communist world, to criticize outdated Communist production methods and to taunt the Red nations for their economic backwardness.

It would be easy to chide the Communist bloc for solving its parking problem by the ingenious method of producing few autos, and then pricing those out of reach of all but the wealthiest citizens.

The temptation is strong to publicize the drabness of Communist shops, the blandness of the Communist diet and the sameness of the workers' apartments.

And many visitors to the Iron Curtain countries have done just that, with the result that Trud, the Russian labor union newspaper, recently described such tourists as members of an "army of ideological saboteurs," out to sway the Soviet people from the Communist path.

But to write off communism for the reasons given above would be a major, and perhaps fatal, mistake.

For in the larger sense, it is not Communist productivity but Communist ideology with which the West must contend.

It is because of this fanatical Communist ideology that the United States spends almost $50 billion a year on its defense budget.

It is because of this fanatical ideology that our diplomats and officials spend almost every working hour of every day trying to devise ways of containing or otherwise thwarting the Communist juggernaut.

The depths of this fanaticism, this faith that communism can change the world, was lucidly described by Whittaker Chambers, who one day in a New York court was asked by a juror what it meant to be a Communist.

"I hesitated for a moment," Chambers recalled, "trying to find the simplest, most direct way to convey the heart of this complex experience to men and women to whom the very fact of the experience was all but incomprehensible."

Then Chambers replied:

"When I was a Communist, I had three heroes. One was a Russian. One was a Pole. One was a German Jew.

"The Pole was ascetic, highly sensitive, intelligent. He was a Communist. After the Russian revolution, he became head of the Tcheka and organizer of the Red terror.

"As a young man he had been a political prisoner * * *. There he insisted on being given the task of cleaning the latrines of the other prisoners. For he held that the most developed member of any community must take upon himself the lowliest tasks as an example to those who are less developed. That is one thing that it meant to be a Communist.

"The German Jew was Eugen Levine. He was a Communist. During the Bavarian Soviet Republic in 1919, Levine was the organizer of the Workers and Soldiers Soviets. When the Bavarian Soviet Republic was crushed, Levine was captured and court-martialed.

"The court-martial told him: 'You are under sentence of death.' Levine answered: 'We Communists are always under sentence of death.' That is another thing it meant to be a Communist.

"The Russian was not a Communist. He was a pre-Communist, arrested for a minor part in the assassination of the Czarist Prime Minister, Von Plehve. He was sent into Siberian exile to one of the worst prison camps, where the political prisoners were flogged. (He) sought some way to protest this outrage to the world.

"The means were few, but at last he found a way. In protest against the flogging of other men, Kalyaev drenched himself in kerosene, set himself on fire and burned himself to death. That also is what it meant to be a Communist."

Sacrifice, dedication, bravery; these are the levers the Communists have used to move the world. And they are the conditions still demanded of loyal Communists.

Most Communist guides, students, and officials I met behind the Iron Curtain proudly stressed the fact that they are helping to build a better future, and that hardship and sacrifice are not to be pitied or deplored, but are the ingredients necessary for purifying their efforts.

Let the West be content with its color television sets, its fancy cars, its stylish clothes; for themselves, these Communists have a world to win, after which they can worry about material comforts.

This does not mean that a Communist society can altogether afford to ignore its citizens' demands for more; Khrushchev's recent wheat transaction with Canada, and the small but significant concessions granted in the satellite nations, indicate otherwise.

But it does demonstrate what loyal Communists have said all along—that they are less interested in filling someone's stomach than in capturing his mind.

For they understand that Communist man does not live by bread alone, therefore, they feel certain they can keep him in line with the spiritual nourishment of Marxism-Leninism.

The saddest memory from my travels behind the Iron Curtain is of the youngsters, not because most of them will never know coke or hot dogs, lipstick or high heels, transistors or hi-fi's, but because as long as they live under communism they will never hear mention of God, except disdainfully or disparagingly.

And because they will never be exposed to the ideas or thoughts of the Western tradition, except as those ideas and thoughts are twisted and run through a Marxist ideological wringer in order that they will come out 99 and 44/100 percent pure.

And because all their exposure to education—and make no mistake, the Communists place great stress on education—will be for the sake of shaping them into obedient, devoted Communists.

All available evidence indicates that the Communist bloc has made impressive economic gains, particularly in areas of steel production, heavy industry, and armaments, where they have concentrated their efforts and manpower.

The only relevant question, therefore, is whether they could have made equally impressive gains without adopting, as instruments of state policy, those dreaded midnight knocks on the door, kangaroo courts, and brainwashing.

Would it not have been possible for them to have achieved the same living standards without distorting and rewriting history, without outlawing opposition political parties, and without erecting walls and barbed wire fences against the outside world?

The question was best answered by Walt W. Rostow, chief State Department policy planner, who in a recent speech said the economies of the NATO countries are growing faster than the economies of the Communist bloc.

"Only a few years back," Rostow said, "it was common to believe that, whatever their demerits, Communist societies had the capacity to sustain much higher rates of growth than societies based on human freedom. This is a proposition which can no longer be scientifically maintained."

Whether it can be scientifically maintained or not, no one I spoke with behind the Iron Curtain, Communist or non-Communist, expects the Reds to alter drastically their approach. These observers hope for a genuine thaw on the part of the Communists, and many believe it will occur before "shrimp learn to whistle," as Khrushchev once put it. But they do not expect it to happen, except perhaps gradually, in the foreseeable future.

And what of the future?

No one can say, least of all a first-time visitor.

But if communism is indeed the wave of the future, as I was reminded during my travels through the satellite nations, I'm afraid that what I saw of it during my visit will cause me to join those who, to paraphrase Lenin, will have to be dragged screaming into the future.

FOREIGN AID AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on November 14, I was privileged to deliver one of a series of lectures sponsored by the Department of Agriculture Graduate School in Washington.

I was impressed by the interest and support expressed for this series. Approximately 750 of the top administrative and technical personnel of the Department of Agriculture and the Agency for International Development attended this lecture.

This was an appropriate opportunity to emphasize an aspect of our international programs which does not receive the attention it deserves.

I speak of our Nation's efforts to help develop the human resources of the developing nations.

It is not enough for us to stimulate the development of the natural and physical resources of countries which are struggling for progress. We have learned by experience that a nation cannot succeed in its efforts for economic and social progress unless it has skilled administrators for its government and pools of managerial and supervisory talent for the private sector of its society.

My prepared remarks for the Department of Agriculture Graduate School lecture detailed the needs for trained public administrators in the underdeveloped nations. In addition, I stressed in extemporaneous comments that we must increase our efforts to increase the numbers of skilled managers and supervisors in the nongovernmental sectors of these nations. Our own talented leaders of business, labor, and the cooperative movement must be challenged to share their skills with the citizens of the underdeveloped nations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD excerpts of my remarks at the Department of Agriculture Graduate School.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION IN THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: THE U.S. APPROACH

(Excerpts of remarks by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Department of Agriculture Graduate School, November 14, 1963)

I have traveled hundreds of thousands of miles as a U.S. Senator trying to measure, evaluate, and understand the reason why so many people in the world continue to live in abject poverty, and why there continues to be so much political instability. Why does democracy seem to have such a hard time raising its head? And, why is it so short-lived? Why does it so frequently succumb to dictatorships and military juntas?

Is there some basic flaw in the societies of Latin America, Asia, and Africa? I cannot believe it. There is no basic flaw in the people. People everywhere have the same hopes and dreams as you and I. They want freedom, just as we do. They are willing to work and sacrifice to get ahead.

Their idealists and their visionaries have caught their imaginations in these new nations. Sometimes they have mustered enough strength to overthrow the ancient tyrannies, and try democracy. But all too often, visions fade in the vacuum of administrative incompetence. A handful of doctors, lawyers, or college professors cannot cope with the raw and angry problems of a people who demand more than they have had. Regularly, tragically, the dreamers are bogged down or are pulled down. The dreary cycle of incompetence, corruption and final violence is again repeated. Typically, democratic experiments are replaced by military coups. Why? It is not solely because the military have the guns. Too often the officer corps is the only group in an underdeveloped nation that is trained in administration.

One of the great tragedies in the developing nations is that there are so very few nonmilitary personnel who have the necessary training and motivation to enter Government service. By default, juntas come to power and stay in power through a failure of democratic leaders to govern efficiently.

The debate on foreign aid which has occupied the Senate for the past several weeks, gives a sharp focus to the discussion today on "Public Administration in Developing Countries: The U.S. Approach." Many people have been frustrated with our foreign aid program. The problems are inherently complex. They involve issues of foreign policy, domestic and international economics, and problems of national security. Our capacity to grasp and administer the problems is compounded by the tremendous variety in the nature of the problems and needs among the different countries.

There is a broad range of conditions. At one end we have countries just emerging from primitive societies. At the other, some will soon take their places among developed nations. To the different stages of economic development we must add the overlay of different languages, religions, cultural patterns, and different political traditions.

Iran has centuries of Persian tradition. Some new African states have a national identity only several years old. Some countries have few high school graduates. Others had distinguished universities before America was discovered. Some countries have vast natural resources. In others, a slim living is eked from soil still scratched with a pointed stick. A thousand variations make it difficult to grasp the foreign aid program and make it difficult for the State Department and AID to administer with the ball-bearing smoothness some people very unrealistically expect.

One problem is present everywhere: every country has serious deficiencies in public administration. It is difficult to "get things done" through Government. There is a shortage of trained managerial talent. There are inadequate fiscal and economic institutions geared to the needs of the Government; inadequate services to the public, particularly the smaller rural areas; and lack of enough modern training institutions to produce skilled public employees.

We can't push a button and improve public administration in 60 countries. We know at home that good administration does not come overnight and it does not come by decree. Furthermore, what fits our American democratic heritage often does not fit countries where government must base itself upon tribal structure, or colonies with an inherited tradition from British or French civil service. In Latin America, the Spanish heritage, military tradition, and the Napoleonic code modify in various ways the structural ideas of the American Government.

In our policies, we recognize this. For 12 years, AID and its predecessor agencies in our Government, and the United Nations have given limited technical assistance in the field of public administration. Before that the Census Bureau extended training and advisory service which helped make a success of the 1950 census of the Americas. The Bureau of the Budget trained some foreign nationals as early as 1947.

This kind of technical assistance has continued in terms of training, institution building, and advisory services.

In recent years we have trained 500–800 people per year from 60 countries, in various skills of public administration. In most cases nationals with some command of English have come to the United States for 6 months to a year. Training combines some specialized courses with observation and work experience in Federal, State, or local government offices.

This has been valuable. It could not possibly reach enough people, however, to make possible rapid improvement in administration in many countries. Therefore a new approach stresses group training of the participants in their own language. In the past year 30 Chileans have been trained in tax collection and administration, in Spanish. Our host here today, the graduate school of the Department of Agriculture, has trained several groups of Congolese, in French. The Alliance for Progress has stepped up the use of Puerto Rico in training Latin Americans.

Training 1,000 or even 10,000 individuals per year in the United States would not be enough to meet the manpower needs of these countries. Think of a country with one lawyer, one personnel man, or just one agricultural agent—who has never driven a tractor or made an important decision. Further training in the United States can be costly, and possibly totally unsuited to the needs of the foreign country. There is no point in having a tax official study the use of our computers if his country is just moving from the abacus to the adding machine. Rather we must build up educational and training institutions abroad, adapted to local needs. Our major resources now go in this way.

An early example was the Institute of Public Administration of the Philippines. The University of Michigan collaborated here. As it grew, U.S. assistance was discontinued. Filipinos man this center now entirely. They train their own people to serve their Government, as well as officials from other countries in the Far East. Michigan State University has helped Brazil set up a school of business. A full Brazilian faculty of 25 gives a 4-year course. A thousand key business executives have been trained.

Some of the greatest needs are for training below the university level. The Alliance for Progress has stressed this. Chile has now a tax training school—375 Chileans have received intensive training, the first time any Latin American revenue personnel have participated in planned, organized, and full-time training. In Guatemala and Paraguay a total of 1,000 public employees per year are trained. In Peru, the Institute of Public Administration of New York assists a major program in the Peruvian Institute of Public Administration.

In all, the United States supports 37 training institutions abroad in public and business administration and economics. Twenty-one of these are operating under the Alliance for Progress. I want to emphasize too that other organizations than the U.S. Government are encouraged to share the load. The Ford Foundation helps in Colombia and Venezuela. The United Nations is giving increasing attention to the emerging countries of Africa.

We are also stressing direct advisory services to foreign governments. Not all American technicians are men in field clothes advising farmers, or nurses showing mothers how to bathe babies. Some 300 Americans, from the U.S. Government, private consulting firms, and universities are working with governments. They are not writing surveys and reports. They are working at modernizing government programs.

Last year Americans helped Jordan install a new budget system. This year they established a new accounting system. In Chile, personnel from our Internal Revenue helped reorganize their internal revenue system: streamlining procedures, writing manuals, decentralizing activity. In Taiwan, fiscal reform is well underway. Automatic data processing there has put some taxes on computers and prepares lists in days that once took years. Daily posting of receipts and disbursements is done by IBM machines. Program and performance budgeting is becoming standard in all agencies. In Panama, Americans have established a well-organized staff office to the President—who can now get top-level advice in planning, budgeting, personnel, and administrative management.

There is no question that administrative progress has been made in the last 10 years. But we have a long way to go in completing the day-to-day administrative improvements which are essential for economic and social development. Waste and inefficiency continues—far more than either the American taxpayers or the developing countries can afford. We have made progress in the mechanics of administration. We now must attack more intangible and difficult political problems—the problems of decisionmaking at the policy level.

The political problem in administrative modernization can be framed in three questions:

1. How can we convince the have-not nations of the urgency of administrative reform?

2. How can the machinery of government be adapted to cope with and assist in rapid and constructive social and economic change?

3. How does one get the mechanism of government to be effective outside the capital cities—in the rural areas?

These are formidable problems. Let me elaborate on them.

It is not easy to define and harder to create a sense of urgency regarding administrative reform. This is often true in the United States, even when we have a reform tradition. It is doubly difficult in countries where there is no such tradition.

Administrative reform must come from within. Reform is substantially a political process. Outsiders can give technical help; but are severely restricted if they try to move beyond that point.

We can do some things to help create a climate and a will. The Alliance for Progress has illustrated some ways to get things moving. Before the Alliance, tax advisers usually just wrote reports which gathered dust in the archives. At Punta del Este, however, the Charter focused on tax reform. The President stressed it. Officials like Teodoro Moscoso stressed it. Our missions and Embassies talked it. It became an important item for discussion in the press. Taxation still isn't fashionable in most of Latin America, but the problem is off dead center. It is being discussed, legislation has been enacted, administrative practices are changing and collections are rising.

Ecuador provides an example of a different approach to administrative reform. We have loaned Ecuador substantial sums for budgetary support and some high priority programs. To make sure they worked, Ecuador got a loan of $1.6 million from AID specifically for administrative and fiscal reform. They are using the money well to this end. In this way both foreign and domestic resources are being mobilized to bring about substantial reforms of a basic character.

It is very important indeed to improve the machinery of government. This can still leave the government impersonal, however. Millions of pesos may be saved by a better budget system, but this may not get milk to babies. Better administration must contribute directly and immediately to better public services that people can see, feel, and identify with.

This is a major problem for us all over the world. Economists can and have made workable plans. Engineers have detailed feasibility projects. Often these are not developed, because countries lack the administrative skills to carry them out. How, for example, does one get agrarian reform or any major economic or social program going where an official government workweek is 28 hours, or where government employees must hold down two or three jobs to make an adequate living?

There is a long way to go. There needs to be more urgency for administrative reform. Administration must institute practical programs in the service of people. The machinery of Government must get out into the rural and outlying areas. In saying that progress has been made, I am not denying that there is a long way to go.

Most governmental machinery in developing countries is geared to a normal time and pace that is completely out of date. In most cases the institutions do not even exist that can respond to current needs with the urgency required.

I believe we need some new ideas in recruiting in public administration. We must find ways to team up experts in agriculture, education, and administration. We can make better use of talent in other agencies of our government, Federal, State, and local. Through multilateral agencies, more use can be made of the experience of foreign countries in creating institutions needed by the developing ones. Our own universities can do more thinking about administrative institutions abroad.

Even more complex than recruiting personnel, however, is the problem of extending good government outside of the capital cities. Most developing countries have a tradition of centralization. Seldom is there a deep philosophy of public service. Able people leave small communities of limited opportunity to seek the advantages of the capital. Officials are reluctant to delegate authority to those who may not exercise it properly. Regardless of the difficulties of conditions however, unless public services get to the people in rural areas, economic and social development is not successful.

At this point the work of the Peace Corps should be mentioned. This is precisely what Peace Corpsmen—and women—do. They get out into the rural areas, the primitive villages, and work. The best of American youth show a willingness to roll up their sleeves and serve the rural people. That is not a tradition in many countries where youth of similar families and status get away as fast as possible to the cities of opportunity. Apart from the value of the projects they develop, this example of the Peace Corps may yet be one of the most effective tools in helping us crack this problem.

How does one get rural development going, if buying a shovel has to be approved in a capital 500 miles away? How does one plan land without maps? How does one develop agricultural production with few clear property titles? When no one below the Cabinet level can coordinate anything or even tell local specialists to get together and talk over problems, it is hard to get anything moving. All decisions cannot be made at the top.

Facing up to these problems, we have shifted our emphasis in public administration in two ways from our technical assistance approach of earlier years:

First, we tailor our assistance to the overall development plan of a country, rather than to do a good, but isolated project. This is our emphasis particularly in Latin America. We are trying to help reshape the economies and societies of the member nations through a concerted attack on outmoded patterns of life and government.

Secondly, we are trying to make the skills we teach last and endure. We do not wish just to demonstrate a better way of doing things and hope that something will stick. We are trying to build our skills permanently into new and reformed institutions to carry them on.

We are also trying to develop these skills by creating institutions suited to the particular country's needs, special characteristics, and national aspirations. There is no use building tight islands of foreign efficiency that are expected somehow (perhaps by osmosis) to be absorbed by the natives. You have to have specific training programs worked out.

We have much to learn from the countries in which we work. We must establish confidence and effective working relationships with people in all these differing countries and I emphasize their difference. This takes time. But it is time we have to take if our efforts are to be meaningful and successful in getting at the roots of the public administration problems.

It will take time, therefore, for important improvements in public administration to be made. When they are, they can have a profound and lasting effect on the societies, the political structures, and the economies of the developing countries.

It is then that Americans will perhaps acknowledge the service of those in their leadership—in the executive and legislative branches—who fought off shortsighted attempts to prevent the spending of a few cents per American citizen, for so vital a purpose in the development of a modern free world.

ON-THE-FARM STORAGE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, there is a very brief paragraph in the current issue of Washington Farmletter—November 16, 1963—on grain storage which reads:

> They're talking at USDA about saying goodbye next year to reseal programs for farmers on grain storage.

The article explains that because of tight storage situations which existed when our surpluses were mounting in the fifties, the Department initiated reseal programs to encourage the provision of storage on the farms.

Now that Commodity Credit Corporation holdings are declining, the grain can all be accommodated off the farms.

Many farmers in South Dakota and elsewhere invested in storage facilities to accommodate the Government when storage was short. The investment of these farmers in storage is entitled to as much consideration as the investment of others.

I serve notice to those who are talking of ending reseal programs that I shall protest any such action as vigorously as I can, and that I expect to be only one of a large number of Senators and Representatives doing so.

ECONOMIC CONVERSION ACT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the highly respected columnist, Mr. Marquis

Childs, has written a thoughtful column on the theme "Too Many Arms, Too Few Brains."

Mr. Childs discusses the drain on our civilian economy resulting from the heavy concentration of research and development in arms spending. He also refers to legislation which I have recently introduced to ease the transition from arms production to civilian production.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Childs' article which appears in the Washington Post of today be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Too Many Arms, Too Few Brains

(By Marquis Childs)

With a presidential year just ahead, it is a safe bet that the rallying cry, "Elect me because I can do more for the great State of * * *," is certain to resound across the land. The eager officeseeker will give the impression that defense contracts, research contracts, projects large and small, are on the political auction block and he and he alone can snare them.

Defense spending takes today 10 percent of the Nation's gross national product. This means that whole communities and large payrolls depend on a continuous flow of dollars from Washington.

A program put forward recently to help ease the adjustment from a cold war economy to a future peacetime economy went almost unnoticed. Senator George McGovern, Democrat, of South Dakota, joined by 10 others including Majority Whip Hubert Humphrey, proposed a national economic conversion commission. The commission would be responsible for drafting a blueprint for converting to peacetime work and for drawing up schedules of possible private and public investment that would help to bridge the transition period. All plants in which 25 percent of operation was in defense would be required to set up an operating conversion committee.

In presenting his proposal to the Senate, McGovern quoted in support of it from an eminently respectable source, a survey of the Morgan Guaranty Bank:

"With about one-tenth of gross national product devoted to military purposes year after year, there has developed a reluctance, both public and private, toward cutting back so sizable a sector of economic activity. Thus, the very fact that makes it important to prepare for the possibility of a reduction in defense outlays—that is, the economy's heavy involvement in defense—could also make it more difficult to achieve reduction."

McGovern uttered a warning similar to that which has long been coming from business. The fact that roughly three-fourths of the Nation's scientific and engineering talent is in military research and development or space has caused a drastic decline in the modernization of civilian industries. The United States, which once led the world in machine-tool production, today has slipped to fourth or fifth place, according to McGovern.

The concentration of research in the Government sector means that this country has lagged behind in new and improved products. In West Germany only 5 to 10 percent of research is in defense and the balance in private industry.

What this means in world competition in the sale of goods and services hardly needs to be poinnted out. The relation to America's unfavorable balance of payments is a direct one. As West Germany, Japan, and Italy have built up new plants, the United States is left today with the unenviable distinction of operating the most outdated metalworking machinery of any major industrial power.

The Wall Street Journay last summer conducted a survey revealing that industrialists felt that high defense and space research salaries paid out of seemingly unlimited funds had priced them out of the market. Betweeen 1954 and 1961 personnel working on Government research contracts rose 317 percent to 190,000. In this same period industry increased its private research payroll only 30 percent to 130,000.

As the demand for technical manpower grows, the supply dwindles. According to the Wall Street Journal survey, the demand for new engineers alone now runs close to 60,000 a year. But in the current calendar year only about 33,700 will be graduated and this is down from 38,134 in 1959. The situation seems to be nearly as acute in the physical sciences, chemistry, and physics.

This is, of course, only one aspect of the cold war economy where adjustments are vital if trouble is avoided. McGovern pointed out that in the aircraft industry over 93 percent of all employees are working on warplanes. In shipbuilding the figure is 60 percent, in radio and communications equipment, 38 percent. Unless these industries are to go on into an indefinite future, turning out more and more war machines to be stockpiled, a basic adjustment will have to be faced up to.

A horrible example of how not to succeed by hardly trying at all is in stockpiling. There, because of the pressure of private interests, the Government acquired mountains of material far beyond any foreseeable use. To repeat that on a far larger scale in armaments would be the height of folly.

REORGANIZATION OF THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION—A SHORT STEP TOWARD IMPROVED SCIENTIFIC PROGRAMS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on November 2, 1963, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Anthony Celebrezze, announced an important step in strengthening one of the vital components of that great Department, the Food and Drug Administration. The Secretary announced the FDA's long-awaited reorganization plan.

The new structure is based, in part, on recommendations submitted in October 1962 by the Second Citizens Advisory Committee on the FDA. That advisory group had been appointed by Secretary Celebrezze's distinguished predecessor, the Honorable Abraham Ribicoff, now the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut.

In a public statement released on Monday of this week, I was happy to commend the Food and Drug Administration reorganization plan as a constructive step forward. The plan will enable the FDA tc serve the public health more effectively.

At the same time, I pointed out very frankly that, as the FDA itself must be aware, this plan represents only a modest step forward. Giant strides are necessary in order to have the FDA gain the scientific stature of, say, the National Institutes of Health.

INVITATION FOR DEPARTMENT'S COMMENT

For this reason, I have asked the Special Assistant to the Secretary for Health and Medical Affairs, who has been handling FDA problems, Mr. B. Jones, to furnish a statement of what I hope will be bold and comprehensive plans to upgrade science further in the FDA.

This statement would be furnished to the Senate Government Operations Committee's Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, of which I am chairman. This subcommittee has been studying interagency drug issues, particularly the problems of the Food and Drug Administration.

The subcommittee has compiled expert judgment from scientists throughout the United States by means of an extensive program of correspondence, over and above our formal hearings.

Our final drug hearings will be held prior to January 31, 1964, as set forth under our current authority, Senate Resolution 27, 88th Congress, 1st session, providing for study of interagency coordination.

THREE SETS OF BACKGROUND MATERIALS

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the Record the text of Secretary Celebrezze's helpful public statement of November 2; my own statement of November 11; and excerpts from comments by one of the many trade publications which during the past year have discussed the Food and Drug Administration reorganization. This is the publication Food Chemical News.

There being no objection, the statement and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Press Release by HEW

A reorganization of the Food and Drug Administration was announced today by Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The reorganization adopts salient features from recommendations of the Second Citizens Advisory Committee on the Food and Drug Administration, which made its report in October 1962.

In making the announcement, Secretary Celebrezze said:

"An important feature of the reorganization is the upgrading of the scientific functions. I expect the reorganization to improve FDA operations all along the line, and thereby provide more effective protection of the consumers' interests.

"The reorganization will not entail the expenditure of additional funds. It adjusts existing functions and deploys the staff so that they will be able to operate more efficiently," the Secretary said.

George P. Larrick, Commissioner of Food and Drugs, made the following comment:

"The plan which has been approved by Secretary Celebrezze has been designed to modernize the structure of the Food and Drug Administration in the light of its new and growing responsibilities. It is a foundation for progressive strengthening of consumer protection in regard to foods, drugs, medical devices, cosmetics, and household chemical products over the next 10 years."

An important feature of the reorganization will be the appointment of a National Advisory Council to the Food and Drug Administration comprised of representative citizens under the chairmanship of the Commissioner of Food and Drugs. It will advise the administration on national needs and the effectiveness of program policies.

A new associate commissioner, who will be a scientist, will give leadership from the Office of the Commissioner to the programs and functions having to do with medicine, science, and research.

Two new bureaus with scientific activities are established—a Bureau of Scientific Research, supporting FDA's basic mission of consumer protection, and a Bureau of Scientific Standards and Evaluation, which will handle safety clearance functions in regard to pesticides, food additives and colors, and develop scientific data to be used in setting standards and tolerances. These Bureaus replace the present Bureau of Biological and Physical Sciences.

No change is contemplated in the present Bureau of Medicine, which has recently been reorganized to handle new responsibilities under the Kefauver-Harris Drug Amendments of 1962.

Enforcement activities will be consolidated in a single Bureau of Regulatory Compliance replacing in part the Bureau of Field Administration and the Bureau of Enforcement, which presently have divided enforcement responsibilities.

Educational functions of the Food and Drug Administration are emphasized in the creation of a new Bureau of Education and Voluntary Compliance. This will include the Division of Advisory Opinions, formerly in the Bureau of Enforcement, which answers industry inquiries on compliance problems. The bureau will also include the industry education branch, and the consumer education branch and consumer inquiries section from the present Division of Public Information, and the consumer consultant program now in the Office of the Commissioner. Press and public information services will be carried on by a new Office of Public Information.

All positions involved in the reorganization are in the career Civil Service. The following list released by Commissioner Larrick shows the organization units and top personnel of the Food and Drug Administration as they will be under the new plan:

Commissioner of Food and Drugs: George P. Larrick.

Deputy Commissioner: John L. Harvey.

Associate Commissioner: To be appointed.

Special Assistant to the Commissioner for National Advisory Council and Special Projects: Dr. Kenneth L. Milstead.

Office of Public Information: W. F. Janssen, Director.

Office of Federal State Relations: James C. Pearson, Director.

Office of Emergency Preparedness: Dr. H. G. Underwood, Director.

Assistant Commissioner for Planning: Winton B. Rankin.

Assistant Commissioner for Science Resources: Dr. O. L. Kline.

Assistant Commissioner for Regulations: Malcolm R. Stephens.

Assistant Commissioner for Operations: J. Kenneth Kirk.

Assistant Commissioner for Administration: Leo L. Miller.

Bureau of Medicine: Director to be appointed; Acting Director Ralph G. Smith, M.D.

Bureau of Scientific Research: Director to be appointed; Deputy Director, Dr. Daniel Banes.

Bureau of Scientific Standards & Evaluation: R. S. Roe, Director.

Bureau of Regulatory Compliance: Allan E. Rayfield, Director.

Bureau of Education and Voluntary Compliance: Director to be appointed; Deputy Director, Shelbey T. Grey.

SENATOR HUMPHREY ASKS FOR BOLD FDA SCIENCE PROGRAM FOR THE SIXTIES

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, has asked the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to present a concrete program to upgrade science in the sixties in the Food and Drug Administration.

A bold program is necessary to fill in the modest plan which recently reorganized the agency, HUMPHREY said.

The reorganization plan, he continued, is a helpful, forward step, but it is far too short to meet FDA's science needs in the biochemical age.

The Minnesota Senator is chairman of a Senate Government Operations Subcommittee, which has been studying Federal drug policies.

He addressed his request to Boisfeuillet Jones, special assistant to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who has been handling FDA problems.

Senator HUMPHREY said FDA's reorganization will "definitely serve consumer interests, as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Celebrezze has soundly stated."

But, HUMPHREY continued, the scientific elements in the plan are only a shadow of what was recommended 13 months ago by the Second Citizens Advisory Committee on the Agency.

The plan's failure to establish a strong, independent Food and Drugs Institute or its equivalent "is the greatest single disappointment," HUMPHREY said.

"Comparatively little is accomplished by mere establishment of a new post of Associate Commissioner for Science or by retitling and shuffling certain other science units" he said.

HUMPHREY expressed continuing confidence in Secretary Celebrezze whom he termed a vigorous, able administrator. "The Secretary knows that it takes people, resources, and programs to fill in what any organization chart may promise," HUMPHREY said.

FDA, he continued, "is to be commended for recent improvements." "The agency, which has long been an orphan in Federal science support, is now experiencing natural growing pains, in order to fulfill complex requirements under the Kefauver-Harris drug law and new regulations."

"The problem is, however, that the food, drug and cosmetic industries are so dynamic and are in such a scientific revolution that FDA can't keep up with them."

"It isn't fair to FDA, to the regulated industries or to the public if the Agency has less than the best in scientific plans, personnel, salaries, equipment, and relationships with the scientific community."

He cited as an example the need for close FDA "teamwork with new and expanded university departments of clinical pharmacology in teaching hospitals throughout the country." This requires a "two-way flow of ideas, experiences, and manpower," he said. FDA must "become more than a mere regulatory agency with a few scientific activities. It must become a regulatory-scientific agency with a stature as high as that of the National Institutes of Health." It is not going to gain NIH's reputation, he said, "by a game of 'musical chairs' or by merely inventing new titles on its stationery or on office doors."

"It is a little difficult," he said, "to figure out why it took 13 months to come up with so limited a reorganization proposal."

A National Advisory Council to the Agency still has not been appointed, although it has been recommended by authorities for not less than 5 years, he noted.

In addition, specialized advisory panels should long since have been established. Such panels would consist of the foremost experts in the land in major medical specialties like pediatric, cardo-vascular, and psychiatric drugs.

He added a note of caution, however. "Some people would apparently like to set some senior panel up over FDA and stack the panel. Their hope is apparently to have the panel then exercise a veto over any of FDA's drug decisions which self-interest groups don't like.

"Consider what could have happened under such circumstances in the case of the baby-deforming drug, thalidomide. If the company could have gone over the head of Dr. Frances Kelsey, it might have pressured some weak panel into requesting her to release the drug. The result could have been tragic," HUMPHREY said.

"There is no substitute for strength and excellence in regulatory scientific personnel," he continued. "Such personnel should be ready and willing to consider the best advice available, but they must not be pressured into sacrificing the public's interest to the demands of some self-interest group."

"Excessive fear or arbitrary pressure can have the harmful result of blocking the release of a truly valuable drug," he concluded. "By contrast, an attitude of recklessness or arbitrary pressure could result in the opposite—in the needless releasing of a drug whose dangers outweigh its advantages.

"A middle ground is needed. It can only be attained if FDA becomes a part of the mainstream of scientific excellence. That goal is yet to be achieved."

[From Food Chemical News, Sept. 3, 1962]

MOUNTING CRITICISM OF FDA POINTS UP REORGANIZATION NEED

Recent criticism of the Food and Drug Administration, both on the floor of the Senate and in the public press, point up the need for a long-overdue reorganization of the agency.

* * * * *

An administrative reorganization of FDA is needed because its organization has not kept up with its vastly expanded size. One or two men can no longer make all the decisions.

[From Food Chemical News, Dec. 3, 1962]

FDA-INDUSTRY COOPERATION, VOLUNTARY COMPLIANCE IS MAJOR THEME AT FLI; JONES CONFIRMS THAT CAC REPORT WILL BE USED AS GUIDE

The Food and Drug Administration and regulated industries had a 1-day sweetness and light session last week in Washington, as the annual Food Law Institute-FDA conference hit a peak of undramatic togetherness.

The CAC report was, of course, the chief topic of interest at the FLI meeting, and HEW's Boisfeuillet Jones made his first public statements on the report at the annual FLI banquet. Jones, special assistant for health matters, has emerged as the key man in implementation of the CAC report. In his speech, he confirmed that the report will be used as a mandate for a reorganization of FDA, but that the actual changes will be worked out by FDA'ers and Jones (see Food Chemical News, Nov. 5, p. 12).

CAC RECOMMENDATIONS WILL NOT BE FOLLOWED TO THE LETTER

Jones made it clear that the CAC report will be used as a guide rather than a detailed map, saying, "Obviously we will not follow the letter of all recommendations." He explained that, "It is understood—and the report clearly stated—that specific recommendations were intended to be illustrative rather than definitive."

An overall reorganization for FDA "is timely and necessary," Jones said, although he commented that it would not be accomplished "precisely as set forth in the report." He revealed that "such reorganization planning is actively underway."

The CAC's comment that FDA's scientific programs should be strengthened, Jones said, is "valid." He added: "Just how this is to be done is not yet clear. That it will be done, however, is certain." The CAC had urged splitting off FDA's scientific work into a Food and Drug Institute. It is believed that FDA will upgrade its scientists without taking such a drastic step.

[From Food Chemical News, Feb. 11, 1963]

WHAT HAPPENED TO THE REORGANIZATION OF FDA?

In October, the Citizens Advisory Committee called for a top-to-bottom reorganization of the Food and Drug Administration. In November, Boisfeuillet Jones, special assistant to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, was given chief responsibility for the FDA reorganization. HEW set a January 1 deadline for the reorganization plan—with the implication that something should be done by the time Congress reconvened.

FDA's New Drug Division was reorganized (see Food Chemical News, Dec. 24, p. 5), just in time to satisfy drug-conscious Members of Congress as they returned to Washington. But there has been no further action.

It had appeared that "Bo" Jones had shrouded his work in secrecy. The suspicion is now growing that there is nothing to be secretive about, that little has been done.

Around HEW, it is pointed out that the reorganization of FDA is a complex matter, that Jones does not have a large staff to assist him, that FDA is not the only matter requiring attention from Jones.

The fact remains, however, that Jones had discussed reorganization with FDA Commissioner Larrick even before issuance of the CAC report (see Food Chemical News, Nov. 5, p. 12). Since the CAC recommendation for a complete reorganization (see Food Chemical News, Oct. 29, p. 13), FDA has sent a reorganization plan to Jones' desk. He also has before him the reorganization plan contained in the CAC report, plus reorganization ideas from another HEW topsider.

FDA MORALE SLIPS IN ERA OF UNCERTAINTY

FDA is in need of a reorganization (see Food Chemical News, Sept. 3, p. 5). As a matter of fact, Larrick requested appointment of the CAC to gain a mandate to justify reorganization.

However, there was no great rush about a reorganization. The programed changes would have permitted an agency doing a good job, by and large, to do a better job. The need for the reorganization became pressing only when HEW responded to the CAC report by promising a quick reorganization of FDA.

Failure to keep this promise has resulted in a period of uncertainty and low morale for FDA'ers, who do not know what their positions will be after the reorganization.

[From Food Chemical News, Apr. 15, 1963]

Boisfueillet Jones, special assistant to Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Celebrezze, told Food Chemical News last week he believes part of the plans for FDA's reorganization will be disclosed at the hearings at which he will be one of the key witnesses.

Enough progress has been made, he said, to be able to give some of the details of the reorganization if questions on the subject are posed by ROBERTS' House subcommittee. "We're moving along very nicely," he said, adding: "I think we've made progress." Jones said many pieces need to be put together before final plans can be formulated.

[From Food Chemical News, Sept. 9, 1963]

"BO" JONES IS EXPECTED TO REVEAL DETAILS OF FDA REORGANIZATION

After months of delay and secrecy, Boisfeuillet Jones, special Health, Education, and Welfare Department assistant for health and medical affairs, will reveal shortly his plans for reorganizing the Food and Drug Administration.

The plan will be unveiled before Senator HUMPHREY'S Reorganizations Subcommittee at 2 days of hearings, which have been tentatively scheduled for Wednesday and Thursday, September 11 and 12, but may be put off until a later date because of conflicts on the Senator's schedule.

Jones promised the plans of the reorganization within 3 to 6 months when testifying before a House Public Health and Welfare Subcommittee in the spring (see Food Chemical News, May 20, p. 7). He testified nearly 4 months ago that the major recommendations of FDA's Citizens Advisory Committee report, including the establishment of a Food and Drug Institute as well as a Food and Drug National Advisory Council, would be adopted in his reorganization.

COMMENDATION OF SECRETARY CELEBREZZE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it should be mentioned that this and other industry and trade publications have been concerned, as have been congressional sources, over delays in this reorganization effort.

We well realize, of course, the many other legislative issues which have had to receive Secretary Celebrezze's personal attention during the past crowded year.

I want it quite clear that I have a high regard for Secretary Celebrezze. He is an able and vigorous administrator. Necessarily, in that vast, complex Department, he has had to delegate many issues to other offices, as in this particular instance.

Mr. President, I also wish to call to the attention of the Senate the proposal we have made in the committee for further advances by and the improvement of the Food and Drug Administration. This agency does not seem to be one of the Government agencies which arouse much public attention; but it is a very important agency, particularly in connection with the new Drug Act, the Kefauver-Harris Act, of last year. The Food and Drug Administration has very great responsibilities in connection with the public health and the public safety. It needs more attention from Congress and more scientific personnel and better facilities with which to conduct its work.

I have often been critical of many of the procedures and decisions of the Food and Drug Administration, but I must also be critical of Congress. Congress has not provided this agency with the necessary manpower, salary schedule, scientific personnel, and technical staff and the facilities needed to enable it to do effective work as a scientific agency of the Government. The Food and Drug Administration is both a police-power agency—for it polices food and drug products and examines their purity, efficacy and therapeutic value. It also is an important research agency, conducting research in regard to new drugs and studies of their application, all of which are extremely important in connection with the public health.

Therefore, I am very happy that my statement of several weeks ago will be looked upon, not as a critical one, but as one encouraging this agency to do even more than it has done.

The Citizens Advisory Committee made some very constructive proposals. Some of them have been adopted in the reorganization plan, and others await action. I encourage both the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and Mr. George Larrick, the Food and Drug Administrator, to give special attention to the other recommendations. We cannot afford to settle for second best in dealing with the reorganization and improvement of the Food and Drug Administration.

Our subcommittee will continue its hearings; and we hope to be able to present before the end of the year a rather thoughtful and, I trust, helpful summary of our activities.

PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS PROVISION IN THE BRACERO PROGRAM

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Jersey, who today spoke to me privately in regard to the so-called bracero bill. I wish to commend him for his work on that bill, for the hearings he held in regard to it, and for the effective leadership he has given to the examination of this type of employment.

As I recall, he brought to our attention the fact that in passing the bracero bill the Senate adopted the McCarthy amendments; but the bill as it will come to us from the House of Representatives will include a House amendment striking out the amendments adopted by the Senate. Nevertheless, that bill authorizes a so-called public accommodations feature in this Government's agreement with Mexico which has been expressly approved, several times, by the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Yes.

This program was enacted in 1951. Article 8 of the agreement with Mexico authorized by Public Law 78 is described as a prohibition against discrimination; and it reads in part as follows:

> Mexican workers shall not be assigned to work nor permitted to remain in localities in which Mexicans are discriminated against because of their nationality or ancestry.

I believe it would be helpful to our debate on Wednesday to have the entire article 8 of the migrant labor agreement of 1951, printed at this point in the RECORD; and I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTICLE 8—PROHIBITION AGAINST DISCRIMINATION

Mexican workers shall not be assigned to work nor permitted to remain in localities in which Mexicans are discriminated against because of their nationality or ancestry. Within a reasonable time after the effective date of this agreement and from time to time thereafter, the Mexican Ministry for Foreign Relations will furnish the Secretary of Labor a listing of the communities in which it considers that discrimination against Mexicans exists. If there is concurrence by the Secretary of Labor that there is such discrimination in any such area, he will not issue, or where appropriate will withdraw, the authorization provided for in article 10.

If the Secretary of Labor does not concur, the appropriate Mexican Consul may request a statement signed by the chief executive officer or officers of the chief law enforcement officer of the community in which the Mexican workers are to be employed, pledging for the community that:

(a) No discriminatory acts will be perpetrated against Mexicans in that locality; and

(b) In the event that the Mexican Consul reports the existence of acts of discrimination against any Mexican because of ancestry or nationality, the local governmental officers who signed the statement will have such complaints promptly investigated and take such community and individual action as may be necessary to fulfill the community pledge.

The Mexican Government will permit employment in such areas if such pledges are furnished.

If, notwithstanding the foregoing, the Mexican Consul reports that discriminatory acts have been committed against Mexicans because of their nationality or ancestry in a locality where Mexican workers are employed, the Mexican Consul having jurisdiction in the locality may request the representative of the Secretary of Labor to join the Mexican Consul in a joint investigation in which event the procedure prescribed in article 30 of this agreement will be followed.

(EXPLANATORY NOTE.—The use of the word "authorization" is simply an editorial change to conform the language in this provision with the appropriate terminology contained in articles 1 and 10.)

Joint interpretation and amendment of March 1954

The Government of Mexico will not include "counties" under article 8 of the agreement in the list of towns, communities, localities, and places where it is considered that discrimination exists against Mexicans on account of their nationality or of their ancestry.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. This program has been extended six times by very large votes—not regional votes, but from the south, east, and west. The public accommodations part of the legislation has thereby been approved six times by the full Congress. Let me say to those who feel that the public accommodations provisions in title II of the civil rights bill are unconstitutional that the Congress has given the lie to that argument by enacting this provision six times. It has been effective in many communities where there was discrimination because of Mexican nationality or ancestry. Under the provisions of the article, the authorities have gone in and have made swimming pools and other areas of public accommodations available to everyone—including Mexican nationals.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the Attorney General of the United States which discusses the analogy between public accommodations provisions authorized by Public Law 78 and the public accommodations provisions of the civil rights bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 23, 1963.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I have read with interest your letter of September 23, 1963, regarding article 8 of the migrant labor agreement between the United States and Mexico, entered into pursuant to the authority conferred by Public Law 78, 82d Congress (65 Stat. 119, 7 U.S.C. 1461 et. seq.). I agree with your suggestion that this statutory program, which has been in effect for 12 years and affirmed by Congress on numerous occasions (67 Stat. 500; 69 Stat. 615; 72 Stat. 934; 74 Stat. 1021; 75 Stat. 761), has implications for the civil rights legislation which is now pending before the Congress.

It seems evident that those Members of Congress who voted in favor of continuing and extending this program saw no objection in principle to the use of governmental sanctions to prevent discrimination based on race or national origin in facilities that are open to the public. To the extent that they saw disadvantages in governmental action that would have the effect of compelling abandonment of discriminatory policies and practices, presumably they reasoned that such disadvantages were outweighed either by moral considerations or by the economic benefits to be gained from the program. Needless to say, I believe that similar moral and economic considerations not only justify but require enactment of the proposed civil rights legislation.

I appreciate very much your bringing this matter to my attention.

Sincerely,

——— ———,
Attorney General.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hold in my hand a copy of the speech made by the Senator from New Jersey on September 19, 1963, entitled, "What Is New About A Public Accommodations Law? Such a law has been on the books for 12 years, and expressly approved six times by the U.S. Senate."

The Senator points out that Public Law 78, which is the Mexican Labor Act, contains an antidiscrimination provision which has been enforced many times.

I should like to read a portion of the Senator's speech:

> For instance, in Slaton, Tex., in the summer of 1960, the Labor Department investigated and found that there was discrimination at restaurants, bowling alleys, and the city swimming pool. At that time, the matter was satisfactorily concluded without the necessity of removing the Mexican nationals under contract in the area.
>
> In the summer of 1961, a formal complaint was made alleging that the Slaton City swimming pool was being operated on a white-only basis and that American school children of Mexican ancestry—not merely Mexican nationals—were denied the use of the swimming pool. Negotiations with city officials followed the investigation in an effort to eliminate this discrimination.
>
> The Mexican Government requested the immediate removal of all Mexicans working in the Slaton area. Through negotiations with Slaton city officials, the situation was eventually resolved in 1962 when the city of Slaton opened its swimming pool to all members of the public.

Then the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] pointed out:

> It would appear that article 8 of Public Law 78 goes far beyond the public accommodation proposals in the President's civil rights legislation. Unlike the public accomodations provision of the civil rights bill, which only prohibits discrimination by businesses that affect interstate commerce, Public Law 78 prohibits discrimination regardless of whether interstate commerce is involved.

The Senator from New Jersey has properly pointed out that if the public accommodations provisions of the bill (S. 1731) are unconstitutional, as some have claimed, it would seem clear that the nondiscrimination provisions in the agreement with Mexico authorized by Public Law 78 are equally unconstitutional, for under those provisions businessmen would not be allowed to discriminate among customers without being subject to governmental sanctions.

Furthermore, the Senator from New Jersey has pointed out—and I agree with him—that the sanctions authorized by Public Law 78 to prevent discrimination are even more severe than the sanctions under title II of the civil rights measure. Thus it seems to me that much of the hullabaloo and much of the skirmishing and arguing about public accommodations legislation is really rhetoric and is not based upon accepted public policy. Here we have a law that has been passed by the Congress several times. It is actively sponsored by able Members of this body. Yet that law authorizes prohibitions against any discrimination in public accommodations, whether they are private or public. Article 8 prohibits any discrimination in employment. It is a totally nondiscriminatory provision that has been authorized by the Congress of the United States.

It has been enacted in part because some people wanted that type of labor which they said they could not obtain in other parts of the Nation—even though I disagree with that conclusion. But the Mexican Government has insisted that its nationals be treated as human beings equal with any other human beings. The Mexican Government has demanded of the Congress and of the Government that its nationals be treated on a basis of full equality. If a foreign government can demand of our Government that its nationals be treated on the basis of equality in every type of facility that this country has within its boundaries, then why cannot the Government of the United States insist that all of its citizens be treated as equals, with full equality of treatment, accommodation and privilege in any facility in any part of the United States?

We are much indebted to the Senator from New Jersey for his splendid speech on September 19, 1963. The Senator's speech is in the RECORD. But I think that when we come to vote tomorrow, or whenever the vote takes place on the so-called bracero bill, we ought to know that in the past the bracero legislation has authorized a nondiscriminatory provision. It has authorized a public accommodations provision so that we will have a pretty good idea of what we are talking about when we proceed to discuss that important item of legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I certainly appreciate having the force of the majority whip behind what I consider one of the fundamentals of justice. If we are in a position to do justice for the Mexican national or the Mexican-American, with equal force we should be able to do it for Americans, whoever they are.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I appreciate his willingness to be present in the Chamber at this late hour. As the Senator knows, we had been discussing the subject earlier in the day, because I thought the bracero bill might be before the Senate today. But some Senators were necessarily absent and could not be here to consider the bill. I thought that we ought to get into the RECORD, at least, that feature of the previous legislation.

The bill which was passed by the Senate is good, sound, public policy. It is my intention that when the House amendments are called up to urge that that bill go to conference, and that the House amendment not be accepted by the Senate. I believe that we would be making a very serious mistake if we supported the House amendments after the action that was taken in this body. I know that we will have not only the support but the leadership of the Senator from New Jersey.

I should like to add once again that his work is a kind of labor of love for justice and equity, because very little public attention is given to such subjects.

Nevertheless, the Senator from New Jersey is the first Senator who has conducted wide-scale hearings on these very important problems facing our migrant laborers. There have been many other hearings over the years in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but I know of the work that the Senator has put into the subject of migratory labor. I know the work of my colleague, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], and the work of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART]. All of them have given great support to the measure. I am hopeful that when the House amendment is debated, we shall have the same forceful leadership that we had a few months ago when we were able to modify the bill as it came from committee and the McCarthy amendments were added to make it a reasonably good proposal.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I wish to make one or two statements. Certainly the leadership in obtaining the improvement of the bracero program in respect to equal treatment for American workers has, of course, been provided by the Senator's junior colleague from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY]. I have been working on the migratory problem ever since I have been in the Senate; but, when we were colleagues in the House, it was the junior Senator from Minnesota who first attracted me to the subject as a humanitarian part of the work of Congress. I am indebted to the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] as well as the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] for the passion with which they have tried to bring hope to American migrant workers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The fact that the amendments to the Senate bill are known as the McCarthy amendments indicates, I believe, the quality of the work of my distinguished colleague. I pay him well-deserved praise, not only for his success as a legislator but, more importantly, because he is willing to take up the cause of the migratory workers. Over the years, these people frequently have not had sufficient representation.

The McCarthy amendment is related not only to Mexican nationals but also to our own American citizens, so that Americans will be treated equally.

We should maintain the Senate bill. I know we will make a determined effort to do so.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. On the subject of migratory labor, I recall that the initial work on migratory labor legislation was the result of a study made in 1940, 1941, and 1942. I was a member of the committee. I was serving in the House at the time. It was called the Tolan committee. It did not deal so much with Mexican labor and the problems existing today as it did with the whole question of the shifting of labor. This was in the aftermath of the dust storms which ravaged the Midwest, with the migration of the "Okies" and "Arkies." The discussion included the mobility in order to supply our defense plants, since we were getting ready for the onrushing war.

It was a tremendous study. I look back upon it with a great deal of pleasure. I recommend a reference to those hearings and to the reports to anyone who is interested in the general subject of migratory labor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the subcommittee has drawn on the findings and conclusions of the committee on which the Senator from Alabama served.

The senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] did much of the foundation work which has been most beneficial to the work of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and to the Migratory Labor Subcommittee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, another Member of the Senate served on that committee—the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], who was a Member of the House at the time.

FURNISHING OF AUTOMOBILE TO MARTIN LUTHER KING BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, within the past few days the Department of Justice has announced that Felton Henderson, while an attorney of the Department of Justice, provided an automobile rented by the Department of Justice for the purpose of transporting Martin Luther King from Birmingham to Selma, Ala., on October 15, 1963, in order that Martin Luther King might attend a so-called civil rights rally. The willful defiance of duly constituted authority, both executive and judicial, in the name of "civil disobedience" is the declared and practiced purpose of Martin Luther King. In one community after another King has incited masses of people to defy, deliberately and contemptibly, lawful orders of competent courts of those jurisdictions. He has encouraged young people, some in their early teens, to obstruct justice and to invite arrest and imprisonment. All of this, I regret to say, he proclaims in the name of the Prince of Peace and justice.

At Little Rock, at Oxford, at Tuscaloosa, the Government of the United States mobilized its military might, expended millions of its dollars, and imposed a full measure of its awesome power for the declared purpose of protecting the integrity of court orders.

With this self-professed dedication to the integrity of court orders the U.S. Government has now admitted providing transportation to one whose very purpose is to defy court orders.

That such transportation was "contrary to Department of Justice regulations" begs the real questions.

Does the Department of Justice have two standards of respect for the courts: one for those with which individuals within the Department may agree and another for those with which they disagree?

Is there such a climate of advocacy prevailing within the Department that employees are moved to bestow special privileges and benefits not available to other citizens upon those whose purpose they advocate?

Is the Department so disposed to question the integrity of every southern sheriff and other law enforcement official that it would dismiss out of hand every report emanating from such officials without even appropriate investigation?

This question is a most important one, particularly in view of Attorney General Robert Kennedy's comments regarding Sheriff Jim Clark, of Dallas County. Just as soon as I learned that Sheriff Clark had discovered Martin Luther King's using a car rented by the Justice Department, I got in touch with the Attorney General and protested the matter as vigorously as I could. I asked for a full investigation and report. In that report, the Attorney General said:

> It is obvious from these facts that neither the Chevrolet nor the Ford, nor any other car rented by the Department of Justice, was used to transport Reverend King. The reports to the contrary are false. Any efforts to ascertain the truth would have revealed these facts.

Later when the Attorney General advised me that Department Attorney Henderson had lied about the matter, the Attorney General furnished me with a statement to correct, as he put it "the inaccurate information" which he had earlier furnished me. In short, on October 22 the Attorney General complained loudly that if Sheriff Clark had made any effort to ascertain the truth, the sheriff would not have made the charges that he did. However, less than 2 weeks later, on November 6, the Attorney General attempted to end the whole matter with a statement correcting "inaccurate information." Not surprisingly, there was no reference by the Attorney General to his earlier statement of October 22 that "any efforts to ascertain the truth" would have revealed the facts.

Apparently there was little regard by Martin Luther King to disclose the truth regarding this case. On October 17, Martin Luther King stated:

> It seems all these charges are completely false.

On November 6, King said:

> It is true I was driven to Selma in an auto that was loaned by a Justice Department official. I never denied this and strongly urged the Justice Department official not to deny it.

While Martin Luther King was at once calling the charges completely false, Sheriff Clark who had disclosed the truth was criticized.

Sheriff Clark is to be congratulated upon his alertness and forthrightness in making public the facts of this case. I have known Sheriff Clark for a long time. He is an outstanding law enforcement official. There was never any reason to doubt the accuracy of his report. Those who know him well, as I do, know him to be careful, thorough, and prudent. The manner in which his report was handled is deplorable and the Government officials responsible owe the Sheriff their sincere apologies.

As deplorable as this case is for its own sake, its greatest importance is that for which it may be symptomatic, and it is for this reason that I have raised the questions that I have. The American people are entitled to know the answers to these questions, and I have asked the Attorney General for his comment regarding them. In addition, I have asked Attorney General Kennedy to furnish me with information regarding any action contemplated by the Department to insure that departmental employees do not repeat the kind of action to which the Department Attorney Henderson has admitted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr HUMPHREY. Is it not true that Mr. Henderson was not authorized by the Department to lend the car, and is it not also true that he has since resigned, and that his resignation has been accepted?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The last part of the question is true. I assume, from what the Justice Department has said, that the first part of the question is true.

When the sheriff of Dallas County, Ala., gave the facts, told where they got the automobile, the tag numbers, and traced it to the rental agency, the Department of Justice hurriedly denied that the car had been so used, and said that any effort to ascertain the truth would have shown the statement to be false. Later, when it was ascertained that Sheriff Clark was correct, the Department of Justice satisfied itself by issuing a correction of inaccurate information.

It seems to me, having made the charge which was made against the sheriff of Dallas County, Ala., and having made other statements even rougher than the one I have referred to, the Department of Justice should have gone further and admitted it was wrong, and should have apologized to the sheriff of Dallas County, Ala., to whom it had imputed a false report. That is the only point I wish to make.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure the Senator is expressing what many of us hold, and what we all ought to hold; namely, that misinformation or falsehoods cannot be condoned in this type of business, or in our private affairs, either. I could be in error, but I understood that the statement which the Department at first issued was made on the basis of information supplied by Mr. Henderson when he said that he had not permitted the car to be used for other than official purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I understand that is correct, but it seems to me that when the sheriff insisted and recorded the exact points between which the car was driven, and the tag numbers, the Department of Justice should have required sworn statements from the attorneys who were involved, or submitted them to a lie test, instead of issuing a statement that the statement by the sheriff was absolutely false and that anybody who took the trouble to investigate would have found it was not true.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not argue with the Senator's statement that that is the way the case should have been handled. I am sure the Senator knows that I feel the so-called violation was not of such serious order. The main part that was wrong was the fact that misinformation was given as to the facts of the case, and that misinformation was used to justify something that was proved later not to be true.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Do not overlook that, based upon the inaccurate information which the Department of Justice had, it made some charges it could not later substantiate. It does not seem to me fair for the sheriff of Dallas County, Ala., who is a good law-enforcement officer, to be pilloried in that way, and left hanging there. To this date the Department of Justice, so far as I know, has not said a word to the sheriff of Dallas County, Ala., apologizing to him for saying that he had made a false report.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure that after the Senator's speech tonight there will be some communications.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I hope there will be.

RECESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 19, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Latvian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that the House of Representatives today marks the 45th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the once-free Republic of Latvia.

Certainly the cause of the oppressed peoples of the world merits the full attention of the entire free world, and I wish to commend and join my colleagues who are taking special note of today's anniversary and who are looking forward to the day when Latvia will be able to rejoin the community of free nations as an independent and free country.

For a Free Latvia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, 45 years ago today, on November 18, 1918, the leaders and people of Latvia declared independence for their nation, as our own forefathers did for this Republic, 150 years earlier. And, like our forefathers, Latvians paid a huge price in lives for freedom while expelling two invaders, in 1918 and 1919. That republic which rose from the ashes of World War I surely had every hope and chance of success. Latvia had educated, devoted leaders, a sense of national purpose, a victorious army, fertile lands and forests, and hardy farmers. The Latvians proved their devotion to democracy by establishing an advanced form of representative government, with a parliament, cabinet, president and freely organized parties. All the basic freedoms enunciated in our own Bill of Rights, were guaranteed to Latvians.

But there was a corrupt Communist element in the Latvian midst, just as in so many other nations. Throughout the years of Latvian independence the Communist Party had represented only a small minority of Latvian voters. That would no doubt have continued to be the case, if Latvia had been located anywhere but adjacent to the Soviet Union, because it was only after impossible demands and then invasion by the Soviet army that Latvia lost her independence. Only then did that tiny minority of Latvian Communists triumph over democracy, and destroy the bountiful fruits of 22 years of dedicated, democratic labor.

Latvians can be sure that for a few years the example of Latvia proved to the world again how well democracy works, just as the present example of Latvia proves every day that no free nation succumbs to communism except in the face of overwhelming force.

As we remember Latvia today let us remember the happy, democratic Latvia of former years, not the sad Latvia of communism. Also, let us wish success to members of the American Latvian Association in this country and freedom-loving Latvians everywhere, in their struggle to bring Latvia back to democracy.

TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include my weekly newsletter, "Capitol Comments," for release today in the Congressional Record. It follows:

Capitol Comments

(By Joe L. Evins, Member of Congress, Fourth District, Tennessee)

TVA

This week in Washington one of the most heated and lively issues being discussed among many Members of Congress and the press is the recent proposal to sell TVA by Senator Goldwater.

This proposal has met with strong and united opposition, not only from the Democrats of the Tennessee Valley area, but also from a number of members of the Republican Party, and others.

In my newsletter this week, I am including quotes from a few of the many remarks made by members of both parties opposing this proposal.

Senator Albert Gore, Democrat, of Tennessee, in a statement to the press called the idea "wholly impractical and contrary to the public interest."

Senator H. S. (Hub) Walters, Democrat, of Tennessee, said, "We in Tennessee are proud of the fine work of TVA and it would be folly to seriously consider the suggestion put forth by someone unfamiliar with the people and the economy of the seven-States area served by TVA."

Representative Howard Baker, Republican, of Tennessee, said he was "unequivocally opposed to the suggestion that TVA be sold to private industry." He stated that "TVA was created by Congress to develop the Tennessee River and is a model for watershed development throughout the world."

Representative James Quillen, Republican, of Tennessee, called Senator Goldwater's statement "very untimely" and said "TVA is doing a useful service to the people in my district, the State, and the whole TVA area."

Representative Clifford Davis, Democrat, of Tennessee, said the proposal to sell TVA "is absolutely ill founded, unwise, and will never happen in this country."

Representative Ross Bass, Democrat, of Tennessee, stated that he was "shocked that a man who is supposed to have the basic concept of government and the intellect to be President of the United States would make such a proposal."

Representative Robert A. Everett, Democrat, of Tennessee, in denouncing the proposal said, "Either Senator Goldwater is misinformed or he cares not for the people of the valley.

Representative Richard Fulton, Democrat, of Tennessee, in referring to charges that TVA is "Socialist" said, "It is regrettable that this successful Government service for the benefit of the people must come under this attack."

Representative Tom Murray, Democrat, of Tennessee, said of the proposal to sell TVA, "Certainly not—not at all."

Senator John Sparkman, Democrat, of Alabama, said it was "entirely impractical and unwise."

Representative Pat Jennings, Democrat of Virginia, called the Goldwater suggestion "utterly ridiculous."

Representative Frank S. Stubblefield, Democrat, of Kentucky, called the idea "the most asinine, stupid suggestion I've heard since I have been in Congress.

Mr. Wiley Bowers, Executive Secretary of the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, said the proposal to sell TVA, "is so absurd that it does not merit serious consideration."

Our Government has been building multipurpose dams for more than 50 years and the TVA has been operating successfully for more than thirty years. TVA's power operations are self-sustaining and self-liquidating. The Tennessee Valley Authority is the Nation's most profitable Government operation—not only from a dollars and cents point of view—of cash returns into the Treasury—but also from the point of view of strengthening our Nation.

TVA payments into the Treasury are in advance of scheduled requirements. Almost one-half billion dollars have been paid into the U.S. Treasury by TVA from power sales.

Other vast benefits have accrued from the operations of TVA, including flood control, navigation, reforestation, conservation, recreation, agricultural and industrial development, and a general improvement in the well-being of our people living in the valley area.

Great savings in power costs have been made for the Government by buying TVA-produced power for the several Government defense agencies located in the South.

Thus, TVA not only represents a great service to the people of the seven-States valley area which it serves locally, it also represents a great benefit to all the Nation.

TVA has survived its critics and will continue to survive and make significant contributions and accomplishments in the future. It stands as a symbol of democracy in action and a symbol to free nations all over the world.

Latvian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, this day, November 18, marks the 45th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the once-free Republic of Latvia. Between 1918 and 1940, Latvia became a bright symbol for the great majority of Americans, who believe in freedom for all nations, large or small. It was a great tragedy when the culture, history, and genius of Latvia were crushed by the second Soviet Russian invasion in 1940. Latvians must be proud of the gains made by their country in the short span of 22 years of independence. Latvia would today furnish a model of progress rather than of tyranny had Russia offered a smile in place of a fist.

Latvia must regain her independence. Her people have the sympathies of all democratic Americans.

They're Only Kids? Ha!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Senator Barry Goldwater appeared in the New York Journal-American on November 17, 1963.

Most of the press seem to be under the impression, or perhaps they are ordered to give the impression, that there is a radical right but no radical left in the United States. Of course this is palpably ridiculous. The only difference is that the radical left is in power today and can call the shots while the radical right has no power whatever.

Mr. Speaker we will have radicals as long as we exist and this is probably a good thing. At least they have principles. But to label one set as pure white and the other coal black is simply vicious partisanship:

They Are Only Kids? Ha!

(By Senator Barry Goldwater)

Democratic cries of pained anguish about the Young Republican convention in California recently grew strangely silent when the Young Democrats held their own western conference and advocated such embarassing things as resumption of diplomatic relations with Cuba and full recognition of Red China.

When cornered about their extremism, party leaders expressed only mild disagreement, saying, in effect, that kids will be kids and that they—the older Democrats—could not possibly agree with such things.

The facts, however, somehow belie these disclaimers, and make the youngsters look like a watered-down version of the real thing.

Most policies of the New Frontier, for instance, are shaped by current and former members of Americans for Democratic Action. Their views on just about every major issue, domestic or foreign, go at least as far as the Young Democrats went, and in many cases further.

Of the 50 current and former members of ADA brought into government by Kennedy, many hold the highest policymaking and advisory posts and have pressed consistently for ADA programs.

Among these are Adlai Stevenson, our U.N. Ambassador, who has denied membership, but who has been identified by the oldtime ADAers as a founder of the organization; Arthur Goldberg, formerly Kennedy's Secretary of Labor and now a Justice of the Supreme Court; Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman; Theodore C. Sorenson, special counsel to and speechwriter for the President; Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., a former chairman of ADA who now is J.F.K.'s administrative assistant, and Assistant Secretary of State Chester Bowles.

Other ADAers are key New Frontier spokesmen in the Senate, the House, in industry, business, organized labor, civic and fraternal organizations and just about every field imaginable. That they influence the policies of and speak for the Kennedy administration is undenied.

There also is the question of the now infamous collection of essays, "The Liberal Papers," compiled under the guidance of present and former liberal Democrats in the House and which has been labeled by Republican National Chairman William E. Miller as "going beyond the Communist line."

The Kennedy administration publicly has stated that the views expressed in the work are "contrary" to its own, but nevertheless has pressed forward on many programs it recommends.

The elder Democrats of the West in particular would do well to refer to a typical example of their own views—the platform of the Washington State Democratic Party adopted at Bellingham, Wash., June 23, 1962—and compare it with the document of the younger westerners. A delegate to the Washington Convention which adopted it stalked out, saying:

"What they have here is the Communist Manifesto. If I had stayed and voted with them, I would have been excommunicated from my church."

In any discussion of extremism—of the left or of the right—these would be points for all good Democrats to keep in mind.

A Bill To Impose Additional Duties on Cattle, Beef, and Veal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and to impose additional duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported in excess of annual quotas. The proposed legislation will increase duties substantially on overquota imports: first, by 5 cents a pound on cattle weighing less than 700 pounds; second, by 6 cents a pound on cattle weighing more than 700 pounds; and, third, by 12 cents a pound on beef and veal, fresh, chilled, or frozen.

These tariff increases will, I believe, restore to American cattlemen much of the domestic market lost to foreign countries in recent years—and with this would come a much-needed strengthening of cattle prices. The time has come for the administration to either support this legislation to impose higher tariffs on imported livestock or to enter into voluntary agreements with the major foreign importing nations to restrict beef imports in a manner similar to that already worked out for dairy products and cotton textiles.

The United States imposes only a token tariff on beef imports—averaging a little more than 1½ to 2½ cents a pound. This represents an open invitation to foreign producers to step up both production and exports to this country. In its outlook report for 1964, the U.S. Department of Agriculture predicts that American beef importations will remain extremely high. Last year, the United States took 79 percent of Australia's beef and veal exports and, for the past 3 years, we have been the market for 90 percent of New Zealand's boneless beef exports.

Today approximately 11 percent of the beef consumed in the United States is imported. Fresh beef imports increased from 414 million pounds in 1960 to 863 million pounds in 1962. Live cattle imports jumped from 645,000 head in 1960 to 1,232,000 in 1962. There have been comparable increases in mutton and lamb imports.

Today choice-fed cattle bring about 25 percent less than they did a year ago in the livestock markets of Kansas City, Omaha, and Chicago. And when the profits are largely eliminated from cattle feeding, the price effect is felt not only in the feeding lots but back on the range, as well.

Even as poor a nation as Haiti, which cannot feed its own population adequately, exported 2.7 million pounds of meat to the United States in the last fiscal year. This fact is a sidelight of the Bobby Baker scandal currently rocking Washington. Cattlemen believe price troubles facing their industry have been caused by unprecedented heavy imports of beef. They foresee continuing depressed prices for domestic cattle unless these imports are substantially reduced.

Western Kansas farmers receive most of their income from wheat and cattle and as I indicated on October 18, this year, the cattle industry is in deep trouble and has been for some time—largely because huge importations of foreign beef have been hammering down prices received by domestic producers. The "Farm Income Situation" released this week by the U.S. Department of Agriculture states that realized net income in 1964 is expected to be 5 percent or more below 1963. This would make farm income in 1964 less than in 1960, the last year of President Eisenhower's administration.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture contends it is powerless to act. The Federal Tariff Commission, however, unquestionably has authority to impose either higher tariffs or quotas or both, on foreign beef. Thus far the Commission has been reluctant to act. Congress, therefore, in my opinion, must override this reluctance with legislation.

A Salute to Latvian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, the stouthearted and liberty-seeking people of Latvia have never been numerous and powerful enough to defend their freedom, their most cherished prize, in their homeland in the Baltics. Most of their modern history has taken an uneven course, and during most of that time they have been subjected to the hated regimes of alien overlords. Since the late 18th century their country had been part of the sprawling czarist empire of Russia. And when that decrepit regime was overthrown in 1917, Latvians felt free, asserted their long-dreamed-of freedom, and proclaimed their national independence on November 18 of 1918.

Since that memorable day Latvians enjoyed freedom for a time before misery and suffering under alien rule again became their lot. During the interwar years they worked diligently and proudly, and succeeded in making their homeland a relatively safe haven for themselves. They rebuilt their war-ravaged country, reconstituted their democratic institutions, and lived happily under their democratic government.

But this relatively short interlude did not last long. The rise of aggressive dictatorship in Germany in the late 1930's, plus the aggressive designs of Stalin on Latvia, threatened Latvia independence. Early in the last war Stalin carried out his evil plan. The Red Army overran and occupied Latvia in mid-1940; then it was annexed to the Soviet Union as one of its constituent Soviet Socialist republics. Thus ended Latvian independence, and then began the unhappy period in the contemporary history of the Latvian people.

Since the end of the last war the Kremlin has strengthened its firm hold over Latvia, and the country has become a mere province of the Soviet Union. Latvians have no freedom, and of course democracy is foreign to the Communist system of government under which they live. They are not masters of their fate, for they suffer under Communist totalitarian tyranny.

On the 45th anniversary of their independence day we wish and hope that they will soon attain their national goal, their freedom, and then live happily in their historic homeland.

Baltic States Robbed of Their Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, 45 years ago on November 18, 1918, the Latvians celebrated their independence day. Free Latvia was not created at the Paris Peace Conference or by the Treaty of Versailles. Instead, the people of Latvia fought for their independence on the battlefields against the Bolsheviks and German invaders at the close of World War I. Many lives were lost but independent statehood was acquired.

Free Latvia started life with an empty treasury, a destroyed industry, devastated fields and a scattered population. Despite these handicaps, Latvia prospered as a nation in the next 20 years and its people achieved a standard of living equal to the other free democratic Western European nations.

After enjoying 22 years of national independence and a constitutional government, Latvia and the other Baltic nations, Estonia and Lithuania, were again invaded by the Soviets and completely occupied by overwhelming Red forces in the beginning of World War II. The Baltic States have been robbed of their independence and transformed into colonies of Soviet Russia.

By its aggressive acts, the Soviets have broken the peace and nonaggressive treaties that existed between Russia and the Baltic nations. Expropriation, exploitation, slave labor, suppression of human rights and fundamental freedom, terror, mass murder, and deportation are the marks of the Soviet occupation in the Baltic States. The brutal Russian rule of the subject people in Eastern Europe is evidence that the Communists are the proponents of colonialism and the opponents of the right of people to determine their own destiny.

The people in the Baltic States desire only to live in freedom and peace and are ready to sacrifice their lives to achieve these goals. I hope the day will come soon when these people and the others who live behind the Iron Curtain will again be restored to their freedom, their rights, and their dignities.

Job Insecurity Faces Union Members if Civil Rights Bill Passes Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, it is generally considered throughout the Congress that the pending civil rights legislation is aimed exclusively at the Southern States. Many persons living in other parts of the country have been deluded into the belief that they will not be affected by the legislation; that its purpose is to "emancipate" the southern Negro, and to wrest political control of the Southern States away from those presently in power.

Mr. Speaker, those who harbor this kind of belief will be in for a rude awakening should the pending civil rights bill become law. The fact is that this bill will shake the very foundations of individual liberty, and will strike just as hard at those in other parts of the country as it will against the people in the Southern States.

This morning a letter was received from a citizen in San Francisco, Calif., which I think contains much food for thought. Because this was an unusual letter and considering its geographical source, in particular, I am taking the liberty of quoting an excerpt therefrom which I feel sure will be of enlightening interest to the Members of this body.

> One of the brighter rays of hope so far is an article in the morning San Francisco Examiner stating that the more conservative Negro leaders are alarmed about the poll showing that white voters are deserting the Kennedys by the millions. Just this week there was an incident here in San Francisco where a group of beatniks and real Communist young punks led by Vincent Hallinan's son picketed in front of a sandwich stand owned by Harold Dobbs, who was a candidate for Mayor. They demanded more jobs for Negroes.
>
> Faced with a political and economic problem Dobbs and his partner negotiated a deal giving the Negroes assurance of prompt employment. Then, the white waitresses called upon their union leaders and demanded that the union protect them under its written contract with Dobbs and Weiss, protesting that the Negroes had no right to interfere with their contract preferences.
>
> It seems to me that disputes of this kind are going to be arising all over the country.

Mr. Speaker, the excerpt quoted above points up a serious problem which will be created by the enactment of the pending civil rights legislation, and I would caution those now enjoying the security of labor union protection to pause and take a penetrating look at the probable effects of this legislation on their employment.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Newsletter of November 16, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT—MORE MILLIONS FOR THE PEACE CORPS

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

The House approved, without a rollcall vote, H.R. 9009 to amend the Peace Corps Act and to up expenditures from $63,750,000 to $102 million, very nearly double. I protested the action and pointed out:

1. The bill was brought to the floor with insufficient information: (a) Only one public witness appeared at the committee hearings; (b) the report contained only boasting accounts of success by Peace Corps administrators; (c) no specific data was presented—the cost by country, by number of workers, projects involved, the success or failure of projects; (d) far too much of the taxpayers' money has been spent in publicizing and glamorizing the Peace Corps.

For my part the Peace Corps is unconstitutional, unnecessary, and self-defeating. We encourage, through it, Government planning, welfare statism, socialism, and godless materialism, all at the expense of capitalism and basic U.S. spiritual and moral values.

1. Government sponsored and directed Peace Corps projects are an unwarranted intrusion into areas properly the function of the private sector. It will eventually supplant the private help to peoples of other countries which has traditionally been the province of missionary and educational efforts.

2. Through the Peace Corps we extend aid to Socialist countries and to countries where people have no freedom but are subjugated by their government.

3. Its accomplishments are uncertain as it becomes a burgeoning bureaucracy.

PRICE FIXING WILL RAISE COST OF COFFEE

The International Coffee Agreement Act of 1963, implemented in the House this week, is going to force American housewives to pay more for coffee. The coffee treaty has already been ratified by the Senate, but the very fact that it was brought to the House for implementation indicates that there is an area for disagreement.

It is important to note that some of us warned last year during debate on the Trade Assistance Act of 1962 that it would lead to cartels, quotas, and limitations of trade.

The coffee agreement proves the point, and serves to point up the duplicity of the President's arguments for the trade bill.

Specific points show what the coffee agreement is as compared to what should be our goal.

1. The agreement is international control instead of competition in a freer import and export market.

2. It is trade by government agreement instead of the workings of the market forces of supply and demand.

3. It is price control and prevents price levels being reached through supply and demand, the only way to assure lowest prices.

4. It is rigid control of the market, not free trade.

Foreign aid became part of the debate when we were told we must have this agreement or increase foreign aid to the coffee countries. In an exchange with Congressman BECKER:

Mr. BECKER. The President said today he did not feel it wise to use the threat of withdrawing foreign aid too frequently. He said if threats of withdrawing foreign aid are used too often, there would be a great temptation on the part of the recipients to say 'Go ahead and cut it off.' Would the gentleman say this would be bad?"

Mr. ALGER. I think it would be very refreshing if we suggested the withdrawal and they took us up on it and reaffirmed their self-respect, which they must surely lose when they take our money."

We were told this bill would increase South American income and provide a higher standard of living. I say this can be accomplished only through capitalism, not through Government planning and control under a Socialist-Communist formula.

POLITICS—POLITICS—POLITICS

Taxpayers should ask themselves how much the President's political trip to Texas is going to cost them. They should question the new Postmaster General's urging of postal workers to get out and work for Kennedy's programs (clear violation of the Hatch Act). They should wonder at the freeze-out of some Members of Congress in getting White House tours for constituents. They should be angry over the use of taxpayers' money to propagandize them to win support for more New Frontier, welfare state, projects in every executive department.

In Memory of Latvian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we should take notice today of an important event which occurred 45 years ago—November 18, 1918. That is when Latvia declared her independence and became an outpost of Western democracy.

Latvian independence was only achieved by the sacrifice of Latvian lives and property. The first Latvian national leaders had to overcome invasions by both German and Russian empires to gain freedom. Then, between the final expulsion of the Bolshevik Russians in 1919 and their return in overwhelming force in 1940, Latvia showed the way to economic, social, and political progress. No one can say that Latvia did not do honor to her dead during those years of independence.

Latvia was one of the first European Countries to reform the currency and financial system. The land reform law of 1920 was a model of fair, democratic dispersal of feudal estates. Happily, it ended forever the supremacy of German—or Balt—nobles over the other 97 percent of the population. Latvian foreign policy was founded on friendly relations with Soviet Russia as well as the West, and trust in the League of Nations. By 1937, there were 5,717 industrial enterprises in Latvia. Seventy thousand farmers were enrolled in 2,300 educational societies. Hydroelectric stations were numerous. The national income increased 120 percent between 1927 and 1938 despite the depression. The Latvian National Bank's assets rose from 48.2 million lats, the local currency, in 1934, to 125.6 million lats in 1939. Latvian trade was almost completely with the West, especially Great Britain, Germany, and the United States, carried in 103 Latvian ships. By 1939, Latvia was almost self-supporting, embarking on the voyage to exciting economic growth.

Soviet Russia ended all of this by invasion in 1940, in direct violation of all existing international law and morals, especially the 1920 treaties giving Latvia complete independence.

We should remember today the hopeful flowering of democracy in Latvia, and many other nations of Eastern Europe. We should remember the conviction of early Latvian leaders, and those who escaped to the West to continue the fight against oppression—many like Janis Cakste, Gustav Zemgals, Karlis Ulmanis, Janis Goldmanis, Karlis Zarins, former ambassador to Britain, and Alfred Bilmanis, former minister to the United States. We should remember the tyranny which destroyed their dreams. We extend our good wishes to their followers both in Latvia, and abroad, and share their hope for future independence for Latvia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT].

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Proverbs 3: 5: *Trust in the Lord with all thine heart; and lean not unto thine own understanding.*

O Thou infinite and eternal God, may the perplexing national and international problems, which we are daily struggling with, make us more conscious of our need of Thy divine guidance.

Help us to feel that our primary and most pressing responsibility is to lead our troubled and groping world back to Thee and the ways of righteousness.

May the Members of the Congress give clear and convincing testimony that they are men and women of integrity and inspired by a sincere desire to maintain and enhance our glorious American traditions.

Grant that the justice of God may find a voice in all their policies and plans and may they fearlessly denounce everything that is contrary to the great moral and spiritual principles.

In Christ's name we bring our petition. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On October 24, 1963:

H.R. 7195. An act to amend various sections of title 23 of the United States Code relating to the Federal-aid highway systems;

H.R. 7544. An act to amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, through provisions of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 724. Joint resolution to provide additional housing for the elderly.

On October 28, 1963:

H.R. 641. An act to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling and deferring certain irrigation charges, eliminating certain tracts of non-Indian-owned land under the Wapato Indian irrigation project, Washington, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 192. Joint resolution relating to the validity of certain rice acreage allotments for 1962 and prior crop years.

On October 29, 1963:

H.R. 2268. An act for the relief of Mrs. Geneva H. Trisler;

H.R. 4588. An act to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Department of the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Mojave B Aerial Gunnery Range, San Bernardino County, Calif., for defense purposes; and

H.R. 6377. An act for the relief of Sp5c Curtis Melton, Jr.

On October 30, 1963:

H.R. 75. An act to provide for exceptions to the rules of navigation in certain cases; and

H.J. Res. 782. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes.

On November 4, 1963:

H.R. 844. An act to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation;

H.R. 845. An act to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation;

H.R. 2635. An act to amend the act of August 9, 1955, for the purpose of including the Fort Mojave Indian Reservation among reservations excepted from the 25-year lease limitations;

H.R. 3306. An act to establish a revolving fund from which the Secretary of the Interior may make loans to finance the procurement of expert assistance by Indian tribes in cases before the Indian Claims Commission;

H.R. 6225. An act to provide for the rehabilitation of Guam, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 6481. An act to permit the government of Guam to authorize a public authority to undertake urban renewal and housing activities.

On November 7, 1963:

H.R. 6500. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 8821. An act to revise the provisions of law relating to the methods by which amounts made available to the States pursuant to the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 and title XII of the Social Security Act are to be restored to the Treasury.

On November 13, 1963:

H.R. 1049. An act to amend sections 334, 367, and 369 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 734, 767, 769) and to add a new section 355 so as to require claims to be filed and to limit the time within which claims may be filed in chapter XI (arrangement) proceedings to the time prescribed by section 57n of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 93n);

H.R. 1311. An act for the relief of Jolan Berczeller;

H.R. 1345. An act for the relief of Peter Carson; and

H.R. 2260. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rozsi Neuman.

H.R. 2445. An act for the relief of Mrs. Barbara Ray Van Olphen;

H.R. 2754. An act for the relief of Mercedes Robinson Orr;

H.R. 2757. An act for the relief of Woo You Lyn (also known as Hom You Fong and Lyn Fong Y. Hom);

H.R. 2835. An act to clarify the status of circuit and district judges retired from regular service;

H.R. 2968. An act for the relief of Kazimierz Kurmas and Zdzislaw Kurmas;

H.R. 3384. An act for the relief of Lee Suey Jom (also known as Tommy Lee and Lee Shue Chung);

H.R. 4145. An act for the relief of certain individuals;

H.R. 6097. An act for the relief of Dr. Pedro B. Montemayor, Jr.;

H.R. 6260. An act for the relief of Wai Chan Cheng Liu; and

H.R. 7405. An act to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize the U.S. Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to vote for an increase in the Bank's authorized capital stock.

H.J. Res. 626. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the establishment of an interstate school district by Hanover, N.H., and Norwich, Vt., and to an agreement between Hanover School District, N. H., and Norwich Town School District, Vt.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2837. An act to amend further section 11 of the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. 311).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7431. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CASE, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL RESEARCH

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Governmental Research be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Labor Subcommittee investigating the St. Elizabeths Hospital may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted to sit during general debate on November 19, 20, and 21.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

WHITE PAPERS VIEW THAT MESS IN CUBA

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, it looks like the image makers are at it again. I hope I am wrong, but I am disturbed by an article which appeared in a Midwestern newspaper which states:

> Two case histories of American foreign policy in action—one resulting in failure, the other in brilliant success—will be presented in two programs of the "NBC White Papers" series on the NBC television network Sundays, December 8 and January 5 (both 10 to 11 p.m.). Chet Huntley will narrate.

According to the image makers, both programs focus on Cuba. The first, "Cuba: The Bay of Pigs," will chronicle events from March 17, 1960, when President Eisenhower first revealed that he had decided to proceed with plans for organizing and training a military force of Cuban exiles, through April 20, 1961, marking the total failure of the force which invaded Cuba.

That is the one that is supposed to be a failure.

The second, "Cuba: The Missile Crisis," will cover developments from the "first" indications of Soviet activity in Cuba early in 1962 to October 28 of that year when Khrushchev agreed to pull out the missiles positioned there.

That is described as the brilliant success.

It is interesting to note that they terminate on October 28 after the President had made his speech, but apparently fail to follow through to give the whole picture where Kennedy backed off, capitulated and yielded. What a "brilliant success."

These apparent "snow jobs" to rewrite history and create false images are sickening.

I am referring this matter to the Republican National Committee with the request they preview these two "white papers"; and if the facts are distorted as they were in the Newburg story and the area redevelopment film, make an equal time demand to set the record straight.

SECOND ANNUAL REPORT OF THE PEACE CORPS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 11 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, I transmit herewith the second annual report on operations under the act covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 19, 1963.*

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

OUTLET STORES, INC.

The Clerk called the first bill (H.R. 2300) for the relief of Outlet Stores, Inc.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

FOR THE RELIEF OF DR. AND MRS. ABEL GORFAIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2706) for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Abel Gorfain.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

CHARLES WAVERLY WATSON, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2728) for the relief of Charles Waverly Watson, Jr.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

JOHN F. MACPHAIL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5145) for the relief of John F. MacPhail, lieutenant, U.S. Navy.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

HANS-DIETER SIEMONEIT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1277) for the relief of Hans-Dieter Siemoneit.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill, H.R. 1277, be removed from the Private Calendar and recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

BRYCE A. SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6182) for the relief of Bryce A. Smith.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This completes the call of bills on the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and pending that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to agree with my distinguished friend from Iowa on time. This subject has been so fully discussed and so clearly understood it appears to me that there is no particular object for extended debate. I wonder if it is agreeable to the gentleman from Iowa that debate be limited to 2 hours, one-half to be controlled by this side and one-half by the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes to the floor from the committee with almost unanimous approval of the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations as well as by the full Committee on Appropriations. I am quite sure this side of the aisle will not use a full hour. However, I concur with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in approving 2 hours general debate.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Iowa and myself.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 206]

Abbitt
Abele
Avery
Bennett, Mich.
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brotzman
Broyhill, Va.
Buckley
Cameron
Carey
Celler
Clawson, Del
Dague
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Derwinski
Dorn
Duncan
Fogarty
Foreman
Gill
Goodling
Halleck
Harding
Harvey, Ind.
Hemphill
Holifield
Hosmer
Jennings
Kastenmeier
Kelly
Knox
Lloyd
Long, La.
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Meader
Milliken
O'Brien, Ill.
Passman
Pilcher
Powell
Randall
Rodino
St. Onge
Schwengel
Shelley
Shipley
Shriver
Steed
Teague, Tex.
Tollefson
Trimble
Wilson, Bob

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. On this rollcall 375 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LIBRARIES AND MEMORIALS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Libraries and Memorials of the Committee on House Administration be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The motion was agreed to.

IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 9140, with Mr. BOGGS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations presents for the consideration of the House this morning the public works appropriation bill. This bill was formerly known as the rivers and harbors bill and while it now covers many subjects it is still in the main a rivers and harbors bill.

The public works appropriation bill marshals and protects and utilizes the material resources of the Nation.

When our forefathers first settled here they found a new continent possessed of apparently inexhaustible resources of every character. It teemed with game. There were deer, elk, buffalo, bear, and every species of game—that seemed to increase more rapidly than it could be consumed. Apparently it was unlimited. For three generations, in some sections of the country for the first four generations, agriculture languished. Each family planted a small patch of corn and a few rows of tobacco but their principal subsistence was game. Today many species of game which then constituted the diet of the average family is extinct. It is gone never to return.

Also, when they first saw the countryside it was covered with vast forests of trees from 100 to 200 years old. They averaged about a yard in diameter. In my immediate neighborhood there was one tree which was so large that when a horseman rode up on the stump, there was room for him to turn the horse around. This timber was rolled up into great heaps and burned. It was for the time being merely an encumbrance upon the land. But those who make accurate estimates tell us that if those logs were available today they would exceed in commercial value the value of the entire farm from which it was cut, with all its modern farm improvements.

In the great northern forests was the Minnesota white pine, the most valuable, the most easily worked, the most durable wood known to the builder. With the coming of newly invented saws they were slaughtered and floated down the Mississippi River and sold to anyone for little more than the cost of transportation. Today you can rarely secure a single stick of Minnesota pine. It has been almost completely obliterated.

There were throughout the continent vast deposits of every mineral, from coal to gold, most of which have now been exploited and many of which have been almost completely exhausted. We wasted in irresponsible and utter profligacy vast resources of every character.

But there was one resource which it took us 200 years to appreciate. When the settlers came here there were thousands of rivulets and hundreds of rivers carrying clear, pure, water to the sea. If you had told anyone that the day would come when somebody would want a drink of pure water they would have laughed at you. But, Mr. Chairman, as incredible as it is—and the statement is corroborated by official statistics—more than one-fourth of the cities of the United States are today faced with pressing problems dealing with an adequate water supply. Many of them cannot secure sufficient water to supply the daily needs of the city, and almost all who are able to secure water find it so polluted that it has to be processed before it is potable. There are cities in the United States today using water twice. After using it once, they must process it and use it a second time.

So it is evident, Mr. Chairman, that of all these vast and boundless resources which we have been wasting and dissipating, water is perhaps the most valuable.

This bill seeks to provide for the conservation, preservation and utilization of soil and water facilities.

Not only are we in need of water for domestic consumption, but in this country the development of industry has changed concepts of transportation. In the early days, civilization came up the rivers on steamboats. Everywhere the ubiquitous steamboat steamed up the river to the most remote sections of the country ,carrying commerce and civilization with it. But there came a time when to our great pride, our railroads drove out the steamboats. Our railroads practically obliterated water traffic. Now we are beginning to realize again as Europe long ago demonstrated, that water transportation is the cheapest and most practical transportation available for heavy commodities. We are today under the necessity, under the pressure of modern industrial conditions, of again providing and utilizing water transportation.

On the Mississippi River, for example, my grandfather told me he remembered when there was no time during the day when you could not either see a boat or hear the deep mellow whistle of one boat miles away on the river.

The boats had carried all traffic. They carried both passenger and freight. But when the railroads came in the rivers were completely abandoned.

However, during the last war when large quantities of commodities had to be moved and cheap transportation was important, we tried the experiment of installing Government barges on the Mississippi. It has gradually spread to other areas and while we thought it was merely a wartime measure involving an expense that could not be justified in time of peace, we discovered that barge transportation was the most convenient, most economical, and the most commodious method of transporting heavy products—oil, coal, ore, building materials and other such bulk freight and cargo.

We are steadily increasing every year the tonnage of transportation on every river in the country. I speak of the Mississippi River particularly because I live on the banks of the Mississippi and the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers are today furnishing barge transportation at so low a cost that it is doing as much to serve the interests of modern American industry as any other single factor.

So, Mr. Chairman, in this bill we propose to solve, and we are solving this pressing industrial problem. We are preserving and conserving water, the most priceless commodity of the day—liquid gold and we are encouraging water transportation and uniting and consolidating our industrial system until today it matches the water traffic of any country in the world.

Mr. Chairman, this bill may not be and, of course, is not a perfect bill, but it is making an invaluable contribution, to our times and to our national needs.

The individual municipalities and the river and harbor projects cannot meet their needs without Federal cooperation. This bill is evidence that the American republic has not only the means of providing these essentials under modern day conditions but that it has the wisdom and will and the determination and is encouraging progress that will make the United States the most prosperous nation in the world.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, if you look above the Speaker's chair, up close to the ceiling you will see a plaque on which these words are chiseled:

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.
>
> Daniel Webster.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, it is on that basis that this Subcommittee on Public Works of the Committee on Appropriations operates year in and year out. This bill has, of course, been erroneously called the pork barrel bill. Let me say this: Every American living today should be grateful for the projects which this Congress has instituted to preserve and conserve our precious resource—Mother Earth. Were it not for the money which has been appropriated and spent for these projects, especially over the past 30 years, this Nation would be a network of gullies, as it was before the Soil Conservation Service and the Army engineers were directed by the Congress to do something about the destruction of our great natural resource—Mother Earth.

I am sure that those who have traveled in foreign lands will agree with me that had those nations that now suffer hunger, strife, and internal unrest, taken care of their lands as we have and as the Western European nations have over the past many years, then those nations today would not be suffering every kind of discomfort that one could imagine. But they forgot or the great, powerful, ruthless land barons forgot or did not care about the long range consequences if their land washed away, eroded away, or blew away, because they had a few million more acres that they could put into production. So what was the difference?

Mr. Chairman, I make no apology for the part that I have played in appropriating funds for the preservation and the conservation of our natural resources.

My friends, about 65 percent of the money which is contained in this bill for the U.S. Army Engineers is either solely for the control of floods or is for multipurpose projects that include the control of floods—floods which in the past have wreaked havoc in every section of our land and destroyed property by the billions of dollars, as well as taken many, many lives.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

So, here today, we are asking the American people to spend a part of their tax dollars—and a rather small part of their tax dollars—to continue this wonderful program of conserving our priceless natural resources.

Mr. Chairman, I shall insert along with my remarks the amounts which are included in this bill with appropriate comparisons with what the administration requested.

The statistics referred to follow:

Activity	Budget estimate 1964 (as amended)	Recommended by the committee	Change from budget estimate
Cemeterial expenses	$10,846,000	$10,800,000	−$46,000
Rivers and harbors and flood control	1,086,816,000	1,055,782,700	−31,033,300
The Panama Canal	33,715,000	31,500,000	−2,215,000
Bureau of Reclamation	370,347,000	348,146,700	−22,200,300
Power agencies of the Department of Interior	76,075,000	54,700,000	−21,375,000
Atomic Energy Commission	2,849,645,000	2,688,169,000	−161,476,000
Tennessee Valley Authority	48,284,000	46,000,000	−2,284,000
Delaware River Basin Commission	156,000	155,000	−1,000
Public works acceleration	45,000,000		−45,000,000
Indefinite appropriations	40,863,000	40,863,000	
Total	4,561,747,000	4,276,116,400	−285,630,600

This bill carries an amount which is $1,258,586,210 below the 1963 fiscal year appropriations. However, $850 million of that amount is attributable to the fact that there is no public works acceleration money in this bill for fiscal 1964 as there was in fiscal 1963. Nonetheless, this bill comes to the floor of the House today under the 1963 appropriations even after adjusting for this nonrecurring item, and it is under the budget in an amount of $285,630,600.

Mr. Chairman, in this bill is $2,688,169,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission. I might say that it is rather difficult for the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations to analyze and determine just how much money should be appropriated to that great and important agency. But I say to the Members of the House that we worked diligently and we had long hearings, after which we marked up the bill, and you will find that as far as the items in the bill for the Atomic Energy Commission are concerned they are a total of $161,476,000 below the budget.

Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, I am proud to have been a party here in Congress, along with my abie colleagues on the committee, in seeing to it that our natural resources are conserved, preserved, and protected. We have many thousands of small watersheds in this great big country of ours. We have about a dozen main streams, main river valleys, and into those great rivers run thousands of tributaries. Mr. Chairman, it has been necessary, in order to stop floods, to build many dams on the upper reaches of those tributaries in order to hold the water as near as possible to the spot where the raindrops fall. That program has not only conserved our soil but it has conserved our water, which is so important.

Most every section of this country today is having a water problem. Most every city is having a water problem. Many small towns are experiencing a very serious water problem. So it is our responsibility, the responsibility of the Congress of the United States, to see to it that none of the rain that falls from heaven runs off the land and into the sea without helping to meet our many needs for water.

We cannot stop every drop, but we have in the past 30 years stopped most of the water that should have been stopped near the land on which it fell. By so doing we have raised the water table underground and we have made the water more valuable and more plentiful for human consumption, for animal consumption, for industry, and for irrigation.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to leave this thought with you. As I have said on many occasions, I am sure that when God made the heavens He made them perfect in every detail. But He left the earth imperfect in most every detail. He had a reason for that. Had He not done so human beings would have perished long ago because they would have become drones with never a wish to improve their lives, like the drone in the beehive. He is finally destroyed because he is not worthy of his keep.

So, Mr. Chairman, when we talk about irrigation, small watershed projects, and flood control we have a name for that. We call it reclamation—reclaiming land that has been destroyed or ruined and in addition we are preventing the destruction of additional land. Like the rest of man's work, the bill is not perfect but it is a good bill and it will continue to improve our programs of reclamation and conservation, and the protection of life and property from devastating floods.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the ranking majority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, it is only recently, after over 185 years as a nation, that we have really come to appreciate the importance of our water resources and the urgency of taking concerted action to provide an adequate water supply for domestic and industrial purposes.

An interesting sign of the times is in nearby Virginia where they are building a town which is going to house 75,000 people when finished. The first thing they are building there is a reservoir to catch the water runoff to assure an adequate supply of water. This has greatly enhanced the value of this land.

It is the first time, I repeat, in the history of this Nation that we are on the right track in our reclamation efforts. I remember as a boy on the Susquehanna River they ran steamboats between Harrisburg and Wilkes-Barre, Pa., a distance of 100 miles. Today you could not run a canoe up that river. That shows the destruction we have had over the years.

During this past year the steel plants in Youngstown have been producing at only about 52-percent capacity, yet they were nearly out of water. And this problem of water shortage faces much of our Nation.

So the committee felt fully justified in adding 30 unbudgeted studies, 17 new planning items, and 18 new construction starts. Including the budgeted items, the bill makes provision for a total of 54 new studies, 53 new planning items, and 51 new construction starts.

I regret that it was not possible, of course, to make provision for all the unbudgeted items that were requested of the committee. About 350 Members of this Congress made requests of our committee to either raise a budget item or include an unbudgeted item. I think this is the best evidence of the need that exists today for water resource development in our country. Every one of these projects will pay back far more in benefits than they cost. Yet you often hear opposition to, and criticism of, these projects from some who claim they are not needed and are a waste of the taxpayers' money.

There is $411.7 million in this bill for the Bureau of Reclamation and the power agencies. Roosevelt is considered one of the greats in conservation. In 1902 he saved the 17 Western States from the robbing and looting that had destroyed many of the great resources of the East. He saved the 17 Western States. But all the money that was spent on reclamation from 1902 to 1932 was about $300 million. He saved them, but adequate money was not provided down through the years. But we now have spent billions since 1932 reclaiming this country, and I mean reclaiming it.

I repeat, as a boy I saw them set fire to the Pocono Mountains, burning trees that it took 200 years to grow.

Let me call your attention to something. Life magazine, that has several million subscribers, calls this the "pork barrel" bill. I only wish they would publish the true facts about the value of these projects. Since 1902 we have appropriated about $4.4 billion for reclamation. Ninety-two percent of this is being repaid to the Government, and the tax revenues from farmers and businesses in reclamation areas now total $5.1 billion—more than the total cost of all the reclamation projects that have ever been built. In 1962, $1.2 billion worth of choice crops were produced and for every worker on an irrigated farm, two additional jobs are generated in the local towns. And yet a magazine like Life comes out and calls it "pork."

Public works appropriations have saved billions and billions of dollars for this Nation by the development of the waterways for low-cost transportation and flood control down through the years. If it were not for these appropriations, what we would have done to the greatest country in the world, and I mean the greatest—America.

I repeat, we invested $4.4 billion in the past 61 years in reclamation projects and the tax revenues that were generated now total $5.1 billion. Can any man or woman on this floor name a bank, business, utility, or anything in the world that has that record? Yet when the bill comes in you find many people talking about it as a waste of money.

I would like to quote from a letter written by a Yakima farmer which appeared in an editorial of a Wenatchee, Wash., paper:

> Wakened at 5 o'clock by an alarm clock from Connecticut, I take the milk pails (Pennsylvania tin) and wend my way to the barn, while the wife prepares breakfast on a range from Kalamazoo, Mich. The breakfast, likely as not, will consist of grapefruit from Florida, breakfast food from Minneapolis, bacon from Omaha or Cedar Rapids, Iowa, served on table china from Ohio or New Jersey, silverware from New York, sugar from Louisiana, etc.
>
> I go out to spray the orchard, using lead arsenate from Missouri, sulfur from Texas or Louisiana. My spray rig is made in Michigan, the tractor in Wisconsin.
>
> When I go to town it is in a car from Indiana and Detroit, with tires from Ohio, Bakelite for accessories from New Hampshire. My car insurance goes to Baltimore, life insurance to Des Moines and Omaha, fire to Hartford, Conn. Shoes for myself and family come from Boston and St. Louis, clothing from New York or Chicago, cotton goods from Georgia, South Carolina, or Mississippi.

And when he finally goes to the great beyond, he tells you, there will be a marker on his grave of Vermont granite that is sent all the way out to the West Coast.

So the whole Nation benefits from these projects, not just the locality. Yet we hear some say, "Oh, do not spend all that money—the budget just cannot stand it and the Treasury cannot stand it."

In every way that you can think of, for every dollar that is spent, it comes back 100-fold.

I spent about 10 years bumming all over this country—and I mean bumming over it and not riding the pullman cars although I might have been on top of the pullman car or under it. What I am trying to tell you now is that I have seen America like very few people have seen it, and there were times I got more education around a hobo jungle campfire at night when we got to talking about America than I have gotten on the floor of this Congress. Now I mean that sincerely. The group that I traveled with really saw and knew America.

A short time ago I said, and I say it again, that before issuing a passport to anybody to go abroad, I would question them as to how much they have seen of America and if the person had not seen a good part of it, he would have to pay a $200 penalty before he got his passport. If the people had a better understanding of our problems, we would be starting work on more of these projects that we are speaking about here today. I mean that. I have seen Europe several times since I came to the Congress and once before in 1917. But there is nothing in all of Europe put together to equal this country. If you see America, you will have no desire to go to Europe. That is why I am down in the well of the House here today. When the time comes to appropriate money for America, don't be haggling about it. Say a prayer, if you will tonight and make a fair confession that we have not been true to our country. I know that down through the years in the time that I have been in the Congress, I have been in favor of giving what they have asked for to this country. I hope on this bill, as it moves along, we will not find any Member of the Congress here trying to put in an amendment or to do this or to do that or hearing somebody say some unkind word. My only regret, as I have said many times, is that this bill, which is for the benefit of America, is not for $3 billion instead of only about $1.5 billion for rivers and harbors and reclamation. It should be $3 billion to try to make up for our abuse and the neglect of our country down through the years.

I hope when the time comes to vote on this bill for passage, that it will be passed here by the full membership of the House in the same way that it was reported out of the committee.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WESTLAND. First of all, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Ohio, as I seem to do annually, on the speech that he has just made and compliment him and the members of his committee on this bill. I thoroughly agree that all this money that is provided in this legislation is the best kind of investment that we can make. You will find me voting for this legislation.

I am sure the gentleman from Ohio knows the great interest that we in the West have in this matter of intertie for the transmission of electrical energy from Bonneville Power Administration down to the Southwest.

In the report this is referred to three different times, and I would like to make a record on this, if I can, with the gentleman from Ohio.

On page 54 you provide $5 million to be controlled by the Secretary of the Interior to begin construction of two extra high voltage lines—one that you say will connect with the California Power Pool and another one will be, I presume, a Federal intertie. But you restrict these funds to the passage of the bill, S. 1007, or some similar legislation.

I am sure the gentleman from Ohio is aware, and the Congress is aware, that this bill is presently in conference with some difficulties over an amendment that carries my name.

Is it the intention of the Committee on Appropriations to restrict these funds or the use of these funds until that conference is settled or until the differences are settled—or just what is the attitude?

Mr. KIRWAN. I think it is the consensus of the committee with respect to the Westland amendment that until the bill involved finally becomes law no funds are to be used for construction. That is why we put the restrictions in there. I think it would have been much better for us if legislation had been passed that way and we could have come to a clearer understanding on the subject. However, no money will be spent here on construction until S. 1007 or similar legislation becomes law.

Mr. WESTLAND. I want to thank the gentleman and his committee for having put in that language, because it certainly helps to work it out at this time.

There is one other question. On page 48 of the report you appropriate $2 million for the Bureau of Reclamation and you put the same type of restriction on that $2 million for the Bureau of Reclamation. Am I correct in that?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes; we put the same kind of restriction on that.

Mr. WESTLAND. In the third instance you apparently have $1.5 million for preliminary engineering—a program for the interconnections to the Pacific Southwest. Is it the gentleman's opinion that the use of these funds will likewise carry the same restrictions as the $2 million for the Bureau of Reclamation and the $5 million for Bonneville?

Mr. KIRWAN. The intent of our action on this whole question was to strengthen the hand of the Secretary of the Interior in his bargaining on these tielines to see that the U.S. Government is protected. And that is what we are all interested in.

Mr. WESTLAND. We are certainly interested in protecting the U.S. Government.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. KEOGH). The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I will yield the gentleman 2 minutes.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. Then, if I understand it correctly, this $1.5 million has no restrictions on its usage?

Mr. KIRWAN. It has no restrictions on it, as you say, except that it must be used for engineering on lines in the Bonneville area.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. The $1.5 million is restricted to the Northwest area for preliminary studies and engineering. This is the purpose for which it was budgeted.

Mr. WESTLAND. It does not say that, and I am very much interested in it.

Mr. EVINS. It is pointed out on page 887 of volume 3 of the hearings.

Mr. WESTLAND. I am glad to get that information. Do I understand that this money could not be spent outside the Pacific Northwest?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is correct.

Mr. WESTLAND. Thank you very much.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I wish to ask some questions following along the questions of the gentleman from Washington in order to be sure I understand what is meant by the Northwest area. Do I understand this will be confined, then, to the States of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes. The Northwest territory.

Mr. ASPINALL. I wish to thank the gentleman for that explanation, and may I commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN]. I think he is one of the great Americans of all time and one of the greatest Americans at least of this era in his desire to see that our own domestic natural resource values are properly conserved, developed, and harvested. His contribution to the life of America will live for a long, long time. I thank him sincerely.

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for those kind remarks.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GUBSER. I would certainly like to join in what the gentleman from Washington and the gentleman from Colorado said about the fine, fair work that was done by the gentleman from Ohio. If he would permit me to, I would like to ask this question. Referring back to the $2 million for the California portion of the proposed intertie from the Northwest to the Southwest, should S. 1007 with the Westland amendment not become law, is it the gentleman's opinion that the $2 million could be spent for the construction of an intertie in that situation?

Mr. KIRWAN. The prohibition is that no construction be started until S. 1007 or similar legislation is enacted into law, with or without the Westland amendment. Should the Westland amendment survive in its present form, it would of course be controlling in the matter of construction outside the Bonneville area.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman for a very clearcut answer.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Ohio yield further?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I wish to commend the chairman of this great committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and his counterpart, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], and also the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] for not attempting to write legislation into an appropriation bill. It so happens that the particular matter which has been brought to the attention of this Committee at this time comes under the jurisdiction of the committee which I have the honor to chair. If we cannot get the authority, then, most certainly, this money should not be spent.

Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful for this approach to the question.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my commendation to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] for the constructive approach that he takes toward this type of public works and to further note the fact that the gentleman from Ohio considers this an investment in the future of America. I certainly concur with the gentleman in those expressions. In addition to that, I want to especially thank the gentleman from Ohio and the members of this committee, on behalf of the people of the congressional district which I have the honor to represent, for the consideration they have always given us with respect to the emergency problems that we have.

I want to take this opportunity publicly to thank the gentleman and the members of the committee very much for that consideration.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH].

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding to me. I shall not long impose upon the time of this body but I want to say that I heartily endorse this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to invite the committee's attention to the report that accompanies this bill, and specifically page 5 of that report. Under those items listed for the State of Illinois, there appears $250,000 for a comprehensive survey of the Wabash River Valley. I certainly commend the committee for the attention that they have given the Wabash Valley, but likewise I must express my disappointment with this amount indicated for the comprehensive survey. It is my understanding that the Corps of Engineers has stated that they have a capability to utilize $450,000 for the purpose of this survey. However, I am aware that both the Bureau of the Budget as well as the administration asked that $250,000 be granted. Therefore, admittedly the committee has allowed the total amount requested by the Bureau. I have just returned from the

Wabash Valley, where I spent two long and difficult days, visiting nearly every project that is under consideration in that watershed. May I say to my colleagues that there is so very much to be done in the field of water conservation and flood control in this area, that I feel concerned with the speed that we are attacking this problem. The overall problem cannot be resolved unless a comprehensive survey is completed, to determine the total utilization of the water resources of this, the greatest undeveloped valley in the world. A few months ago, nearly 200 members of the Wabash Valley Association came to Washington to make their plea for $1 million for this comprehensive study. This association, which is so acutely aware of the needs of the valley, expressed concern with the progress being made in the comprehensive survey. They felt and I do, that we must survey the overall problem, before we seek a cure. The Wabash Valley has suffered for many years from tremendous floods, need of channel approvement, levee construction to protect our farm lands and cities, and this year from inadequate reserves of water in the reservoir systems, to provide an adequate low flow level in the river. Lest the members of this committee might think we are lacking in gratitude, let me make it perfectly clear that we who live in and near the Wabash Valley are most aware of the efforts being made by our Government to correct this situation that has plagued us for years. But, Mr. Chairman, we had hoped that more money could be allowed to help us get along with this most necessary work in the valley. I hope that consideration can be given to the item that I have discussed, and that increased funds be allowed for this badly needed money.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Roudebush] and other members of the Wabash Valley of Illinois and Indiana concerning our interest in seeing the Wabash Valley project accelerated. We deeply appreciate the action of the committee in allowing the amount requested in the President's budget; however, we feel that the vital needs of the Wabash Valley Basin in Illinois and Indiana are so important that this comprehensive basin study should be speeded up as quickly as possible. Millions of dollars in property damage result from annual floods in the Wabash Valley; and, ironically enough, Mr. Chairman, we are experiencing a drought condition this time of year which clearly points up the need for the comprehensive study. We must find a way to harness our devastating floods and preserve this precious water at the proper locations during the low-water period. It is my intention to call this matter to the attention of the President, the Bureau of the Budget, and the other body with a hope that additional funds may be allowed in order that the millions residing in this river basin can have some assurance of protection and utilization of their natural resources. If the other body in their wisdom should allow additional funds, I am indeed hopeful my friends on the House Committee on Appropriations will see fit to agree to this item in conference. Mr. Chairman, we are urging the Army Corps of Engineers to establish a branch office somewhere in the Wabash Valley area, in order to give this great river basin the attention it requires if the above-stated objectives are met.

In closing, let me again express my appreciation to a great committee for bringing out a great bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Bray].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to second the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Roudebush]. We in the Wabash Valley are appreciative of the progress that is being made there and of the fact that the bill provides $250,000 for a comprehensive survey of the Wabash River Valley. At the same time we would like to point out that the Army Corps of Engineers can effectively utilize $450,000 for the survey in this fiscal year.

I am aware that the President's budget requested only $250,000, and the committee has endorsed this figure. However, the need for this survey is urgent, and I believe we would be well advised to consider the urgency of the need.

This river valley has for years been subjected to recurrent floods. This year much of the area has suffered from an extended drought, and the combination of these natural disasters points up again the tremendous opportunity for effective water control.

Mr. Chairman, delaying completion of this survey on the Wabash River would be wasteful. True economy requires that these surveys be completed as quickly as possible so that sound plans can be based on them.

We in the Wabash Valley are proud of its role in the economy, but feel some frustration in knowing that its great resources are not being fully utilized.

We are anxious to see such things as the creation of recreation areas and a reexamination of the feasibility of making barge traffic possible.

Planning in these areas will not wait. It is obvious that new projects will be better designed if the comprehensive survey of the Wabash River is accomplished beforehand.

There are three main elements in a comprehensive river basin study. First, a determination of all needs for water and related land resources, both short term and longer term. Second, a determination of availability of water and related land resources. Third, a formulation of the best plan for applying the water assets against all of the water needs.

In short this comprehensive river basin study would seek to fully consider flood control, navigation, hydropower, irrigation, water supply, water quality control, recreation, and fish and wildlife. It seeks the best regulation of the water and land affected by it.

The need is truly urgent, and we seek urgent consideration of it so that this survey may be completed at the earliest practicable date.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to pay my highest compliments to every member of this committee. They are dedicated Members of Congress. They have worked long and diligently in bringing this bill to the floor of the House.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the clerks of our committee, Mr. Culp and Mr. Wilhelm. They really represent a team that brings us the information which we need. We certainly appreciate their wonderful assistance.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I might say that our good colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Milliken], a hard working member of this committee, is ill and so not present today. However, I am happy to report that he is coming along fine and will be back in the House soon.

I, as you know, have with me today on the minority side the gentleman from New York [Mr. Pillion] and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Rhodes], who have worked side by side with me and with the other members of the committee in bringing this bill to the floor, a bill which we can support wholeheartedly.

There are a few things in this bill that I would have changed had I had my way. But, you know, I do not always have my way, and that is as it should be.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. Don H. Clausen].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I, too, want to commend and thank the committee for giving the consideration to my requests in the district which I have the honor to represent.

I am certain the members of the committee recognize the many flood control problems and navigation projects that need attention in my district. The geographic location, terrain, and weather, heavy winter rains, in particular, make the area I represent somewhat unique by comparison. Approximately 40 percent of the water resources of the State of California have their origin in the north coastal counties that comprise the First District of California. I mention this to illustrate the flood control and watershed development consideration facing us now and in the future.

The members of the Appropriations Committee have been most considerate of my requests, when I have contacted you individually and particularly during my presentation before your committee. In view of the budget deficit problem facing the Congress, I believe the committee has done an outstanding job in presenting this bill to the full House.

There is one project in my district that was not included, however, that I would like to bring to the attention of the committee—the Corte Madera Creek flood control problem in Marin County. This project was not included in the President's budget and I can understand the committee's hesitancy in breaking policy to consider individual projects. However, I think it is incumbent upon me to advise the members of changing circumstances relating to projects as they arise. The Corte Madera Creek flows near the campus of the College of Marin in Marin County. The president of the college came to my office here in Washington recently to advise of plans for expansion of facilities on their campus. At that time, he clearly defined the flood problems as they relate to his expansion plans and the restrictions placed upon them unless corrective action is taken at an early date.

Therefore, I should like to advise the committee that I plan to present my case again before the Senate subcommittee asking favorable consideration of this request and if successful, I will then ask the House conferees to sustain my request. The amount is comparatively small but the timing is of utmost importance in order to properly initiate the funding of this all-important project. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding to me.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask at this time that I might be permitted to direct a question to my good friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]; but, first, I would like to say that I, representing the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Washington, must preface any remarks I make by joining with the gentleman in his high praise and commendation of this committee.

We have been treated very well, in a continuing and an orderly development of many important projects which are in my part of the Northwest in this bill, as usual, and I too know how hard this committee works and what a capable job it has done.

However, Mr. Chairman, I am deeply disturbed that the public works appropriations bill before us today does not contain funds with which to maintain the orderly construction schedule on the Columbia Basin project in the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Washington.

The requested funds of $3.9 million, as scheduled, would be just enough to bring construction on this half-completed project to a virtual standstill. It is the lowest appropriation in my memory.

I think my colleagues should know that when the administration's budget was prepared for submission to the Congress, the new amendatory repayment contracts with the three irrigation districts had not yet been signed. However, in ensuing weeks and months the contracts were not only signed, but were validated by the courts, thus removing the valid reasoning of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bureau of the Budget for not recommending an additional $1.7 million for construction and operation and maintenance to keep the project going on an orderly basis.

The construction on the Columbia Basin project has been facing a slowdown for several years while the amendatory repayment contracts were being negotiated. This was only natural. The Federal Government wanted assurances from the project settlers that the Federal investment would be paid before obligating further construction. Now, however, that assurance has been given. The farmers have obligated themselves into the future and have expressed their faith in themselves and the project. The bill before us today, however, says in effect: We in the Government have no faith in you.

My good friend and colleague from Iowa, the ranking minority member of the committee, is well aware of the good faith efforts carried out by the Columbia Basin project settlers. In committee testimony my distinguished colleague has said many times, in effect, that as soon as these contracts were signed and finalized the project should go forward in an orderly manner.

I know my colleague is concerned, as I am, that the funds to do this are not in the bill.

I wondered if the distinguished gentleman from Iowa would care to comment on this situation?

Mr. JENSEN. I am pleased that the gentlewoman has brought this to the attention of the committee today. I know of her constant interest in this project and especially the part that the gentlewoman has talked about.

The fact of the matter is the homesteaders who homesteaded there in the Columbia River Basin, most of them veterans, bit off a larger chunk than they could chew at the outset. Finally the contract with the Bureau and the veterans was by necessity amended to make it possible for them to keep their land.

Last spring all contracts were negotiated and completed, but I must say it was after the budget was sent to the Congress. I do think it is quite strange that after those contracts were all negotiated, before the markup by this committee of the pending bill, the Bureau did not so inform the committee and make a request that these funds be included in this bill. But they did not see fit to do so. I think I know why. I am afraid there is a little politics mixed up in this thing. That is as far as I want to go on that. However, I am sure the Senate will include the funds that are required in order to comply with the contracts made in good faith by those people that are on that land and who have signed all of these contracts with Uncle Sam in good faith.

Mrs. MAY. I thank the gentleman. Regardless of the reason for the delay in the request of this money, I hope the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bureau of the Budget will see fit to make the request when the bill goes to the Senate and that the House Members when they understand the situation will give earnest consideration to supporting the restoration of this fund to the Columbia River development program.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. It there objection to request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, at almost this precise moment 100 years ago, President Lincoln arose from a sofa on a temporary stand erected at Gettysburg Battlefield, fixed a pair of iron-rimmed spectacles on his nose and read briefly from handwritten notes.

His words were set down carefully in advance. They reflected his somber thoughts on the conflict then drawing to a close and his high hopes that the conflict might contribute to a new birth of freedom and, to the permanence of self-government.

It is now regarded as one of the greatest speeches ever presented, certainly the greatest ever uttered by an American.

It is appropriate that the House of Representatives pause for a moment in today's deliberations, and join in spirit, fellowship, and reflection with those gathered this very moment at the same place in Gettysburg where Lincoln spoke a century ago.

Today, at this very hour, an assemblage is attending a commemorative program at which General Eisenhower is the main speaker. It dedicates anew the battlefield cemetery, and it renews our appreciation for words as well as deeds. The words Lincoln spoke at Gettysburg have become a mighty force throughout the world, serving the cause of human dignity and freedom and peace. Although totally different from the deeds performed by the brave men in blue and gray at the battlefield, they are strikingly similar in the impressive way they have influenced history.

Several of us had hoped that it would be possible to recess from legislative business today, so that all Members could have had the opportunity to be present at Gettysburg. Certainly, this would have been an appropriate gesture. Lincoln once served in this body, and to this body he looked for guidance, support and leadership during the difficult days of the Civil War.

But the legislative schedule could not be altered in time, and perhaps it is also appropriate that we stay on the job. Mr. Lincoln was a great one for wanting to get on with the work at hand. Beginning with his service in the Illinois Legislature, he believed in public improvements and worked for them. He would approve, I believe, the task we undertake today.

As the representative of part of the area once represented in this body by Mr. Lincoln, a district which also includes the Lincoln home in Springfield, Ill., I appreciate your indulgence on this significant occasion.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE].

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, page 48 of the report contains the following restrictions on the Glen Elder project in Kansas:

> None of the funds provided for the Glen Elder project are to be used to purchase in fee above the normal maximum reservoir water level, for fish and wildlife purposes.

On page 431 of part 3 the hearings before the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee there is a discussion on the Glen Elder project relative to the taking of lands in fee, in excess of those under the usual acquisition policy, such excess to be used for fish and wildlife purposes. It was indicated that the Bureau of Reclamation contemplates increasing the amount of land to be purchased in fee by 9,137 acres with this increase to be used for fish and wildlife purposes and in fact the increase is 13,527 acres over the original plan. Under unanimous consent, I include at this point the discussion on fish and wildlife costs from pages 431 and 432 of the hearings:

Fish and Wildlife Costs

Mr. Evins. Do you know what the fish and wildlife costs will be in this project?

Mr. Palmer. The fish and wildlife costs here, the $1,696,000——

Mr. Evins. How much land will be acquired for this purpose only? We are talking about how much land will be acquired for this purpose.

Mr. Stamm. I have some figures here, Mr. Chairman, which may answer that.

In the definite plan report prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation, under usual acquisition policy, we would have acquired 24,500 acres in fee and would have taken easements on 12,600 acres for a total of 37,000.

If we acquire additional lands for fish and wildlife purposes, we would increase the fee taking from 24,500 to 33,700 acres. That is an increase of 9,167 acres, and we would decrease the acreage on which we would have taken easement to 7,400 from 12,000-plus, a decrease of a little over 5,000.

The difference in cost by taking additional land in fee rather than easement would increase the cost by $2,125,000.

Mr. Evins. What justification is there for acquiring this land for this purpose in this area at this time?

Mr. Palmer. Here again we look to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to advise us under the provisions of the Wildlife Coordination Act.

In an amendment recently signed by the Secretary to the overall acquisition policy, each individual agency is held fully accountable for defending whatever land they want bought over and above the land that is required for the normal operation of the project.

Mr. Pillion. Am I to understand now that there is practically no restriction upon these projects in acquiring 30,000 to 40,000 acres of land here for supposed fish and wildlife?

Mr. Palmer. The 30,000 or 40,000 acres you speak about, sir, are the total acreage involved. That figure includes land to be inundated by the reservoir.

Mr. Dominy. Nine thousand, one hundred and sixty-seven acres is where fee would be taken for fish and wildlife purposes.

Mr. Pillion. Could you make that 20,000 or 30,000 and put it in here?

Mr. Dominy. Under the authorizing legislation if the findings of fact could be certified to as to demonstrated fish and wildlife benefits; yes.

Mr. Pillion. You take 10,000 acres and decide suddenly that someone down there is interested in building up this empire. He decides you want 20,000 acres for ducks.

Would that come under fish and wildlife or recreation?

Mr. Dominy. Fish and wildlife.

Mr. Palmer. The determination of the land which would be required for wildlife purposes would come under that agency, Fish and Wildlife, and not Reclamation.

Mr. Pillion. Not recreation?

Mr. Palmer. We have no authority there. The only authority with this is the Congress itself.

Even this $100,000 shown here for recreation, absent some specific and substantive act of Congress, would have to be paid back by power and project users. There is no recreational authorization in this project.

Mr. Pillion. How did the $100,000 get here? Is there authority for this?

Mr. Palmer. These would be specific costs to protect the health and safety of the public and to protect the project works.

Mr. Pillion. This is recreation, $100,000. Is there authority in the legislation to put this in and to charge $100,000 for this project?

Mr. Palmer. We think so; yes, sir.

Mr. Dominy. To allocate it.

Repayment would still have to come from the irrigation and power users, however.

Mr. Pillion. You have a right to allocate it and put it here as part of the cost?

Mr. Dominy. To the extent that the expenditure is actually made for recreation.

We cannot allocate this to the joint cost for recreation. If we spend $100,000 for that purpose specifically we allocate it to recreation.

As I understand this restriction in the report, it will prevent the taking of any land in fee for fish and wildlife purposes on the Glen Elder project. Am I right in this interpretation of the report, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is right.

Mr. DOLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and let me point out, as I did before during subcommittee hearings on June 10, 1963, that consideration of fish and wildlife resource planning involves an increase in lands to be acquired in fee title by 13,527 acres; however, 7,465 acres of these lands would have been covered by flowage or construction easements. I am opposed to fee title acquisition of any additional acreage. I appreciate inclusion of the language on page 48 of the report accompanying H.R. 9140. This language will save approximately $3 million and permit the acreage to remain on the local tax rolls.

ALMENA UNIT, NORTON COUNTY, KANS.

Also, on page 48 I note a reduction of $1,597,000 made in the budget estimate of $5,580,000 in the Almena unit. The committee action deletes funds programed for irrigation features on the Missouri River Basin project, though the report indicates construction funds were provided for beginning construction of the irrigation features in the appropriation bill for fiscal 1963. Deletion of these funds comes as a surprise to those interested in the Almena irrigation unit, and while recognizing the cost per acre is high, it has been called to my attention the cost is apparently no higher now than when this phase of the project was initially programed. Information related to me today indicates many farmers in the unit have proceeded on the basis irrigation facilities would be constructed. It has also been called to my attention that the acreage involved is small, less than 6,000 acres, hence the cost per acre would not set a precedent for future irrigation projects.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Andrews], a member of the committee.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the committee saw fit to remove the funds from the budget request for the Walter F. George lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. These funds have been recommended by the Corps of Engineers, the Department of the Interior, and the Bureau of the Budget for the purpose of acquiring additional lands at the project. The new lands, together with a larger acreage of project lands already acquired by the corps, would be utilized as a national wildlife refuge for the conservation and welfare of migratory waterfowl, a Federal responsibility under international treaties. There is strong local support for the purchase—for public purposes—among the people of both Alabama and Georgia. There is strong national support among the conservationists of the Nation.

This use of such project lands, acquired by the corps along with land for other project purposes, is contemplated by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, as amended by the Congress in 1958. Also, the acquisition of additional lands by the Corps of Engineers for this purpose was specifically authorized as an integral part of the Walter F. George project by the River and Harbor Act of 1962—Public Law 87–874.

There is ample precedent for this approval by the Congress. In the Public Works Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1962, the Congress appropriated funds to the Corps of Engineers for exactly the same purpose. This was for additional lands, and interest in lands at the Jackson lock and dam project on the Tombigbee River. Those additional lands have since been purchased, and, together with project lands previously acquired, now comprise the Choctaw National Wildlife Refuge.

Also there has been a recent and important change in the policy of the administration on this point. With letters to the Speaker and the Vice President of November 2, 1963, the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget submitted proposed legislation to govern incorporation of recreation and fish and wildlife conservation in water resources projects. Among other things, the letter and the proposed legislation give approval to the expenditure of water project funds "for land acquisition to accomplish the Federal Government's obligations to conserve and protect migratory waterfowl. These expenditures are in addition to those made from the Migratory Bird

Conservation Fund for migratory waterfowl refuges."

I sincerely hope these needed funds for the Walter F. George project will be restored to the bill before congressional action on it is completed.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], a member of the committee.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, public works have made America strong and great. They have provided the sinews of much of our national strength.

Before going into a discussion of some of the details of this bill, I think it is appropriate that we reflect upon some of the great federally sponsored projects of the past. These include:

The Panama Canal.

The Hoover Dam with its vast production of power.

Grand Coulee Dam that vibrates the walkway as you cross the Columbia River.

The St. Lawrence Seaway that was fought so bitterly for so long but which has brought commerce into the Great Lakes and into the heart of the Midwest.

Then I cite the Tennessee Valley Authority in my own country, which has brought us out of poverty and erosion into power and prosperity. Its achievements have won world recognition in the development and control of a whole watershed.

We have built massive dams in the Northwest to harness power and prevent floods.

We have built levees along the mighty Mississippi.

We have cleared river channels.

We have dredged harbors. We have developed America.

I ask, Mr. Chairman, how better could these Federal funds have been spent, for all of the projects I have enumerated? For the benefit of all the people of America?

This mighty Nation can well afford to invest in itself in the development of its vast natural resources.

The bill to which I address myself today has been carefully screened.

We have attempted to fit the foot to the boot of what we can afford in view of our overall fiscal obligations.

This bill—the public works appropriations bill for 1964—is one of the most important of the annual appropriation bills coming before the Congress. The bill provides for the continued development of our Nation's resources—for the overall growth and strengthening of the United States.

Appropriations included in this bill will provide funds for the civil works functions of the Corps of Engineers; the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of Interior; the Atomic Energy Commission; the Tennessee Valley Authority; the Panama Canal; the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation; the several public power agencies, including the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration; and various water resources and study commissions.

Our committee has received thousands of pages of testimony—six volumes of hearings—from the various agency heads and their assistants and from State and local public officials, from Members of Congress and from interested citizens in connection with the projects included in this bill. The committee has done a monumental job of analyzing the requests for funds. I want to take advantage of this opportunity to pay tribute to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who also serves as chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. Chairman CANNON's great experience and broad knowledge in the public works field have been invaluable to the committee in analyzing and preparing this bill.

I deem it a great privilege to serve on this committee with the gentleman from Missouri and also with the other members of our committee, including the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MILLIKEN].

The two very able and knowledgeable members of our subcommittee staff, Carson Culp and Gene Wilhelm, also should be commended publicly for their valuable assistance throughout the hearings and in handling many of the details and much of the work on this bill.

This bill carries appropriations totaling $4,276,116,400—a reduction of $285,630,600 in the budget estimates from $4,561,747,000 and a decrease of $1,258,506,210 below appropriations for fiscal year 1963. This is a cut of 6.3 percent.

The budget request provides for 51 new construction starts by the Corps of Engineers and 8 new starts for the Bureau of Reclamation—a total of 59. Included in this our committee has added 17 additional new projects for the Corps of Engineers.

Funds are provided for 25 comprehensive river basin studies by the corps, of which 22 are continuations from last year and 3 are new starts.

In addition, the committee is recommending funds for 30 unbudgeted surveys and for the initiation of planning on 18 unbudgeted projects.

Funds are provided in this bill to continue 35 construction projects to completion and to complete 4 additional projects, having a total estimated project cost of $321 million.

The total amount of appropriations recommended in this bill is $1,457,163,000, for all programs of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation for 1964.

Certainly the appropriations provided in this bill represent a large sum of money, but the funds also represent a capital investment in America. This is an investment which will add overall strength to our country and bring our Nation vast benefits through the prevention of floods, through the reclamation of barren wastelands, through improved waterway systems, through increased use of our water resources, benefits of electricity, the promotion of navigation, and through the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes and for national defense.

Mr. Chairman, projects of the nature funded in this bill have recently come under heavy attack by certain national magazines and others as "pork barreling" which some insist should not be approved by the Congress.

These critics contend that these projects are a waste of money. I disagree wholeheartedly with their thesis. They are indeed investments—wise investments in America and a proper use of public funds.

This committee each year screens hundreds of projects and recommends appropriations only for the most worthwhile. As every Member knows, a great deal of screening and eliminating of projects goes on before the matter is brought before the Appropriations Committee. Legislation must be passed, authorizing each project, before we begin our consideration on the matter of funding the projects. After this is done, we give consideration to appropriations for only the most worthwhile projects and every project must have a favorable benefit-to-cost ratio. The primary purpose of this bill is to provide funds for approved great public works projects for our Nation. I repeat, these are investments in America.

Every region and every section of the Nation will share in the projects included in this bill. It is truly an all-American bill—a bill with a national purpose—one which recognizes the needs of every area of our country.

The benefits that accrue from these projects include flood control, navigation, the generation of electrical power, the prevention of erosion, and the like. However, there is an additional, very valuable benefit which will result from the projects funded in this bill—that of providing increased employment throughout the country. This is only a side effect, but an important additional benefit and one that will mean much to our country at this time and will have long-range benefit for the future.

Approved construction projects, I repeat, are in all sections and in all areas of the United States. Besides the major construction items enumerated, $18 million is carried in the bill for numerous small projects, totaling approximately 28 throughout the country.

About 71 percent of the requested appropriations will be applied to 50 major projects in amounts of $5 million or more each.

The following table gives a breakdown of the total number of projects approved by Congress over the years; the number of projects completed; the number of projects under construction; the amounts appropriated to date; and the amount needed to complete the projects:

TABLE A.—*Number and estimated cost of active authorized projects*

[In millions of dollars]

	Total projects authorized	Completed	Underway	Balance authorized	Total estimated cost	Balance to complete
Activity:						
Navigation	2,511	2,277	103	131	$6,165.4	$2,764.7
Flood control	907	484	164	259	6,848.0	3,359.0
Multiple purpose projects including power	76	29	30	17	6,930.4	2,657.1
Alteration of bridges	20	17	1	2	50.5	14.7
Beach erosion control	91	33	14	44	44.2	33.3
Total	3,605	2,840	312	453	20,038.5	8,828.8

Mr. Chairman, this table shows that for navigation a total of 2,511 projects have been authorized by Congress, and of this number 2,277 have been completed, 103 are presently underway, and 131 additional projects have been authorized. The total estimated cost is $6,165,400,000 with a balance of $2,764,700,000 needed to complete.

The same situation is shown for other types of projects authorized by the Congress for the Corps of Engineers.

For instance, 76 multiple-purpose projects—large projects, including power—have been authorized, 29 have been completed, and 30 are underway, with 17 representing the balance of the number authorized.

It is interesting to note that of the total of 3,605 projects of all types authorized by Congress for the Corps of Engineers, 2,840 have been completed and only 453 remain uncompleted—and only 312 under construction.

BEACH EROSION

Regarding the participation of the Federal Government in beach erosion control projects, the existing law provides for Federal payment of 50 percent of the cost of beach erosion control works for the protection of non-Federal publicly owned or publicly used shores and up to 70 percent of the cost of protection of State and other publicly owned shores.

LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECTS

Local protection projects consist of channel improvement levees and floodwalls, emergency bank protection, snagging, and clearing work on navigable streams in the interest of flood control.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For operation and maintenance for 1964 the bill carries appropriations of $150 million for all operation and maintenance programs of the Corps of Engineers throughout the United States.

This is a reduction of $7,368,000 from the 1964 estimates. We believe this reduction can be absorbed because of the time situation.

With these funds, operation and maintenance can be carried on on some 440 projects during next year.

IMPORTANT TENNESSEE PROJECTS

Among the great projects for which this bill provides funds to continue construction, and of particular interest in Tennessee are funds to continue construction of the Cordell Hull Dam, the Percy Priest Dam and the Barkley Dam—each named for our distinguished former colleagues.

The bill contains some $4.8 million to continue the construction which was begun this year on the Percy Priest Dam on Stones River near Murfreesboro, Tenn.

The bill also contains a total sum of $4.8 million for the continued construction of Cordell Hull Dam on Cumberland River near Carthage, Tenn. The $4.8 million total contains $3.1 million in construction funds for the dam and $1.7 million in funds for the addition of a navigation lock feature to the Cordell Hull Dam—a much-needed navigational feature for this project. The appropriations for the Percy Priest and Cordell Hull Dams will enable these projects to be carried well into the construction stage.

The bill also provides for $27 million for the continued construction of Barkley Dam near the Tennessee-Kentucky border—a valuable project which is now approximately 60 percent completed. The completion of the canal features of this project will tie the Cumberland and Tennessee Rivers together—a major engineering achievement—greatly lengthening the inland waterways of our country.

GENERAL EXPENSES OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS

For general expenses for the office of the Chief of Engineers, and offices of the division engineers; activities of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the work of the Beach Erosion Control Board, we are recommending $15 million.

FLOOD CONTROL—MISSISSIPPI RIVER

For flood control work on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, we are recommending $74,500,000.

These funds will provide for continuing work on the Mississippi River—for raising of 1,600 miles of existing levees along the main river, for enlarging or constructing 1,700 miles of levees on tributaries and side basins, and for channel improvement on the main river, for dredging of the main river to provide a navigation channel 12 feet deep and 300 feet wide from Baton Rouge, La. to Cairo, Ill.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The Bureau of Reclamation is charged by law with planning construction and operating facilities to irrigate lands, furnish domestic and industrial water supply, and develop hydroelectric power and flood control in the 17 western reclamation States, and Alaska and Hawaii.

Total appropriations recommended are $348,146,700—an increase of $5,459,100 over the appropriation for the preceding year, but a reduction of $22,200,300 from the budget estimates.

RECLAMATION FUND

Appropriations to the Bureau are made from the general fund and a special reclamation fund. The reclamation fund is largely derived from certain irrigation and power revenues; receipts from the sale, lease, and rental of public lands; and certain oil and mineral revenues.

Total receipts into the reclamation fund since the passage of the initial Reclamation Act is $1,876 million.

In other words, there have been payments into the reclamation fund from the receipts of sales, leases and rentals of approximately $2 billion.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For general investigation for the work of the Bureau of Reclamation for next year, we are recommending $9,894,000 of which $524,000 shall be for investigation of projects in Alaska.

The committee is recommending an appropriation of $180,190,000 for construction and rehabilitation work by the Bureau of Reclamation—of which amount $75 million shall be derived from the reclamation fund.

This appropriation will provide funding for construction of some 25 major projects throughout the 17 reclamation States. The committee is recommending $38 million for operation and maintenance of reclamation projects authorized by law. Operation and maintenance will be carried on on some 40 irrigation projects.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

For the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration and the Southeastern Power Administration, the committee is recommending a total of $53,400,000 for the work of these agencies. By way of breakdown, these funds include:

Four hundred and ninety-two million dollars for Bonneville, $1 million for Southeastern; and $4,500,000 for Southwestern.

The Bonneville Power Administration, Southwestern, and Southeastern Power Administration are power marketing agencies selling the power produced on projects in their areas to rural electric cooperatives, municipalities, industrial users and others.

The profits from the sale of power by each of these agencies go into the Federal Treasury.

Revenues from Bonneville Power Administration operations are estimated at $86,900,000 for 1964; revenue from Southeastern is estimated at $23,500,000 for next year; and revenue of Southwestern is estimated at $10,800,000—or a total of $121,200,000 in revenue for the U.S. Treasury from the profitable power operations of the Government—this for 1 year only.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The largest appropriations item included in this bill is for the programs of the Atomic Energy Commission. The budget estimates for AEC for 1964 are $2,423,500,000. The committee has approved a total of $2,308,169,000 or a cut and reduction of $115,331,000 from the budget estimates.

A breakdown of the cuts and reductions by various programs for AEC is included in the following table:

TABLE B.—*Public works appropriations, 1964*

Program	Budget estimate	Amount recommended	Reduction
Raw materials	$324, 843, 000	$320, 000, 000	−$4, 843, 000
Special nuclear materials	480, 471, 000	475, 000, 000	−5, 471, 000
Weapons	782, 969, 000	782, 969, 000	----------
Reactor development	530, 548, 000	497, 000, 000	−33, 548, 000
Physical research	219, 077, 000	192, 137, 000	−26, 940, 000
Biology and medicine	76, 973, 000	68, 645, 000	−8, 328, 000
Training, education, and information	17, 194, 000	14, 350, 000	−2, 844, 000
Isotopes development program	9, 260, 000	7, 860, 000	−1, 400, 000
Civilian applications of nuclear explosives	15, 100, 000	10, 000, 000	−5, 100, 000
Committee program	10, 081, 000	9, 331, 000	−750, 000
Program direction and administration	73, 415, 000	71, 560, 000	−1, 855, 000
Security investigation program	6, 950, 000	6, 950, 000	----------
Cost of work for others	6, 240, 000	6, 240, 000	----------
Change in selected resources	53, 242, 000	29, 000, 000	−24, 252, 000
Resources received from other sources	−32, 000, 000	−32, 000, 000	----------
Unobligated balance brought forward	−150, 873, 000	−150, 873, 000	----------
Total	2, 423, 500, 000	2, 308, 169, 000	−115, 331, 000

The committee has made no cuts in the weapons program for the Atomic Energy Commission. The largest reductions have been made in the reactor program and the research program for the Commission.

The Commission has been engaged in reactor development for a number of years and has by this time developed a number of feasible and workable reactors, and it is felt that the Commission should concentrate on the perfection of suitable and satisfactory reactors that have previously been developed.

The $3 million budgeted for assistance to private utilities for further work on power reactors has been denied.

It is the committee's opinion that continuation of this subsidy program is no longer necessary to stimulate utilities in entering the atomic reactor field.

Reductions have been made in other areas of the Atomic Energy Commission's activities, as the hearings developed that the Commission has been operating with large overruns in a number of their programs—particularly in selected resources and the purchase of needed raw materials.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The budget estimates for TVA as approved by the Bureau of the Budget for fiscal year 1964 included an appropriation request of $48 million for navigation, flood control, construction, and general administration.

There are no funds carried in the bill for TVA's power program. TVA's power operations are self-sustaining and self-liquidating; and as a profitable operation, returns are made into the Treasury.

TVA's construction request includes items other than power operations. These include construction of a lock at Guntersville Dam, Ala., rehabilitation of additional facilities at Wilson Dam, Ala., and completion of construction of the Melton Hill Dam and Reservoir near Oak Ridge, Tenn.

An amount of $4 million is included to begin construction of the Between the Lakes National Recreation Area in Kentucky and Tennessee.

Development of a new national park in the area, bounded on one side by TVA's Kentucky reservoir and on the other side by the Corps of Engineers' Barkley Lake—will mean a great new recreational area for our country and will be of particular benefit to the citizens living in the eastern section of our Nation.

This new resort area will have 300 miles of shore line and will offer outdoor recreational opportunities on a large scale. Since most of our national parks are in the West, this new development will mean much to citizens in the heavily populated eastern section of our country.

It is estimated that some 10 million Americans live within 200 miles of the new park area and that 70 million live within 500 miles of the Between the Lakes recreational development. The development is scheduled to be completed over a 5-year period with a total cost estimated to be $35 million.

TVA is the Nation's most profitable Government operation—not only from a dollars and cents point of view—of cash returns into the Treasury—but also from the point of view of strengthening our Nation. TVA is the world's greatest showcase of democracy in action.

I would like to point out at this time, Mr. Chairman, that TVA is a most beneficial and most profitable agency for the Federal Government. TVA is way ahead in its payments into the Treasury and last year returned out of power proceeds more than $48 million to the Federal Treasury. An up-to-date tabulation shows that in the 30-year TVA history this agency has paid back into the Treasury more than $438 million—almost one-half billion dollars.

Power savings cost—lower rates—to the Federal Government have amounted to an additional one-half billion dollars in power purchases by Government defense agencies over the past several years.

TVA thus represents a great service to the people of the seven-States area and also represents a great benefit to all the Nation.

CONCLUSION

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I repeat, this is a big bill, but a good bill—an all-American bill—providing for public works for all sections of the United States.

The projects have been carefully screened and projects with a satisfactory benefit-to-cost ratio have been approved.

The funds carried in this bill will build up America and help strengthen the security of our own country.

This bill should have the unanimous approval of the House and I urge its passage.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I will yield first to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] who previously asked me to yield.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise not only to compliment the committee for the splendid work they have done but also to thank them for the very careful and sympathetic attention they have given to the harbor of Charleston, S.C., where the only Polaris base is on earth, and to thank each of them for the additional funds they have directed to be spent on a study to prevent the continued silting in this important waterway.

The distinguished chairman has taken note of this before as well as the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] who was presiding over the subcommittee at the time the Army Engineers came to testify. I notice you have given $60,000 in addition to the $90,000 budgeted. Here is the reason among other things that I take the floor. The newspapers at home carried articles to the effect that the Army district engineer in Charleston said that they had sought an appropriation of $325,000. Evidently this never got past those who control the budget for the Engineers.

I notice you gave them more than was budgeted. So he is confused as to what he wanted and what his group sent to the budget. I want to ask the chairman this question. If this $150,000 does not complete and conclude the required investigation into the reasons for the silting in this waterway, would the committee give sympathetic attention to additional funds to conclude whatever study is necessary to complete this vital study?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is correct. I will say that we on the committee are glad to cooperate and collaborate with the distinguished chairman-designate of the great Committee on Armed Services on this as well as on all other occasions.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I do not know about being chairman, but I certainly thank you for what you have said.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BASS. I would like to take this time to pay tribute to my friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] who has just addressed the Committee on this bill. We in Tennessee are fortunate to have a man of Mr. EVIN's caliber and capability, and a man who is so diligent in his work, representing us on the Committee on Appropriations. I want him to know that we in Tennessee, and particularly the people in my district, appreciate the efforts he makes in our behalf.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I would like to pay tribute to the great chairman of the Committee on Appropriations who, over a period of years, has shown without any doubt his friendship and his loyalty to the people of my area. We are very proud of the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and we appreciate his interest. I want to commend him and pay tribute to him, as well as to the ranking minority members of this committee, for the good bill they have brought out this year.

Mr. CANNON. I share with the gentleman his warm appreciation of the services of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS]. He is one of the most invaluable and indefatigable members of our committee. Incidentally his delightful book on Congress is a must for every congressional library.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SECREST], such time as he may consume.

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the committee on an excellent bill, and I support it because I believe these improvements constitute wise expenditures of the taxpayers' money.

On May 23, 1963, in Crooksville, Ohio, I attended a public hearing conducted by Col. Harrington W. Cochran, district engineer for the Corps of Engineers in Huntington, W. Va. The hearing was called to determine the advisability of providing improvements of flood control and allied purposes along the Jonathan and Moxahala Creeks. I pointed out the desirability and the great need for this project.

On the 10th of June I appeared before the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee urging the appropriation of $35,000 for a preliminary survey of this project. I am happy that the committee approved this expenditure and that it is contained in the bill before us. I am sure it will result ultimately in great benefit to many communities in my district. These communities in the past have suffered greatly from recurring floods of these two creeks.

On the same day I urged approval of the program recommended in the budget for continued improvement of navigation on the Ohio River. I am happy that the committee has allocated the full amount requested; namely, $7 million for construction of the Belleville locks and dam, $9 million for construction of the Pike Island locks and dam, $1½ million for construction work on the Racine locks and dam, and $250,000 for planning on the Hannibal locks and dam.

These projects are of the greatest importance to the future industrial development of the Ohio Valley and my congressional district, especially to Monroe and Washington Counties that border on it.

I am extremely grateful to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the able chairman of the committee, who has done more to conserve our natural resources than perhaps any man in the history of our Nation, and to all the other members of the committee who have spent long weeks hearing testimony and preparing this appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] such time as he may require.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire at this time to yield to my distinguished colleague from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the committee for including in this bill the million dollars requested by President Kennedy for the Cross Florida Barge Canal. In my opinion, this is the most important item for Florida because it will not only help the State of Florida but the entire Nation. The project will connect the presently unconnected barge channels of the gulf and Mississippi Valley systems with those of the Atlantic Seaboard by a 12-foot by 150-foot lock barge canal across northern Florida from the St. Johns River near Palatka, to the Gulf of Mexico near Yankeetown. It will also mean there will be 2,460 miles of connected waterway uniting two great coastal areas and a bond of commerce from New Jersey to Mexico. There will be five locks with a mean summit pool elevation of 50 feet above sea level for lockage. The needed water will be supplied by pumping from lower levels, thus preventing drafts on the underground water storage. The locks will be at Inglis, Dunnellon, Silver Springs, Eureka, and St. Johns. The length of the canal will be approximately 107 miles and the time required for construction has been estimated at 6½ years. The time for construction can be greatly reduced if desirable. The total cost of the canal will be $157,900,000 with the Federal share being $145,500,000 and a non-Federal share of $12,400,000. Annual benefits from the project will be $8,256,000 and annual charges will be about $7,039,000. The project will have a benefit cost ratio of 1.17 to 1.00.

The Cross-Florida Barge Canal has been a dream since the time of Andrew Jackson. The present project for a high-level lock barge canal was authorized by the Congress in 1942. It was recognized in World War II that the Cross-Florida Barge Canal was a military necessity. During this war the loss in ships to German submarines, because there was no adequate interwaterway route through Florida, was estimated at a billion dollars. This did not include the much more precious loss of American lives and this total amount does not include the cost of cargo on the ships. For years the project has had a favorable economic justification, so it fits into the criteria for these great canal projects and by no stretch of the imagination can be considered a pork-barrel project. The principal benefits from the project will result from the saving in travel distance. For most traffic that will use the project, the saving in distance will be about 360 miles as compared to the 8-foot depth Okeechobee Waterway across south Florida and 610 miles as compared to the open-water route around Key West.

The Cross-Florida Barge Canal will be of particular benefit, Mr. Chairman, to the great district that I represent, the Eighth District of Florida. The canal will cross Levy and Putnam Counties in my district and will be of great economic help to St. Johns, Flagler, and Clay Counties, all in my congressional district. Again, let me say how grateful I am for the favorable consideration of the committee for our Cross-Florida Barge Canal and I hope now that construction can begin within the next several months and that the canal can be completed in the near future. I have requested the Corps of Engineers to make construction headquarters for the canal in Putnam County in my congressional district and I am hopeful that the initial construction work may be made at the Rodman Dam in the Putnam County area.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, on March 11 of this year, the Guyandotte River in southwestern West Virginia went on a rampage. Nearly every spring, the Guyandotte River floods. Flood stage is 20 feet, and this spring the river rose to 31.7 feet—11.7 feet over flood stage. Walls of water tore up houses from their foundations, buckling the floors, ruining bedding and furniture, turning people out into the streets. This was the worst flood that ever hit West Virginia.

On page 37 of the House committee report, is contained the following language:

> The committee has allowed $150,000 of the requested $300,000 for advance planning on the Justice Reservoir project. Within this amount such funds as may be necessary shall be used for a reevaluation of an alternate flood control plan limited to realinement and improvement of the river channel, with such minor retention structures as may be appropriate in connection with such a project. It is expected that a further public hearing will be held on the alternate project and that a report will be submitted to the committee.

Mr. Chairman, $150,000 is totally inadequate for the Corps of Engineers to proceed with advance planning on the Justice Reservoir. Under the authority of the continuing resolution, that sum has already been expended since the beginning of the 1964 fiscal year and the appropriation of only $150,000 would bring all planning to a screeching halt. There would not be a red cent to carry out the very reevaluation which the Appropriations Committee directs.

Now as far as reevaluation is concerned, and additional public hearings, there have been a great number of public hearings and evaluations conducted by the Corps of Engineers and the established committees of Congress since 1957. In 1962, the Congress after extensive public hearings authorized construction of the Justice Dam and Reservoir. The record of these public hearings is contained in the official documents of the Congress.

I cannot understand why the Congress would now reverse itself, and say "You must hold another hearing, another reevaluation" when the decision has clearly been made, and work on advance planning has started.

I have received thousands of letters from people who were driven from their homes last spring, and probably will continue to have their homes and businesses flooded. They have testified for the Justice Dam. They have seen Congress and its committees and the Corps of Engineers carefully weigh the opposition testimony. They have seen Congress and the Corps of Engineers come to a clear-cut conclusion. The people of West Virginia want to see the dirt fly; they are sick and tired of more filibustering on this subject.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that nothing would be gained by opening up this bill to amendment on the floor. I simply express the fervent hope that if and when the other body takes a different approach to this subject that the conference committee would consider voting the full $300,000 requested by the President in his budget, and then move forward with this project as the Congress has directed without any further delay. To do otherwise, Mr. Chairman, would be to imperil the lives and property of tens of thousands of West Virginians.

Mr. CANNON. In response to the remarks of the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out that we are cognizant of the serious floods which have been suffered by Logan County residents and others in West Virginia. The gentleman has been very diligent and forceful in calling to the attention of the committee the needs of West Virginia, and the value of the Justice Dam. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for the additional light which he has thrown on the subject and why the Justice Dam is needed.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEAVER].

PORT DREDGING AT ERIE, PA.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I am surprised to learn that funds have not been included in the budget for the deepening of the approach to the Duquesne marine terminal in the port at Erie, Pa.

A total of $743,000 is necessary to complete a dredging program authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1962. The act modified the original dredging project to provide for the deepening in the terminal sector to the 27-foot depth, the necessary minimum to accommodate properly oceangoing vessels.

The estimated project cost prior to the modification was $2,571,000. The remaining deepening is the only essential project feature remaining to be done at the port.

Completion of work on the harbor depth is of concern to industries in eastern Ohio, western Pennsylvania, and western New York. They are customers or potential customers of this fast-growing port.

To encourage ocean ships to use the facility, a proper depth must be maintained.

Located in a region of heavy unemployment, Erie has hopes that its port will be a major force in restoring the economic stability of that area. A superhighway now being constructed between Erie and Pittsburgh will give western Pennsylvania industries a direct and fast route to Erie.

The development of this new ocean port has been remarkable. Some 75 acres of water lots are being reclaimed in a filling-in project to provide waterfront dock space and industrial sites. Some 750,000 cubic yards of this fill-in material was obtained from earlier dredging supervised by the U.S. Corps of Army Engineers. On May 10, 1963, a $900,000 contract was let for the construction of 1,600 feet of new steel dock space.

I hope this Congress will give serious consideration to including the $743,000 in the 1964 budget to further develop Pennsylvania's only lake port.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record as commending this committee for an appropriation bill which I think is the first one we have had that is actually below the budget estimates of 1964 when those estimates were below the appropriations for 1963. I think this bill will meet the criteria I have established for what is necessary in aggregate spending in order to move toward a balanced budget. I have been voting against every appropriation bill that does not meet these standards, and I am very pleased that the committee in this instance has met these standards.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, may I commend the committee for bringing in a very reasonable and very fair bill. This bill seriously attempts to care for the legitimate needs of all authorized projects. At the same time it keeps the appropriations well within budgetary limitations. The committee has actually reduced the totals heretofore recommended. I think that the members are to be congratulated.

On the other hand, the committee has advisedly made provision for the appropriations needed to carry on work on the seven presently authorized watersheds where authorization authority has become exhausted. That we may all understand the situation, let me explain that it has been the practice of the legislative committee on especially large river basin projects to authorize the project but only to authorize a limited expenditure at a given time. Normally, additional authorizations are made so that these river basins never impose an undue burden on the total in any one year. This year there are seven major river basins in the United States that are running out of authorization authority. One of these is the Brazos River in Texas.

Like most of the other river basins, work has been going on for a good many years. There are presently at least four major dams under construction for the completion of which there is not adequate authorization authority. To stop work on these dams would be tremendously expensive. We all know that ultimately the work would be completed but the legislative committee of the House recognizes that in order to save money—some have estimated as much as $20 or $25 million—this work should continue without stoppage, and the committee brought in a bill earlier this year authorizing continuation of these projects. The bill actually contemplated authority to complete at least a large part if not all of the projects.

The other body sought to limit this authorization authority to the fiscal year. Of course, that enabled them to greatly reduce the total authorization, but they used this saving to authorize additional projects, some of which had been rejected in the past and none of which had been approved or even been finally heard by the House committee.

In an effort to compromise with the other body, the House again passed a bill using the Senate's identical figures as to amount and duration of authorizations but removing the new and inadequately considered projects. Of course, by limiting the authorizations to 1 year the bill gave assurance that there would be consideration of new projects next year.

I had hoped that the other body would accept this effort to compromise in the spirit in which it was made. Unfortunately, so far it has not been accepted. I am still hopeful that sound judgment will prevail and that the other body will accept this compromise.

In the meantime, the bill presently before us makes appropriations available to continue the work on these river basin projects if, as, and when authorization is secured. I believe that the committee has done well in including these appropriations. I commend the membership and I would express hope, in which I know most of the Members of this body join me, that our colleagues across the Capitol may see fit to concede on one part of their views, particularly where this body is offering to accept their figures and timing in its entirety on all of the original projects.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], a member of the subcommittee and a member of the committee, such time as he may require.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, being a new member of this subcommittee, I wish to join in the statements that have been made about my colleagues on this committee, beginning with the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the subcommittee, and of the full Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON]. It has been my privilege to serve with him many years here, and I have never seen anyone work harder to get a dollar's value for a dollar spent. In this bill he clearly shows that a dollar spent on his own Nation is a dollar well spent.

It has been especially pleasing to me to serve this year on this subcommittee dealing with domestic public works, where all members are conscientious believers in conservation of natural resources. For many years it has been my privilege to be chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations handling agricultural appropriations, where we deal with soil conservation and watershed development and flood prevention. In fact, one of the things of which I am most proud is that in 1952 I went before the Democratic Convention in Chicago and got them to adopt a plan to take care of watersheds for this Nation. We did not happen to win that year, but our subcommittee, without budget approval, provided $5 million to set up 56 pilot plants over this Nation. That was the beginning of the great watershed program we have today which is doing so much to reclaim and develop this Nation.

The companion part of the watershed effort is handled by our Subcommittee on Domestic Public Works. Funds for development of rivers and harbors and the major parts of the water system in which the watersheds happen to flow are in this bill. So it is doubly pleasing to me to have a chance to work with my colleagues here who have done such an outstanding job in this area throughout the years.

I am being repetitious in recalling to the Members this illustration, but it stands out to me like a ringing bell. Some years ago when I had the privilege of presiding at a hearing on an emergency appropriation bill, when we were trying to provide that the United States would have ample production facilities to meet an all-out war with Russia, as we walked back over from the hearings, the head of the office handling that matter, Joe Fowler, said, "JAMIE, if I were Joe Stalin"—and it was in Stalin's day—"I would declare 10 years of peace." He said, "Think what it would do to this country if we were to suddenly recall all of the men from the service and they were out of jobs. Think what it would mean if we closed down the factories that were manufacturing munitions. Think what it would mean if we stopped the export of agricultural products which we are exporting because of the threat of war, and you could see that it would mean economic chaos."

Yet, Mr. Chairman, you could see he apparently was right. Even though we had the greatest material prosperity in history, we could not afford to admit that you had to have war or preparation for war in order to have material prosperity. But, my friends, if you will think that statement through, and I repeat this now because we are hearing a lot about the necessity of cutting out foreign aid, calling our troops back home, and many other things because of the balance-of-payments situation, after you think through what he said, you realize that it is not war or the preparation for war that brings prosperity. It is the extra effort because of it.

Mr. Chairman, where in war you burn up your gasoline and destroy your planes, and use up other war materiel and end up a poorer nation, if we were wise enough to put forth that same effort in developing and protecting our great river basins, our harbors, replanting our forests, in building roads and schools, and the many other things so necessary for our domestic development, we could have prosperity and have a much richer country.

Mr. Chairman, I mention that because if I judge present conditions right and the statements which I see and the reports from our Treasury, we are going to have to divert our efforts from foreign aid and other things. If we will do that and spend our effort on our own country, we will end up richer for every dollar we spend.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I thank my chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], for giving me the privilege of serving on this great subcommittee, whose interest is serving America first, last, and always.

With regard to the details of the bill, I quote here from the committee report, page 41, as follows:

> The reduction which the committee has made includes funds for five new positions requested and the $50,000 budgeted for the Cache River project, Arkansas. The latter amount was for an advancement to the State highway department for added costs of Highway No. 64 bridges across the project in order to meet the project dimensions should it be built. If built, the project would be of general benefit to the State and the committee sees no reason why the State should not stand this added cost, if it wants the project.
>
> Lower Mississippi operations: The operations of the Corps of Engineers at Greenwood, Greenville, and Natchez in Mississippi, have been very effective and efficient for years, and no action shall be taken to remove operations which have been carried on from these locations.
>
> Yazoo Basin project, Mississippi: The counties which suffered road damages by reason of building the Sardis Reservoir executed a full release for such damages at the time. It appears to the committee that the amount paid is unreasonably small, as compared to the value of the Teckville crossing to adjacent counties. It is the opinion of the committee that if the State should provide a first rate or primary through highway by way of the former Teckville Crossing, the Corps of Engineers should reopen the matter of prior settlement as authorized by Public Law 526, 79th Congress, and make additional contributions above the usual 50 percent for constructing a crossing in line with the value of the crossing destroyed.
>
> The committee directs the corps to keep open the streams which run into the Arkabutla, Sardis, Enid, and Grenada Reservoirs, and that Federal lands in such areas under the control of the corps shall be handled in such a manner as to enable lessors to operate in such a way as to maintain and develop such lands.

Mr. Chairman, those statements of the Appropriations Committee speak for themselves and are amply justified.

With regard to efforts of the corps to move work affecting many families from Greenville and Natchez, thereby affecting Greenwood, the work has been handled very satisfactorily at these locations for years. A concentration at Vicksburg could well lead to later efforts to handle this huge stretch of river from Memphis and New Orleans, and eliminate Vicksburg. We are opposed to taking any action toward such removal. Present officers may say they have no such intentions—but they will not be there forever.

With regard to other matters covered, these are matters where in most cases the Corps of Engineers has been very cooperative. However, the people in the areas of these reservoirs at the time of construction were led to believe that lands would be leased back at reasonable rates and under such terms as to enable the lessors to protect and develop the lands and prevent the filling of reservoirs, and that the streams entering the reservoirs would be kept open.

On the Teckville Crossing, the corps paid approximately $37,500 to Lafayette County for all road damage, for which the Government got a full release from the county.

Now the corps admits that while the construction of a crossing would cost more than its value with existing roads, the corps agrees that a crossing would be worth more than $3,500,000. After all, Mr. Chairman, other counties have an interest.

Fortunately Public Law 526, 79th Congress, does permit the corps to reopen the matter as directed by the committee in case a primary highway is built.

Whether the State will do this I do not know.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate being on this subcommittee and look forward to being on it for many years. I certainly shall give to these programs my very best efforts to protect America for its people of today and its children of tomorrow. I know if we leave to our children a nation rich in natural resources they will make it fine.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I think the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I could not allow the occasion to pass without joining today with my other colleagues in commending the very distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and the members of his fine committee for bringing out a very, very good bill.

I have the privilege of representing a congressional district which is bounded on both sides by two of the great rivers of the Nation, the Mississippi on the west and the Ohio on the east, and four major river basins in between.

These basins are the Big Muddy River and Beaucoup Creek, the Kaskaskia, Saline River and tributaries, and the Wabash River and tributaries. These basins hold not only great economic hope for the area through navigation improvements, reservoirs and water impoundment, recreation, and many other benefits, but they also hold, Mr. Chairman, great hazards against loss of life and property if they are not harnessed properly to prevent major floods. Without the sympathetic understanding of this committee, we could not proceed with the development of our natural resources and provide the millions of people in this area with proper flood protection. I am particularly grateful to the committee for allowing funds with which to continue advanced engineering and design planning for the Rend Lake Reservoir, the funds for advanced engineering and design planning on the Kaskaskia River navigation project, the funds for a comprehensive study of the Big Muddy River and Beaucoup Creek, funds with which to make a comprehensive basin study of the Wabash Valley area, and funds with which to provide flood protection along the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. We are also looking forward to seeing the replacement on an accelerated basis of the High Life Dam at Mound City, Ill., on the Ohio River.

I want to publicly commend, on behalf of the more than 10 million people of Illinois, the committee for doing an outstanding job. I also want to single out the great staff of the committee, Mr. Carson Culp and Mr. Gene Wilhelm. I have never called them about any matter but what I received their sympathetic consideration. They are always available and able to be of assistance. To all of you we say "Many thanks."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER].

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9140, the public works appropriation bill for 1964.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and all the other committee members for their diligence in preparing and presenting this legislation to the House for consideration today. It is comprehensive and worthwhile. To be sure a great deal of money is involved but the dividends which will accrue to us and future generations will be multiplied many times over. Looking beyond today and to tomorrow, we must not fail to pass this appropriations bill today.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN].

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my personal appreciation to the chairman and members of this important subcommittee for their diligence in bringing us this impressive legislation. I want to particularly congratulate the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] for his great speech here today on behalf of the development of our Nation's resources. No one has spoken more eloquently of the importance to every American of the conservation and utilization of the vast water and land resources of the West. He is indeed one of the greatest friends of the West this Nation has ever had. The Nation has a great stake in the future of its natural resources. This legislation is wisely considered and well presented. I congratulate the committee and urge unanimous approval by the Members.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for the report it has filed on the civil works appropriations bill, and particularly that section relating to the Atomic Energy Commission.

I am particularly delighted by the statement in the committee report to the effect that nuclear power technology has advanced to the point where Government subsidies can be done away with.

There is absolutely no justification for the spending of Government funds to subsidize the construction and operation of large commercial nonexperimental nuclear powerplants. Unfortunately, this is what has been done in the past. It is my hope that the acceptance of this bill by the House, backed up as it is by this strong statement against further Government subsidy, will mark the end of this phase of our civilian nuclear power program.

Let me make it clear that I am not appearing here today in opposition to the Government research and development work on reactor concepts which show promise of being successfully adapted in the future for the production of electricity. I am sure that my fellow members of the Appropriations Committee who reported out this bill also feel that research and development work in the civilian nuclear power field must be carried forward.

But I am unalterably opposed to using the taxpayers' money to subsidize the construction and operation of large, commercial-size nonexperimental plants embodying a proven reactor concept. If I read the Appropriations Committee report correctly, the only subsidies which will be affected are those which would go to this type of plant. After all, the pressurized water and boiling water reactors are the only ones regarded as proven and, therefore, eligible for Government subsidy in the construction and operation of plants.

At least two large, commercial plants using reactors of this general type are now in operation. Yankee Atomic, at Rowe, Mass., has been operating for more than 2 years. Although it was built with Government subsidy, the combine of private utilities which own and operate it do not consider it an experimental plant. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York built a 230,000-kilowatt plant at Indian River without Government subsidy. Company officials state the plant is a part of its system, a baseload plant, and not experimental in any way.

Yet, despite the existence of these two plants, and assurances from utility executives that pressurized water or boiling water reactors can produce electricity competitive with electricity produced in fossil fuel fired plants, the Government is going to spend $42 million in direct subsidies for the construction of three new nuclear plants in the 400,000- to 500,000-kilowatt range.

The contracts for these plants are now being worked out by AEC. They will not be affected by the passage of this bill. The effect of this legislation will be to put an end to Government subsidy for the construction of any other additional plants of this type and size.

The boiling water and pressurized water reactors are now old hat. Both General Electric and Westinghouse are out trying to sell conventional reactors to private utilities, the same as they are trying to sell conventional fuel plants. These two companies are not offering experimental plants; they are trying to sell commercial plants for the production of commercial electricity.

The Atomic Energy Commission has done its job, and done it well, insofar as these water reactors are concerned. They have developed the technology. Prototype reactors have been built and operated. Private industry, on its own, has taken this AEC-developed technology and built with its own funds large plants to produce electricity that is sold to its customers in the same way as electricity produced from coal, oil, or natural gas.

Government participation in the pressurized water and boiling water reactor program should have ended right here. If private utility companies are convinced that powerplants using reactors of this type are sound, they will be built. It does not take a subsidy to induce private business to engage in sound business practices.

I do not believe the continued subsidization of these large, commercial nuclear electric plants is compatible with the spirit of the Atomic Energy Act. It was always my belief that the AEC role was confined to the development of the technology of the various reactor concepts and making that knowledge available to private business for exploitation. Surely, it is not within the province of the Commission to spend taxpayers' money to insure that the end use of Government-financed research and development work will be competitive or will be priced below products and goods already in the mainstream of American business.

Yet, I am afraid that in essence what AEC is doing is holding out the offer of sizable Government subsidies to encourage the building of large, commercial nuclear plants. It is my understanding that the president of the company which will build one of the three large plants I referred to earlier frankly stated that, without the Government subsidy—around $14 million in the case of his plant—he doubted that his company would have gone into this project.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me once again affirm my support of the Appropriations Committee action taken on the AEC funds for the 1964 fiscal year. The committee has acted wisely. I trust this House will give unanimous support to the provision of the bill which eliminates unjustified subsidies for proven, commercial nuclear powerplants.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the Appropriations Committee for its recommendation that $33,548,000 be cut from the reactor development program budget in the Atomic Energy Commission's budget. I particularly am pleased that this action obviously stems from the committee's awareness that nuclear power subsidies are in need of drastic curbing. In the committee's report we find this statement which I consider significant:

> It is the committee's opinion that continuation of this subsidy program is no longer necessary to stimulate the construction of power reactors since it has been demonstrated that they are now producing electric power at competitive costs, at least in those areas of high conventional fuel costs.

I understand that, in line with this opinion, $3 million for research and development and design assistance to utilities which may wish to construct power reactors has been also deleted in the committee's recommendations.

I would like, however, to ask the Appropriations Committee if there are any funds still in the reactor program budget which are available for research, development, and design assistance on commercial-size proven reactor concepts? Specifically, is there any money included in the budget that could be used for subsidizing the design of more water-type reactors?

It is important that clear-cut answers to these questions be made a part of the RECORD. There is no doubt in my mind, from a careful reading of the committee report, that the Appropriations Committee concluded that the time has come to end subsidies for the water reactors. I would like to see a specific prohibition against further subsidies for these plants written into the bill to remove any possible doubt about the intent of the House on this matter.

But lacking such a clear-cut prohibition, I would like to have assurances that the committee's recommendations, if adopted by this House, will accomplish the same purpose—that is, ending the subsidy for large, commercial water reactors.

The continued subsidies by AEC of the building of large, commercial-size nuclear plants, it seems to me, contradicts the original intent of the Atomic Energy Act.

Take the three new plants which were recently approved by the AEC and for which $42 million in assistance will be spent by the Government. Are these plants prototypes? Are they experimental? The answer is "No." Each of them is of the same reactor concept. Some slight variation in design, but all are in the 400,000- to 500,000-kilowatt-size range. All are pressurized water reactors.

By the AEC's own words in its report to the President for 1962 on the civilian nuclear power program, pressurized water reactors are safe and of proven design.

Moreover, there are many reactors of this type in commercial operation. One, the Consolidated Edison Indian Point plant, is of 275,000-kilowatt size.

This type of plant, the AEC tells us, can compete with fossil fuel plants in high-fuel-cost areas. This should prove a sufficient inducement for private utilities to build them with their own money—without any Government subsidy.

I maintain there is no need for urgency in the Nation's program to build nuclear plants. There is no power shortage now or on the distant horizon. There is no possible shortage of low-cost domestic fuels for hundreds of years.

As a representative of an oil and gas, as well as coal producing State, I deplore the policy of the AEC which seems to be that "anything goes" in the way of subsidy so long as it gets nuclear plants built.

Spending our taxes to force an unneeded industry into competition with our vital, unsubsidized domestic fossil fuels industries is one of the greatest inequities Government can commit.

I would like to see in the future a closer adherence by the AEC to the original intent of the Atomic Energy Act. Once it gets a nuclear plant designed, researched, and developed, and possibly a small prototype built, let it turn the building of a large, commercial electric plant over to private utilities.

The AEC should set itself some specific guidelines as to when a nuclear concept has been proven. And when this point is reached, say to the utility industry, "This is a proved concept, it is safe, it is economical. You take it from there."

I do not oppose the development of nuclear power. But I do vigorously oppose "paying the way" for getting commercial-size nuclear plants into operation once they have gone beyond the experimental stage.

I hope the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee will be adopted. I hope, too, that they will accomplish what is long overdue—the curbing of subsidies to nuclear plants that have been proved safe and economically feasible.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, for a number of years I have been speaking out, like a voice in the wilderness, against what I regard as the unwise and unsound policies of the Atomic Energy Commission in regard to civilian nuclear power. I have particularly opposed the subsidization of the construction and operation of large, commercial plants—not prototypes or experimental plants but full-scale commercial operations—which are then able to compete, because of the size and scope of the Government subsidy with privately owned and nonsubsidized powerplants fired with coal and other fossil fuels.

I represent a major coal producing region. In my opinion, this whole civilian nuclear power program affects the jobs of thousands of men and women in my district. It has serious implications for the entire coal industry. Electric utilities provide the largest single market for coal. It is the growth market for coal. If the size of this market—today and in the future—is limited by nuclear power, conceived and nutured by Government funds, then the Government by its own actions will have seriously affected one of the Nation's basic industries.

What the Appropriations Committee has proposed in its report on the Atomic Energy Commission appropriations is not going to sound the death knell of the atomic program. But it is going to cause a lot of people, in and out of Congress, to take another look at this multibillion-dollar program.

The Appropriations Committee will serve the most useful purpose of focusing the attention of this House and the other body—as well as the public—upon the one aspect of the program which has been neglected for too long. I refer to the granting of subsidies from the public treasury to induce the construction of large, commercial nuclear plants. This is what I have objected to. This is what the coal industry objects to so strenuously. The proper role of Government needs to be carefully defined. The action of the Appropriations Committee is a step in that direction.

Is it the proper role of the Atomic Energy Commission to spend hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars developing a certain type of reactor and then spending additional millions to get these plants built and placed in commercial operation?

My answer is an emphatic "No."

Apparently, the Appropriations Committee has now taken this same position.

The Atomic Energy Commission has spent to date in excess of $1,300 million on the civilian nuclear power program. The continued annual expenditure is at a rate of about $200 million a year.

Out of all of this vast Government research have emerged reactors which can produce electric power. The Commission states they are safe to operate. Chairman Seaborg has stated that he would not mind living next door to one, so safe have they become. The Commission has had particular success with pressurized water and boiling water reactors. In its report to the President last year on civilian nuclear power, the Commission said, and I quote:

> They are reliable and safe. It is believed that large reactors of these types could now be built and operated in high-cost fuel areas with a lifetime promise of greater economy than conventional fuels. Even better economics can undoubtedly be achieved in the future from better fuel performance and other general improvements.

In view of this statement, I was puzzled as to why the Commission considered it necessary to participate in the construction of three huge plants of this type.

Recently, Chairman Seaborg, in a letter to me, stated without qualification that the pressurized water and boiling water reactors have been proven. Here are his words:

> A reactor concept is considered proven when it has been developed to the stage where engineering feasibility has been established or where reactor experiment or prototype experience has demonstrated confidence in reactor reliability for the general size contemplated. The pressurized and boiling water reactors are examples of proven concepts, although there could be design variations which might fall outside of the proven category.

You will note that once again Chairman Seaborg states these reactors are safe. The engineering feasibility and the reactor reliability have been clearly established, he assured me.

Is it not reasonable to expect that once this stage of advanced development has been achieved—and after similar plants have been successfully built and operated on a slightly smaller scale—that the Government would step out of the picture?

Unfortunately, that has not happened. A number of months after the Commission reported to the President that the water reactors "have arrived" the Commission came to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and obtained permission to build three more plants—not by any stretch of the imagination experimental plants or prototypes embodying some entirely new concept—but plants using the same proven water reactors. The total direct subsidy involved is in excess of $42 million. These plants will be built and the kilowatts they produce will be sold in competition with coal-produced kilowatts.

Where will this subsidization of commercial nuclear plants end? Would not the public interest best be served by devoting this $42 million to further research into breeder reactors and other concepts than by using it to subsidize commercial plants? I think the AEC should be put on notice that money to finance nuclear research is not inexhaustible. We have a tremendous national debt and every few months it seems this House has to face up to the painful necessity of increasing the ceiling on that debt to avoid financial chaos.

Forty-two million dollars may not appear to be a lot of money to AEC, which deals in billions, but unfortunately, too many agencies of the Government have adopted this same attitude toward the "small" amounts and have not made any real effort to save money. If strict standards for spending Government money had been adopted by the AEC and all other agencies, the continuing financial crisis this Nation faces could at least be considerably diminished. I happen to think $42 million is worth saving, especially when not spending it will have no adverse affect on the public interest.

As I have stated, these three commercial powerplants, with proven water reactors, will be built regardless of what the House does on this appropriation bill.

The important thing is for Congress to let the Atomic Energy Commission know that it does not want any more of this type plant built with Government subsidy.

If the water reactors "have arrived," if the engineering feasibility and the reactor reliability have been clearly established, if commercial plants of the same design and size have been built and operated by private industry without subsidy, if these reactors are proven, then what reason is there for spending Government funds for the building of more of these plants?

Is it the proper role of Government to insure through a subsidy that nuclear plants will produce power cheaper than conventional plants?

I do not think it is. If nuclear powerplants of this type are technically feasible and they are needed, private industry will build them. And they will build them without the Government holding out a carrot in the form of a subsidy.

Mr. Chairman, no one that I know of is asking that the AEC be forced to get out of the business of developing and proving out the various reactor concepts for producing electricity.

What I am demanding is that the AEC stop force feeding the development of nuclear electricity through Government subsidy of commercial, nonexperimental plants. Let the AEC confine the activities to its research and development field, as Congress clearly intended.

The private utility industry is fully capable and, I am informed, perfectly willing to adapt this technical knowledge—the fruit of Government research—to the commercial production of electricity if and when the economics of the situation and the demands of the Nation for electric power so dictate.

The Appropriations Committee is to be commended for its action on the Atomic Energy Commission appropriation. Undoubtedly, the committee will be charged with scuttling the civilian nuclear power program and setting back progress. This is a lot of nonsense. All the Appropriations Committee has done was to restore a sense of balance to the program. It is forcing the AEC to get out of the subsidy business, a step which the Commission should have taken without this prodding from Congress.

The civilian nuclear power program will continue after this bill passes. But first things will be put first. This bill will force AEC out of the power business and back into the laboratory, where it belongs.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in order to bring to the attention of the House an action of the Appropriations Committee which I believe may go further than was intended. It is an action which may not only cripple a truly worthwhile scientific endeavor, but may ultimately cancel out the very savings which it is intended to achieve.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ACTION

In the course of its review of the AEC appropriation—which is contained at pages 21–25 of H.R. 9140—the committee cut out the entire $15 million appropriation intended for new projects under the so-called cooperative power reactor demonstration program. Three million dollars would have been spent in fiscal year 1964 while the remaining $12 million would have been obligated in future years.

Mr. Chairman, the practical effect of the committee's action is to wipe out the possibility of future projects in the cooperative program. It is a severe blow to participation by private industry in the development of atomic power.

Why do I say "severe blow"? The cooperative power reactor demonstration program is the vehicle which makes it possible for private industry—for reactor manufacturers, for utilities, public and private—to play a role in developing atomic power. New reactor types may be risky financial propositions. They, of course, are not expected to produce economic power—this is not their function.

But if we provide some limited assistance to the utilities, they may be willing to invest the much larger sums which are necessary to get these reactors built. This is the theory of the cooperative program—it is a partnership approach to developing the atom.

REASONS FOR THE COMMITTEE ACTION—STATUS OF NUCLEAR POWER

In its report on the AEC appropriation, the committee states the reason for its action as follows:

> It is the committee's opinion that continuation of this subsidy program is no longer necessary to stimulate the construction of power reactors since it has been demonstrated that they are now producing electric power at competitive costs, at least in those areas of high conventional fuel costs.

Mr. Chairman, there is much truth in the statement of the Appropriations Committee. We have made very substantial progress in developing economic nuclear power—particularly in the field of large, so-called water reactors. But even in this field, a substantial amount of work remains to be done. The AEC recognized the fact in its November 1962 report to the President, where it stated:

> Certain classes of power reactors, notably water-cooled converters producing saturated steam, are now on the threshold of economic competitiveness with conventional power in large installations in high fossil fuel cost areas of the country.

Mr. Chairman, there is a substantial difference between the statement of the Appropriations Committee and that of the AEC. The plain fact is that despite our very impressive progress, nuclear power has not been demonstrated to be competitive with conventional sources at this point in time—it is close, but not yet "over the top."

Moreover, there are other reactors still in the very early stages of development—research must be done and prototypes must be built in order to explore the potential of these new reactor types. We must get on with the task of developing advanced concepts—particularly the breeder reactors which produce more fuel than they consume. Surely, we do not intend to "freeze" private industry out of this critically important program. Our Government laboratories are doing brilliant work, but certainly we do not want to shut out the genius and initiative of private industry.

JOINT COMMITTEE VIEWS

Mr. Chairman, I have sat as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for almost 20 years. As I indicated before, the joint committee this year recognized, as does the Appropriations Committee, that water reactors are nearly economic. For this reason, we indicated our strong view against permitting the AEC to go ahead with further assistance for large water reactors, in reporting out the AEC fiscal year 1964 authorization bill. In counseling the AEC not to issue a second invitation for utility design assistance proposals, we stated:

> If this invitation were to be made this year, it appears most certain that a water-type reactor would, of necessity, be the only type to qualify as proven under the Commission's criteria. In order to diversify the technology, the committee believes it would be desirable for other reactor types to have the opportunity to compete for this form of Government assistance. Several different reactor types are expected to come into operation in the near future. Although the degree of their success cannot be predicted now, it is possible that one or more could be considered at the time of a later invitation under the modified third round. This possibility indicates the wisdom of delaying the second invitation under the modified third round for at least another year.

There is no quarrel between the Appropriations Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on this point. We are in full agreement. But, Mr. Chairman, as I said before, we have a long way to go in developing economic nuclear power, particularly in connection with the development of advanced concepts.

THE ROLE OF PRIVATE INDUSTRY

If we allow private industry to play a role in this program, we not only

save millions for the Government which would otherwise be required for Government construction of these plants; we assure that the development of atomic power will proceed in accordance with the sound principles of the free private enterprise system. We do not subsidize uneconomic power—we allow a free economy to work its will, in partnership with Government.

Mr. Chairman, if I may just cite one example. The Appropriations Committee wisely permitted an additional $3.5 million over the request of the AEC, for the so-called seed and blanket reactor—a very promising concept being developed by Admiral Rickover and his people. Someday we may wish to construct a full prototype of this reactor. Such a project would cost the Government $90 million if constructed entirely with Federal funds. But, utilizing the machinery of the cooperative power reactor demonstration program, a utility might be expected to put up a substantial portion of the cost of such a project, with corresponding savings to the Government.

IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPING NUCLEAR POWER

Mr. Chairman, the cooperative power program is essential if we are to get on with the critically important job of developing atomic power. The importance of the task ahead was recognized as early as 1957 by the able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. Speaking on the floor on April 16, 1957, he stated:

> **We must develop as rapidly as possible every potential source of electric and atomic power. A century from now or sooner, these potent sources of energy will be decisive in world survival.**

Mr. Chairman, a few weeks ago, the House approved in excess of $5 billion for the space program. Even its most ardent supporters are hard pressed to spell out the practical advantages of this program. When we are ready to spend billions for space, we certainly do not want to deny a few million for a modest research and development program which can bring a third great source of energy to the American people.

Mr. Chairman, it can certainly not be the intention to cripple this program during a critically important stage in its development. For this reason, I am sure that there has been a misunderstanding here—one that can be remedied. I expect that the AEC will appeal this decision to the Appropriations Committee of the other body. Even if not all the money requested by the AEC is restored, I am sure that a sensible compromise can be reached which will permit the continuation of the partnership approach to the development of atomic power.

The remarks I have made in reference to this program are fully supported in a letter directed to Senator PASTORE, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, by the Honorable Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. I ask unanimous consent to include that letter as a part of my remarks.

The letter from Dr. Seaborg follows:

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., November 19, 1963.
Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR PASTORE: You have asked about the current status of the achievement of economic central station civilian nuclear power.

There are several large commercial nuclear powerplants employing light-water moderated and cooled reactors now being planned for utility construction which have projected power-generating costs competitive with conventional plants in areas of high fossil fuel costs; but there are no plants on the line today which are producing power competitive with conventional fuel costs.

It is our belief, however, that the technology of light-water reactors, such as are now being built, has reached the point of development where they can be expected to be economically competitive in large sizes in some high-cost areas. It is to be hoped that subsequent continued improvement of light-water power reactors by industry will result in their economic application to broader geographic areas than those of the highest fossil fuel costs, and that further support by the Government might be avoided. It is to be noted, however, that the economics of such plants have not yet been demonstrated, that there is a lack of long-term experience in their construction and operation, and that there is financial risk to the utilities in undertaking the projects particularly in the economics of the nuclear fuel cycle.

There is a need for the support of advanced converter reactor concepts. The development of such concepts is a logical step in the realization of "breeder" reactors, which is the ultimate objective of our long-term program. The development of "breeder" reactors will permit the addition of a virtually unlimited source of economic energy.

We should try to carry out this logical development with a minimum of direct Government construction. This can best be accomplished by entering into cooperative arrangements with manufacturers and utilities for the construction and operation of more advanced converter reactors. In this way, the goals of better fuel economy and more efficient utilization of our nuclear materials resources can be realized at a lower net cost to the Government.

Sincerely yours,
GLENN T. SEABORG.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my complete agreement with the remarks of the distinguished vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

He and I have been members of the joint committee since its inception. Over the past two decades, we have been able to witness the remarkable progress atomic energy has made, particularly in the field of civilian nuclear power. I believe we have realized some solid technical accomplishments of which we may all be proud.

For the past 10 years, I have served as chairman of the Joint Committee's Subcommittee on Research and Development. In addition, as many of you may know, I also serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Development of the House Armed Services Committee, and I am also a member of the recently created Select Committee on Government Research. And so, for the better part of 20 years, I have been closely associated with all phases of the Government's research and development program. I know of few fields of Government research which have been so successful with such a modest investment of the taxpayers' dollar. I know of few fields in which Government research can bring such solid tangible benefits to the American people. The research program in civilian nuclear power can provide the Nation with a new energy source—a source which is theoretically unlimited. It can be one of the truly worthwhile legacies that we can leave to future generations of Americans.

Mr. Chairman, the cooperative power reactor demonstration program provides a means for private industry to participate in this important development program. It allows us to brings to bear the inventiveness and creativity of private industry. It allows us to pursue the program of research and development at a fraction of the cost which would otherwise be required, for a totally Government-run program. In short, the cooperative power program makes good technical and economic sense.

I share the hope of the gentleman from California that a sensible compromise can be reached which will permit this vitally important program to continue.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join in the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] and the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]. I believe that the development of atomic power is vitally important to the future growth of the Nation, and it is my sincere hope that a compromise can be worked out which will assure the continuation of a strong research and development effort in the field of civilian nuclear power.

I also note, Mr. Chairman, that the committee, in considering the AEC appropriation, deleted $750,000 which had been programed for a community building at Los Alamos. In its report, the committee stated that it "would be glad to consider funding of such a building, but it is convinced that an adequate facility can be provided at a lower cost."

Mr. Chairman, this building was authorized as part of the legislation which was enacted last year for the sale of the Government-owned community at Los Alamos, N. Mex. Although it was the purpose of that legislation to remove the Government from the so-called "community business," it was, at the same time, the intent of Congress that a healthy and viable community be maintained for the citizens of Los Alamos who are contributing so much to our national defense and security.

The physical heart of an effective community government is its city hall, around which all civic activities are centered.

The community building program for Los Alamos would provide facilities for county management, police protection, courthouse space, and all of the essential elements of good local government. No adequate facilities exist now for these functions.

I think it should be noted that when we disposed of Richland, Wash., and Oak Ridge, Tenn.—the other two atomic energy communities—we provided a community building at a cost of $650,000, in the case of Richland, and $500,000, in the case of Oak Ridge. Los Alamos is a higher-cost construction area, and in addition, it requires facilities not only for municipal functions, but for county operations as well, because the city is the seat of the county.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Appropriations Committee did well to point out its concern over the cost of this building. I hope, however, that an agreement can be reached under which a sufficient sum can be provided in order to build an adequate community structure, taking into consideration the unusual construction problems in a remote area like Los Alamos.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, this bill carries appropriations for the Narraguagus River in the Second Congressional District in Maine. This is a most constructive project long needed by the community. I appreciate the consideration of the committee.

The Portland Harbor project has an appropriation of $1 million for a 40-foot channel. The Corps of Engineers has found ample economic justification for the 45-foot channel and the Congress authorized the project on that basis. I believe it important to give further consideration of this 45-foot channel and appreciate this careful consideration by the committee.

Seaport Harbor is one of the vital seaports of our State. The fund of $718,000 included in this bill will provide for vital improvements.

May I express to the committee my appreciation of their careful study of the needs in Maine.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, the State of Rhode Island has a vital interest in six important projects which are included in the public works appropriation bill, 1964.

Three million dollars of Federal funds are earmarked to assist in the completion of the Fox Point hurricane barrier in Providence. This protective facility will be of great help in guarding the State's largest commercial area from the ravages of hurricane damage.

The Lower Woonsocket flood control project is allocated $1,450,000 in the measure now before us. As a citizen of that fine city, I am well aware of the serious danger which this project is intended to help correct. I strongly recommend your approval of the appropriation specified in the bill.

Other projects necessary to the welfare of my State are the Point Judith hurricane barrier for which $50,000 has been allocated; the Point Judith harbor and breakwater calling for $470,000; the Narragansett Pier hurricane barrier for which $50,000 is set aside; and the Pawtuxet Cove project for which the committee has recommended $230,000.

It is essential to the best interests of Rhode Island and the Nation that the projects I have mentioned be undertaken or continued without delay. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in supporting the allocation of the full amounts approved by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, it is my considered opinion that the most important waterway project before the Congress of the United States is the Cross-Florida Barge Canal. My support of this project is primarily based upon its defense value. Four Presidents of the United States have had an important part to play in the recent history of this project: Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy, and even way back in the 19th century President Andrew Jackson vigorously supported this canal. After extended studies through many years of other various possible alternative routes the present route was selected and the project was authorized in 1942 by a bill, "to promote the national defense and to promptly facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment by authorizing the construction and operation of a pipeline and a navigable barge channel across Florida." This authorization by Congress was not on the basis of any economic justification but solely on its national defense values. The canal, however, was not built at that time because of the necessity in time of war to apply to all manpower and equipment in other directions in the emergencies involved.

As soon as I was discharged from the U.S. Army in 1947, I ran for Congress on the platform of the construction of this canal and came to Congress in January of 1949. I had the active help of President Truman in the accumulation of material necessary for a full presentation to Congress, but was not able to make such a presentation until during the administration of President Eisenhower. Under President Eisenhower's leadership it was thought that it would be well to see if the project could be justified not only for its defense values but also for its economic justifications, and President Eisenhower took the leadership in making this a budget item, and the studies were conducted and they showed economic justification for the project during the Eisenhower administration. Additional surveys were made in the beginning of President Kennedy's administration and they resulted in an even greater economic justification, 500 percent more than the original economic justification, or the final figure of 1.2 over 1.

During President Kennedy's campaign for the Presidency of the United States he had written me and allowed me to publish during that campaign the following statement over his signature:

> I know of your persistent work for the early construction of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal. If I am elected President, I will be glad to cooperate with you in making this project a reality. I regard it not only as important to Florida, but to the economy of our entire country, which must fully utilize all of our natural resources if we are to achieve necessary economic expansion.

President Kennedy has vigorously presented this matter to Congress. He actively urged the favorable action of Congress last year in its approval of his budgeted item of $205,000 for final planning. He placed in his budget this year $1 million to begin construction of the canal and he has urged our approval of the item. The House Appropriations Committee and its Subcommittee on Public Works have approved and I am deeply grateful for this wonderful support by the President and by the committee.

I would like to say something about the defense value of this project. On May 11, 1962, Chairman CARL VINSON of the Armed Services Committee wrote Chairman CLARENCE CANNON of the Appropriations Committee as follows:

> I am very hopeful that during this Congress your committee will see fit to appropriate sufficient funds to make a forward step in the construction of the Cross Florida Barge Canal which is to be a section of the Intracoastal Waterway.
>
> I am very much interested in this project because of its very important national defense aspects.

Chairman VINSON quoted the findings of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, August 30, 1946, in part, as follows:

> The Chief of Engineers has stated in his opinion (hearing before the House Appropriations Subcommittee, January 9, 1946) that the authorized canal will represent, in addition to its economic worth, a value in national security considerably greater than its cost.

On May 29, 1951, the Deputy Secretary of Defense in a letter to the President, stated as follows:

> The Corps of Engineers expressed the views that "a barge canal will afford a short, economical, protected route across Florida for the movement of a large amount of long-haul traffic by barge and small freighters between gulf and Atlantic ports. Large tonnages of raw materials as well as manufactured products are susceptible to movement between those points via protected inland waters at great saving. Completion of the canal would also permit quick, safe, and economical transfer between the east and west coasts of Florida, of floating plant and construction equipment now required to move via the circuitous and dangerous Florida Keys route.
>
> "During World War II, many cargo ships and tankers were lost off the coast of Florida due to enemy action. Many of the cargoes that were lost would and could have moved by barge or small freighter had the barge canal been in existence at that time. The saving in lives, ships, and valuable and critical cargoes would have been great. Similar and comparable savings would also accrue in future serious national emergencies if the canal is in operation."
>
> The Joint Chiefs of Staff find that either of these projects (i.e., the previously considered ship canal or the authorized barge canal) will provide an additional and shorter line of communication between the gulf coast, and the east coast, and would thus reduce exposure of shipping to submarine attack.

In the mentioned report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, they said to the Chief of Army Engineers:

> The economic analysis of a long-lived project could not be considered complete if it covered merely the interval of peacetime years and ignored the recurrent war periods. The insurance value of the avoidance of war losses is, therefore, distributable on an an-

> nual basis and can be at least roughly approximated in dollars and cents for measurement against the monetary annual charges of providing and maintaining the facilities.

The Board then goes on to compute the annual value of this wartime insurance afforded by the project as $3,600,000 based on price and replacement cost levels of 1946. In terms of today's price levels, this figure is above $10 million per year and more than doubles the total economic benefits currently reported by the Corps of Engineers in their interim report as to the peacetime economies to be yielded by the waterway.

The Office of Emergency Planning in the Executive Office of the President, in the fall of last year, reviewed a memorandum on the national defense value of the project, prepared by H. H. Buckman, engineer, and said as follows about it:

> We have reviewed the Buckman memorandum and appended papers and feel that its thesis is sound and its findings still essentially valid with respect to civil as well as military defense. The desirability of a shorter line of communications between the gulf and east coasts is recognized.

Engineer Buckman further points out the tremendous cost of lost shipping in World War II due to the necessity of using the gulf-Atlantic open sealanes, and said:

> Over 1 million gross tons, or 25 percent of all the shipping in these lanes, was lost. The value was $987 million, and 167 ships went to the bottom.

From what I have pointed out to you the national defense value of this canal is outstanding and there should be no further delay in going forward with it.

The lone opposition to this canal has been from railroads, which have traditionally opposed canals all over the country. It should be pointed out, however, that the Florida East Coast Railroad supports the canal and that many individuals in the railroad industry favor the canal. General Morris of the U.S. Army Engineers this year in the House hearings said with regard to railroad interests as follows:

> In a short time the canal will assume its proper place in the overall transportation network. Developments along and adjacent to the canal will be accelerated, particularly by industries utilizing and processing raw materials. When this condition develops it can be anticipated that the volume of traffic transported by rail and truck will also expand due to their natural advantages in the transportation of certain classes of commodities. While this trend can be anticipated from the statistical studies made for the economic restudy of the canal, it has been clearly shown in the growth pattern of transportation in other sections of the country under similar conditions. It is believed that the provision of cheap water transportation for bulky commodities to this section of the Southeastern States will create such developments that loss of traffic to competing rail and truck transportation systems will not be of lasting importance and the resulting improvement of regional economic conditions will ultimately add materially to their traffic.

Before closing this talk, I would like to say a few things about arguments which have been raised against the canal: One is that when the canal reaches the Gulf of Mexico it reaches open waters and the route is no longer well protected until it reaches the next dug canal to the north in the shoreline of Florida some miles away. This question is answered completely by the fact that barges now safely use this partially protected area of the Apalachee Bay just as they now use partially protected routes in the Chesapeake Bay and in the Mississippi Sound. The question was answered pointblank by the Chief of Engineers in his letter to the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House under date of June 15, 1942, as follows:

> With reference to the use by Intracoastal Waterway traffic of the open gulf between the eastern terminus of the present Intracoastal Waterway in the vicinity of Apalachee Bay and the gulf terminus of the above-mentioned barge canal, it may be stated that coastwise traffic now follows this route and that while some danger is connected therewith, I am informed that there is very little time lost in navigating this portion of the gulf. Accordingly, it would be possible to eliminate that section of the Intracoastal Waterway from the improvements proposed in H.R. 6999 and still move very large quantities of commerce by barge from terminals along the gulf coast to the eastern seaboard with the completion of the other improvements proposed in the bill.

Another argument that is made against this canal is that there is an existing canal running across the State of Florida in its southern portions, the Okeechobee Waterway. This southern route is 356 miles longer and is more expensive to construct and maintain even though it does exist in a very limited degree at the present time. Further, its utilization is much more limited than utilization of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal would be, according to authentic and careful studies that have been made over a period of many years. On this point there is a letter from the Office of Chief of Engineers dated May 17, 1962, which went into this question and stated as follows:

> The existing Okeechobee Waterway provides a channel 8 feet deep and 80 feet wide from the Intracoastal Waterway near St. Lucie Inlet to the Gulf of Mexico near Fort Myers Beach. This waterway includes three locks, 50 feet wide and 250 feet long. In 1958, preliminary cost estimates were made for enlarging the Okeechobee Waterway to the same design criteria established for the Cross-Florida Barge Canal project. Those estimates showed that the cost of enlarging the Okeechobee Waterway would exceed $100 million. Traffic studies also showed that the volume of commerce that would use an enlarged Okeechobee Waterway, and the transportation savings therefrom, would be far from sufficient to justify the large cost of improvement of the existing waterway to the dimensions of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal.

Finally, it is said by the railroad lobby that the economic justification of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal is slight and that the benefits are primarily to Florida rather than to the Nation as a whole. As to the economic justification, I would like to point out that even on the most conservative figure presented by the Corps of Engineers, 1.2 over 1, this is an economic justification in excess of other projects which Congress has authorized, projects involving more money than this project, and we are spending money for such other developments right now in actual construction. As to the argument of the locality of the project, this is perhaps the most absurd argument which is raised against the Cross-Florida Barge Canal because it actually has more national significance than any waterway project ever undertaken by the U.S. Government. An accurate reading of the information given to the committee shows that although about 80 percent of the traffic would either start or stop in Florida, only 16 percent of it would be of the within-the-State variety even when most conservative analysis is used as to its interstate utilization.

This compares very favorably with other projects. Moreover, it should finally be observed that this project was not authorized by Congress on the basis of economic justification, but was authorized on the basis of its defense value and that the defense value is certainly the paramount value of this project. Even if all of the economic justification of this project were thrown out the window, the project still should be built because of its defense values of which I have already spoken.

In conclusion I wish to express my deepest appreciation to the House Appropriations Committee and its Subcommittee on Public Works and to the President and to the leadership on each side of the aisle in Congress for support of this project. I sincerely hope that this $1 million in construction funds will be promptly approved.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure today to commend the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee for the excellent job he and the members of the committee have done on the bill appropriating funds for our public works projects.

The people of the Fourth District of Florida are indeed grateful for the favorable consideration given to the sorely needed works in Dade County, Fla. They are particularly grateful that the ranking majority member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], and the hardworking members of the committee recognized the need for the beginning of construction on canal C-111—which is part of the south Dade plan—and Cutler drain. The earmarking of up to $200,000 and $300,000 respectively for these projects, which are an integral part of the central and southern Florida flood control district, is the answer to hundreds of urgent pleas from officials and residents of Dade County.

The area encompassed by the south Dade plan comprises about 227 square miles of agricultural and urban subarea and contains most of the local vegetable farms and groves which make up the nontourist factor of our economy. The area is bounded on two sides by existing flood control works, but expanded urbanization and increased industrialization have rapidly forced farmers onto lands that presently have little or no flood control protection.

Subsequent to the submission of the budget for fiscal year 1964, Aerojet General Corp., which acquired about 74,000 acres of land in the south Dade area and is now finishing work on their new plant, contracted for the development and testing of solid fuel rocket engines for the Air Force. One of the primary considerations in the selection of this site was its location with respect to the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway as a barge transportation route to the Cape Canaveral area.

An early start on construction of canal C-111, as part of the South Dade flood control plan authorized by Congress last year, will serve the dual purpose of flood control and barge transportation for the completed solid-fuel rocket engines to the Intracoastal Waterway and thence to the launch site at Canaveral.

The population of the Cutler drain area, which comprises 38.4 square miles, has increased from 945 in 1950 to 27,300 in 1960 and is still growing rapidly. The area is subject to serious flood hazard due to the fact that local secondary drainage works are ineffective without an adequate primary channel to carry off the floodwaters.

Damaging floods have been experienced in 1947, 1948, 1949, 1952, 1953, 1954, 1958, and twice in 1960. Hurricane Donna, which poured 15 inches of rainfall from September 9 through 11, 1960, and hurricane Florence, which dropped 12 inches of rainfall from September 21 through 25, 1960, left the major portion of the area inundated from 2 to 40 days.

Dade County, because of this constant threat, has added $67,000 to next year's budget for secondary channels in this area; 13.6 miles of primary outlet channels have already been constructed. During the floods of 1960 over 13,000 acres or about 55 percent of the area, were under water. Were there to be a recurrence of this catastrophe, it is estimated that damages would exceed $480,200; average annual flood damages are estimated at $101,600.

The residents and property owners of the Cutler drain area can thank the chairman and members of the Appropriations Committee for lifting this ever-present threat to their lives and property.

In addition to the previously mentioned two projects for which funds were earmarked out of the $14 million approved for the central and southern Florida flood control district, I am pleased to say that the committee provided the full budget request on other projects vitally affecting Dade County.

The committee allocated $1,500,000 for fiscal year 1964 for the continuation of the necessary dredging operations to widen the ship channel in Miami Harbor from 300 to 400 feet. Dade County and the city of Miami are now constructing a causeway, access bridge, and related port facilities at an estimated cost of $9 million in addition to the required non-Federal contribution of $1,826,000. The port of Miami is the second largest cruise passenger port in the United States and cargo tonnage passing over the facilities has increased approximately 75 percent since October 1957.

Included in the bill is $2,085,000 for widening and deepening the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway from Fort Lauderdale to Miami. The existing channel is 8 by 100 feet and these funds will enable construction to the dimension of 10 by 125 feet during fiscal year 1964.

Also included is $75,000 for initiation of a general investigation study of the Everglades National Park. Department of Interior representatives have concluded that the park is not receiving sufficient fresh water inflow during dry weather conditions to support the normal biological conditions within the park. This investigation will determine actual waterflow conditions and the best way of correcting the situation. The study is expected to take about 3 years at a total cost of $400,000.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have this opportunity to convey to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and my colleagues who serve on this important committee, my sincere thanks and appreciation for their consideration and cooperation in approving these badly needed funds for Florida's Fourth District projects.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my deep appreciation to the members of the House Committee on Appropriations for including in the public works appropriation bill on the floor today, $1,500,000 to permit continued construction of our Yaquina Bay and Harbor project in Oregon and also for approving $1,100,000 to continue major rehabilitation work on the north jetty, Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oreg. The committee is indeed to be commended for approving these funds for these most meritorious and important projects.

The Yaquina project, costing $24,400,000 when completed, is of paramount importance to the economy and employment of Lincoln County and, indeed, will benefit all of Oregon. When completed, it will make Yaquina Bay and Harbor a top ranked Oregon port. At the present time, shipment of timber products from Yaquina Bay is very seriously hampered by channel depths. Only partial loadings are now possible and delays in shipments often result. The improvements under this project will remedy this serious handicap to navigation and make Yaquina a year-round harbor and result in large savings in transportation costs and elimination of delays. This will, of course, tremendously assist the lumber industry and open up entirely new phases of commerce from expansion of exports and imports. Commercial fishing and recreation will also be greatly benefited as well as the lumber industry.

Completion of the $2,140,000 rehabilitation project on the north jetty of Tillamook Bay and Bar will also give a tremendous boost to the economy and the employment opportunities of our Tillamook area. Improvement to the north jetty will permit barging of timber products and will also be of great value to commercial fishermen and pleasure craft. The rebuilt jetty will provide a more protected and safer bay entrance and make possible a greater use of the navigation project in the bay.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to express my personal thanks as well as the thanks of his honor, the mayor of the city of New York, Hon. Robert F. Wagner, and of all the people of the city of New York to the members of this committee for their having included in the pending bill an appropriation in the amount of $95,000 for a study by the Corps of Army Engineers on the dangers to navigation which exist in New York Harbor due to floating debris emanating from old and unused piers and sunken and abandoned hulks and derelicts.

This study has been estimated to take approximately 1 year to complete and will include a thorough survey of the New York-New Jersey Harbor and its tributary waters for sources of debris. The study will make it possible for the Corps of Army Engineers to make a determination on the procedures necessary to carry out a project including such matters as temporary waivers of proprietary interest in or the institution of proceedings to have such hulks or derelict structures declared a menace to navigation. This project is vital to the safety of navigation in New York Harbor and the protection of both commercial and pleasure craft.

Our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY], who represents the entire Staten Island waterfront area, the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER], and all those Members of this House who interested themselves in this worthwhile project are likewise entitled to commendation.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, the Mississippi River forms the western boundary of the congressional district I represent, and the Illinois River courses through the district's center.

Through the years the Federal Government has carried out navigation policies on these rivers which, in turn, have increased flood hazards to adjacent farmland.

It is, therefore, a proper responsibility of the Federal Government to help levee and drainage districts meet this hazard with flood control structures.

In this bill are six flood control projects within the 20th District: Planning money, Indian Grave drainage district, $100,000; McGee Creek drainage and levee district, $80,000; Sny Island levee drainage district, $166,000; Clear Lake special drainage district, $51,000; Sid Simpson flood control project at Beardstown, $695,000; the Sny Basin project, $3,500,000.

Each project has been thoroughly studied by local interests and by the Corps of Engineers. Each comes to the House with the recommendation of local interests and the corps.

I am honored to have this opportunity to urge approval of these needed improvements, and to express my appreciation to the chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] for their splendid cooperation.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, the Third Congressional District of Washington, of which I have the honor and privilege of representing, depends to a considerable extent upon water transportation for its economic life.

This nine-county area is bounded on the south by the great Columbia River, on the west by the Pacific Ocean, and on the north by Puget Sound, and it is apparent that good water transportation is essential to the 450,000 people residing in my district.

The public works projects carried out by the U.S. Corps of Engineers over the years have made possible an excellent system of water transportation and the bill passed by the House on November 19 will make further improvements possible.

Over the past several years a system of barge transportation has been built on the Columbia River making possible cheap and efficient water transportation from the interior of Washington to the fresh water ports of Camas-Washougal, Cathlamet, Ilwaco, Kalama, Longview, Vancouver, and Stevenson.

This bill appropriates $1 million for a start of construction on a 40-foot channel, and over the next several years construction will continue so that our ports will be able to accommodate the larger vessels which are becoming more common in today's merchant marine. There have been many instances of these large ships leaving our Columbia River ports less than full laden because of the shallowness of the channel.

This bill will make possible a start on dredging the channel, and will eliminate in time the need for vessels to leave less than fully laden.

This bill also appropriates $100,000 for start of construction on the Camas-Washougal flood control project on the Columbia River. This is an area subject to periodic flooding, and each year at flood stage Columbia River waters seep into land where industrial plants are daily trying to survive in this highly competitive world.

Included in this bill, also, are sufficient funds to maintain the Columbia River and to continue model studies at the mouth in an effort to design structures which will control the shoaling in the area.

The appropriations for the Willapa Harbor area will make it possible for this lumber port to continue to contribute to the employment stability of the area. And the money made available for the Grays Harbor and Chehalis River areas will make it possible for ships to make efficient use of the facilities.

I won't fail to mention the appropriations for the Bonneville Power Authority. The electric power provided by this agency of our Federal Government has made possible an industrial expansion which is the equal of any in the country, and the money in this bill will make it possible for BPA to continue to serve efficiently and well the hundreds of thousands of people living in the area.

In conclusion, I express my deepest appreciation of my distinguished colleagues on the Appropriations Committee and in the House of Representatives. I know full well that this money will be used wisely and well and will reflect great credit on this great body.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I want to join the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] in his expression of appreciation of the cooperation of the members of the committee. I especially want to express appreciation of the invaluable service rendered by the gentleman from Iowa, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, in the long hearings and the preparation of this very intricate and difficult bill.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is one of the most valuable members of the committee and of the House of Representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

For construction and rehabilitation of authorized reclamation projects or parts thereof (including power transmission facilities) and for other related activities, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, $180,190,000, of which $75,000,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers, except those transmission facilities for which construction funds have been heretofore appropriated, those facilities which are necessary to carry out the terms of such contracts or those facilities for which the Secretary of the Interior finds the wheeling agency is unable or unwilling to provide for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customer.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I note there are some $49 or $50 million for the Department of the Interior in this bill. I also note a news story datelined Minneapolis, Minn., November 16, 1963, in which a Dr. Athelstan Spilhaus, dean of the University of Minnesota Institute of Technology, has been delegated to plan the new $10 million fish pond in Washington, otherwise known as an aquarium.

Among other things, according to the news story, Dr. Spilhaus says there is to be a pond with dead fish to show how a polluted stream harms wild life. He also apparently is going to provide a seafood restaurant, the menu of which would include such marine rarities as "Japanese hamburger." A "Japanese hamburger" is described as consisting of raw fish and seaweed.

I hope this restaurant is located at some little distance from the stream that is going to be filled with dead fish because I cannot believe "Japanese hamburger" is going to be appetizing even without the dead fish close by.

My question to somebody on the committee is whether there is any money in the Interior Department's $50 million for the fish pond that is to be located on the Potomac River? Can the gentleman tell me whether there is any money for the Japanese delicatessen in this bill?

Mr. KIRWAN. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. GROSS. Is there any money in this bill for the fish pond to be erected on the Potomac River?

Mr. KIRWAN. When the appropriations for the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium was in here recently the gentleman said he stayed up until 2 o'clock in the morning to study the bill. If he stayed up until 2 o'clock studying this bill I am sure he knows there is nothing in this bill concerning the item.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman give me credit for staying up until 2 o'clock and trying?

Mr. KIRWAN. There is not a dime in this bill for that.

Mr. GROSS. That is all I wanted to hear, and I thank the gentleman for the information.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, without amendment, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT] having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 358, nays 27, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 207]

YEAS—358

Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Cohelan

Colmer
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Glenn
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Horton
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord
Jarman

Jensen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kee
Keith
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilgore
King. Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Landrum
Langen
Lankford
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
Macdonald
Madden
Mahon
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Rains
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel

Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, Pa.
Rooney, N.Y.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Sheppard
Short
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Van Pelt
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
White
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Wyman
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—27

Alger
Becker
Bruce
Clancy
Collier
Devine

Goodell
Gross
Hoffman
Hutchinson
Joelson
Johansen

King, N.Y.
Laird
Latta
MacGregor
Marsh
Michel

Poff
Rumsfeld
St. George

Saylor
Smith, Calif.
Snyder

Stinson
Tuck
Wydler

NOT VOTING—48

Abbitt
Abele
Avery
Bennett, Mich.
Bromwell
Brotzman
Broyhill, Va.
Buckley
Burton
Carey
Celler
Clawson, Del
Dague
Derwinski
Duncan
Foreman

Gill
Goodling
Halleck
Harding
Harvey, Ind.
Hébert
Hemphill
Hosmer
Jennings
Kastenmeier
Kelly
Knox
Lloyd
Long, La.
Mailliard
Martin, Calif.

Martin, Mass.
Meader
Milliken
Multer
O'Brien, Ill.
Pilcher
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Rodino
St. Onge
Schwengel
Shelley
Shipley
Shriver
Trimble
Wilson, Bob

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Milliken for, with Mr. Derwinski against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Bob Wilson.
Mr. Shelley with Del Clawson.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Goodling.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Burton.
Mr. Trimble with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Brotzman.
Mr. Gill with Mr. Lloyd.
Mr. Harding with Mr. Abele.
Mr. Hemphill with Mr. Martin of California.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Jennings with Mrs. Reid of Illinois.
Mr. Randall with Mr. Foreman.
Mr. Duncan with Mr. Bromwell.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Schriver.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Knox.
Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. Dague.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE and Messrs. COLLIER and JOELSON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay".

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained during the vote on the public works appropriation bill. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. MARTIN of California. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained during the vote on the public works appropriation bill. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

NO NEW CIVIL RIGHTS LAW NEEDED

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, there is obtainable from the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, a document entitled "Provisions of the Constitution, Statutes, and Executive Orders and Regulations of the United States Relating to the Infringement of Civil Rights on the Basis of Race, Religion, Color, or National Origin."

I particularly want to invite the attention of my colleagues to this publication because I hopefuly believe that upon reviewing it they will conclude that no additional civil rights legislation is needed.

This document contains some 190 pages of excerpts and references. While I cannot personally vouch for everything it contains, and some of the items do seem rather farfetched in their application to the subject, it is on the whole a commendable job of research.

Here we find a description of the Civil Rights Commission. The various parts of the Constitution that are considered applicable are quoted. The table of contents lists general civil rights statutes, jurisdiction of district courts, statutory provisions having to do with elections, housing, education, employment, transportation, jury rights, and much more, right on down through the use of the Armed Forces to enforce Federal authority.

This interesting document illustrates an important point that ought to be given full consideration in connection with any new civil rights proposals, that is, there is a vast amount of such legislation on the statute books already. It shows that our legal establishment has available sufficient authority to guarantee the civil rights of all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, in view of this super abundance of so-called civil rights legislation, and especially in view of the nature of current proposals, any new such legislation likely to be adopted will have a whiplash effect on the American people, including the very people who now advocate the legislation and those they seek to mollify.

Under the guise of civil rights the executive branch of our Government is seeking power that would enable it to control our homes, businesses, farms, banks, schools, and the election machinery.

Under the guise of civil rights the Executive asks authority to tell you—if you own a business—whom you shall hire, fire, promote, or demote.

Under the guise of civil rights the President seeks power to blacklist individuals and business firms from Federal programs, activities, subsidies, and benefits.

The whiplash, or backlash, if current civil rights proposals are enacted, will be the regimentation of our citizens in ways, and in areas of private endeavor, hitherto undreamed of since first we freed ourselves from the British Crown.

Our Founding Fathers purposely and painfully drafted and ratified a written Constitution primarily to put the Government they were establishing beyond the control of impatient public officials, temporary majorities, and the vacillating moods of public opinion. The current drive for civil rights legislation is spearheaded by impatient public officials under pressure from voting blocs of citizens who, while nowise a majority, hold the balance of electoral power in certain political strongholds, namely the big cities of the North and East.

The whiplash of new civil rights laws would immediately affect and harm upward to 90 percent of our population, but in time its sting would be felt by the other 10 percent as well. The cause of freedom would suffer for all people, for all time, everywhere in this great land of ours.

Clearly, no additional civil rights legislation is advisable, and with such an abundance of such already within our statutes, covering every imaginable subject, certainly none is needed.

ANY AMERICAN WOULD DO THE SAME

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as my name has been used on a personal basis recently, I am submitting the following:

[From the Valley News, El Cajon, Calif., Nov. 1, 1963]

Any American Would Do the Same

Two Texas Congressmen got into a fight this week.

It probably will go down in history as the most highly publicized and shortest brawl ever staged in the Halls of Congress.

The two combatants were Representative Henry B. Gonzalez and Representative Ed Foreman. Gonzalez struck the first blow. It also was the last blow. But Foreman must be given credit for starting the brawl. He ired Gonzalez by indulging in some name calling.

Back in Texas recently, Foreman made a speech to a women's club during which he mentioned that Gonzalez and 19 other Congressmen had voted against increasing the appropriation for the House Un-American Activities Committee.

"I am not going to call Gonzalez a Communist," Foreman told the women, "but he is as extreme to the left as the other 19 and they are pinkoes."

When Texas newspapers printed stories of this speech, the headlines stated that Foreman had pinned a "Pinko Label on Gonzalez."

Gonzalez is no newcomer to the political arena. He knew the label of "pinko" was intended to impugn his loyalty and hold him up to public scorn and ridicule. So he didn't waste any time arguing semantics. He accused Foreman of calling him a Communist and took a swing at him.

For a Congressman to call a colleague "Communist" or "Red," except on the floor of the House where he enjoys immunity, is to commit an act of dangerous libel.

So Foreman used the smear word "pinko." What was he trying to say? Was he trying to say that Gonzalez was not a Communist? Apparently this was not his intent, or he would have gone ahead and said so. Instead, he merely said he was not "going to call Gonzalez a Communist."

Why, as long as he was telling his audience what he was not going to call Gonzalez, didn't he go further? Why didn't Foreman also say that he was not going to call Gonzalez a murderer?

The obvious answer, of course, is that Foreman does not think Gonzalez is a murderer. So why bring up the subject? About his being a Communist, however, Foreman has some definite opinions. But he has no desire to be sued for libel. So he uses his "pinko" gimmick to do by innuendo and inference what he does not dare do directly.

Congressmen develop thick hides. They can listen unmoved while their intelligence, judgment, or generosity is attacked. They will not take violent umbrage if their colleagues describe them as lazy, uninformed, or deaf to reason.

But no Congressman worthy of his salt is going to sit on his hands while his loyalty is impugned. Gonzalez is worthy of his salt. He is from San Antonio, born in the shadow of the Alamo. He has been in public life since 1953 when he was elected to the San Antonio City Council. His loyalty is not subject to question.

Foreman knows this. But he wanted to be as nasty as he could without risking libel. He was asking for trouble.

For grown men to engage in fisticuffs is not becoming. But there are times when about the only proper retort to a deliberate and provocative insult is a good punch in the nose.

The lowest order of life is the character assassin. And the lowest character assassin is he who assails a man's loyalty behind his back merely because of disagreement over a political issue.

Under the circumstances, Gonzalez did what any self-respecting American would do.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was created in April 1953. At that time it was a department of rather modest size, and while its programs were varied there were not too many of them for one central office and one Cabinet officer to keep in reasonably close contact with them all.

During the 10 intervening years Congress and the executive administration have recognized that far too little attention and effort had been given to these important fields and especially the first two, health and education. The new legislation that has resulted from this recognition has vastly increased the size, complexity, and importance of the Department. In our hearings on the 1964 budget for the Department I asked for a listing and brief explanation of the legislative enactments of the last 4 Congresses having an impact on the Department's activities. This list, which totals 80 separate laws, appears on pages 1290 through 1306 of part 1 of the hearings record.

The first annual appropriation act for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was for fiscal year 1954. It included appropriations for 49 offices and activities. It totaled $1.7 billion. The appropriation act for 1964 totals $5.5 billion. Just the part of the 1964 appropriation that would be transferred to the new Department of Health which I propose would amount to more than the entire Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for 1954 and would include approximately the same number of activities as the whole Department of Health, Education, and Welfare had in 1954.

In addition, it is quite obvious that this expansion is going to continue. There is legislation that has passed one or both Houses of Congress this year which will add to the existing responsibilities provided for in the 1964 appropriation act in the field of vocational education, aid to impacted school districts, water pollution control, assistance to certain schools of higher education, programs for the mentally retarded, and assistance in improving mental health to mention a few.

When Secretary Ribicoff resigned in July 1962 he said:

> The man in my job wears 20 different hats a day, runs 110 separate programs and is responsible for 75 separate budget items. * * * Even the small European countries have separate departments for health, education, and welfare. Their cabinet ministers come to see me and can't believe we're trying to run them all from one office.

This was over a year ago. Since then we have added new hats, new programs, and new budget items and, as I said earlier, it is obvious we will continue to do so. This is as it should be for these are vitally important activities that benefit every person in our Nation. My only complaint is that we have gone too slowly in expanding many of them. However, I am firmly convinced that we have reached the point, in fact that we have already passed the point, where all of this multitude of diverse activities can be properly administered in a single department. To me it is the height of foolishness to put off the relatively simple action of setting up separate departments of health and education that will undoubtedly result in better, more efficient administration of these vital programs.

LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Staebler] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, November 18, 1963, marked the 45th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Latvia and it is fitting that we join with Americans of Latvian descent in their observance of this momentous occasion.

The conquest of the Latvian territories in the 18th century by the Russian Empire did not change the Western orientation of the Latvian people. Even under foreign domination, they preserved their national spirit, traditions, and language.

As a result of their insurrection of 1905, Latvia was granted limited representation in the Imperial Russian Duma, which, in the persons of Janis Zalitis and Janis Goldmanis had profound influence on the history of Latvian liberation.

The Latvians were hard hit by the invasion of the German Army in 1915 with over 400,000 Latvians forced to become refugees in Russia. The brave Latvian troops held the Riga front against German forces for 2 years until the Russian revolution of 1917. Realizing that their independence was endangered by the 1917 Russian revolution, the Latvian National Council announced Latvia's separation from Bolshevik Russia on January 5, 1918.

On November 11, 1918, the British Government recognized the Latvian National Council as the Government of Latvia and 7 days later, on November 18, 1918, the first Latvian provisional parliament, the National Council, proclaimed the independence of Latvia.

On December 5, 1918, Soviet troops invaded Latvian territory and formed a Latvian Soviet government, an open breach of the declaration of the right of Latvia's self-determination. On May 22, 1919, Riga was liberated by the Latvian army and German units. After numerous German attempts to overthrow the Latvian Government, an armistice was signed and a peace treaty was negotiated with the Soviets. This Latvian freedom had been paid for by the loss of 700,000 Latvians. The recognition of Latvia by the United States on July 28, 1922, completed full international recognition as an independent and sovereign state with full representation on the League of Nations.

The subsequent occupation of Latvia by the Soviet in 1940 was a clear-cut violation of signed agreements, once again demonstrating Soviet Russia's total disregard for the pledged word.

With their background of Western culture and civilization, the people of Latvia will never recognize Soviet domination of their homeland and will carry on their fight for self-determination and their God-given right to live in freedom.

SUPPORT FOR MEDICARE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the text of my testimony before the Ways and Means Committee in support of the President's medicare proposal:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 3920, NOVEMBER 19, 1963

Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the opportunity to testify in favor of H.R. 3920, the President's proposal to provide medical care for the aged through the social security system. I have introduced an identical bill, H.R. 9095, which is also before the committee.

During the last decade the number of older people in our country has increased by 5 million. Since the end of World War II hospital charges have gone up 400 percent from $9.50 a day in 1946 to $35 a day now. Our senior citizens cannot afford to pay this kind of money very long without going completely broke and destroying whatever assets they might have saved for their old-age retirement years.

Let us examine for a moment one of the alternatives to medicare, the old-age assistance program. In 1950 there were 2.8 million people receiving old-age assistance. Today there are 2.2 million, a drop of 600,000. This has been accomplished for a very simple reason: more and more people are eligible for social security when they reach the age of 65; seven out of eight are able to meet their day-to-day needs without old-age assistance. This is the best argument I know for social security.

There is no reason why any citizen, in this the richest country in the world, should have to depend for his or her livelihood on a government dole. Social security provides the means whereby the citizen can live out his senior years with dignity and self-respect.

Medical care provided through the social security system is merely a logical extension of this principle. Parenthetically it might be noted that those who oppose medicare do so because they say that it is part of a so-called "welfare state" philosophy. If their opposition were to defeat this bill it would inevitably wipe out the decrease in the number of welfare recipients and in fact, increase it over and above the 2.8 million mark of 1950. As our aged population increases, the percentage increases of those who cannot afford the heavy medical expenses of old age.

What we want to do and what we should do is keep these people off the welfare rolls. What we need to do and what we should do is see that these people have the opportunity to provide for their own future medical needs through the social security system.

The American Medical Association has said "no" to medicare. What the AMA is further saying is "put the old people on relief."

There can be no doubt that the late distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. Kerr, and the distinguished chairman of this committee had nothing but the highest respect and regard for the needs and the well-being of those of our fellow citizens over 65 who cannot afford the high cost of being sick. Being responsive to this great concern the Congress, in 1960, adopted what is now called the Kerr-Mills program. After 3 years, however, it is all too evident that this program is not an adequate substitute for medicare. Only half of our States have joined this program and it has not worked well in those.

Frequently the range of assistance available does not include what the patient needs or else the facilities for providing the assistance are inadequate; the choice of a doctor or hospital may be nonexistent, the necessary care being available only in specific facilities or from specific doctors.

The argument has been offered that under the Kerr-Mills Act, the Federal Government's contribution is unlimited since it will match whatever the States provide. The simple fact is, however, that the States cannot match the Federal Government in this area; they just cannot provide enough funds to do the job. Of the 29 jurisdictions (including Guam, Puerto Rico, District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands) which have adopted the Kerr-Mills approach, only four—Hawaii, Massachusetts, New York, and North Dakota—can be said to have comprehensive programs. At the other end of the scale, we find five States with minimal programs, all the rest have what the Bureau of Family Services terms intermediate plans.

An aspect of Kerr-Mills operation which is certainly just as bad as the lack of comprehensiveness in the various State plans is the denial of dignity and self-respect to the aged citizens seeking assistance, by the imposition of a means test. Why should these people have to submit themselves to this procedure in order to receive adequate medical attention that they could have helped pay for themselves through the Social Security System?

Health insurance is not socialism; medicare is not socialism. Like private health insurance, it is merely a means of paying medical bills. It is nothing more and nothing less. I am proud to be a sponsor of this legislation and I strongly urge that this committee report H.R. 3920 to the House at the earliest possible time so that our senior citizens can receive the benefits of medicare with dignity and respect.

Thank you.

SEARSPORT, MAINE, HARBOR CONSTRUCTION

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. TUPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, as Representative of Maine's First District, I am appreciative to the Appropriations Committee of their approval of $718,000 to Searsport, Maine, Harbor for construction, and for the appropriation of $1 million for the Portland, Maine, Harbor dredging project. I am glad that they have concluded, as I have, that it is imperative that actual dredging operations commence as soon as possible in these major Maine seaports.

However, I must in all frankness state that I view with considerable concern the change of the ultimate depth of the Portland, Maine, project from the 45 feet recommended by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, to a depth of 40 feet.

The argument has been made that many other seaports in the United States will wish to have their harbors dredged to 45 feet, and that the House should not set a precedent. I believe that every project of this type should be considered on its own respective merits and that all seaports should be adequate for their commercial needs.

I think it would be advisable to acquaint the House with some of the background relating to this port project.

It has been 17 years since Congress last authorized a dredging project for

Portland Harbor. On April 25, 1961, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, after a thorough survey of conditions, reported that Portland Harbor "is inadequate for present and prospective commerce," and recommended modifications providing for an entrance channel 1,000 feet wide and 45 feet deep, instead of the present 35 feet, and a maneuvering basin and anchorage 45 feet deep instead of the present 35 feet. The cost was estimated at $8,368,000 and they assessed the benefit-cost ratio at 6 to 1. The 87th Congress included in the Public Works Appropriations Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, the sum of $550,000 for preconstruction engineering and to initiate dredging. The preconstruction planning has been completed.

The State of Maine was once among the most influential of all maritime States. We have the potential, the will and the desire for this to be our lot again. Maine is currently making a determined effort to find new markets for Maine-manufactured goods as well as agricultural and fisheries products throughout the world.

The port of Portland in a very real sense is the principal artery for ocean-borne traffic in the heavily populated area of Maine. Portland is one of the most important commercial ports in the country, ranking second among New England ports. It is the second largest petroleum port in the United States, and possibilities for expansion are excellent.

Portland Harbor is an ice-free landlocked port, about 100 miles northeast of Boston. It is served by three railroads. It has 11 berths for deep-draft cargo ships, 8 available berths for deep-draft tankers, covered storage area for 75,000 tons, and ground storage for 2,272 carloads. The city of Portland is Maine's largest city, serving a retail trade area of 250,000 people.

Shipping through the port of Portland during 1962 contributed over $20 million, on a conservative estimate, to the economy of the State. Eleven million tons of crude oil from South America and the Near East was transshipped by pipeline to Montreal, Canada. Four million tons of refined oil mostly from other U.S. ports was received. Also arriving at the port was 56,745 tons of China clay, 182,721 tons of coal, and 39,849 tons of woodpulp. An average of 400,000 tons of dry cargo are moved through the port each year.

As indicated, the principal commodity is crude oil. The operation and maintenance of the pipelines and terminal is estimated to cost $4,200,000 per year and provides jobs for a great many Maine people. Federal, State, and local taxes boost this amount to $6 million per year. The value to the Portland area from servicing and supplying vessels and other incidental expenses averages between $2 and $3 million annually.

The dependence upon crude oil traffic is the major source of revenue for tugboats operating out of this port. If it were not for this assured revenue, they could not provide the vital service to other ports such as Bath—home of Bath Iron Works where many Navy destroyers are built—the Harpswell Navy Base, and Cousins Island. Most, if not all, other port services depend upon this crude oil tonnage.

A glance at a map of the northern part of this hemisphere, and a recollection of history illustrates the importance of the port of Portland in time of war. It is in the vital interest of the United States to have an ice-free, deepwater, sheltered port in the northeastern part of our country.

The expansion of commerce in Portland Harbor is restricted because of relatively shallow rock ledges in the main entrance channel. When a ship drawing 35 feet approaches the harbor 2 hours before low tide, it cannot enter. At least a 4-hour delay is necessary. If there are ocean swells, the time may be longer.

It is impossible for the larger tankers of the 60,000- to 65,000-deadweight-ton class with drafts of 42 to 44 feet to navigate this harbor.

Large tankers of the 40,000- to 47,000-deadweight-ton class—up to 750 feet in length—do presently use the harbor, but only under the most favorable conditions.

It should be borne in mind that when a ship is underway, the bow lifts and the stern sinks deeper into the water. This adds to a vessel's draft. If the vessel is loaded unevenly, this must be taken into consideration, and ocean swells are another factor when considering if a harbor channel is of sufficient depth.

With the trend rapidly developing toward larger and more efficient tankers, the requirement for a 45-foot entrance channel and anchorage is urgent.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has reported that these recommended improvements would result in "considerable annual benefits" from existing and prospective commerce. They pointed out that benefits to the general economy of Portland and the area it serves would be "significant."

It is my sincere hope that the Appropriations Committee will, in future deliberations, see fit to review the matter of the ultimate depth and agree with the findings of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

TO PROHIBIT EXPORT-IMPORT BANK GUARANTEES ON CREDITS TO COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill which would prohibit the Export-Import Bank, or any other Government agency, from guaranteeing the payment of any obligation of a Communist country, or agency or national of that country. This bill is identical to S. 2310, previously introduced by Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, in the Senate. I am happy to join with the distinguished Senator and my Republican colleague from South Dakota in moving to check what could turn out to be a very bad beating for the American taxpayer.

During this session of the 88th Congress, as a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, I participated as a House conferee on a bill to extend the life of the Export-Import Bank. A strong stand by the House prevented the inclusion of an unwarranted $2 billion cushion for the Bank which would have been financed through the direct Treasury borrowing method known as backdoor spending. Instead, the Senate accepted a proposal that I had originally proposed in the first conference to extend the Bank's charter for 5 years, and increase the authorization for credit insurance.

At that time, whatever our differences in approach to spending procedures, neither the House nor Senate conferees had any inkling that the new credit insurance authorization would be used to insure credit for export deals to Communist countries, as now contemplated by this administration. If I had thought this possible at the time, I would have offered this legislative proposal long ago to prevent the Export-Import Bank from ruining its otherwise excellent record of achievement.

The Kennedy administration is well aware that the law prevents the extension of direct loans to Communist countries. This congressional judgment has been based not only on the fact that the Soviet Union has declared itself an enemy of the United States and the free world, but also on the practical fact that the Communist regime has no credit rating in the eyes of Americans who have never received payments or returns on lend-lease items, to name just one factor. As any housewife knows, however, there is more than one way, and one word, to describe a loan.

In this case, credit is to be extended for 18 months on 75 percent of the purchase price for any wheat or other grain sold to Communist countries, and that credit is to be insured by the Export-Import Bank. We are told that commercial bankers are unwilling to extend the credit unless it is guaranteed in full by the Bank. At no time in the past has the Bank ever insured credit for a Communist country, and there is only one instance, with respect to a cotton shipment to Japan last July, when the Bank was supposedly not operating as you may remember, that a full credit guarantee was given. The difference between guaranteeing credit to a democratic nation, an American ally, as against the same guarantee when dealing with an unscrupulous Communist state hardly needs to be pointed out.

We are told that wheat to Russia, or grain to Hungary, is a one-shot deal, the result of their crop failures and not expected to occur again. If this is so, and no further trade is to be expected, why should we expect the Communists to honor their credit obligations? The recent blockade of American and British trucks on the autobahn in Germany, and the arrest of an American professor on spy charges in Moscow is indicative of how deep the "thaw" is between East and West. In fact, at a recent Moscow reception, our Ambassador to Russia heard so many anti-Western toasts that he was driven to ask what had become of the spirit of Moscow. If it goes the way of the spirit of Geneva, it will be the American taxpayer who will pay for the wheat the Russian soldier eats. That is the significance of any insured credit risk for the Communist countries through the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. Speaker, the bill submitted by Senator MUNDT is scheduled for hearings before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee tomorrow. The Democratic leadership in that body has promised to bring it to the floor for a vote next Monday. Under these circumstances, I have sent a letter to the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Texas, Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, urging him to call similar hearings on the House side. Surely, the Members of this body deserve an equal chance to express their opinions on this legislation. My bill provides the vehicle for just such an examination by this committee and I cannot imagine any reason for delaying affirmative action on my request. I would hope that the bipartisan spirit shown by the leaders of the Senate would extend to this side of Capitol Hill as well.

A copy of the bill follows:

H.R. 9144

A bill to prohibit any guaranty by the Export-Import Bank or any other agency of the Government of payment of obligations of Communist countries

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That neither the Export-Import Bank nor any other agency of the Government shall guarantee the payment of any obligation heretofore or hereafter incurred by any Communist country (as defined in section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961) or any agency or national thereof, or in any other way participate in the extension of credit to any such country, agency, or national, in connection with the purchase of any product by such country, agency, or national.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, 10 days ago Dr. Edward C. Crafts, Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Department of the Interior, addressed the annual meeting of the National Audubon Society in Miami, Fla., on the subject of the need for a national land and water conservation fund. Dr. Crafts' remarks were so informative and so pertinent to a bill, H.R. 3846, just reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that I commend it to all Members of the House for reading and study.

The address follows:

NEED FOR LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

(Remarks of Edward C. Crafts, Director, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Department of the Interior, before the annual meeting of the National Audubon Society, Miami, Fla., November 11, 1963)

This is my first trip to southern Florida. It is also the first time I have been privileged to attend an annual meeting of the National Audubon Society. I have heard how successful your meeting was a year ago at Corpus Christi, and am honored to have been offered a chance to speak to you here today.

With its annual budget of over $1 million, membership in excess of 40,000, junior membership numbering in the millions, its several publications, its nature centers, camps, lectures, educational programs, and wildlife tours, I am well aware of your broad conservation objectives and that the National Audubon Society is the largest of the national conservation organizations. Further, the unusually large membership of women in the Audubon Society contributes to its uniqueness and effectiveness.

Earlier in this program, you were addressed by my friend and boss, the Secretary of the Interior. I have no intention of trying to match his eloquence. But we are approaching the moment of truth on some of the hard-rock issues of the day, and there are certain things that I want to say to you. I say these in the hope that I am speaking not only to those of you here today in person, but also to your membership at large and to other conservationists throughout the country.

In recent years, particularly in the last two decades, there has been a great rush to the outdoors. I could quote you statistics as to the dollars spent, investments made, numbers of people participating, activities that are favored, and so on. You may not know these figures, but you are part of this rush. All you have to do is look around on all sides to see it happening.

The cultural and sociological implications have been analyzed by professionals and by foundations, and in such books as the 20th Century publication, "Of Time, Work, and Leisure," Walter Kerr's "The Decline of Pleasure," and Charles Brightbill's "The Challenge of Leisure." The reasons are generally well known. There are more people, more free time, more money, more automobiles and better roads.

In recognition of these changes, the Congress a few years ago established an Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. In due time there was issued an impressive series of reports with numerous recommendations. The report of this bipartisan Commission, headed by Laurance Rockefeller, has been widely heralded and applauded.

One of its recommendations was the creation of a small, new Federal agency to promote coordination among Federal agencies; to serve as a focal point of contact between the Federal Government and State and local governments, and the private sector; to develop an overall, long-range outdoor recreation plan; and to assist in research and education.

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation was thus established by the Secretary of the Interior and within the past few months has been given a charter by the Congress in the passage of an Organic Act, which recognizes the functions of coordination, planning, research, education, technical assistance, and cooperation with State and local governments and private parties.

The Congress in the initial section of that act:

"Declares it to be desirable that all American people of present and future generations be assured adequate outdoor recreation resources, and that it is desirable for all levels of government and private interests to take prompt and coordinated action to the extent practicable without diminishing or affecting their respective powers and functions to conserve, develop, and utilize such resources for the benefit and enjoyment of the American people."

I think few would disagree with this congressional statement of policy. It is the one that controls the fundamental philosophies of this Bureau. It is in harmony with the numerous statements about programs and objectives made before other groups in the past year and a half.

May I underscore particularly that we believe the States should play the key role in intergovernmental relations. We also recognize that the greatest contribution to outdoor recreation now is supplied, and probably in the future will continue to be supplied, by the private sector.

There are certain things we have done, as well as certain knowledge we have gained from experience, during the last year and a half that may be of interest to you.

There is a major problem of effective communication between professionals and laymen consumers of outdoor recreation. It is hard for the professionals to get across to the laymen the scope of their frustrations when their programs or requests for funds are being cut to ribbons, or when they are being knifed by competitors for limited land or water resources. Too many laymen naively think that everyone is for the outdoors, just as they are for motherhood and against sin.

Along the same line, until recent years, most State governments were indifferent toward the burgeoning needs for outdoor recreation. Those who sought recognition of public responsibility in this field were at the bottom of the totem pole; and general quality of workers in this field and salaries paid were both too low.

I have learned that both the recreation worker and the recreation enthusiast are not effectively organized to make their views known where policy is made. Frequently, they are in disagreement or in competition with each other and, thus, often their efforts are ineffectual. A classic example is competition between winter sports enthusiasts and wilderness lovers for the same area. Also where a man's pocketbook and business are concerned, he will fight harder than where his free time or vacation is involved.

It is a fact of life that public agencies must compete for dollars and that recreation is competing against funds needed for defense, for education, for space exploration, for foreign aid, and other activities that are established responsibilities of Government and generally considered of higher priority.

One of the most basic problems is that a proper proportion—whatever that may be—of land and water resources should be devoted to outdoor recreation. This puts the recreationist in direct competition with others who utilize the same resources for commercial or economic purposes. Problems of balance, of multiple use, primary use, and of the allocation of resources close to centers of population as well as problems of public versus private responsibilities and opportunities are among the most difficult ones that we face.

Admittedly, I am not impartial. But, I think the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation has done reasonably well under the circumstances confronting it in the first 18 months of its existence. We were not fortunate enough to light running with money already available, with a statute enacted recognizing the Bureau, or with hiring preference to enable us to attract superior personnel.

We had to pick ourselves up by the bootstraps so to speak and get the money, persuade the Congress to enact legislation, and to hire competitively with old-line established agencies. Fortunately, the challenge of the first new conservation organization in the Federal Government since the 1930's helped us obtain competent personnel with a variety of disciplines and experience backgrounds.

It has been our good fortune to have a policy role in numerous studies that are being made of special situations or areas. Almost without exception, these are controversial. They include proposals for Fire Island, Assateague, and Oregon Dunes National Seashores; an Allagash National Riverway in Maine; a nationwide study of wild rivers, which must consider questions of the utilization or control of water for irrigation, power, or flood control; the study of the North Cascade Mountains in Washington; a nationwide review of a possible system of scenic roads; and numerous others.

I have also learned that recreationists are sometimes their own worst enemy. I am for a wilderness bill, probably as much as anyone here. I helped prepare some of the earlier drafts, and have testified three times on behalf of wilderness legislation when I was in the Forest Service. But I say to you that the frustrations of the proponents should not lead to personal attacks upon Members of the Congress. The most recent example is the reference to the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the November 1963 issue of Field and Stream. The derogatory remarks in that article are completely out of order, and I do not wish to repeat them.

The chairman is a proud and sensitive man. He is a good legislator and like most of us, he does what is right as he sees it. He has done much for conservation and is seeking to do much more. Attacks of this sort serve no good. If they have any result, it is only to lessen and delay chances of enactment of a wilderness bill. As far as I am concerned, they are both unwarranted and sheer folly.

But despite the progress that has been made, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation can be only half an arm until the land and water conservation fund bill is enacted. Until that time, we cannot give the service to the States and local governments that was contemplated in the grants-in-aid recommendations of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

Enactment of this bill is absolutely essential to effective progress by State and local governments and the Federal Government in outdoor recreation.

The bill, because it is long and complex, has not been widely understood. Opposition has sprung up to it, misstatements are being made about it, and it is approaching the hour of decision.

It was introduced by 16 Senators and 11 Congressmen, including 2 from Florida. It is listed in the box score of the New York Times as one of 12 major bills in the Congress; it is similarly listed in the box scores of major bills in the Congressional Quarterly.

The bill was developed after extensive discussion with key State officials from about one-half the States; with conservation, fish, and wildlife, recreation and industrial groups; and with numerous Federal agencies. It is pioneering conservation legislation.

There are three basic premises behind the bill:

1. The first is that States must occupy the key role in developing a balanced national outdoor recreation program.

2. The second is that (a) a substantial acreage of land needs to be acquired by public agencies in order to make it possible to meet future recreation needs, and (b) this acquisition needs to occur promptly before such lands become either unavailable for recreation because of commitments to other uses or prohibitively expensive.

3. The third is that acquisition should be financed with as little impact as possible on the Federal budget and, as a corollary, that recreationists—the direct beneficiaries—should pay a reasonable portion of these costs.

The bill sets up a conservation fund which will be used mostly by the States, partly by the Federal Government. The States will use their share on a 50–50 matching basis for planning, development, and acquisition of outdoor recreation facilities and areas. There is also a provision that Federal aid may be available to counties and local governments if their proposals are included in a statewide outdoor recreation plan.

The Federal agencies—Park Service, Forest Service, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, and the water development agencies—will use their share mainly for acquisition of outdoor recreation areas, and as a partial offset to capital costs allocated to recreation at reservoir projects.

The moneys going into the fund will come from user, entrance or admission fees to Federal areas under certain conditions, from a fuel tax now paid on gasoline used in motorboats which currently goes into the highway fund, income from the sale of surplus Federal real property, and advance appropriations, which are to be paid back from the fund over a period of time.

Of particular interest to this group is a provision of the bill that a portion of the Federal funds may be used for areas authorized for preservation of fish and wildlife species threatened with extinction. We know that since the settlement of this country, over 20 species of birds and 17 species of mammals have became extinct.

You can see from what I have said how essential this bill is to State programs. Many States are gearing up in the expectation of its enactment and availability of Federal funding through the grant-in-aid program. Just this week, Florida, Pennsylvania, and Ohio voted on bond issues to help finance State recreation programs. Washington and California will vote a year hence. Eleven States now have voted bond issues. Four others have them under consideration.

The Governors of several States, including Florida, Washington, New Mexico, Illinois, California, and so on, recognize the furtherance of tourism and the development of adequate outdoor recreation facilities as a key element in their administration.

Both the House and Senate committees have completed hearings. The House committee has ordered the bill reported, but only after much discussion and considerable division of opinion. Some 46 States, either through their Governors or other key officials, are on record as favoring the bill, as are 11 major recreation organizations, 16 labor organizations, and an equal number of other groups. A representative of the National Audubon Society testified at the Senate hearings, but your organization did not go on record before the House committee. Frankly, I would have expected the Audubon Society to be in the forefront of organizations supporting this legislation.

Within the past week, the President, Secretary of the Army Vance, and Secretary of Agriculture Freeman have all written the chairman reiterating their support of the bill and endorsing it in the form in which it was ordered reported by the House committee. This should clear up any question as to position of the administration, possible opposition of the Corps of Engineers or agencies of the Department of Agriculture.

Yet, the bill is running into trouble. Why? Because of misunderstandings, misstatements, half truths, and untruths that are being circulated about it. Most of these revolve about the question of fees to be charged, and the use of income from the sale of surplus Federal real property.

Let me state categorically that contrary to statements that have been made, this is not a proposal to levy any new taxes, to make moneys automatically available without going through normal appropriations processes, nor to authorize large-scale Federal acquisition. The bill does not levy any new taxes. It simply switches a present tax from the highway trust fund to the proposed conservation fund. The bill makes no moneys available except as recommended by the Appropriations Committees and enacted by the Congress in the annual appropriations act, and it contains no new authorization for acquisition of any Federal property.

What it does do is establish a fund, the availability of which is subject to appropriation. As such moneys are made available, the Federal portion may be used for certain acquisitions that may be authorized by other acts of Congress.

Most of the fee questions that are being raised relate to general entrance or admission charges and particularly their applicability to water areas.

In contrast, there apparently is very little objection and general acceptance of the proposal in the bill to authorize specific recreation user fees for particular facilities or services provided by the United States.

With respect to entrance and admission fees, there are numerous limitations and restrictions in the House reported bill, including the following:

1. Such fees may be charged only at land or water areas administered primarily for scenic, scientific, historic, cultural, recreational, or wilderness purposes. This would appear to prohibit entrance or admission fees at water reservoirs administered primarily for flood control, power, or irrigation. Thus, the numerous questions that are raised with respect to Corps of Engineers reservoirs in Oklahoma or other States, appear to have little basis.

2. Entrance or admission fees may not be charged except where (a) the area is administered by a Federal agency, and (b) where recreation facilities or services are provided at Federal expense. This limitation takes care of situations where Federal areas are under lease to States, local public agencies, or private concessionaires, and are administered not by the Federal Government, but by State or county governments or private parties.

3. No fee of any kind (entrance or user) shall be charged for nonrecreational use of water reservoirs, canals, or waterways that are units in a Federal navigation system. This is double protection for those who are concerned about fees being charged on Federal reservoirs or waterways.

4. Nothing in the section on fees shall authorize Federal hunting or fishing licenses, or fees or charges for commercial or other activities not related to recreation. This takes care of sportsmen who have been concerned that the bill would in effect impose a Federal fishing and hunting license over and above present State licenses.

5. No fee (entrance or user) shall be charged for travel by private-noncommercial vehicle over any national parkway or road that is part of the Federal aid system and is commonly used by the public as a means of travel between two places, any or both of which are outside of the area involved. This takes care of most families which wish to take a Sunday drive to view the scenery as well as parties wishing to travel from town A to town B through a national forest or a large tract of public-domain land.

6. No fee (entrance or user) shall be charged for travel by private-noncommercial vehicle to land to which a person has a property right if the land is located within the designated charge area. This takes care of the situation where a person owns private land inside a national forest or a national park and needs to travel over a road to obtain access to and from such private property.

7. Where more than half of the lands in a designated charge area have been acquired by donation from the State, no special

entrance fees may become effective until there has been consultation with the Governor of such State and consideration of his views.

Despite these very clear limitations, questions are being raised about the king's forest and about a czar to regulate travel. There have been headlines about a "New tax to levy fee to sniff flowers, listen to birds."

A letter of October 29 issued by the president of the National Waterways Conference makes numerous unfounded charges and says the bill should be killed.

Because of the numerous limitations on fees, the very natural question arises as to under what circumstances could entrance and admission fees apply. The great bulk of Federal lands would not be subjected to entrance or admission fees, nor would they be charged for most of the Federal reservoirs or riverways.

Within the restrictions described, an annual entrance or admission fee per private noncommercial automobile could be assessed which would be good for a year and to all areas designated by the President as being within the coverage of the fee. This would mean that entrance fees could be levied for the national parks, as has been done for years, and for certain specific areas within the national forest system, wildlife refuges, and other Federal lands and waters where three conditions occur concurrently: (1) special facilities are provided at Federal expense for recreation, (2) the administration is directed by a Federal agency, and (3) the primary purpose of administration is for recreation, scenic, wilderness or related purposes. There is a further requirement that designated areas subject to a fee or charge shall be clearly posted.

Through the use of a single admission fee good for all designated areas, many individuals and families would save considerable money in the course of a year as compared to the present system of a series of individual entrance or admission fees for many of our national parks and recreation areas.

In view of all the questions that have been raised about fees for recreational use of Federal resources it is worth noting that at least 17 States now make an entrance charge to their State parks and at least 42 States impose user fees for services and facilities at such parks and other recreation areas. Several Canadian Provinces make similar recreation charges.

There is also a provision in the bill that proceeds from the sale of surplus Federal real property shall be credited to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This provision likewise is being criticized as unwise.

The proposal here is in effect an exchange of real property no longer needed by the Federal Government for other lands to meet a rapidly growing public need. This is not taking a capital investment and dissipating it to another use. On the contrary, it is a conversion and reinvestment of funds received from the sale of real estate no longer needed to an appreciating capital asset; namely, lands needed for outdoor recreation.

There is nothing in the bill that changes the procedures for disposal of surplus property in any way. There is nothing in it that would affect existing laws and regulations regarding disposal of surplus property to schools, churches, hospitals, States or their political subdivisions. The bill does not deal with procedures for disposal, but only with the use of income from disposals that are made.

I could go on and give you additional details, but I think this is not needed. There is strong support for this bill. The conservation organizations are well organized behind it. The Citizens Committee for Natural Resources, with Ira Gabrielson as its chairman, is waging an all-out effort in support of the legislation. So are numerous other conservation and recreation groups. The Citizens Committee for the ORRRC Report is doing what it can within the limitations of its charter.

I have brought with me and there is available to you a summary of the bill, a statement of the fee provisions, and some key questions and answers. I hope that I have interested you sufficiently to take the time to look at these materials which were prepared to answer numerous inquiries.

I am sure you know that within the last few weeks, Secretary Udall's new book, "The Quiet Crisis," has come off the press. In it he says:

"The land and water conservation fund proposed by President Kennedy may mark a turning point in conservation history. If the States are to provide leadership before it is too late, if the few remaining spacious seashores are to be preserved for all of the people, if wildlife values are to be permanently protected and our national park, forest, and wildlife refuge systems are to be rounded out by the addition of the remaining suitable lands, the task must begin immediately and be completed within the next three decades."

In the introduction to "The Quiet Crisis" President Kennedy has stated that:

"The race between education and erosion * * * has not run its course * * * that each generation must deal anew with the * * * tendency to prefer short-run profits to long-run necessities. The Nation's battle to preserve the common estate is far from won. * * * The crisis may be quiet, but it is urgent. We must do in our own day what Theodore Roosevelt did 60 years ago and Franklin Roosevelt 30 years ago: we must expand the concept of conservation to meet the imperious problems of the new age."

The moment of truth is upon us. I invite the members of the National Audubon Society and all conservationists everywhere to stand up and be counted.

BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS DEFICIT

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Ellsworth] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most dangerous threats to free world security and stability lies in the deficit condition of our balance of payments. It is difficult to dramatize this situation, to bring home its meaning to the man in the street in ways that arrest his attention.

Clarence K. Streit, distinguished author and now editor of Freedom & Union, has done a brilliant, compelling article on "The Danger to the Dollar—and How To End It," which I want to share with my colleagues.

Basically, Mr. Streit's dramatic point is that a devaluation of the dollar could lead to a world depression, that France and Germany together have the power virtually to force devaluation, and that international politics being what it is today, this is well within the realm of possibility.

Streit's analysis of the situation is all the more authoritative because of his close observation of the currency debacle in 1931, which turned depression into great depression. At that time he was New York Times correspondent covering the Basel World Bank and the League of Nations in Geneva. His trenchant analysis of the current situation follows:

THE DANGER TO THE DOLLAR—AND HOW TO END IT

(By Clarence Streit)

A foreign run on the dollar is, in my carefully considered judgment, the most dangerous threat the free face now. Though it would not kill as would atomic war, it is worse than that threat in several ways—in public unawareness of the danger, in scope of direct, immediate, ruinous effects, and in its advantages to communism. Such a run would wreck the gold exchange standard, which is tied to the dollar and on which the monetary stability and economy of the non-Communist world is based.

Current conditions are ominously similar in some basic respects to those that resulted in 1931 in the crash of the gold exchange standard and the British pound to which it was then related, though less than it is to the dollar now. The resulting devaluation of the pound turned the depression of 1929 into the great depression, in which Hitler came to power 15 months later. Most ominous in the similarities between the present situation and the one in early 1931—before the run began that May which toppled the pound in September—are these four:

SIMILARITIES WITH 1931 CRASH

1. The dollar is dangerously vulnerable as was the pound in 1931—and much more depends on it.

2. The remedies on which attention centers now, as then, are technical ones that miss the heart of the trouble.

3. Like those of 1931, political leaders now, ranging from President Kennedy to Governor Rockefeller, seem dominated by monetary experts and forget to apply to this problem and its technicians Clemenceau's dictum: "War is too important to be left to generals."

4. Worst of all, the political factor which precipitated the 1931 crash is ignored now as then and is fundamentally the same; the power politics situation is indeed startlingly similar now to the one which led certain governments to wreck, unwittingly, in 1931 the gold exchange standard in their maneuvering as regards armaments, disarmament, and the political future of Germany.

The danger that this will recur lies in the fact that the power politics situation remains the same in this basic respect: The great bulk of the gold reserves on which monetary stability in the non-Communist world depends—and which is still concentrated in the Atlantic community as in 1931—is still divided there among a few governments by national sovereignty. The figures given in the August Federal Reserve Bulletin show that 76 percent of these gold reserves are divided among the NATO governments—74 percent among eight of them. Here are the figures:

TABLE 1.—*Non-Communist world, June 1963*

[Millions of dollars]

Total gold reserves	41,565
Total NATO gold reserves	31,598
United States	15,830
German Federal Republic	3,753
France	2,814
United Kingdom	2,447
Italy	2,289
Netherlands	1,581
Belgium	1,373
Canada	755
Total, above 8 NATO nations	30,842

The Communist nations keep the amount of their gold reserves secret, but their total is, at best, too small a fraction of those held by Atlantica to endanger an Atlantic union currency. The present danger to world monetary stability is—unlike the atomic danger—plainly due not to the Communists but solely to national sovereignty's division of freedom's gold reserves among the NATO allies. Practically speaking, the only foreign nations that can threaten the dollar's supremacy are seven of these allies.

The dollar's vulnerability is worsened by the fact that, under the gold exchange standard, the paper dollar is rated as being "as good as gold." The central bank reserves of practically every non-Communist nation—except of course, the United States—are composed partly of gold and partly of dollars—mostly in short-term obligations of the United States.

Among the major monetary powers of Western Europe these reserves are more in gold than in dollars. In Canada, Latin America, Asia, and Africa the national currency is most often backed more by dollars than gold.

The United States has guaranteed to convert these foreign-held dollars into gold on demand by the central bank holding them. This presented no problem in the first postwar decade. By 1958, however, these liabilities had grown to $16,159 million, while U.S. gold reserves sank to $20,582 million.

At this point another important fact must be noted, and kept in mind: U.S. law requires that $12,000 million of its gold reserve remain set aside to guarantee the domestic circulation of the dollar. Consequently, only $8,582 million of its gold stock was really available in 1958 to meet the $16,159 million liabilities abroad. Since 1958 this situation has steadily worsened. How vulnerable the dollar now is may be seen from these June 1963 figures in the August Federal Reserve Bulletin:

TABLE 2.—*June 1963 figures*

[Millions of dollars]

Total foreign-held dollar liabilities of United States	25,042
Total gold held by United States	15,830
Earmarked for U.S. circulation	12,000
Available to meet foreign dollar liabilities of the United States	3,830

There is no legal requirement in the United States to maintain a 25-percent reserve of gold to meet its dollar obligations to foreigners. The law does require this ratio to guarantee the dollar's domestic circulation—even though U.S. citizens cannot demand that their dollars be converted into gold. It would therefore seem prudent for the United States to maintain at least this 25-percent ratio of gold behind the dollar's external circulation, especially since foreign central banks do have the right to demand gold for their dollars. The Federal Reserve Bulletin does not report what the ratio of U.S. gold available to meet foreign demand is each year, but these ratios can be computed from the absolute figures it gave in August. Here they are for 1958 and 1963:

Table 3

	Percent
Percentage of U.S. gold available to guarantee its foreign dollar liabilities:	
In 1958	54
In 1963	11
Percentage of gold to dollars legally required to guarantee U.S. circulation	25

Despite the fact that confidence in the dollar abroad is now assured by less than half the ratio of gold reserves legally required to guarantee the domestic dollar, monetary experts—and the statesmen who share their view that this is a purely monetary problem—profess confidence that this will precipitate no run on the dollar. They point out that the central banks which could theoretically start such a run are too aware of the ultimately disastrous consequences for their own economy and currency to start anything so suicidal.

I agree that this is no doubt true—insofar as purely monetary considerations and authorities are concerned. But to me the danger lies in the political factor, which they ignore—at least in practically all public discussion. Since this factor precipitated the run that wrecked the gold exchange standard in 1931, let us turn now to it.

The October Freedom & Union reprinted a play-by-play account, published in the original unabridged edition of Union Now in 1939, of how power politics among the Atlantic nations led to that disaster then. To sum it up briefly:

The Atlantic powers, especially Germany and France, were then in a diplomatic struggle to increase or maintain their ratio of armed power—the key factor for national sovereignty. The Versailles Treaty had disarmed Germany, but the League Covenant had pledged that the victors would reduce their own arms "to the lowest point consistent with national safety." When 1931 began Germany had vainly sought for 12 years to get this commitment carried out—and thus improve its power position. On January 23, 1931, I reported in the New York Times from Geneva that the League Council had finally convoked the World Disarmament Conference to meet February 2, 1932. In February 1931 the British succeeded in bringing the French and Italians into the armaments limitation treaty it had signed with the United States and Japan in London in 1930. Berlin suspected with some reason, that one purpose behind this was to isolate Germany in the coming world conference, and that "the hope of real land disarmament [had been] sacrificed to France by Britain and Italy in order to safeguard their naval interests," and keep Germany down.

A little before the Franco-Italian accord was ready to be signed, Germany struck back with an economic arm; it announced on March 22 that it had formed a customs union with Austria. This was in defiance of the Versailles Treaty, with political implications which the French and Little Entente could not accept—the less so after Berlin thereby succeeded in killing the naval agreement. They sought in turn to kill the customs union with their monetary arm; they exploited the financial difficulties of the Vienna Creditanstalt Bank in order to force Austria to desist. They did not intend to wreck the gold exchange standard, but this diplomatic maneuver got out of hand. Thus began in mid-May the run on the Austrian schilling that led to the pound's devaluation 4 months later, and that of the dollar in 1933.

Now, 32 years later, it is President de Gaulle who feels that the United States seeks to keep France in an inferior role by excluding it from atomic armaments, and also by getting Washington's special ally, Britain, included in the Common Market so that it can advance Anglo-American purposes within today's custom union. Now France is determined to achieve parity with Britain in atomic arms—as Germany was in 1931 to achieve it with France in land armaments—while the United States and the United Kingdom seek to block France now as France sought to block Germany in 1931 * * * all four still move by the same national sovereignty motives.

Result: France has blocked all the efforts of the United States to prevent (from its standpoint) any proliferation of nuclear weapons. From the standpoint of Gen. de Gaulle and many Europeans, these efforts really aim at assuring that the United States will continue to monopolize atomic power in the West and keep its European allies from having any effective voice in its use of this power.

PARIS FEARS RUSSO-UNITED STATES DEAL

In the maneuvering for the diplomatic power which a nation gets from arms and allies, President de Gaulle has also defied the Anglo-Saxons—as he calls the Anglo-Americans—by vetoing British entry in the Common Market, and by negotiating the political pact which has made Bonn the uneasy special ally of Paris. To this pact several other factors contributed, notably (1) mutual comprehension, after two World Wars, of the necessity of Franco-German reconciliation; (2) mutual desire by two governments, proud of their country's important past role in history, to reassert themselves; (3) mutual confidence born of the strength gained through the Common Market; and (4) longstanding mutual fear that the United States and Soviet Russia might one day make a deal to the detriment of Franco-German policy as regards Berlin and other of their national interests.

These fears have been strengthened by a series of events since August 1962. The United States would not risk its cities then in atomic war to stop the building of the wall in Berlin, as Paris and Bonn were willing to gamble theirs—but it ran this risk in October over Cuba. There Washington decided its national interest required this—without giving its European allies any real voice, though their cities and lives were endangered by its decision.

The direct communications between Washington and Moscow that occurred during the Cuban crisis left the allies (as well as the U.S. public) in the dark. They were followed by evidence—to the already suspicious, at least—of a secret deal, balancing the uninspected removal of Russian missiles with a U.S. wink at the continuance of Russian troops in Cuba and removal of its own missile bases in Turkey. Thereafter came the establishment of the "hot line" between Washington and Moscow—permanent, direct, secret communication between the Kremlin dictator and the American President—with no equivalent speeding of U.S. communications with our major European allies, as the Republican House Committee on NATO Unity pointed out.

In this atmosphere came the negotiations of the test ban treaty by the "Anglo-Saxon" atomic powers with Moscow. President de Gaulle promptly attacked it. To him it aimed at preserving the American-British-Soviet atomic monopoly by leaving France the choice of either abandoning its atomic effort, or continuing it under the handicap of being morally isolated (with Red China) from the hundred or so nations that have signed the treaty. He chose the latter course.

Inextricably mixed with these political and armaments factors are the economic and monetary sides of national sovereignty. They played an important if secondary role in precipitating the 1931 run—but a major role in speeding the debacle thereafter. What is the situation now?

The chronic U.S. gold drain, resulting from the continued U.S. balance-of-payments deficit, and the relative stagnancy of the U.S. economy, have added urgency to Washington's need to expand its agricultural and other exports in Europe. Meanwhile the economic strength the Common Market has brought its six nations has made it harder for Washington to deal with them. The hopes Washington placed in its Trade Expansion Act were chilling even before the De Gaulle veto of British entry in the Common Market left them icebound.

The "chicken war" that followed concerns an export of less economic than political importance to the United States.

On the European side, France is the most important agricultural member of the Common Market. Its farmers are unhappy, as are those in the United States. It has powerful incentives to make the most of the Common Market and reduce imports there from the United States and others.

Moreover, all the major Common Market nations are facing serious inflationary pressures. Between 1959 and the end of the first quarter of 1963, the Washington Post reports, consumer prices rose in France 16.3 percent, in Italy 13.7 percent, in Germany 11.1 percent, but only 4.6 percent in the United States. This has now led the French and Italian Governments to take countermeasures, which the Post hopefully concludes "may ultimately rebound to the benefit" of U.S. exports. I fear the inflationary danger will hurt the dollar.

Jacques Rueff, the leading French monetary authority, has long maintained that the current European inflation is the inevitable result of the gold exchange standard. A veteran of its 1931 debacle, he drew a parallel, in an important article 2 years ago, between the inflationary situation preceding it and the current one in Europe. He has warned of the danger of that standard crashing again from economic and monetary causes.

Mr. Rueff has long advised that the way for a country to avoid the inflationary effects of the gold exchange standard is to convert to gold all the dollar portion of its central bank reserves. He would have the gold exchange standard replaced by the old gold standard. The U.S. Treasury strongly opposes this, as do other experts. Mr. Rueff is keenly aware of the danger to the dollar, and hence to Western monetary stability, in any substantial conversion of foreign dollar assets into gold. He urged in 1961 that an international conference be called to solve the problem in a safe and sane way, to avoid the danger of a panic destroying the gold exchange standard again.

Having known Mr. Rueff many years, I feel sure that he can be counted on to throw his great influence in Paris against any move that would risk plunging Atlantica into another great depression. Since he masterminded the successful restoration of the franc after President De Gaulle returned to power in 1958, he should have particular weight with the general, even though he is no longer in the Government.

There is this difficulty, however. The general does not have Mr. Rueff's deep understanding of economics and finance, nor does he attach to them as high importance as Mr. Rueff does. To me, President De Gaulle is one of the truly great statesmen of our time, but his greatness—apart from his character and writing—lies in his work in the fields he knows best and to which he attaches the most importance, the political and military arms of national sovereignty. Too much concentration on these, combined with not enough respect for economic matters or enough understanding of the causes and consequences of a world monetary crash, could be dangerous to the dollar in present conditions.

Perception of this danger grows when one considers the psychological effects of the recent conflicts and maneuvers in the interlocking political, military and economic factors of Atlantic power politics. Suspicion and bitterness have mounted in both camps, most of all between Paris and Washington. Each seems to have lost its sense of fairness and objectivity. Pride and prejudice help keep either from taking the first step toward understanding the opposing point of view—putting one's self honestly in the other's shoes. Franco-American distrust seems to me as bad now as was the mutual distrust between Berlin and Paris in 1931, which I saw contribute so heavily to the crash then.

In these circumstances, it would seem wise to turn to another phase of the situation which is strangely neglected in current public discussions of the dollar's vulnerability. How strong are the monetary arms that Paris and Bonn hold in the diplomatic maneuvering over atomic arms and East Germany?

The danger to the dollar lies in the U.S. short-term obligations to foreigners which it must convert into gold on demand. How much of these are held by our NATO allies as a whole, and by Paris and Bonn in particular?

The August Federal Reserve Bulletin reported that in June the total of these short-term dollar obligations held by all foreign countries—after deducting those held by the International Monetary Fund and other international organizations—was $20,983 million. The Bulletin does not give the total for the NATO nations, but by adding the individual figures, one finds that in June they held $11,749 million, or 56 percent of the total. As for the present power of the Paris-Bonn axis in relation to the dollar, here are the Bulletin figures:

TABLE 4.—*Dollar obligations, convertible into U.S. gold—June 1963*

	Million
Held by France	$1,718
Held by German Republic	2,709
Total, Paris-Bonn	4,427
U.S. gold available to meet such demand [1]	3,830
U.S. deficit	597

[1] After deduction of $12 billion earmarked for U.S. internal currency.

Paris and Bonn thus together now hold the power to force the dollar to devaluate (a power they have held for some time). To imperil thus the U.S. economy, and the world's, they need only exercise their right to turn their dollars into gold—if they are willing to risk the consequences.

As an American, who not so long ago was a monetary policymaker, said to me recently when I discussed this with him: "They could ruin us, either of them." He did not believe either would take so "suicidal" a step, but the fact remains that either is in position to do this. For if either began to convert even a substantial amount of their dollars into gold, other governments would infer that Atlantic power politics had reached the tough stage where they had better convert their dollars into gold before the United States devalued, or declared an embargo. And the run would be on.

The financial and economic effects of even an incipient run on the dollar could be accelerated and magnified by another factor to which too little attention is being paid—the amount of U.S. corporate securities owned abroad. By the latest official estimate, the total at the end of 1962 was $10.3 billion, of which $7.7 billion was held in Europe and $1.1 billion in Canada. Fear of a run on the dollar would give the owners of these securities strong incentive to try to sell them before any U.S. devaluation, or embargo. This would accelerate a fall in Wall Street.

It should be noted, however, that the source of the above figures, the Department of Commerce Survey of Current Business, August 1963, also puts the total of foreign corporate securities held in the United States at the end of 1962 at $5.4 billion. These figures do not include a much greater offsetting factor, direct investments; the total at the end of 1962 given for those of the United States abroad was $37 billion, with $7.6 billion of foreign direct investments in the United States. The fact that the United States holds these powerful arms helps deter a run. But once a run began and the United States fought back with them, the nations thus endangered would not lack means of reprisal. Such a fight would profit only communism in the end.

Let us note another reassuring fact: not only is it highly unlikely that any non-Communist government would deliberately aim to wreck the dollar, but the area where Franco-American cooperation has remained best is the monetary one. As late as July 10 Edwin L. Dale, Jr., the very able correspondent of the New York Times, cabled from Paris:

"The French Government decided today to repay in advance more than $200 million of its foreign debt, the great bulk of it to the United States. The repayment * * * will help the U.S. balance of payments and cut American gold losses. Today's decision is further evidence that France, despite her sharp differences with the United States on political and defense matters, intends to continue her role in the many-sided international cooperative effort on the monetary front.

"France for several years has had the world's largest surplus in her balance of payments, which is reflected in a rapid buildup of her holdings in dollars. These dollars can be used to buy gold in the United States and some have been. To the extent that they are used to repay debt in advance, they are not converted into gold. Thus the U.S. gold loss is reduced." [1]

Even so, the belief that the dollar will remain safe because its fall would bring disaster to all is as open to doubt as similar reasoning that "the balance of terror" will preserve peace. I recall reading in editorials of 1914 that the destructiveness of the new "high explosive shells" would prevent war then. I also read editorials in the late 1930's that the poison gas "balance of terror" would prevent World War II. The belief that this balance will prevent atomic war now is even more widespread, but it did not keep the world from that brink only a year ago in Cuba.

There remains the fact that catastrophe can occur on the monetary as well as the atomic front of power politics, without its being intended. In 1931 both Germany and France had painful recent memories of the miseries of postwar depreciation of the mark and franc—very powerful incentive to preserve the gold standard which had restored them to financial health. Had either government dreamed that their disarmament maneuvering in early 1931 would wreck that standard, I am convinced neither would have made even the relatively minor moves they actually made in Austria.[2] But Paris and Berlin believed they were playing with cards, not with monetary fire. It was the old story of the little campfire the hunters started only to warm themselves, and which set the dry forest ablaze while they slept and destroyed them along with the woods.

In present conditions the temptation for President de Gaulle to play with monetary fire is—despite the strong misgivings of his German partner—already great, and will very probably grow. For one thing, the contrast between the situation in the United States and in France before he came to power in 1958, and the situation now has served to give him a confidence in his own judgment in the monetary-economic area he lacked before. In 1957 the French economy and franc were in a sad state, while the dollar was riding high. Now, after 5½ years of his regime, his franc is back to the pre-World

---

[1] In 1962 France had already helped the dollar in this way by repaying in advance $470 million of its debt to the United States. Further such help is, however, limited, since only $600 million of the French foreign debt remain outstanding.

[2] After the consequences caused even the United States to abandon gold in early 1933, France ardently led the vain fight at the London Monetary Conference later that year for restoration of the gold exchange standard.

War I ratio of roughly five to the dollar and is riding high while the dollar has become vulnerable. In those few years the reserves behind the franc have more than quadrupled, despite the Algerian war burden, while the gold behind the dollar has sunk from $22,857 to $15,830 million—almost a third. It is France that is now annually leading the world in balance-of-payments surplus, and the United States that is in chronic deficit. After only 4 years as President, General de Gaulle was helping—at Washington's request—to keep the dollar stable by repaying in advance money his predecessors had borrowed from the United States to check the franc's decline.

All this will be news to most Americans, but President de Gaulle would have been more than human had he not stressed this contrast as he did in his press conference on July 29:

"To my mind, these present differences politically with the United States are purely and simply the result of the intrinsic changes which took place in the last few years and which are continuing with regard to the absolute and relative situation of the United States and France. France had been materially and morally destroyed by the collapse of 1940. * * *

"It was from America that it received the weapons for its soldiers. France's security was dependent entirely on its protection. * * * But it happens that, since then, France's position has considerably changed. Its new institutions put it in position to wish, and to act. Its internal development brings it prosperity and gives it access to the means of power. It has restored its currency, its finances, its balance of trade, to such an extent that, from this standpoint, it no longer needs anyone. * * * And so, far from borrowing from others, particularly the Americans, it is paying back its debts to them and even on occasion is granting them certain facilities. * * *

"Furthermore, the burden for the United States of its financial support to many states and the military forces it maintains abroad cannot but weigh heavily on it. * * * For these reasons the balance of payments and the dollar problem of the United States are becoming essential concerns."

General de Gaulle would also be more than human if, now that domestic inflation threatens the impressive financial record of his regime, he were not tempted to follow the experts who would correct this by converting France's dollar holdings into gold. And he might not do this as cautiously as they recommend.

The general would be far more than human if he were not also tempted to use this monetary arm—his most effective one in the power politics game—for the further purpose of preventing the United States from making the deal he fears Russia is enticing it to make at the expense of France and Germany. In his press conference July 29 he noted that "the United States sees tempting prospects opening" now for agreement with Moscow, and added:

"Hence all the separate negotiations between the Anglo-Saxons and the Soviets which, starting with the limited agreement on nuclear testing, seem likely to be extended to other questions, notably European ones, until now in the absence of the Europeans, which clearly goes against the views of France."

What a temptation for General de Gaulle to seek to check both the inflationary and Russian dangers to France by giving the "brash young man" in the White House at least a little rap on the dollar knuckles to remind him that, however powerful he is in atomic weapons, the France he snubbed in 1961 now has the monetary whiphand and might wreck the dollar—even during a presidential campaign—if he persisted in his atomic and Russian policies.

I have a very high opinion of the general, and some reason to think that he would accept the kind of Atlantic federation I advocate, if it were offered by Washington. And so I have some hope that he will wait at least until after the next U.S. presidential election before giving the White House too risky a monetary rap. But the administration and the vast majority of the U.S. press and public seem convinced that General de Gaulle is obsessed with nationalistic grandeur, and excessively human in such traits as pride. How they can still expect him, as they implicitly do, to be wise and saintly enough not to use his monetary arm no matter what Washington says and does is quite beyond my understanding.

My own fears, and their dim view of General de Gaulle, rather than their paradoxical hopes, were strengthened by this report in the Washington Post, September 24:

"Indignation over Prime Minister Georges Pompidou's charge yesterday that Americans are involved in an internal and external conspiracy against the De Gaulle regime seems to have distracted attention from a possibly more ominous passage contained in the same speech. This was a hint that France is considering tossing some sort of brick into the international monetary pool. * * *

"'We have been reproached for not attacking the deepest cause of inflation,' Pompidou said, 'that is to say, the present form of the international monetary system. This is an aspect of the situation that we have by no means neglected.'

"This recalls a campaign in the economic daily, Les Echos, a few weeks ago which went so far as to suggest that a healthful devaluation of the dollar might be forced on the United States by a demand for the conversion of France's dollar holdings into gold."

There are, of course, differences between the present danger to the gold exchange and the situation that wrecked it in 1931, as well as the similarities I have dwelt on. The hopeful differences include these: The Western World is not already in a depression now as it was in 1931. There is better protection within the United States against the 1929 type of Wall Street crash, and against unemployment. Much more is known, at least by experts, of the short-term debt factor. The central banks and treasuries of the Atlantic democracies, including notably those of the United States, cooperate internationally much better now. The reparations-war-debts tangle no longer enters the picture.

At least one difference, however, is ominous: Communist Russia, which was not strong enough in any arm of power politics to play an important role in 1931, now is a major player. Only Communist dictatorship can hope to gain from the wrecking of the gold exchange standard now—as Nazi dictatorship did in 1931—and it can hope to gain immensely.

DEPRESSION WOULD BENEFIT SOVIETS

Whereas Russia would suffer fearfully if it sought to win the world by the atomic arm, it would suffer relatively little from a crash of the dollar. The resulting depression would create instead the most favorable conditions for communism to take over much of the non-Communist world intact, by subversion within.

Moscow's best way to achieve this is to push ahead on the course it is now following: By fostering the hope in Washington that such things as Russia's ideological row with Red China, its crop shortage, its ability to help the dollar by paying in gold for U.S. wheat, its signing of the test ban treaty and other straws indicating a general mellowing in Moscow, have opened the door now to agreement on more and more important matters.

This lures Washington away from the task of uniting Atlantica effectively and into direct negotiations with Moscow. It disunites Atlantica particularly by the hope the latter rouse in London and the fear they inspire in Paris and Bonn—thus tightening the existing tension between not merely the United States and France but between London and Paris-Bonn while drawing the latter two together. It adds to Atlantic disunion generally by lessening the fear of Russia that brought NATO into being and has remained its major cementing force.

Present Kremlin policy develops, in short, the conditions in which power politics among the Atlantic democracies could again, as in 1931, wreck the gold exchange standard, spread depression, and divide them ruinously. For whereas military danger tends to unite them, economic-monetary danger is divisive.

By pushing its current policy, the Kremlin can hope to achieve these results before it has had to reward Washington's hopes with anything more than illusory concessions. At the same time it thus adds world-ranging wingpower to the image of Russia as the dove of peace. Success should also bring Red China to heel, by proving how much craftier and safer is Mr. K.'s way of "burying" us than Mr. Mao's. Even Machiavelli could not have devised a better policy for advancing communism and destroying free enterprise, and all the other freedoms, than the lead Moscow now gives and Washington follows.

In my balance, this ominous difference between the situation in 1931 and 1963 outweighs the hopeful differences.

MORE MANAGED NEWS?

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Barry] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the process of managing the news apparently means that newsmen must be managed to achieve the necessary results.

Those who hold great power in public or private life have the capacity to influence the working press. They do so by giving or withholding news. They do so by "other" favors which produce a desire to cooperate on the part of the newsmen.

Thus, the newsman is to some extent subject to pressures from the very powerful people in public life. This, of course, is no reflection on the newsmen, rather it is a reflection upon those who use improper methods to secure their ends. The following article from the Los Angeles Times entitled "Press Sees Two Sides of White House," by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott, is illustrative of the problem. I quote:

Press Sees Two Sides of White House

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

The Kennedy administration, always extremely publicity conscious, has come up with a new status symbol.

It is a White House "master list" of newsmen.

For those enshrined on this select roll there is an extensive assortment of social and professional benefits and favors.

Socially, there are invitations to the numerous White House functions and parties, including intimate dinners, dances, and other events; trips on the President's planes, yachts, and other conveyances; visits to his various weekend and vacation domiciles; and other personal treats and pleasures.

Professionally, newsmen on the "master list" enjoy so-called "background briefings" by the President, members of his staff and other "authorities"; news tips; interviews and other special tidbits, and the privilege of launching "trial balloons" in the guise of exclusive stories.

Existence of this unique "master list" was revealed by its principal keeper—White House press secretary Pierre Salinger (a newspaperman himself once).

An influential Democrat, during a call at the White House, dropped in on Salinger and introduced a reporter, stressing their warm friendship. Salinger responded cordially.

"Haven't I seen you around here recently?" he asked.

"You probably have," said the correspondent, "I've attended some of the press conferences."

"Glad to have you with us," beamed Salinger. "We try to take care of our friends. From now on your name will be on the 'master list.' You will be in on everything; background briefings, news tips, and all the rest. I'm sure you will find it worthwhile."

Newsmen trying to keep track of President Kennedy's backstage manipulations on the embattled civil rights bill in its tortuous course through the House Judiciary Committee had a quite different experience with Salinger.

On the basis of the record, he apparently deliberately tried to mislead them, as follows:

On Capitol Hill they were told by House Democratic leaders they had a conference slated with the President at 4 p.m. Salinger flatly denied it. He emphatically asserted, "No such meeting is scheduled."

Newsman: "But the press wires say the Democratic leaders told them they do have such a meeting with the President."

Salinger: "I am not responsible for what the wires put out. There is no meeting scheduled."

Newsman: "Do you think it is likely to be scheduled later?"

Salinger: "I talked to the President just about 5 minutes ago, and he has no plans to meet anyone. The inference in your question is that we do have a meeting for 4 o'clock that will be discovered later. That is not true. We have no meeting scheduled for 4 o'clock."

At 3:58 p.m., Salinger notified the newsmen that the President was about to meet with Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, and other House leaders on the civil rights legislation.

Later, when asked about this contradiction, Salinger claimed the 4 o'clock meeting had not been scheduled until 3:30 p.m.

Senator JOSEPH CLARK, dour Pennsylvania Democrat, is a millionaire several times over, but he balked like a mule when it came to forking over $250 for a ticket to a party fund-raising affair.

When the President went to Philadelphia last week to put in a campaign plug for Democratic Mayor Tate, the local party organization, at national committee spurring, gave a reception for the President with a $250 admittance charge. Purpose of the affair was to raise some $50,000 for the national committee.

Several hundred local and State Democratic leaders were invited, among them CLARK, the party's lone Pennsylvania Senator.

The day before the reception, CLARK's office telephoned the local organization and complained he hadn't received his ticket. This drew the immediate reply, "We haven't got his check yet. No check, no ticket."

"Do you mean that the Senator has to pay?" was the astonished exclamation.

To those newsmen who are not fortunate enough to be on the "master list," my condolences. Any system of favoritism or nepotism is going to produce the privileged few at the expense of the many.

THE LATE CONGRESSMAN HJALMAR NYGAARD

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to have been elected to represent the First District of North Dakota which had been served so ably and well by my longtime friend, the late Hjalmar Nygaard.

Hjalmar was a man who deeply enjoyed serving the people, whether it was his local townspeople in Enderlin, the State of North Dakota which he served with such distinction during his 12 years in the legislature, or all the people of America whom he represented here in Congress. His life was dedicated to service.

Here was a man who was very proud to be an American, and he was very concerned with the rights and feelings of the individual. Although he was a quiet man, when he spoke out he was firm in behalf of those principles in which he believed and by which he lived.

Hjalmar Nygaard has left an indelible mark on the history of North Dakota and the United States. The Nation has lost a Congressman, true, but North Dakota has lost one of the finest men she has ever produced.

DEPRESSED ECONOMIC CONDITIONS STILL STYMIE VITAL DRILLING ACTIVITY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, despite continuing advances in scientific techniques, new oil and gas reserves are found only by the actual drilling of test wells. Less drilling means less oil and gas discovered.

Declines in drilling activity are not due to any lack of locations to drill but are largely the result of depressed economic conditions in the producing industry caused by rising costs, declining oil prices and severe oversupply conditions both in the United States and every major producing area of the world.

Experience provides increasing evidence that an effective program for controlling foreign oil imports is essential in the interest of national security. The Government's mandatory oil import program has now been in effect for almost 5 years.

However, the continuing decline in U.S. exploration and drilling ever since 1956 constitutes ample evidence that the level of imports under the mandatory program have been set too high to have any corrective influence. Exploratory crew activity in the United States has been reduced by more than 50 percent. Total wells drilled are down 24 percent. Wildcat wells show a decrease of 35 percent. The number of rotary rigs in operation has decreased by more than 40 percent and trained, hard-to-replace, drilling personnel are leaving the drilling business which is experiencing almost depression conditions.

The most serious threat to the program at this time appears to be increased imports from Canada. It is understood that strong efforts are now being made to further substantially increase imports from Canada. During the past year, imports from Canada have been fairly well stabilized as a result of an understanding reached between our Government and that of Canada. Since that time, however, there has been a change in the Canadian Government and the position of the present government is uncertain. This becomes a vital matter since any increase in Canadian imports, without a commensurate decrease from other sources, would present a serious threat to the effectiveness of the entire present program.

As shown in the following table overland imports from Canada have increased substantially since 1959:

[In barrels daily]

	Districts I-IV (east of Rockies)	District V (west coast)	Total
1959	56,000	36,000	92,000
1960	66,000	49,000	115,000
1961	98,000	91,000	189,000
1962	115,000	124,000	239,000
1963 (1st 6 months)	126,000	137,000	263,000

In addition to the threat of increased Canadian imports, the program should be tightened up in several other respects, for example:

RE DISTRICTS I-IV (EAST OF ROCKIES)

In several respects the present program involves estimates rather than being based on actual past experience. For example, the level of imports in districts I-IV is based upon estimates of domestic production for the period under consideration rather than actual production during a prior period. This injects uncertainty which casts doubts on the integrity of the program even though the margin of error in the estimates may be quite small.

Another source of uncertainty involves imports from Canada. Actual overland imports of oil from Canada during the first half of 1963 exceeded the Department of Interior estimate by 6,000 barrels per day in district I-IV and by 6,500 barrels daily in district V—west coast—or a total of 12,500 barrels daily. Further, under the present program no provision exists for correcting differences between estimated overland imports and actual volumes received.

DISTRICT V (WEST COAST)

The level of imports into district V is determined as the amount necessary to supplement domestic availability. The determination of domestic availability, therefore, becomes important.

Calculation of availability in district V—west coast—should be based on the full availability of supplies from all U.S. areas, including the maximum capacity of pipelines into the area. At present, for example, the pipeline from the Four Corners area has a capacity of 80,000 barrels daily and is capable of being substantially expanded. Yet, the Department of Interior in determining the level of imports estimates the availability through this line as only 70,000 barrels daily. The program should serve to: First, encourage the exploration for and development of oil in district V; and second, encourage the movement of oil from other domestic areas of oversupply into the deficit area. The program should provide incentives that would serve these two objectives.

WORLD'S GREATEST SHOWMAN

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege, since coming to Congress, to represent a part of the great motion picture industry of California. No one will deny that in the 20th century it has contributed to the swift development of California as well as to our Nation in many recorded and unrecorded ways.

This phenomenon runs a close parallel to the birth and growth of its motion picture industry which has nurtured and helped build radio and television as supplementary mass media of entertainment and information. Amongst the companies in my district which have been outstanding in leadership in this area is Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, whose roaring lion has become a national symbol. There is no single person to whom this achievement owes more than to the man known around the globe as "The World's Greatest Showman"—Cecil B. DeMille. Although he was born in 1881 near Ashfield, Mass., California is proud to claim him as its son—even if by adoption, for without his pioneering efforts one doubts whether Hollywood and its environs, such as Culver City, ever would have become the world's entertainment capitol.

I deem it a privilege to bring to the attention of my colleagues in Congress the fact that we are approaching the 50th anniversary of the first full-length motion picture, "The Squaw Man," produced by DeMille at a cost of $15,000 from a barn which he had rented in a little-known suburb of Los Angeles called Hollywood.

History designates DeMille as the world's most successful producer-director whose films have grossed over $1 billion. In 1923, he produced his first big silent movie spectacular, "The Ten Commandments," and in 1956, DeMille brought out its second version—this time in color and with sound. The evangelist, Billy Graham, has referred to him as "a prophet in celluloid who had the privilege in bringing some of the word of God to more people than any other man." DeMille also will be remembered as the owner and developer of the first commercial airline in the United States—the man who took complete charge of the Hollywood bond drive in World War II—the man who designed the regulation uniforms in use today at the Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs. Whether he was filming a Bible drama, the story of the Union Pacific, Cleopatra or "The Plainsman," whatever DeMille did, he did profitably with distinction and honor. His career of 45 years in turning out movie spectaculars may well serve as an example of what a citizen's enterprise and dedication to work can accomplish in a democracy such as ours.

That is why I believe the Nation is indebted to Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Television for its distinguished production of "The World's Greatest Showman," the legend of Cecil B. DeMille, which will be presented as a 90-minute color spectacular on the NBC–TV network, Sunday, December 1, with many of movieland's past brightest stars contributing their services in tribute to a truly great American.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, during the vote on the public works bill I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "yea."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM ON WEDNESDAY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to address a question to the acting majority leader, the gentleman from Louisiana. There have been reports on the floor this afternoon that the legislation scheduled for tomorrow would not be taken up. Can the gentleman tell us whether the legislation previously scheduled for tomorrow will be considered?

Mr. BOGGS. The legislation previously scheduled for tomorrow will be taken up as scheduled.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

THE 45TH ANNIVERSARY OF LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the 45th anniversary of Latvian Independence Day. Unfortunately, this event was commemorated in the free world areas with a necessary feeling of sadness, as Latvian refugees keeping alive the historic nature of the occasion, could not truly celebrate.

The people of Latvia itself are not permitted to celebrate their true Independence Day which, incidentally, was achieved at the expense of the original Russian Communist government.

At the present time the Soviet Union, in its deliberate policy of suppressing the nationalistic spirit, is implementing plans to eliminate the structure of the fictitious independence of the Soviet Socialist Republics, and create regional governmental structures rather than the historic nationality lines. The purpose is to scatter nationalistic opposition.

I earnestly appeal to all American of Latvian origin and to Latvian emigree groups throughout the free world to maintain their spirit and determination to work for the restoration of freedom to their homeland. The most important point to emphasize is that freedom will not be achieved for Latvia or any other captive nation of communism if the administration follows its policy of coexistence with the Soviet Union. We must defy those who would surrender all of Eastern Europe to permanent Communist domination.

The brave people of Latvia suffered under centuries of czarist tyranny and were rapidly developing their little land when treacherously engulfed by the Reds in 1940.

Certainly justice will triumph. In commemorating the 45th anniversary of Latvian independence, we look forward to the ultimate restoration of freedom to that brave little nation, when its people will once again control their own democratic form of government and gain freedom from the oppressive dogmas of communism.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Harding (at the request of Mr. Albert), for today through November 30, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Brown of Ohio and to include a tribute to the memory of Charles R. Hook, of Ohio.

Mr. Poage and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Fernós-Isern and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Boland and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Holifield to include a letter in his remarks today.

Mr. Dole to include extraneous matter in his remarks today.

Mr. Philbin and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Roosevelt and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Hanna.

Mr. Rogers of Florida.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Harvey of Michigan) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Derounian.

Mr. Lindsay.

Mr. Collier.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Boggs) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Cohelan.

Mr. Matsunaga.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 912. An act approving a compromise and settlement agreement of the Navajo Tribe of Indians and authorizing the tribe to execute and the Secretary of the Interior to approve any oil and gas leases entered into pursuant to the agreement.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 20, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1379. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions which this Service has approved according the beneficiaries of such petitions first preference classification, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3071. A bill to provide for the establishment of Fort Larned as a national historic site, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 907). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 8462. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain real property of the United States heretofore granted to the city of Grand Prairie, Tex., for public airport purposes, contingent upon approval by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, and to provide for the conveyance to the United States of certain real property now used by such city for public airport purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 908). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 6199. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact of agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 909). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WATTS: Committee on Ways and Means. Senate Concurrent Resolution 19. Concurrent resolution to designate "Bourbon whiskey" as a distinctive product of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 910). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and a resolution were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 9153. A bill to amend the provisions of section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for the exemption of certain terminal leases from penalties; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 9154. A bill to authorize the Weather Bureau to make appropriate reimbursement between the respective appropriations available to the Bureau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9155. A bill to amend section 4(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 to exempt from the provisions thereof special Government employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H.R. 9156. A bill to repeal certain provisions of law relating to the printing as House documents of certain proceedings; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 9157. A bill to amend the provisions of section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for the exemption of certain terminal leases from penalties; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 9158. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a statutory policy governing the broadcasting of views on controversial issues; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 9159. A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 9160. A bill to establish the Department of Education; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 9161. A bill to establish the Department of Health; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 9162. A bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 9163. A bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 9164. A bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 9165. A bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 9166. A bill to provide tax equity by the taxation of cooperative corporations with respect to earnings derived from business done for the United States or any of its agencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 9167. A bill to provide tax equity by the taxation of cooperative corporations with respect to earnings derived from business done for the United States or any of its agencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STINSON:

H.J. Res. 805. Joint resolution regarding Indian fishing rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 9168. A bill for the relief of Mary F. Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 9169. A bill for the relief of Garabed Najarian (Nadjarian); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 9170. A bill for the relief of Ramiro Velasquez Huerta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 9171. A bill to amend the act of May 25, 1920, relating to conveyance of certain parts of rights-of-way by railroad companies; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 9172. A bill for the relief of George, Danae, and Maria Kerassoglou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

(Legislative day of Tuesday, October 22, 1963)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Eternal God, quest of the ages, whom by searching we cannot find, we are sure of Thee, not just because Thou didst speak through the lips of prophets in days of old. We are sure of Thee because, for those who have hearts to feel and ears to hear, Thy voice today is calling.

Thou dost speak to us wherever truth is uttered. We see Thee in all life's loveliness. We touch Thy garment in the sacrament of human love. We sense Thy presence in all brave and generous deeds.

But give us to know that the deepest revelation of Thyself is hidden in our own hearts and in the hearts of our fellows on this strange, earthly pilgrimage. Enlarge our thoughts to make room in our sympathy for the vast multitudes of the disinherited who, in these days, have been stirred by a radiant hope, and who, as sheep without a shepherd, are turning from despair to promise. So may we find our true selves in the need of others, and thus, beyond ourselves, find Thee.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, November 18, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on November 13, 1963, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 310. An act for the relief of Kaino Hely Auzis; and

S. 876. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain land in Prince Georges County, Md., to the American National Red Cross.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS UNDER THE PEACE CORPS ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 11 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, I transmit herewith the second annual report on operations under the act covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963.

John F. Kennedy.

The White House, *November 19, 1963.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2512. An act to clarify the status of members of the National Guard while attending or instructing at National Guard schools established under the authority of the Secretary of the Army or Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2988. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for participation by members of the Armed Forces in international sports activities;

H.R. 3005. An act to amend sections 510 and 591 of title 10, United States Code, to remove the requirement that an alien must make a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States before he may be enlisted or appointed in a Reserve component;

H.R. 8135. An act to provide for the establishment and administration of public recreational facilities at the Sanford Reservoir area, Canadian River project, Texas, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9139. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 779. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of January 28, 1948, relating to membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission, so as to authorize certain appropriations thereunder for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 912) approving a compromise and settlement agreement of the Navajo Tribe of Indians and authorizing the tribe to execute and the Secretary of the Interior to approve any oil and gas leases entered into pursuant to the agreement, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 2512. An act to clarify the status of members of the National Guard while attending or instructing at National Guard schools established under the authority of the Secretary of the Army or Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2988. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for participation by members of the Armed Forces in international sports activities; and

H.R. 3005. An act to amend section 510 and 591 of title 10, United States Code, to remove the requirement that an alien must make a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States before he may be enlisted or appointed in a Reserve component; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 8135. An act to provide for the establishment and administration of public recreational facilities at the Sanford Reservoir area, Canadian River project, Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9139. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.J. Res. 779. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of January 28, 1948, relating to membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission, so as to authorize certain appropriations thereunder for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, it was ordered that there be a morning hour, with statements limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the following subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, of the Committee on Government Operations.

The Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Dr. Herbert Scoville, Jr., of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Benson E. L. Timmons III, of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Haiti.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion of Mr. Mansfield, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 103. Joint resolution to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the work of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped (Rept. No. 645).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 2314. A bill to amend section 5414 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2315. A bill to authorize the Weather Bureau to make appropriate reimbursement between the respective appropriations available to the Bureau, and for other purposes;

S. 2316. A bill to require the inspection of certain towing vessels;

S. 2317. A bill to amend the provisions of section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for the exemption of certain terminal leases from penalties;

S. 2318. A bill to amend the Joint Resolution approved August 20, 1958, granting the consent of Congress to the several States to negotiate and enter into compacts for the purpose of promoting highway traffic safety; and

S. 2319. A bill to amend section 4(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to exempt therefrom "special Government employees" as defined in section 202(a), title 18, United States Code, 76 Stat. 1121; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 2320. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Soos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPROPRIATE REIMBURSEMENT BETWEEN THE RESPECTIVE APPROPRIATIONS AVAILABLE TO THE WEATHER BUREAU

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Weather Bureau to make appropriate reimbursement between the respective appropriations available to the Bureau, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2315) to authorize the Weather Bureau to make appropriate reimbursement between the respective appropriations available to the Bureau, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., November 7, 1963.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are enclosed four copies of a draft bill to authorize the Weather Bureau to make appropriate reimbursement between the respective appropriations available to the Bureau, and for other purposes, and four copies of a statement of purpose and need in support thereof.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there would be no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

LUTHER H. HODGES.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to give the Weather Bureau more effective control and better accountability of services and administrative operations and expenses conducted jointly for two or more appropriations when the costs are not susceptible of immediate distribution directly to those appropriations. Specific examples of such operations and expenses are: the maintenance of inventories of stores used by several appropriations; utilization of personal services of technicians paid from one appropriation but whose services are partially utilized on programs financed by other appropriations; and the charging of administrative and technical overhead to one appropriation with subsequent distribution and charge to the proper appropriation or fund.

The proposed legislation would permit the Bureau to realize the benefits of cost accounting and administer its programs on a cost basis. It would facilitate the distribution of overhead charges and permit the recapture of costs for technical services now given to various programs without reimbursement. The legislation would simplify payrolling by having a technician's salary charged to one appropriation with later distribution of charges to the benefiting appropriations. The legislation would simplify the stores program by continuing purchases of stores from one appropriation and charging the using appropriations upon issuance of such stores from inventory.

Identical authority was provided for the Bureau of the Census in the 87th Congress (Public Law 87-489).

INSPECTION OF CERTAIN TOWING VESSELS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to require the inspection of certain towing vessels. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2316), to require the inspection of certain towing vessels, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., November 6, 1963.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is submitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill to require the inspection of certain towing vessels.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to bring towing vessels propelled by means other than steam under inspection by the Coast Guard.

Section 4427 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 405) presently requires the inspection of every tugboat, towing boat, and freight boat. This section is part of an extensive statutory pattern to insure high standards of safety on merchant vessels through regulation and inspection by the Coast Guard. Although phrased in broad terms, section 4427 has been interpreted by the courts as applying only to vessels propelled by steam. As a result, motor propelled towing vessels are not presently subject to inspection unless they are seagoing vessels of over 300 gross tons.

The anomaly, whereby steam towing vessels are subject to inspection and motor towing vessels performing practically identical services are not, has long been recognized. This anomaly has become increasingly apparent with the increasing dominance of the diesel towing vessel as compared to the steam towing vessel. At the present time, steam tugs have been almost completely superseded by diesel towboats; figures show that in 1962 there were 5,016 diesel tugs in operation compared to 84 propelled by steam.

The present interpretation of section 4427 of the Revised Statutes results in another inconsistency in that barges or self-propelled tank vessels carrying hazardous liquid cargoes on inland waters must be inspected and meet Coast Guard safety standards while motor propelled tugs towing such barges are not required to be inspected. Considering the ever-increasing traffic in dangerous liquid cargoes and the fact that collision is a major source of marine casualties, an obvious potential hazard is involved in permitting such cargoes to be towed by vessels which at present are neither subject to the requirements for safety inspection nor subject to the licensing and certificating of their personnel.

During 1962 the Coast Guard made a comprehensive study of towing vessel operations. The study showed that of 5,100 vessels documented for towing service only 103 were inspected and certificated by the Coast Guard. The remaining vessels were not subject to inspection under existing law.

The data obtained during the study also shows that while the number of towing vessels has increased 20 percent in the past 10 years, the number of casualties has increased by 120 percent to an average of 559 casualties per year for the period from 1960 through 1962. During 1962, for example, 530 towing vessels were involved in casualties serious enough to be reported, which is an average of 1 out of every 10 towing vessels in service. Detailed casualty figures for that year reveal that while no lives were lost due to casualties on inspected towing vessels, 15 lives were lost in casualties involving uninspected towing vessels. The figures further reveal that less than 3 percent of the inspected vessels were involved in reportable casualties compared to 10 percent of the uninspected vessels. During fiscal year 1962 estimated monetary damages due to casualties involving towing vessels were over $9 million.

Analysis of the casualty figures for towing vessels for the past several years leads to the conclusion that operation of diesel towing vessels involves as great a hazard as operation of those propelled by steam, and that this hazard could be reduced by requiring these vessels to comply with Coast Guard safety standards. In brief, the Department has concluded that motor-propelled towing vessels should be brought under the statutory inspection scheme. The proposed bill would, therefore, amend section 4427 of the Revised Statutes to provide for the inspection of towing vessels regardless of the manner of propulsion.

The Department believes that the smaller towing vessels are not a sufficient safety hazard to warrant the increased administrative difficulties and costs which would result if they were subject to inspection. Therefore, the bill would exclude those towing vessels which are less than 15 gross tons and 26 feet in length. This would eliminate from inspection the smaller vessels which engage in limited operations.

The casualty statistics also show that a large percentage of the casualties which have occurred on uninspected towing vessels are of a type which could be avoided or minimized if well-qualified personnel were aboard. For example, during fiscal year 1962 almost 60 percent of the reported casualties involved collisions while another 12 percent involved groundings of the tug or tow. To minimize the hazard to life and property from operation of towing vessels by unqualified personnel, the proposed bill would contain authority to prescribe regulations regarding the meaning of towing vessels and the licensing and certificating of their personnel.

The Department, of course, realizes that there are large numbers of vessels to which the strict application of the inspection and manning requirements would not be appropriate for one reason or another. In some cases it is not possible or practicable to bring the vessel into strict compliance; in other cases to do so would result in severe economic hardship or loss of employment. Therefore, the proposed bill would require the Secretary to take into account the various factors which might appropriately require a lessening of the inspection or manning requirements as to certain vessels. It would also give him authority to exempt additional vessels from the inspection requirement if necessary in the public interest. These provisions are intended to provide sufficient flexibility in administration to enable the Secretary to tailor the inspection requirements more closely to the circumstances of individual vessels. With this authority it should be possible to achieve the maximum safety on towing vessels consistent with the least economic hardship and disruption to the industry. This authority would also permit the gradual application of the requirements to existing vessels to insure an orderly transition period with minimum interference to towing vessel operations.

The proposed legislation would require increased expenditures for inspection and clerical personnel since an additional 4,300 vessels would become subject to inspection. The Department estimates that an increase of 55 officers and 20 civilians would be required. This would result in additional costs of approximately $650,000 per year.

There is enclosed a memorandum which contains in summary form the results of the study made by the Coast Guard of the operation of towing vessels. There is also enclosed for your convenient reference a comparative type showing the changes in existing law that would be made by the proposed bill.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

Douglas Dillon.

EXEMPTIONS OF CERTAIN TERMINAL LEASES FROM PENALTIES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the provisions of section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for the exemption of certain terminal leases from penalties. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2317) to amend the provisions of section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for the exemption of certain terminal leases from penalties, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. Magnuson is as follows:

Federal Maritime Commission,
Washington, D.C., November 13, 1963.
Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: There are submitted herewith four copies of a proposed bill, together with a statement of purpose and need for the draft bill, to amend the provisions of section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for the exemption of certain terminal leases from penalties.

The need for and purpose of the proposed bill are set forth in the accompanying statement.

The Federal Maritime Commission urges enactment of the bill at the 1st session of the 88th Congress for the reasons set forth in the accompanying statement.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

John Harllee,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy (Retired),
Chairman.

Justification for Bill To Amend Section 15, Shipping Act, 1916

The bill would amend section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, so as to exempt from the penalty provisions of that section currently existing leases of terminals provided they are filed with the Federal Maritime Commission within 90 days from the date the bill is enacted into law. The need for the bill stems from the fact that until the former Federal Maritime Board's decision in Agreements Nos. 8225 and 8225-1, 5 F.M.B. 648 (1959) and the subsequent affirmation of the Board's decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit in *Baton Rouge Port Commission* v. *United States,* 287 F. 2d 86, cert. den. 368 U.S. 985, neither the agency nor the industry were clear as to the full circumstances under which leases of terminal facilities fall within the coverage of section 15 of the Shipping Act.

Section 15 provides that all agreements between two persons subject to the Shipping Act which provides for "fixing or regulating transportation rates or fares; giving or receiving special rates, accommodations, or other special privileges or advantages; controlling, regulating, preventing, or destroying competition * * * or in any manner providing for an exclusive, preferential, or cooperative working arrangement," must be filed with and approved by the Commission in order to be lawful. The penalty for carrying out such an agreement prior to Commission approval is up to $1,000 per day.

Leases of terminal facilities quite customarily contain, in addition to the usual grants of estates in land, covenants requiring that the lessee operate the terminal facility according to specified standards and in some instances grant future rights to the lessee. For example, the lease in the Baton Rouge case, above, required that the lessee charge rates "competitive with, and not greater than, rates for similar services and privileges charged at other gulf ports," and gave to the lessee the right of first refusal to lease any similar additional facility which the lessor might construct. The Maritime Board found that these and other covenants brought the lease within the purview of section 15 and the fifth circuit affirmed.

In due course the Maritime Board informed the Department of Justice of its findings in the Baton Rouge case and the Department brought suit against the lessee for civil penalties due under section 15. As other unapproved leases have been determined to be subject to section 15, the Maritime Board and now the Maritime Commission have informed the Attorney General in order that his Department might take such action as it thought warranted. Several additional suits for civil penalties have been filed.

Thus, lessees and lessors of terminal facilities have found themselves in the position of having entered into long-term leases some years ago which they believed not to be subject to section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, but which under the holding of the Baton Rouge case may be subject to that section. The practical choices open to such persons are to submit their leases to the Commission and seek approval, knowing that they may be subject to a suit for fairly enormous penalties or not to file their agreements with the hope that they would not be discovered or that they could successfully distinguish between their lease and the Baton Rouge lease.

It is the Commission's position in suggesting the instant bill that, while a sound regulatory purpose is served in requiring that terminal leases which in any fashion limit or control competition be first submitted to the agency for approval, the needs of justice are not served by exacting penalties for past behavior under what amounts to a new or different construction of the law. In short, it is the consensus of the Commission that a new construction of a statute should be given prospective effect and should not result in penalties for past behavior innocently engaged in.

Because of the variety of legal instruments which are used in granting rights to operate terminal facilities, the language of the bill is not limited to leases but includes licenses and assignments.

The bill would require prompt filing of all existing leases and would eliminate any excuse for not filing future agreements. In short, the bill forgives past violations of the Shipping Act and puts future regulation on a sounder footing.

COMPACTS BETWEEN STATES FOR PROMOTION OF HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Joint Resolution approved August 20, 1958, granting the consent of Congress to the several States to negotiate and enter into compacts for the purpose of promoting highway traffic safety. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, requesting the proposed legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2318) to amend the Joint Resolution approved August 20, 1958, granting the consent of Congress to the several States to negotiate and enter into compacts for the purpose of promoting highway traffic safety, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

OCTOBER 22, 1963.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to submit herewith a draft bill to amend the joint resolution approved August 20, 1958, granting the consent of Congress to the several States to negotiate and enter into compacts for the purpose of promoting highway traffic safety.

The purpose of the proposed bill is to amend the joint resolution approved August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 635), so as to include within its provisions the consent of Congress with regard to agreements and compacts established for the promotion of highway traffic safety that may be entered into by any State and the District of Columbia.

Under the existing language of the resolution the Congress expressly gives its consent "to any two or more of the several States to enter agreements or compacts" for the purpose of cooperative efforts and mutual assistance respecting, among other things, traffic safety and enforcement programs. However, the language has the effect of excluding the participation of the District of Columbia with any State in undertaking such cooperative efforts through a compact or agreement. Since only the Congress, acting as the legislative authority for the District of Columbia, may authorize the District of Columbia to enter into any agreement or compact with a State, the Commissioners urge that the proposed bill be adopted to permit such participation.

An agreement is being considered at the present time by officials of the District of Columbia and the State of Maryland with respect to the mutual adoption of certain procedures which would permit law enforcement officers of both jurisdictions to issue citations to residents of the neighboring jurisdiction for violation of such traffic regulations as may be covered by the agreement rather than, as is now the case, to require such nonresidents to post collateral.

In order that such agreement or any other agreement or compact that may come within the purpose of the aforementioned resolution may be entered into by the District of Columbia, the Commissioners most strongly urge that the proposed bill be approved.

The Commissioners have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners,
District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, TO EXEMPT CERTAIN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 4(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to exempt therefrom "special Government employees" as defined in section 202(a), title 18, United States Code, 76 Stat. 1121. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, together with an explanation thereof.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2319) to amend section 4(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to exempt therefrom "special Government employees" as defined in section 202(a), title 18, United States Code, 76 Stat. 1121, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and explanation presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., October 22, 1963.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Commission has adopted as part of its legislative program for the 88th Congress a proposal to amend section 4(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to exempt therefrom "special Government employees" as defined in section 202(a), title 18, United States Code, 76 Stat. 1121.

The Commission's explanation and draft bill to accomplish the foregoing objective were submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for its consideration. We are now advised by that Bureau that from the standpoint of the administration's program there would be no objection to the presentation of the draft bill to the Congress for its consideration. Accordingly, there are enclosed six copies of our draft bill on this subject and six copies of an explanatory statement with reference thereto.

The consideration by the Senate of the proposed amendment would be greatly appreciated. The Commission would be happy to furnish any additional information that may be desired by the committee to which this proposal is referred.

Sincerely yours,

ROSEL H. HYDE,
Acting Chairman.

EXPLANATION

The Federal Communications Commission recommends that Congress amend section 4(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to except therefrom "special Government employees," as that term is defined in Public Law 87–849, 76 Stat. 1119, approved October 23, 1962. Until section 4(b) is conformed to the new conflict-of-interest standards set out in Public Law 87–849, the benefits contemplated by the statute will remain largely unavailable to the Commission.

Insofar as it is pertinent here, section 4(b) prohibits, inter alia, any "person in (the Commission's) employ" from directly or indirectly having a financial interest in a company engaged in the manufacture or sale of communications equipment, or in broadcasting, or in rendering communications services. These prohibitions apply categorically to any person in the Commission's employ, since section 4(b) draws no distinction between those working for the Commission on a full-time basis, as against special consultants who work on a part-time basis only. Of course, when these restrictions were enacted, it was not a common practice for the Government to use the services of part-time consultants. Nevertheless, the sweeping interdictions of section 4(b) now stand as an obstacle to the use of part-time consultants contemplated by Public Law 87–849, which has liberalized the conflict-of-interest standards as they apply to special Government employees. Thus, for all practical purposes, the benefits of Public Law 87–849 are academic, insofar as the Commission's functions are concerned.

To remedy this situation, it is proposed that the second sentence of section 4(b) of the Communications Act be amended to make it clear that the provisions thereof are inapplicable to "special Government employees." As amended, that second sentence would provide (the new language being indicated by italic) as follows:

"No member of the Commission or person in its employ shall be financially interested in the manufacture or sale of radio apparatus or apparatus for wire or radio communication; in communication by wire or radio or in radio transmission of energy; in any company furnishing services or such apparatus to any company engaged in communication by wire or radio or to any company manufacturing or selling apparatus used for communication by wire or radio; or in any company owning stocks, bonds, or other securities of any such company; nor be in the employ of or hold any official relation to any person subject to any of the provisions of this act; nor own stocks, bonds, or other securities of any corporation subject to any of the provisions of this act: *Provided, however, That the foregoing provisions shall not apply to a 'special Government employee,' as defined in section 202(a) of title 18, United States Code, Seventy-sixth Statutes at Large, page 1121.*"

The sole purpose of this amendment is to relieve "special Government employees" of the restrictions of section 4(b) of the Communications Act. In so doing, it will, to use the words of the Attorney General in his "Memorandum Regarding Conflict-of-Interest Provisions of Public Law 87–849," dated January 28, 1963 (28 F.R. 985), "help the Government obtain the temporary or intermittent services of persons with special knowledge and skills whose principal employment is outside the Government."

It should be further pointed out that the only effect of our amendment would be to permit a "special Government employee" to own stock or business interests in the communications industry while he is employed on a part-time basis by the Commission. Such an employee would continue to remain fully subject to all the conflict-of-interest standards now contained in Public Law 87–849. And in the event a "special Government employee" should become a regular employee of the Commission, or a member thereof, he would then become subject to section 4(b) of the Communications Act. In short, it is not intended to confer on "special Government employees" any rights beyond those now set out in Public Law 87–849.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 328)

Mr. TOWER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 8747) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, November 19, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 912) approving a compromise and settlement agreement of the Navajo Tribe of Indians and authorizing the tribe to execute and the Secretary of the Interior to approve any oil and gas leases entered into pursuant to the agreement.

REJUVENATION OF THE WHITEFISH PILOT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this is the age of bigness. Although we deplore the trend, the growth of giant commercial enterprises and the subsequent demise of their smaller competitors is fast becoming the rule today. Nowhere is this more evident than in the newspaper industry. Improvements in technology, better means of distribution, and increased costs have combined to force hundreds of smaller newspapers out of business or into mergers.

While we are generally aware that this fast-paced competition has reduced most metropolitan cities to a single newspaper, we are much less aware of the effects of this trend on the small community weeklies. They, too, feel the pinch, and their mortality rate is high.

It is therefore refreshing, Mr. President, to witness the exception to the rule. I am referring to the efforts of Mr. and Mrs. Dick Adams to breathe new spirit into the Whitefish Pilot, the weekly paper of the small community of Whitefish, Mont. When Mr. Adams took control of the Pilot 4 years ago, he found a shop full of antiquated equipment and a languishing circulation. After modernization of equipment and an overhauling of selling and circulation procedures, the paper's circulation has doubled in the face of competition from four dailies and several weeklies which sell in the area. In recognition of their fine work, the success story of Mr. and Mrs. Adams was recently featured in the November issue of the American Press magazine.

Mr. President, it is true that the infusion of new capital was necessary to rejuvenate the Whitefish paper. But money alone was not enough. It took imagination and enterprise on the part of Mr. and Mrs. Adams to make the venture a success. Their efforts should be an example to others who are faced with the discouraging prospect of declining business and possible failure. We Montanans are proud that they chose the Treasure State for the site of their operation.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the American Press describing their example be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUNG MAN-AND-WIFE TEAM REBUILDS THE WHITEFISH PILOT

Constructive change is the single most important factor in the process of revitalizing a rural newspaper which had grown stodgy during 40 years of continuous ownership. This is the conclusion of Dick Adams, looking back on his first 4 years as publisher-owner of the Whitefish Pilot in Whitefish, Mont.

More significant among the changes by the Adams husband-wife team in Whitefish have been (1) a switch from carrier to mail distribution, (2) a change from Friday to Thursday publication, (3) a comprehensive reequipping of the back shop, (4) change from 7 column, 12 pica to 8 column, 11 pica pages and, most important of all, (5) aggressive local advertising selling plus intensive local news-feature coverage.

Approximately 4 years ago, Mr. Adams was a publicist for a large corporation in St. Paul, Minn. Along with so many of his journalistic contemporaries, he nourished the dream of weekly newspaper ownership * * * some day. Mrs. Adams not only shared this dream * * * she was well qualified to contribute a full measure of performance from her background as a reporter on the Minneapolis Star-Tribune.

Casual inquiry by the young couple about "* * * the local newspaper * * *" while on a ski vacation at the Big Mountain ski area near Whitefish stimulated an almost alarmingly quick response. Within a few hours of the original inquiry, members of the Whitefish Chamber of Commerce were at Big Mountain to "talk turkey with the Adamses." The wholehearted cooperation from Whitefish business leaders resulted in Adams' ownership of the Pilot late that same winter.

(Mr. Adams ruefully comments that the proximity of an outstanding ski area provided much "built-in desirability" to the Pilot; and in the 4 years the Adamses have been in the area, they've been on skis twice.)

At the time of takeover, Pilot circulation was about 800—almost entirely in the form of Friday morning carrier distribution. Records were most inadequate and the delivery boys were doing little to solicit new subscribers. Within the first 2 months under new management, Pilot distribution was switched to mail. In several issues preceding this change, the Pilot ran house ads announcing the pending switch and requesting area residents to drop in at the office to help the new publishers bring their circulation records up to date. Mr. Adams recalls that many of the residents who did drop in were vague as to when they last paid for their subscription; in all such instances, the subscriber was given the benefit of the doubt but all records were set up on a businesslike basis.

Circulation is now up to 1,690; the Whitefish post office has a total of 1,820 patrons. With such a ratio, Mr. Adams feels they've about reached the saturation point on numbers. He has no plans for going further afield in circulation effort because Flatland County is intensively covered by four dailies—out of Kalispell, Missoula, and Great Falls, Mont., and Spokane, Wash.—plus several strong weeklies. Under such circumstances, the Adamses feel they will do better to continue to concentrate coverage, selling and circulation efforts within the immediate Whitefish community.

A joint promotional effort with the Big Mountain ski area is finding good advertiser reaction. This involves free distribution each week of about 200 copies through the summer resorts in the area (just west of the Glacier Park western entrance). Each such copy is labeled with a special Big Mountain sticker explaining that the newspaper is being given to the tourist on a complimentary basis and, of course, selling the joys of a return visit next winter for the skiing. This inexpensive program has been helpful in building more summer tourist traffic for Whitefish merchants.

The shift in publication date from Friday to Thursday gives the advertiser a better break for weekend shopping, Mr. Adams has found. This shift also opens up the week by adding another day which the Adamses are able to devote to feature writing and advertising work. The move from seven to eight columns was almost as beneficial as a rate increase because it permits more ads per page. The narrower column actually is a rate increase, Mr. Adams points out.

A good measure of community hunger for a good local newspaper is shown by the fact that the first Pilot published by the Adams team contained 12 pages—the largest single edition in 10 years, at the time. Further testimonial to this hunger lies in the fact that most of the circulation jump from 800 to almost 1,700 came during the first year under Adams direction.

In his advertising work, Mr. Adams does everything possible to gain the confidence of his customers to the point that many of them consider him their individual "promotion manager." In carrying out this responsibility, he strives first for consistency; of course he remains alert for ideas and sound reasons to recommend increased space. Because he is so personally sold on the advantages of consistency, Mr. Adams eschews special editions with the exception of the traditional preholiday shopping number, the back-to-school edition, Easter shopping, and each February a special for the Whitefish Winter Carnival.

Feature subject material is limitless in the Whitefish area. The Adamses strive for action pictures to go with each feature. They are both proficient with a Speed Graphic, do their own developing and send all engraving to a commercial firm in nearby Kalispell. Rarely do they run a cut in less than three-column width, believing that if a photo doesn't warrant good display, it probably isn't good enough to use.

Type selection has been completely modernized now. A more recent change was to down-style headlines indented one em to improve readability. The present flag was adopted last spring. It shows a local summer scene with "The Whitefish Pilot" overprinted in Bodoni italics; last fall the flag was changed to show a winter scene as background for the logo.

Though much progress has been made in revamping the equipment to make the Pilot a modern mechanical shop, more investment is still called for. The greatest forward step was made with installation of a web-fed Duplex press complete with automatic folder as a replacement for the wornout flatbed. This has cut press time for the newspaper from almost 8 hours to less than 1 hour. The two Mergenthaler linotypes have been completely rebuilt and modernized. The only original equipment still in service are two job presses which Mr. Adams hopes to replace soon.

Equipment replacement thus far amounts to about 25 percent of the original purchase price. Mr. Adams is currently leaning toward installation of a Multilith press for job work * * * not only for the flexibility this will give him but also to begin to acquaint himself and his staff with offset procedures. Though he knew little about printing production prior to taking over the Pilot, Mr. Adams says he has learned enough now to become convinced that complete conversion to offset for the Pilot as well as most weeklies is a matter of when rather than if.

Despite the back shop improvements in the past 4 years, labor costs still amount to more than 40 percent of the Pilot's gross. In addition to Mr. and Mrs. Adams, the Pilot employs about three-and-one-half persons, including two full-time men. The ability to use unskilled help for major offset production in effect is "automation in reverse," as Mr. Adams sees it. His closest estimates indicate, however, that he could operate with one full-time man to handle offset plate production and printing plus part-time help and cut his present labor costs by 40 percent in dollars.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes in the morning hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, 2 years ago it was my privilege to stand at Gettysburg and deliver the address on the 98th anniversary of the great address by Abraham Lincoln.

I should like, for the Record, to repeat some of the observations I made on that occasion:

> One hundred years ago, a man from Illinois stood at Gettysburg, the destiny of a nation upon his shoulders and the cares of conflict graven upon his face.
>
> From thousands of patriot graves, men who had fallen beneath a July sun were speaking to him. From his anguished soul he was trying to speak to and for them.
>
> He was uneasy. In ink and pencil he drafted and redrafted the remarks which he was invited to make. His mind struggled to embody in few words a message suited to the occasion, setting forth the reason for the conflict, the duty still at hand, and the hope for the future. Yet, out of deep humility, he was impelled to say it was not the words of the living which would be noted and remembered but only the deeds of heroes who had fallen there for the Union.
>
> ### THE NEW NATION
>
> Consider then his words. He spoke of our forefathers—those who were there before him and brought forth a new nation. They were but one of many generations who had gone before, a part of the endless stream which flows through time and history and gives continuity to our national life.
>
> Each generation added to the inheritance which it received from those who had gone before, enriched it, and transmitted it to those who were to follow.
>
> The new Nation which they wrought was conceived in liberty and dedicated to equality.
>
> How freely those words come to the tongue in all parts of the earth—liberty and equality. And what strange meanings are read into them.
>
> Men speak of liberty even as it is being extinguished before their eyes. They speak of liberty, even as it is being transformed into a strange gospel. Men speak of liberty, even as her domain shrinks and she struggles for survival. Men speak of liberty even as such heresies as "better Red than dead" rise up to be embraced by those who have forgotten freedom's price. But the man from Illinois spoke only of that liberty which ennobles and dignifies the individual and preserves his godly image.
>
> ### IMMORTAL PROSE
>
> Then came the deathless question which continues to roll down time's corridor with each generation. Can a nation so conceived and so dedicated long endure?
>
> What strange doubts assail this timid generation of today as it beholds the challenges to both liberty and equality.
>
> We seem beset with fear not faith, with doubt not confidence, with compromise not conviction, with dismay not dedication.
>
> We are drenched with the literature of fear and doubt. Survival has become the main theme. The fallout shelter from which the stars of hope and courage cannot be seen has become the symbol of our fears and misgivings.
>
> Are we to become fearful, unworthy legatees in a blessed, united land where the earth is fertile to our every need, where the skills and ingenuity of men are boundless, where the burdens are bearable, where decent living is within the reach of all, and where the genius to produce is unlimited?
>
> Perhaps we have lost our sense of continuity. Perhaps we have forgotten that we move in that same endless stream which began with our forefathers and which will flow on and on to embrace our children and our children's children. If we have, there will have gone with it that sense of individual responsibility which is the last best hope that a nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to equality can long endure.
>
> Comes then the reminder from the man from Illinois. Men died and are sleeping who fought under a July Gettysburg sun that the Nation might endure, united, free, tolerant, and devoted to equality.
>
> The task was unfinished. It is never quite finished.
>
> Freedom is never fully won at any given time or place.
>
> From Runnymede and the Magna Carta until now is 7½ centuries.
>
> Has there been a generation in which liberty has not been challenged in one form or another?
>
> In the day of our forefathers, the challenge was from a king and his ministers to a people.
>
> When our Capital was burned by the British in 1814 it was an imperious sovereign against an infant land.
>
> When the man from Illinois stood at Gettysburg 100 years ago, it was the challenge flowing from one of the unsolved problems in the Constitution.
>
> Three score years ago, it was a helpless island people against a foreign tyrant.
>
> Twice in our own time, it was the challenge of autocracy and dictatorship versus freedom and self-determination.
>
> And today, it is the challenge of cold war born strangely enough in the crucible of hot war. It is the challenge of a despotic, deceitful system with its own prophets, its own holy book, its own specious promises of salvation, its own image of man as a creature without dignity or the everlasting hope of another more glorious life.
>
> But the challenge to freedom is not limited to forces from without. It embraces also those individuals and groups who are unceasing in their efforts to expand the powers and functions of the Central Government and have it intrude more deeply into the affairs of the people.
>
> These—all these—are the continuing challenges to freedom and the task of the defenders is never finished.
>
> Comes now the shining hope and the duty with which the man from Illinois charged his countrymen.
>
> The hope—a new birth of freedom. But can there be a birth without labor and pain?
>
> Dare we in this soft age believe when men shrink from pain and sacrifice that a new birth of freedom and a new sense of mission can come without pain?
>
> And then the further hope that self-government shall not perish. He did not mean government of the few but of all. He did not say government by the few but by all. He did not say government for the few but for all.
>
> But the key to all is government by the people for the certain way to lose the precious power of self-government is failure to use it.
>
> So spoke the man from Illinois 100 years ago.
>
> His imperishable words are as fresh today as when they were uttered.
>
> ### NEED STILL HERE
>
> The problem today is the same as in his day—whether in this uneasy, fevered world, this or any nation founded on liberty and equality can long endure.
>
> The duty is the same—the duty imposed upon us as a part of that endless procession of men and women to build and ennoble this good land and carry on the unfinished work.
>
> The bonds are the same, for the living cannot separate themselves from their obligation to the dead.
>
> The need is the same—for a new birth of freedom as the lamps of liberty go out in many places, either by force and brutality or by default.
>
> The challenge is the same—for this generation to come out of the gloomy shelters of defeatism and despair and assert freedom's cause under God to all the world with the same vigor and purpose which marked the course of the man from Illinois.
>
> His name you know—Abraham Lincoln.

SENATOR NELSON'S REVIEW OF SECRETARY UDALL'S "THE QUIET CRISIS"

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Secretary of the Interior Udall has written a book entitled "The Quiet Crisis," in which he informs the conscience of America of the great need to preserve our natural resources.

The Washington Post has persuaded my junior colleague, Senator Gaylord Nelson, who is a former Governor of Wisconsin, to review "The Quiet Crisis." My colleague is himself not only an ardent conservationist, but an expert one. As Governor of Wisconsin, he was responsible for the finest conservation program of any State in the Union. The Senator is extraordinarily well informed on the subject. When he came to the Senate my colleague made his first choice of a committee the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and I am sure he is a most useful and expert member of that committee.

I should like to read the last two paragraphs of the review, by my colleague from Wisconsin, of Secretary of the Interior Udall's book:

> Udall's story of tragic waste of priceless assets, mixed with half victories along the way, ends with the grim challenge of the future: The specter of a population twice as large as today's, empowered by new technology to consume resources at an even greater pace, making a new assault on our battered environment.
>
> The message of "The Quiet Crisis" is obvious. We have only a precious few years left to make a massive effort at the State, local, and National level to preserve our fresh water, our soil, our forests and streams, our minerals, and even the air we breathe. If we fail to act, these priceless resources may be destroyed forever.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this brief review of "The Quiet Crisis," as reviewed by the Senator from Wisconsin, printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Udall Writes a Primer for Wonders of America

(Reviewed by Gaylord Nelson)

"The Quiet Crisis," by Stewart L. Udall, introduction by President John F. Kennedy, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 209 pages, $5.

If you want your children to grow up and get rich some day by exploiting the things and the people around them, I wouldn't recommend this book. But if you want them to acquire a reverence for the land and the forests and the wild animals, and to be inspired by the great figures of American history who have expressed this spirit in our public life, then I don't know of a better primer.

Interior Secretary Udall, in this terse little book, manages to see and express conservation as a wide-sweeping, all-encompassing part of American history. It is the story of a political, economic, and philosophical struggle involving cowboys, Indians, transcendentalists, empire builders, robber barons, bureaucrats, and Presidents.

For the most part, it is a sad story of an inevitable tragedy, of how the great American dream of a new empire stretching from ocean to ocean conflicted with many of the scientific principles of conservation. Secretary Udall tells how the new Nation flourished—but only at the expense of the Indian, the buffalo, the virgin timber, the clean water, and the precious topsoil.

The heroes of this story are the few strong figures in our history who have had the soul to appreciate the precious things in our environment, and the backbone to fight to save them.

Udall describes what a masterpiece of creation the American continent was when the Pilgrims arrived. Yet it looked hideous to them, and they set about changing it. The conflict has continued ever since. The American Indian's concept of the land as something that existed for the enjoyment and sustenance of all had to be eliminated—and so did the Indian. The forests had to be cut down to build houses and make way for farms. The beavers had to be trapped to earn cash from Europe. The thin layer of grass on the great plains had to be plowed under to plant corn. The rivers had to be dammed. The western lands had to be given to the railroads. The gold-rich hills had to be washed away with high pressure water hoses to bring out the nuggets of wealth.

Almost from the beginning, a few voices cried out in the wilderness. The result was blazing controversy and, in some cases, great victories for the public's stake in its environment.

"Where can I go now, and visit nature undisturbed?" demanded John James Audubon in the 1820's. His book, "Birds of America," was credited with arousing the national conscience and saving many species, and ultimately the founding of the Smithsonian Institution.

Udall's story of tragic waste of priceless assets, mixed with half victories along the way, ends with the grim challenge of the future: The specter of a population twice as large as today's, empowered by new technology to consume resources at an even greater pace, making a new assault on our battered environment.

The message of "The Quiet Crisis" is obvious. We have only a precious few years left to make a massive effort at the State, local, and national level to preserve our fresh water, our soil, our forests and streams, our minerals, and even the air we breathe. If we fail to act, these priceless resources may be destroyed forever.

McNAMARA'S REPORT TO THE NATION ON AMERICA'S DEFENSE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Secretary of Defense McNamara delivered one of the most significant addresses on the national defense in a long time before the Economic Club in New York City on Monday.

This address not only indicates our substantial superiority over the Soviet Union in nuclear power and versatility. It also indicates how important it is that we keep our guard up.

Secretary McNamara is the top authority on defense. Our defensive power must be a prime ingredient in our international policy as determined in important part by the Congress. For this reason I think it essential that the Members of Congress have the complete text of Secretary McNamara's address available in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that this outstanding and significant speech may be printed in the RECORD, and that a thoughtful editorial on the speech, published in the Washington Post and entitled "Strength-for-Peace Policy," may also be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ROBERT S. MCNAMARA BEFORE THE ECONOMIC CLUB OF NEW YORK, WALDORF ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK, N.Y., MONDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 1963

Before long this administration will be presenting, once again, the details of a proposed national defense budget for the consideration of the Congress and the public. Given the importance of these matters, their complexities and uncertainties, and the existence of real differences of opinion, a degree of controversy is inevitable, and even desirable.

Some controversies, however, reveal underlying differences in perspective that scarcely suggest the participants are living in the same world. Within the past few weeks, some critics have suggested that we have literally hundreds of times more strength than we need; others have accused us of risking the whole future of the Nation by engaging in unilateral disarmament. I would like to believe that criticisms bracketing our policy in that fashion prove it to be rational and sound. But a discrepancy of that order cannot be reassuring. Rather, it indicates that we have failed to convey to some part of our audience even the broadest outlines, as we see them, of the problems that our military strategy and force structure are meant to address. I believe we should be able to move from controversy on that scale toward consensus in military affairs, not always on details or components of our policies, but at least on an appreciation of the major national security problems confronting us, on the broad alternative paths to their solution and on the dominant goals, obstacles, costs and risks affecting choice. My purpose in speaking to you this evening is to help move in this direction.

As a prelude, then, to the coming season of debate, I should like to identify and discuss some basic matters on which a considerable degree of consensus seems to me both possible and desirable, although by no means assured.

These include those overall comparative strengths and weaknesses of the opposing military alliances that form the bold relief in the strategic environment. In short, they are the considerations that seem to have relatively long-term significance compared to the annual budget cycle.

Matters of that degree of permanence tend to be stamped on our minds as being unchanging and unchangeable, the unquestioned framework of daily and yearly policymaking. Yet these factors of which I shall speak do change: more swiftly and more profoundly than our picture of them tends to change. Indeed, I believe it is just the fact that over the last decade this topography has changed—while many maps have not—that accounts for some apparently irreconcilable controversies.

Let me recall the earlier period briefly, for comparison The strategic landscape at the outset of the fifties was dominated by two outstanding features. One was the practical U.S. monopoly of deliverable, strategic nuclear weapons. The other was the Soviet Union and Communist China's virtual monopoly of ground force on the continents of Europe and Asia.

Both of these determinants of Western military policy had changed considerably by the end of the Korean war. The Soviets had produced atomic explosions and had created a sizable nuclear delivery capability against Europe, while NATO ground forces had expanded rapidly, and military operations in Korea had greatly tarnished the significance of Chinese Communist superiority in numbers. But the old notions of monopoly persisted as short-cut aids to thinking on policy matters. And they were not so misleading as they came later to be. Soviet armed forces approaching 5 million men still heavily outweighed the NATO forces in Europe; and Soviet delivery capability against the United States was dwarfed by that of SAC. Moreover, tactical nuclear weapons were being heralded as a new nuclear monopoly for the West.

Even as these earlier notions of monopolies grew obsolete, ideas about the feasibility of alternative policies continued to reflect them. So did ideas about how wars might be fought. Nuclear operations, both strategic and tactical, by the United States in response to Soviet aggression against our allies were considered to be virtually unilateral. Hence it was supposed the problem of credibility of the U.S. response would scarcely arise, even in the case of relatively limited Soviet aggressions. Western reliance upon nuclear weapons, in particular strategic systems, both to deter and to oppose nonnuclear attack of any size seemed not only adequate but also unique in its adequacy.

That sort of situation is convenient for policymakers. It makes policy easy to choose and easy to explain. Perhaps that is why throughout most of the fifties, while the Soviets under various pressures decreased their ground forces and the NATO allies built theirs up, and while the Soviets acquired a massive nuclear threat against Europe and laid the groundwork for a sizable threat against the United States, the picture underlying most policy debate remained that appropriate to 1949. It was a picture of Communist Goliath in conventional strength facing a Western David, almost naked of conventional arms but alone possessed of a nuclear sling. Then toward the end of that decade, the prospect that the Soviets would acquire intercontinental ballistic missiles at a time when our strategic forces consisted almost entirely of bombers focused our attention and our budget even more sharply than before upon our strategic forces. The urgency of the problem of deterring the most massive of attacks was a new reason for thinking that the West could spare neither resources nor thought to deal more specifically with lesser threats. The most urgent task was to provide for deterrence of massive aggression by assuring the survival under any attack of forces at least adequate, in the calculations of a potential attacker, to destroy his society in retaliation. It was now not the assurance of continued nuclear superiority that preempted the attention of policymakers but, on the contrary, the struggle to maintain it.

But it is time for the maps to change by which policy is charted and justified. The old ones, which assumed a U.S. nuclear monopoly, both strategic and tactical, and a Communist monopoly of ground combat strength, are too far removed from reality to serve as even rough guides. Neither we nor our allies can afford the crudities of maps that tell us the old policies are still forced upon us, when a true picture would show important new avenues of necessity and choice.

What most needs changing is a picture of ourselves and of the Western Alliance as essentially at bay, outmanned and outgunned except for nuclear arms no longer exclusively ours. We should not think of ourselves as forced by limitations of resources to rely upon strategies of desperation and threats of vast mutual destruction, compelled to deal only with the most massive and immediate challenges, letting lesser ones go by default. It would be a striking historical phenomenon if that self-image should be justified. We are the largest member of an alliance with a population of almost 450 million people, an aggregate annual product which is fast approaching a trillion dollars, and a modern and diverse technological base without parallel, facing the Soviet Union and its European satellites with their hundred million fewer people and an aggregate output no more than half that of the West.

And quite apart from ignoring the underlying strengths of the West, the outdated picture I have described takes no account of the military capabilities in being that our investment over the last decade, and specifically in the last few years, have bought for us. If new problems put strong claims on our attention and our resources today, it is very largely because we have come a large part of the way that is feasible toward solving some old ones.

Let me summarize the current status of the balance of strategic nuclear forces, that part of the military environment that has preoccupied our attention for so long. In strictly relative numerical terms, the situation is the familiar one. The U.S. force now contains more than 500 operational long-range ballistic missiles—Atlas, Titan, Minuteman, Polaris—and is planned to increase to over 1,700 by 1966. There is no doubt in our minds and none in the minds of the Soviets that these missiles can penetrate to their targets. In addition, the United States has Strategic Air Command bombers on air alert and over 500 bombers on quick reaction ground alert. By comparison, the consensus is that today the Soviets could place about half as many bombers over North America on a first strike. The Soviets are estimated to have today only a fraction as many intercontinental missiles as we do. Furthermore, their submarine-launched ballistic missiles are short range, and generally are not comparable to our Polaris force. The Soviets pose a very large threat against Europe, including hundreds of intermediate and medium-range ballistic missiles. This threat is today and will continue to be covered by the clear superiority of our strategic forces.

The most wishful of Soviet planners would have to calculate as a certainty that the most effective surprise attack they could launch would still leave us with the capability to destroy the attacker's society. What is equally pertinent is that the relative numbers and survivability of U.S. strategic forces would permit us to retaliate against all the urgent Soviet military targets that are subject to attack, thus contributing to the limitation of damage to ourselves and our allies.

Deterrence of deliberate, calculated attack seems as well assured as it can be, and the damage-limiting capability of our numerically superior forces is, I believe, well worth its incremental cost. It is a capability to which the smaller forces of the Soviet Union could not realistically aspire. That is one reason, among others, why I would not trade our strategic posture for that of the Soviets at any point during the coming decade.

But given the kind of force that the Soviets are building, including submarine-launched missiles beyond the reach of our offensive forces, the damage which the Soviets could inflict on us and our allies, no matter what we do to limit it, remains extremely high.

That has been true for our allies ever since the middle and late fifties. Soviet acquisition of a sizable delivery capability against the United States, and more significantly their acquisition of relatively protected forces, submarine launched or hardened, has been long and often prematurely heralded. Its arrival at last merely dramatizes the need to recognize that strategic nuclear war would under all foreseeable circumstances be bilateral—and highly destructive to both sides.

Larger budgets for U.S. strategic forces would not change that fact. They could have only a decreasing incremental effect in limiting somewhat the damage that the United States and its allies could suffer in a general nuclear war. In short, we cannot buy the capability to make a strategic bombing campaign once again a unilateral prospect.

That must, I suggest, be accepted as one of the determinants affecting policy. Another is that the same situation confronts the Soviet leaders, in a way that is even more intensely confining. In fact, enormous increases in Soviet budgets would be required for them to achieve any significant degree of damage-limiting capability. The present Soviet leaders show no tendency to challenge the basis of the U.S. strategic deterrent posture by such expenditures.

In the last 2 years alone, we have increased the number of nuclear warheads in the strategic alert forces by 100 percent. During that period we have more than doubled the megatonnage of the strategic alert forces. The fact that further increases in strategic forces size will at last encounter rapidly diminishing returns—which is largely an effect of the very large investments the United States has made in this area—should be reflected in future budgets. The funding for the initial introduction of missiles into our forces is nearing completion. We can anticipate that the annual expenditure on strategic forces will drop substantially, and level off well below the present rate of spending. This is not to rule out the possibility that research now in progress on possible new technological developments, including the possibility of useful ballistic missile defenses, will require major new expenditures. In any event, there will be recurring costs of modernization.

In the field of tactical nuclear weapons, the picture is in important respects similar. The United States at present has in stockpile or planned for stockpile tens of thousands of nuclear explosives for tactical use on the battlefield, in antisubmarine warfare and against aircraft. They include warheads for artillery, battlefield missiles, demolition munitions, bombs, depth charges, air-to-air missiles and surface-to-air missiles. The consensus is that the United States is presently substantially superior in design, diversity and numbers in this class of weapons.

This is an indispensable superiority, as we can readily understand if we consider how our problems of strategic choice would be altered if the tables were reversed and it were the Soviet Union which held a commanding lead in this field. Nevertheless, what we have is superiority, not monopoly, and even if tactical nuclear warfare can be limited, below some ill-defined threshold of strategic exchange, the key fact is that if the West initiates such warfare in the future it must be expected to be bilateral, in any theater which engaged the Soviet Union. Again, we cannot buy back a monopoly, or the assurance of unilateral use.

Finally, there is the area of what we call our general purpose forces. Within the last 2 years, we have increased the number of our combat-ready Army divisions by about 45 percent, from 11 to 16. There has been a 30-percent increase in the number of tactical air squadrons; a 75-percent increase in airlift capabilities; and a 100-percent increase in ship construction and conversion to modernize the fleet.

But it is not only force size that matters. The key to the effective utilization of these forces is combat readiness and mobility.

The most recent demonstration of our ability to reinforce our troops presently stationed in Europe occurred last month in Operation Big Lift, the first of a series of planned large-scale, worldwide exercises. For the first time in military history, an entire division was airlifted from one continent to another. That movement could never have been accomplished without a massive increase in our airlift capability, which is still being expanded. (It will have risen 400 percent between 1961 and 1967.) It required the development of new techniques to pre-position combat equipment, of which we have two extra division sets now in Europe. It called for new techniques in military training and administration to make sure that units are really ready to move out on a moment's notice. This exercise, in which some 16,000 airmen and soldiers and more than 350 planes took part, is directly relevant to the needs of Europe, where it brought a seventh division to join the six that are to remain in place. It is also relevant to the ability of the United States to fulfill its policy commitments worldwide, swiftly and in effective strength.

But, it might be asked, what is the significance of all this for the realistic security problems of the United States and its allies? To what contingencies are these forces expected to contribute, and how effective might they be, measured against the strength of opposing forces? How meaningful is it to talk of 16 or 20 or 30 divisions in opposing the ground armies of the Soviet Union and Communist China?

Such questions are often meant to be merely rhetorical, in view of the supposed masses of Communist troops. The fact is that they are serious, difficult questions, to which I shall suggest some tentative answers. But it is difficult to encourage realistic discussions of specific contingencies so long as the shadow of the Communist horde hangs unchallenged over the debate. The actual contingencies that seem to be to me most likely and most significant are not those which would involve all, or even a major part, of the Soviet bloc or Chinese Communist armed forces, nor do they all involve Europe. Hence, aggregate figures of armed strength of NATO and the Warsaw Pact nations are not immediately relevant to them. But it is useful to make these overall comparisons precisely because misleading or obsolete notions of these very aggregates often produce an attitude of hopelessness toward any attempt to prepare to meet Communist forces in ground combat, however limited in scope.

The announced total of Soviet armed forces for 1955 was indeed a formidable 5.75 million men. Today that figure has been cut to about 3.3 million; the Warsaw Pact total including the Soviets is only about 4.5 million. Against that, it is today the members of NATO whose active armed forces number over 5 million. The ground forces of NATO nations total 3.2 million, of which 2.2 million men are in Europe, as against the Soviet ground combat forces total of about 2 million men, and a Warsaw Pact total of about 3 million. Both the Soviet Union and the U.S. forces of course include units stationed in the Far East. In central Europe, NATO has more men, and more combat troops, on the ground than does the bloc. It has more men on the ground in West Germany than the bloc does in East Germany. It has more and better tactical aircraft, and these planes on the average can carry twice the payload twice as far as the Soviet counterparts.

These facts are hard to reconcile with the familiar picture of the Russian Army as incomparably massive. The usual index cited to support that picture is numbers of total active divisions, and the specific number familiar from the past is 175 divisions in the Soviet Army.

This total, if true, would indeed present a paradox. The Soviet ground forces are reliably estimated to be very close to 2 million men, compared to about 1 million for the United States. How is it that the Soviets can muster 10 times the number of active, combat-ready, fully manned divisions that the United States has manned, with only twice as many men on active duty? The answer is simply that they do not. Recent intensive investigation has shown that the number of active Soviet divisions that are maintained at manning levels anywhere close to combat readiness is less than half of the 160 to 175 figure.

What remains is a large number, but even that is misleading. For one thing, U.S. divisions have about twice as many men in the division unit and its immediate combat supporting units as comparable Soviet divisions. A U.S. mechanized division has far more personnel in maneuvering units, far more in armored cavalry, far more engineers, far more signals, far more light armored personnel carriers, and far more aircraft available in support than Soviet divisions. In addition to longer staying power, much of the U.S. manpower and equipment margin is muscle that would make itself felt on D-day. If, on the other hand, we were to reorganize along Soviet lines, we could display far greater numbers of divisions comparable to those of the Soviets.

The Soviet combat-ready force remains a formidable one. Moreover, the Russians do have a powerful mobilization capability; in particular, they have a large number of lightly manned or cadre divisions to be filled out on mobilization. Still, this reality remains strikingly different from our accustomed maps of it.

I do not wish to suggest that such aggregate comparisons are by themselves a valid index to military capabilities. But they are enough to suggest the absurdity, as a picture of the prevailing military strengths on which new efforts might build, of David and Goliath notions borrowed from 1949.

None of this is to say that NATO strength on the ground in Europe is adequate to turn back without nuclear weapons an all-out surprise nonnuclear attack.

But that is not in any case the contingency toward which the recent and future improvements in the mobility and capabilities of U.S. general purpose forces are primarily oriented. Aggression on that scale would mean a war about the future of Europe and, as a consequence, the future of the United States and the U.S.S.R. In the face of threats of that magnitude, our nuclear superiority remains highly relevant to deterrence. The Soviets know that even nonnuclear aggression at that high end of the spectrum of conflict so threatens our most vital interests that we and our allies are prepared to make whatever response may be required to defeat it, no matter how terrible the consequences for our own society.

The probability that the Soviet leaders would choose to invoke that exchange seems to me very low indeed. They know well what even the Chinese Communist leaders must recognize upon further reflection, that a nuclear war would mean destruction of everything they have built up for themselves during the last 50 years.

If we were to consider a spectrum of the possible cases of Communist aggression, then, ranging from harassment, covert aggression, and indirect challenge at one end of the scale to the massive invasion of Western Europe or a full-scale nuclear strike against the West at the other end, it is clear that our nuclear superiority has been and should continue to be an effective deterrent to aggression at the high end of the spectrum. It is equally clear, on the other hand, that at the very low end of the spectrum a nuclear response may not be fully credible, and that nuclear power alone cannot be an effective deterrent at this level in the future any more than it has been in the past.

The fact is that at every level of force, the Alliance in general, and the U.S. Armed Forces in particular, have greater and more effective strength than we are in the habit of thinking we have—and with reasonable continued effort we can have whatever strength we need. I have spoken already of strategic weapons, where the great superiority of the United States is the superiority also of the Alliance. In tactical nuclear weapons a parallel superiority exists—and while many of our Allies share with us in manning the systems which would use these tactical warheads in the hour of need, it is not unfair to point out that, even more than in the strategic field, the tactical nuclear strength of the Alliance is a contribution of the United States. That strength has been increased, on the ground in Europe, by more than 60 percent in the last 2 years. Today the thousands of U.S. warheads deployed on the continent for the immediate defense of Europe have a combined explosive strength more than 10,000 times the force of the nuclear weapons used to end the Second World War. Tactical nuclear strength the Alliance has today, and we have provided it.

But neither we nor our Allies can find the detonation of such weapons—and their inevitable bilateral exchange—an easy first choice. At the lower end of the spectrum, therefore, we also need strong and ready conventional forces. We have done our part here and we continue to believe it just—and practicable—for our partners to do theirs.

The most difficult questions arise over the best means for meeting a variety of dangerous intermediate challenges in many parts of the world: those which threaten the possibility of sizable conflict while still not raising the immediate issue of the national survival of ourselves or of any member of our alliances. Conflicts might arise out of Soviet subversion and political aggression backed up by military measure in non-NATO areas in Europe, Latin America, the Middle East and Africa. There is a range of challenges that could arise from Communist China and its satellites in the Far East and in southeast Asia. Most dangerously, approaching the upper end of the spectrum, there is the possibility of limited Soviet pressures on NATO territory itself, along the vast front running from Norway to Greece and Turkey. Both the flanks and the center contain potential targets. And always, of course, there are the contingencies that could arise in relation to Berlin.

It is difficult to say just how probable any of these circumstances might be, although they must be regarded as more likely than still larger aggressions. What one can say is that if any of these more likely contingencies should arise, they would be highly dangerous. Inaction, or weak action, could result in a serious setback, missed opportunity, or even disaster. In fact, if either a nuclear exchange or a major Soviet attack should occur, it would most likely arise from a conflict on a lesser scale, which Western capabilities had failed to deter and which an inadequate Western response had failed to curb in time.

Since World War II, the expansionist impulse of the Communist bloc is clear, but equally clear is its desire to avoid direct confrontation with the military forces of the free world. In Greece, in Berlin, and in Cuba, Communists have probed for military and political weakness but when they have encountered resistance, they have held back. Not only Communist doctrine has counseled this caution, but respect for the danger that any sizable, overt conflict would lead to nuclear war. It would follow that no deterrent would be more effective against these lesser and intermediate levels of challenge than the assurance that such moves would certainly meet prompt, effective military response by the West. That response could confront the Soviets with frustration of their purposes unless they chose themselves to escalate the conflict to a nuclear exchange, or to levels that made nuclear war highly probable—a choice they are unlikely to make in the face of our destructive power.

The basis for that particular assurance cannot be systems in development, or weapons in storage depots, or reserves that must be mobilized, trained, and equipped, or troops without transport. We need the right combination of forward deployment and highly mobile combat-ready ground, sea, and air units, capable of prompt and effective commitment to actual combat, in short, the sort of capability we are increasingly building in our forces.

This capability requires of us—as of our allies—a Military Establishment that is, in the President's words, lean and fit. We must stop and ask ourselves before deciding whether to add a new and complex weapon system to our inventory, whether it is really the most effective way to do the job under the rigorous conditions of combat. We must examine constantly the possibilities for combining functions, particularly in weapons that could be used by two or more services. Given this tough-minded sense of reality about the requirements of combat readiness, it should be possible for the United States not only to maintain but to expand this increased strength without overall increases in our defense budget. As our national productivity and our gross national product expand, the defense budget therefore need not keep pace. Indeed, it appears likely that measured in relative—and perhaps even absolute—terms, the defense budget will level off and perhaps decline a little. At the same time, we are continuing the essential effort to reduce the impact of defense spending our our balance of payments. We have already brought this figure down from $2.7 billion in fiscal year 1961 to $1.7 billion for fiscal year 1963, and we shall continue to reduce it, without reducing the combat ground forces deployed in Europe, and while strengthening our overall combat effectiveness.

And it must be our policy to continue to strengthen our combat effectiveness. I do not regard the present Communist leaders as wholly reckless in action. But recent experience, in Cuba and, on a lesser scale, in Berlin, has not persuaded me that I can predict with confidence the sorts of challenges that Communist leaders will come to think prudent and profitable. If they were again to miscalculate as dangerously as they did a year ago, it would be essential to confront them, wherever that might be, with the full consequences of their action: the certainty of meeting immediate, appropriate, and fully effective military action.

All of our strengths, including our strategic and tactical nuclear forces, contributed last year, and they would contribute in similar future situations to the effectiveness of our response, by providing a basis for assurance that the Soviets would not dangerously escalate or shift the locale of the conflict. But above all, in order to fashion that response, and to promise the Soviets local defeat in case of actual ground conflict, we had to use every element of the improvements in combat readiness and mobility that had been building over the preceding year and a half, including combat divisions, air transport, and tactical air. And the last ingredient was also there: the will to use those forces against Soviet troops and equipment.

Let us not delude ourselves with obsolete images into believing that our nuclear strength, great as it is, solves all of our problems of national security, or that we lack the strengths to meet those problems that it does not solve. In the contingencies that really threaten—the sort that have occurred and will occur again—we and our allies need no longer choose to live with the sense or the reality of inferiority to the Soviet bloc in relevant, effective force. Let us be fully aware of the wide range of our military resources, and the freedom they can give us to pursue the peaceful objectives of the free world without fear of military aggression.

STRENGTH-FOR-PEACE POLICY

Secretary McNamara's fact-packed speech to the Economic Club in New York came at a timely moment. Undoubtedly it was designed for close reading in Moscow and the capitals of Europe as well as in American homes. In a brilliant analysis of the U.S. defense problem and the world's security problem, the Secretary has strengthened hope for a peaceful future while dwelling upon the terrible destructiveness that our arms have attained.

For the benefit of the pessimists who persistently overestimate the strength of the Soviet Union, Mr. McNamara offered concrete comparisons. The U.S. strategic nuclear forces now have more than 500 operational long-range ballistic missiles and will have more than 1,700 by 1966. The Soviet Union, he said, has only a fraction of this missile strength and about half as many bombers capable of first-strike action as are available in our Strategic Air Command. The United States has similar superiority in tactical nuclear weapons.

One of the hopeful notes in the Secretary's speech is his statement that our strategic forces have reached a stage of development where further increases will yield only diminishing returns. Nothing this country can do will restore its nuclear monopoly, and in the absence of a monopoly neither the United States nor the Soviet Union can get much mileage out of piling up more and more nuclear capacity, when each already has enough bombs and delivery vehicles to inflict unthinkable damage, if not total destruction, on the other.

For this reason Mr. McNamara anticipates a substantial drop in the annual expenditures on strategic forces. But there was no hint whatever in the Secretary's words of letting down our guard. He pointed to continued heavy obligations in developing the antimissile and in the maintenance of conventional forces to meet possible smaller aggressive thrusts against which nuclear power is not an effective deterrent.

To our European allies, Mr. McNamara seemed to be saying that there is still much to do to build up the strength of NATO despite the massive nuclear power behind it. To Moscow he seemed to be saying that the United States has not the slightest intention of yielding to pressure or of growing weary under the kind of harassment that the Kremlin has indulged in at Berlin and elsewhere. To the American people he was offering reassurance that this country does have the strength to stand firm through every crisis, that we can maintain an adequate defense without bankruptcy, and that there is no occasion to be jittery when the Kremlin blows hot and cold for the purpose of sowing confusion.

It was not a sword-rattling speech. The Secretary was candid in laying facts on the line, but underlying his exposition of American armed might is the administration's policy of using this strength to discourage aggression, avoid provocation and actively pursue better understanding and peace. "Let us be fully aware of the wide range of our military resources," the Secretary of Defense concluded, "and the freedom they can give us to pursue the peaceful objectives of the world without fear of military aggression."

THE BERLIN PROBLEM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, at this time, we are seeing almost weekly evidence of the ability of the Communists to harass us and put us on the defensive on the access routes to Berlin.

Our long-term objective remains the unification of Germany; but all of us, West and East, free world and Communists alike, know that as long as the world is in its present divided state of strain between the West and the East, neither side is going to permit the loss to the other of the portion of Germany that is currently pledged to it.

We all know that West Germany, with its 11 divisions, is the very bulwark of the West's land forces in Europe today. And, East Germany is not only powerful militarily, but it is now the second largest industrial Soviet satellite nation.

The only way that unification and freedom can come to Germany as a whole is as a result of a reduction in tensions that will lead to an increased porosity of the cruel Berlin wall and of the Iron Curtain itself; a reduction in tensions that will create a climate permitting the establishment of a fully democratic, unified Germany, as envisaged in the Potsdam Conference of 1945; and a reduction in tensions that will mean that both West and East will abide by the results of freely-held German elections.

That is the positive reason for a reduction in tensions.

The negative reason is to avoid the series of incidents that are now frequently occurring on the Berlin-Helmstedt autobahn. A hostile incident, starting by accident, can rapidly escalate to the blow-up point. This danger becomes all the more real as we come to depend on medium-size nuclear weapons for tactical defense, in place of conventional infantry and artillery. Without exaggerating, such an escalation could easily lead to the immolation of all of us. We are very lucky not to have started presently on such a course.

Twice before on the floor of this Chamber I made specific suggestions for lowering of tensions in central Europe and for the development of some constructive solution, some break from the status quo, some effort toward diplomatic actions on our part, rather than perpetual reactions.

In essence, my proposal calls for an internationally guaranteed corridor along the Berlin-Helmstedt autobahn with consequent loss of sovereignty over it by the Communists, in exchange for our recognition of the Oder-Neisse frontier and our recognition of the existence of the East German Government. There are various additions to this idea that I have developed and advanced in the past, including the location in Berlin of the European Headquarters of the United Nations, presently in Geneva, or of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, now in Paris.

I cannot help but point out at this time that if these ideas had been accepted—instead of our being involved in a series of crises in Berlin, we would have started along the path toward a reduction in tensions in central Europe. We could have embarked already on a course of action leading through increasing porosity of the Iron Curtain to eventual unification of Germany.

My own contacts, personally and by mail, with German citizens—as contrasted with their political leaders in government—convince me that such a solution is acceptable to these citizens. I am equally confident that such a solution is privately acceptable to both the West and the East. But, for political reasons and for reasons of barter and the maintenance of good trading positions, the governments on neither side wish to come forth and break the present impasse in which we find ourselves. I would not be so concerned about this matter if it were not for the fact that because of our own unwillingness to try to break this impasse, we are endangering the world itself.

I call, once again, on our administration to seek to rectify the sterility of our policy vis-a-vis Berlin and Germany.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of November 14, 1963, that illustrates the facet of our problem deriving from our lack of a concrete, specified corridor of access.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACCESS TO BERLIN

Twice in 2 months, paralyzing incidents have taken place on the autobahn between West Germany and West Berlin. Either could have eventuated in war. Motives aside, in both cases the trouble arose from differing Soviet and American views of the Allied "right" of access to Berlin.

There is no formal document or international agreement specifically giving the Allies the right of access. In respect to Germany, it springs from the Allied conquest in World War II; there is no worry here. In respect to the Soviet Union, the right springs from various agreements on the occupation and division of Germany and Berlin; none of them explicitly mentions access. The only relevant piece of paper is a memorandum of June 29, 1945, by General Clay in which he recorded his understanding of an oral conversation about access with General Zhukov. There is no question but that in legal and abstract terms the Allies have the right of access. But due to the vague circumstances of its origins, it has been almost continually disputed in theory and contested in practice by the Russians.

The result has been not a clear simple "right" but, as the United States stated in its November 6 note to Moscow, a "right (exercised) in accordance with procedures." This is the key. These "procedures" are actually conditions or limitations established and enforced by the Russians. Typically, in the two recent incidents, the question was not whether the United States had a right to travel but the conditions under which the Soviet Union would allow it to travel.

Three elements have led the United States to accept these "procedures." One is the American recognition that the access territory is occupied in a military sense by the Soviets and thereby is a legitimate matter of interest to them. The second is the simple fact of physical Soviet control: Moscow has the men and the weapons on the spot and, up to a point, it is physically capable of enforcing its will.

The third element can only be called inept American and Allied diplomacy. Time after time since the war, although not invariably, the Soviets have made demands and the Allies have merely acquiesced. Junior military personnel, acting without instructions in new situations hatched by the Russians, have given way without clearing with their political superiors; so it was with the first Soviet demands that convoy troops dismount. Sometimes, as with the 1,500 American troops rushed to Berlin after the wall was erected—they all dismounted, other factors were allowed to override the issue of procedures. Sometimes, it is reported, low-level personnel who acquiesced in new procedures did not even report it to higher authorities; to this day the patchwork of procedures is such that no one will swear he knows what they all are.

Furthermore, the three Western Allies have often failed to coordinate their access practices, thus allowing the Russians to employ invidiously divisive tactics. When the Allies finally did get together in their parallel October 29 notes to Moscow, for the first time they explicitly stated a procedure. The consequence of this was to hand the Russians the effective right to demand that troops in convoys of a certain size dismount.

Access to Berlin is going to remain treacherous as long as the Soviets keep trying to force the Allies out of Berlin. The West must hope that the Soviets will not misunderstand the depth of its commitment there and not push the West too far. But meanwhile the United States must take urgent steps to shore up its position. It must record for its own use the procedures governing access so that there will be no confusion and unnecessary concession. It must insure the closest policy supervision of every American move between West Berlin and West Germany. It must coordinate its access practices with its Allies. And it must recognize that erosion is as sure a way to lose a right as outright abrogation.

BUSINESS LEADER COMMENTS ON TAX BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, early this year Mr. Milton J. Shapp, a respected businessman and civic leader in Philadelphia, Pa., wrote a letter to the President discussing the conditions essential for economic growth and offering suggestions based on his years of experience and study.

This letter has been made public but I want it to be included in official proceedings as we consider the tax bill. I believe we can profit from this thoughtful analysis of the tax cut approach to vigorous economic development.

Mr. Shapp makes several important points which deserve careful consideration. In particular, he points out that:

> Tax savings enjoyed by low income groups or small companies will be spent quickly, creating consumer and industrial demand for many products * * *. Normally, industry will invest in new plants and facilities only when it has sufficient demand for its products and though financing is of course required, the decision to invest is not made just because funds happen to be available.

Further—

> Private investments must be balanced by public investments in wealth-producing physical assets.

He illustrates the dependence of business prosperity on public investments in education, transportation, and resources.

In this context, Mr. Shapp says:

> I do not advocate a program of government spending, but rather one of investment to stimulate the economy.

To preserve this distinction between operating expenses and capital investment, Mr. Shapp suggests adopting a capital budget. This is a practice, he explains, that is employed by every growing, successful business firm in the country.

The letter makes some astute observations and it merits our study. The factors it cites should not be ignored or slighted during Senate deliberation on the tax reduction.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Mr. Shapp's letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JERROLD CORP.,
Philadelphia, Pa., March 27, 1963.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In your recent speech before the American Bankers Association you asked those who have thoughts in regard to your tax program to submit suggestions and criticisms. This letter is written with the hope that some of the ideas I express may help your administration achieve a program for true economic growth.

I believe that two aspects of your tax proposals will prove particularly beneficial. These deal with the cuts that you have recommended for low-income families and those to assist small businesses. I support, too, but to a lesser degree, your proposals to reduce tax rates for large corporations and individuals in higher income brackets, as I do not believe these will result in any material boost to our economy. I make this statement as one who personally is in a high tax bracket and who is the head of a corporation that might save $100,000 a year in taxes if your proposals should be accepted by Congress. However, at issue here is not what I would gain personally, nor what my company would gain immediately through tax savings. We must look at the benefits that would accrue to the national economy by cutting taxes in top brackets. Unless tax reductions help the national economy, they will prove to be illusory in the long run.

Tax savings enjoyed by low-income groups or small companies will be spent quickly, creating consumer and industrial demand for many products. Often the profits of small companies are tied up in accounts receivable, inventory and fixed assets. They find it difficult to convert 52 percent of their profits into cash to meet taxes, and this factor has thwarted the growth of many young companies and slowed down employment increases they could have attained.

However, savings on taxes for large corporations will not necessarily increase investments in a substantive manner. Since 1957, industry's cash flow has been much greater than capital reinvestment in new plant and equipment. In larger perspective, statistics show that since 1922 there has been absolutely no trend relationship between the amount of money in the hands of industry or private investors and the total sums that have been invested in plant expansion or modernization.

Normally, industry will invest in new plant and facilities only when it has sufficient demand for its products, and though financing is of course required, the decision to invest is not made just because funds happen to be available. If substantial tax cuts are granted to individuals in the higher income brackets and for larger corporations, it is predictable that a large portion of the savings will not be used for individual investment but will merely serve to inflate stock market values. Since 1957 there has been a close correlation between the amount of private savings (business and personal) and the rise of stock prices. As you know, however, there is a big difference between sustained economic growth for the Nation and inflated stock values. The latter only gives the illusion of success.

However, if you feel that all individuals and business firms should be permitted to participate in tax savings, I concur. I merely point out that there is little growth benefit to be derived from high level cuts.

I should now like to call your attention to other aspects of the problem. For America to achieve a growth rate sufficient to reduce unemployment to manageable levels, we must increase those types of public sector investments that stimulate and sustain the economy. In previous decades, entrepreneurs furnished all or almost all of the capital that private companies needed. There was no real need a century ago, for example, for mills, mines, or factories to hire educated people. Business owners didn't need clean water, sewage disposal plants, airports, highways, etc., to make substantial profits on their invested capital.

This has all changed. Private investments must be balanced by public investments in wealth-producing physical assets. Business firms today do need educated people at all levels—in production, sales, research, and executive capacities. Highways and airports are essential to transport people and goods. Public investments to purify streams, build sewage disposal plants, etc., are required. In essence, taxes collected from industry, if reinvested in these types of public facilities, are part of the capital required to maximize business profits. These public investments are indeed as important to the operation of modern industry as the factories and office buildings they build for themselves. Yet, since 1946, on a per capita basis private investments have virtually tripled and public investments (Federal, State, and local) have dropped some 4 percent.

In my own business, if I were to invest in research and new production facilities and not balance these investments by training sales and field engineering personnel, etc., I would not obtain optimum profits. In fact, I might very well sustain high losses due to this unbalance in programing.

Ironically, most businessmen oppose public investments. Yet, business profits and the economic growth rate of the country have been retarded specifically because we have failed to maintain balance in our private and public investment programs.

My great fear is that any advantages that might be developed by a tax cutting program will be negated if this is accompanied by a program that reduces investments in needed public facilities. Please note the distinction. I do not advocate a program of Government spending, but rather one of investment to stimulate the economy. I believe that proper public investment will in fact reduce the operating cost of Government.

As to military expenditures, necessary as they may be, with the exception of defense and space funds that are allocated for research and education purposes, there is no long-term growth stimulation provided by these expenditures. Once the hardware is made, it is either abandoned as obsolete (as in the case of military bases in Turkey, England, and with many existing types of naval ships and aircraft), or destroyed in experimental tests.

Studies that Dr. Ernest Jurkat and I have made indicate clearly that public investments to develop people (via education and health programs), resources (for material and energy) and transportation systems, are the only types of public investments that stimulate private investment and spur true economic growth. For example, as shown on pages 58 and 59 of my recent study, "New Growth—New Jobs for Pennsylvania," each increase of $1 in these types of public investments stimulates an immediate (within 1 to 3 years) increase of private investment of $2.40. Together, this $3.40 investment increases GNP by $10.

During the American Bankers Association meeting, you indicated that each dollar of tax cut would stimulate $3 of added growth. This may not occur if public investment programs in these needed domestic facilities are reduced to balance the tax cuts. Even so, the $3 estimate is far below the $10 that could be achieved if a proper level of public investment in selected fields was maintained.

I believe that a more positive answer to increasing growth while maintaining a balanced budget is found in the proposals you suggested in your Yale speech last year. Adopt a capital budget. Segregate operating expenditures from capital investments in budget presentations.

Every successful business firm in this country does just this. No growth company could possibly show a profit if each year all of its capital expenditures were lumped together with secretarial salaries and office supply expenditures. Surely no business could grow if, because it kept "an administrative budget," it failed to make the necessary capital improvements to insure continued expansion and profitability of operations.

I submit the following specific proposals that I believe would help achieve sustained economic growth:

1. The Federal Government should separate capital and operating expenditures in budget presentations. The following items should be considered capital investment items: highways, bridges, health, development of natural resources, sewerage and water systems, housing, community development, airports, local utilities, parks, recreation, education, and research.

It can be shown statistically that investments for each of the above items either increase the economic growth potential of this country by stimulating the development of people, resources, and transportation systems, or they cut operating costs of government. Either case qualifies these expenditures to be listed as investments.

2. We should resort to the businesslike procedure of borrowing to meet capital needs. Tax revenues should be used to meet operating needs of the Government. Amortization repayments and interest charges should be included in the annual operating budget.

3. The Government should immediately institute a study to determine the impact that various investment programs (mentioned in item 1 above) have upon the rate of growth. (I have considerable material available on this subject.) It should be noted specifically that even in such an important field as transportation, the Chairman of the ICC stated last June that there were no studies being conducted to determine the impact that transportation has upon the growth of a community or the Nation. The Department of Commerce has little data that bears on this essential factor. It seems that before we place too much emphasis on the triggering effect of tax cuts, we should know more about the positive factors that stimulate growth.

4. Tax cut proposals should be directed to those phases of the economy where money not collected by the Government would definitely and quickly be put into the mainstream of commerce. This would mean emphasis on tax cuts for all people earning less than $10,000 or $15,000 a year and for businesses earning less than $100,000. I would propose that the 52-percent surtax apply only when a company has reached a $100,000 level of income, with lower taxes applying below that figure.

5. To really stimulate private investments, I suggest that you offer business the option of depreciating any type of capital investment in any length period it chooses. This might cost the Government $5 or $6 billion in taxes the first year or so, but over a brief span, even if industry chose to write off capital investments rapidly, the money would start to flow back into the Treasury as higher profits would not then be cushioned by depreciation reserves unless investment programs were maintained.

Mr. President, as you know, I have supported and continue to support most of the programs that you have advocated. I believe that history will record your efforts to reshape America's position in the world as a major turning point in the affairs of this Nation. The suggestions I have made in regard to your economic program are not meant to be critical for the sake of criticizing.

However, from the private studies I have made of the national economy, I feel that your tax program may not obtain the results you anticipate. On the other hand, this program plays into the hands of those who criticize vitally needed public investment programs. Congress may well alter your tax program, reduce taxes and create deficits without making balanced investments in the fields that generate maximum economic growth.

I shall be very happy to meet with you or any of your economic advisers to explore in greater detail the suggestions and thoughts contained in this letter.

Sincerely yours,

MILTON J. SHAPP.

WHAT HAPPENED TO KING COTTON?

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, Robert T. Davis, Jr., the former mayor of Columbus, Ga., and vice president of Swift Spinning Mills, recently addressed the Columbus Kiwanis Club on the cotton and textile problem.

In his splendid speech, Mr. Davis concluded that King Cotton is not dead yet, but that it does suffer from an illness which only positive governmental action can cure.

> Most of cotton's problems are directly related to Government actions; therefore, the solutions to most of these problems rest with the Government—

Mr. Davis said.

And this of course is true. Moreover, anyone who is cognizant of the cotton and textile situation knows full well that until there is remedial legislation, particularly with reference to the iniquitous two-price cotton system, the situation will not get any better. It will in fact continue to worsen, and more and more mills will either shut down or convert to synthetic fibers.

I consider Mr. Davis' address worthy of wide distribution, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT HAPPENED TO KING COTTON?

In 1930, a professor of economics at the University of North Carolina, Claudius T. Murchison, published a treatise entitled "King Cotton Is Sick." Recently in Macon, a civic club talk was entitled "Is King Cotton Dead?" Over 30 years of sickness is a rough ordeal for anyone to go through. Cotton is still alive, but the illness has caused him to give up his throne and assume a lesser role. Why has this happened? What is the future for cotton? What is the outlook for cotton textiles? Or more important, What is going to happen to the domestic textile industry? These are important questions, not only for these United States, but the South, the State of Georgia, and even closer to home, this community. The textile industry is by far the largest employer in the State of Georgia with over 90,000 persons earning about $375 million annually in approximately 350 plants. With an annual payroll of approximately $33 million, the seven local textile mills have a tremendous influence on our economy. As a matter of current interest, these seven mills make up approximately 22 percent of the total funds raised for United Givers.

To paraphrase a controversial comment of a few years ago, you might say "What's good for the textile industry is good for Columbus." If you are sympathetic with this feeling, I hope for a few minutes you will examine with me this tremendous industry which has a reputation for poor-mouthing, but still forges on somehow, making enough money to provide the American consumer with the least inflated industrial commodity. It is a complex story, with many interesting chapters. It is an old story because the industry began several thousand years before Christ. It is also an industry that began in this country out of necessity—the need for clothing which heretofore had been supplied by the British Empire, whom we had just defeated in gaining our independence. The necessity was so great that the manufacturing equipment had to be designed and put together from memory by the few who had this knowledge. By 1815, the industry employed some 100,000 men, women, and children and consumed about 90,000 bales annually.

Later in the same century, when Eli Whitney invented the cotton gin, the development and growth of the textile industry and the raw cotton industry became one and the same. The production of raw cotton and the spindlage of the textile industry both advanced rapidly until just after World War I, when a period of change began. The sharp rise in cotton consumption began to level off and the productivity of textile mills started a marked increase. These conditions left a growing surplus of raw materials and an excess of productive capacity.

Naturally, under the influence of the New Deal, this surplus of cotton created the necessity for legislative action. The results of these temporary measures of price support and acreage controls are well known. When started in the early 1930's, U.S. production of cotton was over 50 percent of the total world production, however today it approaches only 30 percent. Since then, the growth of cotton outside of the United States has been encouraged to increase about 300 percent, while our production has remained relatively stable.

The Government did nothing to relieve the excess of manufacturing capacity, but the mills have reduced their spindles to a level of only about 53 percent of the 1920 total. Of course, I hope none of you think the Government should have done anything about this, but the fact remains that this improvement in productivity and efficiency still provides the opportunity for the consumer to obtain a better buy in textiles today than they can with any other commodity. For example, the wholesale price index based on 1947–49, indicates textiles at less than the base, when all industrial commodities (including textiles) are about 130. Textile prices have actually gone down while the average prices of all industrial commodities have advanced 30 percent.

Let's go back to King Cotton to see the results of this Government assistance to assure the farmer of his fair share of economic growth. In the first place, it is very evident that the Government's help prevented him from enjoying his historical share of the world market. The price support caused the foreign production of cotton to increase from approximately 12 million bales in 1930 to over 33 million bales now. With our know-how, our efficiency, and our marketing ability, this loss of business was not necessary, except for the simple reason, we priced ourselves out of the market and encouraged others to grow their own requirements. It has also encouraged synthetic fiber producers, especially rayon, to take advantage of this artificially higher cotton price. It also encouraged paper, plastics, and other products to take over cotton textile markets—for example: bagging—for fruit, fertilizers, etc., napkins, towels, tire cord, furniture stuffing, and many others.

Legislative help actually started the downfall of King Cotton's reign. During all this time, you and I were wearing lighter and lighter weight clothes which offset to a large extent the population growth. The same quantity of cotton just went further and we didn't need to grow more for domestic use. The fertilizer manufacturers and the county agents were working all this time and they stayed ahead of the Department of Agriculture by enabling about the same amount of cotton to be grown on a fraction of the acreage required in 1930. Actually, the raw cotton production is increasing so fast, I doubt if the Department of Agriculture can reduce the acreage fast enough to record any significant decrease in bales produced. In fact, last week's report indicated an estimated cotton crop of 15,322,000 bales—almost 2 million more than the domestic and export markets are expected to require. This is 457,000 bales larger than last year's crop on 9 percent less acreage.

In 1955, because of the high price supports, our raw cotton exports fell to the lowest peacetime level since 1871. Thus, to counter the twin problems of American surpluses and increased foreign movement into traditional American export markets, the United States in 1956 set up a special export subsidy program. The subsidy represents the difference between the price of U.S. cotton and the so-called world price for cotton. It may vary from year to year, but since August 1, 1961, it has remained at 8½ cents per pound, or $42.50 for a 500-pound bale. Also, earlier this year, this Commodity Credit Corporation offered for sale on a bid basis cotton for export which in some instances actually amounted to more than a $42.50 discount.

At inception it was recognized that such an export subsidy would create two disastrous impacts on the domestic textile producing industry, both of which would require immediate corrective action: (1) It would kill off the textile export market, and (2) it would invite unfair priced textile imports.

To prevent the first of these, provision was made for the payment of an equalization fee on cotton textile exports on the same per pound basis as the raw cotton subsidy. However, efforts made at the time, and repeated since, have failed to provide an offset for the far more important element of the problem—imports.

U.S. cotton textile imports made from lower priced cotton have increased spectacularly since 1956 while the export subsidy has lowered the price of American cotton to foreign textile mills.

In 1955, immediately prior to the inception of the cotton export subsidy, imports of cotton products amounted to a 363,487,000 square yard equivalent. By 1962, such imports amounted to a 1,165,878,000 square yard equivalent, more than triple the imports of 1955.

Most of these increases in cotton textile imports have been in categories of products in which the raw cotton cost is the predominant one in manufacturing costs, such as in yarns and gray goods. For example, imports of carded and combed yarn, in direct competition with Swift Spinning Mills, have increased from 142,000 pounds in 1955 to 28,453,000 pounds in 1962.

Cotton textile imports have taken over markets that otherwise would have been supplied by American-grown cotton processed by the American industry.

The industry's position was made very clear recently by J. Craig Smith, president of Avondale Mills, when he spoke to an international cotton meeting in Athens, Greece. He said, and I quote, "We have no objections to imports which come in because the quality is better than the quality of products made by American mills. Few textile imports into the United States are in this category.

"We have no objections to imports which can be sold in our country because they are a new style or pattern, or are otherwise different from what we make. Actually, most of our imports, being made for the American market, copy our styles and patterns and participate without cost in the substantial sums that we spend on promotion.

"We have no objections to imports based on more efficient operation in the exporting country. Many of you who have visited American mills have told us that our mills are as efficient as, if not more efficient than, any in the world. You are not able to ship goods into our country because we are inefficient.

"We have no objections to imports where anything resembling a monopoly situation exists. If there is a monopoly industry in the United States, it should have competition from whatever the source. Our American textile industry is the most competitive industry in the world. This competition is reflected currently in earnings of 2 percent to 3 percent on our sales and in a comparative price structure lower than that of any other major industry. Most of you gentlemen would be ashamed to report earnings as low as ours.

"What imports, then, do we object to? We have a law in the United States requiring that we pay a minimum wage of $1.25 an hour or the president of the mill goes to jail. We have another law fixing the support price of our cotton at 32.47 cents per pound. The fine cotton grown here in Greece and in 30 other countries around the world is not available to us except for a negligible quota. Most of our textile imports come in only because they are cheap, and they are cheap only because they are made with cheap labor and out of cheap cotton. Their production in the United States would be completely illegal. These are the imports we are trying to control." End of quotation. This is a good summary and I believe a fair position to take.

At this stage, we can't say "King" cotton, we simply must say "Mister" cotton.

This year, three of the largest cotton textile mill chains in the country announced that they were no longer consumers of only cotton. Springs, Greenwood, and Graniteville made known that they were starting in the synthetic field in a big way. Others have entered into this because of the price and promotional values of synthetics as compared to cotton. The movement is not over and unless something is done and done quickly, cotton will be relegated to a minor role in a few years.

Most of cotton's problems are directly related to Government actions; therefore, the solutions to most of these problems rest with the Government. So far, cotton and the textile industry have received sympathy and promises, but no real positive action. The Tariff Commission has turned us down twice, the Office of Emergency Planning has refused to act and Congress has not been able to get together on any legislation. The President even recognized our plight because on September 6, 1962, after the Tariff Commission had rejected our second case, he said, I quote, "Thus the inequity of the two-price system of cotton cost remains as a unique burden upon the American textile industry for which a solution must be found in the near future. I am therefore requesting the Department of Agriculture to give immediate attention to the formulation of a domestic program that would eliminate this inequity. Such a program would undoubtedly require enabling legislation. Early in the next session of Congress, I shall recommend legislation designed to remove the inequity created by the present two-price cotton system." End of quote and almost end of concern by administration. Unless something is done soon, the patient is going to die.

The Cooley bill, which should come before the House in a few weeks, would eliminate inequities of two-price cotton by providing still another subsidy. The bill doesn't offer the best solution, but it will enable domestic mills to buy their cotton at competitive prices, provide the consumers with better values, and to some extent, stem the tide of imports. The Talmadge bill, now in the Senate Agriculture Committee, seems to be the best approach, but unfortunately, it does not have sufficient support. Ultimately, the Government must get out of the business of buying, storing, transporting, selling, and giving away cotton, as well as all farm commodities. These farm programs cost over $1 billion a year. It also means any American wheat or cotton we sell to Russia or any other Communist country must be subsidized by 60 cents a bushel and $42.50 a bale respectively.

The only way cotton can become king again is for the fiber to be planted, grown, harvested, and merchandised on a free enterprise basis. In addition, his best customer, the domestic textile industry, should be provided with some permanent assurance that imports will be controlled with reasonable quotas. This is not wishing for a handout, or something for nothing, or anything unreasonable. Since these aspirations are reasonable and sound, I have confidence or am optimistic enough to feel that the solutions are forthcoming.

It is on this basis that Swift Spinning Mills announced several months ago a modernization program and expansion program which will involve the expenditure of approximately $3 million in 1964. By the middle of December, we expect to award contracts for the building, the air conditioning, and the electrical work required for a modern and efficient combed yarn mill which will increase our production by 5 million pounds of yarn annually. We will increase our cotton requirements from 35,000 to 50,000 bales annually, or to approximately 10 percent of the cotton grown in Georgia each year. It is interesting to note if nothing is done to eliminate two-price cotton, we will pay $2,125,000 more for this cotton than a foreign mill would pay for the same cotton. We will, of course, be able to run synthetics or blends of cotton and synthetics.

At the present time, we make in every hour and 15 minutes, enough yarn to go all the way around the world, and late next year, the trip could be made about every 53 minutes. Our present electrical power requirements are equivalent to over 3,400 average homes and within the next few years, this could very easily be doubled. The vast majority of new machinery will be purchased from Saco-Lowell Shops, a subsidiary of Maremount Corp. This will be manufactured in Easley, S.C., and Sanford, N.C. Foreign equipment is being considered for the winding operation; however, this is still undecided.

During September, I had the opportunity, along with about 1,000 other Americans, of visiting the International Textile Machinery Show in Hannover, Germany. Practically every textile machinery manufacturer in the world was represented and it was evident that the next few years will see accelerated advancement in this industry. Another encouraging factor is the rapidly increasing capital outlay by both the machinery manufacturers and the textile mills for research and development. For example, textile research and development in 1962 was up 162 percent from 1957, while all industry research and development was up only 50 percent during the same period. We are mighty proud of the DuoCard, which was invented by our superintendent, Otis B. Alston. Our entire production is processed through Duo-Cards and many others have also changed but most important is the fact that this development caused a revolution in the carding phase of textile manufacture. Several of the mills built in the last few years contain only about one-third as many cards as they would have a few years ago and much credit is due to Otis Alston for this progress.

The textile industry has been taking giant strides toward modernization and improved efficiency in recent years. Textile industry outlays for new plant and equipment have been greater than net profits, after taxes, in every year since 1950, wth the exception of 1959. In 1962, textile industry outlays exceeded profits by 73 percent. In contrast to the textile industry performance, profits for all manufacturing industries have been running above plant and equipment expenditures since 1954. Last year, all manufacturing industry profits exceeded plant and equipment expenditures by 21 percent. Estimates of expenditures for new plant and equipment in 1963 indicates $720 million for textiles—up 18 percent over 1962, as compared to an expected 5-percent gain for all industries.

So, in spite of King Cotton's sickness, the textile industry is showing remarkable progress and this could be made more evident if the correct medicine is prescribed for the patient. King Cotton's future simply boils down to a matter of economics, because the textile industry will consume whatever fiber or fibers are most economical and those in greatest demand by the public. It's as simple as that.

ILLUSIONS ABOUT THE TAX CUT

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, so far during the Senate discussions on the tax cut bill we have heard the administration line from almost every conceivable direction—"If we don't have a tax cut, we'll have a recession; if we don't have a tax cut we'll rob the American public; if we don't have a tax cut we'll do this or we'll do that"—is how it has been going.

My colleague, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], has carefully analyzed the proposed tax cut and recently presented his views to an annual meeting of the American Life Convention in Chicago. The convention is an association which includes more than 300 life insurance companies having approximately 95 percent of the life insurance business in the United States. It also includes 13 of the leading life insurance companies in Canada.

Senator BENNETT said in his speech the proposed tax cut bill simply could not produce all of the economic benefits promised by its supporters.

So that my colleagues can see Senator BENNETT's views on this important legislation I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the speech by Senator Bennett.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ILLUSIONS ABOUT THE TAX CUT

(Speech by Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, American Life Convention, Chicago, Ill., Oct. 17, 1963)

I am grateful for the privilege of spending 24 hours with you here in Chicago and for the challenge to try to share with you the latest from Washington.

Because I am a member of the Senate Finance Committee, which began hearings on the tax bill just 2 days ago, this bill suggests itself as my most obvious subject. Ordinarily such a topic does not lend itself to the colorful development expected of an after dinner speaker. This time, however, things have been different. My story, like most serious discussions of economic problems, may bog down in statistics before it reaches the end; but at the beginning, it shows all the elements of a good TV melodrama.

The hurricane of emotional pressure is being swept up for the tax bill. Many businessmen, as well as politicians, are being swept along by it. Those who are crying up the storm say that the decision of our committee will either bring a serious recession immediately or guarantee bright skies forever after. Impetuous youth, that has dawdled along with the problem for more than 30 months, is trying in this way to blow down an "old and mighty oak" represented by our great chairman, Senator HARRY BYRD—an oak which has withstood all such storms for more than 30 years.

For special sound effects we have already had the anguished cry of a faithful New Frontiersman who feels that he has been betrayed. The end of the story may be predictable—its author has the votes. But, for the time being, the show is an exciting one.

The earlier episodes of the tax cut spectacle have built up a great sense of anticipation. People have been grumbling for years under the highest tax levels in our history—greater even than those that existed during the height of World War II. But these grumblings never broke out into open revolt because in only 6 out of the past 31 years has the Federal budget been balanced; and our people have had instinctive opposition to tax cuts in the face of deficits. Now the New Frontier has raised up prophets who preach that deficits are good and that they should be encouraged and increased. The way to do that, they say, is both to increase expenditures and cut taxes simultaneously. They claim this exciting combination can provide immediate blessings, as any fool can plainly see (to quote the immortal Little Abner). Of course, there are a few, like me, who may be blind, who insist, still, in the name of the old Puritanic ethic, that reduced rather than increased expenses should accompany tax cuts.

The prophets hope that the doubters can be reassured with words. At least to them it seems worth a try. And so the words are pouring forth. Here are some of them.

If taxes are cut right now, Christmas can begin a new era of prosperity such as we have never seen before. There will be no more dips in the business cycle—only a steady climb. The cut of $7 billion in 1964, rising to an annual rate of $11 billion in 1965 and thereafter, will really create $30 to $40 billion of new spending money for consumers each year and, at the same time, provide all the funds needed to catch up with the lag in capital investment, to solve the unemployment problem, to solve the balance-of-payments difficulties—and will do all this without creating a new inflation.

On the other hand, they warn darkly, if the bill is not passed, there is a real risk of a severe new recession by New Year's Day.

What a sure fire pitch. What a slogan—"Get some money for yourself and save the country." No wonder they don't want the Finance Committee to probe too deeply—1964 is just around the corner. How can anyone resist this glittering opportunity? How can anyone be so tedious and stuffy as to look this gift horse in the mouth? At the risk of becoming tedious, I am going to try today to do just that.

In developing my thesis today, I shall discuss four assumptions being made by the prophets of tax cut prosperity. The first is general, the other three specific. To me, all are fallacious.

The first and general assumption is that a tax cut can occur in an economic vacuum and that its benefits can be delivered to us directly, setting in motion only those economic forces which will enhance those benefits, and not disturbing any other forces which might offset them.

The measurements and comparisons made by economists are never exact because the many forces in our economy are in constant motion. They never stand still. Therefore, when an attempt is made to measure the effects resulting from one change (in this case the tax cut), the technique is to assume that most, if not all, of the other dynamic components of our economic mix are standing still. Only in this way can they get their basis of comparison. But while this assumption may be useful for analytical purposes, it is not true in fact. All other related factors and forces will adjust themselves to the change, often unpredictably. And so it is with the changes which the tax bill, if passed, may produce, many of which the advocates of the bill prefer to ignore.

This then, is the general assumption against which we should look now at three specific effects claimed for the bill. The first has to do with the income available for consumer spending, the second with income available for investment to create more jobs, and the third with the impact of this bill on the already awakening inflationary forces.

We are told that the reduction in the personal income tax will release about $6 billion in new consumer purchasing power in 1964 which will grow into $9 billion in 1965 and thereafter. We are also told that this will respond to the multiplier theory so that when combined with the effect of corporate rate changes, the output of goods and services in the economy can be increased as much as $30 to $40 billion. Increased spending at these levels, they say, will result in increased business profits which will also turn into increased investment and help provide jobs for the unemployed.

All this is nothing but a new version of the pump-priming theory which was both proposed and discredited in the 1930's. This version is attractive, however, because it promises to put more money in the pockets of each of us. Unfortunately, there are other factors affecting our disposable income which will not remain constant. If we look carefully we can see at least two elements which could reduce and may eliminate the total effect of the Federal income tax cut on personal income.

First, Federal income taxes are not the only ones we pay. State and local taxes are not only heavy, but they are continuing to rise both in rate and in total dollars. The 1962 increase amounted to $4.1 billion. Any increase in State and local taxes, of course, will counteract purchasing power increases made possible through a cut in Federal taxes as far as the net effect is concerned.

A second offsetting factor is the prospect for increase in social security taxes. In 1963, social security taxes increased by $2.3 billion. The net rate increase, due in 1966, will add another equal amount. In the meantime, there are bills before Congress which would increase the base on which social security taxes are computed. If the base is increased to $5,400, this will add another billion dollars.

The point I am making is that the prophets of tax-cut prosperity assume that these two factors will remain constant and will not eat up any of the individual tax-cut benefits. As a matter of fact, they will be offsetting factors.

So much for the first specific assumption. The second is equally suspicious. It is that whatever net increase in personal disposable income may remain after these offsets, there will still be enough to do all of these four things:

1. Increase consumer spending.

2. Provide enough capital for investment in industry and commerce to substantially reduce the existing obsolescence and solve the problem of needed modernization.

3. Finance enough new jobs to break the back of the unemployment problem and,

4. Provide enough for individual investment in government securities so as to keep the financing of the new deficit out of the banking system.

If there is actually an increase of disposable income it is quite likely that most of it will be spent for consumption and the rate of savings will be little larger than that which is already occurring. Savings, during the past several years, have been between 6 and 8 percent of personal disposable income. If this relationship holds for the future, about $5.5 billion would be consumed and about $½ billion of the reduction would be saved and invested. Even as we say this we must remember that interest rates are pushing upward both under the pressure of our balance-of-payments problem and because of some domestic policy. If interest rates continue to rise, individuals will be induced to increase their investment percentage by paying off some of their present debt. A decline in consumer debt could greatly reduce the amount of consumption being attributed to the tax decrease. This is another reason why the claim for consumption spending is highly suspect and has, at best, a very shaky foundation.

Let's turn now to the assurances being given that investment will increase and many new jobs will be created. Considering this we must add in the effects of the proposed decrease in the corporate rates also.

The prophets estimate that corporate tax cut will make $1.5 billion available for investment. If we add the $0.5 billion saved from personal income tax reduction, we have a possible investment total of $2 billion. Against that we have the McGraw-Hill estimate that 22 percent of the $250 billion investment in manufacturing plant and equipment is technologically outmoded. This means that there is immediate need for $55 billion new capital just to bring our present rated capacity up to date. In addition, we will need to provide another $50 billion each year to offset further depreciation and obsolescence. This, of course, does not include capital needs of the economy outside of manufacturing, which is difficult if not impossible to estimate. It already appears obvious, however, that a $2 billion increment would have little effect to correct the situation which would require in excess of $100 billion.

Of course, it does not seem fair to assume that all this money must come only from a tax reduction. Sums used for this purpose now normally come from retained earnings which in turn come from corporate profits. Though the proposed changes in corporate tax rate are supposed to give a boost to corporate profits, they will not be fully effective until 1970; and during the first 2 years, 1964 and 1965, there may be corporations which will actually have a greater tax burden than under the present rate system. This is another condition which will blunt the claimed stimulation of this tax bill.

Even the fact that $2 billion is made available for investment does not assure that it will be invested unless business confidence in the future is improved.

Now, will the tax cut with its increase in the Federal deficit improve business outlook and environment? The very fact that the administration is planning a deficit and at the same time a tax cut is a disturbing factor in the minds of many individuals. Mail which I am receiving has been overwhelmingly in favor of a tax cut only if expenditures are also controlled. Whether we like it or not, growth and prosperity which are the result of spending actions of individuals are greatly determined by the attitudes of these individuals toward the future. If confidence is undermined by New Frontier economic policies, the result will not be increased investment and spending. Even if one should grant that the economic theories used to justify planned deficits at the top of the business cycle were correct, if those who make the spending decisions do not agree, whether through lack of understanding or disagreement with the theory, the result will be the same.

If we expect investment to return to its previous levels in relation to our gross national product, profits which result in investment capital must also rise to previous levels. In 1950, corporate profits after taxes were 8 percent of GNP. Last year they were only 4.7 percent. Since these profits are the prime source of retained investment funds, if they could be restored even to the 1955 rate, an additional $16 billion would be made available; and, at the 1950 rate, the figure would be $20 billion.

Before we leave this discussion of the effect of the tax cut on investments, let's turn to look at the claim that it will provide jobs for a substantial number of our unemployed. First, it is necessary to consider the amount of investment required for each new job. The best estimate I can get is a figure of $16,000 for each new job. Looking first at the modernization of our present equipment, it is obvious that much of this, on an automation basis, will create new production without substantially increasing the number of jobs.

At the same time, to reduce the current unemployment even to 4 percent, we must create 1,315,000 new jobs; and to provide for our expanding labor force, we will need an additional 1 million jobs in 1964 and a rising number every year thereafter. At the rate of $16,000 required to fund a job, this would require a new investment of $37 billion in 1964, increasing annually thereafter.

To try and spread the $2 billion per year which this new tax bill would make available among the many needs which I have already mentioned convinces us that the assumption that the tax cut can be a source of dominant investment income just won't stand up.

There is another area of investment need for the funds to be released. This is the demand to finance increasing private credit and increasing public deficits. The demand for Federal, State, and local public credit expanded last year by about $16 billion, which is higher than all the claimed benefits from the tax cut even without any offsets. The Secretary of the Treasury told the bankers of America at their convention in Washington on October 8 that since 1961 all increases in the public debt had been financed outside of the banking system. If this policy is to continue, then obviously all of the new tax savings must flow into this channel.

To draw a subbalance at this point, I think it is obvious that a tax cut cannot do all of the jobs promised for it.

We are ready now to face the third assumption, which I think cannot be substantiated. The spokesmen for the administration tell us that we need not worry about inflation because this problem has been licked since January 1961 and cannot raise its ugly head again so long as we have idle productive capacity and unemployment. As I have already pointed out, this so-called idle productive capacity is not being used because 22 percent of it is inefficient, technologically obsolete, and undoubtedly high cost. The administration's position, therefore, becomes an anomalous one. It relies upon the evils of underproduction to cure the evil of inflation. It cannot have it both ways.

Of course, we know from experience that inflation has not been stopped even though we have theoretical excess capacity and no Government program has been able to make a substantial dent in unemployment. In the United States, consumer prices have risen 15 percent in 10 years, robbing all fixed incomes and investments, including the more than 112 million outstanding life insurance policies, of approximately one-sixth of their value. Almost every month the consumer price index inches up. Since January 1961, it has risen 2.8 index points, including a rise of nearly one point in the 60-day period of June and July of this year. Since every rise of one index point represents a loss of approximately $4.5 billion in purchasing power, we can see how real a threat this is to the survival of tax cut benefits.

Those who claim there is no inflation, point with pride to the fact that wholesale prices for commodities have been fairly steady. This is true, but it has served to conceal a significant change of pattern in the consumer index where the costs of retail distribution and of services have been increasing both in their comparative proportion to the total consumer spending and in their absolute price levels. Now wholesale prices for manufactured products are beginning to rise on a broad front. Even steel is breaking through the psychological barrier raised by the President's attack on the industry in 1962, and experts see this as the beginning of a new general price rise and therefore a new pressure for inflation.

That we have probably only dammed up the effects of inflation and not eliminated them is more readily seen when we look at our performance in comparison with that of our international trading partners. In the past 10 years, including 1962, U.S. export prices increased about 10 percent. Export prices in Western Europe increased only 1 percent and those of all other major areas in the world went down. No wonder our share of world trade dropped in this period, from 21 percent to 17 percent. This, of course, contributes to today's balance-of-payments problems. Now how can policies which would add to inflationary pressures and raise prices possibly put us in a better position to compete with other countries? Obviously they cannot. Not only that, but if incomes increase, this will result in increased imports rather than increased exports and thus contribute to the problem.

The administration is partially counting on inflationary trends in foreign countries to offset our trade disadvantage. It is true that recently cost-of-living indexes in our trading partners have gone up more than those in the United States. From January 1962 until May of this year (the latest figures available for foreign countries), our cost-of-living index rose only 1 percent while costs in other countries increased from 2½ percent in European countries to 10 percent in Japan. The astronomical price rises that have occurred in some Latin American countries have created Government crises and hastened military takeovers. Some economists say that now we can relax and let foreign inflation close the price gap. I cannot agree with that conclusion. Foreign countries are not going to stand idly by without doing something to control the rapid rise in prices. On the other hand, the policies that are being followed by our administration are definitely inflationary.

Some of us who face special responsibility for shaping, then finally approving or rejecting any tax cut are especially concerned about the long trend of rising Government expenditures and deficits. We are assured that if we vote this cut, it will release new activity which will increase the absolute tax take so that the economy will grow up to the problem and its deficits will be swallowed up—again the pump-priming theory. We had a tax cut in 1948, but our deficits increased by $22 billion between then and 1954.

Some theorists blamed it on the Korean war. Then we had another tax cut in 1954; and since then, without war, the deficits have increased this time by a total of $26 billion.

If the present tax cut is adopted, I think that we must expect deficits to continue to pile up. The present spending pattern with its deficit effects, is to me an inescapable force for further inflation.

Let me return briefly to mention another factor, outside of my original outline, also erroneous.

The Secretary of the Treasury, Douglas Dillon, claimed just last Tuesday in tax hearings that are being held in the Senate Finance Committee that "without the basic reduction in tax burdens proposed in H.R. 8363 (the tax bill), we increase the likelihood of repeating the disappointing record of recent business cycles. On the other hand, a substantial across-the-board reduction in taxes should give our economy the impetus it needs to put an end to this pattern of recession." This is too much to expect of a tax cut. It is not reasonable to claim that it will do away with business cycles. They are an important part of our system and help correct excesses that naturally develop in a free economy. When business cycles are completely stopped, we will have a controlled economy.

One of the things that bothers me most about the impossible claims that the administration is making for the tax cut is that if the tax bill becomes law and if, thereafter, these offsetting factors operate as I think they will, and if, therefore, the rate of production is not greatly stimulated, and unemployment is not greatly reduced, and our balance-of-payments position is not greatly improved, and if inflation keeps climbing up, the New Frontier economists and politicians will not agree that their policies have failed but will attempt to put the blame on the private sector of our economy and herald the failure as proof that the Federal deficits are not big enough. In other words, the administration is attempting to put itself in a "heads I win—tails you lose" position. If there is improvement they will take the credit. If improvement is inadequate, private industry will take the blame.

Now as I close let me summarize again my impressions of what will still happen even if these tax proposals are adopted and in 1964 and 1965 they do reduce total Federal taxes by some $7 and $11 billion respectively.

First, I am afraid this amount will be largely wiped out by increases in State and local taxes plus actual and potential increases in social security taxes and, finally, any new purchasing power remaining will be wiped out by inflation even at its present creeping pace.

Second, like the boxer who, accustomed to reading baseball averages, sold 500 percent of his future earnings and thought he still had 500 percent left, even if there were some real spendable money left, it would not be enough to make any dent in the promises that have been made for it. It cannot carry the load of creating $30 to $40 billion in new multiplier generated consumer income. It cannot supply the funds necessary to modernize plant capacity. It cannot solve our unemployment problems, it cannot finance the new debt that will be created through deficit spending. It cannot do away with business cycles which are the result of private spending decisions. It cannot solve our balance of payments problems.

I can understand why every American wants his taxes cut. The current rates are not only a heavy burden to carry, but a drag on the growth of the economy. But I cannot for the life of me, understand how we can be persuaded that this proposed tax cut, standing alone, is the key to all of our economic problems.

On the other hand, all of us who question the present tax cut proposals could enthusiastically support them if they were matched by a definite and specific program for the control and reduction of Federal expenditures supported by the administration with equal vigor. Instead the official position is that the President cannot control expenditures and in this field he is captive of the Congress. Poppycock. There are several very simple things the President can do:

1. He can reject all proposed new programs which create new spending.

2. He can hold down the expansion of existing bureaus.

3. He can trim the fat and waste out of the sprawling Federal empire instead of adding thousands of new Federal jobs (164,000 since January 1961).

It would take a speech much longer than this one to detail even the obvious expense-saving possibilities that exist but we cannot expect anyone in the administration to make it. Pious generalities can be more easily proclaimed and more easily either forgotten or politically interpreted in the coming 1964 campaign. Unfortunately, too, there is tragic historical evidence that in an election year many American voters, including many businessmen, are either economically illiterate or selfishly myopic and for whatever reason willing to be seduced politically with their own money.

To me this is the unspoken and maybe the major motivation behind the present storm being built up to sweep the tax bill through the Senate and behind the rationalized assumptions being used to defend it.

I do not agree that this cynical appraisal is accurate today for the majority of American voters. I think they still cling to an old-fashioned faith in fiscal responsibility, both for themselves and for their Government. I share that faith and look forward confidently to that day when it will be translated into a sound Federal tax program matched by expenditure control and Federal surpluses instead of deficits.

JAMES MADISON MEMORIAL LIBRARY ON SQUARE 732

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is high time that the Congress act with decency, reasonability and economy to settle the future of its building program on Capitol Hill.

The present dawdling and uncertainty, mixed with preposterous plans for the misuse and arrogant taking of Capitol Hill properties, is unfair to the residents of the area, wasteful of tax funds paid from throughout the country, and ignorant of rational planning.

Residents and property owners in the area close in to the Capitol are compelled to live in uncertainty about the future of their homes, not knowing from one day to the next what wild and grasping announcements of possible takings will be irresponsibly put out by various officials. The uncertainty eliminates or slows down the restoration and upkeep of these areas when congressional policy should be to encourage the beautification of the Capitol area.

Taxpayers across the Nation hear daily of wasteful and absurd expenditures of public funds to haphazardly build monstrous and costly public buildings or cold and lifeless memorials.

Competent architects and engineers, as well as the responsible cultural and architectural planning agencies in Washington, throw up their hands in despair at the refusal of the Congress to rationally consider appropriate development of the seat of the Government.

Mr. President, this is no exaggeration. The Congress should take full note of the growing concern expressed in the press and by public groups.

COMMITTEE OF ONE HUNDRED URGES LOCATION OF THIRD LIBRARY BUILDING ON SQUARE 732

The immediate focus of this growing dissatisfaction with congressional failure to establish sound policies is the proposal for a third Library of Congress Building. It is very encouraging that the Committee of One Hundred on the Federal City of the American Planning and Civic Association has urged Congress to locate this third Library Building on square 732, directly across Independence Avenue from the main Library Building. On November 14, the Committee of One Hundred passed a resolution urging that the parts of the companion bills H.R. 7391 and S. 1920 designating square 732 as the site for the future additional library facility be supported and enacted into law, that the designers of this edifice be most carefully selected to insure a clean-cut, artistic, and harmonious building, that they be required to work closely with the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission during the development of this design.

H.R. 7391 is sponsored in the House by Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, of New Jersey, and S. 1920 is sponsored in the Senate by Senators LAUSCHE, MCCARTHY, CLARK, and I.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the Committee of One Hundred resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is need for additional facilities for the Library of Congress; and

Whereas H.R. 7391 has been introduced by Congressman WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, and in the Senate S. 1920 has been introduced by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS supported by Senator FRANK LAUSCHE, Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY, and Senator JOSEPH CLARK, to locate these additional facilities on square 732, being that square lying immediately south of the present Library of Congress: Now, be it therefore

Resolved at this regular meeting of the Committee of One Hundred on the Federal City of the American Planning and Civic Association on November 14, 1963, That passage be urged of that part of H.R. 7391 and S. 1920 designating square 732 as the site for the future additional library facility be supported and enacted into law, that the designers of this edifice be most carefully selected to insure a clean-cut, artistic and harmonious building, that they be required to work closely with the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission during the development of this design; and also be it

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Congressman WIDNALL, Senator DOUGLAS, Senator LAUSCHE, Senator MCCARTHY, Senator CLARK, the Librarian of Congress, chairmen of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, and the Senate, and to the Fine Arts Commission.

PRESS LABELS HILL PROGRAM "SHOCKING" AND AN "INVITATION TO BLIGHT"

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a number of recent articles in Washington newspapers deserve serious consideration by Members of Congress. In the November 10 issue of the Washington Post, Mr. Wolf Von Eckardt writes in an article that "nothing is as utterly dismaying as the bungling megalomania of Congress which threatens" the spirited effort now being made to rehabilitate the residential area on Capitol Hill.

His language is strong, but I think we deserve it. He notes that there are "many more horrors" like the new House Office Building to come "if the Architect of the Capitol, J. George Stewart, who is no architect, continues to have his way." "Stewart wants both a James Madison Memorial Library and a third Library of Congress Building," he goes on, but urges that the two be combined and comments, correctly, that "the issue is laboriously confused by Stewart."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in full in the Record at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DOUGLAS. In another recent newspaper article, which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of November 17, Mr. Robert J. Lewis recalls his article of 3 years ago in which he urged careful planning by independent and qualified architects, reports that no progress has been made as far as Capitol Hill is concerned, and states that "it is clearer today than ever that the central question the article raised is in even greater need of attention than it was at the time the article first appeared."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record. (See exhibit 2.)

CAPITOL ARCHITECT INCORRECTLY INFORMS CONGRESS ON LIBRARY BILL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Congress should act quickly, both to establish independent and competent planning of proposed additional construction on Capitol Hill and to approve the proposal for a third Library of Congress Building located on square 732.

I want to be very clear on one point, Mr. President. I fully support the request of the Librarian of Congress for additional space and I regret the delay in congressional action on his request. The Library of Congress is one of the great library institutions of the world, as well as an essential and competent adjunct of the Congress. It should have facilities adequate to do its job and I accept in good faith the request of the distinguished Librarian of Congress, Dr. L. Quincy Mumford.

I must add, however, that I think the Library's needs must be met with proper regard for the taxpayers. Other Members of Congress, and I, have urged that the property south of Independence Avenue across from the main Library building, square 732, which was acquired and cleared at a cost, I believe, of more than $5 million, be used for the third Library building. This building could be known as the James Madison Memorial Library to honor that famous Founding Father.

The Architect of the Capitol urges, however, that this large tract of expensive land be used as a park with a small memorial to James Madison and that additional residential property east of the Library Annex be acquired and razed to provide a site for the third Library building. These blocks east of the Annex largely contain restored residences of fine quality. To acquire and destroy them would be very costly and would be a fatal blow to the long efforts of Capitol Hill property owners to privately rehabilitate their property.

But the extravagance and arrogance of the Architect's proposal has seeped through to him, apparently, for he would agree to subgrade vaults in square 732 to supplement the Library's needs.

Mr. President, my study of the facts in this matter has led me to conclude that Mr. Von Eckardt is correct when he says that Mr. George Stewart has "laboriously confused" the issue.

Apparently the Architect opposes the proposal for a James Madison Memorial because, he alleges, it would first, provide only 70 to 75 percent of the Library's space requirements while the lots east of the annex would be adequate; second, a library on this site would be more costly because "a more classic design would be necessary" than on the lots east of the annex; third, a library on this site would bottle up the House of Representatives if additional facilities were included on the lots just south of the House Office Buildings; fourth, this would spread the library facilities and make operation costly; and fifth, a library on this site would be contrary to the wishes and intent of the former Speaker of the House, the late Sam Rayburn.

FACTS SHOW SQUARE 732 LARGE ENOUGH BY ITSELF

Mr. President, even a cursory examination of the facts shows that the Architect is, as he is so often, dead wrong.

In the first place, the fact is that square 732, by itself, is fully large enough to provide all the space requirements of the Library. The Librarian has officially reported to the Congress that the Library needs "nearly 2 million square feet of space, net."

A library building could be constructed on square 732 with three stories fully underground, a fourth story located below grade at Independence Avenue but above grade on C Street, and six additional stories above ground so laid out that they occupy only 60 percent of the total surface area leaving 40 percent for courtyards. Such a building would permit a courtyard memorial, if necessary, to James Madison and supply all the space needed by the library.

I repeat, Mr. President, this would supply all of the 2 million square feet of space needed by the library. Within the building lines square 732 contains 258,038 square feet. Four stories covering 100 percent of the building area would yield 1,032,155 square feet; 6 stories covering 60 percent of the building area would yield 923,939 square feet, and a penthouse at the top could add another 31,906 square feet for a total of 1,993,000 square feet.

This is very close to the Librarian's stated needs. But may I point out that this is a very conservative proposal. Additional floors could be added both above and below ground. The memorial to James Madison could simply be the library itself and since modern library buildings use air conditioning and do not need a courtyard, elimination of the courtyard would add at least 300,000 more square feet.

Mr. President, square 732 is fully large enough to meet the Librarian's needs without additional facilities above the lots just south of the House Office Buildings which was an alternative we earlier proposed.

These estimates of footage available by using square 732 are illustrations only, but in my opinion they show that the Architect's contention is mere propaganda. An independent authority should check this out.

SQUARE 732 LARGER THAN ARCHITECT'S ALTERNATIVE

Moreover, Mr. President, a check of the size of the lots involved in this issue discloses that Mr. Stewart's objections are nonsense because the alternative site he proposes, namely the lots east of the annex, is smaller—I repeat, smaller—than square 732. Square 732 is larger than squares 787 and 788, including the 90-foot width of A street between them, by at least 15 percent.

The figures must be juggled to claim that only the squares east of the annex can provide enough space. Square 732 contains an estimated 258,038 square feet of building space; squares 787 and 788 plus A Street contain only 217,940 square feet.

Mr. President, the Architect's allegation that a library on square 732 would be more costly because it would require a more classic design is preposterous. Actually, judging from his works, I doubt very much that the Architect can recognize a classic design when he sees one. I think the building should be of classic design and it may well be that this would be more costly than the type of monstrosity Mr. Stewart is fond of building, but I think we should have some facts. How much more costly would a classic exterior be than the medieval fortress exterior Mr. Stewart approved for the third House Office Building?

Mr. Stewart's argument that a library on square 732 would "bottle up" the House buildings is laid to rest by the fact that under our proposal all three House Office Buildings will have an unobstructed access to the south. And if Mr. Stewart is worried about further expansion on the lots south of the office buildings, as he claims, then why did he oppose my proposal to the Senate Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations that the underground parking garages to be constructed under those lots contain foundations for above ground building in case that proves necessary?

CONGRESS LED TO BELIEVE SQUARE 732 WAS ACQUIRED FOR LIBRARY

Now, Mr. President, we come to the most interesting argument offered in opposition to the Madison Memorial Library proposal; namely, that the late Speaker Sam Rayburn and other House leaders opposed using square 732 for a library when they secured congressional approval for its acquisition.

A brief examination of the legislative history of the acquisition of square 732 shows this contention to be incorrect. While the library building was not said to be the only purpose to which square 732 would be put, such use was the only specific purpose stated by the sponsors of the provision adopted in the 1960 legislative branch appropriations bill.

Consider the floor debate in the House on this provision to acquire square 732. Several Members raised the question of purpose. Mr. Rayburn, in part, said this—Congressional Record, volume 106, part 11, page 14090:

> I know this, we need this property for expansion. The Library of Congress—I will not say they will be located here—say they need more space, and big space. They may go there, but, if not the Library of Congress, something else.

Does this sound like an intent to use the property for grass and a small memorial?

Or consider the remarks of Congressman Thomas, the subcommittee chairman—Congressional Record, volume 106, part 11, page 14091:

> I feel compelled to make this statement. We appropriated this year $265,000 for rental of urgently needed space for the Library of Congress. You know you have to have an addition to the Library of Congress. Do you want to put it here on the Capitol grounds or do you want to put it 4 or 5 miles away from the other buildings of the Library of Congress? If I could guess with any degree of accuracy where it will be put, I would say it would be right here.

Or, Mr. President, go back to the hearings before the Thomas subcommittee on June 17, 1960. Congressman Thomas asked the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Cannon, what he thought about the proposal to take square 732. Said Mr. Cannon—page 434 of the hearings:

> Mr. Chairman, when I first came to Washington, the Library of Congress was the fourth largest library in the world. It is today and has long been the first library in the world.
>
> Formerly people visiting the United States from abroad would say, "Oh well, America is a money-loving country. Americans are interested only in business; only in piling up dollars. When it comes to the matter of culture, of intellectual attainment, libraries, and historic associations, you have to come to Europe."
>
> So when it comes to the support and expansion of the greatest library and all it implies, an institution which marks us as a people of advanced culture, we should at least provide for inevitable growth and development. A carload of accessions reach the Library every day of the year. When they built the Congressional Library, as always, they underestimated the future need for space. That has been true of every public building we have built, including the Senate and the House Office Buildings.
>
> The construction of a building of this character takes many years as Speaker Rayburn very well knows. It will take at best 4 or 5 years before the building is completed, so the earlier we begin, Mr. Chairman, the quicker we will reach the point when this building will become available.
>
> In the meantime we must pay each year increasing rent for space to accomodate the vast influx of books and manuscripts which flow in every working hour. Our rent for space in the Library will go up with each succeeding year and the quicker we can get this building ready the greater the saving.

Mr. President, I am quoting from the committee hearings on the question of acquiring square 732 and that was the issue. I repeat it was square 732.

And now, Mr. President, let us quote the testimony in this hearing of the Architect himself, Mr. Stewart, who now says in 1963 that square 732 is completely unsuitable for the third library building. Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Stewart if he could give a definite answer at this time whether it is the intention to place the Library on this property.

Mr. Stewart replied:

> That would be a decision of the Joint Committee on the Library, and it probably would be handled in such a way they would certainly consult with the House Office Building Commission if this ground were available.
>
> I might say this: It would be an ideal location for the Library.
>
> Mr. Thomas. That is the next question that I was going to ask you. Would this land accommodate the building? Have you proceeded far enough with your plans and thinking to know that there is enough ground in these two blocks, should it be the decision of the proper committees in the future to locate there?
>
> Mr. Stewart. Yes; and it would take all the ground there if it was decided to put it there.

Mr. President, the Congress has put up long enough with the proposals of the incumbent Architect. The legislative history of the proposal to acquire square 732 shows that he is again up to his old tricks. In 1960 he testified that square 732 was an "ideal location" and contained enough ground for the third library building. Today he claims that the site was never intended for this purpose and is too small.

Mr. President, I urge the members of the Public Works Committee, the Library Committee, and the House Office Building Committee to reexamine the record and to approve location of the third library building on square 732. I urge them to act without further delay which harms the program of our fine Library of Congress.

And I also urge immediate action on the proposals to provide for preparation by qualified authorities of a long-range plan for the development of Capitol Hill. Senators Lausche, McCarthy, Clark, and myself have proposed this in S. 1920. I am encouraged to see the introduction yesterday by Senator Randolph of Senate Joint Resolution 133 which makes a similar proposal. There are others, and I hope that the Committee on Public Works will act promptly on them.

Exhibit 1

Erring Congress Threatens Hill Homes

(By Wolf Von Eckart)

Nothing on the current Washington cityscape is as encouraging as the steady private rehabilitation of the charming residential area on Capitol Hill and nothing is as utterly dismaying as the bungling megalomania of Congress which threatens this spirited effort and our national pride.

Yes, our national pride.

Any morning Capitol Hill residents might wake up to read in the papers that some sneaky rider to an appropriations bill will unleash the bulldozers on property which their own sweat and money has rescued from blight. That this can happen—and it happened only 2 years ago—is shocking enough.

What is worse is that Congress continues to waste millions upon millions to heap pompous blocks of marble upon marble wtihout plan, reason, or design. That is a national scandal.

Just look at that pseudo-Roman fortification, the Sam Rayburn Building. As someone has said about another structure, it can be defended only from the military point of view.

But there are more, many more horrors like this to come if the Architect of the Capitol, J. George Stewart, who is no architect, continues to have his way. He usually does.

Stewart wants both a James Madison Memorial Library and a third Library of Congress building. The two should be combined. But the issue is laboriously confused by Stewart. And while it's all being threshed out in the committees, Representative Howard W. Smith, Democrat, of Virginia might well be drafting one of those riders.

It need only be pinned to an urgent bill at a hectic time and brrrr—there go the bulldozers and another four blocks of that unique, neatly arranged, tree-shaded array of turn-of-the-century architectural charm.

And Representative Smith, Stewart and their friends will have another mammoth "classic" temple just where they want it.

They want it on the neatly fenced, 2-block weed patch south of Independence Avenue and just east of the Old House Office Building. Congress appropriated this site 2 years ago and razed the restored buildings and shops.

Just why Stewart and the Madison men insist on having it there has never been explained. It's not an appropriate site for a memorial, which should be at some focal point. Why must poor Madison be lined up in phalanx of massive office buildings?

This already cleared site, many people feel, would be ideal for the third Library of Congress building which Librarian L. Quincy Mumford says he needs desperately. He wants nearly 2 million square feet of space in which to grow during the next quarter century.

In the absence of an independent study of space needs and such new library methods as the New York Public Library now employs, we must take his word for it. There are experts who believe Mumford's requirements are exaggerated. At any rate, he needs a third building.

To make room for it, Stewart and his friends want to clear four blocks of restored houses and the nice old St. Mark's Church between East Capitol Street and Independence Avenue and between Third and Fifth Streets SE., directly east of the Library of Congress Annex and the Folger Library.

This vandalism is completely unnecessary. In the interest of commonsense and the taxpayer, Representative William B. Widnall, Republican, of New Jersey, and Senator Paul H. Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, and other Senators, propose that the third library building and the Madison Memorial be combined and put on the already cleared site.

Let's call it the Madison Memorial Library, they say, and put a nice statue of James Madison in the court. Stewart and the proponents of the Madison boondoggle, however, don't like this idea. They seem to concede that a hollow temple would be silly. So they'll put some reading rooms into it and some of Mumford's books into a very deep basement. That helps justify the expense a little. Upstairs temple: a mere $15 million. Basement book stacks: a $24 million bargain.

But to take care of all of Mumford's books in the Madison temple, they say, is impossible. It would spoil that classic temple effect. Besides they want that third library building. They want to expand their domain.

Senator Douglas and others, always willing to be helpful, then suggested that buildings for additional books might be put on top of the parking garages Stewart proposes along the south side of the three House Office Buildings.

But Stewart wants greenery on those garages. He wants a view. Even if it is only a view over the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks and the Southeast Freeway.

He hasn't explained how the tunneled garages will fit in with the existing railroad tunnel, the utility tunnels of the Capitol powerplants, the tunnels connecting the various Capitol buildings and the proposed new subway tunnel.

Congress has, of course, not yet acted on the Madison Memorial Library. It may not even get around to it this session. But Stewart has his sketch all ready. And architects DeWitt, Poor & Shelton, who helped him extend the East Front, have already been tentatively commissioned to design that third library.

"If ever there was an example of a misuse of Government power and a concurrent lack of Government responsibility, J. George Stewart in his influential and official position embodies it," observed Representative Frank Thompson, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey, recently.

The American Institute of Architects has now urged a long-range, comprehensive master plan of the Capitol Hill area, which envisions future needs of the legislative branch, the Library of Congress, the Supreme Court, and other needs.

This is imperative.

But it is disappointing that the AIA did not also urge continued preservation of the Hill's residential area. And it seems contradictory and a sad mistake that AIA hastily dived into the Madison Memorial Library hassle and came up on the wrong side.

AIA wants nothing done until there is a master plan. Then why prejudge this plan by recommending that the expansion of the library would be better served in an easterly direction, particularly since AIA does not consider the Madison site appropriate for a memorial.

This is a serious matter. It's not just a question of saving four charmingly livable city blocks. Nor is it only a matter of another pompous DeWitt stone heap. The issue is whether Congress and the people are really in agreement with Stewart's grandiose ambitions for which the third library is merely another bridgehead.

These ambitions have been repeatedly spelled out by Stewart's assistant, Mario E. Campioli. They call for proliferating ever more massive marble House, Senate, and Supreme Court offices and libraries along an East Mall clear to the Anacostia River. In the end, it has been hinted, the Capitol itself might be turned into a museum and a bigger and better one built farther east.

Rome's decline and fall began with such megalomania.

Exhibit 2

[From the Washington Star, Nov. 17, 1963]

A Pattern for the Hill

(By Robert J. Lewis)

Inside and outside of Congress interest has been growing for the past several years in the future setting for the Capitol.

Introduction of a number of bills in both the House and Senate directed to this question followed closely after the appearance in the Star on June 25, 1960, of an article entitled "Mr. Rayburn's Proposal." General objectives of one such bill currently before Congress have received widespread support.

"Some discussion of this matter is appropriate now," the 1960 article stated, "because the House voted, unexpectedly, to approve expenditure of $5 million to buy two blocks of land and private buildings adjacent to the Capitol so that they can be cleared for Government use. The chief aim appears to be, as explained by Speaker Rayburn, to improve 'the looks of things around here.' "

So far, it is a moot question whether there has been any progress towards meeting the late Mr. Rayburn's objective.

But it is clearer today than ever that the central question the article raised is in even greater need of attention than it was at the time the article first appeared.

"The most obvious reason for unsightly deterioration around the Capitol appears to be a lack of understanding of how to achieve the kind of surroundings the Capitol deserves to have," the article said.

"It is entirely clear that policies in the past have invited the blight and abounding lack of good taste that Congress, in its present move, appears to be striking against.

"But will this move mean anything?

"Will the same old invitation to blight on the periphery of the Capitol and its auxiliary buildings be allowed to exist—as it always has existed—because Congress has not seemed to realize that uncertainty over its own intentions in the foreseeable future—and inattention to what the limits, setting and physical characteristics of the congressional enclave should be—is the very thing that largely induces the blight in the first place?"

In the article 3½ years ago, the writer of this column advanced a proposal which later provided the framework for the solution of another major problem affecting the quality of the Washington scene.

Recognizing that an imaginative improvement of Pennsylvania Avenue as the Nation's most important ceremonial way deserved attention of a higher level of talent than normally would be available in a single planning agency, President Kennedy last year entrusted that task to some of the most distinguished designers in the land.

A program of this general nature was suggested to Congress in 1960 as a means of dealing with the Capitol environment.

"The whole job of creating a charming and appropriate setting for the Capitol does not appear to be just a job for planners and engineers," the 1960 proposal noted.

"It probably could best be done in control of Congress, working with a statesmanlike artist, as coordinator, in whom Members could place trust and confidence.

"Thomas Jefferson, with his far-ranging interest in good design and convictions about its essential simplicity, could never have resisted a challenge like this.

"Were Congress to consider this matter of creating an appropriate setting for the Capitol as a project in the large sense, it certainly could count on challenging the interest and services of the country's best qualified and most talented artists and architects of the present day."

Unless a good design is developed which has the support of Congress, the Capitol surroundings will continue to erode. A glimmer of the administrative pattern to achieve such a design is implicit in the supraplanning arrangement now existing for Pennsylvania Avenue.

THE AFFLUENT RAILROADS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the November 16, 1963, issue of the Nation contained a very interesting article which I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate. The article is entitled "The Affluent Railroads," by Desmond Smith, and it points out many of the tactics and bookkeeping efforts on the part of certain large railroad companies who wish to show a loss in their operations. Once they can show this loss, these railroads petition the Interstate Commerce Commission to reduce their commuter service and devote their equipment to the more profitable freight service. In many cases, even freight service has been reduced.

Mr. President, the railroad industry is at a low ebb in the United States, and I believe the major cause for this has been a lack of desire on the part of the railroad management to serve the transportation needs of our citizens. Many railroads are controlled by people who are more interested in depleting the liquid assets of their company, and these people could not care less about how the public is served. I believe the time may be approaching when legislation involving either the Interstate Commerce Act or the Internal Revenue Code will be necessary to remove the financial incentive railroad management now has to show a monetary loss from its operations in order to create a tax shelter for a parent holding company.

I urge that this article "The Affluent Railroads" be read, and, in fact, studied by Congress and the country. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to insert the article in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Affluent Railroads

(By Desmond Smith)

In 1963 the railroad industry is in deep financial trouble (Readers Digest)—as it was in 1950 (Business Week); 1940 (Time); 1920 (the Wall Street Journal) and 1910 (Saturday Evening Post).

In all these magazines during all these years it has been possible to read of the impending bankruptcy of our national railroad system. No doubt about it, the American railroads are a basket case. Little wonder that they have been described by one jaded onlooker as "the most amazing financial-health paradox in our economy—robust on Wall Street, at death's door in the public prints and in the halls of Congress." Politicians, journalists, even financial analysts get tied in knots when they come to examine the looking glass economics of railroading. Critics, including some major accounting firms, have severely attacked the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC) for its present do-nothing attitude toward railroad accounting practice. It is difficult for an analyst of railroad accounts to establish a railroad's degree of profitability when it is not immediately clear how general overhead is being allocated between the operating division and the subsidiaries. Another complaint (unanswered by the railroads) is that depreciation is constantly overstated. And when leaseholders turn out to be subsidiaries, the critical observer will ask, is this another method of hiding income? These are some of the more obvious examples of "Chinese bookkeeping" that have been commented on by others. Sad to say, there are many more.

The railroads have created for all but the stout of heart a Sisyphean task of lifting up the grains of probability from under the weight of possibility, confusion, and doubt. Still, a start has to be made somewhere.

There are some 215,000 miles of railroad lines in the United States, divided between the 106 class 1 carriers and the 22 class 1 switching and terminal companies. However, although the railroads (according to the public prints) stood eyeball to eyeball with bankruptcy last year, their top officers took no pay cuts. As a matter of fact, according to the Interstate Commerce Commission's annual report, they gave themselves a slight raise of about 8 percent. Salaries vary a good deal, as might be expected. The president of the Union Pacific, a railway whose net railway operating income expanded 19.1 percent last year, received $146,600 in 1962. But the president of the bankrupt New Haven Railroad had to get by with a paltry $40,000.

It is worth examining cash dividends (as a percentage of net income) for the class 1 railroads. During the booming war years of 1941–46 the average was 35.2 percent. By 1960 (latest figures), it had climbed to 86.5 percent. Moreover, bankruptcies have declined tremendously since World War II. In 1940, railroads representing 31 percent of total trackage were being operated by receivers or trustees, but by 1960 this had dropped to about 1 percent. Additionally, by 1960 (a recession year), class 1 railroads as a whole showed a splendid assets-to-liabilities ratio of 1.62 (compared with 0.66 in 1939). But bankrupt railroads are to railway presidents on the public-speaking circuit what burnt-out restaurants are to arson-minded restaurateurs. They elicit both sympathy and money.

By coincidence or otherwise, previously well-run railroads, notably in the northeast and mid-Atlantic regions, began to run their passenger services downhill in the late fifties. In Pennsylvania, World War I coaches were brought out from dusty train sheds to give the commuter second thoughts about the joys of train travel. In Connecticut, wealthy commuters found themselves traveling in boxcars. In New Jersey, commuters refused to accept cash payments after a disgraceful campaign of harassment, initiated by a railroad, had failed to move them off the trains. Across the Nation, a design of harassment was built up, planned in the short run to squeeze more money for commuter services and in the long run to drive the last traveler from the tracks to make way for the high-profit item—freight. The strategy included every discomfort imaginable, from broken plumbing and dirty depots and way stations to neglected tracks (that caused delays) and filthy passenger cars. By 1963, a pig could travel across the United States in air-conditioned comfort, but you couldn't.

Curiously enough, the public in the main took the punishment. The railroads blamed the entire mess variously upon finances, the railroad unions, and the weather. Yet the railroad industry's Draconian measures produced results. The commuters put pressure on the politicians, and the politicians applied relief. New Jersey reduced State taxes on passenger facilities and made treasury contributions to the affected communities to offset commuter deficits. Philadelphia created an authority to subsidize the commuter services operated by the Pennsylvania and the Reading Railroads. New York State, itself hard pressed for cash, took the remarkable step of persuading most of the important cities to reduce valuations on railroad properties. Thus the annual taxes payable to New York City by the New York Central were steadily reduced beginning in 1959; by 1962, this carrier paid some $7.5 million less in taxes annually than in 1959. The difference in tax payments obtained by the city was made up by the State.

But such actions as these will not satisfy the railroad companies. "There is much surplus railroad mileage in this country today," says Stuart T. Saundrs, president of the Norfolk & Western Railway, and this is especially true in the East. Of the approximately 225,000 mainline miles now in service, 23,000 miles, or less than 10 percent, carry 50 percent of our total freight tonmiles, and at the other extreme, 67,000 miles, or about 30 percent, carry only 2 percent of the total freight business." As railroad presidents see the situation, they would like to shrink railroad mileage still further to concentrate on the profitable freight business. On the one hand, they claim a special relationship (with attendant privileges) to the economy, since the railroad companies are a vital part of our national defense; on the other hand, they want the right to close down unprofitable routes at their own time and choosing.

Meanwhile the railroads benefit in numerous ways from abandoning track. Savings are realized that amount to $2,500 a mile in taxes, plus $3,000 a mile in maintenance costs. Cash is generated by selling off salvaged materials (at $5,000 a mile). The land is available for real estate purposes—the Boston & Albany Railroad sold 11 miles of its roadbed and right-of-way to the Massachusetts Turnpike Authority for $8 million.

It is precisely because of the railroads' central importance to any national defense plan that such requests to reduce railway mileage can have the central place in a national transportation policy. A policy (or absence of one) that allows railroads to abandon track as they please needs closer scrutiny.

When a railway president begins an article in a national magazine with the statement that "U.S. transportation is highballing to a crisis," and when the financial editor of one of America's great newspapers begins his story, "The country's railroads are highballing toward their best earnings year since 1957," the reader is left in sime confusion. The key to this semantic boggle is simple enough. What the railroad president is speaking about is net railway operating income (freight and passenger revenues), whereas the financial editor is referring to total earnings. This includes other income, an item that is almost always cheerfully black in the railroad ledger. To paraphrase Father Flanagan: There is no "railroad problem," there are only "problem railroads."

The financial picture is similar to that of American industry as a whole. There are blue-chip companies and there are others that are not doing so well. But even such celebrated examples of how not to run a railroad as the New Haven are doing exceptionally well under the other income heading. Last year the New Haven earned $4.3 million on rentals in the Grand Central area of New York City. In recent years, as downtown city areas have been redeveloped, property values have soared, directly benefiting on the other income side of the ledger those companies with poor performance in terms of net railway operating income.

Just how much this can mean can be gathered from a company such as the Chicago & North Western, which estimated last year that surplus real estate no longer included in its railway operations is valued at $40 million. In the western United States the railroad companies are among the biggest landowners. Northern Pacific, for example, controls more than 8 million acres of land; so does the Union Pacific. A close runner-up is the Southern Pacific with some 5.2 million acres. And even more valuable are the mineral and timber rights. The Union Pacific in 1962 showed other income totaling $39.26 million, which nearly matched its net railway operating income of $46.78 million. The Santa Fe's subsidiary, the Chanslor-Western Oil & Development Co., earned $10.29 million before taxes in 1962. In addition, the Santa Fe owns a controlling interest in Kirby Lumber Co., which has lumber, oil, and gas interests in Louisiana and Texas.

Few people who have ever looked at railroad balance sheets objectively doubt that for many class 1 railroads, the return on investment is high. For the 10-year period from 1951 to 1961, the class 1 railroads had an average net-income-to-revenue of 7.19 percent. During this same period, General Motors averaged 7.62 percent; General Electric, 5.62 percent and United States Steel, 7.34 percent. Certainly, when compared to these bellwhether corporations, it is clear that the railroad industry's financial health is sound.

Over the last half-century, the railroads haven't had a bad run for their money. Much of the strength inherent in the railroad establishment is derived from the fact that many of the same financial interests that controlled the railroads at the turn of the centuary are still involved today. Now that the railroad industry has left the monopoly era it is finding the age of competition rough going. In the past, railroads set their own tariffs on the basis of "what the traffic can bear"; unlike the business competitors they were exempt from antitrust laws that prevented other industries from price-fixing. Today, however, the railroads have to meet competition from an aggressive trucking industry, from pipe lines, from barge traffic and from the airlines. To earn the kind of profits they have become accustomed to in the second half of the 20th century they will have to squeeze all the water they can out of their overhead. "First and foremost," says Milton J. Sharp, a Pennsylvania industrialist, "the attitude of railroad management must change. Every business has competition. The difference is that the railroads complain about it instead of doing something to counteract it. They complain that their competition is unfair because of Government subsidies to improve highways, airports, harbors, etc. They forget that they, too, were heavily subsidized at the outset. They received all kinds of benefits, including land at low prices."

Recently, pressed by competition, the industry has belatedly recognized that the bulk of its plant is obsolete and needs replacement. The current investment in new equipment is running at the rate of about $1 billion a year. Technology is, in turn, taking away jobs at an astounding rate. Since the end of World War II, every second railwayman has lost his job. Railroad employment in 1963 has fallen to the bottom of the depression levels. The railway workers have lost 700,000 jobs since 1945, for there is almost no job on the railroads that cannot be automated, from "crewless" trains and remote-control locomotives to electronic classification yards. Although automation has brought economic security to the few, it is bringing devastating unemployment for many. The Railroad Brotherhoods, their memberships in a militant mood, have thus brought the automation question to a showdown over the right of management to change work rules. The changes in question would eliminate 65,000 jobs—mostly those of firemen who presently ride diesel locomotives in freight and yard service.

Obviously, to survive, the railroad industry has no alternative but to drag itself into the 20th century. And it must modernize its antiquated plant and track. The railway unions, too, must drop mental attitudes that match the railroad managements' "cuspidor age" thinking processes. Yet, until recently the unions did not oppose mechanization, nor do they oppose automation now. What they seek is the kind of approach that has already been worked out in the steel and aluminum industries for solving the serious problems that automation brings. They contend that in the second half of the 20th century the kind of social Darwinism currently in favor with much of railroad management is inhumane. "We pledge the fullest cooperation to management in accepting the new technology and making it work as it should," says W. P. Kennedy, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. "We ask in return that management pledge us an equitable share in the fruits of increased productivity * * * and that it accept some of the social costs of technological displacement."

In the notorious featherbedding public relations campaign, railroad management gave the Brotherhoods their answer. The public was told in words and pictures that the featherbedding railwayman was the root of all the railroad's troubles. Yet—and this is the real irony—by sticking to this sham issue, the railroad industry has weakened its long-range objective, which is surely to see a strong and viable railroad system that is capable of retaining its place in the Nation's transportation complex.

Meanwhile, with troubles ahead on the labor issue, the railroads are cutting away at passenger schedules, automating at a rapidly rising rate, shrinking railroad mileage, examining merger deals—and making money. In the first half of this year, net income rose to $270 million (compared with $181 million in the 1962 period). In part this favorable position was due to new liberalized depreciation guidelines and a 7-percent investment credit allowed late last year. It came just in time, for the special Korean war tax credits were running out. In a way the public ought to be sorry over the Internal Revenue Department's action, for it might have been fun to watch the railroad industry's awesome public relations battalions go to work on that assignment.

A FAIR TEST FOR KREBIOZEN

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on October 23, 1963, the Denver Post printed an editorial entitled "Tests Needed To End Krebiozen Fight." This is a fine, objective piece of writing and it makes the same point that I have always made: namely, that only a fair and impartial test can judge the effectiveness of krebiozen. As the Denver Post makes very clear, they are not in a position to judge or pass on this question, and this is precisely the stand I have always taken. Only a fair and impartial test can settle this controversy. I should like to draw attention to a quotation in this editorial of the words of the great Alexander Fleming, discoverer of penicillin, who once said:

> Penicillin sat on the shelf for 12 years while I was called a quack. I can only think of the thousands who died needlessly because my peers would not use my discovery.

The Denver Post then makes this most sober comment that "man should never make such a tragic mistake again." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Tests Needed To End Krebiozen Fight

A committee of 24 physicians assembled by the National Cancer Institute, after reviewing 504 case histories of krebiozen-treated patients, has concluded that a clinical test of the drug is not justified.

But the committee's conclusion that the drug is worthless in the treatment of cancer will not end the amazing krebiozen dispute.

For more than 12 years, opponents and backers of krebiozen have engaged in a bitter tug of war. Scientifically, neither side has gained an inch.

Opponents of the drug have charged quackery and fraud. Backers have charged conspiracy and persecution.

Opponents have shown conclusively first that krebiozen doesn't exist, then that it exists but it is merely mineral oil, and now that it is really creatine, a common amino acid derivative found in large quantities in the human body and ineffective against cancer.

Backers have shown conclusively that krebiozen causes regression of certain types of tumors and eases pain in many cases of terminal cancer.

In truth, neither side has shown a thing.

Dr. Stevan Durovic, discoverer of krebiozen, and Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, chief scientific sponsor of the drug, are not likely to let up now. Neither are the dozens of doctors who say they have used it, and that it works.

And neither, judging from the intensity of feeling shown to date, are the 400 cancer victims in the United States who believe they need krebiozen to stay alive—or the relatives of many cancer victims who have been given the drug in the late stages of the disease.

The American Medical Association, on the other hand, will surely continue opposing the efforts of the drug's backers. Along with the influential American Medical Association will be most of the medical profession.

But who is right? Ordinarily, we would be inclined to accept the edict of the American Medical Association without question on a medical issue. And yet, it seems to us that enough evidence has been presented in the past 12 years at least to justify a clinical test of krebiozen.

The physicians who back the drug are not quacks. They are scientists who believe the drug krebiozen is effective in the treatment of cancer and warrants further investigation. They have never made fantastic claims.

Perhaps they are wrong. But if there is just one chance in a million that krebiozen is the beginning of a solution in the dreadful cancer problem, it should be given the fairest and fullest possible test.

Even if the tests showed that use of the drug results only in relief of pain without the toxic effects of narcotics, the finding would be worthwhile.

Even though the American Medical Association leaders are opposed to a National Cancer Institute test for krebiozen, we have been told by individual physicians and researchers that at least the scientific theory behind the drug is sound and that they think it should be tested.

The Food and Drug Administration banned interstate shipment of krebiozen on July 12. Thereafter, many patients who had been using it moved to Illinois where it is manufactured.

Emphatically, we wish to make the point that we do not, and cannot, pass judgment on the effectiveness of the drug. We do, however, suggest that the reading and interviewing we have done indicate that there is enough here to warrant krebiozen being given a fair clinical test.

We cannot laugh off the conviction of hundreds of cancer victims who believe it is sustaining them.

And a reading of history indicates that it is foolish to cast aside any drug that shows even an inkling of promise against a disease that strikes one in every four Americans.

Alexander Fleming, discoverer of penicillin, once said:

"Penincillin sat on the shelf for 12 years while I was called a quack. I can only think of the thousands who died needlessly because my peers would not use my discovery."

Man should never make such a tragic mistake again.

THE AIRPLANE: ALASKA'S LIFELINE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, an article published in this month's Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association publication, Pilot, is a most interesting and valuable one. Written by Steve McCutcheon, "The Airplane: Alaska's Lifeline," describes the very great importance of the airplane to my State's economy and society. Alaska is a State which has jumped from the dogsled to the airplane overnight. Alaska is a State over a large part of which there are no roads whatever. In many communities the only way to travel is to fly.

Steve McCutcheon, a pilot himself, and a good friend of mine over many years, sets this forth clearly.

I ask unanimous concent that his article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Airplane: Alaska's Lifeline

(By Steve McCutcheon)

The importance of air transportation in Alaska is virtually unparalleled. The airplane is a way of life. The extremely high degree of aviation activity in the 49th State has been brought about by deficiencies in surface transport.

For example, with a land area equal to one-fifth of the Continental United States, Alaska only has approximately 1 mile of road per 100 square miles of land. In contrast, road density in the rest of the United States is about 1 mile of highway per square mile. The seasonality of access to many communities in Alaska by surface methods makes the urgency of air transport even greater.

On a per capita basis, there is at least 1 pilot's license for every 55 persons and 1 aircraft for each 156 residents in Alaska. One of the true pioneers of Alaska generally thought to be the trapper and gold miner actually is the hard-working bush pilot. The annals of aviation in this north country are well documented with stories of personal sacrifice of these unsung heroes.

Only recently Alaska's Gov. William A. Egan—himself an old pilot—appointed the widow of a member of the State legislature to her husband's vacant seat. Her husband had lost his life in a crash attempting to bring a sick person of a remote village to the hospital at Nome in a snowstorm. He had flown into the ground in the terrible whiteout.

Airline pilots, too, many former bush pilots, have had a firm hand in the development of modern aviation in Alaska. Their record of safety is amazing, particularly when it is realized that one of the toughest, most hazardous airline routes in the world is flown at least once each day by Reeves Aleutian Airlines. This routes lies down the long Aleutian Peninsula—the birthplace of wind and fog.

That general commercial aviation has had a strong hand in the development of Alaska is apparent from the fact that only 10 percent of all the food consumed is locally grown.

Tourism in the northernmost State continues to expand, as more and more each year head for the 49th State for recreation among its scenic splendors and abundant big game. Current tour business in Alaska is worth about $40 million. Present forecasts indicate the 1964 season will run at least 20 percent ahead of this year. The airlines certainly will come in for a handsome share of this increase. All airline traffic to Alaska is now jet, while Northwest Orient is running fanjet ships.

New hotels and lodges have been built, some largely predicated upon the constantly increasing air traffic. More are under construction and planned for the future by State authorities. During the last 10 years individual tourist-supported businesses have reported from 10 to 100 percent average annual increases. A good deal of this obviously is due to more frequent air service to many points within the State as well as the increase in direct service from New York City, Chicago, and Seattle-Portland.

A startling figure or two lend firm support to the allegation of Alaska's burgeoning air industry. In 1960 there were 63.2 civil aircraft per 10,000 persons. Montana was second with 14.3, while the average of the whole United States was 4 planes per 10,000 of population.

It is an amazing fact that many Alaskan children have never seeen an automobile. Yet, in remote spots of this northern State these same children will spot the distant silhouette of an aircraft, immediately call it by name, probably announce the horsepower, cruising speed, and load capacity, and like as not name the pilot.

Metropolitan Anchorage, with a population of roughly 88,000, is the hub of air commerce for Alaska as well as the international transpolar routes. A brief comparison of historical records reveals some substantial expansion of the utilization of aircraft.

In 1954, according to FAA reports, there were seven scheduled airlines operating out of the huge Cook's Inlet City. In that same year there were 6,885 departures, carrying 61,564 persons, 1,678.7 tons of mail and 2,666.3 tons of general cargo. (A general cargo in Alaska can mean a load of freshly caught king salmon, a herd of dairy cattle, a cargo of live chickens, several beluga whales or some walruses, bales upon bales of furs, strong boxes of gold bricks, oil drilling bits, a tractor, a small river boat, a load of king crabs, crates of fresh lettuce from the Matanuska Valley, fresh milk, dry goods or cement.)

In that same year 1954, Alaska was still a Territory but it reported 67 communities serviced by air. Total operations for the whole 586,000 square miles was 53,057 departures carrying 227,987, more than the whole population of Alaska. In addition that year, 4,500 tons of mail and 8,200 tons of cargo were also airlifted.

While 1957 saw 67 communities serviced by air the 1960 figure had risen to 156. By 1963 there were over 250 publicly owned air facilities in the State of which at least 150 have scheduled flights by one or more commercial carriers.

Alaska's biggest city, Anchorage, has the largest State-owned civil air facility. Anchorage International currently handles the largest transpolar intercontinental jets as well as turbine and piston-powered craft, besides the interstate and intrastate skeds and nonskeds.

Anchorage International provides terminal facilities for both national and international travelers, space for airline ticket counters, baggage facilities, weather bureau, customs and immigration as well as Department of Agriculture, restaurant, bar and the internationally famous dining room. A new ultramodern, high-speed mail-handling facility has recently been put into operation by the U.S. Government only a stone's throw from the airport terminal building.

A portion of this huge aviation complex is novel. That portion is the integral floatplane facility of Lake Hood. Here is one of the very few civil seaplane bases that may boast its own control tower. Currently there are more than 375 aircraft based at this marine terminal. Operations are limited as there is no more tiedown space available and a waiting list of several hundred presently exists. FAA reports that nearly 25 percent of all U.S. registered floatplanes tie down at Anchorage's Lake Hood facility.

All manner of airframe and engine service is available at the water's edge. Runways lead to International for amphibious craft. More are under construction. Lake Hood has a wheel field also which is several thousand feet long, paralleling the canal that connects Lake Hood with Lake Spenard. Several miles south of Anchorage International, there is a private floatplane facility with an east-west runway of more than 6,000 feet. Here homeowners park their aircraft right at the front door.

Last year there were 49,236 operations off Lake Hood. The forecast is that by 1980, assuming some improvement can be made in the tiedown problem, there will be 100,500 annual operations.

Recently Alaska's Governor Egan initiated an all-out campaign for removal of Federal restrictions that handicap the Sourdough State in tapping the rich international tourist business.

Target of the drive is a CAB ruling which prevents extension of stopover privilege to through passengers on foreign-flag carriers, while they are at Anchorage or Fairbanks International Airports.

In a letter to CAB Chairman Alan Boyd and Director Gilmore of the U.S. Travel Service, Governor Egan said that an estimated 42,000 persons per year—passengers on the intercontinental transpolar flights are restricted from extending their contact with the United States beyond the confines of the Alaskan air terminals. The Governor stated that if only 5 percent of these people could be successfully encouraged to spend 10 days in Alaska, it would add more than a million dollars per year to the Alaskan economy.

Under present CAB regulations, should a passenger of Air France or SAS stop over in Anchorage or Fairbanks they would be required to continue their journey to the orient via an American carrier. JAL, KLM, and Canadian Pacific do not have passenger rights so that their passengers could under no circumstances remain in Alaska for any length of time. With Lufthansa of West Germany about to enter the transpolar route stopping at Anchorage, sizable numbers of touring foreigners are prevented from seeing our northern State.

A decision has been promised shortly; meanwhile, the State of Alaska is going ahead with the expansion of all facilities including $620,000 which is being spent at Anchorage International for phase 1 of the multimillion-dollar terminal expansion and runway updating. Fairbanks International is scheduled for $498,000, for development of their general aviation area, including apron, taxiway, and access road, noise abatement and an inbond incinerator.

Largest single expenditure of the year will be $2,300,000 when the airport gets underway at scenic Sitka, former Russian capital of Alaska, located in southeastern Alaska. Other major projects include $850,000 for landing strip extension at the Bristol Bay metropolis of Dillingham. Homer, an agricultural and fishing community on the big game-rich Kenai Peninsula, will get $85,000 for apron expansion and taxiway extension. McCarthy will get $136,000 for an airport to serve east-central Alaska. Noatak, a village of several hundred Eskimos situated on the Noatak River not far from the Chukchi Sea, will get $60,000 to level up a strip built on permafrost.

The Prince William Sound city of Seward, the ice-free southern terminal of the Alaska Railroad, famous for its mid-August Silver Salmon Derby each year, is to get a quarter of a million to extend its runway, and to relocate the highway which passes near the end of the current strip.

Under construction is a million-dollar field at Point Barrow, another million-dollar field at the small Eskimo village of Savoonga on St. Lawrence Island, while a substantial airport is near completion on the lower Yukon River between the settlements of Mountain Village and Andreafsky.

Recently the Federal Government has turned over to the small towns of Nenana (famous for the Alaskan ice breakup lottery) and Kenai the fields formerly operated by the FAA.

Kenai, oil capital of Alaska, also has a sound economic backbone, supported by a thriving commercial catching and canning of Cook's Inlet salmon as well as a substantial business in airborne big game guides and outfitters.

With wise foresight the Kenai city fathers have retained former Alaska Director of Aviation, Eugene Roguszka, as a consultant in the planned expansion and improvement of facilities at the airport. The updating of the facility will be a combination of city, State, and Federal aid moneys. The Kenai project will require about $700,000 to complete.

Of major importance to Alaska's two big internationals is the construction and equipping of ultramodern fire and rescue stations. Outside of jets hitting a few moose there have been no accidents on either of the big airports; but the State is not relaxing. They are providing the highest quality of machines and trained men to maintain the enviable safety records.

James E. Moody, Alaskan-born chief engineer of the State department of aviation, stated that the construction of some fields in the permafrost regions posed tough problems not encountered in general aviation in the southern 48 States.

The sites of Barrow, Savoonga, Noatak, Shungnak lie in the permanently frozen ground area. They require careful and extensive analysis of permafrost condition prior to field construction. In such places, overlay embankment type runways were the first application, so far as Moody knew, of A. H. Lachenbruch's theories on design for permafrost construction. The design is unique and progressive, for the engineers calculate the thickness of embankment needed to maintain thermal balance according to scientific formulae instead of rule of thumb. When thermal balances get out of adjustment the underlying permafrost thaws unevenly so that the fill material undulates until finally the field is useless.

Most bush fields in Alaska are officially secondary airports with a runway length not less than 2,500 feet. They serve villages or settlements of from 30 to several hundred persons.

Trunk airports have a minimum runway length of 4,000 feet. They serve larger communities or may serve a whole section of this vast State.

In southeastern Alaska, the bulk of operations are of a marine nature, utilizing both floatplanes and amphibious types such as the Grummans.

In 1963, at least 14 units will have been constructed or rehabilitated through enlargement.

Activity in the field of air transport and establishment of facilities is nothing short of phenomenal. For instance, new construction of trunk airports, which cost from a quarter of a million to a million dollars with runways over 4,000 feet, is underway at Point Barrow, America's northernmost community on this continent; at Savoonga, close in the shadow of Soviet Siberia; and at Andreafsky on the lower Yukon River.

Enlargement programs running as high as $6 million per airport are underway at the international airports in Anchorage and Fairbanks, as well as at Seward, Kotzebue, Homer, Fort Yukon, and Dillingham.

Reconstruction of bush and trunk airports is being carried out at Gambell, only 40 miles from Soviet territory, Sand Point, Noatak, Central, Koyukuk, and Karluk.

New construction of secondary (bush) airports with runways at least 2,500 feet in length is underway at: Buckland, Shungnak, Ambler, Togiak, Emmonak, Tunaunak, Kotlik, Wainwright, Nulato, Russian Mission, Nitemute, Clarks Point, Pilot Point, Teller Mission, Goodnews Bay, Stebbins, Shageluk and the village of St. Michael, once famous as headquarters for Klondike gold stampede riverboats.

Stateside persons interested in aviation seldom think in terms of marine terminals for aircraft. But this aspect of flying in Alaska is important. This certainly is pointed up in Alaskan expenditures for floats and facilities for water borne aircraft.

Substantial seaplane facility construction is going on at Anchorage's Lake Hood. The rest of these communities are in the southeastern panhandle section of the State; Funter Bay, Angoon, Hawk Inlet, Kake, Kasaan, Hoonah, Wrangell, Metlakatla, Tongass Harbor, Craig, Pelican, Baranof, and Petersburg, all are receiving either new or additional float aircraft facilities.

Larry Johnson, director of aviation for the State, is a former war pilot as well as civil pilot. Upon query, he stated shortly—"There's a boom on in aviation in Alaska. Our department is doing its share to keep it booming."

"THE QUIET CRISIS"

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, our distinguished Secretary of Interior, Stewart L. Udall, has given the Nation a literary masterpiece entitled "The Quiet Crisis." I have just completed reading it and I recommend without hesitation that every Member of the Congress read this important book.

In his foreword, Mr. Udall raises the question, "What does material abundance avail if we create an environment in which man's highest and most specifically human attributes cannot be fulfilled?"

Secretary Udall, with whom I was privileged to serve as a Member of the House of Representatives, is uniquely qualified to answer this question. He does so in beautiful, highly informed prose in "The Quiet Crisis."

Each generation—

Writes the Secretary—

has its own rendezvous with the land, for despite our fee titles and claims of ownership, we are all brief tenants on this planet. By choice, or by default, we will carve out a land legacy for our heirs. We can misuse the land and diminish the usefulness of resources, or we can create a world in which physical affluence and affluence of the spirit go hand in hand.

In an introduction to Secretary Udall's book, President Kennedy writes:

We must develop new instruments of foresight and protection and nurture in order to recover the relationship between man and nature and to make sure that the national estate we pass on to our multiplying descendants is green and flourishing. I hope that all Americans understand the importance of this effort, because it cannot be won until each American makes the preservation of "the beauty and the bounty of the American earth" his personal commitment. To this effort, Secretary Udall has given courageous leadership, and, to this understanding "The Quiet Crisis" makes a stirring and illuminating contribution.

Mr. President, today's Washington Post carries a notable review of "The Quiet Crisis," by our colleague from Wisconsin, Senator Gaylord Nelson. Senator Nelson is admirably qualified to review this work. As Governor of Wisconsin, he became known nationwide as an effective and farsighted champion of conservation. What he has to say about the subject of resources development and the building of a better life for Americans is always significant.

In reviewing "The Quiet Crisis," Senator Nelson says:

If you want your children to grow up and get rich some day by exploiting the things and the people around them, I wouldn't recommend this book. But if you want them to acquire a reverence for the land and the forests and the wild animals, and to be inspired by the great figures of American history who have expressed this spirit in our public life, then I don't know of a better primer.

The Senator from Wisconsin adds:

The message of "The Quiet Crisis" is obvious. We have only a precious few years left to make a massive effort at the State, local, and national level to preserve our fresh water, our soil, our forests and streams, our minerals and even the air we breathe. If we fail to act, these priceless resources may be destroyed forever.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the review by Senator Nelson be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 19, 1963]

"The Quiet Crisis" by Stewart L. Udall

(Reviewed by Senator Gaylord Nelson)

If you want your children to grow up and get rich some day by exploiting the things and the people around them, I wouldn't recommend this book.

But if you want them to acquire a reverence for the land and the forests and the wild animals, and to be inspired by the great figures of American history who have expressed this spirit in our public life, then I don't know of a better primer.

Interior Secretary Udall, in this terse little book, manages to see and express conservation as a wide sweeping, all encompassing part of American history. It is the story of a political, economic and philosophical struggle involving cowboys and Indians, transcendentalists, empire builders, robber barons, bureaucrats and Presidents.

For the most part, it is a sad story of an inevitable tragedy, of how the great American dream of a new empire stretching from ocean to ocean conflicted with many of the scientific principles of conservation. Secretary Udall tells how the new Nation flourished—but only at the expense of the Indian, the buffalo, the virgin timber, the clean water, and the precious topsoil.

The heroes of this story are the few strong figures in our history who have had the soul to appreciate the precious things in our environment, and the backbone to fight to save them.

Udall describes what a masterpiece of creation the American Continent was when the Pilgrims arrived. Yet it looked "hideous" to them, and they set about changing it. The conflict has continued ever since. The American Indian's concept of the land as something that existed for the enjoyment and sustenance of all had to be eliminated—and so did the Indian. The forests had to be cut down to build houses, and make way for farms. The beaver had to be trapped to earn cash from Europe. The thin layer of grass on the great plains had to be plowed under to plant corn. The rivers had to be dammed. The western lands had to be given to the railroads. The gold-rich hills had to be washed away with high-pressure water hoses to bring out the nuggets of wealth.

Almost from the beginning, a few voices cried out in the wilderness. The result was blazing controversy and, in some cases, great victories for the public's stake in its environment.

"Where can I go now, and visit nature undisturbed?" demanded John James Audubon in the 1820's. His book, "Birds of America," was credited with arousing the national conscience and saving many species, and ultimately to the founding of the Smithsonian Institution.

Francis Parkman, a proper Bostonian, lived with the Sioux Indians and wrote "The Oregon Trail." Udall comments, "To him, the saga of American settlement had all the overtones and grandeur of classic tragedy." Ralph Waldo Emerson and Henry David Thoreau developed a philosophy of conservation "when the raid on resources was gathering momentum in the forests of Wisconsin, the mountains of Colorado and the valleys of California." George Perkins Marsh warned that America could become as desolate as the moon if her resources were squandered.

Carl Schurz, a crusading Senator from Wisconsin, was called un-American for supporting the plan of John Wesley Powell to plan irrigation projects, share water equitably and make settlement programs work with nature. Gifford Pinchot, partly by winning the confidence of outdoorsman Theodore Roosevelt, helped set aside hundreds of millions of acres of land in public reservations, and open the door to a national park system. John Muir fought to save the purity of the wilderness, even from the likes of Pinchot. Franklin D. Roosevelt seized upon a depression as a time to make a great advance for conservation.

This story of tragic waste of priceless assets, mixed with half victories along the way, ends with the grim challenge of the future: The spector of a population twice as large as today's, empowered by new technology to consume resources at an even greater pace, making a new assault on our battered environment.

The message of "The Quiet Crisis" is obvious. We have only a precious few years left to make a massive effort at the State, local and National level to preserve our fresh water, our soil, our forests and streams, our minerals and even the air we breathe. If we fail to act, these priceless resources may be destroyed forever.

Mr. McGOVERN. In the Book Week Review section of last Sunday's Washington Post, the distinguished critic and noted naturalist, Mr. Joseph Wood Krutch, offers a stimulating review of Secretary Udall's volume. He describes it as a work of outstanding importance. Mr. Krutch credits Secretary Udall with having a better understanding of the nature and importance of conservation issues than any other Government official of this generation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the review by Mr. Krutch be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 17, 1963]

There's a Bottom to the Well

(Note.—"The Quiet Crisis," by Stewart L. Udall, illustrated, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 209 pages.)

(By Joseph Wood Krutch)

Conservation is a livelier subject now than it has been at any other time since the days of Theodore Roosevelt. Like virtue it has no declared opponents but like virtue again it is defined in so many different ways that it needs no enemies.

To some, conservation means no more than efficient exploitation with a more or less genuine regard for the material needs of the future. To others it includes the preservation of the natural scene for its own sake. And even among the latter there is no substantial agreement. Why preserve nature? For health? For recreation? Or (most importantly of all so some say) for the sake of the wonder and beauty whose disappearance would leave the human spirit deprived of one of its greatest sources of strength—an awareness of the world which man, in his pride, did not make but to which he nevertheless belongs?

Every concrete proposal becomes immediately a battleground. Should the national parks be developed in a way which makes them less and less nature preserves, more and more recreation centers for all the outdoor but artificial amusements of urbanized man—hunting, motorboating, motorcycling, portable TV sets, etc.? If the answer to this question is "Yes,"then should wilderness areas be set aside to serve the purposes for which the parks were originally established? Are areas of extraordinary and unique beauty, of so little value, comparatively speaking, that their destruction is of no importance if they happen to offer a convenient site for a dam, a missile range, or an atomic installation?

All these questions are being answered in individual cases—usually in the affirmative, occasionally in the other. The wilderness bill is kept languishing in committee despite the fact that it would probably pass both Houses of Congress. Glen Canyon, one of the most magnificent spectacles on the continent, has just been flooded by a dam which many contend serves no important purpose, and Congress has refused to appropriate funds for the protection of Rainbow Bridge despite the fact that such protection was promised when the dam was authorized.

Nothing is more badly needed than a definition and a clarification of the meaning, aims, and methods of the conservation which no one is openly against. This is precisely what Secretary of Interior Udall's book undertakes to do, and though much has, of course, been written on the subject, "The Quiet Crisis" is of outstanding importance for several reasons. The first is simply the fact that the author's position makes his opinions certain to carry weight. The second reason is that he is amazingly well informed and far more alive to both the nature and importance of the issues than, in my opinion, any other Government official of this generation has been. A third reason is that his short book is concise, clear, vivid, factual, extremely readable and, when the occasion calls for it, eloquent. Even those who cry "sentimental" at my suggestion that money and power are not the only real values can hardly accuse Udall of sentimentalizing. What is perhaps more important; his writing is miraculously free of any trace of that gobbledegook which few men in public life seem able to avoid.

Instead of presenting the issues as either abstract or new, he has chosen a historical approach and traced the whole story of the dominant attitudes toward the American earth from the time of the pre-Columbian Indians, to the present day. He has shown how the crucial issues of the present have repeatedly arisen and how they were settled.

The Indian lived with nature in a way impossible for a large population, and there is truth, of course, in President Monroe's statement, "The hunter or savage state requires a greater extent of territory to sustain him than is compatible with the progress and just claims of civilized life—and must yield to it." But that was taken to mean, first, that the Indian should be exterminated, and second, that it was our pleasant duty to recklessly exploit and destroy the natural world. First, the pioneers like Daniel Boone and later the mountain men of the West lived as hunters. Then, after their individual and minor depredations, came the systematic exhaustion of wildlife resources by the Astors et al., the reckless transfer of large public areas to railroad builders and others, and the quick destruction of the forests. Thomas Jefferson had had other ideas but reckless waste was encouraged by what Secretary Udall calls the myth of superabundance.

And it was not until thinkers like Emerson and Thoreau and scientist-reformers like George Perkins Marsh raised their voices that other attitudes received a hearing.

It is impossible even to summarize the long and frequently dreadful history which Secretary Udall so brilliantly sketches, but two horrible examples may be given. Maine and Pennsylvania sold off enormous tracts of virgin forest at 12½ cents an acre. As for the preservation of wildlife, President Grant vetoed the first bill ever introduced into our Congress for the preservation of wildlife because, presumably, he agreed with Gen. Phil Sheridan, who had boasted that the buffalo hunters were doing more to subjugate the Indians by depriving them of their food supply than the Army had been able to do in 20 years. "Let them kill, skin, and sell until the buffalo is exterminated, as it is the only way to bring about lasting peace and allow civilization to advance."

The myth of superabundance of the natural as opposed to the superabundance of the manufactured is concerned. But the questions how, what, and why our resources should be protected, are still very much an issue and, despite minority protests, it is by no means sure that those to whom conservation means merely efficient exploitation will not carry the day. Too few agree with or even understand what Secretary Udall says in his foreword:

"Each generation has its own rendezvous with the land, for despite our fee titles and claims of ownership, we are all brief tenants of the land. * * * We can misuse the land and diminish the usefulness of its resources; or we can create a world in which physical affluence and affluence of the spirit go hand in hand. * * * What does material abundance avail if we create an environment in which man's highest and most specifically human attributes cannot be fulfilled?"

Anyone who wishes to consider the question of the relation of conservation to such fulfillment cannot do better than to read "The Quiet Crisis."

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, while I hope that my colleagues will take the time to read the entire volume, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the foreword to Mr. Udall's book and the introduction by President Kennedy, as well as the closing chapter entitled "Notes for a Land Ethic for Tomorrow."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREWORD TO "THE QUIET CRISIS," BY STEWART UDALL

One week last fall two events came to my attention which seemed to sum up the plight of modern man: the first was a press report which indicated that T. S. Eliot, the poet, was a victim of London's latest "killer fog" and lay gravely ill; the second was a call from a preservation-minded citizen of New Hampshire who informed me that Robert Frost's old farm—fixed for all time in memory by the poem "West-running Brook"—was now an auto junkyard.

The coincidence of these two events raised questions in my mind: Is a society a success if it creates conditions that impair its finest minds and makes a wasteland of its finest landscapes? What does material abundance avail if we create an environment in which man's highest and most specifically human attributes cannot be fulfilled?

Each generation has its own rendezvous with the land, for despite our fee titles and claims of ownership, we are all brief tenants on this planet. By choice, or by default, we will carve out a land legacy for our heirs. We can misuse the land and diminish the usefulness of resources, or we can create a world in which physical affluence and affluence of the spirit go hand in hand.

History tells us that earlier civilizations have declined because they did not learn to live in harmony with land. Our successes in space and our triumphs of technology hold a hidden danger: as modern man increasingly arrogates to himself dominion over the physical environment, there is the risk that his false pride will cause him to take the resources of the earth for granted—and to lose all reverence for the land.

America today stands poised on a pinnacle of wealth and power, yet we live in a land of vanishing beauty, of increasing ugliness, of shrinking open space, and of an overall environment that is diminished daily by pollution and noise and blight.

This, in brief, is the quiet conservation crisis of the 1960's.

It is not too late to repair some of the mistakes of the past, and to make America a green and pleasant—and productive—land. We can do it if we understand the history of our husbandry, and develop fresh insight concerning the men and the forces that have shaped our land attitudes and determined the pattern of land use in the United States.

This book is an attempt to outline the land-and-people story of our continent. It is dedicated to the proposition that men must grasp completely the relationship between human stewardship and the fullness of the American earth.

STEWART L. UDALL.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *July 1963.*

INTRODUCTION BY JOHN F. KENNEDY

The history of America is, more than that of most nations, the history of man confronted by nature. Our story has been peculiarly the story of man and the land, man and the forests, man and the plains, man and water, man and resources. It has been the story of a rich and varied natural heritage shaping American institutions and American values, and it has been equally the story of Americans seizing, using, squandering, and belatedly, protecting and developing that heritage. In telling this story and giving this central theme of American history its proper emphasis and dignity, Secretary Udall puts us all in his debt.

From the beginning, Americans had a lively awareness of the land and the wilderness. The Jeffersonian faith in the independent farmer laid the foundation for American democracy; and the ever-beckoning, ever-receding frontier left an indelible imprint on American society and the American character. And Americans pioneered in more than the usual way. We hear much about land reform today in other parts of the world, but we do not perhaps reflect enough on the extent to which land reform, from the Northwest Ordinance through the Homestead Act of the Farm Security Administration and beyond, was an American custom and an American innovation.

Yet, at the same time that Americans saluted the noble bounty of nature, they also abused and abandoned it. For the first century after independence, we regarded the natural environment as indestructible—and proceeded vigorously to destroy it. Not till the time of Marsh and Schurz and Powell did we begin to understand that our resources were not inexhaustible. Only in the 20th century have we acted in a systematic way to defend and enrich our natural heritage.

The modern American record in conservation has been brilliant and distinguished. It has inspired comparable efforts all around the earth, but it came just in time in our own land, and, as Mr. Udall's vivid narrative makes clear, the race between education

and erosion, between wisdom and waste, has not run its course. George Perkins Marsh pointed out a century ago that greed and shortsightedness were the natural enemies of a prudent resources policy. Each generation must deal anew with the "raiders," with the scramble to use public resources for private profit, and with the tendency to prefer shortrun profits to longrun necessities. The Nation's battle to preserve the common estate is far from won.

Mr. Udall understands this—and he understands too that new times give this battle new forms. I read with particular interest his chapter on "Conservation and the Future," in which he sets forth the implications for the conservation effort of the new science and technology. On the one hand, he notes, science has opened up great new sources of energy and great new means of control. On the other hand, new technical processes and devices litter the countryside with waste and refuse, contaminate water and air, imperil wildlife and man, and endanger the balance of nature itself. Our economic standard of living rises, but our environmental standard of living—our access to nature and respect for it—deteriorates. A once-beautiful nation, as Mr. Udall suggests, is in danger of turning into an "ugly America." And the long-run effect will be not only to degrade the quality of the national life but to weaken the foundations of national power.

The crisis may be quiet, but it is urgent. We must do in our own day what Theodore Roosevelt did 60 years ago and Franklin Roosevelt 30 years ago: we must expand the concept of conservation to meet the imperious problems of the new age. We must develop new instruments of foresight and protection and nurture in order to recover the relationship between man and nature and to make sure that the national estate we pass on to our multiplying descendants is green and flourishing.

I hope that all Americans understand the importance of this effort, because it cannot be won until each American makes the preservation of "the beauty and the bounty of the American earth" his personal commitment. To this effort, Secretary Udall has given courageous leadership, and, to this understanding, "The Quiet Crisis" makes a stirring and illuminating contribution.

John F. Kennedy.

NOTES ON A LAND ETHIC FOR TOMORROW—CHAPTER XIV OF "THE QUIET CRISIS," BY STEWART UDALL

"We abuse land because we regard it as a commodity belonging to us. When we see land as a community to which we belong, we may begin to use it with love and respect."—Aldo Leopold, "A Sand County Almanac."

Beyond all plans and programs, true conservation is ultimately something of the mind—an ideal of men who cherish their past and believe in their future. Our civilization will be measured by its fidelity to this ideal as surely as by its art and poetry and system of justice. In our perpetual search for abundance, beauty, and order we manifest both our love for the land and our sense of responsibility toward future generations.

Most Americans find it difficult to conceive a land ethic for tomorrow. The pastoral American of a century ago, whose conservation insights were undeveloped, has been succeeded by the asphalt American of the 1960's, who is shortsighted in other ways. Our sense of stewardship is uncertain partly because too many of us lack roots in the soil and the respect for resources that goes with such roots. Too many of us have mistaken material ease and comfort for the good life. Our growing dependence on machines has tended to mechanize our response to the world around us and has blunted our appreciation of the higher values.

There are many uprooting forces at work in our society. We are now a nomadic people, and our new-found mobility has deprived us of a sense of belonging to a particular place. Millions of Americans have no tie to the "natural habitat" that is their home. Yet the understanding of the grandeur and simplicity of the good earth is the umbilical cord that should never be cut. If the slow swing of the seasons has lost its magic for some of us, we are all diminished. If others have lost the path to the wellsprings of self-renewal, we are all the losers.

Modern life is confused by the growing imbalance between the works of man and the works of nature. Yesterday a neighbor was someone who lived next door; today technology has obliterated old boundaries and our lives overlap and impinge in myriad ways. Thousands of men who affect the way we live will always remain strangers. An aircraft overhead or an act of air or water pollution miles away, can impair an environment that thousands must share. If we are to formulate an appropriate land conscience, we must redefine the meaning of "neighbor" and find new bonds of loyalty to the land.

One of the paradoxes of American society is that while our economic standard of living has become the envy of the world, our environmental standard has steadily declined. We are better housed, better nourished, and better entertained, but we are not better prepared to inherit the earth or to carry on the pursuit of happiness.

A century ago we were a land-conscious, outdoor people: the American face was weather-beaten, our skills were muscular, and each family drew sustenance directly from the land. Now marvelous machines make our lives easier, but we are falling prey to the weaknesses of an indoor nation and the flabbiness of a sedentary society.

A land ethic for tomorrow should be as honest as Thoreau's "Walden," and as comprehensive as the sensitive science of ecology. It should stress the oneness of our resources and the live-and-help-live logic of the great chain of life. If, in our haste to "progress," the economics of ecology are disregarded by citizens and policymakers alike, the result will be an ugly America. We cannot afford an America where expedience tramples upon esthetics and development decisions are made with an eye only on the present.

Henry Thoreau would scoff at the notion that the gross national product should be the chief index to the state of the Nation, or that automobile sales or figures on consumer consumption reveal anything significant about the authentic art of living. He would surely assert that a clean landscape is as important as a freeway, he would deplore every planless conquest of the countryside, and he would remind his countrymen that a glimpse of grouse can be more inspiring than a Hollywood spectacular or color television. To those who complain of the complexity of modern life, he might reply, "if you want inner peace find it in solitude, not speed, and if you would find yourself, look to the land from which you came and to which you go."

We can have abundance and an unspoiled environment if we are willing to pay the price. We must develop a land conscience that will inspire those daily acts of stewardship which will make America a more pleasant and more productive land. If enough people care enough about their continent to join in the fight for a balanced conservation program, this generation can proudly put its signature on the land. But this signature will not be meaningful unless we develop a land ethic. Only an ever-widening concept and higher ideal of conservation will enlist our finest impulses and move us to make the earth a better home both for ourselves and for those as yet unborn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

FEDERAL AIR POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 615.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 423) to accelerate, extend and strengthen the Federal air pollution control program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments, on page 2, line 8, after the word "welfare," to insert "including"; on page 3, at the beginning of line 13, to insert "the making of"; on page 4, line 13, after "(1)", to insert "conduct, and"; in line 14, after the word "acceleration", to strike out "of" and insert "of,"; in line 19, after the word "and", to insert "provide"; at the beginning of line 25, to strike out "confronting" and insert "in cooperation with"; on page 5, line 3, after the word "affect", to strike out "or be of concern to communities in various parts of the Nation or may affect"; after line 7, to insert:

> (4) initiate and conduct a program of research directed toward the development of improved, low-cost techniques for extracting sulfur from fuels.

In line 16, after the word "recommendations", to insert "by him"; on page 6, line 6, after the word "individuals", to strike out "upon such terms and conditions as he may determine;" and insert "for purposes stated in paragraph (a) (1) of this section;"; in line 11, after the word "to", to strike out "section" and insert "sections"; in the same line, after "3648", to insert "and 3709"; in line 24, after the word "biological", to insert "effects of varying"; on page 7, line 2, after the word "thereof", to insert "and"; in line 5, after the word "air", to strike out "pollution;" and insert "pollution."; after line 5, to insert:

> (c) (1) In carrying out the provisions of subsection (a) of this section the Secretary shall conduct research on, and survey the results of other scientific studies on, the harmful effects on the health or welfare of persons by the various known air pollution agents (or combinations of agents).
>
> (2) Whenever he determines that there is a particular air pollution agent (or combination of agents), present in the air in certain quantities, producing effects harmful to the health or welfare of persons, the Secretary shall compile and publish criteria reflecting accurately the latest scientific knowledge useful in indicating the kind and extent of such effects which may be expected from the presence of such air pollution agent (or combination of agents) in the air in varying quantities. Any such criteria shall be published for informational purposes only and

made available to municipal, State, and interstate air pollution control agencies. He shall revise and add to such criteria whenever necessary to reflect accurately developing scientific knowledge.

After line 23, to strike out:

(9) recommend to air pollution control agencies and to other appropriate organizations, after such research as he determines to be necessary, such criteria of air quality as in his judgment may be necessary to protect the public health and welfare; and

(1) establish, equip, and maintain regional field laboratory and research facilities for the conduct of research investigations, experiments, field demonstrations and studies, and training relating to the prevention and control of air pollution, and insofar as practicable, each such facility shall be located near institutions of higher learning in which graduate training in such research might be carried out.

On page 8, after line 14, to strike out:

SEC. 4. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $6,000,000 for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $7,000,000 for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and $10,000,000 for each succeeding year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, for grants to air pollution control agencies to assist them in meeting the costs of establishing and maintaining programs for the prevention and control of air pollution. Sums so appropriated shall remain available for making grants as provided in this section during the fiscal year for which appropriated and the succeeding fiscal year.

(b) From the sums available therefor for any fiscal year the Secretary shall from time to time make allotments to the several States, in accordance with regulations, on the basis of (1) the population, (2) the extent of the air pollution problem and (3) the financial need of the respective States. For purposes of this section, population shall be determined on the basis of the latest figures furnished by the Department of Commerce, and per capita income for each State and for the United States shall be determined on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the continental United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

(c) From each State's allotment under paragraph (b) for any fiscal year, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to air pollution control agencies in such State in an amount equal to two-thirds of the cost of establishing and maintaining programs for the prevention and control of air pollution: *Provided*, That in the case of grants to an interstate air pollution control agency (as defined in section 10(b)(2)) the grant shall be made from the allotments of the several States which are members of such agency on such basis as the Secretary finds reasonable and equitable.

(d) Such grants shall be made, in accordance with regulations, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary may find necessary to carry out the purposes of this section. Such regulations shall include provision for special financial incentives for regional air pollution control programs which meet criteria established by the Secretary as necessary for the effective control of air pollution in the area.

(e) Sums allotted to a State under subsection (b) of this section which have not been obligated by the end of the fiscal year for which they were allotted because of a lack of approvable applications shall be reallotted by the Secretary, on such basis as he determines to be reasonable and equitable and in accordance with regulations promulgated by him, to States from which approvable applications have been made but which have not been approved for grants because of a lack of funds in the allotment of such State. Any sum made available to a State by reallotment under the preceding sentence shall be in addition to any funds otherwise allotted to such State under this Act and shall be available for grants to air pollution control agencies in such State.

(f) Payments of grants under this section shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Treasury Department

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 4. (a) From the sums authorized for the purposes of this Act but not to exceed 20 per centum of the total authorization, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to air pollution control agencies in an amount up to two-thirds of the cost of developing, establishing, or improving programs for the prevention and control of air pollution: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized to make grants to intermunicipal or interstate air pollution control agencies (described in section 9(b) (2) and (4)) in an amount up to three-fourths of the cost of developing, establishing, or improving, regional air pollution programs. As used in this subsection, the term "regional air pollution control program" means a program for the prevention and control of air pollution in an area that includes the areas of two or more municipalities, whether in the same or different States.

(b) From the sums available therefor for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall from time to time make grants to air pollution control agencies upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary may find necessary to carry out the purpose of this section. In establishing regulations for the granting of such funds the Secretary shall, so far as practicable, give due consideration to (1) the population, (2) the extent of the actual or potential air pollution problem, and (3) the financial need of the respective agencies: *Provided*, That any agency receiving such grant shall not have reduced its non-Federal funds from the preceding fiscal year during the fiscal year in which it receives such grant.

(c) Not more than 12½ per centum of the grant funds appropriated for purposes of this Act shall be expended in any one State.

On page 12, after line 8, to strike out:

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL ADVISORY BOARD

SEC. 5. (a)(1) There is hereby established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an Air Pollution Control Advisory Board, composed of the Secretary or his designee, who shall be chairman, and nine members appointed by the President none of whom shall be Federal officers or employees. The appointed members, having due regard for the purposes of this Act shall be selected from among representatives of various State, interstate, and local governmental agencies, of public or private interests contributing to, affected by, or concerned with air pollution, and of other public and private agencies, organizations, or groups demonstrating an active interest in the field of air pollution prevention and control, as well as other individuals who are expert in this field.

(2)(A) Each member appointed by the President shall hold office for a term of three years, except that (i) any member apointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term and (ii) the terms of office of the members first taking office after July 1, 1964, shall expire as follows: Three at the end of one year after such date, three at the end of two years after such date, and three at the end of three years after such date, as designated by the President at the time of appointment. None of the members appointed by the President shall be eligible for reappointment within one year after the end of his preceding term.

(B) The members of the Board who are not regular fulltime officers or employees of the United States, while attending conferences or meetings of the Board or while otherwise serving at the request of the Secretary, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, but not exceeding $100 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(b) The Board shall advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Secretary on matters of policy relating to the activities and functions of the Secretary under this Act.

(c) Such clerical and technical assistance as may be necessary to discharge the duties of the Board shall be provided from the personnel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

ABATEMENT OF AIR POLLUTION

SEC. 5. (a) The pollution of the air in any State or States which endangers the health or welfare of any persons, shall be subject to abatement as provided in this section.

(b) Consistent with the policy declaration of this Act, municipal, State, and interstate action to abate air pollution shall be encouraged and shall not be displaced by Federal enforcement action except as otherwise provided by or pursuant to a court order under subsection (g).

(c)(1)(A) Whenever requested by the Governor of any State, a State air pollution control agency, or (with the concurrence of the Governor and the State air pollution control agency for the State in which the municipality is situated) the governing body of any municipality, the Secretary shall, if such request refers to air pollution which is alleged to endanger the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, give formal notification thereof to the air pollution control agency of the municipality where such discharge or discharges originate, to the air pollution control agency of the State in which such municipality is located, and to the interstate air pollution control agency, if any, in whose jurisdictional area such municipality is located, and shall call promptly a conference of such agency or agencies and of the air pollution control agencies of the municipalities which may be adversely affected by such pollution, and the air pollution control agency, if any, of each State, or for each area, in which any such municipality is located.

(B) Whenever requested by the Governor of any State, a State air pollution control agency, or (with the concurrence of the Governor and the State air pollution control agency for the State in which the municipality is situated) the governing body of any municipality, the Secretary shall, if such request refers to alleged air pollution which is endangering the health or welfare of persons only in the State in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate and if a municipality affected by such air pollution, or the municipality in which such pollution originates, has either made or concurred in such request, give formal notification thereof to the State air pollution control agency, to the air pollution control agencies of the municipality where such discharge or discharges originate and of the municipality or municipalities alleged to be adversely affected thereby, and to any interstate air pollution control agency, whose jurisdictional area includes any such municipality and shall promptly call a conference of such agency or agencies, unless in the judgment of the Secretary, the effect of such pollution is not of such significance as to warrant exercise of Federal jurisdiction under this section.

(C) The Secretary may, after consultation with State officials, also call such a conference whenever, on the basis of reports, surveys, or studies, he has reason to believe that any pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring and is endangering the health and welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges originate. The Secretary shall invite the cooperation of any municipal, State, or interstate air pollution control agencies having jurisdiction in the affected area on any surveys or studies forming the basis of conference action.

(2) The agencies called to attend such conference may bring such persons as they desire to the conference. Not less than three weeks' prior notice of the conference date shall be given to such agencies.

(3) Following this conference, the Secretary shall prepare and forward to all air pollution control agencies attending the conference a summary of conference discussions including (A) occurrence of air pollution subject to abatement under this Act; (B) adequacy of measures taken toward abatement of the pollution; and (C) nature of delays, if any, being encountered in abating the pollution.

(d) If the Secretary believes, upon the conclusion of the conference or thereafter, that effective progress toward abatement of such pollution is not being made and that the health or welfare of any persons is being endangered, he shall recommend to the appropriate State, interstate, or municipal air pollution control agency (or to all such agencies) that they take necessary remedial action. The Secretary shall allow at least six months from the date he makes such recommendations for the taking of such recommended action.

(e)(1) If, at the conclusion of the period so allowed, such remedial action or other action which in the judgment of the Secretary is reasonably calculated to secure abatement of such pollution has not been taken, the Secretary shall call a public hearing, to be held in or near one or more of the places where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originated, before a hearing board of five or more persons appointed by the Secretary. Each State in which any discharge causing or contributing to such pollution originates and each State claiming to be adversely affected by such pollution shall be given an opportunity to select one member of such hearing board and each Federal Agency having a substantial interest in the subject matter as determined by the Secretary shall be given an opportunity to select one member of such hearing board, and one member shall be a representative of the appropriate interstate air pollution agency if one exists, and not less than a majority of such hearing board shall be persons other than officers or employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. At least three weeks' prior notice of such hearing shall be given to the State, interstate, and municipal air pollution control agencies called to attend such hearing and to the alleged polluter or polluters.

(2) On the basis of evidence presented at such hearing, the hearing board shall make findings as to whether pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring and whether effective progress toward abatement thereof is being made. If the hearing board finds such pollution is occurring and effective progress toward abatement thereof is not being made it shall make recomemndations to the Secretary concerning the measures, if any, which it finds to be reasonable and suitable to secure abatement of such pollution.

(3) The Secretary shall send such findings and recommendations to the person or persons discharging any matter causing or contributing to such pollution; to air pollution control agencies of the State or States and of the municipality or municipalities where such discharge or discharges originate; and to any interstate air pollution control agency whose jurisdictional area includes any such municipality, together with a notice specifying a reasonable time (not less than six months) to secure abatement of such pollution.

(f) If action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution within the time specified in the notice following the public hearing is not taken, the Secretary—

(1) in the case of pollution of air which is endangering the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, may request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of pollution, and

(2) in the case of pollution of air which is endangering the health or welfare of persons only in the State in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, may, with the written consent of the Governor of such State, request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of the pollution.

(g) The court shall receive in evidence in any such suit a transcript of the proceedings before the Board and a copy of the Board's recommendations and shall receive such further evidence as the court in its discretion deems proper. The court, giving due consideration to the practicability of complying with such standards as may be applicable and to the physical and economic feasibility of securing abatement of any pollution proved, shall have jurisdiction to enter such judgment, and orders enforcing such judgment, as the public interest and the equities of the case may require.

(h) Members of any hearing board appointed pursuant to subsection (e) who are not regular full-time officers or employees of the United States shall, while participating in the hearing conducted by such board or otherwise engaged on the work of such board, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(i)(1) In connection with any conference called under this section, the Secretary is authorized to require any person whose activities result in the emission of air pollutants causing or contributing to air pollution to file with him, in such form as he may prescribe, a report, based on existing data, furnishing to the Secretary such information as may reasonably be required as to the character, kind, and quantity of pollutants discharged and the use of devices or other means to prevent or reduce the emission of pollutants by the person filing such a report. After a conference has been held with respect to any such pollution the Secretary shall require such reports from the person whose activities result in such pollution only to the extent recommended by such conference. Such report shall be made under oath or otherwise, as the Secretary may prescribe, and shall be filed with the Secretary within such reasonable period as the Secretary may prescribe, unless additional time be granted by the Secretary. No person shall be required in such report to divulge trade secrets or secret processes and all information reported shall be considered confidential for the purposes of section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code.

(2) If any person required to file any report under this subsection shall fail to do so within the time fixed by the Secretary for filing the same, and such failure shall continue for thirty days after notice of such default, such person shall forfeit to the United States the sum of $100 for each and every day of the continuance of such failure, which forfeiture shall be payable into the Treasury of the United States, and shall be recoverable in a civil suit in the name of the United States brought in the district where such person has his principal office or in any district in which he does business: *Provided*, That the Secretary may upon application therefor remit or mitigate any forfeiture provided for under this subsection and he shall have authority to determine the facts upon all such applications.

(3) It shall be the duty of the various United States attorneys, under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, to prosecute for the recovery of such forfeitures.

On page 22, after line 7, to strike out:

ENFORCEMENT MEASURES AGAINST AIR POLLUTION

SEC. 6. (a) The pollution of the air in any State or States which endangers the health or welfare of any persons, shall be subject to abatement as provided in this section.

(b) Consistent with the policy declaration of this Act, municipal, State, and interstate action to abate air pollution shall be encouraged and shall not be displaced by Federal enforcement action except as otherwise provided by or pursuant to a court order under subsection (g).

(c)(1) Whenever requested by the Governor of any State, a State air pollution control agency, or (with the concurrence of the State air pollution control agency for the State in which the municipality is situated) the governing body of any municipality, the Secretary shall, if such request refers to air pollution which is endangering the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, give formal notification thereof to the air pollution control agency of the municipality where such discharge or discharges originate, to the air pollution control agency of the State in which such municipality is located and to the interstate air pollution control agency, if any, of such State, and shall call promptly a conference of such agency or agencies and of the air pollution control agencies of the municipalities which may be adversely affected by such pollution, and the air pollution control agency and interstate agency, if any, of the State or States in which such municipalities are located. Whenever requested by the Governor of any State, a State air pollution control agency, or (with the concurrence of the State air pollution control agency for the State in which the municipality is situated) the governing body of any municipality, the Secretary shall, if such request refers to air pollution which is endangering the health or welfare of persons only in the requesting State in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, give formal notification thereof to the air pollution control agency and interstate agency, if any, of the requesting State, to the air pollution control agencies of the municipality where such discharge or discharges originate, and of the municipality or municipalities alleged to be adversely affected thereby, and shall promptly call a conference of such agency or agencies, unless in the judgment of the Secretary, the effect of such pollution is not of such significance as to warrant exercise of Federal jurisdiction under this section. The Secretary shall also call such a conference whenever, on the basis of reports, surveys, or studies, he has reason to believe that any pollution referred to in subsection (a) and endangering the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges originate is occurring.

(2) The agencies called to attend such conference may bring such persons as they desire to the conference. Not less than three weeks' prior notice of the conference date shall be given to such agencies.

(3) Following this conference, the Secretary shall prepare and forward to all the air pollution control agencies attending the conference a summary of conference discussions including (A) occurrence of air pollution subject to abatement under this Act; (B) adequacy of measures taken toward abatement of the pollution; and (C) nature of delays, if any, being encountered in abating the pollution.

(d) If the Secretary believes, upon the conclusion of the conference or thereafter, that effective progress toward abatement of such pollution is not being made and that the health or welfare of any persons is being endangered, he shall recommend to the appropriate State or municipal air pollution control agency (or to both such agencies) that it take necessary remedial action. The Secretary shall allow at least six months from the date he makes such recommendations for the taking of such recommended action.

(e) If, at the conclusion of the period so allowed, such remedial action has not been taken or action which in the judgment of the Secretary is reasonably calculated to secure abatement of such pollution has not been taken, the Secretary shall call a public hearing, to be held in or near one or more of the places where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originated, before a hearing board of five or more persons appointed by the Secretary. Each State and each municipality in which any discharge causing or contributing to such pollution originates and each State and each municipality claiming to be adversely affected by such pollution shall be given an opportunity to select one member of such hearing board and at least one member shall be a representative of the Department of Commerce, and not less than a majority of such hearing board shall be persons other than officers or employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. At least three weeks' prior notice of such hearing shall be given to the State, interstate, and municipal air pollution control agencies called to attend the aforesaid hearing and the alleged polluter or polluters. On the basis of evidence presented at such hearing, the hearing board shall make findings as to whether pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring and whether effective progress toward abatement thereof is being made. If the hearing board finds such pollution is occurring and effective progress toward abatement thereof is not being made it shall make recommendations to the Secretary concerning the measures, if any, which it finds to be reasonable and suitable to secure abatement of such pollution. The Secretary shall send such findings and recommendations to the person or persons discharging any matter causing or contributing to such pollution, together with a notice specifying a reasonable time (not less than six months) to secure abatement of such pollution, and shall also send such findings and recommendations and such notice to the State, interstate, and municipal air pollution control agencies of the State or States, and of the municipality, where such discharge or discharges originate.

(f) If action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution within the time specified in the notice following the public hearing is not taken, the Secretary—

(1) in the case of air pollution which is endangering the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, may request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of the pollution.

(2) in the case of air pollution which is endangering the health or welfare of persons only in the State in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, may, with the written consent of the Governor of such State, request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of the pollution.

(g) The court shall receive in evidence in any such suit a transcript of the proceedings before the hearing board in such case and a copy of such board's recommendations and shall receive such further evidence as the court in its discretion deems proper. The court, giving due consideration to the practicability and to the physical and economic feasibility of securing abatement of any pollution proved, shall have jurisdiction to enter such judgment, and orders enforcing such judgment, as the public interest and the equities of the case may require.

(h) Members of any hearing board appointed pursuant to subsection (e) who are not regular full-time officers or employees of the United States shall, while participating in the hearing conducted by such board or otherwise engaged on the work of such board, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(i) In his summary of any conference pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall include references to any discharges allegedly contributing to pollution from any Federal property. Notice of any hearing pursuant to this section involving any pollution alleged to be affected by any such discharges shall also be given to the Federal agency having jurisdiction over the property involved and the findings and recommendations of the hearing board conducting such hearing shall also include references to any such discharges which are contributing to the pollution found by such hearing board.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

AUTOMOTIVE VEHICLE AND FUEL POLLUTION

Sec. 6. (a) The Secretary shall encourage the continued efforts on the part of the automotive and fuel industries to develop devices and fuels to prevent pollutants from being discharged from the exhaust of automotive vehicles, and to this end shall maintain liaison with the manufacturers of automotive vehicles and fuel producers. For this purpose, he shall appoint a technical committee, whose membership shall consist of an equal number of representatives of the Department and of the automotive and fuel manufacturing industries. The committee shall meet from time to time at the call of the Secretary to evaluate progress in the development of such devices and fuels and to develop and recommend research programs which could lead to the development of such devices and fuels.

(b) One year after enactment of this section, and semiannually thereafter, the Secretary shall report to the Congress on measures taken toward the resolution of the vehicle exhaust pollution problem and efforts to improve fuels including (A) occurrence of pollution as a result of discharge of pollutants from automotive exhaust; (B) progress of research into development of devices and fuels to reduce pollution from exhaust of automotive vehicles; (C) criteria on degree of pollutant matter discharged from automotive exhausts; (D) efforts to improve fuels so as to reduce emission of exhaust pollutants; and (E) his recommendations for additional legislation, if necessary, to regulate the discharge of pollutants from automotive exhausts.

On page 29, after line 17, to strike out:

REQUIREMENT OF REPORTS

Sec. 7. (a) The Secretary is authorized to require any person whose activities result in the emission of air pollutants causing or contributing to air pollution which has been the subject of a conference under section 6 to file with him, in such form as he may prescribe, a report, furnishing to the Secretary such information as may reasonably be required as to the character, kind and quantity of pollutants discharged and the use of devices or other means to prevent or reduce the emission of pollutants by the person filing such reports. Such reports shall be made under oath or otherwise, as the Secretary may prescribe and shall be filed with the Secretary within such reasonable period as the Secretary may prescribe, unless additional time be granted by the Secretary. All information in such report shall be considered confidential for the purposes of section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code.

(b) If any person required to file any report under this section shall fail so to do within the time fixed by the Secretary for filing the same, and such failure shall continue for thirty days after notice of such default, such person shall forfeit to the United States the sum of $100 for each and every day of the continuance of such failure, which forfeiture shall be payable into the Treasury of the United States, and shall be recoverable in a civil suit in the name of the United States brought in the district where such person has his principal office or in any district in which he does business: *Provided*, That the Secretary may upon application therefor, remit or mitigate any forfeiture provided for under this subsection and he shall have authority to determine the facts upon all such applications.

(c) It shall be the duty of the various United States Attorneys, under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, to prosecute for the recovery of such forfeitures. The costs and expenses of such prosecution shall be paid out of the appropriation for the expenses of the courts of the United States.

On page 31, in the heading in line 6, after the word "Federal", to strike out "Faciliries" and insert "Facilities"; in line 7, after "Sec.", to strike out "8." and insert "7. (a)"; after line 17, to insert:

(b) In order to control air pollution which may endanger the health or welfare of any persons, the Secretary may establish classes of potential pollution sources for which any Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over any building, installation, or other property shall, before discharging any matter into the air of the United States, obtain a permit from the Secretary for such discharge, such permits to be issued for a specified period of time to be determined by the Secretary and subject to revocation if the Secretary finds pollution is endangering the health and welfare of any persons. In connection with the issuance of such permits, there shall be submitted to the Secretary such plans, specifications, and other information as he deems relevant thereto and under such conditions as he may prescribe. The Secretary shall report each January to the Congress the status of such permits and compliance therewith.

On page 32, at the beginning of line 10, to change the section number from "9" to "8"; in line 12, after the word "any", to strike out "office" and insert "officer"; in line 22, after the word "detailed", to insert "to the same extent as if such personnel had been detailed under section 214(b) of that Act"; on page 33, at the beginning of line 5, to change the section number from "10" to "9"; in line 23, after the word "more", to strike out "cities, counties, or other local governments" and insert "municipalities"; on page 34, after line 3, to insert:

(c) The term "interstate air pollution control agency" means—

(1) an air pollution control agency established by two or more States, or

(2) an air pollution control agency of two or more municipalities located in different States.

At the beginning of line 10, to strike out "(c)" and insert "(d)"; in line 12, after the word "Islands", to strike out "and Guam." and insert "Guam, and American Samoa."; at the beginning of line 13, to strike out "(d)" and insert "(e)"; at the beginning of line 16, to strike out "(e)" and insert "(f)"; after line 18, to insert:

(g) All language referring to adverse effects on welfare shall include but not be limited to injury to agricultural crops and livestock, damage to and the deterioration of property, and hazards to transportation.

In line 24, after "Sec.", to strike out "11." and insert "10. (a)"; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "This" and insert "Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, this"; on page 35, after line 3, to insert:

(b) No appropriation shall be authorized or made under section 301, 311, or 314(c) of the Public Health Service Act for any fiscal year after the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, for any purpose for which appropriations may be made under authority of this Act.

After line 8, to insert:

RECORDS AND AUDIT

SEC. 11. (a) Each recipient of assistance under this Act shall keep such records as the Secretary shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examinations to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipients that are pertinent to the grants received under this Act.

On page 36, after line 6, to insert:

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 13. (a) Funds appropriated by Public Law 88–136 under "air pollution" shall be available to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act not to exceed $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, not to exceed $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, not to exceed $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, not to exceed $42,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and not to exceed $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

At the beginning of line 20 to change the section number from "13" to "14", and at the beginning of line 21, to strike out "Act of 1963" and insert "Act"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of July 14, 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1857–1857g), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

"SECTION 1. (a) The Congress finds—

"(1) that the predominant part of the Nation's population is located in its rapidly expanding metropolitan and other urban areas, which generally cross the boundary lines of local jurisdictions and often extend into two or more States;

"(2) that the growth in the amount and complexity of air pollution brought about by urbanization, industrial development, and the increasing use of motor vehicles, has resulted in mounting dangers to the public health and welfare, including injury to agricultural crops and livestock, damage to and the deterioration of property, and hazards to air and ground transportation;

"(3) that the prevention and control of air pollution at its source is the primary responsibility of States and local governments; and

"(4) that Federal financial assistance and leadership is essential for the development of cooperative Federal, State, regional, and local programs to prevent and control air pollution.

"(b) The purposes of this Act are—

"(1) to protect the Nation's air resources so as to promote the public health and welfare and the productive capacity of its population;

"(2) to initiate and accelerate a national research and development program to achieve the prevention and control of air pollution;

"(3) to provide technical and financial assistance to State and local governments in connection with the development and execution of their air pollution prevention and control programs; and

"(4) to encourage and assist the development and operation of regional air pollution control programs.

"COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES AND UNIFORM LAWS

"SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary shall encourage cooperative activities by the States and local governments for the prevention and control of air pollution; encourage the enactment of improved and, so far as practicable in the light of varying conditions and needs, uniform State and local laws relating to the prevention and control of air pollution; and encourage the making of agreements and compacts between States for the prevention and control of air pollution.

"(b) The Secretary shall cooperate with and encourage cooperative activities by all Federal departments and agencies having functions relating to the prevention and control of air pollution, so as to assure the utilization in the Federal air pollution control program of all appropriate and available facilities and resources within the Federal Government.

"(c) The consent of the Congress is hereby given to two or more States to negotiate and enter into agreements or compacts, not in conflict with any law or treaty of the United States, for (1) cooperative effort and mutual assistance for the prevention and control of air pollution and the enforcement of their respective laws relating thereto, and (2) the establishment of such agencies, joint or otherwise, as they may deem desirable for making effective such agreements or compacts. No such agreement or compact shall be binding or obligatory upon any State a party thereto unless and until it has been approved by Congress.

"RESEARCH, INVESTIGATIONS, TRAINING, AND OTHER ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary shall establish a national research and development program for the prevention and control of air pollution and as part of such program shall—

"(1) conduct, and promote the coordination and acceleration of, research, investigations, eperiments, training, demonstrations, surveys, and studies relating to the causes, effects, extent, prevention, and control of air pollution; and

"(2) encourage, cooperate with, and render technical services and provide financial assistance to air pollution control agencies and other appropriate public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and individuals in the conduct of such activities; and

"(3) conduct investigations and research and make surveys concerning any specific problem of air pollution in cooperation with any air pollution control agency with a view to recommending a solution of such problem, if he is requested to do so by such agency or if, in his judgment, such problem may affect any community or communities in a State other than that in which the source of the matter causing or contributing to the pollution is located.

"(4) initiate and conduct a program of research directed toward the development of improved, low-cost techniques for extracting sulfur from fuels.

"(b) In carrying out the provisions of the preceding subsection the Secretary is authorized to—

"(1) collect and make available, through publications and other appropriate means, the results of and other information, including appropriate recommendations by him in connection therewith, pertaining to such research and other activities;

"(2) cooperate with other Federal departments and agencies, with air pollution control agencies, with other public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and with any industries involved, in the preparation and conduct of such research and other activities;

"(3) make grants to air pollution control agencies, to other public or nonprofit private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and to individuals, for purposes stated in paragraph (a)(1) of this section;

"(4) contract with public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and with individuals, without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529; 41 U.S.C. 5);

"(5) provide training for, and make training grants to, personnel of air pollution control agencies and other persons with suitable qualifications;

"(6) establish and maintain research fellowships in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and at public or nonprofit private educational institutions or research organizations;

"(7) collect and disseminate, in cooperation with other Federal departments and agencies, and with other public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations having related responsibilities, basic data on chemical, physical, and biological effects of varying air quality and other information pertaining to air pollution and the prevention and control thereof; and

"(8) develop effective and practical processes, methods, and prototype devices for the prevention or control of air pollution.

"(c)(1) In carrying out the provisions of subsection (a) of this section the Secretary shall conduct research on, and survey the results of other scientific studies on, the harmful effects on the health or welfare of persons by the various known air pollution agents (or combinations of agents).

"(2) Whenever he determines that there is a particular air pollution agent (or combination of agents), present in the air in certain quantities, producing effects harmful to the health or welfare of persons, the Secretary shall compile and publish criteria reflecting accurately the latest scientific knowledge useful in indicating the kind and extent of such effects which may be expected from the presence of such air pollution agent (or combination of agents) in the air in varying quantities. Any such criteria shall be published for informational purposes only and made available to municipal, State, and interstate air pollution control agencies. He shall revise and add to such criteria whenever necessary to reflect accurately developing scientific knowledge.

"GRANTS FOR SUPPORT OF AIR POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAMS

"Sec. 4. (a) From the sums authorized for the purposes of this Act but not to exceed 20 per centum of the total authorization, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to air pollution control agencies in an amount up to two-thirds of the cost of developing, establishing, or improving programs for the prevention and control of air pollution: *Provided,* That the Secretary is authorized to make grants to intermunicipal or interstate air pollution control agencies (described in section 9(b) (2) and (4)) in an amount up to three-fourths of the cost of developing, establishing, or improving, regional air pollution programs. As used in this subsection, the term 'regional air pollution control program' means a program for the prevention and control of air pollution in an area that includes the areas of two or more municipalities, whether in the same or different States.

"(b) From the sums available therefor for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall from time to time make grants to air pollution control agencies upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary may find necessary to carry out the purpose of this section. In establishing regulations for the granting of such funds the Secretary shall, so far as practicable, give due consideration to (1) the population, (2) the extent of the actual or potential air pollution problem, and (3) the financial need of the respective agencies: *Provided,* That any agency receiving such grant shall not have reduced its non-Federal funds from the preceding fiscal year during the fiscal year in which it receives such grant.

"(c) Not more than 12½ per centum of the grant funds appropriated for purposes of this Act shall be expended in any one State.

"ABATEMENT OF AIR POLLUTION

"Sec. 5. (a) The pollution of the air in any State or States which endangers the health or welfare of any persons, shall be subject to abatement as provided in this section.

"(b) Consistent with the policy declaration of this Act, municipal, State, and interstate action to abate air pollution shall be encouraged and shall not be displaced by Federal enforcements action except as otherwise provided by or pursuant to a court order under subsection (g).

"(c)(1)(A) Whenever requested by the Governor of any State, a State air pollution control agency, or (with the concurrence of the Governor and the State air pollution control agency for the State in which the municipality is situated) the governing body of any municipality, the Secretary shall, if such request refers to air pollution which is alleged to endanger the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, give formal notification thereof to the air pollution control agency of the municipality where such discharge or discharges originate, to the air pollution control agency of the State in which such municipality is located, and to the interstate air pollution control agency, if any, in whose jurisdictional area such municipality is located, and shall call promptly a conference of such agency or agencies and of the air pollution control agencies of the municipalities which may be adversely affected by such pollution, and the air pollution control agency, if any, of each State, or for each area, in which any such municipality is located.

"(B) Whenever requested by the Governor of any State, a State air pollution control agency, or (with the concurrence of the Governor and the State air pollution control agency for the State in which the municipality is situated) the governing body of any municipality, the Secretary shall, if such request refers to allied air pollution which is endangering the health or welfare of persons only in the State in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate and if a municipality affected by such air pollution, or the municipality in which such pollution originates, has either made or concurred in such request, give formal notification thereof to the State air pollution control agency, to the air pollution control agencies of the municipality where such discharge or discharges originate and of the municipality or municipalities alleged to be adversely affected thereby, and to any interstate air pollution control agency, whose jurisdictional area includes any such municipality and shall promptly call a conference of such agency or agencies, unless, in the judgment of the Secretary, the effect of such pollution is not of such significance as to warrant exercise of Federal jurisdiction under this section.

"(C) The Secretary may, after consultation with State officials, also call such a conference whenever, on the basis of reports, surveys, or studies, he has reason to believe that any pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring and is endangering the health and welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges originate. The Secretary shall invite the cooperation of any municipal, State, or interstate air pollution control agencies having jurisdiction in the affected area on any surveys or studies forming the basis of conference action.

"(2) The agencies called to attend such conference may bring such persons as they desire to the conference. Not less than three weeks' prior notice of the conference date shall be given to such agencies.

"(3) Following this conference, the Secretary shall prepare and forward to all air pollution control agencies attending the conference a summary of conference discussions including (A) occurrence of air pollution subject to abatement under this Act; (B) adequacy of measures taken toward abatement of the pollution; and (C) nature of delays, if any, being encountered in abating the pollution.

"(d) If the Secretary believes, upon the conclusion of the conference or thereafter, that effective progress toward abatement of such pollution is not being made and that the health or welfare of any persons is being endangered, he shall recommend to the appropriate State, interstate, or municipal air pollution control agency (or to all such agencies) that they take necessary remedial action. The Secretary shall allow at least six months from the date he makes such recommendations for the taking of such recommended action.

"(e)(1) If, at the conclusion of the period so allowed, such remedial action or other action which in the judgment of the Secretary is reasonably calculated to secure abatement of such pollution has not been taken, the Secretary shall call a public hearing, to be held in or near one or more of the places where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originated, before a hearing board of five or more persons appointed by the Secretary. Each State in which any discharge causing or contributing to such pollution originates and each State claiming to be adversely affected by such pollution shall be given an opportunity to select one member of such hearing board and each Federal Agency having a substantial interest in the subject matter as determined by the Secretary shall be given an opportunity to select one member of such hearing board, and one member shall be a representative of the appropriate interstate air pollution agency if one exists, and not less than a majority of such hearing board shall be persons other than officers or employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. At least three weeks' prior notice of such hearing shall be given to the State, interstate, and municipal air pollution control agencies called to attend such hearing and to the alleged polluter or polluters.

"(2) On the basis of evidence presented at such hearing, the hearing board shall make findings as to whether pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring and whether effective progress toward abatement thereof is being made. If the hearing board finds such pollution is occurring and effective progress toward abatement thereof is not being made it shall make recommendations to the Secretary concerning the measures, if any, which it finds to be reasonable and suitable to secure abatement of such pollution.

"(3) The Secretary shall send such findings and recommendations to the person or persons discharging any matter causing or contributing to such pollution; to air pollution control agencies of the State or States and of the municipality or municipalities where such discharge or discharges originate; and to any interstate air pollution control agency whose jurisdictional area includes any such municipality, together with a notice specifying a reasonable time (not less than six months) to secure abatement of such pollution.

"(f) If action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution within the time specified in the notice following the public hearing is not taken, the Secretary—

"(1) in the case of pollution of air which is endangering the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contirbuting to such pollution) originate, may request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of pollution, and

"(2) in the case of pollution of air which is endangering the health or welfare of persons only in the State in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, may, with the written consent of the Governor of such State, request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of the pollution.

"(g) The court shall receive in evidence in any such suit a transcript of the proceedings before the Board and a copy of the Board's recommendations and shall receive such further evidence as the court in its discretion deems proper. The court, giving due consideration to the practicability of complying with such standards as may be applicable and to the physical and economic feasibility of securing abatement of any pollution proved, shall have jurisdiction to enter such judgment, and orders enforcing such judgment, as the public interest and the equities of the case may require.

"(h) Members of any hearing board appointed pursuant to subsection (e) who are not regular full-time officers or employees of the United States shall, while participating in the hearing conducted by such board or otherwise engaged on the work of such board, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(i)(1) In connection with any conference called under this section, the Secretary is authorized to require any person whose activities result in the emission of air pollutants causing or contributing to air pollution to file with him, in such form as he may prescribe, a report, based on existing data, furnishing to the Secretary such information as may reasonably be required as to the character, kind, and quality of pollutants discharged and the use of devices or other means to prevent or reduce the emission of pollutants by the person filing such a report. After a conference has been held with respect to any such pollution the Secretary shall require such reports from the person whose activities result in such pollution only to the extent recommended by such conference. Such report shall be made under oath or otherwise as the Secretary may prescribe, and shall be filed with the Secretary within such reasonable period as the Secretary may prescribe, unless additional time be granted by the Secretary. No person shall be required in such report to divulge trade secrets or secret processes and all information reported shall be considered confidential for the purposes of section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code.

"(2) If any person required to file any report under this subsection shall fail to do so within the time fixed by the Secretary for filing the same, and such failure shall continue for thirty days after notice of such default, such person shall forfeit to the United States the sum of $100 for each and every day of the continuance of such failure, which forfeiture shall be payable into the Treasury of the United States, and shall be recoverable in a civil suit in the name of the United States brought in the district where such person has his principal office or in any district in which he does business: *Provided*, That the Secretary may upon application therefor remit or mitigate any forfeiture provided for under this subsection and he shall have authority to determine the facts upon all such applications.

"(3) It shall be the duty of the various United States attorneys, under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, to prosecute for the recovery of such forfeitures.

"AUTOMOTIVE VEHICLE AND FUEL POLLUTION

"SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary shall encourage the continued efforts on the part of the automotive and fuel industries to develop devices and fuels to prevent pollutants from being discharged from the exhaust of automotive vehicles, and to this end shall maintain liaison with the manufacturers of automotive vehicles and fuel producers. For this purpose, he shall appoint a technical committee, whose membership shall consist of an equal number of representatives of the Department and of the automotive and fuel manufacturing industries. The committee shall meet from time to time at the call of the Secretary to evaluate progress in the development of such devices and fuels and to develop and recommend research programs which could lead to the development of such devices and fuels.

"(b) One year after enactment of this section, and semiannually thereafter, the Secretary shall report to the Congress on measures taken toward the resolution of the vehicle exhaust pollution problem and efforts to improve fuels including (A) occurrence of pollution as a result of discharge of pollutants from automotive exhaust; (B) progress of research into development of devices and fuels to reduce pollution from exhaust of automotive vehicles; (C) criteria on degree of pollutant matter discharged from automotive exhausts; (D) efforts to improve fuels so as to reduce emission of exhaust pollutants; and (E) his recommendations for additional legislation, if necessary, to regulate the discharge of pollutants from automotive exhausts.

"COOPERATION BY FEDERAL AGENCIES TO CONTROL AIR POLLUTION FROM FEDERAL FACILITIES

"SEC. 7. (a) It is hereby declared to be the intent of Congress that any Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over any building, installation, or other property shall, to the extent practicable and consistent with the interests of the United States and within any available appropriations, cooperate with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and with any air pollution control agency in preventing and controlling the pollution of the air in any area insofar as the discharge of any matter from or by such building, installation, or other property may cause or contribute to pollution of the air in such area.

"(b) In order to control air pollution which may endanger the health or welfare of any persons, the Secretary may establish classes of potential pollution sources for which any Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over any building, installation, or other property shall, before discharging any matter into the air of the United States, obtain a permit from the Secretary for such discharge, such permits to be issued for a specified period of time to be determined by the Secretary and subject to revocation if the Secretary finds pollution is endangering the health and welfare of any persons. In connection with the issuance of such permits, there shall be submitted to the Secretary such plans, specifications, and other information as he deems relevant thereto and under such conditions as he may prescribe. The Secretary shall report each January to the Congress the status of such permits and compliance therewith.

"ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 8. (a) The Secretary is authorized to prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out his functions under this Act. The Secretary may delegate to any officer or employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such of his powers and duties under this Act, except the making of regulations, as he may deem necessary or expedient.

"(b) Upon the request of an air pollution control agency, personnel of the Public Health Service may be detailed to such agency for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act. The provisions of section 214(d) of the Public Health Service Act shall be applicable with respect to any personnel so detailed to the same extent as if such personnel had been detailed under section 214(b) of that Act.

"(c) Payments under grants made under this Act may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Secretary.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 9. When used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(b) The term 'air pollution control agency' means any of the following:

"(1) A single State agency designated by the Governor of that State as the official State air pollution control agency for purposes of this Act;

"(2) An agency established by two or more States and having substantial powers or duties pertaining to the prevention and control of air pollution;

"(3) A city, county, or other local government health authority, or, in the case of any city, county, or other local government in which there is an agency other than the health authority charged with responsibility for enforcing ordinances or laws relating to the prevention and control of air pollution, such other agency; or

"(4) An agency of two or more municipalities located in the same State or in different States and having substantial powers or duties pertaining to the prevention and control of air pollution.

"(c) The term 'interstate air pollution control agency' means—

"(1) an air pollution control agency established by two or more States, or

"(2) an air pollution control agency of two or more municipalities located in different States.

"(d) The term 'State' means a State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

"(e) The term 'person' includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, State, municipality, and political subdivision of a State.

"(f) The term 'municipality' means a city, town, borough, county, parish, district, or other public body created by or pursuant to State law.

"(g) All language referring to adverse effects on welfare shall include but not be limited to injury to agricultural crops and livestock, damage to and the deterioration of property, and hazards to transportation.

"OTHER AUTHORITY NOT AFFECTED

"SEC. 10. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, this Act shall not be construed as superseding or limiting the authorities and responsibilities, under any other provision of law, of the Secretary or any other Federal officer, department, or agency.

"(b) No appropriation shall be authorized or made under section 301, 311, or 314(c) of the Public Health Service Act for any fiscal year after the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, for any purpose for which appropriations may be made under authority of this Act.

"RECORDS AND AUDIT

"SEC. 11. (a) Each recipient of assistance under this Act shall keep such records as the Secretary shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examinations to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipients that are pertinent to the grants received under this Act.

"SEPARABILITY

"SEC. 12. If any provision of this Act, or the application of any provision of this Act to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, and the remainder of this Act, shall not be affected thereby.

"APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 13. (a) Funds appropriated by Public Law 88-136 under 'air pollution' shall be available to carry out the purposes of this Act.

"(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act not to exceed $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, not to exceed $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, not to exceed $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, not to exceed $42,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and not to exceed $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 14. This Act may be cited as the 'Clean Air Act'."

SEC. 2. The title of such Act of July 14, 1955, is amended to read "An Act to provide for air pollution prevention and control activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes".

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill, as so amended, be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Maine? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, Senate bill 432, the Clean Air Act, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] and 24 cosponsors, would replace the Air Pollution Control Act of 1955 with a new and more comprehensive program for the improvement of air quality.

Briefly, S. 432, as reported by the Committee on Public Works, provides the following:

First. Encouragement of cooperative activities between State and local governments for air pollution control.

Second. Expanded research and development in air pollution control programs.

Third. Grants for the support of State and local efforts to initiate and improve air pollution control programs.

Fourth. Enforcement authority for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in interstate air pollution cases.

Fifth. Increased control of air pollution by Federal installations.

These expanded areas of Federal activity are essential to a meaningful national air pollution control program. Federal, State, and local cooperation can meet the growing crisis in air pollution. But we cannot allow ourselves to be dissuaded from a forceful and determined effort to meet this problem by those who want to wait until we know more; by those who are more interested in avoiding the cost of cleaning up than in cleaning up the cost of doing nothing.

The proposals in S. 432, as amended, are based on hearings by the special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution on the following bills:

S. 432, sponsored by Senator RIBICOFF and others; S. 444, sponsored by Senator ENGLE and others; S. 1009, sponsored by Senator NEUBERGER; S. 1040, sponsored by Senator CASE of New Jersey; S. 1124, sponsored by Senator WILLIAMS of Delaware; and H.R. 6518, as enacted by the House of Representatives.

Each of these proposals has contributed to the development of the bill as reported by the Senate Public Works Committee. From the provisions of the several bills and from the constructive suggestions made by the Senators and other witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee or submitted statements, we have been able to develop a legislative proposal which should advance the cause of air pollution control in all parts of the Nation.

I want to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee [Mr. MCNAMARA] for his leadership and cooperation in our efforts to develop sound air pollution legislation. I am grateful to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and my other majority colleagues on the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution for their constructive assistance on S. 432, and to the minority members of the subcommittee, led by the able Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] for their cooperative spirit and help. Because of the joint effort we were able to muster, and the contribution of our able staffs, the legislation we have presented today has the unanimous approval of the Senate Committee on Public Works and substantial support from various segments of our society.

Mr. President, there is today a national recognition of the air pollution problem. For years men have been aware of the sooty deposits which accompany industrialization and we have been aware of the nuisance of unpleasant odors from manufacturing processes in certain industries. But so long as these side effects of industry and modern technology seemed to be nuisances and no more, we accepted them as one of the necessary drawbacks in our modern civilization.

With the outbreak of sickness and death associated with air pollution, our scientists became concerned that air contaminants could cause harm to man. Now, the Nation is aroused.

In the recent hearings of the special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Senate Commitee on Public Works, civic leaders, industrialists, medical doctors, and technicians all agreed that air pollution is a growing menace and that it must be controlled.

Air is life. We all know that we need fresh air every few seconds if we are to live. What we are not always aware of is that air is needed to sustain the kind of world in which we live. But the use of air in heating our homes, running our factories, driving our cars, and burning our wastes discharges pollutants into the air and results in physical and economic damage to the Nation.

Air pollution is injurious to health. We know, for example, that air pollution cost 4,000 lives in London in December 1952, 340 deaths in the same city 10 years later, 17 lives in Donora, Pa., in October 1948, and 200 lives in New York in November 1953. Untold thousands of Americans have suffered and died as a result of the long-term injurious effects of air pollution.

As the staff report on air pollution, prepared for the special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, has pointed out:

> Of much greater overall significance than acute episodes (of air pollution) is a growing body of evidence that long-term, low-level air pollution can contribute to and aggravate certain diseases.

We do not know all we want to know about the relationship between certain harmful agents in the air and disease, but we do know enough to establish a connection between various substances in the air and numerous respiratory ailments. These include: First, the common cold and other upper respiratory tract infections; second, chronic bronchitis; third, chronic constrictive ventilatory disease; fourth, pulmonary emphysema; fifth, bronchial asthma; and sixth, lung cancer. Close correlations have been shown between all of these diseases and the level of air pollution. In addition, there is a close correlation between the size of cities, the amount of air pollution, and the incidents of respiratory disease as a result of air pollution.

There are those who say that not enough is known to justify cleaning up air pollution now. They say we must wait until we have more specific evidence on the connection between air pollution and disease before we insist on cleanup in the air. I say there is no time to wait. We are not experimenting with the mortality of fungus, or of plants, or of mice. We are faced with the problems of injury and death to human beings—to ourselves, to our neighbors, and to our children. This is a national problem, requiring the closest cooperation between the Federal Government, State, interstate, and local agencies. If we place any value on human life, we will act now.

Air pollution is not only a menace to health, it is source of economic loss in agriculture, in the conservation of fish and wildlife, and in the upkeep of homes and the maintenance of personal property.

Air pollution injures plants and causes hundreds of millions of dollars of losses to our agricultural economy every year. Recent research in plant pathology has demonstrated that the kinds of plants affected and the nature of injury produced vary with the agent. This has made it possible to identify some of the specific pollutants which injure plants and to prove, in some cases, that they have caused damage as far away as 100 miles or more from the point where they originate. Eastern white pine, grapevines, tobacco, spinich, grains, fresh vegetables, and flowers have suffered from air pollution. Livestock have suffered serious adverse effects from airborne fluorides. Corn and peaches are susceptible to hydrogen fluorides.

The annual cost of air pollution damage to property has been estimated at

$11 billion for the Nation. Air pollution accelerates deterioration of metals, fabrics, leather, rubber, paint, concrete and building stone, glass and paper.

For the homeowner air pollution adds to the cost of painting, cleaning of clothing and furniture, and the replacement of many items. For industry, the cost of air pollution is measured in the replacement and protection of precision instruments and other complex control systems which are so important to modern technology.

Travel is affected by air pollution. In at least two recent instances—one in Pennsylvania and another in Louisiana—major turnpike crashes were attributed to poor visibility caused by air pollution. Air pollution, aggravated by atmospheric conditions, has increased transportation costs for air carriers. It has been estimated that 15 to 20 air crashes in the United States in 1962 could be attributed to air pollution.

To these health and economic hazards we may add the nuisances of irritated eyes, unsightly haze, soiled clothing and buildings, and unpleasant smells. Air pollution makes life difficult, costly and unpleasant.

Air pollution is no respecter of persons, property lines, community boundaries or State lines. Subject only to the laws of nature, it moves across the face of the earth in the envelope of air which surrounds and sustains us. Air pollution is local in origin, but its effects are widespread. Only a forceful and coordinated attack on the problem will bring us to a meaningful solution.

Our supply of air is limited. It cannot be increased. The supply of air is fixed as are our supplies of other natural resources such as coal, petroleum, iron ore, uranium, and water. We realize that these are not limitless and must be conserved. We must take the same view of our air resources.

Our population is increasing and our standard of living is going up. Our industries, homes, and office buildings and motor vehicles take the air, combine it with fuels and return the air-polluting compounds to the air. The more we prosper, the more we foul the air we breathe.

Approximately a ton of air is required for every tankful of gasoline used by a motor vehicle. The billion gallons of fuel consumed annually by motor vehicles in the United States used 94 trillion cubic feet—640 cubic miles—of air.

Other fuels need comparable quantities of air. Burning a ton of coal consumes about 27,000 pounds of air, and a gallon of fuel oil about 90 pounds of air, while approximately 18 pounds of air are used in burning a pound of natural gas. About 3,000 cubic miles of air must be provided annually to satisfy the oxygen requirements of the fossil fuels presently used in the United States alone.

If we do not halt the present rate of pollution from all major sources we will be heading down a one-way road to physical and economic disaster.

We are doing something about air pollution. But our efforts have been late in coming and they have been very limited. We need to do much more. Our Federal air pollution program really got underway, in a very limited fashion, in 1955. Our present Air Pollution Control Act has a threefold program of research, technical assistance, and public education. It recognizes the primary place of local and State programs to control air pollution. At the same time, the act is based on the realization that air pollution is not confined to a single jurisdiction. It is a national problem, requiring a national program of research, technical assistance, and support.

One-third of the States have established programs to deal with air pollution. Most of these, however, are quite limited in scope. Local government programs, where they exist, are generally understaffed and without sufficient financial and trained manpower resources to meet their needs. Only 34 local programs have annual budgets exceeding $25,000. Seven of these are in California. Of the other 51 local air pollution control agencies, 21 tried to function on less than $10,000 per year. In the past decade, despite a 30-percent increase in urban population, there has been, outside of California, no overall increase in manpower to combat air pollution at the local level.

Mr. President, S. 432 represents a major step forward in our effort to combat the insidious threat of air pollution. It is similar to H.R. 6518, passed by the House. It is my belief that we will be able to reach an agreement with the House in the near future on a clean air act.

At this point I would like to summarize the provisions of S. 432. The purpose of S. 432, as amended, is to:

First. Replace the Air Pollution Control Act of 1955 in its entirety with a new version, a Clean Air Act.

Second. Express the findings of the Congress that the increase in air pollution and the complexity of the problem of air pollution has been brought about by urbanization, industrial development, and the increasing use of motor vehicles. The act further recognizes the damage to the public health and welfare and the economic losses resulting from air pollution. It indicates also that the primary responsibility for the prevention and control of air pollution rests with State and local governments and that Federal financial assistance and leadership is essential.

Third. Express the purposes of the act to protect the Nation's air resources, to continue and extend the national research and development program, to provide technical and finanical assistance, and to encourage and assist the development and operation of air pollution control programs.

Fourth. Encourage cooperative activities by State and local governments for control of air pollution and uniform State and local laws. Authorize the Federal Government to participate in such measures.

Fifth. Grant the consent of Congress to two or more States to negotiate and enter into agreements or compacts—requiring ultimate approval by Congress—for the prevention of air pollution, and the establishment of such agencies as may be necessary to make effective such agreements or compacts.

Sixth. Authorize a broad program of research, investigations, training, and other activities relating to air pollution control.

Seventh. Authorize the compilation and publication of criteria reflecting accurately the latest scientific knowledge indicating the type and extent of effects which may be expected from the presence of air pollutants, such criteria to be revised in accordance with latest developments in scientific knowledge.

Eighth. Authorize grants to air pollution control agencies to develop, establish, and improve programs for the prevention and control of air pollution, specifying that grants to air pollution agencies shall not exceed 20 percent of total funds authorized.

Ninth. Authorize grants up to two-thirds of the cost of developing, establishing, and improving air pollution control programs to air pollution control agencies, and up to three-fourths of such costs to intermunicipal or interstate air pollution control agencies.

Tenth. Authorize a procedure to carry out abatement actions whenever the health and welfare of persons is being endangered by air pollution.

Eleventh. Direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to encourage continued efforts on the part of the automotive and fuel industries to prevent pollutants from being discharged from the exhaust of automotive vehicles.

Twelfth. Authorize the establishment of a technical committee to evaluate progress in the development of automotive pollution control devices and fuels, and to develop and recommend research programs which would lead to the development of such devices and fuels; also to make the necessary reports on the findings with respect to results obtained and steps necessary to alleviate or reduce pollution from these sources.

Thirteenth. Recognize the need for cooperation by Federal departments in controlling air pollution from installations under their jurisdiction and authorizing a procedure whereby the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may establish pollutant sources for which a permit must be obtained in cases where any matter is being discharged into the air which may add to the overall air pollution problem.

Fourteenth. Authorize establishment of such regulations as are necessary for the effective administration of the bill and provide for accountability of financial assistance furnished under the act.

Fifteenth. Authorize fiscal year funds for 1964 to be used for the purposes of this bill, and authorize funds as follows: Fiscal year 1965, $25 million; fiscal year 1966, $30 million; fiscal year 1967, $35 million; fiscal year 1968, $42 million; and fiscal year 1969, $50 million. The total authorization for the 5-year program would be $182 million.

Mr. President, S. 432 is a sound piece of legislation. It is a meaningful step in the right direction on the road to more effective air pollution control, and a healthful environment for all of us.

I urge its passage by the Senate.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I am very happy that the Senate is considering S. 432 as amended, known as the clean air bill. It was my privilege to be a cosponsor of this legislation.

The increase in air pollution and the complexity of the problem of air pollution has been developing to the extent that it has become a serious public hazard, a damage to the public health and welfare and to the economy. It has become necessary that every reasonable and practical step be taken at every level of Government to help meet the air pollution problem.

It is well to keep in mind that much is being done already by industry and local governments, but the problems of air pollution have been developing in scope, number and complexity much faster than have our efforts to deal with them. Therefore, this legislation is timely and provides for a more realistic and effective clean air program.

This legislation recognizes that the primary responsibility for the prevention and control of air pollution rests with State and local governments while at the same time providing Federal financial assistance and leadership.

It is my belief that this legislation will help provide the coordination, stimulus, research and technical assistance essential to a successful clean air program.

It is a privilege to serve on the subcommittee under the chairmanship of the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie]. The subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works under his leadership, along with the other members of the committee and the staff, worked most effectively, objectively, and diligently on this legislation.

Air is probably the most important of all our natural resources. Everyone is aware that we need fresh air in order to live. This legislation will go far in overcoming air pollution and assuring safe and clean air for our citizens.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, for myself and the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], I offer a patent amendment to insure that the fruits of the research to be funded by this legislation will be freely available to Federal and State governments and to the general public, and I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 7, between lines 23 and 24, it is proposed to insert the following new subsection:

(d) All scientific and technological research or development activity contracted for, sponsored, cosponsored, or authorized under authority of this Act which involves the expenditures of Government funds shall be provided for in such manner that all information, uses, processes, patents, and other developments resulting from such activity will (with such exceptions and limitations, if any, as the Secretary may find to be necessary in the interest of national defense) be available to the general public. This subsection shall not be so construed as to deprive the owner of any background patent relating thereto of any right which he may have under that patent.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, this amendment has been discussed with the Senator in charge of the bill. I believe he is agreeable to accepting it at this time.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, there were some reservations in the committee about such a provision in the bill. The provision was included in the bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Oregon. The reservations resulted because we had not taken much testimony on this subject.

Since the hearings we have explored the record with reference to the problem. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement I have had prepared on other pieces of legislation to which similar amendments have been attached.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Senate of the United States has on many occasions expressed its view that the results of publicly financed research should be freely available to the general public.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 contained such provisions, which were reaffirmed in 1958.

So did the coal research and development bill enacted by Congress in 1960, the helium gas bill enacted in 1960, the oceanography bill passed by the Senate in 1961, the saline water and the disarmament bills passed by the Congress in 1961.

In this session of Congress the Senate unanimously legislated in the public interest by making sure that research authorized by the mass transit bill (S. 6) and the water resources bill (S. 2) would be used for the benefit of all the American people.

Mr. MUSKIE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare policy in this field, which is consistent with the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of the Patent Policies of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Submitted to the House Government Operations Committee by Manuel B. Hiller, Department Patents Officer, May 24, 1963

Consistent with the Department's statutory responsibility for the advancement of science and knowledge and the dissemination to the public of the results of research, it is the general policy of the Department that the results of Department-financed research should be made widely, promptly, and freely available to other research workers and the public. This availability can generally be provided by dedication of a Government-owned invention to the public. Consequently, our regulations, in which our patent policies are expressed, uniformly provide as to employee inventions, inventions resulting from Government grant support or from contract, that the ownership and manner of disposition of all rights to such inventions shall be subject to determination by the head of the constituent unit responsible. Copies of the pertinent regulations are attached hereto.

Part 6 of the regulations establishes the general policy of the Department: viz, to provide by publication or other means for free access to the results of Department research. It also provides the criteria for issuance of licenses under patents for administration of which the Department has responsibility (45 C.F.R. 6.3).

Part 7, covering employee inventions, insures that such inventions when directly related to the employee's official functions or to which the Federal Government has made a substantial contribution shall be owned and controlled by the Government for the public benefit. The criteria for determining domestic rights to employee inventions, which are set forth in section 7.3 and are identical to those provided in Executive Order 10096, provide for flexibility in making determinations respecting title to employee inventions.

Part 8 of the regulations governs inventions resulting from research grants, fellowship awards, and contracts for research. As to research grants, the regulations provide—

"That the ownership and manner of disposition of all rights in and to such invention shall be subject to determination by the head of the constituent unit responsible for the grant" (45 CFR 8.1(a)).

The criteria upon which that determination is to be made, set forth in section 8.2, are similarly calculated to secure wide availability of the invention.

However, where a grantee institution has an established patent policy and its objectives are consonant with the policy objective of the Department, disposition of invention rights may be left with the grantee by the head of the operating agency making the grant provided a formal agreement can be reached between the Department and the grantee which then governs invention rights arising under all grants to that institution by that operating agency of the Department. Such agreements are executed only where there is assurance that any invention resulting from the project will be made available to the public without unreasonable restriction or excessive royalties (sec. 8.1(b)).

Section 8.6 provides for similar disposition of invention rights arising out of the performance of work under research contracts. The same alternative provided to nonprofit grantee institutions is carried forward in the contract area by a provision in the regulation that contracts for research with nonprofit institutions may leave the invention rights for disposition by the institution if its policies and procedures are acceptable as meeting the requirements applicable in the grant situation.

There is one exception to the Department's policy against relinquishment of invention rights to a private contractor, viz, where contracts with industrial profit-making organizations in the cancer chemotherapy program are involved. That program represents an intensified effort of the Public Health Service, with special appropriations made available under a congressional directive, to explore exhaustively and rapidly the potentialities of chemical compounds in the control of cancer. Because of the peculiar exigencies of this program and in order that the resources of pharmaceutical and chemical firms may be brought to bear with a minimum of delay, an exception to general Department policy has been authorized in the negotiation of industrial contracts for this program. (Sec. 8.7; and see, patent policy statement of the Secretary applicable to cancer chemotherapy industrial research contracts, July 31, 1958, set forth in section 6–10–20 of the materials attached hereto.) In essence, that exception provides that in industrial research contracts in the cancer chemotherapy program, the contractor may accept either the standard patent clause which implements the general policy of the Department reserving the right of disposition of inventions to the Surgeon General, or a standard alternative clause leaving the right to patentable inventions with the contractor subject to certain limitations deemed necessary to protect the public's interest in the results of contracted research. The crucial provision therein (sec. B.4 of the policy statement) reserves to the Surgeon General the right to either dedicate the invention to the public or to issue royalty-free, nonexclusive licenses notwithstanding and in derogation of any patent which the contractor had theretofore obtained. The exercise of that right is conditioned upon a finding that either the supply of the invention is inadequate to meet the public need, the price is unreasonable or its quality is insufficient. Moreover, the right is subject to certain procedural safeguards which are specifically spelled out in paragraph B.4 of the Secretary's statement of policy.

There is thus provided a mechanism by which the public interest in any invention resulting from Government-financed cancer research is protected against insufficient supply to meet the public need, unreasonable price or inadequacy of quality. At the same time, the Department's policy and the contracts executed pursuant thereto provide reciprocal protection against precipitate governmental action which might destroy rights to which a contractor might reasonably be entitled.

Summarizing, the criteria employed by the Department for the disposition of invention rights in the field of employee inventions, research grants, fellowships, and research contracts are designed to foster the dissemination of the scientific and technical information gained thereby and to insure that the benefits of such work will be available to the public.

Mr. MUSKIE. With this background, I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment and take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon for herself and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long].

The amendment was agreed to.

CLEAN AIR ACT

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, we are about to come of age in our relationship with our environment. The bill now before the Senate, S. 432, the Clean Air Act, represents the product of joint effort by the distinguished chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution [Mr. Muskie], the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], who has given us the benefit of his broad experience as Secretary of HEW, and others among us who have long sought appropriate action to preserve the purity of our skies.

For myself, this legislation represents the culmination of an effort begun nearly 3 years ago. The bill which I introduced at that time and the bill which we are called upon to debate today were in measured response to the indelible portrait of death and destruction by air pollution, drawn for us in deep strokes by President Kennedy in his health message to the Nation:

> Economic damage from air pollution amounts to as much as $11 billion every year in the United States. Agricultural losses alone total $500 million a year. Crops are stunted or destroyed, livestock become ill, meat and milk production are reduced. In some 6,000 communities various amounts of smoke, smog, grime, or fumes reduce property values and—as dramatically shown in England last year—endanger life itself. Hospitals, department stores, office buildings, and hotels are all affected. Some cities suffer damages of up to $100 million a year. One of our larger cities has a daily average of 25,000 tons of airborne pollutants. My own home city of Boston experienced in 1960 a "black rain" of smoke, soot, oil, or a mixture of all three.

Last week's New York Times carried a report from the annual meeting of the American Public Health Association of the first conclusive finding that normal city air pollution affects death rates.

The report, the joint report of the Division of Air Pollution of the U.S. Public Health Service and the Vanderbilt University School of Medicine, found that residents of polluted areas suffered increased death rate from respiratory infections.

This report follows close upon several recent investigations which have revealed the peculiarly lethal role played by sulfur compounds. These studies have demonstrated the existence of a dramatic relationship between the levels of sulfur dioxide and sulfur trioxide in the air and the frequency and duration of chronic respiratory diseases including asthma, emphysema, bronchitis, and even the common cold which each year costs this Nation tens of millions of lost workdays. There is also evidence that sulfur dioxide and sulfate levels have been extremely high during the several acute episodes of air pollution in this country and abroad which took the lives of many victims.

Sulfurous compounds in the air are produced primarily by the combustion of sulfur-containing fuels such as coal or oil. It is abundantly clear that if we were able to remove the sulfur from fuels before they were burned, economically and efficiently, we would have taken a great stride toward curing the air pollution problem. As of yet, however, such methods have not been perfected.

It was for this reason that I proposed that the subcommittee adopt a provision directing the Secretary of HEW to conduct extensive research toward the development of improved low-cost techniques for extracting sulfur from fuels. Happily the committee bill incorporates this measure.

As a cosponsor of S. 432, I commend the committee for its creative work in bringing before the Senate legislation truly deserving of the title "Clean Air Act."

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Polluted Air Said To Raise Death Rate" be printed at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

POLLUTED AIR SAID TO RAISE DEATH RATE

(By Walter Sullivan)

Kansas City, Mo., November 12.—What is said to be the first clear evidence that normal city air pollution affects death rates was presented here today.

The report dealt with a survey of deaths in and around Nashville, Tenn., in the 12 years that ended in 1960. It found that two factors strongly affected death rates from diseases of the respiratory system: the extent of air pollution and economic status.

Those who did the study believe it demonstrates that the levels of pollution characteristic of city air have important long-term effects on health. They were surprised, however, to find no correlation between air pollution and the incidence of lung and bronchial cancer.

The report was presented to the annual meeting of the American Public Health Association being held here this week. Some 4,000 specialists from this country and abroad are in attendance.

The weakness of present administrative machinery for combating air pollution and other health problems was also discussed at today's sessions. A series of reports was presented on the nationwide survey of this machinery, initiated last year by the National Commission on Community Health Services.

The target date for reports by the seven task forces delving into various aspects of this problem is next November. In the spring of 1963 there is then to be a National Conference on Community Health Services. The project is being sponsored by a number of national health agencies.

The Nashville study was developed jointly by the Division of Air Pollution of the U.S. Public Health Service and the Vanderbilt University School of Medicine. The Tennessee health department furnished business machine cards giving data on the death of 38,207 people in and near Nashville.

Those of the deceased for whom addresses were available were classified both according to the economic level of the section in which they lived and the air pollution characteristics of that section. To this end 123 air-sampling stations were operated for a year. Data were drawn from 67 census districts in the city area. It was then possible to study the air pollution effect, free from influence by economic considerations. Similarly the effect of economic status could be separated from that of pollution.

For example, the socioeconomic factor was presented only for those exposed to moderate levels of pollution. This, presumably, eliminated the pollution effects on the relative statistics. Likewise, air pollution factors were presented only in terms of those tabulated as middle class.

Residents were divided economically into three classes. Those of the lowest class had a death rate from respiratory disease of more than 60 per 100,000 compared to only 25 per 100,000 for those of the upper class. The effects of air pollution were broken down according to various indexes of pollution, such as dust fall and the content of sulfur oxides. The latter are byproducts of the burning of coal and other fuels.

In all cases, the sections of the city subjected to heaviest pollution were areas of maximum deaths from respiratory diseases. Past surveys of this sort have been criticized on the ground that the effects of poverty were intertwined with pollution effects. If a person is poor he is likely to live in a smoky section of town.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement on this subject prepared by the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], who is perhaps the Senate's most determined and articulate champion of a sound public patent policy, may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR RUSSELL B. LONG, DEMOCRAT, OF LOUISIANA

Polluted air is injurious to the health and welfare of our people. The Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized by S. 432 to conduct research; promote the coordination and acceleration of research investigations, experiments, and studies; and to engage in other designated activities that would assist in protecting the public health and welfare and the productive capacity of the population.

The growth of urbanization, industrial development, and increasing use of motor vehicles have resulted in polluting the air, with serious danger to the health and well-being of the public. Air pollution prevention and abatement is essential if growth and progress is to continue.

The research to be financed by these funds is intended to benefit the public. Its purpose is the increase in knowledge and the development of devices that will enable us to lessen the dangers resulting from air pollution. It may even become a "must" for the public to use specific inventions designed to reduce air pollution. Such inventions could well include devices to curtail poisonous gases coming from automobile exhausts and industrial plants, devices for burning all kinds of wastes and for many other purposes. It is natural, therefore, that the results of the research should be available to those whom the research is intended to benefit: The United States, the individual States, the general public, and the populations of many areas which suffer from problems of polluted air.

The effects of air pollution in my State of Louisiana, in New Orleans, for example, are all too evident. The incidence of lung cancer is considerably higher there than the national average. In addition, in the New Orleans area there are periodic epidemics of asthmatic attacks. At that city's Charity Hospital, for example, the normal load of asthmatics appearing for emergency treatment increases from an average of 25 to 30 per day up to 200 or more at certain times. This condition can be benefited potentially by better control of atmospheric conditions.

The amendment proposed by myself and the junior Senator from Oregon will assure that the intent and purpose of this legislation will be carried out for the benefit of all our people. This amendment is substantially the same as the corresponding provisions of S. 1009, the air pollution control bill introduced by Senator NEUBERGER, and H.R. 4415, introduced by Congressman ROBERTS. A reading of the hearings on this bill, at least on the House side, indicates that the Public Health Service approved the patent section.

This item is one of the two stressed by Senator NEUBERGER before the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution as being required to maximize the public benefits of this legislation.

The subcommittee chairman recognized the necessity of the amendment, and stated during Senator NEUBERGER's testimony that the "provision in your bill is a sensible one and that is as we achieve breakthroughs in the state of art in dealing with the problem, unless those are made available on a wide scale, we are going to substantially inhibit progress in the field."[1]

On October 10 of this year the President of the United States issued a memorandum on Government patent policy to the heads of the executive departments and agencies. Under that document the results of Government-funded research in fields which directly concern the public health or public welfare would be made freely available to the general public. Obviously, the research authorized by S. 432 would fall under this category. We must remember, however, that the President's memorandum does not have the force of law and is only a policy recommendation. My proposed amendment is consistent with that policy recommendation.

The Senate of the United States has on many occasions expressed its view that the results of publicly financed research should be freely available to the general public.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 contained such provisions, which were reaffirmed in 1958.

So did the coal research and development bill enacted by Congress in 1960, the helium gas bill enacted in 1960, the oceanography bill passed by the Senate in 1961, the saline water, and the disarmament bills passed by Congress in 1961.

In this session of Congress the Senate unanimously legislated in the public interest by making sure that research authorized by the mass transit bill (S. 6) and the water resources bill (S. 2) would be used for the benefit of all the American people.

The only difference between those bills I just mentioned and this air pollution control bill is that this one directly concerns the health and welfare of our people. It does not seem reasonable to me that we try to protect the public interest in disarmament or helium gas bills and then fail to do so in legislation, the primary purpose of which is to guard the health of the public.

To carry out the provisions and the objectives of this act, it is imperative that inventions, know-how, and technical data resulting from air pollution prevention and control should be freely available to everyone. To permit private interests to acquire proprietary rights to withhold from the public or to delay the benefits of such research would be to defeat the worthy purpose of the measure.

I believe that the amendment we have offered is the absolute minimum that is necessary.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am aware of the fact that the bill was reported by the committee virtually unanimously.

Mr. MUSKIE. It was.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I know that all minority members of the committee support the bill.

Some opposition has been registered with me on the ground that industry has done such an excellent job in researching this whole problem and is a little alarmed about the intrusion of the Federal enforcement power. I understand that intrusion could not occur unless it came on the request of a Governor in a given State or when the pollution started in one State and carried over into another, therefore making it an interstate matter.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I have amendments on this subject which I believe will take care of what the Senator has in mind.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to record what the Commission said in Pittsburgh, where an exceedingly good job has been done:

> Industry's determination to do everything in its power to rid all affected areas of air pollution is perhaps better realized when measured in dollars and cents. It is spending at the rate of $500 million a year for pollutant control, a sum which exceeds the annual taxes collected by 32 States and exceeds the annual budgets of 42 States. And it is only fair to point out that much of these expenditures are for equipment, sometimes massive in size, that is not only nonproductive but often slows normal production in a plant.

In connection therewith, the Illinois Manufacturers' Association made a statement on the bill. I ask unanimous consent to include it in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRUENING in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY ILLINOIS MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION, RE PENDING FEDERAL LEGISLATION, RE AIR POLLUTION

The Illinois Manufacturers' Association (IMA) fully appreciates that prevention of air pollution is a subject of importance to every citizen and that effective action is required to achieve and maintain a goal of cleaner air.

However, IMA is opposed to Federal intrusion in this matter in the form of S. 432 or H.R. 6518, or of any other proposed Federal legislation on air pollution control that would expand the Federal Government's role in local air pollution control and abatement.

The Federal Government's role should be limited strictly to that of providing research material and technical know-how to assist the several States and their local governments in their responsibility for policing and enforcement.

This is clearly stated in the existing law, Public Law 159, 84th Congress, approved July 14, 1955, as amended.

Public Law 159 stresses research and technical assistance and development of methods for control and abatement of air pollution by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare and by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. It recognizes the primary responsibilities and rights of the State and local governments in controlling air pollution and authorizes Federal grants to assist local governments in their programs.

The specific objection of the IMA to S. 432 or H.R. 6518 or to the other proposed Federal legislation on the subject of air pollution, is that such bill or bills provide for direct Federal intervention into State and local government affairs—specifically, Federal activity in the area of abatement or control.

It is IMA's position that the purported need for Federal interference, as was contended in hearings on this bill in the House, was based on a premise that there has been over the past years, an increase and growth in the amount, volume and complexity of air pollution which has resulted in increased hazard to public health.

IMA believes this contention is refuted by substantial evidence showing that air pollution nationally is on the decline now. Industries have made significant progress in controlling smoke emissions. They have substituted oil and gas heat for coal in many instances and have installed and are installing new cleaning devices, as well as engaging in better housekeeping. Evidence shows that in a period a few years, measured dustfall in Chicago proper has decreased substantially. The same experience will be found in other areas of the country.

---

[1] "Air Pollution Control," hearings before Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, Sept. 9, 10, and 11, 1963, p. 200.

The only other possible justification for further injecting the Federal Government into this area of local jurisdiction is the assumption that the State or local governments are either not able to handle the problem or have refused to do so. This certainly is not true, as successful local programs have been instituted in recent years in Pittsburgh, Chicago, and St. Louis and at the State level, here in Illinois; during the last session of the legislature, a very effective air pollution statute was enacted with the cooperation of Illinois industry and with the active assistance of this association.

Where air pollution problems arise between States and action need be coordinated, IMA believes that States involved (for example, Illinois and Indiana, or Illinois and Wisconsin) can cooperate by means of interstate compacts as is being done currently in regard to automobile safety device legislation. This is certainly preferable to Federal legislative control.

The Illinois Manufacturers' Association expresses the hope that the legislation relating to this subject now pending in the U.S. Senate will be rejected because it is unnecessary and represents an unwarranted intrusion by the Federal Government into the prerogatives of the State and local governments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think there is much to be said about the fear and apprehension of consistently calling upon the enforcement arms of the Federal Government to intervene in matters that are essentially local in character and should not go beyond State lines. I am glad to know that the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] will in part cure this problem with an amendment which he proposes to offer.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, it has been consistently the intention of the committee to protect the primary areas of the States and local governments in this field. I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that the Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., expressed the same concern which the minority leader has expressed. Many changes in the bill were responsive to that concern. Since the bill has been reported, we have received a letter from the Manufacturing Chemists' Association commending the committee's work on the bill.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed at this point in the RECORD as further reassurance to the minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator from Maine.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANUFACTURING CHEMISTS'
ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Washington, D.C., November 6, 1963.

HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Having seen S. 432, the Clean Air Act, as amended and reported, we would like to commend your subcommittee for the highly significant improvements it made therein, rendering the bill, in our view, far superior to its original form or to the bill received from the House. We believe the provisions, in sections 3(a)(3) and 5(c)(1)(C), for Federal cooperation with local, State, and interstate agencies, and for the discretionary exercise of Federal enforcement authority in interstate situations represent constructive and eminently desirable amendments. They clearly reflect the conscientious efforts of the subcommittee to protect local, State, and interstate air pollution control agencies in meeting their responsibilities without Federal action wherever they are able and willing to do so.

From the position taken by our association during the subcommittee hearings, you are aware of our belief that Federal enforcement of air pollution control should in each instance be predicated upon an invitation issued at the State level. This would allow for fully effective Federal leadership, and at the same time it would minimize diversion of Federal effort from research, training of technical personnel, and related technically oriented endeavors where we believe the Federal Government can make the greatest overall contribution to progress in this important field. While this position is not fully reflected in the bill as reported by the subcommittee, we wish to express our deep appreciation for the careful consideration accorded our recommendations by the subcommittee and staff assistants concerned.

Sincerely,

G. H. DECKER,
President.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the senior Senator from New York, for himself and the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 12, after the period on line 5, to insert the following:

> No grant shall be made under this section until the Secretary has consulted with the appropriate official as designated by the Governor or Governors of the State or States affected.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, under section 4 of S. 432, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants directly to local air pollution control agencies without the concurrence, approval or consultation of the States in which the local recipients of Federal funds are located. The deep concern that the State air pollution agencies might be bypassed by direct allocation of funds by the Federal Government to local air pollution agencies is reflected in the report of the Senate Public Works Committee on this bill and in the testimony before the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution. The Public Works Committee specifically recognized and dealt with the problem of the local agencies bypassing the State by stating at page 8 of its report on S. 432:

> The committee would expect, however, that in the administration of this program, the Department will take precautions to insure that a grant will be made only after appropriate consideration has been given to the views of the State air pollution control authority (where such a State authority exists) with respect to the particular program for which a grant is sought.

Secretary Celebrezze recognized the problem in testifying before the subcommittee at page 72 of the subcommittee record of hearings that:

> I would recommend that we be permitted to make grants directly to local communities with the State, of course, taking an active part.

Edward Michaelian, county executive of Westchester County, N.Y., representing the counties of the United States, expressed his concern over the bypassing of the States in the allocation of funds when he testified at page 132 of the record of hearings that:

> It is my personal opinion that the State should be a party to such interlocal agreements, acting in a supervisory capacity subsequent to the receipt of a grant for assistance or a grant-in-aid from the Federal Government.

New York State, however, is sufficiently concerned with this problem to feel that the requirement for coordination between local and State air pollution control agencies be expressly provided for in the bill.

I am, therefore, introducing an amendment to prohibit the allocation of funds under section 4 of the bill until the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has consulted with the appropriate officials as designed by the Governor or Governors of the State or States affected. In view of the fact that only one-third of the States have established programs to deal with air pollution, it is evident that all States do not have State air pollution control agencies with whom the Secretary of HEW may consult. It is intended that the Secretary of HEW would, in good faith, consult with the appropriate official designated as responsible for air pollution control matters by the Governor or Governors of the State or States in which the local agencies receiving the funds are located.

My amendment is thus intended to require that the work of the local agencies, receiving Federal funds, be coordinated with the State agencies to insure an effective air pollution program and to prevent duplication of effort. After full discussion with the Senator from Maine and others interested in the bill, it is our feeling that the provision for consultation satisfies the previously stated requirements and provides adequate safeguards for the problems I have depicted.

I hope that the chairman of the subcommittee and the Senate will consider the amendment favorably.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. As the Senator from New York has pointed out, the proposed amendment is completely consistent with the entire philosophy of the committee and the intentions of the committee. It is a constructive change in the bill, and I am willing to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] for himself and the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send another amendment to the desk, which I offer on behalf of myself and my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 19, line 19, beginning with the word "may", to strike out all before the period on line 22, and insert in lieu thereof "at the request of the Governor of such State, shall provide such technical and other assistance as in his judgment is necessary to assist the State in judicial proceedings to secure abatement of the pollution under State or local law or request the Attorney General to bring suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of the pollution."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the primary concern reflected by this amendment is that the States have an opportunity through their own law enforcement agencies to enforce intrastate air pollution violations. With respect to the institution of proceedings on intrastate air pollution, section 5(f)(2) of S. 432 presently provides that "in the case of pollution of air which is endangering the health or welfare of persons only in the State or local law. It would also permit charges in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate", the Secretary with the written consent of the Governor of such State, may request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of the pollution. My amendment would allow the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, upon the request of the Governor of the State affected, to provide such technical and other assistance as in his judgment would be necessary to assist the State in bringing proceedings under State or local law. It would also permit the Secretary, again upon the request of the Governor of the affected State, to request the U.S. Attorney General to bring suit on behalf of the United States. In effect, the amendment would authorize the Secretary, contingent upon the request of the Governor of the concerned State, either to assist the State in bringing abatement proceedings under local law in State courts or to request the U.S. Attorney to bring proceedings in a Federal district court. This amendment would be consistent with the policy of S. 432 as expressed in section 1(a)(3).

Secretary Celebrezze, on page 64 of the record of hearings of the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Public Works Committee, testified to his preference for State enforcement. The report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare also reflects the Department's preference for enforcement by State or local authorities to the procedure of the U.S. Attorney General bringing suit. There is additional testimony, presented by the National Association of Attorneys General, supporting the enforcement by State legal officers of intrastate problems.

The concern for local enforcement was also reflected in the intrastate air pollution enforcement section of H.R. 6518 which the House passed on July 24, 1963. The House-passed bill provided that, at the request of the Governor or Attorney General, the Secretary shall provide such technical and other assistance as is necessary to assist the State in judicial proceedings to secure abatement of the pollution under State or local law.

It is believed that State and local enforcement of purely intrastate pollution problems would be a healthy and constructive contribution to the air pollution program. Moreover, the flexibility of alternatives for enforcement provided for in this amendment will go a rather considerable distance toward meeting the point made by the Senator from Illinois, as well as satisfying the concerns of many of us.

Again I emphasize that we are dealing with differing states of preparation in different States. Hence, there must be flexibility of approach. Not every State is equipped, as my own State is, to deal with enforcement problems. Therefore, I believe, after much consideration, this is a fair and equitable way to work out the problem, consistent with the policy of the bill.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. The thrust of the amendment offered by the Senator from New York is that in intrastate pollution, any action by the Federal Government shall be initiated only by the request of the Governor. Therefore, in intrastate questions, control is within the State entirely or the State administration. I think this, too, is consistent with the philosophy of the bill and the thinking of the committee. It is a constructive addition to the bill, and I am willing to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEATING subsequently said: Mr. President, I am happy to join with my colleague the distinguished senior Senator from New York in offering these amendments. I would like to take this opportunity, also, to compliment the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] and the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] for their diligent efforts to devise the best possible bill.

The main objective of our two amendments is to insure Federal-State cooperation in preventing air pollution. The New York State Department of Health, under the leadership of Dr. Hollis Ingraham, spends more than a quarter of a million dollars a year on an extensive air pollution control program. In addition, a number of cities and communities in the State have their own programs. Since our State and many others have had considerable experience in this field, we want to be sure that they are given a substantial part to play in this Federal program.

Our amendments provide:

First. That the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare consult with the State government before awarding a grant within the State; and

Second. That the consent of the Governor of the State be obtained before the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare gives technical assistance to the State and before the Attorney General of the United States was asked to take any action to combat intrastate pollution.

I am gratified that the distinguished Senator from Maine has agreed to accept these amendments and trust that their inclusion in this bill will bring about a strong Federal-State program—with shared responsibilities and pooled resources—to eliminate this menace to our health and welfare.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, under the leadership of the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Senate Committee on Public Works has brought to the floor of the Senate two bills of great importance.

First, the water pollution control bill, S. 649, which was overwhelmingly approved by the Senate on October 16. I was proud to be a cosponsor of this measure which makes meaningful improvements in the Nation's clean water program.

Second, the clean air bill, S. 432, now before the Senate. As author of the bill I know I speak for its many cosponsors in paying tribute to the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] and his entire subcommittee for the prompt attention it has given this important problem. And I think special praise is due the ranking minority member of the subcommittee [Mr. BOGGS] who joined with me last January as one of the first cosponsors of S. 432.

The Muskie subcommittee, Mr. President, in less than a year of intensive study and effort has presented to the Senate carefully worked out effective measures to deal with air and water pollution. Since, like sin, everyone opposes dirty air and water few realize how controversial measures to deal with the problems can be. The bill before us was no exception—but by careful and deliberate action the subcommittee has worked out a landmark bill deserving of the unanimous approval it received by the full Committee on Public Works. This in itself is a tribute to the leadership of the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE]. And to the effective assistance given him by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] and all the members of the subcommittee.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I wish to express my gratitude to the Senator from Connecticut for his very generous remarks. He is, of course, the leader in the Senate with reference to this legislation and what has been accomplished by "holding our feet to the fire," in a sense, by calling attention to these problems and by the proposals he has made. I am grateful for his leadership.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. I want to endorse what the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] has so ably said to the Senator from Connecticut in appreciation of his leadership in this field. I am glad to be a cosponsor of the bill that was introduced to establish this air pollution control authority. I thank the Senator from Connecticut for his kind remarks.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, after listening to the Senator from Illinois, I should like to point out to him and to other Senators that within the next few days I will introduce an amendment to the tax bill, which recognizes the role industry must play if we are to accomplish the objectives of the bill. I believe the enactment of a tax program to encourage private industry and the bill which will pass today will be a two-pronged attack on the problems of air pollution.

Mr. President, this bill is a good reminder that dirty air is not a partisan matter and partisanship went out the window in order to work out an acceptable and at the same time effective bill.

Actually, Mr. President, when it comes to the problem of dirty air there is neither room nor time for partisanship. The original air pollution control bill establishing the present Federal clean air program was introduced by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], who was also an early cosponsor of S. 432, and effective air pollution control has long been sought by the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE]. Adequate legislation in this field has consistently been advocated by the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], another cosponsor of S. 432, whose special concern about the health effects of air pollution have been incorporated in the bill.

We must face up to the fact that the land on which we live and work, the air we breathe, the water we drink and use in industry, agriculture, and recreation have been altered over the past half century by a manmade fallout far more abundant and potentially more dangerous than the contamination of nuclear weapons testing. The nuclear test ban treaty we begin debate on today will be a great step toward ending one source of air pollution—radioactive fallout. We must not miss the opportunity to prevent and bring under control all the other poisons in our atmosphere.

Since there is such a vast amount of air above us, many people ask how is it possible that pollution can be a serious problem. The answer is that only a small part of the total air supply is available for our use in any single location. Over one-half of our population now lives on less than 10 percent of the land area of the country. For the most part, sources of air pollution are concentrated where people are concentrated. Furthermore, there is every indication that, by 1970, two-thirds of our population at that time will live in this same limited land area.

We are already overburdening those portions of the air resource available to many of our cities. Few people realize the enormous amount of pollutants being discharged into the atmosphere. One of our larger cities has a daily average of 25,000 tons of air-borne pollutants. More than 180 million Americans live on the bottom of an ocean of air contaminated by an ever-growing volume and variety of pollutants.

How did all this happen? The answer is found, oddly enough, in the very hallmarks of contemporary society—our technological capacity, industrial output and rising standard of living. Manmade forests of advanced technology sprout up across our land, creating an abundance of services and consumer goods, and creating vast amounts of waste materials.

As our Nation has grown—as more people crowd together in bigger cities and drive more millions of automobiles and trucks—contamination of our air becomes more serious—sometimes critical.

The essential elements of the problem are simple. We burn fuels in thousands of ways to produce the power and products necessary to our high standard of living. Often we burn them poorly—hardly ever completely. Our factories and automobiles throw chemical compounds into the air. Acted upon by sunlight, they produce new compounds more damaging and toxic than the original wastes.

So we turn our precious air supply into a vast dump for gases, fumes and many many different dusts. We have created sewers in the sky.

The damage caused by this dirty air is appalling. It hurts our lands, stunts or destroys our crops, makes our livestock ill, reduces our meat and milk production. It soils and corrodes buildings, bridges, monuments, and physical structures of all kinds. It causes extensive plant damage of many types. It irritates the eyes. By reducing visibility it creates traffic hazards. It causes unpleasant odors. It endangers our very health and lives. Expert estimates of the high price we are paying for filth in the air today run as high as $11 billion a year, and this figure does not include the most important cost—the cost to our health. We do not have any realistic figures for the medical and hospital care of people made sick by breathing—day in and day out, year in and year out—air that is simply not fit to breathe. Neither do we know exactly how many people each year die of air pollution. But some things we do know.

We all know the story of Donora, Pa. There, during 3 days of dense, choking smog, in October 1948, 20 people died and more than 4,000 suffered acute illness because their part of the ocean of air was too polluted for safe breathing.

In 1952 between 4,000 and 5,000 Londoners died in a single week. The cause? Polluted air.

In December 1953 New York City was pinned under an inversion that trapped filthy waste between layers of air, making the air unfit—even lethal—for human lungs. When the weeklong smog was over, 200 people were dead. These 200 deaths were not even noted until 9 years later when a statistical study brought this quiet tragedy to light.

Just last December, London was hit again. The death toll was 300 to 400 at the latest count, and British health officials think the real number killed will prove much higher after hospital records and death certificates have been thoroughly examined.

This episode occurred 3,000 miles from our shores. At almost exactly the same time, a stagnant air mass over the northeastern United States caused a steady, alarming increase in pollution levels from Richmond to Boston. In our Northern Hemisphere, weather systems move from west to east. The set of meteorological circumstances which caused the London smog, developed in the eastern United States several days earlier, with the result that sulphur dioxide levels in Philadelphia and New York, between November 30 and December 4 of last year, averaged three and a half times normal, and were, for several days, over five times normal.

During this same period, levels of solid matter in the air rose correspondingly. In my own State of Connecticut, the 5-day average in Hartford and Middletown was over three times normal with individual days of from four to five times normal.

If we had not been lucky—if this mass of contaminated air had not been blown out over the ocean—the United States might have suffered the worst air pollution calamity in history.

I think in this mid-20th century, as we contemplate putting a man on the moon, we would be negligent if we continued to rely on the wind to save us from air pollution disasters.

These episodes of acute illness and death are serious but of even greater concern is the problem of the long-term effects of air pollution. Constant exposure of urban populations to low concentrations of air poisons which could result in gradual deterioration of health, chronic disease, and premature death is a modern day fact of urban life. Leading scientists feel air pollution may have a good deal to do with aggravating heart conditions and increasing susceptibility to respiratory disease—asthma, bronchitis, emphysema, and lung cancer—particularly among older people and the ever-growing urban population.

Studies will show that death rates for cardio-respiratory diseases in the United

States are greater in urban than in rural areas, and, in general, increase with city size. Within the last few years, this urban-rural difference has also shown up in mortality of infants less than 1 year of age and is accounted for by respiratory illness.

A recent study in a southern city shows that acute asthmatic attacks among susceptible patients were directly correlated with variations in total sulfate air pollution from time to time.

Finally, although I am not a scientist, I think only commonsense is needed to tell us that the rising incidence of lung cancer in this country, particularly in cities, emphasizes the need for a careful look at the health importance of air polluted with potentially carcinogenic substances.

Analyses of air samples from over 100 cities by the Public Health Service have shown that 3–4 benzpyrene, a potent carcinogen, is present in concentrations which could result in human dosages approximating or exceeding that from cigarette smoking.

A recent report entitled "Atmospheric Factors on Pathogenesis of Lung Cancer" by Kotin and Falk, states:

> The most satisfactory explanation for the consistent observation of an increased incidence of lung cancer in urban populations is exposure to polluted air.

According to the recent report of the Committee on Environmental Health Problems:

> Because a number of statistical studies have indicated a higher incidence of lung cancer in urban than in rural areas and because such well-known experimental carcinogens as benzpyrene have been found in community air, the finger of suspicion has been pointing for some time to atmospheric benzpyrene and related aromatic polycyclic hydrocarbons as at least contributory etiologic agents in lung cancer. Certainly it does not seem possible to attribute the alarming increase in lung cancer incidence to smoking alone. A growing body of experimental evidence incriminates atmospheric hydrocarbons.

Mr. President, the problem of air pollution has obviously gone beyond the simple eye irritation nuisance stage. These are deadly poisons being poured into our atmosphere. It is time we do something more than talk about them. We need a national clean air program as envisioned in S. 432.

The role of the Federal Government to date in this field has been limited to a supporting one of research, technical assistance to public and private organizations, and training of technical personnel. We urgently need significant expansion in the scope of the Federal air pollution control program.

The Federal Government must provide leadership, encouragement, technical know-how, and financial assistance to local and State governments in the development of a national program of research and development for the prevention and control of air pollution. This is its proper job. This national problem requires national effort. State and local agencies cannot deal with the situation alone.

Current city, county, and regional air pollution control activities need expansion, also. Data submitted at the National Conference on Air Pollution show that only 34 local governmental air pollution control agencies have annual budgets of $25,000 or more; fewer than 1,000 people are employed by all local governments to control their air pollution problems; and only 13 air pollution control agencies employ more than 10 people. About 200 cities with populations over 50,000 are considered to have air pollution problems, but only approximately half of them have an air pollution control program—and many of these programs are seriously understaffed.

In addition, State air pollution control programs must be strengthened. Of the more than $2 million all 50 States spent for air pollution control in 1961, more than half was spent by California alone. Although today most States have air pollution control legislation of some kind, only 17 States spend more than $5,000 annually for their programs; only 9 States spend $25,000 or more. And only approximately 150 people are employed by all State Governments to combat their air pollution problems. State activities must be greatly accelerated if all citizens are to enjoy clean air.

We must obviously elevate the Federal role in air pollution control to a proper status of responsibility and leadership while recognizing the basic responsibilities of State and local governments and helping them fulfill those responsibilities. This is the purpose of S. 432. Adoption of this legislation will give us an action program with two basic elements—first, stepped-up research on some still unanswered questions regarding the sources, the nature, and the effects of air pollution and on better methods and instruments for abating it; and second, more effective control through application of our present knowledge.

I am convinced the American people are now ready to support such a program and to accept the regulation and costs that are necessary to carry it out. They realize that the days of letting poisonous wastes billow into the air are over—that air pollution is a threat to our economy, to our health, and to our lives.

The air we breathe is free, but when it is filled with filth, it is no bargain.

I urge the enactment of S. 432.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in the Senate in expressing appreciation to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] for sponsoring the basic bill and for campaigning for its enactment. I shall be glad to join in sponsoring the tax amendment, as will other Senators also. This is extremely constructive proposed legislation.

I have had occasion to work closely with the Senator from Maine. Sometimes he has been with me, and sometimes he has been against me, but always he has worked most creditably and always has made a very fine contribution to this body.

My old friend, CALEB BOGGS, is a constant source of joy and pleasure, and has always been, as I have seen him come along through the House of Representatives, as Governor of his State, and now in this present august position. He has always given to the people of our Nation a luminous mind and understanding.

I shall conclude my remarks in a moment. I call attention to subsection 4(b) of the bill, and the fact that it provides three criteria upon which grants under the bill shall be made. First, there is population; second, the extent of the actual or potential air pollution problem; and, third, the financial need of the respective agencies.

Rather than trying to do anything further with the bill by way of amendment, as this is essentially a matter of administration, I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill on the floor this question, so that the legislative history may be clear.

With respect to subsection 4(b) of S. 432, is it not the committee's intention, in considering the three factors to which due consideration shall be given in establishing regulations for the granting of funds, that the Secretary shall place primary emphasis on "the extent of the actual or potential air pollution problem?"

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the committee intends that in evaluating the three factors the Secretary give primary consideration to the extent of the actual or potential air pollution problem. The House version of the Clean Air Act contained a general formula for the allocation of grants to the several States to "assist them in meeting the costs of establishing and maintaining programs for the prevention and control of air pollution." The Senate committee modified the language to insure that the Secretary gives sufficient weight to the areas of serious air pollution as he administers the grant program. We want to meet the problem where it exists.

It is clearly the intent of the committee that primary emphasis be given to the extent of the actual or potential air pollution problem in the community or area for which an application for funds is made. The committee recognizes that air pollution is most severe in the areas of concentrated population, where there are large numbers of motor vehicles, and where there is a substantial volume of pollution from industrial buildings, refineries, and other chemical plants, and homes, apartments, and public buildings.

I assure the Senator from New York that it has been the understanding of the committee that this is the area of primary emphasis.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator from Maine. I believe his statement clarifies the legislative history.

I close my remarks by calling attention to another provision in the bill, which I believe is a very important one for Senators to bear in mind as we move into this new concept in our country. I refer to the provision giving an incentive for interstate cooperation through interstate compacts.

We talk about decentralization. This is the way to do it. I had the honor to sponsor, in connection with the mass transportation bill, a provision enabling States operating under interstate compacts to pool their participation.

The committee has made a valuable contribution by endorsing the use of incentive premiums, increasing the amount of the Federal participation where such pooling under interstate compacts takes place.

I call the attention of Senators to an excellent precedent in terms of the Government techniques which are involved. I congratulate the committee, and I thank the chairman for his cooperation.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I do not want to delay the passage of the bill. I merely wish to express my congratulations and gratitude to the distinguished Senator from Maine for assisting in this matter and accepting these amendments to this very helpful and constructive bill.

Mr. JAVITS. My colleague from New York may not have been in the Chamber at the time, but I made it clear that both of us sponsored these critically important amendments.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank my friends from New York.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, without delaying the Senate, I also wish to add my voice to the expressions of my colleagues in the Senate in appreciation for the work that has been done by the Senator from Maine. I am in favor of the whole bill. In particular, I am glad that there was included in it a provision I suggested during the consideration of the bill by the subcommittee and the full committee. It deals with the mandatory application of the criteria with respect to various agencies. This provision will be most helpful. I support the whole bill, and I am grateful to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. The committee drew very heavily on the Senator's own bill in shaping that provision in the bill now before the Senate.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, this body is once again charged with the responsibility of enacting legislation for the improvement of our physical environment in the enhancement of public health and the general welfare.

Recently, under the exceptionally able leadership and floor management of the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], the Senate passed by an overwhelming majority the Water Pollution Control Act of 1963. The same philosophy of Federal responsibility within a framework of Federal, State, and local partnership is implicit in the pending Clean Air Act. I have cosponsored both of these vital bills.

We have long recognized the right of the people of our communities to have pure foods, pure milk, and pure water. And we have increasingly come to recognize the regulative powers of Government to assure those rights. It is now evident that additional governmental action and authority is necessary to assure the right to breathe clear air—the most ubiquitous of the elements of our natural environment.

During our hearings of the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, conducted under the chairmanship of Senator Muskie, it was amply demonstrated that local and State efforts to control air pollution are not keeping pace with the rapid process of industrialization, the increase in our national fuel and energy requirements, and the growing concentration of our population in great metropolitan centers, many of which cross State boundaries. It is in answer to the problems generated by these conditions that the pending measure calls for increased research and training activities, grants for local air pollution control programs and limited Federal authority in the field of abatement. West Virginia has established a State air pollution unit, and we would hope to fit it within the framework of cooperative assistance of this act.

Findings presented to our subcommittee by the Public Health Service indicate that all communities in the United States with populations of more than 50,000 have air pollution problems, as do about 40 percent of the communities in the 2,500 to 50,000 population range.

Yet, only 17 States maintain air pollution programs which require expenditures of more than $5,000 annually, and local agencies in 1961 spent approximately $8.2 million. This is a grossly inadequate effort when compared to the estimated $10 billion in annual property damage wrought by air pollution on farm and flower crops, livestock, soiling and corrosion of buildings and materials, and in the hazards to surface and air transportation.

One cannot, of course, measure in dollar terms the cumulative effect of air pollution in the creation and aggravation of respiratory and bronchial ailments. It has been frequently demonstrated by investigators in the United States and abroad that the frequency of occurrence of such illnesses is higher in areas which have higher air pollution levels.

Mr. President, all the evidence testifies that the pending measure is a necessary and desirable advance in the exercise of Federal responsibility for enhancing the public health and general welfare. I am confident that the Senate will act with dispatch in approving S. 432.

PROGRESS IN AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, there is no doubt that a great deal more research needs to be done in the field of air pollution. I am for research; I think it has been valuable, and I hope it is continued.

But I also think there is a great need for action—a need to put into practice the air pollution control methods and devices which research has already provided. The existing air pollution program is fundamentally inadequate, because it provides funds solely for research, and research alone will never clear away the smog.

The Clean Air Act of 1963, which I was pleased to join Senator Ribicoff in sponsoring, would provide funds to State and local agencies for air pollution control programs, and it seems to me that this is the approach we need if we are going to do the job of eliminating air pollution. I think that the House vote of 272 to 102 in favor of a similar proposal is evidence of concern over the damage to health and property caused by air pollution, and I hope that the Senate will show the same concern by passing S. 432 overwhelmingly.

A New Jersey allergist, Dr. Frank L. Rosen, has made a long study of the effects of air pollution on the human body, and I would like to call the attention of the Senate to some of his observations.

In addition, the September issue of Reader's Digest contains an article which not only lists the dangers of air pollution, but also describes progress that has been made in some areas and could be made in others if public opinion demanded it.

I think an examination of these articles can be of substantial help in clarifying the issues involved in the control of air pollution, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Reader's Digest, September 1963]

HOW POLLUTED IS THE AIR AROUND US?

(The stuff we pour into the air we breathe adds up to a major hazard for city dwellers. This hopeful study shows how the problem can be licked.)

(By Wolfgang Langewiesche)

People can have clean air if they demand it. The remedies for air pollution are known; they need only to be applied. Some cities already have applied them: in Pittsburgh, the housewife now washes her curtains twice a year, instead of once a week. St. Louis has abolished its pall of smoke. In London, the big fog of December 1962 killed only 340 people as against 2,000 for a similar fog in 1952. And Los Angeles, despite a spectacular increase in population and industry, is at least holding its own.

But, while the worst places are getting better, good places are getting bad. It's the shadow side of prosperity and progress: more power used; more cars; and even the poor now keep warm. In Paris, days with fog have increased in our lifetime from 90 per year to 150. Metal roofs that used to be good for 20 years now last only 5. Lung cancer is on the increase. In Austria and Italy, the beautiful valleys are filling with smoke. In Rome, the picturesque pines are dying, their needles coated on the underside by an oily deposit that comes from the air.

Everywhere the lungs of city dwellers, which should be pink inside, are black with dirt.

Different cities have different problems because of different climates and different fuels. In Los Angeles, the main problem is automobile exhaust. In London, it's coal smoke. In New York City, it is ash and smoke from burning garbage. Elsewhere it's smoke and dust and smells from steel mills, cement works, powerplants, smelters, oil refineries, papermills, chemical plants.

Though the mixture varies from city to city, the ingredients are always much the same. There are solid particles—many of them too small to be seen; bits of metal, bits of stone, bits of carbon and ash. There are droplets of oily and tarry matter. They float in the air almost as a gas; or slowly fall out, coating windshields, vegetation—everything. And there are gases, some of them visible or smelly, others not noticeable. Some of these things are poisonous; others are merely dirty. Some attack stones and metal. Some are known cancer agents. Some react chemically with others to form new poisons: stuff that kills vegetation, cracks rubber or attacks ladies' stockings. And all of this dirt is put into the air by nobody else but us.

Most of this dirt can be stopped at the source.

Industrial air pollution can be stopped by fitting the right kind of device. For instance, the electrostatic precipitator. It works by electromagnetic attraction—the way, in school, a glass rod rubbed with silk picks up bits of paper. Mounted in a factory chimney, the precipitator picks the soot and fly-ash out of the smoke. Other devices mix the escaping gases with water in a whirling cyclone, or run them through filterbags like those of a vacuum cleaner, or expose them to chemicals which capture the noisome vapors. Any industrial operation can be made virtually smokeless, odorless and dustfree. All it takes is money—a lot of money.

Small household fires are harder to clean up. The open fireplace, which still heats most homes in England, is responsible for most of the smoke problems of the world's coal-burningest country.

To clean up home fires in England, the Clean Air Act of 1956 empowered local governments to set up smoke-control areas. These are parts of town in which, quite simply, smoke must not be seen to come from chimneys. But you are excused if you burn coke or "smokeless" coal. To burn these, you may need a more elaborate grate or an enclosed stove; or else you can change to gas or electric heat. The cost of the conversion is borne 30 percent by the householder, 30 percent by the local government, 40 percent by the National Government. Progress is slow—but measurable. In London's West End the air now contains, on the average, one-third fewer soot and ash particles than 10 years ago.

St. Louis cleaned up using a similar method, right after the war, by passing an ordinance requiring that only smokeless coal could be fired by hand; the smoky coal may be used only with mechanical stokers. Smoke and soot are a sign of incomplete combustion—too little air. With enough air and a hot-enough fire, smoke will burn, but it takes the forced-draft, elaborate furnaces of industry to do it. Coal was classified; coal dealers were licensed and forbidden to sell the wrong kind. Inspectors, instead of policing and annoying everybody, policed the dealers' delivery books. It has worked like magic.

But visible smoke is only part of the problem. When you burn coal, or coke, or heavy fuel oil, you liberate an invisible gas—sulfur dioxide. This gas comes out of the most scientific industrial plant just as it does out of sooty household fires.

This sulfur gas makes building stones crumble and eats into metals. What it does to our lungs we don't know. Where it can clinge to floating bits of ash and soot, it often changes into a chemically even more aggresive form, sulfur trioxide, which penetrates deeply into the lungs. There's now a German and an American process being developed that takes the sulfur out of the flue gases of big powerplants. Both, however, will be expensive, maybe too expensive.

Los Angeles now forbids the burning of sulfurous fuel oils during the 7 months of the smog season. Industry then shifts to natural gas. Los Angeles is lucky, as are other U.S. cities, in that it has plenty of cheap natural gas, and the smog season is in summer, when gas is not needed for house heating. Europe has more difficulty. It has not yet found many deposits of natural gas, and the smog season is in winter.

The British will soon bring natural gas from the Sahara by ship. The French are the first Europeans to store gas in porous rock layers underground, creating artificial gas wells. The use of natural gas wherever it can replace coal or other fuels may help clean Europe's air.

But now, the automobile. The bulk of automobile exhaust is carbon dioxide and water vapor—both of them harmless. Mixed in with this is carbon monoxide, a deadly poison; benzpyrene, a cancer agent; all sorts of other fumes produced by incomplete combustion of the gasoline. Add fumes from hot and half-burned oil, and a sloppage of raw gasoline. All this we breathe as we drive in each other's wake.

There's worse to come. It is what happens to automobile exhaust after it has blown away with the wind, and we've forgotten about it. At first it is invisible and unsmellable. Then, in the next few hours, under the influence of sunlight a lot of chemical reactions take place between the oxygen and water vapor of the air, the half-burned gasoline vapors, and similar pollutants from other sources. Entirely new substances form, both gases and submicroscopic droplets, with chemical names and chemical smells. And that is the famous smog of Los Angeles. Photochemical smog is the accurate name for it.

This stuff is bad in an entirely new way. It sickens trees and damages commercial crops. It irritates noses and lungs, makes eyes smart, cracks rubber tires. It cuts down visibility and spoils what once was a paradise on earth. It is a specialty of southern California because that region has so much sunshine, and a car for just about every adult. But you see photochemical smog now also in New York, Rome, Paris, even in Honolulu. It has damaged growing tobacco in Connecticut, vegetables in Maryland. All it takes is a windless day, a lot of traffic, and sunshine.

California is trying to starve the smog of its raw material by stopping the flow of unburned and incompletely burned gasoline vapors into the air. Automobile exhaust can be cleaned up with ease—in the laboratory. You simply run the exhaust gas through an afterburner, a chamber where the unburned or half-burned portions of it are burned up. The problem is how to build the same idea into a practical accessory that will do it on an automobile—one that costs no more than, say, $100, lasts at least 10,000 miles, and works under all driving conditions.

So determined are Californians to clean up their air that they have done a novel thing in lawmaking: a law in full force now requires afterburners on all new cars sold in California—starting a year after a special board will have certified at least two such devices as practical.

Another California law is already having effect. The smogmaking fumes an automobile spews out come not only from the exhaust pipe, but also from the crankcase breather tube, hidden under the hood. Beginning this year, new cars sold in California must have this vent connected to the air intake of the engine, so that the engine will suck these fumes back into itself and burn them up. In response to this California law, all American cars, for all markets, now how this arrangement. Many European makes have long had it.

It takes not only smoke to make a smog, but also a special weather setup. The air is clear on days when upward currents can carry the smoke away to high levels, and thin it out in the vast air ocean. The air gets thick on days when these upward currents are not working. What stops them? Normally the air aloft is colder than the air near the ground. Sometimes this normal condition is reversed, and a layer of warmer air lies aloft, on top of cooler air. Such an "inversion" acts as a lid. A batch of smoke rising from a chimney, for instance, the moment it rises into a warm-air layer finds itself cool by comparison, has no lift, and cannot rise farther. All the smoke gets trapped below the inversion.

The most dramatic of all air-pollution problems, the classic London fog, is caused by a strong inversion which forms very low—only 300 or 400 feet above the ground. Below this lid, the smoke of millions of coal-burning fireplaces is trapped and can not get out. The inversion usually lasts several days. Visibility goes down to 5 yards, officially; unofficially, you cannot see your own feet. The beastly stuff is a dirty yellow. Being not fog but almost solid coal smoke, it comes into the houses and does not dissolve, as real fog would.

The inversion that brings on Los Angeles smog is much higher—about 2,500 to 4,000 feet. It leaves much more room for smoke to dissipate. But it is persistent. Elsewhere in the world, an inversion lasts a few days, then is blown away. The Southern California inversion can be there day and night all summer long.

Since inversions cause smog, could we blow them away? Could we somehow heat dirty air so it will balloon away? It would take too much energy—megatons of heat every hour. The same goes for "smoke sewers" which would collect smoke and lead it to a superchimney high on a mountain: they would cost too much. Maybe someday we can spray chemicals from high-flying airplanes to clean the air.

But, for the present, the only known way to clean up our air is to put less smoke into it, and this needs the compulsion of law.

It's much like taxes: nobody wants to do his share if he can't be sure that everybody else will pay up, too. Smog control is expensive. A catalytic cracking unit in a refinery may cost $7 million; smog-control equipment for it costs $3 million. An open-hearth furnace in a steel plant may cost $200,000; smoke control costs another $150,000. A little drycleaning shop may need a $3,000 carbon filter. It is difficult for a business to go voluntarily to such expense.

Industry, therefore, generally fights back: First against smoke-control legislation in general, then against its detailed provisions, then against their enforcement. The arguments are always the same: "You'll drive jobs out of town." "It will price our product out of the market." "The stuff may stink, but you can't prove that it is a menace to health." "We have been making smoke here for 50 years. Why are we suddenly the villain?" None of these arguments is phony; some make good points.

Just the same, where public opinion is determined, smog control wins. The fact is that industry does not fight back very hard. Often a company is quite willing to be compelled, provided only that its competitors are forced to go to the same expense. In the last analysis, if industrial costs rise across the board, the bill is paid by the public. And the rewards are very great: Apart from health angles there's the effect on real estate values, the savings in cleaning bills, the reduction in airline delays, and the overall effect on the community.

The world's most smog-controlled city is Los Angeles. Not only is there that seasonal prohibition of sulfurous fuels, but every other source of pollution is covered, too. In Los Angeles you can't burn refuse; you can't let raw gasoline vapors escape from storage tanks; you can't run a dry-cleaning shop, printing press, restaurant kitchen, dog-food factory, coffee roasting plant without a vapor filter. You can't even make dust. Before a contractor starts an earth-moving job, he has to soak the ground deeply with water.

Industry has greatly cleaned up, at enormous cost. The refineries are almost odorless and smokeless. The Kaiser steel mill at Fontana is a good example of virtually smokeless steel making; it looks dead by contrast to the spectacular belchings of, say, South Chicago. The great remaining dirt source is the automobile, and the law about that is already in force.

All this may sound a little ridiculous, since Los Angeles is still so much troubled. But with its difficult climate and its enormous growth, Los Angeles would by now have disaster days if Californians acted as most other people act. If Los Angeles can hold its own, other cities can have their air crystal-clear.

A hundred years ago the civilized world made a great effort to get clean drinking water. At the time, this seemed unnecessary to some, impossible to others; but it was done. Now the world wants clean air.

[From Consumer Bulletin, September 1963]

THE ROLE OF THE ALLERGIST IN THE BATTLE AGAINST AIR POLLUTION

(By Frank L. Rosen, M. D.)

In many respects we are the cleanest people in the world. Our teeth glisten and gleam. We bathe often with the finest soaps, use millions of dollars worth of deodorants lest our perspiration offend—yet the air we breathe is dirty. And in this dirt there is danger.

Air pollution, a major peril to all of us, is a far greater menace to our allergic patients. They also are more susceptible to variations in weather, and changing weather factors themselves may induce asthma without the existence of any air pollution problem. When a combination of both factors occurs, then allergic patients are hit much harder than the general population.

Epidemics of air pollution with resultant bronchial asthma, bronchitis, and other respiratory and cardiac aggravations have been described in medical literature and received wide coverage by the lay press. I reported one such incident in New Jersey which occurred in November 1953. The individual patient, however, who gets asthma, bronchitis, running nose, burning of the eyes, etc., from polluted air, has received remarkably little attention. In his search for the cause of these symptoms, rarely does the general physician or even the allergist consider air pollution as a cause.

The menace of air pollution is great. Yet, strangely enough, most people consider it no more than a minor annoyance, like an unusual, irritating odor or a larger laundry bill, although it causes losses in the United States estimated at $1.5 to $11 billion a year. We are more disturbed by local sewage problems, and certainly by the more dramatic but less universally encountered problem of cancer related to smoking.

AIR POLLUTION MORE IMPORTANT THAN SMOKING?

Benzpyrene is a leading chemical substance that is blamed as a cause of lung cancer. "It was estimated that the average quantities of benzpyrene inhaled by persons exposed for a year ranged from 0.1 microgram in a State forest to 150 micrograms in one of the cities. By comparison, it was estimated (in a U.S. Public Health Service publication) that a person smoking one pack of cigarettes daily for a year, might be exposed to 60 micrograms. Thus, a person breathing the air of some cities over a year's time might inhale as much benzpyrene as from smoking two packs of cigarettes daily." Hoffman and Wynder of the Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research have reported finding that gasoline engine exhaust gas condensate contains agents that promote tumors on mouse skin. Its tumor activity was compared to that of corresponding concentrates of cigarette smoke condensate. It was found that the tumor potency was about two times higher for the exhaust tar than for the cigarette smoke condensate.

Thus one can see that air pollution is just as important, if not more so, than cigarette smoking in the causation of lung cancer. Unfortunately, one can give up smoking but one cannot give up breathing polluted air.

AIR POLLUTION FROM MOTOR VEHICLES

A 40-year-old woman moved to a new home within a block of a heavily traveled highway. Her asthma attacks increased in both frequency and severity and were relieved only when she moved to a new area.

A 40-year-old man gets asthma attacks chiefly on his way to work and coming home from work, while he is in heavy traffic surrounded by noxious fumes. This is such a widespread occurrence that it is essential that our cars be equipped to make exhaust products innocuous or nearly so, regardless of cost. During New York City's unprecedented ban on nonessential vehicles during the February 1961 blizzard, air pollution dropped dramatically, by 66 percent.

AIR POLLUTION FROM INDUSTRIAL FACTORS

I have several patients who get asthma attacks on days when the wind blows a pollutant from a nearby factory. I also have a patient who gets asthma only on days when a neighboring chemical plant makes penicillin. The meteorologist at a nearby airport informed me that many people who work there have nasal and bronchial symptoms when pollutants are blown in from local industrial areas by the winds. A new offender at large airports is the jet plane. The takeoff of one commercial jetliner has been estimated to create a quantity of air pollution equivalent to that produced by 6,850 passenger cars.

In industrial medicine we see patients whose asthma attacks have been precipitated by minute concentrations of chemicals in the factory air. These triggered attacks often persist for years, causing untold headaches for the courts in compensation cases.

AIR POLLUTION FROM SPRAY AND INSECTICIDES

Rachel Carson, in her recent bestselling book, "Silent Spring," dramatically portrays the universally harmful effects of insecticides and sprays. The allergic patient suffers to a far greater extent not only from the toxicity but from sensitization reactions.

Recently, I saw a 9-year-old boy who would come home with asthma after attending day camp. At first I thought it was due to exertion or exposure to pollens and molds in the fields. I later found that these factors were not the cause, but that he had been exposed to spray in the area. It seems that many day camps spray the grounds daily with insecticides before camp starts, and sufficient time was not allowed for complete dispersion of the vapor.

AIR POLLUTION FROM LEAF BURNING

In October, in the suburbs, leaf burning becomes a menace for patients with allergic respiratory disease. In New Jersey, the Air Pollution Control Code states:

"Prohibition of air pollution: No person shall cause, suffer, allow or permit to be emitted into the outdoor atmosphere substances in quantities which shall result in air pollution."

Note well, however, that "open burning of plant life grown on the premises is not intended to be covered by this code." In other words, you may burn your own leaves in your own backyard, even if your neighbor gets an asthma attack from the smoke. Many towns have passed local ordinances prohibiting the burning of leaves because of a fire or pollution hazard. Other towns have passed laws that such burning may be stopped if it is a nuisance to a neighbor. Certain towns in New Jersey, like many others elsewhere, do nothing, because they say, "We cannot afford the cartage and many people will not use the leaves for compost."

The allergist must take the lead in warning the health officers, the physicians, and the public as to the dangers that leaf burning adds to the air pollution problem.

AIR POLLUTION FROM RAGWEED POLLEN

Unfortunately, a patient may listen to the pollen count on the radio, read it in the newspapers and, if it is high, his symptoms are increased by the power of suggestion. Often these pollen counts are taken many miles from his environment, and have little relationship to the count in his immediate area. It is the pollen that is in his own environment that is important.

I have a large framed picture of a ragweed plant in my examining room. Not long ago, I saw a 30-year-old woman with severe hay fever symptoms who looked at the picture and asked, "Is this ragweed? Does this cause my hay fever? It's growing very high right outside my bedroom window. It even comes into the bedroom." She was getting a pollen count of thousands when the reported count was ten. Her symptoms cleared dramatically when her husband cleared up the backyard.

Meteorologic factors are just as pertinent as the amount of pollen produced. The pollen is borne on the wind, and its direction is of primary importance. For example, hay fever patients who live in shore areas do well on days with an ocean breeze, but with a land breeze their symptoms are similar to those of their inland brothers in distress. Pollen can blow into a community from 100 miles distant. So local laws, even if they are strictly enforced, do comparatively little to cut down the amount of pollen in the air.

WHAT CAN ALLERGISTS ACTUALLY DO ABOUT AIR POLLUTION?

We can think about air pollution as a cause of symptoms of many of our patients. I am convinced, after being in the practice of allergy for 25 years, that many asthmatics are wrongly labeled psychosomatic, when their trouble is actually coming from polluted air. Studies are now going on in Los Angeles, New Orleans, Nashville, and other cities to determine the effect of air pollution on bronchial asthma. Far more work of this nature is needed.

The U.S. Public Health Service, the State, city, and county health departments are eager to cooperate with us, but allergists must be the ones to inform them of the particular problems of the allergic patient. We must initiate interdisciplinary conferences where we can exchange information with health officers, engineers, botanists, etc. After all, our patients are more susceptible than anyone else to air pollution factors, and the more we learn about this subject the more we can do to make their environment—and that of all the rest of us—a healthier and more pleasant place to live in.

We have taken great strides in other fields of preventive medicine, but we are only beginning to grapple with the vital problem of air pollution. The air is a giant open sewer, and since we have no choice but to breathe it, it is high time we paid some attention to the garbage we spew into it.

ADDITIONAL POINTS FROM DR. ROSEN'S ATLANTIC CITY PAPER, READ BEFORE A SESSION OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Medical evidence has been piling up in the past few years that air pollution is deadly—it can kill you quickly, as it did 4,000 in London in 1 week in December 1952, or 400 in a week in December 1962. It can kill you slowly with an earlier death from prolonged chronic illness like lung cancer, bronchial asthma, chronic bronchitis or emphysema.

THE MOTOR VEHICLE AND AIR POLLUTION

Motor vehicles cause 60 to 80 percent of the pollution problem in cities. "I thought they had something to put on a car now so that it's harmless," is a remark I hear frequently. The comment refers to the crankcase ventilating device (blowby). It seems to me that the public is being lulled into a false sense of security with this mechanism.

So far as I know, no practical solution has yet been achieved for the tail pipe exhaust, which is responsible for at least 70 percent of the air pollution from motor vehicles.

LEAF BURNING

"Last year at least one and possibly two deaths were reported in local papers of asthmatic children who died after inhaling the smoke of burning leaves," says a Long Island, N.Y., physician.

THE RAGWEED PROBLEM

In a letter to the New York Times, dated August 2, 1959, Dr. Louis Mamelok stated, "Many years ago, after the first frost, when hay fever sufferers (in New York City) stopped sneezing, their symptoms returned. The cause was a windstorm from Louisiana, bringing ragweed pollen from an area where frost had not appeared yet."

A booklet on hay fever revised by the Allergy Foundation of America in August 1962, states, "The seed of ragweed may lie dormant in the soil for 20 years, so that weed eradication must be continued for many successive seasons."

The Air Pollution Code of my own State, New Jersey (January 1962), certainly gives authority for eradication of ragweed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be offered, the Chair places before the Senate the House bill, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6518) to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move to strike out all after the enacting clause in the House bill, and insert in lieu thereof the text of S. 432, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 6518) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate bill, S. 432, is indefinitely postponed.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine.

The motion was agreed to; and the Chair appointed Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. MOSS, Mr. METCALF, Mr. BOGGS, and Mr. PEARSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my intention to call up another bill, on which I understand the debate will not take too much time. Before I do so, I would be derelict in my duties and responsibilities if I did not commend the distinguished junior Senator from Maine. In this session he has reported to the Senate two extremely worthwhile bills, among others, one having to do with water pollution, and, today, the bill having to do with air pollution. He is to be commended for the initiative and consideration he has shown with respect to these two most difficult problems. The same goes for the distinguished ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS].

All members of the subcommittee and of the Committee on Public Works, which reported the bill to the Senate, are entitled to the thanks of the Senate and the country. A special vote of thanks should go to the distinguished Presiding Officer, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], who, as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare did so much to get these programs started, and deserves great credit.

AMENDMENT OF HOUSING ACT OF 1954

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 622, Senate Joint Resolution 129.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 129) to amend section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954 to increase the amount available to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator for advances for planned public works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to take a very brief period of time to give a short explanation of the bill.

The bill seeks to amend, by additional authorization, section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954. This section, providing for advances for public works planning, was written into law in 1954. The first appropriation was made the following year, and appropriations have been made each year since that time. The total authorization to date has been $58 million. All of that amount has been appropriated except $2 million, and that $2 million is carried in the current independent offices appropriation bill as it passed the House.

The Committee on Banking and Currency recommended that the authorization be increased by an additional $10 million. The administration had requested $18 million, but the committee recommended $10 million. The purpose of the bill is to authorize the appropriation of the additional $10 million.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I oppose the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 129. The Community Facilities Administration advances for public works planning program is becoming one of the most popular of Federal programs—and well it should.

Under the advances for public works planing program, Community Facilities Administration provides interest-free loans—interest-free planning money—for public works projects. Practically every non-Federal public agency is eligible to borrow the money. Repayment to Community Facilities Administration is not necessary if the project work does not go into construction. If the borrowing public agency decides to construct only a portion of the project, only that corresponding portion of the advanced planning cost must be repaid to Community Facilities Administration. So there are three repayment practices in effect:

First, the money does not have to be paid back at all.

Second, only a part of it has to be paid back.

Third, the money that is paid back is interest free—that is, interest free to the borrowing agency, not to the Federal Government.

Also, do not forget the grand prize if the project is lucky enough to be the recipient of an accelerated public works program grant. In this case, the entire project can be constructed at Federal Government expense.

All kinds of planned projects are available for these interest-free advances, even recreation facilities. I hope Community Facilities Administration does not begin to compete with other Government agencies and go into the bowling alley and ski-lift businesses.

The financing for the advances for public works planning program is provided from a revolving fund. The interest-free advances that are repaid are returned to the revolving fund and spent again. However, the revolving fund has not been revolving fast enough. It is impossible for it to do so when money is offered free to communities large and small, urban and rural, throughout the country.

Senate Joint Resolution 129 provides for an increase of $10 million authorization for the advances for public works planning program. Community Facilities Administration requested $18 million for this fiscal year. It supported the request by facts and figures. At present there is a backlog of applications for the free money in the amount of $16.5 million. Community Facilities Administration would like to process those applications immediately, I suppose, so that another $16.5 million in applications, or $20 or $30 million, can be accepted and processed next year. I am not pulling these latter figures out of the air. The budget program level for Community Facilities Administration for fiscal 1964 is $25 million.

Thus, the following situation exists: HHFA offices throughout the country and CFA fieldmen stand ready and willing to accept applications for free money from communities throughout their area. The applications are accepted; but alas, there is no money. So what does the community do? It gets up in arms. It wants to know why its application does not get the community the free money, as it did for its neighbors. CFA has the answers. One can imagine what is said: "There is no money, but when Congress authorizes and appropriates some, you will get yours."

Then the mail becomes heavy: "Our applications for free money have been accepted," the local communities say, "so please vote for more money for the whole program so that we can get ours."

I am not being critical of CFA's personnel or its office operation. Every question I have asked of CFA has been answered in a thorough, detailed, and apparently conscientious manner. They have always been most cooperative. I am worried about how far the advances for public works planning program could conceivably go. I am worried about its inherent tendency to stifle and discourage local public initiative—the initiative of communities to make their own plans and to solve their own problems.

It seems to me that this is one more instance of the Federal Government, by a calculated effort, reducing communities to the status of dependency on the Federal Government to the extent that their sense of individual, local initiative and responsibility is being destroyed. It is my fervent hope that this measure will be defeated.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, many of the views expressed by the Senator from Texas are shared not only by me, but by many other people throughout the country as well. As a result, I have been examining into the program as presented to see if any of its phases might be changed or corrected, or any of its problems solved. I have not been able to ascertain how this money can be kept in the advance planning stage and at the same time be free if it is not used. If it is to be used for advanced planning, presumably the money will be needed. If it does not come through in the form of construction, there is very little that can be done to have it paid back. Otherwise, presumably, application would not have been made for the money from CFA.

It seems to me that a perfect opportunity is afforded to put more sense into the Government loan program, regardless of the type of program. So I have prepared an amendment which would provide that any loan which is made to a local community, and which then goes through the construction process and is repaid, must bear interest from the time of the advance at the cost of the money to the Government. This would solve one problem.

What would the distinguished Senator from Texas, who has been so kind as to yield to me temporarily, think of that type of approach?

Mr. TOWER. The Senator from Colorado has suggested an eminently reasonable and sound approach.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from Texas. At this point, if the Senator from Texas has finished, I should like to obtain the floor in my own right, so that I may offer an amendment.

Mr. TOWER. I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

At the end of the joint resolution, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 2. Section 702(c) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) Advances under this section to any public agency shall be repaid by such agency when the construction of the public works is undertaken or started: *Provided,* That if the public agency undertakes to construct only a portion of a planned public work it shall repay such proportionate amount of the advances relating to the public work as the Administrator determines to be equitable. Any advance or part thereof required to be repaid shall bear interest from the date the advance was made to the date construction is undertaken or started at a rate determined by the Administrator which shall be not more than the higher of (1) 3 per centum per annum, or (2) the total of one-half of 1 per centum per annum added to the higher of 2½ per centum or the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the date of the making of the advance: *Provided, however,* That, in the event repayment is not made promptly, the unpaid sum shall bear interest at the rate of 6 per centum per annum from the date of the Government's demand for repayment to the date of payment thereof by the public agency'."

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, this amendment would really make only two changes in existing law. The first change provides that any advance funds to be repaid under existing law shall bear interest at the average interest rate charged by the Government or that is charged to the Government now for bonds sold for a maturity period of 10 years.

The other change is in the penalty rate which was established in cases in which repayments were not made promptly. It was 4 percent previously, and I propose to change the rate from 4 to 6 percent. The reason for the change upward is that interest payment—this is on advances that are required to be repaid at the present maturity—will be in the neighborhood of 4 percent. It seemed to me that the penalty rate for not paying when payment was due should at least be higher than the interest rate. That is the real reason for this proposed change.

There are certain factors that should be explained. Out of a total of $58 million that has been appropriated for the advance planning program, $52.6 million has been disbursed, according to the schedule on page 6 of the report, as of July 31, 1963. Advances repaid have amounted to $22.3 million. Not a single one of those advances has borne any interest.

It does not seem to me that at a time when the Government is having constant and recurring deficits and when the Secretary of the Treasury said no later than yesterday that the national debt limit might easily have to be raised to $330 billion in 1966, we should continue going ahead with a spending program without even requiring the recipients of the so-called benefits of the Federal spending to repay the cost to the general taxpayers of the money advanced—because the general taxpayers pay that cost to the Government; on any occasion when Government money is loaned, the general taxpayers are actually lending it to the community involved, which is getting the benefit of the money, and should pay the cost of the money to the general taxpayers.

That is what I am trying to provide for—plus a charge of the usual one-half of 1 percent for administrative costs, as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, in order to pay for the administrative costs.

I hope the distinguished Senator from Alabama will be willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the Senator from Colorado modify his amendment so as to make it comply with the existing law in regard to public facility loans? There is very little difference in the interest rate—probably less than one-eighth of 1 percent, I believe. I refer to the rate called for by section 203 of the housing amendments of 1955. In other words, this formula is already set out in the law.

If the Senator from Colorado wishes me to do so, I shall read a part of that act. The formula for interest charges may be found in two places. First let me read the requirements by the HHFA

Administrator on interest payments to the Treasurer:

> Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury which shall be not more than the higher of (1) 2½ per centum per annum, or (2) the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the issuance by the Administrator and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum.

Now let me read the formula for interest charges made by the Administrator to the community:

> The interest rate shall be not more than the higher of (A) 3 per centum per annum or (B) the total of 1 per centum per annum added to the rate of interest paid by the Administrator on funds obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury.

It makes a difference of approximately one-eighth of 1 percent in the interest rate. That formula is already in the law which relates to public facilities. After all, that is the formula the communities are accustomed to. The interest formula for college housing loans is based on the same concept.

So if the Senator from Colorado will consent to that modification of his amendment, I shall certainly have no reluctance whatsoever in accepting his amendment as thus modified.

Mr. DOMINICK. First, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Alabama that, personally, I am not in favor of the formula now used in connection with college housing and now in the Communities Facilities Construction Act, for the reason that it does not return to the Treasury the cost of the money to the general public, when the money is borrowed in order to provide funds for communities which will use them. I believe that both in connection with this bill and in connection with other bills which include lending-rate formulas, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] objected to some of the provisions in regard to computation of the interest rate, and suggested that we should use the formula proposed in my amendment. This is one reason why I wish to have provision made for a formula which will establish a pattern to be followed throughout the lending operations of the Government, and thus will pay back to the Government at least the cost to it—which is all I am requesting; I am not proposing that the Federal Government make a profit from these transactions.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But I believe the formula now in the law does that. In connection with loans to communities one-half of 1 percent is added to the rate charged by the Treasurer. I read the formula by means of which the Secretary of the Treasury makes the money available to the agency. The agency in turn charges an additional one-half of 1 percent. That provision is found in the preceding subsection. The actual cost to the community under the formula provided at the present time would thus be 3⅞ percent.

I understand that the formula the Senator from Colorado proposes probably would be 4 percent or probably a little less than 4 percent. So there is very little difference between the two; and the formula provided by existing law does pay to the Treasury the cost of the money loaned. In fact, the Government makes a little profit from the transactions, and this formula is already being used. So I wish the Senator from Colorado would accept this modification of his amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I wonder whether at this time I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Colorado may be allowed to suggest the absence of a quorum, without losing his right to the floor.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have suggested to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] that if he would modify his amendment in accordance with the present formula, I would be willing to accept it. It is my understanding that he is willing to do that, and I send it to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment, as modified, will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the joint resolution it is proposed to insert a new section as follows:

> SEC. 2. Section 702(c) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended to read as follows:
>
> "(c) Advances under this section to any public agency shall be repaid by such agency when the construction of the public works is undertaken or started: *Provided*, That if the public agency undertakes to construct only a portion of a planned public work it shall repay such proportionate amount of the advances relating to the public work as the Administrator determines to be equitable. Any advance or part thereof required to be repaid shall bear interest from the date the advance was made to the date construction is undertaken or started at a rate determined by the Administrator which shall be not more than the higher of (1) 3 per centum per annum, or (2) the total of one-half of 1 per centum per annum added to the higher of 2½ per centum or the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the date of the making of the advance: *Provided, however*, That, in the event repayment is not made promptly, the unpaid sum shall bear interest at the rate of 6 per centum per annum from the date of the Government's demand for repayment to the date of payment thereof by the public agency."

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I accept the modification.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, as modified.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado for proposing what I consider to be a vast improvement on the measure. He has, I believe, improved it considerably and made it far more acceptable.

However, this does not obviate my opposition to the measure. The fact still remains that the advances for public works planning programs proffer free money, in many instances, which does not have to be repaid. I believe that sometimes encourages planning on the part of a community under Federal auspices, rather than a community taking its own initiative and financing its own program.

I still believe it has the objection of rendering communities too dependent on the Federal Government. I shall therefore vote against the measure, even though I wholeheartedly support the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I can well appreciate the reservations that the Senator from Texas has, and I share a great many of them. I also have been active in my own local community. I have served in several different capacities, in the process of trying to plan what the community developments will be for community facilities of all kinds.

There are many areas, even in my own State, where it becomes difficult to find the necessary funds unless a program of the kind proposed is available.

I am not so sure this is the only program that should be available, or that it is the best program; but it is the only one we have at the moment. I am perfectly willing, with this amendment, to support the program for this year until something better can be devised.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I share the feelings expressed by the Senator from Colorado. It is the smaller communities that are able to avail themselves of this program, and therefore to plan and put into effect badly needed community programs.

I am indebted to both the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] for their cooperation. I fully understand the viewpoint of the Senator from Texas. I believe that as he examines the record of what has been accomplished, and as he visits around in his own State, he will see how much good has been done by this program.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TOWER. I am well aware that there are about 30 applications pending from my State at the present time, but the program is not necessarily good merely because some communities would benefit from it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I did not intend it that way.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD tables

showing how this program has been carried out. The first table shows the advances made under the program by States and the second shows lists of cities in my State of Alabama which have participated under the program.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE VI-7.—*Net advances for public works planning approved by States during calendar year 1962 and cumulative through Dec. 31, 1962*

State	January through December 1962		Cumulative through Dec. 31, 1962	
	Number of projects	Amount	Number of projects	Amount
Alabama	10	$412,735	39	$1,750,519.00
Alaska	13	428,306	46	1,310,468.25
Arizona	4	52,888	50	735,594.57
Arkansas	19	151,337	40	238,782.90
California	43	890,062	322	6,423,492.40
Colorado	7	48,511	33	1,168,551.79
Connecticut	11	267,864	41	1,696,730.34
Delaware	-----	-----	1	14,206.87
District of Columbia	-----	-----	1	27,500.00
Florida	10	142,100	66	1,327,523.16
Georgia	8	232,132	29	587,393.08
Hawaii	2	78,125	5	106,831.40
Idaho	5	75,880	22	174,709.84
Illinois	18	121,076	97	2,732,873.00
Indiana	1	3,000	10	384,161.25
Iowa	5	60,685	25	256,383.50
Kansas	22	147,585	72	482,607.61
Kentucky	6	33,400	27	513,265.85
Louisiana	31	472,048	118	2,432,006.98
Maine	20	284,450	40	473,441.65
Maryland	5	86,278	26	939,437.00
Massachusetts	18	261,052	95	2,296,472.19
Michigan	9	173,937	34	1,239,339.31
Minnesota	5	134,200	28	374,340.64
Mississippi	13	122,510	37	534,973.64
Missouri	11	174,248	26	708,967.51
Montana	17	151,888	141	1,388,684.67
Nebraska	-----	-----	2	32,519.60
Nevada	2	52,335	11	120,193.13
New Hampshire	10	90,000	43	732,713.02
New Jersey	33	1,883,183	111	5,402,766.08
New Mexico	1	10,000	3	13,000.00
New York	20	598,119	94	2,690,044.66
North Carolina	9	66,535	31	345,751.07
North Dakota	-----	-----	-----	-----
Ohio	3	185,713	51	1,969,067.61
Oklahoma	1	2,213	4	212,332.00
Oregon	35	557,360	106	1,443,358.24
Pennsylvania	64	1,806,605	218	6,673,454.87
Rhode Island	2	42,300	9	376,564.42
South Carolina	1	63,213	12	344,288.88
South Dakota	-----	-----	3	58,250.00
Tennessee	6	97,162	23	356,777.00
Texas	19	308,894	81	1,770,058.79
Utah	5	72,460	19	194,120.00
Vermont	11	454,428	76	1,325,550.83
Virginia	3	56,800	29	436,185.16
Washington	32	1,440,272	135	6,350,816.96
West Virginia	15	390,117	44	934,435.63
Wisconsin	1	9,000	12	227,650.45
Wyoming	-----	-----	8	74,950.00
Puerto Rico	9	1,057,690	9	1,057,690.00
Virgin Islands	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total (net approvals)	595	14,250,696	2,605	63,470,796.80

Source: 16th Annual Report of Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Program of advances for public works planning, State of Alabama

APPROVED PROJECTS—ACTIVE

Location	Type	Project No.	Advance
Abbeville	Sewer	3076	$3,125
Arab	do	3070	22,228
Auburn (Auburn University)	Educational	3035	16,065
Bayou LaBatre	Sewer	3036	6,336
Birmingham	do	3018	131,426
Do	Roads	3044	260,000
Collinsville	Sewer	3050	2,500
Cottonwood	do	3063	1,500
Cullman	Water	3074	10,000
Dothan	Airport	3060	21,250
Gadsden	Sewer	3009	135,000
Haleyville	do	3024	22,500
Huntsville	Hospital	3066	150,000
Do	Library	3064	35,000
Lafayette	Sewer	3058	2,850
Leighton	do	3031	3,000
Mobile	Water	3032	40,000
Montgomery	Sewer	3040	13,268
Do	do	3072	6,955
Do	Storm drains	3014	5,859
Prichard	Sewer	3069	19,332
Sheffield	do	3026	13,050
Tuscaloosa	Water	3034	98,175
Do	do	3056	152,441
Tuskegee	Sewer	3002	4,000
Winfield	Water	3073	9,250
Total (26 projects)	-----	-----	1,185,110

APPROVED PROJECTS—REPAID

Location	Type	Project No.	Advance
Arab	Water	3052	$23,985
Birmingham	Sewer	3005	27,500
Chickasaw	do	3010	13,650
Do	do	3011	9,156
Cullman	do	3006	10,000
Huntsville	City hall	3046	75,048
Jasper	Sewer	3027	28,000
Do	do	3049	4,424
Mobile	Water	3004	103,800
Do	Hospital	3017	67,000
Do	Sewer	3030	30,000
Montgomery	do	3039	4,121
Pritchard	do	3028	30,000
Scottsboro	Water	3021	27,000
Tuscaloosa	Sewer	3001	94,347
Total (15 projects)	-----	-----	548,031

APPROVED PROJECTS—CANCELED

Location	Type	Project No.	Advance
Athens	Sewer	3054	$14,194
Birmingham	Grade separation	3057	33,000
Glencoe	Sewer	3063	1,350
Montgomery	do	3019	15,000
Do	do	3041	2,200
Newton	do	3059	1,150
Tuscaloosa	Educational	3016	11,000
Total (7 projects)	-----	-----	77,894

APPLICATIONS PENDING

Location	Type	Project No.	Advance
Montgomery	Water	3075	$94,000

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I also wish to express my gratitude to the Senator from Alabama, who as usual has been very courteous and very thoughtful in his consideration of the bill and the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 129) is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 129) was passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 702(e) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended—

(1) by inserting after "July 1, 1961;" the following: "$10,000,000 which may be made available to such fund on or after July 1, 1963;"; and

(2) by striking out "$58,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$68,000,000".

SEC. 2. Section 702(c) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Advances under this section to any public agency shall be repaid by such agency when the construction of the public works is undertaken or started: *Provided,* That if the public agency undertakes to construct only a portion of a planned public work it shall repay such proportionate amount of the advances relating to the public work as the Administrator determines to be equitable. Any advance or part thereof required to be repaid shall bear interest from the date the advance was made to the date construction is undertaken or started at a rate determined by the Administrator which shall be not more than the higher of (1) 3 per centum per annum, or (2) the total of one-half of 1 per centum per annum added to the higher of 2½ per centum or the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the date of the making of the advance: *Provided, however,* That, in the event repayment is not made promptly, the unpaid sum shall bear interest at the rate of 6 per centum per annum from the date of the Government's demand for repayment to the date of payment thereof by the public agency."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. H.R. 8747, making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

EXCESSIVE IMPORTS OF BEEF PRODUCTS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Agriculture Department on Monday released a report which forecasts that net farm income will decline by nearly $400 million in 1963 and by another $600 million next year—a total reduction over the 2-year period of around $1 billion.

Naturally, the Department has a readymade scapegoat to blame for this anticipated decline in net farm income—the failure of the wheat referendum last May and the alleged expected lowering of wheat prices. As further insurance, the Department tacks on the sharp rise in production expenses as another possible excuse. What this attitude boils down to is this: The farmer is at fault for any plight he may be in today, this year or next year.

The wheat referendum is only a smokescreen to hide the reasons for the decline. I suggest that ill-advised policies of the administration are the real reasons. And I submit that the farm income situation is even worse than the administration would have us believe—that certain "adjustments" were made to peg the decline at a $1 billion level, when in actuality it should be more.

I believe that Secretary Freeman need not look any further than the plight of the livestock industry to pinpoint a major reason for this decline in net farm income. If he would bother to check livestock marketings for the first 10 months of this year, he would find that his own Department estimates receipts at nearly $160 million below the comparable period of last year.

And if he bothered to check, he would find that the open-end, unrestricted beef importation policy of this administration is having a serious impact on cattle prices throughout the United States—between 25 and 30 cents per 100 pounds on the price of marketed choice steers and about 50 cents per 100 pounds on the price of marketed utility cows. I will have more to say about this later.

Few will deny that world trade is imperative to improvements in world economy. And it would be contrary to long-established policy to totally exclude certain imports as a means of resolving an economic problem in any one segment of our domestic economy. But it is economically untenable and suicidal to completely ignore the gradual strangulation of an industry through depressed prices induced to a considerable degree by this open-end and unrestricted importation policy, which is so seriously affecting the livestock industry in general and the cattle industry in particular.

Much has been said and written in recent weeks about the condition of the livestock industry. Recently, my distinguished colleagues—Mr. CARLSON, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. DOMINICK, and Mr. SYMINGTON—entered into a colloquy over the seriousness of the threat of surging beef imports and the effect on U.S. livestock prices. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] correctly observed that "the livestock industry is facing a critical situation and in many instances it is disastrous to our livestockmen." As long ago as last April, I brought this to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate—see pages 6560–6561 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 18.

The untimely importation policy of this administration is a major cause of the declining farm income situation, but the administration failed to mention it in its release Monday.

It does not do any good to pretend the problem does not exist and that if one looks the other way long enough it will disappear. This has been the approach of the administration and more particularly the Agriculture Department. In his trip through the farm belt recently, Secretary Freeman was continually questioned by very concerned cattlemen on the zooming meat import problem. Heavy imports, they said, add to the already high domestic production and keep prices down. Mr. Freeman countered with the argument that most of the imported beef is cheaper quality types not under price pressure here, and therefore the contention of the cattlemen was incorrect.

Apparently he completely overlooked the fact that the animals producing cheaper quality beef eat feed grains, and increased imports means less consumption of our own feed grains, which are in surplus.

Typical of the answers was one given in response to a question from Marvin Russell of the Nebraska Farmer. As reported in the November 2 issue of that farm magazine, Mr. Freeman had this to say:

> At this time I would say there is no reason to believe that beef imports, according to our most careful calculations, are adversely affecting beef prices to any significant degree.
>
> We're, of course, very concerned that there's been a significant increase in the volume of imports, but those imports are almost exclusively of cow beef rather than fed steer beef, and cow beef prices have been holding up very, very well. There has not been any dropoff.
>
> The price weakness has been in fed beef, and here there have not been imports. That price weakening has been from increased and quite heavy marketings rather than imports.
>
> And so at this time, although we're watching this very, very carefully, we do not feel that the imports are having any adverse price effect on American producers.

Russell dryly observed:

> We doubt that many ranchers or cattle feeders will buy Freeman's explanation. Their opinions generally seem to be that when imports amount to as much as 10 percent of our total meat supply, there just can't help being some influence on price.

Even as Mr. Freeman was talking, his Department was compiling statistics which indicated that in August alone, beef imports were running at a rate of 12.3 percent of domestic production and for the first 8 months of this year, at a rate of 11 percent.

The highly respected Wallace's Farmer also had some comments on Mr. Freeman's statements. In an editorial on October 5, it said that Secretary Freeman's answers have not been completely satisfactory. I would like to quote pertinent passages from this editorial:

> He said cow prices have remained steady, and this is the grade we import. We are not marketing enough hamburger and sausage-type animals to satisfy our markets. Therefore, reasons Freeman, beef imports do not hurt fed steer beef prices.

The editorial then went on to say—

> We feel his statement is only partly true. Every meat competes with every other meat, to some extent. If a consumer's belly is full of Australian hamburger, he isn't going to be in the market for U.S. steak, ham, or lamb chops. Furthermore, some 30 to 40 percent of a fed beef carcass goes into ground beef in direct competition with the imported product.

First, I think that Secretary Freeman should reexamine those cow prices which he claims have remained steady. According to official USDA figures, cow prices in January 1961 were $15.70 per hundred weight; in October 1963, the price had declined to $14.64. The annual for 1961 was $15.66 and thus far for the first 10 months of 1963, the price is running at an average of $15.36. Just what does he mean by prices being steady?

Second, in making his comments, and downgrading the effect of beef imports, Mr. Freeman obviously was not aware of what was going on within his own Department. In the 1964 Outlook Issue of the "Livestock and Meat Situation" of November a study by the Economic Research Service indicates that when the imports equal about 10 percent of total domestic beef production—as they have more than been doing recently—they would cause, on the average, a drop of about 1 percent in the price of Choice steers and nearly 3 percent in the price of utility cows.

If this is true—although I believe the impact is even greater—livestock producers would otherwise have received an additional 47 cents per hundred pounds in the price of utility cows in 1961 and 1962.

And what does this mean in receipt losses? For 1961, it comes to $6.6 million and in 1962, $6.62 million. And with the imports running even higher this year, the 1963 loss due to unrestricted importation policies will no doubt be greater.

In this 3-year period, the income loss for this grade of beef alone will amount to some $20 million.

Now, let us examine the effect on Choice steer prices. In 1961, the reduction, as a result of the level of imports, amounted to approximately 27 cents in the price of Choice steers per 100 pounds; in 1962, a reduction of nearly 30 cents.

This means that, in 1961, the out-of-the-pocket loss to livestock producers amounted to $28 million and in 1962, nearly $31.4 million. There will be, according to every barometer, at least a $32 million loss this year. The 3-year totals add up to some $91.5 million in marketing losses.

That is a total pocketbook loss to beef producers of $111.5 million in this 3-year period—just in these two grades of beef alone. Needless to say, losses in the slaughter livestock industry mean losses elsewhere in agriculture.

Here is a rundown on the receipt losses incurred in shipping to various markets on the one grade of Choice steer alone: Chicago: 1961, $2.8 million; 1962, $2.7 million; Omaha: 1961, $1.4 million; 1962, $1.4 million; Sioux City: 1961, $1.2 million; 1962, $1.3 million; St. Louis: 1961, $190,000; 1962, $208,000; South St. Joseph: 1961, $485,000; 1962, $547,000; Kansas City: 1961, $349,000; 1962, $312,000; Denver: 1961, $377,000; 1962, $289,000; Indianapolis: 1961, $190,000; 1962, $188,000; South St. Paul: 1962, $364,000; Sioux Falls: 1961, $235,000; 1962, $253,000.

Receipts from marketings of livestock and livestock products during the first 9 months of 1963 are reported down $50 million from the comparable period for 1962 even though the volume increased—on page 6 of Farm Income Situation for November. Actually, it appears that receipts were down $99 million—page 10 of the report shows receipts for the period January through September of 1962 at $14,462 million; whereas for the same period of 1963, receipts are shown at $14,363 million—a difference of $99 million—not $50 million. I suppose press releases have been issued showing the smaller loss so that farmers will think things are not as bad as they actually are. But in addition, for the month of October these receipts are estimated at $2 billion—down about 3 percent.

In light of these figures, I seriously question Mr. Freeman's statements that imports are not having a significant effect on cattle prices in the United States. He had better check his story with his Economic Research Service, which made this statement in the November report:

> If imports are a smaller proportion of domestic production, the effect on fed cattle prices is less; if they are a larger proportion, the effect on prices is greater.

Mr. Freeman should be reminded that livestock production expenses zoomed from the $2.5 billion recorded in 1960 to more than $3 billion last year, with every indication, borne out by official reports, that they will be even higher this year. He should be told that the parity ratio—the relation between the prices farmers received to the prices farmers paid for goods and services—stood at 77 in October, compared to 81 in December 1960, the last month of the Eisenhower administration.

He should be informed that beef producers are encountering recurring short-term price difficulties, even though beef has been one of the few products for which demand has been growing faster than the population—with the per capita consumption of beef jumping from 85.2 pounds in 1960 to an estimated 95.1 in 1963, and an even higher estimate of 97 pounds in 1964. He should be advised that the beef steer-corn price ratio has dropped from 26.2 in December 1960 to 20.3 in October 1963; that the hog-corn ratio has dropped from the 18.1 of December 1960 to 14.1 in October of this year; that the monthly average price of Choice grade slaughter steers at Chicago has decreased from $26.86 per 100 pounds recorded in December 1960 to $24.03 this last October, and that the price received by producer for slaughter steers, all grades, has gone down from the $26.61 of December 1960 to $23.97 in the month of October 1963; that livestock loans under the Farmers Home Administration have jumped from the $41.3 million reported in fiscal year 1960 to close to $75 million in fiscal year 1963; that purchases of feeder cattle on loans under the Production Credit Administration have soared from a total of 32,246—valued at $97 million—in 1956 to 36,319—valued at close to $253 million—in 1962.

Perhaps Mr. Freeman should try to coordinate the needs of the Armed Forces with the problems of the beef producers in order that more beef will be procured in this country. Total military purchases dropped from 275 million pounds, valued at $149 million, in fiscal year 1960 to 268 million pounds, valued at $146.7 million, in fiscal 1962, while the total in the Armed Forces was increasing over 200,000. And even now, it is estimated that these purchases, running at approximately 20 to 22 million pounds a month, will be lower this year, bringing the fiscal year total to less than $140 million.

The Defense Establishment, it is estimated, is purchasing abroad for resale purposes in commissaries about 1 million pounds a month; this would come to a rate of more than $4 million a year in non-U.S. purchases; a factor which has an influence on the flow of gold as well as on the income of our beef producers.

Then Secretary Freeman should read further the 1964 Outlook Issue of the Livestock and Meat Situation of November.

I quote from page 21 of that report:

> Cattle feeding programs representative of typical feeding programs in the Corn Belt generally showed small profits, and substantial losses in some cases, during the 1962–63 feeding season. * * * According to these representative feeding programs, net returns per head have not been so low, or losses so large, in many years for most types of feeding operations. Compared with the previous season, lower returns were due primarily to a combination of higher prices for feeder stocks and lower prices for fed cattle in all but one of the programs. Feed costs for all types of programs were somewhat higher in 1962–63, but this accounted for only a small part of the decline in net returns. Transportation and marketing expenses and pasture costs were practically the same in both years.

He should examine this table—a table which shows the net return per head on heifer calves dropping from $29.88 in 1961–62 to $7.14 in 1962–63; the net return on steer calves dropping from $64.87 to $1.46; the net return on good yearling steers dropping from $28.08 to a loss of $20.12; and the net return on heavy steers dropping from $54.19 to a loss of $17.14.

These are conditions which demand action—not an ostrichlike attitude.

The import situation, which Mr. Freeman determines is of no significance, contains the ingredients of disaster for our livestockmen.

Despite continuing price difficulties, cattlemen have been and are faced with soaring imports of beef and veal. No one is claiming that the growing level of imports is the sole cause of lower fed cattle prices, but I maintain that it is a major factor, resulting from the unfortunate policies of the Kennedy administration. And the problem will be worsened if the United States does not hold to a firm position in negotiations upcoming with the Common Market.

Back in May, Gerald Leighton, president of the Chicago Live Stock Exchange, was quoted in the Chicago Tribune to the effect that the deluge of foreign beef swamping this country's markets presents such a threat to the freedom of U.S. cattlemen that it has become frightening. The Tribune quoted Mr. Leighton as charging that cattlemen are being—and I quote—"sold out" for a dual purpose: to buy the friendship of foreign nations and to shackle the freedom of one of the most independent groups of men in agriculture.

If Mr. Freeman pursues his intentions as expressed in his "Report of the Secretary of Agriculture" for 1962 released earlier this year, he will continue to look the other way while imports continue to soar.

In his report, Mr. Freeman said and I quote:

> An agricultural policy for today's world must be based on the principle of supply management, whereby agriculture would be provided with a means of doing, through Government, what most industry does for itself when it adjusts production to the amount it can sell for a profit.

Whether this attitude reflects a policy of do-nothingness in order to bring the livestock industry to its knees from which it would have to plead for price supports in exchange for Government regulation is a timely question. Mr. Freeman cannot blame cattlemen if his continued inaction causes them to draw such an inference.

And I most emphatically disagree with another statement by Mr. Freeman in that same report:

> The year 1962 thus set in motion new forces to add momentum to the upswing in agriculture which is being felt throughout the land. There was in rural America a

> firmer mood of confidence and optimism than had prevailed in many years. Obviously, agriculture turned an important corner in 1961 and 1962 and hopes were bright that progress would continue in 1963 and beyond.

If we have turned a corner, it is the wrong one, especially as it involves the livestock industry.

When imports of beef and veal reach a per capita level of 9.4 pounds, up 4.1 pounds from 1960, it is time all of us became concerned. When beef and veal imports jump from 775,510,000 pounds—carcass weight equivalent—valued at $182,175,000 in 1960 to 1,445,058,000 pounds valued at $312,153,000 last year, with imports during the January–August 1963 period running 22 percent above the same months of last year, then this administration had better get off dead center.

Australia, in 1962, contributed 46 percent of the total U.S. tonnage imported, and its share this year will be even greater. Its beef and veal imports have increased from 17.7 million pounds recorded in 1958 to 444.9 million pounds last year with 253 million pounds already shipped to the United States from January through July of this year. Australia, since modification in late 1958 of the United Kingdom-Australian Meat Agreement, which restricted Australia from shipping other than token quantities of meat to countries other than the United Kingdom, has emphasized exports to the United States. Australian exports of beef and veal totaled 549 million pounds in 1962, of which 81 percent was shipped to the United States. And there is no letup in sight since cattle numbers in that country have increased in the past 4 years and supplies of meats for export are expected to continue at high levels.

New Zealand has increased its total from 130.7 million pounds in 1960 to 213.6 million pounds in 1962, with 138.3 million pounds exported to the United States through July of this year. New Zealand accounted for 22 percent of the total imported into the United States and was the second largest supplier last year.

And what are the prospects for 1964? I think the best answer is provided by the Department of Agriculture in its 1964 Outlook:

> Prices of cows in 1964 will depend on imports of beef as well as domestic cow slaughter * * *. Imports will likely be up again in 1964, and prices of cow beef, although expected to be somewhat lower, will not be down enough to curb imports of beef and veal.
>
> The gain in beef production in 1964 likely will be around 3 percent—a little smaller than the increase in cattle slaughter because marketings likely will be at lighter weights. The experience in the past decade indicates that normal gains in population, income and continued preference for beef could make it possible to absorb 3 percent more beef and still maintain relatively stable prices to cattle producers. With consumer incomes likely to advance by a significant amount in 1964, prospects are that cattle prices for the year as a whole will not differ much from 1963 levels.

In other words, things are not going to be any better for the beef producer next year, so far as the U.S. Department of Agriculture is concerned. The time for action on imports is long past due. There can be no real national economic prosperity unless our basic livestock industry shares fairly in the national net income. More money in the livestock men's pockets means more money to be spent for goods produced elsewhere in the Nation.

I do not advocate the elimination of beef and veal imports, but I do say that with feed grain surplus problems and depressed livestock prices, we should hold these imports to the 1960 levels. I do not necessarily advocate a limitation on the basis of volume. I believe that perhaps a limitation on the basis of percentage of domestic consumption would be satisfactory. For example, if 1960 imports of beef and veal equaled 5 percent of domestic production, that is what the rate should be this year, instead of 11 or 12 percent.

Because our increasing population demands increased domestic production, the volume of imports could be expected to rise, although the percentage limit would remain constant. This would be a fair and workable approach. Later, if the feed grain program were eliminated, and if the farmers started to receive a fair share of national net income, consideration could be given to permitting the percentage figure to increase.

Mr. President, I have a group of approximately 28 items, consisting of various tables and articles. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 18, 1963]

FARM INCOME EXPECTED TO DROP BY $1 BILLION OVER 2-YEAR PERIOD

(By Julius Duscha)

The Agriculture Department had some bad news for farmers yesterday that undoubtedly will hurt President Kennedy and other Democrats in the 1964 campaign.

Department economists estimated that net farm income will decline by nearly $400 million this year and may go down by as much as another $600 million next year.

This would mean a total reduction of $1 billion in net farm income over a 2-year period and obviously would give Republicans a telling political issue in rural areas.

In the Midwest and the West farmers generally vote Republican, but in the South they usually support Democrats.

Net farm income was at its height in 1947 when it reached $17.3 billion. During the Eisenhower administration the figure reached a low of little more than $11 billion in 1957.

By 1960 the figure had climbed back almost to $12 billion. In 1961 net farm income increased to $12.5 billion and in 1962 it totaled $12.6 billion.

The 1963 estimate is now $12.2 billion. A 5 percent reduction next year, which Department economists say is possible would place the figure at $11.6 billion.

The farm income forecasts were made by the Department's Economic Research Service. The annual Agricultural Outlook Conference begins today.

The 1964 outlook issue of the Department's quarterly publication, Farm Income Situation, attributes the 1963 decline in net income "to production expenses rising faster than realized gross farm income."

Much of the 1964 income drop, the publication continued, will probably be the result of lower wheat prices.

Last May wheat farmers rejected in a referendum a program that would have guaranteed them high prices but would have sharply restricted their production. As a result, wheat prices may drop from their current level of $2 a bushel to as low as $1.25 a bushel next year. More than half of the Nation's farmers grow wheat.

The reduction in farm income this year will probably mean no decrease in income per farm, however, because of the continued decline in the number of farms.

Current estimates place the number of farms at 3.5 million, compared with the 3.7 million during the last farm census in 1959.

Per farm income was at a record high of $3,414 last year and is expected to be about the same this year. But a reduction in per farm income is expected next year if net farm income declines by 5 percent.

Farm income declined this year despite large direct Government payments to farmers, which the Agriculture Department said are expected to be slightly higher than the 1962 figure of $1.7 billion. More than $1 billion went for the wheat and feed grain programs.

The Budget Bureau estimated last January that the Federal Government would spend nearly $5 billion in the current fiscal year on "special aids and services for farmers."

This amounts to about 40 percent of net farm income, but not all of this money goes to farmers.

[From the Nebraska Farmer, Nov. 2, 1963]

HERE'S WHAT FREEMAN LEARNED IN NEBRASKA: WHEAT PROGRAM FAVORED; FEED GRAIN PROGRAM OK'D; BEEF IMPORTS CAUSING GRAVE CONCERN

(By Marvin Russell)

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman made a flying trip through Nebraska last month. And he learned some things about what Nebraska farmers and ranchers are thinking.

He learned that:

1. They want some kind of wheat program.
2. They generally approve the feed grain program.
3. They are highly concerned about imports of beef and the effect of these imports on beef prices here at home.

There was no indication on his part, however, that he will attempt to do anything about what he learned. In fact, he indicated there's not much that he can or will do.

He said he had worn out quite a bit of shoe leather trudging up to Congress to see what might be done about a wheat program after last spring's referendum. He has gotten no encouragement there, he said. He said there is just flatly no chance of getting a new voluntary wheat program approved by Congress at the present session.

Nevertheless, Freeman said he found more support for a wheat program in Nebraska than in any place he had visited up to that time in his series of "report and review" meetings with farmers. His two meetings in Nebraska—at North Platte and at Grand Island—were Nos. 6 and 7 in the series. He went on from Nebraska to Montana and the State of Washington.

WHEAT PROGRAM 3 TO 1

Discussing the Nebraska desire for a wheat program, he said no one would expect the people gathered at North Platte to be "screaming advocates of farm programs," but in a show of hands they favored a wheat program by 3 to 1.

Incidentally, this caused him to make at least one change in the speech he had prepared for delivery later at the ASCS convention in Grand Island. The advance copy of that speech had one sentence which read: "In my trips to wheat areas so far, I have not yet found strong support for any wheat programs."

Freeman must have found Montana and Washington State wheat growers also in favor of a program, for when he got back to Washington, D.C., he announced he had found sentiment "sharply favorable to continued programs."

"But when I have asked farmers to describe the kind of a wheat program they would support, the answer is not clear at all," he said.

"There is also a hard core of vocal opposition to any kind of wheat program or farm program. This opposition is making itself heard very effectively."

Recommending that wheat growers get together on the kind of program they want, Freeman concluded: "As matters now stand, there is little prospect for a wheat program to pass the Congress in 1964."

Concerning the feed grain program, Freeman said he found some concern in Nebraska regarding "some aspects" of it, but generally it seemed to have whole-hearted approval. The "some aspects" apparently referred to the Dawson County dispute over rates allowed for diversion payments on certain farms.

BOOST BEEF TARIFF?

We asked Freeman if he didn't think tariff rates on beef imports ought to be boosted. He replied at considerable length, although his answer really boiled down to: No, he didn't think tariff rates should be boosted.

Here's what he said:

"At this time I would say there is no reason to believe that beef imports, according to our most careful calculations, are adversely affecting beef prices to any significant degree.

"We're of course very concerned that there's been a significant increase in the volume of imports, but those imports are almost exclusively of cow beef rather than fed steer beef, and cow beef prices have been holding up very, very well. There has not been any dropoff.

"The price weakness has been in fed beef, and here there have not been imports. That price weakening has been from increased and quite heavy marketings rather than imports.

"And so at this time, although we're watching this very, very carefully, we do not feel that the imports are having any adverse price effect on American producers."

We doubt that many ranchers or cattle feeders will "buy" Freeman's explanation. Their opinions generally seem to be that when imports amount to as much as 10 percent of our total meat supply, there just can't help being some influence on price.

The week Freeman was in Nebraska, cow beef prices were about steady but cows on the hoof at Omaha were 25 to 50 cents lower.

[From Wallace's Farmer, Oct. 5, 1963]

STOP MEAT IMPORTS?

We like to increase exports of farm products. But we get upset about rising imports of foods that compete directly with those we produce.

Cattlemen are getting more and more alarmed over rising beef imports. We imported a record 1.4 billion pounds of beef and veal in 1962. The 1962 imports amounted to about 9 percent of our domestic production. And the live feeder cattle imported equaled 3.6 percent of the cattle slaughtered.

Should we clamp down on meat imports? They are especially irritating at a time when feeders are taking losses because of sharply lower fed cattle prices.

Secretary Freeman's answer to this question at Monticello, Iowa, did not completely satisfy. He said cow prices have remained steady, and this is the grade of beef we import. We are not marketing enough hamburger- and sausage-type animals to satisfy our markets. Therefore, reasons Freeman, beef imports do not hurt fed steer beef prices.

We feel his statement is only partly true. Every meat competes with every other meat, to some extent. If a consumer's belly is full of Australian hamburger, he isn't going to be in the market for U.S. steak, ham, or lamb chops. Furthermore, some 30 to 40 percent of a fed beef carcass goes into ground beef in direct competition with the imported product.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, May 28, 1963]

FOREIGN BEEF POURS INTO THE UNITED STATES, SAYS LEIGHTON—CATTLEMEN BEING "SOLD OUT," HE CHARGES

(By Arnold Erickson)

The deluge of foreign beef swamping this country's markets presents such a threat to the freedom of U.S. cattlemen that it has become frightening, Gerald Leighton, president of the Chicago Live Stock Exchange, warned yesterday.

He charged that cattlemen are being "sold out" for a dual purpose: (1) "to buy the friendship of foreign nations and (2) to shackle the freedom of one of the most independent groups of men in agriculture."

"The dictatorial possibilities of the beef import situation is obvious," Leighton said. "The seven countries that ship us beef are increasing cattle herds at a record pace. They already have 4,500,000 more cattle than the United States, a total of 108,247,000."

ACCOUNT FOR 85 PERCENT

The seven countries are Australia, New Zealand, Argentina, Paraguay, Uruguay, Mexico, and Brazil. In 1962, these countries shipped to the United States 818,251,392 pounds of beef, or 85 percent of that imported.

"In the last year, they added 4,181,000 to their herds," Leighton said. "Since the 1956–60 period, these herds have been increased by 7,766,000, and since 1951–55 by 12,059,000. None of these countries can consume the beef from these record numbers of cattle.

EARMARK MORE TONNAGE

"This group of countries is confidently earmarking an ever-increasing tonnage of beef for future shipment to the United States. They obviously have assurances of some sort from spokesmen in authority in this country on which to base such expansion plans for surplus beef that has no place in their domestic trade.

"The United States recently has become the world's greatest beef importer, a position formerly held by the United Kingdom. According to the foreign agricultural service at least one of this group of countries has agreed to curtail beef shipments to Britain for the remainder of the year to assist in stabilizing cattle prices in Britain. As a result that country may face a surplus problem unless it can dump more beef in the United States."

Leighton said cattlemen are asking these questions: "Must cattlemen curb production to make room for foreign beef in order to stave off further market collapse? Is this the position Washington planned when it allowed the record imports?"

In the first quarter of 1963, beef imports soared 18 percent above the 1962 record, and took more than 30 percent of the trade for manufacturing beef, a grade used extensively for hamburgers and canning.

U.S. imports of cattle and beef, lambs, and lamb and mutton compared with production, 1950–63

CATTLE AND CALVES AND BEEF AND VEAL

Year	Imports				Meat production [3] (million pounds)	Imports as a percentage of production
	Live animals		Meat (million pounds)	Total [2] (million pounds)		
	Number (1,000 head)	Meat equivalent [1] (million pounds)				
1950	438	157	348	505	10,764	4.7
1951	220	91	484	575	9,896	5.8
1952	138	47	429	476	10,819	4.4
1953	177	62	271	333	13,953	2.4
1954	71	35	232	267	14,610	1.8
1955	296	93	229	322	15,147	2.1
1956	141	43	211	254	16,094	1.6
1957	703	221	395	616	15,728	3.9
1958	1,126	340	909	1,249	14,516	8.6
1959	688	191	1,063	1,254	14,588	8.6
1960	645	163	775	938	15,835	5.9
1961	1,023	250	1,037	1,287	16,341	7.9
1962	1,232	280	1,445	1,725	16,311	10.6
January–August 1962	583	132	893	1,025	10,895	9.4
January–August 1963	555	118	1,086	1,204	11,386	10.6

LAMBS AND LAMB AND MUTTON

Year	Imports				Meat production [3] (million pounds)	Imports as a percentage of production
	Live animals		Meat (million pounds)	Total [2] (million pounds)		
	Number (1,000 head)	Meat equivalent [1] (million pounds)				
1950	97	3	3	6	597	1.0
1951	14	(4)	7	7	521	1.3
1952	(5)	(4)	6	6	648	.9
1953	1	(4)	3	3	729	.4
1954	1	(4)	2	2	734	.3
1955	8	(4)	2	2	758	.3
1956	3	(4)	1	1	741	.1
1957	18	1	4	5	707	.7
1958	40	1	41	42	688	6.1
1959	76	2	104	106	738	14.4
1960	50	1	87	88	768	11.5
1961	1	(4)	101	101	832	12.1
1962	21	1	143	144	809	17.8
January–August 1962	3	(4)	95	95	533	17.8
January–August 1963	1	(4)	115	115	503	22.9

[1] Estimated at 53 percent of the live weight of all dutiable imports of cattle and for lambs an average 30 pound carcass.

[2] Canned and other processed meats have been converted to their carcass weight equivalent.

[3] Total production (including an estimate for farm slaughter).

[4] Less than 500,000 pounds.

[5] Less than 500 head.

Meat imports: United States, by country of origin, 1958 to date

[In million pounds]

Product and year	Imports, by country of origin, product weight												Total imports	
	Canada	Mexico	Argentina	Brazil	Denmark	West Germany	Poland	Netherlands	Ireland	Australia	New Zealand	All Other	Product weight	Carcass weight equivalent
Beef and veal: [1]														
1958	53.6	75.0	216.7	13.6	2.5	0.3	---	0.3	23.8	17.7	183.7	32.0	619.2	909
1959	22.6	48.9	128.6	36.0	3.4	.3	---	.3	42.0	224.0	161.6	54.6	722.3	1,063
1960	18.9	39.1	52.7	9.0	4.5	.3	(2)	.1	52.8	144.7	130.7	39.3	512.6	775
1961	32.3	53.4	65.2	16.3	6.5	.3	0.1	.1	64.4	233.9	154.4	33.5	689.2	1,037
1962	19.4	59.3	55.9	17.2	7.7	.4	.4	.1	70.7	444.9	213.6	49.8	970.9	1,445
1963, January–July	11.1	39.8	53.5	3.3	.6	.2	1.0	(2)	40.0	253.0	138.3	62.9	603.7	907
Lamb and mutton:														
1958	1.2	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	14.6	7.0	1.2	24.0	24
1959	.8	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	40.6	12.8	2.6	56.8	57
1960	.1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	38.5	9.1	2.0	49.7	87
1961	.1	(2)	---	---	---	---	---	---	(2)	44.6	10.8	.2	55.8	101
1962	.5	---	.1	---	---	---	---	---	.2	65.9	11.1	.3	78.2	143
1963, January–July	(2)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	50.1	9.2	.2	59.5	107
Pork:														
1958	61.9	(2)	(2)	---	38.7	7.0	27.0	44.7	.1	---	.1	3.3	182.8	193
1959	59.1	(2)	(2)	---	37.3	4.7	26.9	43.4	.2	---	.2	3.1	174.9	186
1960	47.3	(2)	(2)	---	40.7	2.7	35.1	42.0	.2	---	.1	5.9	171.3	186
1961	44.7	.1	---	---	46.2	1.7	34.7	42.0	.2	---	(2)	5.8	173.7	187
1962	46.8	(2)	---	---	63.8	1.3	39.8	43.4	2.0	(2)	.1	7.9	203.8	216
1963, January–July	25.7	---	---	---	44.2	.4	25.3	26.4	1.1	---	(2)	4.3	127.4	135
Total:														
1958	116.7	75.0	216.7	13.6	41.2	7.3	27.0	45.0	23.9	32.3	190.8	36.5	826.0	1,126
1959	82.5	49.0	128.6	36.0	40.7	5.0	26.9	43.7	42.2	264.6	174.6	60.3	954.1	1,306
1960	66.3	39.2	52.7	9.0	45.2	3.0	35.1	42.2	52.9	183.2	139.9	47.2	733.7	1,048
1961	77.1	53.5	65.2	16.3	52.7	2.0	34.8	42.1	64.6	278.5	165.2	39.5	918.7	1,325
1962	66.7	59.3	56.0	17.2	71.5	1.7	40.2	43.5	72.9	510.8	224.8	58.0	1,252.9	1,804
1963, January–July	36.8	39.8	53.5	3.3	44.8	.6	26.3	26.4	41.1	303.1	147.5	67.4	790.6	1,149

[1] Includes quantities of other canned, prepared, or preserved meat not elsewhere specified. Assumed to be mostly beef.

[2] Less than 50,000 pounds.

Source: Compiled from official records of the Bureau of the Census.

Hogs and corn: Prices received by farmers and hog-corn price ratio, United States, by months, 1961 to date

Month	Hogs, per 100 pounds			Corn, per bushel			Hog-corn price ratio		
	1961	1962	1963	1961	1962	1963	1961	1962	1963
January	$16.70	$16.50	$15.40	$0.963	$0.951	$1.03	17.3	17.4	15.0
February	17.60	16.30	14.80	1.00	.956	1.06	17.6	17.1	14.0
March	17.10	16.00	13.70	1.01	.968	1.06	16.9	16.4	12.9
April	16.80	15.40	13.60	.965	.988	1.08	17.4	15.7	12.6
May	16.10	15.30	14.30	1.02	1.03	1.10	15.8	14.8	13.0
June	15.80	16.10	16.00	1.03	1.03	1.16	15.3	15.4	13.8
July	16.60	16.90	17.10	1.05	1.04	1.19	15.8	16.3	14.4
August	17.30	17.40	16.80	1.04	1.02	1.19	16.6	17.2	13.9
September	17.50	18.20	15.40	1.04	1.04	1.21	16.8	17.4	12.7
October	16.60	16.40	15.20	1.02	1.02	1.08	16.3	16.3	14.1
November	15.70	16.20	---	.938	.938	---	16.7	17.3	---
December	16.10	15.70	---	.947	1.00	---	17.0	15.7	---
Average [1]	16.70	16.40	---	1.00	.998	---	16.6	16.4	---

[1] Simple average.

TABLE 7.—*Number of cattle and calves on farms Jan. 1, calf crop, number slaughtered, and imports, United States, 1955 to date*

[By 1,000 head]

Year	Number of farms Jan. 1		Calf crop	Imports	Number slaughtered		
	Cattle and calves	Cows			Cattle	Calves	Total
1955	96,592	49,121	42,112	314	26,588	12,864	39,452
1956	95,900	48,283	41,376	159	27,755	12,999	440,754
1957	92,860	46,859	39,905	728	27,068	12,353	39,421
1958	91,176	45,430	38,860	1,152	24,368	9,738	34,106
1959	93,322	45,244	38,938	709	23,722	8,072	31,794
1960	96,236	45,871	39,353	663	26,026	8,611	34,637
1961	97,319	46,370	39,954	1,043	26,467	8,081	34,548
1962	99,782	47,379	40,960	1,250	26,905	7,854	34,759
1963	[1] 103,530	[1] 48,594	41,752	[2] 1,100	[2] 28,100	[2] 7,300	[2] 35,400
1964	[3] 106.5–107	---	---	---	---	---	---

[1] Preliminary. [2] Partly forecast. [3] Forecast.

Specified costs and net returns in 6 selected Corn Belt cattle feeding programs, 1961–62 and 1962–63 [1]

Feeding program	1961–62				1962–63			
	Price per 100 pounds			Net return per head [2]	Price per 100 pounds			Net return per head [2]
	Paid for feeder	Received for fed cattle	Margin		Paid for feeder	Received for fed cattle	Margin	
CALVES								
Heifer calves, short fed: Bought as Good and Choice, September–October. Sold as Choice, June–July	$25.01	$25.21	+$0.20	$29.88	$26.20	$23.40	−$2.80	$7.14
Steer calves, long fed: Bought as Good and Choice, September–November. Sold as Choice, August–October	27.86	29.18	+1.32	64.87	30.49	24.24	−6.25	1.46
YEARLINGS								
Medium yearling steers, short fed: Bought as Medium, September–October. Sold as Good-Standard, January–February	21.14	24.35	+3.21	18.34	21.89	24.33	+2.44	12.11
Good yearling steers, short fed: Bought as Good, September–November. Sold as Choice, April–June	23.79	26.24	+2.45	28.08	25.74	23.02	−2.72	−20.12
Yearling steers long fed: Bought as Good and Choice, September–November. Sold as Prime, July–September	24.68	30.14	+5.46	72.41	26.99	25.02	−1.97	−4.74
HEAVY STEERS								
Heavy steers, short fed: Bought as Good, September–November. Sold as Choice and Prime, March–May	22.44	28.23	+5.80	54.19	24.62	23.91	−0.71	−17.14

[1] Feeding programs designed to be fairly representative of average feeding programs in the Corn Belt. Feeders are purchased in Kansas City and sold at Chicago.

[2] Net return over cost of corn, hay, protein supplement, pasture, transportation and marketing expenses. Does not include labor, overhead, cost of other feeds and death loss, or credit for manure and for hogs following feeders.

Steer prices at Chicago by weight group and differences between grades, by months, 1960–61

PRIME

Month	1960			1961			Difference in prices between Prime and Choice (all weights)	
	900 to 1,100 pounds	1,100 to 1,300 pounds	Margin	900 to 1,100 pounds	1,100 to 1,300 pounds	Margin	1960	1961
January	$27.90	$28.14	$0.24	$29.00	$28.90	−$0.10	$1.65	$1.37
February	28.51	28.54	.03	27.96	27.60	−.36	1.78	1.57
March	30.53	31.33	.80	27.42	27.41	−.01	2.98	1.67
April	30.50	31.09	.59	26.98	27.22	.24	3.07	2.09
May	30.28	31.01	.73	25.15	25.32	.17	3.42	1.73
June	28.82	29.47	.65	23.81	23.56	−.25	2.77	.99
July	27.44	27.86	.42	23.46	22.88	−.58	1.74	.70
August	26.32	26.60	.28	25.07	24.95	−.12	1.28	.88
September	25.92	26.06	.14	25.01	25.10	.09	1.11	.80
October	26.08	26.09	.01	25.26	25.55	.29	.95	.78
November	27.22	27.24	.02	26.25	26.59	.34	1.06	1.00
December	27.96	28.06	.10	26.95	27.40	.45	1.11	1.20

CHOICE

Month	1960			1961			Difference in prices between Choice and Good (all weights)	
	900 to 1,100 pounds	1,100 to 1,300 pounds	Margin	900 to 1,100 pounds	1,100 to 1,300 pounds	Margin	1960	1961
January	$26.74	$26.39	−$0.35	$27.97	$27.15	−$0.82	$1.68	$1.83
February	27.23	26.75	−.48	26.66	25.84	−.82	1.59	1.94
March	28.46	28.49	.03	25.92	25.71	−.21	2.17	1.86
April	28.08	28.24	.16	25.26	25.14	−.12	2.07	1.59
May	27.84	27.98	.14	23.67	23.49	−.18	1.99	1.36
June	26.24	26.42	.18	23.04	22.38	−.66	1.89	.80
July	25.73	25.63	−.10	23.03	22.07	−.96	1.54	.64
August	25.01	24.85	−.16	24.35	23.82	−.53	1.36	.81
September	24.91	24.69	−.22	24.45	24.20	−.25	1.23	.77
October	25.12	24.93	−.19	24.59	24.60	.01	1.13	.94
November	26.41	26.10	−.31	25.48	25.54	.06	1.15	1.16
December	27.03	26.61	−.42	26.14	26.14	0	1.44	1.44

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service, Livestock Division.

Steer prices at Chicago by weight group and differences between grades, by months, 1962–63

PRIME

Month	1962			1963			Difference in prices between Prime and Choice (all weights)	
	900 to 1,100 pounds	1,100 to 1,300 pounds	Margin	900 to 1,100 pounds	1,100 to 1,300 pounds	Margin	1962	1963
January	$27.36	$27.92	$0.56	$28.26	$28.53	$0.27	$1.46	$1.17
February	28.00	28.63	.63	25.94	26.02	.08	1.89	1.17
March	28.88	29.97	1.09	24.79	24.92	.13	2.81	1.18
April	28.80	30.35	1.55	24.82	25.07	.25	2.69	.98
May	27.36	28.21	.85	23.79	23.75	−.04	2.30	.88
June	26.58	27.25	.67	23.78	23.79	.01	1.89	.52
July	27.03	27.86	.83	25.58	25.69	.11	1.40	.88
August	29.25	30.06	.81	25.38	25.26	−.12	1.88	.52
September	31.18	32.55	1.37	24.75	24.64	−.11	2.60	.39
October	30.51	31.63	1.12	24.72	24.90	.18	2.10	.74
November	30.94	31.96	1.02	--------	--------	--------	1.74	--------
December	29.65	30.62	.97	--------	--------	--------	1.82	--------

Steer prices at Chicago by weight group and differences between grades, by month, 1962–63—Continued

CHOICE

Month	1962			1963			Difference in prices between Choice and Good (all weights)	
	900 to 1,100 pounds	1,100 to 1,300 pounds	Margin	900 to 1,100 pounds	1,100 to 1,300 pounds	Margin	1962	1963
January	$26.27	$26.50	$0.23	$27.21	$27.27	$0.06	$1.75	$1.70
February	26.74	26.94	.20	25.11	24.86	−.25	2.22	1.24
March	27.34	27.69	.35	23.94	23.75	−.19	2.33	1.24
April	27.60	28.22	.62	24.06	24.02	−.04	2.01	1.04
May	26.10	26.46	.36	22.99	22.67	−.32	1.69	.94
June	25.29	25.50	.21	22.99	22.90	−.09	1.35	.79
July	26.22	26.58	.36	24.85	24.75	−.10	1.55	1.16
August	27.42	28.34	.92	24.88	24.52	−.36	1.89	.76
September	29.55	30.14	.59	24.10	23.62	−.48	2.23	.74
October	29.06	29.92	.86	24.11	23.93	−.18	1.80	.75
November	29.74	30.62	.88				1.85	
December	28.61	29.20	.59				1.89	

Source: Livestock and Meat Situation, Nov. 8, 1963, Economic Research Service.

Slaughter steers—Monthly average price: Chicago

	1960	1961	1962	1963
CHOICE GRADE (100 POUNDS)				
January	$26.42	$27.42	$26.39	$27.27
February	26.69	26.17	26.76	24.93
March	28.08	25.70	27.31	23.63
April	27.76	25.05	27.45	23.77
May	27.43	23.43	26.02	22.61
June	26.04	22.45	25.25	22.69
July	25.64	22.38	26.50	24.72
August	25.07	24.13	28.19	24.60
September	24.80	24.34	29.85	23.94
October	24.94	24.55	29.50	24.03
November	26.08	25.58	30.13	
December	26.86	26.13	28.91	
Average	26.24	24.65	27.67	
ALL GRADES				
January	$26.10	$27.02	$25.90	$26.90
February	26.37	25.84	26.04	24.69
March	27.40	25.33	26.65	23.30
April	27.13	24.73	26.80	23.51
May	26.75	23.09	25.62	22.43
June	25.58	22.30	24.91	22.54
July	25.30	22.23	26.12	24.66
August	24.75	24.01	27.88	24.47
September	24.62	24.21	29.63	23.80
October	24.83	24.45	29.29	23.97
November	26.00	25.44	29.89	
December	26.61	25.84	28.59	
Average	25.93	24.46	27.20	

Source: Livestock Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Beef-steer-corn price ratios, Chicago basis [1]

	1960	1961	1962	1963 [2]
January	22.8	24.5	24.0	22.8
February	23.4	22.9	24.2	20.7
March	23.8	22.9	24.1	19.2
April	22.5	22.9	24.0	19.5
May	22.1	20.4	22.3	18.3
June	21.3	20.0	21.9	17.5
July	21.2	19.6	23.4	18.6
August	20.9	21.3	25.4	18.5
September	21.1	21.9	26.7	17.7
October	23.5	22.4	26.6	20.3
November	27.1	23.2	27.8	
December	26.2	23.9	25.5	
Average	23.0	22.2	24.7	

[1] Bushels of No. 3 yellow corn equivalent in value to 100 pounds of beef steers from the Corn Belt, sold out of 1st loads at Chicago for slaughter, all grades. Explanation and example: The price of slaughter steers per hundredweight at Chicago in March was equivalent in value to 19.2 bushels of corn, as compared to 26.2 in December 1960, the last month of the Eisenhower administration and below.

[2] Preliminary.

Source: Feed Situation, ERS, USDA.

Production Credit Administration loans for the purchase of feeder cattle [1]

	Value	Number
1956	$97,093,000	32,246
1962	252,705,000	36,319

[1] Based on a 10-percent sampling.

Source: Library of Congress (Production Credit Association, under the Farm Credit Administration, is an independent agency located in the Agriculture Department Bldg.)

Total military purchases centrally procured by the Defense Supply Agency for shipment on worldwide basis

	Fiscal year 1960		Fiscal year 1961		Fiscal year 1962	
	Pounds	Value	Pounds	Value	Pounds	Value
Carcass beef	131,000,000	$55,500,000	119,000,000	$46,700,000	100,000,000	$39,400,000
Boneless beef	105,000,000	73,100,000	108,000,000	70,500,000	129,000,000	88,500,000
Other beef	39,000,000	20,400,000	40,000,000	18,000,000	39,000,000	18,800,000
Total	275,000,000	149,000,000	267,000,000	136,000,000	268,000,000	146,700,000

Source: Defense Supply Agency.

Loans under the Farmers Home Administration

Operating loans	Total loans		Loans, purchase of livestock	
	United States	Iowa	United States	Iowa
Fiscal year 1960	$198,275,519	$6,900,252	$41,232,481	$1,772,545
Fiscal year 1961	233,324,651	7,470,708	50,626,238	1,934,145
Fiscal year 1962	275,324,354	9,064,103	66,071,218	2,328,757
Fiscal year 1963	300,467,098	12,926,192	74,801,495	2,972,373

Source: Operating Loan Division, Farmers, Home Administration, Department of Agriculture.

Estimated impact on cattle prices of a 10-percent change in imports of beef and veal under different assumed levels of imports[1]

[In percent]

Assumed levels of imports as percent of total domestic production[2]	Estimated effect of a 10-percent change in imports on price of—[3]	
	Choice steers at Chicago	Utility cows at Chicago
5	−0.7	−1.7
10	−1.1	−2.7
15	−1.4	−3.5
20	−1.6	−4.0

[1] Livestock and meat situation, November 1963, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

[2] Domestic production of beef and veal are held constant at 1962-63 levels.

[3] The estimated effects of beef and veal imports on cattle prices are based on the supply-price relationships shown in the following table.

The effect of selected factors on the price of Choice steers and Utility cows at Chicago as measured by a statistical analysis, 1948-62[1]

[In percent]

Selected factor	Deflated price at Chicago of—	
	Choice steers	Utility cows
Effect on price of a 1-percent change in—		
Per capita supply of steer and heifer beef	−1.33	−2.29
Per capita supply of cow beef plus imports of beef and veal	−.29	−.74
Per capita consumption of pork, veal, lamb, and mutton	[2] −.27	−1.20
Per capita disposable income deflated by Consumer Price Index	1.25	2.61

[1] Based on statistical (regression) analyses using annual data in logarithms for the period 1948-62. The regression analysis also included a shift variable (0-1 variable) which took into account that conditions may have been different in the period 1948-57 and 1958-62.

[2] Coefficient does not differ significantly from zero when tested at the 5-percent level.

Source: "Livestock and Meat Situation," November 1963, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Production and consumption per person of red meat and poultry, United States, 1955–63 and forecast for 1964

PRODUCTION (million pounds)[1]

Year	Red meat					Poultry meat[2]	Red and poultry meat
	Beef	Veal	Lamb and mutton	Pork	Total		
1955	13,569	1,578	758	10,990	26,895	4,390	31,285
1956	14,462	1,632	741	11,200	28,035	5,174	33,209
1957	14,202	1,526	707	10,424	26,859	5,438	32,297
1958	13,330	1,186	688	10,454	25,658	6,043	31,701
1959	13,580	1,008	738	11,993	27,319	6,353	33,672
1960	14,727	1,108	768	11,605	28,208	6,390	34,598
1961	15,298	1,044	832	11,411	28,585	7,334	35,919
1962	15,296	1,015	809	11,841	29,961	7,132	36,093
1963 [3]	16,470	940	760	12,200	30,370	7,300	37,670
1964 [4]	16,950	900	750	12,000	30,600	7,450	38,050

CONSUMPTION PER PERSON (pounds)

Year	Red meat					Poultry meat[2]	Red and poultry meat
	Beef	Veal	Lamb and mutton	Pork	Total		
1955	82.0	9.4	4.6	66.8	162.8	26.3	189.1
1956	85.4	9.5	4.5	67.3	166.7	29.6	196.3
1957	84.6	8.8	4.2	61.1	158.7	31.4	190.1
1958	80.5	6.7	4.2	60.2	151.6	34.1	185.7
1959	81.4	5.7	4.8	67.6	159.5	35.2	194.7
1960	85.2	6.2	4.8	65.2	161.4	34.4	195.8
1961	88.0	5.7	5.1	62.2	161.0	37.8	198.8
1962	89.1	5.5	5.2	63.9	163.7	37.2	200.9
1963 [3]	95.1	5.0	4.9	64.9	169.9	37.4	207.3
1964 [4]	97.0	4.8	4.7	63.5	170.0	37.8	207.8

[1] Production of red meats is carcass weight equivalent of production from total U.S. slaughter.

[2] Chicken, including commercial broilers, and turkeys, ready-to-cook (eviscerated) basis.

[3] Preliminary.

[4] Forecast.

U.S. beef and veal imports, carcass weight equivalent

[Thousands of pounds]

Year	Beef								Total veal	Total beef and veal
	Fresh and frozen	Pickled and cured	Canned	Sausage	Other beef	Other canned n.s.p.f.	Boneless	Total beef		
1954	7,520	27,416	168,784	398	8,187	5,766	12,537	230,608	1,048	231,656
1955	6,112	6,172	172,498	371	8,305	6,629	28,674	228,761	275	229,036
1956	5,140	9,799	143,999	468	7,338	6,915	36,894	210,553	245	210,798
1957	32,863	12,794	188,624	586	7,976	18,975	128,520	390,338	4,878	395,216
1958	58,880	7,250	224,606	874	12,691	176,753	414,488	895,542	13,506	909,048
1959	39,136	8,407	187,441	1,230	10,439	120,083	680,317	1,047,053	16,138	1,063,191
1960	14,685	1,107	151,538	1,135	8,369	26,636	556,765	760,235	15,275	775,510
1961	25,096	1,115	188,563	1,128	10,010	29,833	764,905	1,020,650	16,474	1,037,124
1962	18,767	620	166,238	1,159	16,223	28,908	1,187,632	1,419,547	25,511	1,445,058
1963 (January-August)	12,255	533	148,626	669	12,123	22,461	876,756	1,073,423	12,100	1,085,523

U.S. production of beef and veal by major classes, imports of beef and veal, and prices

Year	Production of steer and heifer beef, and veal[1]		Production of cow and bull beef[1]		Imports of beef and veal[2]		Cow and bull beef production plus imports		Prices at Chicago	
	Actual	Per capita	Actual	Per capita	Actual	Per capita	Actual	Per capita	Utility cows	Choice steers
	Million pounds	*Pounds*	*Million pounds*	*Pounds*	*Million pounds*	*Pounds*	*Million pounds*	*Pounds*		
1947	7,564	53.0	4,025	28.5	64	0.4	4,089	28.7	$14.26	$26.22
1948	6,495	44.7	3,594	24.8	356	2.4	3,950	27.2	19.49	30.96
1949	7,412	50.2	2,970	20.1	254	1.7	3,224	21.8	16.33	26.07
1950	7,235	48.2	3,150	21.0	505	3.4	3,655	24.3	19.36	29.68
1951	6,543	43.3	2,978	19.7	575	3.8	3,553	23.5	24.48	35.96
1952	7,482	48.8	2,935	19.1	476	3.1	3,411	22.2	19.53	33.18
1953	9,760	62.6	3,746	24.0	333	2.1	4,079	26.1	12.41	24.14
1954	10,031	63.0	4,121	25.9	267	1.7	4,449	28.0	11.46	24.66
1955	10,251	63.2	4,449	27.4	322	2.0	4,771	29.4	11.52	23.16
1956	11,262	68.1	4,369	26.4	254	1.5	4,623	28.0	11.37	22.30
1957	11,208	66.6	4,086	24.3	616	3.7	4,702	27.9	13.61	23.83
1958	10,894	63.6	3,192	18.6	1,249	7.3	4,441	25.9	18.41	27.42
1959	11,278	64.6	2,884	16.5	1,254	7.2	4,138	23.7	17.79	27.83
1960	12,387	69.8	3,012	17.0	938	5.3	3,950	22.3	15.68	26.24
1961	13,137	72.8	2,753	15.3	1,287	7.1	4,040	22.4	15.66	24.65
1962	12,945	70.8	2,922	16.0	1,725	9.4	4,677	25.6	15.50	27.67

[1] Estimated from total commercial slaughter.

[2] Includes meat equivalent of live animals imported.

Inspected imports of cattle (number) by months, 1961 to date [1]

Month	From Canada			From Mexico		
	1961	1962	1963	1961	1962	1963
January	22,821	23,371	29,253	68,909	82,886	105,876
February	8,618	14,694	15,383	47,411	83,777	71,382
March	9,837	24,412	11,997	59,976	83,568	58,070
April	14,744	27,411	22,422	65,741	73,673	84,077
May	18,560	32,784	17,533	32,109	50,970	46,297
June	13,822	16,870	11,480	8,311	15,085	15,326
July	32,867	14,476	9,205	3,944	8,748	14,681
August	59,886	21,978	10,090	11,061	16,547	10,154
September	65,101	28,402	----------	16,319	25,594	----------
October	122,866	101,066	----------	43,396	71,273	----------
November	110,327	135,561	----------	78,986	129,043	----------
December	27,352	57,757	----------	104,034	131,751	----------
Year	506,301	498,782	----------	540,197	772,915	----------

[1] Inspected when offered for importation.

Compiled from reports of the Animal Inspection and Quarantine Division of the Agricultural Research Service.

Imports of cattle from Canada and Mexico, excluding breeding animals, 1952 to date

FROM CANADA

Year	Dutiable cattle (head)				
	700 pounds and over		Under 200 pounds	200 to 699 pounds	Total dutiable cattle
	Cows for dairy purposes	Other			
1952 [1]	4,636	4,244	714	968	10,562
1953 [2]	21,811	22,931	3,515	896	49,153
1954	17,633	46,798	2,872	3,377	70,680
1955	25,252	17,543	3,256	2,218	48,269
1956	22,678	2,914	3,571	1,390	30,553
1957	18,857	186,036	10,486	151,059	366,438
1958	19,586	230,025	13,580	373,671	636,862
1959	14,998	90,259	30,738	186,630	322,625
1960	20,247	60,865	32,079	140,471	253,662
1961	24,972	88,660	28,605	337,452	479,689
1962	15,481	72,205	41,315	351,336	480,337
1963, January–July	6,776	34,899	35,471	30,324	107,470

[1] Imports prohibited beginning Feb. 25, 1962, due to foot-and-mouth disease.
[2] Embargo removed Mar. 1, 1953.
[3] Embargo removed Sept. 1, 1952.

FROM MEXICO

Year	Dutiable cattle (head)				
	700 pounds and over		Under 200 pounds	200 to 699 pounds	Total dutiable cattle
	Cows for dairy purposes	Other			
1952 [3]	2,381	43,617	96	81,185	127,279
1953 [4]	175	25,364	485	101,901	127,925
1954	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
1955 [5]	1,424	56,153	539	189,631	247,747
1956	1,684	11,124	848	96,594	110,250
1957	480	44,236	7,914	283,842	336,472
1958	1,255	80,589	3,231	403,166	488,241
1959	1,597	45,697	1,037	317,095	365,426
1960	371	19,631	1,773	369,113	390,888
1961	46	36,410	8,655	497,999	543,110
1962	34	36,732	24,925	690,228	751,919
1963, January–July	7	16,078	23,408	391,004	430,497

[4] Imports prohibited beginning May 23, 1953.
[5] Embargo removed Jan. 1, 1955.

Source: Compiled from official records of the Bureau of the Census.

Meat exports: U.S. exports and shipments by countries, 1958 to date

[In million of pounds]

Product and year	Exports, by destination, product weight										Shipments to territories [1]	Total exports and shipments	
	Canada	Mexico	Bahamas	West Germany	Jamaica	Trinidad	Netherlands	Venezuela	All other	Total		Product weight	Carcass weight equivalent
Beef and veal:													
1958	15.8	0.4	1.0	(2)	1.1	0.5	(2)	0.6	5.4	24.8	8.8	33.6	49
1959	17.6	.4	1.4	(2)	1.1	.2	0.1	1.0	5.6	27.4	9.9	37.3	53
1960	19.5	.2	1.8	----------	1.3	.3	.2	.8	5.3	29.4	12.3	41.7	56
1961	18.9	.2	1.8	(2)	1.6	.5	.1	.1	6.7	29.9	13.3	43.2	58
1962	16.9	.1	1.9	(2)	1.2	.2	.1	(2)	6.7	27.1	13.8	40.9	53
Lamb and mutton:													
1958	.4	(2)	.1	----------	(2)	(2)	----------	(2)	.2	.7	----------	.7	2
1959	.4	.1	.2	(2)	(2)	(2)	----------	(2)	.1	.8	----------	.8	2
1960	.7	(2)	.2	----------	(2)	(2)	----------	(2)	.6	1.5	----------	1.5	2
1961	.5	(2)	.2	(2)	(2)	(2)	.4	(2)	.5	1.6	----------	1.6	2
1962	.5	(2)	.2	----------	(2)	----------	----------	(2)	1.3	2.0	----------	2.0	3
Pork:													
1958	1.1	5.8	1.6	1.9	1.6	1.2	.7	3.1	37.3	54.3	48.2	102.5	118
1959	1.1	11.0	1.4	3.4	2.0	1.4	1.8	4.1	44.7	70.9	55.4	126.3	143
1960	16.3	5.5	2.0	1.5	2.7	2.8	.5	5.1	33.0	69.4	53.3	122.7	138
1961	36.2	6.7	1.8	2.3	2.9	2.9	.7	6.4	8.4	68.3	56.8	125.2	139
1962	33.8	6.7	1.8	1.5	3.5	3.3	.2	5.1	7.8	63.7	57.5	121.2	132
Total: [3]													
1958	20.4	6.5	2.9	1.9	2.8	1.8	.7	5.9	48.0	90.9	78.0	168.9	169
1959	22.6	11.9	3.1	3.5	3.2	1.7	1.9	7.3	53.6	108 8.	85.5	194.3	198
1960	37.2	5.9	4.3	1.7	4.1	3.2	.7	8.0	42.5	107.6	87.4	195.0	196
1961	56.2	7.1	4.1	2.5	4.6	3.5	.8	7.0	19.8	105.6	95.0	200.6	199
1962	51.7	7.0	4.0	1.5	4.9	3.7	.4	5.3	19.3	97.8	98.2	196.0	198

[1] Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands and Guam.
[2] Less than 50,000 pounds.
[3] Including sausage, bologna and frankfurters canned and not canned, sausage ingredients, meat and meat products not elsewhere classified, and canned baby food.

Source: Compiled from official records of the Bureau of Census.

Meat animal imports: Number of cattle, sheep, and hogs imported, United States, 1940 to date [1]

Year	Cattle									Sheep and lambs			Hogs		
	700 pounds and over			Under 700 pounds			Dutiable cattle	Breeding cattle (free) [2]	Total cattle	Dutiable	Breeding sheep (free) [2]	Total sheep and lambs	Dutiable [3]	Breeding hogs (free) [2]	Total hogs [3]
	Cows for dairy purposes	Other	Total	Under 200 pounds	200 to 699 pounds	Total									
1940	9,600	169,720	179,320	104,602	346,289	450,891	30,211	13,621	643,832	205	3,178	3,383	274	38	312
1941	13,387	205,488	218,875	102,195	412,312	514,507	733,382	16,375	749,757	8,373	3,829	12,202	45,117	50	45,167
1942	19,566	180,054	199,620	66,518	386,495	453,013	652,633	16,218	668,851	1,859	3,604	5,463	460	89	549
1943	34,934	77,520	112,454	14,269	502,909	517,178	629,632	22,978	652,610	1,404	2,884	4,288	79	521	600
1944	33,624	25,696	59,320	5,861	276,297	282,158	341,478	16,791	358,269	137,476	3,257	140,733	25	192	217
1945	43,984	41,995	85,979	9,742	393,672	403,414	489,393	22,230	511,623	97,969	3,171	101,140	80	545	625
1946	66,085	25,915	92,000	10,053	413,665	423,718	515,718	42,186	557,904	3,885	3,627	7,512	115	1,189	1,304
1947	43,917	888	44,805	7,642	2,010	9,652	54,457	30,048	84,505	868	4,829	5,697	255	2,925	3,180
1948	84,275	214,645	298,920	23,571	96,335	119,906	418,826	42,853	461,679	50,517	3,892	54,409	355	2,028	2,383
1949	49,061	194,916	243,977	41,535	126,614	168,149	412,126	21,332	433,458	38,562	2,692	41,254	50	1,335	1,385
1950	46,591	173,000	219,591	38,985	179,709	218,694	438,285	22,684	460,969	97,127	3,340	100,467	120	865	985
1951	35,626	117,479	153,105	15,609	51,107	66,716	219,821	19,138	238,959	14,312	2,591	16,903	950	535	1,485
1952	7,017	47,941	54,958	810	82,280	83,090	138,048	2,413	140,461	304	603	907	185	11	196
1953	22,009	48,320	70,329	4,000	102,831	106,831	177,160	21,066	198,226	868	1,283	2,151	24,030	395	24,425
1954	17,633	46,798	64,431	2,872	3,377	6,249	70,680	15,376	86,056	1,480	(4)	1,480	30,715	(4)	30,715
1955	26,676	73,696	100,372	3,795	191,849	195,644	296,016	18,361	314,377	7,640	----------	7,640	6,588	----------	6,588
1956	24,364	14,038	38,402	4,419	97,984	102,403	140,805	18,554	159,359	3,158	----------	3,158	382	----------	382
1957	19,342	230,272	249,614	18,400	434,901	453,301	702,915	24,938	727,853	17,832	----------	17,832	746	----------	746
1958	20,841	311,724	332,565	16,811	776,837	793,648	1,126,213	26,194	1,152,407	39,769	----------	39,769	9,094	----------	9,049
1959	16,600	135,956	152,556	31,775	503,725	535,500	688,056	20,699	708,755	75,521	----------	75,521	2,367	----------	2,367
1960	20,618	80,496	101,114	33,852	509,584	543,436	644,550	18,624	663,174	49,767	----------	49,767	6,162	----------	6,162
1961	25,018	125,070	150,088	37,260	835,451	872,711	1,022,799	19,922	1,042,721	979	----------	979	3,151	----------	3,151
1962	15,515	108,937	124,452	66,240	1,041,564	1,107,804	1,232,256	17,773	1,250,029	20,845	----------	20,845	3,277	----------	3,277

[1] Imports for consumption 1940 to date. Imports from Virgin Islands not included.

[2] Includes other imports not subject to duty.

[3] Imports reported in pounds beginning 1940; pounds converted to 200-pound hog equivalent.

[4] Sheep and hogs for breeding are included with "Animals for breeding n.e.c." beginning 1954.

U.S. imports of cattle and beef compared with U.S. production, by months, 1958–63

CATTLE AND CALVES AND BEEF AND VEAL

[In millions of pounds]

Year and item	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Year
1958													
Imports [1]	86	90	79	94	96	95	123	112	123	121	111	120	1,249
Domestic production [2]	1,317	1,046	1,076	1,113	1,152	1,169	1,244	1,171	1,242	1,323	1,059	1,174	14,086
Imports: Percent of domestic production	6.5	8.6	7.3	8.4	8.3	8.1	9.9	9.6	9.9	9.1	10.5	10.2	8.9
1959													
Imports [1]	103	88	79	108	115	131	108	114	143	86	73	106	1,254
Domestic production [2]	1,202	1,013	1,102	1,172	1,141	1,185	1,246	1,159	1,264	1,278	1,160	1,240	14,162
Imports: Percent of domestic production	8.6	8.7	7.2	9.3	10.1	11.1	8.7	9.8	11.3	6.8	6.3	8.5	8.9
1960													
Imports [1]	73	72	74	90	72	76	85	113	81	64	62	76	938
Domestic production [2]	1,275	1,162	1,284	1,141	1,279	1,332	1,251	1,406	1,399	1,360	1,281	1,229	15,399
Imports: Percent of domestic production	5.7	6.2	5.8	7.9	5.6	5.7	6.8	8.0	5.8	4.7	4.8	6.2	6.1
1961													
Imports [1]	75	66	80	99	78	111	117	153	111	134	151	112	1,287
Domestic production [2]	1,316	1,159	1,324	1,209	1,400	1,412	1,279	1,433	1,352	1,427	1,321	1,240	15,890
Imports: Percent of domestic production	5.7	5.7	7.0	8.2	5.6	7.9	9.1	10.7	8.2	9.4	11.4	9.0	8.1
1962													
Imports [1]	121	98	170	119	99	119	118	182	168	165	191	176	1,725
Domestic production [2]	1,409	1,180	1,310	1,212	1,391	1,348	1,360	1,429	1,275	1,450	1,288	1,215	15,867
Imports: Percent of domestic production	8.6	8.3	13.0	9.8	7.1	8.8	8.7	12.7	13.2	11.4	14.8	14.5	10.9
1963													
Imports [1]	121	175	158	119	149	125	175	181	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------
Domestic production [2]	1,424	1,230	1,344	1,369	1,470	1,373	1,442	1,473	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------
Imports: Percent of domestic production	8.5	14.2	11.8	8.7	10.1	9.1	12.1	12.3	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------

[1] Beef, veal, and meat equivalent of live cattle and calf imports.

[2] Commercial beef and veal production. (Does not include farm slaughter.)

Utility cows—Average prices, 12 markets

	1961	1962
Chicago	$15.66	$15.50
Denver	16.17	15.79
Fort Worth	15.45	14.94
Indianapolis	15.14	15.06
Kansas City	15.76	15.58
Oklahoma City	15.14	14.76
Omaha	15.65	15.37
St. Joseph	15.52	15.06
St. Louis	15.72	15.40
Sioux City	15.57	15.47
Sioux Falls	15.37	14.68
South St. Paul	15.40	15.31

Source: Market News, Department of Agriculture.

Utility cows—Average number of head [1]

[Cows make up 20 percent of all slaughter cattle. Utility cows make up 25 percent of all cows]

	Total, national slaughter of cattle	Total cows	Total, utility cows
1961	25,500,000	5,100,000	1,275,000
1962	26,000,000	5,200,000	1,300,000
1963 [2]	----------	----------	----------

[1] These figures are an estimate.

[2] The 1963 figure will run a little higher than the 1962 figure.

Source: Market News, Agriculture Department.

Utility cows—Average prices, Chicago market

	1961	1962	1963
January	$15.70	$14.87	$15.07
February	16.14	15.26	15.00
March	16.48	15.97	15.52
April	16.95	16.06	15.74
May	16.53	15.91	16.31
June	16.52	16.42	16.28
July	15.03	15.31	15.33
August	15.42	15.20	15.65
September	14.70	15.65	15.10
October	14.78	15.31	14.64
November	14.70	15.22	--------
December	14.97	14.91	--------
Yearly average	15.66	15.50	15.36

Source: Market News, Agriculture Department.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SIMPSON. First, Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Iowa for his exhaustive research on this important question. The Senator is making a vital contribution, which should be given consideration by the committee.

I invite the attention of the Senator from Iowa to the fact that, in January of this year, I was joined by a distinguished group of Senators in introducing a bill, S. 557, which would curb the extensive beef imports which are depressing cattle prices in this country. Our bill would establish an annual quota equal to the average annual quantity of beef imported during the preceding 5-year period. I assume the Senator is familiar with that bill.

If the bill were passed, our country would continue to import a reasonable quantity of beef to meet the supplemental beef needs of the country, and it would curtail the excessive imports of beef and veal, which pose such a threat to the cattleman.

As the Senator probably knows, recently the American National Cattlemen's Association, and other persons connected with State associations, have gone to New Zealand and Australia to do what the administration should be doing to protect the cattlemen and feeders, in order to establish some kind of rapport with New Zealand and Australia and bring about a voluntary restriction by those countries with respect to imports to this country. Does not the Senator feel that under the law the administration should have taken care of this matter?

Mr. MILLER. I do not believe it ought to be even a matter of law. It ought to be a matter of commonsense for nonelected public officials, who are being supported by the taxpayers, including the very people who are hurt by the depressed cattle prices, to have enough initiative by themselves to start trying to work out some kind of voluntary reduction in imports so far as these two countries are concerned. There are other countries also, but I focus attention on these two counties because of the tremendous increase in imports from them. It should have been a matter of plain, good administrative judgment.

Mr. SIMPSON. No doubt the Senator from Iowa remembers that on September 24 of this year the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] delivered an excellent speech, in which he called attention to a law which gives President Kennedy complete authority to eliminate the excessive beef import problem. The authority is contained in section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, which provides:

> The President is authorized to negotiate agreements with foreign governments in an effort to limit the export to the United States of agricultural commodities or products.

At that time the Senator from Nebraska appealed to the President to act under authority granted to him by Congress. Does the Senator recall that speech?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; I appreciate the Senator's bringing up this point at this time, because it is very pertinent. Most of my remarks today have been directed at the Secretary of Agriculture. I wish to make it clear that I never said that the Secretary of Agriculture had the power to stop imports or to reduce imports. What I have said is that he should at least have enough gumption to go to the Secretary of Commerce or to the President and ask him to utilize the powers he already has. Instead of that he has compounded the problem by treating with disdain the statistics which his own Department has published, and using an ostrichlike approach. That is the reason why I do not believe the Secretary of Agriculture is a friend of the American farmers, particularly of the livestock men.

Mr. SIMPSON. I agree with the Senator. It is my belief, as well as the feeling and opinion throughout the Rocky Mountain States, especially in the State of Wyoming, that there is need for relief, and that the reason why we have not received relief is that the Kennedy administration is not sympathetic toward the livestock men; otherwise the administration would have employed the law already on the statute books.

There is drastic need for relief. We have not received it; and one reason is that the Kennedy administration is not sympathetic to the livestock man. If this administration understood the livestock industry or was interested in it we would not be experiencing these difficulties, because this serious situation could be corrected administratively.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Wyoming well knows that if there is any segment of our economy which is completely independent and is not leaning on the Government, it is the livestock industry.

He also knows that if there is any idea that the way to handle agricultural production is through supply management by some nonelected government official, who feels that the way to start chipping away is to get hold of the livestock industry and cause it to fall into such a plight that it has to look to the government for price supports and the accompanying regulations, the freedom of the agricultural industry in general, and the livestock industry in particular, will be a closed book. This possibly could motivate some of the nonelected public officials in the Department of Agriculture and elsewhere in their apparent disinclination to do anything about this situation, even to ignore it. But it is unfair to suggest that when cattlemen complain about imports of beef and veal, they are wrong; that they do not know what they talking about, when the Department of Agriculture Research Division itself knows that if imports rise to 10 percent—and they have been much higher than that—we can expect a 1-percent drop in the income from choice steers and a 3-percent drop in the income from utility cows alone.

Mr. SIMPSON. Would not that be a severe blow to the State of Kansas and to the other Plains States and the Rocky Mountain States?

Mr. MILLER. As the Senator from Wyoming knows, it has its effects, first of all, in the marketplace—the slaughter livestock marketplace and the cattle feeders in the Corn Belt, particularly Iowa, Nebraska, Illinois, Minnesota, and Kansas. In turn, if the slaughter livestock prices are depressed, that will inevitably affect the rancher who raises feeder cattle in the States of Wyoming, Montana, Colorado, and Nebraska, and in the Southern States as well.

In turn, if those producers are not going to be able to make a good income—if they incur losses of millions of dollars—they will not buy as much in goods and services, many of which are produced or performed in the Eastern States. So there is a chain reaction.

There is an old saying, and it has been proved so many times that I do not know why it even needs to be repeated, that there cannot be a healthy economy if basic industries, such as agriculture, are weak and depressed.

Mr. SIMPSON. I concur in the statement of the Senator from Iowa. I should like to lend further credibility to his excellent statement by pointing out that in 1960 the per capita civilian consumption of beef and veal in the United States was 91.4 pounds. The consumption rose to 95.4 pounds in 1962. During this 2-year period, the total meat consumption increased 4.3 percent, while the consumption of imported beef increased 81.8 percent. That is a good indication of the difficult situation confronting the livestock industry in America.

Mr. MILLER. As I said earlier, imports of beef and veal have more than doubled. I am not impressed merely by the percentage increase; I am impressed by the volume. When we consider 12 percent of our total domestic production and translate that into millions of pounds—over a billion pounds—and into the prices and the impact on the feed grain situation—because, after all, every one of those pounds could have contained some feed grain, and more feed grain could have been consumed in the United States. The 12 percent accounts for a staggering total.

So merely to slough off the figures and say, "It is not a significant impact on our livestock industry to have increased imports," or to look the other way and ignore the problem and hope that someone will not get hold of it, is a mistake, especially since no researchers have got hold of it. If Mr. Freeman thinks we are not going to say anything about it on the floor of the Senate, and if he thinks the American people will be led to believe that everything is fine, and that we are barking up the wrong tree with respect to imports, he is sorely mistaken.

Mr. SIMPSON. He has disregarded the spirit of the stockmen, who have not asked for Government assistance, but who want to live under a system of private enterprise, in which they conduct their own business and make their own markets.

Mr. MILLER. I do not know whether the State of the Senator from Wyoming was visited by the Secretary of Agriculture on his recent swing around the country. According to press releases, the Secretary was seeking to feel the pulse of the farmer, to find out what farmers were thinking. But the Senator from Iowa can report that the Secretary of Agriculture visited his State, and that on the basis of conversations I have had with persons who were present at the meetings and persons who attended meetings of other States, it appeared that Mr. Freeman made his swing around the country not so much to listen to what farmers wanted to tell him, as to tell farmers what he wanted them to hear.

It is all very well to publish advance releases to the effect that the Secretary is going out to listen to what farmers have to say and that he wants to get the grassroots feeling, but it is another thing to go out and tell the farmers what he wants them to hear. Then, if there is a question-and-answer period, someone is planted in the crowd, someone who has been tipped off ahead of time concerning the questions the Secretary would like to ask. That is one thing, and that is the way it has been. But it is quite another thing to announce a meeting and then to sit back and listen to the farmers get a load off their chests.

The Secretary of Agriculture could just as well have come to the Senate and talked with persons like the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson], who knows as well as any other Member of this body what the livestock picture is like, especially from the standpoint of the ranchers, because he has been in the industry himself, has been the Governor of his State, and knows as well as anyone else what the livestock situation is.

Mr. Freeman could have saved the taxpayers a large sum of money if, instead of running out to the Rocky Mountain area, he had sat down with the Senator from Wyoming for 20 or 30 minutes. He could have obtained from him all the information he needed, so far as the ranching area is concerned. Then the Secretary could have consulted with the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska and Mr. Curtis] and with my own colleague from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper], who is the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, a longtime Member of the Senate, a former Governor and Lieutenant Governor, and an experienced legislator, one who knows what farmers are thinking about. I see no reason for the Secretary to be running around the country at the taxpayers' expense, when he can obtain the needed information in Washington.

Mr. SIMPSON. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Iowa in that respect. Again, I compliment him for the excellent contribution he has made concerning this onerous problem, which must be solved for the welfare of the people of his own area and for the economy of the entire Rocky Mountain region, as well.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his kind remarks and constructive statements.

PROPOSED ANNUAL DISCLOSURE OF SOURCES OF INCOME AND FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS BY OFFICIALS AND STAFF MEMBERS OF EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE BRANCHES

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, Congress is now midway in the 11th month of the longest session in years. Unfortunately, the unusual length of the session is the only distinction—and a dubious distinction indeed—that this Congress has so far achieved.

It appears, however, that we may be on the verge of still another dubious distinction—a new low in public confidence in the integrity of the Congress as a whole. The resignation of the majority secretary and subsequent developments reported in the press have cast a reflection on the Congress as an institution, Members as well as staff.

Recently, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger] and I wrote to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration and urged that the provisions of our bill, S. 1261, of which the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] is a cosponsor, be made a part of the Baker inquiry established by Senate Resolution 2112. Our bill would require annual disclosure of all sources of income and financial transactions by elected as well as top appointed officials and by high level staff in both the executive and the legislative branches.

I am sure many Senators have been disturbed by the comments made on this subject—including one made by the majority leader, who, as I understand, has given at least tentative approval of the idea of disclosure.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. CASE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I was speaking personally, only.

Mr. CASE. Yes, and I should have made that clear, although I believe it was implicit in what I said.

The chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration has since indicated that the committee has decided that the "scope of its present inquiry be pertinent to the terms expressly declared in Senate Resolution 2112 itself." The chairman added:

> Of course, this does not mean that the desirable objectives of S. 1261 and related proposals could not receive the appropriate attention of the committee in due course.

We hope the committee will make very clear that the committee's decision does not rule out following up all aspects of the matter, no matter where they may lead, for the good name of the Senate is at stake. It will be vindicated only if the committee demonstrates its determination to let the chips fall where they may. Specifically, we hope the Rules Committee will not limit its recommendations to the staff of the Senate.

The senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] ably pointed the way for a searching, objective inquiry. His own unbiased factual approach has earned the respect and confidence of press and public. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record, in connection with my remarks, several newspaper articles concerning the distinguished Senator from Delaware and several editorials.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Elizabeth (N.J.) Daily Journal, Nov. 8, 1963]

Bad Practices in U.S. Government

Incidents in Washington hint that Congress may feel compelled to do something about its own waywardness in the broad field on conflict of interest as well as kindred laxity among others in Government, also the bureaucratic tendency to withhold information from the public. In fact, two bills that would rectify much of this complex situation have been introduced—without perceptible subsequent progress.

The bills are a draft by Senator Case of New Jersey and Senator Neuberger, of Oregon, requiring disclosure on interests that might subject a member of Congress, its staff, or others in the $20,000 category to suspicion of conflict, and another by Senator Long of Missouri dispelling secrecy by various offices.

Either, if law, probably would have squelched the lush activities of the resigned Senate majority clerk, Robert Baker, who appears to have become a capitalist and entrepreneur on a $20,000 salary. Nobody likes to deprecate or tarnish another's ability to prosper, but the circumstances surrounding Mr. Baker's operations are grounds for the inquiry the Senate is contemplating.

If his activities were the only instance, his case might be passed over, but others have been equally conspicuous. More are suspected.

Hearings and indictments and even convictions are a matter of locking the barn too late. The Case-Neuberger legislation would head off these situations by spotlighting those growing too rich too fast while drawing Government salaries. The Long bill also would do much to correct the persistent practice of hiding pertinent data behind rubber stamps of security, a device often too thin to be tolerated.

The American Newspaper Publishers' Association and the American Society of Newspaper Editors believe the Long bill would put more facts about Government in the Federal Register, the official publication. The public might not see them, but they would be available to honest officials, to dedicated editors, and to reporters who wanted to find them.

Public dissatisfaction with the recurrence of chicanery, unethical if not illegal, is stirring Congress. Continued pressure will bring about corrective legislation—although not until next year.

Nonstop Session

Majority Leader Mansfield's announcement to the Senate that Congress will have to stay on until the start of the 1964 session on January 3 comes as no great surprise. The possibility of a nonstop session was apparent as far back as May, when the first signs of the Washington stalemate appeared.

What is surprising is the fact that Democratic leaders insist this will be a year of accomplishment. They still hope to put the tax and civil rights bills on the President's desk before New Year's Eve.

But this optimism is not substantiated either by the record or the prospect. An unyielding calendar makes it almost certain Mr. Kennedy won't get the bills this year. Civil rights legislation, for example, faces long debate on the House floor and is not likely to reach the Senate before December 1.

The House-passed tax measure is in its fourth week of hearings before the Senate Finance Committee, with more than 100 witnesses still to be heard. Chairman BYRD won't be unhappy if he has to halt tax-cut consideration by reason of certain filibuster when civil rights arrives in the Senate. So the tax cut has even less chance than civil rights for 1963 enactment.

Also awaiting final action is other important legislation, much of it routine housekeeping matters. Take the appropriation measure: Only 4 of the 13 bills needed to run the Government in the current fiscal year have been sent to the White House. Even money for Congress' own payroll is deadlocked in a conference quarrel.

The last time Congress met continuously was in 1941, a war year. This year's reason can be only failure to try to reach legislative solutions to problems sent up from the White House. Such abdication of Congress constitutional function would be inexcusable.

[From the Star-Ledger]

HE LETS THE CHIPS FALL AS THEY MAY

(By Philip Meyer)

WASHINGTON.—If the U.S. Senate may be said to have a conscience, it resides in the person of Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware.

His is the still, small voice that got the Bobby Baker investigation on the road and is being counted on to help keep it on a straight line.

A 17-year Senate veteran who looks like a country preacher, WILLIAMS has not sought the role. In fact, he disclaims it. He has a much simpler explanation for his activity as a kind of freelance corruption seeker.

NONPARTISAN

WILLIAMS' investigative activity has been remarkably productive and nonpartisan. He uncovered the "Irving" Sachs-T. Lamar Caudle tax scandal in the Truman administration and was the first Member of the Senate to criticize President Dwight D. Eisenhower's aid, Sherman Adams. Earlier this year, he helped smoke out the details of New York Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL's oversea junkets.

Blessed with a small constituency—Delaware is smaller than many congressional districts—WILLIAMS has the staff manpower to devote to investigative work. But that is not the real secret of his success at digging up information.

Washington is full of people with stories to tell but no one to tell them to. The word has gotten around that WILLIAMS is a good listener who can be trusted and that he is not a man who will shrug off an accusation and drop it in the wastebasket.

"Once you get into a thing like this, people come to you," he says. "Then one thing feeds on to another, and you get the story uncovered."

NO STONE UNTURNED

Although he gets many crackpot tips and suggestions, WILLIAMS considers them all. "If I drop something," he said, "I immediately become a participant in covering it up."

Nevertheless, he demonstrated a charitable nature by admitting that he has files on minor offenses of Government officials that will remain forever closed. "A man can make an honest mistake."

"I've always said one political party is just as honest as another," he noted. "I don't think a man goes wrong because of his political affiliation. And, anyway, a man who's crooked would change his politics at the least provocation."

WILLIAMS rejected the suggestion that the Republicans might be more interested than the Democrats in pressing the Baker investigation.

"When you go into something like this," he said, "you never know where it will go. It might take us to either side of the aisle."

MISSED COLLEGE

Born 59 years ago on a Delaware farm, WILLIAMS was ninth of 11 children and never went to college. Unlike some politicians similarly situated, he refuses to put on the "plain folks" bit.

"Not going to college has been a real handicap," he admits.

This self-effacement extends even to his political prowess. He was a feed and grain dealer with no previous Government experience when he ran for the Senate.

"I got the nomination in 1946 because nobody else wanted it," he said. "Luckily that turned out to be a Republican landslide year, and I got elected."

Compulsive muckrakers tend to brag about the enemies they accumulate. Not WILLIAMS, who views the world in simple terms of good and evil, reflecting his Methodist upbringing.

"I think most people are pretty honest," he said. "The only enemies you create by uncovering wrongdoing are the participants, and I don't want them as friends anyway."

[From the Newark Evening News, Nov. 2, 1963]

THE SENATE'S ANSWER MAN—WILLIAMS OF DELAWARE SHUNS HEADLINES FOR FACTS

(By Doris Fleeson)

WASHINGTON.—The public's best hope of learning the complete Robert (Bobby) Baker story lies with the growing army of men and women who confide in Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Delaware Republican, the man who started it all.

The unique quality of WILLIAMS is that where other politicians attract followers, he attracts facts. In turn, he has such an attachment to data that he follows through on it and gets unusual results.

Most Senators can outtalk him. Few outknow him when he decides the facts warrant his personal and public attention.

He has never discussed the type of people who furnish him with information. It is a fair guess, though, that, unlike the glib hoodlums of plausible conspirators who put many Senate investigators in the headlines, they are citizens with unusual commonsense and a good grasp of double-entry bookkeeping.

TACIT ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The Senate has tacitly acknowledged that this is so in its failure to put WILLIAMS on its high-powered investigating committees and give him a staff. It knows that it would be hard to muddy a WILLIAMS trail once the Senator maps his course.

Perhaps this is just as well. Even the best staff tends to become corrupted by the good notices of press and magic lantern. Its members can easily be distracted from the hard labor of reports, controversial conclusions and—oh, horror—legislative remedies for the evils uncovered.

WILLIAMS has even startled Washington by rebuffing the customary surefire ingredient of a beauty-and-sex witness in the Baker case. He just said flatly that he did not know anything about a West German model discussed in the press and would not, therefore, mention her to the Rules Committee in private session.

The Senator's preferred figures are of a different kind. They may in the end prove more formidable, though he has not yet drawn any conclusions. He has, in fact, been entirely fair to Baker.

RELUCTANCE CRITICIZED

The Senate is being criticized for its plain reluctance to handle the Baker case in the same aggressive manner with which it pursues conflict of interest in the executive branch. It remains to be seen whether it proposes to pursue the apparent corrupters on the Washington scene as well as those it may decide were corrupted.

There is nothing really very secret about the Washington operations suggested by the Baker affair. Yet Congress has been resisting full disclosure of the affairs of its Members as a starting point and an example.

Baker was an important figure in the operations of the Senate but only as a mirror of Senate power. The word for the situation as it is developing seems to be not that it is sinister but shabby, a misuse of political relationships.

The employers of Baker and his associates can hardly claim they knew nothing of it at all. And the public, which likes to feel holier than its capital city, might remember that it employs in a very real sense the Congress and renders a verdict on its handling of affairs every 2 years.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Nov. 6, 1963]

THE WORLD OF BOBBY BAKER

(By Richard Wilson)

A few months ago not very many in Washington, and certainly not the public generally, knew that a personable young man named Robert G. Baker was secretary of the Senate majority. Nor would any, except the initiated, have appreciated the nature of this position and its function.

The initiated know, however, that Baker was one of those essential functionaries who make representative government work. There are scores of men throughout the Government who are rarely mentioned publicly, but who grease the wheels of public administration. They remain happy, in Baker's case profitably so, in their anonymity.

Alger Hiss was one of these—no more. This is not to say there is any further comparison between Hiss and Baker, but perhaps the parallel serves to illustrate the place that these essential functionaries occupy, especially when they are rather young and energetic—young men on the go.

Baker did not make policy. He merely served the Democratic Senators and the leadership in various helpful ways, particularly the leadership because he kept tabs on how Senators would vote.

Baker was, therefore, at the very heart of entrenched privilege and position in the Federal hierarchy. Many people have tried to define the nature of the U.S. Senate and the status of its members, without much success.

Perhaps it is enough to say that the 6-year term, which transcends the 4-year term of the President, and the willingness of voters to return Senators term after term, creates in the body itself and its Members a certain permanency lacking in other high positions.

Out of this permanency grow privilege, perquisites and influence. This need not necessarily be related to partisan politics. Because of his status and influence on legislation or other matters, a Republican Senator may be a power in a Democratic administration, and vice versa. Senatorial relationships with private enterprise for gain are permissible; indeed, a Senator is remiss if he does not vigorously represent the varied interests, public and private, of his own State.

A complex interplay of status, position and influence create a political sea in which some men swim like fish and others flounder. Baker was a swimmer, with a natural affinity for such men as Lyndon Johnson of Texas and the late Robert S. Kerr of Oklahoma.

In this Senate sea, the dikes between what is public and what is private are not very firm. The dikes leak. As service and experience lengthen and status rises, a naturally endowed Senator comes to accept and exploit certain practices and privileges which at first may seem to him rather outside the spirit of representative government.

Thus the atmosphere of privilege and position grows, carefully nurtured and preserved by the Bobby Bakers who have come down through history in their varying incarnations.

This courtly world of the Senate is a pleasant one, peopled by well-dressed men and scented by the aroma of Havana cigars, face lotion and bourbon whisky. It includes also, it now develops, several stunning girls in their 20s, a ravishing German girl, and a lavender-carpeted modernistic townhouse within easy access of the Capitol.

This world of the Senate, this world of carpeted and well-decorated hideaways in the Capitol building itself, and of privilege and perquisite—this world is shaken.

It is not so much that Bobby Baker might have violated the law, if indeed there is any law violation at all, but that Bobby's way of life and work in the Senate atmosphere of privilege and preference enabled him to live in a $125,000 house, own another, and engage in profitable business ventures on a large scale.

In the current Senate investigation should show that these ventures were made possible, or easier, by Baker's cultivation of the great and powerful, then the spotlight should really turn on the Senate, itself.

For, it may well be that Bobby learned the formula of success by watching the example of his powerful friends. It is now commonly said that Baker has done nothing that his betters haven't done, but has only committed the ancient sin of being found out.

Nor, in the world of the Senate, is it astonishing that some pretty young ladies should have gotten mentioned, for this is part of the Senate legend, too. It would only be astonishing if, through the Baker case, what was legend was proved to be fact, and truth became stranger than fiction.

[From Newsweek, Nov. 8, 1963]

Mess in Washington?

(By Kenneth Crawford)

Lamentations about the state of public morality are again heard in the land. This time the keening is over the activities of Bobby Baker, get-rich-quick former secretary of the Democratic majority in the U.S. Senate. The dirge is familiar. The history of revelations of questionable conduct in high places duly deplored by all good men reaches back to the Republic's beginnings.

There were land-speculation scandals in George Washington's administration. The notoriety of Peggy O'Neill almost disrupted Andrew Jackson's Cabinet. Teapot Dome still stands as the most conspicuous monument to the memory of Warren G. Harding. In more recent times there have been teapot tempests over deep freezes, fur and vicuna coats, and one oriental rug.

These affairs follow a pattern. First come rumors of misconduct and cautious reports weighted with innuendo. Then comes vindication of the accused or incriminating revelation. This, in case of revelation, is followed by a wave of righteous wrath. The wrongdoer is punished and reform of the system that made the wrongdoing possible is demanded. Sometimes a new law results. In any case, the excitement dies down and a period of complacency ensues.

INDIGNATION

There is some variety in the crimes and peccadilloes of sinners in government. But there is monotonous similarity about the expressions of indignation they inspire. The times and the customs are always called to account. From editorial sanctums, pulpits, and public forums come warnings that the Nation's moral fiber is dangerously frayed, particularly at the governing edge. There is invariably a blanket indictment under the heading, "Mess in Washington." Social critics speak of public virtue in the past tense, assuming that it went the way of the hoop skirt.

This is an unjust and unjustified assumption. Public servants are probably no better and no worse inherently than they were 30 years ago or 20 years ago. But observation over a long period suggests that legislators, judges, executives, and bureaucrats in the Federal service are better trained, better informed, and more competent now than they have been in the past. Moreover, ethical standards are more exacting, especially in the executive branch, which employs the most people.

In recent years, Congress has been severe in its surveillance of the executive and judicial branches. Its own members have made reputations as investigators more often than as legislators. It has passed scores of laws governing the conduct of the executive bureaucracy. Some of these have worked. But the watchdog has failed to watch itself. The result is that Congress is laggard in matters of ethics. Alone among the three branches, it openly condones conflicts of interest on the part of its members. Thus, perhaps, its long tolerance of one of its employee's adventuring in the thickets of the fast buck.

RESPONSIBILITY

It would be a mistake to conclude, however, that most Members of Congress, or even a large proportion of them, take advantage of their freedom to confuse public responsibility with private gain. A few doubtless feel that they are serving a constituent when they help themselves—that what's good for them is good for their State and for the country. This was approximately the attitude of the late Senator Robert Kerr of Oklahoma, an oil millionaire who guarded the interests of the petroleum industry without hesitation or apology. He also, incidentally, befriended Baker.

A contrasting concept of responsibility is presented by the case of the late Senator Estes Kefauver of Tennessee. Probate of his will revealed that he owned stock in several of the pharmaceutical companies whose practices he was investigating at the time of his death. His persistent inquiries had several times reduced the value of his own holdings.

Neither attitude—Kerr's nor Kefauver's—is typical. But Congress is becoming increasingly sensitive to criticism of its own shortcomings. It is not impossible that self-reform bills already introduced will eventually become law as a result of the Bobby Baker excitement.

[From the Oregonian, Oct. 31, 1963]

Double Standard

The Senate Rules Committee's investigation of the financial adventures of Robert G. Baker, resigned secretary of the Senate's Democratic majority, should focus congressional attention on a bill which, if enacted, would help prevent or expose conflicts of interest.

This is S. 1261, requiring annual disclosure of the sources of income and financial interests of top Government officials, including Members of Congress and congressional staff employees. Chief sponsors of this measure are Senators Maurine Neuberger, Democrat, of Oregon, and Clifford P. Case, Republican, of New Jersey, who have advised the committee by letter:

"It is significant, we believe, that the inquiry in which the committee is now engaged was the result of public disclosure of certain business activities and financial transactions of the Senate majority secretary (Mr. Baker). Had the requirements of our bill been in effect, the Senate would not have had to depend on outside sources to alert it to a situation which reflects on the integrity of the Senate itself. Indeed, had our bill been law, the situation might not have arisen at all."

Senators and Representatives for years have clung to a double standard on conflicts of interest. While roughly treating by public exposure in hearings those officials and employees in the executive branch suspected of using their positions to enrich themselves, they have consistently and haughtily declined to apply the same standards to their own financial interests. A Senator with oil wells does not abstain from voting on an oil bill which means profit for him; rather, he is usually in the forefront in advocating it. Few Members of Congress give up their private business or professional incomes to avoid conflicts of interest. They are above such petty considerations.

Attempts by conscientious "reform" Senators and Representatives to at least require the provision of a public record of earnings and interests of Members and staff workers have failed in the past. Burial in committee is the fate of such bills. But if the Rules Committee is forced by public opinion to lay the Bobby Baker case bare, whether or not Members of Congress are involved, perhaps Congress can be shamed into adopting the Case-Neuberger bill or something similar. We commend our lady Senator for pursuing the matter at a most appropriate time.

[From the Orlando Evening Star, Nov. 2, 1963]

Police for the Policemen

(By James Marlow)

Washington.—Five years ago Senator Richard L. Neuberger, Oregon Democrat, complained that nobody polices the policeman, that Congress can investigate the whole area of government but nobody polices Congress.

For example: the head of a Government department must rid himself of his stock before the Senate, to prevent conflict of interest, lets him take office. This is to prevent his profiting from some company he may do business with.

But a Member of Congress can have all kinds of outside interests, and even fight for a law to help those interests, but he doesn't have to rid himself of anything or reveal anything about his total income.

Neuberger said, "I fear it has a corroding effect on government generally when a member of the President's Cabinet can be ordered to jettison his corporate portfolios by Senators who themselves may be dabbling in oil, cotton futures, television, hotel chains, or uranium.

"If Federal Commissioners are to be pilloried for accepting * * * airplane tickets to Palm Beach, how can Senators and Representatives continue profitable associations with law firms retained by banks, railroads, labor unions, and utility companies?"

In short Neuberger was calling on Congress, which has passed laws to prevent conflict of interest on the part of Federal officials and other Government employees, to pass a conflict of interest law on itself.

Congress ignored him with great calmness, as it has ignored similar proposals by other Members of both Houses for years. Recently two former Members of Congress were convicted of influence-peddling while they were in Congress.

Neuberger died of cancer in 1960. His wife, now Senator Maurine Neuberger, also an Oregon Democrat, was elected to succeed him that same year. Last week she picked up where her husband left off.

She and Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, New Jersey Republican, asked consideration of a bill they had introduced requiring top Government officers, Members of Congress, and their staff to report their yearly income, including gifts of substance and assets and liabilities and their financial transactions to the Comptroller General, with these reports available to press and public.

CASE has made this kind of proposal repeatedly and, like the late Neuberger, has been ignored.

He and the present Senator NEUBERGER made their pitch in a letter to Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN, North Carolina Democrat, who is chairman of the Senate Rules Committee which today begins an investigation of a former Senate employee, Robert G. Baker.

Baker, who was paid about $20,000 a year, resigned this month as secretary of the Senate Democrats after newspaper disclosure that he seemed to have an extraordinary number of outside financial interests.

His duties for the Democrats included rounding up party members for rollcall votes in the Senate and a wide variety of personal and business favors for Democrats. In addition to his various outside business interests he had a law practice.

What started the disclosures about him was a $300,000 civil damage suit filed against him by the Capitol Vending Co. which charged he had accepted commissions of $5,600 to put its machines in plants working for the Government and then had ended the deal when Capitol refused to sell out to another vending company in which Baker is alleged to have held stock.

The Jordan committee's hearings on Baker's financial activities were to be held behind closed doors.

Mrs. NEUBERGER and CASE told JORDAN that if their bill on financial disclosures by Members of Congress and their employees had been law, Congress would not have had to be informed about Baker by outside sources.

While Congress has shown practically no interest over the years in proposals like those of NEUBERGER and CASE, it has been prompt to get indignant about wrongdoing in the executive branch and has had full-scale investigations.

Right after President Kennedy took office in 1961 he asked Congress to tighten and broaden the laws against conflict of interest as it applies to employees of the executive branch. He got quick action. The law was passed.

But there's hardly a chance in a billion that Congress will do anything about itself.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. CASE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK. I wish to express my general agreement with the statement of the Senator from New Jersey. As one member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I hope very much that the bill introduced by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] will receive—in due course, and perhaps "with all deliberate speed"—adequate hearings, and will be favorably reported to the Senate.

I agree that the bill which these two fine Senators have sponsored, and which I cosponsor, is not directly connected with the investigation now being made by the Rules Committee into the activities of employees of the Senate. There is no necessary logical connection between improper conduct by our employees and a conflict of interest on behalf of ourselves. And yet what has happened in the press and before the public, since the investigation which the Rules Committee is now conducting got underway, should be clear warning to us that we must take a good, hard look at our own situation. It seems to me abundantly clear that we cannot, like so many ostriches, put our heads in the sand while we insist on the most rigorous conflict-of-interest requirements with respect to all appointees of the executive arm of Government whose nominations must be confirmed by the Senate.

We cannot now, at long last, look into the conduct of employees in the Senate and impose upon them—as I have no doubt we shall in due course do—rigorous requirements to protect them against conflict of interest, and at the same time ignore widespread charges about our own.

I call the attention of Senators to Herblock's cartoon in this morning's Washington Post. It is entitled, "I Declare, I Don't Know Where-All the Lad Picked Up Such Habits."

The cartoon shows a character, who unfortunately has tended to become characteristic of Members of this body, entitled, "'Inner Circle,' Senate Finaglers," and he is talking to a young man dressed exactly the same way, entitled, "Bobby Baker."

For some time I have had before the Senate a proposed change in the rules which would enable us to put cartoons into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is a shame we cannot do so, because the description of a cartoon—such as I have just given—is often quite inadequate to convey its biting satire.

For some time my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and I have made public to the Senate our own financial condition. We do that from time to time, because our investments may change. The majority leader did the same thing a year or two ago. I hope that the bill which has been jointly sponsored by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and which I am happy to have cosponsored, will receive hearings and will be passed before the 88th Congress adjourns.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] for his assistance in this matter, and also for his cosponsorship.

I make this observation on the points he has just made. The Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and I understand the priorities that the committee must follow in the orderly pursuit of its business. We recognize that the inquiry into the facts is of paramount concern at the moment.

We hope that eventually, when the committee finds itself in possession of the facts and its report thereon, it will consider legislative recommendations also, and at that time we believe a bill will be appropriate, at least for consideration.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CASE. In one moment I shall.

We merely wish to urge that the inquiry should include not only individuals within the specific terms of the resolution—namely, members of the staff and officers of the Senate—but also Members of the Senate itself, and anyone else. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the author of the resolution, has made clearly apparent to all that that was his intention. He has stated that he was advised by legislative counsel that his resolution is competent to permit the committee to do so.

I am now glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, at my request, the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress compiled a most interesting memorandum, entitled, "Conflict of Interest Procedure in the British Parliament." This memorandum was prepared by Virginia W. Brewer, an analyst in international relations. It sets forth that in the British Parliament a member is required to make the following statement:

> I swear that my constituents have no local interest in the bill and I have no personal interest in it.

It further requires that no Member who has a direct pecuniary interest in a question shall be allowed to vote on it.

I do not say that we should necessarily have the same conflict-of-interest rules as do our friends across the sea, but I believe this memorandum on conflict of interest in the British Parliament will be of real interest to Senators and to other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONFLICT-OF-INTEREST PROCEDURE IN THE BRITISH PARLIAMENT

(By Virginia W. Brewer)

It "is the convention of the House of Commons that a Member must make known his financial interest in any subject that he discusses in debate. And every member of a standing committee must sign a 'declaration of independence that would cause quite a stir in Washington.'" It says: "I swear that my constituents have no local interest in the bill and I have no personal interest in it."[1]

The above quotation from George B. Galloway's "The Legislative Process in Congress," is a part of his brief discussion of differences between ethics in Congress and Parliament. The quotations within it are from a statement made at the New York Herald Tribune Forum in 1951 by Mr. Alistair Cooke, American correspondent of the Manchester Guardian. Mr. Cooke is further quoted, thus:

"When a man goes to Westminster, he does not go as a one-man delegation from an industry or a crop. Very often he may have only a rough idea of what his constituents do for a living. For there is no locality rule in the British system, which is not an oversight but a provision meant to leave the Member of Parliament comparatively free to give his best to the affairs that concern the nation as a whole. This is quite different from watching the Congress bring up a bill and expecting your man to amend it in your interest. This difference may not be so good for the folks back home, but it does make possible a national legislature and encourages the honesty of its members."

---

[1] Galloway, George B., "The Legislative Process in Congress," New York, 1953, p. 385.

Dr. Galloway goes on to say: [2] "Thus the British system protects the Member of Parliament from temptation, whereas some other systems, as Mr. Cooke remarked, 'tend to put a representative on the receiving end of a cornucopia and then expect him to be a demigod. I believe with Mr. Dooley that no Congressman ever corrupted himself, but as long as he is half representative and half business agent or trade delegate, business will too often be able to call the tune of the lawmaker.' "

In British parliamentary parlance what is known in the United States as conflict of interest is referred to as personal pecuniary interest.[3] While it is a long-established principle in Great Britain that in both Houses of Parliament personal interest affects the right of Members to vote in certain cases,[4] "it should be further understood, [that] this interest * * * must be a direct pecuniary interest, and separately belonging to the persons whose votes were questioned; and not in common with the rest of his Majesty's subjects, or on a matter of State policy."[5] The principle that broad interests do not constitute sufficient ground for disqualification was asserted as early as 1604, and has been reiterated in Parliament on various occasions, as well as in the 1811 instance just quoted.

In the House of Commons the rule stands that no Member who has a direct pecuniary interest in a question shall be allowed to vote on it. But "on occasions when the objection of personal interest has been raised, which came obviously within the exemption from the application of the role * * * the Speaker or the Chairman has overruled the objection, or has decided that a motion to disallow the vote would be out of order."[6]

(For the only instance in which a vote was disallowed on a question of public policy, and for the very limited number of instances with regard to private bills see the accompanying paper.)

With respect to Ministers of the Crown (who are also Members of Parliament), Sir Winston Churchill, then Prime Minister, in reply to a question in the House of Commons, on February 25, 1952, furnished a copy from the official report of a recent ruling by himself on the subject. This "was referred to in toto by Mr. Butler in [a] recent case of its kind (i.e., that of the Minister of Transport, January 28, 1960), and it is that which is current today." This reference made in 1961, by D. C. M. Platt,[7] goes on to say that Sir Winston's statement consists largely of a compounding of earlier rulings, and gives the following digest of it: [8]

"Ministers are urged so to order their affairs that no conflict arises, or appears to arise, between their private interests and their public duties. They must not engage in any activities which may distract their attention from their public duties, and they must, in cases of retention of private interests, declare those interests if affected by public business, while detaching themselves from the consideration of that business. Ministers must resign all directorships, public or private, paid or unpaid, with the exception of directorships established for the maintenance of private family estates or directorships and offices held in connection with philanthropic undertakings. And even these should be resigned if any risk of conflict with Government interest arises. Ministers must divest themselves of a controlling interest in any company, and of shares, whether controlling or not, in concerns closely associated with a Minister's own Department. Finally, Ministers should scrupulously avoid speculative investments in securities about which they have, or may be thought to have, early or confidential information." (496 H.C. Deb. 53. 702-3.)

It will be evident that the above ruling applies to Ministers because of their executive capacity as well as their legislative duties. Yet the requirements are not a great deal stricter than those for the other Members of Parliament, with which they are interwoven.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I should like to yield to the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] but I shall be happy to yield first to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] for purposes of clarification of one point which came up in my colloquy with the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. He is correct in his analysis of the intent of the resolution. It would give to the Rules Committee full power to conduct the investigation and to find out at any point of the investigation whether employees of the Senate or Members of the Senate are involved in any wrongdoing.

I was advised by the legislative counsel that the Rules Committee already had ample jurisdiction. The resolution, as it was drawn, merely confirms such powers. While I hope we find as we get into the investigation that not too many people are involved. Nevertheless, we can stop at nothing less than a full and complete investigation and a determination of all the facts surrounding the case. We must lay all the facts out without regard to who may be involved—and that would include not only all employees but even, if necessary, ourselves as Members of the Senate.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President——

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I am committed to yield to my colleague and cosponsor, and I should like to leave in her hands the matter of——

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly now, at this point, as I must leave the Chamber.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I am glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. TOWER in the chair) The Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] does not have the floor.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, with the consent of the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], I am glad to yield briefly to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. With regard to what the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has just said concerning the investigation now before the Rules Committee, there has been a great deal of speculation in the press, and a considerable amount of curiosity, as to what the Rules Committee will do.

Something should be said to clarify one phase of this matter. The Rules Committee has not unduly delayed the selection of its counsel, associate counsel, or investigative staff. The press may not be aware of the difficulty involved in persuading people to give up positions which they hold for a temporary job, the difficulty of finding counsel who are free virtually to drop their practice, and the difficulty of recruitment of what may be a much larger staff. The investigation so far being conducted is so extensive, both in volume and in geography, that in my judgment the staff will probably have to be substantially enlarged. I believe it is not impossible that in addition to the two experts from the General Accounting Office who are serving the majority investigator and the minority assistant investigator, there may have to be 8 or 10 other persons with investigative experience—perhaps with previous FBI training—to run down all the leads. With the possibility of well over a hundred witnesses to be heard, the groundwork being done, I believe, reflects creditably on the Rules Committee. It is certainly proceeding in a bipartisan fashion with complete agreement as to how this investigation should be conducted.

Confronted as we are with a towering mass of leads and evidence, and information presently falling short of evidence, the committee can be expected, in my judgment, to pursue the matter diligently, with great awareness of its responsibility to the Senate and to the people.

I would expect the integrity of the Committee on Rules and Administration to be respected by those who are interested in the investigation. I am perfectly satisfied that every lead will be explored and that everything relevant to the investigation will be most carefully looked into.

As one member of the committee, I share the determination of all other committees that nothing shall be "swept under the rug." Such inferences are hardly justified.

The committee can be expected to fulfill with great care, with diligence, and with the application of a great deal more time than any of us would like to give to it—the application of such time as is required—its responsibility of seeing that the investigation is completed as expeditiously as possible. Such an investigation will cover all matters which have in the course of time been referred to the committee.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has the floor.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania, and also thank the Senator from Delaware for his earlier remarks.

I now yield to my colleague the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER].

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I believe it is timely to comment once more that the Senator from New Jersey and I have been interested in the legislation for lo, these many months preceding the recent confusion. The case which has received some recent notoriety is not necessarily pertinent one way or another to this particular legislation.

---

[2] Galloway, op. cit., p. 385, quoting from: "Balancing Moral Responsibility and Scientific Progress," report of 20th annual New York Herald Tribune Forum; Oct. 22-24, 1951, p. 44.

[3] May, Sir Thomas Erskine, "Sir Thomas Erskine May's Treatise on the Law, Privileges, Proceedings, and Usage of Parliament," 16th (1957) edition, London, 1957, p. 439.

[4] May, op. cit., p. 439.

[5] Platt, D. C. M., "The Commercial and Industrial Interests of Ministers of the Crown," in Political Studies, vol. 9, 1961, p. 271, quoting 20 Parl. Deb., p. 1012.

[6] May, op. cit., p. 439.

[7] Platt, op. cit., p. 290.

[8] Ibid., p. 290.

Most of my moments and days during the short period of time I have served in the Senate have been pleasant, and will leave me with wonderful memories. There is only one part of my task that I do not like, and that is when I serve on a committee and there comes before me an appointee of the President of the United States to serve as a part of his official family or to serve in a regulatory agency, and we "put him on the rack." He is usually someone taken away from business because he has a great contribution to make, or from labor, or from the professions; yet we treat him as if we are going to crucify him. We ask him to divulge his financial status and a good many of his private business arrangements.

We accept that procedure for appointees but we are unwilling to do the same for ourselves. So long as we believe it is necessary for a member of the President's Cabinet, it seems to me we should be willing to undergo the same scrutiny.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the distinguished lady yield?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentlewoman from Oregon forgets that Members of the Senate are screened by the electorate before they ever get to the Senate. They are confronted by people at election time. It does not make any difference how large or how small the meeting is; any American citizen can stand in his place and ask, "How many shares of General Motors do you own? What interest have you in the petroleum industry? How many shares of du Pont have you? How many shares of Ford Motor stock do you own, since they have Federal contracts?"

Those who come before the committees are not screened by the voters. Senators are screened. If the voters are on their mettle and want to know something about a Senator's personal affairs, they are perfectly free to ask. They can cause one's name to be placed on the front page and keep one from coming to the Congress, if they are interested. That situation does not obtain in the case of administrative and executive appointments.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President——

Mr. DIRKSEN. The appointees are culled out of industry. They come to this city. Obviously they must be screened.

I do not know that anybody—not even Charles Wilson—has been crucified or excoriated by a committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has the floor.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I should like to reply to my distinguished colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield again to the Senator from Oregon.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Also, after the voters have put us in the Congress, if they find out that we have not performed well they can withdraw us from our positions. I do not believe, however, that this excuses our unwillingness to meet the standards which we require of others.

It seems to me that most legislators—I should say 99.99 percent of them—are honest and upright, people with whom I am glad to be associated. We seem to be reluctant, however, to put ourselves to the same tests as are applied to others.

Every one of us knows that we must go before the electorate. We are willing to go before the electorate. Why are we not willing, therefore, to live up to standards to which we expect other people to adhere?

Merely because the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Illinois are willing to disclose their financial resources——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh; the Senator from Illinois is not.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. He has not reduced himself to a class B citizen yet.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I shall be happy to yield to my colleague the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sorry.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I appreciate the concern of my colleague the Senator from New Jersey, but I enjoy sparring with the Senator from Illinois, who is always gracious.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, since I have the floor, I interrupt the colloquy merely to say that I had no doubt of the competence of the Senator from Oregon to deal with our beloved colleague the Senator from Illinois on her own terms with adequate skill. It was merely because I wished to reassert my own possession of the floor that I interrupted the colloquy.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I have only a few more words, if I may continue Mr. President.

Senators give the impression that they are trying to hide something. I should like to see a bill, of the type of the resolution the Senator from New Jersey and I support, considered. Then we would at least be saying that we are not above reproach, that we are not beyond the pale of such consideration. I do not believe it is asking too much of us to put ourselves upon the public altar, so to speak.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Legislators Hurt Their Own Image," published in the Eugene, Oreg., Register-Guard of November 7, 1963, dealing with the proposal that Members of Congress reveal outside sources of income.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATORS HURT THEIR OWN IMAGE

Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER has dusted off an old proposal, one that was dear to the heart of her late husband when he was a Senator. She thinks Congressmen ought to let the public know what outside sources of income they have. In this she is joined by Senator JOSEPH CLARK, Pennsylvania Democrat, and Senator CLIFFORD CASE, New Jersey Republican. The proposal is timely because of the odor arising from the Senate Chamber as a result of the Bobby Baker case. The Senate is now investigating that case in a modest way, inquiring into the conduct of Senate employees, but not, repeat not, into the conduct of Senators themselves.

Congress has been very jealous of its immunity from public scrutiny. An official of, say, the space agency, would never be allowed to hold stock in a firm that did a lot of business with the agency. Heavens, that would be conflict of interest. But a Member of Congress can own a space capsule factory and still serve on committees dealing directly with the space program. That, according to the prevailing ethic, is not conflict of interest. It's just coincidence, and not very important coincidence at that.

In the House, EDITH GREEN and ROBERT DUNCAN have also urged that Congressmen bind themselves by the same rules they so readily impose upon employees of the executive department. But they aren't getting anywhere with their ideas.

Because Congressmen are so reluctant to bind themselves by the rules they impose upon others, the public wonders about Congress. And that leads to what may be the greatest single problem in American Government, the decreasing prestige of the legislative branch. Legislators themselves, who are responsible for the tarnished image of the legislative branch, should be deeply concerned about it. But they are not.

It is the idea of a freely elected legislature with real authority which distinguishes our form of government from the tyrannies around the world. A legislature in which the people have confidence is essential if free government is to prevail. But the people must have confidence in it.

The people cannot have confidence when they learn that Congressmen won't come through, themselves, with the kind of full disclosure they so readily demand of other Government employees. The public wonders about some of these trips around Europe that seem to have only the slightest bearing on public business. And, in a time when economies are so strongly demanded by Congress, the public wonders about the New Senate Office Building, which somewhat resembles the Taj Mahal—in cost if not in architecture.

Nor is this serious problem confined to Congress. It crops up in the States, too. Certainly here in Oregon the legislative branch is in poor repute. And it is the fault, largely, of the legislators themselves. Why won't they entertain Senator Ed Fadeley's suggestion for the registration of lobbyists? Why should legislators pay their own secretaries so much more than other State secretaries get? Why should there seem to be one set of standards for legislators, another for other State officials and employees?

Most legislators, State and National, are decent, competent, honest, hard-working people. But they are reluctant to let the public know it. Instead, they give the public the idea that they're trying to hide something.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President——

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have a little legislative conflict of interest today.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I shall be happy to yield the floor in just a moment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The appropriation bill is highly necessary, and should be passed today.

I was assured that the colloquy would take only 2 or 3 minutes. I was assured that at 12:30. It is now 2:30.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I have no intention of keeping the Senator from Washington from his legislative duties, which we all share with him.

In conclusion, it has been a satisfaction to me not only from the standpoint of my duties as a legislator, but also in a personal way to have had an association with Dick Neuberger, our colleague's late husband and predecessor, and now with her and with the Senator from Pennsylvania in this particular matter. We are not the only Senators who have made such proposals. Both Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and other Senators have been interested in the same sort of measure.

We have no pride of authorship. We believe the principle of disclosure is perhaps the key to the most serious problems we face in this area.

Unlike the Senator from Illinois, we do not regard this as any stain upon our escutcheon or as reflecting in any way upon the Congress as a whole. We suggest that this should be made a matter of general application, rather than a spotty and fortuitous application by individuals, as has been true in the past.

Mr. President, I yield the floor; and I thank the Senators for their patience.

Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. KEATING addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I join in the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey. The proposed legislation which I have introduced would require the disclosure of holdings in any corporation or other body regulated by the Federal Government. That, it seems to me, is the very minimum which any Member of Congress should disclose.

I hope very much that the Committee on Rules and Administration, in connection with its consideration of our present problems, will in due course consider all the bills which are before the committee. There are a number of such bills. The committee should consider them and report favorably to us one of those measures.

Like the Senator from New Jersey, I have no pride of authorship; but this has been a subject that has engaged my attention for a decade. I think we have been very remiss, and that some of the recent disclosures would not have taken place if some of this legislation had been on the statute books. I think it is high time we legislate, not only in regard to our employees, but also ourselves.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the issue ought to be made clear. First of all, there pends in the Rules Committee a resolution for an investigation. In addition, there are resolutions dealing with the question of disclosure of assets by staff and personnel, and by Members of the Senate. There seems to be a disposition in some quarters to give that latter resolution a free ride on the coattails of the present investigation. That is quite a different thing. Time and time again, we have had resolutions calling for the disclosure of assets. My position on the matter has not changed. I do not panic under attack. It is high time for the Congress to quit retreating when its Members are under attack.

Attack on the Congress is nothing new. I went back over a period of 125 years and examined editorial comment. It is almost always the same. I can show quotations from editorials over a period of a hundred years, stating that if God made Congress, He would not be proud of it. The number of quotations of that kind is legion. Always in an hour of crisis Congress becomes a whipping boy, and then it begins to run. That is when it ought to stand up to attack, because it is the most important branch of the three coordinate branches in this Government. Congress can abolish and dissolve every court in the land, except one, if it so desires. Congress can abolish every Cabinet position. It can abolish virtually every position in the Government. It is no wonder President Monroe said that Congress is the central core of the Government.

For 30 years I have been in one or the other Houses of Congress. I am proud of the service. I do not regret it at all. Shakespeare once said:

> Cowards die many times before their deaths; the valiant never taste of death but once.

When the attack comes, I want to be there to defend the legislative branch of Government. There is an attack. We see it in cartoons. We see it in editorials. The complaint about the archaic machinery is not the issue before Congress. Editorial writers write about absenteeism and many other superficial and frothy matters. We can resolve the issue by pinpointing where it belongs—the divergence and difference of opinion between the Congress and the President of the United States on his program. I shall reach that subject in due time. But I am not going to be pressured by this frothy attack, and I am not going to be taken in by a resolution which makes people think that we cleanse ourselves when we disclose our every asset.

As I previously stated, I have been on the platform before my constituents since 1926. Any man, any citizen, could stand up and say, "DIRKSEN, what do you own?" if he had wanted to know, and he would have received an answer. But I am not going to see it done by compulsion. That is the spirit of prohibition.

It required a long time for the prohibition period to incubate. At long last, those who thought alcohol was a curse and an evil felt they had to control the behavior of their fellow citizens. They were successful; and the 18th amendment went into the Constitution. It is the only amendment that, instead of saying, "Congress shall not," said otherwise, "The people shall not." It did not last, and it could not last, because it was alien to the whole spirit of the Constitution.

Now come people who say we must disclose our assets, when it is up to the electorate of each Member and the people back home to take a Member of Congress to task if they wish to do so. If they want to find out from EVERETT DIRKSEN, and if they will say, "You disclose all you own, including your income tax," maybe I will be prepared to do so. But if we say to 180 million taxpayers that we are going to accomplish it by having posted on the post office door all one owns, we will get around to disclosure that covers everybody.

I was here under the Roosevelt administration, when we passed the "Pink Slip" Act, so that there was a pink slip attached to one's income tax blank and people could find out what one's income was. One became the target of the blackmailers, the junk mailers, and everybody else. It did not take long to eliminate that provision.

Those who want to disclose their assets can do so. Why not? Nobody is stopping them. Nobody is stopping 537 Members of the House and Senate from putting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a disclosure of how much they own in real estate, stocks and bonds, and so forth. What is to stop them?

No; that does not make them happy. They have to compel everybody else to do it, and then want to be the monitors over everybody else's morals. That is what I object to. Compulsion is becoming one of the fine arts in Government. I am opposed to such compulsion, and I shall continue to be opposed, because when I was elected to the Senate I was elected under the qualifications contained in the Constitution. I held up my hand to support the Constitution and defend the laws of the country. Now it is proposed that I be reduced to a class B citizen.

I did not give up my citizenship when I came to the Senate. I do not propose to do so. Public office would not be worth it. If the proponents of such proposals want to impeach my reputation or my character, they can do it, but they are not going to do it and see me remain silent in this seat. When these bills come along, the dignity and self-respect of the Senate demand that they be rejected by a substantial vote, because then we retain our respect as citizens of the United States, in addition to being Senators.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, it is clear that the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from New Jersey, and his colleagues have a difference of opinion, and I shall not detain the Senate, particularly the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] longer, except to say that I see no——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I want the Senator to yield to me on that subject, if he will.

Mr. CASE. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator after my comments.

Mr. MAGNUSON. When the Senator from Illinois was talking, I could not help remembering the best example of compulsion I know of that related to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CASE. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator now.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Some time ago a candidate was running against me. He kept the question going through the papers, "Why doesn't the Senator reveal his income tax?"—leaving the impression that there was something wrong. I would not do it. But the day after election I did it, and he felt quite ashamed. I waited until the people had passed on me, because they had known me for years in my State. Then I had no objection whatever to revealing that information. That is the best example of compulsion I could think of while the Senator from Illinois was speaking.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I feel a little freer now to say a word or two, since I know the Senator from Washington wants to rest after that addition to our colloquy.

I see no relevancy whatever in the prohibition amendment. The opposite is true. The purpose is not to make anything illegal, but merely to make it possible for the facts to come out, so that the public may make a judgment. I agree that we are responsive, especially, to our constituents. For most purposes we rely upon their judgment to pass upon our conduct. The purpose of the proposed legislation is to make it possible for our constituents to know what the facts are, so they may pass judgment upon us with that knowledge.

When this is done, we shall have accomplished a purification—yes, I am not afraid of the word "purification"—of Congress which shall make it a stronger instrument of Government.

I am interested not only in ethics, but also in Congress and its procedures, and the reform of many governmental procedures in the executive branch of our Government, not in any case for the purpose of reducing Congress or any other department or agency, or degrading it, but for the purpose of making it stronger.

I have not in any way been shaken by the argument presented by the Senator from Illinois this afternoon.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the eloquent argument of the Senator from Illinois. For the moment I am compelled to say that I am in utter and complete disagreement with his argument. To my way of thinking the question of disclosure of financial interests by Members of this body is a simple question of right and wrong. I am for it.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8747) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if Senators will bear with me and the other members of the Appropriations Committee, who have spent some weeks on the Independent Offices appropriations bill, I shall make a brief statement about it. Because it is a very complex bill and involves some 26 agencies and a very substantial amount of money, I shall not discuss each item in detail. I am sure that Members of the Senate will have questions on the various agencies and amounts. I and the other members of the committee will try to answer any inquiries addressed to us by other Members of the Senate with reference to the pending bill.

So long as we are talking about the Senate, before I begin my discussion of the bill, and because I have been reading about what Congress is doing and not doing, and that we are late, I wish to say to the Senate that the bill did not come to us from the House of Representatives until the first part of October. We had to work on a bill of some magnitude, and we did it, I believe, with great dispatch.

I compliment the other members of the subcommittee and of the full committee. The appropriation bill for fiscal 1964 covers approximately 26 agencies, and the appropriations as reported to the Senate total $13,356,789,650, which is an increase of $287,270,950 over the House bill, and is under the estimates by $1,263,653,350. This is a very substantial cut from the budget.

Of the larger amounts in the bill, $5,387,843,000 is for the Veterans' Administration, of which $1,081,186,000 is for medical care.

This is in-hospital care. I repeat to the Senate what I have said on other occasions, that we still find that every other bed in the 180 veterans hospitals in the Nation is still used for a medical case. The line on the chart does not seem to go down.

The amount of $5,190 million is for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which is $1.5 billion over last year, and accounts for a like increase in the totals for the bill over last year—$770,483,000 is for the Federal Aviation Agency—$597,671,750 is for the General Services Administration, of which $163,623,150 is for the construction of Federal buildings all over the country for the next fiscal year. The buildings are listed in the report, and a list of the sites and planning are listed in the report State by State, and city by city.

The $472,946,400 is for the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which includes $100 million for the urban renewal fund and $100 million for housing for the elderly fund; $373,200,000 is for the National Science Foundation; $135,338,000 is for civil defense, plus $30 million for the medical stockpile and health activities.

The committee recommends restorations totaling $298,420,950 over the House, and reductions of $11,150,000.

The largest restoration is $90 million to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The next largest restoration is $50 million to the National Science Foundation.

The next largest is the restoration of $47,538,000 to civil defense, to provide for stocking the shelters in existing buildings that have been surveyed and marked.

Most of the small restorations were made to allow the agencies to continue at the 1963 level of positions.

In other words, the committee served notice on the agencies that the amount of money to be appropriated was appropriated with the understanding that there would be no increase in Federal employment for the present fiscal year. There is only one exception, and that is with respect to a small increase to the Federal Aviation Agency, which would allow new employees to man the safety towers which are being constructed or will be constructed during the coming year. The committee has taken a tough position on increasing the number of Federal employees, and has said to all the agencies that there will be no new employment, and that all agencies will continue at the 1963 level, with the one exception that I have mentioned.

One item is over the budget estimate by $2,978,000. This is for medical research in the Veterans' Administration. We felt that with the in-hospital medical care bill reaching the staggering amount of $1,081 million, the amount for medical research not only will save suffering, but might save some money in the Veterans' Administration.

This has been done on other occasions, and it has paid off in substantial benefits.

A technical mistake was made in reporting the bill. The language was approved by the committee, and the following amendment should be included in the bill:

On page 36, line 22, following the word "equipment" insert: "(including the purchase of aircraft for experimental purposes)".

This amendment was voted on and approved by the committee, but was inadvertently omitted from the bill. I ask that the amendment be adopted.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be regarded, for the purpose of amendment, as original text; provided, that no point of order shall be considered to be waived by reason of agreement to this order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 3, line 1, after the word "Office", to strike out "$4,045,000" and insert "$5,265,000", and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided,* That not to exceed $1,000,000 of the foregoing amount shall remain available until expended for studies and research to develop measures and plans for emergency preparedness and telecommunications."

On page 3, line 12, after the word "activities", to strike out "$5,190,000" and insert "$4,190,000".

On page 4, line 6, after "per diem", to strike out "$780,000" and insert "$980,000".

On page 4, line 23, after the word "law", to strike out "$70,000,000" and insert "$70,638,000"; in line 24, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$13,500,000" and insert "$18,000,000", and on page 5, line 1, after the word "amended", to strike out the comma and "and not to exceed $14,078,000 shall be available for management expenses for civil defense including not to exceed 1,062 positions."

On page 5, line 8, after the word "shelter", to strike out "surveys and marking" and insert "surveys, marking and stocking", and in line 9, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "$17,800,000" and insert "$64,700,000".

On page 5, after line 20, to strike out:

"No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used for construction of fallout shelters."

On page 6, line 11, after "(50 U.S.C., app. 2281(h))", to strike out "$25,000,000" and insert "$30,000,000".

On page 6, line 23, after "per diem", to strike out "$10,115,000" and insert "$10,365,000".

On page 7, line 6, after the word "Board", to strike out "$75,000,000" and insert "$81,000,000", and in line 7, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$5,000,000".

On page 8, at the beginning of line 2, to strike out "$21,680,000" and insert "$21,930,000".

On page 11, line 24, after the word "snowshoes", to strike out "$515,775,000" and insert "$535,000,000", and in line 25, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the colon and

"*Provided,* That total costs of aviation medicine; including equipment, for the Federal Aviation Agency, whether provided in the foregoing appropriation or elsewhere in this Act, shall not exceed $5,100,000 or include in excess of 315 positions"; and in lieu thereof, to insert a colon and

"*Provided,* That total costs of aviation medicine, excluding employee health services but including equipment, for the Federal Aviation Agency, whether provided in the foregoing appropriation or elsewhere in this Act, shall not exceed $6,500,000 or include in excess of 408 positions:".

On page 12, line 24, after the word "aircraft" to strike out "$110,000,000" and insert "$100,250,000".

On page 13, at the beginning of line 19, to strike out "$35,000,000" and insert "$45,000,000".

On page 14, line 2, after the word "ammunition", to strike out "$3,500,000" and insert "$3,663,000".

On page 14, line 12, after the word "ammunition", to strike out "$3,810,000" and insert "$4,045,000".

On page 16, line 16, after the word "only", to strike out "$15,800,000" and insert "$15,400,000".

On page 16, line 23, after the word "individuals", to insert "and not to exceed $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses", and at the beginning of line 25, to strike out "$11,750,000" and insert "$11,950,000".

On page 17, at the beginning of line 8, to strike out "$12,100,000" and insert "$12,329,500".

On page 18, line 11, after the word "moving", to strike out "$200,875,000" and insert "$214,875,000".

On page 19, line 22, after the word "including", to insert "fallout shelters therein and", and in line 23, after the word "buildings", to strike out "$152,540,700" and insert "$163,623,150".

On page 20, at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "$309,600" and insert "$326,800".

On page 20, at the beginning of line 14, to strike out "$2,075,400" and insert "$2,271,450".

On page 20, line 16, after the name "California", to strike out "$4,743,900" and insert "$5,130,000".

On page 20, at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "$990,000" and insert "$1,097,250".

On page 20, at the beginning of line 20, to strike out "$6,620,400" and insert "$7,129,750".

On page 20, line 21, after the name "Indiana", to strike out "$990,000" and insert "$1,098,200".

On page 20, line 24, after the name "Indiana", to strike out "$811,800" and insert "$902,500".

On page 21, line 2, after the word "Kentucky", to strike out "$279,000" and insert "$294,500".

On page 21, line 3, after the word "Maine", to strike out "$3,192,300" and insert "$3,470,350".

On page 21, line 6, after the word "provided", to strike out "$12,108,600" and insert "$13,020,700".

On page 21, line 8, after the word "Michigan", to strike out "$3,591,000" and insert "$3,790,500".

On page 21, line 10, to strike out "$1,581,300" and insert "$1,740,400".

On page 21, line 12, after the word "Missouri", to strike out "$1,421,100" and insert "$1,564,650".

On page 21, line 14, after the word "Montana", to strike out "$1,953,000" and insert "$2,142,250".

On page 21, line 16, to strike out "$308,700" and insert "$325,000".

On page 21, line 18, after the word "Montana", to strike out "$1,436,400" and insert "$1,516,200".

On page 21, line 20, after the word "Nevada", strike out "$4,185,900" and insert "$4,533,400".

On page 21, line 22, after the word "New Hampshire", to strike out "$310,500" and insert "$349,600".

On page 21, line 24, after the word "New Hampshire", to strike out "$2,078,100" and insert "$2,276.200".

On page 22, line 2, after the word "New Mexico", to strike out "$317,700" and insert "$335,350".

On page 22, line 4, after the word "New Mexico", to strike out "$747,000" and insert "$788,500".

On page 22, line 6, after the word "New Mexico", to strike out "$1,377,000" and insert "$1.515,250".

On page 22, line 7, after the word "Ohio", to strike out "$36,639,000" and insert "$39,161,850".

On page 22, line 10, after the word "Rhode Island", to strike out "$715,500" and insert "$755,250".

On page 22, line 12, to strike out "$2,529,900" and insert "$2,757,850".

On page 22, line 14, to strike out "$288,000" and insert "$319,200".

On page 22, line 16, to strike out "$510,300" and insert "$570,950".

On page 22, line 17, after the word "Texas", to strike out "$13,898,700" and insert "$14,880,800".

On page 22, line 20, to strike out "$937,800" and insert "$1,039,300".

On page 22, line 22, to strike out "$270,000" and insert "$285,000".

On page 22, line 24, to strike out "$292,500" and insert "$308,750".

On page 23, line 2, after the word "Washington", to strike out "$284,400" and insert "$300,200".

On page 23, line 4, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$11,434,500" and insert "$12,069,750".

On page 23, line 7, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$32,580,000" and insert "$34,823,200".

On page 24, line 14, after the word "law", to strike out "$45,500,000" and insert "$46,500,000".

On page 24, line 24, after the word "law", to strike out "$9,275,000" and insert "$9,500,000".

On page 25, at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "$4,725,000" and insert "$4,975,000".

On page 26, at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "$2,712,000" and insert "$3,112,000", and on page 27, line 14, after the word "transfer", to insert "in kind".

On page 28, at the beginning of line 12, to insert "and for reimbursable services"; in line 14, after the word "operations", to insert "and for reimbursable services"; in line 15, after the word "activities", to insert "and for other agencies"; at the beginning of line 19, to insert "administrative operations for"; at the beginning of line 21, to insert "excluding reimbursements for automatic data processing services)"; in line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$18,150,000" and insert "$13,580,000", and in line 24, after the word "program", to insert "(excluding reimbursements for automatic data processing services)".

On page 32, line 13, after the word "only", to strike out "$15,325,000" and insert "$15,725,000".

On page 35, line 14, after "(12 U.S.C. 1701q et seq.)", to strike out "$75,000,000" and insert "$100,000,000".

On page 36, line 9. after the word "only", to strike out "$24,500,000" and insert "$24,840,000"; in line 10, after the word "than", to strike out "$1,910,000" and insert "$1,918,000", and in line 12, after the word "than", to strike out "$1,270,000" and insert "$1,276,000".

On page 37, line 3, after the word "Administration", to strike out "$3,926,000,000" and insert "$4,006,000,000".

On page 37, line 9, after the word "law", to strike out "$680,000,000" and insert "$690,000,000".

On page 38, after line 12, to strike out:

"No part of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act shall be used for expenses of participating in a manned lunar landing to be carried out jointly by the United States and any Communist, Communist-controlled, or Communist-dominated country, or for expenses of any aeronautical and space activities (as defined in section 103(1) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958) which are primarily designed to facilitate or prepare for participation in such a joint manned lunar landing."

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

"No part of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act shall be used for expenses of participating in a manned lunar landing to be carried out jointly by the United States and any other country without consent of the Congress."

On page 39, line 23, after the word "services", to strike out "$323,200,000" and insert "$373,200,000", and on page 40, line 9, after the word "Act", to strike out the colon and "*Provided further,* That no part of the foregoing appropriation may be transferred to any other agency of the Government for research".

On page 40, line 25, to strike out "$13,775,000" and insert "$14,100,000".

On page 41, line 13, after the word "Specialists", to strike out "$37,840,000" and insert "$37,940,000".

On page 42, line 18, after the word "law", to strike out "$14,510,000" and insert "$14,800,000".

On page 42, at the beginning of line 23, to strike out "$31,720,000" and insert "$36,720,000".

On page 43, line 18, after the word "Code", to strike out "$1,075,186,000" and insert "$1,081,186,000".

On page 45, line 10, after the word "Code", to strike out "$72,754,000" and insert "$76,877,000", and in line 11, after the word "expended", to insert a colon and "*Provided,* That the limitation under the head "HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY FACILITIES" in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1956, on the amount available for technical services for rehabilitation of the neuropsychiatric hospital at Downey, Illinois is reduced from $2,063,225 to $1,575,000: *Provided further,* That $1,722,000 shall be used for the sites and planning expenses involved in the construction of a Veterans Administration hospital at Bay Pines, Florida".

On page 46, line 5, after the word "expenses", to strike out the comma and "but not to exceed $246,240,000,".

On page 54, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$770,000" and insert "$1,000,000".

On page 56, line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$9,200,000" and insert "$9,600,000", and in line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$76,065,000" and insert "$77,065,000".

On page 58, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,240,000" and insert "$1,600,000".

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the committee worked long and hard on this complex bill. I am sure Senators will have some questions to ask about the various items.

The distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] worked with me on the bill, as he has done in years past. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], a new member of the committee, and other Senators ably assisted in reaching our decisions on the items in the bill.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences [Mr. ANDERSON] and members of other committees gave us the benefit of their advice.

Other amendments are pending. I believe the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] have amendments to offer.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am ready to offer my amendment, if the Senator from Washington has concluded.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Unless Senators desire to ask general questions, I will yield the floor temporarily.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. INOUYE. I direct attention to page 21 of the committee report, under the heading "National Science Foundation." The fourth paragraph relates to Project Mohole, and states:

> Such a diversity of scientific and engineering opinion has been presented to the Committee on Project Mohole that it is obvious that construction of the large drilling platform at this time would be unwise. The committee therefore directs that no planning, research, or construction funds leading to such platform be expended until more data is available to this committee upon which it can base a more informed judgment.

Does that statement mean that Project Mohole is canceled?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall ask the Senator from Colorado to add to what I am about to say. My feeling, and I believe it was also the feeling of the committee, was that this directive would not stop Project Mohole. We said, in effect, that because there is a great diversity of scientific opinion, and because some of the problems are controversial, the National Science Foundation should, for the next 5 or 6 months, keep the program in suspension and not spend any money on the construction of a platform or do engineering work connected with the platform, until such time as they can appear before the Bureau of the Budget, which will be within the next 30 days, and give the Bureau the benefit of better and more cohesive information concerning this controversial program. Then we might continue with Project Mohole and obtain better results. I do not have the impression, and I do not think the committee has either, that Project Mohole has been abandoned. We are merely suggesting a little different procedure than has been followed heretofore.

I yield to the Senator from Colorado, if he desires to add to what I have said.

Mr. ALLOTT. I do not regard this directive as an abandonment of Project Mohole. It would require an hour and a half or 2 hours, to give a complete history of this subject, although I shall be perfectly willing to do it if the Senator wishes me to do so.

Even the Bureau of the Budget saw fit last spring to eliminate construction funds for this project. So far as I know, up until the last few days, the cutoff was still in effect. It was in effect when the agency appeared before the committee.

The facts are that the minutes of several meetings of the Amsoc Committee, which was the official adviser to the National Science Foundation on this project, showed that the overwhelming sentiment was in support of an intermediate vessel, an intermediate approach to the Mohole project. There are several members of the Amsoc Committee, which is a Committee of the National Academy of Science. "Amsoc" stands for American Miscellaneous Society.

Dr. Haworth, the new director of the National Science Foundation, testified before the committee that in view of the 3 months he had been in his position and the limited opportunity he had had to consider the question, he had formed no conclusion.

The House Merchant Marine Committee held an extensive investigation in the last few weeks, and held the most recent hearing in the last 2 or 3 days. I understand that they intend to look further into the question.

I believe the language in the report should be construed to mean that until the National Science Foundation and the scientists of the country who are skilled in this area—and I assure the Senator from Hawaii that I do not consider myself to be skilled in this area—can reach some consensus as to the best way to proceed with the actual planning, the design and building of this big platform should stand in abeyance.

I hope I have answered the question of the Senator from Hawaii. If he has specific questions, I shall try to answer them.

Mr. INOUYE. I thank the Senator from Colorado. I have been advised that the Subcommittee on Oceanography of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries completed hearings on this subject on November 12. I have been further advised that there is every reason to believe that the committee will, upon completion of its deliberations, come forward in support of the National Science Foundation and recommend proceeding with the construction of a large platform.

Mr. ALLOTT. If the Senator from Hawaii has such information, the conclusion his informant drew was different from the conclusion drawn by my informant when he discussed the problem with me.

Mr. INOUYE. I have been told that the temporary moratorium on the project would, in effect, mean total cancellation. That fear has been expressed by certain members of the National Science Foundation. Would the Senator from Colorado say that that is a correct understanding?

Mr. ALLOTT. I would not say it is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the chairman of the committee yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. On pages 20 and 21 of the report are four directives. The Senator from Washington will recall that this question arose concerning power transmission lines in the REA work. There was no opportunity to take the item out of the report. The Parliamentarian has informed us that there is no way to strike an item from a report. We wanted to strike some language pertaining to the REA, but there was no way to do so. So a stipulation was written into the report.

I call attention to the items for the National Science Foundation, to which the Senator from Hawaii has referred. The language to which he has referred does stop the work. It reads:

> The committee therefore directs that no planning, research, or construction funds leading to such platform be expended until more data is available to this committee upon which it can base a more informed judgment.

That is legislative action in the report, and Congress cannot act on it.

I read further from the report:

> The committee notes the conflict of asserted jurisdiction in the field of administration of common trust funds. It is our opinion that national banks are adequately supervised by the Comptroller of the Currency, and directs that no funds appropriated in this bill be expended by the SEC for that purpose.

That deals with a legislative function which belongs to the Banking and Currency Committee.

And the report refers as follows to the Space Administration:

> The committee found that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has initiated an academic grant program which is projected to cost between $21 and $28 million per year in the near future. Because of the overlap with other governmental grant education programs, the committee questions the propriety of such a program administered by this agency, and therefore directs that no new grants be made without specific authorization and appropriation.

So this is a new method of putting legislation into an appropriation bill in such fashion that it cannot be attacked by either House.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; it is only a limitation on the appropriation.

Mr. ANDERSON. But these are included in the report. If they were provisions of the bill, a Senator could move that they be stricken out. But when they are put in the report, they cannot be attacked.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not think that language would be subject to a point of order if it were a part of the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. I did not say that. I said that if it were in the bill, it might be stricken out by means of a motion. But when it is put in the report, it is immune to any action by the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But this has been done for years.

Mr. ANDERSON. For years?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. A long study was made of it, in connection with the construction of the REA transmission lines; and it had not been engaged in for so many years then.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This has been a common practice by the Appropriation Committee; namely, to put such statements in the report. The House Committee does this, too.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will not argue about what the House Committee does.

Mr. MAGNUSON. When we wish to express an opinion about certain expenditures of funds, we do so by including such statements in the report. This has often been done.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does not the Senator from Washington think that is a legislative function, rather than an appropriation function?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not think it is, because this statement is not included as a part of the proposed law. In the report we merely suggest to the agency that this is the way we feel about the matter. I suppose that technically any agency could ignore what the committee says in the report, and could proceed to disregard it.

Mr. ANDERSON. But the agency would have its head chopped off when its representatives appeared before the Appropriations Committee at the next session, would it not?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Perhaps so; but the agency could ignore the report.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I think this is a very strange procedure.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Sometimes we have been ignored when we included certain statements in a report.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I would also like to voice the concern expressed by the Senator from New Mexico as he related it to the committee report section's dealing with NASA as well as the National Science Foundation.

NASA is now conducting a program of predoctoral training which I feel is most necessary to further encourage an increase of doctorates in aeronautical and space-related fields. The need in these fields is now and not in the future. Every report indicates a present critical manpower deficiency.

It should be made clear that in this day of domestic program's to lessen the unemployment problems in certain areas of our Nation an improvement in the intellectual climate of such areas would go far toward encouraging the expansion of a technical industry, resulting in increased employment possibilities.

The added duty of not only NASA but the Congress as well, to insure U.S. leadership in aeronautical and space-related science and technology is clear in this period of the cold war.

I believe I am correct in stating that six schools in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania are participating in this program.

The amount of predoctoral grants is $1.1 million. With the national and area benefits that could be derived from such a program, I hope that the Congress will not unreasonably limit or stymie the present and future program.

With respect to the provision relating to the National Science Foundation, I am glad to see that the Committee restored the $50 million cut by the House. However I would personally prefer an additional increase, with emphasis on undergraduate science education facilities. A strong base for advanced science and engineering must grow from and be developed on the undergraduate education level. This is the source that our scientists reach for, for original orientation, motivation, and basic scientific fundamentals.

A present emphasis on undergraduate education and facilities will broaden the number of educational institutions that might furnish our scientific community a valuable source of qualified students.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, who helped us with the NASA appropriations—and let me say that the particular limitation he discussed a moment ago I have also discussed with him privately—that I am glad of his interest and of the interest of the committee in this; but we have found it necessary to be very specific in writing the report, because in many cases the various agencies disregard the expressed wishes of Congress. So in that connection it is necessary to be very explicit.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And in reports we often state that a certain amount of money is to be spent for a certain project; and in other cases we say we do not want the money spent for this or that project.

Mr. ANDERSON. Let me consider the first example of the four on these two pages. I read now from the top of page 20 of the report:

> The committee takes notice of the fact that there is substantive legislation pending before the Congress designed to solve the recurring boxcar shortage. Until the Congress has had a chance to pass upon such legislation, the committee directs the Commission—

To do certain things.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Why not wait until the legislation is enacted, and see what the legislative committee decides is the proper thing to do, and wait until Congress approves.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We merely say that with the money available to them, we expect them to direct personnel to work on the boxcar shortage, particularly at harvest time. That language is a directive to them to do so. But the reason why we state that legislation is pending is that the Interstate Commerce Commission now has no authority to direct the movement of boxcars, but personnel of the Car Safety and Service Division can encourage, persuade, and take similar action. When the boxcar bill comes before us, if it is enacted, the Interstate Commerce Commission will have legal responsibility to take action.

But this is a very difficult situation. I have introduced the bill every year; but every year the Members from the States east of the Mississippi River have opposed the bill, although Members from States west of the Mississippi were in favor of it. Unfortunately, the eastern group is the larger.

Mr. ANDERSON. But I point out that on this basis, when the foreign aid appropriation bill is being dealt with by the Appropriations Committee, it could write certain items into the report, and thus could be successful in stopping certain operations of the foreign aid program without permitting the Senate to have a chance to pass on that question. So I think this is a dangerous trend.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am a member of the subcommittee. The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is present. I believe we have written into many reports on foreign aid certain directives.

Mr. ANDERSON. Have they been included in the bill, where Congress could deal with them; or have they been included in the report, where Congress could not deal with them?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Both.

Mr. MAGNUSON. At times it is better not to clutter up a bill with too many things. If the agencies will read the report, perhaps it is better to have them proceed voluntarily—rather than by law—to do what the committee requests. This is common practice by the Appropriations Committees; it has been done many times. We do it all the time. We could write such a provision into the bill, but sometimes among the parliamentary experts there is a difference of opinion as to whether such a provision is language added to an appropriation bill, and, therefore, whether a two-thirds vote, rather than a majority vote, would be required in order to approve such a provision. I suspect that sometimes when certain language is a little controversial, the committee says, "Let us put it in the report."

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I suspected that that was the situation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; and that frequently happens. But the Appropriations Committee will express its opinion on all these matters. It always has, and it has a responsibility to do so. Otherwise, I do not think the committee would be carrying out its responsibility to Congress or to the Government agencies themselves.

Furthermore, sometimes an agency will say, "Please put something in the report, to help us do certain things," and we do so. A good example of that is—and I am sure the Senator from New Mexico and all other Senators will agree about this—the part of the report which deals with the General Services Administration. The testimony shows that it would like the inclusion of language by means of which we would direct certain things to be done. So in the report we state:

> In approving funds for the construction of Federal Office Building No. 5 in Washington, D.C.—

A so-called little Pentagon which will be built—

> the committee took note of the fact that the Administrator is making a concerted effort to remove the temporary buildings on the Mall and on Constitution Avenue. The committee completely agrees with and supports the Administrator in this effort and urges that FOB No. 5 be used to accomplish the demolition of the World War II temporary buildings, as well as the Navy and Munitions Buildings still standing from World War I, through the relocation of employees from such structures or through other space adjustments which will accomplish this purpose.

The General Services Administration needed that language in the bill, because it never could get the Defense Department—even after the new Pentagon was built—to vacate the old buildings on Constitution Avenue. So, in effect, we are directing them to do so, and we hope they will. This is an instance in which the Department itself wanted language of this sort to be used.

Mr. ANDERSON. I merely point out that it substitutes the opinion of a majority of the committee for the opinion of a majority of the Congress.

I am not pressing; but, except I dislike to see it appear in the appropriation bill. I believe that a majority vote of the Congress is more important than merely a majority vote of the committee, as reflected in the report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We must make some statement in the report. Suppose a part of the space program would cost $9 million, the appropriation for which would come under general appropriations for NASA, and for which the committee did not appropriate money. It would be said none of that money within the total should be used for that particular project. That would be done without picking it out and putting the name of the project in the bill.

I believe the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] has an amendment to offer.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 325 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Arkansas will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 37, line 3, strike out "$4,006,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,605,400,000".

On page 37, line 9, strike out "$690,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$621,000,000".

On page 37, line 22, strike out "$494,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$444,600,000".

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add to the amendment as cosponsors the names of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, my amendment to the bill would reduce the appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by $519 million. It would cut a flat 10 percent in each of three categories: "Research and development," "Construction of facilities," and "Administrative operations." The reduction would be as follows: Research and development, $400,600,000; construction of facilities, $69,000,000; administrative operations, $49,400,000.

Before I proceed further, it might be said that the reduction would be an across-the-board cut of 10 percent, which is true. I believe that the nature of this organization and of its own budget warrants this kind of approach. In further defense of the approach, I point out that on page 38 of the bill, at the top of the page, under "General Provisions," the following appears: "not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act may be transferred to any other such appropriation."

So, even though the Senate should cut the amount—which I urge it to do—the agency will have plenty of leeway in case of any emergency under that transfer power to transfer 5 percent of the amount which, even if the amendment is adopted, would be $4½ billion, which is quite a substantial sum.

I wrote to the space agency some time ago requesting a breakdown as to the effect of a cut of this kind, and the agency was unable to supply it. I have that letter, which I shall place in the Record at the end of my remarks. In any case, that is the way I had to approach the question. I believe it is the only feasible way to approach it.

Simply stated, the purpose of the amendment is to allow time to reevaluate the goal of trying to reach the moon in this decade and to proceed on a more deliberate and thoughtful basis. Even with this reduction the appropriation would be about $1 billion—or 27 percent above last year's amount. I might point out parenthetically that the proposed reduction is approximately the same as the amount which the Senate, for reasons of economy, cut from the foreign aid bill.

I have already expressed my views on the crash program to reach the moon. I believe, as I said in a speech on October 17, that there is a dangerous imbalance between our efforts in armaments and space on the one hand, and employment and education on the other. The proposed appropriation for NASA, in my opinion, reflects this imbalance. I believe that it should be substantially reduced. I further believe that any funds which are withheld from the space program should be reallocated to programs of education and employment which are before the Congress this year. I subscribe to the view expressed by the senior Senator from Louisiana, who said during the Senate hearings on the appropriation bill:

> I do not believe that the people of our Nation, on the whole, are interested in who gets to the moon first.

The question before us, as I said on October 17, is not whether we should or should not send a manned rocket ship to the moon but whether the project is so vital and so urgent as to warrant the indefinite postponement of other national efforts. This question has been debated at length in recent months. I have heard nothing to persuade me that it would be a national calamity if the landing on the moon were delayed until 1980 or 1990. I have heard and seen a great deal which persuades me that our continuing neglect of deteriorating schools and rising unemployment would be a national calamity.

Judging from the many letters which I received in response to my speech of October 17, my own constituents and many people from all over the country subscribe to this view. In this instance, the people are well ahead of the Congress and the administration.

When we speak of a manned lunar landing program, we are talking about the expenditure of at least $20 billion of tax money, and probably a great deal more. Some estimates run as high as $50 billion. In our debate on this appropriation bill it is essential that we maintain some perspective on the vast sums of money involved, and particularly on the projected $20 billion—to take the minimum figure—for a landing on the moon. The sum of $20 billion represents more than the total cost of running the Nation's public elementary and secondary school system last year, including outlays for new construction. It is nearly four times the amount spent last year for our public colleges and universities.

We could build 10 TVA's with $20 billion. And it represents about twice the amount invested in Corps of Engineers water development projects since the turn of the century. If we are to examine the space program in meaningful perspective, we must relate space expenditures to the costs of pressing public needs and attempt to establish reasonable priorities among them.

The question facing the Senate in deciding the level of appropriations for NASA is not whether or not we want to go to the moon or indeed whether we want to beat the Russians in getting there. We would obviously like to do both. The issue is rather one of priorities and of the relative urgency of public needs. Our Federal budget is nothing more than a reflection of national needs as determined by the President and the Congress. The plan to place a man on the moon and to return him safely to earth during this decade is a national goal set by the President and approved by the Congress. Perhaps it was set at a time when there was a need for distraction of public attention from problems that were most unpleasant and not susceptible to easy solutions. But we should now judge this "great adventure" in the cold light of reality without being swayed by extraneous issues. There is no virtue in "muddling through" with a bad decision. If the Congress decides that a mistake was made and that the goal is too risky and expensive, it should face up to its error and proceed to correct it. It is not easy for Congress to admit that a mistake has been made, but when vast sums of money—and quite possibly human lives as well—are involved, it cannot afford to do otherwise. Congress must determine whether reaching the moon in this decade is an enterprise so vital to the national interest as to warrant a priority call on the Treasury over all of the other pressing needs in the public sector of the economy.

During the first 5 years of NASA's existence, $7 billion has been expended on a $35 billion space program to be carried out by the end of this decade. The budget request for NASA jumped from $3.7 billion in fiscal year 1963, to $5.7 billion for this year, an increase of 54 percent. I doubt that any other Federal program can match NASA's growth record. Mr. Webb has told the Congress that approximately this same amount would be required for another fiscal year before the program would begin to taper off. The reasons offered for this vast public expenditure have been less than persuasive. Having heard the arguments about prestige and spinoff to the civilian economy and a great human adventure, I remain unable to understand what great catastrophe would befall us if the manned space program were to be delayed by 10, or even 20 years.

At the risk of being considered something of a troglodyte, I cannot bring myself to believe that going to the moon is essential simply because it is new and creative and adventurous. Still less can I bring myself to believe that the education and welfare of our people warrant lower priorities than space simply because these are old and unimaginative objectives of public policy. The real question before the Congress is not whether we should or should not explore outer space but whether we want to spend 17 times as much on space adventure this year as on clearing urban blight and slums, whether we want to spend 25 times as much on space as on providing adequate public housing for low-income families. These are the essential questions that confront the Senate.

The manned lunar program is not essential to the Nation's security. It is not another Manhattan project in which every day counts and money is no object. No one to my knowledge contends that the Nation will be weaker or less able to defend itself if this program is substantially cut back. During hearings before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations earlier this year, I asked Gen. Maxwell Taylor if he felt that the moon project had a direct bearing on our military security. "No sir," he replied, "I do not think it does." I also asked if he saw any military significance in the program to put man on the moon. "Personally," he said, "I see no present military need."

General Taylor's views are backed by space agency officials and scientists. During the hearings before the House Appropriations Subcommittee, Mr. Webb was asked if the military at this time had any need or any use for Saturn 1, 1-B, or V boosters. "As of today," he said, "no military mission has been established."

Dr. Harold Urey, one of the Nation's most distinguished scientists, stated that the moonshot program "has no contribution to make to the national defense at all." In fact, he said, "very little of the space program outside of the first 500 to 1,000 miles above the earth has any importance to military things at all. It certainly has no importance from the standpoint of trying to deliver missiles from one part of the earth to another." Dr. Robert Seamans, Jr., NASA Deputy Administrator, was quoted in the Washington Sunday Star earlier this year as saying:

> As for the trip to the moon, this obviously is not being carried out for military reasons. There is no military advantage in the foreseeable future of being on the moon. But it is an extremely exciting adventure and will provide important scientific data.

I would add that it is also an extremely expensive adventure and I know of no reason why we cannot explore the heavens at a more leisurely pace.

Our military experts have also disclaimed any use for the large boosters being developed for the manned space effort. Gen. Curtis LeMay, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, told the House Armed Services Committee last February:

> We can't really define an offensive weapon for use in space that will be more efficient and less costly than one we could do the same job with on the ground or in the air.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Would the distinguished Senator prefer to have questions asked and comments during his address or prefer to conclude his address?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will abide by the Senator's desire, if he wishes to ask a question.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I appreciate the opportunity to do so with respect to the military advisability of the program, and would comment on three or four points made by the able Senator.

With respect to the military aspect, we heard testimony by the experts—I remember Dr. Seamans was one of them—that, of the $20 billion planned for the lunar project, only between $1 billion and $2 billion would be directly allocated to the moon effort. The other $18 billion or more incident to the lunar program, primarily because of the tremendous interest in additional thrust on the part of the military, necessary to possible new weapons—could be considered a defense effort and would have to be spent, regardless of whether there was decision to go to the moon or not.

I remember at the retirement dinner for Gen. Thomas White, as intelligent and broadminded a military officer as I have known—a great linguist, and a great student of the military art—who at the present time is the military editor of Newsweek. He said, in effect, at his retirement dinner, "I want to leave one short message with you. There was a day when those who controlled the ground controlled the world. Then those who controlled the sea controlled the world. Today, as we know, those who control the air control the world. My prediction is, if I can be sure of anything, I am sure that tomorrow those who control space will control the world."

The people I respect most in the military field, ones who understand the importance of the new environments are interested in the vital importance of space to our national security.

The problem, as I see it, is one that has many facets. However, the question of national prestige is important here. So is education of the utmost importance. The budget for the National Science Foundation has increased more, in percentage, in recent years than has the budget for the space program, to the best of my knowledge. The National Science Foundation budget in 1958 was $48 million. The request made by the administration for this year was $589 million.

I only mention that to present that some of the other budgets responding to the nature of the world around us at the present time are increasing in comparable manner to the space budget.

This is a great deal of money, but I was looking recently at the figures of gross national product of this country. Last year the GNP was $554,900 million, of which $357 billion actually comprised consumer demand. I understand consumer income is now about $450 billion.

If the estimates in NASA, including those of the Director and the first or second assistant, Dr. Seamans, are correct, the cost of going to the moon—leaving aside the defense aspects of the program—are about one day's GNP of the United States. I hope the Senator will give those facts some consideration when we come to a vote on this bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the Senator's contribution. He cites General White, who is retired. I was citing General Taylor, who is not retired and who presently has responsibility for the defense of this country. In committee I asked him specifically if the moon project had any direct bearing upon our military security. He said, "No, sir, I do not think it does." I also asked him if he saw any military significance in the program to put a man on the moon. He said, "Personally, I see no present military need."

I do not think the Senator from Missouri would discount General Taylor as also being cultivated, intelligent, and linguistically inclined. He happens to be Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at the present time.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator puts me in an embarrassing position, because not only he but General Taylor were both born in a famous Missouri town.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator should not be embarrassed; I was, too.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Therefore I hesitate to criticize either of these eminent fellow Missourians. I am sure General Taylor could verify that what he was talking about was that, in that particular part of the overall $20 billion assigned to the effort to reach the moon, if figures are segregated, we are talking about 5 to 10 percent, at the most, as the straight lunar effort.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I referred only to the military aspect of the program. The Senator is reading more into my comment than I said.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator said the lunar project.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I said "military."

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes, but the lunar project, the part about putting the man on the moon, has nothing to do with the vital military importance of getting adequate thrust, whether we put a man on the moon or not, to have a space platform comparable to what we hear the Russians are planning to have.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator has any special information about what the Russians are going to do that is not available to us at the present time, I would be interested in it. I question whether such information is reliable.

Mr. SYMINGTON. We do know of their recent orbits. We know of their superiority in thrust. We do know they have done, not once, but a number of times——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But that is not going to the moon.

Mr. SYMINGTON. But this is the thrust the military need, the thrust they require, and the effort to get that thrust is included as part of the cost of going to the moon.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There are other experts, scientists and others, that I shall quote, who have testified directly in this connection. I have already quoted Dr. Seamans. I was trying to respond to your question item by item—to consider the military significance of space, the prestige factor, and its economic fallout, as they call it. I was speaking now only of the military significance.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it ought to be pointed out again clearly that the question the Senator from Arkansas dealt with was direct benefits to the military effort by going to the moon.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. There is this difference between this $20 billion and the project of going to the moon. What they have been talking about is 2,000 hours of earth orbiting, and that every dollar of that will be useful to the military.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The military has its own program. There is $1,700 million in the budget this year for the military space program, in addition to the NASA budget.

Mr. ANDERSON. The space program of NASA in general is completely tied in with the space program of the military. They are identical.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would not be surprised that they are identical and completely duplicating.

Mr. ANDERSON. No. NASA has things it needs to know about Gemini, and the military has things it needs to know about Gemini.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would not be surprised. The military looks after its own. It has $1,700 million to look after its own. General Taylor is a responsible man. Earlier this year, when we were talking about the test ban treaty, everybody, particularly the opponents, thought that General LeMay was the last word on the treaty. He said we cannot really design a weapon for use in space that would be more efficient and less costly than one that could do the job on the ground or in the air. This statement directly relates to the military value of going to the moon.

I am not saying it is not a great feat for those who feel inferior and who think we, as a Nation, need the prestige. I do not see why the United States should feel so inferior that we have got to show the Russians that we can get to the moon first. That is the only real question.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the able Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The military have not been known for having unanimous opinions on military weapons.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Over the years I have noticed that all three services have firm ideas as to what the military weaponry should be. Seldom do any one of the three services agree with each other. That position is now further refined. We learn that in the Navy there will be some admirals who feel the carrier is the primary answer, whereas others believe the submarine is the answer. Also, in the Air Force, some thinking revolves around the newer, faster, larger, long-range bombers. There is no secret about that. Other persons in the Air Force, however, disagree, believe that the long-range, high-altitude, faster B-70 or its equivalent is out from the standpoint of the best way to enter a country that had attacked the United States. They believe the Dyna-Soar furnishes a new avenue of research and development. They believe in manned orbiting units.

Fortunately, we have a Secretary of Defense who, for the first time is really trying to coordinate these constant disagreements, which are very expensive, and pick out from the various requests what he believes is best for each of the services, fitting them into a single defense policy.

With that premise, it is important to give consideration to the fact that Secretary McNamara, who has already had such success in reducing costs, is 100 percent behind the President's proposed space program, as presented on the Senate floor this afternoon.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. However, that is not his particular responsibility.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator quoted General LeMay. His responsibility is not NASA either.

If we wish to quote anyone from the military, I would rather quote the Secretary of Defense than anyone else.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I quoted Dr. Seamans, the NASA Deputy Administrator, who said:

> As for the trip to the moon, this obviously is not being carried out for military reasons. There is no military advantage in the foreseeable future being on the moon. But it is an extremely exciting adventure and will provide important scientific data.

I can well imagine that it is exciting to scientists to play with these boosters. It is a wonderful thing. As I said in the beginning, I am not against anyone going to the moon if he wishes to do so. However, I am simply against putting the program on a crash basis and devoting so much money to it that it cramps the whole budget so we cannot get money for much more important items, some of which I have mentioned, and others which I will mention later. It seems absurd to me to have an expansion of this program almost overnight from nothing to 32,000 employees and more than $5 billion, when it will have no real bearing on our security in the immediate future.

This is not like the Manhattan project. There is no great war in progress. No one feels that we are about to be attacked. In any case, this is a long-range program and I merely propose that we go at it a little more moderately. I am only proposing a cut of 10 percent, which is very nominal. We cut the foreign aid bill very substantially last week, without blinking an eye. I believe the Senator from Missouri voted for the cuts. I do not want to go over that again.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I did not want to get into it, either, the foreign aid debate. There was one country for which we were putting up money to train paratroopers; then we found they did not have airplanes. But I present this point for the distinguished Senator's consideration. Dr. Seamans testified that only 10 percent, at a maximum, down to 5 percent, of the lunar project can be segregated to the actual part of the program of going to the moon, with the rest necessary for the defense effort. It seems to me that is very important. I have one more point to make.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. On that point, let me say——

Mr. SYMINGTON. May I just add one more point?

In August 1957, as an ad hoc member of the Senate Subcommittee on Military Appropriations, an admiral came up and asked for $40 million more. When questioned by the subcommittee, he said, "We wish to be sure that we will be the first to orbit."

He got the $40 million. Within about 6 weeks however, the Soviets put up the first Sputnik. Then we had some hearings because of the reaction of the American people to this extraordinary technical accomplishment on the part of the Soviets.

Therefore, I hope that the Senator, who of all people in the Senate—and I say this with great sincerity—knows the importance of a favorable position for the United States with other countries, will not write off the tremendous impact on world opinion which would come, regardless of any military need if the Russians were first to land on the moon.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is now getting into the question of national prestige. In all frankness, sputnik was a shock to us, because we were so complacent and conceited that we thought we were the only one who could do it. Until then we considered Russia a backward country. Momentarily it had quite an impact. Look at the Russians now, coming to us hat in hand to buy wheat, or at least to the Canadians and the Australians, who have enough sense to do business with them. What about the prestige that sputnik gave them? In does not feed their people. It does not convert anyone to communism. It was a trick, a kind of gambit, or whatever one wishes to call it.

So far as real prestige goes, it is nothing unless it is followed through. They orbited first, it is true, but we orbited second. I do not know but that we are just as well off as they are, even in the orbiting business.

We are certainly a great deal better off in being able to feed our people, in providing them with a decent living, and educating them.

I do not mind if someone wishes to go to the moon. I merely object to our trying to go tomorrow, and spending $5 billion doing it. If we try to do that, a great deal of the money will be wasted. Much of it has already been wasted. I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in Fortune magazine, written by Richard Austin Smith. This is the most persuasive article I have seen on this subject. I suppose the Senator would say that Mr. Smith is prejudiced. However, to me it is a most persuasive article. If anyone wishes to take some ridiculous example of waste, he can find them in the space program. This part of the space program does not seem to bother anyone.

We have had an endless number of misdirected efforts in connection with the missile program. In the beginning we went all out in the direction of developing, first, the Bomarc missile. Then when that did not pan out, we decided to go into the Minuteman program, then to the Titan, and so on.

Some failures are inherent in this kind of program and I am not saying that we should abandon the program. I merely say that if we balloon this program all out of reason, we will find that there will be nothing comparable to it in size and in the amount of money involved. It is downright silly for us to go overboard with the idea that we will impress someone by going to the moon.

The headlines will be forgotten a week after they appear.

If we allow basic sources of strength, such as our schools, our cities and the other things that I have mentioned, to deteriorate, I believe it will be said that this democracy has failed. Going to the moon will not save the democratic system. I do not believe it is important or significant, but I am willing to go along with a reasonable expansion of the space program, an expansion far greater than any other program that I know of in government.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have very great respect for the Senator, as he well knows. In this particular case, however, for reasons we have already discussed, I cannot agree, and would add one more point. When we establish a program in private business that runs into say only a few million dollars, the most important thing to do is carry out the program, once it is agreed upon. The expense comes about in readjusting the program, increasing or decreasing it. We can easily triple the cost of any manufactured article by increasing or decreasing the program.

I remember when with the Air Force, the Chief of Research and Development, at that time General LeMay, once said he was upset, saying "We have done nothing during the first 6 months of this year except program. First we say we will spend so much money; then we say we will spend less. We go first to the War Department—then we go to the Bureau of the Budget. Then we go to the Treasury Department and the President. Finally we come to Congress with a program they change; so it is all actually readjusted not less than five times."

His point was that scientists and engineers, instead of being engaged in research and development, had been engaged in reprograming, per se. Everyone knows that when there is a program of this scope, especially one rapidly expanding, there will be waste, mismanagement, and personnel problems.

But one thing is certain. If the program is cut, then increased, then cut again, 5 percent, 10 percent, or any other amount, without having the reduction apply to specific items, and even so, there will be much more waste before the end result sought is accomplished.

I am a member of the Committee on Astronautical and Space Sciences, ununder the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and believe an excellent defense in support of the program was made by Mr. Webb and his assistants. We ought to give consideration to a program of such vital importance for the future of the United States, rather than chip at it year by year. If we do I guarantee there will be more inefficiency. We ought to decide whether we want to go to the moon or not, and then stick to the program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would be delighted to proceed in that way. I am not chipping at the program. I am trying to avoid an extraordinary ballooning of it this year. A 54-percent increase is provided this year. My own guess would be that we will go through with this program; there is great momentum behind it on the part of many Senators, because a large part of the work will be done in particular States——

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator means American States?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; Mississippi, Florida, Missouri, and others. The work will be well distributed this year to get votes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Do not leave Arkansas out.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Arkansas does not have any of it, that I know of, so I can take an objective view. I am not speaking contrary to the personal interests of any of my constituents.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I honestly do not think this program is approached on that basis.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has been talking about chipping away.

Mr. SYMINGTON. A 10 percent reduction is a chip.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But the amount has not yet been approved. The committee seeks to increase the amount by about $2 billion, but the amount has not yet been approved. I assume the agency is not yet spending it—although perhaps they are so sure of its appropriation that they are already spending it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The House has approved.

Mr. FULBRIGHT But it has not been appropriated. I was trying to save us from making this mistake.

I will venture to prophesy that if this amount is approved, it will not be many years—perhaps one or two—before Americans will be disgusted with it. We will then cut it back, as we have cut back foreign aid, because the moon program is a silly program; and proceeding on a crash basis is bound to result in extraordinary and unnecessary waste.

I am not saying that the program should be eliminated. I am not chipping away at anything. I am saying we should not double it—almost 54 percent—in 1 year.

This is a new program. Its personnel are comparatively inexperienced with it. I know Mr. Webb. He is a fine man. I do not wish to reflect upon Mr. Webb. But only 3 or 4 years ago he was running an oil company in Oklahoma. What does he know about space? I imagine he has read much about it in the last 2 or 3 years; but his knowledge is certainly not comparable to that of General Taylor in the military field or with that of some other men who have spent their lives in the military field.

I am not talking about eliminating the program. I merely say we should examine it a little more carefully and be a little more deliberate in the way we spend money on it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If it is decided that we shall go to the moon, it will be necessary to have research and development, which will entail a relatively small investment by the people.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If it is decided to go by 1970. That would be all right if it were decided to go by 1990.

Mr. SYMINGTON. We can follow the instructions of the Commander in Chief. He says he wants to proceed this way this year.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Who is the Commander in Chief?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The President.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Since when does the Senator from Missouri have any respect for his opinion?

Certainly the Senator did not follow any of the President's advice last week on the foreign aid bill. Why, all of a sudden, is the President an expert on this subject?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am disappointed by that remark of the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is the truth. I pleaded with the Senator from Missouri to support the foreign aid bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I voted for the foreign aid bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. After cutting—after cutting it substantially.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am certain that my percentage of support of the President is at least equal to that of the able Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In any case, I did not put it on that basis.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If I may continue for a moment, suppose we decided, on the basis of what this administration would like to do, that we should go to the moon by a certain time. That would mean the research and development would start. After that, it would be necessary to spend considerably more to get into design and engineering. The machinery, equipment, and units needed to proceed would then be designed. Then there would be added expense for production engineering. Then there would be still more expense in getting into the tool engineering. Then it would be necessary to make the tools to manufacture the equipment needed, steadily increasing cost.

Finally the production itself would begin, before the operation of the finished product.

The point I make is that it is logical, when we go into a big program like this, to have additional expense in each successive year.

Otherwise, procedure would be totally contrary to the normal design and production of anything first designed, then built in the United States, from an automobile to an air force.

The fact we are each year increasing the amount of money quietly but steadily——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is not increasing quietly and steadily. What is proposed is an enormous, outrageous increase. What was last year's appropriation? Was it not $3.7 billion? This year the amount asked was $5.7 billion, and the bill recommends $5.19 billion. That is a tremendous increase in 1 year. It is not a gradual increase.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Last year $323 million was provided for the National Science Foundation. This year the amount recommended is $589 million, at the request of the Administrator. I am not necessarily against that, but everything in this situation today is increasing steadily.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is such a small amount that I did not bother with it. The one I am talking about is so big that it makes a tremendous impact. It is prejudicing many of the important activities of the country that are essential to its long-term life, as I shall mention in a moment. I have mentioned them in passing, but I have additional illustrations. The amount sought for space would have a tremendous impact upon other activities that are really important to the country.

We cannot afford to play around with this project in the limited period until 1970. I do not propose to eliminate the program. Does not the Senator believe that to increase the amount from $3.7 billion to $4.5 billion would be quite an increase in 1 year?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes, I do.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is all I am suggesting; nothing more.

Mr. SYMINGTON. As a member of the subcommittee headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Washington, where this subject was discussed in detail, based on what is wanted and why, provided it is desired to accomplish this aim at all, I believe this is the right way to do it.

All I say is, let us decide whether we want to do it or do not want to do it. Otherwise, each year the Senator from Arkansas will feel the same way about this program that I feel about the scope of the foreign aid program.

I do thank the very able Senator from Arkansas for permitting me to make these observations.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The fact is that the Senator's amendment would still permit a substantial increase in the space program, by some $1 billion.

It will mean that since 1960, when there was a $550 million appropriation, there will have been, approximately, a ninefold increase for this agency; and after the Senator's amendment is adopted, this program will be one of the largest of all the programs of the Federal Government.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; after my amendment is adopted, the total increase over last year's appropriation will be more than $1 billion a year.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Perhaps even more important than the increased spending for the program is the fact that this program, more than any other Government program, will absorb a great many of the scientists of the country, and thus will prevent their working on other projects, including education projects?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; and it will also keep them from working in industry.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes. It is my understanding that in 1970, one out of every four U.S. scientists will be working for NASA, in the space program; and also that approximately 10 times as many scientists are now working for NASA, as compared the number working for the various branches of NIH—and in my judgment NIH is overstaffed now. So my point is that NASA attracts a very large number of scientists; but scientists are in very short supply, particularly in defense activities, but also in education. If they are absorbed by this agency, that will mean we shall have to make a choice between our various priorities, and we shall have to starve some of the other priorities, which are also very important.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator from Wisconsin is entirely correct. He may have overstated the percentage involved. Later I shall submit figures in that connection.

Nevertheless, the Senator's main point about distortion of the normal distribution of our supply of scientists is, I believe, quite correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to know the source of the Senator's information that by 1970, one out of every four scientists in the United States will be working for NASA.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In a few minutes I will give an exact source. But the statement is generally based on an article which I wrote for Nation's Business. My staff and I spent some time getting the material together. We corresponded with a number of scientists. Based on the projections in regard to the size of the NASA program by 1970 and on the number of scientists who then would be working for it, this was our estimate; and I assure the Senator from New Mexico that it is not an off-the-cuff estimate, but is based on very careful study by my staff and me over a period of several weeks.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me read from an interview with Dr. Seamans:

> At the beginning of this year something like 3 to 4 percent of the scientists and engineers required by this country were being used by the space program. This proportion will grow to 6 to 7 percent by the beginning of the next year, and may get slightly higher as we continue through the decade. Although this represents a significant proportion, it does not approach the figures used by those who say we are taking much larger numbers. Moreover, through our graduate training program with American colleges and universities, we are augmenting the national capability and pool of scientists and engineers.

Mr. ANDERSON. I appreciate that statement, because probably it states the fact. But 25 percent is a ridiculous figure, and it should not be stated on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This is a statement on the priority to be given this program. The Senator from Missouri was discussing priorities. The NASA officials would not state the priority to be given the proposed cuts. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] asked for this information at the hearings; and I also requested such information.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall be highly pleased to have the Senator from West Virginia do so.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I shall do so because it is reasonable and realistic.

Will the Senator from Arkansas indicate in detail—as I believe he proposes to do—the imperative but unmet needs in this country?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, I shall try to develop that point.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I consider it to be a very important point, and I believe that we in no wise diminish the prestige of the United States by delaying the effort to place a man on the moon by a certain number of years, whatever that number may be in our best judgment. There are problems facing the American people here on earth; and I presume the Senator from Arkansas will give considerable attention to these needs—imperative needs—in the course of the presentation of his views.

I understand that his amendment would make a 10-percent cut. Is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I point out that I stated for the RECORD that I joined with the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] in supporting a similar amendment in connection with the defense program. Our amendment received two affirmative votes. Several Senators manifested interest in reducing defense appropriations substantially but indicated reluctance to support such action because it would amount, in their opinions, to unilateral disarmament.

However, I feel that the pending amendment will receive much wider support in the Senate because the defense structure is not as directly involved.

On August 2, 1963, the conscientious Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] spoke meaningfully in this forum in justification of reducing spending in the area of defense, including the military aspects of atomic energy. He discussed new perspectives on American security. I commended him and associated myself with his viewpoint in general. Subsequently, as stated, I supported the specific amendment for a percentage reduction of the defense appropriations as recommended by the Committee on Appropriations.

On numerous occasions since August 2, I have spoken on the need to cut expenditures sharply in the areas of defense, nuclear activities, foreign assistance, and in the space exploration program. Not only have I been encouraged by the high degree of acceptance of my declaration that the security of our country rests on economic and political as well as military competence, I have been amazed by the extent of the public response.

Many citizens have spoken and written their agreement with my further observation that unsurpassed military power in combination with areas of grave economic weakness is not the only basis for a sound security policy. The net result can be domestic and international political weakness.

In addressing the subject of defense appropriations reductions during debate on the bill before the Senate on September 24, 1963, I said:

> We must achieve savings in military spending, and if we are to do so we must begin by reducing the appropriations proposals now before us. We must follow through with cuts in the Atomic Energy Commission weapons acquisition and subsidy appropriations requests. It is my view that there must be reductions in the money requests to come before us for the space program. And there must be further savings realized when we reach the business of appropriating for the foreign aid programs.
>
> We can and we must save billions in these categories that drain off so much of our gross national product and require so much of our national income that we are unable to fulfill our obligations to our own people at home and to provide the economic foundation that makes all the rest possible.
>
> A higher priority and a higher percentage of the budgeted dollar must be assigned to the requirements of our domestic programs, especially in the fields of education, health, job opportunities and job training, and public improvements, including continuation of the program of accelerating public works on a Federal-local matching basis.

Mr. President, we have failed to achieve significant reductions in the defense appropriations, insofar as compared with last year's level. We have assured substantial cuts in foreign assistance by reason of the actions of both bodies on the authorization bill. We now must face our responsibilities and opportunities in the appropriations for the space program, just as we soon will meet those relating to appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission.

Both NASA and AEC funds can be pared without, in my judgment, doing violence to the program of either agency.

Obviously, there is a considerable manifestation of economy-mindedness because of the feeling that tax reduction legislation will be enacted. We must not place all of the burden of budget cuts on domestic social and economic programs while continuing to subscribe huge funds to the defense, atomic energy, and space programs.

Some persons term percentage reductions an approach with the use of an ax, but I prefer affording agencies some leeway in reducing items within a total budget, with Congress directing an overall percentage reduction to achieve a stated ceiling.

I will support the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from West Virginia very much for his support, and I shall try to develop the point he has mentioned.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have been asked by many Senators whether an attempt should be made to complete action by the Senate on the bill this evening. The bill contains many other important items, and Senators wish to know whether it is anticipated that the bill will be passed this evening or whether the Senate will proceed for some time with further debate on the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, and resume consideration of the bill tomorrow.

Can the Senator from Arkansas estimate how much longer his remarks will take. I know he has been interrupted by a number of questions.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; there have been a number of questions, although I think they have been quite proper.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, for this is a very important matter.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is a very important matter and I would much prefer to have the vote on the amendment taken tomorrow, inasmuch as very few Senators are now in the Chamber. By tomorrow all Senators will at least have had an opportunity to read the debate which has occurred and consider the views presented this afternoon.

I agree with the Senator from Washington that it is important for us to determine whether we are to send a man to the moon by 1970 and, if so, whether we are to devote to that project $20 billion or $30 billion or $40 billion. An article published today in the Washington Star notes that there has been a delay of 2 years in working on a booster because some of the material used was faulty. It might be 1980 or 1990 before we place a man on the moon, if we have an orderly project.

Therefore, I hope the Senator from Washington will not seek to force the Senate to vote today on this amendment, but, instead, will permit the vote on it to be taken tomorrow.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will discuss this point with the leadership.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield briefly to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. ANDERSON. I understand from both the majority leader and the minority leader that they hope to have the Senate complete its action on the bill tonight. I hope so, too.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I was trying to obtain the estimate from the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In my judgment this bill is as important as the foreign aid bill and merits more time. I do not wish to delay the Senate merely for the purpose of delay, and I have no intention of attempting to do so.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was merely trying to obtain a rough idea or estimate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Washington says there are other items to be debated, too.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I believe this amendment should be put in the proper perspective.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am trying to do so.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The committee voted for this amount because after the House had acted and long after the original budget had been determined by the administration, the Senate Space Committee went over all these items with a rather fine-tooth comb.

They came forth with an estimate of all the scientists—I do not care who they are—that this was a lunar program to get a man on the moon by 1970. It was not a crash program. It was not dragging its heels. It was going along with what might be called reasonable progress. The committee tried the very thing we are talking about—to separate the difference in amounts—and we cut the Senate authorization a couple of hundred million.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And the Senate increased the authorization voted by the House.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In the Senate authorization.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We tried to separate, dollarwise, what it would cost to have what we might call a reasonable space program without going to the moon. To do so is most difficult because they are intertwined. The work is stated in the report. But the testimony was clear to all of us that if the moon did not exist, we would still proceed with 90 to 95 percent of the program. Perhaps. There are many who might wish to vote for a cut that would accomplish that result dollars and cents wise, but it is difficult for the Space Committee to take these programs apart.

One big item is the booster—the Saturn program. It may turn out to have a hundred times more value in the defense of this country, even though it must be used to go to the moon, or to any other place. Space platforms, and the meeting of people in space, are most important. Those objectives are intertwined, and going to the moon is a part of the project, though it may be glamorized more.

It is easy to ask—and I, myself have asked—"When we get to the moon, so what? What have we found out?" What is discovered may be useful in connection with many problems in space. Even civilian uses may be discovered. There is a medical spinoff on the project, too, which may be of untold value to the people of this country and the rest of the free world. There are many other things—the use of metals is one—in all parts of the program which bring us closer to the objective of the program, if we go ahead with it.

Read the testimony of a year ago or 2 years ago. We were told that the agency would ask for a great increase this year because the program would have reached a point at which it would have to be increased. Some of the great increases are necessary because this is difficult hardware to buy. The orders must be sent in. The hardware cannot be manufactured overnight. Most of the work is contractual. Many industries involved in the thousands of contracts are receiving a great deal of benefit from the research, even though one industry may be making a very small gadget which fits into the overall plan. I know of several. The aircraft industry is one. They claim they work with the Defense Department in all these efforts and that they have other jobs. We can read that in the testimony. Defense has its other jobs, but the agencies work together. Without the two, Defense could not do certain things; no one else could.

The committee arrived at the figure in the bill after long days of hearings by the Committee on Aeronautics and Space Sciences as to how far it could cut the appropriation. So the RECORD will be clear, the budget estimate was $5,712 million. The authorization was $5,350 million. So the committtee, of which the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is chairman, cut one-half billion dollars from the estimate. The Senate appropriation was $5,190 million. So we are down $600 million at the present time from what it was thought was needed a year ago.

There is one other point to be considered. They are about 5 months behind now. That is not the fault of the Senate. Why the other body did not get busy on these appropriation bills, I do not know. They may have had good reason, but they are behind at the present time. If we are going ahead with this project, we must "get in there" to get this hardware to do these necessary things.

I am no expert in this field. We must get the advice of experts. There is some scientific controversy involved.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator believe there are any experts in that field?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I believe some of the men are experts.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Who does the Senator think is an expert?

Mr. MAGNUSON. There have been people in the scientific field in the U.S. community who have been interested in space matters for years. This is not an overnight thing. I do not know how many people are aware that the first space effort made by anyone was in Russia, during the days of the Czar. It was an effort in rocketry. Then the Germans picked it up. We have had scientists in this field for a long time. We are lucky to have men like Von Braun and others who have the necessary background. They are as expert as anyone can be. Of course, no one knows everything about the subject.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But they are experts only in the technical sense.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am talking in the technical sense.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am talking about those qualified to evaluate the importance of this project.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Physicists are involved in this program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not long ago we were told that atomic energy would solve all our problems. We have poured billions of dollars into atomic energy, and we now hear little about it except as it applies to weaponry.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, the Senator from Arkansas should have been with me——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Atomic energy was going to furnish power to everybody free, and——

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Arkansas should have been with me 2 weeks ago when we dedicated the biggest atomic powerplant in the whole world.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Washington has been very successful in getting money for his State. I congratulate him on it. I envy him his record. If I had such a fine record, I would certainly not worry about reelection any more than the Senator from Washington does. But, of course, that is not what we are talking about. I merely think we have been grossly oversold on what to expect out of the space program. I am not minimizing its importance. I do not say it is unimportant, or that we should not go to the moon. I am saying it is not so important that we should lay aside education, urban renewal, unemployment problems, and everything else, in deference to it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Arkansas is setting himself up as one who knows the exact amount that would be required. One cannot build a $20,000 house for $18,000.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not believe anyone else knows. I have before me a letter. I tried to obtain guidance from the space agency but I did not get very much. I am perfectly willing to submit this letter to the Senate. I intended to do so before.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There are books of testimony to which I have listened.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] tried to get some information on where cuts could be made, and he got nowhere. Frankly, I do not believe they are capable of giving it to the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We went into that question, too. I admit it is very difficult to get any of them to separate the amounts.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They want the whole amount.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There are many other things involved. As I have said, if the question were merely one of going to the moon for prestige——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is the main excuse.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If that were the whole purpose of the program, I would vote to cut the whole program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is the purpose—to get to the moon by 1970.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is all there is to it?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The program has gained momentum under the impetus of getting there before the Russians. That momentum has begun to fade a little, in view of Khrushchev's latest statement. Director Webb and others first tried to downgrade the cost. When it was first discussed, they were not bothered about the cost. Going to the moon was going to cost $20 billion. The momentum is beginning to fade because the Russians have said they are not so interested, and Mr. Webb is now saying they did not mean $20 billion. Within a year there has been a complete change in their approach.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to make one more comment and then I will yield to the Senator from Arkansas and let him proceed.

I do not believe it would be accurate to suggest that Director Webb, Dr. Dryden and others involved in the program—and there are many others whose names I shall not state—have not been very frank with the committee in previous years to tell them that the program will cost a great deal of money.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They surely have.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They would have been much happier with us, I am sure, if they could have said, "It will not cost much. Can we go ahead with it?"

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They have been "weaseling" lately, saying it will not cost so much.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And if we had said, "Go ahead." Everybody was for it.

I do not know whether this is the exact amount in dollars and cents needed, but I know that this will not keep the program from reasonable progress.

This is a program on which we have put our stamps of approval. The money is spent, it is true, in a thousand different places in the United States. It is difficult even to evaluate some of the things which occur, considering that a small company might have a subcontract or even a sub-subcontract for one of the items which might be used in this effort.

I hope that we shall not create the impression that the business of landing a man on the moon, literally and technically, is all that we are talking about. It is only one of the things about which we are talking.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator will admit that that is the way in which it is being glamorized. It has been brought out that all the astronauts are going to get a million dollars for their stories. This appeals to young people. I see stories published about going to the moon that I am sure create a great deal of interest on the part of youth.

The Senator knows that this is one of the principal things involved.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator does not believe that to be the case, he can go to any toyshop at Christmastime and see what the young children are buying and what the stores are selling to the young people of America. The youngsters are interested in it, whether it is right or wrong.

There was a NASA exhibit at the fair in my State. There have been many around the country. Any day at the exhibit a person would see the youngsters, from the age of 7 or 8 up to 15 years, lined up four deep. They were quite interested in the program.

This program involves many tough scientific problems, and the answers will be of value to us.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was not criticizing the Senator for taking time. If I was construed to be so doing, I apologize. I have been taking up some time, too.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I hope the Senator from Arkansas will encourage the leadership not to ask for a vote on the amendment tonight, but to permit an extensive and searching debate of the serious questions of national policy raised by the excellent speech of the Senator from Arkansas.

I sometimes wonder what is happening in the Senate. Perhaps because of my wonderment I was categorized last Sunday by a very able member of the press as probably the most unpopular Senator in this body. I rise this afternoon to make myself even more unpopular, because I bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that it required more than a month, as the Senator from Arkansas knows, for the Senate to approve the test ban treaty. In my opinion, that treaty could have been approved, and should have been approved in 2 days.

It required the Senate exactly 2 hours to pass the Defense Department Appropriation bill, immediately after consideration of the test ban treaty. That bill involved tens of billions of dollars. There was no adequate discussion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It was $47 billion, was it not?

Mr. CLARK. Forty-seven billion dollars.

It took the Senate about 20 minutes to pass a bill to extend the draft for 4 years.

Yet, with respect to foreign aid—a proposal for peace, as to which I supported the Senator from Arkansas in his unsuccessful effort to prevent the President's program from being mutilated—the Senate took 3 weeks to consider the bill, cutting out $10 million here and $25 million there, with Senators becoming upset and aroused, and carrying on in a way which I could not well describe within the limitations of the rules of the Senate.

Now the Senator from Arkansas, with great courage, raises a fundamental question of the priorities for programs, which relates to the entire concept of our American civilization. Do we wish to be a group of "Buck Rogers"? Do we wish to placate the children in the toy stores, about whom the Senator from Washington was talking? Shall we respond with our immediate votes when we find that at Christmastime all the children want to go to the moon, or to play that they are going there?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was responding to a question about the children.

Mr. CLARK. I did not yield to the Senator.

Or, instead, shall we do something important about upgrading the education of American young people? Shall we do something important about rebuilding our cities and remedying the situation in the slums? Shall we do something important about the No. 1 problem in my State, which is unemployment?

We do not have in Pennsylvania all of the great space and defense agencies which seem to take up most of the real estate of the great State of Washington.

I should like to see something done about the problems which face the American people. I should like to see some kind of civilized perspective taken about where we are heading.

The Senator from Arkansas has raised that question, not only in the Senate in speech after speech, but also in New York, where I heard him make a great speech last January, and elsewhere.

I believe the Senator from Arkansas is entitled to the complete attention of the full membership of the Senate. I have a speech to make, which will not be too brief. I should like to make that speech on this subject before the Senate reaches a vote. This afternoon we are facing one of the most important issues of policy which will come before the Senate in this session.

Mr. MAGNUSON rose.

Mr. CLARK. I do not blame my friend the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator has just finished blaming me.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is an able representative of the State of Washington. He and his junior colleague have done a magnificent job for the State of Washington. The Senator has done a wonderful job as chairman of the appropriations subcommittee, in bringing the bill to the Senate for consideration.

But the Senator from Washington, like the chairman of every other subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, and the chairman of every subcommittee of every legislative committee of the Senate, has a vested interest in the matter consigned to his authority, in respect to bringing the bill to the Senate. He would like to give us the biggest and best space program that the scientists can devise.

I am chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I have a vested interest in seeing to it that some of the money of this great Republic is spent to put people back to work. I know that the space program has a very small impact on employment, compared with many other industries, such as the rebuilding of cities, the educational system, and a number of other matters. I should like to see this question fully debated. I commend the Senator from Arkansas for his efforts in that regard.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Just a minute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will yield to the Senator in a moment.

I believe the Senator from Pennsylvania has raised a crucial point. This is a question of priorities. Neither of us is saying, "Let us eliminate the space program." We say, "Let us not turn everything over to it and let everything else fall by the wayside."

I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Either the Senator from Pennsylvania did not hear what I had to say a few minutes ago, or perhaps he was not in the Chamber.

I rose to ask the Senator how much time he thought he needed, so that the Senate could do the very thing the Senator is talking about.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I believe I stated the proposition very fairly to the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator did.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I said that if we did not want this program I would vote against it.

The State of Washington does not have much interest in the space program, technically. We are interested in the power business.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. All kinds of power businesses.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. All kinds of power businesses.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We do not have many contracts in this field in the State of Washington. We probably have fewer than any other State of our size. Boeing Aircraft had some.

The main contracts are in Louisiana, at Cape Canaveral, and at other places. It is a little unfair to make such a statement about Washington.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was talking about atomic energy. The Senator will admit that atomic energy has a pretty important position in Washington.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the Senator yield to me first?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Naturally, since we spent so many days studying this program, we feel that at least a little knowledge on the subject has rubbed off. We have a responsibility to make decisions and to tell the Senate why we made certain decisions.

We know that no matter what we do in regard to this problem, there will be some who will not agree with us.

I do not know how I could have stated the proposition in any fairer way.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] asked me a question a few minutes ago about how I arrived at the estimate that one out of every four American scientists will be working for NASA by 1970. While this was based on an estimate of independent scientists, not NASA spokesmen, it was specifically cited in the New York Times for July 28, 1963.

The New York Times article read in part as follows:

> Citing NASA's own estimates of its trained manpower needs through the decade, Prof. Barry Commoner, of Washington University, St. Louis, says that the Space Agency will require the services of one in every four U.S. scientists by 1970.

Dr. Commoner is not paid by the Space Agency. He has every right to make estimates, as other scientists have. Perhaps his independence of NASA gives his estimate a greater objectiveness.

The Senator from New Mexico has used some excellent sources. I do not say the source I have used is correct, but it is relevant to the fact that the agency is absorbing an enormous amount of one of the most important resources this Nation has: scientific manpower.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite correct. It must be a rather broad estimate, because much depends on what the Congress does. If we appropriate the amount requested, I suppose it could approach that figure. I did not have that particular statement.

I return to my argument about the particular significance of this program.

It should also be remembered that the military has its own space program designed to fit its particular needs, and this program is being pursued this year at the rate of some $1.7 billion. In an article in the current Fortune magazine, to which I referred a moment ago, Richard Austin Smith comments:

> Even the young space colonels of the Air Force never saw much utility in Apollo. The plain fact is that if Apollo and all the other programs that made up NASA's $5.7 billion budget request for 1964 were to be suddenly scrapped, the military (which has a $1.7 billion space program of its own) would have to spend only an additional $500 million to make up for whatever help NASA had been giving.

That is a very significant statement. It states that if the whole Apollo project is obliterated, and NASA's other programs, the military, by adding $500 million, instead of having the $5 billion, could make up whatever NASA is doing to supplement the military aspect.

So I think the conclusion of the statement of both the scientists and others I have mentioned that the aspect of national security is of no real significance in the national budget is accurate.

The security argument is even less persuasive when it is remembered that the Congress has never been hesitant about emasculating the foreign aid program even though every President, Secretary of State, and Secretary of Defense since the program began, and our top military leaders as well, have consistently said that foreign aid was essential to the Nation's security.

Over the years I think practically every important member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff also consistently has said that foreign aid was essential to the Nation's security. They said it this year, and they have said it every year while I have been in the Senate. There was no more determined advocate of the foreign aid program than President Eisenhower throughout his administration. I may say he was more successful in restraining those who wished to cut it than the present administration has been.

Despite strong and consistent support for the foreign aid program by the Nation's top military and civilian defense officials, the Congress has freely slashed the President's aid requests by hundreds of millions each year.

The Senate, as no one needs to be reminded, has just completed its most spectacular effort in this field, having rendered its sovereign judgment that the President and his top civilian advisers are quite mistaken in the importance which they attach to the aid program as an instrument of national security. Having overruled the Nation's defense experts on foreign aid, the Congress should have no hesitancy, from the standpoint of security, at least, in cutting back the crash program for a landing on the moon, which our defense experts assure us has little, if any, relevance to national defense.

The program to land a man on the moon is scarcely more valuable as a scientific enterprise than for military purposes. One leading scientist has said that by including men in the moon exploration program, results will come much slower and the cost will be much greater.

Mr. Webb, the Director of this enterprise, when asked during a hearing before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee if the prospective scientific benefits of the moonshot justified the cost, replied:

> The answer is no, if you limit it to science.

Dr. Newell, who is in charge of space science for NASA, added:

> A very large fraction of the scientific information that we will obtain by the lunar landing project could also be obtained by the unmanned technique.

Dr. Philip Abelson, director of the Geophysical Laboratory, Carnegie Institution of Washington, and editor of Science magazine, conducted a straw poll among scientists not connected with NASA programs. He reported that the vote was 110 to 3 against the manned lunar program.

Dr. Polykarp Kusch, chairman of the Department of Physics of Columbia University, told the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences last June that he felt the space program, from a scientific standpoint, "attempts to do too much too fast."

The President's science adviser, Dr. Jerome Weisner, told the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee that if the program were judged purely as a scientific program, "We could do it at another pace." He went on to say that he thought "the cost would be more or less the same if we did it in twice the time."

There are, of course, many distinguished scientists who support the present program, but I do not know of one who has attempted to justify its pace and cost as essential to scientific objectives.

If the moonshot program cannot be justified on the basis of its importance for science or national defense, it can only be justified as a program—a very costly program—for enhancing national prestige.

I think this is really at the root of the whole program.

Assuming that prestige can be bought, who can say with any degree of certainty how much it costs and what kind of activity pays the richest dividends? The probable truth is that we are in a race not with the Russians, but with ourselves. Khrushchev's latest statements, which may or may not be taken at face value, indicate that the Russians are continuing their efforts to send a man to the moon, but do not wish to engage in a race with the United States. It may well be that we have entered a trap of our own making, that we have committed ourselves to a futile race of which the outcome can only be outright failure or a pyrrhic victory.

I think that the policies of our Nation will have a far greater impact on the world if we sustain our space program on a more reasonable scale and divert some of the talent and money involved to solving some of our pressing problems here on earth. The uncommitted nations of the world are far more likely to be impressed by the way in which we use our resources to create a better world than by our spectacular achievements in space—achievements that may dazzle the world for a day or a week but that will soon be lost in the tides of history. In this connection it is worth noting that not a single nation has succumbed to Soviet influence as a result of the launching of sputnik and subsequent Russian space exploits. It seems clear that the triumph of being first on the moon will be a fleeting and costly one, a 9-day wonder of history, a gaudy sideshow in the real work of the world.

It is argued that the space program, like the defense program, is such a great boon to the economy that much harm would come to many important industries and any number of communities if the pace were retarded. I am fully aware of the significance of the great industries whose financial health is dependent on the space program. With nearly $589 million authorized this year for construction of new facilities related in one way or another to the manned lunar landing program, NASA-supported activities have become major economic factors in many States. Our economy obviously needs stimulation to achieve a higher growth rate, to reduce unemployment, and to bring about utilization of idle productive capacity. The aerospace industries, however, where these billions for the space program will be spent, are not in need of stimulation. A look at the help wanted section of the classified ads is convincing proof that there is no unemployment problem in space oriented industries. It is difficult for me to imagine how spending $280 million more in construction of new facilities at Cape Canaveral will ease the lot of an unemployed West Virginia coal miner or a farmer eking out a bare existence in the Ozarks.

Expansion of the space program will undoubtedly accentuate existing distortions in the economy brought about by disproportionate concentration of human and physical resources in the defense and space oriented industries. One commentator has said that the significant aspect of the problem is not that 10 percent of the gross national product is devoted to military and space purposes but that three-fourths of the engineering and scientific talent of the country is occupied by work in these fields, thus draining away the technological competence that would normally be devoted to civilian purposes. It is interesting to note that only about one one-hundred-and-fiftieth, or $3.5 million, of the NASA budget is slated to be invested in finding ways to adapt knowledge gained through the space program to industrial applications. That is an almost infinitesimal part of the huge budget. According to Dr. Seamans, the space program utilized some 3 to 4 percent of the Nation's scientists and engineers at the beginning of this year, but he predicts that this proportion will grow to 6 or 7 percent by the beginning of 1964, and may continue to increase throughout the decade. NASA and its contractors have in fact been drawing off large numbers of the most creative scientists and engineers, leaving the less gifted for the civilian-based economy. The June issue of Mechanical Engineering reported a survey of engineering salaries which showed that an average of $9,300 annually was paid in machinery and capital goods industries compared with $11,500 in aerospace industries. As the space effort absorbs the talents of more and more scientists and engineers, the disparity will no doubt increase.

Of more basic concern is the growing role of the Federal Government in science. It is not a healthy situation to have a large segment of the scientific community working directly or indirectly for the Government. In the fiscal year 1963 Federal funds made up more than two-thirds of all expenditures for research and development in the Nation. The $14.4 billion spent by the Government last year was more than triple the research and development outlays made during all of World War II. Defense and NASA programs accounted for 80 percent of Federal research and development expenditures last year and will account for an even larger share this year. I recently read that 76 percent of all scientists and engineers working in electronics for example, are supported by Federal funds. The impact of this on civilian oriented electronic needs is not difficult to imagine.

In contrast to the volume of Federal outlays for defense and space oriented research, only $95 million was committed by the Government last year for research in the social sciences.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the figure the Senator used involves all defense.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. Including space. If the Senator is going to deliver an antispace speech, I wish he would separate the two items. If he did so, he would find that nearly all the figures he used relate to defense.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not delivering an antispace speech. It is an anti-man-on-the-moon speech. These are two distinct items.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator was present, I am sure, when the late Senator Connally talked about the man who had a little fish in his hand, and said, "Don't wiggle so, fishie; I don't want to do anything to you but gut you."

The Senator from Arkansas does not want to do anything to the Space Administration but gut it.

I am sorry he feels that way, but I can understand why he does. At the same time I do not want him to charge all of the cost to the space program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I said that the $14.4 billion spent by the Government last year was more than triple the research and development outlays made during all of World War II. Does the Senator disagree with that statement?

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I also said that the Defense and NASA programs accounted for 80 percent of the Federal research and development expenditures last year, and will account for an even larger share this year. Is that not an accurate statement?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it is. I only wish that he would tell us how much was for space and how much for defense. A person reading his speech could very easily be confused by these statements.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We know that the Defense budget is outrageous. Yet it is sacrosanct, and no one dares raise his voice against it, or question it in any way.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am perfectly satisfied if the Senator has made that clear.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator knows that that is no excuse for NASA growing up like its daddy. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] challenged the idea that this program has no military significance. I believe that the military justification for NASA is minimal.

Mr. ANDERSON. The military uses of the guidance system are of far more significance to the military than to NASA. The booster that goes into it does not know whether it is carrying a civilian or a military man.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The military, under their own program, are exploring items that are useful within a range of 500 to 1,000 miles. I believe several of the witnesses testified that for military purposes that is about the extent of their interest. I do not know whether the Senator was present when I quoted General Taylor as saying that so far as he could see, the space program has no military significance.

Mr. ANDERSON. I was present.

I tried to point out to the Senator from Arkansas that General Taylor's comment was directed to a specific question, the direct military value to that small portion of NASA devoted to going to the moon, which is $1.9 billion to $2 billion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is not small when we consider what we have been getting for such a program as accelerated public works and vocational training.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator should recognize that if we cut $800 million out of this budget, we will not get anything more for education.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe that the prospects for getting it are that much enhanced. I cannot accept the idea that Congress is going to continue to reject education. We came very close to passing a Federal aid to education bill and only the Rules Committee in the House defeated the will of both Houses. The Senator knows that. I only wish to leave the door open, in the hope that we shall not continue to condemn the next generation to ignorance and illiteracy. I am hoping that in some way we will get around the stumbling blocks to education legislation.

Mr. ANDERSON. I join the Senator in that hope. He and I have been in Congress for a quarter of a century, in one body or the other. He recognizes that while all these speeches are made, if this money could be siphoned off, how wonderful it would be for education. But Congress has not passed an education bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is only one item. There are others which are less controversial.

Mr. ANDERSON. I recognize that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Education is only one. It happens to be the most important and in the past 20 years Congress has come close to enacting an education bill. Last session it came closer than ever, but the bill became fouled up in the Rules Committee. I grant that is a major stumbling block, but I have not given up hope that sooner or later it will be possible to educate the young people of this country adequately.

Mr. ANDERSON. I compliment the Senator from Arkansas. I am not giving up hope on education, although many times I have been close to giving up hope. I do not want to give up hope on anything.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have a copy of a publication entitled "Federal Funds For Science XI, for fiscal years 1961, 1962, 1963," published by the National Science Foundation. It relates in part to the exchange we have just had. Perhaps I should read a portion of it into the Record:

> The relative amount of support by the three agencies having the largest research and development programs was expected to change during the 3 years. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration's rate of increase from fiscal year 1961 to 1963 was expected to be greater than that of any other agency. In fiscal year 1962 the National Aeronautics and Space Administration became the second largest supporter of research and development, supplanting the Atomic Energy Commission. During the 3-year period, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's obligations for research and development were expected to increase from 9 to 22 percent of the total Federal research and development programs.

Mr. ANDERSON. So if the two of them add to 80 percent, only 60 percent was military and 20 percent might be NASA.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It was 22 percent.

Mr. ANDERSON. What we might keep in mind is that if a man started to build a boat, he might spend a small amount for the design of the boat. Suddenly when he began to build it, the costs might rise rapidly. That is what is taking place in this instance. Sixty-eight percent of the NASA budget is for hardware, which we are only now finally getting ready to build.

The Senator wants to take us back closer to the limit of what we spent when we were trying to plan ways to build the hardware.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. All I am trying to do is to slow down the pace of the program. I believe it is impinging upon other activities; and I do not mean education alone. I believe that the space program is impinging upon the whole budget. The entire Arkansas delegation and the entire delegation from Oklahoma had to rush to the Budget Bureau a few weeks ago in response to a rumor that there was to be a slowdown of the Arkansas River program, a program to which the Budget Bureau is committed. Three hundred and fifty or four hundred million dollars has already been spent on it. I am sure the pressure upon the Bureau of the Budget on such items as the Arkansas River navigation project unrelated as it is on its face, comes in large degree from the great increase in funds for the space program.

I cannot say that if funds are cut from this program, they will be spent in a certain other program. But I do know that there is a probing throughout the Government to determine where money can be saved.

This pressure colors the prospects for passage of the tax bill. Much as I personally disagree with the view that there cannot be a tax cut until there is a saving of money somewhere, for those who accept that philosophy, I say here is a good place to save. Here is an opportunity to move toward a balanced budget.

The cut I propose in the space budget would be comparable to the one that was made last week in the foreign aid authorization bill. If every week we could make a healthy cut in programs which are superfluous, perhaps the budget could be balanced.

I say that the pace of this program is not essential. We should explore space in a reasonable way. If we proceed on a crash basis, I believe the results will be grossly disappointing, as they were in connection with the atomic energy program.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I started to speak a while ago. I do not want to extend the Senator's time. However, I think we are pretty well satisfied with the results of the atomic energy program. We promised to make it available for civilian power. We are entering the 300,000-kilowatt range and are now building some stations that are economically worthwhile.

Atomic energy is also worthwhile in medicine. There are many worthwhile aspects of atomic energy. If the opportunity permitted us to do so this afternoon, we could have a most interesting discussion of the progress of atomic energy.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not want to be misunderstood. The Senator makes my views appear to be too black or too white. I have never opposed the atomic energy program. I am only saying it was allowed to come into existence so rapidly that it required a great deal of money, while other programs that I have mentioned, and shall mention later, have been shoved aside because of a desire to limit the budget. My whole argument is based upon the question of priorities. I would never say that atomic energy should not have been pursued. All I am saying is that we rushed in and acted hastily. The time when atomic energy is to be competitive with oil and gas is more remote than we at one time thought it was. Will not the Senator from New Mexico agree to that?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is a correct statement.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is all I am saying. I have never said that the atomic energy program should not have been pursued. We should have done it, but we should have given a little higher priority to some other items, such as urban renewal. We are driving urban people mad by the kind of traffic conditions that exist in the cities and States.

There are other important problems in our society such as crime and the pollution of our streams. Stream pollution is a national disgrace. I pass beside the Potomac River and Rock Creek every day. If the wind is right, they smell like the sewers they are.

Similar conditions exist all over the country. Those are conditions that I think should have priority over the possible advantages of going to the moon.

This is my only point.

I thoroughly agree with the Senator that some day atomic energy will come into its own.

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe it has already come into its own. A moment ago, the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] mentioned the very large Hanford plant. We know that that plant was included in an appropriation bill a couple of times. It was eliminated from the atomic energy bill. At that time, people said, "If this enormous plant is not to be built, we should not build the great laboratory that is to be constructed near Stanford University, including the accelerator. Those moneys could be used for something else." The Hanford plant was eliminated, but we did not see 5 cents of the money go to medicine or education.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Large sums have been spent for medical research. That has been one of the fastest growing fields of research. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill] has almost equalled the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] in persuading Congress to appropriate money. The increase in funds for cancer research the past 5 years has been remarkable. Does not the Senator from New Mexico agree?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was paying the Senator from Washington a compliment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator did not need to do so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I know the Senator does not need it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Since the Senator from Alabama and I started on this program, the longevity of the American people has increased 6 to 8 years.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator believe that while they are here, they are any happier, even though their lives have been lengthened?

Mr. MAGNUSON. They are unhappy about some things. I do not know whether they would be much more unhappy if they thought they would not have those 6 extra years.

Speaking of percentages, the bill is $1,263 million under the budget estimate. The biggest cut under the budget amount is for the Space Agency. In other words, we have treated the Space Agency very much like the other agencies. No agency will have any increase in positions.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have not considered the other agencies, but the second largest agency is the Veterans' Administration. By how large a percentage was the Veterans' budget increased over last year's, compared with NASA's?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Veterans' Administration has a fixed budget. We have provided $5 billion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It does not have to be fixed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. By law, the benefits must be paid.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But more can be paid, if Congress wishes to do so.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I know that a law would have to be enacted.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is what is being done in this instance. To what other agency has an increase been given that is comparable with the increase given to the Space Agency?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Percentagewise?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; in any substantial amount.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The National Science Foundation asked for a comparable increase.

The increase made for the Veterans' Administration was only for fixed charges.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But dollarwise, are not those very small increases over the amounts in last year's budget?

Mr. MAGNUSON. This year the Veterans' Administration appropriation will be almost $6 billion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What was its appropriation last year?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Almost $1 billion less. It has increased almost $1 billion in this bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In 1 year?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, because of the increase in the number of veterans who receive the benefits and the retirement pay.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does not the number decrease as time goes by?

Mr. MAGNUSON. World War II accounts for 17 million veterans who are on the rolls. So many of them are still alive, and I hope that continues to be the case, for I am one of them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How about the veterans of the First World War?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Some of them are dying. But quite a few of these payments go to Spanish-American War veterans.

However, the point is that the cut made in this item is perhaps the largest cut made in any appropriation item.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But this item was the largest one to begin with.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; but last year we were told that if we continued this program, it would increase to this extent. So I do not think this surprises us.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think anyone is deceived; but in the very mad life we lead, until substantial amounts of money are required for a program, people do not pay much attention to it. I confess that I may have been preoccupied with something else last year, because it was an election year, but I had no idea that there would be a $20 billion or $30 billion lunar project, until the program was discussed again this year. Now we are told that we are committed to it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But Congress can always turn down the request.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am asking that there be only a slowdown, not a turndown.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But this was made known to us long ago. I have been on the Space Committee ever since it was created; and we always were told that if we went ahead with this program, this would be the year when the amount required would be this large.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did not this program become important only after the Russian sputnik was launched?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. A Space Committee was working prior to that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I mean the lunar project.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; thought was given to it all along.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not recall that.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is not the situation at all. The first work done in this field was done by Dr. von Braun and others on what they called Project World Series. If they had been able to obtain from Congress the money they then requested, we would have been from 3 years to 5 years ahead of the Russian sputnik. But Congress would not provide the money then requested.

Furthermore, the cost of moving from earth orbit to the moon is only a relatively small one; perhaps only $3 billion or $4 billion more will be required for the last jump.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But we have had men in orbit. Do we now have the jump on the Russians?

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Because their most recent development is a very significant one. I refer to the fact that they are able to move their space vehicle backward, forward, up, and down. The Russian woman who orbited, orbited more times than the total number of orbits by all the Americans who have orbited. That was possible because she had a larger spaceship, a better spaceship, and a more maneuverable spaceship.

I do not say that we have not done very well. I think we have done very well; and the fact that we have done very well prompted Khrushchev to propose that the United States and Russia work together in this field. But a few days later he followed up that statement by saying that the Russians would proceed on their own.

I agree with the Senator that the hope is to proceed into space a great deal farther by 1964; and that development will involve the most important space project next to the project to reach the moon.

The original program called for $6,700 million. The Bureau of the Budget made them trim it down, and they trimmed it down to approximately $5,700 million, as I recall—a very large cut. Then the House made another very large cut. The conference committee reached an intermediate figure—but still there was a very large cut.

When this item was considered by the Independent Offices Appropriation Subcommittee headed by the Senator from Washington, the additions which were made were only for items which we believed absolutely essential.

I have watched the Appropriations Committees work a number of times, and I think our Appropriations Committee was as careful with this item as it could possibly be. Therefore, we did not request an exorbitant amount, and I do not think an exorbitant amount would have been allowed if we had requested it.

I commend the committee, and particularly the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], for what I regard as a very sensible amount for the program. I do not believe the amount the Senate subcommittee voted as an addition to the amount voted by the House is at all exorbitant, for it is only an additional $90 million.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Perhaps so, but the total for the program to reach the moon is a very great amount.

Mr. ANDERSON. I say only that after the House cut the amount very substantially, the Senate subcommittee added only a very small amount, and only for specific purposes. So I do not think the Senate committee failed to discharge its obligations. I think it performed very well.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I hope the Senator from New Mexico realizes that I am not criticizing either him or his committee or the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson]. There is an honest difference of opinion as to the relative importance of this activity when compared with other activities. This is the only point I am endeavoring to make.

Mr. ANDERSON. I realize that. I merely say to the Senator from Arkansas that we can easily say that if we spend less money for this program, larger amounts can be spent for education or for other purposes. However, we find that that does not happen.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I grant that probably it would be very difficult to spend such additional amounts for education. However, as I proceed I shall mention many other programs which I believe are being delayed or reduced because of a desire to reduce expenditures. For example, why is the vocational education bill being held up now?

Mr. ANDERSON. I assume that all programs dealing with education are being held up until we get further along.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No, I do not think that is the reason. The problem is with the budget. The accelerated public works program has done a lot of good for the people of my State. Yet there is no more money for it—not unless the public works appropriation bill is enacted, and that bill provides only another $45 million for it. We are almost ashamed to mention the amounts we are providing for other programs and yet look at the amount we are providing for the send-a-man-to-the-moon program. Ten TVA's could be built with the amount being devoted to the reach-the-moon program.

Mr. ANDERSON. No, for I accept the national goal the President announced to Congress, and which Congress endorsed. I do not believe in marching forward one day and marching backward the next day. I want to proceed with the program which has been agreed upon, and for which plans were made. However, it is not a $20 billion program. The part which represents only sending a man to the moon involves less than $2 billion, according to the testimony of Dr. Seamans.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. However, that testimony is difficult to understand. The Senator from Washington himself said it was almost impossible to segregate the cost of getting a man to the moon from Dr. Seamans' testimony.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is difficult to do so because so many of the programs are interrelated, and involve space activities, weather activities, medical items, and many others.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield briefly to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have been trying to divert some money from this program to the program for work in oceanography. I have been attempting for a long time to do that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The oceanography program appeals to me much more than space.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I succeeded in having some funds diverted from the man-to-the-moon project; but I must agree with the Senator from New Mexico that the money thus diverted did not find its way into the oceanography program. Actually, we know more about the back side of the moon now than we know about three-quarters of the earth's surface.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that is a disgrace. I shall support the Senator.

Perhaps this is an accurate measure of our national sense of values. Few, if any, questions are ever raised about spending billions for developing new and more efficient ways to kill, but a loud outcry is raised over any effort to increase support for research in those fields which are concerned with ways of improving human life and building a more rational and peaceful world.

Inevitably, we return to the question of priorities. How can we justify a space budget of over $5 billion for the current fiscal year when so much remains to be done to eliminate unemployment, to provide adequate classrooms and teachers for America's young people, to eliminate slums and urban blight, to clear our polluted streams, to expand our parks and recreation areas, and to find living space and facilities for a population increasing by millions every year? The list of social challenges is seemingly endless and Congress has scarcely begun to devise adequate programs to meet them, particularly in the field of education. Until we have made significant progress toward the solution of these great problems of our own society, the expenditure of vast sums of money on outer space can only be regarded as reflecting a tragic distortion of our national values and priorities.

The most neglected area of our national life is public education, and there is an extreme imbalance in the quality of education between the rich States and the poor States. This imbalance is reflected in such statistics as the following: In 1962, 54 percent of the registrants for the draft in South Carolina failed the mental test, compared with a 4-percent failure rate in the State of Washington. In Louisiana, 21 percent of the adult population have less than 5 years of schooling compared with only a 3-percent rate in Iowa. In my own State, as another example, only 29 percent of adults have finished high school compared with 56 percent in Utah. The root of the problem is the disparity in annual per pupil expenditures—for example, $645 in New York compared with $255 in Alabama. There is little hope that these great gaps can be eliminated without substantial help from the Federal Government. And there is little hope that such help will be forthcoming unless we divert resources from such costly and marginal projects as the program for landing on the moon before 1970.

Recently the Senate passed a badly needed, long-delayed bill to expand the Federal Government's contribution to vocational education. The Senate bill provided only $173 million for this program. By comparison, each of the big boosters that will be used in the manned lunar program will cost approximately $150 million. The vocational education bill is apparently in deep trouble because of a dispute between the Senate and House conferees over the distribution formula, and it may never come out of the conference committee. It is difficult for me to understand how the Congress can justify spending $150 million for one fleeting probe into space and have such great difficulty in agreeing on a comparable amount for a full year's support of vocational education on a national scale.

The Senate has passed a Federal aid to education bill four times since World War II. Yet Congress is probably less inclined to enact a general aid to education bill now than it was when the first bill passed some 15 years ago. The administration's request for a program of $1.5 billion over 4 years apparently has no chance for passage in the foreseeable future although the total requested for 4 years of aid to improve schools amounts to less than half of the cost of the manned space program this 1 year. I might point out that the appropriation in this bill for NASA is more than the total spent for all public colleges and universities last year. When we have reached the point that the Federal Government is spending as much for a space adventure, ostensibly to enhance national prestige, as is spent for all of our public colleges and universities, it is clearly time for the Congress to do some very serious thinking about our national scale of values.

For another comparison, Senators should note that the entire natural resources program of the Federal Government this year calls for an expenditure of $2.6 billion. This sum represents the total annual investment of the Federal Government for parks, forests, dams, power facilities, drainage and irrigation projects, and all other activities to conserve and to develop the Nation's natural resources. All of these projects will yield public benefits for many years to come. Their projected cost is a billion dollars less than the amount authorized for the manned space program in this fiscal year and $2 billion less than the amount that will be appropriated for NASA even if my amendment for reductions is adopted.

Consider the following hypothetical examples: If the manned space program were eliminated, we could easily add the $970 million water project advocated by the junior Senator from Arizona to the budget for natural resources this year, pay for the entire package and still have some money left over. And only one-third of the amount authorized this year for the manned space program would fully defray the costs of the 24-year, $1.2 billion program to develop the Arkansas River for power, flood control, navigation, and recreation.

Senators might contrast the $5.19 billion requested this year for space exploration with the meager support given Federal activities to make our communities cleaner and more healthful places in which to live. Urban renewal projects which are cleaning up slums and blighted areas in communities throughout the Nation are budgeted for less than $300 million this year. The program to assist in providing decent housing for low-income families in hundreds of cities and towns is supported at $205 million. Federal grants to aid in construction of community sewerage facilities to clean up our polluted rivers and streams will be financed at a level of $90 million. Each year billions of gallons of unusable water flows through the rivers and streams of communities suffering from severe water shortages. Here in the Nation's Capital we have a river so polluted it offends the nose and the eyes. Its water is not fit for swimming, fishing, or drinking. There is indeed something very wrong, it seems to me, when the Congress refuses to provide funds to cope with these problems but is apparently willing and eager to provide $20 billion or more to send a man to the moon.

I do not contend that funds saved by reductions in the space program can be diverted directly to education or other neglected projects where greater effort is needed. I do believe, however, that the adoption of my amendment would make it easier and more practical for Congress to give serious attention to some of the pressing domestic problems to which I have referred. The minimum result of a reduction of $519 million in the NASA appropriation and of a decision to abandon the goal of reaching the moon by the end of this decade would be to ease the fiscal situation to the point where chances for enacting needed domestic legislation should be significantly improved. The Senate has passed a number of measures this year—such as the ARA extension, mass transit, vocational education, and Youth Conservation Corps bills—which are now being held up in the other body obviously for budgetary reasons. If the space program were cut back a billion dollars below the original budget request, as I propose, and the Congress were to make it clear that the program was to be continued on something less than a crash basis, with consequent decreases in annual funding requirements, many Members in the House now opposed to the Senate bills might be willing to reconsider their opposition to this important domestic legislation.

In reflecting on the crash program to reach the moon and the irrational priorities of public policy which it involves, I am reminded of the passage in Jonathan Swift's "Gulliver's Travels" in which the author visits the Academy of Projectors in Lagado. The academy is an institution in which scientists engage in studies and experiments of brilliant inventiveness, which, however, are grotesquely irrelevant to the needs of the destitute society in which they live. One scientist is engaged in a project for extracting sunbeams out of cucumbers, to be put in hermetically sealed vials and let out to warm the air in raw and rainy summers. Another has devised a method for building houses from the roof downward to the foundations and another has invented a contrivance by which the most ignorant person would be able to write books on philosophy,

poetry, politics, law, mathematics, and theology without having to study.

The Academy of Lagado, and others like it, the author explains, had become great centers of scientific progress and invention. The only drawback of the great preoccupation with science, Swift points out, is that in the meantime, the whole country lies in waste, the houses are in ruins, and the people are without food and clothes. But far from being discouraged, the people are enormously enthusiastic about the academies and their work and the few troglodytes who persist in living in neat houses and raising edible crops are looked on with contempt as enemies of art, who preferred their own ease and comfort to the general improvement of the country.

In closing, I assure my colleagues that it is neither the purpose of my amendment, nor my personal desire, to eliminate the manned lunar program. My purpose in offering this amendment is to place the space program in some perspective in relation to long-neglected domestic needs. The exploration of outer space, including the landing of Americans on the moon, is a worthy and inspiring objective whether or not it is pursued in competition with the Russians. But so long as millions of Americans are deprived of employment and adequate education, of material needs, and the opportunity for personal fulfillment, the exploration of space cannot be more than a secondary and long-term objective. Our first responsibility is to our own people, whose character and well-being are the ultimate source of national strength and the ultimate concern of a free society.

Mr. President, I wish to commend to my colleagues an article that appeared in the November issue of Fortune magazine written by Richard Austin Smith and called "Now It's an Agonizing Reappraisal of the Moon Race." In this article, Mr. Smith examines the various factors involved in the moon landing project and urges that the crash program be abandoned in favor of a long-term program to develop a broad capability in space. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Smith's article may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

NOW IT'S AN AGONIZING REAPPRAISAL OF THE MOON RACE

(By Richard Austin Smith)

(NOTE.—Two and a half years after the President committed the United States to getting there before the Russians, serious doubts about the burdens of a crash program are plaguing science, industry, and NASA. A drastic change of pace may be coming. James Webb and Congress seem to be increasingly far apart on the need for an eventual $20 to $40 billion to finance the moon race. But are they really? Webb, the NASA Administrator, opposes congressional budget cuts but appears to yearn for the more orderly, broadly based program of the old days. He is too good a bureaucrat to argue publicly with the President, but was quick to point out to Congress that Kennedy had already begun to soft-pedal the "moon first" goal.)

It is probably too much to say, as some of NASA's more panicky partisans have, that the whole U.S. space program now stands in mortal peril. The $600 million that Congress has so far whacked out of NASA's $5.7 billion budget request seems intended to put the portly giant on combat rations, not a starvation diet. Capitol Hill's tougher, more critical attitude toward NASA appears confined to counting the cost of our achieving preeminence in space rather than challenging the aspiration. A halt has simply been called to issuing the agency any further blank checks and this in turn ends Congress indulgent custom, begun in 1961, of encouraging NASA to double its budget every year. Nevertheless, NASA and the space program have reached a critical stage in their evolution; the next 2 years could very well see a realinement and reevaluation as sweeping as that which rocked NASA a little over 2 years ago when President Kennedy suddenly committed the Nation to a $20 to $40 billion program of beating the Russians to the moon.

This time, as before, the moon race lies at the heart of the reevaluation and this time the President again appears as a prime mover in bringing about the reappraisal. By accident or design, he clearly signaled a change in pace in his United Nations speech inviting the Russians to make manned exploration of the moon a joint venture instead of a competition. True, the U.N. proposal had all the earmarks of a trial balloon hurriedly inflated at the 11th hour to make a headline. But those who knew what had been going on in the lunar program found strong support for their view that reappraisal was now inevitable. So astonishing an invitation from the man who had started the race in the first place implied at least a new Washington view about the urgency of winning.

The fact is the President has been keenly aware of growing skepticism in many quarters. Among scientists the initial enchantment has faded before the mounting costs and the fear of heavy drain on other fields of scientific endeavor. Less and less is heard of the military urgency of exploring and "conquering" the moon; on second thought even the Air Force has decided its interests lie more in "inner-space" capability (up to 500 miles) than in the moon. Even some of those who put enormous emphasis on being first to the moon for reasons of national prestige are beginning to question whether an orderly development of space capability is being sacrificed just to achieve a prestige victory.

To be sure, the space race still has plenty of powerful adherents. Congressional support has been fortified by the judicious spreading of Apollo contracts among congressional districts; many citizens still want to beat the Russians to the moon at any cost; some scientists retain an almost mystical attachment to Apollo as a stimulating challenge and the greatest of adventures. And the race idea might regain powerful support overnight should the Russians pull off another space spectacular. But even so, the problems of the moon race as now conceived are of the kind that will progressively worsen.

The trouble stems from the simple fact that the Apollo program as a race is a far different undertaking from Apollo pursued at a reasonable pace. The race timetable calls for bringing it to a culmination in 1967 or 1968 instead of sometime in the seventies, as NASA originally planned; this speedup has increased the cost by around $8 billion. The drain on scientific manpower has gone up commensurately; the original time schedule envisioned recruitment of personnel through an expanded educational program, while the race schedule demands a rising percentage of scientific and technological talent in the pool today. Moreover, the preeminence given Apollo has made it virtually impossible for NASA to achieve orderly progress in other lines of space endeavor. Such a balanced approach has to give way as Apollo gets the best men, the highest priorities, and the bulk of the money. Apollo has become, not surprisingly, the tail that wags the dog.

Nobody is more aware of the possibility of a drastic realinement in space than NASA Administrator James Webb himself. Though Webb is a consummate high-level operator and takes his breaks as they come, he is, at the same time, one of Washington's more experienced administrators, which means that he has learned to be cautious. He has always seen the practical wisdom of a balanced, orderly program. His enormous management problems would be reason enough. Even before the advent of Apollo he had been hard pressed handling an agency that was at best a loose collection of research centers—Ames, Lewis, Langley, Edwards—plus one development center, Huntsville. Huntsville had been inherited from the Army, which in the postsputnik era was accustomed to letting Director Wernher von Braun write his own ticket. The research centers had been inherited from the old NACA, perhaps the most loosely run organization in the Government. But tough as things were in the early days of NASA, the saddling of this shaky management structure with the moon race seemed to magnify every problem. The agency virtually exploded. Its $915 million budget for fiscal 1961 shot up to $1.8 billion in fiscal 1962, more than doubled again in 1963 ($3.7 billion); personnel increased from the 17,500 people of 1961 to 28,500 in 1963.

Webb established the Office of Manned Space Flight with responsibility for the Apollo project and tried to bring the major centers under control, but the best he could work out was a kind of informal council. The centers, which had always had considerable autonomy, helped themselves to more of it, using the pressure of the race to justify their doing pretty much as they pleased. The Office of Manned Space Flight itself rapidly became an overbalancing element of the organization (claiming 60 percent of NASA's 1963 and 1964 budget and getting 90 percent of all the publicity), with its own separate Washington offices and a director rivaling the Administrator in importance.

To be sure, Webb is well aware that the idea of beating the Russians at anything has great utility in loosening up the congressional purse strings—and he has made the most of this. The United States, he admonished a congressional committee early this year, could not hope to get to the moon in this decade if NASA's requested $5.7 billion budget for 1964 was seriously cut. Yet, somewhat ambivalently—and much to the exasperation of those in direct charge of Apollo—he went out of his way to point out that the United States was no longer trying to be first to the moon. In a most remarkable statement this March he told the Congress, in essence, that it should take its cue from what the President had not said in an important speech on our space effort the previous fall. "The President," Webb emphasized, "did not say that our national goal is that of landing the first man on the moon or for that matter of being first with respect to any single achievement in space. We have done many things first and we will do many other things first including, we hope, sending the first explorers to the moon, but this is not the objective the President stated. Rather he forcefully declared our determination to attain 'a position of preeminence' in space and to 'become the world's leading space-faring Nation.'" Was Webb even then signaling an end to the moon race in favor of something eloquently if vaguely described as "space-faring"?

THE COSMONAUT AND THE BAY OF PIGS

To keep the current reappraisal in perspective, it is worth remembering that even as late as January 1961 a moon shot was not NASA's primary objective; it was instead a goal toward which the agency would judiciously move as its knowledge of space developed through more fundamental programs. Those programs were described by the NASA Administrator at the time as being: (1) The early application of earth satellites to practical uses, (2) the study of the space environment and celestial bodies to gain specific knowledge, (3) the determination of man's capacity to function usefully in space, in order to open the way to manned exploration of space, the moon, and the planets. What had changed all this, of course, were the events of April 1961. On the 12th, the Russians won a second epochal triumph in space, cosmonaut Yuri Gagarin becoming the first human being to orbit the earth. On the 19th, U.S. prestige suffered a humiliating setback when the invasion of Cuba ended in disaster at the Bay of Pigs.

An aroused President had then asked NASA what we could possibly do to surpass the Russians in space. It was not an easy question to answer. The demonstrated Soviet superiority in booster power foredoomed our chances of beating them in any middle-range achievements such as a manned space station or a manned circumnavigation of the moon; the United States, NASA reasoned, would have to pick a goal that was so far in the future as to diminish the importance of the present Russian advantage. After a month of feverish pencil work within NASA and soulsearching within the White House's Space Council, it was finally decided that a crash program of manned lunar exploration, using specially developed boosters, the Saturns, was the earliest venture on which the United States could reasonably hope to come out ahead. The point to be noted, in the light of reappraisal, is that the moon race was chosen not because the moon itself had a special value but because a moon landing—out of several other ventures seriously considered—offered the first important space victory the United States could hope for.

On May 25, 1961, Kennedy officially launched the moon race in his special message on urgent national needs. We were confronted, he said, by the need to embark on "a great new enterprise * * * to take a clearly leading role in space achievement," and the heart of the enterprise was landing a man on the moon and returning him safely to earth "before this decade is out." From then on, Project Apollo was a reality. The combination of national prestige, scintillating new horizons, and pork in the sky pushed the venture through Congress with unexampled speed. By July 20, with hardly a dissenting vote, Congress authorized a space budget 60 percent bigger than Eisenhower's January request. Kennedy's moon race became a national goal with a DX (top) priority.

The effect of this decision on NASA is without a parallel in Government since the crises of the great depression. Even in war—the $2-billion Manhattan Project comes most readily to mind—NASA's ordeal would have been virtually without peer as an organizational convulsion. Its job was to take a project on which feasibility studies had been completed only the week before Kennedy's speech and proceed to major hardware development at top speed.

Whole new facilities had to be planned, built, and staffed, existing programs such as Mercury had to be revamped to speed Apollo, new intermediate programs like Gemini (the two-man space capsule) had to be initiated, and hundreds of other projects that should have been done sequentially had to be done concurrently because of the tremendous pressures of time—e.g., the program for unmanned exploration of the moon, previously intended to precede manned exploration by 5 or 6 years, went forward almost hand in hand with the development of the hardware for manned lunar capability. By the same token NASA's methodical examination of alternate avenues of development had to be sacrificed to the demands of the time schedule. Principal case in point: because the big liquid-fueled rockets had been under development for 4 years at Huntsville, they offered a greater prospect of successful performance than giant solid-fueled boosters, so the moon shot was built around them—though the military interest lay in easily stored, instantly ready solids. Some hint of the breakneck speed is reflected in the fact that $630 million worth of contracts were signed in the 6 months following Kennedy's speech, $921 million more in the next 6 months.

All this made trouble enough, but NASA's Apollo problems were compounded by an additional handicap: while it was hiring hordes of new people and letting hundreds of millions of dollars worth of contracts, the agency still had to operate in the dark. NASA had only the most general notion of how it would get to the moon or what would be found there. Was a direct ascent to the moon and a "soft" landing there the best method? Or should two vehicles be put into earth orbit and the moon capsule launched from them? Or should the lunar craft go into temporary orbit around the moon and put off a capsule that could land, then rendezvous later with the space ship for a return to earth? Was the lunar surface a sea of electrostatically charged dust that might engulf the capsule, was it a collapsible crust, or one continually riddled by "shrapnel" from ricocheting meteorites?

Lacking the time to find out because of the frantic speedup, NASA made time the governing consideration and proceeded accordingly. North American was awarded the prime contract for Apollo ($400 million) in November 1961, without even knowing what mode would be chosen for going to the moon. When the lunar-orbit-and-rendezvous method was finally decided upon almost a year later (it was the quickest), the budgeted amount for that contract had to be increased 200 percent ($1.2 billion). Even as late as this year Grumman Aircraft was awarded a $390-million contract to design the lunar landing module without having the foggiest notion what kind of surface it would be required to land on; the hurry-up Ranger probes, five so far, have all failed to bring back this essential information.

Despite the absurdities and inequities of this situation, things were going fine, so far as the public or the average Congressman could see, because of the momentum generated by the old program. Navigation and communication via American satellites were thrilling the world. The secrets of the weather were being unfolded every day by the Tiros meteorological satellites. The Mercury program was a whole series of splendid accomplishments—four men into orbit, four successful missions. Yet at the very time the national enthusiasm for space was at its height, in the months following Col. John Glenn's flight, a secret reappraisal was actually going on—and going on in NASA itself.

The affair surfaced in a climatic battle between Webb and Brainerd Holmes, then Director of Manned Space Flight. The two had been personally at odds for some time—Webb wanting to stay "top dog" in NASA and Holmes aspiring to that spot—but the struggle centered on a $400 million supplemental appropriation Holmes wanted to help speed up the slipping Gemini and Apollo programs. Thus the question at issue was really the pace of the lunar race. Holmes maintains Webb had assured him early in 1962 that he would put in for the $400 million. Webb declares he never made any such commitment. Another member of NASA's top brass describes the contretemps as simply "a case where Brainerd Holmes had to learn that the public expressions of the President did not mean a blank check. He took it to mean encouraging the contractors to go ahead faster."

In any event, when August rolled around, Webb refused to authorize the $400 million supplemental and Holmes found himself in an unpleasant situation. With Apollo's DX priority and beating the Russians always in mind, he had urged the contractors to go for broke; they had put on more people and he had stepped up the spending rate. Now without the supplemental there would not be sufficient funds to maintain the pace and the contractors would have to cut back. Cutbacks, of course, mean layoffs and layoffs set political wires to humming. So a month later, in September, the issue of the supplemental came before the President.

Kennedy had practically invited Holmes to ask for the extra funds during his tour of the space centers earlier that month, according to one Congressman, by asking directly if there were any place money could be put to speed up Apollo. But when the matter of Apollo's pace landed on his desk as an issue, he decided it was worth reconsideration. Webb was dead set against granting the extra funds and made plain his disagreement over the importance and priority given the manned space program. A White House poll of key space people on Capitol Hill, including the late Senator Robert S. Kerr, Chairman GEORGE MILLER, of the House's Science and Astronautics Committee, and Chairman OLIN ("TIGER") TEAGUE, of the House Subcommittee on Manned Space, disclosed them to be as sharply split as Webb and Holmes. The request was quietly shelved. The President, patently, was having some second thoughts too. The extent of Kennedy's subsequent reservations about the pace of the moon race can be read in the fact that in June 1963, when a recrudescence of the Holmes-Webb split gave him another opportunity to back an impatient Holmes or a circumspect Webb, he went along with Webb—and Holmes returned to private industry.

THE CASE AGAINST THE RACE

What had no doubt impressed the President were growing signs of disenchantment with the moon race both inside and outside the NASA enclave. It was no secret in Washington that the White House science adviser, Jerome Wiesner, has been increasingly critical of Apollo, and Wiesner reflected a growing and important sector of the scientific community. New Mexico's Senator CLINTON ANDERSON took note of the situation last June by convening his Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences to hear what a dozen scientists had to say about space goals. To a certain extent the disenchantment was a predictable reaction to the initial moon-race "sell," to a certain extent it represented a victory for the unpersuaded who had never liked space much anyway, but principally it could be explained as the kind of second thought that was bound to come.

The attack on the scientific value of the race has occurred at three levels. On the first level are those unpersuaded scientists who believe that the investment of money and talent in Apollo is out of all proportion to the foreseeable benefits, if weighed against what those resources might accomplish in other fields. The most effective spokesman for this school is Dr. Warren Weaver, vice president of the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, who has a lively concern about some of the things that might be done with the $20 to $40 billion of the moon race. With $30 billion, he wrote in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, "we could give a 10-percent raise in salary, over a 10-year period, to every teacher in the United States from kindergarten through universities (about $9.8 billion); give $10 million each to 200 of the best smaller colleges ($2 billion); finance 7-year fellowships (freshman through Ph.D.) at $4,000 per person per year for

50,000 new scientists and engineers ($1.4 billion); contribute $200 million each toward the creation of 10 new medical schools ($2 billion); build and largely endow complete universities with medical, engineering, and agricultural faculties for * * * 53 of the nations which have been added to the United Nations since its original founding ($13.2 billion); create 3 more permanent Rockefeller Foundations ($1.5 billion); and still have $100 million left over to popularize science."

THE THREAT TO THE SATELLITES

The second level of attack on Apollo comes from scientists who are enthusiastic about a major exploratory effort in space but fear that Apollo and other man-in-space programs will swallow all the funds from the really important scientific programs, those that can be effectively accomplished with instruments. These minimally financed unmanned space flights have contributed by far and away the bulk of the scientific information obtained to date. The discovery of the Van Allen Belts, universally regarded as the outstanding accomplishment of the space age, was the result of an initial investment of at most $1 million; the Orbiting Solar Observatory and Nerv experiments have also been conspicuous successes for penny-ante outlays.

The third level of attack on Apollo comes from the growing number of scientists who have reached the conclusion that the race just isn't worth it. Dr. Philip Abelson, director of the Carnegie Institution's Geophysical Laboratory and editor of Science, official journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (membership: 76,000), recently conducted an informal straw poll among scientists not connected with NASA. The vote was 110 to 3 against the manned lunar program. "How one views Apollo," he says, "depends on what you think the basic values are. If you figure, as I do, that the yield is going to be awfully darned small, then you're going to be considerably more critical than if you think it's a big deal. I think very little in the way of enduring value is going to come out of putting a man on the moon—two or three television spectaculars—and that's that. If there's no military value—and people admit there isn't—and no scientific value—and no economic return, it'll mean we've put in a lot of engineering talent and research and wound up being the laughingstock of the world."

Dr. Polykarp Kusch of Columbia University, a Nobel laureate in physics, predicted to Senator ANDERSON's committee that the impact of the lunar program on research and development would be "extremely small." "I don't think," he declared, "we are going to get anything of the dimensions of the theory of chemical valence, which has been an enormously productive intellectual construct, or anything as effective as the quantum theory of physics, or anything as effective as the picture which the contemporary biologist has of genetic processes * * * I very much doubt the prospective purely scientific results are reasonably commensurate with the investment. I am commenting not only of the funding but also of the investment of men, which no amount of funding can replace."

THE COST IN BRAINPOWER

This latter aspect of the moon race, the drain of scarce manpower, has led some scientists to the conclusion that the program may actually render a disservice to science. NASA's requirement for men in the physical sciences, even taking the agency's own estimates, will siphon off 7 to 10 percent of the Nation's physicists—enough, some think, to hamstring effort in other fields of research. NASA's Apollo demands will certainly clash head on with the program to educate more scientists. The universities and colleges will need twice the number of Ph. D.'s they formerly retained on their staffs if they are to meet the tremendously expanded college enrollments of the middle sixties. Yet the college requirements for more Ph. D.'s will be reaching a peak just at the time NASA's are too. (The moon program alone is expected to demand the services of 350,000 people, many of them scientists and engineers.)

On the other hand, if NASA were to get the first-rate scientists, which it needs, then the effect might be even more pervasive. For the percentage of really creative and imaginative men in science is not considered to have kept pace with the rapid growth of competent technicians; the former are a very scarce commodity, perhaps numbering no more than 200 to 300, whose diversion to the new field of space would inevitably rob an established discipline of leadership. "We have a limited pool of genius," Dr. Abelson explains. "If we transfer genius in one direction, that genius isn't going to be available elsewhere. These fellows who have genius are transferable. They can learn physics and know all about nuclear physics, and then with a few years of study they can begin making important contributions in biology."

It should be noted that on space, as on practically every other issue, the views of the scientific community are far from monolithic. As critics of the NASA program have found voice, defenders also have spoken up. Last spring Chemists Harold Urey and Willard Libby, and Geneticist Joshua Lederberg, Nobel Prize winners all, joined five equally distinguished scientists in a special press release disputing Dr. Abelson. Man in space, they stated, is essential to the scientific objectives of lunar exploration, and the pace of the program must be geared to the urgencies of the response to the national challenge. But they did not specifically underwrite Apollo as a scientific proposition. And the fact that they felt it necessary to rally behind a program that, a year ago, needed no defenders indicates how severely scientific support for the moon race has eroded.

THE MILITARY'S NEW LOOK

Something of the same reevaluation has been going on in the military areas. In the first burst of space enthusiasm some military pundits seized on the moon as everything from the "high ground" so cherished by infantrymen to an indispensable Gibraltar guarding the portals to the universe. Under closer examination the military theories about the moon have undergone a significant deflation. Prime example: Use of the moon for a missile base. Moon-based missiles—shot on a trajectory of 240,000 miles from a moving launching pad diverging from its earthly target at speeds up to 1,000 miles per hour—have been found wanting when compared to earth-based ICBM's, which are only a few thousand miles from their targets.

The military's prime interest at this time is not the moon but operating capability in "inner space"—the zone up to 500 miles above the earth. Even here, however, its pace is exploratory rather than headlong. Last February, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, told the House Armed Services Committee: "We can't really define an offensive weapon for use in space that will be more efficient and less costly than one we could do the same job with on the ground or in the air."

Dr. Lawrence Kavanau, until recently space specialist with the Defense Department's Office of Defense Research and Engineering, goes one step beyond LeMay to point out that no really new military space missions have been discovered since 1958 and even a few of the 1958 items were described as early as 1946. The emphasis is rather on assembling new technological "building blocks," the broad base on which future systems may be built.

Even the young space colonels of the Air Force never saw much utility in Apollo. The plain fact is that if Apollo and all the other programs that made up NASA's $5.7 billion budget request for 1964 were to be suddenly scrapped, the military (which has a $1.7 billion space program of its own) would have to spend only an additional $500 million to make up for whatever help NASA had been giving.

A MATTER OF THE INNER MAN

The most persistent justification for the moon race, of course, is that of prestige. Those Americans who never will forget the awesome sight of sputnik streaking through the night sky simply feel in their bones that we must beat the Russians to the moon as a global demonstration of the superiority of our system. But has the United States so little to offer the world in other fields than space that our prestige would really be blighted if Russia beat us to the moon? Would the splendor of another American breakthrough like the Salk vaccine go into eclipse because a Soviet spaceship touched down on the lunar surface before we did?

"Everyone especially wants to be sure that the United States is ahead of the Soviet Union," said President Lee DuBridge of the California Institute of Technology, "but the wholly unanswerable question, I fear, is this: How much prestige can we buy for $1 billion, for $5 billion, for $30 billion, or $100 billion? We just do not know. At least I do not know. And even if we did know, we still do not know whether $1 billion will buy more prestige if invested in space or in housing or in education or medicine or military power or foreign aid programs."

Perhaps the only certain thing about the prestige issue is that the pattern of our recent competition with the Soviet should have made it plain, if it has not, that a lunar landing by either side will not be the clear-cut propaganda coup of Sputnik I. Regardless of who gets there first, the other will doubtless have something ready to steal some of the thunder of the feat—e.g., an interplanetary probe.

Even those who put more stock in space prestige than DuBridge raise questions of what kind of space prestige is best. The overriding question is simply whether the spectacular first of a moon shot is as important as a solid second built on space capability. Apollo, it should be remembered, is a tremendous but very narrowly defined engineering effort, strictly designed for the purpose of getting a man to the moon and back. The Saturn V rockets are larger than needed for inner-space use, too slow in launching for regular military use, too expensive for logistical supply, and too small for practical use in manned shots beyond the moon. Moreover, their ever-larger bundles of liquid-fueled engines offer little to the advancement of the state of the art. As Dr. Donald Hornig, a member of the President's Science Advisory Committee, observed, the lunar race has put us in the position of the airplane designers of 1925 who suggested that we put a hundred engines on an airplane to make it carry big loads.

THE COMING SQUEEZE

The logic of events is working powerfully for a formal reappraisal of the moon-race goal. On the one hand, Congress is starting to cut NASA's budgets, on the other NASA sticks by its commitment to the moon race. For various reasons Apollo is falling behind schedule. Gemini, the program that is expected to work out the rendezvous techniques for Apollo in a series of two-man orbits, has already "slipped" some 6 months. The first manned flight around the earth in the Apollo capsule is now 9 to 11 months behind schedule and is not expected to take place before 1966. This has moved the lunar shot itself from 1967 to 1968 at the earliest, but difficulties with the F-1 engines of the

Saturn may make for additional slippage. If NASA is still saddled with Apollo as a top (DX) national priority, it will simply have to pour on more money in an effort to buy back the lost time and thereby stay in the race. Yet if Congress refuses to grant any over-all increase in NASA's total budget, on grounds that $5.7 billion or even $5.1 billion is a big enough commitment of national resources for space, then it is likely that Apollo will encroach on the meager $1.5 billion of NASA's budget for unmanned space applications. Thus, lacking a deliberate change in plan, NASA will be spending less and less on the kind of balanced approach that more and more people want.

There is another reason why the lunar-race question is bound to come into clearer focus in the months ahead: the real impact of Apollo on NASA's wobbly management structure is becoming increasingly evident. Webb tacitly acknowldeged the deepened misgivings about NASA management in a well-publicized reorganization program introduced early last month. But it is doubtful that shifts in the chain of command can cure what ails an Apollo-oriented NASA. For example, the Houston center, which is supposed to coordinate the work of the contractors in bringing Apollo to completion, is itself in urgent need of coordination; its managerial group is one of the weakest within NASA and during the period of explosive growth—the center grew from 800 in 1961 to 3,500 people in 1963—has found little time to set its own house in order. Yet NASA in Washington still lacks the kind of top management that can step in and take over if Houston should bungle this all-important job of coordination.

Dr. George Mueller, Brainerd Holmes' successor as head of the Office of Manned Space Flight, is a technical man, a distinguished one, and a fine teacher as well; yet his gentle, almost diffident temperament and lack of administrative experience hardly suggest that his office will be run even as forcefully as Brainerd Holmes ran it. The latter, in the opinion of many qualified to judge, did a fine job at Manned Space Flight, but he had to do it by joining forces with Houston and the other centers rather than establishing his office's hegemony over them. Now, under the pressure of the final phases of the moon race, effective intervention by Washington would seem even tougher. The greater the urgency to meet the deadlines, the greater will be the temptation for the centers to insist on a completely free hand.

Jim Webb's strength lies in his powerful connections with Congress, constantly reinforced with a judiciously distributed outpouring of space funds. When pressed on his budget he wastes little time in arguing the case for Apollo; instead he tells congressional critics rather baldly that the first effect of budget cutting will be a cutback in contracts already awarded. He has won the enormous gratitude of such powerful Texans as Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON and Congressman ALBERT THOMAS, chairman of the House subcommittee in charge of NASA's appropriations, for his stirring defense of the estimated $250 million Houston center; he carries great weight as well with Senator CLINTON ANDERSON and Congressman GEORGE MILLER. But even these worthies cannot protect Webb on the management front. As will become increasingly clear, NASA's demands have been more than he has been able to cope with, and, under the crushing load of Apollo, perhaps more than anybody is able to cope with.

As Webb's day of reckoning approaches, he will probably get considerable personal support from the companies with large NASA contracts. But the contractors are perhaps more conversant with his management problems than anybody else. They know that they must make their principal connections with the powerful centers. However, much as they would like to deal with Webb, they have discovered the hard way that their livelihood depends on those in the centers who are the most effective challengers to Webb's authority.

THE FAILURE OF FALLOUT

Webb has also lost a substantial amount of support outside the aerospace industry. His lecture-tour promises of a broad industrial fallout from the lunar race have just not panned out. Experience with close tolerances and working with new materials have undoubted value to industry, but the very nature of the moon race militates against their wide usage or inexpensive acquisition. A recent study on "The Commercial Applications of Missile/Space Technology," prepared for NASA by the University of Denver, found it was "too early" to look for commercial byproducts. When would the right time be? About a decade from now.

AN ORDERLY PROGRAM

The 2½ years that have elapsed since the President decreed the moon race have, in short, added perspective to the other elements of an epochal human undertaking. It is inconceivable that Americans, having taken the first steps into space, could ever be dissuaded from going on. But it is more and more doubtful that the orderly approach to an undertaking that—to use Fortune's words of June 1962—is "hitching the economy to the infinite" will be served by a moon race that is hitched to an unrealistic timetable. Even such an Apollo enthusiast as Brainerd Holmes concedes that "the lunar program makes sense only if we go on from there—" to the planets. So let's take our time doing it. The crash timetable should be abandoned in favor of one that places the moon in perspective: i.e., as one way station in the sequential development of space. NASA will then have a chance to shake down and the Nation will be better prepared for the immense costs involved. For make no mistake, the outlays that are so dismayingly big on today's research and development will be dwarfed by tomorrow's costs of maintaining a station in space or on the moon.

Such a revision in goals will, of course, bring a considerable outcry from those who have a large stake in Apollo—principally the NASA centers and the contractors—on grounds that a stretchout will cost more in the long run. But it need not, given some judicious shifting of manpower to other projects, an end to the buildup of Apollo's overhead, and the obvious savings that will result from not having to do everything on a crash basis. To postpone the decision will cost even more because the biggest spending on Apollo is just about to start: during fiscal 1964 and 1965, NASA hopes to sink about $4 billion a year in the moon race and keep this rate in 1966 as well if the program runs into trouble. Instead the present lunar program could be continued through Gemini to determine such useful things as rendezvous techniques. Apollo and the costly hardware phase of the Saturn V's, however, would wait on the more complete explorations of "inner space."

Once the distorting influence of Apollo's high priority is reduced, we could then redefine the goal of developing a broad capability in space. For $2.5 to $3 billion it should be possible to have the sort of program that Caltech's President DuBridge outlined to a congressional committee: sending up many instrumented satellites to measure the Van Allen layers, cosmic rays, magnetic and gravitational fields. Some would observe weather patterns, carry communication systems and optical or radio telescopes for observations unimpeded by the troublesome atmosphere of the earth. The program would move forward at a slower pace than NASA does now in order to allow for the proper assimilation of material. (Data from the weather satellites, for example, is coming in faster than its meaning can be interpreted and applied.) In essence it would be like the present NASA program but with these all-important differences: (1) it would be a balanced effort, free of the dislocation caused by the emphasis on Apollo, (2) it would be free of the pressure of time, which increases costs and reduces benefits, (3) it would be subject to periodic reappraisal, substituting flexibility for the rigidities now characteristic of Apollo.

Whether such a program would get us to the moon ahead of the Russians would seem to be beside the point. The important thing is that when we did touch down on the lunar surface it would not be just a stunt. Behind our achievement would be the kind of deep knowledge that can take 240,000 miles in stride and not even breathe hard. We would have won the only race really worth winning, leading the Russians and the rest of the earth to a broad capability in space.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD following that article a short excerpt from U.S. News & World Report for November 25, 1963, entitled "Where Billions for Research Go."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE BILLIONS FOR RESEARCH GO

"Stop, look—and probably cut back."

That is the sign going up on more and more Government-sponsored projects in research and development in the vast and expanding world of U.S. science.

The reason? Congress is suddenly getting disillusioned by rising costs, evidence of mismanagement, and lack of practical results in many areas.

At the same time Congress is hearing, in investigations just getting underway, that many scientists are also very disturbed about trends in Government-paid research. These scientists fear long-range effects on science itself.

THE $100 BILLION—AND RISING

Figures given to Congress show that about $100 billion has been spent for research and development—public and private—in the past 10 years.

If spending goes on at the present rate of about $20 billion a year, some $200 billion will be poured out in the name of "science" in the next 10 years.

At latest count, more than a million and a quarter scientists, engineers, and technicians were employed in the United States—three out of five on Government projects. Their ranks will have to be more than doubled in 10 years if the present pace is maintained.

No one knows where these additional trained people will come from. There is a shortage of teachers already, and it is getting worse.

Against this background, these questions are being asked: Where are the billions for research and development going? What are taxpayers getting for the 15 billions spent on research and development this year? Is politics being played in the way money for science is distributed around the country? Is it wise to have so much of the scientific community dependent on Government payrolls? What practical use is made of all the research?

On page 74 is an excerpt from a recent speech by a Member of the House of Representatives, who apparently spoke for many Congressmen when he said, "The honeymoon is over" for Federal research and development.

CUTBACKS AND INVESTIGATION

This year, the House already has:

Appointed a special committee to survey research in all its forms.

Cut funds for: the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation, and a project to drill a hole through the crust of the earth.

Included research-and-development funds in the across-the-board cutback in defense appropriations.

The accompanying charts give you facts and figures underlying the growing controversy.

Where the Government put up about $10 billion last year, private industry spent about $4.7 billion. Colleges, universities and private scientific institutes, although they do an important share of the Nation's research, paid for only 3 percent of the national total.

The same pattern of spending is being maintained this year, with the Government paying for, and thus tending to dominate, two-thirds of the country's scientific effort.

More than 90 percent of the Government's projects are concentrated in four fields: defense, space, atomic energy, and health. But the range of research under those headings is so broad that this too has become a source of rising criticism, particularly in Congress.

TOO LITTLE "PURE" SCIENCE?

Most scientists stress this point: Only a tenth of all research-and-development money goes for so-called basic research, which is the source of future progress.

Scientists also see another danger: The glamour of space and atomic energy research is attracting promising men away from fields such as biochemistry where, many believe, the most important discoveries for humans are to be made.

Dr. Richard J. Russell, of the Louisiana Coastal Studies Institute, told the House Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development: "Short-range programs * * * such as placing a man on the moon, are draining talent from our universities at an alarming rate * * *. I feel that our national capability [in science] will decline to a point where we may well become a second- or third-rate nation."

Another aspect of the question was stressed by Dr. H. Guyford Stever, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who told Congress: "We have a serious imbalance * * * in the area of engineering, which is pointed to our daily life rather than some of the more glamorous fields."

A very large number of new ideas that are practical from an engineering point of view for industry and consumers, he said, are now originating overseas, where research is not preoccupied with "a large defense activity and * * * a space program."

Many scientists connected with industry, while they agree on the need for more "basic" research, also call for better use of what is already known.

Recently, it is pointed out, a moon shot was held up because a faulty adhesive was used in one small component.

Yet the fact that the adhesive was faulty had been known to some scientists for 2 years or more.

This sort of "knowledge gap" crops up with increasing frequency, scientists in industry say.

UNFAIR DISTRIBUTION?

Under the surface, but potent politically, is the feeling that too much money has gone to the east and west coasts of the United States.

The Midwest and the South, in particular, feel slighted.

So strong is this feeling that the Government's plan to put a multimillion-dollar Environmental Health Center near Washington had to be changed. The new center has been delayed at least a year, site undetermined.

Martin Goland, director of the Southwest Research Institute of San Antonio, Tex., told congressional investigators that technical knowledge "is probably adequate to feed our economy, except that it isn't doing it" because it is being concentrated in too few research-rich areas, remote from the bulk of U.S. industry.

AHEAD: MORE CONTROLS

Apparently Congress intends to watch research spending far more closely in the future. That may increase the problem that some scientists worry most about: Government control, sometime in the future, over science and even control over scientists themselves.

Federal research funds[1]*—soaring Government spending for research—a target for economizers in Congress?*

[In billions]

Year ended:	
June 30, 1947	$0.7
June 30, 1952	2.2
June 30, 1957	4.4
June 30, 1962	11.2
1963 (estimate)	14.7

[1] Obligations for all research and development programs.

Source: Nationa' Science Foundation.

Year's total of research spending

	Percent
Defense, $7.8 billion	53
Space, $3.7 billion	25
Atomic energy, $1.5 billion	10
Health and welfare, $0.8 billion	5
All other programs (including those in agriculture, commerce, natural resources, etc., and those of the National Science Foundation), $0.9 billion	7

IN AMERICAN SCIENCE, THE GOVERNMENT PUTS UP $2 FOR EVERY $1 THAT PRIVATE SOURCES SPEND

An estimated $15 billion was spent for all types of research development and support of science in the United States in the year ended June 30, 1962, latest on record. Of that sum—

	Percent
Federal Government put up $9.7 billion, or	65
Private industry put up $4.7 billion, or	32
Colleges put up $0.3 billion, or	2
Other groups put up $0.1 billion, or	1

NOT ENOUGH DOLLARS FOR BASIC RESEARCH?—FACTS BEHIND A GROWING ARGUMENT

This has been the approximate splitup of research-and-development money in the United States in recent years, according to the National Science Foundation:

	Percent
Basic research ("pure" science, seeking fundamental new knowledge)	10
Applied research (projects aimed at producing useful objects or methods from known information)	22
Tests, and manufacturing operations, involved in research	68

Many scientists feel that a larger share of research money—and scarce scientists—should be devoted to "pure" science, the bedrock for future advances. Others disagree, say it's time to put more effort on using the knowledge already available.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a copy of my letter to Hon. James E. Webb of October 31, 1963, and his answer to me of November 13, 1963, together with certain tables showing the allocation of money in the program relating to the matter under consideration.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 31, 1963.

Hon. JAMES E. WEBB,
Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WEBB: As you know, it is impossible to determine from the NASA Authorization Act and the committee reports on it, the net amounts for the various aspects of the Apollo project for the 1964 fiscal year. A breakdown of this cost information is, I believe, necessary for proper evaluation by the Congress of the space program. Therefore, I would appreciate it if you would provide me with the following information:

1. The amounts in the research and development section of the NASA Authorization Act that can be attributed directly or indirectly to the Apollo project. A listing of the amounts attributable to the Apollo project in each research category (launch vehicle and propulsions systems, lunar and planetary exploration, etc.) would be the most meaningful way to present this for my purposes.

2. What new facilities are authorized in the 1964 Authorization Act that will be used in direct support of the Apollo program? What are the amounts authorized for each of these projects?

3. What is likely to be the delay in making the first attempt at a manned lunar landing if the funds for Apollo were cut back this year by 10 percent? Twenty-five percent? Fifty percent?

I would appreciate your providing me with this information within the next 2 weeks.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., November 13, 1963.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: We are supplying information that is responsive to two of the three questions you addressed to Mr. Webb concerning funding of the NASA manned lunar landing program in fiscal year 1964. The answer to your third question, relative to the delay in the program that would be incurred if program funding were to be reduced by various amounts, is being prepared in conjunction with a detailed schedule review that is now underway. It is expected that we will be able to furnish the information you requested on that point by about November 30, 1963.

The amounts that are to be used in support of the manned lunar landing program are listed, by subject area, in table I. The facilities that will be used in direct support of the program, and the fiscal year 1964 authorization for each, are listed in table II.

When the information responsive to your third question has been developed, we will send it to you.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD L. CALLAGHAN,
Assistant Administrator for Legislative Affairs.

TABLE I.—*Research and development programs directly and indirectly supporting the manned lunar landing program—fiscal year 1964 authorization*

Manned spacecraft system	$1,496,600,000
Launch vehicle and propulsion systems	1,123,500,000
Aerospace medicine	11,000,000
Integration and checkout	125,000,000
Systems engineering	37,000,000
Lunar and planetary explorations	154,300,000
Tracking and data acquisition	108,000,000
Total, research and development	3,055,400,000

TABLE II.—*Facilities in direct support of manned lunar landing program—fiscal year 1964 authorization*

LAUNCH OPERATIONS CENTER	
Advanced Saturn launch complex No. 39	$191,819
Advanced Saturn supporting facilities	9,084
Barge lock and channel	900
Manned spacecraft facilities	6,287
Modifications to Saturn launch complex No. 34	1,310
Modifications to Saturn launch complex No. 37	3,435
Range instrumentation sites	4,798
Utility installations—New area	23,638
Cafeteria—MILA	873
Calibration and Standards Laboratory—MILA	2,867
Central instrumentation facility—MILA	31,248
Launch equipment shop—MILA	1,517
Optical and electronic component servicing facility—MILA	855
Range engineering and administrative building—MILA	605
Vehicle maintenance and service facilities—MILA	--------
Total, Launch Operations Center	279,236
MANNED SPACECRAFT CENTER	
Additions to mission control center	8,409
Atmospheric reentry materials and structures evaluation facility	2,695
Launch environment and antenna test facilities	7,265
Mission simulation and training facility	2,069
Project engineering facility	2,761
Ultrahigh vacuum space chamber facility	2,378
Center support facilities	3,697
Spacecraft control technology laboratory	5,828
Total, Manned Spacecraft Center	35,102
MARSHALL SPACE FLIGHT CENTER	
Accelerated test and calibration facility	$1,610
Additions to the components test facilities	3,675
Addition to the test support shop	1,500
Barge dock and loading facilities	591
Expansion and modernization of the high-pressure gas and propellant systems	2,000
Hangar for vehicle components	[1] 3,500
Modernization of instrumentation and control systems in east area	3,500
Modification to the vehicle assembly building	(1)
Extension to load test annex	3,656
Total	20,032
MICHOUD PLANT	
Addition to production facility	5,220
Park and security improvement	460
Road and airstrip rehabilitation	375
Vehicle components supply building	2,633
Total	8,688
MISSISSIPPI TEST FACILITY	
Advanced Saturn first stage (SIC) static test facilities	35,983
Advanced Saturn second stage (SII) static test facilities	19,148
Bridge for U.S. Interstate Highway No. 10	4,500
Control center and data acquisition and handling facilities	4,613
Electronic, instrumentation, and materials laboratory	2,716
F-1 engine system test stand	6,541
Maintenance facilities	2,280
Navigation lock	6,604
Sonic measuring facility	1,760
Transportation and parking facilities	4,597
Utility additions and extensions	6,559
Warehouse addition and storage facilities	936
Waterways and docking facilities	3,959
Total	100,196
VARIOUS LOCATIONS	
Facilities for F-1 engine program	14,238
Facilities for H-1 engine production	1,410
Facilities for J-2 engine program	6,900
Facilities for SIVB stage programs	5,105
Improvements to the RL-10 A-3 engine test facility	500
Instrumentation ships	83,300
Lunar excursion module test facilities	14,500
Manned space flight data acquisition and tracking facilities	19,500
Total	145,453
Total, COF authorization	588,707

[1] Projects combined by House committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that comments about scheduling, and so forth, not be included as a part of my speech, but follow my speech and come at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The debate referred to is as follows:

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, we have reached the hour of 5:10 p.m. I have discussed the subject of procedure with several Senators. If we proceed for another 20 minutes and then convene at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, and at that time if we could then have in effect a unanimous-consent agreement limiting the debate to 1 hour on the amendment and any other amendment, we could make progress on the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin wished to make a statement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I would suggest an hour on each amendment.

Mr. CLARK. I am perfectly willing to make my major speech tonight if Senators desire me to do so. Tomorrow, if I could have 5 to 10 minutes to complete my argument, I would be content with whatever arrangement the Senator from Arkansas could work out.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator will have such time tomorrow as he would like.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am reminded that tomorrow the Committee on Foreign Relations will hold a hearing on the question of foreign agents.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, may I have the attention of the Senator from Washington?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Perhaps we could come in at 11 a.m. tomorrow and discuss other sections of the bill. Then when the Senator from Arkansas has finished with the meeting of his committee, we might proceed on the so-called Fulbright amendment, with a limitation of 1 hour of debate on each side.

Mr. CLARK. The time is satisfactory. My problem is the same as that of the Senator from Arkansas. The Committee on Banking and Currency is conducting a hearing on the bill related to the sale of wheat to Soviet bloc countries. The hearings start tomorrow morning with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] coming before the committee. The bill is very important. All members of the committee ought to be present. I expect that the committee will remain in session for a couple of hours. The so-called Fulbright amendment could go over until tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Washington expressed agreement to that. He suggested that the Senate consider some other matter in the morning and then take up my amendment in the afternoon after the committee is through with its hearings.

Mr. ANDERSON. Perhaps we might go over until 12 o'clock tomorrow, and at that time the Senate would meet, have what might be called a morning hour, then proceed for an hour or an hour and a half on the amendment, and then go to another subject.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Washington. If the Senator wishes to continue his speech, it is perfectly satisfactory to me. But would it not be feasible to come in at 11 a.m. tomorrow, and take up some of the other subjects related to the bill? Several Senators on our side of the aisle have indicated that they would like to say a few words. I should like to be sure that the time is controlled in such a way that they may also make their remarks on the particular subject before the Senate. So why could we not come in at 11 a.m., while the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Foreign Relations are meeting? The committees would then meet until 12. That arrangement could be a part of the understanding.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. My problem is that I have committed myself to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] to raise a question on the bill which, as the Senator from Washington knows, has to do with the Securities and Exchange Commission. I am committed to offer two amendments to the bill. I have to be present from 10 to 12 at the hearing of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the Senator from Washington consider a further suggestion? Could we not return at 11 a.m. tomorrow, and devote the time between 11 a.m. and 12 noon to a morning hour? At 12 noon the Senate could consider other features of the bill, and at 2 o'clock the Senate could again proceed to consider the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ALLOTT. I would have to object to that arrangement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I was advised in a rather preliminary fashion that the majority leader was detained for a few minutes with some official callers. I anticipate that he will be back in the Chamber in 5 or 10 minutes. We have had tentatively on paper a proposal to convene early tomorrow morning and try to obtain a limitation of debate on the amendment so that consideration of the bill might be concluded.

I respectfully suggest that we abide the return of the majority leader to the Senate; perhaps then an arrangement can be arrived at.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is what we are trying to do.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is what we are trying to do. The Senator from Illinois will recall that tomorrow morning the Committee on Banking and Currency is to consider the so-called Mundt wheat bill. The Committee on Foreign Relations has also scheduled a hearing on the question of foreign agencies, with which the Senator from Illinois is acquainted. Such hearings illustrate one of the problems of coming in early.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, and so far as it lies within my power, I would give assurance to the Senate now that there would be no objection to committee meetings through the period when the Senate is in session, if it comes in early tomorrow.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, to clarify my position, my point was not only that the committees would be meeting, but also that I wished to be present when other questions related to the bill were being considered. There is a conflict. One cannot be in two places at once. The Senator from Illinois knows about the hearings of which we are speaking.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. Is the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas pending?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand that there are a half dozen other amendments.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. My amendment is pending.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That amendment could be set aside.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It could be set aside temporarily and the Senate could return to its consideration at 2 or 3 o'clock tomorrow. I have no objection to that kind of procedure. But since the majority leader is not present, I am merely throwing out that suggestion for the Senator to talk to him about.

Mr. DIRKSEN. However, if there is no prolonged discussion on the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas——

Mr. CLARK. There will be.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There will be beyond, let us say, what might be a stated reasonable hour?

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will yield——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I am a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Tomorrow the committee will consider the bill related to the sale of wheat. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt] is the first witness.

I have two amendments to the bill before the Senate which I am committed to offer, and another matter which could be handled in colloquy, which I promised the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], who had to be absent, I would take up with the Senator from Washington. I am perfectly willing to enter into a reasonable unanimous-consent agreement to vote if my rights in that regard can be protected. I do not care about the arrangements in respect to time tomorrow as long as we can arrange the schedule so that I will not have to be in two places at once.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, may we have the regular order?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is the Senator speaking in relation to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. CLARK. I will do anything that the Senator from Arkansas wishes to do.

Mr. ANDERSON. Would the Senator from Arkansas be willing that the Senate vote on the amendment at 6 o'clock tonight?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; not tonight.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the regular order.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I was wondering if the Senator and the Senate would be amenable to a unanimous-consent agreement tomorrow of, say, an hour on each amendment and 2 hours on the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With the understanding that it will begin at 3 o'clock, in accordance with the previous colloquy?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire] has one or two amendments; that the Senator from Pennsylvania has one or two——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have a matter I wish to discuss. I do not intend to offer an amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There are several.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is what I am saying. It is being proposed that there be a time limit.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Two hours on the bill. If more time is needed, it will be asked for.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have a matter to discuss that I think several Senators are interested in.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have the difficulty that I have a meeting in the morning as does the Senator. I do not know that I can agree to the request. I do not want to be foreclosed. This is an important amendment. This amendment would save as much money as was saved in 3 weeks on foreign aid, that Senators took so much pleasure in doing.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator should not look at me.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It would save almost the same amount.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I assure the Senator that I will not bring up his amendment for discussion or for a vote until he gets here.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Wisconsin said to me, "I am going to support the amendment, and I want to say something." We did not contemplate any problem here.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator will have plenty of time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think the time suggested is enough. I do not see why the Senator does not proceed in the normal way. Why should it take such a short time to pass a $5 billion bill when it took us 3 weeks to pass a $3½ billion bill on foreign aid? No Senator even requested a limitation of time during those 3 weeks.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was not handling that bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I object, then, for the time being.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I was present long enough to hear a part of the debate. At the risk of being repetitious, I propose to give a very brief history.

Some reference was made in the debate to the military significance of the space program. Avoiding as many personal references as possible, the Senator from Mississippi was a member of the Armed Services Committee when the matter of creating a Space Committee and the Space Administration came up and the bill was introduced. The Senator from Mississippi heard the testimony of military witnesses and others. A short time later the Senator from Mississippi became a member of the Space Committee. The chairman of the committee was the then Senator from Texas, Mr. Johnson, now the Vice President. The chairman designated the Senator from Mississippi to hold the first hearing.

Mr. President, I refer to the first major hearings on a program that could be called a real space program, held by the present Space Committee of the Senate. Those hearings were conducted in the Old Senate Office Building, and extended for 3 or 4 or 5 weeks.

One of the main witnesses at those hearings was Dr. Dryden, whose services in this field antedated the Space Committee and the Space Administration. He was head of the old NACA.

Dr. Dryden and other witnesses outlined, with amazing accuracy, the various programs we have since seen coming to pass in the space program.

The weather satellites, the photographic satellites, the telephone satellites, and many others moving into the larger fields, were outlined then in great degree and detail.

From the very beginning this project involved various figures each year, starting with a few thousand dollars. As the Senator from Mississippi recalls, about the second year it became a billion dollar project. The figures have been projected with reasonable accuracy until now.

Mr. President, I emphasize this and point out that several years ago the program was laid out largely as it is now, and that its progress has been noted for its amazing accuracy. When various projects were outlined to us, frankly, I did not think that we would be able to carry them out, but we have been able to do so, with great success, and with great credit.

I also remember the testimony of our military friends, who were not altogether friendly, in the beginning, to the idea of creating a Space Administration. I know their feelings and their professional viewpoint. They thought they were being left out. They thought so wrongfully, of course. That is no reflection on them. They are very aggressive and militant; and they should be.

I have seen progress made from year to year in the development, with the military aspect coming back into the program. For a while we said publicly that there was no military significance to it. That was a part of the secrecy of the program. We were emphasizing the point that this was merely exploration, that it was a peaceful undertaking. Everyone connected with it knew that it had military significance.

Two or three years ago it came out in the open. The policy was changed, and we began to talk about the program more openly with respect to its military significance.

We had been ahead of the Russians in many things. We still are. However, they had great power, tremendous thrust, mighty engines, and terrible rockets. I know that General Gavin testified to the effect that unless we had a rocket with a million-pound thrust, we would not continue as a nation. That was one of the most dramatic statements I ever heard. This program has progressed, and it is making progress today.

Frankly, I thought the President of the United States used an unfortunate term in his original expression in his message, when he talked about this program being a moon shot, a shot to the moon. That has been a misnomer from the very beginning. Going to the moon is merely an exercise. The program means that we desire to be preeminent in space. The only question is whether we shall be. It is a question of whether we are to master space. That has been the question from the beginning. That is the question now. It is the only question. The matter of landing on the moon is merely an exercise in carrying out a program that will make us masters of space, and preeminent in space.

The question with reference to a reduction in the amount of money is whether or not we shall slow the program down and postpone it, and in that way perhaps let someone else be preeminent in space. It is not a race, as has been said. It is a race only for our own protection. It is a race to that extent only.

We have already pared the program down. I believe the legislative branch has the major responsibility in that regard. The House has worked on the program. The committees have worked on it. I have also, being a member of each of the committees. No Senator knows more about this very complicated subject than does the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. When any proposal survives the steamroller that he puts on these questions, and the inquiries he makes, it is bound to have some merit.

From beginning to end this bill was worked on to the utmost degree by the Space Committee. The Senator from Mississippi does not deserve any credit. He was doing other things, and could not be present at all the hearings, but he knows enough about it. Then the Appropriations Committees in both Houses worked on the program. The subcommittee headed by the Senator from Washington dealt with this subject, and has done excellent work.

The amount has been continually pared down. The question now is whether we are to abandon the effort to be preeminent in space.

The Gemini program has been referred to. Very definitely the military has a part in it. There has been general agreement between Mr. Webb and Mr. McNamara with respect to this program.

Gemini is a part of the program. When that is completed, we shall go into the Apollo program. That will involve big rockets, big thrust, and missiles. We must have them if we are to protect ourselves.

I say again that the matter of going to the moon is merely an exercise. It is almost totally a misnomer. The purpose of the space program is the conquest of space. Anyone who has had anything to do with this subject knows that whoever controls outer space will control the earth. We do not want to take a chance. Anything can happen in that field. It is a field in which we cannot possibly afford to be second best. Those of us who are familiar with the subject feel that we know what the program is. The minimum that is necessary is what is represented by the bill; and it should be passed as written. I commend the Senator from Washington and his subcommittee.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. It has been argued today that the project has no military significance, as regards our security, or at least very little such significance.

The Senator has had unique experience as a member of the Armed Services Committee and the Space Committee and Senators have great confidence in his judgment. He states that all the research involved in the program has great military significance, as well as significance for our security. Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. I say that without any qualification, based on the feeling of General Shriver, for one. He is in charge of the scientific programs of all the services and others. I have always favored the military having more and more to do with the space program. They are coming more and more into it.

Mr. COOPER. I believe it is generally considered, by a great many people, that the amount of money included in the bill for this specific project is for the purpose of sending a man to the moon. Is it possible to separate the cost of this specific project from the other funds for all the other types of space research being carried on?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi cannot separate it. It is a major project in the mastery of space. There are many other things that go with it. This is one of the specific things. When we do this, we are mastering space, and certainly we will be preeminent in it.

Mr. COOPER. The authorization has been reduced by about $500 million, I believe.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator believes that a cut of another half billion dollars would not be wise. Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. I believe the Senator has correctly stated that point. It would be too drastic, and would slow the program down. Of course, it costs a great deal of money. This is new ground we are breaking. This is a pioneering effort. It is exploration. That is why it will run into a great deal of money.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am deeply appreciative of what the Senator from Mississippi has said. He serves on the Space Committee and also on the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees. He is an expert and one of the great authorities in this field. We should pay attention to him when he talks about the conquest of outer space as compared with the lunar portion of this program.

The Senate should know that only $1.9 billion of the $20 billion in this part of the space program will be used for manned and unmanned lunar exploration.

For that reason we are making a great mistake when we speak of it as being a moon shot. That is misleading.

The moon may not have any particular lesson to give us, but I think the development of the boosters, all the guidance equipment, all the instrumentation, all the capability of putting a man into space, and the ability to rendezvous in space, which is of vital importance in controlling our excursions and inquiries into what is beyond—all these have a vast importance and effect on our military posture. We are now spending, in military research and development, almost as much as we are asking in this bill for the entire space program. For that reason, I feel that we have a sharing with the military, not a duplicate, but a common and concurrent source of knowledge. Furthermore, I know of no bill that has come before us in recent times that has been cut more than half a billion dollars below the budget. The committee bill is $510 million less than the amount asked by the budget. It is $160 million less than the authorization. It has been trimmed down from the budget request by relentless examination of this program. This was not a perfunctory study of what was needed. Everything was gone into with the greatest of care. While the subcommittee was not unanimous in reporting the bill, it was almost unanimous, restoring $80 million for operations and research and $10 million for facilities—a $90 million increase over the deep cut the House made.

But the cut that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas today seeks to make is another half billion dollars. In the long run, because of the slowdown and a change of plans, and the making of an entirely different schedule from the one that has been carefully programed by the experts, it will cost a great deal more than he would care to see cut. He proposes a reversal, a turning back, and a changing of a green light to red.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Oklahoma is correct on every point he has made. I wish to read a quotation from General Power, who is now Commander in Chief of the Strategic Air Command, as quoted by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] at page 9496 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for this year. General Power said:

> We must continue our intensive nonmilitary effort along the entire spectrum of space and space-related sciences. The primary responsibility for this effort rests with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Its close cooperation with the Department of Defense will not only further its own objectives of the peaceful conquest of space but also help create the building blocks for the future military systems which may be required, to repeat President Kennedy's words, "to make sure that space is maintained for peaceful purposes."

We always emphasize "peaceful," but it is really a part of the propaganda, so to speak, of this program from the beginning. It is the military's business, as the general says. When we hit the moon, we shall still have rockets and will be rendezvousing.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I think the majority leader wishes to propose a unanimous consent agreement. I shall be quite happy to wait until he has done so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to propose a unanimous-consent request that there be a limitation of debate of 2 hours on the Fulbright amendment and 1 hour on all other amendments, the time to be equally divided, and 2 hours on the bill.

Mr. CLARK. Starting when, may I ask the majority leader?

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tonight, it recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be no morning hour tomorrow. The time limitation will start at 12 o'clock sharp, if the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wish to ask the distinguished minority leader whether the 2 hours provided for debate on the bill would allow me 10 minutes for a necessary colloquy?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from New York has that assurance.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am not quite clear about how the time on my amendment would be allocated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that the pending amendment would be brought up later in the afternoon tomorrow.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. When?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Whenever the Senator would like to have it taken up.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Specifically, at 2 o'clock?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I cannot set a specific time, because of other time limitations; but as close to that time as the Senator from Arkansas desires.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not understand how that would work. It might be 6 o'clock.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; at approximately the time the Senator wishes to take it up. We do not know how much time will be taken in allocations. The Senator from Arkansas says 2 o'clock.

Mr. ANDERSON. Would it not be possible for the Senator from Montana to say that if an amendment were pending on which the time might run until 20 minutes past 2, which could not be avoided, that amendment might be set aside and the Senator from Arkansas be recognized?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator would provide that if my amendment were laid aside now, it would come up at 2 o'clock tomorrow, that would not necessarily cut off the proponent of another amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator allow me a little leeway, because something not under my control might arise? I should like to make it 2 o'clock, give or take a few minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I respect the intentions of the majority leader, but I noticed that after 3 weeks of debate on another bill, he could not get his way on it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Many times. Perhaps I cannot get it tonight. But I am trying to arrange a modus operandi.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wanted to be certain that my amendment would come up at a reasonable hour.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator can bring it up at 2 o'clock.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And have 2 hours for the proponents?

Mr. ANDERSON. Why does not the majority leader agree to set aside what is pending at 2 o'clock?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We can always yield time back.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall be glad to do my best to have the Senator's amendment come up at 2 o'clock sharp; I was only asking him to allow me a few minutes leeway.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator can make a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas be taken up at 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, my understanding is that there would be 2 hours on the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Two hours on the Fulbright amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Two hours on each side?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Two hours on the amendment, 1 hour to a side.

Mr. ALLOTT. Two hours equally divided?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; 2 hours on the side of the proponents.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thought it was 2 hours on the amendment. Time can be taken on the bill.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Arkansas wants 2 hours on his side.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. I do not care what the other side wants.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The time for the other side can come out of time on the bill. Two hours will be allocated to the Senator from Arkansas, the proponent of the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT That is correct; 2 hours beginning at 2 o'clock.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Washington will be able to get time from the time on the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But I expect to talk about other items in the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator can get more time from the time on the bill. It was the Senator's idea to arrange some agreement. We are trying to help him.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thought the Senator said 1 hour on each side.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That was my understanding, but I was mistaken. The Senator can get time from the time on the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know whether I can or not. Why does the Senator from Arkansas get 2 hours on his amendment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I need it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I amend my request again so as to provide 3 hours on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is agreed to.

The unanimous-consent agreement, reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Wednesday, November 20, 1963, beginning at 12 o'clock noon, during the further consideration of the bill H.R. 8747, the Independent Offices Appropriations Act, 1964, debate on the pending Fulbright amendment (No. 325), which shall begin at 2 p.m., shall be limited to 3 hours, of which 2 hours shall be controlled by Mr. FULBRIGHT and 1 hour by the majority leader; debate on any other amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, before I yield the floor, I shall yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, before the Senator yields, I should like to ask a question of the majority leader.

In view of the unanimous-consent request, does the majority leader expect that there will be any votes tonight?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No.

Mr. CLARK. I understand the Senator from Mississippi has yielded to me.

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. I wish to say to the Senator from Oklahoma that he and the Senator from Mississippi have made a plausible argument in support of the appropriations the committee requests in this bill. The Senator from Oklahoma was quite eloquent in discussing the various huge appropriations recommended by the committee, at the request of the administration, for the space program; and he told us how important they are. I wish to ask him and the Senator from Mississippi—although I think I know the answer they will give—whether they believe the space program is more important than the rebuilding of our cities and the program of urban renewal and slum clearance.

Mr. MONRONEY. No; and I think we must develop the best possible society we can in terms of rehabilitating our cities. But neither do I believe we dare neglect supporting the leadership of this administration in pushing to new developments in science, many of which are associated with outer space, and will pay great dividends to our Nation's safety and economy.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator from Oklahoma.

On the other hand, I believe the Senator from Arkansas is absolutely correct when he says the space program involves a question of priorities and that there are fiscal limits beyond which we cannot go.

I suggest that the inevitable result of the very great emphasis on military expenditures, in which I know the Senator from Mississippi sincerely believes—although I think he believes in larger expenditures for this purpose than are necessary, and also the inevitable result of the expenditures for space which the Senator from Oklahoma advocates is that not enough money will be devoted to urban renewal or education or the serious problem of chronic and persistent unemployment in Pennsylvania and in many other parts of the country. Therefore, I say we must consider the priorities which necessarily are involved.

Is it not true that if the huge amounts being requested for the space program are provided—and I point out that the appropriations requested this year for the space program are much larger than the amounts provided for it last year or the year before; in fact, they are the largest ever requested for this program—inevitably many Senators who will vote for these appropriations subsequently will say, "We cannot afford to provide support for area redevelopment, which perhaps will cost $30 million or $40 million" or "we cannot afford to have a retraining program" or "we cannot afford to continue the urban renewal program." Does not the Senator from Oklahoma believe that will be the inevitable result of the undue priority—to my way of thinking—being placed on the space program? I ask him this question because I know he is much more experienced than I am.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for the compliment; but I know of no program that has received a cut of more than half a billion dollars in the amount budgeted for it. That cut has been sustained by this committee. The House voted to make a deep cut in the amount for the space program, and we were asked to restore half of the $1 billion cut the House voted. But our committee voted to restore only $90 million—in an attempt to keep the program on schedule, if we could possibly do so.

Mr. CLARK. How does the budgeted amount for the space program this year compare with the corresponding amount last year?

Mr. MONRONEY. As the Senator from Pennsylvania well knows, the amount this year is much larger.

Mr. ANDERSON. About $2 billion.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from New Mexico says it is about $2 billion.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think that is correct, because the hardware required must be ordered now, in advance of its use. It will be delivered during the next 2 or 3 years.

Mr. CLARK. Then I advocate that we slow down the space program and devote more of our resources to slum clearance, urban renewal, education, and other essential programs.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in response to the argument that the amounts proposed to be appropriated for the space program are too large, I point out that last year I handled the appropriation bill which involved the highest percentage reduction carried in of any appropriation bill Congress handled last year. That was the military appropriation bill, and a 17-percent reduction was made in it. I do not boast of that, but that did happen.

In discussing the space program, I point out that there could be no slum clearance program if we were not wise enough to provide adequately for the space program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Pennsylvania has asked about the urban redevelopment program, the slum clearance program, and other programs. Is it not true that the funds spent for the space program are spent in the interest of the safety and security of the United States, and that that program must have top priority, because there cannot be urban redevelopment or slum clearance unless we first provide for the safety and security of the Nation?

Mr. STENNIS. Certainly. I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts, and I thank him for his observation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to state, as other Senators have said, that I appreciate very much the excellent service and the important contributions the Senator from Mississippi has rendered in working in connection with this field. I also know of his outstanding knowledge of military affairs and of the very important contributions he has made in the committee because of that knowledge. He has helped us very greatly in dealing with all these problems.

After listening to his remarks, it seems to me that he wants the United States not necessarily to be the first to place a man on the moon, but to obtain preeminence in space.

Furthermore, I point out that the statement made by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is of very great importance to me, because he is known throughout the country as the aviation expert of the Senate. I believe he is, and I hope he is; but I notice that he is able to appreciate that there are other important programs; and I thank him for the stanch support he has given us in connection with this program.

I also thank the Senator from Mississippi for his very valuable contributions in connection with it.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator spoke of the building blocks for this program. Can he state how much of these funds will be spent in Mississippi?

Mr. STENNIS. A relatively small amount.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Approximately $100 million?

Mr. STENNIS. In Mississippi there is a small ancillary space program which is merely for a missile testing site, not a launching site.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe that under this program $100 million will be spent in Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I do not believe the amount is quite that large. But I was interested in this program a long time before any developments in connection with it occurred in Mississippi. Furthermore, the work in Mississippi is ancillary to the work done in Louisiana.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Louisiana also has very large installations in connection with this program, does it not?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, very large.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The largest installations under this program are in Mississippi, Texas, Louisiana, Alabama, and Florida, are they not?

Mr. STENNIS. Perhaps so; but certainly the amount spent under this program in Mississippi is not nearly as large as the amounts spent in Arkansas on the aggregate program of flood control, canalization, and improvement of rivers—all of which, I think, are justified, and I voted for them. However, it is amazing to note the amounts spent in Arkansas in the last 10 years.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was asking about the space program.

Mr. STENNIS. I understand, and I answered the Senator's question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But I did not get a very clear answer to it. I said that I understand that under this 1-year program, $100 million will be spent this year in Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Since the budget has been made, no definite calculation of that sort has been arrived at, so I cannot state the exact amount. But the latest calculation which has been made since the budget was concluded shows that the contracts for construction work in Mississippi will amount to approximately $80 million.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. On November 13, I received a letter from NASA, in response to my letter to Mr. Webb. I shall submit the letter for the record. On page 2, he refers to the Mississippi test facility and to the other items in Mississippi, and they total $100,196,000.

Mr. STENNIS. Perhaps that figure was taken from the original budget figures. But with the reductions which now have been made, I would think the amount for construction work in Mississippi would be between $75 million and $80 million, or something of that sort. At any rate, this work is necessary; and I have not heard the Senator from Arkansas deny that it is a necessary and essential part of the big rocket testing program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I realize that the Senator from Mississippi was not in the Chamber when I began to speak. I did not deny the importance of the work to be done in Mississippi or elsewhere, but I disputed the claim that it had to be done in such a short time, and that such large amounts must necessarily be spent in any 1 year.

Mr. STENNIS. The imputation is that I am influenced in my position because of a project of Mississippi. I caught that very clearly and I am sure everyone else did. The Senator is very good at making himself understood.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If it was in my State, I would be greatly influenced by the situation. That would be normal.

Mr. STENNIS. I find that my interest in the program far antedates the establishment of any project of that character in Mississippi. I am interested in the Army, yet there is not a single Army unit in Mississippi. I have been espousing the cause of the Army for 12 to 15 years.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; I know the Senator from Mississippi has, and very successfully.

Mr. STENNIS. I have favored the cause of the Army, and yet not one single Army unit or single Army man is in Mississippi tonight, unless it is the National Guard.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ANSWERING THE SOVIET MANPOWER OFFENSIVE

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania will offer an amendment to restore all the funds requested by the President for the National Science Foundation. The President has assigned to the National Science Foundation the urgent task of meeting our national needs for highly skilled scientific manpower. The Senate committee has proposed $50 million more to close a $94 million difference between the administration request and the House version of H.R. 8747. I would like to ask about the $44 million remaining. I believe our national needs for manpower will become increasingly acute in coming years and urge the Senate to approve the full amount. Why is there an urgent need for a manpower program?

First. The Soviet Union is waging an intense manpower offensive aimed directly at American preeminence in science and engineering. The strength of our national defense depends upon the scientific and engineering talent we can marshal to design new weapons systems and defenses. New reactors for our atomic submarines, new communications systems, and stronger missile systems depend upon the brains that conceive them. The recent DeWitt report and other studies have shown that the Soviets are straining every resource of their educational system in order to overtake the West in technology and basic research. We have 9,000 Ph. D. engineers at work in this country. The U.S.S.R. has 30,000. We ignore the Soviet manpower offensive at our peril.

Second. The Federal Government has itself placed immense demands upon the national scientific community. The Government employed 101,400 scientists and engineers in 1959. This figure is expected to increase to 165,000 in 1970. Moreover, the Government's needs for research and development now require the time of about two-thirds of all the working scientists and engineers in the Nation. A vigorous effort on the Government's part will be necessary to preserve balance in manpower resources.

Third. Too few scientists and engineers receiving their B.S. or B.E. degrees go on to take graduate training. In order to make a significant contribution to modern engineering or scientific progress, an investigator simply must have the skill and knowledge which can be acquired only by having done research himself. Meaningful work in the sciences requires a graduate degree. There is a widespread feeling among the employers of American scientists and engineers that more graduate training is needed in order to enhance the quality of work being done in our laboratories. The report of the President's Science Advisory Committee on "Meeting National Manpower Needs in Science and Technology" stated:

> Apart from adding to the student's substantive knowledge, graduate education and research provide a discipline of mind that fosters objectivity and a capacity to continue the learning process independently. Even 1 year beyond the baccalaureate often virtually doubles a student's exposure to science or engineering, thus greatly strengthening his capacity to contribute in all fields of employment, including science teaching in elementary schools.

In 1960 a paltry, inadequate 2,900 doctorates were awarded in math, physical sciences, and engineering. That amounts to only 8 percent of the 1955 mathematics bachelors, only 16 percent of the 1955 physical sciences bachelors, and a bare 3.6 percent of the 1955 engineering bachelors. The goal of the President's manpower program is 7,500 doctorates in these three critical fields by 1970. That goal is an important element of national policy and I hope it will not be overlooked.

Fourth. A central purpose of the President's manpower program is to expand support geographically, to those schools and areas of the country which are not now receiving it. In northern New England, the Southwest, the Midwest, and South, and the Northwest there are colleges and universities which do not now receive extensive support, but which could be converted to new centers of excellence. The report of the President's Science Advisory Committee recognizes that a center of excellence need not be an immense laboratory building with a very large staff. A center of excellence can be a single department within a university or even a competent investigator who could become the nucleus of a new graduate department. We must start such new graduate departments, to enable all sections of the country to participate more equitably in this century's inspiring march toward technical progress. In studying the allocation of defense contracts and other government procurement, I early discovered that the money goes where the brains are. The purpose of this manpower program is to provide for a more even distribution of talent, taking advantage of every opportunity to increase graduate enrollments in math, the physical sciences, and engineering.

OUTLINES OF THE PROGRAM

The House denied $94 million requested by the President in order to carry out the science manpower program. Of this figure, $45 million was for science education and graduate research facilities. Eighteen million was for the science development program. Three million was to expand the existing fellowship program. Twenty-five million was to be used for traineeships. Three million was for administrative costs. I would like to explain these further.

These programs are in large part familiar National Science Foundation efforts: fellowships and support to colleges and universities. There is already some $93 million in the House version of this bill for these purposes, and that sum was approved by the Senate committee. The President's request for an additional $94 million was unusual. Every element of the request was designed to help meet the Nation's manpower needs. The $45 million for science education and graduate research facilities would go to construct new research facilities, but only in areas where this would help meet manpower needs as well as important research goals.

The $18 million for the science development program would go to improve instruction, help universities create new graduate departments, and expand enrollments. In each case, this would be done with an eye to national manpower goals. The Senate recently passed a higher education facilities bill, but this was aimed primarily at undergraduate education. The National Science Foundation program will be aimed specifically at engineering, mathematics, and physical sciences, and on a graduate level only. The $25 million would be used for a new purpose, the support of graduate students in these three fields in the first year of their work. Three million dollars would be required to conduct examinations, evaluate facility proposals, supply technical advice to universities, and otherwise administer the manpower program.

PROPOSAL TO INCREASE THE DOLLAR AMOUNT OF H.R. 8747

The difference, Mr. President, between the President's proposal and the action of our Senate committee, is $44 million. This is a very large sum. The Senate committee has acted with imaginativeness and generosity in increasing the House version by $50 million, most of which would be spent for purposes of education. Why, then, should we advocate going further at this time? The fiscal year is already partly underway. Could an additional $44 million be used responsibly and well?

Mr. President, an additional $44 million, if provided, would permit support to be extended in order to meet the plans for increasing our resources of scientific manpower. The largest fellowship item in the President's program is $25 million for first-year graduate student traineeships. There is well-grounded fear that House language forbidding new National Science Foundation programs might forestall the traineeship program altogether. And yet it is the very heart of the manpower program. The $25 million appropriation, according to the Comptroller of the National Science Foundation, would permit support for 12,250 first-year graduate students in math, the physical sciences, and engineering, as opposed to the 3,210 who received Federal support in 1960.

Without the traineeships, the usefulness of the rest of the manpower expansion program would be compromised. With the traineeships, which I hope our Senate committee will provide, this Nation could take a long step toward fulfilling the obligations of the decade in which we live. That accounts for $25 million. The $18 million for the science development program would account for almost all of the rest of the funds proposed in this amendment. And the science development program will accomplish the other main purpose of the manpower program, securing better geographical distribution of Government science support.

BETTER GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF SUPPORT

Mr. President, I have heard of whole graduating classes of engineers leaving the State in which they were trained. I understand that Physical Abstracts and Chemical Abstracts, for one recent year, failed to disclose a single paper written in the universities of an entire State. Our scientists are crowding to Massachusetts, small areas of the Atlantic coast and the Midwest, and to Texas and California. Fully half of our scientists and engineers work in only six States. The science development program of the National Science Foundation will create new centers of excellence where they do not now exist. This is a very important national objective. It can be done step by step, selectively, and with constant attention to quantity. This is the very best kind of support for science, building our universities to a point where they can attract the resources they need from many sources instead of one.

The science development program will help to meet that need as well, and lay the foundation for wider participation by our several States in the technical revolution of our time. As a Senator from a small State, I feel this need very keenly indeed. Programs of this kind will help our University of New Hampshire start whole new graduate faculties and exciting programs to meet the research needs, not just of my State, but of New England as a whole.

MEETING URGENT IN MANPOWER NEEDS

In summary, Mr. President, such funds will help the United States to graduate urgently needed graduate engineers, mathematicians, and physical scientists. This is only the beginning of a long-range manpower program which must look to other areas as well as science and technology. I am not saying that science is all important. But this particular subject has been studied and restudied. We in the Congress have been critical of the President for our national lag in meeting manpower needs. Now the President has offered a program. It must be extended to other areas as well as math, physical science, and engineering. But the report of the science advisers shows the urgency of this particular area. It is an area wherein we are ready to act. The National Science Foundation and Bureau of Labor Statistics issued a report entitled "The Long-Range Demand for Scientific and Technical Personnel." This report stated that while we must graduate 720,000 engineers to meet the need by 1970, only 262,000 engineers received their first degree in the preceding decade, or roughly one-third of the number needed in the next decade. Engineering enrollments dropped 11 percent in 1958 and have not climbed back since. You need only glance at the want-ad section of a Sunday paper in order to realize how immense the needs have become.

Mr. President, the United States stands in some danger of having too few scientists and engineers by the end of this decade. The problem has been studied. A solution has been proposed. The Soviets are outracing us in bringing all their manpower resources to bear on critical military and economic problems. A full restoration of these funds will provide our country with the brains we will need in the years of contest that lie ahead. The amount is responsible. It will help spread support into other States. I submit that such additional funds are a sorely needed necessity for the times in which we live.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. **MAGNUSON**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be authorized to meet while the Senate is in session tomorrow, no matter what time the Senate convenes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXCESSIVE MEAT IMPORTS

Mr. **SIMPSON**. Mr. President, I am once again called upon to speak about the serious problem of excessive meat imports which has placed America's livestock industry in a precarious position.

In January of this year, I was joined by a distinguished group of Senators in introducing a bill, S. 557, which would curb the extensive beef imports which are depressing cattle prices in this country. Our bill would establish an annual quota equal to the average annual quantity of beef imported during the preceding 5-year period. The beef imports making up this quota would be taxed at the present rate. Imports coming into this country in addition to this quota would be subject to an additional duty.

If this bill were passed, our country would continue to import a reasonable quantity of beef to meet the supplemental beef needs that we do have; and yet, the bill would curtail the excessive imports of beef and veal which pose such a threat to the cattleman.

The Foreign Agriculture Service Division of the Department of Agriculture had informed me that the beef and veal imports had increased 41 percent in 1962 over 1961. Total red meat imports had increased 36 percent in 1962 over 1961. On the other hand, our exports of beef and veal had decreased by 9 percent.

A large portion of these beef imports are of a processing quality. In fact, about one-third of the processing beef consumed in this country is imported from foreign countries. Now over 11 percent of all beef and veal consumed in the United States is imported.

In 1960 the per capita civilian consumption of beef and veal in the United States was 91.4 pounds. It rose to 95.4 pounds in 1962. Over this 2-year period total meat consumption increased 4.3 percent while the consumption of imported beef increased 81.8 percent. I feel that this comparison makes it crystal clear that the growing quantities of beef imports to this country are a serious threat to the cattlemen, producers, and feeders.

I thought that these figures were alarming and corrective action should be taken, and thus, I introduced a bill which would bring relief and curb the excessive imports.

Here it is 10 months later and no relief is in sight. The Economic Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture in its publication for November 1963 says:

> Imports during January-August 1963 were 22 percent above the same months of 1962.

Remember 1962 figures were 41 percent above the 1961 figures. There is a direct relationship between the high beef imports and the low prices our cattlemen are now receiving at the marketplace.

As you well know, the cattle industry is free from all governmental controls. Therefore, we have a true market where supply and demand do determine the prices. Consequently, cattle prices are affected by the 1½ billion pounds of meat shipped into this country. When cow beef or processing beef competes with fed beef for the consumer's dollar, cow beef prices have a direct effect on fat cattle prices and vice versa. The fat cattle market recently plummeted and one of the reasons was that imports can be sold here in the States 5 to 10 cents a pound cheaper than beef can be produced. The per capita consumption of imported beef has jumped in the last 2 years 81.8 percent. Thus it is patent that the increased consumption of beef which is imported into this country at prices below our production costs have pulled down the prices received by our livestock men.

Whenever imports change the total supply of beef in a free market prices are pulled down.

There is a drastic need for relief. We have not received it and one reason is that the Kennedy administration is not sympathetic to the livestock man.

If this administration understood the livestock industry or was interested in it there would be no need for legislation because this serious situation could be corrected administratively.

However, it appears as though the President is preparing to reduce or eliminate the existing duties at the GATT negotiation table.

In 1930, Congress established tariffs on beef imports. In 1948, a 50-percent reduction was made on those tariffs. Now our GATT team is preparing to negotiate new agreements and beef and veal are listed as articles which will be considered subject to the further reduction or elimination of duties.

I ask the President to direct his representatives who are at the negotiation table to protect the interests of our livestock industry. All meat products should be removed from the list subject to negotiation by the GATT team.

Senator HRUSKA delivered a very fine speech on September 24 of this year, calling attention to the law which gives President Kennedy complete authority to eliminate the excessive beef imports problem. The authority is contained in section 204 of the Agriculture Act of 1956 which provides:

> The President is authorized to negotiate agreements with foreign governments in an effort to limit the export to the United States of agricultural commodities or products.

I appeal to the President to act under the authority which was granted to him by Congress.

Not only do I ask that the President and his advisers consider the interests of the livestock men in their negotiations, but I ask Congress to take action on this matter. The American National Cattlemen's Association and the National Livestock Feeders Association and many other State groups have urged the enactment of our bill which would bring the needed relief. Corrective steps must be taken soon.

I address this body today asking you and President Kennedy to arm yourselves with the facts so that we can give the proper protection to our livestock industry.

REPLY TO FORMER SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN ACHESON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, today's New York Times published a report of a speech given last night by former Secretary of State Dean Acheson. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD preliminary to my replying to it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 19, 1963]

ACHESON BIDS UNITED STATES REMAIN IN EUROPE—ASSAILS THOSE WHO SEEK TO REDUCE COMMITMENTS

WASHINGTON, November 18.—Dean Acheson has joined—and at the same time deplored—what he calls another great debate about the extent of U.S. involvement in Europe.

Contending that the strength of Western conventional forces in Europe is the key to most U.S. objectives there, the former Secretary of State criticized those who, he says, believe that U.S. interests might best be served by reducing American commitment in Europe.

Mr. Acheson's remarks were prepared as the 70 Brien McMahon lecture, delivered at the University of Connecticut in Storrs this evening. He arranged for distribution of the text of the lecture in Washington and it has been widely discussed here in recent days.

The lecture series honors the late Senator Brien McMahon, of Connecticut.

HE ASSAILS EISENHOWER

Mr. Acheson singled out for criticism former President Dwight D. Eisenhower and George F. Kennan, former Ambassador to the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia.

He criticized General Eisenhower for suggesting that the United States might well begin to think of recalling some of its troops from Europe. He criticized Mr. Kennan, himself an outspoken observer of foreign policy, for suggesting a "neutralized Germany possessing only weapons of defense" and accused him of indiscreet Machiavellianism for raising the possibility of an East-West deal over German heads.

Less directly, the former Secretary of State to President Harry S. Truman berated the Kennedy administration for being too timid in its efforts to woo West Germany and work intimately with Chancellor Erhard's government to promote ambitious new Atlantic projects.

Mr. Acheson believes that the debate over the extent of American involvement in Europe is likely to be a repetition of the so-called great debate of the winter of 1950–51.

He detects irony in this because the first "great debate" found General Eisenhower on the other side, arguing against former President Herbert Hoover and the "Fortress America" concept and deciding in the end to run for the Presidency primarily to defeat attempts to disengage the United States from European affairs.

BASES OF CRITICISM

Mr. Acheson's criticism of General Eisenhower refers to views the former President expressed in a recent article in the Saturday Evening Post and in his memoir, "Mandate for Change." The criticism of Mr. Kennan's views refers to a recent article in Look magazine.

Both Mr. Acheson and Mr. Kennan are regarded in Washington as distinguished and experienced students of European affairs. The irony behind their current disagreement is that the vigor with which they have pressed their firm views has eroded the influence of both among their friends and former colleagues in the Kennedy administration.

TALK HELD DAMAGING

While joining the debate, Mr. Acheson seemed to express serious reservations about the act that it was taking place at all. Merely to talk about reducing U.S. fighting strength in Europe, he said, may be only slightly less damaging than actual withdrawal of troops.

He contends that high-level chatter about such a possibility will destroy Allied confidence, and especially German confidence, in American leadership and do more to erode Western unity than French nationalism or the current Soviet peace offensive.

The debate to which Mr. Acheson refers has also raged for some time within the Kennedy administration. Some administration officials have long been tempted by the economies that could be derived from withdrawal of troops from Europe without, they contend, reductions in military effectiveness.

This temptation has been strengthened by revised estimates of Soviet strength in Eastern Europe, now judged at the Pentagon to be no greater than the strength of Western forces on the continent. Mr. Acheson still speaks of the need to match Soviet forces and either does not know of or does not accept the new estimates.

Mr. MORSE. As one who participated in the great debate of 1950–51 to which Mr. Acheson referred, and who shared his view at that time that large-scale American forces were needed in Europe, I am very sorry that Mr. Acheson fails to see that changes have taken place in the intervening 13 years that call for changes, too, in American policy.

The most significant of all these changes is the nature of nuclear warfare that has developed since the days of Mr. Acheson's secretaryship. In 1950, the great threat to the security of Europe was the huge mass of Soviet troops and ground forces that had been built up during World War II. To provide a reasonable assurance that these massive Russian forces would not move across a still-prostrate Europe, it was necessary and desirable that American ground forces of some size also locate in Europe.

But as nuclear forces have grown on both sides, the likelihood of a big conventional war in Europe is becoming infinitesimal. Both the Soviet Union and our NATO allies have recognized and acted on this new fact of the world power arrangement.

We know, for example, that the present administration undertook soon after coming to office to increase conventional forces in Europe as a means of providing an alternative to nuclear war. But it did not get far. It did not prevail with the largest of our allies, with the exception of West Germany, and even West Germany has not completely fulfilled her commitments to furnish the ground troops she owes to the Alliance.

Great Britain has never put onto the Continent her contingent of ground forces, not even at the time of the Berlin crisis of 1961. France remains the most delinquent of all the NATO members in furnishing her assigned manpower to the Alliance. France, in particular, is assuming that there is no longer any real danger of a Soviet ground attack across Europe, and as a key member of the Alliance, both in size and in geography, her actions must to a large extent determine the actions of the other NATO members.

There must also be added to the changes in the factual situation in the year 1963 the reduction in Soviet ground forces. The extent of this reduction is also reported in today's New York Times. It reports a speech by Defense Secretary McNamara indicating that not only is Russia far behind the United States in nuclear capability, but that its troop strength in Europe is now considerably less than many Americans have been assuming. Secretary McNamara estimates that even including the highly unreliable forces of her eastern satellites, Russian strength in Europe probably does not exceed 3 million men.

For the United States to continue to keep men in Europe when our effort is not matched by our allies in their own defense, and when the menace of Soviet attack is less than at any time since the end of World War II, let me say to Mr. Acheson, is senseless, unless the United States really does have the intention of dominating the policies of Western Europe for the foreseeable future. That is an intention we have always denied having. I certainly do not think that is the American objective in Europe, nor should it ever be.

Having done so much under Mr. Acheson's leadership to restore Western Europe to a strong and healthy physical, economic, and moral state, the United States should now be turning over to the Europeans themselves the responsibility for their own defense. That was our objective in the Marshall plan and in NATO. Neither of these foresaw a permanent American dominance of Western European defenses.

Of course, it is hard for someone who was so bound up in the Marshall plan and in the early days of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to recognize the impact of the success of these programs upon American policy today. I believe that is what Mr. Dean Acheson is guilty of.

Today, it is former President Eisenhower who has recognized this impact, not Mr. Acheson. I entirely share the view of the former President that the United States could well cut its military manpower in Europe to a single division. Surely the reasons that make it reasonable for France and Britain to ignore their NATO commitments are equally valid for the United States. If we have failed to persuade our allies of the rightness of our views on manpower, then I believe we must accept their view that large-scale ground forces on the spot in Europe are unnecessary.

We cannot possibly justify, on the basis of any argument, maintaining six American divisions in Europe so long as our NATO allies, including West Germany, are refusing to fulfill their manpower commitments to NATO.

Certainly, I do not belittle the evident desire of Mr. Acheson to continue a close American relationship with the Federal Republic of Germany. But I am astonished that he thinks it is in our interest to woo West Germany, or otherwise compete with others for Germany's favors. That kind of relationship is no more sound for long-range purposes than the relationship which for years put the United States in the role of Europe's protector. An alliance of equals requires equal effort, equal responsibility, and an equal desire to seek similar objectives on the part of the members. No useful Atlantic alliance can exist on the basis of an exclusively American desire for Atlantic partnership, nor on the basis of an undue American share of the manpower defending Europe.

It is my own personal view that the United States will have a better friend and ally in Germany if she is primarily responsible for her own defense in both manpower and in financing. The same is true of our other European allies. I do not know of any American objective in Europe other than the one we have sought ever since the end of World War II, and that is to keep its member nations free from Communist domination. The sooner they are able to do that for themselves, the better. I think the evidence is that they are able to do it, except for the highly complex nuclear shield which the United States holds over Europe along with much of the rest of the world.

I welcome the indications that the administration is preparing to reduce the level of American manpower overseas, especially in Europe. The need for them is declining, and our effort to keep them there has not been matched by our allies. It is no "disengagement" from Europe to bring our own efforts into line with those of our partners. We will never be "disengaged" from Europe so long as there is no final German peace treaty, and not even then, because the welfare and security of Western Europe will always be of vital interest to the welfare and security of the United States. This will be true whether we have any NATO-type treaty or not, and it will be true even in the absence of the threat of communism.

We shall always welcome friends in Europe who want to work with the United States in defense, trade, and other matters. But they will be a lot more welcome and our partnership with them will be much more fruitful if they are carrying their own weight and are not leaning on the United States either because we want them to or because they want to.

I say most respectfully that in my judgment Mr. Acheson's recent speech in New York City shows that apparently he has not changed his point of view in 10 years. But the facts have changed. He is 10 years behind the facts. It is time that Mr. Acheson got into this decade and recognized that he really has no justification for making a plea that we squander millions of American taxpayers' dollars on Europe when our NATO allies have served clear notice on us that they have no intention of keeping their NATO commitments.

This administration should not be lulled into an error of judgment on the basis of this point of view expressed by Mr. Acheson. I sincerely hope that Mr. Acheson will face up to the realities as to what is the true position of our NATO allies. I am one who will continue to say to America and to the world, "The time has come to call a halt to the squandering of hundreds and hundreds of millions of American taxpayers' dollars on unjustifiable expenditures in Europe."

Mr. President, in the New York Times of yesterday there was another interesting position taken by one editor of that paper in an editorial entitled "Perils in Cutting Aid," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERILS IN CUTTING AID

Argentina's oil seizures cast dark new clouds over the Senate-House conference that will set the authorization ceiling for foreign aid. Both Houses already have mauled the aid bill President Kennedy sent to Congress. His original figure of $4.5 billion is expected to come out of conference trimmed down to $3.6 billion, the lowest figure authorized since the Marshall plan.

And that will not be the end of the emasculation process. A Congress, angered by the frustrations of American foreign policy in Latin America and other trouble spots, plans even deeper cuts when it comes to actual appropriations. Representative PASSMAN, archenemy of foreign aid and chief custodian of its pursestrings in the House, has his ax whetted for a slash to $2.7 billion. Senator MORSE wants to end the whole program next year unless the administration changes it drastically.

Hamstringing foreign aid with too little money and too many restrictions is dangerous and irresponsible. The program helps keep 3,500,000 allied soldiers in the front lines of defense against Communist expansionism. It is a bulwark against poverty, disease, and economic underdevelopment in a dangerous and untidy world, vulnerable to Communist subversion. It has been a potent instrument for advancing our foreign policy, and it will continue to be—unless Congress persists in loading it with detailed prohibitions that strip the President of the freedom of maneuver so essential in a period when international relationships are highly volatile.

Our aid will not buy us the allegiance of any nation. It will not cause them to jettison their own nationalistic drives. We are not dealing with satellites, nor do we want them. That is why Mr. Kennedy is right in holding that any disputes with countries we help—whether over Latin-American oil seizures or Nasser's Arab imperialism or Indonesia's hostility to Malaysia—must be dealt with by diplomatic negotiations and legal procedures. The President should have latitude to decide when aid should be given and when withheld. For Congress to tie his hands on how aid is administered is to cripple the United States in the conduct of its foreign policy.

Mr. MORSE. This is an interesting attempt at a rationalization of the administration's unsound position on foreign aid.

I pay little heed, Mr. President, to the comment in the editorial about the senior Senator from Oregon:

> Senator MORSE wants to end the whole program next year unless the administration changes it drastically.

I do not ask for fairness from the New York Times, because I will never get it, but at least in fairness to the readers of the New York Times the editors should have reported the true position I have taken on foreign aid. Even the Committee on Foreign Relations did a better job in its report on the position taken by me than did the New York Times editor, for the committee report pointed out that the committee gave great attention, thought, and consideration to my amendment, which would have brought to an end foreign aid as it now operates at the end of fiscal year 1965, but would have reinstituted foreign aid on the basis of very clear conditions and guidelines for 50 countries.

There is not a word about that in the New York Times editorial.

The New York Times editorial also says that those of us who opposed the program apparently were guilty of the following:

> Hamstringing foreign aid with too little money and too many restrictions is dangerous and irresponsible.

It is too bad that the New York Times was not fair enough to its readers to point out the facts that we presented as the basis for our criticisms of foreign aid. I described at some length a pile of critical reports, made by the Comptroller General, which stood 18 inches high. Those were devastating reports, showing hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars of waste of the American taxpayers' money. Those reports showed in many instances how the waste and inefficiency had led to much corruption in the administration of foreign aid abroad, not by the United States but by recipients of foreign aid to whom we turned over these millions of dollars without the necessary checks and restrictions upon expenditures.

There was not a word about that in the New York Times editorial, because the printing of the facts would never have sustained the thesis of the editorial. That is typical of the editorial policy of the New York Times, because it cannot reconcile much of its editorial policy on many issues with the facts.

For the benefit of the New York Times, I give only one little piece of evidence that we can offer by legion. I wish to read a letter dated November 15, 1963, which I have received from one who can speak with knowledge of what has happened in the administration of foreign aid. It is as follows:

POMPANO BEACH, FLA.,
November 15, 1963.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing in my present capacity as a private citizen to commend you for the courageous fight which you have led to reduce our foreign aid expenditures where they are no longer needed or are misused and to congratulate you on your success in winning a modest cut in your amendment to reduce military aid to Western Europe.

You may not recall me. I had the privilege of meeting with you in a briefing session with Ambassador Sparks when I was in Venezuela as agricultural attaché and later accompanied you on the trip throughout the countryside west of Caracas where we visited some farms.

I spent about 10 years in foreign service, first as agricultural adviser to the European Headquarters (OSR–ECA) for 3 years during the Marshall plan where it was my responsibility to advise and help further agricultural aspects of the plan as well as keep informed our American farmers' organizations and European farmers' organizations of the progress of this plan and enlist their cooperation. I traveled throughout Europe and was instrumental in helping to enlist support of European farm leaders for the objective of the European Community idea and the NATO. For this purpose I arranged for a luncheon and briefing conference with General Eisenhower, then supreme commander of SHAPE with a very representative group of European agricultural leaders. In addition since World War II, I traveled to Europe almost every year attending various international conferences, serving as a member of the U.S. delegations to FAO meetings in Copenhagen, Geneva, Stockholm, and Rome, and other conferences in Italy, Mexico City, and Nairobi. I also promoted the sending of the first agricultural trade missions by President Eisenhower to Europe, Asia and Latin America, and Middle East, and served on one of them. I served later as agricultural attaché in Rome, Caracas, and Brussels. I cite these things not to boast at all but simply to point up the fact that I have had considerable opportunity to observe at first hand our foreign aid, and especially in Europe.

What you have been advocating with respect to discontinuing our present type of military aid to Europe has been long overdue. I was one of the enthusiastic supporters of the Marshall plan and NATO and still regard them as great achievements, but the sad fact is that our allies in Europe for many years have failed to do their part in raising their own troops and paying their proper part of the military defense of their own countries. At the beginning they were not able to pay the cost of building up necessary forces.

They have failed to keep their commitments to NATO while we have kept ours—at terrific cost to our taxpayers. They have been coasting on our leniency and overgenerosity. It is unnecessary and unfair to our taxpayers for us to keep large military forces in Europe.

Europe is able to build up and maintain the necessary forces, as Europe is not poor but prosperous. When their countries were devastated and their balance-of-payments was in desperate condition, we generously came to their aid. Now when we are running a dangerously heavy balance-of-payments deficit (which would be no longer any danger were it not for the excessive funds we are pouring out for foreign aid) our allies are unwilling to assume their proper share of the burden of defending their own countries.

As you are well aware, the real deterrent to Russian aggression against Western Europe or elsewhere is our overwhelming superiority of atomic power; it is not our ground forces and air forces in Europe. The combined military power of NATO actually available in Europe would do no more than delay the Russians in overrunning Europe by its great superiority of land forces aided by air and missile power. Our troops' presence there is mainly furnishing some temporary muscle power and a psychological deterrent.

I think we are fully justified in saying to our allies now and back it up with action, that it is their responsibility to furnish the necessary troops needed by NATO and a major part of their equipment, so long as we are guaranteeing to come to their aid against aggression immediately (as we are now prepared to do with our missile power, our Polaris power, and our airlifting power for moving our troops there). It is ridiculous that they are not willing to support sufficient troops for the defense of their own countries and peoples and that we have to keep large military forces there at enormous expense. France, I believe, agreed to supply about 20 divisions to NATO and has only about 3. Only Germany has anything like done its part in this respect, and she could do much more, but our other allies there should awake to the danger to themselves if they continue to furnish only small token military forces while Germany, because of her front-line position, is forced to build greater and greater armed forces. If a new Hitler should come to power in the future, they would be in a perilous position.

It would be foolish, of course, to withdraw all our forces at once, but we should serve notice that they are going to be withdrawn progressively and rapidly, and then we should back this up with progressive reduction of military aid to support a continued high level of U.S. forces in Europe. We have proved in two World Wars our readiness to save Europe. We have expended 100 billion in foreign aid since the war, but we simply have got to curtail our foreign aid program, not only in Europe, but we need a complete reassessment and reduction of our entire worldwide foreign-aid program on a realistic basis that will safeguard the security of our own country as well as giving needed aid to worthy underdeveloped countries.

We should stop giving aid to our potential enemies who are allied with Communist Russia or dominated by communism, because we surely have learned by now that no Communist-dominated country is our real friend. They are out to destroy all that we hold dear—freedom of the individual, the capitalistic system of free choice and opportunity, and are instead building policy states that are keeping their peoples in a state of tyranny and fear.

Therefore, I feel deeply and I believe great numbers of fellow Americans regardless of party affiliations are convinced that we should stop aiding such countries as Yugoslavia, Poland, Indonesia, Algeria, Egypt and all other countries that are under a Communist totalitarian dictatorship. We profess on the one hand to abhor dictatorships, yet we tolerate the building up of one of the most oppressive dictatorships right at our own shores, in defiance of the Monroe Doctrine and the Rio Pact and still continue to allow Castro to export trained sabateurs and arms throughout Latin America and even now to Algeria, despite President Kennedy's assurance to our people and to Latin America that he would not allow this to be done any longer (at time of Cuban crisis).

Please pardon me for writing you at such length, Senator, but I feel that we citizens have a duty to perform to give our support to efforts to correct these longstanding abuses of our generosity and which threaten our fiscal security.

I hope that you will be successful in this effort and that Congress will go on from there to bring about a complete overhauling of our entire foreign aid program by next year.

Sincerely yours,

W. RAYMOND OGG.

P.S.—I neglected to inform you that I retired voluntarily in June 1962 for reasons of health and am living here now. Although I am not from your State, I thought perhaps you might be interested in having my views. You are at liberty to make any use of them you see fit, if you find them of value, of course.

Also I hope you will not be disturbed by President Kennedy's bitter attack on Congress for not accepting his program. The slogan that "Foreign aid is essential to our own security" was true in the Marshall plan days but in recent years it has become an outworn formula to get money out of Congress. The excessive waste and misuse of foreign aid is endangering our security instead of protecting it.

In these three pages he has made the case I tried to make in 3 weeks here on the floor of the Senate. That is my case, on three pages. I have buttressed that case by presenting for the RECORD the evidence that supports it.

The fight on foreign aid is not over. It has only started. And it is not going to be over, so far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned, until reforms are brought about in it that will protect the American taxpayers from just the kind of criticism brought out by Mr. Ogg, who worked in this field for some 10 years, and as to which he is a competent witness to testify.

I want to publicly thank Mr. Ogg for his courage as a citizen statesman, for bringing out in the broad daylight of public exposure his findings in regard to what he knows to be the facts based upon his work in the field of foreign aid. I thank him from the bottom of my heart.

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FREEMAN TO NATIONAL GRANGE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Secretary Freeman, on November 12, 1963, addressed the 97th annual session of the National Grange, during which he made public a recently completed study made by the National Agricultural Advisory Commission on the subject of the "Family Farm in American Agriculture."

I found the Secretary's comments most interesting and I feel sure that they will be informative to a great many Americans, both those engaged in agriculture and those in other pursuits.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that this speech, together with the report, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the speech and report were ordered to printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, AT THE 97TH ANNUAL SESSION OF THE NATIONAL GRANGE, HOTEL MULTNOMAH, PORTLAND, OREG., NOVEMBER 12, 1963

I am grateful for this opportunity to once again join you at your national session. You received me very kindly in Fort Wayne a year ago, and your hospitality here in Portland makes this a most pleasant visit for me.

A Grange session is an important occasion for many reasons. One is that as the oldest of farm organizations, you signify the importance of unity and organized effort among farmers and the fact that it is more important today than ever before that farmers speak with one clear voice. I have chosen this important occasion to make public a very important study recently submitted to me by the National Agricultural Advisory Commission, on which your own Harry Caldwell gives outstanding leadership as Chairman. And further on the basis of that study, I want to set down here a very important statement of administration farm policy.

The study, entitled the "Family Farm in American Agriculture," is a clear and simply written document of great importance to you and to all Americans. I hope you will read and discuss it in your local granges. I would like to see this study become a subject of discussion and debate in rural and urban areas from one end of the country to the other, so that the air could be cleared of misunderstandings about the family farm. We hear much talk these days that the family farm is done. I suspect the majority of the American people consider the family farm a carryover of the past. But the Commission study, based on unromantic logic and hard economics, makes totally different findings. It concludes that the family farm is one of the main supporting beams of our high standard of living, and the key to our unchallenged world leadership in agriculture. Family farms have met the requirements of a technological age as well as they once met the needs of settling a new country.

The important statement of policy I want to make here is that the family farm is the keystone of the agricultural policy of the Kennedy administration. Just as the amazing productivity of American agriculture is the solid foundation for our unparalleled standard of living, so the family farm is the rock upon which we have built the achievement of American agriculture. We believe the family farm is essential to the strength and well-being of our Nation. We are determined that in the total national interest the family farm will continue to grow in efficiency and effectiveness. National farm policies have been and will in the years ahead be shaped to enable the efficient family farm to maintain its independence so that it can continue to meet our basic needs for food and fiber.

Nothing would please me more than to see the Commission study become the center of controversy and debate. It subjects the family farm to a test as to its worth as a commercial enterprise. It does not measure its social and moral values, although it recognizes that these, too, are of critical importance. There is no question that the family farm, as an institution, contributes enormously to the social fabric of our Nation and its moral virtues of hard work and emphasis on family are essential parts of our national heritage.

But the debates and doubts we hear today as to the worth of the family farm do not question its moral and social values, they question only its contribution to the Nation as an efficient commercial enterprise.

Let me, for a moment, then renew in more depth those phases of the study which deal with the economic value of the family farm and with the implication of those findings.

The Commission defines the family farm as one that does not hire more labor than the family provides, or about 1.5 man-years. The family farmer also has a substantial equity in land, equipment, or livestock, for unless he has such an investment, it is unlikely he will have managerial control or security.

It should be apparent by this definition that the size of a farm, or the amount of capital invested, or the value of farm output are only indicators, for the family farm can be big or little in these terms. The distinguishing feature of the family farm is the incentive that ownership and management of a farming operation vests in the family that does most of the work.

First of all the Commission report makes it clear that as of now the family farm is not fading away. Instead it is growing both in relation to the number of farms and to its share of production.

Taking only the measure of hired labor as a criterion, a clear picture of the dominance of the family farm emerges. In 1944, farms employing less than 1.5 man-years of hired labor accounted for 94.5 percent of all farms and they marketed 66.5 percent of all farm products sold. In 1959, these farms accounted for 95.7 percent of all farms and for 70.1 percent of all marketings.

The Commission also considered another important question. They asked what dollar volume of output, as it relates to the size of the farm, would be necessary to bring a decent living for family farmers. Here the Commission concluded that in order for the family farm to be of an adequate size—to provide the family with a standard of living on par with most other Americans—sales of $10,000 or more on the average are required, under today's conditions. Some farms grossing less than $10,000 will actually be more profitable than some which gross $20,000, but on the average the $10,000 figure is a useful guide.

Here again the Commission study shows that the trend in recent years has been strongly in this direction. Between 1949 and 1959 the number of farms with sales of $10,000 or more—and hiring less than 1.5 man-years of work—increased 95 percent. In comparison, farms selling less than $2,500 worth of farm products declined 43 percent (excluding farms omitted by change of census definition). At the same time the Commission noted that the number of farms with sales above $10,000 and hiring more than 1.5 man-years of work—the larger than family farms—also declined in number, decreasing some 3 percent in that decade.

We all recognize there is a substantial number of family farms which are not adequate in terms of gross marketings. Our goal is to enable them to become adequate, efficient family farms or to help the families who live on them to find either adequate nonfarm employment, to combine farming and off-farm jobs or, if they choose, to find jobs outside their present communities. To do otherwise would be unfair, if not cruel, to those who cannot obtain an adequate income or decent life on an inadequate farm.

The Commission findings that the family farm is a going commercial enterprise growing stronger—not weaker—seem to me to be based on solid fact. Rather than a dying vestige of a past era, the family farm continues to be the most efficient means of producing food and fiber that has ever been devised. There is no other system of farming which provides its customers with food at so low a cost in relation to total income. In no other country does the consumer eat for less than 19 percent of the average family's spendable income, or have so nutritional and diversified a diet. This, then, is the measure of the success of our American family farm.

The achievements of the family farm system contrast dramatically with the troubles so evident today in Russia and other Communist nations. Agriculture, for the most part, cannot be treated like a factory—particularly in producing the more specialized foods which people want as their incomes improve. There are too many variables to consider in agriculture, and they cannot be engineered so as to be performed simultaneously by specialized labor and machinery. There can be no efficient assembly line for agriculture. In fact, the effort to apply factory principles to farming is the weakness of Russian agriculture, and the basic reason they will never equal the family farm in productivity and efficiency.

Let me emphasize, however, that neither history nor the conditions of natural advantage necessarily guarantees the future of the family farm in the United States. I would alert you that there are forces unrelated to the efficiency of family farming which work constantly to erode its economic strength, to compress and control its markets and to alter its independent position. Concern for this danger is highlighted by the Commission study, and I would like to quote what they have said:

"The investment required in a well-organized family farm has grown to the point where acquisition of ownership by the succeeding generation of farmers is even more difficult than it has been in the past. The net income of farm families has become a smaller proportion of income from marketings as purchased supplies and machinery have played a larger part in production; family incomes are more vulnerable than formerly to the effects of sharp price declines or crop losses resulting from adverse weather.

"Mass merchandising methods in food distribution have created markets in which buyers demand large volumes of uniformly good quality from producers. Some marketing functions once performed on the farm have been moved beyond the farm gates to processing and distribution industries. In some instances, processors are integrating entire production operations with their nonfarm operations. In others, suppliers are performing a large part of the production function under contractual arrangements. Possible future developments in this area will take the form of close working relationships between independent farmers and business firms, but disappearance of farm production as a distinct and separate operation is conceivable in some cases."

In other words, vertical integration, contract farming, and the growing dominance of the retail end of the food process—all unrelated to efficiency of the family farm—may well endanger family farm agriculture.

The Commission study also makes it clear that commodity programs have been a key influence in the growth of the adequate family farm and that these programs must continue in some form.

The study reports that, "The root of the farm problem is the inability of the ordinary economic adjustment processes to carry the extraordinary burden placed upon them by rapid technological advances in agriculture." The problem then, is overproduction, or the ability to produce far beyond our capacity to consume, sell, or give away.

The Commission study points out that the disappearance of many inadequate farms will not materially alter the overproduction problem confronting the more productive farms, just as price supports favorable to adequate family farms will not solve the income problems on the smallest farms.

Thus, the Commission concludes, "programs to support farm income have contributed, directly or indirectly, to such income and financial solvency as the more successful competitors enjoy."

The Commission report makes it clear that commodity programs, rather than being relief or social welfare programs, have been and are necessary for the efficient farms which require heavy capital investment. They are helpful to the small, inadequate size farm, but they are not designed for that purpose.

But the questions repeatedly asked and the violent criticism directed toward commodity programs, even as American agriculture is acknowledged to be supremely successful in accomplishing its prime purpose of feeding our people effectively and well, are an indication of the searching examination of agriculture now underway. As in other parts of our economy, many changes are taking place, and we are trying to understand them better.

The Commission study, for example, is one of the signs of ferment which indicate we are approaching a decisive period in American agriculture. It is a time when the people as a whole and farmers in particular are in the process of enunciating a new agricultural policy that gives meaning and direction to what seems at times to be a confused picture with unanswerable questions. We have been moving in the direction of clarification for some time, although the efforts to test the limits of the new agricultural policy are often obscured by the noise and rhetoric of the debate.

We have, for example, subjected the family farm to the most rigorous kinds of tests under the most severe conditions, and it has emerged stronger and more vigorous than before. We have tested various types of commodity programs, as well as efforts designed to eliminate them, and have found they will continue to be necessary if adequate family farms are to receive reasonable returns during a period of rapid and massive technological change.

The new agricultural policy that is gradually emerging is much broader than commodity programs alone. It recognizes that we must make full use of our resources, both natural and human, in rural America—and commodity programs alone do not provide the full range of opportunities necessary to broaden the rural economic base.

In this respect, the commodity programs of the Grange are a phase of the testing process of the nature of a new agricultural policy. I commend you for the Grange community service program, and I only wish that I could be here to congratulate the winner of your community service contest.

We are developing within the USDA a series of programs and services designed to assist the rural community and the farmer to expand the range of job and income opportunities. You have heard me talk about rural areas development before, and you will hear me talk about it in the future, for it is an essential part of a dynamic and expanding rural economy. We seek to use land, not idle it. We seek to encourage community growth, not its stagnation and decline. We seek to make use of rural resources to meet the needs of the city for outdoor recreation—for space and green land—and to provide the rural community with new income opportunities. We oppose the philosophy which would drive people off the land when there is so much need for all the goods and services which land and people can provide.

Another area where we have been testing and probing to enlarge the scope of our farm policy is in the relationship between agricultural trade and aid. This administration, as you know, has taken strong and vigorous action to protect and expand world markets for the products of our farms. I leave from here tomorrow, in fact, to attend a symposium in Amsterdam where a discussion of agricultural trade with the Common Market is now underway among government leaders, businessmen, and private citizens from both sides of the Atlantic. The USDA is sponsoring this trade conference as an effort to enlarge the peaceful dialog on ways to encourage liberal trade policies for farm products.

The President has fought hard and will continue to insist that the fair and legitimate interests of American agricultural trade be recognized by the Common Market. We are competing more and more effectively all over the world for agricultural markets. We now maintain two permanent exhibits in Western Europe and in Japan, and we join with more than 40 commodity groups in various promotion efforts. We anticipate a record export volume this fiscal year, possibly as much as $6 billion in sales as compared to $5 billion last fiscal year.

But a concern for ways to enlarge present commercial trading opportunities is not enough. Herschel Newsom recognized this clearly in his address when he said that agriculture "must achieve a climate which will give reasonable prospect * * * to its ability to meet the incredible food demands of an exploding population everywhere." He strikes to the heart of our opportunity when he said that "those who are recipients of our abundance and benevolence today will be customers of our productive plant tomorrow."

He is right. The potential expansion of our productive capacity in the United States, if it is to find markets, depends in large measure on the development throughout the world of standards of living high enough so that a growing number of people will be able to buy the products of our farms and factories. This is especially true in Latin America and the Far East. Our own continued enjoyment of abundance thus depends upon the extent to which underdeveloped peoples of the world can be helped to achieve their potential for abundance so they can buy.

There are of course many questions which remain to be answered, and I can see many difficult problems ahead as we build a new agricultural policy. But there is emerging today a much fuller appreciation of the role of agriculture and rural America in the modern world in which we live. We should encourage and stimulate this appreciation to the maximum extent possible, for out of it can come new and unprecedented growth and opportunity. It will require that we do many new things, not the least of which is to begin thinking in terms of a world of science and technology and potential abundance for all—not in terms of yesterday's world of scarcity and hunger.

After many years' intimate association with the problems of agriculture, I am increasingly convinced that the key to peace and plenty in the world of the future is agriculture. It promises a new dimension of living for all Americans, and it can provide the means of achieving adequate food and fiber in a world which even today is still two-thirds hungry.

Perhaps you will say it is a dream. But it is not an impossible dream, and I ask you to share it with me, and to work with me to make it a reality.

THE FAMILY FARM IN AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

(A report of the National Agricultural Advisory Commission, November 12, 1963)

The family farm remains the backbone of American agriculture because it has shown remarkable capacity to adapt to new methods and markets in a dynamic economy. The very changes that have enabled it to remain efficient, however, have so transformed it in some respects that an erroneous impression sometimes exists that the family farm has disappeared.

The essential feature of a family farm is not its acreage or its technological progressiveness but the degree to which productive effort and its rewards are vested in the family. The family farm is an agricultural business in which the operator is a risk-taking manager, has a substantial investment, and, with his family, supplies a large part of the labor. Under this arrangement, the incentive to produce efficiently becomes especially dominant.

The boundary between family farms and the larger-than-family farms is necessarily indistinct. Employment of two or three men is not now inconsistent with the family farm, nor was it 50 years ago. For statistical purposes, however, we may say that the amount of hired labor does not exceed the amount of family labor, which on the average farm is about 1.5 man-years. Substantial equity in land, equipment, or livestock is involved also in the concept of the family farm. Unless the operator has a significant investment, he is not likely to have much managerial control or security.

TECHNOLOGY AND CHANGES IN FARMING

Mechanization and other technological advances have greatly increased the amount of farm products a family can produce. The desire for more income provides the motive, while mechanization and other technology provide the means, for family farmers to enlarge the size of their farm businesses. These developments—in many ways paralleling automation in industry—mean that fewer resources, including labor, are needed in agriculture. Opportunities for young men to get started on adequate family farms are necessarily much curtailed because of substitution of capital for labor.

Adequate family farms today are commercial enterprises in which the operator's technical know-how and managerial skill are more important than his physical prowess. Credit and leasing arrangements frequently are the means by which the family brings under its control sufficient resources for an efficient unit. The level of living possible on a semisubsistence farm, while perhaps no lower now than generations ago, is no longer acceptable to farm people who wish to share in the rising incomes characteristic of the American economy.

THE FARM PROBLEM AND THE FAMILY FARM

The farm problem is a problem of persistent income disadvantages for farm people. One aspect is low income on farms having far too few resources for an adequate producing unit. Another aspect is low earnings, compared with returns outside of agriculture, on labor and investment on the productive farms that produce the great bulk of our agricultural products. The latter grows out of a persistent tendency to overproduce as a result of advancing farm technology. It is intensified by shrinkage of some markets as other technology develops substitutes for farm products—for example, manmade fibers for natural fibers.

When improved production methods become available, individual farmers adopt them, increase output, strive to expand, and bid up the price of land. Production rises faster than the market grows; prices and incomes are driven down. The numbers of farms and of farmworkers decline, but the rate of adjustment required to hold farm incomes at reasonable levels exceeds the feasible rate. The age of many farmers (50.5 was the average age in 1959), their lack of skill for nonfarm work, distance from industrial centers, and unemployment in the economy at large are practical obstacles to more rapid adjustment. The basic difficulties of agriculture as this process unfolds would exist whether the same farm resources were divided among half as many farms or twice as many. Family farms by far predominate in our efficient agriculture, but they do not create the circumstances in which downward pressure on farm incomes is generated.

Policy to maintain reasonable incomes in American agriculture is not an attempt to preserve an inefficient or anachronistic institution. The root of the farm problem is the inability of ordinary economic adjustment processes to carry the extraordinary burden placed upon them by rapid technological advance in agriculture. The difficulty is intensified by the high efficiency of U.S. agriculture, the speed with which it translates innovations into more production, and its inability voluntarily to hold excess capacity idle.

Economic adversity has fallen most heavily on operators of small farms who, because of age, inadequate resources, or other reasons, have not been able either to keep up in the race to expand or to find remunerative nonfarm employment. But the cost-price squeeze has been general throughout agriculture. In most of farming, programs to support farm income have contributed, directly or indirectly, to such income and financial solvency as the more successful competitors have enjoyed.

DEVELOPMENT AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE FAMILY FARM SYSTEM

At the time of the establishment of the thirteen American Colonies, feudalism was the dominant pattern in European farming. But though attempts were made, the system was not easily exported to the New World. Europeans escaping the oppressions of feudalism demanded assurance that they would become farmowners if they came to the Colonies. In some instances, headrights to small amounts of land were offered to those who could get transportation to America—a forerunner of the homestead movement. Over a long period, settlers resisted and eventually abolished the entail system, primogeniture, quitrents, and other restrictions on opportunity to own, operate, or develop land.

Owner-operation of land was admirably suited to the requirements of settling a new country. It was, moreover, consistent with early Americans' beliefs in equal opportunity for individuals, their equal rights as citizens, and identification of praiseworthy character with proficient work. The family farm became a symbol of such virtues in a predominantly agricultural society.

The land policy by which the West was opened up reflected strong attachment to the family farm ideal. After several anticipatory measures, the Homestead Act of 1862 made homesteading the established national policy. Also in that year, the land-grant college system and the U.S. Department of Agriculture were created. These became the basis for the research and educational work that farmers could not do for themselves but which was essential for a progressive agriculture. A century later, systems patterned after the American model were to be established in remote countries of the world in an effort to stimulate agricultural development.

By 1920, the long period in which agriculture supplied the Nation's food and fiber by increasing the crop acreage and labor force had come to an end. Thereafter, production was increased by mechanization, improved plant varieties, better cultural practices, and all the other advances lumped under the heading "Technology." The economic pressures constituting the present farm problem began then and strengthened in the following decades, though the depression of the 1930's and wartime conditions at times masked their effects. Both agriculture's technological performance and the resulting economic pressures have been especially high in the past decade, as described in preceding pages of this report.

The rising efficiency of family farm agriculture over the decades has enabled the United States to shift gradually to a highly industrialized economy producing the world's highest level of living—including more and better food per person than when 90 percent of the population was agricultural. The American people are better fed, and for a smaller proportion of their income, than any other nation. Family farmers have demonstrated their ability to meet the requirements of a technological age as well as they once met the needs of settling a new country. The land ownership system on which the family farm is based has proved clearly superior to collectivist arrangements or to feudalism as transplanted to countries now struggling to develop economically.

THE CURRENT POSITION OF THE FAMILY FARM

Though the character and size of the family farm are changing, as an institution it has held its own in American agriculture. In 1944, farms employing less than 1.5 man-years of hired labor comprised 94.5 percent of all farms and marketed 66.5 percent of all farm products sold. In 1959, such farms accounted for 95.7 percent of all farms and for 70.1 percent of all marketings.[1]

The basic economic influence on the farm size toward which agriculture is moving at any one time is the relation of production costs per unit of output to size of operation. Farms too small to employ family labor productively, using modern methods, have high production costs if family labor is valued at moderate annual wages. Since the high unit costs are not compensated for by correspondingly high prices, the earnings of the family for its labor and investment on such a farm are in fact low.

Production costs per unit in most types of farming fall as size of farm increases up to the point where available family labor and a full complement of equipment are utilized effectively. Beyond that point, costs per unit typically do not change much. Exceptions exist in certain types of farming and marketing as well as production economies sometimes are obtained by larger-than-family farms. But in most of agriculture the well-organized family farm is as efficient as any unit. Indeed, the managerial flexibility and the profit incentive of the family farm often give it an advantage over larger farms depending on salaried employees for management and labor.

The drive for proficiency and the increase in the size of farm a family can operate are reflected in the rapid reduction in the number of the smallest farms. Between 1949 and 1959, the number of farms selling less than $2,500 worth of farm products declined 43 percent (excluding farms omitted by change of census definition). The number of farms with sales between $2,500 and $10,000 dropped 21 percent. The number with sales exceeding $10,000 but hiring less than 1.5 man-years of labor increased 95 percent. Thus the tendency was to move toward efficient, family-size farms. In contrast, the number of farms with sales in excess of $10,000 and hiring 1.5 or more man-years of labor declined 3 percent.

Changes in the farm labor force suggest similar conclusions. In 1910, 3.4 million hired workers (USDA series) comprised 24.9 percent of the farm labor force. In 1952, 2.1 million hired workers were only 23.4 percent of the total. Hired workers declined in absolute numbers to 1.8 million in 1962 but rose to 27.3 percent of the farm labor force. The increase in the proportion reflected the rapid decline in the smallest farms rather than an increasing importance of larger-than-family farms relative to efficient family farms.

Tenancy in American agriculture has fallen steadily since 1930. In that year, 42.4 percent of all farms were operated by tenants; in 1959, the percentage was 19.8. Only about one-half of 1 percent of all farms are operated my managers. Sharecropping in the South has been falling rapidly. Such changes point to increasing managerial control and financial equity on the part of operators.

In contrast, contract farming has curtailed the range of decisions left to some farm operators, especially in poultry farming. Developed in a proper way, contract farming can be a means by which family farms gain access to capital or establish desirable market outlets for their products. Such results are particularly likely to be obtained if farmer-controlled cooperatives make the contractual arrangements. Experience has shown, however, that contract farming can also put the operator of a farm nearly in the position of a hired farm laborer with no assurance that the arrangement into which he has entered will be continued. On balance, the decline of tenancy probably has outweighed operators' loss of managerial control under contracts, but efforts should be made to steer the development of contract farming in directions conducive to maintaining independent family farms.

PROSPECTS FOR THE FAMILY FARM

The ability of the family farm to hold its own despite dramatic changes in agriculture in recent decades indicates its competitive vigor. The average size of farm will increase and the number of farms will decline as farmers continue to adjust to technological advance, but the family farm promises to dominate agriculture indefinitely if a favorable economic environment is provided. Positive programs will be needed if family farms are to be assured of sharing equitably in the rising incomes of the American economy. A great challenge for farm policy is to keep the high productivity of a family farm agriculture from resulting in chronic depression of the income of farm people.

---

[1] Sources of information and elaboration of the main points contained in this report are contained in the accompanying supplement.

The relation of production costs to size of farm continues to permit well-organized family farms to be as efficient as larger operations in most types of production. Especially in crop farming, it is not possible to break the production process down into many steps to be performed simultaneously by specialized labor and machinery. Thus an important advantage of large-scale factory production is not available in much of agriculture.

The present geographic distribution of family-size and larger-than-family farms seems highly stable. Each type shows a strong tendency to persist in the areas where it has been long established. There is little prospect that large farms will become less important in California, the Southwest, the Mississippi Delta, or Florida. Elsewhere, the family farm has great staying power.

Despite the vigor of the family farm, certain developments do pose problems for its future and for its continuing contribution to the Nation. The investment required in a well-organized family farm has grown to the point where acquisition of ownership by the succeeding generation of farmers is even more difficult than it has been in the past. The net income of farm families has become a smaller proportion of income from marketings as purchased supplies and machinery have played a larger part in production; family incomes are more vulnerable than formerly to the effects of sharp price declines or crop losses resulting from adverse weather.

Mass merchandising methods in food distribution have created markets in which buyers demand large volumes of uniformly good quality from producers. As a result, marketing advantages for large producers of some products are appearing that formerly did not exist or were of little importance. Some marketing functions once performed on the farm have been moved beyond the farm gate to processing and distribution industries. This shift has reduced the economic services to be provided by farmers and has presented them with new kinds of marketing problems. In some instances, processors are integrating entire production operations with their nonfarm operations. In others, suppliers are performing a large part of the production function under contractual arrangements. Possibly future developments in this area will take the form of close working relationships between independent farmers and business firms, but disappearance of farm production as a distinct and separate operation is conceivable in some cases.

The self-employed farmer competes with others like himself and with hired farm labor. The farm family will not earn favorable returns on its own labor when hired labor is chronically cheap. Farm wages vary widely among areas and type of work, but average farm wages are low compared with industrial wages. The reasons are complex and include the lack of skill and low productivity of part of the hired labor force. An abrupt advance in the cost of hired labor would severely squeeze many farm employers. Over the long run, however, the opportunity for family farmers to compete and to earn satisfactory returns for their labor will be enhanced if wages and working conditions for hired farm labor compare favorably with those in industry.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A HEALTHY FAMILY FARM AGRICULTURE

1. Public understanding: One of the primary needs for achieving a healthy family farm structure is a broad public understanding of how family farming, the high productivity of agriculture, and the farm problem are related to each other. Misconceptions lead to beliefs that the farm problem would be solved if family farms were eliminated, that farm programs are intended to preserve an institution of sentimental but no economic value, or that farmers could readily solve their own problems if they only would. We recommended, therefore, that a concerted and continuing effort be made by farmers themselves and by public agencies serving agriculture to inform the people of the country about the economic position of farming and of the place of family farms in it, so that realistic and effective policy can be forthcoming.

2. Education and related services for farmers: Continued public support of agricultural research, extension, education, soil conservation, and similar services will contribute to a favorable environment for family farms. Such services have helped family farmers to be as technologically progressive as the largest farm operations. In other circumstances, giant units capable of hiring technical experts and even of developing their own trade secrets would have had an important advantage. Redirection of research, extension, and related activities is necessary from time to time to meet new problems of agriculture and of rural areas. We recommend a policy of combining (a) technical services for individual farmers with (b) programs to permit orderly adjustment to technological change as being in the best interests both of family farms and of the economy at large.

3. Strengthening and broadening the role of farmer-controlled cooperatives: Encouragement of agricultural cooperatives assists family farmers to realize economies of large-scale purchasing and marketing. The greater emphasis on volume and uniformity by buyers in some commodity markets has increased the need for cooperative marketing by individual farmers. Beyond these long-established functions, cooperatives are increasingly challenged to develop bargaining power more nearly commensurate with that of the giant firms with which they often deal. We recommend examination of the legal framework within which cooperatives operate, credit policies, and the USDA's work on problems of cooperatives, followed by action to put into effect such changes as seem capable of strengthening and extending the role of farmer cooperatives.

4. Ownership of land by farm operators: Family farmers may come to have a serious disadvantage in competing for land not because they cannot operate it efficiently but because of limited financial resources. We recommend reducing the competition for farmland by nonfarmers by changes in income tax provisions now favorable to such bidders. We urge that more adequate information be obtained on the ownership of farmland, on the influence of demand from outside of agriculture, on the effects of inheritance taxes, and on the technical means by which demand for land might be confined more largely to farm operators. We also recommend that State and local governments base taxation of farmland on its agricultural value while it is being farmed.

5. Special needs for credit: Existing programs to extend credit to farmers with reasonable prospects for success but with limited financial resources have had a good repayment record and have demonstrated their usefulness. Care should be taken to direct these efforts toward farms of sufficient size to permit efficient operation. We recommend that special attention be given to (a) credit for combining small units into adequate family farms under potentially good managers, and (b) modification of credit instruments and practices to permit more readily the carrying of a stable level of debt once the operator has acquired a reasonable equity.

6. Minimum wages and working conditions for hired agricultural labor: Better employment conditions and wages for hired farm labor will improve the competitive position of family farms relative to that of larger-than-family farms. Concern about the welfare of farm people surely includes, in a democratic society, the welfare of families who work for farmers. Farm wages and other conditions of employment are at or above industrial minimums in important parts of agriculture but not in all. We recommend that minimum wages and improved working conditions, in terms adapted to agricultural production, be extended, by stages, to hired farmworkers on a national basis until comparability with industrial minimums is attained.[2]

7. Equal application of price support programs to all farms: A recurring question is whether farm programs should be designed to give special advantages to small farms. Small minimum allotments often are necessary for administrative feasibility. Proposals for more significant advantages for small farms frequently distinguish between small and economically adequate farms rather than between family and large-scale farms. Such provisions might operate to tenants' disadvantage in areas where tenant-operated farms are larger and more productive than the average. Proficient production is highly valued in the American economy; program concessions to inefficiency are not likely to endure. We recommend the application of price support programs equally to all farms, with modifications for administrative effectiveness and flexibility of farm operations, as the policy most likely to preserve the good name of the family farm and to be consistent with effective operation of farm programs.

8. The inadequate farm unit: Despite the large decline in numbers of the smallest farms in the past two decades, it must be recognized that many uneconomic units remain on which family incomes will be low even if price-cost relationships are favorable for the family farms that produce the bulk of all farm products. The size of farm required for an adequate unit is likely to increase as technology advances. The earning power of some operators of small farms is low because of their advanced age or inability to acquire other skills; the resulting income problem should be treated as a general social problem rather than as a farm problem. Little real good will be done by somehow forcing families out of unfavorable farm situations into unemployment in cities, though statistically the farm situation would be made to look better. This difficult problem must be approached from many directions: Development of rural nonfarm resources, training for adults with potential earning power in industry, employment information, education and counseling of rural youth for nonfarm careers, and consolidation of small farms. A high level of employment in the economy at large is absolutely vital for long-range solution of the problem. We commend the sympathetic frankness with which this situation has been recognized in the establishment of rural development and other programs, and we recommend continued efforts on all fronts to alleviate it.

9. Farm price and income programs: Farm programs will continue to be necessary if families on adequate farms are to receive reasonable returns for their labor and investment. The disappearance of many inadequate farms will not materially alter the overproduction problem confronting the more productive farms, just as prices favorable to adequate family farms will not solve the income problems on the smallest farms. We recommend continued efforts to develop farm programs to create earnings on adequate family farms comparable with those outside of agriculture and to promote the long-run interests of the general public. Such programs properly include measures to

---

[2] For three dissenting views on minimum wages, see following page.

put agricultural products to such useful purposes as aid to underdeveloped countries and domestic food distribution to needy people. Almost surely some means of restraining production, whether by so-called voluntary or mandatory means, will be required. It is not reasonable to expect to have precisely enough farm capacity so that full production just clears the market at satisfactory prices in normal times; and it would not be prudent national policy to attempt it. It will also be desirable to carry reserve stocks for emergencies as a national security measure and to level out consumers' supplies rather than as a strictly farm program. Farming operates in an economy in which substantial power to maintain prices and wages exists for other groups. Farming will need the stabilizing influence of price programs for key commodities if it is to share equitably in the product of the total economy to which it contributes so much.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES R. SAYRE REGARDING RECOMMENDATION NO. 6

In this report the proposal for mandatory minimum wages and upgrading of farm working conditions is coupled with a specific objective, to "improve the competitive position of family farms relative to that of larger-than-family farms."

A much broader perspective is required to preappraise fully the problems which would be involved.

Several probable effects—some good and some bad—are obvious. Added rural unemployment would be a direct result of a rigid farm wage structure. Accelerated labor-reduction technologies would cut heavily into future farm-community job opportunities.

In many areas where hand labor is a seasonal need there are numerous off-season benefits that accrue to farmworkers, making their returns on a year-around basis greater than is indicated by statistical measures. Minimum wage scales would eliminate such arrangements.

A bit less obvious, but of serious consequence, these impacts would hit mainly the least trainable parts of the Nation's wage earners.

The pattern of farm production in the United States has evolved following the principles of comparative advantage and specialization with high volumes of interregional trade. Elimination of wage differential would tend to disrupt mobility and other relationships which would increase selling prices for food and fiber. This would lessen further the competitive strength of U.S. farm products in markets highly sensitive to price adjustments.

Additionally, with the imposition of minimum wages some production areas would be helped economically; others would be damaged. Family farms and farm-based enterprises would be hurt alongside the larger-than-family farms in the areas forcefully shifted in their comparative relationships to a disadvantageous position.

The competitive climate for labor, capital, managerial capacity, and land within production areas and between production areas must be taken into account, along with industrial wages for adequate considerations of labor returns as a part of general farm policy.

The further development of the family farm is one of the American ideals which should be fostered. New entry into family farm status should be made as easy as possible. The ambitious and prudent rural family farm unit of their own needs the freedom of job choices, of selling their labor —all of it—to best advantage. That is the usual way in which families, who operate farms, seek to push for increased size of business, either vertically or by taking on more land.

Restrictions upon job opportunities for the "landless" rural family wanting to achieve family farm status would often limit their income to that of the head of the family. It would tend to promote various types of "moonlighting" and other evasions. It would give a competitive advantage to the rural family operating land versus landless rural family residents. The family farm household could "use and sell" all of its labor. The nonfarm family would be hobbled by statute.

It is my view that thorough studies should be made of the full implications of mandatory minimum wages and their likely economic and social effects to provide more adequate grounds for farm policy determinations. Proposals for minimum wages in relation to a single target could lead to serious distortions in the rural economy.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM V. RAWLINGS REGARDING RECOMMENDATION NO. 6

I wish to disassociate myself from concurrence in this recommendation.

I recognize that employment conditions and wages for hired farm labor are a matter of concern, but I cannot agree that the solution lies in this recommendation.

I view this problem as a social problem and I do not agree that the economic condition of agriculture is such that will permit agriculture to bear the entire burden of correcting this social problem.

It may be that the recommendation for hired farm labor will improve the competitive position of family farms relative to that of larger-than-family farms. The fact remains that the accomplishment of the recommendation would involve a substantial increase in overhead for family farms without any prospect of comparable increases in income and the result would be a further shrinkage in the already low, net income of family farms. I cannot reason that although the shrinkage in net income for family farms may be less than the shrinkage in net income for larger-than-family farms, that such a result would be in the interest of family farms, nor consistent with the objective of parity of income for risktaking farm operators.

Further, it is my feeling that the necessary working hours during rush periods, the fact that much farm labor is paid a steady wage even through periods of unemployment and partial employment, the wide variance of fringe benefits to many farm laborers such as housing, etc., all add up to a most difficult, if not impossible problem in enforcing such legislation should the objectives of this recommendation be enacted into law.

STATEMENT OF C. D. DOSKER REGARDING RECOMMENDATION NO. 6

I am not a bit sure that the imposition of minimum wages is going to improve the competitive position of family farms in relation to that of larger-than-family farms.

In many cases there are conditions other than that of wages alone which affect the hired employees of the family farm. This has to do with housing, the furnishing of food in the form of home-slaughtered meats, vegetables, poultry, fuel, and many things that enter into the cost of living as against the wage earner on the larger-than-family farm.

I am concerned that the imposition of minimum wages may eliminate from employment many people who due to physical handicaps can now find some employment in agriculture when they are no longer able to work in industry and thus take a load off the public relief rolls.

The application of minimum wages to farm help is going to impose an additional bookkeeping problem upon the family farmer.

I am certainly an advocate of the highest wages possible, but I have seen in industry what happens to the physically handicapped, and I think these people are entitled to employment, and no regulation should make it impossible for these people to be self-sufficient.

I think it is rather wishful thinking to talk about the wage level of farm help attaining that of industrial minimums. The law of supply and demand is just as effective in agriculture as it is in industry, but we must remember that there will continue to be a large number of subsistence farmers. The same must apply on the farm as in industry. There must be an exemption on the number of employees that a farmer could have before coming under the effects of a regulation of this kind. You will always have the need of migratory labor at harvest time. Many schoolchildren now find some source of income in this type of work.

As I stated at the meeting, I think section 6 needs a great deal of study before any outright recommendations are made in regard to minimum wages and working conditions for hired agricultural labor.

STATISTICAL SUPPLEMENT

The following pages contain additional information, mostly statistical, relating to the position of the family farm in American agriculture. The first four tables were prepared by Radoje Nikolitch of the Farm Production Economics Division, Economic Research Service, USDA. "Abnormal" farms, sometimes omitted from the tables, are institutional farms, Indian reservations, agricultural experiment stations, grazing associations, and the like. They comprised less than 0.1 percent of all farms in 1959.

The information given by tables 1–3 has been summarized in the main body of this report. Table 4 gives additional detail on the largest farms; some of the farms with sales of farm products exceeding $100,000 in 1959 employed less than 1.5 man-years of hired labor.

Table 5 records the decline in the importance of tenants, including croppers, since 1930. Both the proportion of farms operated and the proportion of cropland harvested have declined steeply. Part owners have increased in importance as owners have expanded by renting additional land and as some tenants have purchased land.

As table 6 shows, full and part owners together operate about 75 percent of the farms in all value-of-sales classes above $2,500. The percentage of full ownership is greatest on farms having sales of less than $2,500. Table 7 shows the large variation in sales per "commercial" farm, by tenure class, among the major regions of the country. In some areas—Illinois and Iowa—the tenant-operated farms are distinctly larger, on the average, than those operated by full owners; in others—Alabama, Mississippi—the reverse is true.

Changes in the numbers of hired and family farmworkers are given in table 8. The peak in total farm employment was reached in 1916, at 13,632,000 workers.

Tables 9 and 10 give data on farm real estate sales. Transfers of a single farm from a buyer to a seller who will operate it as a single farm are less frequent than sales of real estate to become part of a farm. Tenants have become less important as buyers of farms as their numbers have declined; owner-operators have become more important as buyers. The principal change on the selling side has been an increase in the importance of miscellaneous sellers other than active or retired farmers, estates, or lending agencies.

The inability of the smallest farms to provide an adequate living for the family has led to more off-farm work as well as to larger farms. In 1934, only 11.2 percent of farm operators worked off the farm 100 or more days (partly due to high industrial unemployment). The percentage rose to 23.3 in 1949 and to 29.9 in 1959. As table 11 shows, off-farm work was most important on the smallest farms in 1959. Five out of eight farm operators selling less than $2,500 worth of farm products had other income exceeding the value of products sold.

TABLE 1.—*Number of farms by value of farm marketings and proportions of all farm marketings* [1]

Value of marketings [2]	Farms			Proportion of all farms		Proportion of all farm marketings	
	Number		Change from 1949 to 1959				
	1949	1959		1949	1959	1949	1959
	Thousands	*Thousands*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
$20,000 and over	[3] 229	312	+36	4.3	8.4	34.3	50.1
$10,000 to $19,999	[3] 255	482	+89	4.7	13.0	16.7	22.0
$5,000 to $9,999	721	653	−9	13.4	17.7	22.8	15.5
$2,500 to $4,999	882	617	−30	16.4	16.7	14.4	7.4
$2,500 and over	2,087	2,064	−1	38.8	55.8	88.2	95.0
Under $2,500	3,287	1,634	−50	61.2	44.2	11.8	5.0
All	5,374	3,698	−31	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

[1] Abnormal farms excluded.

[2] Prices received by farmers decreased 3 percent. This change is too small to have a bearing on change in the number of farms by value of marketings.

[3] Preliminary estimates.

Source: Derived from U.S. censuses of agriculture.

TABLE 2.—*Number and marketings of farms with specified man-years of hired labor as percentage of all farms, United States, 1944 and 1959* [1]

Man-years of hired labor	Farms				Marketings [2]			
	1944		1959		1944		1959	
	Number [3]	Percent of total	Number	Percent of total	Value	Percent of total	Value	Percent of total
	Thousands		*Thousands*		*Millions*		*Millions*	
Farms with less than 1.5 man-years	4,925	94.5	3,542	95.7	$13,318	66.5	$21,359	70.1
Farms with 1.5 man-years or over	284	5.5	159	4.3	6,693	33.5	9,110	29.9
Total	5,209	100.0	3,701	100.0	20,011	100.0	30,469	100.0

[1] Alaska and Hawaii not included.

[2] Valued at 1959 prices received by farmers.

[3] Adjusted to 1959 definition of farm.

Source: 1945 Census of Agriculture and data derived from special tabulation by the census of a sample of farms for the 1959 Census of Agriculture.

TABLE 3.—*Number and percentage change in number of farms with specified man-years of hired labor and value of marketings, and percentage of all farms, United States, 1949 and 1959* [1]

Man-years of hired labor and value of marketings	Number of farms		Percent change		Proportion of all farms	
	1949	1959	Increase	Decrease	1949	1959
	Thousands	*Thousands*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Less than 1.5 man-years:						
$10,000 or more marketings	334	650	95	--------	16	31
$2,500 to $9,999 marketings	1,529	1,257	--------	18	73	61
Total	1,863	1,907	2	--------	89	92
1.5 or more man-years:						
$10,000 or more marketings	150	144	--------	4	7	7
$2,500 to $9,999 marketings	74	13	--------	82	14	1
Total	224	157	--------	30	11	8
All farms with $2,500 or more	2,087	2,064	--------	1	100	100

[1] Alaska and Hawaii not included.

Source: Derived from U.S. Census of Agriculture, and data derived from special tabulation by the Bureau of the Census of a sample of farms for the 1959 Census of Agriculture.

TABLE 4.—*Numbers of farms and farm marketings by size of farms in value of sales and by specified man-years of hired labor, United States, 1959* [1]

Size of farm in value of sales	Number of farms			Value of marketings		
	Total	Proportion with—		Total	Proportion of farms with—	
		Less than 1.5 man-years of hired labor	More than 1.5 man-years of hired labor		Less than 1.5 man-years of hired labor	More than 1.5 man-years of hired labor
	Number	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Thousand dollars*	*Percent*	*Percent*
$100,000 or more	19,861	11.3	88.7	4,862,959	7.6	92.4
$40,000 to $99,999	81,974	46.6	53.4	4,658,830	44.0	56.0
$40,000 or more	101,835	39.4	60.6	9,521,789	25.4	74.6
Less than $40,000	3,599,529	97.3	2.7	19,788,474	90.6	9.4
Total, all farms	3,701,364	95.7	4.3	29,310,263	70.1	29.9

[1] Does not include Alaska and Hawaii.

Source: Data derived from special tabulation by the Bureau of the Census of a sample of farms for the 1959 Census of Agriculture.

TABLE 5.—*Changes in importance of different forms of tenure, United States, 1920–59*

Year	Full owners	Part owners	Managers	All tenants	Croppers [1]	Total
Percent of farm operators:						
1920	52.2	8.7	1.1	38.1	8.7	100
1930	46.3	10.4	.9	42.4	12.3	100
1940	50.6	10.1	.6	38.8	8.9	100
1950	57.4	15.3	.4	26.9	6.4	100
1959	57.1	22.5	.6	19.8	3.3	100
Percent of cropland harvested:						
1929	34.6	21.6	1.9	41.9	5.4	100
1939	35.9	22.1	2.0	40.0	4.0	100
1949	35.2	33.0	2.1	29.7	2.4	100
1959	30.4	42.7	2.0	24.9	.9	100

[1] South only. Included in "All tenants."

Source: Census of Agriculture.

TABLE 6.—*Distribution of farms among tenure classes, by value of products sold, United States, 1959*

[Percent of farms in class]

Value of products sold per farm	Full owners	Part owners	Managers	All tenants	Croppers [1]	Total
$40,000 or more	31.4	44.0	5.6	19.1	0.2	100
$20,000 to $39,999	32.4	41.2	1.6	24.8	.3	100
$10,000 to $19,999	35.6	37.2	.7	26.6	.6	100
$5,000 to $9,999	44.5	30.6	.4	24.5	2.8	100
$2,500 to $4,999	54.1	22.8	.3	22.8	6.4	100
Less than $2,500 [2]	74.4	11.2	.1	14.3	3.7	100
All farms [3]	57.1	22.5	.6	19.8	3.3	100

[1] South only. Included in "All tenants."

[2] Includes part-time and part-retirement farms but not "abnormal" farms.

[3] Includes "abnormal" farms.

Source: 1959 Census of Agriculture, vol. II, ch. X.

TABLE 7.—*Average sales per commercial farm* [1] *in different tenure classes, by regions, 1959*

Area or region	Full owners	Part owners	Managers	All tenants	Croppers	All farms
The North	$9,226	$13,922	$61,163	$12,865	----------	$11,703
Illinois, Iowa	11,120	16,928	66,560	15,855	----------	14,496
The South	7,659	12,581	67,291	6,519	$3,794	9,147
Alabama, Mississippi	6,964	10,922	51,194	[2] 3,511	2,751	6,796
The West	17,427	33,435	186,053	26,070	----------	26,884
California	24,261	64,738	227,226	45,017	----------	42,267
United States	9,549	15,533	89,277	10,726	----------	12,147

[1] Census definition. All farms with value of sales of $2,500 or more plus farms with sales between $50 and $2,499 and not part time, part retirement, or abnormal.

[2] $4,207 for tenants other than croppers.

Source: From tabulations for a sample of farms, 1959 Census of Agriculture, vol. II, ch. X.

TABLE 8.—*Average annual number of farmworkers, United States*

Year	Family workers	Hired workers	Total workers	Hired as percent of total
	Thousands	*Thousands*	*Thousands*	
1910	10,174	3,381	13,555	24.9
1920	10,041	3,391	13,432	25.2
1930	9,307	3,190	12,407	25.5
1940	8,300	2,679	10,979	24.4
1950	7,597	2,329	9,926	23.5
1951	7,310	2,236	9,546	23.4
1952	7,005	2,144	9,149	23.4
1953	6,775	2,089	8,864	23.6
1954	6,579	2,060	8,639	23.8
1955	6,347	2,017	8,364	24.1
1956	5,899	1,921	7,820	24.6
1957	5,682	1,895	7,577	25.0
1958	5,570	1,955	7,525	26.0
1959	5,390	1,952	7,342	26.6
1960	5,172	1,885	7,057	26.7
1961	5,029	1,890	6,919	27.3
1962	4,873	1,827	6,700	27.3

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 9.—*Percentage of sales of rural real estate by type of intended use*

Item	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962
Single farm bought as—						
Single farm	48	45	43	42	40	39
Part of farm	18	18	19	20	21	20
Part-time farm	3	3	3	3	3	3
Total	69	66	65	65	64	62
Part of farm bought as—						
Single farm	6	7	5	5	5	6
Part of farm	19	20	22	23	24	24
Part-time farm	1	1	2	2	2	2
Total	26	28	29	30	31	32

Source: Farm Production Economics Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 10.—*Farm real estate transfers: Percentage distribution by type of buyer and seller, United States, years ended Mar. 1*

[In percent]

TYPE OF BUYER

Year	Tenant	Owner-operator	Retired farmer	Non-farmer	Total
1944	32.8	33.3	2.8	31.1	100
1945	28.6	34.4	3.3	33.7	100
1946	29.2	34.6	3.5	32.7	100
1947	30.1	33.9	3.8	32.2	100
1948	32.3	35.5	4.0	28.2	100
1949	31.0	36.5	4.6	27.9	100
1950	30.6	36.5	4.5	28.4	100
1951	25.7	37.5	4.7	32.1	100
1952	24.8	38.3	4.7	32.2	100
1953	23.7	38.3	4.3	33.7	100
1954	23.7	38.1	4.3	33.9	100
1955	24.1	38.7	4.4	32.8	100
1956	21.7	37.9	4.9	35.5	100
1957	19.9	39.9	4.2	35.9	100
1958	20.0	39.8	5.2	35.0	100
1959	18.4	41.4	4.0	36.2	100
1960	16.2	46.9	3.1	33.8	100
1961	16.6	48.1	3.2	32.1	100

TABLE 10.—*Farm real estate transfers: Percentage distribution by type of buyer and seller, United States, years ended Mar. 1*—Continued

[In percent]

TYPE OF SELLER

Year	Active farmer	Retired farmer	Estate	Lending agency and county, State or Federal Government	Other	Total
1944	43.5	19.3	12.7	16.5	9.0	100
1945	49.3	14.7	16.0	7.6	12.4	100
1946	52.2	16.3	15.2	5.8	10.5	100
1947	46.5	15.4	15.5	4.2	18.4	100
1948	50.1	15.0	14.9	3.0	17.0	100
1949	52.9	16.9	16.1	2.2	11.9	100
1950	51.9	15.9	15.3	1.6	15.3	100
1951	52.5	16.3	14.4	1.3	15.5	100
1952	55.2	15.0	14.1	1.2	14.5	100
1953	54.3	14.4	15.5	1.2	14.6	100
1954	51.6	15.0	16.4	1.1	15.9	100
1955	53.9	15.8	14.9	.8	14.6	100
1956	51.6	17.0	16.0	1.1	14.2	100
1957	50.7	18.2	15.3	.7	15.0	100
1958	47.1	19.7	17.0	1.0	15.2	100
1959	38.1	19.7	15.6	.5	26.1	100
1960	49.8	12.8	10.8	.6	26.0	100
1961	49.4	14.1	12.0	.4	24.1	100

Source: October 1961, "Current Developments in the Farm Real Estate Market," and earlier issues. Estimates for 1944–51 not strictly comparable with later years because of method of weighting. Prepared in Farm Production Economics Division, Economic Research Service.

TABLE 11.—*Proportions of farm operators reporting specified amounts of off-farm work and other income, by value of farm products sold, United States, 1959*

Value of farm products sold per farm	Percent of all farms	Percent of farm operators working off farm, 100 days or more	Percent of farm operators reporting other income exceeding value of farm products sold
$40,000 or more	2.8	9.5	5.7
$20,000 to $39,999	5.7	9.0	5.9
$10,000 to $19,999	13.0	10.4	6.9
$5,000 to $9,999	17.6	16.2	12.6
$2,500 to $4,999	16.7	26.7	27.3
$2,500 or more	55.8	17.0	14.6
Less than $2,500	44.2	46.1	62.5
All farms	100.0	29.9	35.8

Source: From a tabulation of a sample of farms from the 1959 Census of Agriculture, vol. II, ch. II.

SECRETARY FREEMAN ON LUMBER PROBLEMS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish there had been in manuscript form another great speech the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, made a few days ago at the Congressional Hotel. It took place at a breakfast that was arranged by the National Lumbermen's Manufacturing Association. The Secretary of Agriculture was on the spot, so to speak. It was supposed to be a meeting in which the Association was going to file, and in which it did file, a series of complaints against the administration of certain forest policies, or, according to them, a lack of administration of forest policies.

I am sure the Secretary of Agriculture won the respect and high regard of every Member of Congress who had been invited to attend that breakfast to hear what the Secretary might say after the bill of particulars had been presented to him by a series of spokesmen for the association.

I want to go on record as expressing my great admiration for the courage, the objectivity, and the factual knowledge of the Secretary of Agriculture.

I come from a great lumbering State. We have our lumber problems. There is no question that we need some changes in certain of the policies of the Forest Service.

I do not know of anyone who recognizes that fact and appreciates it more than the Secretary of Agriculture himself. I think it was good that the National Lumbermen's Association had the breakfast. It is quite befitting our system of democracy that cabinet officials be put on the spot, and that complaints be presented to them. Some of the complaints needed to be made. The Secretary of Agriculture recognized this.

He gave us a report on what had been done already in respect to some of the complaints. He gave assurance that the other complaints would all be considered. He stood his ground however, in respect to his rights and his duties as head of the Department of Agriculture with jurisdiction over the Forest Service, when he indicated changes recommended by any advisory committee would have to be justified on the facts.

Although the particular advisory committee about which there was discussion at the breakfast had made a report, and much of the report, in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture, is sound, he nonetheless, filed his caveat as to certain reservations that he had concerning it.

Now it is up to the National Lumbermen's Association to come forward with additional evidence which will justify the changes that they seek from the Secretary of Agriculture. I am satisfied if they do so, they will get the support of the Secretary of Agriculture. If they present the evidence, the senior Senator from Oregon will urge upon the Secretary of Agriculture that their justified complaints be met. I know they will be.

Mr. President, I take this moment to extend my compliments to the Secretary of Agriculture for his very fine statement and sound position that he took at that breakfast.

BEEF IMPORTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Oregon cattlemen, as well as the livestock producers in many areas of our country, have noted with great concern that there seems to be no end to the recurring price difficulties in the fed-cattle market in recent years.

As this domestic price situation deteriorated, imports into this country of beef and veal from abroad have been increasing. In 1962 imports of beef and veal reached 1,455 million pounds carcass weight. During January to August of 1963 imports were 22 percent higher than the equivalent period of 1962.

Our cattlemen cannot help but note that beef and veal imports plus the meat equivalent of feeder cattle imports have risen in recent years at a faster rate than U.S. production. In 1962 these imports equaled 10.6 percent of our domestic production as compared with 7.9 percent in 1961.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent that there be printed a series of tables prepared by the U.S. Department of Agriculture which deal with this situation.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*U.S. imports of cattle and beef, lambs, and lamb and mutton compared with production, 1950–63*

CATTLE AND CALVES AND BEEF AND VEAL

Year	Imports				Meat production[3]	Imports as a percentage of production
	Live animals		Meat	Total[2]		
	Number	Meat equivalent[1]				
	Thousand head	*Million pounds*	*Million pounds*	*Million pounds*	*Million pounds*	*Percent*
1950	438	157	348	505	10,764	4.7
1951	220	91	484	575	9,896	5.8
1952	138	47	429	476	10,819	4.4
1953	177	62	271	333	13,953	2.4
1954	71	35	232	267	14,610	1.8
1955	296	93	229	322	15,147	2.1
1956	141	43	211	254	16,094	1.6
1957	703	221	395	616	15,728	3.9
1958	1,126	340	909	1,249	14,516	8.6
1959	688	191	1,063	1,254	14,588	8.6
1960	645	163	775	938	15,835	5.9
1961	1,023	250	1,037	1,287	16,341	7.9
1962	1,232	280	1,445	1,725	16,311	10.6
January–August 1962	583	132	893	1,025	10,895	9.4
January–August 1963	555	118	1,086	1,204	11,386	10.6

LAMBS AND LAMB AND MUTTON

Year	Imports				Meat production[3]	Imports as a percentage of production
	Live animals		Meat	Total[2]		
	Number	Meat equivalent[1]				
	Thousand head	*Million pounds*	*Million pounds*	*Million pounds*	*Million pounds*	*Percent*
1950	97	3	3	6	597	1.0
1951	14	(5)	7	7	521	1.3
1952	(4)	(5)	6	6	648	.9
1953	1	(5)	3	3	729	.4
1954	1	(5)	2	2	734	.3
1955	8	(5)	2	2	758	.3
1956	3	(5)	1	1	741	.1
1957	18	1	4	5	707	.7
1958	40	1	41	42	688	6.1
1959	76	2	104	106	738	14.4
1960	50	1	8	88	768	11.5
1961	1	(3)	101	101	832	12.1
1962	21	1	143	144	809	17.8
January–August 1962	3	(3)	95	95	533	17.8
January–August 1963	1	(3)	115	115	503	22.9

[1] Estimated at 53 percent of the live weight of all dutiable imports of cattle and for lambs an average 30-pound carcass.

[2] Canned and other processed meats have been converted to their carcass weight equivalent.

[3] Total production (including an estimate for farm slaughter).

[4] Less than 500 head.

[5] Less than 500,000 pounds.

TABLE 2.—*U.S. beef and veal imports, carcass weight equivalent*

[In thousands of pounds]

Year	Beef								Total veal	Total beef and veal
	Fresh and frozen	Pickled and cured	Canned	Sausage	Other beef	Other canned n.s.p.f.	Boneless	Total beef		
1954	7,520	27,416	168,784	398	8,187	5,766	12,537	230,608	1,048	231,656
1955	6,112	6,172	172,498	371	8,305	6,629	28,674	228,761	275	229,036
1956	5,140	9,799	143,999	468	7,338	6,915	36,894	210,553	245	210,798
1957	32,863	12,794	188,624	586	7,976	18,975	128,520	390,338	4,873	395,216
1958	58,880	7,250	224,606	874	12,691	176,753	414,488	895,542	13,506	909,048
1959	39,136	8,407	187,441	1,230	10,439	120,083	680,317	1,047,053	16,138	1,063,191
1960	14,685	1,107	151,538	1,135	8,369	26,636	556,765	760,235	15,275	775,510
1961	25,096	1,115	188,563	1,128	10,010	29,833	764,905	1,020,650	16,474	1,037,124
1962	18,767	620	166,238	1,159	16,223	28,908	1,187,632	1,419,547	25,511	1,445,058
1963 (January–August)	12,255	533	148,626	669	12,123	22,461	876,756	1,073,423	12,100	1,085,823

TABLE 3.—*Imports of cattle from Canada and Mexico, excluding breeding animals, 1952 to date*

FROM CANADA

Year	Dutiable cattle (head)				
	700 pounds and over		Under 200 pounds	200 to 699 pounds	Total dutiable cattle
	Cows for dairy purposes	Other			
1952 [1]	4,636	4,244	714	968	10,562
1953 [2]	21,811	22,931	3,515	896	49,153
1954	17,633	46,798	2,872	3,377	70,680
1955	25,252	17,543	3,256	2,218	48,269
1956	22,678	2,914	3,571	1,390	30,553
1957	18,857	186,036	10,486	151,059	366,438
1958	19,586	230,025	13,580	373,671	636,862
1959	14,998	90,259	30,738	186,630	322,625
1960	20,247	60,865	32,079	140,471	253,662
1961	24,972	88,660	28,605	337,452	479,689
1962	15,481	72,205	41,315	351,336	480,337
1963 (January-July)	6,776	34,899	35,471	30,324	107,470

FROM MEXICO

Year	Dutiable cattle (head)				
	700 pounds and over		Under 200 pounds	200 to 699 pounds	Total dutiable cattle
	Cows for dairy purposes	Other			
1952 [3]	2,381	43,617	96	81,185	127,279
1953 [4]	175	25,364	485	101,901	127,925
1954					
1955 [5]	1,424	56,153	539	189,631	247,747
1956	1,684	11,124	848	96,594	110,250
1957	480	44,236	7,914	283,842	336,472
1958	1,255	80,589	3,231	403,166	488,241
1959	1,597	45,697	1,037	317,095	365,426
1960	371	19,631	1,773	369,113	390,888
1961	46	36,410	8,655	497,999	543,110
1962	34	36,732	24,925	690,228	751,919
1963 (January-July)	7	16,078	23,408	391,004	430,497

[1] Imports prohibited beginning Feb. 25, 1962, due to foot-and-mouth disease.
[2] Embargo removed Mar. 1, 1953.
[3] Embargo removed Sept. 1, 1952.
[4] Imports prohibited beginning May 23, 1953.
[5] Embargo removed Jan. 1, 1955.

Source: Compiled from official records of the Bureau of the Census.

TABLE 4.—*U.S. imports of cattle and beef compared with U.S. production, by months, 1958–63*

CATTLE AND CALVES AND BEEF AND VEAL

[In millions of pounds]

	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Year
1958													
Imports [1]	86	90	79	94	96	95	123	112	123	121	111	120	1,249
Domestic production [2]	1,317	1,046	1,0.6	1,113	1,152	1,169	1,244	1,171	1,242	1,323	1,059	1,174	14,086
Imports: Percent of domestic production	6.5	8.6	7.3	8.4	8.3	8.1	9.9	9.6	9.9	9.1	10.5	10.2	8.9
1959													
Imports [1]	103	88	79	108	115	131	108	114	143	86	73	106	1,254
Domestic production [2]	1,202	1,013	1,102	1,172	1,141	1,185	1,246	1,159	1,264	1,278	1,160	1,240	14,162
Imports: Percent of domestic production	8.6	8.7	7.2	9.3	10.1	11.1	8.7	9.8	11.3	6.8	6.3	8.5	8.9
1960													
Imports [1]	73	72	74	90	72	76	85	113	81	64	62	76	938
Domestic production [2]	1,275	1,162	1,284	1,141	1,279	1,332	1,251	1,406	1,399	1,360	1,281	1,229	15,399
Imports: Percent of domestic production	5.7	6.2	5.8	7.9	5.6	5.7	6.8	8.0	5.8	4.7	4.8	6.2	6.1
1961													
Imports [1]	75	66	80	99	78	111	117	153	111	134	151	112	1,287
Domestic production [2]	1,316	1,159	1,324	1,209	1,400	1,412	1,279	1,433	1,352	1,427	1,321	1,240	15,890
Imports: Percent of domestic production	5.7	5.7	6.0	8.2	5.6	7.9	9.1	10.7	8.2	9.4	11.4	9.0	8.1
1962													
Imports [1]	121	98	170	119	99	119	118	182	168	165	191	176	1,725
Domestic production [2]	1,409	1,180	1,310	1,212	1,391	1,348	1,360	1,429	1,275	1,450	1,288	1,215	15,867
Imports: Percent of domestic production	8.6	8.3	13.0	9.8	7.1	8.8	8.7	12.7	13.2	11.4	14.8	14.5	10.9
1963 [3]													
Imports [1]	121	175	158	119	149	125							[3] 847
Domestic production [2]	1,424	1,230	1,344	1,369	1,470	1,373							[3] 8,216
Imports: Percent of domestic production	8.5	14.2	11.8	8.7	10.1	9.1							[3] 10.3

[1] Beef, veal, and meat equivalent of live cattle and calf imports.
[2] Commercial beef and veal production (does not include farm slaughter, which is included in table 1).
[3] 6 months.

TABLE 5.—*U.S. production of beef by major classes, imports and prices, 1947–62*

Year	Production of steer and heifer beef, and veal [1]		Production of cow and bull beef [1]		Imports of beef and veal [2]		Cow and bull beef production plus imports		Prices at Chicago	
	Actual	Per capita	Actual	Per capita	Actual	Per capita	Actual	Per capita	Utility cows	Choice steers
	Million pounds	*Pounds*	*Million pounds*	*Pounds*	*Million pounds*	*Pounds*	*Million pounds*	*Pounds*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*
1947	7,564	53.0	4,025	28.5	64	0.4	4,089	28.7	14.26	26.22
1948	6,495	44.7	3,594	24.8	356	2.4	3,950	27.2	19.49	30.96
1949	7,412	50.2	2,970	20.1	254	1.7	3,224	21.8	16.33	26.07
1950	7,235	48.2	3,150	21.0	505	3.4	3,655	24.3	19.36	29.68
1951	6,543	43.3	2,978	19.7	575	3.8	3,553	23.5	24.48	35.96
1952	7,482	48.8	2,935	19.1	476	3.1	3,411	22.2	19.53	33.18
1953	9,700	62.6	3,746	24.0	333	2.1	4,079	26.1	12.41	24.14
1954	10,031	63.0	4,121	25.9	267	1.7	4,449	28.0	11.46	24.66
1955	10,251	63.2	4,449	27.4	322	2.1	4,771	29.4	11.52	23.16
1956	11,262	68.1	4,369	26.4	254	1.5	4,623	28.0	11.37	22.30
1957	11,208	66.6	4,086	24.3	616	3.7	4,702	27.9	13.61	23.83
1958	10,894	63.6	3,192	18.6	1,249	7.3	4,441	25.9	18.41	27.42
1959	11,278	64.6	2,884	16.5	1,254	7.2	4,138	23.7	17.79	27.83
1960	12,387	69.8	3,012	17.0	938	5.3	3,950	22.3	15.68	26.24
1961	13,137	72.8	2,753	15.3	1,287	7.1	4,040	22.4	15.66	24.65
1962	12,945	70.8	2,922	16.0	1,725	9.4	4,677	25.6	15.50	27.67

[1] Estimated from total commercial slaughter.
[2] Includes meat equivalent of live animals imported.

TABLE 6.—*Meat imports: United States, by country of origin, 1958 to date*

[In millions of pounds]

Product and year	Imports, by country of origin, product weight												Total imports	
	Canada	Mexico	Argentina	Brazil	Denmark	West Germany	Poland	Netherlands	Ireland	Australia	New Zealand	All other	Product weight	Carcass weight equivalent
Beef and veal: [1]														
1958	53.6	75.0	216.7	13.6	2.5	0.3	----------	0.3	23.8	17.7	183.7	32.0	619.2	909
1959	22.6	48.9	128.6	36.0	3.4	.3	----------	.3	42.0	224.0	161.6	54.6	722.3	1,063
1960	18.9	39.1	52.7	9.0	4.5	.3	(2)	.1	52.8	144.7	130.7	39.3	512.6	775
1961	32.3	53.4	65.2	16.3	6.5	.3	0.1	.1	64.4	233.9	154.4	33.5	689.2	1,037
1962	19.4	59.3	55.9	17.2	7.7	.4	.4	.1	70.7	444.9	213.6	49.8	970.9	1,445
1963 (January-July	11.1	39.8	53.5	3.3	.6	.2	1.0	(2)	40.0	253.0	138.3	62.9	603.7	907
Lamb and mutton:														
1958	1.2	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	14.6	7.0	1.2	24.0	24
1959	.8	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	40.6	12.8	2.6	56.8	57
1960	.1	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	38.5	9.1	2.0	49.7	87
1961	.1	(1)	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	(2)	44.6	10.8	.2	55.8	101
1962	.5	----------	.1	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	.2	65.9	11.1	.3	78.2	143
1963 (January-July)	(2)	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	50.1	9.2	.2	59.5	107
Pork:														
1958	61.9	(2)	(2)	----------	38.7	7.0	27.0	44.7	.1	----------	.1	3.3	182.8	193
1959	59.1	(2)	(2)	----------	37.3	4.7	26.9	43.4	.2	----------	.2	3.1	174.9	186
1960	47.3	(2)	(2)	----------	40.7	2.7	35.1	42.0	.2	----------	.1	5.9	171.3	186
1961	44.7	.1	----------	----------	46.2	1.7	34.7	42.0	.2	----------	(2)	5.8	173.7	187
1962	46.8	(2)	----------	----------	63.8	1.3	39.8	43.4	2.0	(2)	.1	7.9	203.8	216
1963 (January-July)	25.7	----------	----------	----------	44.2	.4	25.3	26.4	1.1	----------	(2)	4.3	127.4	135
Total:														
1958	116.7	75.0	216.7	13.6	41.2	7.3	27.0	45.0	23.9	32.3	190.8	36.5	826.0	1,126
1959	82.5	49.0	128.6	36.0	40.7	5.0	26.9	43.7	42.2	264.6	174.6	60.3	954.1	1,306
1960	66.3	39.2	52.7	9.0	45.2	3.0	35.1	42.2	52.9	183.2	139.9	47.2	733.7	1,048
1961	77.1	53.5	65.2	16.3	52.7	2.0	34.8	42.1	64.6	278.5	165.2	39.5	918.7	1,325
1962	66.7	59.3	56.0	17.2	71.5	1.7	40.2	43.5	72.9	510.8	224.8	58.0	1,252.9	1,804
1963 (January-July)	36.8	39.8	53.5	3.3	44.8	.6	26.3	26.4	41.1	303.1	147.5	67.4	790.6	1,149

[1] Includes quantities of other canned, prepared, or preserved meat not elsewhere specified. Assumed to be mostly beef.

[2] Less than 50,000 pounds.

Source: Compiled from official records of the Bureau of the Census.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, George W. Johnson, executive secretary of the Oregon Cattlemen's Association, recently brought to my attention a resolution adopted at the 50th annual convention of the Oregon Cattlemen's Association expressing the deep concern of this important segment of Oregon's agricultural industry with respect to the ever-increasing imports of cattle and beef. I have told my constituents that I shall do everything in my power to seek a sound solution to this difficult problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of November 12 to which I have alluded together with the resolution attached thereto, including the signatures, be printed at this point in my remarks, together with a letter dated November 14 from Mr. F. A. Phillips, of the Baker Production Credit Association, commenting upon the situation.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRINEVILLE, OREG.,
November 12, 1963.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We submit for your consideration resolution No. 1 passed by the Oregon Cattlemen's Association during its 50th annual convention held in Baker, Oreg., November 6-8, 1963.

Attached to the resolution are the signatures of 428 cattlemen and other registered voters of this State who favor the resolution as passed. We hope you will make this the No. 1 order of business for your State and do everything within your power to carry out the wishes of these people.

We are certain you are fully cognizant of how important the cattle industry is to Oregon and to the entire United States. The cattle business is the lifeblood of many of our rural communities. The economic stability of many small business firms throughout the State will rise and fall depending on the stability of the cattle producer.

The past year and a half the imports of beef and veal increased to such an extent that it is now having a depressing effect on cattle prices. If these excessive imports of meat from foreign nations continue without restrictions it will be real detrimental to the cattle industry and to the total economy of Oregon.

May we emphasize that we do not ask that the imports of meat be eliminated or that the cattlemen are asking for a Government subsidy. We only ask for reasonable protection against the large importation of cheap meat that will have a depressing effect on our own market. We ask that our rights not be bartered away but that we have reasonable protection under the Constitution of the United States so that we may continue to have a reasonable income somewhat commensurate with other phases of society.

Thank you for any assistance you may render.

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE W. JOHNSON,
Executive Secretary, Oregon Cattlemen's Association.

RESOLUTION 1

"Whereas cattle and beef imports are arriving in the United States in ever-increasing quantities and depressing beef cattle prices; and

"Whereas these depressed cattle prices represent a tremendous loss to the economy of Oregon and the Nation and jeopardize the future success of the beef cattle industry in the Nation: Be it

"*Resolved,* That the Oregon Cattlemens' Association ask Congress and/or the executive branch of the Federal Government to provide the beef cattle industry with realistic protection against excessive cattle and beef imports through a system of higher tariffs or quotas or both; be it further

"*Resolved,* That all efforts be made to delete cattle and beef from the list of commodities on which tariff concessions are to be granted at the forthcoming Geneva Trade Negotiations."

We the undersigned cattle people of Oregon strongly urge you support the above resolution:

C. M. Otler, Diamond, Oreg., rancher; Larry H. Davis, Portland Oreg., restaurant; John A. Marshall, Klamath Falls, rancher; Clarence Dallas, Lakeview, rancher; Virginia Dallas, Lakeview, rancher-housewife; Mrs. J. E. Simmons, cattleman; Mr. and Mrs. Norman Hansen, ranchers; J. E. Herburger, Northwest Livestcok P.C.A.; Larry Walterman, rancher; Samuel Sokol, rancher; Mr. and Mrs. Patrick C. Morrissey, rancher; Mr. and Mrs. Dale Ellis, traders; Candael E. Cook, nutritionist; C. C. McDonald, Lakeview, Oreg.; Eloise McKettrick, Baker, Oreg.; Betty Hardman, Baker, Oreg.; Wallace E. Hardman, Baker, Oreg.; Oran McKettrick, Baker, Oreg.; Roger Fuen, SCS Keating treasurer; Fred Jay Wans, RR., Baker, Oreg.; Leil Hahan, rancher; Tom Boyd, N. Powder.

Henry E. Rooper, Wasco Co.; Sellah F. Rooper, The Dalles; Bert W. Hawkins, rancher; Helen T. Hawkins, rancher; Eugene B. Perkins, rancher; Chas. M. Carlton & Sons, rancher; Mark Binkmiaier, Enterprise; Mrs. Marian Binkmiaier, Enterprise; Roscoe E. Duncan, Baker; Gaylord Monda, Baker; Bert Gagler, rancher; Geo. W. Gross, Durkee; Dorothy E. Gross, Durkee; Hanluss H. Wendt, Baker, Oreg.; John S. Leffert, Baker, Oreg.; Morm Kolb, Baker, Oreg.; Mrs. Harlan H. Wendt, Baker, Oreg.; Mrs. John Hawkins, Baker, Oreg.; Bert Hart, Heppner; Charles R. Kopp, cattleman; Mrs. Charles R. Kopp, housewife; H. L. Smith, First Nat'l Bank of Oreg.; Fred Offenbacher, cattleman; C. C. Jones, G.E. Co.; J. Offenbacher, U.S. Nat'l Bank; Rod Wright, cattleman; Norman Jacobs, cattleman, Klamath; Glenn Troglan, cattleman, Klamath; Thomas G. Kelly, John S. Osborn.

Juan Breaks, rancher; Roxie Cutting; Helen M. Langley, rancher; Harland E. Langley, rancher; Morton Naylor, Milton Meander, Morton Davis, Union, Farmer; Fred Lemcke, John Day, rancher; Edith Lemcke, John Day, rancher; Charles Locey, Ironside, Oreg.; W. R. Sanilan, Baker, Oreg.; H. L. Wellman, Baker, Oreg.; John A. Payton, Baker, Oreg.; J. W. Freeman, Baker, Oreg.; Luoni E. Bermhoff, Baker, Oreg.;

Robert McMunn, Pocatello, Idaho; Clinton L. Kuhl, Jr., John Day, Oreg.; Lowell Hirsch, Huntington, Oreg.; Jerry Breese, rancher; Doug Breese, rancher; Ira Stewart, Brownsville, Oreg.; Crystock, Brownsville, Oreg.; Annie Williams, Canyon City, Oreg.; S. L. Williams, Canyon City, Oreg.; Blanche and Everett L. Miller, Jordan Valley, Oreg.; Mrs. Clyde Ward, Baker, Oreg.; Clyde Ward, Baker, Oreg.; Bruce Boos, Hereford; Helene Kelly, Angus; Herb Kelly, Hereford.

D. C. Benton, mayor of Baker; Charlotte Ward, Clyde Ward & Sons; Bill Frinstt, Baker; Norma Elliott, Bridgeport, Oreg.; Marianne G. Shurtliff, Baker, Oreg.; J. W. Richardson, Madras rancher; W. J. McNult, Ontario, Oreg.; Estel B. Moser, Jamison, Oreg.; Harvey Jacobs, Baker; Alice Norton, Baker; John M. Young, Redmond, Oreg.; Dorothy Mackenzie, Pendleton, Oreg.; Mrs. Henry Lazinka, Ukiah, Oreg.; Mrs. Bob Lazinka, Ukiah, Oreg.; Conant J. Paxton, Baker, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Myron Miles, Baker, Oreg.; Daniel Llendy, Richland, Oreg.; M. J. Galliger, North Powder; Ralph M. Carlburgh, Haines, Oreg.; George V. Nigolesen, Richland, Oreg.; James Passman, Baker, Oreg., P.C.A.; Chas. C. Duby, Keating, Oreg.; Tom Collyn, Ritter, Oreg.; Daniel A. Withers, Paisley, Oreg.; Tom Colvier Jr., Ritter, Oreg.; Irving Shanbro, Prairie City; Mrs. James Teater, Post; Wm. McCormack, Prineville; Donna McCormack, Prineville.

Eve Colton, Medicine Springs Route, Baker, Oreg.; Herb B. Deneret, Myrtle Point, Oreg., Cowbeelee; Jane Harper, Route 1, Box 161, Brooks, Oreg.; Mr. James Burke, Keating, Oreg.; Blossom Burke, Keating, Oreg.; Wayne Troy, Pleasant Valley, Oreg.; Helen Troy, Pleasant Valley, Oreg.; Bob Ciesiel, Baker, Oreg.; Manbeben Ciesiel, Baker, Oreg.

Mr. and Mrs. Ted Arnoldus, North Powder, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Bernal Coles, Haines, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Lew Robbins, Baker; Mr. and Mrs. W. B. Hall, Baker; Mary G. Otley, Diamond, Oreg.; Edyth Bohnert, Central Point, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Carl D. Anderson, Condon, Oreg.; Vernon Z. Jacobson, Baker, Oreg.; Lela A. Jacobson, Baker, Oreg.; Kathryn Nelson, Hereford, Oreg.; Hazel Warner, Baker; Sylvia Warner, Harrisburg, Nebr.; Ed J. Warner, Baker, Oreg.; Blanche S. Miller, Jordan Valley, Oreg.; Lorraine S. Woodridge, Maupin, Oreg.; Ed R. Jackmore, Corvalles, Oreg.; Rod McCullough, Baker, Oreg.; Joann B. Boyer, Haines, Oreg.; Mrs. Syd Johnson, Baker, Oreg.; Robert J. Steward, Baker, Oreg.

Mr. and Mrs. Jack Raburn, Madras, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Bill Johns, Athens, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Frank E. Widman, Baker, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Wm. Schaan, Baker; Mr. and Mrs. L. H. Schilky, Baker, Oreg; Mr. and Mrs. H. P. Glenn, North Powder, Oreg.; G. Ann Smith, Mitchell, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. F. C. Cherry, Mitchell, Oreg.; Lucile Thompson, Diamond, Oreg.; Joe Beach, Enterprise, Oreg.; Lillian Beach, Enterprise, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Donald Sullivan, Hereford, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Joe Logsdon, Hereford, Oreg.; Elizabeth Campbell, Klamath Falls; Olive H. Marshall, Klamath Falls, Oreg.; J. E. Simmons, Redmond, Oreg.; Mrs. J. E. Simmons, Redmond, Oreg.; Bill M. Russell, Lake Oswego; Pat Russell, Lake Oswego, Oreg.; J. S. Vincent, Portland, Oreg.; Mrs. Ermire Davis, North Powder, Oreg.; Rita Jackson, North Powder, Oreg.; Jean Sheffert, Baker, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Mell Tingle, Madras, Oreg.; Mrs. Paul Schoen, Madras, Oreg.

O. D. Hotchkiss, rancher and stockraiser; Roy N. Andotrom, stockman; Jack E. Johns, rancher and stockman; Gene Officer, rancher; Joe W. Officer, rancher and stockman; Mrs. Jack Officer, rancher and stockman; Wm. F. Peitz, farmer; D. E. Jones and son, stockman; Annie Perkins, stockwoman; Mrs. Harry Elliott, stockwoman; Harry Elliott, stockman; Mrs. H. B. Daniels; George A. Johnson, heating; Mr. and Mrs. John Chohlis, editor; Don Tippett, stockman; Geo. W. Johnson, see OCA; Mr. and Mrs. Marvin Darby, ranchers; Mr. and Mrs. T. G. Barnard, State land board; R. C. Holloway, taxpayer; Bill Bird, Halfway; Duane Bunch Durher, rancher; Frank J. Gardner, rancher; Paul Schoen, Madras, Oreg.; Dan Warnock, Baker; Millie Perrini, Sumpter Valley; Clyde Perrini, Sumpter Valley; Dornn Furman; Mrs. Floyd Vaughan, Durkee, Oreg.

Mr. and Mrs. Tom Demley, Baker, Oreg.; Celia Titus, Durkee, rancher; Mrs. R. H. Becker, Cove, rancher; R. H. Becker, Cove, rancher; Lester Robinson, Union, rancher; Bernice Staggs, Baker, rancher; Jim L. Staggs, Eleanor H. Davis, Union, rancher; Theron King, Pendleton, farmer; Mrs. Theron King, Pendleton, housewife; Mrs. Rives Waller, Baker; Rives Waller, Baker, Oreg.; Lanita Lacey, Ironside, rancher; Jo Ellen Sinclair, Effie Wellman, Baker; Florence Pavton, Baker; Nilens R. Freeman, Baker, Sutton Creek; Mrs. Bill Kuhl, Baker; Mrs. Bob Thomas, Baker; Bob Thomas, Baker; Mrs. Robert McMinn, Pocatella, Idaho; Henry M. Heyden, La Grande, Oreg.; Margaret Kuhl, John Day, Oreg.; Mrs. Lowell Hursh, Huntington, Oreg.; Doris Boren, Prineville, Oreg.; Edna Heyden, La Grande, Oreg.; Tom Cline, Milton, Freewater; Sadie Rich, Hubbard, Oreg.; Priday B. Holmes.

Virgil Elliott, Bridgeport, Oreg.; Norma A. Richardson, rancher; Mr. and Mrs. J. C. Cecil, retired; Mr. and Mrs. Carl Mazo, Riley, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Walt Sehrock, Bend, Oreg.; Harry Burkhardt, Vale, Oreg.; Thomas B. Joyce, Juntura, Oreg., cattleman; Rodney Rosebrook, Bend, Oreg., cattleman; Bill Chastain, Baker, Oreg.; Estel Powers, Travis I. Powers, Harold Bryan, Hermiston, Oreg.; Vian Hotchkiss, Baker, Oreg.; Al Cheney, Deora, Colo.; Robert Nelson, Hereford, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Wallace Ragsdale, Eagle Point, Oreg.; J. F. Walton, Long Creek; O. F. Hutton, Keating; Harry C. Gerher, Klamath Falls, livestock; Bob Lemcke, Seneca, Oreg.; Florence Lemcke, Seneca, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Dan Forsea; Mr. and Mrs. Emery Cox, Haines, stockman; Mr. and Mrs. W. H. Govern, Haines; Florence Fenamormee, Medford; Walter S. Swikers, Jr., Richland; Willard Bunche, Baker, Oreg; Mary C. Ridstrom, rancher; Pauline Yancey, rancher, Prineville, Oreg.; Dorothy A. Peetz, farmer's wife.

Lanta M. Burnside, Richland, Oreg.; Mary Skorus, Richland, Oreg.; Paul Lorning, Haines, Oreg.; Orville Fisher, Haines, Oreg.; George F. Bilber, Baker, Oreg.; Brookit Tyyne Hawley, Sumpter Valley, Oreg.; M. L. Jackson, Mitchell, Oreg.; Oscar Lee Jacobson, Haines, Oreg.; Elmer Jackson, Mitchell, Oreg.; Geo. B. Russell, Vale, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Tom McElroy, Vale, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Paul Stewart, Caldwell, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. D. E. Clark, Baker, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Herbert Chandla, Baker, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Harvey Winedt, Baker, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Carroll Lacey, Ironside, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Grabner, Baker, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. W. E. Justus, Haines, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Andrew J. Monrow, Madras, Oreg.; J. A. Macy, Madras, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. E. Brent Perkins, Baker, Oreg.; Mr. and Mrs. Earl Heize, Baker; Earl Heize, Baker, Oreg.; Helen M. King, Baker, Oreg.

Mrs. M. S. Hanan, Paisley, Oreg.; M. S. Hanan, Paisley, Oreg.; Dave Clark, Jr.; Walter Jacobson, North Paisley, Oreg.; C. E. Davis, North Paisley, Oreg.; Paul Miller, Cutters Bend, Oreg.; Mrs. Paul Miller, Cutters Bend, Oreg.; Bob Fletcher; Walde Markgraf, rancher; Mrs. Walde Markgraf, rancher; Mr. and Mrs. Virgin Puquet, ranchers, Carl Warner, rancher, Baker, Oreg.; Gladys Clark, rancher, Paisley; Lloyd T. Woodside, Maupin, Oreg.; Edw. Sullivan and Sons; Arleta Turner, rancher, Medical Springs, Oreg.; Bob and Janet Teppett, Mortgage Ins. Corp.; Mr. and Mrs. Jack Wilson, North Powder; Mrs. Dan Tiphett; Mrs. Wilfred Daggett; Wilfred Daggett, Enterprise, Oreg.

Mr. and Mrs. Bill Duff, Adams, Oreg., cattlemen and rancher, wheat; Hallie Daniels, livestock; Mr. and Mrs. Ted Ryan, Trumaterials, Inc.; Earl Smith, Mitchell, Oreg.; Alice Warnock, in care of Sumpter Stag; Mr. and Mrs. Dan Warnock, Jr., rancher and banker; J. Q. Freeman, Baker; F. A. Phillips Baking Co.; B. D. Kuhl, Dom, Baker, Oreg.; Robert Warner, Harrisburg, Nebr.; Dorro C. Sokol, Prairie City, Oreg.; Earl J. Charton, Baker, Oreg., Baker Lumber Mills, Inc.; Melvin E. Tingle, Madras, Oreg.; Bill A. Mazer, McNary, Oreg.; Grace K. Williams, Canyon City; Betty Ellis, Richland; Margaret Stewart, Keating; Palma Rouse, Baker; Jack Rouse, Baker; A. E. Anderson, Lakeview; Fred Anderson, Lakeview; C. J. Croghan, Lakeview; Mrs. C. J. Croghan, Lakeview; M. R. Tidmore, Richland; Bettie Anne Warner, Baker; Mr. Bonnie Graham, Rancher.

Carrie Hoke Lester, president, Cunningham Sheep Co.; Robert Lister, Pendleton, Oreg.; Mau Roughnock, Burns Star-Rob Bend; Roland Ebell, rancher; Grady Romans, rancher; James Cummings, Sr., rancher; Dick Hotchkiss, rancher; Kenneth Ramon, rancher; Bernard Allen, rancher; John Bohmert, rancher; Maude T. Johnson, Bates, Oreg.; Katherine Walton, Long Creek; Dean Forth, Reeth, Oreg.; Ray O. Peterson, Klamath Falls; Myron Harper, Brooks, Oreg.; M. O. Galligin, North Paradox; Mr. and Mrs. Charles C. Ebell, Baker; Jack Travis, Hood River; Donald S. Yancey, cattle; Daniel T. Murphy; Margorie Hankins, Baker, Oreg.; Vi Gouldin, livestock; Alvin Bishman, stockman; John Colton, Jr., farmer; Gene Duncan; Boyd Smith, Leslie Salt Co., Leslie; Ted Hyde, Klamath Falls; Dose Campbell, Klamath Falls; George N. Holcomb, Richland, Oreg.; Wadian Holcomb, Richland, Oreg.

Jack L. McClellan, cattleman; Dr. A. M. Morgan, veterinarian; J. W. McClaran, cattleman; James D. Aleppell, cattleman; John Harkins, cattleman; Eugene Choal, Sr., cattleman; Wayne Ryan, cattleman; Leon Thompson, cattleman; Harold Otley, rancher; Gordon Stanley, rancher; Howard W. Smith, rancher; Fred B. Pistrar, fossil; Grace Toby; August Tobey; D. Seger, baker; Joseph V. Worthman, Creswolf; Sharon Kaye, Klamath Falls; Yarusky Laudt Cattle Co., Klamath Falls; Stiner Kasby, Durtee; Richard L. Offenbarke, Zackgrinelle; Wallace B. Demen, Myrtle Point, Oreg., cattleman; Don Holehfers, cattleman; Wade Office, Seneca, Oreg., cattleman; Joe Olivee, cattleman; Bob White, Jr., Larson, Oreg.; R. L. Weir, cattleman; W. Marshall, cattleman; Charles Jones, cattleman; Jack E. Jones, cattleman.

BAKER PRODUCTION CREDIT ASSOCIATION,
Baker, Oreg., November 14, 1963.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Oregon cattlemen held their 50th annual conference here in Baker, November 6, 7, 8, 1963. They passed a resolution on the meat imports with over 300 individual signatures attached to the resolution. I think you have received a copy by this time.

If we do not get stiff duties and low quotas on imported meat right away, we will soon be in the position we were in in 1932 when Jesse Jones of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation called a group of cattlemen and cornbelt operators and bankers together. Out of this meeting came the setting up of the Regional Agiculture Credit Corporation to loan money to the farmers and cattlemen to get wheels rolling again.

The fat cattle market has declined steadily the past 6 months and is now selling 6 to 7 cents below what it was 6 months ago. This decline in fat cattle prices has caused the feedlot people who finish cattle for the market to lose anywhere from $40 to $50 per head on their operation, and these losses are reflected back to the producers who grow

> the feeder cattle. If this condition continues very long, the entire economy of the country will be wrecked.
>
> The Baker PCA has loaned ranchers and stockmen this year in excess of $20 million. We furnish them with all their operating expenses and in turn get all the receipts of their sales, so we know what their losses are. The income from the ranchers and farmers of Baker County over 85 percent comes from livestock so a loss to those farmers is very depressing to our economy.
>
> * * * * *
>
> We are hoping that our delegation in Congress will get behind this Simpson bill or some other bill that will give us relief from this Australian and New Zealand beef.
>
> Thanking you in advance for anything you may be able to do for us in this matter, I am,
>
> Respectfully yours,
>
> F. A. PHILLIPS.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in bringing these points to the attention of the Senate, I think I have an obligation to direct to the attention of the Department of State the fact that there is serious concern lest in our GATT negotiations the interests of American agriculture be sacrificed.

In my judgment, our negotiators at the GATT conference should keep in mind that the best interests of the United States are served if American agriculture is maintained in a strong and solvent condition. If the economic situation of American agriculture deteriorates as the result of concessions made by the State Department, I feel sure that there are a great many American citizens who will be demanding an explanation from Congress.

THE PROPOSED APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION IN THE PENDING INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the acting majority leader for a moment. I may not be here and I may not return in time for a vote tomorrow on the pending business, although I think I probably shall. The Senator from Minnesota has been at meetings such as the one I am going to attend, in which we have been rushed for time. He knows that I do not hesitate to ask my host to have me speak either before the meal or during the meal. I shall do that in New York City tomorrow noon, so that if possible I can get back in time for the vote and discussion tomorrow afternoon on the pending matter.

My speech tomorrow will be on foreign policy. It will be before a citizens group which I believe is entitled to hear a discussion of that subject matter. In my judgment it is very much in the interest of my administration to give the speech. I am going for that purpose.

Because the Senators in charge of the bill are not on the floor, I wish to make this statement. Then I would appreciate it, in my absence, if the majority leader would call the attention of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] to the statement I am now making for the record, so that he may answer it tomorrow afternoon, in case I do not get back in time to call it to his attention myself.

A number of Oregon scientists have expressed to me their concern over the language in the House report, page 16, concerning the National Science Foundation, which states:

> NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
>
> The committee is concerned at the rapidly rising cost of Government support of research. The only increase recommended for the Foundation in 1964 is for the cost of pay act increases. Funds are not recommended for any of the new programs proposed in the 1964 budget estimate. The committee requests that no new programs be started. The amount approved in the bill for 1964 is $323,200,000. This is $265,800,000 below the amount requested.

I note that the Senate committee report on page 21 states with respect to the restored $50 million:

> The amount restored is recommended for addition to the educational programs.

Am I correct in my interpretation that by this language the committee intends that the $50 million can be used to fund new starts contained in the budget estimates?

I wish the Senator from Minnesota would get an answer for me in my absence, for legislative history purposes, because I am very much concerned about the inadequacy of funds for fundamental research in the sciences. Basic research is needed if we are to solve the problems which confront the welfare of the American people in the fields other than military security. It is so easy to come before the Senate with the old scare argument "We need these millions and billions of dollars for security and research." What about heart research? What about research in arthritis and cancer? What about inadequate support for research in the whole field of health? What about basic physical, chemical, and biological research? We ought to do a much better job. The bill worries me from the standpoint that so much is proposed for so-called security research but so little for human welfare.

I want the Senator from Minnesota to know what prompts this question that seeks to make a legislative history on this subject. There is at the University of Oregon a great scientist in chemistry, Dr. Novak. He has been in Washington for a week. He has expressed to me his deep concern about the restrictions of the bill in the field about which I am speaking. He is an objective man, a dedicated scientist. He lives and moves and has his being in the intellectual world. I am sure the Senator from Minnesota will understand that I pay him no disrespect when I say that Dr. Novak lives in a world that the Senator and I really cannot begin to comprehend, for our world is so different from his. He good naturedly said:

> Senator, I am no politician. I haven't any idea about political matters. I am sure there must be some reason, politically, for the bill being in its present form, but I cannot understand that. However, I know what we need if we are to do a job in the research divisions of universities that the American people are entitled to have their Government help us do.

Listening to a man such as that, one knows he is humble, because he is acting completely in the realm of idealism and of dedication to finding the facts. He opened new vistas to me, as we discussed the bill. I do not think that in the hurly-burly of tomorrow, when we come to vote on the bill, we can justify the oversight of not pausing long enough to make this legislative record to give some assurance that this rather sweeping language in the House version will not prevent the agencies of our Government, which otherwise would cooperate with this scientist and his colleagues, from making available money that could be used in new projects, programs that he has in mind, including the building of the necessary facilities, because research cannot go on without properly equipped laboratories.

That is why I am speaking at this rather late hour. I apologize to the Senator from Minnesota for keeping him here this long, but he and I, whether others may fully appreciate it, are working for a great cause these minutes, for if he and I can make a contribution to the legislative history of the bill, a history which will result in the interpretation I am making of our own Senate committee's language—I think it is a fair interpretation—then at least we will not have slammed the door in the faces of the doctors Novak, who are dedicated scientists, devoted to trying to do something for human welfare in their various research laboratories, by working on projects not connected with security, but connected, in the last analysis, with human understanding and happiness.

I will appreciate it if the Senator will help me in this endeavor during my absence tomorrow.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I welcome the request of the Senator from Oregon. I assure him that it will be honored. I will ask the cooperation of the officers of the Majority Policy Committee to communicate with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] promptly tomorrow morning, so that this portion of the record, as outlined by the Senator from Oregon, may be brought to Senator MAGNUSON's attention. I am confident that the response by the Senator from Washington will be along the lines of the interpretation of the Senator from Oregon concerning the additional $50 million that was provided by the Senate committee.

I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations. My recollection of the addition of $50 million is that it was to permit the National Science Foundation to engage in new programs and also in the construction of new facilities that are necessary for upgrading the graduate study programs in the great universities.

The Senator from Oregon is exactly correct when he says that the best facilities and the extra moneys are needed for the graduate study programs themselves. I for one am much discouraged by the action of the Senate committee. I had proposed in committee that we restore up to $500 million. The administration asked for $500 million in its budget request. I had asked that at least

$500 million be provided, since the programs of the National Science Foundation are so basic to the long-term national interest.

It is the National Science Foundation that really provides the seed-bed money, so to speak, for intellectual attainment and scientific progress. The Senator from Oregon will have my enthusiastic cooperation.

I understand the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] intends to offer an amendment tomorrow to increase the amount of funds for the National Science Foundation; in other words, to bring the amount somewhat closer to the administration's request. The House figure leaves us exactly where we were, except a little worse off. In the meantime, some costs have risen. This is particularly true of scientific equipment. There has been an increase in the cost of certain kinds of necessary equipment, especially laboratory equipment. Therefore, the action of the other body with respect to the National Science Foundation is not one that puts us ahead but, at best, holds us still or holds us on the same course as last year. I think it permits a retreat.

So when we go to conference, we ought to have more than the $50 million added by the Senate committee as a part of the increase. I know that the Senator from Oregon will agree with me in that observation.

Mr. MORSE. I agree completely with the Senator from Minnesota. I thank him for his interest.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

DR. JAMES T. MADDUX—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 43)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a veto message from the President of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Walters in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, returning, without his approval, S. 1201 for the relief of Dr. James T. Maddux, which, without objection, will be printed in the Record without being read, and, with the accompanying bill, will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and will be printed:

To the U.S. Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 1201, "for the relief of Dr. James T. Maddux."

Dr. Maddux is an employee in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration. The bill would direct payment to him of the difference in salary between that which he received for the period July 9, 1961, through February 17, 1962, as a physician in the associate grade and that which he would have received had his promotion to full-grade physician been made effective on the earlier date, which was the date he first became eligible for this advancement. The records of the Veterans' Administration show that promotion of Dr. Maddux was not administratively approved until February 18, 1962, because of an inadvertent misfiling of his papers.

While this occurrence was unfortunate, the promotion which was thereby delayed was not owing to Dr. Maddux as a matter of right. No employee of the Veterans' Administration's Department of Medicine and Surgery has an absolute right to a promotion at any given time or according to a given schedule. The regulations which provided for Dr. Maddux's eligibility did not of themselves confer a promotion, but provided only for orderly consideration of the question of his advancement. To approve this bill would be to encourage employees to make a contrary assumption concerning regulations of this character, and it would lead to claims for retroactive compensation on the basis of details in the handling of promotion documents. Such undesirable results would be all the more likely because the bill suggests that a promotion should be effective on the very first day an individual becomes eligible for it, a rule which is not practical in a vast number of cases.

In these circumstances, I find myself unable to approve S. 1201.

John F. Kennedy.

The White House, *November 19, 1963.*

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS—SPEECH BY PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate the important address the President made in Miami, last night. The President was speaking before the Inter-American Press Association; and in his speech on the Alliance for Progress and the problems confronting this hemisphere, he spoke frankly and from great knowledge.

The President did not minimize the problems facing the Alianza, nor did he yield to the temptation to seek easy solutions. It often seems that people view Latin America in only two ways: either they think Castro is the sole problem; or they despair and say that nothing can be done—that it is just too great a problem. The President, being knowledgeable and deeply committed to the advancement of hemispheric relations—the traditional policy of Democratic administrations—took a more intelligent and detached view of the situation.

So far as Castro and Cuba are concerned, the President enunciated a solution for the people of that unfortunate island. The problem, the President said, is not Cuba; it is Castro and Communism. He continued:

> Once this barrier is removed we will be ready and anxious to work with the Cuban people in pursuit of those progressive goals which a few short years ago stirred the sympathy of many people throughout the hemisphere.

This should allay any doubts which any citizen of Latin America might have had about the source of irritation in Cuba. We are not against progress or against reform. We are its advocates and proponents. We are against those who enforce tyranny on their people and try to export to their neighbors this evil commodity.

In the more complex area of positive action for the future, the President divided his approach into four fronts: First, the front of social justice; second, the front of economic welfare; third, the front of political democracy and stability; and fourth, the front of international responsibility. In each of these areas he offered his view on what constructive steps could be taken to improve the situation. His thought-provoking statements should be read and studied by anyone who wishes to be informed on this vital program.

It is very advantageous that our President can speak with such knowledge and compassion to members of the inter-American press. Not only does he demonstrate his grasp and interest in problems which are extremely important to the citizens of these countries, but he also admirably represents the intentions and interest of the citizens of the United States. We are fortunate to have such representation.

I ask unanimous consent that the President's speech be made a part of the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TEXT OF PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS TO PRESS ASSOCIATION

I'm very proud to be here tonight. I'm particularly interested in the fact that two of our distinguished guests this evening are former Prime Ministers of Peru and are now publishers of newspapers. It does suggest to those who hold office that when the time comes that if, as they say in the United States, if you can't beat them, join them—and

This association and its members carry a very large responsibility for the defense of freedom in the hemisphere. Through the press, you create the vital public awareness of our responsibility and appreciation of our dangers.

Your work to fulfill this responsibility, and the courageous fight of your association for freedom of the press and the liberty of the citizens make me very proud to come to this meeting.

I want to commend the American publishers who are here for their interest in the Inter-American Association. And I want to express a very warm welcome to those of you who have come from our sister republics to visit our country on this important occasion.

I think it's appropriate that this meeting should take place as the annual review of the Alliance for Progress at São Paulo has ended. That Congress and Conference has reviewed our progress, examined our defects—on occasion, applauded our achievement. It has been a forum for discussion and critical analysis.

A COMMON DEDICATION

And if one fact emerges from that meeting it is, despite differences on specific problems, there is a common dedication to a common belief in the fundamental principles of the Charter of Punta del Este, in the soundness, the urgency and I believe the inevitability of the Alianza Para el Progreso.

Indeed, it could not be otherwise. For those principles, the goals and the methods of the Alliance, represent the only hope whereby men of good will can obtain progress without despotism, social justice without social terror. And it is on the Alliance for Progress that we base our common hope for the future. That hope is for a hemisphere where every man has enough to eat and a chance to work; where every child can learn and every family can find decent shelter. It is for a hemisphere where every man, from the American Negro to the Indian of the Altiplano, can be liberated from the bonds of social injustice, free to pursue his talents as far as they will take him.

It is a hope for a hemisphere of nations, each confident in the strength of its own independence, devoted to the liberty of its citizens, and joined with all the nations of the West in an association based on national strength and a common dedication to freedom. For we all share in this hemisphere a common heritage. And if the idea of Atlantic community is to have full meaning it must include the nations of Latin America.

The fulfillment of these hopes is not an easy task.

It is important that the people of the United States, on whom much responsibility rests, realize how enormous that task is.

They can see its dimensions in the fact that Latin America is the fastest growing continent in the world. Its population has increased 10 percent in the past 10 years. Its almost 200 million people will be 400 million people by the 1980's.

They can see its dimensions in the fact that tens of millions of their neighbors in the south exist in poverty with annual incomes of less than $100—that life expectancy in almost half the countries of Latin America is less than 50 years—that half of the children have no schools to attend—that almost half the adults can neither read nor write—that tens of millions of city dwellers live in unbearable slums—millions more live in rural areas and suffer from easily curable diseases yet without hope of treatment—that in vast areas men and women are crippled by hunger while we possess in the United States the scientific tools necessary to grow all the food we need.

These problems—the hard reality of life in much of Latin America—will not be solved simply by complaining about Castro, by blaming all problems on communism or generals or nationalism. The harsh facts of poverty and social injustice will not yield easily to promises or good will. The task we have set for ourselves in the Alliance for Progress, the development of an entire continent, is a far greater task than any we have ever undertaken in our history. It will require difficult and painful labor over a long period of time. Despite the enormity of these problems and our heavy responsibility, the people of the United States have been asked to sacrifice relatively little.

Less than 1 percent of our Federal budget is allocated to assist half a hemisphere. It is the people of Latin America who must undergo the agonizing process of reshaping institutions, not the people of the United States.

It is the people of Latin America who must draw up development programs and mobilize their total resources to finance those programs, not the people of the United States.

It is the people of Latin America whose cities and farms, homes and halls of government will bear the shockwaves of rapid change and progress, not the people of the United States.

It is the people of Latin America who will have to modify the traditions of centuries—not the people of the United States. Certainly we in the United States cannot fail to do so little when so much is at stake for so many.

The last 2½ years have been a time of trial and experiment. We have labored to build a structure of cooperation and common effort for years to come. No nation in the Americas can deny that much more must be done to strengthen and speed our efforts; that there have not been setbacks and disappointments. That is why we intend to support strongly the leadership of the new inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress and why we are working to clear away unnecessary obstacles to the swift administration of U.S. contributions.

But necessary concentration on obstacles and improvements should not obscure the fact that the Alianza Para el Progreso has also made important progress. We have created new machinery for inter-American cooperation.

The United States has committed $2.3 billion to the Alianza and the Latin American nations have committed billions more. In many countries there have been new efforts at land reforms and tax reforms, education and agriculture.

The basic issues of progress and reform, long ignored, have become the battleground of the political forces of the hemisphere. And on the economic front, last year 10 of the 19 Latin American countries exceeded the per capita growth of 2.5 percent established by the Charter of Punta del Este.

CALL FOR STABILITY

Nor can the failure of some to meet the goals of the charter be placed wholly on the shortcomings of the Alliance. No amount of external resources, no stabilization of commodity prices, no new inter-American institutions can bring progress to nations which do not have political stability and determined leadership.

No series of hemispheric agreements or elaborate machinery can help those who lack internal discipline, who are unwilling to make sacrifices and renounce privileges. No one who sends his money abroad, who is unwilling to invest in the future of his country, can blame others for the deluge which threatens to overcome and overwhelm him. For the Alianza Para el Progreso is not an external aid program. It is more than a cooperative effort to finance development plans. It is a battle for the progress and freedom of all of our nations.

And it must be fought on every front of national interest and national need. First is the front of social justice. It is impossible to have real progress as long as millions are shut out from opportunity and others forgiven obligations. In my own country we have prepared legislation and mobilized the strength of the Federal Government to insure to American Negroes and all other minorities access to the benefits of American society. Others must also do the same for the landless campesino, the underprivileged slum dweller, the oppressed Indian.

Privilege is not easily yielded up. But until the interests of a few yield to the interest of the nation, the promise and modernization of our society will remain a mockery to millions of our citizens.

The second front is the front of economic welfare; the principle that every American has the right to a decent life for himself and a better life for his children.

This means we must continue to perfect national development plans; to improve financing machinery and institutions. It means that every nation must be willing to make sacrifices and mobilize its own resources for development.

It also means that the United States of America must live up to the full its commitment to provide continuing help. I have pledged the full energies of this Government to insure that commitment will be met. And it's my hope that the Congress of the United States and the people of the United States will recognize not only the obligation that lies upon them but also the opportunity.

ALLIANCE DOES NOT DICTATE

In pursuit of economic welfare the Alianza does not dictate to any nation how to organize its economic life. Every nation is free to shape its own economic institutions, in accordance with its own national needs and will. However, just as no country can tell another how it must order its economy, no nation should act within its own borders so as to violate the rights of others under accepted principles of international law.

Private enterprise also has an important place in the Alliance for Progress. There is not enough available public capital either in the United States or Latin America to carry development forward at the pace that is demanded. Yet the net flow of foreign capital alone was almost $250 million less this year than last—a third as much as the entire request to the U.S. Congress for assistance funds in this hemisphere.

If encouraged, private investment, responsive to the needs, the laws and the interest of the nation, can cooperate with public activity to provide the vital margin of success as it did in the development of all the nations of the West and most especially in the development of the United States of America.

This country would not have achieved its present growth rate if it had not been for the development capital—the private development capital—that came to this country, especially in the years prior to World War I, when the United States was an underdeveloped country.

If we are to have the growth essential to the requirements of our people in this hemisphere, then an atmosphere must be developed and maintained that will encourage the flow of capital in response to opportunity. Today that capital is moving into growth here in the United States and into Western Europe. Together we must provide the environment that will encourage its flow to Latin America.

And third, is the front of political democracy and stability. This is at the core of our hopes for the future.

There can be no progress and stability if people do not have hope for a better life tomorrow. That faith is undermined when men seek the reins of power and ignore the restraints of constitutional procedures. They may even do so out of a sincere desire to benefit their own country. But democratic governments demand that those in opposition accept the defects of today and work toward remedying them within the machinery of peaceful change. Otherwise, in return for momentary satisfaction, we tear apart the fabric and the hope of lasting democracy.

The Charter of the Organization of American States calls for, and I quote, "the consolidation on this continent, within the framework of democratic institutions, a system of individual liberty and social justice based on respect for the essential rights of man."

URGES PEACEFUL SETTLEMENTS

The United States is committed to this proposition.

Whatever may be the case in other parts of the world, this is a hemisphere of free men capable of self-government. It is in accordance with this belief that the United States will continue to support the efforts of those seeking to establish and maintain constitutional democracy.

And fourth is the front of international responsibility.

We must honor our commitment to the peaceful settlement of disputes, the principle of collective action and the strengthening of the inter-American system.

We must also continue to invite and urge the participation of other Western nations in development programs. And the United States will continue to urge upon its allies the necessity of expanding the markets for Latin American products.

But just as we have friends abroad, we also have enemies. Communism is struggling to subvert and destroy the process of democratic development, to extend its rule to other nations of this hemisphere.

If the Alliance is to succeed, we must continue to support measures to halt Communist infiltration and subversion and to assist governments menaced from abroad. The American States must be ready to come to the aid of any government requesting aid to prevent a takeover linked to the policies of foreign communism rather than to an internal desire for change.

My own country is prepared to do this.

We in this hemisphere must also use every resource at our command to prevent the establishment of another Cuba in this hemisphere, for if there is one principle which has run through the long history of this hemisphere it is a common determination to prevent the rule of foreign systems or nations in the Americas.

We have ultimately won this battle against every great power in the past. We will continue to wage it and win it. And as we gain momentum and strength the appeal and force of communism will greatly diminish. This has already begun to happen. Castroism, which a few years ago commanded the allegiance of thousands in almost every country, today has far fewer followers scattered across the continent. Experience in China, the Soviet Union, and in Cuba itself has revealed that the promises of abundance under tyranny are false. We ourselves can prove that democratic progress is the surest answer to the promises of the totalitarian.

These are the many fronts of the Alliance for Progress. The conduct of those fronts, the steady conquest of the surely yielding enemies of misery and hopelessness, hunger and injustice is the central task of the Americas in our time. No sense of confidence, of optimism in the future of the hemisphere as a whole can conceal our feelings at the self-inflicted exile of Cuba from the society of American Republics.

The genuine Cuban revolution, because it was against the tyranny and corruption of the past, had the support of many whose aims and concepts were democratic. But that hope for freedom and progress was destroyed.

The goals proclaimed in the Sierra Maestra were betrayed in Havana.

It is important to restate what now divides Cuba from my country and from the other countries of this hemisphere. It is the fact that a small band of conspirators has stripped the Cuban people of their freedom and handed over the independence and sovereignty of the Cuban Nation to forces beyond the hemisphere. They have made Cuba a victim of foreign imperialism, an instrument of the policy of others, a weapon in an effort dictated by external powers to subvert the other American republics.

This, and this alone, divides us.

As long as this is true, nothing is possible. Without it everything is possible.

Once this barrier is removed we will be ready and anxious to work with the Cuban people in pursuit of those progressive goals which a few short years ago stirred their hopes and the sympathy of many people throughout the hemisphere.

No Cuban need feel trapped between dependence on the broken promises of foreign communism and the hostility of the rest of the hemisphere. For, once Cuban sovereignty has been restored, we will extend the hand of friendship and assistance to a Cuba whose political and economic institutions have been shaped by the will of the Cuban people.

But our—but our pursuit of the goals of the Alianza Para el Progreso does not wait on that day. In 1961 the American nations signed the Charter of Punta del Este. Today, more than 2 years later, despite dangers and difficulties, I support and believe in the Alliance for Progress more strongly than ever before.

With the Alliance, the inter-American system, the American nations can look forward to a decade of growing hope and liberty.

Without it the people of this hemisphere would be left to a life of misery with independence finally gone and freedom a futile dream.

SAYS SOME FEAR OBSTACLES

I am well aware that there are some who, fearing the size of the obstacles, the resistance to progress, the pace of achievement, despair of the Alliance.

But that same note of despair has been sounded before. In 1948, a distinguished Senator rose on the floor of the American Congress and said of the Marshall plan:

"If I believe there were any good chance of accomplishing these purposes I should support the bill, but in the light of history, in the light of the history of this very Congress and its predecessors, we cannot say there's a chance of success. All the evidence points to failure."

Despite this we pressed ahead. The result is modern Europe.

I do not discount the difficulties of the Alliance for Progress—difficulties far greater than those confronted by the Marshall plan. Then we helped rebuild a shattered economy whose human and social foundations remained. Today we're trying to create a basic new foundation capable of reshaping the centuries-old societies and economies of half a hemisphere.

But those who know our hemisphere, like those who knew Europe in 1948, have little doubt that if we do not lose heart the gloomy prophecies of today can once again fade, in the achievements of tomorrow, although the problems are huge.

The greatest danger is not in our circumstances or in our enemies but in our own doubts and fears. Robert Frost wrote 50 years ago: "Nothing is true except a man or men adhere to it, to live for it, to spend themselves on it, to die for it."

We need this spirit even more than money, or institutions, or agreements. With it we can make the Alianza Para el Progreso a reality for generations who are coming in this hemisphere. And ultimately we will hold a continent where more than 20 strong nations live in peace, their people in hope and liberty and believing strongly in a free future.

AN OLYMPIC VICTORY PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have long been interested, both as a citizen and as a Senator of the United States, in our country's great Olympic teams.

In 11 months, this Nation faces another great challenge in international competition. I refer to the October 1964 Olympics in Tokyo.

Today, I offer a brief program for America's sports efforts—not just in 1964, but also in 1968; and not just in the Olympics, but also in future pan-American games and in other international athletic contests.

I wish to enlist the cooperation of the Congress in this effort. At this late hour, this evening, I speak for the record, of course; but if the United States is to live up to its high standards of performance in connection with all other areas of life, certainly it needs cooperation and participation by Congress in connection with the participation of Americans in sports.

The program I now propose is not just for the purpose of winning gold medals of victory; it is a program to do our best and to send our best—win, lose, or draw.

It is a program, too, to broaden the base of U.S. sports—to get spectators out of the stands and onto the playing fields. It is a program to enlist millions, where there are now only thousands of participants in many sports; and to enlist thousands in some so-called minor sports where there are now only hundreds.

PAST MEETING OF OLYMPIC COMMITTEE

First, however, let me say that during the weekend, November 9–10, there was held here in Washington an important meeting of the U.S. Olympic Committee.

Since the meeting, the sports pages of newspapers throughout the country have featured many articles interpreting what happened. The interpretations vary. I was not there, so I could not venture a judgment. Even if I had been there, I would not do so, because my interest is, not in how this or that private group fares, but in how the public interest fares.

I wish well to all interested private sports groups—to the AAU, the NCAA, and the emerging third force of independents. Frankly, their differences with one another have become so complex that it seems next to impossible for an outsider to fathom who is right or what is right.

An outsider does get to feel, I say in all frankness, that there is a little too much institutionalization at work. There is too much of a tendency to get so lost in the fight for one's own organization, that all other fights—the big fight for U.S. sports victories—get lost in the shuffle.

I note, for example, that Kenneth L. (Tug) Wilson, USOC president, is quoted as saying at the meeting's conclusion:

> I leave here with a heavy heart. I think there is a lot of soul searching ahead for all of us. We have spent 2 days bickering over little things instead of working on ways to have better Olympic teams in 1964.
>
> But I still have hope. Maybe things have got to hit bottom before they reach the top.

Before and after the meeting, many groups and individuals got in touch with me.

Several have since told me that some of the public reports of the disputes were overstated. They contended that many constructive steps which were taken by the Olympic Committee tended to be obscured by the noise of some of the quarrels on a few specifics—for example, over baseball and gymnastics.

It is, as I have said, next to impossible for an outsider to judge. What I do know is that the other great powers in the world, and many of the small powers, are working as a unit, without internal dissension, to win top honors in 1964 at the Innsbruck, Austria, games and at Tokyo.

So the time is long overdue for the United States to get its eye "back on the ball."

SEVEN-POINT PROGRAM

What specifically should be done?

First. This Nation needs a U.S. sports foundation. This foundation should help foster local, State, regional, and national athletic competitions, in conjunction with existing private sports organizations.

It should get our youngsters, in particular, during the school year, during the recess periods, and both before and after graduation into the habit of sports participation and athletic excellence.

Junior Olympic efforts exist here and there, but on an irregular, catch-as-catch-can, spotty basis.

Second. This Nation needs a massive Olympic development program for the youngsters who are championship material.

Everything possible must be done to train them, encourage them to remain amateur, and to train their coaches.

Some few clinics at present receive support from the U.S. Olympic Committee. The tiny size of this program can be judged by the fact that the whole USOC Olympic development effort is budgeted at $500,000.

By contrast, other nations spend tens of millions of dollars for their Olympic development programs. That includes programs in so-called minor sports that this country has hardly heard of, and in which our participants invariably do poorly.

Third. This Nation needs Olympic-type facilities to train our athletes under Olympic-type rules.

Mr. President, I digress to point out that the richest Nation in the world, which says it believes in competition rather than collectivism, has the worst Olympic-type facilities of any major nation. Apparently, because we cannot make any money out of these activities, we downgrade them.

Fourth. This Nation needs to increase its budget for international athletic exchange under the Humphrey-Thompson law. Unfortunately, the outlay for all oversea exchanges of all types—cultural and other—has not increased a nickel since we wrote the first authorization in 1956.

Fifth. The President and his administration should continue their close interest in the problem. One of the most encouraging factors during this past year has been the personal attention which has been given by our Chief Executive and by the Attorney General of the United States, despite their other enormous burdens, as well as by other Federal officials.

They have been careful not to interfere in any private aspects of amateur athletics; but at all times they have lent their good offices toward resolving problems within the sports family.

It is my hope and expectation that President Kennedy will further demonstrate his deep personal interest in America's Olympic effort. I hope and believe that if the President's busy schedule will permit, he will meet with as many of the members of our team as possible before it journeys to Tokyo.

Further, it is my hope that a token of the gratitude of the American people will be expressed to our athletes after their return, through an appropriate Presidential symbol, perhaps an "Olympic Participation Medal."

It is an ironic fact that the American Olympic participant does not receive from his or her own government any tangible expression whatsoever as a permanent memento of having represented us in the Olympics.

Sixth. Every American should contribute to the United States Olympic Committee for the 1964 games. Each should give what he or she can—a dime from youngsters, a dollar, a hundred dollars, or a thousand dollars or more from businesses or other organizations.

Seventh. More State, regional, and national civic events should be staged, at which the Nation gets to see and know our top amateur athletes.

There ought to be in every American city an Olympic ball at which funds are raised, with closed-circuit television and with our highest officials and stars of the entertainment world participating.

These are but a few of the necessary steps we should take.

Meanwhile, Federal agencies should continue their efforts to achieve the greatest possible results under the President's Council on Fitness.

INTEREST OF SENATE REORGANIZATION SUBCOMMITTEE

I have expressed my views as an individual Member of the Senate and as chairman of a Senate Government Operations Subcommittee which is interested in interagency coordination.

One of the principal achievements of our subcommittee's interest was the issuance, in August 1963, of Executive Order 11117, establishing a new Inter-Agency Committee on International Athletics. This Federal committee is going to be an active group. It will help to assure a sound governmentwide policy in the international sphere of sports.

PAST STATEMENT AND EXECUTIVE ORDER

Prior to last weekend's meeting, I was asked for comment on the USOC meeting by one of America's distinguished sports writers, Mr. Edward Schoenfeld, of the Oakland Tribune. I was happy to make available to him a statement which, I understand, has been widely used—both in that noted newspaper and elsewhere.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my comments this statement, together with a helpful letter from the Department of State, enclosing the text of the President's Executive order.

There being no objection, the statement, letter, and Executive order were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR HUMPHREY URGES GREATER UNITY IN AMATEUR SPORTS AT HISTORIC MEETING OF U.S. OLYMPIC COMMITTEE THIS WEEKEND

The meeting of the U.S. Olympic Committee this weekend can be a great turning-point in the history of amateur athletics in the United States. It can set this country on the path to unity in amateur sports and to victory in international athletic competition. Or the meeting can prove to be a tragic step backward or merely result in a further impasse.

I earnestly hope that the hopes of tens of millions of sports enthusiasts throughout our country will be realized through this meeting.

I know that I speak for great numbers of Americans in stating these points very frankly:

1. We have been disappointed at the continued "family quarrel" which has split amateur sports wide open.

2. The quarrel has needlessly undermined America's showing and prestige in international athletics.

3. In this country,.athletics are overwhelmingly nongovernmental in nature; that's the way they should be kept. None of us wants the U.S. Government to intervene, if it doesn't have to. The Government has enough of its own problems to attend to.

4. Nevertheless, the U.S. Government does have a legitimate interest in fostering a sound solution. The U.S. Olympic Committee was chartered by the U.S. Congress. If the goal of Public Law 805 is not being achieved, then, the Congress has little alternative but to review that law and make whatever changes are necessary in it.

5. The American people do not propose to see the Communist world make further propaganda "hay" out of American sports defeats.

6. The American people will insist that the U.S. Congress assert itself in this matter if the U.S. Olympic Committee, as presently constituted, demonstrates that it is unable to solve its own problems without further delay.

7. The U.S. Attorney General's office, the State Department's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Exchange, the President's Council on Fitness have done whatever is feasible under the circumstances in careful cooperation with private groups. I commend these Federal agencies and their officials for lending their good offices to heal the split among amateur sports organizations.

The "ball" is now in the hands of the organizations representing the amateur athlete. These organizations have the talent and the ability to run with the ball to an American touchdown. Or they can fumble it so badly, that the Congress will be forced to pick up the ball.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, August 22, 1963.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is with further reference to your letter of March 26, 1963 concerning the position of the United States in the Olympic games and other international amateur athletic competitions. There has been quite a bit of activity in this field during the past few months. Mr. Nicholas Rodis of my staff has been the Government official most concerned with these matters, and he has kept Mr. Julius Cahn completely informed. I wish at this time to bring to your personal attention the following major development which I am sure will be of interest to you.

1. There has been established by Executive order an interagency committee to assure continuity and coordination in the Federal Government's attention in the field of international amateur athletics. The State Department (Mr. Rodis) chairs the committee. This committee will act as a permanent clearinghouse in Government of current information on international athletic matters and a focal point for liaison with appropriate bodies in the amateur athletic field.

2. The U.S. Olympic Committee has been quite active in recent months. The officers and executive committee of the USOC have been exploring ways and means to provide a more strongly organized United States effort in international athletic amateur competitions. I understand that later this fall the full membership of the U.S. Olympic Committee will meet to discuss the proposals developed by the officers and the executive committee.

I wish to express the appreciation of the Department of State for your welcome interest in this very important field. All of us concerned with the subject matter are quite encouraged by the recent initiatives taken by the appropriate domestic amateur athletic leaders. I will keep your office informed of significant new developments in this field as they occur and we become aware of them.

Sincerely yours,

LUCIUS D. BATTLE.

[From the Aug. 16, 1963, Federal Register]

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS: TITLE 3—

THE PRESIDENT

EXECUTIVE ORDER 11117

Establishing an Interagency Committee on International Athletics

Whereas it is vital that the United States be constantly informed concerning all events, activities, and conditions that might have a potential effect upon the foreign relations of this Nation and the well-being of its people; and

Whereas international amateur athletic competitions and related activities conducted by private individuals and organizations free from Government sponsorship, interference, or control frequently make significant contributions to international good will and elevate standards of physical welfare throughout the world; and

Whereas these activities merit sympathetic attention and encouragement by the United States; and

Whereas it would be advantageous for the Department of State to have the advice and assistance of other departments and agencies in discharging its responsibilities in this regard:

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1(a). There is hereby established the Interagency Committee on International Athletics. The committee shall collect, exchange, and review information concerning amateur athletic matters that might tend to affect the foreign relations or general welfare of the United States. The committee shall be composed of representatives to be designated by the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (in his capacity as Chairman of the President's Council on Physical Fitness), and the heads of such other departments and agencies as the President may from time to time designate, or as may be invited to participate in the activities of the committee upon its request. The head of each department or agency represented on the committee shall designate one or more alternates. The representative of the Department of State shall serve as chairman of the committee.

(b) As deemed necessary to facilitate its work, the committee may request any executive department or agency whose activities have significant implications for the work of the committee to designate a liaison officer to consult with and advise the committee.

(c) The departments and agencies represented on the committee shall, in accordance with law, furnish such assistance as may be required for the work of the committee, in conformity with section 214 of the act of May 3, 1945 (59 Stat. 134, 31 U.S.C. 691).

SEC. 2. To facilitate the collection, coordination, and review of information by the committee, the committee may request information and views from Federal departments and agencies and from such organizations and individuals as may be willing and able to provide information pertaining to its work. The committee shall, from time to time, submit reports and recommendations, as appropriate, to the President and to the Secretary of State, and shall keep officials of the departments and agencies represented on the committee currently informed of its activities.

SEC. 3. The representative of the Department of State, in addition to serving as chairman, shall have primary responsibility for the collection of comprehensive information on current and impending developments pertaining to amateur athletics, and he shall make such information available to the committee.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 13, 1963.*

"A SENATOR'S WIFE"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a Senator's lot is not always a happy one. There are long hours of work, difficult legislative problems to solve, the needs of constituents to satisfy.

But, as I can personally testify, all the problems of a Senator's public life fall into an acceptable pattern when he has as his partner in life a devoted, able, intelligent, and understanding wife.

The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] is fortunately blessed with a most attractive, intelligent, charming, creative wife who has not only cared for their fine family, but also participated constructively and enthusiastically in the civic life of Washington.

Ellen Proxmire is in her own right a woman of great political ability and experience. She has successfully managed two senatorial campaigns, she has written extensively on political matters, and she continues to be a most helpful volunteer in her husband's office.

Now, Ellen Proxmire, a truly lovely lady, has just written a book about her life as a Senator's wife. And, as a result, others have been writing about Ellen. Katherine Evans in a recent article beautifully describes her as the "answer to any politician's prayer." I agree, and I think everyone will who reads the article.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANSWER TO ANY POLITICIAN'S PRAYER

(By Katherine Evans)

WASHINGTON.—Pity the poor bachelor politician. He has no wife to ring doorbells, raise money, and make speeches when he campaigns—no wife to slave in his office if he wins or hold his hand if he loses.

We've just had a long talk with Ellen Proxmire, who is the answer to any politician's prayer (in this case the politician is her husband, Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin), but we wonder how candidates without wives ever make the grade.

Ellen Proxmire has just finished a book about her life as a political wife called "One Foot in Washington," which will be published by Luce & McKay after Christmas. It's recommended reading for any wife who is urging her husband to run for the Senate, the House of Representatives, or dogcatcher. Little does she know how hard she'll have to work.

Ellen Proxmire is the best example we know of the hardworking political wife who is indispensable to her husband's career. She's done all the usual things like ringing doorbells and licking envelopes in campaigns, pinchhitting for her husband as a speaker, and being nice to constituents. But she is also:

A star television performer (she often appears with her husband on his weekly television show); an honest-to-goodness political pro (she was executive secretary of the Wisconsin Democratic Party when they first met); a veteran campaign manager (she ran both his successful campaigns for the Senate); a crackerjack officeworker (until her youngest child was born, she worked fulltime in her husband's office—now she's there 2 days a week); and experienced writer (she temporarily canceled a biweekly newspaper column while writing her book).

The fact is that Ellen Proxmire has done just about everything there is to do in her husband's office—except go on the payroll. That's where she draws the line.

"No matter how hard a congressional wife works or how invaluable she is to her husband, putting her on the payroll is a mistake. You just can't justify it to constituents."

In addition to young Douglas, the Proxmire family has four teenagers, two here in Washington and two away at boarding school. At home, Ellen Proxmire does most of the housework and all of the cooking. In her spare time (believe it or not, there is some) she reads six daily papers, the news magazines, and a great deal of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Having a Senator in the family is not all beer and skittles.

"It's hardest on the children," says Ellen Proxmire, "because a politician's family life is plagued by uncertainty. We can seldom spend holidays together, or take family vacations, or even eat meals together. Christmas is the only time we can count on being together."

But Ellen Proxmire's not complaining. She's always been fascinated by politics and, if having one foot in Washington and the other foot in Wisconsin makes for a rather precarious balancing act, she still finds it exciting and fun.

What's the biggest asset a politician's wife can have, we wanted to know.

"The ability to accept any situation," she said, serenely.

And a politician? A wife, we think, like Ellen Proxmire.

RECESS TO TOMORROW AT NOON

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order previously entered, to tomorrow, Wednesday, November 20, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 19 (legislative day of October 22), 1963:

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

Dr. Herbert Scoville, Jr., of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Benson E. L. Timmons III, of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Haiti.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The 470th Anniversary of the Discovery of Puerto Rico by Christopher Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, 470 years ago, on November 19, 1493, Christopher Columbus, during his second voyage to the New World, discovered the island of Puerto Rico. He landed on the west coast of the island and took possession of it in the name of the Crown of Castille. For 15 years, the island was bypassed by the early Spanish colonizers, but in 1508, a young soldier, one of the companions of Columbus in the discovery of Puerto Rico, came back from Old Hispaniola, with 40 arms companions, to conquer and to settle. He was Juan Ponce de León. He founded the city of San Juan and organized it in accordance with the laws of Castille. Such was the beginning of the history of the Puerto Rican people.

For four centuries following the discovery, a stream of settlers continued to come to Puerto Rico from the Spanish peninsula. African slavery, established in the early days, existed until March 27, 1873, when all slaves, 33,000 of them, were set free amidst the rejoicing of all Puerto Ricans, including the slave masters. The aboriginal Indian disappeared, not as a result of warfare, but because of the diseases of the white man to which the Indian had no immunity; because of their early migration to neighboring islands to escape serving the newcomers, or because they were absorbed into the bloodstream of the new races which had come to the island. By the end of the 18th century, 100,000 inhabitants occupied the island.

Puerto Rico entered the 19th century with about 100,000 inhabitants but at the end of that century, it had 1 million people. This demographic development was not the result of natural increase alone, but of the continuous migration from the Iberian Peninsula to the Caribbean island. In addition, in the early years of the 19th century, the Spanish loyalists from Venezuela, as they fled from the wars of independence in the Spanish main, found a haven in Puerto Rico. This historic occurrence was parallel to the settlement of American loyalists in the Canadian Maritime Provinces as a result of the American War of Independence.

The purpose of this brief résumé of the 470-year history of the Puerto Rican people is to recall that today marks the date when the island of Puerto Rico was incorporated into the Western civilization; that this happened 470 years ago, and that because of those centuries of history, Puerto Rico is today the oldest community under the U.S. flag.

It was because Columbus discovered the island, it was because Columbus incorporated it into the Crown of Castille, that a historical process began, whereby the Puerto Rican people have attained their present station.

At the end of the 19th century, the old ties with Spain dissolved. In 1917, Puerto Rico became a community of U.S. citizens. There are today 2½ million U.S. citizens in Puerto Rico. It is a showcase of freedom, democracy, modern life and high ideals and endeavors. Puerto Rico is a leader of thought and action in the Caribbean. It is also a haven for those who are fortunate enough to have escaped from despotism and oppression which unfortunately has showed its head in less fortunate lands in the Caribbean area.

Today is a holiday in Puerto Rico and I think it is proper that the people of Puerto Rico are paying tribute to the great explorer who made their existence possible; to that strong figure who so influenced the history of the world; to Christopher Columbus, the Admiral of the Ocean Sea, who offered mankind a new world for Western civilization to develop. As the representative of the people of Puerto Rico, I feel honored in paying tribute to his towering historical figure.

Tribute to John Michael Carmody

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, many of us lost a friend in the death of John Michael Carmody, November 10. Friends of Rural Electrification, family farmers, labor, in fact the entire Nation, lost a dedicated servant. A servant who stood the test at a time when the need for his leadership was greatest—the dread thirties.

As the second Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, John Carmody, more than any other individual, stimulated the organization of rural electric cooperatives which brought electricity to the farmers. Aggressive in his defense of co-ops, he valiantly withstood the attacks of the private power companies.

As President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Coordinator of the Government's major work relief agencies and a member of the National Labor Relations Board, John Carmody also proved to be a true friend of labor from the beginning and continued to be throughout his entire life.

We who are concerned with the welfare of rural America feel deeply the void left by this man to whom we owe a great deal. A man whose fruits of labor we will continue to harvest for many, many years.

Of John Carmody it can be said: he was a dedicated public servant, a distinguished citizen devoted to the welfare of people—a truly great man.

Charles R. Hook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in memory of Charles R. Hook, I include the following:

In the recent passing of Charles R. Hook of Middletown, Ohio has lost one of her outstanding citizens, and America has lost an internationally known industrialist—a man who served his Government, his State and his country in many ways. For 58 years Mr. Hook served in important executive positions with the Armco Steel Corp. of Middletown. He had the profound conviction men are more important than machines and applied a philosophy of simple humanity in the building of Armco Steel, which demonstrated the human side of business could be its most important aspect.

Mr. Hook accepted vital and important assignments as adviser and assistant to the two Hoover Commissions and served as Chairman of the Task Force on Business Organization of the Defense Department. Through his service and that of his task force, Federal taxpayers have been saved many millions of dollars annually in defense operational costs.

In April of 1962, Mr. Hook, as Chairman of the continuing Committee of the Hoover Commission Task Force Members, was presented with a special citation for his devotion to principle and his great contribution toward bettering our governmental structure, by former President Herbert Hoover at the annual meeting of the Committee in his suite at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York.

How Mr. Hook rose from a $2-a-week office boy in a Cincinnati steel plant to become an internationally known industrialist is one of the most interesting success stories that can be written. Wishing to learn from the ground up, he asked to be sent into one of the plants as a laborer. Promotions and recognition followed in quick succession until he became president of the Armco Co. of Middletown, Ohio. During his career he still found time to take an active part in a long list of national business organizations. Besides his work with the Hoover Commissions, our Government frequently made use of Mr. Hook's knowledge and experience. In 1938 he was appointed by President Roosevelt as a member of an American mission to study labor conditions in England and Sweden. Again in World War II he was asked to undertake another important mission when the war effort was hampered by a serious shortage of steel. President Truman also called upon him for assignments on several occasions, and under the Truman administration he was made a member of the Joint Labor-Management Conference. In 1952 he was appointed to the Government mission headed by Charles Sawyer and again went overseas to study Europe's economy. He was made Chairman of an Advisory Commission on Service Pay for the Armed Forces in 1947.

In spite of his many responsibilities, which were time consuming, Mr. Hook still found time to help American youth. For many years he was active in Boy Scout work, both locally and as a member of the National Boy Scout Council. Probably the award he prized the most highly was the Silver Buffalo—the highest honor the Boy Scouts of America can bestow upon anyone. He has frequently been honored for contributions to public service. He was given the Gary Medal by the steel industry for outstanding achievements in the field of human relations in industry. He was named Man of the Year by the National Association of Manufacturers in 1955. In 1957 he received the Governor's Award, the highest honor Ohio can confer upon a native son.

Latvian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, all nations subjected to alien regimes suffer under discriminations and a series of legal disabilities, and some suffer endless hardships and persecutions. Still others are deprived of all forms of freedom and are prisoners in their homeland. Such has been the lot of the people of Latvia for more than two decades. As a matter of fact, theirs has been an unenviable lot since they were brought under the ruthless rule of Russian czars late in the 18th century, except during the two decades of interwar years.

At the end of the First World War many nations in Europe attained their freedom and independence. The Latvians were one of these liberated peoples. After attaining their fredom and the establishment of the Latvian Republic they managed to live in peace and prosperity and also in relative safety for a little more than two decades. But as the clouds of war began to thicken late in 1930, they became apprehensive of their national safety. Soon their worst fears turned out to be true. Early in the war their freedom and independence became a casualty of the war. In mid-1940 Latvia was overrun by the Red army, then the country was annexed to the Soviet Union, and the unhappy Latvians became subjects of the Kremlin.

During the war there was a change in their status, though not for the better. For about 2 years they were subjected to Hitler's Nazi regime, and toward the end of the war, when the Red army returned once more, the Kremlin's agents again flooded the country. These ruthless Communists have been ruling over Latvia since then. During all these years helpless Latvians are hoping and praying for their delivery from Soviet tyranny. On the 45th anniversary of their independence day we all join them in their prayer and hope that soon they will be free in their homeland.

Kennedy Administration's Deliberate Sabotage of Kerr-Mills Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, before my Committee on Ways and Means, this morning, Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, laid bare for every citizen of the United States to see, not only the sabotage being perpetrated on the Kerr-Mills program by some in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, but also the violations of the law. I am pleased to include his testimony, which should be read by every American:

KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION'S DELIBERATE SABOTAGE OF KERR-MILLS PROGRAM

(Statement of Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, to be presented to House Ways and Means Committee, Tuesday, November 19, as part of hearings by committee on medical care for the aged.)

My primary purpose in testifying today is to call to the attention of the Ways and Means Committee barriers and obstacles which have been placed in the path of implementing the Kerr-Mills program, Public Law 86–778, in my State of South Dakota and in other areas as well. I think your contemplation of this situation is vital because of the testimony that will likely be presented during these hearings that Kerr-Mills has not met the problem of providing medical assistance to the older citizens of this country who have need for such assistance. I am convinced that when full implementation of Kerr-Mills is completed and each of the several States has had the experience of several years of administering and improving their programs with the full and vigorous assistance of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which agency is charged with the execution of the act, then and only then can the final determination of success or failure be applied. Any such judgment before that time, is highly premature.

South Dakota's Legislature began studying the possibility of implementing the Federal law in its 1961 session only a few months after the enactment of the Federal act. The legislature initiated a study through its legislative research council to determine the need and scope for the program in the State. This cautious approach proved particularly valid because of experiences in other predominately rural States which initiated extensive programs only to face difficulty later in working out scope and financial support.

I was pleased to cooperate with the South Dakota Legislature in 1963 when they decided to adopt their rather unique approach in solving the problem of providing medical assistance to our elder citizens. The implementing legislation provided for a "pilot" program to determine within a short time, the number of needy persons, the extent of their need, and a more accurate determination of the cost of the full program. The State department of public welfare was empowered to enter into a contract for the purchase of prepaid health coverage for eligible individuals. The law includes a provision that their insurance carrier must operate without profit or loss. The prepayment aspect of the plan and the pilot program will curtail high administrative costs of this medical assistance plan. The State legislature acted on the belief that it is conforming with the Kerr-Mills Act, Public Law 87–778 as amended by section 122 of Public Law 87–543.

The high regard I have for the Kerr-Mills approach in solving the problem brings me to the recent report of the Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly to the Senate Special Committee on Aging. Frankly, gentlemen, I am disturbed at what I consider the erroneous conclusions drawn by the majority in that report. For just a few minutes, I should like to dwell on several points in that report.

The Senate Special Committee report acknowledges and admits that the Department of HEW should attempt to help in the successful implementation of Kerr-Mills program at the State level. In fact, on page 17, section 3, it is stated, "The Department clearly has responsibility to assist the States in implementing the enabling legislation." It goes on to state, "All evidence available indicates that the Department has accepted and fulfilled that responsibility to the extent possible.

Gentlemen, it is my contention that this last statement is inaccurate. It is my intention to point out that while the Congress clearly obligated the Department of HEW in administering this public law, to provide constructive assistance to the States, the exact opposite was attempted in many instances by various members of Department staff.

The Senate Committee report accuses the States of "distortion of Congressional intent" in some of the MAA programs which have been implemented. I say the Department is guilty of failing to carry out Congressional intent by a program of deliberate sabotage of an act passed by this Congress and signed by the President.

First, instead of disseminating helpful and constructive information to the public about this law, staff members of the Department have, on many occasions, made public statements and written articles in which the Kerr-Mills law was maligned, ridiculed, and described in half-truths and false generalities.

For instance, Donald Kent, Ph. D., of the Department staff made the following statements in a meeting in Springfield, Ill., on April 7, 1962. "Kerr-Mills is just the same old relief program. * * * Relief is too expensive. * * * I believe we are facing the same tired old proposition that some people are more important than others and that we shouldn't worry too much about the less important ones."

On April 17, 1962, Mr. Ivan Nestingen, Under Secretary of the Department, told the Nashville, Tenn., Sertoma Club that the Kerr-Mills program was not working; it could not do the job, but could only supplement the King bill. He said "90 percent of the funds being spent are being spent in the three States with smallest population."

In Madison, Wis., on March 31, 1962, Mr. Wilbur Cohen stated at a meeting of the Wisconsin Committee on Health Insurance for the Aged Through Social Security: "There is a great deal more to fear from the Kerr-Mills bill because by definition it is socialized medicine with a vengeance."

Mr. Phillip H. DesMarais, Deputy Assistant Secretary of HEW, addressed a group in Hartford, Conn., on March 26, 1962, and passed out literature which stated, "Kerr-Mills does not adequately take care of the near needy or even many of the very needy."

"Means test medicine in many cases does not let you choose your own hospital and doctor."

"Means test medicine can mean danger to health and safety."

Mr. DesMarais also spoke to at least one other group on the same subject. That was in Chapel Hill, N.C., on April 13, 1962.

On March 19, in Houston, Tex., Mr. Nicholas Zumas, Assistant Under Secretary, held a similar meeting.

In my own State, in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., a workshop conference was held on April 6, 1962, at which Mr. Dean Coston, Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary was the featured speaker. The important feature of this meeting, which drew only about 30 people, was that it was open only to persons who opposed Kerr-Mills and supported King-Anderson. Although Mr. Coston was appearing at taxpayers' expense, the chairman of the conference stated in a letter dated April 2, 1962, that no organization could send a representative unless the organization supported King-Anderson.

And on April 25, 1963, Mr. Ivan Nestingen spent approximately 6 or 8 minutes of a 20- to 25-minute talk before the Chattanooga, Tenn., Rotary Club deriding Kerr-Mills using such phrases as "administrative monstrosity" "optical illusions," "not a program which a great Nation like ours can be proud of."

Gentlemen, in these stated instances, we have public servants, paid with public funds, traveling at public expense, going about the country trying to destroy public confidence in a law enacted by this committee and the Congress. Not only do I question the legality of such use of Government funds, but I believe they have deliberately distorted the intent of this committee and this Congress.

Now, let me turn to more specific attempts by HEW personnel to sabotage Kerr-Mills. This is at the State legislative level and one instance occurred in my neighboring State of Iowa.

Iowa has had enabling legislation for MAA since 1961, but at the time the bill passed, no funds were appropriated. In 1963, a new bill was introduced in the legislature providing that those eligible for OAA benefits would not be eligible for MAA. Before this bill could be acted upon, HEW wired the Governor's office saying the provision to exclude OAA recipients "is not acceptable."

Gentlemen, I call your attention again to the section of the Senate special committee report which accuses the States of "distortion of congressional intent" by transferring OAA recipients to MAA. How can the majority report of the Senate committee condemn this practice and HEW at the same time uphold it by refusing to accept an MAA program which seeks to prevent the action? In fact, HEW in a later telegram to the Iowa Legislature again stated that approval could not be given to a program which denied assistance to persons because they had received OAA benefits.

The story of HEW's contradictory statements to Iowa is a long one and many other examples such as the ones just mentioned can be documented for this committee if it wishes. Suffice it to say that HEW has not carried out its responsibility of assisting in the implementation of Kerr-Mills in Iowa.

This brings me to a similar set of circumstances in my own States.

The story of HEW delay in South Dakota's case is most distressing. The plan submitted by the South Dakota Department of Public Welfare provided that the State would purchase insurance contracts for persons over age 65 who were eligible under the standards established by State law. The purpose of the insurance approach is to provide for eligible recipients a program most similar to what person with greater income would secure for themselves. Public Law 86–778 provides for the insurance mechanism but it becomes obvious that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been most reluctant to see it used.

Chronologically, the South Dakota story goes like this:

During both the 1961 and the 1963 legislative sessions, Mr. Alfred Poe, Kansas City regional office, HEW, met with State welfare department officials, legislators, and representatives of the vendors of health services. He was appraised of every draft of the bill, its amendments, and its final wording. On February 11, he sat in on a joint meeting of the State senate and house committees on health and welfare, the welfare commission, and the Governor, and made statements to the effect that major changes would have to be made in the program before Federal approval would be forthcoming.[1] Under questioning by Governor Gubbrud, he admitted that there was actually nothing in the South Dakota law that would cause it to be turned down but there were questionable areas that would require elaboration.

The bill was signed into law March 11, 1963, and a plan submitted by the State welfare department to the regional HEW office on June 10. According to a statement made by the State director of public welfare at a welfare commission meeting in Yankton, S. Dak., on August 29, the plan was mailed from Kansas City to Washington on June 17. On June 28, a representative of the South Dakota State Medical Association was told at a meeting of HEW personnel that the plan had not as yet been seen in Washington.

In August, a letter was transmitted from the Washington office of HEW to Kansas City, indicating that the questions posed by Mr. Poe in his letter of transmittal of the plan to Washington should be answered before the plan was approved. The questions put to the South Dakota department were basically the same points already discussed on the previous occasion. After the questions were answered by the State department of public welfare in early September, no further word of plan approval or disapproval was evidenced by HEW.

On October 18, a representative of the South Dakota State Medical Association and the State director of public welfare met with HEW officials in Washington at which time they were told that one more statement was needed from the South Dakota Attorney General before approval could be given. This information was secured and relayed to proper personnel in the Bureau of Family Affairs, HEW on October 24, at which time the medical association representative was told that the plan would go to the Commissioner for decision without delay. It seemed that this timetable would be followed when information was given to Congressman Ben Reifel on October 25 that the plan would receive a decision "this week."[2] On November 6, Mr. Reifel's office was told that the material was in the hands of general counsel and would go to the Commissioner soon for a decision. To date, no decision has been made.

To the elderly in South Dakota who may have need of such a program, the Department of HEW has withheld care for a period of 6 months which, in fact, will mean a longer delay because of the time involved in setting up the mechanics of the program after approval.

Can any other conclusion be reached than that the Department has been deliberately delaying approval because the program might well prove a workable design for the rest of the Nation to emulate thereby weakening the argument for H.R. 3920?

ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

I would also like to refer to a portion of the report of the subcommittee that charges excessive administrative costs in the operation of some of the Kerr-Mills programs.

The point may be well taken that government administrative costs are high. This does not exclude Federal Government administrative costs as contemplated in the social security approach. This is precisely the reason that the South Dakota Legislature wanted the claims paying function, the statistical function, and liaison with the vendors of care maintained by nongovernmental agencies trained and equipped to do such administration. The State welfare department's contract with Blue Cross and Blue Shield obtains the services of two organizations which have combined administrative costs in acting as fiscal agents for South Dakota's old-age assistance program of less than 3 percent.

It is my understanding that Kansas Blue Cross and Blue Shield offered to administer that State's OAA and MAA programs at one-half of 1 percent. This is a striking illustration of the need to give the South Dakota plan an opportunity to prove itself.

CONCLUSION

It has been said before this committee and in countless other places that Kerr-Mills is not a perfect program for providing the Nation's elderly with health care. I have attempted to show why. It is the victim of a planned program of interference on the part of the Department of HEW, King-Anderson supporters in the Congress, and welfare workers and officials at the State and county level. These people, many in places of immense power, have used every means at their disposal to discredit Kerr-Mills in the eyes of the public, to confuse State legislatures in their attempts to enact proper programs, and to demean potential recipients of MAA benefits with meaningless redtape used under the guise of the means test. How could any program work perfectly with this kind of hamstringing at every turn?

Given a reasonable chance Kerr-Mills can and will develop into a mechanism which will answer the health care problem for every needy aged person in this country. But time must be allowed. Since the act was passed in 1960, only 3 years ago, 28 States and 3 other jurisdictions have implemented the act and have it in operation. Ten other States have enacted laws which will become effective shortly or which are awaiting approval of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Of the 12 States which have not passed cooperating legislation, 5 will meet in regular session early next year with the opportunity of acting. In the State of Texas, the electorate voted on the 9th of this month to remove constitutional barriers so the legislature can act in its next session to implement Kerr-Mills in that State. As a matter of record, only 3 of the 50 States have done nothing at all. This is a highly enviable record when it is realized that since 1960 Congress has always had legislation pending which would establish the social security oriented program and the possibility has thus existed that any State medical assistance program with its committed State funds might quickly be superseded.

---

[1] Associated Press Dispatch, Feb. 12, 1963.

[2] Associated Press story dated Oct. 29, 1963.

I urge the committee to consider this problem carefully before enacting a compulsory program of compulsory health insurance attached to the social security program. "Medicare" is a gross misnomer for this approach because it provides no medical care at all. It is simply a very inadequate and partial program of hospital insurance and certain other limited services and does not give the aged or the needy the kind of care that they require. The Kerr-Mills Act, on the other hand, recognizes that after retirement one may have a variety of ailments and so it provides for doctors and surgeons and hospitalization and nursing and drugs and dental benefits.

The reason Kerr-Mills can give a more adequate protection against a compulsory universal program is simple. This medicare program, being compulsory, requires that it be available to everybody so it is available to the wealthy as well as to those who don't need it at all instead of limiting to those people who require assistance at the time of an ailment in old age.

Another reason the compulsory medicare concept is wrong is that it does nothing whatsoever to protect the young family during its working years. It requires them to pay a tax sometimes as long as 45 years on the gamble that maybe after age 65 they will need some health benefits and on the improbable hope that nothing will happen to the family until that time.

In addition, past history assures us that social security taxes will continue to rise sharply. No one can foretell with any degree of accuracy the upper limits of that increase.

Originally, the social security tax was set at 1 percent each on the employer and the employee on the first $3,000 of annual wages. Now it is 3⅝ percent each on income up to $4,800. The tax on the self-employed has risen during the same period from 2¼ percent of the first $3,600 of income to 5.4 percent on the first $4,800. For many taxpayers, the social security tax already takes a bigger bite out of income than the Federal income tax. Even without the enactment of medicare, the tax rate must be increased to provide for an actuarially sound trust account. By 1968, the employee-employer total tax will be 9.25 percent. Estimates based on actual claim experience of insurance companies indicate that within 6 years the estimated cost of the program will require a joint tax on a $5,000 income of 11 percent. This estimate is based on present benefits provided by the pending legislation. Once enacted there is little question that pressures would be engendered to expand the scope of the program, increase the benefits, provide for longer periods of time, and to lower the age limit. All this would, of course, substantially increase the wage tax and the employers tax for all American workers.

There is another feature of the compulsory wage tax and the corresponding tax upon employers for the limited health services proposed by the King-Anderson bill which I strongly dislike. That is the fact that this would be a system of regressive taxation for health purposes entirely violating the concepts of progressive taxation which have so long served us so well in the field of income taxes. In short, the health tax would entirely ignore and violate the ability-to-pay concept of taxation. It would in fact tax the very poor and the very rich at precisely the same tax rates on that first important segment of their annual income which serves as the tax base. For some Americans, for example, their entire income would be subject to this new tax grab while for the wealthy and the well-to-do by far the larger percentage of their income would be exempt from any health tax assessments or payments. In many ways this proposed Federal health tax is far more unjust to those with marginal incomes than would be a Federal sales tax which some are now proposing in lieu of Federal income taxes.

Another important consideration which seems to me to argue against the compulsory social security approach is that in establishing such a program we are taking an irreversible step. I say "irreversible" because we will be requiring people to pay taxes to a program from which they cannot benefit until age 65 so, once started, it would be exceedingly difficult to discontinue. To take such a step at this stage strikes me as very unwise. We are venturing into an entirely new area so far as the Government is concerned. We cannot predict with accuracy at this point what problems and difficulties will be encountered. This being the case it seems to me that any program established should be highly flexible so that it can be easily modified to meet unexpected problems which are bound to arise. From this standpoint the pending proposal would be most unsatisfactory.

I urge the committee to ponder well this extremely important and far-reaching and irreversible decision and I strongly urge sufficient time for the Kerr-Mills Act to be tested in the laboratory of life so that its true worth can be examined and evaluated. Until that is done, I strongly urge this committee and the Congress not to take the irreversible step of approving the King-Anderson bill.

Forty-fifth Anniversary of Latvian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 45th anniversary of the declaration of independence of our former sister republic, the Republic of Latvia. It is appropriate that all true Americans should pause once again to pay tribute to the valor, gallantry, and spirit of the Latvian people.

It is an occasion also for all of us to rededicate our purpose with vigorous determination to the liberation of Latvia and the other small, helpless nations that have been dragged behind the Iron Curtain by a combination of bestial violence, unconscionable diplomacy and subversive infiltration.

Latvia was one of the three Baltic Republics overrun by the Red Army invasion of 1940. For many years Latvia struggled against discouraging odds to establish and maintain her freedom. First, it was czarist Russia, which oppressed Latvia until 1918. It is the declaration of independence after the czarist collapse that we remember today. Then the well-known Soviet methods of force and subversion were used to temporarily impose a puppet Latvian Government, for 5 months in 1919. But the Latvian people heroically rejected this farcical regime. During this time also Latvia had to defeat the remnants of German imperialism in the Baltic.

Then for a too short 20 years Latvians guided their own destiny. And they did an admirable job of it. Latvia became a respected, dedicated member of the League of Nations in 1921. She made great advances in manufacturing and agriculture. Ninety-five percent of Latvian trade was with Western Europe and the United States during the thirties. The Constitution of Latvia was founded on the latest constitutional principles of Western thought. In the Latvian Parliament, the Saeima, party government of the kind we know was the modus operandi.

On August 11, 1920, the defeated Bolsheviki had agreed to final and irrevocable independence for Latvia. And for a few years, while Stalin consolidated his power, Latvia was not unduly molested. On February 5, 1932, Latvia and the Soviet Union signed a treaty of nonaggression which absolutely forbade the Soviet Union to meddle in Latvia affairs. But if anyone took hope from this, it was false hope, as so often before and since. Because, soon thereafter, in violation of their spoken and written word, the Communists began the careful, militant subversion of free Latvia. The pace was notably increased in 1935, and Latvia's fate was assured by the infamous treaty with Hitler in 1939. It took Stalin very little time to concentrate 16 divisions on Latvia's border and, this time, force capitulation.

The decline and terrible repression of Latvia after that are well known. Fortunately, a few Latvians have been able to reach freedom and to continue the fight against the Soviet Union. There is no doubt the majority of Latvians, whether at home or abroad, desire self-determination.

As I have stated so many times, there can be no compromise on the great human questions of the destiny of free peoples. Foremost among these is the right of nations desiring it to be free, the right of each individual to be free, the right of the human soul to find expression in free institutions, to achieve that measure of freedom bestowed by the Creator, the right of the lowly and the weak to be protected in their choice of life and in their desire and intention to walk humbly in the ways of the Lord seeking and enjoying the privilege that can come only from free government to order their own lives and to be liberated from the bondage and the slavery which selfish, rapacious tyrants impose upon them.

Let us be true to our own glorious heritage of freedom. This heritage was not won through fear and trembling, appeasement and cowardice. It was won through bitter sacrifices, bloodshed, and suffering by millions of people, past and present, who were willing to give everything they had—their honor, their possessions, their material resources, and their lives to protect and sustain our liberties. This heritage was won through determination, through strength, through courage, through fearlessness, and it can only be preserved and protected by the same means.

It is fitting that on this 45th anniversary of Latvian independence we should pledge anew to all small nations under the yoke of Soviet tyranny and oppression our determination to work for the restoration of freedom to these unhappy lands.

Let it be known by the great freedom-loving Latvian people and all oppressed peoples the fight for freedom is our fight because it is the fight for liberty, democracy, justice, morality, and human decency.

Let us express our determination and hopes for a free Latvia to take her rightful place among the free nations of the world.

Remarks of Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson at Douglas Space Center Dedication in Huntington Beach, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD T. HANNA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday in Huntington Beach, Calif., the Vice President of the United States, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, honored us by delivering the principal address at the dedication of America's newest and most modern center for space research and development. This space center was designed and built by Douglas Aircraft, Inc., a leader in this, the age of space.

Vice President JOHNSON's excellent speech outlined this Nation's commitment to, and stake in "mankind's last and greatest frontier—the frontier of space."

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of the Vice President's speech at this point in the RECORD.

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON AT THE SPACE CENTER DEDICATION, HUNTINGTON BEACH, CALIF., NOVEMBER 14, 1963

This is a day of great and justified pride for all associated with the building of this outstanding center of research and development for the age of space.

It is a credit and honor to our system that a private organization begun in the back of a barber shop could within a lifetime grow in size, talent, and vision to participate in the pioneering of our Nation's search for peace out in mankind's last and greatest frontier—the frontier of space.

This center is not dedicated today as a monument to past achievement. It is dedicated, rather, as a testament to our American faith in the future and in our own national resourcefulness for achieving and realizing the potential of that future.

If there has been a single characteristic responsible for our success over the past 200 years, it has been the characteristic American confidence in the future. It was that same confidence which brought other generations westward across the continent to build what has been built in such a short time here on the shores of the Pacific.

Today, in our land—and in the world—there are those who argue for the view that we should not push forward into new realms or new enterprises unless this is clear and compelling evidence of competition from other nations and other systems. I believe the American people reject the concept that their future—or the future of freemen everywhere shall be defaulted to the vision and ambition of the totalitarians.

We refuse to accept so negative a doctrine that we are not to interest ourselves in space unless the Communists are interested in space. We cannot live as freemen if for the sake of our own comfort, convenience and complacency, we permit ourselves to become slaves to the limitations, the deceptions or the guile of the Communist system and its leadership.

Those who say—as some are inclined to do—that our purposes and the purposes of communism in space exploration are the same misread and misunderstand the history and meaning of our times. In 1957 when the Soviets placed the first sputnik in orbit, the Communist rulers of Russia refused to consider sharing the fruits of space research with other nations—refused to consider committing themselves to developing space for peaceful purposes alone. In that same year, we of the United States clearly stated our own national policy and purpose. We committed and dedicated ourselves to sharing the fruits of space research with all mankind—and to the sole objective of developing the uses of space for peaceful purposes.

It is significant that while the Communist efforts are conducted behind a curtain of secrecy, we of the United States enjoy the cooperation, support and alliance of more than 60 nations for our space program. It is significant that while we of the United States can and do propose joint endeavors for peaceful purposes, the Soviet both rejects our proposals and devotes itself to attempts to dissuade us from continuing on the programs we have established.

America's commitment to the exploration of space for peaceful purposes—and for the good of all mankind—is a firm commitment. We will not retreat from our national purpose. We will not be turned aside in our national effort by the transparent maneuvers of those who would attempt to divert us.

Our national purpose in space is peace—not prestige.

Our foremost objective is not to send a man to the moon but to bring a greater measure of sunlight into the lives of men on earth.

Our space technology and research have moved forward rapidly and dramatically since the early days of the age of space barely half a decade ago. But our achievements and accomplishments in this field remain in their infancy. It is imperative that at this critical point of development and progress we keep our space technology and science free of the control and misdirection of arbitrary policy changes.

The history of science is a history of unending service to the betterment of life for man. The same has not always been so true for the history of political science. We must not fasten down upon the scientific potential of this new age the limited vision of passing political causes and conveniences.

We have the country we have—our cause of freedom has the strength it has—because we have always maintained faith and confidence in the future and in our own ability to control it for the good of man.

Today the full complex of our society—business, labor, education, and government—are working together in resolute and determined commitment to realize the potential of the space frontier. Our objective must be to continue on this sure course, laying aside petty rivalries, idle jealousies and momentary discomforts to bring the full strength of our remarkable capabilities to bear on achieving the potential opening now before us—and before all the world.

A failure in space would be the costliest failure of our national history—a failure ultimately fatal to the cause we have championed at such great sacrifice and with such great devotion throughout this 20th century. On the other hand, success in space—the success we shall eventually win—may well be the greatest economy of our history if, by that success, we succeed in bringing closer to reality a world without war, a world of universal peace, freedom and justice.

Thus, today, with great pride and greater expectations, we dedicate this center to the service of the future and the cause of freedom which is our country's cause and the highest cause of man on earth.

Crossing the Broadcast Rubicon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, now that the 1964 TV season is in full swing, the onslaught of the TV rating services has begun. As the time for each periodic rating report draws near, TV executives and actors shudder and feverishly await the fate of their standing. Executives wonder whether their companies are going to rank first, second, or third, and ponder what that actually means since the companies are only separated by a few percentage points. Actors, directors, and producers worry that their meal tickets may possibly be arbitrarily cut off. Why should these fears that exist in one of America's largest industries be based on the apprehension of unreliable surveys and ratings? This injustice is one that is still evident, even after a full congressional hearing by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee on Investigations.

It has been hoped that the National Association of Broadcasters and the rating services could work out a sound plan of cleaning up this numbers racket. If the industry itself cannot work out the gross inequities being fostered by the rating services, then the Congress must take the initiative to see that a reliable system of television ratings is established if they are to continue.

At this point in the RECORD I would like to insert a speech by the Honorable OREN HARRIS, chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee before the Association of Broadcast Executives of Texas last week. He dealt with two threats facing the broadcasting industry: first, the stranglehold which the audience measurement services appear to have over most of the industry; and, second, the so-called fairness doctrine of the FCC which he said, in his judgment, threatens to inject the Commission into the day-to-day programing decision of the licensee:

SPEECH OF HON. OREN HARRIS, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE BEFORE THE ASSOCIATION OF BROADCAST EXECUTIVES OF TEXAS, NOVEMBER 14, 1963, DALLAS, TEX.

Your association—ABET—is to be commended for your farsightedness, vision and recognition that to run a broadcast business and get the greatest utilization out of this resource in rendering a public service requires the efforts, cooperation and coexistence of any number of allied interests in this field. There is no other system like ours in the world. It is truly a hybrid organization. In a way it is similar in its total operation to a great bureaucracy, difficult sometimes to find the true head or source.

Even so, in its infancy the broadcast industry has emerged through a maze of difficulties and is providing service to our people beyond imagination. It is truly an American enterprise. I salute the executives in the industry who obviously have provided guidance, organization and stability.

Even so, the broadcasting industry of today has become the melting pot of confusion in a stew of pronouncements, interpretations and rulemaking proposals which has resulted in greater frustration, fear, and uncertainty than I have yet to see with a regulated industry.

Why is this so? I think there are a number of reasons for it.

First, the very nature of the industry itself—highly competitive, the service it performs to the public, dissemination of ideas in a free society and limitation of available frequencies in the spectrum.

In the second place, the origin of the industry as a necessary, partially regulated industry, as a private enterprise profitmaking business and as an industry under this system destined to influence the lives and fortunes of our people.

In the third place, this situation prevails to some extent because of the enthusiasm for freedom and opportunity for the industry to take its place in our business community without unnecessary interference except to serve the public interest.

In the fourth place, it is partially due to varying opinions and views of those charged with the responsibility of regulation from time to time as how best they can carry out their duties as they think the Congress intended.

And, finally, in the fifth place, this condition exists in part due to the failure of so many of you engaged in this business to realize the industry has yet to cross the Rubicon.

With this preface I would like to discuss briefly what I regard as two serious threats to the exercise of your responsibilities as licensees. As you know so well, your privilege to operate a broadcast facility is conditioned by your obligation to serve the public interest. The discharge of that obligation, as I see it, becomes more difficult than it might be otherwise by a combination of circumstances.

First, our system of broadcasting is financed not by you, the licensees, but by advertisers who may or may not share your feeling of obligation to serve the public interest. For the advertiser, broadcasting is but a means to his end—larger sales and bigger profits. I do not disparage that goal, for the healthy growth of our economy depends on its achievement. But I am mindful that the advertiser's efforts to reach the largest possible audience with his commercial messages may be an obstacle to the attainment of your statutory goal.

Unlike for the advertiser, broadcasting is for the licensee an end in itself. The law places on you the sole responsibility for carrying out your obligation to serve the public. Licensees may not delegate the discharge of their statutory obligation to anyone—advertisers, advertising agencies, network organizations, rating services—anyone. I will return to this theme in a moment.

Another difficulty you must live with is that you operate under the constant watchful eye of a Federal regulatory agency, the Federal Communications Commission. The broadcasting industry is, under the law, not a public utility. Yet because the broadcast media use the limited public airwaves, and because of the tremendous impact these media have on the listening and viewing public, it is necessary that some degree of regulation be imposed.

But the fact of the FCC's regulatory authority in no way changes the fact that the day-to-day responsibility for transmitting programs that serve the public interest is that of the licensee alone. Just as licensees may not delegate their responsibilities to advertisers or others, nor may this responsibility be usurped by the Commission—at least as I think that Communications Act stands today. (And I don't think Congress is in any mood to shift that licensee responsibility to anyone else.)

Having said this, I would now like to focus more closely on two facets of the total problem as examples of the "melting pot of confusion" previously referred to.

First, the stranglehold which the audience measurement services appear to have over most of the industry.

Second, the so-called fairness doctrine of the FCC which, in my judgment—at least insofar as I am able to understand what it means—threatens to inject the Commission into the day-to-day programing decisions of the licensee.

I have been asked by a good many people why our committee saw fit to make an investigation of the rating services which lasted some 18 months and culminated in 5½ weeks of public hearings. The rating companies are, after all, private businesses, I am reminded, and not now subject to FCC licensing or other regulation.

The answer is twofold. First, the committee wanted to find out the extent, if any, to which rating reports influenced licensees' decisions on programing, the purchase and sale of time, and the like. We were concerned, and I am still concerned (particularly when I read of the anxiousness with which the industry has awaited the October Nielsen reports), about the abdication of sound judgment by broadcasters in favor of numbers purporting to show sheer audience size.

Secondly, once the committee had become aware of the pervasiveness of the influence of the rating figures on licensee decisions, we thought it important to learn whether the figures merited the great faith placed in them by so many. While some statistical studies of the ratings had been made, none of these had attempted to go beyond the public claims of the rating companies. We felt we had to know more about sample design, field work, and tabulating and editing procedures than had been known before.

What we found out was hardly reassuring. The committee staff interviewed hundreds of people and retabulated several surveys, using the original field materials—interview sheets, diaries, and the like, supplied by the rating companies. The staff attempted to discover from the rating companies the techniques they used in editing the raw data. When they tried to apply the techniques the companies said they used, they often got results dramatically different from those published by the survey companies. While the committee recognizes the logic and legitimacy of many editing and weighting techniques, it was clear to us that some used were not at all appropriate. The eminent statistician engaged by the committee as a consultant characterized one such weighting scheme as—

"Nothing more or less than an excuse for doctoring the figures which were developed in the survey to perhaps bring out the personal opinion of whoever does the weighting."

The president of another rating company admitted that the figures circulated to his subscribers amount to little more than a calculated guess.

Still another survey company, in its promotional material, invited stations to say what they wanted about their delivery of the spendable dollar, and then document it with a report put out by that company.

In addition, there were many admissions during the hearings of carelessness and lax supervision. And there were unexplained instances of inconsistency within the same company in the use of editing techniques.

We do not claim or even pretend to be statisticians. But you don't have to be a statistician to see that the rating companies often have been doing one thing while they said they were doing something else.

You don't have to be a statistician to know that something is wrong when a survey firm does interviewing for a local report in counties where the local stations' signals don't even reach. Or when no interviewing is done in counties admittedly within the metropolitan area.

You don't have to be a statistician to understand that, in view of all the sources of bias and error disclosed during the hearings, the rating services have been claiming much greater precision for their figures than the facts can justify. And when the life and death of programs, the economic fortunes of producers and performers, even the existence of stations themselves may depend on differences of tenths of rating points, I think you can appreciate the committee's concern.

One thing that has been disconcerting is the attitude of some broadcasters and advertisers that nothing can or should be done to improve audience research. Many broadcasters seem satisfied with the ratings as they have been. Or at least they have been resigned to the present system on the ground that ratings are the only audience indicator that exists. The feeling seems to be that no one can do without comparative figures.

I submit that this is the outlook of the man with a crutch. If the crutch is known to be defective, he should want a better crutch. But his ideal is to be restored to health so that he will be strong enough to throw the crutch away.

I would like to make it perfectly clear that I am not a crusader, the committee has not been crusading. We did not start out on a witch hunt; we knew what we were doing from innumerable reports and we have been serious in our efforts toward correcting a bad situation and one which, if permitted to continue, would result in dire consequences.

Segments of your industry are now and have been working diligently to improve the quality of audience research. If you are going to have to continue to rely on ratings you should insist on the best research existing knowledge and techniques can produce.

I believe, with a few broadcasters, that your ideal should be to make your stations and your industry strong so that you will not need audience numbers in order to raise your revenue. But I am fearful most of you still feel the need for some kind of statistical crutch.

You may very well then ask—"how can you pay for it?" In view of the enormous sums of money, upward of $1 billion, that hang in the balance each year, it should not be difficult to meet the cost for sufficient sample sizes, better supervision and quality controls, as well as other improvements.

It was contended during the course of the hearings that the results of a statistical survey can be at best no more reliable than the raw data underlying them. I might also remind you that we had expert testimony which expressed the view that if you feed "garbage" into a computer, you will get "garbage" out.

Your National Association of Broadcasters proposes to do something about it in a three-point program that would assure ratings to be "valid, reliable, effective, and economically viable." It proposes:

1. The establishment of minimum standards and criteria in the field of broadcast audience measurement, and a system of accreditation of rating companies based on such standards and criteria:

2. The organization and supervision of Rating Audit Service; and

3. The projection of a continuing, effective program of research in audience measurement methodologies.

Unless you recover your own responsible decisionmaking functions, you will have no one but yourselves to blame, should the Federal Government on behalf of the public undertake to do something about it.

This brings me to the second principal point of focus in this discussion—the fairness doctrine.

FAIRNESS DOCTRINE

The fairness doctrine is undoubtedly a well-intentioned attempt by the FCC to reconcile the spirit of fairness as contained in section 315 of the Communications Act, dealing with political candidates, with the right of broadcasters to editorialize on controversial subjects.

Before attempting to analyze some of the problems I see in the considered fairness doctrine, let me undertake to put it in its proper perspective.

The equal-time provision of section 315, the right to editorialize, and the fairness doctrine are analytically separable subjects for discussion. Yet in much of the recent debate on these subjects they have become terribly confused.

It seems to me there is a need for clarification, at which I will now make a modest attempt.

First, let us consider the intent and requirements of section 315. By itself, the section does not require that a licensee allow air time to any legally qualified candidates for political office. But once a licensee has allowed a candidate to use its facilities to advance his cause, section 315 requires the licensee, if requested, to grant the opponent or opponents equal time under comparable conditions to advance his or their side of the story. It further denies to the licensee any power of censorship.

Despite persistent efforts on the part of broadcasters, particularly the networks, to abolish the equal time rule, Congress has never seen fit to do so. The closest we have come is to vote, this year as in 1960, to suspend the operation of the rule so as to permit the so-called great debates between candidates of the two major parties for the Presidency and the Vice Presidency.

The FCC has over the years, as we all know, blown hot and cold on the subject of editorializing by broadcasters. Since the overturn by the Commission of the Mayflower rule, licensees have been free to express editorial opinions—in the same manner generally that newspapers do. But many licensees have been and still are reluctant to program editorials on a regular basis, for fear they will run into trouble—either from advertisers fearful of any controversy, or from the Commission, especially since the enunciation by the Commission in 1949 of the fairness doctrine.

As early as 1958 I advocated the practice of editorializing by broadcasters. My views have not changed. It seems to me contrary to our traditions of free expression to forbid broadcasters to speak out on controversial issues of importance to their communities—as the FCC did in the old Mayflower case.

But when the Commission reversed itself in 1949 in order to permit broadcast editorials, it may have opened a Pandora's box of troubles, both for itself and for broadcasters. For at that time, it set forth the fairness doctrine.

The fairness doctrine, as I understand it, imposes on any licensee which editorializes on political campaigns or other controversial matters, an affirmative obligation to seek out spokesmen for viewpoints contrasting with those expressed by the licensee. Now that, on the face of it, seems simple and fair enough. But its simplicity is, I think, deceptive. For it seems to assume issues of a two-sided nature; for example, "We should get out of the United Nations; we should stay in the United Nations." Or, "We should not cut Federal taxes; we should cut Federal taxes."

But, what of the many side issues raised by such controversies? Take the tax-cut issue, on which there are many shades of opinion. Many responsible persons believe there should be no tax cut until the Federal budget is balanced. Others believe that only with "planned deficits" can our economy continue to grow at a satisfactory rate under present conditions. (And what, parenthetically, is a "satisfactory" rate?) Many people believe, quite sincerely, that a tax cut, unaccompanied by reforms in our tax structure, is unthinkable. But they disagree heatedly over which specific reforms are needed. Others feel that we should cut taxes now and worry about reforms later when there may be more agreement on the subject of "which reforms."

I think this brief excursion into the tax cut issue will give you some idea of the problems raised by the fairness doctrine.

Let us say that a station broadcasts an editorial simply favoring a tax cut now—reforms or no reforms. Must the licensee mail to various spokesmen for all these and other different viewpoints transcripts of the editorial? Must he solicit them to use his facilities to express their various attitudes?

If he must—and I see nothing in the fairness doctrine that says he need not—he would be taking on an intolerable burden. I submit that the logical result of the fairness doctrine would be that the licensee would broadcast no editorials at all.

And this is precisely the opposite of what the FCC says it wants to encourage.

My feeling is that the judgment as to what "contrasting" viewpoints a broadcaster should permit to be aired over his facilities should be left with the licensee, where the Communications Act put it in the first place.

To these burdens that a concentrated effort to enforce the fairness doctrine would impose on licensees should be added the additional administrative burdens on the Commission itself. If we are to believe the Commission spokesmen who appear before the House Appropriations Committee, the Commissioners and staff are plenty busy as it is. The kind of effort that would be required for a thoroughgoing enforcement program in this field would divert much Commission manpower from tasks to which the Congress has assigned higher priority.

I cannot but conclude that the net result would be a setback to the public interest.

I have offered for your consideration what I consider two real threats to broadcasting in the public interest. Our committee is keenly aware of them, and you may be sure we are closely watching every development. Our primarily objective, as I see it, is to remove whatever obstacles we can that stand in the way of the freedom of a responsible broadcasting industry. I hope that through our studies and our hearings the committee has made some headway toward that goal.

But, in closing, I remind you again the key to a flourishing and improving system of free American broadcasting lies largely with you, the licensees. If the full potentialities of our system can be achieved and our people can realize the advantages of this vast resource, we will have "crossed the Rubicon."

Life Expectancy Greater in Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, life is not only more enjoyable in Hawaii; it is also longer. Statistics appearing on page 12 of Parade magazine of Sunday, November 17, 1963, point to the fact that the average life expectancy for men living in Hawaii is 3 years longer than others of his specie living elsewhere in the United States—the average life expectancy for men in Hawaii being 69.5 years and those in other parts of the United States being 66.5 years. For some reason or other, women living in Hawaii have just about the same life expectancy as women living on the mainland. The average woman in Hawaii may expect to live to be 73.3 years of age, while those on the mainland may expect 73 years of living.

The reason for the longer life of the male specie in Hawaii may be that in the Aloha State men have more to live for. The eternal springtime climate, the beautiful scenery colored by Mother Nature, the swaying palm trees in tropical moonlit nights, and of course the lovely maidens with their tantalizing hula hands may in part account for this increased life expectancy in our paradise isles. In any event, Mr. Speaker, a man should look forward to living in Hawaii if he hopes to live longer than the average male. Hawaii welcomes you even for a short visit to find out the real reason why its men can expect to live longer.

In Recognition of Miss Debbie Reynolds and Her Work With Emotionally Disturbed Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, since its founding in 1955, the Thalians, an organization for emotionally disturbed children, has had as its most ardent supporter, film star Miss Debbie Reynolds, a valued constituent of mine. Miss Reynolds has been instrumental in raising funds for the organization, which is a nonprofit, tax-exempt corporation chartered by the State of California.

In the beginning, its fundraising efforts benefited the Reiss-Davis Guidance Child Clinic in West Los Angeles. As the group became larger and its income increased, Miss Reynolds spearheaded the group's dream by organizing a clinic of its own. This clinic was dedicated in 1959 on the grounds of the Mount Sinai Hospital and is called the Thalians Clinic for Children. At the present moment the clinic is operating at peak level, with more than 125 children under regular observation.

In 1961, when the Cedars of Lebanon and Mount Sinai Hospitals merged, the combined organization began to raise funds for a $50 million medical center for Los Angeles. As part of the center's building fund, the Thalians pledged themselves to raise $1 million to construct and maintain a Thalians building to contain an expanded clinic for children. Miss Reynolds, again, is the vital force behind this drive.

Miss Debbie Reynolds, film star and mother, with so many other pressing duties, should most certainly be applauded for her invaluable service to this group.

Congressman Harold R. Collier Reports to the People of the 10th District of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith a report to the residents of the 10th Congressional District of Illinois summarizing the major legislation and my activities as their Representative during the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

In reporting annually to my constituents in past years, I had always done so following sine die adjournment. The 1963 session, however, is not likely to come to a close until shortly before Christmas—and there is even the possibility that the record-breaking duration of the current session may run through the end of December.

Looking back to my first term as a Member of Congress, it is difficult to understand why a legislative body which was able to complete its work and adjourn in August must now drag through a 12-month session. What is more significant is the fact that less has been accomplished in the way of legislative action this year than was achieved when the sessions were shorter. The fact of the matter is that indecision and indirection have plagued both the House of Representatives and the Senate, especially, on the prime political issues of this administration.

Less than 3 years ago the liberals in the Federal administration charged that Congress was moving too slowly because the House Rules Committee impeded the process of legislation. This committee was admittedly inclined to be conservative in recent years. It is the committee, as you know, which determines which legislation shall be reported to the floor of the House and prescribes the conditions of debate on various bills.

"Enlarge the Rules Committee," said the liberals, "and we shall get legislation moving." And, thus, Congress packed the Rules Committee by adding three members. Again during this session of Congress, the expansion of the Rules Committee was continued through majority action. It is indeed ironical that the expansion of the Rules Committee not only failed to do what the liberals claimed—but the record reflects contradictory results. Previously, the Rules Committee was used as a buffer for other committees which felt it politically expedient on other occasions to move bills which were known to be generally unpopular or which would become political "hot potatoes" if they ever got to the floor. Thus they were frequently tabled presumably en route to the floor of the House.

We have a prime example of this in the controversial Federal aid to education bill because the several proposals to provide Federal funds for primary and secondary schools have become completely entangled in politics and religion. Many of the proponents of this type of legislation are content to see it resting quietly for if such a bill was ever reported many Representatives would find themselves in the difficult position of having to deal with the aid to private and parochial school programs. This is a situation packed with political dynamite in many areas.

With approximately a month remaining before the 1964 session gets underway, there are still important items of unfinished business.

The foreign aid appropriation bill is in serious trouble. The House slashed $582 million from the authorization bill—and the Senate is apparently in no mood this year to restore it as it did in the past. The ardent proponents of the multibillion-dollar foreign aid program of yesteryear are now coming around to supporting the position of the conservatives that have been trying to cut back during the past decade. The sad fact of the matter is that more governments have been overthrown or seized by coups around the world in the past 15 years than in the previous 75 years. Our position in the world today is admittedly no better and in many cases worse than it was when we embarked upon our foreign aid program. Certainly in some areas U.S. aid was necessary but, for the most part, the program has lost its appeal and has directly affected our critical imbalance of payments. Furthermore, our Western European allies have failed to meet their commitments and obligations in the cold war which continues with new eruptions and fluctuating tensions in the Far East and Latin America.

On the home front there is obviously deep public concern over Government fiscal policies. Three times during the past year Congress was obliged to raise the national debt because the Nation continues along a course of deficit spending. I have opposed Federal spending increases at every level as well as voting against increasing the public debt because of the frightening implications of pursuing policies which I consider fiscally irresponsible.

Aside from the fiscally sick condition of the Treasury, Government expansion into one area after another in our national life creates a consistently mushrooming bureaucracy. It appears to me that the American people are becoming more and more skeptical of Government programs as a panacea for every problem which develops in our economic and social system.

The House-passed tax reduction bill written by the Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member, is stalled in the Senate and may not get to the Senate floor before the turn of the year. While I personally feel a tax reduction across the board is necessary and desirable, I opposed final passage after an amendment to tie a curb on Federal spending to the tax bill failed. It is my understanding that many Members of the Senate feel that a tax reduction on borrowed money will only compound the Nation's fiscal problem in the months ahead.

The Ways and Means Committee began hearings on the various medicare proposals for the Nation's elder citizens 2 weeks ago. There is practically no chance for any such bill being reported this year—and there are grave doubts that such legislation will be passed in 1964 despite it being a presidential election year with the usual political pressures being present.

The fate of civil rights legislation is at present unpredictable and may well depend upon how successful Members of both legislative bodies are in amending titles II and III of the measure during floor action.

Significant in the pattern of this year's legislative activity was the defeat of the area redevelopment program which, after 2 years, failed to do the job which its sponsors predicted.

American farmers soundly defeated the wheat referendum—an action which can only be construed as disappointment and disgust with Government controls of the Nation's agricultural economy.

And now for a more personal report on this past year's session. Because of the fact that this has been the longest session in peacetime history, congressional mail has been unusually heavy and has not tapered off during the months of September, October, and November, as it did in previous years. Needless to say, the length of the session has also made it impossible for me to spend the time in my district office that I did in the past.

LEGISLATION WHICH REPRESENTATIVE COLLIER INTRODUCED DURING THE 88TH CONGRESS

H.R. 1904: A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the sale of his principal residence by a taxpayer who has attained the age of 60 years.

H.R. 3286: A bill to establish a Commission on Aircraft Noise Abatement to study means for abating aircraft noise and to recommend corrective measures.

H.R. 3927: A bill to provide for medical hospital care for the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes.

House Joint Resolution 268: Constitutional Amendment—Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

House Resolution 265: A House resolution to amend the Rules of the House to further restrict action on bills providing for the withdrawal of money from the Treasury.

House Resolution 279: A House resolution to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

H.R. 4775: A bill to allow deduction for expenses incurred by taxpayer for education of a dependent.

House Concurrent Resolution 133: A House concurrent resolution requesting the President to initiate action in the United Nations calling for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia and the return of exiles from these nations from slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union.

H.R. 5986: A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the rate of duty on brooms made of broom corn.

H.R. 5987: A bill to terminate the retailers' excise tax on cosmetics and other toilet preparations.

H.R. 5988: A bill to reduce excise tax on all-channel television sets to 5 percent.

H.R. 6409: A bill to amend the Anti-Dumping Act of 1921.

H.R. 6490: A bill to repeal the excise tax on communications.

House Concurrent Resolution 166: A House concurrent resolution to revise and simplify the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

H.R. 6635: A bill to amend sections 162 and 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to deductibility of certain business, entertainment, and so forth, expenses.

H.R. 6911: A bill to prohibit the use of the term "mahogany" in interstate commerce in connection with woods which are not in fact mahogany.

H.R. 6926: A bill to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from social security benefits.

H.R. 8204: A bill to amend the Federal Employees Compensation Act to remove certain inequities in rates of pay.

H.R. 8535: A bill to provide for the right of persons to be represented by attorneys in matters before Federal agencies.

H.R. 9077: A bill to amend tariff schedules on aluminum products, TV picture tubes and for other purposes.

More than 500 residents of my congressional district visited in my Washington office during 1963. In almost every instance my staff arranged for visits to the White House, provided gallery passes for both the House and Senate for visitors, and arranged for tours of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Bureau of Engraving, and other places of historical interest in the Nation's Capital.

Early this year, as in the past, we conducted a public opinion poll throughout the district. This was done by selecting families at random and mailing a questionnaire to get the grassroot sentiments of my constituents on the major legislative issues. Nearly 20,000 people in the 10th district participated in this poll, the results of which were published in the last issue of my newsletter.

Our congressional district is the largest in Illinois and one of the largest in the Nation with nearly 600,000 population. It is understandable, therefore, that the workload in an office such as mine is perhaps heavier than most of those where Representatives' districts average about 420,000 constituents.

In addition, my new committee assignment, which resulted in my being appointed to fill the one minority vacancy on the House Ways and Means Committee, was far more consuming in time and effort than I had experienced previously. This was primarily because our committee wrote the tax bill and revised 34 of the 37 recommendations for structural changes in the existing tax law. No committee in the Congress met more frequently or conducted the number of hearings on a single bill than our committee did on the tax legislation this year.

The longer sessions have resulted in sharply increased living and travel expenses for Members of Congress who previously maintain two homes only 7 or 8 months of the year instead of the full year. The number of essential trips back and forth from Washington to the Member's congressional district to fulfill the usual commitments nearly doubled notwithstanding the fact that each Member is allowed only three round trips from Washington to his district in a single congressional session. This, together with the associated problems of a 12-month session, resulted in demands by many Members for sharp increases in compensation—particularly since the Congress, by the established rules of the House, should adjourn by midnight on July 31 of each year. It is permitted to stay beyond this date only because the Korean war emergency declared by President Truman back in 1950 was never rescinded by either President Eisenhower or President Kennedy thus technically leaving the Congress in a state of national emergency. Aside from the merits of the salary issue, it is my personal feeling that such action should be deferred until we get our fiscal house in order and reduce the ever-increasing Federal Treasury deficits.

In conclusion let me say that while the length of the long duration of this session is not conducive to the best legislative process or the enjoyment of the Congressman's work, I am honored and privileged in being able to represent the 10th District of Illinois in the U.S. Congress. The first session of the 88th Congress has been marked with certain achievements and more than its share of failures but this must be expected in the light of the seething world situation on one hand and the many controversial domestic issues on the other.

I have not had the opportunity to become as well acquainted with the residents of the new area of my congressional district as I would like. Under normal conditions, if Congress had completed its business and adjourned as it should around Labor Day, I would have had the opportunity to fulfill more of my commitments in the Maine, Leyden, and Cicero Township areas which were added to the 10th District in the legislative reapportionment in 1962.

I welcome the opinions and views of the people in my district on the many important issues with which our Nation is faced today. Staff members in my district office (Pioneer 9-4115) are available daily to assist constituents who may have problems pending with the various agencies of Government such as the Veterans' Administration, Immigration and Naturalization Service, and so forth. Matters concerning legislation should be directed to my Washington office at room 1622, Longworth House Office Building in the Nation's Capital.

The Negro Revolt: A Challenge to American Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, last month I was invited by the Intergroup Education Project of the Berkeley Unified School District to make the opening address at the annual Berkeley Community Enlightenment Series.

The subject which I was asked to present, "The Negro Revolt: A Challenge to American Education"—is both a current and a critical national problem.

I believe our colleagues may find this inquiry into a complex social issue to be of interest.

The address follows:

THE NEGRO REVOLT: A CHALLENGE TO AMERICAN EDUCATION

Ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply honored to be with you this evening as we begin this second annual community enlightenment series. Public participation and discussion are the backbone of our democracy—they are the lifeblood of a free and open society—and in a very real sense this series is in the great tradition of our American heritage.

On a personal basis, let me add, that Mrs. Cohelan and I are both very pleased to be home. This has already been a long session of Congress, and there is no question that we certainly have much left to do.

The subject before us tonight is a formidable one, but it is one in which I have had a long and a deep interest, and I welcome the opportunity to discuss it.

THE PROBLEM AND PROGRESS

This year of 1963 marks the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation—an act which declared in unmistaken ringing terms that all men shall be free—and of the Gettysburg Address which reaffirmed that all men are created equal.

This month of October in 1963 marks the 10th anniversary of still another historic event; of a Supreme Court term which struck down discrimination in our public schools, under the guise of separate but equal, as a violation of the 14th amendment to our Constitution, as a denial of equal educational opportunity for all.

In those 100 years, and more particularly in the last 10, grudging progress has been made. The Commission on Civil Rights has reported that more Americans than ever before are exercising more fully their rights as citizens. Today slightly over half of the 6,200 school districts in the 17 Southern and border States have both white and Negro students; 113 districts were desegregated for the first time this fall—18 of them by Court order—and in 2 States—South Carolina and Alabama—the previous all-white color line was broken.

But across our land Negro children are continuing to attend segregated schools.

Ninety-four percent of the 265,000 Negro students who attend school with whites in the South do so in the border States. In the South, schools are generally segregated by official policy, notwithstanding the Supreme Court's finding that segregation on the basis of race cannot constitutionally be enforced. And, school segregation is not limited to this area alone. In the North and West de facto segregation continues; segregation because of existing housing patterns, and the practice of assigning pupils to neighborhood schools. As the Commission on Civil Rights has stated: Concentration of colored Americans in restricted areas of most major cities produces a high degree of school segregation, even in communities accepting the Supreme Court's decision.

THE PROBLEM IN GRAPHIC TERMS

The story of school segregation, however—of its heavy cost to the individual and the Nation—cannot be told in terms of statistics alone.

Education is the keystone of our democracy—it is the centerpiece in the arch of freedom and progress. It is required in the performance of our most basic public responsibilities. It is a principle instrument in awakening the child to cultural values, in preparing him for later professional training, and in helping him to adjust normally to his environment. It is the very foundation of good citizenship.

For the Nation, increasing the quality and availability of education is vital to our national security and domestic well-being. But availability and quality cannot be meaningful when minority groups are denied equal opportunity—a denial which the Court has ruled inherent where discrimination is practiced.

For the individual, open doors to the schoolhouse, to the library and to the college are vital in achieving the richest treasures of our open society: the power of knowledge—the training and skills necessary for productive employment—and the wisdom and understanding needed for good citizenship in today's changing and challenging world. The Supreme Court, in its 1954 decision declared in fact: "It is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education."

But the fact remains that many Negro children who entered grade schools in 1954 have entered segregated high schools this year, suffering a loss which can never be regained. The lack of equal educational opportunity deprives the individual of equal economic opportunity; it restricts his contribution as a citizen and a community leader; it encourages him to drop out of school; and it imposes a heavy burden on the effort to eliminate discriminatory practices from our way of life.

It is startling, but the Negro in America today has half as much chance of completing high schools and a third as much chance of completing college. He has a third as much chance of being a professional man and half as much chance of owning his own home. He has twice as much chance of being unemployed and the prospects of earning only half as much.

This, of course, is the real story of school segregation. This is what a rising tide of Negro discontent against the complacency of our time—the Negro revolt, if you will—has revealed. And although the Horatio Alger legend is a well-established article of our country's folklore, few Americans, today, I think, would agree that the typical Alger hero would have made it had his skin been of a darker shade.

DEPRIVED AND DISADVANTAGED

The temptation is certainly strong to say that the Negro child should be seen merely as any other child, respected as an individual, and provided with an educational program that will best meet his particular needs.

The answer is, of course, that the Negro child, like every other child, is entitled to be treated as an individual. Such treatment is the only sound basis for carrying on his or any other child's education, but this easy generalization does not completely come to grips with the whole truth.

The American Negro youngster and his fellow minority members are part of a group that for a long time have been the object of special political, legal, and social action. This is not a question of what should have been, or might be tomorrow, but an undeniable and inescapable fact of today.

As the very able and distinguished president of Teachers College, Columbia University, Dr. John Fischer, has stated:

"Every Negro child is the victim of the history of his race in this country. On the day he enters kindergarten he carries a burden no white man can ever know, no matter what other handicaps or disabilities he may suffer. When all the variability is conceded, it cannot be denied that every American Negro child must expect to encounter certain problems which none of our other children face in quite the same way."

Elaborating on this point, the Educational Policies Commission in a recent statement has emphasized that a substantial minority of Americans have grown up in cultures which are not compatible with much of modern life. This minority consists by no means only of Negroes, nor are all Negroes culturally disadvantaged. But vast numbers of them are disadvantaged as a direct consequence of legal, social, and I would add, economic segregation.

Many of the Negro children who come to school today are victims of their parents' lack of knowledge and of schooling—parents who in turn are victims of a situation over which they frequently had little or no control.

Teaching reading, for example, to a first grade child who has never seen an adult with a book requires an approach quite different from one appropriate to a child in whose home books are as normal as food. Similarly, a child who has never known sustained conversation with his parents must first learn the skills of continuing discussion before he can learn much else in school.

Pilot projects in California, New York and elsewhere have repeatedly shown that a tremendous, but unlocked potential exists. And the Civil Rights Commission, on the basis of numerous studies, has stated that a gap exists between the average starting white and Negro student—a gap which may represent as much as 1½ to 2 school years by the time the child reaches the high school grades.

A PROGRAM EXPLORED

What then does this mean for our schools today? In light of our democratic values, what guidelines for policy and practice are implied?

The first thought follows quite naturally from what has already been said—that the assessment of each student, and the release of his potentialities, must be approached on an individual basis. Each student's education must be peculiarly his own. Its success cannot be achieved unless seen against the history from which he has come, and in terms of the environment in which he currently lives.

With this as a start we can move to a second thought—the thought that equality of opportunity should mean more than a schoolroom desk for every child. It should mean that every student may rightfully expect to find himself in fair competition and on an even footing with his classmates.

Today, of course, this situation does not exist. Many Americans, and the Negro in particular, have been systematically deprived of the conditions which would make this ideal a reality. Progress has been made, but much more is required.

Again quoting from Dr. Fisher of Columbia—a man with long experience in this field:

"Is it not a reasonable contention—and a just one—that to compensate for past injustices, we should offer these children educational services beyond the level of what might be called standard equality? Could it be that to achieve total equality of opportunity in America we may have to modify currently accepted ideas about equality of opportunity in education itself?"

The answer, I think, must be a resounding yes, and the precedent, of course, is already well established.

COMPENSATORY OPPORTUNITY

Thousands of mentally and physically handicapped children today regularly receive teaching service above the norm. They benefit from physical facilities and supporting services which are more extensive and more costly than those furnished to children considered physically and mentally normal. No one, I am sure, would dispute the justness and wisdom of this approach, but it inevitably leads us to the suggestion that the generalization should apply to other underprivileged groups as well—that we may need to substitute for our traditional concept of equal educational opportunity a new concept of compensatory opportunity.

I doubt that anyone could say precisely what compensatory opportunity should mean in every case. But it could very well include some of the following:

Lower student-teacher ratios in certain schools;

Additional guidance services and special physical facilities;

Enlistment of teachers especially prepared to serve disadvantaged or deprived youngsters;

Development of curriculum particularly relevant to present life and the interests of pupils;

Encouragement of peer group support;

Parental involvement in school activities; and

Combinations of work and study programs.

California, as many of you know, initiated a 2-year pilot program of compensatory education for culturally deprived children this year—a program in which Berkeley is one of the first 24 participants. Berkeley has also been a pioneer in drawing on a great local resource—the University of California—for teacher trainees to work in classrooms of particular need.

Unfortunately, programs of this type today are few and far between. Their expansion needs to be encouraged and new ideas need constantly to be sought and tested. Berkeley can take pride in what it has done, but the need is so great, and the horizon so broad, that humbleness, perseverance, and an inquiring mind should be our constant guides.

EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE

A third and final thought might best be described as a striving for quality; as the quest for educational excellence.

Certainly one of the truly knotty problems in the North and West today is the matter of attendance lines which are drawn so that one race predominates in a school.

James Conant, in his excellent book, "Slums and Suburbs," has made a clear distinction between de jure and de facto segregation. He has indicated his belief that there is nothing wrong with socially unbalanced schools, provided they reflect the neighborhood; are not the result of assignment because of race, and offer an equivalent quality of education.

Others disagree quite radically with Conant, arguing that present concentrations of Negroes and other minority groups have been artificially achieved and that artificial means must be followed to break the pattern. And the case can certainly be made that the real issue is how to lead all of the communities' children into meaningful encounters with each other, to the end that they develop skills of citizenship commensurate with the demanding times in which they live.

The Supreme Court, of course, has not yet ruled on this question, but several lower courts have. In *Clemons* v. *The Hillsboro Board of Education* and in *Taylor* v. *New Rochelle,* Federal courts have stated that gerrymandering of school attendance boundaries for the purpose of confining Negroes to one school violates the 14th amendment. And in *Goss* v. *The Knoxville Board of Education,* the Court ruled that "no official transfer plan or provision of which racial segregation is the inevitable consequence, may stand under the 14th amendment."

It is well to note, however, that the Commission on Civil Rights, in its latest report, has found that the open enrollment plans studied had little effect on the racial composition of schools, even when transportation was provided.

In spite of all efforts to achieve racially heterogeneous schools, it seems evident, the Commission stated, that many, particularly in the large cities, will retain a large degree of racial imbalance until discrimination in housing and employment are things of the past.

It seems to me, therefore, that while our efforts on other fronts should not slacken, that we should be concerned with insuring the highest standard of educational excellence in all of our schools, regardless of their racial composition.

President Kennedy stated in a message to Congress last year that:

"Our progress as a nation can be no swifter than our progress in education. Our requirements for world leadership, our hope for economic growth and the demands of citizenship itself, all require the maximum development of every young American's capacity."

The simple truth is that a free nation can rise no higher than the standard of excellence set in its schools and colleges. Ignorance and illiteracy, unskilled workers and school dropouts, breed failures in our social and economic system. They are the seedbed of delinquency and unemployment, of a loss of productive power, and a furtherance of chronic dependence. Failure to improve educational performance is not only a moral laxity, it is a poor social policy, and poor economics.

CONCLUSION

The steps to improved quality, of course, are not simple—they require time, and they require support. But the difficulties of operating schools which can cope successfully and simultaneously with both racial and educational issues are among the most puzzling and difficult facing the American people today.

They in turn require patience and perseverance, and a willingness to being. As the story goes, Marshall Lyautey, a great French general of the twenties, went out one day and asked his gardener to plant a tree. But, the gardener complained, this tree won't flower for 100 years. "Well then," responded the marshal, "We have no time to lose. Plant it this afternoon."

Our tree—the tree of true equality and excellence of educational opportunity—a tree which is the challenge for American education today, should and must flower before another 100 years have passed. But we too must begin today, and we too must be able to say with the poet:

> "Give me men to match our mountains,
> Give me men to match our plains,
> Men with empires in their purpose,
> and new eras in their brains."

Statement Re the 45th Anniversary of Latvian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on this 45th anniversary of Latvia's rebirth as a free and independent state, Americans remain strongly convinced that Latvia, like all other nations, is entitled to freedom and national self-determination.

Though Latvian independence has been suppressed by forced incorporation into the Soviet Union, the Latvian people have displayed a determination to maintain their ideals and preserve their national heritage. The American Government, by refusing to recognize the illegal Soviet annexation of Latvia, registers its support for Latvia's cause and confidence that the Latvian nation will endure.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1963

(Legislative day of Tuesday, October 22, 1963)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, as once more in this chamber of deliberation there sounds the summons to prayer in a tense time, when so much for so many depends on what these servants of the people's will do and say here, save us, we beseech Thee, from turning just from dull habit and with unexpectant hearts to the reality in which we live and move.

We would that this daily moment of devotion shall make each of us more vividly aware of Thee, not only as a help in ages past, but as a quickening presence, a sustaining power, a refuge from the tumult and confusion of the world.

Like a lark rising on morning wings to sing its rapturous song at heaven's gate, so may we rise above all sham and drudgery, hopes deferred and broken dreams, with undaunted spirits to lift our own paean of faith above the common ground:

> "This is my Father's world,
> So let me ne'er forget
> That though the wrong seems oft so strong
> God is the Ruler yet."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, November 19, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. 167)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of the United Nations Participation Act, I transmit herewith the 17th annual report covering U.S. participation in the United Nations during 1962.

This record tells the story of deep United Nations engagement in the great issues of the 1960's. It demonstrates that, despite the financial irresponsibility of some of its members, the organization has, through executive action and parliamentary diplomacy, played an indispensable role in dealing with an impressive number of the world's problems.

The United Nations political relevance—and its developing capacity for effective action—is indicated by a brief look at several major aspects of world affairs and at what the United Nations did about them in 1962.

GREAT POWER CONFRONTATION

When the Soviet Union sought to alter the balance of nuclear power by installing missile bases in Cuba, the United Nations—as well as the Organization of American States—proved an important instrument in resolving the most dangerous crisis of the nuclear era. The Security Council served as a forum in which the U.S. Government made clear to the world that its actions, taken in concert with its neighbors of the hemisphere, were the reasonable response of rational men to a sudden and unacceptable threat in their midst. The Secretary General, only recently elected to his post after a period as Acting Secretary General, provided a useful point of contact in the early stages of negotiations with the Soviet Union. The United Nations also could have provided an on-site inspection service at short notice had the Cuban Government not refused to cooperate with the world organization, and made necessary a continuation of other means of surveillance in the interest of hemispheric security. Finally, the United Nations provided an appropriate place for negotiating the remaining issues after Soviet missiles had been withdrawn.

It was in 1962 that a major United Nations peacekeeping force in the Congo established a level of internal security which permitted a very substantial reduction in the size of that force. The Central Government of the Congo, assisted by the United Nations, has preserved—in the words of the charter—its "territorial integrity and political independence"—and thereby forestalled a threat to international peace—in the face of three attempts at secession: a Communist-sponsored effort in the north, a local eruption in the interior, and a secession backed by outside interests in the south. Assisted by technical aid from most of the specialized agencies of the United Nations, the Government of the Congo has meanwhile increased its capacity to manage an economy of rich potential in the face of severe difficulties, including a crippling lack of trained manpower and experienced administrators.

In two other fields the United Nations has continued to be a vital instrument to effect a disengagement in important sectors of the great power confrontation. The Organization has served as a forum for encouraging an agreement for the cessation of nuclear weapon testing and for promoting progress toward general disarmament. It has served, as well, as a mechanism for negotiating legal principles and technical cooperation in outer space. We must be no less concerned with these persistent efforts to shape the future within the framework of the United Nations Charter than we are with United Nations operations designed to respond to the alarm bells of the present.

OTHER INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS

During 1962 an impending conflict was averted in west New Guinea—the first territory administered by an international organization—by the patient work of a United Nations mediator. In the Middle East the United Nations Emergency Force, the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine, and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees were on the job of removing and reducing tensions, and controlling those that could not yet be removed. In Kashmir, United Nations contingents patrolled under provisions of truce and cease-fire agreements. In Korea, a United Nations Commission stood ready to help in the unification of the country in accordance with resolutions of the General Assembly. Since the end of 1962, the United Nations has begun another work of peacemaking, through an agreement for the disengagement in Yemen of the United Arab Republic and Saudi Arabia.

FINANCING PEACEKEEPING

At the 17th General Assembly the United Nations received and then accepted the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice that peacekeeping expenses of the United Nations in the Congo and the Middle East, earlier approved by the Assembly, are expenses of the Organization within the meaning of article 17 of the charter. The failure of member states to pay their related assessments would thus subject them to the loss-of-vote provisions of article 19. The Court's opinion and its acceptance set the stage for what, based on later actions by the General Assembly, promises to produce a sturdier sense of financial responsibility on the part of most of the members.

COLONIAL QUESTIONS

Despite predictions of "another Congo," the United Nations trust territory of Ruanda-Urundi moved peacefully from dependence under Belgian administration to independence as the Republic of Rwanda and the Kingdom of Burundi and then to membership in the United Nations. The organization continued to tackle the problems of nonviolent transition as awakening peoples moved steadily toward independence from older colonial patterns. The remnants of the world's colonial past still present some hard cases—the last precisely because they are the hardest—which will test the capacity of the world community and of the United Nations to devise the procedures and institutions of peaceful change.

It should come to us as no surprise that the struggle for national self-determination should be so closely linked with other fundamental questions of human rights. It has been so in our own country. As the decolonization process nears an end—with miraculously little bloodshed—men and nations can shift their attention from national freedom to the larger issue of individual freedom.

THE DRIVE FOR MODERNIZATION

Through its specialized agencies and regional commissions—its technical assistance and preinvestment work, its civil role in the Congo, its new projects such as the world food program, the world weather watch, and regional planning institutes, its standard-setting and rule-making roles in such fields as maritime safety and international radio frequency allocations, its useful reports and its many conferences—the United Nations moved ahead as the principal international executive agency of the decade of development. We continue to believe it possible, through vigorous international cooperation, to achieve an average annual rate of economic growth of 5 percent in the newly developing nations by the end of this decade.

In short, the United Nations in 1962 was confronted—in practical and operational ways—with a broad agenda of the great issues of our time. Like most institutions devised by man, the United Nations exhibited both accomplishments and shortcomings. But despite noncooperation from some members and wavering support from others, the organization moved significantly toward the goal of a peace system worldwide in scope. The United States will continue to lend vigorous support to the building of that system.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 20, 1963*.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1868) to amend the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 986), as amended, relating to adult Indian vocational training, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 7155. An act to facilitate the work of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9140. An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 7155. An act to facilitate the work of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H.R. 9140. An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Permanent Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8747) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Under the agreement of yesterday, the pending Fulbright amendment (No. 325) will be laid aside until 2 o'clock.

In the meantime, the bill is open to further amendment.

THE CAUSES OF BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS DEFICITS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in my statement of last Monday, I pointed out that cumulative balance-of-payments deficits since 1950 have amounted to $25 billion—$28 billion, including obligations to international agencies. The United States has only $4 billion in free gold to pay this liability on demand; and about half our current liabilities are held by Western European countries.

How did we get into this position?

At the end of World War II, Western Europe was devastated physically, its economic resources were depleted, and a pall of "helpless confusion" hung over the Continent. The threat of internal Communist revolution was ever present, and the ability of the Western European countries to hold the line against Russia was doubtful.

A consequence of these conditions was that these countries were not able to carry the burdens of both civil and defense expenditures necessary to hold their colonial empires.

At first there was a somewhat naive thought, prevalent in many quarters, that through UNRRA we could take care of the humanitarian needs of relief; and also that through ordinary financial devices of credits and investment, with the British loan and the setting up of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank through the Bretton Woods agreements, we could take care of the industrial rehabilitation of war-torn countries.

The United States soon discovered, however, that this was not enough, and that Western Europe needed massive infusions of United States capital for reconstruction. This was the time when everyone spoke of the "dollar gap," a phrase which meant no more than that the European countries had need to import goods from the United States—for which, however, they had no means to pay, either in accumulated capital or current earnings.

The United States adopted, therefore, a set of policies designed to put dollars into the hands of Western Europe—and later Japan—dollars to pay for American goods.

First, in 1946, there was the Truman doctrine—direct grant aid and military assistance, given to Greece and Turkey.

Then there was the Marshall plan, started in 1948—$17 billion of grant aid, which plan required no interest and no repayment.

In addition to making money available through grants, it was the policy of our Government, at that time, under the aid program, to encourage procurement in foreign countries, to the extent supplies were available.

Then our Defense Department started a planned offshore procurement program. This also put defense dollars into the hands of foreign countries. In addition, the stationing of U.S. troops abroad had the effect of making more U.S. dollars available to other countries.

Finally, we initiated, and continued, a trade agreements program designed to reduce U.S. tariffs, so that the countries in question could sell more goods to us, and thereby earn more dollars.

During this period we were very generous not to demand reciprocal concessions; in fact, in many cases we actually allowed these countries to set quotas on American imports, on the excuse they had balance of payments deficits.

There were two results of these activities:

First. We rebuilt the industrial plant of Western Europe with the most up-to-date technology, far more advanced than some in the United States.

Second. We opened up our markets to the countries in question.

By the time the Marshall plan ended, in the fiscal year 1953, we had already started running balance-of-payments deficits.

As economic aid tapered off, we undertook the buildup of NATO; and under the foreign procurement policy of the Defense Department, along with the stationing of troops and bases abroad, we poured billions of dollars into defense establishments, from Scandinavia to Africa, from Scotland to Turkey.

All of this activity again caused a tremendous outflow of dollars, in fact cumulatively, for military assistance and economic aid, and not counting the expenditures for American troops, we spent $46 billion in Western Europe.

If one adds to this the direct military expenses for the maintenance of U.S. troops, it has been estimated that our expenditures in Europe would come close to $65 billion.

In the meantime, revitalized European industry began to export in increasing amounts, both to this country and to other countries, all around the world, in competition with the United States. These exports often undercut U.S. markets.

Listen to these figures of progress:

Western Germany alone increased its manufactured exports from $3 billion in 1950 to $11 billion in 1962, an almost 400 percent increase.

During the same period, the United States increased its exports of manufactured products from $7 billion to only $11 billion, a 65 percent increase.

Little West Germany now exports as much manufactured products as does the United States. As a result, West Germany now has a prosperity unparalleled in its history.

The ratio of U.S. exports to total world exports went down substantially from 26.2 percent in 1953 to 19.9 percent in 1962.

A large part of our manufactured exports are foreign aid financed; and if this item were eliminated from our total exports, the U.S. share of commercial world export markets would be even lower.

During the same period, West Germany increased its share of world trade of manufactures from 13.4 to 21.1 percent. Italy and Japan both doubled their share of world markets. France stayed constant, and the United Kingdom went down.

Another indication of the U.S. position in international trade is to be found in the relative figures of exports and imports. In 1947 the net difference between exports of goods and services, and imports, was $11.5 billion in favor of the United States—exclusive of transfers under military grants. On merchandise account alone this favorable balance of the United States was $10 billion.

Of course, $6 billion of this favorable balance was due to exports under Government programs and unilateral transfers; but in spite of this outpouring of U.S. grants and loans, we still ended up the year with a $4.5 billion surplus.

But there was a serious deterioration in 1950. In that year the net income of the United States on account of export of goods and services was down to $1.8 billion, mainly because merchandise exports had gone down from $16 billion in 1947 to $10 billion in 1950. We ended up the year with a payments deficit of $3.5 billion.

Then it really started.

With the sole exception of 1957, this Nation has been running a deficit ever since, in varying amounts, from minus $305 million in 1951 to minus $3.9 billion, the high point, in 1960. This is because our net income from the sale of goods and services over imports has gone down from $11.5 billion in 1947 to $4.8 billion in 1962.

When you consider that $2.8 billion of that amount results from Public Law 480 and foreign aid financed exports, the net surplus in 1962 was only between $1.9 and $2 billion.

Another way of comparing the relative position of the United States in the export market is to compare merchandise exports with merchandise imports—ex services. Whereas in 1947 our total merchandise exports were $16 billion, in 1950 they went to $10 billion.

In the 13 years since, these exports have gone up to $20.5 billion in 1962. Imports increased steadily during that period, from $6 billion in 1947 to $16 billion in 1962. And whereas our exports contain aid-financed exports of $2.8 billion, our imports are on a cash basis.

These results are due to:

First. The "industrial revitalization" in Western Europe and Japan;

Second. U.S. liberal trade policies;

Third. Inflationary price increases;

Fourth. "Fundamental structural changes" in the import requirements of the United States, as well as in the exports of our major industries.

As example, before World War II, oil exports once provided a net income to the United States. Currently, however, imports of oil have become a negative factor in our balance of payments, to the tune of over a billion dollars a year, the net difference between imports of oil, as against exports.

Again, before World War II we imported only 2 million tons of special grades of iron ore. Now we import over 30 million tons.

This one change requires a net outpayment of some $350 million a year.

The automobile industry was once a net earner of dollars for us to the tune of $1.3 billion a year; but now the industry has dropped about $1 billion of its earning capacity for the United States, because foreign production has been substituted for U.S. exports; and if the Canadian program of reducing imports of U.S. automobile parts is put into effect, it is very possible that the exports of this industry will no longer earn the United States a net income.

These three illustrations are but a few of the many that could be given, to show the fundamental, lasting, structural changes in the export-import picture of the United States.

Government capital and unilateral transfers amounted to $6.1 billion in 1947. They dropped to a low point of $1.7 billion in 1954, then started to increase, until in 1962 the figure was $3.9 billion—exclusive of U.S. military expenditures, transfers of U.S. military equipment, and Public Law 480 transfers of agricultural commodities.

Our military expenditures during all that period have remained around $3 billion a year. Thus, between U.S. military expenditures abroad, and unilateral Government transfers, in 1962 this Nation had a net outpayment of $6.9 billion—reference, appendix, table I, "U.S. Balance of Payments, 1947-62," page 278, Brookings report, published by the Joint Economic Committee.

In the meantime, there has been a major movement of private capital.

In 1947, private long-term capital investments abroad by U.S. citizens amounted to $900 million. This item remained well below a billion dollars during most of the years immediately following.

In 1956, however, the rate of U.S. capital investment abroad started increasing, from $1.9 billion in that year to $2.5 billion in 1962; and the earnings on foreign investments to the U.S. increased steadily, year by year, from $1.1 billion in 1947 to $3.3 billion in 1962.

Total income returned to the United States on private investments abroad has actually been greater, cumulatively, than total investments abroad during this period; and greater, in each year, than the annual outflow of investment capital.

This development is the one bright spot in our international economic relations; but the fly even in this ointment could be considered the loss of wages to American workers which results from this increase in U.S. financed foreign production.

In summary, from the above analysis one comes to the inescapable conclusion that our balance of payments deficits are due primarily to:

First. Structural changes in our import-export relationship.

Second. Continuance of Government expenditures abroad, for foreign aid, and for military expenses incident to the maintenance of U.S. forces.

In my next statement on balance of payments I shall address myself to an analysis of the various remedies proposed to solve this payments deficit problem.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bayh in the chair). The Senator from Washington is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is deeply interested in the subject and will offer some good remedies for the serious deficit of trade problem. There is one point that seems to escape the attention of nearly everyone in this field. About half the deficit is the result of travel. Every year, Americans spend abroad—I believe this year will be the highest—about $1,500 million plus. It has never varied much.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct. I believe it is $2½ billion gross, and $1½ billion-plus net.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Those who come to this country spend a maximum of, I believe, $400 million. So every year, roughly, there is a billion dollars of outflow without a corresponding amount coming in.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It is more than that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I was amazed at the amount in 3 or 4 years. To encourage foreign travel to this country now is not going to be the correct answer. It will never be a great deal more than it is, but this year it is up 26 percent.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct. The unfortunate fact is that the citizens of many countries to which we have given a great deal of aid are allowed a strictly limited amount of money to spend in our country. That is an unfortunate development. We have no limitation of any kind on our own citizens.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Almost everyone in the world would like to come to America. I am not making a speech for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, but it is true that nearly everyone wishes to come to the United States.

Mr. SYMINGTON. And stay here for a time, and spend money here.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct; but they have the impression that it costs too much to make a trip to the United States. Of course, it does not; it is just as cheap to travel here as in any other country in the world. We have done a great deal—of which I am sure the Senator will take note—to simplify obtaining passports, visas, and things of that kind, so that people can come here. There is also the intangible value gained when people from other countries come to America and see the country and meet the people. To that benefit one cannot attach a dollar sign. Other than the causes which the Senator from Missouri has mentioned, a great deal of the outflow of gold—50 percent of it, at least—has been the result of travel.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the able and distinguished senior Senator from Washington. He has put his finger on one of the primary reasons for the continuing unfavorable balance of payments.

First are the offshore military expenditures, which have totaled at least $36 billion since World War II.

Another is foreign aid, which has been discussed at length in the Senate.

More than from the standpoint of foreign aid in the loss of gold, however, if the latter program is now controlled as well as stated by the Agency for International Development, is tourism.

I hope this aspect of the problem, as suggested in the wise remarks of the Senator from Washington, will be fully considered by our Government.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8747) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 321 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 7, line 7, it is proposed to change "$81,000,000" to "$79,000,000" and change "$5,000,000" to "$3,000,000".

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes from the time on the bill to the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield].

CAMBODIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, today's Washington Evening Star carries a statement relative to Cambodia that "American Staff Will Be Slashed From 300 to 20."

In the press of late, there has been a flurry of reports pertaining to Cambodia. The reports are not clear or consistent. What they do indicate, however, is that there is about to be a termination of assistance from the United States to that country at the insistence of the Cambodian Government. There are also charges, apparently, by the Cambodian Prime Minister that certain agencies of the U.S. Government are implicated in efforts to overthrow his Government.

The hostility which is involved in this episode is most deplorable. But it is not the first time, Mr. President, that it has occurred. The history of our relations with that nation for the past decade, on the whole have been friendly.

But from the outset they have also been characterized by repeated misunderstandings and unnecessary personal irritations. And, I want to say, Mr. President, that in my judgment and in all frankness the fault is not all on the other side.

There have been indications, time and again, that the Cambodians wished to avoid a heavy dependency on outside aid. Time and again, they have indicated their desire to move toward its termination. Time and again these indications have been ignored or made light of by agencies of this Government.

The United States has provided $300 million in aid to Cambodia during the past decade. That is a very sizable amount of money although it is far less than that which has gone to Thailand, to Vietnam, and to Laos in the same area. Moreover, the level has been declining in recent years with Cambodian encouragement and concurrence. This aid has made a significant contribution to the remarkable internal progress of Cambodia and to its capacity to defend itself against invasions with a small but highly effective and dedicated military force and an intensely nationalistic and Khmer-conscious people.

One would assume, Mr. President, that we would have taken with some seriousness in the past this desire of the Cambodian Government to terminate assistance. One would assume that it would have been welcomed by us, especially in view of what has just recently transpired on the floor of the Senate in connection with the foreign aid bill.

One would assume, Mr. President, that we would find a measure of satisfaction in the realization that our aid had helped Cambodia to reach a point at which it felt capable of doing without a special assist from us. One would assume that we would be generous in our respect for a nation and a government which had the courage and the fortitude to attempt to make it largely on its own. One would assume that there would have been expressions of admiration for these hard-working people and for its hard-working chief of State. One would assume that we would have gone out of our way to provide assurances that we would do what we could to sustain, to encourage, and to fortify this courageous effort. In short, Mr. President, one would assume that we would have been delighted that Cambodia was prepared to attempt to end its one-sided dependence on our aid.

But is that what has transpired? Except for President Kennedy's statement, as published in the Evening Star for November 14, 1963—

> "It is my hope that Prince Sihanouk, who must be concerned about the independence and sovereignty of his country—he has, after all, been involved for many years in maintaining that independence—will not decide at this dangerous point in world affairs to surrender it," the President declared.
>
> "I would think that he is more concerned about Cambodian independence than we are. After all, he is a Cambodian.
>
> "Not to protect his nation's independence would be folly," Mr. Kennedy said, "and I don't think he is a foolish man"—

What has been the reaction of the executive branch? Of the press? Look at the noncommittal statements issued by the Department of State on behalf of all the relevant agencies of this Government. Look at the news reports and the editorials in recent years. Do you find approval of this Cambodian desire or do you find it subject to derision? Do you find a warm encouragement of the desire of the Cambodians to get off the foreign aid chuckwagon? Do you find the assurances that we will do what we can to make the transition orderly and to minimize the shock of the severance of aid? You find nothing of the kind. On the contrary, you find a clear suggestion that there is something idiotic in this desire. You find it regarded as almost inadmissable—a kind of betrayal—that Cambodia should dare even to think that it might make do on its own. You find almost a condemnation of the Cambodian desire to dispense with subsidies in one form or another of $30 million a year from the United States. You find a wide variety of disparaging comments on the character and ability and the sanity of its Chief of State. You find a former king bent upon the preservation of the institution of the monarchy and the traditions of Buddhism in his country branded even as a quasi-Communist. You find him referred to as a playboy and saxophone player.

Yet this particular Chief of State, with his great personal dedication and energy, more than any other in southeast Asia that I know of, has found a common ground with his own people. He has been both the inspiration and the core of their efforts to preserve their unique culture while establishing for it a safe place in the mainstream of human development in the second half of the 20th century.

You find, in short, almost a hostility to a nation which, with far less than most at the start, has developed within its borders a remarkable degree of progress and political cohesion and stability and a level of human freedom and public participation in the life of the nation which exceeds most if not all of the other nations of southeast Asia. Of course, Cambodia has made mistakes. Of course, there are unavoidable differences with Cambodia on southeast Asian issues. But is that a valid explanation for the kind of intemperate deprecation of the character of its Chief of State which has been widespread almost since the beginning of the independence of Cambodia?

I must confess, Mr. President, that I cannot understand these attitudes. I think they are disgraceful. I think that they are improper as a basis for normal, friendly, and mutually beneficial relations between ourselves and other nations. I think they do a disservice to our foreign relations for they suggest that the only relationship we trust, at least for the present in Asia, is one of continued dependency of those nations on our aid if not our superior wisdom. And, this is the case at a time when the pressures within this Nation are rising for a great reduction if not a termination of aid.

No one can foretell what the political future of southeast Asia will be. But it ill behooves us to assume that we know what is best for another nation in a setting 10,000 miles away, a setting of which we knew little scarcely a decade and a half ago and have yet to learn much. It ill behooves us to operate apparently on the principle that any southeast Asian nation will automatically sink into communism not long after it dares to pull the plug of its dependency upon our aid. If that is the case, what are we talking about when we talk about terminating this aid program in the near future? And if it is, indeed, the case we will only have hastened the day of Cambodia's collapse by intemperate and insulting comments on its Chief of State. We will only have hastened the day by a hostility or an indifference to the laudable effort of the Cambodians to stand on their own feet.

In the end, the gloomy predictions that Cambodia will be pushed into the orbit of Communist China may well be realized. And if it happens we can charge a great deal of the responsibility to the inadequacies of our own understanding and our bureaucratic ineptitude.

If we would really serve our legitimate national interests in southeast Asia we will not disparage, ridicule, or discourage this effort of Cambodia to dispense with our aid. On the contrary, we will do what we can to salvage a good will which need never have been lost. And what we can do at this late date is at least to have the good grace to welcome the effort to dispense with our aid and not exacerbate the difficulties of the transition. For if they are multiplied then we will have done more than our share to topple this small nation into the outstretched arms of Communist China or other predatory elements which may be in the vicinity.

What we can do is not to condemn Cambodia for dropping our aid but encourage other nations in that area also to try to dispense with it. What we can do is to redouble our efforts to bring about a better climate between Cambodia and its neighbors, both West and East, to the end that the fears, warranted or unwarranted which impel the Cambodians to look—and in my judgment in error—toward China for succor may be minimized.

I would strongly urge this body and this Government to think twice about writing off Cambodia and the remarkable achievement which with our assistance has been registered in this small and isolated nation of southeast Asia. We ought to find satisfaction in what we have helped to build. We ought to find satisfaction, not discomfort, in the fact that the Cambodians feel strong enough to try to stand on their own feet. The only regret is that what should have been a moment of great pleasure to us, as vindication of the concept of foreign aid, is clouded with a most unfortunate hostility. And, I repeat, in my judgment the fault lies as much in our own strange bureaucratic ineptitude over the years as it does with the seemingly erratic behavior of the Cambodian Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD an extract dealing with Cambodia from the report which represents the joint findings of the distinguished Senators from Rhode Island and

Delaware [Mr. Pell and Mr. Boggs] and myself at the conclusion of a visit to southeast Asia about a year ago.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CAMBODIA

Cambodia has developed into one of the most stable and progressive nations in Southeast Asia. Apart from difficulties on its borders with Thailand and Vietnam, the kingdom enjoys complete peace and has registered a remarkable degree of economic and social progress in a decade. The leadership of Prince Sihhanouk has been a key factor in this achievement. Abdicating the throne in order to participate actively in political affairs, the Prince has led the kingdom with an understanding of his people, with personal dedication, and with immense energy. He has maintained cooperative relations with France on the new basis of full national independence and equality and the French, today, continue to play a major part in the development of the country. Cambodia's contacts with the rest of the world have been greatly expanded and now encompass all of the major powers, Communist and non-Communist. In international circles, Cambodia has come to occupy an influential role among the smaller nations and was a prime mover in the convening of the Geneva Conference on Laos.

Outside assistance has been supplied to Cambodia by many countries, including Soviet Russia and Communist China. The United States has provided over $300 million in assistance from 1955 to 1962. But the level has been declining, with Cambodian encouragement and concurrence.

In spite of this assistance, however, Cambodian-United States relationships have encountered repeated difficulties from the outset. In retrospect, many of these difficulties appear superficial and avoidable. Whatever the difficulties, there is not and can hardly be any legitimate basis for a direct conflict with this remote Asian kingdom. There are on the other hand, possibilities for deepening cultural and economic contacts of mutual benefit. Indeed, Cambodia's inner progress and declining dependence on U.S.-grant aid points to a foreseeable termination of these programs, not in chaos but in a transition to an enduring relationship of mutual respect and mutual advantage. Finally, Cambodia's existence as an independent nation at peace with all of the great powers is of exemplary value if there is ever to be a durable and peaceful solution to the basic problems of southeast Asia.

It would appear very much in order for the United States to make every effort to understand the position of the Cambodians and to use its good offices in every practicable way to encourage settlement of the border difficulties with Thailand and Vietnam. Our military aid to these countries is undoubtedly a factor in exacerbating Cambodian fears and, hence, has intensified the difficulties which have characterized United States-Cambodian relations. However they may appear to us, these fears are very real to the Cambodians and exert a powerful influence on the course of its policies which of late have tended toward an extreme neutralism.

As noted, there has already been a decline in the level of one-sided U.S. aid to Cambodia and apparently, the Government of that country desires a continuance of this process. We should seek to meet this desire in an orderly fashion. At the same time, far greater emphasis should be placed on expanding more mutual relationships. Educational and other exchanges and the promotion of tourism, for example, can be of great value in this connection. The possibilities of stimulating investment and enlarged trade should also be fully explored. It would appear greatly in our interest to make every reasonable effort to encourage a transition from what has been a stormy and one-sided aid relationship to a new relationship of greater understanding and mutuality.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. If I have time remaining, I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Montana has made an excellent statement. It has been almost national idiocy over the years for us to insist not only upon determining how the other countries of the globe should conduct their governments, but also that they take aid from us at the expense of the American taxpayers. I am happy that Cambodia has decided she no longer needs our assistance. It is to her credit. It would be to our discredit if we tried to force our money and other assistance on her in spite of her objections.

As the Senator from Montana has said, we have been trying to lay down guidelines as to how many of the countries of the globe should conduct their affairs up to this point.

But until we can determine with some degree of accuracy how the affairs of our own Nation ought to be conducted, I think it ill behooves us to try to force our image and opinion on every other country, large or small, with which we come in contact.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished Senator from Vermont for his comments. As always, he has hit the nail on the head.

PRESERVATION OF WILDLIFE AND BEAUTY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss].

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, an improved program of protection for the Nation's wildlife and beauty, and better stewardship of the public domain, is a compelling interest in this country. The Kennedy administration has made this a principal objective; State and county official and citizen groups work at it constantly, and there are millions of sportsmen and nature lovers throughout the country who have made conservation a personal crusade.

Among the most effective leadership in this field is that of Mr. Harold S. Crane, director of the Utah State Department of Fish and Game. Mr. Crane has received an award from the Department of the Interior for his work, and is also the recipient of the Jim Bridger Award of Utah State Forestry.

At the recent annual convention of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners, in Minneapolis, which was attended by experts from the United States, Canada, and Mexico, Mr. Crane was elected chairman of the executive committee. He was also one of the principal speakers, giving the excellent speech on conservation and recreation which summarized results of a questionnaire on wildlife management and conservation submitted to those responsible for these functions in most of our States. The results indicate many areas in which there is substantial agreement between the States and the Federal Government, but others in which we need greater cooperative efforts. Because I believe this speech to be of significant interest to all Members of Congress, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Congressional Record at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

State's Views on Federal Recreation Programs

(By Harold S. Crane, director, Utah State Department of Fish and Game)

Two and one-half years have passed since President Kennedy expressed his desires to identify his administration with a strong conservation movement. When he spoke at the dedication of the National Wildlife Federation's new home office, he commented on the material wealth and power provided to us by our natural resources and added that we must keep America a "place where wildlife and natural beauty cannot be despoiled," and where our people can "find the materials and spiritual strength upon which our greatness as a country depends."

Many conservation leaders at that time felt this to be the beginning of a new era of great opportunity, especially as the administration had indicated its awareness of the appalling and serious contradiction and conflict in the Federal effort brought about by the lack of centralized review of agency policies and programs for water, forest, parks, public land, wildlife, and recreation.

The Secretary of the Interior was to take the lead in resolving these conflicts. Consequently, 1 month later, at the 26th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference, Secretary Udall spelled out the strong interest of the Department of the Interior in developing a new program with basic objectives of better stewardship of the public domain, emphasizing multiple use and indicating, among other things, that the Bureau of Land Management Advisory Board would be reconstituted to give a broader representation to other interests, including wildlife and recreation.

In May of last year at the White House Conference on Conservation, Secretary Freeman committed the Department of Agriculture to a program of increasing the recreational opportunities on both public and private lands. He made particular reference to recreation as a cash crop, indicating that this would bolster farm income, and at the same time, make good use of a portion of the Nation's surplus lands.

Certainly, it would appear that at last we now realize that the real wealth of our Nation consists not of reserves of gold or silver, but in the character, quality, and health of all the people and the abundance and variety of our natural resources.

It is true that in the transition from the saddle horse to the interstate, our natural resources have, indeed, been exploited in producing our present complex, specialized and demanding society. Thus, in the long struggle in the development of conservation, from Theodore Roosevelt to the present, the above declarations of encouragement, with the emphasis on recreation, including hunting and fishing, and the new spirit of cooperation that seemed evident, were sincerely welcomed.

The outdoors lies deep in the American tradition, and more and more people are finding here the renewing experiences necessary to help cope with modern life. "Today's challenge is to assure to all Americans permanent access to their outdoor heritage," so stated the Outdoor Recreation Resource

Review Commission, which was created by the 85th Congress to study the recreation problem.

What then is needed to provide outdoor opportunities to the American people? Certainly the demand is obvious. Almost 90 percent of our people participated in some form of outdoor recreation in 1960 on approximately 4.4 billion separate occasions. This activity is expected to triple in the next 37 years.

From the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission report, we learn that people's wants are simple—"a path to walk along, an attractive road for a drive, a place to swim, or a shady hillside for a picnic." These things are wanted by people close to where they live, and we find most people now live in our growing metropolitan areas. Further, we learn that we have enough land and water, but fail to use it effectively. Access is a big problem.

SOME FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Now what are some of the Federal recreation programs? Since World War II, Government agencies have been hard pressed to meet user demands. The National Park Service is past midpoint in Mission 66, a 10-year program to make more effective use of the national park system. The Forest Service initiated Operation Outdoors and additional appropriated funds have contributed toward recreational development in our national forests. The Corps of Engineers, the Bureaus of Reclamation and Public Roads, the SCS, and others have indicated a diversion from single objectives as in the past toward multiple use, recreation being recognized as one of these. The Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife are seeking legislative authority to recognize outdoor recreation in their programs.

It is anticipated that the newly organized Bureau of Outdoor Recreation will provide the promised coordination and leadership necessary in order that these and other groups of government—local, State, and National—may participate fully and consistently in a total national recreation program.

FUTURE FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Future plans for Federal action are incorporated in several recommendations of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission and may well be the programs that will be as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ORRRC

8-1. Federal high-density recreation areas (class I) that serve primarily local recreation needs should be placed under State or local government control. "There is no need why Federal agencies with national responsibilities should provide for local needs."

8-2. General outdoor recreation areas (class II) should be carefully planned for and developed at Federal reservoirs.

8-3. General outdoor recreation areas (class II) should be established at suitable locations in national parks and monuments. This would eliminate the need for further nonconforming development in natural environment (class III) and unique natural (class IV) areas and at the same time provide the necessary facilities and services for enjoyment of the areas. (This is good, provided they go far enough to include hunting and fishing.)

8-4. The Forest Service should identify and preserve unique natural areas (class IV) within the national forests.

8-5. The interpretive and education services of the Federal agencies should be expanded.

8-6. Congress should enact legislation providing for the establishment and management of certain primitive areas (class V) as wilderness areas.

8-7. The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife should take the lead in dealing with the legal, economic, organizational and other problems related to the provision of public hunting and fishing opportunities.

8-8. Surplus Federal lands suitable for outdoor recreation purposes should be made available to State and local governments at no cost, with appropriate reversion clauses.

8-9. The Bureau of Indian Affairs should provide increased assistance to Indian owners in developing the economic potential of public outdoor activity on their lands.

8-10. In view of the urgent needs of urban dwellers for areas that can be used for recreation activities, the Commission endorses continuation of the recently authorized open space program.

8-11. Legislation should be enacted to permit consideration of public outdoor recreation benefits created by small watershed projects carried out under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954.

8-12. Certain programs and policies of the Department of Agriculture should be modified where practical to take account of their potential for proving public outdoor recreation opportunities. (As indicated, Secretary Freeman has called for the cooperation of agriculture and recreation. He said, "Ours is a nation of abundance of food and a shortage of recreation * * * outdoor recreation should become a cash crop.")

8-13. Federal and State Governments should give explicit recognition to recreation values in the planning and design of highways.

As indicated, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation would function to coordinate Federal recreation programs. That this is needed is evidenced by the fact there are now over 20 Federal agencies involved in some aspect of outdoor recreation. The situation is similar in the States. Direction is needed. This new agency is to provide grants-in-aid, sponsor and conduct research, encourage interstate and regional cooperation and generally develop a national coordinated plan based on local, State, regional and national needs.

In discussing the subject further, I would like to present the results of a questionnaire sent to each of the States; make some additional comments and conclude with what I consider to be some constructive suggestions.

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE AND COMMENTS

1. In your opinion, through the Federal programs are States relinquishing their responsibilities in fish and game to the Federal Government? Yes, 25; no, 24; no answer, 1.

That one-half of our State administrators feel we are relinquishing our fish and game responsibilities is a serious accusation. The Federal Government has only the right to function in those powers and authority granted to it by the representatives of the people of the several States. All fish and game (except possibly for migratory species), within the various States, not held by private ownership, legally acquired, have been declared property of these respective States. Therefore, we must not lose initiative. Strong leadership within the States is essential to maintain our traditional ownership.

2. Do you feel there is unnecessary duplication of effort in Federal Recreation programs? Yes, 38; no, 10; no answer, 2.

As State administrators we can well wonder if the new spirit of cooperation that seemed evident over 2 years ago has not fallen by the wayside when over 75 percent answer "yes" to the above question. The dark cloud of inter- and intra-agency competition instead of cooperation still hangs heavily overhead. For example, this competition and duplication seems very evident at Flaming Gorge Reservoir where the National Park Service is planning to spend in excess of $8 million by June 30, 1969, for recreation development; whereas, the U.S. Forest Service, in turn, is spending an additional $2 million for similar developments. In this case two agencies are building five boat launching facilities with the accompanying campground and picnic areas on approximately 32 miles of reservoir in Utah. The U.S. Forest Service Sheep Creek boat ramp will be about 10 miles from the National Park Service development in Lucerne Valley. Primary access to both of these ramps will be through Manila with very little difference in road distances. With the present road systems, traffic will have to pass immediately by the Cedar Springs boat ramp to reach the Dutch John Draw ramp, both of which are being constructed and maintained by the U.S. Forest Service. With present roads, traffic would have to pass by both of these ramps to reach the National Park Service ramp on Antelope Flat. According to our best information there are no immediate plans for building additional highways north from the Dutch John area. As it now looks, almost all of the use will be at Cedar Springs and Lucerne Valley. Without a lot of additional road construction, I doubt if the public will pass one ramp and drive many miles to reach another that has no better facilities to offer.

It is my opinion that if either one or the other of these Federal agencies had complete management responsibilities, fewer facilities would have been considered adequate. Certainly there is a duplication of personnel.

3. If your answer to question 2 was "yes," do you feel the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation will help alleviate this situation? Yes, 27; no, 13; no answer, 10.

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation is being critically observed. Either, as many hope, it will coordinate the whole recreation effort into an efficient operation or, as many fear, it will only duplicate data available elsewhere at time and expense, and become one more of several agencies trying to do the same job.

4. Will the present or proposed Federal recreational programs usurp States' rights to manage wildlife resources on Federal lands? Yes, 25; no, 21; no answer, 4.

Many States expressed considerable concern on this point. Generally they feel that if the States exert strong leadership this will not be a problem. Certainly there is plenty for the Federal agencies to do without encroaching upon the States rights to manage wildlife.

5. That land is constantly being withdrawn from public hunting and fishing through various means is well known. Would public hunting on any presently restricted Federal land benefit game management? Yes, 41; no, 7; no answer, 2.

Most of the "no" answers were qualified to apply only to their particular State. The policy set forth in the Leopold report of the National Park Advisory on Wildlife Management opposing a multiple use concept on park's lands, even in remote isolated areas away from headquarters and visitors, is typical of the attitude that game biologists and managers object to in the majority of the States.

The artificial environment, regulated superficially under man's influence, only approximates the primitive conditions and in many instances is hazardous to it. The State game departments cannot accept a purist attitude toward these areas in total, especially as these type of areas are threatened to increase with new acquisitions. Perhaps a reclassification of these single use areas under the ORRRC proposed system to include hunting would not be unrealistic.

6. (a) In your State, what is the present trend in private land ownership and wildlife? Hunting and fishing on these lands increasing, 25; decreasing 18.

Three States felt this condition to be static in their respective States. Many felt private clubs, organizations and companies, etc., by leasing these lands for hunting and fishing rights were responsible for increased used. Some indicated this was a good trend as it took pressure off of public areas.

(b) Are Federal programs necessary to aid private recreational development? Yes, 11; no, 32; no answer, 7.

Several States felt the answer would be "yes" if the States failed to accomplish this.

7. If you have State parks, does your State game department manage the resource to include public harvest of game? Yes, 21; no, 28; no answer, 1.

This situation is similar to the national one where one use is permitted only in many States; however, several States indicated progress in opening these areas to multiple use.

8. (a) The land and water conservation fund bill advocates the collection of moneys through user fees for public use of Federal lands, including hunting and fishing. Are you in agreement with these proposals? Yes, 23; no, 26; no answer, 1.

Several of those who answered "no" indicated they would have answered "yes" if hunting and fishing were excluded. They were in favor of charging for use of developed areas and physical facilities only. This attitude was almost unanimous in the western public land States.

(b) If your answer to part (a) was "yes," do you feel that the States can justifiably oppose or discourage private landowners who wish to charge for recreational use their land? Yes, 3; no, 19; no answer, 1. (Only those who answered question 8(a) "yes" were requested to answer question 8(b).)

9. If the Federal Government charges user fees on public lands, could this not encourage private owners to do likewise, wherein they have not done so in the past? Yes, 46; no, 4.

Many felt this to be a good practice and encouraged it as it provides additional public use. The trend is in this direction. The Department of Agriculture, in particular, is encouraging landowners to capitalize on wildlife as a supplemental income. Fisheries and wildlife people must recognize this trend and aid in rural area or community development programs to safeguard and direct wildlife and fisheries needs.

10. In your State, is there a contradiction of effort in Federal programs involving different agencies or even the same agency. For example: Drainage and land improvement projects for agriculture, flood control, etc., by one group and land acquisition and development for recreational purposes by another? Yes, 36; no, 10; no answer, 4.

The channelizing program of the Pecos River and the Rio Grande in New Mexico, the drainage projects in southeast Missouri, the GSA disposing of lands, the ACP encouraging drainage in areas where the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife is trying to restore marshes, the loss of fish and game habitat through public roads projects all are only typical of the multitude of reasons prompting over 70 percent of the State fish and wildlife administrators to object to many of the present programs. The coordination and cooperation called for by the President, especially between the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Interior, is evidently slow in materializing.

In spite of the stated objectives of the Bureau of Land Management, little more than window dressing has been given toward implementing the multiple-use concept. The advisory boards on the State and National levels have been reorganized to provide broader representation. The Bureau is to be complimented on this progress; however, amendment of the Taylor Grazing Act will be necessary before the local advisory boards can adequately represent other interests.

One area of serious conflict lies between the Bureau of Public Roads and the Department of Agriculture along with other agencies concerned with river resources. In spite of introduced legislation to require coordination, the Bureau continues to dominate the scene, giving insufficient attention to recreational resources in its expanded highway building program. The recently issued administrative order provides some hope, but I think we might be well advised to take a wait-and-see attitude. The States are woefully weak in not requiring better coordination among State agencies.

We hope the new era of great opportunity is not struggling in vain to escape from the old chasm of interagency jealousy and conflict.

11. Are hunting and fishing and wildlife resources being given adequate and proper consideration in Federal and State planning? Yes, 22; no, 23; no answer, 3. Several felt progress was being made, but not fast enough.

12. In view of the above questions, is there an apparent conflict in your State between wildlife interests and other forms of recreation? Yes, 26; no, 19; no answer, 3.

Those States with combined game, fish, and recreation departments were the ones that apparently have the fewest problems here. Zoning of water courses by State and local governments to restrict use and resolve conflicts involving power boating, water skiing, fishing, and other types of water sports is gaining favor.

AREAS WHERE MORE FEDERAL LEADERSHIP MIGHT BE EXPECTED

When we discuss State and Federal responsibilities, it must be against a changing background. Initially the Federal Government assumed major leadership and responsibilities in resource management, but over the years, the States have assumed increasing competency and have demonstrated a willingness and a strong desire to assume additional leadership and responsibility. In some fields, however, the Federal Government has been slow to recognize this change.

As pointed out earlier, there are some specific areas in which the States want the Federal Government to relinquish responsibility. There are others, however, which must remain a Federal responsibility and in which we should urge additional leadership. I would list these as follows, not necessarily in their order of importance:

1. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation should be the central point for guidance and information on all phases of outdoor recreation. It should draw together the wealth of information now available on the natural resources aspect of outdoor recreation, together with the sociological and economic data and make this available to all agencies having responsibilities in the recreational field.

Further, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation should outline research needs and suggest how these might be satisfied.

2. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation should announce at the earliest possible moment its ideas on the type of recreation plans that will be required, both State and Federal, assuming ultimate passage of the land and water conservation fund bill. The States should be planning now to take advantage of Federal funds when, and if, they become available.

3. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation apparently needs a stronger position in providing coordination, since it is obvious that inter-agency jealousies continue to hamper cooperation.

4. The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife could deemphasize some programs which the States are entirely capable of handling. They could increase their efforts in developing waterfowl programs and concerning themselves more with the pesticide and pollution problems. More emphasis should be placed on research and less on law enforcement and management. I think it is also fair to suggest that the Bureau develop more imaginative programs. We have seen little new, with the exception of the wetland preservation program, and little as yet has been demonstrated here.

5. The Secretaries of Commerce, Agriculture, and Interior should be required to sit down and resolve questions concerning road construction and resource use. Funds should be made available to adequately protect recreational, scenic, and wildlife values. This matter appears to be a subject for Presidential and congressional concern.

6. While rural area development and community development programs require a grassroots approach, the Federal Government has basic responsibilities for guidance and leadership. The tremendous economic importance of wildlife resources has not received due consideration in rural area or community development programs. As wildlife people we must assume a portion of the responsibility because many community and rural areas are not aware of this untapped potential. Once rural and urban areas become aware of this important wildlife resource, wildlife will assume a positive, rather than a neutral or in some cases a negative value.

7. Several agencies of Government, but especially the Department of Agriculture, have been promoting the use of private lands for recreation purposes. While the Department of Agriculture must have final approval on the expenditure of its funds, the State fish and game departments should have greater responsibility in programing and project approval.

8. With the increased attention being given to the recreational use of private lands, there is a need for a national review of some of the very basic problems that will be encountered and suggestions and alternatives on how these might be satisfied. It is my understanding that the Department of the Interior is now preparing such a guide, and it would be my hope that it will be available soon.

9. One of the real problems that everyone will encounter as we develop recreational plans will be the role and responsibility of private industry and the local, State, and Federal governments. Private landowners can hardly be expected to undertake developments if faced with the prospect of public competition. By the same token, the specific role of local, county and State governments needs to be more clearly spelled out. Beyond this, there will be interstate responsibilities. The Federal Government, specifically the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, could be helpful in thoroughly analyzing these problems and offering suggestions.

10. Federal pollution control activities under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are directed primarily at problem situations which pose a threat to human health and well-being. In view of the fact that all responsibility for pollution control by Federal agencies is vested in this Department, we strongly urge that more consideration be given to fish and wildlife interests than has been granted in the past.

I doubt if there is as deep a conflict between State and Federal responsibilities as sometimes assumed. There are some areas where we, as State administrators, want and expect to exercise more responsibility. By the same token, there are areas in which we would like to see the Federal Government assume greater leadership and guidance. We hope this will be forthcoming.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8747) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] on page 7, line 7.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes under my time on my amendment.

My amendment would cut back the subsidy for helicopter service from $5 to $3 million. There have been subsidies for helicopters for 10 years, ever since 1954. Originally this was supposed to be an infant industry needing a 2- to 3-year subsidy. The subsidy started at less than $2 million. Throughout the years it has grown steadily.

In connection with any subsidy we should examine the benefits to the Nation and the benefits to those who receive the service. Who travels on the helicopter service? This subsidy goes to only three cities, namely, New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles.

Very few people travel by helicopter. Only about 1 person in 7 ever flies. Only about 1 in 20 or 30 flies regularly. But only 1 in 1,000 uses helicopter service at all. Only 1 in 10,000 uses helicopter service regularly.

Those who use helicopter service are, by and large, people who can afford to pay for the service. They are mostly business people, who can afford to pay for it. They are, if not the most affluent, among the most affluent people in America.

In New York the sole helicopter service is between Wall Street and La Guardia and Idlewild Airports. On the basis of questioning, the time saved by using such helicopter service is 30 minutes. The proposed subsidy is close to $2 million for New York alone. When this subsidy benefits only those who want to save time by flying from Wall Street to one of the airports, the subsidy cannot be justified.

The Chicago situation is even less justifiable.

There was a time when Chicago had two international airports, Midway and O'Hare. Furthermore, those who want to get downtown can take a subsidized helicopter flight from O'Hare to Meigs Field, on Lake Michigan, which is only a few blocks from the Loop.

But Chicago has a surface freeway system from O'Hare Field downtown, which I have taken many times. It takes only about 20 or 25 minutes. It may take a little more time in the rush hour, but not much more. So the Chicago subsidy is to save a handful of people 10 or 15 minutes.

In Los Angeles the situation can be justified even less. There is only one international or national airport there, not several, as is the case of Washington, where perhaps helicopter service could be justified to some extent. Los Angeles has only one major airport. It is true that Los Angeles is spread over a very large area. It is true that there are 80 small airports in the area. But there is only one international airport. According to the testimony before the subcommittee, those who use the helicopter service are only 1 in 80 of those who fly. As I said before, only about 1 in 10 flies at all. In Los Angeles, very few people use that service. They are usually the leading motion picture and aircraft executives. If they want to use the helicopter service to save time, they should pay for it.

More than half the cost of travel by helicopter is now paid under subsidy by the Federal Government in these three cities.

If people want this rapid-fire, superlative service, they should pay for it, and they can pay for it.

The clinching argument on this question was made last year in conference. I should like to quote what the conferees said last year:

> The conferees agreed that subsidies for helicopters should be ended shortly; that this service should be made self-supporting or concluded.

The House provided $3 million in the bill this year, to be divided equally among the three cities, as the initial step in terminating the subsidy.

My amendment would return to the House level. It would not completely eliminate the subsidy. It is a moderate amendment, which provides what the House language provides.

Senators may say, "Give it another year at $5 million." We always like to go along with our colleagues, and colleagues can make impassioned pleas when they have certain installations in their particular States, and we are sympathetic with them. But we have been going along like this for years. Why should Senators say, "Give us another 1 or 2 years"?

It seems to me that the House action was sensible. It cut back the subsidy moderately, from $5 to $3 million.

I hope the Senate will take this opportunity to save $2 million by agreeing to the amendment.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I want to take about 2 minutes. There is a great deal of merit in what the Senator from Wisconsin has said, but there are two sides to the coin. This is a problem the committee has had before it for many years. As a practical matter, the House always provides that there shall be an equal amount for all three cities for that service, and it just does not work. We are trying to get the bill in a condition in which the subsidy will not be taken away from the service.

There was the problem of new equipment. Two cities have had it. Los Angeles requires it because it is a growing area and has to give more service. The New York helicopter system had a bad accident, which will have serious effects. It has the new equipment, and is rendering much better service.

One of the reasons why New York has a larger amount than might be thought necessary is that a great deal of mail is hauled. I think the Senator from Rhode Island will recall that the Post Office Department was paying $2 a ton. I will obtain the figures and place them in the RECORD. If the Post Office Department would pay what others have to pay for carrying mail, we would see a different picture in New York. This problem was considered in committee. It was decided that instead of doing what the House has been doing, making cuts without any sense of practicality, we would do what the CAB suggested must be done under the law.

I would like to see the problem solved, because I believe there should be some helicopter service in other places in the country. The fact that it is limited to three cities keeps the situation frozen. I agree with the Senator from Georgia, that there is no better place in the country where helicopter service should be provided than in the Puget Sound area.

To come in from or go out to the airport requires a 5- or 6-hour drive around the Sound, to any of the communities to which one wishes to get, and that time could be cut to 15 minutes by helicopters. The terrain lends itself ideally to the use of helicopters.

The problem is being worked on, although I do not know how much progress has been made. The helicopter companies render service that is absolutely necessary. They are in the same position as the local transport airlines. It is almost an obligation to continue it, because CAB must make these payments whether it likes to do so or not. Under the law, as it now stands, a certain amount must be paid.

Secondly, there is a large investment in this service. Furthermore, I know of no more soul searching that has been occasioned in committee than in connection with this particular item.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me some time?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield the Senator from Oklahoma 5 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. I, too, can understand why the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin and many others question the helicopter subsidies. If it were only a matter of saving the people who use the service a half-hour's time or an hour's time in getting from the airports to the cities, to reduce the time of arrival in the central part of the city after the plane has arrived at the airport, or to make it easy to have transportation provided from downtown New York to the 3 great airports in New York City, or if this were purely a luxury service for 1 out of 100 or so air passengers, I could well understand the desire to reduce the subsidy by $2 million, as the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin proposes.

However, I point out, that the committee brings in a bill with a reduction of 15 percent from the budget estimate and from the recommendation of CAB, by cutting the bill from $5,775,000 to $5 million.

Our main interest is to try to create a new phase of aviation, a phase in which, when there are adequate machines to take care of the traffic, masses of traffic will be carried above the crowded, congested areas. In some of these areas the Federal Government must pay up to $50 million a mile in order to construct throughways to get across the sprawling cities to suburbs, and to various parts of the cities.

Whether this program will work, I do not know, but we are trying to make it work with turbopowered helicopters that carry 25 to 30 passengers, which offer for the first time an economical seat-mile cost for transportation over the congested areas by means of the vertical takeoff and landing aircraft.

We are considering a growing industry; and if that industry can give us the machines, we shall be able to solve the problem, which is difficult. We shall be able to save much more money than we are now paying to construct throughways, to aid transportation to the suburbs.

The great manufacturers firmly believe in this probability. General Electric believes in it, and is investing a great deal of its money in engines and parts for participation in the helicopter program, and the production of turbo-powered aircraft, which are more economical in the kind of operation we have in mind. Sikorsky has a similar machine. It has been operating for only 1 year, and already it has proved the value of the service.

The program of providing helicopter service has been in effect for 16 years. We tried to operate the system with reciprocal motors, in noisy, shaky, lumbering craft. This money does not apply to private industry alone, or the transportation of civilians alone. The military have also been seeking improved operations of helicopters.

I should like to see more than three companies in this operation, because we are now at the limit of what we can pay in subsidies. I do not want to see enlarged subsidies put into effect. That has been the issue, and that is where the complaints arise because, for example, we cannot give helicopter service to Washington or Atlanta.

We cannot provide the services for St. Louis, or to some other cities, and must limit it to three crowded airport complexes. Chicago does not have a complex now, and its business has gone down. The Los Angeles area, like the New York area, has a sprawling complex of airports. We have seen the airplane industry devote hundreds of millions of dollars to the production of subsonic jets. It may do it again by producing supersonic jets. This is an industry that may grow, if we do not kill it off in its infancy. So far only three areas that I have mentioned are receiving the service. We cannot provide it in any other area—not because we favor any particular area or any groups of companies, but because the amount provided for this service does not permit service anywhere else at this time. No one can make any definite prediction when the companies will be subsidy free. CAB has said that in 5 or 6 years they have not been able to say when that time will be. Now, it is said, they will stick their necks out and say they think that in 4 or 5 years a subsidy will not be necessary. With aircraft carrying 35 passengers, there is hope of reaching that goal.

We cannot put all the traffic into one airport, as was true with Washington Airport, or as would be the case with Idlewild or LaGuardia. It cannot be done in Los Angeles, and in many other places.

Vertical takeoff and landing service will be a great part of aviation. To save $2 million now will perhaps make useless the $250 million that has gone into the subsidies. I am certain that if the amendment is adopted the existing helicopter operation will be killed off. Perhaps Chicago can operate on $1 million, because it is the operation that is least necessary today. Its volume has gone down, while the volume in other areas has gone up. I believe we can expect the amount to be apportioned equally. I believe the Senator has copied the House language verbatim. Therefore under the Senator's amendment each of these areas would receive only $1 million.

If it is proposed to establish a measure for a subsidy, let the CAB decide what an operator is entitled to on the basis of miles flown—seat-miles and route-miles. To say that we are going to give a subsidy to each one every year would be extravagant.

The amendment, while it should be voted down, should cause us to evaluate a vital new part of the aviation industry, one which may eventually surpass the long-haul traffic operations in volume.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield 30 seconds to me

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The amendment merely changes the figures. It does not provide that $1 million shall be given, and no more than $1 million, to each of these cities, which I would think might or might not be practical; but there is nothing in the amendment itself that so provides. The amendment merely changes the figure—and only the figure—in the bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not have the report before me, but the testimony in the hearings. The distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], who is an expert on this subject, will support me, I believe, and say that the way the House amendment was drafted and the way the report language read, it would require the payment of equal amounts to all three companies, the needs of which are not equal, for their very existence and survival.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That question would be in conference, because all my amendment would do would be to change the figure.

Mr. MONRONEY. There would be nothing in conference. The Senator would restore and lock up a Senate committee item, and not afford an opportunity for negotiation with the House.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is no language in the bill, as it will pass the Senate, which provides that this amount must be increased, or must be equally divided among the three cities.

Mr. MONRONEY. But the only change the Senator proposes is in the amount; therefore, there would be nothing in conference if the amount were the same. Therefore, we would be locked in with the amount the House has written into the bill. The testimony in the hearings was that every one of the companies would have to share, and share alike.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senate report is different.

Mr. MONRONEY. But the Senator's amendment would overturn the Senate report, which is based not upon the $5,775,000 that was asked for, but on the reduction of 15 percent that made up the $5 million figure. If the Senator's amendment should change the amount to the identical amount that is in the House bill, we would have nothing with which to go to conference with the House.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. As a member of the Subcommittee on Air Transportation of the Committee on Commerce, of which the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma is the able chairman, and as a member of the subcommittee which considered the bill, I commend the Senator for what he has said and associate myself with his statement.

Mr. MONRONEY. I deeply appreciate what the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire has said. He has been most helpful and cooperative.

The biggest thing ahead of us in aviation is not supersonic transportation. The big advance of the future will be in traveling short distances in vertical-landing-and-takeoff aircraft. If we cannot develop an economical means of air transportation for commuter service, we shall hamper our coast-to-coast air traffic. Headway is being made. Considerably more headway has been made in the past year or two in vertical takeoff and landing development. If that program is successful, we will shortly see greater progress than we have seen to date.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, it would be clearly illogical to say that the arguments made by the Senator from Wisconsin have no weight. They have. But I believe there is one part of the record that ought to be made clear, if we are to understand the question or to act upon it intelligently.

When the authorization for helicopter service was made, it was made upon the basis and the understanding that an experiment was to be conducted; that it was to be the basis for determining whether a service could be operated economically in short hops by means of vertical takeoff and landing craft, whether it be a helicopter, or "chopper," as we call it, or some other craft.

When the program was started, the only craft that were available were some piston-powered helicopters. There was never any contention, so far as I know, by anyone, that the small, piston-powered helicopters could ever justify themselves. But they did justify themselves, because it was upon the experience that was gained from many hours of operating in the Korean war that the U.S. Government was able to go into full-scale production and utilize helicopters during that war. In the recent hearings, we received testimony that the helicopters had effected a saving to the military of more than $75 million.

Now we are considering the present situation. For years, we have been looking forward to a cheaper and more economical helicopter. We have seen the advent of the turbine-powered helicopter. Two companies produce it. As has been said, they are two different types of helicopter. There has never been any contention—and I wish to make this perfectly clear for the record—by anyone who I have heard testify in the 5 years I have served upon this committee that the piston-powered helicopters could ever pay their way.

The statements made by the managers of the Los Angeles system and the managers of the New York system were that when turbine-powered helicopters begin operations, the cost will be increased for the first few months—perhaps for the first year of operation. After that, they expect the cost to drop dramatically. Both the New York company and the Los Angeles company presented to the committee graphs, showing that exactly this has been the case. Those companies began to receive their first helicopters in the calendar year 1962. Some of their equipment has not been delivered, even into this year. Some of it is still expected. By the way, the Government has guaranted the greater portion of the purchase price. So if we should jerk the props out from under them—and $3 million would jerk the props out from under them completely—the companies would be up against a wall, and the Government would be up against the necessity of making good the guarantee of payments for the helicopters.

The operators of the helicopter systems have said, in addition—and this has been their uniform testimony in the 5 years I have been a member of the committee—that after the first increase in cost—what they call their landing period in the operation of the helicopters—the cost would drop off immediately.

The operational figures of both companies, as given to the committee, showed dramatically that this has been the case. I wish to make it perfectly clear that I do not favor extending the subsidy ad infinitum. The companies are now in their second year of operation with the turbine craft. It would be logical for Congress to say, in effect, that the Government will support them through the first learning period, 2 or 3 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Colorado has expired. The Senator from Washington has 2 minutes of his allotted time on the amendment remaining.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Colorado 2 minutes on the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. I wish to make it perfectly clear that while the companies are in the developmental period, the Government should stay with them; but I believe we ought to say to them that at the end of next year, or the year after, we shall end all subsidies. We should tell them that if they cannot operate thereafter on a profitable basis, the subsidy will be withdrawn. But I wish to make it clear that at no time have they ever claimed that they could operate on a subsidy-free basis at the end of next year or the year after.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time allotted to me.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield for a question?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The operators of the helicopter services have been very free about letting us examine their records, including their operating costs, their profit sheets, their taxes—anything at all. We have found that their operations are about as down-to-earth as they could be. No large salaries are involved. If there is any benefit derived, the passengers will get it.

Mr. ALLOTT. And the cities involved.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And the cities involved.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, we are dealing here with the wave of the future in transportation. Congress has established the policy that it is in the national interest for the Government of the United States to assist in the pioneering of helicopter operations in large metropolitan areas, in order to determine the feasibility of enabling American business and American citizens to reach airports from their houses in suburbia more quickly— and safely—than driving through dense automobile traffic.

What has been said today by three able Senators who are knowledgeable in this field—the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]—has amply demonstrated that this program will serve the national interest. I regret the proposed amendment which would scuttle it.

I was particularly interested in one comment which the Senator from Colorado made on the value of the program to the military. Listen to what the chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board said. I read from page 268 of the committee hearings:

> Mr. BOYD. I would like to add one thing, Mr. Chairman.

He was addressing the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. Then Mr. Boyd said:

> While we don't feel and we never have attempted to base the concept of helicopter service on savings to the military, there is some very good evidence that the helicopter scheduled operations have saved the military far more than the total amount of subsidy that has been paid for the helicopter operations.
>
> We have information to this effect not only from the manufacturers but from the Department of Defense.

The Senator from Colorado specifically documented that argument in terms of the use of helicopters in the Korean conflict.

I speak in vigorous opposition to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin because it flies in the face of the wave of the future in regard to the transportation needs of the American people. So I hope this amendment will be rejected, and I hope this program will continue to run its reasonable course, until the American people will have before them examples of feasible helicopter service available to any American metropolitan area to those who want progress in air transportation in the United States.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I believe I have 10 minutes remaining. I yield 3 minutes of those to the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], although I believe he will use that time to attempt to devastate the position I take.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his courtesy, and I hasten to assure him that I shall not devastate his position. All of us respect him highly.

However, I believe some local facts should be pointed out. The Senator from California, the Senator from Oklahoma, and other Senators have set forth the basis for this operation in connection with the aircraft industry.

This operation probably makes the greatest single contribution that is made in connection with air transportation in metropolitan areas and in connection with solving the existing problems in those areas incident to automobile travel and traffic. I associate myself with the remarks of those Senators.

In addition, I point out this operation is not making a profit. This is a very important point. From the remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin, one might conclude, "If they want to run helicopters, let them pay for the operation." But I point out that the United States would be the one to pay for it, both as regards the purchase of the helicopters, their maintenance, and the conducting of the experiments. That would be the result if in the future—as a result of the adoption and enactment of this amendment, if that were to happen—this operation were to be drastically curtailed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have often heard it asked, "Why should this be done to enable people to reach Wall Street more easily?" However, it happens that the Battery is the place in the lower part of New York City where helicopters can land; and from that area people can move by means of the subways and automobiles to the other parts of the New York City area. So the helicopter service to the Battery is not at all for the sole benefit of those who work in Wall Street. It is a fact that great numbers of New Yorkers work in that area of New York City, and improved transportation service to it is essential.

Furthermore, I point out that in the 9 months ending in September 1963, the New York Airways Co. lost $140,000, but the company still has an outstanding debt in connection with the purchase of the turbine-powered helicopters which it now uses; the company still owes $2,600,000 of the $3,200,000 required for their purchase. So if this item is reduced to $3 million, it will be impossible for the company to pay off its obligations, and it will have to shut up shop.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may I have an additional minute?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for an additional minute.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

So, Mr. President, it is clear that it would be just as well to eliminate the entire item, rather than to reduce it from $5 to $3 million.

Furthermore, this activity is conducted by private enterprise.

In addition, in Vietnam our forces are operating with helicopters; and the experience gained in operating them in New York and Chicago supports the operation of helicopters by our forces in Vietnam, both in terms of operating and maintaining the equipment.

Inasmuch as the company is losing money and cannot maintain itself unless we provide at least the proposed $5 million, and inasmuch as it has already been shown that both from the point of view of our metropolitan areas and from the point of view of our military forces, this operation is an extremely desirable one, certainly those who are operating the company are entitled to credit for rendering assistance to the rest of the people of the United States.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], who no doubt will continue the assault on the position I take.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. His yielding to me is typical of his customary generosity. It is very kind of him to yield time to Senators who oppose the position he takes. All of us who serve with him know that he is always most fair.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senator from Oklahoma made a very strong case for continuing the Federal program for certificated helicopter operations. Obviously, if the item we are debating were drastically cut or eliminated, and if the certificated operations were forced to end—as would have to be done if the proposed reduction were made—the Federal Government would have to take them over in order to maintain vital and needed public services. And in view of their largely experimental character, the Federal Government would have to assume all the burdens and risks incidental to making further progress in this area—a task for which I believe the Government is ill equipped and which, therefore, it should not be asked to undertake.

The $5 million in payments to helicopter carriers which is called for by the committee amendment compares very favorably with the $6,042,000 in 1962 and the $5,378,000 in 1963. Prospects are that if the operations are permitted to continue, further gradual reductions can be made.

I entirely agree with the Senator from Colorado that we cannot and should not continue the subsidy forever. On the other hand, to terminate it abruptly, as would be done by the proposed reduction of helicopter payments to $3 million, would literally throw away the beneficial results of our experience with certificated helicopter operations, and would deprive the traveling public of needed services. It would also put many persons out of work and have other devastating side effects.

It is important to stress the point made by the Senator from Washington and commented on by my colleague from New York; namely, that the three existing helicopter carriers are a crucial link in the national and international transportation network and by no means can be said to serve only local interests. To take New York Airways as an example, only 4 percent of its patrons use its services for purely local transportation. Ninety-six percent of its passenger movements, to the contrary, form part of longer haul trips in domestic or international commerce. It is, therefore, the national and not a local interest which we are talking about now.

But if I may be permitted a brief parochial note, let me point out that in 1964 and 1965 we will be having something called the New York World's Fair. The Senator from Washington is familiar with it; and I know he will be there, and we will receive him in the same way in which he so graciously received many of us at the Seattle Fair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the junior Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the junior Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from New York is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

So, Mr. President, from the parochial point of view, the proposed reduction to the $3 million voted by the House would be absolutely devastating, for it would end the operation of New York Airways just at a time when not only will its services be required more than ever before—for New York Airways plans to have direct flights from the Pan Am Building in midtown New York to the World's Fair site; but also just when, with the added revenues to be derived from such flights, New York Airways will for the first time have a realistic chance of converting its experiment into an economically sound operation and eventually withdraw from all Federal assistance.

Therefore, Mr. President, for these two reasons—first, because the proposed reduction would not be in the national interest, which, of course, is what we must concern ourselves with chiefly in dealing with these matters; and, second, because of the harmful effect such a reduction would have on transportation services in metropolitan areas—certainly this amendment should be rejected.

This is not the time for an abrupt cutoff. I appreciate the work which has been done by members of the Appropriations Committee on both sides of the aisle in relation to the figures at which they have arrived.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes, all of which I probably will not use.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has talked about the proposal as a new phase of aviation. The distinguished Senator from California called it the wave of the future. We have been giving away this subsidy now for 10 years—since 1954. It has been said year after year that we will get off it. The wave of the future, the new phase, seems to be continued giveaway for an uneconomical service the market will not buy.

We all recognize that the State of California is a magnificent State, with a marvelous climate, many attractions—and with billions of dollars of defense contracts. It has by far the largest concentration of people working in industries subsidized by the Federal Government.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Is the Senator from Wisconsin trying to prejudice the Senate against the State I represent?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Of course not. I started by saying that California was a great State, with a salubrious climate and many attractions.

Mr. KUCHEL. I object to the comment of the Senator from Wisconsin on the subject of defense contracts as being irrelevant and immaterial to this debate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is relevant and material. We already provide large amounts of Federal money which is beneficial to the State of California. But we are now providing also, on a discriminatory basis, that only Los Angeles, New York, and Chicago shall receive this particular subsidy benefit.

It has been said that we would be off subsidies in 1964–65. Every realistic Senator knows that we will never be off subsidies unless we do what the House has done—start cutting down. This is a subsidy that is going up. It started with less than $2 billion, and now it is $5 billion.

It was said by the distinguished Senator from New York that if we discontinue subsidies the American people will have to pay for these helicopters. It is said that we permit a situation to develop in which we can be locked into a subsidy and Congress is told it has lost its power to get out of it. We should provide for a tapering off, and bring about a reduction of $3 million in the coming year.

I conclude by contending that many of those who are interested in cutting spending somehow find a soft spot, when it comes to reducing subsidies for business or those who operate primarily in the top echelons of business.

I know that the amendment will not receive very much support in the Senate. I know that the amendment to cut out the supersonic plane will not get very much support, and an effort to cut down FAA will not get very much support.

There is an obvious reason for this. The people who are most influential and affluent in our society have been getting great benefit from Government spending. No one ever talks about that. It is not discussed in editorials. It is not usually discussed in the Senate Chamber.

The most rapidly rising Government spending is not in the farm area or in defense. The most rapidly rising area is in subsidies to business—in water transportation, in the promotion of business, and in aviation.

This helicopter subsidy is a small subsidy, but it seems to me it is the least justifiable of all. So few get it. We have had it for a long time. The Senate agreed with the House in conference last year that the subsidy should be terminated; but we continue it year after year.

Mr. President, if the Senator in charge of the bill is ready, I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 322, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be printed in the RECORD without being read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

> On page 11, line 25, change "$535,000,000" to "$515,775,000" and add the following: "That total costs of aviation medicine, including equipment for the Federal Aviation Agency, whether provided in the foregoing appropriation or elsewhere in this Act, shall not exceed $5,100,000 or include in excess of 15 positions: *Provided further*,".
>
> On page 13, line 19, change "$45,000,000" to "$35,000,000".
>
> On page 14, line 3, change "$3,663,000" to "$3,500,000".
>
> On page 14, line 12, change "$4,045,000" to "$3,810,000".

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] would join me in a discussion of the language in the report which appears at the bottom of page 21, which states:

> The committee notes the conflict of asserted jurisdiction in the field of administration of common trust funds. It is our opinion that national banks are adequately supervised by the Comptroller of the Currency, and directs that no funds appropriated in this bill be expended by the SEC for that purpose.

The Senator from Washington knows there is controversy and conflict in the asserted jurisdiction in this area. The Senator also knows there is a bill before the Committee on Banking and Currency on which hearings have not yet been held, which would grant jurisdiction in this matter to the Comptroller of the Currency and the other Federal bank supervisory agencies. Yesterday, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] expressed his strong opposition to this approach to legislative problems through Appropriation Committee reports. We know the legislative or parliamentary fact that there is no way to strike it from the report. Therefore, I wish to discuss briefly with the Senator what the possible effect of this language would be. Before I do so, I should like first to yield to the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me now, inasmuch as I have another committee meeting which I must attend?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The full Appropriations Committee met in the office of the full committee over in the New Senate Office Building to mark up the bill. We had come to the Senate Chamber without quite finishing it.

So far as I knew, at that time there was only one money item that had not been acted upon. I had another engagement, and I had not reached the Capitol when the committee voted to insert in the committee report language which would settle an issue that is still pending before the Banking and Currency Committee.

Senators will recall the excellent work which the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] did on the SEC's proposed amendments to the Securities and Exchange Act this spring and summer. I believe the Senate adopted the measure, S. 1642, unanimously. I do not remember one vote against it.

After the hearings had been concluded, I received a letter from the American Bankers Association asking me to present to the committee an amendment that would have put the operations of banks as to pooled managing agency or custody account funds under the exclusive control of the Comptroller of the Currency, and to exempt these pooled funds from the Investment Company Act of 1940. I said, "The proposal is controversial. We have had no testimony on it. I could not propose that amendment to the committee at this stage of the proceedings." So I did not.

Subsequently, the distinguished Senator from Colorado introduced that bill, S. 2223.

The committee has been so burdened with other work that it has not gotten around to acting on it.

Today for the first time, I find that during my absence the Appropriations Committee took jurisdiction away from our committee and inserted, in the committee report on the pending bill, language which would exempt, or which would try to exempt, the banks from this regulation. But they cannot exempt them from the criminal provisions or from possible liability to third persons for violation of the act. Some banker may be mislead into doing things which would put him in jail by taking from the committee that handles the bill jurisdiction over the subject, by writing that language into the committee report. It is just that simple.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may answer the question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know where the Senator from Virginia was——

Mr. ROBERTSON. I know where I was. I know where the Senator was when he did it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We were down in the basement.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator had left the main committee room.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The full committee was meeting in the Appropriations Committee room, but we—including the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Colorado—came over here at 2 o'clock because the Senate was in session. We had a majority. The chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], presided. But we did meet 3 hours down there. The Senator was very near, but he was not present at the meeting. He might have had a good reason not to be there, but surely there was no intention on the part of the committee to discuss the subject in some way when the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee was absent.

The committee decided this.

The language in the report is intended to do the reverse of what is suggested by the Senator from Virginia. It is not intended to take jurisdiction away from the Senator's committee, but to hold this matter in abeyance, when there is a conflict and a controversy as to who has jurisdiction, until the committee can make a decision.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does not the language state——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the Senator permit me to finish?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does not the language state, in effect, "You shall not enforce the law"? There is a criminal penalty in the law, but it is not to be enforced.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to finish my answer.

We merely say that for the purposes of the bill, which will be in effect only until next July—and I hope this will be settled by that time—the SEC should not try to proceed to move further into this field, in effect, until the committees have made up their minds. That is all we wish to do. That is all the committee intended.

That is the best answer I can give, as chairman. I do not have any great knowledge about all the details, but I know that a controversy has been in progress as to who has jurisdiction.

I have said on many occasions that the controversy should be settled and that the Congress should settle it. I believe Congress will.

In the meantime, from what I know about national banks, they are pretty well examined. Some of the securities underwriters do not like this, I suppose, because it might slow up a little of their business. I do not know that to be a fact, but it is what the people who are in the business say.

We are not saying that this should not be done or that there should not be a complete examination. We are merely saying that until the Banking and Currency Committees of the Congress make up their minds there should not be a further proceeding in this field.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Let me state the legal aspect.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am merely reflecting the committee view.

Mr. ROBERTSON The Investment Company Act of 1940, was carefully considered by the Congress, based upon many months of study of the matter by the SEC and the security industry, and Congress passed that bill. The SEC is convinced that the act put banks, with respect to such transactions, under that law, except for certain specified exemptions, and provided a criminal penalty if they should violate it.

A Member of the Senate introduced a bill to take the banks out from under the Investment Company Act. The Banking and Currency Committee has not gotten around to the point of acting on that bill, so now somebody from the Appropriations Committee steps in to say, "No money under the bill can be spent to enforce the law."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, no; that is not a proper interpretation.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I ask the Senator to read the language.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is not a proper interpretation at all.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is what I think it states—that the law should not be enforced. Remember that there is a criminal penalty involved in the Investment Company Act, and a bank which goes into this new field may be subject to criminal penalties.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We will make the legislative history clear, if that is the way the language is being interpreted. It is now being made clear. That was not the intention at all. It was merely an intention to hold things in abeyance until the committees can make up their minds.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is entirely satisfactory with the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There was no such intention as the Senator has stated.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The House conferees would not agree to this, as we would not agree to their legislating about area parks. They will make a report saying that they are not bound by this language. Then it will be said, "We mean it one way, and you think it means something else."

Mr. MAGNUSON. We mean it the way we have said. The Senator's interpretation is not what we meant.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. For the record I should like to make one statement first. The Senator from Colorado conducted an examination into this field. He is very knowledgeable in the field because of his past experience in private life. I am sure he can add some comments to allay any concern Senators may have.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Before he allays my concern, I should like to read the language for the record. Then it can be explained.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I know what the language is.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The report states that the committee "directs that no funds appropriated in this bill be expended by the SEC for that purpose." That is, to make the banks conform to the law Congress passed. If that does not mean the law is not to be enforced, I cannot understand plain English.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We thought we were doing the committee a favor, until it could make up its mind.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. This language attempts to repeal the law until we get around to deciding whether we wish to repeal it or not.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Would not the Senator agree that language in a committee report cannot amend existing law?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course it cannot.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Therefore, if a bank's activity in an investment area places it in the category of an investment company, the Investment Company Act of 1940 would apply, and any violation could be prosecuted.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course it could. We could not repeal the law by language in a committee report.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a point of fact?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe the argument of the Senator from Colorado will fit in with this statement. Can the Senator not say that all that is intended is to continue whatever is now the situation?

Mr. MAGNUSON. And nothing further should be done.

Mr. JAVITS. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Until the committees can make up their minds. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. The reason is that the SEC does have some jurisdiction——

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is disputed.

Mr. JAVITS. The SEC does have some jurisdiction and may have some problems in connection with the mandate to enforce existing law to the extent it is now proceeding. What we do not wish to do is to push further into this field with the money appropriated.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. If that is the intention, everybody understands it. This is what the SEC is now doing. It is asked to do nothing further until Congress passes upon the question. That is a fair "freeze." I agree with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] that the language in the report goes further. It is all right, so long as we have a clear understanding that we are putting on a "freeze" so that nobody will move further.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That was the situation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let us get it clear that the present proceedings of the SEC in present cases are not to be affected.

Mr. JAVITS. Naturally.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We must make that crystal clear.

Mr. JAVITS. The SEC will continue to exercise the powers it is exercising now, to the extent it is exercising them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Under existing law.

Mr. ALLOTT. And to the extent the SEC is permitted to exercise them.

Mr. JAVITS. They are not to push further.

Mr. ALLOTT. And they are not to expand the budget by another $250,000 or $500,000 in order to push into a field which is at best, at the moment, in great dispute.

We honestly believed when we entered this area that we were helping the Congress. Instead of getting over into the jurisdiction of another committee, I believe we properly performed the duties of the Appropriations Committee, because this is an area which is under dispute.

I refer Senators to the fifth report of the Committee on Government Operations of the House, made this year. It is a long, detailed report. I know the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] has read it completely. It is on this subject. It goes into detail, discussing not only the legal aspects, but also the historical and policy aspects of the question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one who sat beside the Senator from Colorado and listened to the language as it was put into the report, I believed, when I listened, that it would merely do what the Senator said, that it would merely prevent the use of the funds for extended activity until Congress could determine exactly what the law is.

Mr. ALLOTT. There are two ways that this could be accomplished. One would be by court action. The other would be by action of the Congress. I am sure we all agree that the better way is by congressional action.

If the Senator will yield for this purpose, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from the fifth report of the Committee on Government Operations entitled "Common Trust Funds: Overlapping Responsibility and Conflict in Regulations."

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMON TRUST FUNDS: OVERLAPPING RESPONSIBILITY AND CONFLICT IN REGULATIONS—REPORT BASED ON A STUDY BY THE LEGAL AND MONETARY AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE

INTRODUCTION

Overlapping authority and duplication of regulation by administrative agencies lessens the efficiency of the operations of the executive branch and is wasteful of taxpayers' dollars. The effect on the persons and industries involved is to subject them to confusion and to the hardship and expense of attempting to alleviate the situation thus created.

A responsibility of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee is to examine and evaluate the efficiency and economy of the operations of certain executive branch departments and agencies. In the inquiry here reported the subcommittee examined the operations of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency of the Department of the Treasury and of the Securities and Exchange Commission in a matter arising from the revision of the Comptroller's Regulation 9,[1] which governs the exercise of trust powers by national banks.

On February 5, 1963, the Comptroller of the Currency announced a proposed adoption of provisions under which, inter alia, trust departments of national banks would be permitted to collectively invest in common trust funds the moneys deposited with them in managing agency accounts, and under self-employed (Smathers-Keogh Act) retirement plans. Shortly thereafter the Securities and Exchange Commission publicly asserted that the Securities Act of 1933 and the Investment Company Act of 1940[2] could apply to certain uses of such collective investment funds. The Comptroller strongly refuted their applicability. On April 5, 1963, while the conflict of views between the agencies remained unresolved, and before the Commissioner of Internal Revenue had ruled on the income tax aspects involved, the Comptroller put into effect revised regulation 9.

The power and authority of the Comptroller to permit banks to establish common trust funds authorized by the revised regulation was not questioned by the Securities and Exchange Commission and was not an issue for the subcommittee. The questions relating to the tax status of such common trust funds are pending before the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. The subcommittee was concerned with the fact that in this important matter the agencies were applying different standards and criteria to the same Federal statutes; and with the consequences of such action.

To lay a basis for resolution of the problem, a hearing was held by the subcommittee on May 20, 1963. Witnesses who appeared were the Honorable William L. Cary, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission; the Honorable James J. Saxon, Comptroller of the Currency; Mr. Charles W. Buek, president of the United States Trust Co. of New York, appearing on behalf of the American Bankers Association; and Mr. Robert L. Hoguet, Jr., executive vice president, First National City Bank, New York, N.Y.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. Section 584 of the Internal Revenue Code, and its antecedents, exempted a common trust fund from income tax if maintained by a bank exclusively for the collective investment of moneys contributed by the bank in its capacity as a trustee, executor, administrator, or guardian and in conformity with the regulations of the Federal Reserve Board.

2. During the quarter century (1936–62) when the Federal Reserve Board supervised common trust fund operations of national banks, the funds were restricted, by Board regulation, to moneys contributed by banks in their capacities as trustee, executor, administrator, or guardian.

3. The Securities and Exchange Commission considered such common trust funds exempt from the Investment Company Act of 1940 under the specified exemption in section 3(c)(3) thereof, and from the Securities Act of 1933, as involving no public offerings of securities.

4. On September 28, 1962, Public Law 87–722 transferred the authority over trust powers of national banks from the Federal Reserve Board to the Comptroller of the Currency.

5. On April 5, 1963, the Comptroller of the Currency issued revised regulation 9 which, among other things, permits national banks to maintain common trust funds of managing agency accounts.

6. The Comptroller, contemporaneously with issuance of revised regulation 9, requested the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to issue a ruling of income tax exemption for common trust funds of managing agency accounts. No tax ruling was issued before the revised regulation became effective.

7. The revised regulation also permits the collective investment by national banks of self-employed persons' retirement (Smathers-Keogh) plans.

8. The SEC claims that common trust funds of managing agency accounts bear such similarity to mutual funds as to make them amenable to the Securities Act of 1933; and that while an exemption from the 1940 act is available under the act's employee's pension trust provisions of section 3(c)(13) for common trust funds of Smathers-Keogh accounts, "securities" under the 1933 act are involved.

9. The Comptroller claims total exemption for such common trust funds from applicability of the securities laws.

10. Duplicate regulation by the two agencies arise through the Comptroller's authorization and regulation of such common trust funds. The SEC sought to minimize the problems thus created by facilitating compliance by banks with the securities laws. The Comptroller refused to accept, in principle, that the securities laws were applicable.

11. Before the revision became effective, the Secretary of the Treasury supported the Comptroller's position that the conflict be resolved by court action.

12. The Comptroller suggested to the banks that they not submit to the jurisdiction of the SEC voluntarily.

13. The opinion of the Attorney General, as a means of resolving the conflict, was not sought.

14. The Comptroller claims that the revised regulation, the supervision by banking agencies, and the overlay of trust law provide more protection to bank "investors" than they have under the securities acts.

15. Regulation by both the SEC and the Comptroller of the operation of common trust funds held in banks for their customers would impose hardships on banks, through the necessity of complying with separate registration, reporting, and other requirements, and the additional legal, operating, and other costs involved. Such duplicate regulation would probably make it uneconomic for banks to handle managing agency accounts in modest amounts or to receive deposits under the provisions of the Smathers-Keogh Act.

16. While the SEC has power under section 6(c) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 to exempt common trust funds from that act, it does not feel it should grant such exemption. The SEC contends that such customers of banks should be entitled to the same protections afforded mutual funds shareholders.

17. Whatever ruling the Internal Revenue Service makes on tax status, the matters of conflict and duplication of regulations by two agencies over the same subject will persist until resolved.

18. The collective investment of small managing agency accounts is a logical and reasonable extension to such accounts of the common trust fund investment advantages enjoyed by small estates and trusts.

19. The Congress has exempted bank securities and common trust funds from the provisions of the 1933 and 1940 acts, in the manner stated in those acts. Such exemption of the common trust funds here considered could result in eliminating the expenses that litigation would entail, plus savings of up to $250,000 per year, the estimated prospective costs of SEC supervision.

20. The most expeditious and economical means of eliminating the problems created by the overlapping agency authority and duplicate regulation lies with the Congress.

RECOMMENDATION

In order to eliminate the problems created by overlapping authority and duplicate regulation, it is recommended:

To the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives that it direct its attention to the consideration of legislation which would specifically exempt common trust funds of managing agency accounts and Smathers-Keogh plans maintained by national banks from the Federal securities laws, and provide for such protection for investors therein as may be deemed necessary.

BACKGROUND

The nub of the differences between the SEC and the Comptroller is the Commission's contention that common trust funds of managing agency accounts authorized by the Comptroller's revised regulation are so similar to mutual funds that the Federal securities laws apply to their operation. Also involved is the SEC's contention that operation under the regulation of common trust funds containing Smathers-Keogh accounts will involve the public offering of a security.

Common trust funds are variously defined in Federal and State laws. In brief, they are funds maintained by trust institutions for the collective investment of moneys from the personal trusts or estates of which the institution is fiduciary. Before such funds were authorized by the States, each trust of which a bank was trustee had to be invested separately. The unit costs to a bank in the servicing of small trust accounts were so high that they found this business largely unprofitable. Small trusts, individually invested, could not attain the investment benefits, such as adequate diversification of investments, management, and liquidity, and the low costs enjoyed by large trusts. The need to correct these situations gave birth to common trust funds.

The first common trust fund was established in 1927. Their growth was relatively slow, for by the end of 1935 only 16 such funds were in existence. The Federal Reserve Board's "Survey of Common Trust Funds, 1961" (Federal Reserve Bulletin, May 1962, p. 528), reflects their expansion. At the end of 1961 there were 511 common trust funds in 327 trust institutions. Total assets exceeded $3.5 billion. The number has since grown to 584 common trust funds in 360 banks.

A. Early tax problems

In 1934 a proponent of legislation to exempt common trust funds from income taxes stated this was necessary because the Treasury Department had taken the position that any trust which transacted business was taxable as a corporation. In explanation of the proposal he said (Senate Finance Committee hearings on H.R. 7835, 73d Cong., 2d sess., p. 195):

---

[1] Title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, pt. 9; Federal Register, Apr. 5, 1953, p. 3309.

[2] 15 U.S.C. 77a and 15 U.S.C. 80a.

"I have drawn my proposed amendment so that it would not exempt from the corporate tax the typical investment trust, as it is commonly understood, where securities are sold to the public and there is a management fund and all that sort of thing. I do not touch those, but only funds held by incorporated banks or trust companies as the result of commingling private trust funds, and where the trustee has the sole power and control over the investments, and where no certificates or securities are sold to the public."

The proposal was not adopted. Common trust fund operations suffered a severe setback in 1936 when the Treasury's contentions were upheld (*Brooklyn Trust Co.* v. *Commissioner of Internal Revenue* (C.C.A. 2) 80 F. 2d 865). The effect was to subject such funds to corporation income taxes, in addition to the taxes payable by the beneficiaries of the participating trusts.

A proposal for tax relief was then renewed, the proponent stating that it was "designed to make it possible for banks and trust companies to give people with small estates all the advantages of the common trust fund without imposing upon those estates the burden of double taxation." Any apprehension that the funds may be "commercialized or used for speculative purposes" could be allayed by the requirement that to qualify for tax exemption the funds would need to be established and operated under the regulation of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (Senate Finance Committee, hearings on H.R. 12395, p. 794).

In substance, the proposal was enacted as section 169 of the "Estates and Trusts" provision of the Revenue Act of 1936. As carried over into section 584 of the Internal Revenue Act, it defines a common trust fund for tax exemption purposes to mean: "* * * a fund maintained by a bank (1) exclusively for the collective investment and reinvestment of moneys contributed thereto by the bank in its capacity as a trustee, executor, administrator, or guardian; and (2) in conformity with the rules and regulations * * * [formerly of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, now of the Comptroller of the Currency]."

The 1936 Revenue Act made separate provision for the tax treatment of "mutual investment companies" (sec. 48(e)), the precursor of present section 851 of the Internal Revenue Code which governs tax exemption of regulated investment companies.

B. The Federal securities laws

In brief, the objectives of the Securities Act of 1933 are to provide investors with financial and other material information concerning securities offered for public sale and to prohibit fraud in their sale. Under the act, before the public offering of securities, a registration statement must be filed with the SEC disclosing such facts as (1) the registrant's properties and business, (2) the significant provisions of the security and its relationship to the registrant's other capital securities, (3) information as to the management of the registrant, and (4) certified financial statements. Investors must be furnished with a prospectus (selling circular) containing the salient data set forth in the registration statement.

Section 3(a)(2) of the Securities Act of 1933 exempts from the act "any security issued or guaranteed by any national bank."

The Investment Company Act of 1940 governs the activities of issuers engaged primarily in the business of investing, reinvesting, and trading in securities, whose own securities are held by the investing public. The act's requirements include registration with the SEC; disclosure of financial condition and investment policies; prohibition against registrants changing the nature of their business or their investment policies, or adopting or changing management contracts, without the approval of stockholders. Transactions between such companies and their directors, officers, or affiliated companies or persons are regulated. The companies must file periodic reports and are subject to the Commission's proxy and "insider" trading rules, and numerous others. Their securities must be registered under the 1933 act.

Among those exempt from the 1940 act as not being "investment companies" are:

"SEC. 3. (c) * * *; any common trust fund or similar fund maintained by a bank exclusively for the collective investment and reinvestment of moneys contributed thereto by the bank in its capacity as a trustee, executor, administrator, or guardian."

C. Federal Reserve Board regulation

Federal supervisory authority over the trust powers of national banks resided in the Federal Reserve Board from 1913 until September 1962. On December 31, 1937, the Board amended its regulation F, which governed trust powers, by authorizing national banks to establish and maintain common trust funds in the States where State banks were permitted to maintain such funds. Regulation F applied only to national banks; however, to qualify their common trust funds for income tax exemption State banks were obliged to comply with its provisions.

In 1955 the Board amended regulation F to permit the collective investment of various employee-benefit funds, such as pension, thrift, welfare, profit-sharing, and bonus plans established for the exclusive benefit of employees or their beneficiaries. Section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code exempted such common trust funds from income tax when operated in conformity with rules and regulations of the Board.

The Board also permitted national banks to operate managing agency accounts under which the bank performed advisory and management investment services for individual customers for a fee. Each such account, however, had to be administered separately; the collective investment or commingling of such accounts was prohibited.

Regulation F provided that "funds received or held by a national bank as a fiduciary shall not be invested collectively" except for the employee-benefit funds discussed above (several others not here involved), and those defined as follows:

(2) As used in this part the term "common trust fund" means a fund maintained by a national bank exclusively for the collective investment and reinvestment of moneys contributed thereto by the bank in its capacity as trustee, executor, administrator, or guardian.

(3) The purpose of this section is to permit the use of common trust funds, as defined in section 584 of the Internal Revenue Code, for the investment of funds held for true fiduciary purposes; and the operation of such common trust funds as investment for other than strictly fiduciary purposes is hereby prohibited.

In the Board's concept, common trust funds were to be used merely as aids in the administration of trusts; they were not to be operated as investment trusts to attract those primarily seeking investment management of their funds (Federal Reserve Bulletin, May 1940; 25 F.R. 12479).

D. Subsequent developments

On September 20, 1962, the Federal Reserve Board's authority over the trust powers of national banks was transferred to the Comptroller of the Currency by Public Law 87–722. The Comptroller adopted the provisions of regulation F, without change, except to rename it regulation 9.

The Self-Employed Individuals Tax Retirement Act of 1962, known as the Smathers-Keogh Act, was enacted on October 10, 1962, as Public Law 87–792. In general it permits self-employed persons to be covered by qualified retirement plans; to deduct (within specified limits) contributions made to such plans; and to be free from income tax thereon until they receive the funds on retirement, or as otherwise provided (Internal Revenue Code, sec. 401). Such funds, when trusteed by a bank, are exempt from income tax (Internal Revenue Code, sec. 501).

THE PROPOSED REVISION

On February 4, 1963, the Comptroller announced to a trust conference of the American Bankers Association that on the following day the Federal Register would publish a proposed revision of regulation 9, and outlined the major changes expected to be made in three categories: (1) Collective investment; (2) conflicts of interest, and (3) management supervision. The Comptroller said:

"In the field of collective investments we have made what we deem significant and far-reaching improvements. We have recognized the proper place of banks in this area and the fact that banks with established trust departments are uniquely fitted to serve the public and compete with other institutions in this field."

Three types of collective investment funds were to be permitted: First, the then familiar type of common trust fund in which it is permitted to place individual trusts held by the bank in the capacity of trustee, executor, administrator, or guardian. Second, those consisting solely of assets from retirement, pension, profit-sharing, stock bonus, or other trusts which are themselves exempt under the Internal Revenue Code, including trusts set up under the Smathers-Keogh Act. Third, those containing funds held by the bank as fiduciary, other than as trustee, executor, administrator, or guardian. Accounts commonly known as managing agency accounts were intended to be covered by this last category.

All "interested parties" were invited to submit comments, and notice was given of intention to make the revision effective on or about April 5, 1963. Oppositions to the proposed revision were filed by the Investment Companies Institute and the National Association of Security Dealers. The SEC filed no comments. The revision became effective on April 5, 1963.

ATTEMPTS TO NEGOTIATE

Before the proposed revision was announced there had been communications and discussions between representative of the SEC and the Comptroller, in which the SEC asserted the possible applicability of Federal securities laws to the collective investment in common trust funds of Smathers-Keogh and managing agency accounts.

According to Chairman Cary, the SEC's purposes in communicating with the Comptroller before issuance of the revision (in addition to seeking to avoid any public conflict of views) had been to make fully known the SEC's position on the applicability of the Federal securities laws, and if that were accepted in principle, to work out procedures (such as through a short form registration in the case of Smathers-Keogh plans, and any possible exemptions under the 1940 act) to expedite the whole process.

At the hearing the Comptroller said that in discussions with the SEC before promulgation of the revision it became perfectly plain to him that the two areas were nonnegotiable:

"When Chairman Cary stated that he would be willing to negotiate if we would accept in principle the applicability of the SEC-administered statutes, he asked us to do something which we cannot do. Even if we were disposed to do this, it would not be binding on any banking institution subject to the regulation of this Office in this respect. We have no authority to concede legal issues, particularly in this area, where the banks do not agree with the SEC interpretations."

The Comptroller so informed Chairman Cary by letter in January 1963. In response, Chairman Cary said he was sorry that the Comptroller saw no basis for the cooperation the SEC had in mind, and that he was "extremely anxious to develop a coordinated policy when two agencies appear to have overlapping jurisdiction." He enclosed a proposed short form registration statement which the SEC had prepared to facilitate registering any securities issued by banks in connection with Smathers-Keogh plans.

In the Comptroller's opinion, stated at the hearing, that form was no solution to the problem, for, he said, the SEC conceded that if it were put into use, the SEC could then require the full use of all its reporting requirement. Industry witnesses concurred in that view.

In issuing the proposed revision, the Comptroller said:

"It is our firm belief that the reasoning adopted by Congress in excepting securities issued by banks from the Federal securities laws continues to be sound and justified. That reasoning was based on the concept that the continuous internal examination and supervision of banking by the bank regulatory authorities makes application of the less rigorous disclosure pattern of SEC regulation superfluous and unnecessary. In any event, our own regulation, as I have previously stated, will require full public disclosure of the terms and conditions of operation of each collective trust as well as periodic financial reports of its financial condition.

"The substantial legal, accounting, printing, and administrative expenses entailed in SEC registration and reporting could very well have the effect of nullifying the purposes which Congress sought to effect by the Smathers-Keogh bill.

"In view of the often-expressed congressional intent that the regulatory power over national banks rests in our Office, and particularly in view of the most recent expression of that intent as to fiduciary functions, it is our position that the SEC laws do not apply to the collective investment funds set up by national banks pursuant to law and our regulations."

On February 7, 1963, right after the proposed revision was published, Chairman Cary wrote the Secretary of the Treasury that the Commission desired to avoid litigation which could result from banks operating under the revision. In that letter he said the SEC had made every effort to assure the Comptroller of cooperation in developing a coordinated program to avoid any undue burden resulting from concurrent jurisdiction of the two agencies. He expressed regret that it was now evident that the Comptroller disagreed with their interpretation of the laws which the Congress entrusted his Commission to administer. Saying that the Commission did not have the qualification, much less any desire, to become involved in matters of banking regulation, he further said:

"We regard the types of regulation to be different in objectives, administration, and impact. They are not mutually exclusive in their application. And we do believe that if our laws are applicable to what is basically an investment company security, we must apply them uniformly—whether the fund involved be administered by a bank, * * * or the conventional investment adviser."

On March 6, 1963, the Secretary replied, saying that it seemed to him that there was a very serious question concerning the applicability of the Securities Acts to the proposed activities of national banks, and that he did not feel that it would be unfortunate or unseemly, from the point of view of the Government, if the matter had to be resolved by a court case. The next day, in a letter to the chairman of a banker's committee which had assisted the Comptroller in preparing the proposed revision, Chairman Cary so stated the SEC position:

"Some proposals for the use of collective investment funds in connection with self-employed retirement plans resulting from the recent Smathers-Keogh legislation would involve the issuance of a security registrable under the 1933 act, although a 1940 act exemption would appear to be available for these plans.

"However, any contemplated merchandising of interests in other collective investment funds as investment media, whether in the form of a trust or in the form of a managing agency account, as apparently would be permitted under the proposed revision of regulation 9, would place national banks squarely in the conventional investment company business. Under these circumstances there would be both the issuance of a security required to be registered under the 1933 act and a collective investment fund subject to the provisions of the 1940 act. To put it another way, the fund, as distinguished from the bank, would in substance be an investment company and the issuer of a security."

He suggested a meeting, saying it was not SEC's purpose to discourage banks from engaging in the activity if permitted by the appropriate bank regulatory authorities, but only to acquaint the banking community with SEC's concept of its statutory responsibilities and, if possible, to assist in working out compliance with SEC laws in the least burdensome way feasible, through cooperative effort. He said the SEC had already made efforts in that direction through the preliminary development of the proposed short form for registration under the 1933 act of Smathers-Keogh account funds.

The Comptroller then made a press statement regarding that letter, refuting the SEC's assertions and claiming express exemption of common trust funds from operation of the Federal Securities Acts. He also said he would regard as "extremely unfortunate" the "voluntary submission by the banks to the SEC laws," and expressed the "hope these matters would be resolved speedily through appropriate judicial proceedings, in which we would expect to intervene."

Thus the sharp conflict of views between the agencies was unresolved when the Comptroller issued the revised regulation. According to statements at the hearing, banks have long felt the need for authority to commingle small managing agency accounts. Regulation 9 gives them that authority. It also authorizes them to pool Smathers-Keogh accounts. However, exercise of the authority by the banks, in practical effect, is circumscribed by the dread of submission to dual regulation.

THE AGENCIES' DIVERGENT VIEWS ON THE FEDERAL SECURITIES LAWS

The views of the SEC and the Comptroller of the Currency on the interpretation and applicability of the Federal securities laws in respect of common trust funds are diametrically opposed.

Among the issues on which the two agencies are poles apart are the following: The SEC claims that the units of participation or interest in a comminiged investment fund are securities, whether or not represented by a written document. The Comptroller claims that under revised regulation 9 the participation interests in a common trust fund will run from the bank as trustee of the common trust fund to itself as (in the case of managing accounts) holder of funds entrusted to it, and that such participation will not be evidenced by any certificate or document, but by mere book entries. In such circumstances, says the Comptroller, no security is issued; further, even if a security were involved, the 1933 act would have no application to it, because that act specifically exempts from the operation of its provisions the securities issued by a bank, and these would be issued by the bank.

To that, the SEC asserts that the securities would not be issued by a bank, as that word is used in the Federal securities laws, but by a separate entity, to wit: the common trust fund. The Comptroller denies that a common trust fund is a separate entity, arguing that it is the bank itself, acting as a fiduciary which is involved, and not a collective investment fund.

The Comptroller also contends that common trust funds are not subject to the 1940 act because that act expressly excludes from its definition of investment companies both banks and any common trust fund or similar fund maintained by a bank. The SEC, on the other hand, claims that common trust funds are clearly within the act's definition of investment company, and that such funds are excluded from the definition only when they are maintained by a bank exclusively for the collective investment and reinvestment of moneys contributed thereto by the bank in its capacity as trustee, executor, administrator, or guardian. The common trust funds here involved, says the SEC, do not derive their moneys from such sources, and therefore are not excluded from the act's operation.

The Comptroller claims that the word "trustee" as used in the above-quoted exclusionary provision includes not only inter vivos and testamentary trusts in which the bank is formally designated and acts as trustee, but also managing agents who have discretion to determine whether or not funds held by them will be invested in a common trust fund of managing agency accounts. This position the SEC refutes.

The Comptroller also contends that under revised regulation 9 the decision of whether or not to invest managing agency accounts in a common trust fund rests solely with the bank holding such accounts, and that the regulation so restricts advertising and solicitation that no "public offering" (a prerequisite in certain circumstances, to applicability of Federal securities laws) could be involved. Contrariwise, the SEC position is that a bank could not profitably render those services unless it obtained many accounts and pooled them, and that this necessarily means solicitation of customers, i.e., a public offering, whether or not advertising is used.

This brief cataloging of but some of the positions of the two agencies illustrates how far apart their views are on the interpretation and applicability of Federal securities laws as regards common trust funds. Their differences run not to mere peripheral matters, but to the very basics; in fact, so far as is evident, there appears to be no common ground upon which they agree.

THE AGENCIES' VIEWS ON CUSTOMER-INVESTOR PROTECTION

The two agencies are at odds also on the question of which agency affords better protection to the customer-investor. The Comptroller points to the requirements in regulation 9 that each collective investment fund must be established according to a written plan, copies of which must be filed with the Comptroller, in the principal office of the bank, and provided to any person on request. A bank must make an annual financial report for its common trust funds, and a copy of such report likewise must be furnished to any person upon request. These requirements, says the Comptroller, plus the additional requirements imposed by regulation 9, plus the continuous and intensive supervision of bank trust departments, plus the overlay of trust law which will apply to the operation of these funds, results in a far more effective protection of the bank "investor" than is afforded investors in mutual funds by the securities laws.

The SEC counters by saying that when "the banks go the mutual fund way, it is clear that they are subject, under present legislation, to the mutual fund ground rules, or to put it into its proper perspective, the investor in bank-sponsored mutual funds is entitled to the same protection as the investor in non-bank-sponsored mutual funds."

The major shortcoming of regulation 9 with respect to disclosure, says the SEC, is that it does not insure that an investor will be furnished a body of information which he can compare with information he has concerning similar investment media and thereby intelligently choose the vehicle he desires to use. Thus, among other things, the SEC says, no prospectus is required and much of the detailed financial and management information required under the securities laws is not required to be given under the regulation. The 1940 act, SEC says, provides protections designed to prevent the many forms of overreaching at the expense of the participants in a fund, and while regulation 9 sets out rules designed to prevent self-dealing, all or part of them may be negated by exculpatory provisions in the agreement between the bank and the investor, or by local law to the extent that local law permits any of the activities forbidden by the section. Other requirements of the Investment Company Act, says the SEC, makes for superior investor protection.

The Comptroller says his Office's Trust Division is responsible for the examination of trust departments, and for reviewing the exercise and discharge by the institutions of their trust powers, the conduct of bank trust personnel, the internal auditing systems maintained by many banks, and the procedures in handling trusts. The examination which is required to be maintained at least once a year in every national bank, says the Comptroller, looks primarily to what surcharge liability or risk thereof might exist. Trust departments are separate departments, requested to operate with a separate distinct group of professional technicians—tax, investment, etc. The Comptroller's Office maintains a staff of 1,300 examiners throughout the country; there are specific forms for trust examination reports, and a manual of instructions for trust examiners which includes a separate extensive section dealing with collective investments. According to the Comptroller, there is no more intensively regulated business in the country.

Many more detailed examples of protections afforded by the two agencies are cited by each in support of its claim of superior protection. Only a few are here mentioned to indicate the breadth of their claims. The protections afforded by the agencies are not identical; and any which may be not stated identically; consequently there could be important differences in them in practice. However, even if they were uniform in every respect, that would not dispel the fact of overlapping jurisdiction and responsibility of the two agencies.

PRESENT STATUS

Promulgation of revised regulation 9 at the time and in the climate of its issuance contributed little—if anything—toward resolution of the basic problems. Exercise by banks of the powers to expand their common trust fund operations under the regulation would bring them full tilt into contest of, or compliance with, the SEC claims. In that circumstance, after the revision became final, the president of the American Bankers Association Trust Division put out a letter urging banks to defer variation of their common trust fund operations until the issues raised by the SEC were clarified. It was his expressed hope that this would "minimize the possibility of precipitating action that might prejudice or even foreclose our prospects of working out reasonable solutions to the problems involved."

The status of the matter at the time of the subcommittee hearing, May 20, 1963, was (a) that cautionary advice was still in effect; (b) a meeting had been held between the SEC and a group representing the banks, and more meetings were contemplated; (c) several banks had publicized intentions to operate common trust funds of Smathers-Keogh or managing agency accounts; however, (d) none had been put into effect. Whatever purpose there may have been in promulgating the regulation when it was done, it did not serve to get the banks moving into operation of the expanded common trust funds.

Involved in this "horrendous" duplication of regulation, according to the Comptroller, are "a mass of banks, varying in size, many of which would find it completely impossible to comply with our own regulation and one by the SEC as well. This is particularly true in view of the heavy burden of SEC reporting requirements alone, in addition to our own. Registration, in the case of these banks, and the other requirements, would impose such additional expenses for legal, internal operating, and other costs as to make this prohibitive."

Involved also is the effort and cost of duplicate administration by the two agencies. The SEC estimates that employment of about 25 more persons may be necessary in the first year, at a cost of about $125,000. These costs can be expected to increase to $250,000 per year if its estimate of 500 such common trust funds is reached.

The Comptroller attributes SEC's assertion of jurisdiction to what he claims is an extensive effort by the SEC to extend its arm into the entire arena of banking. The SEC, on the other hand, in its letter to the Secretary of the Treasury, indicated it had no desire to become involved in matters of bank regulation; and at the subcommittee hearing Chairman Cary said he desired to make clear that the SEC was not opposing the participation of banks "in the mutual fund industry," and that its concern was for proper investor protection. The SEC position was summarized in this excerpt from the record:

> Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, then, as I see it, the position of the Commission is that unless the Congress or the courts decide that this particular type of transaction is exempt, you feel the public responsibility under existing law to do something about it.
>
> Mr. CARY. That is correct.

It seems only fair to point out that the Securities and Exchange Commission is charged with the administration of the Federal securities laws; that the Commission possesses extensive experience and expertise in the field; and that the interpretations accorded to the pertinent securities laws by the Commission in this matter are not patently untenable. In such circumstances, the Commission's conduct of this matter seems consonant with its responsibilities.

The efficacy of the Comptroller's performance in the premises is not readily measurable. According to him, to force common trust funds within the confines of the mechanics of the Investment Company Act of 1940 would make it impossible for banks to have such funds, and the SEC's suggestions for negotiation proved impossible. That left unresolved the full force of the SEC claims. Also, although income tax exemption is vital to the operation of common trust funds of managing agency accounts, the revision was issued before the Commissioner of Internal Revenue could rule on their tax status; in fact, the Comptroller did not formally ask for a ruling until the same week that the revision was issued.

The subcommittee's interest in fostering economy and efficiency in the operations of the agencies involved, at this stage, is in determining how the conflict may best and most speedily be resolved. Since primarily this is a matter of duplicate administration by two executive agencies, a solution might have been sought, before the revision was made effective, by requesting an opinion from the Attorney General. This was not done. Or legislative clarification could have been sought. And certainly the tax status should have been ascertained. At present the two remedies available are court action or legislation, and the latter would seem to offer best prospects for fullest and earliest relief. The Comptroller, at the hearing, stated that the sooner the SEC issue is resolved, whether in court or by the Congress, the better for all concerned.

The length of time litigation would likely take is indicated by the SEC proceedings reported in *SEC* v. *Variable Annuity Co.* (359 U.S. 65), which involved substantially the same securities laws as here discussed. That case began on June 19, 1956, and was not concluded until the Supreme Court's decision on March 23, 1959. At that rate, revised regulation 9 could not have any real significance on the common trust funds here considered for until about 3 years after commencement of litigation, and that assumes that the decision will be favorable to the industry, and will dispose of all issues. Should it not, the industry at that point of time would be no better off than it is now.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Colorado a question.

If a bank entered into investment activity which brought it under the provisions of the Investment Company Act, the SEC or the Department of Justice could prosecute any violation of covered activity under the Investment Company Act, could it not?

Mr. ALLOTT. If the bank were under it.

Mr. JAVITS. That is all right.

Mr. ALLOTT. If the bank were under it.

I say to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey and the distinguished Senator from New York that I have been under great pressure from the mutual funds. I have not been under any pressure from the banks. About 6 months ago I received a letter from a close friend of mine. I should be happy to put that letter in the RECORD, if any Senator wishes to have me do so.

I believe the language I have drawn probably expresses our opinion, but if other Senators feel otherwise and if it were possible to correct the report language, I would do it. I would suggest something along this line:

> The committee notes the conflict of asserted jurisdiction in the field of administration of common trust funds. It is cognizant that bills have been introduced in both the House and the Senate (that is, S. 2223 and H.R. 8499 in the House) to resolve this conflict. It is our opinion that national banks are adequately supervised by the Comptroller of the Currency and directs that no funds appropriated in this bill be expended by the SEC for that purpose, at least until the Congress has had a chance to consider S. 2223 or similar legislation.

I know that some persons have taken umbrage at the report language, but, in all sincerity, I must say, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, having read the report and studied the matter, I could not conscientiously let the SEC go into an expansion of their personnel and an expenditure of far more money when it is a disputed matter that the Congress should resolve.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not believe we have the question before us with respect to expansion and getting more personnel, but the Self-Employment Act is coming on the scene, and it will point up the problem in a dramatic way. Let them continue as they now do under existing law, with the present personnel, if we all understand that they are not to push forward until we settle the question. This would be a fair and reasonable compromise for all.

Mr. ALLOTT. I think it is a fair and reasonable compromise to obtain a settlement of this question, which should be determined.

Mr. JAVITS. May I make a suggestion to the chairman of the committee? The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] gave us more time than we thought we would need. Would the chairman yield him some more time?

Mr. PROXMIRE. This was time on the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I appreciate this colloquy in an attempt to straighten out language that could have been misunderstood, but which is now understood.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the amendment before the Senate now is my amendment No. 323. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This amendment would eliminate $60 million——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not certain he understood the Senator's question correctly. It is amendment No. 322 that is now before the Senate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I withdraw amendment No. 322. I call up my amendment No. 323.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 15, to eliminate lines 1 through 6, as follows:

CIVIL SUPERSONIC AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENTS

> For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the development of a civil supersonic aircraft, including advances of funds without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.SC.C. 529), $60,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the amendment would eliminate, save, or cut $60 million from the amount now in the bill. It would eliminate it by cutting out the provision for research and development of civilian supersonic aircraft. This $60 million is only a part of the cost of the supersonic plane. Congress has already appropriated $20 million.

The expensive part of the supersonic transport project comes in the third and final stage; namely, development of prototypes, flight testing, and certification by the FAA. However, the taxpayer will have already invested $91 million in this project for studies before we ever even reach the third phase. Certainly more consideration should be given to the potential financial commitment which we are making.

Estimates I have heard are that this plane would cost approximately $1 billion, of which the Federal Government would provide $750 million. This was President Kennedy's estimate. While I am sure the President did the best he could to make the estimate accurate, our experience with research development is that in the future it always costs more. So the floor of the cost is $750 million, and perhaps it will be much more.

This amendment would reduce spending in the future by much more than $60 million—by three-quarters of a billion dollars, or perhaps $1 billion.

I agree entirely with the statement made by the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] when he stated that he was opposed to this project. According to the senior Senator from Arkansas:

> I would not have thought that the national interest of this Nation depended upon a race for prestige with Britain and France.

It is important to recognize initially that this is a completely new field of endeavor for the FAA. It has never previously had any responsibility or experience in the development of aircraft. In the past, such work, if done at all by the Government, has been done principally by the military.

Where, then, is the justification for expenditures on this supersonic aircraft? It is striking to observe that the Defense Department has not testified in support of these expenditures. Neither has the military volunteered to pay for the research which is involved. Thus, for the first time—I repeat, the first time—we have the Government stepping in to do development work on an aircraft which will be entirely for civilian use.

The difference between the supersonic transport and other Federal expenditures for development of aircraft is that the military has not participated in this development. According to Dr. Harold Brown, Director of Research and Engineering for the Defense Department, there is "no justification" for a supersonic transport "from a military standpoint." Thus, he has said that the Defense Department has seen no justification for spending money to develop one.

One of the outstanding criticisms of this program has been made by the FAA Administrator himself. Mr. Halaby stated:

> If we pay the whole bill as though we were buying an airplane to be provided by the Government * * * then we have gone a long step toward reaching right down into the engineering department, the production department, and the treasury department of each of these companies and telling them in detail about everything they should do. This is a subtle form of nationalization. We don't want to move in the direction that the British and French have moved. We don't want to nationalize our corporations.

However, we are going at least 75 percent of the way which the Administrator criticizes. Obviously the Government has become the majority investor, if not stockholder, in every company that attempts to develop this supersonic aircraft.

Incidentally, this precedent, if established, could easily then be used by the FAA to step into many other areas of aircraft development. For example, considerable interest exists in the development of a new substitute for the old and venerated DC–3. It would not be surprising if the FAA wished in the future to do this development work on behalf of private industry.

Before the Senate Commerce Committee on October 21 Jerome Wiesner, Director of the Office of Science and Technology, stated:

It was perfectly proper for him to say this. I disagree with him, but I think we should recognize what he is saying—

> This is a new experience for the Government, but I don't think it is the last one. It is becoming increasingly clear that we have the manpower, the capacity to do many things, which a private sector of the economy just can't pay for, and we are going to have, I think, increasingly to ask whether it is * * * in the national interest to do something of this sort.

This sort of comment makes it clear that if we begin a program such as this, the Federal Government will gradually be taking over design and development of all private aircraft.

I do not say that the Federal Government will be moving in, to all aircraft, but experience proves that once a subsidy is launched—and this is a launching pad—it is difficult, if not impossible to pull back, particularly when Congress receives the kind of pressures to which it is subjected from aircraft manufacturers. They are fine, decent, patriotic men, who have contributed much to our defense, but they are influential and are very persuasive in persuading conservatives as well as liberals, Democrats as well as Republicans to proceed with these expanding subsidy commitments.

On August 14 President Kennedy appointed Eugene R. Black, former President of the World Bank, as a special adviser on the development of a supersonic transport. Mr. Stanley DeJ. Osborne, board chairman of the Olin Mathieson Chemical Co., was named Black's deputy. No report has as yet been received from this group, and yet we are going ahead with this commitment.

In other words, we are going ahead before we get a report from this committee of men appointed by the President only a few months ago.

It should also be noted the NASA has done considerable research and development work in the past on supersonic airframes. If these funds are granted to the FAA, it will be simply another case of duplication, an overlapping of work already done by NASA. No such expenditures should be made until the research already conducted by NASA has been evaluated for applicability to the supersonic aircraft.

Many industry objections—I repeat, industrial objections—have been heard against this program. Yet, despite these objections, we continue along our route of attempting to assist the industry. It seems to me the evidence is quite clear that the industry we are attempting to assist is not in this case interested in our assistance.

The FAA proposals require manufacturers to put up 25 percent of the development costs, probably at least $250 million. This same industry lost over $800 million in developing turbojets and supersonic jets, and are obviously loath to commit themselves for this new program.

Many airline officials have also criticized this program. Their reason is quite clear. With the greater costs of flying a supersonic transport, higher fares must be imposed. It seems doubtful that passengers will be willing to pay a higher price simply in order to save relatively short periods of time.

A supersonic jet might save perhaps 3 hours in flying time from New York to Paris, and perhaps 2½ hours in flying time to London. However, again the cost would be higher, and the economics of this saving would be very questionable.

Mr. W. C. Mentzer, senior vice president of United Airlines, has said that the economics of supersonic flight are ridiculous. The prospect of 19 airlines coming across the Atlantic, according to Mentzer, and "converging on New York from overseas in supersonic transports looks like economic suicide."

Technicians have also criticized the supersonic transport. Mr. B. K. O. Lundberg, Director General of the Aeronautical Research Institute of Sweden, has said that it would be impossible to thoroughly safety-check the SST before it was introduced. He has further stated:

> The sonic boom which SST would create might be such a nuisance that the SST's now being designed might not be permitted to fly at all outside the SST manufacturing countries. * * * The enormous investment and effort needed to develop SST's will hamper the brilliant prospects now in sight to make aviation a really safe, cheap, and convenient means of mass transportation.

Criticism has come from Government sources as well. Allen S. Boyd, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, has stated that—

> Unlike the present jets, the possibility of supersonic aircraft achieving important economies over predecessor types is dubious.

He expresses a substantial doubt that the SST's would obtain any true market economies. He also raised the specter of additional Government outlays in the future, stating:

> That if the U.S. airlines buy the SST's they may need Federal subsidies to cover operating losses. If they do not buy it, they may lose passengers and need subsidies anyway.

One reason that has been given for building the supersonic jets is that if we do not build them, Britain or France will alone build them, and then we shall have to buy the planes from them. It is argued this will make our balance-of-payments situation worse.

The fact is that the relatively small amount that buying these planes from Britain and France would cost us in that future period during which we are likely to have a balance-of-payments problem, would be far outbalanced by the billion dollars that it would cost the industry and Government to produce the plane.

What in the world is wrong with our letting our allies, with their growing economies and outstanding scientists, engage in this area of nonmilitary research? That makes sense to me.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. As we discuss development of the supersonic transport, I wish to emphasize that there is a requirement closer to home. For the moment I shall not discuss the subject to which the Senator directs our attention, but will speak of a pressing domestic need.

In a State like our West Virginia, where DC–3 aircraft are still serving our citizens and our industries, we need a replacement for the aircraft that are flying the local service routes. Acceptable DC–3 replacement is something that has not been achieved by the aircraft companies in cooperation with the airlines. As the Senator from Wisconsin knows, local service carriers do not have the funds with which to finance this sort of development in conjunction with the aircraft companies.

As my colleague is aware, they are now receiving a subsidy from the Federal Government to serve smaller cities and communities. This is necessary service. It is desirable service. In the case of West Virginia, it is a much needed service.

Many towns in our State are not served by passenger trains. A case in point is my home city of Elkins, which has a population of approximately 9,000 and is the center of a considerable trading area.

There are, however, local air carriers, such as Allegheny, Lake Central, and Piedmont, which provide daily scheduled flights for the traveling public, the shipper of cargo, and the handling of the mails.

I believe it is important at this point in the debate to indicate that there are unmet needs in DC–3 replacement. We need planes developed to fly between local points for distances of 100 to 150 miles.

I shall not discuss at this time the desirability or undesirability of the supersonic developmental program. However, there is perhaps a question of priority—a need to place first tasks first. It would seem that we should accentuate the effort to produce an effective local service aircraft.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. He is absolutely correct. There are certain priorities. The spending of three-quarters of a billion dollars on this plane—and the estimates I have that at most there would be 30 or 40 planes ultimately in operation—should not be a first priority, in my judgment.

Let us sum up. I can do so very briefly.

First, there is no military value connected with this plane, based on the testimony of experts in the Pentagon. They have done all the research work that is necessary, and they have decided that they cannot use the plane. Other alternatives are better.

Second. The economic feasibility of this plane for private enterprise is very questionable. The leading experts in the aviation industry have questioned it.

In the third place, the program involves a vast amount of money. Our allies can do the job. They are already doing it, and they can continue to do it. We can rely on their making the unavoidable mistakes, and tying up their scientists in the field of research.

Perhaps I have stressed too much the expenditure of money in my remarks. We have a shortage of experts and scientists. We need them desperately in defense, industry, and in education.

However, to squander the talents of scientists, to duplicate the work that is being done, not by Communists on war work, but by our allied countries, in peaceful pursuits, seems to be fundamentally wasteful.

This would be the first big step in a subsidy to a private manufacturer, with no defense benefits.

Based on previous experience with subsidies, we know what will happen. The subsidy will continue to grow.

I agree with those who favor this program when they say that if we are to kill the supersonic program we should kill it at the outset, when our investment is minimal—about $20 or $30 million—and not wait until we have appropriated $60 million.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, if the Senator from West Virginia will turn to page 6 of the report of the committee, he will note the following language:

> Board policy should assist local service carriers in strengthening their operations in two major respects:
>
> 1. By strengthening their route systems in a manner which will permit profits from the better segments to maintain and improve service at smaller cities without increases in subsidy.
>
> 2. By encouraging the acquisition of more modern equipment which will build revenues by attracting more traffic and, at the same time, lower unit costs. On the smaller traffic segments, a modern replacement for the DC–3 is an economic and service necessity.

I merely wish to say to him—and I do not think it needs expansion—that many of us throughout the country are in exactly the same situation as he is.

I should like to reply to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] concerning supersonic transport. Frankly, some of his arguments remind me of the arguments that were made in the days of open-cockpit airplanes. People said at that time, "If an airplane is ever built with a closed-in cockpit, it will not be possible to fly it, because the pilot will suffocate." That was said over and over throughout the country. I am sure the Senator from Wisconsin—he has a smile on his face—remembers that.

Congress must decide—and we have previously decided this—where we are going in this field. In my opinion, it is far more logical to put our money into supersonic transport than it is to put it into the project of putting a man on the moon. People may disagree with me, but that is how I feel.

I remember when airplanes traveled a hundred miles an hour. If we had told the people of those days that we would cross the country in planes that travel more than 500 miles an hour, they would have told us we had a screw loose somewhere in a vital part of the head.

So the next development of the air age will not be in missiles catapulting around the earth. It will be in supersonic transport. It may be asked, "Who wants to travel twice or three times the speed of sound?" In every advancement of aircraft, the improvements have been taken up and absorbed.

Who would ever have thought 10 years ago, or at the conclusion of World War II, that $6 million could be spent on a jet aircraft and still have that aircraft operate at a profit? But it is being done. Just as we progressed from the very small plane to the old Ford trimotor and then through the DC-3, the DC-4, the DC-6, and the DC-8, to the "Connies," and all of that group, including the Lodestar, and have reached the present jet craft, just as surely, if we are going to look to the future, we shall have to develop supersonic craft.

The interest shown in the French and British version, called the Concorde, is ample proof of that. That version is perhaps a mach 2, perhaps a mach 2.2 airplane. The purpose of developing a supersonic transport, such as the one that is envisioned, is to make it a mach 2.5 or a mach 3 aircraft.

What shall we pay for such a plane? The distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] conducted extensive hearings in his subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce. As a result of the hearings—and I feel certain he will confirm this in his remarks in a few minutes—first, it will be necessary to comply with the President's criteria that the aircraft companies themselves—the builders—must pay 25 percent of the cost of development. That is what the report states, and that is how the committee feels about it.

Second, the program of development must not cost more than $1 billion. Of that amount, the aircraft operators themselves—the airlines—must agree to repay 1½ percent of their gross revenues as a repayment of the amount the Government will advance for design in this field.

Third, the plane must be one which can be delivered at a cost of between $20 million and $22 million, in order to be economically feasible.

In its report, the committee has directed the FAA to receive proposals for this plane on January 15; to study the proposals; and then to advise Congress whether they comply with the prerequisites that have been established by the President in this field.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Colorado has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. If the FAA reports that those criteria are not met, we do not propose to go into the second and third phases of the design. If the criteria are met, we will go ahead and have participation, as I have described it.

What we are really talking about is a question of policy, which Congress has determined before. We have already devoted $31 million to this project. It is true, as the Senator from Wisconsin said, that there would be no military value in this plane, except from the fallout of knowledge of aerodynamics and motor construction that would come to military aircraft from the construction of such a plane. But the supersonic plane could not be converted into a bomber any more than an RS-70 could be converted into a passenger plane.

The Senator from Wisconsin said that the economic value of the plane is questionable. I have touched on that. No one would have thought we would pay $6 million for a jet plane and operate it at a profit; but it is being done. In 10 years, we shall be operating supersonic planes, and operating them profitably, I believe.

I sincerely hope that the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin will be rejected; that we will show our faith in the courage that has built our previous planes and will develop the planes of the future; that we will show our faith in our own country, because surely—and this is one of the most significant arguments—if we stay out of this field, we will surrender a possible $4 billion production to our friends in Europe, when that $4 billion production could be made effective all over the United States.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I agree with the statement of the distinguished Senator from Colorado that it is very important to proceed with the development of a supersonic plane now. First, if we are not willing to commit ourselves or if we have not the courage to commit ourselves, we ought to kill this program.

Second, the time element is highly important. If we let a year go by, we shall perhaps see the market absorbed by our competitor—the British and French consortium—in manufacture of the Concorde supersonic plane. Enough research has already been done to move to the stage we are talking about. We are not talking about research; I should like to advise the Senator from Wisconsin that we are talking about detailed design and the competition to produce the best plane of a supersonic nature that American free enterprise and industry can build. The question is whether we wish to remain in the leadership of aviation or are willing to surrender it without any effort.

If we expect to retain the leadership we have always had, particularly in supplying the great planes for the airlines of the entire world, as we have done in the past, we shall have to move. We are losing out now because we are not meeting the challenge, except in one field; namely, the long-legged jets. We are being beaten on most of the other models by our foreign competitors. We cannot continue to manufacture the oldest styles of airplanes in the sky and still expect American companies to buy our planes.

We have found that out already. Our largest operators of planes are now buying short-range jets from Great Britain and France. We have not been able, because we were late in getting into the short-range jet production, to crack this market. The major market we have is for the large long-range jet. It is doing very well. It is a fantastic plane. Despite the money the Senator from Wisconsin said was lost, that plane is now doing very well.

But let us not be as late with the supersonic plane.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield more time to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will yield more time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The unanimous-consent agreement provides that at the hour of 2 o'clock the Fulbright amendment will be taken up. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Washington had a discussion with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] relating to his amendment?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. It will be agreeable to proceed to dispose of the amendment now under consideration, which will take a short period of time, and then to proceed to the Fulbright amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the disposition of the Proxmire amendment; and then take up the Fulbright amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Do I understand that that has been cleared with the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It has been cleared with the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the Senator from Arkansas believed that it would be agreeable to conclude with the consideration of my amendment, provided it would take only 15 or 20 minutes more. If more time were needed, he would have to object.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Very well.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I wish to answer briefly some of the points which the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has made. The supersonic jet would not be a military plane. No military need for a supersonic transport has been identified. Perhaps two or three would be sold for VIP purposes; but as a workhorse, nothing has been proposed.

We must have competence in the American airframe industry and engine industry to build a supersonic plane. It has very definite military significance. Otherwise, we would have an obsolete, deteriorating airframe industry. It must met the competition of the British and the French.

The Senator says that while we do not want to nationalize our aviation industry, we should surrender it to the nationalized industry of Great Britain and France. He proposes we tell them we cannot build such a plane, that it is beyond our capability, that the market is not that good; that we cannot afford it; that we must take second place in the building of a plane that we know will be the flagship of the skies for the next 20 years.

I, for one, want to see American flags on the planes which will be operated in the future. If we are not able to manufacture American planes capable of exceeding the speed of sound, we had better return to the manufacture of a good DC-3, because that is all that would be left for us. If the United States cannot develop the capability of producing aircraft of this new type, in my opinion the American aviation industry will go down the drain. The way to keep the U.S. aviation industry from being nationalized is to help it in the way the Government has helped so many other industries—among them, the dairy industry, which has been helped in connection with its production of milk. In this way we can now, for the first time, help this industry produce the needed planes, which it must produce if it is to remain in business.

In addition, I point out that these aircraft companies are not trying to persuade Congress to go along with this cost-sharing proposal.

Instead, Congress is trying to persuade them to go along with it. This proposal was made by the President, after it was found that the American-flag airlines had placed orders for the French Concorde. They placed those orders because they did not know whether Congress would "move off the dime" and proceed to enable the American companies to produce the needed planes. However, when Congress showed an interest, the orders for the new plane came in; and the American companies are lining up to place their orders for the first new planes of this type, because it is clear that the companies which operate supersonic planes will get the business.

Consider what happened to the propeller-driven planes when the jets first came into use. These supersonic planes will be relatively so much faster than the jets—as compared with the difference in speed between the propeller-driven planes and the jets—that the need for this development is clearly all the greater.

Furthermore, this program will not result in duplication of the research being done by NASA. The program will cause a design competition which will utilize the best brains in American aviation and will use NASA research, and NASA facilities, all of which is now being used and will be used, and will use the work done on the B-70. It will use both the proposed contribution by the Federal Government and the 25-percent contribution which the companies must make, under the provisions of the bill as reported by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The time yielded to the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from Washington.

Mr. President, these companies wish to be able to use American-built planes. If we were to eliminate this $60 million item from the bill, we might then just as well "throw in the sponge," because the result would be to cause a delay of 1 or 2 or 3 years; and our companies would not be able to enter the race that late and still attain production in a competitive market.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Did not the committee make clear in its report that Congress will keep in close touch on this operation, and that after the second stage is completed, and before any further steps are taken, Congress will be notified?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes, Congress would be notified if the operation goes beyond the President's program, which limits the expenditure by the Federal Government to $750 million; and the industry must provide its 25 percent of the total.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I cannot add very much to what the Senator from Oklahoma and other Senators have said about this item; but I point out to the Senator from Massachusetts that the hearings are replete with assurances that this arrangement never was intended by Congress to be utilized for the full program until after the designs have been completed and after it is definitely determined that this is what we wish to do.

Second, I point out that our committee held 10 days of hearings on this matter, even though the authorization for the Federal Aviation Administration had been included. We thought it important that we make careful examination of this matter; therefore, we proceeded with the hearings. We talked to the manufacturers involved. What the Senator from Oklahoma has said is quite correct—namely, the Federal Government has been trying to get the manufacturers to participate in this program.

Since the hearings closed, several downpayments have been made on orders which have been placed for the new type plane. So there is no question that American operators want to buy these aircraft, and there is no question about their agreeing to pay, in this connection, 1½ percent of their gross revenues.

I also point out that the research in connection with a project this large had to be handled in this way. Four or five years ago we hoped the aircraft companies would be able to do this work jointly; but we found that is not feasible. At one time, two of the American aircraft manufacturers thought seriously of working with Great Britain and France on the development of this new type of plane.

However, the main point is that after all the hearings, all the committee reports, all the Presidential studies, and everything else in connection with this matter, the fact still remains that the United States has had a lead in world aviation for a long, long time. Thank God, we had it prior to World War II. We even had it in World War I—small though it was. We have had that lead because the American companies have always built better airplanes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time the Senator from Washington has yielded to himself has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 1 more minute.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am sure that both the Commerce Committee and the Appropriations Committee almost reached the conclusion that if we were not going to build a better airplane than the British and the French are now building, we might as well forget about U.S. aircraft production, and begin to purchase from others the aircraft we need.

In short, we are setting out to do this in order to keep American air superiority in the world. If we find we can do it economically and feasibly, this is what we want to do, and Congress will be kept informed at all times. So the provision is worded in a strong way.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to my amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I can quickly sum up my argument in support of the amendment.

The debate has been very revealing to me, because I think the Senator from Oklahoma, the Senator from Colorado, and the Senator from Washington—who are extraordinarily able and articulate, and who know far more about this field than I do—have agreed that this item has no direct military value and that it is of very highly questionable economic merit. As the Senator from Oklahoma said, it has been necessary to force the industry to agree to participate in this project, for the American aviation industry is not at all sure that it will work satisfactorily and that they will be able to charge fares sufficiently high to make the program pay. They realize that they may lose millions of dollars through this operation.

It will cost the Federal Government $750 million. This will be the first step in getting the Government into this kind of subsidy of the aircraft industry, and will be the beginning of at least a degree of socialization.

The argument the Senator from Oklahoma made against the amendment—and this is the argument which it is difficult to meet—was that in the absence of this huge expenditure, the U.S. military would lose the airframe industry. However, I ask this question: What do we want it for? I suppose we lost something when we stopped building battleships, and I suppose we lose something when we stop building any other kind of weapon. But the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense have gone along with the ending of spending by this Government for the construction of long-range supersonic bombers. They recognized the bombers are obsolete.

It is true that we are buying thousands of planes, but they are smaller planes. They are fighter planes. The overwhelming majority of planes produced by the aircraft industry in this country are produced for the military, and that will be the situation in the future. But how ridiculous, when the military has said that they will not use and do not want a supersonic bomber, for us to come along and say, "Yes, but whether the commercial people feel that the planes will be economically feasible or not, we feel we should appropriate $750 million to produce them, not because we think they will probably need it particularly, but because we want to keep the airplane industry alive."

Mr. President, I submit that is not an efficient way to operate the military. We have a $52 billion budget for defense in this country; and for us, in addition to that amount, to provide the kind of subsidy to private industry which is proposed, when it is agreed that it would be of no direct military value, seems to me not to add up.

I conclude by agreeing wholeheartedly with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], who has said that if we are going to kill the $750 million program, the time to kill it is now, today, in the next few minutes, as we vote on the amendment.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield me 1 minute?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. In answer to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, I should like to say that we have spent $5 billion for boosters for spacecraft. We will have spent approximately $6 billion when we get through with the program for the capsule. As the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] has said, it is highly important that we support both programs so that we might maintain leadership in aviation and keep our free enterprise system from surrendering to a socialized and nationalized industry, such as those which are bringing out that type of plane.

If we wish to tell the world that our modern industry cannot keep up in the 20th century unless we socialize, we shall do a great deal to make that impression worldwide by saying that we cannot afford to assist private industry to do the job.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. So that there may be no mistake, the amendment about which we are speaking does not involve $750 million, but an appropriation of $60 million.

Mr. MONRONEY. And the amount will not be spent unless industry meets the terms that the President has laid down. Otherwise, a report must be made to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. On that question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] is absent due to death in family.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senators from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper and Mr. Miller] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] would each vote "nay."

The results was announced—yeas 6, nays 72, as follows:

[No. 242 Leg.]

YEAS—6

Douglas
Fulbright
Holland
Proxmire
Robertson
Young, Ohio

NAYS—72

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kuchel
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGovern
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Monroney
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—22

Anderson
Church
Dodd
Engle
Goldwater
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Hruska
Kennedy
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
McGee
McIntyre
Miller
Morse
Morton
Nelson
Simpson

So Mr. Proxmire's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] graciously consented to the Senate's proceeding after 2 o'clock, despite the unanimous-consent agreement, in order to complete debate and action on the previous amendment. He is present now. I ask if his amendment is the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arkansas (amendment No. 325).

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, under the agreement, the Senator from Arkansas has 2 hours, and the opponents have 1 hour. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the Senator from Arkansas will agree with me that it is entirely possible the debate on his amendment may not require 3 hours.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is quite possible.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Senators should know that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They should not rely on a vote coming in 3 hours. It may come before that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There will be a quorum call before the vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, there are several committees meeting on various urgent matters. I think it would clarify the situation if we could get some idea as to how long consideration of the amendment will require. Will it take about 2 hours to have the debate on the amendment on both sides?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. My best guess is about 2 hours. It is only a guess.

I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania, because he has a committee meeting to attend.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Fulbright amendment. The issue before the Senate was clearly posed yesterday by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] when he said, "The richest nation in the world nonetheless has limited resources." We are that nation. We must, therefore, select priorities among the thoroughly worthwhile proposals which are pressing upon the Congress for authorization and appropriation.

As the distinguished columnist, James B. Reston, said the other day with regard to our space program:

> The question is which comes first—the moon or the slums, the unexplored or the unemployed, security or solvency?

I hope the Senate will keep its eye on this question of priorities, because I do not think there is a Senator in this Chamber who is not interested in exploring the mysteries of outer space. Certainly I am. It is an exciting adventure. It is not only in our national interest, but in the international interest of all mankind. The only problem is, How much, how soon, and at what cost to other programs?

Mr. President, since the tax bill came over from the House—and indeed even before—there has been a wave of what I would call almost reckless economy sweeping the Congress. There seems to be a feeling that because the President's tax cut program will likely, in due course, pass, we must cut the heart out of all other programs before the Congress except those two sacred cows, defense and space.

I have no doubt that many Senators will enthusiastically be voting for this program. I myself shall support it if the Fulbright amendment is defeated—with some reluctance, but I shall support it. I shall support it enthusiastically if the Fulbright amendment is adopted. The same Senators who almost voted like sheep in 2 hours for a $47 billion defense act—and I did, too; I have no doubt it was needed—will be saying, in a little while, as they already have said by their votes and speeches on the floor, "We cannot expand the program for retraining the unemployed. It is too expensive. We must get a man on the moon ahead of the Russians. We cannot approve the extension of the Area Redevelopment Administration Act and give it a new authorization for appropriations. We cannot afford to bring new industry into areas of chronic and persistent unemployment. We must get a man on the moon."

In the other body, it is said we cannot have a youth employment opportunities bill because it costs too much money. The Senate is spendthrift, they say in the other body, so the House will keep the lid on expenditures, because "we must get a man on the moon."

The accelerated public works program—which I am glad to say was adopted in the previous Congress—will come to a halt because, it is said in the other body, we cannot afford it; we "must get a man on the moon."

It is said in the other body that we cannot spend money on mass transit problems, because we have to "get a man on the moon."

Mr. President, it is said that we cannot spend money, even as provided in the bill, to continue the graduate education of scientists, physicists, and engineers who are badly needed for the space program, because it is said that expenditures for education are not "fiscally responsible."

There has been some question as to how much the man-to-the-moon adventure is going to cost. Eloquent and able Senators have decried the position taken by the Senator from Arkansas and me in giving less emphasis to the man on the moon. They say this is only a minor part of the space program. Perhaps it is. But on the floor of the Senate, on August 8 of this year, when I was objecting to the authorization bill for the space program, and I suggested that perhaps $1 billion of the authorization would be utilized to put a man on the moon, I was corrected by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], who said, "Oh, no; the figure is $2.5 billion to put a man on the moon."

I agree that those of us who are supporting the Senator from Arkansas are perhaps mildly overdramatizing the ludicrous side of this sterile adventure, this high school cross-country race, this phobia of competition as opposed to cooperation. We are doing it for good and sound reasons. We are doing it because what we get out of getting a man on the moon is as nothing compared with what we can get out of giving the unemployed skills so they may find jobs, out of what we can get by enhancing the educational opportunities of our American youth, and what we can do for our future by rebuilding our cities. These are the real challenges before America. These are the areas laying most sensible claim to our scarce financial resources.

In this overdramatization we are reaching for a basic truth. And that basic truth is what the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has been saying all along: it is a question of priority.

Twenty million Americans are on the brink of poverty, but we cannot do much about that, it appears, because all this money goes for space and defense.

I do not begrudge this money. I voted for it, but I do think it is too much and too soon. As the speech of the able Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, made a day or two ago indicates, our defense expenditures are tending to level off. We should be stretching out our space expenditures, and we should be putting more of our not unlimited resources into programs of domestic well-being, which, in my judgment, have a considerably higher priority.

I have introduced—and it has been referred to the Banking and Currency Committee—a bill to be known as the Community Development Act of 1963, which would involve an expenditure of $3.1 billion over a 4-year period to rebuild our cities, to rehouse our lower income families, and to move forward with sound urban redevelopment.

Yet when that bill comes to the floor there will be Senators, voting today for the pending program, who will say, "We cannot afford it. Most of our resources have been put into a matter which we consider of far higher priority." That matter will be the man on the moon. But the priority is not higher; it is lower.

Therefore, I urge that we keep our sense of perspective. I urge again that careful thought be given several speeches of the President of the United States, who has said time and time again that outer space should be developed internationally; that no nation should attempt to get a priority; and that we should make this great effort a matter of international cooperation.

Why do we not, in our space program, get the help of nations in Western Europe which we have been helping back to prosperity? Where is West Germany's contribution to the space effort? Where is the French contribution? Where is the British contribution? Where is the contribution of the Lowlands? Where is the contribution of the richest little nation in Europe, Switzerland? Why should we carry the whole load?

I go further and ask, Why are we not making an earnest effort, as the President suggests—and I know he will want to do so—to bring the Russians into the program, so that dollar for dollar, Soviet money will be put up for this space project, and the dollars we save can be put into domestic programs?

No matter how we slice it, I suggest that behind the entire space effort is the immature concept that we have to get there first, ahead of someone else, so that Old Glory will wave on the moon before the Red Star.

I would like to see the flag of the United Nations on the moon. I would like to see an international cooperative effort to conquer space. In that case I would be prepared to vote every dollar of the U.S. funds to pay our fair share. But why should we carry the entire load?

I should like to make a few brief comments about a part of the debate yesterday. I refer Senators to the comments of the very able Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] yesterday, which appear at pages 22379 and 22380 in the RECORD, where he calls attention to the close relationship between the space program and defense. He points out that perhaps we are not being entirely candid when we consider space expenditures as being entirely for civilian and peaceful uses. He says that this effort is essential because from the military point of view we must conquer outer space. Those are not his exact words, but I believe they are a fair paraphrase of his thought.

I suggest again, with all due deference to my good friend from Mississippi, whose sincerity I honor, but with whose views I find myself not in accord, that we should look at this problem on the basis of international cooperation, not international competition. We are not trying to conquer outer space for the United States of America, and we should not be; and the President has said, time after time, that so far as he is concerned we are not.

I suggest that the argument of the Senator from Mississippi against the Fulbright amendment carries him to the full length of suggesting that we should go into outer space as a part of our effort to prepare for war. I suggest that that philosophy and concept is erroneous.

With all due deference to my good friend, the Senator from Mississippi, that is the way I feel about it.

Yesterday there were comments made by other Senators, including the Senator from Oklahoma, which I undertook to answer in the Record at pages 22382 and 22383. Comments also were made by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], who suggested that the space program is essential to insure our national security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. If what the Senator from Massachusetts has said is really the case, then perhaps the Fulbright amendment is wrong. However, I suggest that that case has not been made, and I suggest further that it cannot be made.

Mr. President, as I hasten from the floor to add my little bit as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, to make it possible to go forward with the wheat deal with the Russians, I end on this note. The Fulbright amendment raises important philosophical questions for Congress. It should be fully debated. I wholeheartedly support it. I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New York.

A CODE OF ETHICS FOR THE SENATE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I interrupt the debate on the pending bill only because I have a rather special point I wish to make with reference to the colloquy that took place on the floor yesterday, relating to a code of ethics for the Senate itself.

As I am the principal sponsor, together with the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating], of Senate Concurrent Resolution 5 and S. 281, designed to develop a code of ethics for the Congress through a joint committee and to provide an interim code of ethics, I wish to address myself to this situation.

I feel that we must have a code of ethics for the Senate. I do not believe such a code would make us class B or any other class of lesser citizens than other Americans. On the contrary, since we are riding herd so closely on the executive department regarding alleged conflicts of interest, and are keeping such a close eye for any derelictions in the judiciary, we cannot exclude ourselves.

We in Congress vote on everything under the sun. If we tried to disqualify ourselves because of any relationship we have to any of these matters we vote on, we probably would sit here mute and voteless most of the time. The only substitute is full disclosure.

Therefore, I should like to join with the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], with the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger] and with my colleague from New York [Mr. Keating] in the plea to Congress for action on this proposed legislation.

My bill, for example, is based on my experience as attorney general of the State of New York, where we actually put into effect a code of ethics for legislators.

It did not end the world. It did not materially embarrass their legislative work. Every legislator felt himself to be as much a man of dignity and probity afterward, as he was before.

I put that system into effect. It is a relatively simple system. It calls for a disclosure of substantial investments or loans, or anything of that nature, having to do with a company regulated by the State.

My bill in Congress relates to any enterprise regulated by the Federal Government and requires disclosure of one's interest in it.

Whether a Senator disqualifies himself from voting or not is his business; but I believe the public has a right to know what he owns on the question of accountability. We are living in a fish bowl. We are public trustees. For example, a Senator may be asked about his vote on a particular subject. I had that problem in New York the other day regarding a referendum on offtrack betting. I could have said, "My vote is secret. I cannot tell you anything about it." But I would not dream of doing that. Because of my position, I stated how I voted—I happened to have voted "no" in that case—and why I did so.

I know there was a discussion on this subject yesterday. I have complete respect for my colleagues, including the minority leader, who so graciously came into the Chamber when he learned I would speak on this subject. I have the greatest respect for differing points of view. Discussion can only be helpful, because it will concentrate public attention upon this situation.

Many of us worry because of a seeming diminution of public respect for Congress, which may be attributable to the fact that the session has continued so long and we have not done much. In my opinion, the reason is a failure of governance on the part of the President and the majority party. Nonetheless, the respect for Congress as a whole has declined somewhat.

We can do much to fortify the respect people have for us if we do not try to write a special deal for ourselves. We must class ourselves with the very people whom we are, in a sense, supervising. In accordance with the Legislative Reorganization Act, we have legislative oversight over all Government departments. If we set standards of ethics for them, then we have a duty to set a standard of ethics for ourselves. I do not consider that to be the remotest diminution of our dignity, any more than judges who impose upon themselves canons of ethics suffer any diminution of their dignity when they pass upon the affairs of other people; or corporate directors, who must report their transactions to the Securities and Exchange Commission or other trustees.

I hope the Senate will act soon on the proposed legislation.

I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks editorials from Life magazine and from the New York Times on this subject:

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Nov. 20, 1963]

Capping the Pressure

More than the good name of the Senate is involved in the machinations of Senate Aid Robert Baker; at stake is public confidence in all who pass and execute the laws in Washington. That is why Senator Case, of New Jersey, has urged the Committee on Rules and Administration to let the investigation be a real one no matter where it leads. His warning must be heeded in the Congress.

Federal legislators do have ethical ground rules to guide them on certain activities. They may not receive outside compensation for rendering services before a Government agency; nor may they negotiate contracts with the Government, accept payments or gifts for rendering any services, practice law before the Court of Claims, or conspire to defraud the Government. These, of course, cover only the most obvious and flagrant abuses.

But there is a gray area where conflict of interest does arise, as, for example, where a pre-Washington legal or business connection continues and legislation comes up which may profit a Congressman or his family. Here private and public interest collide, and scrupulous behavior is essential, though it is not always observed.

A joint committee on ethics has been proposed, which would call for fuller disclosure by members of Congress of their outside dealings. A number of other specific recommendations have been made to establish watchdog committees in Congress to investigate charges of conflict of interest and rule on them. Surely a code of ethics is called for to define official propriety. Unfortunately, it is obviously needed—as has been proved once again by the recent affair involving Representative Byrnes of Wisconsin.

There cannot be two codes—a tough one for executive wheelers and a lax one for legislative dealers. The Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations has uncovered facts which have led to resignations outside of Congress; the Senate Rules Committee should show equal vigor in self-examination. The "pressure of opportunity" (to use President Kennedy's felicitous phrase) exists in and out of Congress; it must be capped wherever found.

[From Life magazine, Nov. 17, 1963]

Congress Should Police Itself

"I believe that my retainer has not been renewed or refreshed as usual. If it be wished that my relation to the Bank should be continued, it may be well to send me the usual retainers." Thus wrote none other than Senator Daniel Webster to the Bank of the United States in 1833. The messy state of governmental ethics it denotes was somewhat improved in the early 1850's. But to judge today from the tangled trail of Senate Democratic Majority Secretary Bobby Baker the U.S. Congress seems overdue for another cleanup. Congress rigorously polices the conflict-of-interest rules that govern such appointed officials of the executive branch as the New Frontier's indiscreet ex-Navy Secretary Fred Korth. But the Congressmen's own private law practices, business connections and investments, their personal lives, are their own affair subject only to review by their constituents at reelection time. "I fear that it has a corroding effect," Oregon's late Senator Richard Neuberger once wrote, "when a member of the President's Cabinet can be ordered to jettison his corporate portfolio by Senators who may themselves be dabbling in oil, cotton futures, television, hotel chains or uranium."

Corrosive it is indeed—and one of the most profound problems of modern democracy. Just how should a parliamentary body police its own unwritten honor system that is or ought to be binding on the membership? The British precedent is harsh. Cabinet ministers are expected to divest themselves wholly of business commitments on taking office. M.P.'s who wish to speak or vote on any matter in which they have a financial interest must first, so goes the phrase, "declare interest." Ethical conduct of office can be enforced most sharply by the Tribunal—an independent, "quasi-legal," judicial inquiry set up by motion of both Houses of Parliament. While not a court of law, the Tribunal has the high court judge's power to compel attendance and testimony of witnesses under oath. It can require men who have been mere bystanders to expose their private lives and conversations more or less like prisoners in the dock.

In the United States, parliamentary reformers also proceed along the alternative courses of divestment and/or disclosure. The second is more promising. In the current session of Congress, as in the previous three, New Jersey Republican Senator CLIFFORD CASE has introduced legislation that would require Congressmen and executive department officials alike to disclose their net worth.. Specifically, CASE wants Congressmen to report each year all sources of income, including gifts of $100 or more, also to report all trades of securities, commodities and real property—these last to be filed with the Comptroller General as part of the public record. CASE and his cosponsors would even insist that any Congressman who does his duty for his constituents by intervening before regulatory agencies, tax commissions, etc., do so only in public and that their letters or statements also become part of the record.

Would all this frighten able but nonaffluent men away from the Congress much as from the executive branch? Not so, say the reformers, and especially if Congressmen get the pay raise from $22,500 to $32,500 they have been awaiting for almost 10 years.

Wrote Hamilton in "The Federalist": "The aim of every political consideration is, or ought to be, first to obtain for rulers men who possess most wisdom to discern, and most virtue to pursue the common good of society; and in the next place to take the most effectual precaution for keeping them virtuous."

There are those who argue that such congressional reform as CLIFFORD CASE's cannot be enacted and ought therefore to be abandoned—or that there is no real way to legislate the private standards of a public servant, so why bother. They are flouting "the most effectual precaution" advocated by Hamilton as a must for democracy. They are opting, in effect, for the doctrine of South Dakota's Senator KARL E. MUNDT, who once remarked good humoredly and unforgettably, "You can't make a Senator do anything."

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8747) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for the leadership he has taken on the subject before the Senate. I am pleased and proud to be a cosponsor of the amendment. I first came to understand the Senator's position several months ago, when I read a series of lectures he delivered at Tufts College before the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, in which he outlined brilliantly the reasons for the amendment he is offering today. Those lectures have since been published in book form, in a volume that I hope every Member of Congress will read. In it, the Senator deals not only with the space problem, but with the whole range of American values in the 1960's, as well.

I believe it is that larger problem that we are discussing today—the question of what constitutes national strength. The Senator from Arkansas is not advocating a policy of weakening our country; he is advocating a course of action which will strengthen the people of the United States and will make this country a better place in which to live, a stronger country, one that is more capable of meeting its responsibility in today's world.

We have fallen into a pattern in our country in which we are too prone to measure national defense in terms of military spending alone. We talk about the defense budget, which is perfectly proper; but defense is measured by many more indexes than the amount of money spent on armaments, or even spent on the space program. There is a notion in some quarters that the reason for heavy Government spending is that there has been a sharp increase over the years in the amount of funds devoted to welfare purposes—such programs as education and health—whereas, the fact is that in recent years we have been spending a smaller and smaller proportion of our Federal budget for those purposes, and a larger and larger percentage for such programs as those of the Defense Department, space science, and atomic energy.

If we examine the Federal budget for this year, it becomes clear that we are allocating directly to the armed services about 50 percent of the entire Federal budget. Once we turn the Federal dollar over and look at the other side, we find that another 78 percent of the Federal budget is allocated to programs related to national defense, programs such as space science; veterans' benefits, with which none of us quarrels; and interest on the Federal debt, which is almost entirely a war debt. So it is perfectly correct to say that about 28 percent of the entire Federal budget is devoted to paying for the cost of past wars or preparing for a possible future conflict.

When we look at the items in the Federal budget that could bear a welfare label, even in the broadest sense of the term—everything we are doing in the field of education, in the field of health, in the field of aid to the blind, medical research—all those programs combined take only 7 cents of the Federal dollar. Twenty-five years ago we were spending several times that much. My recollection is that more than one-third of the Federal budget in 1940 was allocated to welfare programs for which we now designate approximately 7 percent of the budget.

Big government itself is associated not with the growth of welfare programs, but with the growth of what could be called warfare programs. The senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who has left the Chamber, recalled a few minutes ago that a few weeks ago the Senate approved a $47 billion defense budget in about 2 hours.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield the Senator 3 more minutes.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator. At the time that appropriation was being considered, some of us made an effort to bring about a modest reduction in the appropriation. It was unfortunate that the timing necessarily had to be on the same day that the Senate dealt with the ratification of the test-ban treaty. Within a matter of minutes after the Senate had approved the test-ban treaty, it turned to the consideration of the defense appropriation. In that climate of opinion, many Senators were fearful of voting for reductions in the defense budget, believing that they might be accused of giving in to the so-called euphoria in the wake of the approval of the test-ban treaty. But I am convinced that a growing number of Senators and Representatives are concerned about the approval of a far larger defense budget.

I hope we may anticipate next year—and I fully believe that we may—a much longer and more intensive examination of military appropriations on the floor of the Senate. I am proud to be one of two Senators who voted for a 10-percent reduction in the programs for procurement and research and development in the defense budget, not because we thought that that would weaken the defense budget, but because we thought that the way to strengthen the United States was by reducing our investment in surplus equipment that is not needed, and by preventing the allocation of so much of our scientific and industrial resources to military purposes. This is the basic reason why I support the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas, who is suggesting exactly the same approach to the space budget that I proposed in connection with the defense budget—namely, a 10-percent cut in the funds. The amendment would not in any way curtail proper operation of the space program, but it will help put it into better perspective. It would free scarce resources and also manpower which is urgently needed for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arkansas for yielding this time to me.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Arkansas for yielding this time to me.

Mr. President, I wish to express my sympathy and association with the remarks of the Senator from South Dakota, who has pointed out that too many of our domestic programs are bound to be curtailed if we invest so much money in the race to the moon.

It is often asked, "Why not do both?" But, Mr. President, it seems to me that in dealing with multibillion-dollar programs, it is wise to consider their relative importance and to arrive at a correct understanding of the priorities involved.

THE MOON IN FOCUS

In that connection, let us consider education. Is it more important to place a man on the moon by 1970, rather than 1980 or 1990, or to engage our energies in the pursuit of an educational system adequate to the demands of the mid-20th century? Is a base on the moon a more critical need than adequate housing for the earthbound? Does the accelerated procurement of a $150 million rocket booster outrank the expansion, at a comparable cost, of the Federal Government's contribution to vocational education?

Who is not intrigued by the prospect of landing a man on the moon? It is a romantic goal. We have conquered many new frontiers, such as was done when Lewis and Clark succeeded in reaching the Oregon country. Now we are looking for new fields to conquer. An accelerated program to land a man on the moon is an appropriate goal for a nation which has fulfilled the material needs of its citizens. But we are not yet that civilization.

Last month the voters of Oregon rejected an increase in their State income tax. Because of this, the State of Oregon is now forced to shortchange the students in its schools, the needy on its welfare roles, the unfortunate inhabitants of its State institutions. These are tragic lapses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. President, who can turn to the citizens of his State and say, "You cannot afford to serve the needy, but I have just endorsed your participation in a great romantic—and extravagant—adventure."

The Senator from Arkansas has prepared his case well. He cites our principal military leaders in support of his claim that the moon project has no direct bearing on our military security. He argues with taut logic that the increment to our international prestige from a successful moonshot would be of relatively minimal benefit. And he dispatches with deserved scorn the argument that a successful moonshot is essential to preserve the damage caused to our collective psyches by the launching of Sputnik in 1958.

In short, Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas has made his point. I am honored to be a cosponsor of his amendment.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 6 minutes to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Fulbright amendment. It would cut $519 million from the $5,700 million proposal for the Space Administration. I would find it difficult not to agree with the cogent, logical, and persuasive arguments presented for this 10-percent cut in the large space program appropriations. No Senator minimizes the importance of the space program, but there must be some limit upon the expenditures made at a time when other domestic needs which I consider far more pressing are neglected on the ground that the Nation cannot afford them.

I am far more concerned with the 5 million American unemployed than I am with getting one, two, or three men on the moon at the earliest possible date. To me, the unemployment of 5 percent of our working force poses a far greater challenge than a race with the Russians to see which nation will first place a man on the moon.

Right now, a program of major importance to the national economy—the public works program—has run dry of funds. Many admirable projects have been processed and are ready to go but cannot go into effect because the money has run out. This public works program, for which $800 million has been appropriated, has done great things, within its fiscal limitations, to begin needed projects and to put our unemployed back to work. But the sum authorized and appropriated for that purpose was far from adequate. It should have been many times larger. I have pending an amendment to increase the authorization to $2,500 million for public works on the planet on which we live, so as to take care of the needs of the people on this populated orb, rather than to propel one, two, or three men to our unpopulated satellite.

The amount which would remain after the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, which would reduce the pending NASA authorization, would be twice what has been requested and what is needed in order properly to restore the accelerated public works program. I repeat my conviction that no more important undertaking challenges Congress; no need is more pressing; no purpose should be given greater priority than that given to the program to put our unemployed men and women back into the dignity, self-sufficiency, self-respect, and happiness of gainful employment.

Mr. President, I could list many other needs on this terrestrial sphere which, in my view, should have priority over the inflated space program, however desirable it may be—and I do not minimize its importance. There are many needs in addition to the needs for reemployment, such as education, health, and slum clearance, all of which are intimately intertwined with the historic American aspirations for a better and more abundant life. In relation to our earthly needs, which are not adequately supplied by current authorizations and appropriations, the billions of dollars sought for the crash space program seem to me needlessly large.

Nothing that I can say can amplify the eloquent words spoken yesterday by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], whose amendment has been so ably supported by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger].

I am proud to be associated with them in this constructive effort.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, before I yield further time, let me inquire whether other Senators wish to have time in which to speak.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Florida wish to have time yielded to them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to reserve part of the time under my control.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I shall be glad to proceed at this time, if that is desired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, first, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that I voted with him on the foreign aid bill and at no time did I support any of the cuts he opposed. So I do not want him to begin to believe that he is getting even with the Senator from Florida by proposing an amendment of this type. I hope he is not trying to do that, because there is no basis for it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The foreign aid bill is not in the same category, and has not the same relationship to Arkansas that the pending bill has to Florida. The foreign aid bill did not contain anything for Arkansas, whereas the pending bill provides an appropriation of approximately one-quarter of a billion dollars, I believe, or perhaps more, for Florida. I congratulate the Senator from Florida for having that interest in the bill. The question of whether the amendments offered to the foreign aid bill were or were not adopted was not important to Arkansas.

Mr. SMATHERS. I am sure that is true, and I realize that it is not important to the Senator from Arkansas to have that much money spent in his State, or that having that much money spent in his State would in no wise affect his support of this cut.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yesterday, the State of Missouri was referred to in connection with the moon program. I state for the rcord that, so far as I know, the Lunar program contains nothing for the State of Missouri. A manufacturer from Missouri tried hard to get the Apollo program, but lost. Therefore, to the best of my knowledge, no part of the Lunar program is in Missouri.

I thank the Senator from Florida for yielding.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator for that comment. I should like to get the record straight with the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I also want to get it straight. I am not trying to punish anyone for voting for or against the foreign aid bill. Of that I can assure the Senator. The libel is going about that the foreign aid bill was the Fulbright bill. That was strictly a libel. It was the administration's bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. I understand that completely, and I supported the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was not a special sponsor of that bill, therefore I did not wish to admit even the possibility or the thought that I was trying to get "even" with anyone because of the way they voted on that bill. It has nothing to do with it.

Mr. SMATHERS. Somewhere I read in the Record or in the newspapers that the able Senator from Arkansas said, "They are starting to cut the foreign aid bill and I should like to let them know that we can cut some of these other bills, too." I did not hear that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I made the statement: "They struggled 3 weeks to cut foreign aid $500 million. Here is an opportunity to save just as much money in one simple amendment." A more efficient use of the time of the Senate is the only point I made.

Mr. SMATHERS. At the time the Senator from Arkansas made that statement, it is too bad the Record could not show the statement, "He said that with his usual cute, wry grin on his face."

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I did not intend to get into this colloquy but both the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Florida have mentioned this matter. I noticed in the Record this morning—I had not realized it—that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas said he pleaded with me on the foreign aid bill. We all know that the Senator from Arkansas would plead in a kind and fair fashion. As I remember, the Senator from Arkansas recommended a cut of $385 million in the Senate bill, which I did not support. Perhaps that reduction was too much, one could have thought at the time. But in the end, we did vote to cut the bill to $3,700 million.

Knowing the Senator is fair in his thinking on these matters, I would remind him that he did say to me in discussion of the aid bill, at one point, that what he was most interested in was the amendment that had to cater to the trade aspect with respect to some countries. He added he hoped that I could support that particular amendment.

To the best of my knowledge, this is the only time he ever spoke to me about the aid bill in question. I not only voted with him on that amendment, but also I spoke several times on the floor in favor of what he desired, and would hope I had a small part in the vote, which resulted in a 55-to-11 victory for the administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Florida 5 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Missouri. He is quite right in respect to what I said. I did not speak to him about the other matter, for since he is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations and had attended the hearings very conscientiously, I did not believe it was necessary. He understood as much about the bill as I did.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I was at Cape Canaveral last Saturday, and was privileged to be with the President of the United States. While there, we saw the many marvelous things which are being done.

I believe the leading military authorities of the United States as well as some of the leading scientists working on the program were also present.

I remember very distinctly the question that was asked: Does this program have any military benefit whatever?

Emphasis was placed on the fact that it had great military benefit, and that if it were possible for the Soviet Union or the Communist world somehow to control outer space, most of the weaponry we have today would be of no use whatsoever. It would be absolutely obsolescent.

I remember hearing that statement only a few days ago, and it made a profound impression upon me.

I remember hearing the question asked: Is there any possibility that what we are doing at the cape might eventually be used to control even the weather?

I remember hearing one great scientist there saying, "Yes; we believe there is the possibility in this area of finally doing something with the weather."

It is obvious that if any country can control the weather of any other country, if it were possible for the Communists to say there are going to be nothing but droughts in the United States, no wheat to sell, no barley, no rice, no citrus, this would be a barren world and they might take it over and control it. They did not say that was going to be done, but it is possible that it could be done.

I remember hearing in some other discussion that one of the reasons we are somewhat in trouble with the Communists today is that in the early days when we could have put a sputnik into the air rather easily, a mistake of judgment was made, not by one man—not by any individual, certainly—but by a group of people. Even with the missile power we then had we could have put a sputnik into the air, and probably before the Soviet Union did.

We did not do it. We did not do it because we did not want to spend the money. No one realized that people throughout the Western World would be impressed with the economy of the Soviet Union and the caliber of its scientists and technology, and all the rest.

The fact that the Russians were able to put in orbit the sputnik is one of the reasons we have had more and more difficulty around the world. Communism has been able to say, "We have been in existence only since the early 1900's, and look what we did. We have put a sputnik in orbit, and we were the first to put people up there. Perhaps our system of bringing people out of poverty and giving them that which they want is quicker and better than that of a free enterprise system." That is one of the reasons we have many problems, even in our foreign relations today.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SMATHERS. If I can get a little more time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not quite follow the argument of the Senator from Florida. Does the Senator say that since they have put up the sputnik we have had considerably more difficulty? Does the Senator intend to say that other countries voluntarily became Communist as a result of the sputnik?

Mr. SMATHERS. I do not say they have done so voluntarily. But I say on the Dark Continent of Africa and in Latin America, Communist talk, with respect to how effective the Communist system is, is given great impetus because they were first in space.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What is the evidence of this? I was under the impression that our relations with many of these countries, particularly with Russia, was somewhat less tense today than it was at the time of the sputnik.

Mr. SMATHERS. We have had the Berlin crisis since the day of the sputnik.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It was more crucial before than since.

Mr. SMATHERS. We have had the situation in Cuba, and we have seen other things develop wherever we go. I have traveled somewhat in that area, and I have heard the Communists say, "Look what we can do." Every day we listen to Mr. Khrushchev, we hear him say, "We are going to catch them, because we are doing a better job."

I do not believe it, and the Senator from Arkansas does not believe it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; and I do not believe anyone else does, either.

Mr. SMATHERS. I disagree. Why do we have to continue to appropriate such large sums of money for foreign aid?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We do not have to. For foreign aid?

Mr. SMATHERS. For foreign aid.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Florida 5 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thought the Senator was going to say the space program——

Mr. SMATHERS. No, the Senator was asking for a large foreign aid program. I am with him on that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How inconsistent can the Senator be? The Senate just cut the request of the administration by more than a billion dollars. Is that evidence that the Senate is not as concerned about the threat of communism as it was?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am not worried about the Senate. I am worried about the Senator from Arkansas.

Is the fact that a cut was made in the foreign aid program any reason why the Senator from Arkansas should turn around and say, "Now we should cut the space appropriation because foreign aid was cut. I want the space program to be cut."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not say that. The Senator is saying that.

Mr. SMATHERS. What I am trying to say to the Senator from Arkansas is that he and I are usually together on programs. I believe, in most respects, we still are.

How well we do in outer space has a great deal to do with our foreign aid program, because it gives us prestige and standing. But I do not want to spend all my time on that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me say one thing about foreign aid. I deny any such connection. The basic speech I made yesterday I made last spring, about April, as soon as I found out about the outrageous request for a space program.

That is in the RECORD. The Senator from South Dakota referred to it. It has been printed. That was last spring, before foreign aid was under consideration by the Senate.

Mr. SMATHERS. I do not wish to misquote my good friend, and I do not wish to make any imputation with respect to him which is not correct, but I should like to have the full value of his statements.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In fact, I thought then that the cut should be about $1 billion.

Mr. SMATHERS. There is no question that the space program has much to do with our defense. I should like to mention another related subject.

There are spinoff benefits from this program which are absolutely fantastic, medically. I have been made acquainted with the fact that since the work has been done on the Mercury astronaut suits, great good has been accomplished for people who previously suffered from heart disease of a certain type. I do not know exactly the technical name for it, but it is some cardiovascular trouble. What has been learned from the development of the Mercury astronaut suits has enabled hundreds of thousands of patients to put on the same kind of suit and to become ambulatory, useful citizens.

In the space program there has been developed a guidance system and, as a refinement, there has been developed a radar system which can be put around the chest of a blind person to help him. This is quite remarkable. It achieves better results than the seeing-eye dogs who used to lead the blind. The blind can tell whether they are going up or down steps. They can tell when they are approaching an object. The system is like that used by an airplane flying at a rapid speed through the darkness at night, or in bad weather. By use of this device, a blind person can "see."

If I had time, I could name about 165 "spinoff" benefits to the medical profession which have resulted by virtue of this particular program.

Of particular interest to me, because of a rather painful experience, is the development of a certain type of spinning object, such as is, I believe, used in the nose cone of the Mercury capsule, which moves fast, in order to cut down heat. The dental profession is now using this. It is entirely possible that even the Senator from Arkansas could join with me, without fear, in going to the dentist in the future, because the work would be painless.

These are only a few of the things which result from this type of program.

I end my comments with a little appeal. I am certain that when Columbus started his journey to discover a short way to the Indies he did not really know what he would find. He discovered a great continent, a rich continent. He made history. The benefits which have resulted for mankind have been tremendous.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SMATHERS. We do not really know what is in outer space. As the Vice President and others have said, if we are first on earth we ought to be first in space, because if we are not first in space we may no longer be first on earth. There are many things out there which need to be discovered. If they are discovered by someone else, the result may be to reduce us to the status of an impotent nation with no defense, with no weather information, with no scientific development of the character we need.

There are many things to cut. I did not vote for a cut on the foreign aid bill, and I shall not vote for this proposed cut, because I cannot help thinking that it is not in the character of the American image and of the American people. We are always exploring, always moving out seeking to be first.

There are many things yet to be discovered which can redound to the benefit not only of the United States, but also of all humanity. This is not the place or the time to become overly conservative and to cut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in the debate on this amendment yesterday, certain statements were made which would indicate that the civilian space program has little military value.

The statement was made also that the manned lunar program is not essential to the Nation's security. To my knowledge, no one has contended that the Nation will be any weaker or less able to defend itself if this program is substantially cut back.

To support these statements answers by Gen. Curtis LeMay, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, were used.

Mr. President, I have listened to testimony from many witnesses, both civilian and military, over the past few years; and while there is some disagreement, of course, as to the manner in which the programs shall be pursued, I have yet to hear anyone, particularly in the military, say that our overall national space program does not materially aid the national security of the United States.

I take this opportunity to quote some of the military figures and defense figures who have testified in recent days with respect to the question now before the Senate.

General LeMay, who appeared before the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives on the Defense Department Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1964, stated on page 587 of those hearings, and in answer to a question whether there was much military application to our moon shot program, application to military requirements, the following:

> No, it is not aimed primarily at military application, but I am sure a lot of the techniques and scientific information that evolves from this program will have military application and use.

General LeMay later answered with respect to a question whether he thought it was wise for the United States as a nation to undertake the expenditures in space to reach the moon in a manned flight:

> This is a very difficult one to answer from a strictly military standpoint, of course, I would rather be trying to go to the moon for other reasons—in other words, aim it as a military project rather than just a scientific project, let science fall out rather than let the military applications fall out of it.

Secretary of the Air Force Zuckert, in appearing before the Armed Services Committee of the House on military posture hearings, stated:

> In recognition of the increased impact of space programs on our national resources and their direct effect on our future national security, Air Force space activities are closely coordinated with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. One example is the recent agreement between the Defense Department and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on the Gemini program.

Let me quote from Gen. Bernard Schriever, who appeared before the House Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight of the Committee on Science and Astronautics in the hearings on the NASA fiscal year 1964 authorization:

In connection with General Schriever, especially now that Admiral Raborn has retired, I believe it would be almost universally agreed that no one knows more about newer weaponry and newer weaponry plans than the able general who now heads the Air Force Systems Command, General Schriever.

On page 833, General Schriever is shown to have stated:

> I have also often stated my belief that the civilian and military portions of the national space program must complement each other with closest possible relationships at all working levels. This is why I have taken management and organizational steps such as establishing General Ritland as my Deputy for Manned Space Flight.

Quoting General Schriever further in the same hearings, in answer to the question:

> Is this manned trip to the moon necessary in your judgment?

General Schriever's answer was:

> I have always felt that a lunar program was an essential objective for the overall national space effort.

General Schriever later in answer to a question asked of him whether there is both a civilian as well as a military gain or benefit from this research and development for the manned lunar landing, answered:

> Yes, definitely. Here again it is a little bit difficult to compile a laundry list of specific items and say these all have applications to the military mission. However, I can point out certain things. The Gemini program, for example, certainly has tremendous contributions to make in the objectives of that program. The whole matter of the man and creating an environment for man to operate in is absolutely essential from a military point of view.
>
> The near earth activities are of greater interest to us than the ones that are essentially involved with a lunar orbit and the lunar part of the job. That does not mean that some future date this will not also interest us.

I would like to quote from the House Committee on Science and Astronautics hearings on space posture when General Ferguson, Deputy Chief of Staff, Research and Development, testified as follows:

> The space activities of NASA have produced and will continue to produce highly important data which is available for application to problems of national security * * *. In seeking to identify and advance the development of military capabilities for space, the Air Force wishes to take full advantage of the important knowledge that NASA acquires. We strongly support, in both thought and action, the necessity and the value of NASA's scientific explorations.

I would like to call the attention of the Senate to the letter introduced in the RECORD on August 9 of this year by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] in connection with NASA's authorization. The letter was addressed to Senator ANDERSON, chairman of the Senate Space Committee, from Brockway McMillan, Under Secretary of the Air Force. Mr. McMillan commented on the military items in the NASA fiscal year 1964 budget. I will not take the time to read the whole letter, but simply quote from it. In it Mr. McMillan stated:

> In our search for military benefits which the Defense Department might derive from the NASA program, we have found there are many technical areas wherein advances by either agency will benefit both. It is particularly clear that the broad underlying base of technology being produced by the NASA will substantially benefit military space programs.

Finally, Mr. President, I would like to quote from testimony by Mr. Gilpatric, Deputy Secretary of Defense, before the Senate Space Committee, in connection with NASA's fiscal year 1964 authorization. Mr. Gilpatric's testimony can be found complete in part 1 of these hearings beginning on page 604. I will not read the entire statement, but will only make mention of a part of his statement in which he said:

> First, the United States has a single national space program. The Defense Department and the NASA are each responsible for major portions of that program. It is a primary policy objective of both of us that our efforts in the Defense Department and those of the NASA shall be conceived, planned, and executed to insure that the totality of our space efforts adds up to a single program in the national interest * * *. Space, like other mediums, affords useful and often unique ways for achieving defense objectives. Some of these are by no means uniquely military—improved ways to communicate or keep track of the weather worldwide are simply examples. Other applications may turn out to be more distinctly and uniquely useful and necessary from a strictly military point of view * * *. Space systems and devices are not simply military or nonmilitary merely because they are developed by one agency or another, since that factor does not uniquely determine their future application. Moreover, our national successes and failures in space may have significance outside the purely military domain, since they support national endeavors and validate our national will and strength in the eyes of the entire world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I ask for 5 more minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I have taken the time of the Senate to quote statements made by some of our best military and civilian Defense Department officials because I feel it is important to show that our civilian space program has much application to our national security. I would not like the idea left that there will be no military benefits derived from our civilian space program. The fact that there is no direct benefit in the form of a military weapons operations system is not important at this time. I would only add in closing that I doubt if in 1907 when the Wright brothers first succeeded in lifting their fragile craft off of the ground, there were very many people who stood up and said that this feat was of tremendous military significance. However, history has shown us that less than a decade later airplanes were playing a very important part in the prosecution of World War I.

Mr. President, I do not believe anyone at this time can possibly foresee the utilization that will be made of space. I have personally supported the U.S. position that space shall be utilized for peaceful purposes, but for myself I wish to see our program go forward so that in the future, should it ever become necessary, the United States will be in a position of preeminence in space and able to defend itself or take the offensive in this medium as well as on the land, on the sea, and in the air.

In that connection, I mentioned yesterday remarks of the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, Gen. Thomas White, before he retired from the Air Force. Going back to the days when this Agency was created, there was a great deal of apprehension about the arbitrary demarcation between the civilian and military interest in space. If it had not been for the able late senior Senator from New Hampshire, Senator Bridges, I think it fair to say the military would have had little or no position in space.

When the bill was considered—and the legislative history and the hearings held at that time will so verify—it was realized that the military should have a vital interest in the space program; and as one has watched the rapid developments in recent years in what might be called the art of defense—I hope my colleagues will realize that this art has changed more in the past 15 years than it did in the previous thousand.

The former President of the United States, and a former great military leader, Dwight D. Eisenhower, recently said he thought we should heavily reduce the number of ground forces we have in Europe at this time. I have felt that way for sometime, for many different reasons. If all this is a question of expense, I would prefer to see this country save money—especially as in this case it would help us with our serious problem of unfavorable balance of payments—by taking some of our divisions out of Europe, rather than compromising in the newest of all arts, space, in which medium some day we might be forced to defend our country.

For these reasons, I shall vote against this reduction, and hope the Senate will also take into consideration the fact the amount recommended in the bill has already been reduced between some $600 million from what the administration originally requested.

Mr. FULBRIGHT obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield, without his losing his right to the floor, so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On whose time is the roll to be called?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the time consumed in the quorum call be not charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 243 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kuchel
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, much of the debate yesterday involved a numbers game, the outcome of which depended upon whose figures one believed, and at what time they were made. A debate along these lines really misses the point. The question of whether $2 billion or $50 billion is required to put a man on the moon is not the question. The point is whether we want to pursue any kind of space program on a crash basis.

The question is not whether we would or we would not have a space program. It is purely a question of whether we shall proceed on a "crash" basis. Are the benefits that we hope to derive from space exploration so important that they deserve priority consideration over so many pressing needs in the domestic sector of the economy?

Two principal arguments were advanced yesterday and I wish to address myself briefly to them. It was argued that the program to land a man on the moon costs only $2 billion of the official estimate of $20 billion for manned space exploration this decade. The rest of the $20 billion, it was said, would yield military or defense benefits and that the program should be judged in that light. I cannot accept this thesis. Statements by our military and space officials that I quoted in my speech yesterday clearly indicate that the thrust of the space program is not military. It would, in fact, be a monstrous deception of both the Congress and the public if it were. The declaration of policy and purpose of the 1958 act that authorized establishment of NASA clearly states that the agency was established to make a peaceful exploration of space.

I believe it would be worth while to quote the first section of the act:

> (b) The Congress declares that the general welfare and security of the United States require that adequate provision be made for aeronautical and space activities. The Congress further declares that such activities shall be the responsibility of, and shall be directed by, a civilian agency exercising control over aeronautical and space activities sponsored by the United States, except that activities pecular to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems, military operations, or the defense of the United States (including the research and development necessary to make effective provision for the defense of the United States) shall be the responsibility of and shall be directed by, the Department of Defense; and that determination as to which such agency has responsibility for and direction of any such activity shall be made by the President in conformity with section 201(e).

The act itself clearly states that that is not the purpose of the program. The argument was not advanced by the proponents of the present bill until recently. Six or eight months ago the primary emphasis on the bill was that we must "get there before the Russians" for prestige purposes. It was not even alleged that it was primarily for military purposes. The NASA Act states:

> The Congress hereby declares that it is the policy of the United States that activities in space should be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind.

It further provides that NASA shall have responsibility for space activities except "activities pecular to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems, military operations, or the defense of the United States—including the research and development necessary to make effective provision for the defense of the United States—shall be the responsibility of, and shall be directed by, the Department of Defense."

So I think if we now come forward, as some of the proponents do, and say that the main justification is military, the statement is in direct violation of the stated purpose and is an afterthought, even within the year, in regard to the bill itself.

Mr. President, I believe it would be proper to put into the RECORD for the information of the Senate a section of the report to the Congress from the President of the United States for 1962 on the Department of Defense. The statement begins on page 33. I shall not read it. It is too long.

I ask unanimous consent that the section of the report to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the section was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAPTER IV. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Introduction

As their contribution to the national space program, the Department of Defense, during 1962, expanded the research and development effort designed to keep the peace. These efforts are based on the belief that the capability to discourage or deter an attack via space is essential to keep the peace on this new frontier of man's endeavor.

DOD space projects fall into two principal categories: First, those projects directed at clear, identifiable military needs and requirements. Examples include the development of communications, navigation, and ballistic missile early warning satellite systems. The second class of projects is designed to investigate promising military space capabilities which will create a broad flexible technological base and to develop devices and subsystems which can be readily adapted for the design and engineering of major systems as future military space requirements and needs are identified: A prime example of a major project in this latter category is the Titan III standardized launch vehicle which was approved for development in August 1962.

Titan III will be capable of performing a wide variety of space missions involving a broad span of payload weights. It is expected to serve as a general purpose launch vehicle for more than a decade, performing a role in space operations for the DOD and NASA, as appropriate. Thus, it represents a major technological building block upon which the structure of the future military space capability will be built as part of the national launch vehicle program.

Space efforts of the Department of Defense are fully coordinated with the activities of NASA and other Government agencies in order to assure that planning for potential military applications of the future properly considers and applies all appropriate aspects of research and development in space with special emphasis on minimizing duplication. Military space efforts are properly integrated as an essential element of a consolidated national space program in which many Government agencies are participants.

Cooperation and accord at the management and operating levels in DOD and NASA contribute to the complementary characteristics of the collective space efforts. For example, the military communications satellite system is being developed to satisfy the peculiar requirements of the DOD for reliability, security, resistance to countermeasures, access to remote areas, and use by mobile units. It will supplement, but not replace or duplicate, space communications systems being developed by NASA and the electronics and communications industry.

Concurrent with its efforts to advance and exploit space technology, the Department of Defense sustained its traditional interest and participation in programs devoted to the advancement of aeronautics. Continuing progress in this important area was made during the past year.

Selected portions of the DOD program in the areas of space technology and aeronautics are highlighted in the following sections:

SPACE DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Standardized space boosters

During the year substantial progress has been made in developing standard configurations of our first generation of space boosters. These include the Atlas and Thor boosters and the Agena upper stage vehicle. Objectives of the standardization program are: increased reliability, increased producibility, increased flexibility in assignment of vehicles from one program to another and decreased overall space program costs.

The Thor space booster was standardized on a step by step basis during actual use. Initial standard Thor vehicles were delivered in mid-1962. The Agena standardization was undertaken as a program on an accelerated schedule. Initial vehicles were delivered in April 1962 and flown in June and July 1962. The Standard Atlas program is being pursued in a similar manner to the Agena program. Initial vehicles were delivered late in calendar year 1962.

Titan III

The Titan III is a standardized space launch system which will be developed and utilized as part of the national launch vehicle program as outlined in the joint agreement between the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of NASA. This launch vehicle, to be developed by the Air Force, will meet Department of Defense and NASA future needs to place 5,000 to 25,000 pounds of payload in low earth orbits. The Titan III takes full advantage of the Department of Defense's investment in the two stages of the Titan II ICBM, with minimum modifications, along with large solid motors and a new upper stage as the essential building blocks.

The Titan III system was the first large program to utilize new DOD procurement procedures. Before program approval was given, a program definition phase (phase I) was established and funds were released in December 1961 to determine costs, vehicle performance, and appropriate model configuration, as well as to select the prime contractor and establish the overall DOD management organization. The phase I program definition effort was completed in the second quarter of calendar year 1962 and the objectives of the phase I efforts have been verified by the Air Force and the Department of Defense.

The basic program for Titan III is believed better defined than any large scale development undertaken in many years. Unique new management arrangements have been established for the conduct of this program. One important aspect is that approximately 75 percent of fiscal year 1963 contract funds for research and development are being disbursed under incentive type contract arrangements. These contracts were fully defined before the program schedule was given a "go-ahead."

Transit

The Transit satellite navigation system developmental program is progressing as planned, and should be available for worldwide fleet operational deployment in the second quarter of calendar year 1963. During 1962, principal research efforts were concentrated on increased system reliability and accuracy, the refinement of refraction and geodetic data, satellite power and stabilization technology, and prototype development of shipboard navigation equipment.

The launch of Transit IVB on November 15, 1961 marked the last planned launch of a Transit satellite from the Atlantic Missile Range. All future launches—except for four Thor Able-Star launches—are programed for Scout vehicles to be launched from the Pacific Missile Range. A Transit VA satellite was launched December 19, 1962.

When operational, the Transit system will provide reliable, worldwide, all-weather navigation for important units of the Navy.

Communications satellite program

In May 1962, the Secretary of Defense reoriented the Department of Defense communications satellite program. In this reorientation, he directed the Defense Communications Agency to provide overall management and integrate the ground and space systems into the Defense Communications System. The Secretary directed the Air Force to develop two communications satellites—one a medium altitude system using many satellites, and one a synchronous altitude system using relatively few satellites. The Secretary directed the Army to develop the ground communications environment.

The Department of Defense has also continued its participation in NASA's Syncom program. Two fixed DOD ground stations neared completion at Fort Dix, N.J., and Camp Roberts, Calif., the installation of a terminal aboard the NS *Kingsport* was accomplished, and mobile stations were developed. Communications experiments utilizing the Syncom satellite will be conducted during 1963.

To provide experience for personnel who are participating in the NASA and DOD communications satellite programs and in order to evaluate past efforts of developing mobile terminals, a program was initiated utilizing ground stations developed for the commercial Telstar system.

The Navy, the Air Force, and the Army have communications programs aimed at utilizing the moon, and other passive and semiactive reflectors. Additionally, the Navy is considering the use of a satellite relay to communicate with submerged submarines.

X-20 development

The X-20 project formerly Dyna-Soar is aimed at the development of a small piloted glider to be boosted into space flight by a Titan III booster from the Cape Canaveral missile test site.

The X-20 program is financed and administered by the Air Force and supported by the NASA. The purpose of the program is to construct and test a manned military space research vehicle which will explore the problems and conditions of hypersonic flight beyond the range of the X-15 research aircraft by achieving orbital velocity. The program will demonstrate the capabilities of pilot controlled reentry and recovery from orbit. The pilot of the X-20 glider will have the ability to control his return to earth by extending his flight path by several thousand miles straight ahead or to either side followed by conventional landing. This will enable the pilot to select the time when he will initiate reentry and to control the point where he will land.

During 1962, the X-20 designs were finalized in conjunction with the selection of the Titan III as the launch vehicle. Development on the glider subsystem has proceeded to a point where fabrication of the first gliders is expected to begin this year.

Inspector

Work is continuing on the satellite inspector program to demonstrate rendezvous and inspection of a noncooperative object in space by orbiting with it. Program assessment resulted in the termination of a prototype coorbital demonstration system and initiation of an inspection system definition study. Efforts continued in close coordination with the NASA Gemini program. A joint DOD-NASA study of both programs was accomplished and areas of mutual development effort identified.

ICBM alarm

The objective of this program is the research and development of a space-based attack alarm system intended to maintain continuous surveillance over ballistic missile launches on a global basis. Such a system would consist of unmanned satellites carrying infrared sensors which can detect ballistic missiles in powered flight as they emerge from the atmosphere.

During 1962, several technical advances were made in furthering this development. Infrared measurements from ground-based, airborne, and orbital tests yielded new scientific data on target and background discrimination techniques.

Anna

The Anna geodetic satellite program is a triservice project under Navy management with NASA cooperation. The satellite combines three separate systems developed independently by the military services. The Navy system employs the principle of radio doppler, essentially that used in the Transit navigation satellite. The Army system employs a radio ranging transponder called Secor; that is, "sequential collation of range." The Air Force system employs a high intensity flashing light or optical beacon.

Purpose of Anna is to provide locations of tracking stations to an accuracy of 100 feet relative to the center of the earth, and to define the earth's mean attraction potential to an accuracy of 5 parts in 10 million. These accuracies are required to provide a framework for subsequent mapping, navigation, reconnaissance, and other applications requiring this precision.

Anna IA was launched on May 10, 1962, but did not achieve orbit due to the failure of the booster second stage.

Anna IB was launched on October 31, 1962, and is presently furnishing geodetic data.

Large solid propellant motor program

In accordance with the agreement between the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of NASA, the Department of Defense is conducting advanced state-of-the-art technical development in the field of very large solid rocket engines with the dual objectives of advancing knowledge and the development of such engines.

Large solid motors with diameters up to 120 inches are already under development. A 100-inch-diameter three-segment motor was successfully fired in February 1962. A 120-inch-diameter motor, 40 feet in length, was fired in May 1962 producing 400,000 pounds' thrust for a burning time of 130 seconds. On September 15, 1962, a 96-inch tapered-diameter two-center-segment motor incorporating a dual thrust vector control system, hypergolic ignition, and a radial-segment motor was successfully fired. This development work has provided design data on grain configuration, burn rates, and internal pressures.

The development of large solid propellant motors with diameters of 156 inches and 260 inches is being investigated. The 156-inch motor is the largest segmented solid propellant motor capable of rail transportation from current production facilities to coastal launching sites. The 260-inch motor may demonstrate the feasibility of very large monolithic motors and provide technical foundations for further developments. Development of this large motor will also provide pertinent background data in procedures and processes for fabrication, propellant production and handling, testing, and facility requirements.

Nuclear detection satellite

A joint DOD/AEC program of satellite-based detection of nuclear tests in space is being conducted. Its objective is to confirm experimentally detector sensitivity, reliability, and system performance capability in the space environment by conducting experiments to obtain data on the background effects of the natural radiation environment in space. Of particular interest are possible natural radiations in space which might be similar to those expected from a nuclear detonation in space. The program consists of cooperative flights with other space programs and high altitude flights of spacecraft designed specifically for the program.

AERONAUTICS DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Laminar flow control demonstration aircraft

The laminar flow control aircraft program is intended to demonstrate that the design and manufacture of a wing capable of achieving laminar flow by means of suction through a large number of very fine slots in the surface is practical. It is intended to determine quantitatively through a full scale flight demonstration the magnitude of drag reduction possible and to assess the maintenance requirements in an operation environment.

The achievement of greatly reduced aerodynamic drag through laminar flow control would result in increased payload or range for aircraft designed to incorporate this feature. The FAA has assisted in financing the program which is also of interest to nonmilitary activities. Two demonstration aircraft are designed X-21A's.

X-15 research aircraft

The X-15 aircraft were built to provide exploratory data on aerodynamic, structural and physiological problems of manned flight at hypersonic speeds and space equivalent altitudes.

The range of performance has gradually been expanded as speed and altitude have been increased. Maximum altitude reached so far is 314,750 feet and the maximum speed has been 4,151 miles per hour. Concurrently with this effort additional flights have been devoted to aerodynamic research, heat transfer investigation, development of flight controls, and reentry techniques.

The X-15's will continue gradually to expand the flight envelope where data from earlier flights indicate that an ample margin of safety exists. In addition to the above objectives, the X-15's may be used as test bed aircraft for a group of advanced experiments in aeronautical and space sciences. Some of the primary projects in the program are ultraviolet stellar photography, improvement of attitude and guidance references for orbiting spacecraft by means of a horizon scanner, high altitude density measurements using an alphatron ionization gauge, collection of infrared and ultraviolet data at extreme altitude, advanced vehicle systems and structural materials.

Triservice VTOL development program

In July 1960, the Assistant Secretaries of the Air Force, Army, and Navy (Research and Development) agreed that it was desirable to conduct a triservice program to determine the operational suitability of vertical takeoff and landing (VTOL) aircraft. The three services had conducted research on the technical feasibility of the various configurations of VTOL aircraft, but the military usefulness had not been determined. Since such a project would have joint interest, a triservice program to cover approximately a 5-year period was established in fiscal year 1961.

In January 1962, it was agreed that the triservice VTOL program should be equally funded by the three services and consist of the following tasks:

(a) A VTOL tilt-wing transport aircraft, designated the XC-142A, with executive management assigned to the Air Force.

(b) A VTOL tandem tilt-propeller aircraft, designated the X-19A with executive management assigned to the Air Force.

(c) A VTOL tandem rotating ducted fan research airplane, now designated X-22A, with executive management assigned to the Navy.

V/STOL surveillance aircraft program

In 1961, the Army initiated the development of V/STOL (vertical/short takeoff and landing) research aircraft applicable to the battlefield surveillance and target acquisition roles. This program will provide technical and limited operational information that will further define the characteristics of the replacement for the present OV-1A (Mohawk) series.

Three design approaches will be evaluated during fiscal year 1963 and fiscal year 1964, which are identified as follows:

(a) XV-4A (Hummingbird).
(b) XV-5A (fan in wing).
(c) XV-6A (P-1127).

SPACE GROUND SUPPORT

Space detection and tracking system (Spadats)

The Norad Space Detection and Tracking Center at Ent Air Force Base, Colo., are operated for the space detection and tracking system (Spadats) by the U.S. Air Force Air Defense Command (ADC). The U.S. Navy operates the Spasur system, an interferometer fence extending from the east coast to the west coast, as an element of the Spadats. A full backup capability to the Spadats center exists at L. G. Hanscomb Air Force Base, Bedford, Mass., and an ADC detachment is on duty to operate the center in the standby mode.

Significant progress has been made in 1962 on improvement of the capability of the Spadats.

Procurement of a high resolution radar sensor in Alaska has been initiated.

Construction has started on a Spadats phased array radar at Eglin Air Force Base, which will have considerably improved capability for satellite detection and tracking over existing sensors. When completed, the radar will be able to detect simultaneously and track large numbers of orbital objects in real time. The capability will exist for on-site determination of orbital parameters.

Work was completed on a fully automatic, digitalized computation and data analysis system for Spasur. This system underwent improvements in 1962 and reached full operational status as an element of Spadats on January 1, 1963. The automatic system is capable of full evaluation of any satellite contact within 5 seconds after passage through the fence.

DOD national ranges

The national ranges, which are operated by the DOD, consist of the Atlantic Missile Range (AMR), the Pacific Missile Range (PMR), and the White Sands Missile Range (WSMR). The planned growth of the ranges to support the expanding space efforts is progressing on schedule.

DOD support to the manned Mercury launches and recoveries during the past year has been extensive and has been a major contribution to the success of those space program milestones. In addition to the launch facilities of the AMR, tracking and data coverage was provided by the AMR, PMR, WSMR, and other DOD installations. DOD recovery forces have successfully recovered astronauts from both the Atlantic and Pacific Ocean areas. Seventeen thousand DOD personnel were engaged in support of the October 1962 six-orbit Mercury shot.

Continued improvements were made in the land and shipborne capabilities of the national ranges, for tracking, telemetry, data transmission, and data reduction.

At the AMR, the Air Force is proceeding with plans for a Titan III installation. A Titan II weapon system launch complex will be converted to accommodate the initial phase of Titan III development, and a new integrate-transfer-launch (ITL) facility will be constructed. The ITL facility will permit assembly and checkout of the Titan III in the vertical position and transfer by means of rails to the launch position after checkout while remaining in the vertical position. Plans are also proceeding at the AMR for the conversion of existing launch facilities for the Gemini and Gemini target, nuclear detection satellite, and satellite inspection programs.

At the PMR a new probe launch complex and Scout launch complex were completed and other launch pads are under construction. These will accommodate both DOD and NASA activities for both probe and orbital vehicle launches.

WSMR will be the sites of the Apollo abort system (Little Joe II) tests and a NASA-operated Apollo propulsion development facility.

Churchill research range

In October 1961, the Department of Defense assigned the responsibility for operating the Rocket Research Facility at Fort Churchill, Canada, to the U.S. Air Force, effective July 1, 1962. The range extends approximately 400 miles eastward over the Hudson Bay and southward along the coast for about 100 miles. The range is used by scientists from U.S. Air Force, U.S. Navy, NASA, Canadian Defense Research Board, and the National Research Council. Intergovernmental coordination of activities of the range are carried out through the Operational Coordinating Group, an official, joint United States-Canada working group concerned with the range operation.

SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

Vehicle flight control

The vehicle flight control program is intended to develop an integrated flight control capability for manned and unmanned aerospace vehicles. The program includes display, data sensors, computers, and adaptive controls. The X-15 research aircraft is being used as a test bed. The adaptive control portion of this program has been installed and has completed the acceptance flight test program.

Aerospaceplane

The Air Force is investigating advanced developments to determine the feasibility of the aerospaceplane concept. The concept embodies a manned maneuverable and reusable vehicle capable of placing large payloads in orbit. Feasibility studies have been initiated in propulsion and structure.

Other aeronautical research

Programs have continued to increase the aerodynamic and flying quality performance of current type subsonic and supersonic aircraft. Applied research is being conducted also in the aerodynamics and stability and control of V/STOL vehicles.

Crew escape for flight vehicles

Until 1956, the applied research program in crew escape was focused on the ejection seat method of emergency escape. Shortly thereafter, it became apparent that the open ejection seat was not adequate for future high performance vehicles. Programs were initiated to investigate (a) the encapsulated seat, (b) ejectable nose section capsule, and (c) reentry type of escape systems.

During 1962, advances were made in increasing the temperature capabilities of propellant actuated devises from 200°F to 400°F. Design criteria for two pure rocket escape systems ejection devices were obtained and experimental firings successfully conducted. Work was begun in 1962 toward the establishment of nonseparable escape concepts where a large crew and mission duration preclude separable reentry escape systems. Also, in 1962, full-scale models of an ejectable nose emergency escape capsule are being track tested at Edwards Air Force Base. Seven track tests were scheduled for 1962 including a 900-knot run.

Electrical propulsion

The Department of Defense has continued research and development of several forms of electrical propulsion. These efforts have been closely integrated with the NASA efforts. The DOD has particular interest in application of electrical propulsion for attitude control, stationkeeping, orbit adjustment and other situations where the characteristics of high specific impulse and low thrust are useful. A ballistic space test of an ion engine was carried out in the latter part of 1962 but a power failure prevented useful results. A small plasma engine was developed to maintain the spin rate of a satellite. Other electric propulsion engines will be tested in conjunction with orbital tests of Snap units.

Advanced air-breathing propulsion

A 3-year effort has been completed on increasing the performance parameters for all jet type propulsive devices. Two different principles using separate approaches to reduce weight and increase performance were tested for approximately 50 hours in two test engines.

A high-work-per-stage and high-efficiency compressor were used in both concepts. Two different engineering approaches were used to decrease the combustor size by 50 percent and both engines used a single high-work-per-stage turbine to drive the compressor. This enabled the construction of a very short engine with only two bearings instead of the usual four to six. The design goal was 10 pounds of thrust for each pound of engine weight compared with the normal practice wich gives 5 to 6 pounds of thrust for each pound of engine weight.

The features proven by these experimental tests when used in a design for a jet engine will permit lighter engines with higher efficiencies.

Space power equipment

The Department of Defense continued to examine various concepts for meeting the anticipated high electrical power requirements of future satellites. For possible requirements of more than several hundred watts careful consideration has been given to both nuclear and solar powered generators. In 1962, significant management action was accomplished to insure vigorous development of a nuclear power unit to generate several hundred kilowatts of electrical power.

Spur was initiated in 1960. The study, design, and test effort has thus far evolved a power system concept which uses a liquid metal cooled fast reactor supplying thermal energy by means of a potassium Rankine cycle conversion loop to turbine driven electric generator. The tests conducted included material compatibility tests, both static and dynamic, fuel element property evaluations, compatibility tests of the fuel element materials and cladding, creep-rupture tests of the turbine and pump materials, potassium-lubricated-bearing tests, and boiling and condensing potassium heat transfer tests.

The Department of Defense by letter dated October 2, 1961, requested the Atomic Energy Commission to expand its efforts in experimental space power reactors toward the Spur design criteria. In the ensuing months, the AEC initiated the Snap–50 reactor development in the power range needed by Spur. Meetings between the Chairman, AEC, the Administrator of NASA, and the Secretary of the Air Force resulted in a memorandum of understanding between DOD, AEC, and NASA on the management by AEC of an integrated Snap–50/Spur program.

Progress was made during the year in the Snapshot program which is a companion to the AEC Snap program. Snapshot will provide vehicles and services for orbital proof tests of Snap 10A and Snap 2. The first orbital flights of this program are scheduled for 1964 and will use the Atlas/Agena launch vehicle to place Snap 10A in orbit.

Hi-definition radar

A program has been initiated to demonstrate a technological capability to build high resolution, long range, space tracking radar.

The program is intended to provide the technology necessary for greatly improved detection, identification and tracking of orbital or ballistic objects.

Infrared

Infrared detectors have been developed which have many applications in satellite and space systems. Satellite systems require IR detectors for horizon scanners used in vehicle stabilization, in star trackers used for navigation, for IR space communications, for detection and tracking systems used for satellite rendezvous, and various other applications. Presently available long wave length detectors, with response in the S–14 micron region (necessary for cold body detection) require cooling to liquid nitrogen, neon, hydrogen, and even helium temperatures (–268.9°C). Special minature cryostats, requiring low power input, but reliably providing these temperatures continuously for long periods of time, are being developed. Long wave length detectors requiring less cooling, or no cooling at all, must also be developed for greater reliability and lower electrical power requirements.

Ultraviolet

The ultraviolet region of the spectrum is also being explored primarily from the point of view of utilizing this region for image formation outside the earth's atmosphere where ultraviolet energy is not attenuated. Ultraviolet background measurements have been made in cooperation with NASA.

Extensive work in the field of optics in recent months has provided many advancements of considerable importance to peaceful exploitation of the aerospace environment. Optical sensors have long been recognized as providing a means toward achieving high resolution and high angular accuracy, but to achieve this potential high performance, large diameter optical elements and mirrors are required. Recent experiments have resulted in new lightweight mirrors of large diameter capable of maintaining a precise optical shape.

Lasers

The explosive field of Laser (light amplification by stimulated emission of radiation) research is also resulting in techniques that will make this device a valuable tool, in connection with optical sensors, for many operations in aerospace vehicles. It will provide extremely sensitive and high resolution devices, for example, guidance and exploration.

In this area of research, there has been extensive coordination even on an international basis. The recent NATO-SADTC Symposium on Technical and Military Applications of Laser Techniques was held in France, summer of 1962.

Data handling

The many problems associated with handling pictorial data or the output of imaging sensors is also under study. Phototape is one result of these efforts. It is essentially like the sensitive element of a TV picture tube except that it is flexible and can be rolled up and the information stored for later readout. It is relatively insensitive to nuclear radiation, reusable and combines some of the best features of TV and photography. It is being considered for use in the Nimbus type meteorological satellites. The effect of radiation, which exists more intensely in space, on photography and image forming systems is being evaluated. The effect of the earth's atmosphere on image forming sensors is also under extensive study. Atmosphere affects performance of sensors in three ways. The natural turbulence places a limit on resolution under some conditions of operation, induced turbulence due to passage of a vehicle through the atmosphere places other limitations, and, finally, depending upon vehicle skin temperature and meteorological conditions, the atmosphere reduces the ability of an image forming sensor to provide proper contrast discrimination. These problems and techniques for solving them, carry high priority, and success in this field has many peaceful applications.

Environmental research rocket and satellite support

The environmental research rocket and satellite support program provides rocket boosters, spacecraft equipments, and associated services, to place research experiments in the space environment for scientific purposes. The purpose of the program is to consolidate all booster services and flight hardware procurement for space environmental research under a single manager in order to obtain the economies gained by central purchase of rocket vehicle and allied equipments in standardized configuration, central assignment and full utilization of payload space, and provision of standard ground support. The types of rocket vehicles used by this program cover a wide range.

The program also utilized pods which are attached to the exterior of Atlas and Titan II developmental and test vehicles in a piggyback fashion. In this way, surplus weight-lifting capacity of test ICBM's is used for valuable scientific research as an adjunct to their primary mission, without the normally associated high booster costs. During 1962, 49 environmental research experiments were carried in scientific passenger pods on Atlas boosters. The experiments covered research in the life sciences, electromagnetic propagation, aeronomy, ionospheric physics, energetic particles and fields, energy conversion, and reentry physics.

Eight NASA-Air Force Scout orbital vehicles, and seven Blue Scout, Jr., deep-space probes were purchased in 1962 with delivery, and subsequent launch scheduled to begin in early 1963. These vehicles will be used for research in radar detection and resolution, energy conversion, geospace magnetohydrodynamics, energetic particles and fields, and life sciences.

During 1962, approximately 50 research sounding rockets were launched and the data obtained were furnished to other interested organizations. Most of these were fired from the White Sands Missile Range and the Eglin Gulf Test Range. Employed in this program were a wide variety of vehicles which had the capability to carry geophysical sensors weighing from 10 to 200 pounds to altitudes over 1,000 miles. Several series of rocket launchings have been made for repeated experiments for determination of variations in upper atmospheric kinetic, composition, and chemical properties.

The highest reentry speed ever obtained for a manmade object, 14 kilometers per second, was achieved last May. The reentry body was a steel ball of about three-fourths inch diameter which was propelled downward from a height of about 200 miles. The ball became an artificial meteor, creating a bright trail visible in Virginia and North Carolina. A six-stage solid-fueled rocket, Trailblazer 2, was used in the experiment. The last four stages were used to propel the artificial meteor downward. The rocket was launched from Wallops Island.

Space technology satellites

The Air Force continued its launch of space technology satellites at an increasing rate during 1962. The program consists of testing components, propulsion, guidance systems, and techniques used in various U.S. space projects. Space capsule recovery is foremost among techniques being developed.

A standardized second stage and satellite vehicle was tested and all missions utilizing it were fully successful. The vehicle will be used for many of the Air Force, Navy, and NASA programs in the future. The payload capacity of space technology space vehicles has provided a most fruitful opportunity for scientific measurements. Instrument modules for experiments are carried as part of the payloads.

During 1962, 13 of these research payload modules have been carried into orbit aboard space vehicles and research data have been made available to interested agencies. Each of these modules usually contains a number of experiments. About 65 experiments have been placed in orbit this past year. The instruments flown on these satellites were designed to measure density, micrometeorites, cosmic radiation, electron and ion densities, magnetic fields, and galactic radio noise.

Examples of experiments which were performed during 1962 are:

(a) A plasma probe was flown five times to obtain data regarding the electrical structure of the F region of the ionosphere. Density and temperature of both the positive and negative particles of the ionosphere were measured.

(b) A standing wave impedance probe was flown six times which consists of a 24-foot balance dipole antenna which was unrolled in orbit. Observations are interpreted in terms of electron density at satellite altitude.

(c) Nuclear emulsions have been flown and recovered from 12 flights. These emulsions are studied to determine the flow of energetic particles trapped in the geomagnetic field and also to learn more about incident cosmic rays.

(d) Many active experiments have flown to measure properties of the Van Allen radiation belt. These measurements were especially important during 1962 due to the enhancement of the belts caused by the United States and Soviet high-altitude nuclear tests.

Asset

The Air Force aerothermodynamics elastic structural systems environmental test (ASSET) program was initiated to provide an economical and feasible means to supplement and verify the validity of ground facility data by obtaining basic knowledge of the actual free flight environment in the critical heating regime surrounding hypersonic reentry vehicles with lifting surfaces. Four test vehicles will be boosted into a reentry trajectory by the Thor/Delta and Thor boosters. These unmanned vehicles are designed to test full-scale components of various structural concepts and materials. The first launch is scheduled for mid-1963.

General support, research, and development

Our efforts in space are undertaken not only to meet certain well-defined military needs and requirements, but also to create a vigorous and broad base of new technology which will allow us to undertake development of future systems to fulfill a clear, identifiable military need or requirement. The DOD is supporting exploratory and advanced developments aimed specifically at the evolution of "technological building blocks" for space. These developments (some of which have been covered in the foregoing) include a great variety of efforts in bioastronautics, the development of advanced sensors, the evolution of advanced propulsion systems and power supplies, developments in materials, and a multitude of exploration and research efforts aimed at learning more about space flight and the space environment.

COOPERATION WITH OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Close coordination and cooperation with other Government agencies was continued and enhanced during 1962. Examples of this have been cited already in some of the projects discussed above such as standardized space boosters, large solid propellant motor program, X-20, X-15, space nuclear detection and Anna.

Additional examples have been mentioned in the description of activities at the national ranges. In addition to the above, the following are considered worthy of special mention:

Participation with the NASA in the Aeronautics and Astronautics Coordinating Board for the purpose of coordinating the activities of the DOD and NASA to avoid undesirable duplication, to achieve efficient utilization of available resources, to identify problems requiring solution, and to exchange information.

Participation in the Joint Meteorological Satellite Advisory Committee.

Participation with the AEC in the development and use of space nuclear power units.

To insure effective and coordinated management of DOD support to programs of NASA, the DOD issued a directive on February 24, 1962. This directive specifies that basic agreements for support will be made between Secretary of Defense and the Administrator, NASA. It defines the responsibilities within the DOD for the support of NASA including assignment of responsibility to the Secretary of the Air Force for research and development, test and engineering of satellites, boosters, space probes, and associated systems necessary to support NASA.

The Air Force created the Office of a Deputy to Commander, Air Force Systems Command, for Manned Space Flight as follow-on to the DOD assignment of Space R.D.T. & E. to the Air Force. This Deputy maintains an office in NASA headquarters in order to help assure the closest management level interplay between the two agencies responsible for the national space program.

A memorandum of agreement between the Air Force and the Federal Aviation Agency was signed into effect on September 4. It relates to research, development, test, and evaluation (R.D.T. & E.) required to meet the needs for safe and efficient navigation and traffic control of all civil and military aviation. The purposes of this agreement are to:

(a) Insure timely response and full consideration of U.S. Air Force requirements in FAA programs.

(b) Provide the mechanism whereby U.S. Air Force and FAA will coordinate and cooperate in R.D.T. & E. projects of mutual interest.

(c) Enable each agency to observe and participate in R.D.T. & E. programs to the extent necessary to discharge their respective agency responsibilities and effect overall Government economies.

Closer relationships have also been established with the National Aeronautics and Space Council and specific contact points for particular areas of interest have been established.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That language very clearly describes what the responsibilities of the Department of Defense are in that area. Again I remind Senators that there is an appropriation of $1.7 billion for the Department of Defense for exploration in space, aside from the appropriation now under discussion. So to make the plea that the proposal would affect the military aspect is absolutely wrong. It is not so. It would be quite incidental and wholly marginal.

Although I do not desire to repeat the entire colloquy, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in a direct answer to the direct question as to what effect the lunar program would have on defense, said that he did not think that it would have any. I quoted that statement yesterday. It occurred at a hearing of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and is contained in an official report.

Statements by the President have consistently emphasized that peaceful exploration was the objective of the NASA program. In a letter to Congressman ALBERT THOMAS, dated September 23, the President wrote:

> We do not make our space effort with the narrow purpose of national aggrandizement. We make it so the United States may have a leading and honorable role in mankind's peaceful conquest of space.

Space activities in general were taken away from the Defense Department and placed in the hands of a civilian agency in 1958 in order to change the complexion of our program from one keyed to military uses to one which would increase man's fund of knowledge of the heavens for peaceful applications.

As I have said, the military has its own space program, being funded at a level of some $1.7 billion this year. There is little doubt that the military will proceed on its own to develop the type of space knowledge most adaptable for its own purposes. Indeed this is required under the division of authority in the NASA Act. Dr. Dryden, in his testimony before the House Appropriations Committee stated:

> I think the problem is one of defining a weapons system based on man in space. Just as soon as the military can define such a weapons system, then I think they must go ahead with the development of the specific equipment needed for that.

There will undoubtedly be some spin-off from the NASA program to military use. This is inevitable in a program of this magnitude and novelty. There will also, of course, be some spin-off for civilian purposes. The NASA budget, in fact, contains the grand total of $3.5 million—I think that is about one one-hundred-and-fiftieth—to see this new knowledge is made available for application in industry. Accepting the thesis advanced yesterday that $18 billion of the manned space program is for defense purposes, it seems most unusual to me that this vast sum is being expended for research when the top military people say they cannot envision an end for any knowledge that might be gained. This would, in effect, amount to another $18 billion for defense research, bringing the total for research for military purposes up to an astronomical figure. And this expenditure would all be in hope that something would turn up that would justify cost of the program in the long run.

I wish to make one other point about the military argument. Our top military leaders have always said that foreign aid is essential to the Nation's security. In spite of this fact strong support for foreign aid, Members of both the House and the Senate, who consider themselves to be friends of the military, consistently oppose the foreign aid legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded by the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 10 additional minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, foreign aid is admittedly designed to protect and enhance the Nation's security now. Space explorations may or may not result in new military systems at some date in the future. We have no assurance that there will ever be any important military offshoot from the space program. I might also point out that, in the case of foreign aid, the President has a peculiar and individual responsibility under the Constitution. This is not true with the space program where the Congress has an equal responsibility and should have no hesitancy in exercising its responsibility to determine the correctness of the pace or extent of our space effort.

The second major argument advanced is actually part and parcel of the first argument. It is to the effect that the manned Lunar program actually will cost only about $2 billion. When we turn to this question we become bogged down in a sea of conflicting statistics, statements, and predictions. It is difficult for me to understand how the cost of this program can change so rapidly. The letter and related material from NASA, which I inserted in the RECORD, referred to the allocations for the manned Lunar program, not to a manned space program. The attempt to separate the cost of the actual landing on the moon from the other aspects of the space program cannot be done, as the Senator from Washington admitted yesterday. We have an integrated space program, the basic objective of which is to land a man on the moon. Every other accomplishment before that achievement will be only a step in the process. All of the elements in the existing program are necessary to achieve this objective. Dr. Seamans, in his testimony on the appropriation bill, said:

> The $20 billion we are talking about includes all of the elements which we feel are absolutely necessary for the Lunar exploration, including the scientific aspects, the development of the boosters and the ground tracking of the space craft. You cannot take from that $20 billion any element and still have an opportunity for this major expedition.

If the end objective of our program is not to put a man on the moon by 1970, there is little justification for the present pace.

There are, of course, other predictions on the bare cost elements in the program peculiar to placing a man on the moon—elements which would not have any practical application to achievement of other objectives. Dr. Welsh, Secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, said, in his testimony before the Appropriations Subcommittee, that approximately $7 billion of the $20 billion allocated for the manned lunar program is involved directly with landing on the moon. Dr. Seamans gave another estimate in his testimony before the Senate Space Committee this year when he said:

> Many of the measurements that we are making with our manned vehicles are not particularly in support of the manned lunar landing and, if you include that support plus the tracking stations and the ships that are included under tracking and data acquisition, you will find the total manned lunar effort and everything that proceeds it (sic) probably comes to more nearly three-fourths of the budget.

He also said, in testifying before the House Appropriations Subcommittee, that some 25 or 30 percent of the NASA effort had no relation to the manned lunar landing program. He said:

> A manned lunar landing program does bring together a large part of the NASA objective and gives the pace important objectives and ties things together but it does not include some 25 or 30 percent of our effort.

It might be mentioned that the large vehicles and their boosters, the Saturn 1, 1B, and 5, are being developed solely for manned space aimed at getting a man on the moon and back. The budget request this year for these vehicles was $800 million for Saturn 5, $159 million for Saturn 1, and $76 million for Saturn 1B.

It has been quite difficult to get meaningful information on the space program. It is such an amorphous mass or miasma that it is almost impossible to get a handle on it. I envy those Senators who feel they are well versed on the technical and budgetary aspects of it. I cannot compete with them on details, and I do not profess to be an expert in this area. My argument is based on simple questions of priority and the relative needs of society, an approach which we as Senators should take toward every money bill. I tried to obtain information on the possible effects of reductions in the NASA appropriation, but without success. This information, according to NASA, will not be available until about November 30, which will, of course, be too late for use by the Senate in judging the question before it. Apparently, it is very difficult to get positive guides from this Agency on areas where reductions could be made with the least delay or harm. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] asked the officials to prepare such a priority list, but none was forthcoming. Representative THOMAS, the chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee, asked for a similar list of projects where cuts might be made. He also had no luck.

It is argued that the pace of the program at the budget request level is exactly right and that if it were speeded up or slowed down it would cost more. Apparently the argument is that the heavy overhead involved, if stretched out over a longer period, would inevitably increase costs. It seems rather unusual to me that this Agency has worked itself into such a budgetary situation, especially in view of the fact that it prides itself on having contracted out to private industry more than 90 percent of the funds appropriated to it. I understand that some 90 percent or more in dollar volume of NASA's contracts are let on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis. I would submit that there is a very good potential for reductions in the cost of some of these contracted programs if the manned space program were pursued at a less hectic pace which would permit more competitive bidding on contracts. Cost-plus contracting, in my opinion, contributes very little to running an efficient and economical operation. I do not know of any situation in private industry or Government where haste has made for economy.

I find it impossible to digest all of the information about the financial aspects of NASA's operations. Apparently, there are a number of persons in private industry who were at least willing to make the attempt. One enterprising entrepreneur, the hearings related, duplicated the four volumes of the NASA's budget justifications and sold them at $40 a volume. I suppose he did quite a business with the 1,500 concerns that hold prime contracts worth $25,000 or more with NASA.

We see in NASA a prime example of the operation of Parkinson's law. The program has grown so fast and expanded into so many facets of our national life that in some areas it has become the tail that wags the dog. At the end of NASA's first year—only 4 years ago—it had 9,286 employees and expenditures of $338,900,000. At the end of this fiscal year, it expects to have 32,500 employees—and there is $5,190 million in this bill to finance its operations. It employs more scientists and engineers now than the total of all its employees in 1959. I find it difficult to believe that this kind of growth rate encourages efficiency and frugality with the taxpayers' money.

I noticed a few items in the budget request that struck me as being somewhat unusual. NASA is now in the education field in a big way, and I have serious doubts that this is a healthy thing for the country. NASA, it develops, is conducting its own student aid program at a rate of $7,000 per student per year, and it will soon have between 3,000 and 4,000 students under the program studying in nearly 100 universities. The goal, as I understand it, is to finance the education on the doctoral level of sufficient students to produce 1,000 Ph. D.'s a year—one-fourth of those graduating in the scientific and engineering fields relating to NASA activities. This program added up to nearly $14 million last year and is only part of the NASA educational work. NASA is also in the college construction grant business and plans to make grants of some $12 million this year for 11 academic research facilities. I find it hard to justify this Agency's participation in aid to education when we have so much difficulty in getting straightforward, across-the-board, aid-to-education legislation through the Congress.

NASA appears to be in the public relations business in a big way also. It has a budget this year of over $6 million for its public relations program. Perhaps the expanded distribution of press releases explains why the budget for printing and reproduction jumped from $1.6 million last year to $4.8 million this years. In any case I think that there is sufficient interest in the public and the communications media to cut down substantially on the program to create or maintain NASA's image. Our Nation's exploits in space speak pretty well for themselves, and I have noted no lack of ingenuity on the part of reporters in finding out what is going on in the Government. They will do it in spite of the efforts of taxpaid press agents to gloss over facts or suppress information.

One item in the NASA budget struck me as being particularly interesting, and that was the $460 million slated for construction of the 45-story assembly building and the three launching pads for the

Saturn 5 system. The assembly building, which is to be 520 feet tall, and about as wide, will equal in volume 1½ Pentagons, I am told. I only hope that some serious consideration is being given to what can be done with the building after the Saturn program is completed.

These very minute aspects of NASA's program indicate, I believe, that the Congress should take a much closer look at the activities of this Agency. In a program that has grown as rapidly as this one, a considerable amount of waste and duplication will occur as a matter of course. The way to bring it under control is not by nitpicking at such cases as develop. We must, I believe, approach this from a standpoint of a basic public philosophy. Is it more important for us to finance space at the rate of $5.2 billion than it is for us to make a more adequate attack on some of the grave deficiencies of our socity? Nothing I have heard during this debate has convinced me that my amendment cannot be adopted without any danger to the Nation's security or welfare.

A persuasive case has been made that the prospects for passage of needed legislation to correct some of the deficiencies of our society would be much improved by slowing down our self-imposed race to the moon. The 1965 budget is now being prepared in the executive branch. Congressional action calling for a more practical and leisurely pursuit of space exploration will bear much weight in the decisions being made on how to apportion the very strictly limited funds available. If it is obvious that Congress wishes to devote less effort to space relative to other programs it will improve prospects for funding of alternative domestic programs and ease the final pinch that clouds future action on the tax bill.

I hope that my amendment will be adopted.

I do not wish to burden the RECORD too much, but just as an illustration of some of the things that happen, and inasmuch as there have been many other illustrations of mistakes in other programs, and as an example of how the rapidity in the development of this program has resulted in waste, I want to read a short statement from the Washington Star of November 19.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has 1 hour.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield myself 5 minutes.

The Washington Star for November 19 carried the following story from which I read:

> Centaur—an upper stage for the Mercury-boosting Atlas-D missile—uses two 15,000-pound-thrust hydrogen engines. It was developed at great cost in a program which has been sharply criticized in Congress and elsewhere for poor management.
>
> Now about 2½ years behind schedule and far above original cost estimates, the Centaur has never flown under its own power. An attempt to fly it in May 1962, ended in disaster when hydrogen tankage ruptured before the Centaur engines got a chance to ignite.
>
> A second Centaur firing, originally scheduled for October 1962, was delayed.
>
> If Centaur fails in the forthcoming shot, there will undoubtedly be great pressure to abandon the project, which has already cost an estimated $500 million.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Would the Senator mind pointing out whether the Centaur was an Army device, or an ARPA device, and was only recently transferred to the Space Agency?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not know. This article does not indicate that. It is now under NASA.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is now under NASA. It started out as one of ARPA's projects. I am sure the military did the best it knew how.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And I believe NASA did, too.

Mr. ANDERSON. But I do not believe NASA should be blamed for what the Army or ARPA did.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not blaming anybody. I am only pointing out that mistakes are inevitable when we double a program of this size every year. I do not think the Army or NASA are to blame. I say that the Congress is to blame. I am not seeking to blame Mr. Webb. He does what he is paid to do, but the Congress is most improvident. This program is degenerating into a grab bag of goodies for everybody. If we look at the record of the distribution of funds, we see there is something in it for everybody. Of course, most of it goes to California, Texas, Alabama, and Florida, but there is something in it for everybody. Even Arkansas gets $300,000, which is big money for Arkansas. One of the leading citizens of my State was recently taken on a guided tour of Huntsville. He wrote me a letter saying that he did not understand why I was not enthusiastic about the space program, because he had seen wonderful things at Huntsville.

Mr. ANDERSON. Was he a guest of NASA or the military?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. He did not state that. He said his comments were his private opinion. Even those who are taken for tours by the Navy year after year, when they write and say how wonderful it was, do not say whether they were the Navy's guests. They just write as citizens. We do not know why they write those letters.

Mr. ANDERSON. I only want to say that I do not feel that that little waste of money—if it happened as to the Centaur, and we are not sure whether it was a waste—means——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Five hundred million dollars is a "little" in this program, I will admit. If such waste was found in foreign aid, or if $5 million had been spent wrongly, we know how much we would have been criticized.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator started this discussion of waste. I was trying to point out how the record with regard to Navajo was misleading. It was alleged there was evidence of waste in that respect. Now we are beginning to find out it has real value. There have been many evidences of real value when it was thought there was waste. I am not sure the Centaur will be found to have been a waste of dollars. Time after time we have succeeded in putting up space objects in orbit. They have been successful. I think it should be pointed out that there have been successes, and not merely failures.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have not alleged that it is all a failure. The Senator from New Mexico and the other proponents of this program seem to think I am for abandoning this program. I repeat, I am not for abandoning it. I have merely proposed an amendment which cuts only 10 percent from this enormous amount. This is to be distinguished from an authorization. This is an appropriation bill. This is the ceiling. This is distinguished from a bill like the foreign aid authorization bill, with which the Senate struggled for 3 weeks just to set a ceiling on the amount that could be spent. Foreign aid will still be cut further.

The Senator reminds me of an incident I do not like to recall too much, but I remember that on one of the first times I went to the White House in company with the Senator from New Hampshire, under the administration of President Eisenhower, the Senator made one of the most persuasive arguments I have ever heard criticizing the multiplicity of missiles then being developed. He said that we had the Sergeant, the Private, the WAC Corporal, and I do not know how many others. Then he said, "Mr. President, can you not bring into this some order, some specialization, so every agency is not going off in every direction?" I am sure the Senator remembers it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I not only remember it, but very distinctly, because I have spent a great deal of time on the missile problem. I recognize that a good job has been done. I do not know whether the Senator knows how frugal I am in this field——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am making the point that we give some thorough consideration to a program that has grown as fast as this one.

My main point is the pace at which we are seeking to enlarge the program, at great expense and great sacrifice to other programs. That is the only point I am making. I am not saying that there should not be a space program.

The Senator from Florida has stated that it is to be justified on the basis of so-called medical fallout.

If there is medical fallout from the space program which has value, why not have that taken care of in the regular way, in the medical research program?

We have put up more than a billion dollars for medical research into all forms of disease. That is the orderly way to do it.

To try to justify the space program because there may be some medical side effect seems to me to be a far-fetched argument. By the original act, it was not intended to have military objectives.

As I said before, this is a race to the moon for prestige. That was asserted some time ago by the proponents. Now that that purpose has begun to fade the proponents are saying—and I am not referring to the Senator from New Mexico, but rather to the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Florida, who spoke a short time ago today—that it is justified by its military aspects.

That is directly contrary to the policy statement on the basis of which the act was originally passed. I do not see how it is pertinent at all. It ought to be justified on the basis of the policy as stated in the original act.

When we look at the distribution of funds and the contracts for research and construction it is easy to see that it would be almost a miracle for the Senate to vote for a substantial cut.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point three pages of a table appearing at pages 1137, 1138, and 1139 of the hearings on NASA authorization for fiscal year 1964.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—ESTIMATED DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS TO PRIME CONTRACTORS OR CONSTRUCTION LOCATION, FISCAL YEARS 1962, 1963, AND 1964

This chart does not represent expenditures on a State-by-State basis. Such data are not available. The following notes explain how the chart was prepared.

The data in this chart represent this Agency's estimate of the "Prime contractor location" or "Construction location" distribution of funds appropriated to NASA during fiscal years 1962, 1963, and 1964. It is essential that anyone using these data understand that they do not represent a distribution of where payments will be made and are subject to the following qualifications resulting from the methods by which the information was compiled.

1. The figures for "Construction of facilities" are credited to the State in which the facility is to be constructed.

2. The figures for "Operations" are credited to the State in which the NASA installation is located.

3. The figures indicated for "Research and development" are based on the estimated primary place of performance of the prime contractor. For fiscal years 1963 and 1964, the figures reflect, in part, significant amounts expected to be placed on contracts currently in force, and, in part, on the distribution of the balance of the funds on the basis of factors developed from the actual data available for fiscal year 1962.

4. It is important to realize that none of the figures in the chart reflect the State-by-State distribution of expenditures which result from subcontracting and supply expenditures related to the prime contractor's work. Although, in general, subcontracting information is not available to NASA, studies of the effect of subcontracting have been made. They reveal that many prime contractors spend more than 50 percent of the contract funds through thousands of subcontractors and suppliers scattered throughout the country. As a result, through the contracting system, the actual expenditure of the funds involved are spread over a much broader base and have a much wider distribution than the figures in this chart would indicate. For example, special data were obtained from nine companies located in six States receiving more than 50 percent of NASA's prime contract awards. They subcontracted to more than 10,000 first-tier subcontractors and suppliers located in 46 States.

Location based on estimated primary place of performance of prime contracts, subcontract information not available.

State	Fiscal year 1962				Fiscal year 1963				Fiscal year 1964				
	Research, development, and operation		Construction of facilities	Total	Research, development, and operation		Construction of facilities	Total	Research, development, and operation		Construction of facilities	Total	Percent
	Research and development	Operation			Research and development	Operation			Research and development	Operation			
Alabama	99.9	88.6	30.3	218.8	130.1	113.1	43.5	286.7	37.7	132.3	38.5	208.5	3.70
Alaska	5.2		1.2	6.4	2.7			2.7	3.2			3.2	.06
Arizona	6.9			6.9	5.4			5.4	5.9			5.9	.10
Arkansas	(1)			(1)	.3			.3	.3			.2	(2)
California	542.0	31.6	44.3	617.9	1,239.8	37.6	85.1	1,362.5	2,394.4	49.4	66.6	2,510.4	43.95
Colorado	4.5			4.5	4.6			4.6	8.4			8.4	.15
Connecticut	4.7			4.7	9.5			9.5	41.2			41.2	.72
Delaware	(1)			(1)	.3			.3	.3			.3	(2)
Florida	62.6	6.5	116.3	185.4	89.8	15.8	327.0	432.6	91.6	37.2	313.4	442.2	7.74
Georgia	4.1			4.1	6.7			6.7	7.3			7.3	.13
Hawaii					.1			.1	.1			.1	(2)
Idaho					1.9			1.9					(2)
Illinois	10.3			10.3	16.0			16.0	13.9			13.9	.24
Indiana	2.0			2.0	2.7			2.7	3.4			3.4	.06
Iowa	2.3			2.3	2.3			2.3	63.3			63.3	1.11
Kansas					.8			.8	.8			.8	.01
Kentucky					(1)			(1)	.2			.2	(2)
Louisiana	22.8		11.1	33.9	220.5		18.3	238.8	456.9		10.0	466.9	8.17
Maine					.2			.2	.2			.2	(2)
Maryland	32.9	38.2	12.2	83.3	51.4	55.0	17.5	123.9	52.5	68.2	20.9	141.6	2.48
Massachusetts	24.3			24.3	41.6	.8		42.4	79.0	4.2	5.0	88.2	1.54
Michigan	6.9			6.9	6.3			6.3	5.4			5.4	.09
Minnesota	3.6			3.6	9.2			9.2	85.4			63.4	1.50
Mississippi	.1		19.0	19.1	.1		73.2	73.3	.1		111.7	111.6	1.96
Missouri	86.8			86.8	231.7			234.7	340.1		1.5	341.6	5.98
Montana					.1			.1	.1			.1	(2)
Nebraska													(2)
Nevada	.6		22.9	23.5	.4	.4	17.5	18.3	.4	.6	20.5	21.5	.38
New Hampshire	.4			.4	.4			.4	.3			.3	(2)
New Jersey	33.2			33.2	61.8			61.8	60.8			60.8	1.06
New Mexico	2.1		.4	2.5	5.8		1.6	7.4	4.2		15.0	19.2	.34
New York	68.0			68.0	132.7			132.7	379.8			379.8	6.65
North Carolina	2.1		5.0	7.1	1.3		3.5	4.8	2.1			2.1	.04
North Dakota													(2)
Ohio	13.9	45.5	1.9	61.3	35.2	54.3	43.5	133.0	13.4	67.1	25.8	106.3	1.86
Oklahoma	.8			.8	1.4			1.4	1.1			1.1	.02
Oregon	(1)			(1)	.6			.6	.3			.3	(2)
Pennsylvania	31.1			31.1	29.0			29.0	42.5			42.5	.74
Rhode Island	.3			.3	.5			.5	.3			.3	(2)
South Carolina					.1			.1	.1			.1	(2)
South Dakota	.1			.1	.8			.8	.5			.5	(2)
Tennessee	2.7			2.7	2.8			2.8	2.8			2.8	.05
Texas	40.3	23.8	66.7	130.8	66.2	50.2	45.3	161.7	56.6	71.3	37.7	165.6	2.90
Utah	(1)			(1)	.7			.7	.4			.4	(2)
Vermont	.1			.1	.2			.2	.1			.1	(2)
Virginia	17.0	53.6	18.7	89.3	30.1	59.5	25.3	114.9	7.4	64.5	11.8	83.7	1.47
Washington	.4			.4	2.2			2.2	1.5			1.5	.03
West Virginia					.8			.8	2.2			2.2	.04
Wisconsin	5.7			5.7	12.6			12.6	10.7			10.7	.19
Wyoming													(2)
District of Columbia	13.5	24.7		38.2	38.3	48.2		86.5	45.8	65.5		111.3	1.95
Various locations			8.2	8.2			36.1	36.1	26.7		121.6	148.3	2.60
Total	1,154.2	312.5	358.2	1,824.9	2,501.0	434.9	737.4	3,673.3	4,351.7	560.3	800.0	5,712.0	100.00

[1] Less than $50,000.

[2] Less than 0.01 percent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I point to the distribution of funds. There is so much money in the bill that it would be very embarrassing for any substantial number of Representatives and Senators to vote to cut it. I cite the contracts with California companies as one small example. If I were from California, I would find it very difficult to vote to cut the bill. California, under the budget for fiscal year 1964, is allotted $2,510,400,000. That is its slice of the pie.

The budget graduates on down to the smaller ones. Of course some of them get nothing. But, only a very few States get nothing.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the table appearing at page 1135 of the same hearings. It is entitled "Chart 1. Survey Showing the Effect of Subcontracting." This shows where subcontracts are placed.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHART 1

SURVEY SHOWING THE EFFECT OF SUBCONTRACTING

Geographical distribution of NASA 1st- and 2d-tier subcontracts awarded by 12 of NASA's major prime contractors and their 1st-tier subcontractors for the period January 1962 through June 1963

State	Distribution based on principal place of performance of prime contracts		Distribution based on place of performance of subcontracts	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Alabama	$1,859,076	0.3	$888,346	0.1
Arizona			10,670,794	1.6
Arkansas			171,558	
California	417,383,676	61.2	305,014,972	44.7
Colorado			4,526,845	.7
Connecticut	73,043		26,175,909	3.8
Florida	5,018,909	.7	37,286,028	5.5
Georgia			174,593	
Illinois			9,367,643	1.4
Indiana			1,778,852	.3
Iowa			18,335,666	2.7
Kansas			642,439	.1
Louisiana	15,486,002	2.3	6,429,028	.9
Maine			156,018	
Maryland			21,677,456	3.2
Massachusetts			32,593,623	4.8
Michigan			8,232,572	1.2
Minnesota			41,429,746	6.1
Mississippi			45,311	
Missouri	208,593,135	30.6	2,931,719	.4
Nevada			1,203,426	.2
New Hampshire			$117,854	
New Jersey			10,029,794	1.5
New Mexico			36,326	
New York	$28,973,022	4.2	72,179,120	10.6
North Carolina			575,680	.1
Ohio			10,188,022	1.5
Oklahoma			1,470,688	.2
Oregon			641,472	.1
Pennsylvania			47,437,736	7.0
Rhode Island			385,614	.1
South Carolina			11,328	
Tennessee			559,474	.1
Texas	4,871,907	.7	4,390,063	.6
Utah			1,124,455	.2
Vermont			66,214	
Virginia			224,170	
Washington			369,665	.1
West Virginia			647,026	.1
Wisconsin			2,071,516	.3
Total	682,258,770	100.0	682,258,770	100.0

NOTE.—The above table is based on data obtained in a survey of 12 of NASA's major prime contractors in 8 States. Each prime contractor was requested to report on every subcontract awarded in excess of $10,000 and each 1st-tier subcontractor awarded a contract in excess of $50,000 was requested to report on every 2d-tier subcontract in excess of $10,000. The data in the table reflect the 1st-tier subcontracts awarded from January 1962 through August 1962 and the 1st- and 2d-tier subcontracts awarded from September 1962 through June 1963. The lack of data on 2d-tier subcontracts for the period January 1962 through August 1962 results from the fact that the survey was initiated in August 1962 and retroactive data back to January 1962 were obtained only on 1st-tier subcontracts.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I also call attention to the table which shows the distribution of research grants. Here again there is something for everyone. Certainly even Defense, with its $47 billion budget, is not quite as well distributed as the NASA budget. Everyone gets a little something from NASA.

NASA has learned from past experience that it pays to do this. Every State in the Union gets substantial research grants, even Arkansas, which has a small part of it in two grants, one for $30,000, and another for $20,000.

NASA is not content to go into every university in the country, it even goes abroad. They have distributed research grants in Canada and England, and scattered them around so that even those people could be inclined to get their relatives or friends in the United States interested enough to ask their representatives to vote for the bill.

I am sure the bill has very strong support. It is understandable that it would have, under these circumstances. What I am trying to do is not to defeat the bill, not to reject it, but merely suggesting that it may be changed moderately. It could well stand a cut of 10 percent, as proposed in my amendment.

There is a provision in the bill to make possible the transfer of 5 percent from one category to another. I suppose that such a transfer could be made; and if it were made, I doubt that any particular project would be pinched. They might take a little money out of their public relations fund which they use for advertising. They have $6 million in the bill for public relations to go around the country with spacemobiles and drum up support.

I remember when the Senate adopted a specific restriction against the State Department spending a nickel on informing the public about foreign aid. It was said that that was terrible, that it was a gross misapplication of public funds. However, in this bill an amount of $6 million is specifically set aside for advertising. I suppose it is used to send out spacemobiles around the country, for example, to impress children with how wonderful it will be to go to the moon, and then to have the children go home, I suppose, and ask their parents to vote for the program.

That is what happened with my friend who was taken down to Huntsville.

Whenever an agricultural bill is before the Senate, there is a conflict of interest. The city people think the agricultural people are imposing on them, and are charging more for cotton or wheat than they should. I cannot see anyone who has a conflict of interest in the pending bill, because everyone seems to get something out of it. I do not know of any interest that could say, "This imposes upon us." That is, no one except the taxpayers, and, of course, they are without representation.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator mentioned the agricultural situation. Did he note the report in yesterday's newspapers that the agricultural experts at the Department are predicting a drop in farm income of about a half billion dollars this year, and another half billion dollars next year, for a total of $1 billion? That is about what the Senator is proposing be saved in the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; I saw that article. If we refuse to sell any of our surplus of grain abroad, our surpluses will be worse in the years to come, because we will either have to sell them or stop growing what we are now growing. I would not be surprised if the Senate voted not to sell any wheat to the Russians. We may just have to let the weevils eat it.

Mr. President, finally I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a chart entitled "Thirty Largest Contractors (Business Firms) Listed According to Net Value of Direct Awards, July 1–December 31, 1962," appearing at page 328 of the House hearings on the bill.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

30 largest contractors (business firms) listed according to net value of direct awards, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1962

Contractor	Net value of awards	
	Thousands of dollars	Percent of total awards to business
Total awards to business	$826,053	80.90
1. North American Aviation, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.[1]	197,400	23.9
2. McDonnell Aircraft Corp., St. Louis, Mo	84,577	10.2
3. Aerojet-General Corp., Azusa, Calif.[1]	44,776	5.4
4. General Dynamics Corp., San Diego, Calif.[1]	41,652	5.0
5. Chrysler Corp., New Orleans, La.[1]	32,805	4.0
6. Boeing Co., Seattle, Wash.[1]	31,536	3.8
7. Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc., Santa Monica, Calif.[1]	30,963	3.7
8. United Aircraft Corp., West Palm Beach, Fla.[1]	26,324	3.2
9. Radio Corp. of America, Princeton, N.J.[1]	18,870	2.3
10. International Business Machines Corp., Rockville, Md.[1]	18,377	2.2
11. Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp., Bethpage, N.Y	17,458	2.1
12. Space Technology Laboratories, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.[1]	15,130	1.8
13. General Electric Co., Philadelphia, Pa.[1]	14,342	1.7
14. Mason Rust, Lexington, Ky	11,987	1.5
15. Bendix Corp., Baltimore, Md.[1]	10,908	1.3
16. Ling-Temco-Vought, Inc., Dallas, Tex.[1]	8,494	1.0
17. Brown Engineering Co., Inc., Huntsville, Ala	8,056	1.0
18. Hughes Aircraft Co., Culver City, Calif.[1]	8,014	1.0
19. Republic Aviation Corp., Farmingdale, N.Y	6,394	.8
20. Hayes International Corp., Birmingham, Ala	5,727	.7
21. Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Sunnyvale, Calif.[1]	5,388	.7
22. Union Carbide Corp., Fontana, Calif.[1]	4,765	.6
23. General Motors Corp., Milwaukee, Wis.[1]	4,312	.5
24. Norair Engineering Corp., Washington, D.C	3,367	.4
25. Roediger Construction, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio	3,000	.4
26. Electro-Mechanical Research, Inc., Washington, D.C.[1]	2,958	.4
27. Packard Bell Electronics Corp., Los Angeles, Calif.[1]	2,895	.4
28. Collins Radio Co., Dallas, Tex.[1]	2,862	.3
29. Piracci Construction Co., Inc., Baltimore, Md.[1]	2,422	.3
30. Ampex Corp., Redwood City, Calif.[1]	2,374	.3

[1] Awards during period involve more than 1 contractor address.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Record the letter the President of the United States sent to the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture on September 23, 1963.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The White House,
Washington, September 23, 1963.

Hon. Albert Thomas,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Al: I am very glad to respond to your letter of September 21 and to state my position on the relation between our great current space effort and my proposal at the United Nations for increased cooperation with the Russians in this field. In my view an energetic continuation of our strong space effort is essential, and the need for this effort is, if anything, increased by our intent to work for increasing cooperation if the Soviet Government proves willing.

As you know, the idea of cooperation in space is not new. My statement of our willingness to cooperate in a moon shot was an extension of a policy developed as long ago as 1958 on a bipartisan basis, with particular leadership from Vice President Johnson, who was then the Senate majority leader. The American purpose of cooperation in space was stated by the Congress in the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, and reaffirmed in my inaugural address in 1961. Our specific interest in cooperation with the Soviet Union, as the other nation with a major present capability in space, was indicated by me to Chairman Khrushchev in Vienna in the middle of 1961, and reaffirmed in my letter to him of March 7, 1962, which was made public at the time. As I then said, discussion of cooperation would undoubtedly show us "possibilities for substantive scientific and technical cooperation in manned and unmanned space investigations." So my statement in the United Nations is a direct development of a policy long held by the U.S. Government.

Our repeated offers of cooperation with the Soviet Union have so far produced only limited responses and results. We have an agreement to exchange certain information in such limited fields as weather observation and passive communications, and technical discussions of other limited possibilities are going forward. But as I said in July of this year, there are a good many barriers of suspicion and fear to be broken down before we can have major progress in this field. Yet out intent remains: to do our part to bring those barriers down.

At the same time, as no one knows better than you, the United States in the last 5 years has made a steadily growing national effort in space. On May 25, 1961, I proposed to the Congress and the Nation a major expansion of this effort, and I particularly emphasized as a target the achievement of a manned lunar landing in the decade of the 1960's. I stated that this would be a task requiring great effort and very large expenditures; the Congress and the Nation approved this goal; we have been on our way ever since. In the larger sense this is not merely an effort to put a man on the moon; it is a means and a stimulus for all the advances in technology, in understanding and in experience, which can move us forward toward man's mastery of space.

This great national effort and this steadily stated readiness to cooperate with others are not in conflict. They are mutually supporting elements of a single policy. We do not make our space effort with the narrow purpose of national aggrandizement. We make it so that the United States may have a leading and honorable role in mankind's peaceful conquest of space. It is this great effort which permits us now to offer increased cooperation with no suspicion anywhere that we speak from weakness. And in the same way, our readiness to cooperate with others enlarges the international meaning of our own peaceful American program in space.

In my judgment, therefore, our renewed and extended purpose of cooperation, so far from offering any excuse for slackening or weakness in our space effort, is one reason the more for moving ahead with the great program to which we have been committed as a country for more than 2 years.

So the position of the United States is clear. If cooperation is possible, we mean to cooperate, and we shall do so from a position made strong and solid by our national effort in space. If cooperation is not possible—and as realists we must plan for this contingency too—then the same strong national effort will serve all free men's interest in space, and protect us also against possible hazards to our national security. So let us press on.

Let me thank you again for this opportunity of expressing my views.

With warm personal regards.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. COTTON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. SALTONSTALL (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] is absent because of death in family.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is absent due to illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Ken-

NEDY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

The respective pairs of the Senators from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and that of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] have been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 46, as follows:

[No. 244 Leg.]

YEAS—36

Bartlett
Beall
Bennett
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Church
Clark
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hickenlooper
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
McGovern
Morse
Mundt
Neuberger
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Russell
Scott
Talmadge
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.

NAYS—46

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Cooper
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Hart
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Keating
Kuchel
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Monroney
Moss
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Ribicoff
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—18

Cotton
Dodd
Engle
Goldwater
Hartke
Hruska
Kennedy
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
McGee
McIntyre
Miller
Morton
Nelson
Saltonstall
Simpson
Yarborough

So Mr. FULBRIGHT's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 324

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 324, but ask that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment offered by Mr. PROXMIRE is, as follows:

On page 37, line 3, change "$4,006,000,000" to "$3,926,000,000" and on page 37, line 9, change "$690,000,000" to "$680,000,000".

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, first, let me ask whether the Senator from Washington will agree to a 10-minute total limitation—5 minutes to a side—on the debate on this amendment, with the understanding that after the debate on it is concluded, there will be a yea-and-nay vote on the question of agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Very well. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on the amendment be limited to 5 minutes to a side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to my amendment No. 324, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. First, Mr. President, I ask that the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] be added as a cosponsor of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia has been the leader in the Senate in a great fight to bring a sense of realism and practicality into the space program. The pending amendment would cut the NASA appropriation by a little less than 2 percent—not by 10 percent or $500 million as did the previous amendment, but by a little less than 2 percent, or $80 million. In short, the amendment would return the amount for this item to the amount voted by the House of Representatives. Specifically, the amendment would cut the appropriation for research and development from $4,006 million to $3,926 million.

In 1963, the appropriation for NASA research and development was $2,900 million. My amendment would permit a $1 billion increase in the appropriation for research and development—an increase of approximately one-third, in this 1 year.

The amendment would also reduce the appropriation for construction by $10 million, or a little more than 1 percent.

NASA has just completed an immense construction program. As the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has so eloquently and so well stated, I feel that there is much waste in the space program; I think that has been extremely well documented by the Senator from Arkansas, and I believe that all Senators know of this.

There may be some Senators who feel that a $500 million cut would have been too much. But this amendment calls for a reduction or cut of only $90 million or approximately 2 percent, and I think the record justifies the making of such a cut.

The record made by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] supports the cut in this appropriation in great detail; therefore, I shall not speak longer in support of the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, my remarks on this amendment will be very brief, for the question of making a cut in this appropriation item has already been discussed quite thoroughly.

The pending amendment would put this entire item in conference with the House. There are items which we wish to discuss with the House conferees; the Senator from Idaho has an item which will require discussion between the Senate conferees and the House conferees; but I hope we do not have to have a conference with the House conferees on the amount of this item, because of this amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator from Washington mean to say that there will not be a conference?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I did not say that; but if this amendment is rejected, there will not be a conference with the House on this amount.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Just on the amount?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. We want to be in a position to have a conference with the House, because there are some amounts we wish to talk about with the House conferees.

Therefore, Mr. President, this amendment should be dealt with by the Senate in the same way that it dealt with the preceding amendment. The argument in opposition to the preceding amendment was made at considerable length, and the same argument applies in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time on the pending amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment (No. 324) offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, on behalf of himself and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McGOVERN (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. SALTONSTALL (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri

[Mr. Long], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] is absent because of death in family.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is absent due to illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] would each vote "yea."

The pair of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 39, as follows:

[No. 245 Leg.]

YEAS—40

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Beall
Bennett
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Church
Clark
Cooper
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hickenlooper
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Morse
Mundt
Neuberger
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Scott
Talmadge
Thurmond
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—39

Anderson
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Cotton
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Hart
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Keating
Kuchel
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Monroney
Moss
Muskie
Pastore
Ribicoff
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Tower
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—21

Carlson
Dodd
Engle
Goldwater
Hartke
Hruska
Kennedy
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Miller
Morton
Nelson
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smathers

So Mr. Proxmire's amendment (No. 324) was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to; and on that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Washington that he is not eligible to make the motion.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President——

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Chair has recognized the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, must a Senator have been on the winning or losing side to be eligible to make a motion to reconsider?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am merely asking a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. A parliamentary inquiry has been propounded.

The Chair advises the Senator from Montana that, to be eligible to make such a motion, the Senator must have been on the prevailing side.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Or the motion can be made by a Senator who did not vote.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, after having voted in the affirmative, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Can there be debate on a motion to table?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Washington that the motion is not debatable.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. Aiken voted in the affirmative when his name was called.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the roll is being called. There can be no parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Is a vote "nay" a vote not to lay on the table?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, that is out of order. There has been a response to the call of the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will please be in order. The clerk will continue the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. BURDICK. On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] is absent because of death in family.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long]. If present and voting, the Senator from

Wisconsin would vote "yea," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] are necessarily absent.

Also, the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

The pair of the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 38, as follows:

[No. 246 Leg.]

YEAS—41

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Beall
Bennett
Boggs
Carlson
Church
Clark
Cooper
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hickenlooper
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
McGovern
Morse
Mundt
Neuberger
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Russell
Scott
Talmadge
Thurmond
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—38

Anderson
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Cotton
Eastland
Edmondson
Hart
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Kuchel
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Monroney
Moss
Muskie
Pastore
Ribicoff
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Tower
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—21

Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Dodd
Ellender
Engle
Goldwater
Hartke
Hruska
Keating
Kennedy
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
McGee
McIntyre
Miller
Morton
Nelson
Robertson
Saltonstall
Simpson

So, Mr. Douglas' motion, to lay on the table Mr. Clark's motion to reconsider, was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN and **Mr. DIRKSEN** addressed the Chair.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask to have it stated.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama will be stated.

The **Chief Clerk.** It is proposed, on page 34, line 4, to strike out "$2,000,000," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$12,000,000, of which amount $10,000,000 shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H.J. Res. 785 or S.J. Res. 129."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield first to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I want to ask the majority leader about the program while Senators are present in the Chamber.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Very well; I yield to the minority leader.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is still hoped that action on the bill can be completed this evening. Then, if the Senate will give its approval and consent, we would like to call up the bill reported from the Finance Committee, having to do with the debt ceiling, tomorrow.

On Friday, I understand the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] will be ready to take up the Library Act bill, reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

In the meantime it may be possible to consider measures to which there is no objection. Tentatively, that is the schedule.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, when does the Senator plan to bring up the conference report on the legislative appropriation bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish I could give the Senator a reply, but at the request of a Senator of some standing, action has been held up. I cannot answer. I hope it will not be too long.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The continuing resolution adopted on October 28 expires on November 30. Can we have assurance that the conference report will be brought before the Senate prior to the Thanksgiving recess?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will do my best.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In any event, can we have the assurance that before the legislative appropriation conference report is considered in the Senate, Senators will be notified? Personally, I expect to object to an extension unless the conference report is acted upon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Delaware is making a fair request. So far as it will be in the control of the leadership, he will be notified before another continuing resolution comes before the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator. The reason I think this is so important is that a Member of the other House has seen fit to cast a reflection on the character of every girl working with the U.S. Senate. I, along with every Member of the Senate, resent such an irresponsible statement and am determined that the charge not go unchallenged.

This is not just a charge against the Senators but what is even more reprehensible is that it is an attack on the character of a lot of nice girls. The Senate should demand that the man who made these charges either prove them or deliver a public apology.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, we cannot hear a word being said, and we ought to be hearing what is being said. I hope Senators will raise their voices and that those who are talking will take their seats.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yielded so the minority leader might query the majority leader about the program. I am under the impression that I am still yielding under that understanding.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8748) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

JURISDICTION OVER MUTUAL FUNDS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there is a statement in the report of the Committee on the Independent Offices Appropriations bill which deals with the jurisdiction of the Comptroller of the Currency and the SEC in respect to the building up of mutual funds. I should like to place a statement on that point in the Record, because there is a bill on that subject pending before the Banking and Currency Committee. In order that this statement may be in the Record as a part of the legislative history, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT

The Appropriations Committee report on the Independent Offices Appropriations for 1964 contains a paragraph at page 21 as follows:

"The committee notes the conflict of asserted jurisdiction in the field of administration of common trust funds. It is our opinion that national banks are adequately supervised by the Comptroller of the Currency, and directs that no funds appropriated in this bill be expended by the SEC for that purpose."

This seems to be an attempt by the Appropriations Committee to legislate on a subject which is now pending before the Banking and Currency Committee. In discussion on the floor yesterday Senator Anderson raised this question in a colloquy with the manager of the bill, Senator Magnuson. (The colloquy appears at p. 22358, Congressional Record, Nov. 19, 1963.)

Effective April 5, 1963, the Comptroller of the Currency adopted a regulation which for the first time would authorize a national bank to maintain a collective fund for the pooled investment of the bank's managing agency accounts—in other words authorize national banks to sponsor and operate what is in substance a mutual fund.

> The Securities and Exchange Commission then took the position that a mutual fund sponsored by a bank, like any other mutual fund, would be subject to the Federal securities laws.
>
> The Comptroller of the Currency sharply disputed this, claiming that the Federal securities laws have no application.
>
> There is presently pending before the Senate a bill, S. 2228, to exempt bank collective trust funds from the Federal securities laws. This bill which has been referred to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, should, after public debate, resolve the issue.
>
> There are complex and important questions involved in this dispute, not only affecting a matter of jurisdiction between two Government agencies, but also involving the question as to whether the Glass-Steagall Act should be partially repealed so as to permit commercial banks to engage to some extent in the securities business.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask to modify my amendment. The wrong page was given. It should be page 35, line 4.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator has a right to modify his amendment. The amendment is so modified.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. My time is limited. I have 30 minutes on my amendment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, a point of order.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. TOWER. I should like an opinion from the Presiding Officer as to whether or not the amendment of the Senator from Alabama is in order.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Chair advises the Senator from Texas that the point of order is not in order at this time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me remind the Senator from Texas that Senate Joint Resolution 129 has passed the Senate. As I understand, under our rules, this language can be put in the pending appropriation bill and the point can be raised later under a point of order.

I should like to take the time to speak briefly on an item in the report. It appears on page 20 of the report, dealing with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The committee language is as follows:

> The committee found that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has initiated an academic grant program which is projected to cost between $21 and $28 million per year in the near future. Because of the overlap with other governmental grant education programs, the committee questions the propriety of such a program administered by this agency, and therefore directs that no new grants be made without specific authorization and appropriation.

Mr. President, Senators are aware of the many specific accomplishments of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration during the 5 years since the enactment of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, and of the great progress which this country has made in overtaking the early Soviet lead in space research and exploration.

We have witnessed the brilliant success of the Nation's manned space flight program in Project Mercury—an unbroken record of six successes in six attempts despite the severe limitations of the booster capacity which was available. We observed with considerable awe the flight of Mariner II last December, when it traveled 180 million miles, and after a complex midcourse correction reached the vicinity of Venus when that planet was 36 million miles away. We have observed the successful flights of seven Tiros spacecraft and today these satellites have assumed an important role in the forecasting of worldwide weather conditions. Meanwhile, with Telstar, Relay, and Syncom, we have seen and heard practical demonstrations of satellite communication by radio, telephone, and television.

My purpose today, however, is not to review specific U.S. achievements in space. Significant and dramatic as they are, these achievements are of less importance to the future of the United States than the development of the basic resources which made them possible. It is this point—the manner in which our investment in the NASA program is building a basic structure of space power for the United States—which I would like to emphasize in these remarks.

Our national investment in the civilian space program has added and is adding to our national strength and to our future capacity to attain and maintain preeminence in space in several important ways:

First, we have developed within the government the organization and structure required for the management of this vast research and development enterprise and for the others which must inevitably come during the years ahead as we advance into the new age of science and technology. This organization, also, is developing a strong core of scientific and engineering talent which is operating at the frontiers of knowledge to perform the very advanced research which will insure U.S. leadership in space far into the future.

Second, the Nation is designing and constructing the massive engineering complexes here on earth which are required to build, test, and launch the powerful space vehicles which will assure and maintain U.S. preeminence in space.

Third, through the performance of more than 90 percent of NASA's work under contract with American industry we are building a structure of manufacturing competence. This will remain available for the design, development, and production of space boosters and spacecraft which will serve our needs for any future purposes which the national interest may require. This resource is of significance not only because of the strength it provides the Nation with which to meet any challenge we may encounter in space, but because of its contribution to the economy of the country in bolstering the aerospace industry as military requirements for aircraft and ballistic missiles are phasing out.

Fourth, the conduct of the space program is developing within the American industrial structure a reservoir of highly skilled engineering manpower trained to deal with the incredibly complex systems and subsystems required to perform effectively over long periods of time in the hostile environment of space. This is a resource which can be developed only over an extended period of time, but which could well be required on very short notice in the interests of our national security.

The development of these basic resources is apparent, I am sure, to my colleagues in the Senate, and most thoroughly appreciated. There is a further resource, however, of equal if not greater importance to the future welfare of the United States which may, I fear, be less appreciated and less well understood. I refer to the NASA activity in its sustaining university program through which contracts for basic research related to the NASA mission are awarded to the universities of the Nation and provisions made for NASA support of advanced graduate training and facilities which will enhance the ability of the universities to carry out NASA missions.

NASA during its first 5 years has sponsored substantial research in universities to provide a base for the highly sophisticated technology required for a better understanding of the environment, and for the ultimate conquest of space. As the program has grown and accelerated, the need for new mechanisms to utilize fully the university's unique capability to establish the United States as the foremost power in space science and technology, has become apparent.

It was evident that an adequate supply of trained personnel and a thorough knowledge of natural space phenomena were essential if the Nation were to progress at the optimum pace in its space efforts. It was also apparent that the Nation could not be content, as it emerged into an age in which progress is based on new scientific knowledge and very advanced technology, with a concentration of scientific research and graduate education in a relative handful of universities restricted to a few limited areas of the country.

The NASA sustaining university program was initiated in fiscal year 1962 to enlarge university participation in aeronautics and space science engineering endeavors, and to do so while strengthening the universities on a broad basis throughout the country—the "haves" as well as the "have-nots." This program has sought to do this, with considerable success, in three major ways:

First. Recognizing the increased demands for scientists and engineers in fields of space-related science and technology during the years ahead NASA undertook a program which would support its mission through provision of predoctoral training grants to graduate students in engineering, mathematics, and the physical sciences. Let me emphasize the words, "support its mission." NASA's objective is not one of subsidizing graduate education for education's sake. Rather, the training grants are designed to insure that the scientific and engineering manpower required to gain the maximum benefit at the minimum cost from the billions being invested in space research and exploration will be available during the years ahead.

Second. It has been NASA policy, throughout the past 5 years, to place its basic research, to the extent possible, within the natural home of science—the university. This policy serves two significant purposes. First, it produces urgently needed scientific knowledge which will enable NASA to carry out its missions. Meanwhile, however, while getting this job done, the funds expended by NASA on research within the university serves to supplement the training of young scientists and engineers who participate in these projects. NASA has recognized, however, that in some instances the performance of substantial research in hitherto little known and little developed fields puts a substantial burden on the already overloaded physical facilities on the university campus. As a consequence, in selected instances where the urgent need exists, NASA has made some grants for the addition of laboratory space needed effectively to conduct the research which the agency is sponsoring.

Third. Space research differs from the scientific endeavors with which the universities have had most of their experience in the past in that space activity touches on virtually every scientific discipline. Recognizing this, NASA has supported grants which enable the universities to increase their role in support of its program through encouragement of creative multidisciplinary investigations, development of new capabilities, and consolidation of space-oriented activities.

Of great significance to me, and I am sure to many of my colleagues, is the emphasis being placed in NASA on broadening the base of graduate education and research in the performance of its mission. Dr. Clark Kerr, president of the University of California, in the second of the Godkin lectures at Harvard this year, observed that:

> The general policy of Federal agencies in allocating research grants to universities for the past two decades has been one of "seeking excellence wherever it is;" one of accepting the established pattern and following it.

Dr. Kerr went on to note that there is increasing emphasis on the development of additional outstanding centers of graduate instruction and research.

NASA's first objective, of course, must be to carry out expeditiously and successfully the missions assigned to it by the Congress. Therefore, it has used, is using, and will continue to use the substantial scientific researches available to it in the most highly developed scientific and technical institutions such as MIT, Cal Tech, and others. Meanwhile, however, those who are administering the NASA program have recognized that the national interest requires a development of scientific competence and graduate educational facilities in all parts of the Nation as science becomes an increasingly important factor in industrial development. This is a matter of extreme importance to those of us from the less highly industrialized States who are concerned with future economic growth and employment opportunity in the areas we represent.

Mr. President, I believe the policy established by NASA with respect to university participation in this challenging space effort, and the broad strengthening of the universities throughout the Nation which these policies will produce, may well be one of the most important benefits which the Nation derives from the funds we are allocating to the space effort.

The NASA university program is not an educational effort which overlaps the scholarship programs being carried out through other agencies of the Government. Rather it is one uniquely constituted to insure the supply of specially trained scientific and engineering manpower which will be required for the successful completion of the missions already assigned to NASA by the Congress. The program would be vital to the country if it served no other purpose.

It is reassuring to me, however, that through the policies established by NASA in the conduct of its university relationships the Nation, throughout the 50 States, will develop a stronger university system. It is important that brilliant young students who have the latent talent to contribute to the Nation's advance in science and technology will have the opportunity to develop that talent. And certainly none of us can fail to appreciate the importance of producing the most brilliant scientists and engineers of which we are capable to supervise the investment of many billions of dollars in future space research.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I am very surprised to discover that the Committee on Appropriations, in its report on the NASA request for fiscal 1964, apparently seeks to curtail this important NASA activity, an activity which has already demonstrated its great potential contribution to the accomplishment of the NASA mission and the welfare of the country.

In this report the committee finds that:

> The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has initiated an academic grant program which is projected to cost between $21 and $28 million per year in the near future. Because of the overlap with other governmental grant education programs, the committee questions the propriety of such a program administered by this agency, and therefore directs that no new grants be made without specific authorization and appropriation.

Mr. President, I find this language both vague and obscure. Certainly the committee cannot intend to hamstring NASA in the conduct of one of its most significant activities. A clarification of the meaning of this language is certainly required if this body is intelligently to consider the appropriation which is before us.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama were of great interest to me, and serve to reinforce my own conviction that the investment which we have made in space research, and which we propose to make in the future, must be considered in the context of the long-term basic resources which are being provided.

I wish, particularly, to support his views with respect to the relationships which NASA is developing with the Nation's universities. Certainly, the physical facilities which are being constructed to support our space effort are important, but highly trained minds, capable of mastering complex problems at the cutting edge of science and technology, may well prove to be an even more vital resource in the years ahead.

Many of you may have read the report on this problem prepared by the President's Scientific Advisory Committee. This report strongly reinforces the conclusion that a special effort must be made to insure that young Americans interested and capable of working in these fields become available to meet our future scientific and engineering manpower needs. The report indicates that qualified students are available who would not otherwise enter graduate research training unless new opportunities are available. It recommends an immediate increase of 8,000 new starts in the number of federally-assisted graduate students in engineering, mathematics, and the physical sciences.

The advisory committee proposed that, as a necessary and achievable goal, the Nation turn out 7,500 Ph. D.'s a year in these fields by 1970, compared with 3,400 in 1962. NASA, recognizing the demands which it will make on the scientific and engineering manpower pool, has undertaken to support the training of that portion of trained people required to meet its anticipated future programs.

The program was initiated in 1962, with grants to 10 universities for the support of 10 graduate students at each university for a period of 3 years. The total cost of this program was approximately $2 million. In fiscal year 1963, the program is being increased by about 800 trainees enrolled in 90 universities throughout the Nation. The cost, $15 million, for 900 potential Ph. D.'s to carry out NASA work in the years ahead.

The attitude of the scientific community toward this activity is evident from the report of the Iowa summer study sponsored by the National Academy of Sciences. During an 8-week review by this group of senior scientists and engineers from universities, Government, and industry, full support was given to sponsorship by NASA of 4,000 students in graduate training at a given time, with the objective of producing a minimum of 1,000 Ph. D.'s a year. With the approval of the Congress, this is the ultimate NASA objective.

My distinguished colleague from Alabama has noted the emphasis which NASA is placing on broadening the base of graduate education in the United States. This is a matter of great importance to the Nation, and one which deserves amplification.

The most recent reports available to me indicate that there are in the United States nearly 1,500 colleges and universities which grant a baccalaureate degree after 4 years of study. Of these, some 1,100 grant bachelor's degrees in science or engineering.

Of these 1,500 institutions, about 150 grant the Ph. D. degree or equivalent in at least one field of science or engineering, almost always in association with original science or engineering research.

NASA Administrator James E. Webb noted recently, however, that these 150—which constitute only 10 percent of the Nation's total of universities—may be further broken down into three types:

First. The large, first-rank schools which steadily become stronger because of the competence they already possess.

Second. The intermediate institutions with competence in several selected areas, capable faculties, substantial enrollments, and good physical plants.

Third. The less fortunate institutions with critical problems involving faculty, location, general financial conditions, physical plant, and so forth. Often these universities produce excellent graduate students, but in general they suffer in comparison with the first two groups.

By far the largest proportion of federally sponsored research has been concentrated in the first two groups, for reasons which existed long before Federal funds became a significant source of university financial support. In other words, Federal support has not made these universities leaders, but rather has tended to concentrate in schools which are already leaders and could offer maximum results from the money spent. Moreover, in such a situation, the strong tend to become stronger.

In planning its policies relating to the universities, NASA has skillfully avoided two hazardous pitfalls. It has recognized that if it were to make grants only to a handful of leading universities, it would neglect an opportunity to develop and strengthen other institutions which can make an important contribution to the space effort. Meanwhile, however, the agency has recognized that accomplishment of its mission is its prime responsibility, and that it cannot undertake a program with the primary objective of reconstructing the weaker schools.

As Administrator Webb has pointed out, the NASA "contribution to broadening the research base, and lessening concentration, must take the form of a conscious effort to seek out competence in other universities, in addition to the big 10 or the big 20, and fan the spark of creativity in places where even modest encouragement to move ahead can produce large results of national benefit."

As a result of these policies, NASA is supporting research at all of the 20 first-rank schools, but also at about 80 others. In the case of predoctoral training grants, only 4 of the first 10, made in 1962, went to schools ranked among the "big 20." This year, 19 of the 20 are included—but there are training grants at 69 other schools which are not among the 20 leaders.

Mr. President, when the various forms of NASA activity with universities are reviewed—project research grants, seed grants to initiate participation by smaller schools, and training grants—it is discovered that NASA is already working with about 100 universities throughout the Nation which are not among the "big 20." The base is being broadened, and as this stimulus is applied, the research conducted in these newly participating schools may be expected to increase.

I will make one final point which is of significance to those who are concerned that the educational institutions in their States have an opportunity to develop into stronger institutions through participation in the NASA program. The manner in which NASA is awarding its predoctoral training grants is uniquely designed to foster development of stronger institutions. This is achieved through the award of the grant to the institution, rather than to individual scholars.

The significance of this method lies in the fact that the university, as an institution, is given the opportunity to select its own candidates for instruction on its own campus. The promising scholar, armed with an individual grant, cannot shop among the leading institutions to select his school, thus further concentrating competence in graduate instruction. The school receiving the grant, if it selects its candidates wisely, may enhance its chances of retraining the student as a faculty member once he has received his Ph. D.

Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Alabama for speaking so forcefully on this subject, and I concur wholeheartedly in his views regarding the fundamental resources being developed through our investment in space research.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Since the debate has started on the bill I have reacted against this provision, because the language appears in the report, and we cannot reach it by amendment. I should like to have the attention, particularly, of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Second, it is a restriction on the authorization. It is not in the appropriation bill, but in the report of the Appropriations Committee.

It seems to me, I may say in all kindness, that it is not proper procedure. However, since the debate has started I have heard the able chairman of the Space Committee say that he has already scheduled hearings, to study this very subject, and plans to go through with the hearings.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The schedule was set up over a month ago, and the hearings will start tomorrow morning. We intend to go through with the hearings and study this subject.

Only one part scares me at all. I believe I understand what the committee was trying to do, and I am sympathetic with what it tried to do. What scares me is that the committee says in its report that no new grants shall be made. That stops the program completely. If it had said no new programs shall be started, that would be another story. We hope to clarify this point in the hearings, and try to get the group on a reasonable position, which will fully meet the desires of the Appropriations Committee.

Later I intend to make a statement, and to submit a resolution, which would make it possible to study the program. I wish this language had not been quite so strong.

Mr. ANDERSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I am deeply disturbed by the language contained in Report No. 641 on NASA's appropriation relative to NASA's academic grant program.

It is my understanding that the intent of this language is to prevent NASA from continuing its university training grant program for fiscal year 1964 until a separate authorization and appropriation is enacted.

The committee, in arriving at a recommendation that $5.511 billion be authorized, was cognizant of the fact that a reduction to this amount, from the $5.712 billion originally requested, would result in some curtailment of hardware development in the on-going NASA programs. After careful study, however, there was neither the desire nor the intention on the part of the committee that restrictions be placed on the basic activities of the agency which will be at the heart of our progress in space in the years ahead.

In my judgment, the university program is such an activity. As my distinguished colleagues from Montana and Alabama have suggested, the American people can have confidence that this Nation will be equipped to meet any challenge which confronts it in space only if we make certain that we have the highly trained manpower needed to do the work.

Mr. President, I would like to emphatically state my position in connection with this program. NASA's budget request for fiscal year 1964 contained $55 million for facility, training, and research grants programs. The graduate training portion of this program was begun by NASA in the spring of 1962 when they expended approximately $2 million for grants to 10 universities for 3-year support of 10 graduate students at each university. In fiscal year 1963 NASA increased this program by expending just under $15 million for an additional 786 trainees at 88 universities. So, at the present time NASA has nearly 900 graduate students in this type of training. NASA requested for fiscal year 1964 $25 million for their training program, $18 million for facilities, and $12 million for research grants.

The legislative committees of the House and Senate scrutinized extremely carefully this program. I would like to call the attention of the Members to part 1 and part 2 of the hearings before the Senate Space Committee, during which considerable attention was paid to this program. On page 297 of part 1, Dr. Newell of NASA discussed at length the sustaining university programs. On page 305 a list of first and second year participants by universities is listed. On page 311 additional information concerning NASA's predoctoral training grants is furnished. Considerable testimony in these pages is devoted to the information submitted. Furthermore, page 723 of part 1 gives a complete statement on the programs administered by the Office of Grants and Research Contracts of NASA. This statement carries through some 8 pages.

In part 2 of NASA's authorization hearings, I call attention to testimony appearing on page 1057, pages 1085 through 1087 and pages 1110 through 1113. In taking this testimony from NASA the committee took notice that the national space program relies heavily on the skill and training of the people who are in the program and that success would be contingent, not only upon NASA, but also upon the efforts of other government agencies, industry, universities, and the scientific community in general. I also call the attention of the Members to page 1119 of the authorization hearings, which contains material submitted by Dr. Jerome Wiesner and contains Dr. Wiesner's testimony before the House Committee on Education. This material extends through page 1127 of the hearings. I also call attention to the Senate Space Committee Report No. 385 wherein this program for fiscal year 1964 is spelled out beginning on page 86 and continuing through page 93.

After thoroughly analyzing NASA's needs, the legislative committees, for fiscal year 1964, authorized the appropriation of $40 million of the $55 million originally requested. Pursuant to this cutback, NASA has indicated that it is allocating for fiscal year 1964, $20 million for training, $12 million for facilities, and $8 million for research grants.

Mr. President, I am in agreement that the extension of governmental grant educational programs needs to be looked at and that NASA's programs should continue to be scrutinized carefully. Furthermore, NASA should be held to the amounts authorized and appropriated for these programs. However, I feel that NASA has justified their requests for fiscal year 1964 and that they should be allowed to continue this program at the $40 million level authorized by the legislative committees. I would assure the members that our committee intends to require NASA to stay within the confines of its program as set forth in the authorization hearings and, for my part, can assure the Appropriations Committee that no reprograming moneys would be allowed to be utilized and no new policies would be inaugurated without further specific authorizations and appropriations. I am also prepared to introduce an amendment to the appropriations act that would require NASA to conform to the same reprograming requirements with respect to any construction of any major facility in connection with its programs for grants to nonprofit institutions of higher education or to nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of scientific research as is applicable to NASA's other reprograming authority for research and development and construction of facilities programs.

I would not like at this time, however, to cut off the proposed program for NASA for fiscal year 1964 which, in my mind, would lend emphasis to the statement that whenever a cut is made in NASA's program that it is the scientific programs which are materially affected.

Mr. President, the Senate Space Committee is keenly aware of the concern from many sources over the various types of Federal aid to education programs now being carried out by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

Some of the concern expressed has been over the fact that there is much duplication involved in the many Federal Government educational programs now being pursued by various Government departments and agencies. Mr. President, the staff of the Space Committee has been busy for some time looking into the Government educational aid programs and NASA's participation in such programs. In conducting their research the staff has had available to it some of the excellent work done by other committees in Congress in this area. It has availed itself of the House Committee on Education and Labor's House Document 159. It has also had available the National Science Foundation's reports and reports made by the President's Science Advisory Committee. Because of the concern expressed and the investigation on the part of the staff, the Space Committee is scheduling hearings this week, Thursday and Friday, on NASA's educational programs and policies. These hearings authorized about a month ago, are scheduled to look into not only the aspects of NASA's educational programs, the reasons and necessity for them, and NASA's projected programs in the future, but also to see wherein NASA's programs fit into the overall policy of the Government with respect to educational grants and to what extent, if any, duplication exists between NASA and other governmental programs. To this end, the committee is beginning its testimony Thursday by having Dr. Jerome Wiesner appear to testify in connection with the administration's overall educational programs.

I would hope that the Senate would not indicate that it is its intention to deny NASA to continue their fiscal year 1964 program for facility, training, and research grants, but would allow this program to continue in the manner as set forth by NASA before the authorizing committees, and with the understanding that the program would be limited to the expenditure of $40 million for fiscal year 1964 which started last July 1, of which $20 million would be allocated for training grants.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, before the program went further, the committee wanted to slow it down so that it could be studied and to give the Space Committee an opportunity to examine it. I believe I am reflecting what the committee had in mind.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I find myself in complete agreement with what the chairman has said. I believe it is desirable to hold this program down, so that it may be carefully studied.

But the language of the report, if taken literally—that no new grants shall be made—would completely destroy the program.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I feel the same way. That is the clarification I want. The report states that no new grants shall be made. Frequently the grant programs are laid out over a series of years. Commitments are made, although grants are not actually made at the time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Not for this program. This is a fairly new program. It has been pushed, but not over a series of years.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe the chairman will bear out my statement that grants are made over a series of years.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They may be made in the future.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There are not many, and the reason is that we wanted to have Congress examine into the program. Apparently, this is a new program, with certain overlapping features. Let us not have the RECORD unclear about that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That may be. I have discussed this question with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. I do not argue that there may not be overlapping; but I believe less overlapping will be found so far as this particular training is concerned than will be found in many other fields. What I want to be certain of—and I think this would clear the situation—is that this language will not be a restriction upon carrying out commitments already made.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the chairman would be safe in assuming, for the legislative history, that that is not the intention of the committee.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I agree with the statement just made by the chairman. I have discussed the situation privately with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. The question has arisen because, for the first time since the committee has had these people appear before it, within my recollection, the committee learned that they were conducting such a program. It costs between $7,000 and $7,500 a person. About $3,500 is provided to the student, about $3,000 to the college, with something additional for dependents. The total amount is about $7,500 a person, and there are about 700 or 800 students.

Mr. ANDERSON. Seven hundred and eighty-six.

Mr. ALLOTT. Seven hundred and eighty-six students. So we suddenly found that we were confronted with a project which, essentially, is a Federal aid-to-education measure.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not argue about the objective; I merely want assurances that the program will not be crippled.

Mr. ALLOTT. I agree wholeheartedly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The legislative committee is making a study of the program, so I am sure it will submit a proper recommendation.

Mr. ALLOTT. A good portion of yesterday afternoon was devoted to debating the budget for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. There has been a good deal of debate on it this afternoon. This is proper, good, and helpful. But this agency also says that every dollar in its budget is "tight"; yet we suddenly find that it is projecting $20 to $28 million, according to Mr. Webb's testimony, into a program that no one had ever heard of before. It was the committee's view—and I think it was unanimous—that the program ought to be slowed down. Then the Senator from New Mexico informed us that it was his intention to examine into the question fully.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I am concerned about this problem and the remedy for it. What would the Senator from Alabama propose instead of the specific language which is contained in the report?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not understand that that can be changed. I am seeking a clarification.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The statements made by the Senator from Washington, chairman of the subcommittee, and the Senator from Colorado, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, are sufficient. Those statements were clear.

Mr. STENNIS. It seems to me that they should clarify the situation.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. What is the definition of a "new grant"?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I said the language on that point was unclear and obscure.

Mr. CURTIS. Does that mean a new grant or another university?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not only is there that question; but suppose the commitment were made over a period of 3 years—and I know that some have been made for that period. The first grant would be made for the first year. The university would set up its facilities on a 3-year basis. It was thought that this language might be restrictive enough to cut off the second and third years; that that might be held to be a grant. The chairman has cleared up that point.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I suppose the word "program" would have been a better definition. But it is a grant for 3 years, the grant is made for 3 years.

Mr. SPARKMAN. When the grant is made, the payment can continue.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is talking about an individual payment?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We can clarify that.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield, if I have time remaining.

Mr. CLARK. I strongly support the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] in the colloquy in which they have just engaged. This educational program is of great importance to my State. The University of Pennsylvania, the University of Pittsburgh, Penn State University, and a large number of other institutions of higher learning in my Commonwealth are enabled to train scientists, engineers, and technicians who are badly needed for the NASA program. They are in short supply.

I make the additional point, in all humility and with all deference to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. HAYDEN] and the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. MAGNUSON], that, in my opinion, the Committee on Appropriations has exceeded its authority in directing that no new grants should be made without specific authorization and appropriation. This is a legislative program for the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. I would hope that the Committee on Appropriations would show some decent self-restraint in not usurping the authority of other committees by bringing a program of this sort to an end through what is really an indirect method, namely, by a statement in a report on an appropriation bill. Frankly, I am not in favor of it. Therefore, I commend the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Alabama. I hope that as a result of this discussion, the program in question may continue, to the extent approved by the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The program is under the general authority of the space agency. It is always authorized. We are considering now the expenditure of the money. The legislative committee merely examines the program, and may reaffirm the authorization or reaffirm some new programs. The space agency has been participating in this program for a short period of time under general authorization. This is not a question of authorization; the program is now in effect.

Mr. CLARK. I understand that what is before the Senate is the question of appropriation. My suggestion, I say in all due deference to dear friends, is that the statement in the report is not only unwise but, in my opinion, exceeds the authority of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I disagree with the Senator's statement, because if that were true, the Committee on Appropriations has been exceeding its authority for 100 or more years.

Mr. CLARK. I think it has been. I agree with the Senator on that point.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Washington is correct when he says that the Committee on Appropriations has considered these questions for more than a hundred years. He recognizes, as I do, that for many years legislative committees made the appropriations.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. It was only when legislative authority and appropriation authority were divided into legislative committees and the Appropriations Committee that this question arose. I was a member of the House Committee on Appropriations. In that position, I made a careful and exhaustive study of how these duties were divided.

While I might tend to agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania, nevertheless, the very fact that the Senator from Washington makes the kind of statement he has made and the Senator from Colorado makes the kind of statement he has made, should disarm those who are worried about the situation, because in my opinion the program is a good one. The original position taken by the Senator from Colorado was that he wanted to know more about it.

The Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences had had hearings scheduled for several weeks at the time this question came before the committee. We intend to start tomorrow morning and to pursue the matter further. I am sure that when we have finished, the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Colorado will be satisfied.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am satisfied with the record that has been made and with the statements that have been made by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The chairman of the committee sometimes finds himself in a difficult position. I voted against the language, but the committee voted to incorporate it in the report.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator from Colorado can say what he wishes to say in 2 minutes, I will yield him 2 minutes.

Mr. ALLOTT. I can say it in 1 minute.

The question of the Committee on Appropriations writing language such as this into the report was raised yesterday. This morning I therefore had my staff examine half a dozen appropriation reports of this year, including the Department of the Interior, the legislative appropriation, and the District of Columbia appropriation—and all of them contained not one, but dozens of such directives. I thought the Senator from Pennsylvania should be aware of that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sure that is true.

Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to make an appropriation contingent on the bill as passed by the House. The bill dealing with this matter was passed yesterday by the Senate; and the testimony has already been taken by the committee on this particular appropriation item, with the idea of its being a contingent appropriation.

So I hope the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield briefly to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I invite the attention of Senators to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for yesterday, on page 22399, at which point I raised with the Senator the question I have been discussing. I wish to make this statement in regard to the legislative history.

In speaking yesterday I asked:

> Am I correct in my interpretation that by this language the committee intends that the $50 million can be used to fund new starts contained in the budget estimates?

Mr. MAGNUSON. This is the intent of the committee in that connection.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control, because I understand that a point of order will be made. After it is made, the amendment can be discussed.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I raise the point of order that the amendment of the Senator from Alabama is legislation on an appropriation bill, and therefore is not in order.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). The Chair rules that the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama depends upon a contingency—namely, the enactment of another legislative bill. Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order, and brings to the attention of the Senate the fact that a similar ruling was made by the Chair on August 7 of this year, during the consideration of House bill 5888, the appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Alabama will state it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Do I correctly understand that because in the amendment reference is made to the House action on the bill, the amendment is out of order, but that if that reference were stricken out and if the reference in the amendment were only to the bill as passed by the Senate, the amendment would be in order?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Chair rules that under rule XVI, section 2, on page 17 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the effectiveness of the amendment would depend upon the happening of a contingency; and, therefore, the Chair rules that the amendment is out of order.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then, Mr. President, I modify my amendment by striking out any reference to any bill.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Chair asks the Senator from Alabama whether the amount in question was shown in the legislative bill?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It was.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Then the amendment as modified is in order.

The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. TOWER. Is it not true that the authorization has not been passed by the House of Representatives.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** An amendment is in order if it appropriates funds heretofore authorized by a bill passed by the Senate at this session.

Mr. TOWER. Then let me ask how the amendment, as modified, reads?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment, as modified, will be stated.

The **LEGISLATIVE CLERK.** On page 35, in line 4, it is proposed to strike out "$2,000,000", and to insert in lieu thereof "$12,000,000".

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Massachusetts will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand that the Housing Act of 1954 provides a total authorization, and that the additional amount of $10 million, as proposed by the amendment, would be above the authorization carried in the 1954 act, and that the new act has not yet been passed. Therefore, the amendment would be out of order.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Chair is of the opinion that the requirement of the rule pertains to a measure passed by the Senate, not as enacted into law. Therefore, the Chair is of the opinion that the amendment, as modified is in order.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the ruling of the Chair is that the modified amendment is in order although it is based upon the contingency that a bill passed by the Senate has not yet become law?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Chair's original ruling was that the amendment was out of order because it was contingent upon the passage of a measure by the House of Representatives.

The amendment, as modified, appropriates funds already authorized by the Senate at this session; and, therefore, the amendment, as modified, is in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the fact that the remaining time has been yielded back, the Senator from Alabama inform the Senate what appropriation he seeks this amendment for. I do not think Senators should vote for an appropriation without knowing what it is for, and I have no idea of that, from the debate which has been had thus far.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was about to yield to the Senator from Alabama some of the time which was available to me, so that he might explain his amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if the chairman of the committee will yield a few minutes to me, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. MAGNUSON. First, let me ask whether there are further parliamentary inquiries to be made. The Chair has ruled.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Chair has ruled that the amendment, as modified, is in order; and it is the understanding of the Chair that the remaining time has been yielded back.

Mr. ERVIN. I requested unanimous consent that notwithstanding the fact that the remaining time was yielded back, the Senator from Alabama be allowed to explain his amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then, Mr. President, before finally yielding back the remaining time under my control, I yield to the Senator from Alabama, from the time available to me on the bill, whatever time he needs to explain the amendment.

I say to the Senator from North Carolina that I am not familiar with the amendment, either; but I wished to wait until the parliamentary inquiries had been concluded and disposed of.

Therefore, I now yield to the Senator from Alabama, from the time available on the bill which is under my control, whatever time he requires.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I did not know there was opposition to the amendment. The chairman of the committee indicated to me that he was willing to accept the amendment; and his committee held hearings on the amendment, and the hearings are included in the printed volume which is on the desks of Senators.

The administration asked for $18 million additional, to be added to the authorized funds under section 702 of the National Housing Act. That item is for public works planning, for loans which are made to the smaller towns and cities.

Yesterday, we added an amendment. Heretofore, the loans have been repayable without interest; but yesterday we added an amendment requiring that from now on the loans bear interest. They are for the purpose of allowing the smaller cities and towns to plan for public works. The Senate passed the bill only yesterday, and there was floor debate on the bill, particularly in connection with the Senate amendment which requires that interest be paid.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But we held hearings on the general proposition, not on the exact amount.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is true that this is a very worthy activity of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Most of these loans are made to towns of less than 5,000 population, so I understand.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I can supply the exact figures for the RECORD. Usually the loans are made to towns which cannot pay very much for a staff or for consultants to be used to make plans. The grants have been made for this purpose; and when the bonds are sold, the grants are repaid.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; and now they will be repaid with interest.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. Formerly, they were repaid without interest; but now a requirement for the payment of interest has been added.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Since the 83d Congress, when section 702 was first written into the act of 1954, the authorization was a total of $58 million, and $56 million of that amount has been used up. The administration this year asked for $18 million additional. Our committee reported out a proposal for $10 million. That is what the Senate adopted yesterday, and to that I am asking to have the amendment added.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, what is the status of the provision, as amended, in the event the House fails to enact the resolution enacted by the Senate yesterday? Therefore, there would be no authorization for the proposed appropriation?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The ruling of the Chair is based in part on section 1 and also section 2 of rule XVI, on page 17 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, part of which the Chair will read:

> All general appropriations bills shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations,

and no amendments shall be received to any general appropriation bill the effect of which will be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add a new item of appropriation, unless it be made to carry out the provisions of some existing law, or treaty stipulation, or act, or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 39, line 23, it is proposed to strike the numeral and insert "$423,000,000.00."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may need. For the information of the Senate, I expect to be brief. I do not expect to take as much as half the time allotted under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. President, the amendment deals with the appropriation for educational purposes for the National Science Foundation. The 1963–64 estimate in the budget was $589 million. The House allowed $323,200,000, thus cutting more than $260 million from the President's request. The committee recommendation restored $50 million of that very large cut.

My amendment would restore another $50 million.

In my opinion, the executive witnesses, including Dr. Leland J. Haworth, Director of the National Science Foundation, made an extremely strong case for the entire amount which the administration requested. Senators will find Dr. Haworth's statement on page 737 and following pages in the hearings.

To quickly summarize what he said, he pointed out that the budget of $589 million requested was the consequence of intensive studies made of the situation which faces the Nation; that it reflects the considered judgment of the National Science Board and the staff of the National Science Foundation concerning national needs in science and the current and prospective ability to meet those needs; that about 80 percent of the funds appropriated to the Foundation go to approximately 650 colleges and universities which participate in one or more of our programs.

I doubt if there is a Senator in the Chamber who has an institution in his State which would be favorably affected, if the program of the President had been adopted, which has not been unfavorably affected by the large cut made by the House, and which would not have some of its wounds healed if an additional amount were restored by this amendment.

Dr. Haworth points out that there is a critical shortage in engineers, mathematicians, and physical scientists for the space program; that the needs are seriously outstripping the supply; that there is a need to double the number of first-year graduate students in these fields by 1970; and that the Federal Government must provide a major portion of the support for this expansion of scientific capabilities.

In summary, the National Science Foundation proposes expanded efforts in a number of programs that will:

First. Encourage and support national programs in basic science with emphasis upon high quality research in all fields.

Second. Encourage the achievement of higher standards of excellence by individuals and by institutions.

Third. Attract sufficient numbers of qualified students to science as a career.

Fourth. Stimulate growth of existing centers of scientific excellence and the development of new centers of such excellence wherever feasible.

Fifth. Encourage individual and cooperative programs to increase research emphasis on scientific areas of national interest.

The request of the National Science Foundation was buttressed by a pamphlet entitled "Meeting Manpower Needs in Science and Technology," which is a report of the President's Science Advisory Committee. It contains a foreword written by the President under date of December 13, 1962, in which he endorses the program of the National Science Advisory Committee for these scholarships and for this educational program.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to express my support of the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I should like to ask the Senator a question and to make a comment on this point: I notice that the Senator voted to cut the NASA appropriation $90 million. I did, also. My reason for doing so was that I felt we do not wish to slow the program down as sharply as would the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]; but I believe many of us felt perhaps a little too much has gone into it on that level.

Does not the Senator from Pennsylvania feel that this amendment has a corelationship to what we did in respect to the other vote, in the sense that here we are dealing with a strictly scientific inquiry in balancing out the extent, in terms of the country, of the scientific effort which has been put forward as between space and other disciplines?

Mr. CLARK. I do indeed; and if my amendment is adopted it will develop brains. The amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] scratched out the purchase of machines.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator realizes that by his vote and the vote of the Senator from New York, the easiest thing for NASA to cut out now is educational programs.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct, and I hope he will support the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. We have been trying to keep the provision in the bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have said about enough. I hope I am not telling any tales out of school. The Senator in charge of the bill supported such a restoration in committee, but unfortunately he was not able to secure its adoption. Therefore, I hope that the Senator at least will deal gently with the amendment and perhaps we can put back some part of this badly needed program.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, all I can do is to inform the Senate what happened in the committee. The Senator from Pennsylvania is not telling any tales out of school.

I sometimes yield to the better judgment of the committee on an item. With respect to this item, I probably have been a little more emotional than most members of the committee, inasmuch as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and I introduced the bill to establish the National Science Foundation. Other Senators helped up, but we and Dr. Vannevar Bush, and others many years ago helped to establish it. We have had more than a passing interest in it.

I believe that the House cut the amount too much. I believe the National Science Foundation asked for too much, and that the Bureau of the Budget gave them too much, although the program has been accelerated somewhat during the past year.

I made a motion in the committee to do what the Senator from Pennsylvania would like to do. Then there was a motion to provide the amount agreed to by the House. Then we agreed on the $50 million item. I had hoped we could get $100 million, because of the necessity of negotiating with the House. We shall probably have to split the difference with the House, anyway, before we are through.

I accepted the $50-million figure, because 5 months of the fiscal year will have passed before the money is made available. The amount the Senator requests could be used, it is true.

I could not accept the amendment, even though my personal feelings lean in that direction, because the committee was very strong about keeping the figure at $50 million. That was not because the committee was against the National Science Foundation or its work, but because it was felt, 5 months of the fiscal year being gone, that that would be the correct amount.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is that a fair statement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. Do I correctly understand that the time will come from the time of the opposition?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, what the Senator from Washington, the chairman of the committee, has stated is entirely correct. We were faced with two alternatives. One was a question of adding $100 million. The other was the question of the retention of the House figure of $323.2 million.

I point out for the RECORD and for Senators who are in the Chamber that several factors are involved. One is that Dr. Haworth has recently come into the National Science Foundation. I regard him as a very eminent man. I am sure he is entirely just. I am sure he is a man of great integrity.

But because of certain things which have been happening in the National Science Foundation—in particular, I refer to the controversy over the Mohole project—he has had "to get on top of" many things in a short time. I am personally confident that there will be considerable administrative changes in the organization of the National Science Foundation after he has had an opportunity to make them.

Last year the National Science Foundation had $322.5 million. The Bureau of the Budget, very unwisely, I believe—probably on the basis that it could not resist doing so, if it were to increase NASA so much—made the figure $589 million. That would have been an increase of 82.6 percent in 1 year.

I submit to Senators that no human being and no group of human beings could expand a particular function of government, even this function, that fast and do it logically.

I am aware of where the money goes. I have been subjected, as I presume all other Senators have been, to pressures from people all over the country, who have been told, falsely—not by Dr. Haworth but by other people associated with the National Science Foundation—that the appropriations were being cut. No such thing has occurred. Even the House provided $1 million more than was available for the past fiscal year. The figure is being cut from the budget recommendation.

If the bill is passed and sent to conference, it will probably become a law about the first of December. Therefore, the funds will not be released to the National Science Foundation until approximately the first of the year—at best, in the last days in December. Therefore, if the amount is raised by $50 million, it will be equivalent to a $100 million yearly appropriation, nearly.

That was one thing the committee considered. I am sure it is what impelled the chairman of the committee to agree, as he did—and as the committee unanimously agreed—to provide $50 million. By providing $50 million we are, in effect, raising the budget $100 million for the year, because there will be only a half year in which to spend the money. By increasing on the basis of $100 million a year we will be providing 25 percent more this year than we did last year. I believe anyone would agree that, no matter how laudable the purpose of any agency may be, if its budget is increased by that amount, it is not being mistreated and will have an adequate opportunity for expansion of functions.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As the Senator from Washington has said, he and I fought for the National Science Foundation many years ago. We had a hard job getting $7.5 million for them at that time. The figure will now be up to $373 million, if the committee recommendation is adopted.

I agree with what the Senator from Washington and what the Senator from Colorado have said. Both have aptly expressed what went on in the committee.

One item was quite convincing to me. There was a strong feeling in the committee that we should not increase the amount at all. I invite attention to one sentence on page 21 of the committee report, which reads:

> The amount restored is recommended for addition to the educational programs.

By putting that sentence in the report the committee was unanimously convinced that it should adopt the $50 million increase.

I say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania, that there was considerable feeling, as expressed by the Senator from Colorado, as to not increasing the amount at all. Because it was so late in the year, there was an agreement to accept half of the $100 million. We unanimously agreed on that and put in the report the reference to "educational programs."

I feel that I shall have to support the committee.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator has mentioned the fact that the committee supported the figure of $50 million. Those of us who support the figure consider the fact that there probably will be enacted into law the bill which has passed both Houses and which is now in conference, for aid to higher education, which contains a considerable amount of money for purposes which at least parallel the educational provisions of this proposal, though perhaps not leading to the higher level of doctorates. For that reason we feel that $50 million additional to bring the figure to $373 million, would be a satisfactory advance for the year.

We can proceed, within a few months, to consider the new budget estimate, which will apply to the fiscal year to begin only 7 or 8 months from now.

I have always voted for higher level of funding for most educational bills, but I believe it should be wise at this point not to overstretch our luck. We should stay with the committee figure of $373 million, considering the other appropriations of the college aid bill which undoubtedly will be authorized when the House and Senate complete action in the conference.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct. I appreciate his remarks.

The Senate should understand that the effect of the amendment would be, really, to increase the appropriations on the basis of $200 million a year, which would be excessive.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Am I correct in the assumption that the appropriation in the bill was reduced $90 million by a prior amendment?

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes.

Mr. ERVIN. Are we not getting pretty close to Christmas?

Mr. ALLOTT. I do not know. I have sort of lost track of the calendar.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Senator think we ought to give the American taxpayers, who also like to have institutions of learning in their States, this $90 million cut made in the appropriation?

Mr. ALLOTT. From the letters I have received in the last few days, I am sure they would appreciate it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I support the amendment. It is very desirable. It is an investment in brains. I do not think we can spend too much on higher education. This amount is below what the administration wants. In view of the fact that we spend so much on the space program, we ought to go along with this increase.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. In reply to the Senators from Colorado, Massachusetts, and Oklahoma, I point out that the amendment now under consideration would still leave the appropriation $166 million less than the President of the United States asked for.

It is true that, because a part of the fiscal year has gone by, an increase in the appropriation now means more than it would have if it had been passed, as the law requires it should be passed, before the first of July; but that is why the amendment calls for an increase of only $50 million instead of asking for the restoration of a larger sum.

No one can say precisely just how much this cut will cost in terms of scientific and technological lag. But whatever the cost, with our country's well-being and security at stake, it is more then we can afford.

I say to the Senator from Oklahoma that it does not answer the question to say we will get more money for higher education, which question is now pending, and may be brought before us. We need all this money for brains. This is not merely my statement. The President of the United States says so. Dr. Wiesner, the President's Scientific Advisor, says it. Even the Bureau of the Budget says so.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a newspaper article which was published in the Washington Post for Thursday, October 17, entitled "American Science Seen in Danger of Slowing Up," may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN SCIENCE SEEN IN DANGER OF SLOWING UP

(By Howard Simons)

American science is in danger of losing the kinds of motivation that have carried it to unsurpassed heights during the past two decades.

This was the gist of a 2½-hour discourse on the state of American scientific research by Presidential Science Adviser Jerome B. Wiesner before a subcommittee of the House Science and Astronautics Committee yesterday.

Wiesner told the Congressmen, in effect, that American science was at a plateau after a giddy ascent motivated by military needs and the rude shock of sputnik.

RELATIVELY STABLE

Now, he said, the development of weapons "which has stimulated much of our scientific progress of the last 10 years" has reached a point of relative stability. And, there are indications that the impetus sputnik provided to move American science and education forward is on the wane.

Wiesner set forth a number of themes during his appearance before the Congressmen. One of these was to suggest that although "the scientific military revolution has stabilized" there are other important demands that must be met by science and technology. But, he indicated his concern that it will be difficult to rally support for these nonmilitary and nonspace activities.

AS KIND OF INSURANCE

Another theme was that the Nation must continue to invest in basic scientific research as a kind of insurance policy against unknown threats and unforeseen opportunities.

Wiesner drew a sharp line between basic research or "the pursuit of new knowledge" and development or the actual application of knowledge such as building an airplane or rocket. In fiscal 1963 Wiesner said, the Federal Government spent $1.4 billion for basic research and $13 billion for development.

Wiesner said that all too often persons in and out of Government confuse these two activities, lump them together and call them research.

As a rule of thumb, he suggested that in the case of basic research the Government should support "all really creative people." As for development or the application of science, Wiesner said that Government would have to be "far more careful than it used to be" in how it spends these dollars.

SHOULD KNOW IN ADVANCE

"There was some justification in the past," he told the Congressmen, "to go ahead and develop more than we could use. But today costs are such that we should know what we want before we go after it."

At the same time, Wiesner warned against tinkering with the present level of national involvement in science and technology. He said that the present alltime high level "cannot be reduced in any major way without at the same time severely distorting many of the most important national objectives."

For this reason Wiesner deplored the recent action of the House Appropriations Committee, which halved the National Science Foundation's fiscal 1964 budget request. He suggested that such budget cuts could destroy the Nation's "broad fabric of scientific knowledge."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks an article from the New York Times of October 24, 1963, entitled "Science Aid Asks New Grant Policy. Wiesner Would Aid Regions in Building Up Centers."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCIENCE AID ASKS NEW GRANT POLICY—WIESNER WOULD AID REGIONS IN BUILDING UP CENTERS

WASHINGTON, October 23.—Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, the President's science adviser, advocated today a policy of using Federal research money to promote the scientific growth of technologically backward regions of the Nation.

In effect, he was urging that the Government introduce a potentially controversial criterion into the method following in awarding thousands of scientific grants, particularly to universities.

Until now, these Government grants have been awarded primarily on the basis of the scientific quality of the experimenter.

The difficulty of this method, Dr. Wiesner said, is that it is making "the rich get richer and the poor get poorer."

As he noted, there is a widely held view that this system discriminates against areas with modest scientific establishment with the larger universities using Federal funds to attract scientists and students away from the smaller institutions.

Dr. Wiesner suggested that one of the most perplexing problems now confronting scientific policy planners was how to reconcile the present basis of awarding research grants on the basis of quality with the need to build up centers of scientific excellence in new regions of the Nation.

To abandon the quality standard might lead to political favoritism and Federal support of unproductive research.

As Dr. Wiesner put it, it would be "disastrous to the scientific enterprise if standards other than quality were made the primary basis for the allocation of money for support of basic research."

He advocated, rather, that Federal money be given to potentially promising universities for building up new centers of excellence in graduate education and research, "particularly in geographical areas aspiring to acquire a technological base."

Much the same approach was suggested yesterday by Dr. Paul M. Gross, chairman of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, in an appearance before a House subcommittee.

It is an approach that the administration is having trouble persuading Congress to adopt. Funds for such institutional grants were included in the National Science Foundation budget this year but were stricken by the House.

Dr. Wiesner spoke at ceremonies marking the centennial of the National Academy of Sciences, the honor society of American science.

USE OF KNOWLEDGE

In the first 2 days of the celebration, speakers have reviewed the rapid expansion of knowledge in understanding the universe, matter and life. In today's final session the emphasis shifted to a discussion of how this new scientific knowledge can be translated to the general public and used for the public welfare.

Assembled for the philosophical discussion were some of the elder statesmen of American science, men who 20 years ago helped develop the atomic bomb and who now are the scientific policy planners.

The chairman of the session was Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky, of Harvard University. The speakers included Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, of the Institute for Advanced Study, Dr. James B. Fisk, of Bell Laboratories, and Dr. I. I. Rabi, of Columbia University.

Dr. Oppenheimer suggested that barriers between scientists and the nonscientists "could perhaps be markedly reduced if more of them knew a little of what we were up to, knew it with pleasure and some confidence."

In the same vein, Dr. Rabi said it should be a matter of greatest concern to the scientific community to communicate to the general public the deep meaning, the excitement, and satisfaction of scientific discovery.

"Unless the public shares in our aspirations and our satisfactions in the scientific enterprise," he said, "the pure scientific impulse will have to be diluted and even distorted" toward such immediate ends as military developments.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I concluded by saying that in 1960 only 3,000 doctoral degrees were awarded in engineering, mathematics, and the physical sciences in this country. The President's Science Advisory Committee has said that if we are to meet our national needs, we must have 2½ times that many by 1970.

The proposed amendments to the National Defense Education Act will go part of the way toward meeting this need. But unless the National Science Foundation receives adequate funds for the support of graduate education, the goal cannot possibly be met.

I now quote Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, President Kennedy's principal science adviser, who recently said, speaking of the reductions made by the other body in the National Science Foundation requested appropriation:

> These recent cuts in the President's budget are all the more alarming in that they will severely arrest the capability of the NSF to meet its statutory responsibilities in research as well as in education. Unless funding through NSF increases to support basic research, education, and the development of institutions, the broad fabric of scientific knowledge and manpower needed to maintain current development programs will deteriorate.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. CLARK. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation of the remarks made by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] on the need for greater emphasis in the field of graduate study for scientists and engineers.

I have for some time now made clear my interest in the critical scientific manpower situation which confronts this country. In my opinion, the technical excellence which we must have to maintain the necessary economic and military superiority in the face of the Communist challenge will not be maintained unless we bolster our educational efforts at every level. But particularly I am concerned with the opportunity that the Senate now has to emphasize the importance of expanding graduate study. For it is from this academic source that the bulk of our new ideas and theories in science will come. As Senator McIntyre has ably pointed out, the Soviet Union is presently turning out more than three times the number of Ph. D.'s in engineering than are being produced by this country.

It is also a matter which can easily be proven that the Government's need for scientists and engineers has severely strained the need for scientific manpower by other segments of our national economy. I further support this amendment because of what it would accomplish for our smaller universities and colleges which are hard pressed for finances in their efforts to move into the graduate field. The University of Nevada has made some efforts in graduate study, and I believe they are a typical example of a modest-size university attempting to make their contribution in the space age. Their efforts and the efforts of schools of comparable size should be encouraged because of the enormous stake the Nation has in their pusuit of excellence.

The additional 50 million for science education and graduate research facilities would help this Nation to meet its manpower needs, and I do not believe that economizing in this important task will assist us in reaching our goals.

I strongly believe that there is an urgent need for a better geographical distribution of support for our universities. It is apparent that the growth of colleges in this country and the development of increased capabilities is concentrated in altogether too few States, and our educational advancements seem to prove out that the rich get richer and the poor get poorer as far as competitive education is concerned. There is an urgent need for a wider participation by the States, and Nevada is one of those States which feels this need.

Mr. President, many opportunities have come to the Senate to improve the finances and growth of our educational system. We have missed most of these opportunities, and I wonder whether the Nation doubts our ability to keep pace in education. We have an opportunity in this amendment to provide an answer to that question.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time, if the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Colorado will do likewise.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, no Senator on this side seeks any time. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is absent due to illness.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] is absent because of death in family.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea" and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre] is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea" and the Senator from Arkansas would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] are necessarily absent.

Also, the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 57, as follows:

[No. 247 Leg.]

YEAS—20

Bayh
Cannon
Clark
Gruening
Hart
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGovern
McNamara
Metcalf
Pastore
Pell
Ribicoff
Scott
Symington
Yarborough

NAYS—57

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Case
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Gore
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Mansfield
Mechem
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Saltonstall
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—23

Beall
Byrd, Va.
Dodd
Engle
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hartke
Hayden
Hruska
Keating
Kennedy
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
Miller
Morton
Nelson
Neuberger
Russell
Simpson

So Mr. Clark's amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if he can advise the Senate, so far as he knows, how many more amendments will be offered and whether there are any yea-and-nay votes impending. Does he expect to have a yea-and-nay vote on passage of the bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] has another amendment.

Mr. CLARK. I shall call up my amendment, but I do not intend to ask for a yea-and-nay vote. I shall discuss it for no more than 5 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] has an amendment. I have not inquired whether he wishes a yea-and-nay vote on his amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I have been trying for some time to be recognized. I intend to offer a very important amendment, and on it I shall ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall ask for the yeas and nays on passage; therefore Senators can expect at least two more yea-and-nay votes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have one amendment to offer, but I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote on it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment. I hope the Senator from Washington will listen to the reading of the amendment. I hope it will be accepted, because it carries out the discussion we had with him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Chief Clerk. On page 38, between lines 2 and 3, it is proposed to insert the following new paragraph:

> No part of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act for "Research and Development" may be used for the construction of any major facility, the estimated cost of which including collateral equipment, exceeds $250,000, unless (1) a period of thirty days has passed after the receipt by the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of

> the Senate of notice of the nature, location, and estimated cost of such facility, or (2) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the construction of such facility.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, this proposal arose from a discussion in the Committee on Appropriations. The able Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] were much interested in the transfer of funds for the construction of facilities without any authorization. I thought it was desirable not to require that authorization and promised that I would offer an amendment which would seek to make it possible to require the approval of the committees before the authorization of transfers could be made. If we wish to hurry the process, we can do so. The committees can hold hearings and dispose of the question; otherwise, we would have to issue a directive, as before.

The present law merely provides that if the amount is above $250,000, the committee shall be informed about it. But no authority is given to anyone to do anything about it. This amendment would provide the committees with an opportunity to do something about it, if they desired.

I hope the chairman will accept the amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have discussed the amendment with the Senator from New Mexico. The language provides a general tightening of the procedure. So far as I am concerned, I will accept the amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. The amendment is a good one and should be adopted.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to know how the amendment fits in with a statutory provision in the authorization with respect to the Electronic Research Center, which the Senate has previously considered with respect to the NASA authorization bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. It would have no effect whatever. The committee must be notified about a transfer; and we would be given 30 days to say something about it if we wished to.

Under present law, if the amount involved is more than $250,000, the committee must be notified. If the committee did not like what had been done, neither the House nor the Senate committee could do anything about it. It seems to me to be desirable that if the agency does not like what has been done, it ought to be able to say to the committees that the agency does not approve the proposal, and to hold it for 30 days.

Mr. JAVITS. I call the Senator's attention specifically to a statutory provision in the authorization legislation about an Electronic Research Center:

> PUBLIC LAW 88–113, THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1964
>
> Section (h) No part of the funds authorized by this section may be expended for the establishment of an Electronic Research Center unless the Administrator has transmitted to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate and to the Committee on Science and Aeronautics of the House of Representatives a detailed study of the geographic location of, the need for, and the nature of, the proposed Center, and (1) each such committee has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the establishment of such Center, or (2) forty-five days have passed after the transmittal by the Administrator of such study to those committees.

Will this amendment change what is already in the authorizing legislation on that subject?

Mr. ANDERSON. It will not. The amendment has to do only with facilities which involve training, and activities of that kind.

Mr. JAVITS. It would not in any way affect the particular provision to which I have referred?

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

Mr. JAVITS. New York will try hard to show its entitlement in that regard, just as Boston will, and other places may. I do not want to let any language get into the bill which would change what has already been done.

Mr. ANDERSON. I guarantee the Senator that it will not.

Mr. MAGNUSON. On that particular subject, a committee was appointed.

Mr. JAVITS. That is correct; we are satisfied.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand the committee is about to make its report, or will do so at least within the next 10 days.

Mr. JAVITS. I merely wanted to be certain of my understanding.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. The committee to which the Senator from Washington has referred is to make a survey of possible locations for space research operations, is it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. That committee is not involved in this amendment in any way. That activity is under a separate operation entirely.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That was my understanding.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I call up my amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "$64,700,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$17,800,000".

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, on this amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. This is an important amendment. I shall try to be brief and to the point.

The other body approved an appropriation of $17,800,000 for research and shelter survey and marking for civil defense purposes—that is, to place the hideous yellow-and-black signs on Government buildings all over the country, thus defacing the buildings.

The Senate Committee on Appropriations has increased this amount to $64,700,000. Therefore, if my amendment shall be adopted, it will prevent $46,900,000 of the taxpayers' money from being absolutely wasted. In any event, no more should be appropriated for this purpose than the amount approved by the other body.

Over the past 12 years, more than $1,300 million of the taxpayers' money has been foolishly wasted on silly civil defense schemes. Today, 18 years after Hiroshima, the United States has no civil defense worthy of the name. Most of what exists consists of absurd plans on paper; the rest is confusion.

Simple arithmetic proves that any shelter program large enough to be meaningful—if such a thing is possible—would cost many billions of dollars. However, civil defense officials follow the bureaucratic rule of keeping first estimates low enough to induce Congress to authorize some colossal lunacy, knowing that they can always get more once a program is born. Many civil defense officials are in Ohio. They are former Democratic officials who are now feeding at the public trough. They are friends of mine. They have good jobs, they sit around doing nothing, waiting for the bomb to drop.

Those favoring a massive fallout shelter building program have estimated that it would cost anywhere from $20 to $200 billion. In their recent book entitled "Strategy for Survival," Thomas L. Morton, dean of the College of Engineers at the University of Arizona, and Donald C. Latham, an electronics researcher, concluded that a national community shelter program would cost in excess of $37 billion.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I associate myself with the stand taken by the Senator from Ohio. I shall support his amendment. The Civil Defense shelter program is a part of the propaganda drive of the military to frighten the American people, in order to justify further raids by the military on the Treasury of the United States.

If ever there was a boondoggle, this is it. The sad part is that it is also a program of deception. It is about time Congress brought it to a halt.

I am glad my State was the leader in the Nation in bringing to an end support for the so-called civil defense program. The movement started in Portland, Oreg. Other cities have followed suit. At long last, the American people are getting wise to this shocking boondoggle.

I shall support the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I am happy to have the great and distinguished senior Senator from Oregon associated with me in this effort. I shall be happy to have him considered as a cosponsor of the amendment.

Only recently the city of Portland, Oreg., voted to abolish its civil defense program, which was costing $110,000 of local funds annually. The Los Angeles City Council slashed $209,000 from its civil defense budget request, reducing the amount to $30,000. The staff was reduced from 26 to 3.

The officials of Baltimore, Md., are considering taking similar action. The city comptroller has called for the outright elimination of the city's civil defense organization. A few weeks ago, Mayor Theodore McKeldin, of Baltimore, stated that he would drastically reduce the budget request for civil defense purposes.

Herman Kahn, one of the foremost proponents of fallout shelters, has estimated that a reasonable program might involve a gradual buildup from about $1 billion annually to somewhere in the neighborhood of $5 billion annually. A recent estimate by Prof. John Ullman, chairman of the Department of Management of Hofstra College, would place the cost as high as $302 billion. Regardless of which of the expert opinions is cited, the price tag would be astronomical. Even then, there is no guarantee that a shelter program will be at all effective. With extensive advances being made in rocket and nuclear technology, it would probably be obsolete before completion. One of the scientists now working on advanced weapons technology is reported to have said: "You ain't seen nothing yet," compared with what is coming into sight in the way of new weapons.

There is the possibility of more deadly types of warfare for which shelters offer no protection whatever—chemical and biological warfare. Any Nation that would unleash a thermonuclear war would probably not hesitate to use other methods equally as terrifying.

Is the Congress prepared to embark on such a vast gamble and to spend perhaps $200 billion of taxpayers' money? Let us have no illusions. In reality this is what the civil defense planners are asking us to do.

Anyone who has taken the trouble to look into the matter is aware of the fact that most building owners have ignored or refused requests to provide shelters, and that ordinary citizens have lost interest. During each crisis the get-rich-quick shelter salesmen appear. As soon as the crisis abates and public interest fades completely, they crawl back under the rocks from whence they came.

Communities throughout the Nation are awakening to the fact that thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money has been spent on foolish programs with no tangible results except for the fact that in many instances livelihoods were provided for ex-politicians and city hall parasites.

Mr. President, there is no shelter building program in Great Britain, France, or in any of the major Western Powers. Reliable observers in the Soviet Union report that there is no fallout shelter program in Russia. Henry Shapiro, dean of the American correspondents in Moscow, wrote:

> No foreigner here has seen any civil defense shelters. The average citizen is unaware of the existence of shelters.

Still, it is proposed that this Nation construct such shelters and stock them with the products of the manufacturers of the country, and let them mold there.

Yet we learn from our observers in the Soviet Union that the people of that nation are being taught first aid procedures and that the civilians should undertake to learn street fighting and fighting from cellar to cellar and block to block. But none of this changes the attitude of the civil defense organization of this country.

Preston Grover of the Associated Press took a similar position when he stated:

> Attachés from embassies who have looked around the country for sign of shelters have found nothing. Foreigners live in many of the newest buildings put up in Moscow, and they have no bomb shelters.

In 1961, the New York Times published a report from Moscow by Harrison Salisbury which stated:

> About 12,000 miles of travel in the Soviet Union by this correspondent in the last 4 weeks failed to turn up evidence of a single Soviet bomb shelter.

Mr. Salisbury, agreeing with Mr. Grover of the Associated Press, said:

> Diplomats, foreign military attachés, and correspondents who have traveled widely in the Soviet Union report that there is no visible evidence of a widespread shelter program.

Mr. President, it is interesting to note that through the uncertain years while this Nation and the Soviet Union were building up our nuclear capacities, no real interest could be stirred up among the general public or in the Congress for any form of civil defense. During that time it is true that over $1 billion was appropriated in piecemeal fashion but not for any really serious or effective plan of action. Actually, we were soothing our consciences "just in case" a nuclear war would come. Year after year we appropriated $75 million or $100 million or $80 million for civil defense purposes, always "just in case." Neither the Eisenhower administration nor the Kennedy administration nor the Congress over the past 12 years has really faced up to this issue. It was always easier to pretend that something was being done. It assuaged the fear of a possible future guilty conscience.

Now we are again being asked to appropriate—in this case, an additional $47 million—"just in case."

It is only human to grasp at straws when faced by an overwhelmingly difficult situation, and in appropriating these funds which gradually began to total a staggering sum. This is what was done. No one in his heart really believed that the civil defense fishnet would be of any protection in a surging sea of nuclear destruction.

Mr. President, when we enter the Senate Office Building, we see a hideous sign, defacing the building—as if in a moment of terror, in the event of a nuclear attack that might burst upon us, any real man would rush into such a shelter, and leave his wife and other loved ones in a suburb in Maryland or Virginia. Even if some coward survived after lurking in a cellar somewhere, waiting for the conquering paratroopers to come, the wrong kind of people would survive to rebuild the world after that devastating attack. But of course, no such thing would occur.

Mr. President, you will recall that in the midst of the Berlin crisis in the summer of 1961, Congress hurriedly appropriated $200 million of hard-earned taxpayers' money for fallout shelters. No American family was made any safer or more secure as a result of that expenditure. It in no way deterred the aggressive acts of the Soviet and Red Chinese dictators. The Cuban crisis over a year ago itself is ample evidence of this fact. In fact, building fallout shelters and stocking them with food and water is only an exercise in defeatist psychology.

General LeMay and others have said that our protection lies in spending money for defensive weapons, rather than in preparing to hide in a hole, waiting for paratroopers to descend.

The Cuban crisis proved that our best—and probably the only—civil defense in this nuclear age is a firm, determined, resolute stand against aggression, such as was taken by President Kennedy in October 1962, plus the nuclear power—which we have—to support it. We would be far wiser to appropriate additional funds for our missile programs, our jet aircraft, and our missile-bearing Polaris submarines than for civil defense schemes that are hopeless at their inception.

Nevertheless, the civil defense planners continue to mesmerize the American public with the illusion that we have an effective defense program. Although the Congress appropriated $208 million in 1961 and an additional $38 million in 1962 for marking and provisioning fallout shelters, when the crisis came most of them could not be found, were not marked, or were unusable. Only a handful were provisioned. Rations and medical kits on which millions of dollars had been spent were still stocked in Federal warehouses and arsenals. Warning systems were inadequate and virtually useless. This is probably not too important, for in event of attack with nuclear warheads there would be, at most, perhaps 10 minutes' warning before the intercontinental ballistic missiles fell on American cities.

We heard about the warning system which was abandoned. An evacuation program was adopted for Cleveland; and under that program, in the event of a nuclear attack, Cleveland residents were supposed to travel by the main highway to Lorain, Ohio. However, at the same time the people of Lorain, Ohio, would, in many cases, be traveling by the same highway the 25 miles to Cleveland. So, in such a moment of terror, the citizens of the two cities would be driving in opposite directions, preventing each other from arriving at the places where they were told to go. What nonsense, Mr. President. Yet $1,300 million was spent on that program.

Mr. President, wherever one turns nowadays, one sees the ugly black-and-yellow civil defense shelter signs. Does any Member of this body believe these signs on public buildings and apartment houses will save any American lives in the terrible event of a nuclear war? Nevertheless, we are being asked to appropriate $50 million additional for more such signs and for more so-called civil defense biscuits to mold and rot in the basements of public buildings throughout the Nation.

Mr. President, this is an important amendment. It is meritorious, and it should be adopted by a yea-and-nay vote of the Senate. The amendment would not remove from the payroll any of the Democratic political hacks in Ohio who are feeding at the public trough—although now are in the process of being succeeded by some Republican, has-been politicians—because Ohio now has a Republican Governor. This amendment would not cause any of those people who are feeding at the public trough—but are doing nothing except sit around, waiting for a bomb to drop—to do anything different; under the amendment, they could continue to sit around and gossip and draw their salaries; but the amendment would do away with the purchase of more of the so-called civil defense biscuits, and would prevent the erection of any more so-called shelters in public buildings throughout the Nation.

Incidentally, I note that in the budget for fiscal year 1964, the average salary for paid civil defense employees will be $9,520 a year, one of the highest in the entire Federal bureaucracy. This is startling information, Mr. President. By comparison, employees of the famous Federal Bureau of Investigation, whom we respect because they are rendering important and needed service would receive average compensation of $8,383, as against an average of $9,520 for the civil defense, has-been politicians who are feeding at the public trough. There is an opportunity to end all that. My amendment would afford the Senate an opportunity to start to put an end to that procedure.

I call to the attention of the Senate the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Today we have heard a great deal about the work they are doing. I am proud to be a member of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. The average salary of the employees of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is $9,122, as compared with $9,520, which is the average salary paid to civil defense employees, many of whom are ex-politicians.

All Senators know that the Small Business Administration is a good organization which renders service to the people of our country. The average pay of the employees of the Small Business Administration is $7,509. I ask Senators to compare that salary with the $9,520 paid to employees of the Civil Defense Agency.

I cite those figures because I believe it is high time that we call a halt to the extravagance we are witnessing. It is not merely waste, but a throwing away of the taxpayers' money.

I started speaking out against this boondoggle back in 1959, when I was a new Member of the Senate. At the start my efforts constituted a lone fight. I am trying to make a sensible argument that my amendment is worthy of serious consideration and should be adopted. I do not suppose it will be, but it should be.

The average salary of the employees of practically every Government agency and bureau into which I have looked is considerably less than that of the employees of the Civil Defense Agency. It is difficult to find another agency in the Federal Government in which so many have done so little to earn so much or to receive so much, because they did not earn it.

Mr. President, before we appropriate additional millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to continue this boundless boondoggle, I urge that we take a good hard look at what these expenditures will accomplish. I also urge that the administration review its entire civil defense policy.

It gives me no pleasure whatever to oppose an administration program. We hear talk about spending millions of dollars for insurance. We all believe in insurance protection, but when the prospect of any necessity for that risk is so fantastically unlikely and out of the question, then it is merely a waste of money. Let us put an end to wasting more of the taxpayers' money on ridiculous holes in the ground, and on ugly yellow-and-black signs on beautiful public buildings, on apartment buildings, and on business buildings in the cities of our Nation, and in patronizing huge companies to help them get rid of their so-called survival biscuits.

I have seriously offered my amendment. It would reduce the amount of the committee's recommendation for shelter survey, and for marking from $64,700,000 to $17,800,000, which is the amount approved by the House of Representatives. I seriously offer the amendment. I hope that Senators will grasp this opportunity to start to put an end to this utter folly of throwing away money on the program. Our allies, Canada, France, and England, will have none of it. Our enemy, the Soviet Union, does not have a shelter program within its borders. The Soviet Union has a program, but Senators know what the program is. It might be called first aid when one is injured. It is designed to teach civilians in the Soviet Union to fight from house to house and from cellar to cellar, to defend themselves and not to crawl into a cellar in a building, leaving their wives and children out in the suburbs somewhere, and grovel down in the cellar waiting for the nuclear bomb to explode.

Mr. President, I shall not take any more time. I have presented a meritorious amendment, which I hope very much will be adopted by a vote of the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senate will vote in a moment.

I commend the Senator from Ohio for his conscientious survey of the program at all times. The Senator from Ohio was largely responsible for the Senate committee not approving a vast shelter program which was proposed 2 years ago. Because of many of the things that I and others pointed out, the program was shifted from the old civil defense organization to the Defense Department. Then we told the Army Engineers to survey the United States and find out where possible shelter sites might exist throughout the country. The Army did so. They have almost completed the program. I believe they have only a little updating to do. The Army has found that existing structures could accommodate 70 million spaces.

The Senator from Ohio might observe that the term is "spaces."

Nevertheless, we did take that action. Those spaces are in fire departments, schoolhouses, large downtown buildings and large communities, urban centers, and in small towns, too.

As the Senator will recall, last year we approved the expenditure of money to begin to stock those spaces. The items included some biscuits, but I call attention to the fact that they also have provided mobile hospitals and caretakers, who have, incidentally, served without salary, and the communities have all those facilities if something should happen.

The amount provided in this bill would finish the equipment of the spaces and shelters that have been surveyed by the Army Engineers and would adequately stock them.

We went into the question of how the shelters would be stocked and all related questions. That also involved a great deal of volunteer work. The people in the cities of my home State, in the city of Birmingham, in cities in South Carolina and other States, joined with those making the survey and furnished that help, too, to provide facilities in case something should happen. Preparations would include the bringing in of mobile hospitals.

The money provided in the bill would merely finish the stocking process. The amount needed a year from now, unless we go into some other shelter program, would be very little.

The Bureau of the Budget in the present case requested $264 million. We have recommended $64 million to finish the job, which is $200 million under the budget figure.

The only other civil defense program in which we have engaged is in relation to new Federal buildings. I am amazed that Senators have not asked me about them, because they are all listed. We have allowed a small amount, in addition to the original construction plans, to permit some flexibility so that General Services might provide foundations in new Federal buildings that would serve as suitable shelters and would be a part of the shelter program.

The Senator from Ohio has not talked in vain about this over the years, because otherwise we might have embarked upon a big shelter program which would have involved billions of dollars. We have not done so.

We will finish this program. The committee added a little in the bill for mobile hospitals. The goal is 2,160. There are now about 1,700. These are quite valuable for any disasters or emergencies in local areas.

I hope the Senate will approve of the completion of the program which, in my opinion, is somewhat modest compared with the original plans for civil defense.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, first I congratulate the Senator from Ohio for his persistent, sound campaign to eliminate the worst boondoggle in the history of the United States, the so-called civil shelter program, which will not shelter anybody.

I also congratulate the Senator in charge of the appropriation bill, the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. Magnuson], for his very temperate and unenthusiastic presentation in behalf of the proposal. No one could have presented a more tepid support for it, and I thank him for that.

I believe it would be fantastic for us to add $46 million to the $17 million which the House approved. It would be sheer waste. Not only would it be sheer waste, but also would be fraud and deception on the American people.

If a nuclear bomb were to be dropped, the entire program would be of no value. All it does is delude some people into believing that somehow they will be protected. That is absolute nonsense, and we all know it.

I hope we shall have the "guts" and commonsense to cut this appropriation and to vote for the Young amendment.

This is a way for Senators who are in favor of economy to show they mean what they say. We all talk in favor of economy. I do not know a single proposal with respect to which we could more clearly demonstrate our desire for economy and to save the taxpayers' money. We should vote for the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] and save $46 million which otherwise will be squandered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, does the Senator from Washington yield back his remaining time?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is absent due to illness.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] is absent because of death in family.

I further announce that, if present and voting the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] are necessarily absent.

Also the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson], is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 48, as follows:

[No. 248 Leg.]

YEAS—28

Bennett
Boggs
Carlson
Church
Clark
Curtis
Douglas
Edmondson
Ervin
Gore
Gruening
Hickenlooper
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
McGovern
Mechem
Morse
Mundt
Pearson
Randolph
Robertson
Smathers
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Walters
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—48

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Cotton
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Fong
Hart
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Kuchel
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Moss
Muskie
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—24

Beall
Byrd, Va.
Cooper
Dodd
Engle
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hartke
Hayden
Hruska
Keating
Kennedy
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
Miller
Morton
Nelson
Neuberger
Russell
Simpson

So the amendment of Mr. Young of Ohio was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALLOTT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 322, and ask that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with. I am not asking for a yea-and-nay vote. I shall not take the allotted time on the amendment.

First, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that it be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment offered by Mr. Proxmire is as follows:

> On page 11, line 25, change "$535,000,000" to "$515,775,000" and add the following: "That total costs of aviation medicine, including equipment for the Federal Aviation Agency, whether provided in the foregoing appropriation or elsewhere in this Act, shall not exceed $5,100,000 or include in excess of fifteen positions: *Provided further,*".
>
> On page 13, line 19, change "$45,000,000" to "$35,000,000".
>
> On page 14, line 3, change "$3,663,000" to "$3,500,000".
>
> On page 14, line 12, change "$4,045,000" to "$3,810,000".

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the amendment would cut back the appropriation for the Federal Aviation Agency to the House level. It would save a little more than $30 million.

Federal subsidies and services for the aviation industry have grown about as rapidly in the last 7 or 8 years as any subsidy the Federal Government has. In 1957 the Federal subsidies to aviation amounted to about $220 million. In 7 years they have soared so that this year budget requests for 1964 are $885 million.

When the House made this cutback, it stated, and I am reading from the House report:

> The committee recommends $515,775,000 to operate the national system of air traffic control and other facilities and programs of the FAA, which is an increase of $26,845,000 over 1963 and $29,725,000 less than the budget estimate. The Administrator has done an excellent job, and his job is a most difficult one. The committee thinks this amount will enable him to continue to do an excellent job. There is no desire to restrict essential activities or endanger

> safety, but this Agency consistently has received substantial increases in recent years and it is now time to level off. About 9,700 jobs have been added to FAA in the last 3 years, and the number has almost doubled in the last 5 years.
>
> One of the Agency's greatest budgetary problems has been annualization of new positions. The committee has frowned on this practice and urged agencies not to indulge in it, but FAA proposed to annualize 2,700 jobs in its 1964 program. Only part of such costs are allowed and if budget increases are again sought for such purpose the committee does not intend to approve them. Pay increases account for approximately $18 million of the increase the committee is recommending over 1963, and 342 positions funded last year by the Department of Defense for the Aircraft Movement Information Service are being transferred to FAA in 1964 at a cost of $3,518,000.
>
> The committee suggests that the Administrator give further study to the locations of flight service stations. It appears that there are too many and that they are too expensive, but it realizes he has problems in trying to close some of them, although substantial savings would result.
>
> The committee also notes that there are still too many employees in the District of Columbia that should be in the field, and upholds the Administrator's hand in making transfers to the field. It also urges that the total number of employees be reduced whenever and wherever possible. Experience and training should improve the efficiency of the organization and training and efficiency increase should permit a reduction in personnel.
>
> The bill includes the same limitation on total expenses for aviation medicine as in 1963. The FAA in the past year violated the terms of the limitation in that it had 381 jobs and the limitation was 315, and it spent $6,074,500 and the limitation was $5,100,000. The limitation is on total costs and total is to include everything. The committee is of the opinion the Agency clearly misunderstood the limitation and did not intend to violate it.

I have discussed this particular provision with the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. Because of his protest of what this would do, I modify my amendment to provide, on line 6, in lieu of "15" the figure "381", which is the number of positions FAA has. Thus there would be no cutback in personnel, but there would be no increase.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator may modify his amendment.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. The FAA has nearly doubled its total personnel during the last 5 years. However, they have requested an additional 1,030 personnel for fiscal year 1964. In my opinion, a restriction on additional personnel would enforce economies in the use of this personnel within the Agency. Without such a restriction, I do not believe that this rapidly growing agency will ever be contained.

The FAA is now reaching a position where it has a ratio of personnel of one employee for each two active civil aircraft. This would mean that if the owner of each of these aircraft were footing the bill for FAA's services, the average tax per aircraft would be $6,350. Does the flying industry really need this much service from this agency?

One specific example is enough to indicate the rapid and inefficient growth of the personnel. In 1948 the Air Traffic Control Center in Chicago had 29 people. In 1963 it has between 450 and 500 people. Obviously, traffic requirements have increased during this period. On the other hand, we have heard a lot about increases in mechanical devices such as radar which should ease the pressures on personnel. Clearly traffic has not increased by 200 percent or more in this period of time.

The FAA has argued that innumerable facilities would have to be shut down if funds were not available for additional manpower. However, the Agency had an authorization for 554 more positions than it filled in fiscal 1963. This is not surprising if an examination is made of the number of facilities operated by FAA. The number of air traffic centers is virtually the same as in 1952. It has not increased. The number of towers has grown only by 50. The number of combined station towers has increased only by 33 and the number of flight service stations has decreased by 80. These are changes which have occurred since 1952.

The FAA has purchased a substantial amount of new equipment. The justification given at the time that funds were requested for these purchases was that they would reduce the number of personnel necessary. Yet personnel has consistently risen.

In a recent speech the FAA Administrator, Najeeb Halaby, has indicated that additional personnel are not needed, even though they have been requested in the budget. In addressing the Air Traffic Control Association in Dallas in October of this year, Mr. Halaby stated:

> The days of billowing expansion are over. In most places we have arrived at the point where adding more men will not improve the quality or capacity of our system.

The FAA plans to employ some 57,000 people. It is important to recognize that if this number were reduced it would not require any cutback on current services. The Agency's strength at the present time is only approaching 47,000 people. It is fantastic to assume that such substantial increases in the near future are necessary after all of the growth which has occurred in this Agency during recent years.

However, the case against other parts of the FAA budget is even more damaging. One of the worst areas of wasteful expenditures is in research and development. During the first 5 years of the FAA, Congress has appropriated approximately $250 million for research and development. However, there have been no real results to date from this tremendous expenditure of funds. The House recognized this inadequacy in its report and cut back the research and development funds from $50 to $35 million. I think even further cuts would probably be appropriate until such time as the FAA can indicate that a well-organized and potentially fruitful research program is underway.

Where are the alleged results from this tremendous expenditure of funds over the last 5 years?

The Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association has recommended a 36-percent reduction in the FAA budget. Mr. Halaby has contended that this would "roll back the level of service the FAA provides to the early 1950's."

Let us look at the figures. The FAA asked for $210,359,000 for traffic management and $222,962,000 for facilities maintenance. AOPA has recommended that these figures be $170 and $180 million respectively. The amounts recommended by AOPA would provide more money than was authorized in 1962 and more money than was actually used in fiscal year 1963.

The figures on increases in air traffic simply do not support the increases in expenditures being requested by FAA. For example, between fiscal years 1962 and 1963 aircraft operations rose only 6 percent. Instrument operations at towers rose 2 percent. The number of IFR aircraft handled at air traffic centers showed no change. The number of instrument departures increased only 1 percent. The number of instrument flights over radio stations dropped by 1 percent and the number of instrument approaches dropped by 4 percent. At flight service stations there was a 7-percent increase in contacts, and a 4-percent gain in the use of flight plans. Yet the FAA has requested a 10-percent increase for air traffic service operations and maintenance.

One of the areas in which tremendous amounts have been spent is in all-weather landings. However, we are no closer to a solution in this area than we were 5 years ago, with the exception of some innovations which we have obtained from work done in England.

Two of the areas in which extensive research has been conducted have now been abandoned. We heard a great deal for several years about data processing techniques for all flights throughout the country. This research project has now been abandoned. An additional substantial amount of funds was spent for so-called three-dimensional radar. The FAA Administrator has now indicated that this project too has been abandoned. So where are the results of our $250 million expenditures in the past? Any reasonable research program should be able to point to some results with this expenditure of funds over a period as long as 5 years.

The waste in the research and development area is actually twofold. According to the Airways Modernization Act of 1956 and the precedential derivatives which accompanied that act, most flight research previously conducted by the military was taken over by the FAA. The FAA has not yielded any results in these fields. We should be sure, therefore, that our Military Establishment is continuing with its own flight research independently of the FAA. It may well be more reasonable for the FAA to have no research funds and simply to acquire its technological gains from the military. I am not providing for that in my amendment. I am providing for a cut.

Another general area of criticism of the FAA can be made with respect to weather research. A continuing effort has been made by the FAA to take over weather research from the Weather Bureau. Clearly the FAA has no particular competence in this field except as it draws upon the Weather Bureau. I see absolutely no reason why there should be duplication of weather research by both the FAA and the Weather Bureau. This area of expenditure should be eliminated entirely.

The present duplication in the provision of weather information between both the FAA and the Weather Bureau may well have been a contributing factor in some recent air crashes. For example, in the Eastern Airlines crash at National Airport almost exactly a year ago on November 30, 1963, the CAB in its analysis of that crash stated the following:

> The Board determined the probable cause of this accident was the technique employed by the crew during abandonment of the approach under fog conditions not adequately reported.

The first recommendation of the CAB in this case was that "the air traffic control procedures require the transmission of all operationally significant weather information in terminal areas to approaching aircraft." In this case weather information was provided only by the FAA to the approaching aircraft even though better information was available from the Weather Bureau located on the field.

Another field of research which has been promoted by the FAA is medical research. Here the FAA has not only impinged upon research that should more appropriately be conducted by others, but it has also violated injunctions explicitly given to it by the Appropriations Committee. In fiscal year 1963 a ceiling was placed on FAA medical research of $5,100,000 and 315 positions. FAA exceeded the appropriation by nearly a million dollars and exceeded the personnel ceiling by 66 positions.

In the first place the FAA has done a considerable amount of basic research in the medical field that should have and, in fact, is being done by others more effectively. A good example of this is their research in the field of the aging process. A substantial amount of research in many of these fields is being done at NIH and I see no reason why funds should be duplicated for research by agencies such as FAA which are less competent.

In the second place the argument may be used that there is appropriate medical research to be done in the field of human flight. However, very extensive research in this field has already been done both by the Air Force and the Navy. It seems incredible to me that apparently the FAA has not even attempted to compare any of its results to date with those obtained over a long period of time by the Air Force and the Navy. Again, this is simply not an appropriate area of examination for the FAA to be spending funds on.

There are only two other sections of the bill, which my amendment covers, and I can speak of them very briefly. One would cut the appropriation for the Washington National Airport by less than $200,000, down to the House figure. The other provision refers to Dulles Airport, and that appropriation would be cut by little more than $200,000, back to the House figure. The justification for the cuts are contained in the House report as follows:

> Washington National Airport: The budget estimates proposed consolidated funding of the two airports in the Greater Washington area. The committee continues to recommend separate funding and has included in the bill $3,500,000 for operation and maintenance expenses of Washington National Airport. This is $163,000 less than the budget estimate and provides for continuing the present employment level. The bill also provides $2,075,000 for construction at the airport, including $1,938,000 to light the centerline and strengthen the main runway, and $137,000 for parking lot lighting and expansion.
>
> Dulles International Airport: The bill includes $3,810,000 for operation and maintenance of this airport. This is a reduction of $527,000 in the budget estimate. It allows for 396 positions, which is 44 more than 1963 and one-half the increase requested. The workload does not appear to warrant more than the number the committee has approved.
>
> The committee has reduced the request for facilities improvement from $2,241,000 to $450,000. The bill includes $398,000 to expand auto parking facilities and $54,000 to make minor modifications to a utility building, but does not include the $1,728,000 requested for seven additional mobile lounges. The price for these additional vehicles is too high. A sizable part of the price of those the FAA has purchased included costs of initial development and testing. Now the cost ought to be reduced. Instead, the contractor wants to increase the price. If the cost cannot be reduced by a substantial amount, namely one-third to one-fourth, then the committee urges the Administrator to give consideration to changing contractors or buying a less expensive vehicle for future needs.

I hope that on a voice vote there will be substantial support for the amendment. I will not ask for a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if I had more time this evening I would like to correct the Record on research by FAA. I thoroughly disagree with the Senator's conclusion with respect to that point. However, I wish to yield such time as he may require to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], who is probably the most knowledgeable man in this field, either in the Commerce Committee or on the Subcommittee on Appropriations which handled the bill.

The Senator from Wisconsin has one point in his speech, but I do not know whether it is valid enough for the Senate to support it. However, I repeat that the pending bill as reported to the Senate is $1,263 million under the budget. Even better than that, there is no agency in the entire bill with respect to which we have allowed an increase in employment. Parkinson ought to write a chapter about that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will tell him about it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. FAA is the one exception. We have specifically given it an amount of money which we believe is needed to increase the number of employees needed to man the towers which are now being constructed. That is for safety reasons.

That is the only exception. I believe it is the first time in the Senate that a bill has been reported to the Senate which has not allowed an increase in employment, with only one exception, to which the Senator has referred. This deals with the safety of aviation.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin would cut at the vital part of our air safety program in his effort to reduce the amount provided in the bill by some $33 million.

In the first place, the operations expenses for men and maintenance are a vital part of our entire air traffic control system. As much as I respect and honor the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Associations, they are talking about single-motor private planes generally.

A few are twin-motored business planes. Statistics will show that the scheduled airlines of America today carry more people than all the intercity railroads and buses combined carry. The gigantic, 150-passenger jets, flying at almost the speed of sound, and other fast aircraft that fill the air arrive at the major airports, in a ½-minute to 1-minute landing sequence. So there is a real need for the air traffic control system.

Much of the single-motored aircraft traffic can be taken care of, and is taken care of, at the small, lightly used airports, where air traffic controllers are not so necessary; and where the traffic control pattern is not operated by radar or on a 24-hour basis.

In order to try to compress the expansion of this amount for operations and man and make usable the $77 million worth of new equipment that is ready to go into the system, the Committee on Appropriations sweated and strained to try to allocate funds to make this system operational.

Many of the things that have been urged by Congress upon the FAA to be included in the system, to make it more reliable and safer, at a cost of $77 million are now ready for operation. It will be necessary to operate this new equipment generally around the clock, on a three-shirt basis. The manning of this equipment will require 945 more men. The equipment includes 8 long-range radars, 13 radar bright-display equipments, 19 remote air-ground peripheral communications circuits, 2 air traffic control towers, 5 separation of combined station-tower facilities, and much other expensive equipment requiring operation, operators, and maintenance.

The committee has tried to make it possible to operate this equipment. In order to do so, and at the suggestion of the FAA, we cut by $10 million the funds for the establishment of new facilities and other things that are desired. But the equipment that we are now buying, we want to make operational. So $10 million of the $20 million cut Senator Proxmire is trying to make is a transfer from one account, "new facilities," to "operations."

On behalf of those other items, it is necessary for FAA to absorb 342 people that have been paid by the Air Force and who operate the Aircraft Movement Information Service. Formerly under the Air Force, they have been transferred to FAA.

We are trying to establish one system of air traffic control. We have absorbed

352 military persons, and it is necessary to pay for them. So this brings us out to about $10 million added cost. Further, $9 million is included for a pay raise increase already voted. Then two items alone account for $19 million.

Other items require staffing, maintenance, and servicing of the facilities.

I feel that in order properly to operate the system, which involves more than a billion dollars' worth of equipment, it had better be well staffed and well manned. That is why we will need the $20 million added to the bill, an amount which the Senator from Wisconsin would eliminate.

The item for research facilities deals not only with airframes; it deals also with the entire air traffic control system—such things as radar. Three-dimentional radar did not work—radar bright-display equipment, new coding-in on sequence reporting by transponders, gives three-dimension information in another way, but needs some more men to operate.

So it is necessary to go forward with research. Raising the amount from $35 million to a $45 million level leaves us a smaller amount than was spent last year. A total of $60 million was spent last year on research, in an effort to bring about a more modern and better air traffic control system.

When the Senator from Wisconsin talks about a 57,000-man ceiling, he is misinformed. The new ceiling is 47,000 men. This is what the FAA is holding the system to, regardless of new hiring developments.

As to the demands of air traffic control and related research, the research has included $35 million or $45 million a year on radar, on the effectiveness of motors on airframes and in dozens of mechanical items.

But the human being is the most important factor. On the man up front depend all of the lives in the aircraft. They depend on his prime health, his reaction speed, his emotional stability, his nerves, his freedom from stomach disorders, and so forth. The research even includes the effect of tranquilizing drugs and various other types of medicine, including cold serums. These things must be done to insure the functioning of airmen. They are not duplicated by any other research.

The committee held hearings over many years to ascertain from the military, the Navy, and the Air Force what their research disclosed that would be useful to civil aviation. This was long before the FAA established a medical research center. Most of the problems studied by these organizations had little bearing on airline flying.

Now we are confronted with an amendment which seeks to eliminate a small expansion of this research by 27 persons. The FAA did not violate the House directive, because they stayed within the 315-job limit in the medical records and research programs.

I see a need to have adequate medical service and research. The bill provides a minimum of 100 men now engaged and will increase it 127, including caretakers, janitors, and others who perform custodial laboratory services.

It would be a very serious blow to the safety and security of our greatest air transportation system, one that operates worldwide and carries more traffic than any other public transportation, except automobiles to so seriously reduce so many items as asked by this amendment.

Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Minnesota wished to ask a few questions of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. I do not observe the Senator from Minnesota in the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on the passage of the bill, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to take a moment of the time of the Senate to ask a question of the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] about an item on page 45 of the independent offices appropriations bill, in lines 16 through 19. It relates to the Veterans' Administration hospital at Bay Pines, Fla.

Does the Senator from Florida believe that language in any way conflicts with section 5001(c) and section 5002 of title 38, United States Code?

Section 5001(c) relates to hospital and domiciliary facilities, and reads as follows:

> (c) The location of each hospital or domiciliary and its nature (whether for domiciliary care or the treatment of tuberculosis, neuropsychiatric cases, or general medical and surgical cases) shall be within the discretion of the Administrator, subject to the approval of the President.

Section 5002 relates to construction and repair of buildings and it reads as follows:

> The construction of new hospitals, domiciliaries and outpatient dispensary facilities, or the replacement, extension, alteration, remodeling, or repair of all such facilities shall be done in such manner as the President may determine.

I ask this question only because I do not wish to see the Independent Offices bill establish a precedent that would violate these two subchapters and the section to which I have referred.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the question and I appreciate the Senator's concern. It was I who asked the committee to insert in the bill the provision referred to which relates to the hospital at Bay Pines, Fla. The provision is as follows:

> *Provided further*, That $1,722,000 shall be used for the sites and planning expenses involved in the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital at Bay Pines, Florida.

I certainly have no intent to disturb the customary course of procedure under law whereby Congress has, by prior legislation, charged the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, subject only to the approval of the President, with great responsibility in the matter of locating hospitals and domiciliary facilities. I should like the RECORD to show, in the case of Bay Pines Hospital, that I believe that procedure has been followed completely.

The hospital was established under such an order many years ago, in the early 1920's, I believe. I know something about the Bay Pines Hospital because in the early 1920's I was a service officer in my local American Legion post and was frequently in that hospital during that time. It is also close to my home.

In 1958, in the independent offices appropriations bill for fiscal year 1959, acting upon the budget submitted by the Veterans' Administration and the President, Congress included within a blanket appropriation, funds in the amount of $1,722,000 for planning and engineering services, and so forth, in connection with an addition to the hospital.

The purpose of the committee amendment is simply to follow precedent in this matter. We requested our able staff to look up the precedent. We found a number of precedents directly applicable to this kind of situation in which the intent of Congress is merely to insist upon the continuity and the stability of the recommendations made by the Administrator and supported by the President.

That appropriation of $1,722,000 has been available since 1958. It has been mentioned in the reports of both House and Senate Appropriations Committees heretofore. The committees have been exceedingly concerned with regard to this matter.

We are told by the Veterans' Affairs Department of the State of Florida that something like 1,100 veterans in serious condition are hospitalized in veterans' hospitals outside the State of Florida, some at distances of 1,000 miles or more; furthermore, we are told that there is a long waiting list at each of the hospitals, both within our State and at those outside our State which accept patients from our State. We have been anxious for a good long time to have this additional wing constructed at Bay Pines.

Last year the committee included in its report to the Senate the following statement beginning on page 21:

> The committee approves the recommendation of the House Appropriations Committee relative to the earmarking of funds heretofore appropriated for the veterans' hospital at Bay Pines, Fla. The committee further recommends to the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration that technical services contracts for the new construction at Bay Pines be let no later than during calendar year 1963 because of the critical shortage of beds in Florida Veterans' Administration hospitals, as shown by the long waiting lists at Bay Pines and other Florida hospitals, and the fact that approximately

> 900 Florida neuropsychiatric veterans are hospitalized outside of Florida and remote from their homes.

The House committee report contained comparable language.

This year, upon inquiry, we found that nothing had been done. Our directions last year were that the money be used for the necessary engineering to move ahead with that very much needed project in calendar year 1963. We found however that the Administrator did not intend to go ahead.

The Administrator has been good to us in Florida in many ways. I have great respect for him, but in this particular case, and as to this particular hospital, located in an area in which there are a million and a half people and an excess number of veterans over the capacity of Bay Pines Hospital, we felt that his ideas have not been in accord with the best service to veterans in that area. So when this year we found that he was not proceeding, we asked him, when he appeared before the committee, as to what his intentions were. He said he would feel bound to proceed if we placed in the bill what amounted to a mandate for him to go ahead with the planning.

The colloquy between the Administrator and myself at the hearing will be found at page 2197 of the hearings of this year.

So this year the committee included the following statement in its report on page 23:

> The record of the hearings before the subcommittee includes correspondence from the Florida Council of 100 with most cogent reasons for proceeding at long last with the architectural and engineering work relating to the expansion of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Bay Pines, Fla.
>
> Data submitted to the committee from the State of Florida, Department of Veterans' Affairs, reveals that as of July 19, 1963, there were 152 veterans on the waiting list for the VA hospital at Lake City, Fla.; 587 veterans were on the waiting list for the veterans hospital at Bay Pines; 645 veterans were on the waiting list of the VA hospital at Coral Gables—in all a total of 1,384, all of whom had been found eligible. In addition, the information provided reveals that 1,098 Florida veterans were hospitalized outside the State of Florida by the Veterans' Administration and that a total of 395 Florida veterans were awaiting hospitalization outside the State in VA hospitals.
>
> The Administrator's testimony before the subcommittee indicated a reluctance to proceed with site and planning expenses for this project even though it was authorized and funded some years ago in the absence of a clear-cut statement in the form of appropriate wording in the bill. The committee has therefore recommended the following language be included in the bill: ": *Provided further*, That $1,722,000 shall be used for the sites and planning expenses involved in the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital at Bay Pines, Florida."

The Administrator has been courteous. He has been cooperative as to every other hospital in our State. We have no complaint except in the one instance of which I have spoken. At any rate, the fact that the project has been authorized for a long time is so shown by the budget submitted yearly by the Veterans' Administration. For many years the budget has carried an item for Bay Pines, which has already been partly appropriated for, and which the budget shows will require eventually an appropriation of $12 million. I point this item out to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I see.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the budget presentation, the item is carried under the heading, "Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities—Schedule of projects not under construction as of 6-30-62—Includes only those projects costing in excess of $25,000 each for which a portion or all of the funds have been appropriated or are being requested in this submission."

So there is nothing irregular about the procedure.

To the contrary, if the distinguished Senator will look at the bill, he will find that the sentence immediately prior to the one about which he is asking relates to a somewhat similar situation handled in former years by our committee in almost that identical way.

We do not wish to depart from that precedent. We have carefully abstained from doing so. But we do desire that the Administrator know that the Congress has some responsibility in the matter, and that the Congress in supplying the funds, upon requests made by the Administrator and approved by the President, expects diligence to be used, and we want continuity and stability in the program.

Mr. President, I have tried to be responsive. I hope I have not been too long. But we have as much interest in the Veterans' Administration as anyone else. We have as much respect for it. Every year we are getting tens of thousands of additional veterans in Florida, particularly those who need a salubrious climate and perhaps hospitalization a little later. As specified by the Administrator himself, he considers the hospital to be the best veterans' hospital in the country. He has said that if he had to be sick and go to a hospital, there is where he would wish to go. It is located on a 700-acre plot, with a vast space available for extension, looking out over the Gulf of Mexico, and almost priceles now because, from the standpoint of residential development in the St. Petersburg area, it is about the only undeveloped area remaining.

So we believe that the project should move ahead. In all kindness we are insisting upon it. The committee rather reluctantly—because it, too, has exactly the same feeling that the Senator from Minnesota has voiced and exactly the same feeling that the Senator from Florida has expressed. But the project is one that should move. Therefore we put that item into the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like my friend, the Senator from Florida, to know that the only reason I raised the question is that I did not wish future Congresses to look upon this particular case as a precedent or as a violation of what is in the public law.

I believe the Senator's explanation is exceedingly helpful and most satisfactory. I thank him very much.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my friend for his understanding. I know of his closeness to the Administrator. I hope he will tell him that we are very fond of him in our State. He has done many good things for us. We hope he will never have to go to our hospital, although he says he would prefer to go there than to any other in his jurisdiction, if ever he has to. We like him, but we want him to go ahead with the extension of this hospital, which is so badly needed in the area.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in connection with the Federal Power Commission appropriation, I note that the House had voted an increase of $770,000 over the fiscal year 1963 appropriation. The House report stated that their figure of $11,750,000 for salaries and expenses would provide for the cost of pay increases in 1964 and for 12 new positions. During the hearings before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Independent Offices it was made clear by the FPC that in fact they would have to reduce their present personnel force if the House figure prevailed.

I am very much aware of the excellent job the FPC is doing in establishing rates and in their other regulatory work with large power companies in California and elsewhere, and I do not believe that their present personnel level should be cut back. I have checked the figures and find that the Federal Power Commission increased their personnel by 202 in fiscal year 1963 to a level of 1,150 employees. The FPC also increased their personnel during fiscal years 1961 and 1962. I am gratified that the Senate Committee on Appropriations has added $200,000 to the House figure for salaries for fiscal year 1964, and I wish to emphasize that this is the absolute minimum total figure, which is $11,950,000, to keep FPC effective during this fiscal year. In fact, Commissioner Swidler testified that he would need an addition to the House figure of $490,000 rather than $200,000 to hold his present personnel level. It may be that with one-half of the fiscal year gone, the extra $200,000 will suffice. I wish to emphasize that this Senate figure is not one for bargaining, but represents the absolute minimum, if not somewhat below the minimum, that FPC can accept and still do its excellent work at its current level of effectiveness.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, during the past 11 months I have joined with my Senate colleagues in making many crucial decisions which affect the welfare and future of this Nation.

Few of those decisions, however, were as vital to our future as the one we face this week on the independent offices appropriations bill. I refer specifically to the Senate Appropriations Committee recommendation that we include a $46.7 million appropriation to complete the stocking of shelter areas found in the recently completed Defense Department survey.

I have no idle interest in this subject. For the past few months I have been in frequent communication with the office of Mr. Steuart L. Pittman, Assistant Secretary of Defense, on the subject of civil defense fallout shelters.

I have thoroughly studied quantities of information supplied at my request by Mr. Pittman's office. This information ranged from estimates of lives which might be saved by an adequate shelter program to national surveys to sample the country's psychological reaction to fallout shelters as related to our determination—or lack of it—to risk a thermonuclear holocaust if necessary.

I need not tell my colleagues how close we have tread on the fiery brink of such a disaster beginning with those dark days of last fall when, so I am told, two men carried snub-nosed revolvers into the depths of the Pentagon's War Room with orders to shoot anyone who panicked.

And then there was that problem on the autobahn recently when a delay of one of our convoys precipitated another grave crisis.

Fortunately for us the American people have a strong faith in the leadership of our country. They have shown courage at such times but, more than that, they were hopeful—nay—confident, that the crisis would be resolved.

But I think we owe the people something more. I think they need to be told that such crises may not always be resolved. I think they need to be told that they will be given some kind of protection—and supplies enough to guarantee the continued existence of millions of Americans should enemy rockets with nuclear warheads begin raining down upon us.

I for one am unwilling to shoulder the responsibility for anything less than an adequate shelter program with adequate supplies.

To those who reply that they would not want to survive in a world devastated by thermonuclear blasts, I can only agree with those who counter that each citizen should at the very least be given the right to exercise the option.

I hope that we will all again exercise that leadership which our country has every right to expect from us and give our solid support to the Appropriations Committee's recommendation for $46.7 million to complete the stocking of shelter areas.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is absent due to illness.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] is absent because of death in the family.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the aforelisted Senators would each vote "yea."

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] are necessarily absent.

Also the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating], the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 72, nays 1, as follows:

[No. 249 Leg.]

YEAS—72

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGovern
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough

NAYS—1

Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—27

Beall
Byrd, Va.
Clark
Dodd
Engle
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hartke
Hayden
Hruska
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
Miller
Morton
Nelson
Neuberger
Russell
Saltonstall
Simpson
Young, N. Dak.

So the bill (H.R. 8747) was passed.

Mr. **MAGNUSON**. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. Bayh in the chair) appointed Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Hill, Mr. Ellender, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Russell, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Allott, Mr. Saltonstall, and Mr. Young of North Dakota conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. **MAGNUSON**. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Modifications and Improvements Under Mercury Manned Flight Network

A letter from the Acting Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on modifications and improvements under the Mercury manned flight network; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Amendment of Statutes Relating to Fees for Certain Services Under Navigation Laws

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal and amend certain statutes fixing or prohibiting the collection of fees for certain services under the navigation laws (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Administration of Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, for the calendar year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Visa Petitions According First Preference to Beneficiaries

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning visa petitions according the beneficiaries of such petitions first-preference classification (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Amendment of Flood Control Act of 1962, Relating to Bradley Lake Project, Alaska

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Flood Control Act of 1962 with respect to the Bradley Lake project, Alaska (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. **SMATHERS**, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H.R. 8969. An act to provide, for the period ending June 30, 1964, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act (Rept. No. 646).

By Mr. **PASTORE**, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, without amendment:

S. 2267. A bill to amend Public Law 88–72 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 647).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2321. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to prohibit the fraudulent sale of transportation in interstate, overseas, or foreign air commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HART:

S. 2322. A bill to amend the provisions of section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for the exemption of certain terminal leases from penalties; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 2323. A bill for the relief of Amelita R. Lorenzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. Carlson):

S. 2324. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the falsification of identity by senders of communications to Members of the Congress with respect to legislative measures or matters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kuchel when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. Jackson):

S. 2325. A bill to provide for the construction of a new Veteran's Administration hospital at Vancouver, Wash.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S.J. Res. 134. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of a bipartisan Commission to make a detailed study of food and fiber needs; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Humphrey when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

PROHIBITION OF FRAUDULENT SALE OF AIR TRANSPORTATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, the essential objective of which is to prohibit the fraudulent sale of air transportation. Specifically, the proposed law would prohibit any person other than an airline or its employees to sell or offer for sale air transportation or to hold himself out by solicitation, advertisement, or otherwise as one who sells, provides, furnishes, or contracts for such transportation, except to the extent that such person is specifically authorized in writing by an airline.

During the past year, as in previous years, national attention has been focused on incidents in which unsuspecting air travelers have been stranded. They had contracted for specific air transportation, often on charter flights, or believed they had done so, only to find on arrival at the airport that either no plane was available or that the trip had been otherwise canceled. It is not difficult to imagine the disappointment and frustration of one who finds that the trip, to Europe perhaps, or elsewhere, which he had planned and saved for so long, had been canceled only hours before departure. Such incidents can be attributed almost invariably to unscrupulous promoters who claim that they have authority to sell air transportation when in fact they do not. They claim that they can secure transportation on airline X for a certain price on a certain day. Yet the airline has no knowledge of the commitment and gave the promoter no authority to contractually obligate it. Consequently the transportation is not provided. A tourist looking forward eagerly to his journey finds himself victimized and stranded.

This, of course, is not a practice of recognized travel agents. In fact they have been the greatest champions for legislation to eliminate it. The recognized travel agents are reputable and conscientious businessmen and women who are dedicated to serving the needs of the public. They are responsible citizens and a credit to their community. It is indeed unfortunate that a relatively few so-called promoters, engaged in the fraudulent sale of air transportation, have blemished their fine reputation.

This bill, through the imposition of civil penalties will, in my view, do much to minimize, if not eliminate, the fraudulent sale of air transportation and will afford the public the necessary protection against strandings and similar incidents alluded to previously.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bayh in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2321) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to prohibit the fraudulent sale of transportation in interstate, oversea, or foreign air commerce, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AN INFECTION IN THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS: ONE POSSIBLE REMEDY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on October 15, I noted in the Senate that of the 3,000 telegrams which descended on my office in support of S. 684, the so-called freight forwarders legislation, it turned out that many were sent as a result of pressure solicitation but, more important, a number of these telegrams were sent by other than the persons whose names were affixed to them. I stated that I regarded such conduct by any lobby as an infection in the democratic process.

The mail obviously is of great importance to a Senator in determining thoughtful constituent opinion. Continuous communication between the elected and the elector is the heart of the democratic process of this Republic. There is a basic constitutional right for each American citizen to petition his Government and those who represent him, if he so desires. However, it is one thing to receive an opinion from a constituent just prior to consideration of legislation in the Senate and then later find out, subsequent to the resolution of the issue that was before us, that the letter, telegram, or communication which had been received did not in fact come from the individual whose name had been affixed to it. I noted on October 15 that such activity was a desecration of the democratic process and despicable conduct at best.

Upon consultation with the Federal Communications Commission, the Post Office Department, and the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, I found that there was no Federal law covering this circumstance—the misuse of another's name on a communication to an elected representative. The California Legislature in its last session made it a misdemeanor to sign another person's name to a letter to a newspaper. I believe that it is time for Congress to remedy this situation as it concerns one of its basic sources of public opinion—constituent mail. Thus, I have today introduced a bill, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], who is the ranking Republican on the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, a bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit the falsification of indentity by senders of communications to Members of Congress. This proposed legislation would include mail, telegrams, and any instrumentality or facility for communication in interstate or foreign commerce. If a false, fictitious, or assumed name, title, or address other than one's own proper name, title, or address were subscribed to such communication with the intent to deceive or mislead its recipient, a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both, could be levied against a person convicted of committing such a deception.

Mr. President, I ask consent that this bill lie on the desk until December 2 so that additional Members of the Senate might coauthor it if they so desire. I also ask consent that the text of this bill be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record, and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from California.

The bill (S. 2324) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the falsification of identity by senders of communications to Members of the Congress with respect to legislative measures or matters, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Kuchel (for himself and Mr. Carlson), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, relating to fraud and false statements, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1028. Communications to Members of Congress

"Whoever, being the originator of any communication transmitted through the mails or by any other instrumentality of or facility for communication in interstate or foreign commerce to any Senator, Representative, or Resident Commissioner in Congress with respect to any actual or proposed legislative measure or matter, subscribes or causes to be subscribed to such communication any false, fictitious, or assumed name, title, or address, or any name, title, or address other than his own proper name, title, or address, with intent to deceive or mislead the recipient of such communication as to the identity, title, or address of the originator thereof, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

(b) The analysis of such chapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"1028. COMMUNICATIONS TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.".

FOOD IS POWER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently in addressing this body in connection with the introduction of the proposed Wheat Act of 1963, I stated that, and I quote:

> Our reserves now of food and fiber, and our ability to produce such commodities in abundance, are resources to be prized; to be used boldly and imaginatively, and not to be dribbled away. This must be conserved.

I further pointed out that I intended to address the Senate on this subject.

Mr. President, as the elected representatives of our various constituencies, we are chosen to be leaders in appraising the directions in which events are moving. We are elected to come forth with suggestions and recommendations on how this great Nation's policies can result in security and prosperity here at home. We are elected to make contributions to policies which will result in what is the most important single underlying concern of all men and women; namely, world peace. As an important factor in such policy considerations, I shall continue to try to evoke from this body and to alert the electorate as to the need for a very careful analysis by a blue ribbon bipartisan commission of the needs of this Nation for food and fiber reserves.

There is a need for a serious modification in the attitude of the American people in regard to the stocks of commodities now held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. While in many ways these commodities have been burdensome and costly to store, these are assets, not liabilities. Too often have I heard unthinking people state that all of the total carryover stocks of any commodity are in surplus. They have made reserve stocks synonymous with surplus. While I agree that in some cases the total carryover of a single commodity might have been or is too high, I also point out that for many commodities the total carryover stocks are entirely too low.

As the largest agricultural exporting nation in the world, we act rather strangely at times. Sometimes we leave the impression that the fruits of our farmers' labors are so great that they are liabilities. Certainly the rest of the world can read, and to even imply remotely that we are getting rid of liabilities in our export market is to downgrade the commodity in the eyes of possible buyers. Certainly we now have arrived at a stage where we can tell the world that our supplies of commodities, while available for sale, will be liquidated only to a certain level, and that such liquidation will be orderly. I do not intend to stand by and have opponents of all farm programs leave the impression that we are in a period in our agricultural policy of bankruptcy disposals. Farmers deserve better of the American people and the rest of the world than that kind of foolishness. Farmers and all the rest of us need a sane reserve policy, based on facts, not on prejudice.

THE FARMER'S CONTRIBUTION TO AMERICAN STRENGTH

I think it is high time all the American people took note of the contribution the American farmer has made, not only to the well-being of this country, but to the rest of the world. We have taken the daily modern miracle called agriculture in stride, and consider it commonplace.

From my many contacts with our farmers, marketers, processors, and other agriculture-oriented people, I come away almost in awe at the farmers' contribution to our economy. Actually, can any one man fully do justice to and appreciate the level of social progress which this modern miracle called agriculture has brought forth?

We need to study and restudy the contributions of agriculture to the growth of our economy. We need to study the dependence of the rest of our economy on the gallant 8 percent of our population who take the risks of drought and flood and hail and early frost and insects and markets. We need to study just how we can improve the lot of this numerically and proportionately shrinking group in a constructive bipartisan spirit. We need to do these things, if for no other reason than as a simple matter of justice. We need to do these things because there are many others primarily dependent on the productivity of this basic force in our society.

NEED OF FOOD RESERVES

If we are to fully understand the need for adequate and desirable levels of reserves, we must give some consideration to the great accomplishments of agriculture by most standards of performance. Let us examine our farmers' production record. In the past 10 years the average increase in annual output per hour on the farms is three times the rate of increase in nonfarm activities. One American farmer now produces enough for 27 people, whereas only 20 years ago he produced only enough for 11.

We are in the midst of a real technological revolution in agriculture that not only is irreversible—except for temporary adverse weather effects—but is rapidly accelerating with jet age speed. The American consumer is now enjoying his food at the lowest cost in terms of human effort expended of any people in the world. Not only does he have the world's richest diet, but he has the world's most nutritious diet. Today, only about 19 percent of the average consumer income is spent for food and fiber, as compared with 27 percent of consumer disposable income in 1947, and he is getting foods of much better quality. This percentage is the lowest on record and the lowest in the world relative to the earnings of consumers. If Americans were eating the same diet as in the 1930's, the average family would budget only about 15 percent of its earnings for food.

We have been witness to a massive shift from cheaper carbohydrates, such as bread and potatoes, to the higher protein, high vitamin foods, such as meat, milk, fruits and vegetables. Actually, the housewife is now getting better quality and more processing and precooking than ever before in the food she buys. Thus, the cost of food alone has declined even more than the above figures would indicate.

Let us examine the ability of farmers to increase their productivity and thus release manpower for production of other goods and services. At the same time production has been increasing, employment in the agricultural labor force has declined rather sharply. This has meant that sufficient workers to account for one-fourth of the growth in civilian nonagricultural employment have been released farm workers. We now are at a point where it takes less than 7 million workers to produce our food.

Let us examine the ability of our farmers to serve our U.S. foreign policy. While the quantity and quality of U.S. food consumption has been upgraded, we have been witness to a sharp increase in exports of food and fiber. We now are exporting about $6 billion worth of food and fiber annually. It is estimated that in the current fiscal year total exports will be about $6 billion, and that about $4.2 billion will be sales for hard currency. In our balance-of-payments account our total exports exceed total imports by about $4 to $5 billion. Thus, this agricultural abundance is greatly aiding our balance-of-payments situation.

AGRICULTURE AND BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

The soundest and simplest way to maintain our balance of payments would be to utilize to a maximum the productive efficiency of our farmers by finding ways to increase our agricultural exports even more. The American farmer has a tremendous interest in the policies that are developed in the European Economic Community, because these discussions will have an important bearing on what may happen to farm exports to the Common Market. It is essential that our Government do all that it can to make sure that American farm exports are not handicapped by a European Economic Community agricultural policy. The opportunity to expand our farm exports is excellent if we bargain hard and from strength. President Kennedy has been given authority by Congress to negotiate for the opening of greater trade opportunities through the Trade Expansion Act. We must do all we can to see that this authority is intelligently used to make tariff and other concessions in favor of our agricultural exports.

Let me mention just one spectacular example of the export possibility in the European Common Market area. The present population of the European Economic Community is about 175 million and is increasing at a steady rate. The wages of their workers are increasing at a rapid rate. When wages of low income groups go up, the first use made of the extra income often is to buy more meat. The average meat consumption in the European Economic Community increased from 101 pounds per person in 1955-56 to 118 pounds per person in 1960-61. As their meat consumption rises, so does the need for feed grains and protein meals.

If these people were to increase their meat consumption to the U.S. per capita level, their livestock would require imports of several times the current levels for feed grains and protein meals. This would provide a great opportunity for U.S. agriculture and industry to produce on idled acres and to export. It would add to both farm income and nonfarm income, plus substantially helping the balance of trade. I am convinced there will be this opportunity and that other opportunities will be available in other parts of the world, if we are in a competitive position with other sellers. We must offer the best quality at the most reasonable price. There is no substitute for price and quality when it comes to competing for commercial markets abroad.

FOOD FOR PEACE

Under the food-for-peace program, food has become an important form of foreign economic assistance. Let us examine the ability of our farmers to provide assistance to underdeveloped countries under the food-for-peace program. I am greatly impressed by the single basic fact that it was our farmers' productive ability that made the entire U.S. foreign assistance effort possible in the food field. Here again I resort to facts in order to impress upon you the magnitude of the work which made this possible under the food-for-peace program.

Witness the following:

First. In the 9 years that the food-for-peace program has been in existence, we have been able to ship overseas a grand total of almost $13 billion worth of food. During that same period dollar sales amounted to $26 billion.

Second. Our food donations have been greatly increased in the past 2 to 3 years. They now are providing supplemental feeding for 100 million undernourished people. Three-fourths of all the commodities are now programed for children through organized school lunch efforts, through other nutritional feeding, and through family feeding plans in which the parents may participate by exchanging work for food.

Third. One of the food-for-peace programs which has given me the greatest pleasure has been the fact that in our total feeding operations abroad school lunch programs have now been extended to 40 million children in 91 countries. This program is growing every day. This food-for-peace school lunch in many areas of the world is the only square meal that the child gets all day. It may amaze you to learn that many children have been encouraged to go to school just to get that one meal. Educators in the affected areas have told me that the learning capacity of many, many children has been increased tremendously.

Fourth. We initiated a program under which we use food for wages. We use the food to pay for the building of roads and schools, the establishment of irrigation systems, the construction of homes and public buildings, and the settlement of new areas. Here we have a program under which the workers get food that is needed to feed their families at the same time that they work to better their communities.

Fifth. American foods are being used to provide a stabilizing catalyst in many new emerging nations which are attempting to grow within a democratic format. Available food prevents riots and revolution.

Sixth. As economic conditions permit, food-for-peace nations graduate to dollar markets. Witness Japan which has become the largest single purchaser of American farm products, and which not many years ago was a beneficiary of the food-for-peace program. The Japanese have cultivated a taste for U.S. wheat, milk, and corn products. This taste was whetted by the food-for-peace program, including the special school lunch program.

Spain has become a $70 million a year cash market for U.S. farm products. Market development funds generated under Public Law 480 were used to build this demand. It was not too many years ago that the soybean industry persuaded the Spanish Government to try some of our soybean oil under the food-for-peace program. It was not long before the foreign currency sales of soybean oil were replaced by dollar sales. Currently, Spain is a tremendous cash buyer of our soybean oil.

Mr. President, I believe that fundamentally when the history of the 20th century is written, the development and the expansion of the food-for-peace program will be looked upon as one of the most constructive steps ever undertaken by any nation. We must recognize that in the absence of our farmers' abundant productivity—the so-called agricultural surpluses—this could not have been possible.

FOOD AND POPULATION

The Economic Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture has just completed a study which should be carefully considered by every Member of this body. The basic question raised was "how can the world produce food for the population that will more than double from three to six billion plus in less than four decades when there is little new land to draw on in many areas and not enough capital to raise yields much in most areas?"

Diets have improved steadily in the so-called developed world. Today, there are no shortages of food on a nationwide basis anywhere in the Western World. However, there are food deficits almost everywhere in the less developed parts of the world—Asia, Africa, and Latin America. In these areas the population has increased much more rapidly than food production, and the number of people suffering from malnutrition actually has increased since the early 1900's. In the years ahead the less developed regions will have great difficulty in providing more and more people with even the same low quality diets.

In an era of new nations and rising aspirations we must ask ourselves what are the implications. People want and need more food and better food with more of the proteins, fats and other nutrients that are essential for normal health. That study shows that even with greatly expanded food imports, if this less developed area of the world succeeds in raising the available food per person 20 percent above present levels, by the end of this century it will have to: First, almost triple its present production; second, increase present food output by a quantity approximately the current food production of the entire world; and, third, achieve in spite of limited resources an annual increase in production rates for food substantially higher than that ever attained by the so-called affluent societies of North America and the rest of the industrial West.

In the world today 4 children are born every second—well over 300,000 a day. Man has scarcely begun to assess the long-term implications of this phenomenal growth rate. The United Nations estimates now that nearly 3½ billion people will be added to the world population by the end of this century. Most of the people will be added in the less developed countries, areas that are least able to feed themselves.

If I have startled you with the above figures, it should be noted that by 2000 A.D., Asia alone will have a population greater than the present population of the entire world.

We are finding ourselves in a situation under which the less developed world is in to improve its economic level, carrying a double burden of a population growth rate in excess of twice the West and a much smaller per capita availability of land, water and other natural resources.

Population growth is not in itself the most significant factor in the indicated food shortage facing the less developed world. Unfortunately, countries with enough land to support their food needs are not the ones having the most children. The so-called man-land ratio is out of balance. Since not much more new land can be brought into production, the only escape valve can be higher yields per acre.

NORTH AMERICA AND FOOD SUPPLIES

As we take a hard look ahead, it becomes apparent that North America will become increasingly important as a supplier of grain to the world's deficit regions. Prewar Asia was a net exporter of grain of some 2 million metric tons per year. By 1960-61 it was a net importer of 16 million metric tons.

During the late 1930's Latin America was the dominant supplier of the world grain markets, exporting more grain than North America and Oceania put together. By 1960-61 this area was importing grain both to feed a bigger population and to provide a little better diet.

Africa was not traditionally much of a grain exporter or importer. Although Africa's grain output has kept pace with a population growth, nevertheless it has slipped over the line to become an importer of about 2 million metric tons of grain a year in order to meet its peoples' growing demands for more food.

Western Europe has long been the world's largest grain market. However, the Soviet Union, which has been a net exporter of grain along with the rest of Eastern Europe, is going to develop a sizable deficit and will continue to need substantial imports.

This leaves North America and Oceania as the only major grain suppliers. North America will become increasingly important as the supplier of grains to the world's deficit regions.

While from the above figures it is obvious that the growing food problem is primarily confined to less developed countries, it is important to note that in a larger sense it is a world problem. The industrial West must be fully committed to its solution.

That solution will call for both a reappraisal of annual world food requirements and annual world food resources. Furthermore, we need a new look at world food reserves to meet the vagaries of weather. In recent years the weather cycle struck down the grain crops of mainland China and the accumulated surpluses of North America and Oceania came to the rescue. This year, these accumulated surpluses are being called for to meet the reduced crop yield of Russia and Eastern Europe. By the end of the 1963-64 crop season we will be able to pat ourselves on the back as we see our Government-held surplus stocks of food and feed grains greatly reduced.

But it is a moment like this—when we are not certain how long the adverse weather cycle will hover over Russia and Eastern Europe, or how soon the favorable crop years in North America may turn into years of substantially lower yields—that we must do our best to foresee the future.

I know our meteorological science can tell us little as yet about growing conditions a year or 2 or 3 years in advance in this or any other country. But the available records of crop production and weather over the past 30 to 50 to 70 years can tell us a great deal. In examining some of these records I found that the course of the agricultural production revolution has not progressed at an even pace. The trends in productivity—or yields per acre—have not advanced along an upward straight line course, but have been subjected over recent decades to the impact of weather cycles.

FOOD PRODUCTION AND WEATHER

Sometimes these reversals in trend have been masked by an unusually good year, both in the United States and other grain producing countries. The fact that yields per acre both in exporting and importing countries are now substantially higher as a result of technological advances does not at all guarantee us against a falling off of yields from these higher levels. And the fact that ultimately still higher levels may be expected and attained does not lessen the price and distribution problems that adverse weather in important exporting and importing countries could pose on the immediate future.

This is one of the reasons I am interested in having a bipartisan commission assemble the facts as to prospective demands and supplies, country by country. For in interpreting the recent changes in supply and in making projections for the immediate and long-term future, an opportunity will be afforded to examine the longtime records for clues to coming weather effects. The records have been accumulating and from what I have seen I am convinced not only that they contain important clues, but that it is high time they be presented for all to see and appraise.

Mr. President, I am indebted to Dr. Louis Bean, a prominent and distinguished economic analyst who has made available to me the wealth of information he has gathered over the years on weather and the role it plays in crop yields and production.

I also am grateful to Louis M. Thompson, associate dean of agriculture at Iowa State University in Ames, Iowa. Dr. Thompson presented a paper yesterday before the Water Research Symposium, sponsored by the Soil Science Society of America and the Soil Conservation Society of America, in which he said, and I quote:

> It is this writer's opinion that a moving average for corn yield in Iowa describes a weather trend better than it describes a trend for adoption of technology.

In summarizing his remarks, Dr. Thompson stated:

> That—

And again I quote:

> about half of the increase in yield (of grain crops) for 1950 to 1960 can be attributed to a change to more favorable weather, and that only about half the upward trend was due to technology.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the summary of Dr. Thompson's paper, entitled, "Our Recent High Yields—How Much Due to Weather?"

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF REMARKS BY LOUIS M. THOMPSON, ASSOCIATE DEAN OF AGRICULTURE, IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY, BEFORE WATER RESEARCH SYMPOSIUM, DENVER, COLO., NOVEMBER 19, 1963

During the past 2 years the writer has analyzed weather variables and crop yield trends for the 11-State area from North Dakota to Texas and from Iowa and Missouri across Illinois and Indiana to include Ohio. Corn, soybeans, wheat, and grain sorghums were studied by analyzing the data of five States for each crop. Multiple regression analyses were made by using years for technology and several weather variables, including preseason precipitation, monthly rainfall, and monthly temperature during the growing season. All studies brought out one important fact, and that is the weather of the first half of the decade of the 1950's was relatively unfavorable to grain crops while the last half of the decade was relatively favorable to grain crops. Consequently, a trend line based on crop production in the period from 1950 to 1960 results in a trend line about twice as steep as the longer-term trend line developed from 1930 to 1962. In other words, the several studies show that about half of the increase in yield from 1950 to 1960 can be attributed to a change to more favorable weather, and that only about half the upward trend was due to technology.

In addition to the change from unfavorable weather of the early fifties to more favorable weather in the late fifties there has been a gradual change since 1930 toward cooler July temperatures and higher July rainfall. In other words, part of the long-term trend upward in grain production since the mid-thirties is due to a gradual improvement in weather for grain production.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also call to the attention of my colleagues an article entitled "How Serious Are Our Feed-Grain Stocks?" which Dr. Thompson wrote for the February 1963, edition of Iowa Farm Science. In this paper, Dr. Thompson makes some pertinent observations. He states that, and I quote:

> What's really at the heart of our surplus stocks of feed grains is our capacity to produce them. Without the capacity to produce more than we use each year, we'd have no surplus stocks and would not be so concerned about adding to them. Prices, too, have a role in feed-grain production and use, but let's stick mainly to our production capacity and the size of our stocks.
>
> To consider our production capacity, we need to go one step further. Most of our increased farm productivity has been attributed to improved technology. But we know that other factors also affect our total capacity. One of these is weather—aside from minor year-to-year local variation, a most important factor.

Dr. Thompson concludes in this article, and again I quote:

> It could be a serious mistake to ignore weather and to assume that the trend in increased yields and productivity from 1950 to 1960 occurred solely because of improved technology. Our most recent studies show that about half of this trend is due to technology and half is due to weather.
>
> Again, this isn't to say that we don't have excess capacity or surplus stocks or that there are no problems involved. But perhaps we should temper our judgment of the terms "excess," "surplus" and "burdensome" by asking "under what conditions?" If, for example, we were to have a major widespread drought or to become involved in another global war, "reserves" of feed grains might be a more appropriate term for some of the stocks.

For those whose musings today lead them to weigh concerns along with blessings, there may be some applications in the observations of Francis Bacon some 3½ centuries ago in his essay of "Seditions and Troubles":

> The surest way to prevent seditions (if the times do bear it) is to take away the matter of them. For if here be fuel prepared, it is hard to tell whence the spark shall come that shall set it on fire. The matter of sedition is of two kinds; much poverty and much discontentment * * *. And if this poverty and broken estate in the better sort be joined with a want and necessity in the mean people, the danger is imminent and great. For the rebellions of the belly are the worst.
>
> The first remedy or prevention is to remove by all means possible the material cause of sedition whereof we spake; what is want and poverty in the estate—above all things, good policy is to be used that the treasure and moneys in a state be not gathered into few hands. For otherwise a state may have a great stock, and yet starve.

We have yet to make the full intellectual adjustment to our present position. We remain sometimes enamored of false values. Comfort, for example, is hardly the proper standard of a great nation. Comfort is the lot of the vegetable and the objective of the lapdog.

For a virile people require more of national goals than creature satisfactions. What is borne in on us from all quarters is the practical economic and political meaning of the Biblical tenet that we are our brother's keepers. And what is presented to us by virtue of circumstances is an opportunity—an opportunity for leadership in accommodation to orderly change in our domestic society and in the world we inhabit.

It is an opportunity as fresh and exciting as it is rigorous and uncertain. Not all change is automatically desirable, and not all change is within our power to guide or control. But change there will be, and the highest task of leadership is to foresee and shape the forces that, like wind and rain, continually alter environment.

I have now become convinced that the time is at hand to free our farmers from their concern over the long-term implications of regulations and control. What we should try to do is to encourage shifts in production into those commodities for which expanding needs are foreseen.

A BIPARTISAN COMMISSION ON FUTURE FOOD RESERVES

As a second step, I again urge my colleagues to authorize the appointment of a blue ribbon bipartisan commission to analyze our future reserve requirements. We must be sure that our own food reserves be maintained at a level to assure us the continuation of a healthful standard of living even if we should have a serious crop setback. In the absence of such reserves, a serious crop setback could set off a chain of inflationary forces which would create serious long-term economic difficulties.

These are only two of the steps we must take as we march down the long road ahead. We must have food reserves to bolster our proud position. For food is power.

Mr. President, at this time I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution providing for the appointment of a bipartisan commission to make a detailed study of food and fiber needs. I urge that this joint resolution receive early consideration and approval.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 134) providing for the appointment of a bipartisan commission to make a detailed study of food and fiber needs, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to appoint a bipartisan commission composed of a chairman and eight other members, three of whom shall be appointed from the agricultural community, three of whom shall be appointed from the public, and three of whom shall be appointed from Government. Such Commission shall make a detailed study with respect to the amount of food and fiber needed to meet domestic and export requirements, including programs in which the United States participates in order to aid the needy peoples of foreign nations, the management of supplies in the national interest and in the interest of the free people of all nations, and the need for strategic reserves of such commodities, and shall report to the President within twelve months from the date of this joint resolution its recommendations with respect thereto. The President is authorized, whenever he determines such action necessary, to pay for each day's attendance at meetings and while traveling to and from such meetings, transportation expenses and, in lieu of subsistence, a per diem in the amount authorized under the Travel Expense Act of 1949 for Federal employees. No salary or other compensation shall be paid. Thirty days after the submission of its report to the President the Commission shall cease to exist. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to enable the President to carry out this joint resolution.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

Address delivered by Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz to the 75th anniversary banquet of the International Association of Machinists, September 21, 1963, Seattle, Wash.

KITTERY NAVAL SHIPYARD, MAINE

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, a week ago I received a most gratifying letter from the president of local No. 4 of the American Federation of Technical Engineers, Portsmouth-Kittery Naval Shipyard. I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION
OF TECHNICAL ENGINEERS,
LOCAL NO. 4,
Portsmouth, N.H., November 12, 1963.

Hon. MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: Congratulations on your single accomplishment in getting the Navy Department to admit that the "just won't work" charges recently leveled at the Kittery Naval Shipyard workmen are just not true.

When these damaging statements were first published, this organization immediately sent telegrams to six area Senators and numerous Representatives, demanding that they be proved or retracted and requesting a full congressional investigation.

We believed then, as we do now, that people who are innocent have nothing to fear from an investigation of false charges. Consequently, we were greatly encouraged by your immediate response to our request and the positive steps which you took to have the charges investigated.

The subsequent award of a nuclear attack submarine to the shipyard was hailed by some as an indication of the Navy's confidence in our activity but this observation had rather a hollow ring to it as long as the original charges were allowed to stand.

The success of your campaign to require the Navy to tell the truth about this matter, represents the final vindication of the workers at the Kittery Naval Shipyard and deserve the same wide publicity given to the original charges.

Once again, as in 1958, when you almost succeeded in winning the battle for equalization pay, you have demonstrated your willingness to fight persistently, against strong opposition, for what you believe to be right.

In a world where political expediency appears to be the rule, rather than the exception, yours is a type of representation too seldom seen but deeply appreciated by your constituents.

Respectfully yours,
TIMOTHY D. FLYNN,
President.

CENTENNIAL OF THE SOKOL MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, February 14, 1965, will be the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Sokol movement in the United States. The issuance of a commemorative stamp would be a suitable gesture of appreciation for this fine organization dedicated to strengthening the Nation by strengthening its citizens.

Over 250,000 Americans of all ages now belong to Sokol educational and physical fitness units and participate in programs of physical and cultural training. Since 1865, Sokol has built its own gymnasiums, conducted children's summer camps and supported language schools, libraries, and cultural groups. It has done this in the belief that physically fit, mentally alert, and culturally aware citizens will make ours a strong Nation. While the organization is nonpolitical, it encourages its members to actively serve their communities and the country with selflessness and patriotism.

President Kennedy has urged us to undertake a campaign for physical fitness, lest we become a nation of spectators. He has praised "the part the American Sokol organization has played in establishing physical fitness and good sportsmanship as major objectives of recreation, education, and our way of life."

A commemorative stamp would render due recognition to the Sokol movement and would emphasize the importance of physical fitness to the Nation. I hope the Postmaster General will issue such a stamp. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of a letter dated November 20, 1963, to the Postmaster General requesting the issuance of a commemorative stamp along with a memorandum further explaining the activities and objectives of the Sokol organization.

There being no objection, the letter and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOKOL CENTENNIAL
COMMEMORATIVE STAMP COMMITTEE,
Cicero, Ill., November 20, 1963.

Hon. JOHN A. GRONOUSKI,
Postmaster General, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. POSTMASTER: President John F. Kennedy wrote the following: "I appreciate the part the American Sokol movement has played in establishing physical fitness and good sportsmanship as major objectives of recreation, education, and our way of life. In years to come, I hope American Sokol's example will inspire millions more to join in this pursuit of excellence."

February 14, 1965, will mark the centennial of the founding of the first Sokol (Falcon) Educational and Physical Fitness Unit in the United States of America. Since its founding the Sokol movement has expanded from coast to coast, numbering hundreds of units with a membership well over 250,000. We feel that the issuance of a commemorative stamp honoring the Sokol's centennial will bring into sharper focus the constant need for physical fitness and the feasibility of its execution.

The accompanying memorandum presents the highlights of a century of work. We hope you will deem the Sokol's continuous training of thousands of children and adults worthy of the issuance of a commemorative stamp.

The Sokol's slogan of "For Neither Profit nor Glory" is as unblemished today as when first conceived. Our only desire is to have the entire Nation as conscious of physical fitness as we have been during the past century.

We again congratulate you upon your elevation to your high post and wish you well in your entire future.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed by Representatives of the following:) American Sokol Organization; Federation of D.A. Sokol of the U.S.A.; Polish Falcons of America; Slovak Gymnastic Union Sokol of the U.S.A.; The Slovak Catholic Sokol; Union of Czech Catholic Sokols.

Memorandum—Sokols in America To Commemorate Centennial

Sokol (Falcon) is an organization dedicated to physical, mental, and cultural training of its members, and the children who attend its gymnasiums.

The first Sokol unit in the United States was founded on February 14, 1865, in St. Louis, Mo. Within a few years Sokol units were formed in Chicago, New York, Baltimore, Cleveland, Milwaukee, Detroit, Cedar Rapids, Omaha, etc. Since then the Sokols have established units from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast and from Canada to the Rio Grande. For a century they have carried on an uninterrupted course of training thousands upon thousands of individuals, of both sexes, from 6 years of age to well past 60. They built and supported their own gymnasiums, supported foreign language schools, assembled libraries, formed and aided cultural groups, conducted summer camps for children, and have an enviable record of less than 1-percent rejections when entering military service. They trained their own instructors and workers in all departments. Hundreds of outstanding coaches in our American elementary and high schools, playgrounds, and colleges received their early training in the Sokol gymnasiums and carried on the Sokol philosophy of physical training for everyone.

Never in all this time have they solicited any branch of government for financial support feeling that it was their duty to contribute all of this to the national welfare.

Their slogan of "Neither for Profit nor Glory," is as unblemished today as when first adopted. Their credo could well be adopted by the entire Nation for it is as applicable to it as it has been to the Sokols. It is:

"Our first and overall task rests in the premise that before any other demands, we must preserve our Nation in that general vigor that does not allow a nation to die, in that steady and fresh strength, in that physical, spiritual, and moral health that will not allow any decay to set in and with that no stagnation, which is the worst fate that could happen to a nation."

From one unit in 1865 the Sokols grew in the United States to a total membership of over 250,000.

Within the last few years, new gymnasiums have been built or expanded by Sokols in Baltimore, Md.; Cleveland, Ohio; Dallas, Tex.; Los Angeles, Calif.; St. Louis, Mo.; Detroit, Mich.; as well as by Sokol units in Chicago, Ill., and elsewhere. A rejuvenating spirit is seen everywhere within Sokol ranks.

Physical training as a valuable aid to general education was well understood in the golden age of Greece, and by outstanding pedagogs during the last five centuries. Comenius, Rousseau, Pestalozzi, Friedrich Jahn, Huxley, as well as scores of our modern American teachers, have fought throughout their lives for the simultaneous development of the body as well as the mind. This inevitably produces those characteristics so vital for any nation to maintain its existence.

The Sokol training goals are:

1. To strengthen and improve the health of individuals;
2. To train people of strong will, capable of self-denial, people of firm and constant character who can put their plans into action (self-discipline, perseverance, self-confidence, integrity);
3. To form of them more competent working units (ability, dexterity, reliability);
4. To teach them to work for society and in society (cooperation, consideration, social responsibility);
5. To make them the basis of a healthier posterity;
6. To increase their defensive capacity (Armed Forces);
7. To influence them by beauty in nature, the arts, and man's other creations, and to inculcate in them a sense for beauty; and
8. To make them forever conscious that liberty and freedom are a priceless gift, its protection a sacred duty.

The Sokol founders conceived the idea that physical education might provide an outlet for hitherto untouched and perhaps unrealized national energies. But bodily exercise was not the ultimate goal to them for they had studied Greek literature and culture for many years. Mechanical drill and perfection in set exercises was less important to them than the balanced integration of all the capacities of the human mechanism. They originated a gymnastic technique completely independent of other methods. In addition to raising the level of health and general well-being throughout the land, the Sokol movement is a school for democracy, preparing its members for participation in every phase of life, either in their own cities and towns, or later in more trying times on a wider field, in the struggles for preserving national liberties and their maintenance in a troubled world.

The leading ideas in the Sokol movement are the equality of all members, comradeship, and loyalty to the Nation as a whole. This almost Spartan training axiomatically leads to higher scholastic attainments, independence, rapid rise in rank in any field of endeavor whether civilian or military. Delinquency at any age is unknown.

Of the thousands in the Sokol ranks, it is rare to find one who is not a veteran of the Armed Forces, just as 25-, 40-, 50-, and 60-year memberships in the Sokols are quite common. Physical fitness tests and competitions have been conducted as a matter of course for decades, in every class and age group.

Dr. Hans Kraus of New York University conducted the AAHPER tests comparing the fitness of European and American youth: 9 percent of the Europeans failed, 60 percent of the Americans flunked (Newsweek, May 11, 1959); only 3 percent of the Sokol children failed.

There was no fatal casualty in Sokol gymnasiums in decades, or even one among Sokol trained youth in high school or university competitive sports.

Mr. Joseph Jerry Mulla of Sokol Detroit was selected for Admiral Duffek's Operation Deepfreeze, in 1957, out of thousands, to keep up the morale and physical fitness of the men.

Mr. Kriz of Sokol New York, was the only American to ever win a gold medal in Olympic gymnastic competitions.

Sokols have a record of less than 1 percent rejection, long before World War I, when entering the U.S. Armed Forces. In every national crisis our gymnasiums are bare. All our young men are accepted for service. The Sokol system of gymnastics, calisthenics, marching, games, and athletics is a scientifically designed one to take into consideration the needs and exercise of every part of the body, internal as well as external. It is rich in material so that drilling does not become monotonous. It is the result of the combined thinking and experience of thousands of dedicated, qualified medical men, physiologists, and outstanding instructors. This applies to all age groups, tots, children, juniors, as well as men and women.

America's almost fanatical desire for winning teams has been the downfall of the physical fitness program for the overall citizenry. The Sokols like to win too, and have plenty of local, district, and national competitions, but their primary object has been to elevate the general level rather than concentrate on a few stars. As a rule the stars already have a fine constitution and development and need training the least.

The issuance of a stamp commemorating the centennial of the Sokol movement would have a great impact upon the general public. It would highlight the constant need for physical fitness and bear evidence of the results when training starts at 6 years and does not end even at 60. This continuous activity can be seen at any time in any Sokol gymnasium.

We trust that you will consider this request favorably as "Neither for Profit Nor Glory," has been a way of life for the Sokols for a century and not just an empty slogan.

James L. Cihak, *Chairman.*

POOLING OF INVESTMENT ACCOUNTS BY BANKS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Senate bill 2223, now pending in the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, is designed to permit banks to commingle investment accounts into a common pool, and to solicit such accounts from the public, in the same manner as mutual funds are offered to the public.

The Securities and Exchange Commission has asserted its belief that such bank-sponsored mutual funds should be subject to the Federal securities laws as are offerings of other securities including the well-established mutual funds. This is a subject that I believe should be thoroughly considered by the Congress, and testimony from all sides should be heard.

I am disturbed, therefore, that in the report of the Senate committee granting appropriations to the SEC, a clause has been inserted which would deny to the SEC the right to use any of the appropriated funds for the regulation of the bank-sponsored mutual funds.

This does not seem to me to be the right legislative process, and while I intend to vote in favor of the appropriation bill, I wish to voice my opposition to binding the hands of the SEC in this fashion.

TOBACCO AND THE PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] has written an important book entitled "Smoke Screen: Tobacco and the Public Welfare." It deserves to be a bestseller and I am sure it will be. The book is only 136 pages long; it will take Senators no more than a couple of hours to read; I assure them the book is worth their time. It is well-written; unburdened by psuedo-scientific jargon or self-righteous moralizing. Senator NEUBERGER sticks to the facts; she carefully examines the evidence on cigarette smoking by leading medical men all over the world, and concludes that the health case against cigarette smoking is indisputable. I suspect that few who read her book with an open mind will hold to a different conclusion.

Although Senator NEUBERGER is cognizant of the facts and uses them fairly, she has not written a tedious or stuffy book. From the first line, "Mice are unenthusiastic smokers," to the last, Senator NEUBERGER is able to find humor, even in the sad facts about cigarette smoking. Of course, a good source for humor lies in the advertising campaigns of many cigarette companies. She properly castigates "the high priest of hidden persuasion" and quotes one magazine which speculates that the next cigarette singing commercial will be:

> The best taste you ever did smoke; every inch a child's smoke.

This pinpoints one of the most objectionable facets of the cigarette problem—the advertising campaign to persuade adolescents to smoke. Senator NEUBERGER quotes Dr. Michael B. Shimkin, associate director for field studies of the National Cancer Institute, who said:

> Cigarette advertising equates smoking cigarettes with bravery, sexual virility and social status, and in view of this campaign it is little wonder that so many youngsters smoke.

Senator NEUBERGER's book went to press before the most offensive cigarette commercial that I have seen made its appearance. How many American parents, who have teenage sons like I do, have winced when they heard that inane but carefully calculated jingle:

> Luckies separate the men from the boys, but not from the girls.

I am sure that all reputable advertising people join in protesting this abuse of technique. As the trade journal, Advertising Age, proclaimed on August 26:

> The Lucky Strike campaign is described as an effort to reduce the degree of youth appeal in cigarette advertising. Yet such a claim must be made either in deep ignorance of youthful psychology, or else, in utterly brazen cynicism, since clearly its effect will be the opposite of that proclaimed. Anything which "separates the men from the boys" means, in ordinary speech, something which is too tough a challenge for a boy—and by that token, something a boy is likely to regard as eminently worth doing as a means of proving his grownup estate.
>
> In a time when advertising people are talking about self-policing by the industry, this kind of advertising can go a long way toward convincing the public that self-policing by admen is unlikely to be effective.

It is obvious that the term "utterly brazen cynicism" is appropriate in this particular case. But this insidious advertising campaign has not been dropped since Advertising Age correctly identified it; I suppose the increased cigarette sales to adolescents more than make up for the criticism which the campaign might cause. One of the purposes of Senator NEUBERGER's book is to expose this kind of unscrupulous advertising directed at youth.

Neither Senator NEUBERGER nor I, nor anyone else in Congress I know, proposes to interfere with an adult's right to smoke cigarettes, regardless of what the health hazard may be. But it is clear that cigarette smoking for many people is an addiction, especially if it is begun in youth. An adolescent, often plagued by the need to try to prove that he is grown up, is surely placed in a hard position to resist taking up the smoking habit, when he is constantly subjected to a ceaseless barrage of unprincipled advertising equating manliness in sports, sex, and sophistication with the smoking of X brand of cigarette. Senator NEUBERGER not only criticizes this sick trend in cigarette advertising, but also questions the strange silence concerning the facts of cigarettes and health, on the part of governmental agencies and much of our communications media.

In her effort to be fair, Senator NEUBERGER points out that some have acted responsibly in trying to bring the facts to public attention, citing among others, the Reader's Digest, Consumer's Union, Time, Newsweek, the Atlantic Monthly, Harper's, the New Republic, the Nation, CBS, Edward P. Morgan, and LeRoy Collins.

Senator NEUBERGER has a four-point program which Congress should seriously consider: First, education of both the presmoking adolescent and the adult smoker; second, expanded research, in the technology of safer smoking; third, reform of cigarette advertising and promotion; and, fourth, cautionary and informative labeling of cigarette packages. Senator NEUBERGER's book and her concern in this important matter represent real services to the American people.

I ask unanimous consent to insert several articles at this point in the RECORD which either review or comment upon Senator NEUBERGER's book "Report on Smoking Is Devastating" by Jack Anderson, which appeared in the October 31 issue of the Washington Post; an editorial "Smoking Education" from the October 21 issue of the Medical Tribune; a review by Donald Mintz from the November 8 issue of the Washington Evening Star; an article by Peter Bart entitled "Advertising: Cigarette Promotion Assailed" from the November 8 issue of the New York Times; an article by Caryl Rivers from the November 11 issue of the Baltimore Sun; and an article by W. H. Stringer which appeared in the November 14 issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 31, 1963]

REPORT ON SMOKING IS DEVASTATING

(By Jack Anderson)

The tobacco tycoons are doing their best to delay and dilute the long-awaited Presidential report on cigarettes and cancer, which should be ready to release by December 15.

Though elaborate precautions have been taken to make sure the report doesn't leak out before it can be edited, this column can state that the individual studies contain overwhelming evidence that smoking can cause not only lung cancer but heart, stomach, bronchial, and other ailments.

These studies are now being boiled down by Dr. Peter Hamill of the National Library of Medicine into a report that should present a devastating case against the tobacco habit.

It will be submitted to pack-a-day smoker Anthony Celebrezze, the efficient, ebullient Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who hasn't concealed his lack of enthusiasm for battling the tobacco interests.

He has made it plain that he doesn't consider it "the proper role of the Federal Government to tell citizens to stop smoking."

He puts smoking in the same category as overeating and overdrinking, insisting privately: "I don't believe that the prohibition of smoking by the Federal Government would be any more effective than the prohibition of alcohol."

HEW spokesmen assured this column, however, that Celebrezze believes the Government has a duty to warn citizens against health hazards.

Celebrezze will send the report up to President Kennedy, who is even less anxious to get his fingers burned by the cigarette controversy. Certainly he has no desire to antagonize tobacco State Senators and Congressmen while his civil rights reforms and tax cuts are still pending.

When the cigarette subject was brought up at a May 1962 press conference, the President handled it like a butt that had burned down to his fingers.

"That matter is sensitive enough, and the stock market is in sufficient difficulty without my giving you an answer," he hedged. "* * * Perhaps I would be glad to respond to that question in more detail next week."

The following week, he turned the problem over to an advisory committee and announced happily that, "The survey would take some months or go into 1963."

The loudest howls about the Presidential report are coming from the Agricultural Department, which is more concerned about the tobacco crop than public health. If the report is made public on December 15, wail the marketing men, it might hurt the December tobacco auctions.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, who smokes sparingly, is fearful that the report will reduce cigarette sales and damage an important industry.

Apprenhension over the forthcoming report also is high at the Federal Trade Commission, which is responsible for regulating dangerous and deceptive advertising.

Eighteen months ago, the Commission acknowledged to Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, that it has authority to crack down on tobacco advertising. The Commission put off her demand for action, however, by claiming it needed "competent probative scientific evidence."

This should now be furnished by the Presidential Committee, thus putting the Commission on the spot. It may have no alternative but to require tobacco companies to include a warning of the cigarette hazards in all their newspaper-magazine ads and radio-TV commercials.

The advertising abuses are hit by Senator NEUBERGER in a book, "Smoke Screen," just off the Prentice Hall press.

She checked on commercials, for example, depicting baseball stars Mickey Mantle, Roger Maris, and Whitey Ford as contented Camel smokers.

She found that Mantle had smoked Camels briefly, then had switched to Viceroys. But he was last reported using Bantron, an antismoking pill.

Maris also had smoked Camels, but had stopped smoking altogether a month before the commercial appeared. The only information the Senator could find on Ford's smoking habits was a sports story quoting him after a shutout victory.

"This was the best I've felt for nine innings since the first game of the World Series against Cincinnati," boasted Ford.

The reason for his improvement: "I quit smoking," said Ford.

The President's Study Committee on Smoking and Health has done little original research but has merely summed up the existing information on the tobacco problem. Several distinguished doctors contributed studies.

One of the most convincing reports was submitted by Harvard's noted statistician, Prof. William Cochran, who compiled staggering statistical evidence that cigarettes cause lung cancer, heart trouble, and other ailments.

After 20 years, for example, a pack-a-day smoker is 200 times more likely to develop bronchial adenocarcinoma, a type of lung cancer, than is a nonsmoker.

[From the Medical Tribune, Oct. 21, 1963]

SMOKING EDUCATION

Oregon's Senator MAURINE B. NEUBERGER is now the author of "Smoke Screens: Tobacco and the Public Welfare." We hope her book, on sale next month, goes like hotcakes and promptly appears on the list of best sellers.

Senator NEUBERGER has a deft wit and a sprightly style; her book can be easily read in a couple of hours—to everyone's profit. She has for some time been in the forefront of efforts in Congress to do something constructive about the menace of cigarette smoking but modestly disclaims that this entailed any courage on her part. "Of course," she writes, "if thousands of acres of burley tobacco, instead of wheat, grew in eastern Oregon, or if Portland and Salem were as economically in thrall to the manufacture of cigarettes as such North Carolina cities as Durham and Winston-Salem, I might not be diffident about accepting praise for my courage." Her analysis of the financial stake in cigarette smoking is illuminating.

The program the Senator espouses is one Medical Tribune heartily endorses. "I consider that there are four general sectors of Government activity in which remedial action is presently both justified and tardy: (1) education of both the presmoking adolescent and the adult smoker, (2) expanded research into the technology of safer smoking, (3) reform of cigarette advertising and promotion, and (4) cautionary and informative labeling of cigarette packages."

An admirable way for the physician to further "education of both the presmoking adolescent and the adult smoker" is to recommend the reading of this book.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Nov. 8, 1963]

CIGARETTES AND THE SENATOR

(By Donald Mintz)

"Smoke Screen: Tobacco and the Public Welfare," by MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, 151 pages, Prentice-Hall, Inc.; $3.95.

"Since I'm not a doctor," writes Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER, "I can't justify this book as an authoritative treatise on the medical aspects of smoking (which it most assuredly is not), nor can I claim any special insight into the economic, sociological, psychological, or even historical aspects of the smoking phenomenon. But I am a legislator, and I do make a modest claim to be at home with the questions of Government responsibility. And, since this book culminates a year-long period of relatively intense study and contemplation of the smoking problem, I hope that my conclusions would be of some use to those who are now called upon to chart the course of national policy with respect to smoking; namely, the Surgeon General's Committee on Smoking."

If Senator NEUBERGER's work were only "of some use" to a particular Government committee it would hardly need to be printed and sold to the public at large. Either her claim is too modest, or the text of her book would better have been sent over to the Surgeon General in typescript.

USEFUL BOOK

The former is the case; "Smoke Screen" is a remarkably interesting and useful little book.

The basic medical facts are naturally included, and Senator NEUBERGER has had the foresight to have the manuscript checked by two expert physicians.

But these facts are merely her starting point. The emphasis is on documenting the response to these facts made by the tobacco, advertising, and communications industries and Government agencies which might reasonably be expected to take an interest, and finally in outlining a suggested public policy for the future.

The generally irresponsible nature of the reaction to the dreadful facts about smoking is fairly widely known. Senator NEUBERGER's book shows, however, that the extent of the irresponsibility on all sides is greater than even a relatively hardened cynic might have supposed.

One particular episode may give the average citizen a certain grim pleasure. It seems that when a U.S. Senator writes to the president of a television network asking specific questions and suggesting—ever so gently—that the Senate has certain investigatory powers, she receives an answer that carefully avoids the questions, an answer, indeed, that seems to assume that the Senator is dull enough to be satisfied by faintly disguised noninformation. In short, the Senator and the citizen get the same snow job.

SUGGESTS LEGISLATION

Senator NEUBERGER is not a prohibitionist. She knows that cigarettes and other forms of smoking tobacco can no more be banned than could potable alcohol. Moreover, she knows that even if a ban were possible, there would be no moral or constitutional justification for inflicting it.

She does, however, suggest that the Government can and should take steps to redress the balance; the balance, that is, between the endangered citizen and the numerous, powerful interests that assault him with a variety of weapons ranging from money to motivation research.

"There are four general sectors of Government activity," she writes, "in which remedial action is presently both justified and tardy: (1) education of both the presmoking adolescent and the adult smoker, (2) expanded research into the technology of safer smoking"—this has to do with the chemistry of tobacco combustion and further work on filtration—"(3) reform of cigarette advertising and promotion, and (4) cautionary and informative labeling of cigarette packages."

It seems Senator NEUBERGER omits a matter of the greatest importance. She remarks that members of her staff have been reading about the effects of smoking on health for some time now. Yet many continue to smoke. Perhaps we should add a fifth general sector: Research into the physiological and psychological factors that cause people to take up and cling to the smoking habit.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Nov. 8, 1963]

ADVERTISING: CIGARETTE PROMOTION ASSAILED

(By Peter Bart)

The cigarette industry may have placated some critics recently by voluntarily curbing ads directed at young people, but vehement opposition still remains.

This fact was underscored yesterday with the publication of a lively new book, "Smoke Screen: Tobacco and the Public Welfare." The book was written by Senator MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, and is published by Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Senator NEUBERGER's book presents a sweeping indictment of cigarette advertising and proposes some controversial Government controls over the industry.

All cigarette packages and ads, she urges, should contain warnings of the hazards of smoking. In addition Senator NEUBERGER believes that the Government should embark on an intensive advertising and educational effort of its own to "depict the dangers of smoking."

CURBS HELD NEEDED

No Government campaign against smoking will have any impact without strong restraints on advertising, the Senator writes. Just 16 percent of the population is completely convinced that cigarette smoking is "a major cause of lung cancer," she reports, and the principal reason for this skepticism is the wide latitude given cigarette advertisers.

She cites studies conducted by the American Cancer Society as indicating that "smokers rely on the continued existence of cigarette advertisements as proof that smoking could not be all that bad."

The Senator concludes: "I can think of no Government action relating to the smoking problem which would be more universally acclaimed than surgery of the malignancies of cigarette advertising."

Senator NEUBERGER urges the Federal Trade Commission to take the initiative in requiring health warnings on ads and packages. If commission actions are vitiated by the courts, she writes, then the Federal Communications Commission should step in with its enforcement powers. When a radio or television station broadcasts an offensive cigarette ad, the FCC should lift its license on the ground that the station is not serving "the public interest."

The Tobacco Institute had no comment yesterday on Senator NEUBERGER's book.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Nov. 11, 1963]

OPPONENTS MET SQUARELY

(By Caryl Rivers)

WASHINGTON.—When Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER of Oregon picks a fight, she doesn't look around for someone her size.

The petite, fragile looking, Democratic lady legislator isn't afraid of the heavyweights. Her latest opponents are formidable ones—the tobacco industry, the Daughters of the American Revolution, and the rightwing.

In her new book, "Smoke Screen," she examines the links between smoking and cancer. She is also campaigning to change the tax-free status of the DAR and other so-called educational groups that distribute rightwing political propaganda.

A third project is more favorable legislation for working mothers. She is sponsoring a bill to increase tax deductions allowed for child-care expenses.

THE HEAT'S ON

Mrs. NEUBERGER admits she never runs away from an issue because a long, hard fight may be in the offing. She quotes Harry Truman's favorite saying: "If you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen."

In her antismoking campaign, Senator Neuberger lashes out at the tobacco industry for failing to face up to the statistical findings that incriminate cigarettes as a major factor in the increase of lung cancer. She also criticizes cigarette advertising campaigns directed at recruiting young smokers.

"I don't want to prohibit smoking or eliminate the $8 billion tobacco industry," she says. "But I do feel the U.S. Government should do the same things that it has done with foods and drugs.

SHOULD BE LABELED

"Cigarettes should have a label listing the nicotine and tars and a warning should be included that the product may have an effect on the smoker's health. There should also be a tolerance level set for the amount of nicotine and tars allowed."

Senator Neuberger believes that the Government should conduct a vigorous antismoking campaign, and that the cigarette industry should be urged to police its advertising.

The Senator also says that U.S. taxpayers are subsidizing groups that specialize in anti-Semitic and anti-Catholic propaganda, and that conduct political crusades to impeach the Supreme Court, destroy the United Nations and attack the State Department as pro-Communist.

"When I join liberal groups, I have to pay to support their political activities. These rightist groups have every right to exist and to speak, but let them pay taxes, too," she says.

When she attacked the tax-free status of the DAR, Mrs. Neuberger said that she was supported by a great many DAR members who were upset by the activities of the group's leadership. She quotes a New York DAR chapter head who claims the organization has been "warped from its original purposes" and that "the general membership has no voice of any kind in the formation of DAR policies."

Mrs. Neuberger asks how the DAR can claim to be a nonpolitical organization when it has publicly opposed the Domestic Peace Corps, called the administration "subservient to the U.N.," claimed that the Federal courts are usurping the powers of the State legislatures, and called public housing and urban renewal "socialistic measures"?

WOMEN'S NEEDS

As a woman Member of Congress, the attractive blond Senator feels she is more conscious of the needs of the women of the country than are her male colleagues. Thus, she has long campaigned for a better tax break for working mothers.

"This is an area where the double standard really shows up," she says. "A man who has a business can deduct a box seat at the World Series or a theater party as a business expense, but a working mother can't deduct the cost of a housekeeper."

The Senator has introduced a bill that she says will improve the situation somewhat by allowing deductions of up to $900 for women with more than two children for nursery school costs. The maximum is now $600—whether a woman has 1 child or 10. Under present legislation, if a man and his wife earn over $4,500 a year, child care deductions cannot be taken. The new bill would up this figure to $7,000.

WATERED-DOWN STATUS

Senator Neuberger served on the President's Commission on the Status of Women, and her committee examined this problem.

"I wasn't at all happy with the report that was finally issued," she says. "It was watered down several times before the report was made public. So I decided to write my own bill."

Mrs. Neuberger is known as a champion of women's interests in the Congress. One of her longstanding campaigns has been for better consumer education.

"A workingman can stand on the picket line for days to get an increase in salary, and after he gets it, his wife can fritter it away in one trip to the grocery store."

She notes with dismay that the women who can least afford expensive "convenient foods" are the ones who use them most. To do her bit for the consumer, she writes a newsletter recommending publications dealing with housewives' shopping problems.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 14, 1963]

State of the Nations—New Drive on Cigarettes

(By William H. Stringer)

Washington.—The tobacco industry in the United States is about to face its second rendezvous with destiny.

The first came in 1954–55 when the initial reports of a link between cigarette smoking and disease were bruited about. Cigarette sales fell. The industry turned to the promotion of filter tips and to the study of motivational research for its advertising (the Marlboro tattoo came along to suggest a spurious manliness for instance). Sales bounded up again.

Now comes the second assault, a cumulative barrage, including the "I don't smoke" advertising campaign of the American Cancer Society, the book "Smoke Screen" by Senator Maurine Neuberger, Democrat, of Oregon, the increased efforts to educate teenagers in high schools, and finally, the report ready by the year's end (presumably) of the 10-expert, Surgeon General's Advisory Committee on Smoking and Health.

If this report unequivocally links cigarette smoking to lung and heart disease, as many observers believe it will, some portion of the estimated 67 million Americans who smoke cigarettes will be considering whether they shouldn't break themselves of the habit.

This doesn't automatically guarantee that they will make the requisite effort. At a recent Washington gathering to launch the Neuberger book, a publisher's representative confessed that he was a pack-a-day smoker, that he believed all of the Senator's strictures against smoking, but that he saw no way to rid himself of the desire.

Tackling the cigarette's incredible hold on Americans (it is equally strong in many other parts of the world) is no small task. The Surgeon General's report, if it is alerting and straightforward, still could be watered down, before release, by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or by the White House. Tobacco is a main crop for some 750,000 farm families. Three million workers are busy manufacturing and distributing tobacco products. Six southern tobacco States have key legislators in Congress. It will be argued that Government must not tamper with a major, $8 billion industry.

The Tobacco Industry Research Committee can be expected to issue obfuscating counterblasts alleging "insufficient proof" to any asserted connection with disease. Typically, the president of the Tobacco Grower's Information Committee said the other day he was confident the Surgeon General's Committee would not be "stampeded emotionally."

If a strong report is issued, should the Government then do anything? Senator Neuberger is prepared to propose legislation, the moment the report appears, requiring that cigarette packages carry a warning label on smoking hazards, and that the Government regulate the amount of tar and nicotine in cigarettes. New standards of acceptable advertising could be established.

Whether such measures would reduce cigarette consumption is uncertain. When the Royal College of Physicians issued a powerful report in Britain, consumption declined by 12 percent but soon rebounded. When a portion of humanity even feels that it must turn to drugs and depressants for surcease from today's tensions, instead of looking higher for support, it is obvious that a major effort—individual and collective—would be required to free people from tobacco's grip.

But surely for American youth the lesson can be driven home—through film strips, school information, and (shall one hope?) parental example. For the evidence is that those who begin smoking earliest in life go on to smoke the most packs per day—become the most confirmed smokers—as adults. And authorities agree that the best place to stop the habit is before it starts.

EXTENSION OF ECONOMIC AID TO NATIONS WHICH NO LONGER NEED IT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, it is increasingly obvious that the people of the United States no longer favor aid to the prosperous countries of the world, and more important perhaps, they expect these countries to bear their fair share of our common defense costs, an undue proportion of which are now borne by the United States.

An editorial entitled "The Free Ride Can't Go On Forever," by Samuel H. Day, cogently argues this point. Mr. Day is a real "quadruple threat" journalist—an energetic reporter, a wise editorial writer, an editor, and, at times, even a cartoonist. His editorials on foreign policy are always well considered. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Day's recent foreign policy editorial which appeared in the November 5 issue of the Lewiston, Idaho, Morning Tribune inserted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Free Ride Can't Go on Forever

A report from the Republic of South Africa about automobile sales in that faraway country illustrates a major problem now confronting the Western World. South Africa imports all its motor vehicles, and during 1962 West Germany replaced the United States as a main supplier of the South African market. The U.S. share of the automobile market has fallen from 25 to 9 percent in 7 years. Its share of the commercial vehicle market dropped from 40 to 23 percent. West Germany's share of the auto market has risen from 14 to 33 percent and its share of the commercial vehicle market from nil to 14 percent.

This is a rather spectacular example of what has been happening elsewhere since the end of World War II. Germany and many other nations left prostrate by the war have now recovered their economic health and strength. Not only that, they have in many cases successfully challenged their former benefactor, the United States, in the world markets. As it is with West German cars and trucks, so has it been with Japanese plywoods, British turbines, Italian motor scooters, and many other products.

The industrial nations of Western Europe, all of which were once the recipients of massive doses of American aid, now have themselves become the dispensers of foreign aid. The United States still gives the largest amount of foreign aid, but several other nations are outdoing the United States in terms of their own resources. In 1962 the foreign aid program of France was higher per capita than that of the United States. In the same year the United States ranked behind France, Portugal, Belgium, and Germany in the ratio of foreign aid to gross national product. Quite obviously these nations are in no need of assistance from us.

The economic emergence of these industrial nations—together with the decline of the United States from its former preeminence in international trade—provides much of the impetus for the current U.S. reappraisal of its various foreign assistance programs. The economic aid program is in more serious trouble than usual in Congress because liberals have joined conservatives in the attack. The industrial powers of Western Europe for the most part no longer receive economic assistance from us. But their performance now as economic competitors and political rivals of the United States has been seized upon as an argument against economic aid. The argument is a logical one where it applies to the continued extension of economic aid to nations which have outgrown the need of it.

Equally logical are the arguments being raised with greater insistence against unquestioning continuation of military aid programs throughout the world. Military aid is essentially no different from economic aid. The nation which receives outside help for necessary military defense may safely divert the equivalent tax revenue to its economic well-being. This is what is happening now in Western Europe. Nations like West Germany are being heavily subsidized by us through military assistance while they outdo us on the world trade markets. The U.S. subsidization has been both direct, through the stationing of troops and armament abroad, and indirect through the building and maintenance of the colossally expensive nuclear deterrent, which serves all the West.

Senator FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, states the matter well in an article in the current issue of Harper's magazine:

"Let it be understood that we are there (in Europe) as invited guest * * *. Our presence in Europe is no longer a rescue mission * * * but simply a division of responsibility, as between rich equals for the mutual advantage of each.

"If we furnish our nuclear deterrent for the defense of Europe * * * then Europe must make fair exchange, including at least: 1. No further diffusion of nuclear arms, for this will involve intolerable risks, both to us and Europe itself * * *. 2. Equitable financial and economic arrangements to assist us in solving our adverse balance-of-payments problems * * *. There is no good reason why the force levels of American troops quartered in Europe should not be reduced, and the difference made up by an added commitment of European troops.

"It is essential, too, that European trade barriers against American agricultural and industrial products be reduced or removed."

The fact is that the industrialized nations of Western Europe, particularly those which have formed economic unions among themselves, now have advanced to full partnership with the United States. Their economic independence is no longer questioned. Now they must expect to share fully in the burdens of maintaining that independence. We cannot afford to continue giving them a free ride militarily, and they should not expect it.

PROJECT HOPE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in a world torn by conflicting political ideologies on almost every side and threatened by military might in every corner, no matter how obscure, it is an all-too-rare occasion these days when one can stop for a moment and gaze upon the tranquil scene of man striving to help his fellow man.

Many throughout the world have become inured to the potential cataclysmic consequences that a few misspoken words, a few misinterpreted actions, could bring upon all mankind. Many more must reach deep within themselves to find that a spirit of brotherhood still exists in the souls of men.

But there are few—if any—of us here today who are not moved by the valiant efforts of a few Americans in their battle against disease, malnutrition, and suffering in many lands which do not enjoy the benefits of good health that most of us take for granted.

I refer to Project Hope, the People-to-People Health Foundation and the teaching-training hospital ship SS *Hope* which, at 2 p.m. today, weighed anchor in New York City and set forth on yet another medical mission, this time to Ecuador.

I pay particular tribute to the 89 physicians, dentists, nurses, pharmacists, physical therapists, X-ray technicians, medical secretaries, dietitians, medical technicians, and dental hygienists who sail aboard her, many of whom will not return to their homeland for many months.

To this dedicated group of Americans, all of us can but offer our thanks and, perhaps, the wish that we, too, might one day find the inner happiness that comes only to those who participate in such a true people-to-people effort.

Many of my colleagues in the Congress have risen to praise Project Hope and its founder, Dr. William B. Walsh.

At the risk of repetition, however, let me remind my colleagues of the nearly miraculous work of these dedicated members of the medical profession in Indonesia, South Vietnam, and Peru.

In Indonesia, the story is told of the blind farmer and his blind daughter—who had never seen each other in their lives—who traveled for 2 days by oxcart to the coast to visit the white hospital ship. Along the way, they were warned—even taunted—that the *Hope* was a rumor, that they would find nothing when they reached their destination. Yet, they found *Hope,* their eyesight was restored, the father and the daughter saw one another for the first time and as they returned home, the people along the way were dumfounded. But long queues of sick and unhealthy people had long since begun to visit the *Hope* and its outpatient clinics. When the *Hope* left for South Vietnam, the Times of Indonesia said:

> The East forgets many things but never, never loses its reverence for a teacher. Those on the *Hope* will linger long in our memory.

The story was much the same in South Vietnam. Outpatient clinics were established, and working with their counterparts *Hope's* doctors and nurses taught and trained the South Vietnamese medical personnel in American procedures and techniques while caring for the infirm. *Hope's* medical people journeyed to the delta region, and frequently the Vietcong left their wounded behind for they knew that they would receive the best of care from the "Hopies," as the *Hope* personnel were called.

When the *Hope* arrived off Trujillo in northwestern Peru last May, scarcely 20 residents of this pro-Castro area were on hand to greet the vessel. Ten months later, 45,000 people, the Castro-type beards long since removed, crowded onto the quay and dock to wave goodby. They had decorated the ship from stem to stern with garlands of flowers, many held infants in their arms who had been cured of heretofore incurable diseases by the "Hopies" and thousands wept openly and unashamedly as the ship left.

As the Peruvian pilot prepared to leave the ship he said:

> Tell your country to send people to Latin America, for this gets to the people * * * look at the thousands of peoples on the shore * * * there is living proof. They have been deeply touched by the *Hope,* their lives changed.
>
> No—

He said—

> tell them to send more *Hope* ships.

To the more than 500 members of the medical profession who have served aboard the former U.S. Navy hospital ship in Indonesia, South Vietnam, and Peru and to the 89 leaving today, to be joined by 21 more physicians when the *Hope* arrives in Guayaquil on December 2, I offer for myself—and my colleagues as well—an expression of deep humility and gratitude that is indeed difficult to put into words.

Mr. President, I am proud of the num- of Californians participating in this voyage. I ask consent that a list of the names, titles, and addresses of members of the medical staff on this voyage be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOYAGE III

Donna Adamcin, nurse, Cleveland, Ohio.

Dorothy Aeschliman, nurse, Sacramento, Calif.

Drexler Agner, medical technician, Woodland, Calif.

Ruth Anderson, nurse, Kenmore, N.Y.

Eugene Bannigan, supply clerk, Greenlawn, N.Y.

Lowell Barker, nurse anesthetist, Frewsburg, N.Y.

Michael Beahm, pharmacist, Luray, Va.

Elizabeth Berry, nurse, New Britain, Conn.

Elaine Besterman, medical secretary, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Jennie Bianchi, nurse, New York, N.Y.

Barbara Birdsall, nurse, San Francisco, Calif.

Ann Campion, nurse, Waterbury, Conn.

Edith Clark, nurse, New York, N.Y.

June Collier, medical technician, San Francisco, Calif.

Mildred Combs, medical secretary, Charlotte, N.C.

Mary Cook, nurse, Niles, Mich.

Virginia Cook, nurse, Niles, Mich.

Henry Coyne, supply clerk, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Vivian Crosswhite, physical therapist, Rochester, Minn.

Eugene Daniello, supply clerk, Rome, N.Y.

Kristena De Luz, dietician, San Jose, Calif.

Delia Dorame, nurse, Palo Alto, Calif.

Mary Elmore, nurse, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Mary Finley, nurse, Los Angeles, Calif.

Doris Fooks, X-ray technician, Lexington, Ken.

Forsythe, Paul J., Rev., minister, Richmond, Va.

Ignatia Foti, nurse, New York, N.Y.

Elaine Frevert, nurse, Washington, D.C.

Judith Gaiser, physical therapist, Washington, D.C.

Bonnie Goodwin, nurse, St. Paul, Minn.

Dorothy Grimes, nurse anesthetist, Wolcott, Conn.

Gloria Hammond, medical technician, Palo Alto, Calif.

Jackie Harris, medical technician, Columbus, Ohio.

Olive Lee Harrison, nurse, Grove City, Pa.

Martha Henderek, medical technician, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada.

Carol Hendrick, medical technician, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Elfreda Hester, nurse, Woburn, Mass.

Darlene Jeanes, medical secretary, Indianapolis, Ind.

Audrey Johanson, nurse, Pueblo, Colo.

Shirley Johnson, nurse, Grand Rapids, Minn.

Virginia Johnson, nurse, San Francisco, Calif.

Margaret Kiolet, nurse, Great Falls, Mont.

Sally Kyle, medical secretary, West Yarmouth, Mass.

Lottie Lamphere, nurse, Lansing, Mich.

Catherine Langer, medical secretary, Albuquerque, N. Mex.

Dolores Lawler, medical technician, New York, N.Y.

Mary Layman, nurse, San Jose, Calif.

Nina Ludwig, nurse, Evansville, Ind.

Elaine Mack, nurse, Cleveland, Ohio.

John F. Magner, S.J., minister, San Francisco, Calif.

Nancy Malik, nurse, San Francisco, Calif.

Rita Martin, nurse, Broughton, Kans.

Ellen Mathews, medical secretary, Washington, D.C.

Jeanne McDonald, X-ray technician, San Francisco, Calif.

Vyn Meier, sanitarian, Grand Haven, Mich.

Malcolm Metcalf, X-ray technician, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

Ann Murphy, dietician, Valhalla, N.Y.

Shirley Norstrom, nurse, Minneapolis, Minn.

Patricia Paez, medical secretary, Arlington, Va.

Champe Phillips, physical therapy, El Paso, Tex.

Howard R. Porter, M.D., general and thoracic surgery, Oakland, Calif.

Winifred Quinn, nurse, Arlington, Mass.

Carol Renkowitz, nurse, Easton, Pa.

Ann Roden, nurse, South Bend, Ind.

Kim Sasano, nurse, Arvada, Colo.

Jonathon Schmidt, electronics maintenance, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Adelaide Schoch, nurse, San Francisco, Calif.

Barbara Schwenk, medical technician, St. Paul, Minn.

Peggy Sherwood, pharmacist, Cleveland, Ohio.

Janice Smith, medical technician, Fresno, Calif.

Ana Soto, Ph. D., medical technician, Miami, Fla.

Alfred J. Sparks, hospital administrator, New York, N.Y.

Roger Steadman, medical technician, Buffalo, N.Y.

Carolyn Strong, X-ray technician, Baltimore, Md.

Priscilla Strong, nurse anesthetist, West Hartford, Conn.

Irene Tegenkamp, medical technician, Dayton, Ohio.

Grace Tucker, nurse, Dalton, Mass.

Ethel Vande Bunte, nurse, Hudsonville, Mich.

Helen Ward, nurse anethetist, Winston-Salem, N.C.

Dorothy Webster, nurse, Boston, Mass.

Julie Wehrle, dental hygienist, Hollidaysburg, Pa.

Kathleen Williams, nurse, Seattle, Wash.

Doris Winter, dental hygienist, Pittsburgh, Pa.

BLUEPRINT FOR A STRONGER CONGRESS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, my good friend and colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey, CLIFFORD CASE, has again demonstrated his concern about the need for improving the operations of the legislative body in which we have the honor to serve. I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD his article from the November 23, 1963, issue of the Saturday Review, entitled "Blueprint for a Stronger Congress."

In this article, Senator CASE suggests a number of specific ways in which we can improve congressional procedures. In my judgment, they are worth reading and pondering.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLUEPRINT FOR A STRONGER CONGRESS

(By CLIFFORD P. CASE, U.S. Senator from New Jersey)

What can be done about revitalizing Congress?

There has been no comprehensive attempt to bring congressional procedures and practices up to date since the enactment of the LaFollette-Monroney Congressional Reorganization Act in 1946. Since then, our Nation has gained 2 new States, has increased its population by 50 million, and has moved into an entirely new range of international and national problems.

In looking over the activities of Congress from a perspective of 18 years of service, I recognize that there is no simple, one-shot solution. Our problems are many, and each of them may require a separate approach.

Earlier this year, I joined with Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, in a resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Organization of Congress to study procedures and practices with a view toward improving the efficiency of our branch of Government. Originally, I had urged that experts from the public, as well as Members of Congress, be included in a Hoover Commission type of study group, but the Senate Rules Committee in approving the resolution has decided to limit the group to Members of Congress. Unfortunately, the committee also excluded the House and Senate rules from its purview. Still, I believe we can do a good and necessary job under this resolution.

The Rules Committee accepted several of the problem areas which I included in my legislation and used them to illustrate the nature and scope of the proposed inquiry.

The first problem area is the scheduling of measures for consideration and action. Legislation is now very slow in coming to a vote during the early months of a session of Congress, with an inevitable end-of-session pile-up.

Congressional Quarterly, which keeps a boxscore on major legislation, reported at the end of September that thus far only six major bills had been enacted into law by the 88th Congress. Significantly, all six of these were enacted by almost unanimous votes, indicating that they were relatively noncontroversial. Four were routine, one was an emergency, and only one enacted any new program. The six were the corporate and excise tax extension, increasing the debt limit, aid for medical schools, the rail dispute bill, feed grains, and extension of the draft.

Perhaps of equal significance is the tabulation by Congressional Quarterly of action on proposals made by President Kennedy. Fully one-third have received no action in the House or the Senate—not even a hearing. This is not to suggest that the proposals of a President should automatically be made law, but I am concerned that many of these proposals have been buried in committee and there has been no opportunity for a vote on their merits. This points up the tremendous powers of a committee or subcommittee chairman.

A recent example concerns the wilderness bill, a major piece of legislation that has been passed by the Senate twice. It is now in a House committee with no action, not even a hearing, pending. It makes no sense that one man, chairman of a committee or subcommittee because of longevity, can block consideration of an important bill.

Delay has not only beset purely legislative measures, but has also tied up the annual appropriation bills that provide necessary funds for carrying out governmental programs. Our Government runs on a fiscal year that ends June 30. As of that date, we had passed only one appropriation bill. In fact, as of the first week of October, we had approved only 3 of the 10 major appropriations measures. This means, of course, that the Government is functioning largely on continuing resolutions that permit temporary financing, but not breaking any new ground, not permitting any shift or alteration in major congressional programs.

An example of the need for such shifts involves the public schools of the District of Columbia. The Congress has been told that the city schools desperately need 388 new teachers to keep the size of classes at something approaching a reasonable level, but the plea has been butted about and at the moment the Senate is nowhere near passing the bill. As a result, this new school year is moving along with last year's quota of teachers, and thousands of youngsters will be irrevocably harmed. This example is typical of what happens throughout the Government. As one newspaper pointed out recently: "If an indecisive and vacillating board of directors ran the financial affairs of a large corporation the way Congress handles those of the Federal Government, the disgusted stockholders would rise in wrath and throw them out of office."

I cite these facts to demonstrate the great need for expediting our present lagging procedures. Here are some of the suggested remedies which I believe are worthy of consideration: Setting a deadline for committee action on bills recommended by the executive branch, if not on all bills, and on nominations and treaties submitted by the executive branch; scheduling congressional committee meetings on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, and sessions of the full House and Senate on Tuesdays and Thursdays, and, as necessary, on Saturdays; extending appropriations bills to cover 2-year periods so that Congress may concentrate on legislation in one session and on appropriations in the next session, with due provision for consideration of emergency legislation.

A second problem is the structure, staffing, and operation of congressional committees. The role of absolute seniority in appointment to committees and especially in selection of chairmen should be reexamined. Clarification and modification of committees' jurisdictions is overdue. Rules of procedure, particularly for convening investigations and handling witnesses, should be enacted to cover all committees. The role of the House Rules Committee should be reexamined.

A third problem involves the role of Members of Congress in the appointment of postmasters and the making of appointments to military service academies and other Government agencies. Congress could eliminate politics by placing post office appointments exclusively under civil service and handling the nominations to the various academies by civil service examinations.

A fourth problem is legislative overseeing of the administration of laws. We need a more systematic and effective method of seeing to it that the intent of Federal law is carried out. But this problem also involves not only intent but also the manner in which legislation is put into effect. One example related to this question is the Area Redevelopment Act, which has been the subject of numerous complaints that it has been used for partisan advantage.

One of the sharpest of these complaints came from Representative CLARENCE E. KILBURN, Republican, of New York, who told a House Banking and Currency Committee hearing that the ARA had dispatched a telegram to his Democratic opponent the day before his reelection last year to announce an industrial loan to repair and modernize a pulp and paper mill. The effect of the announcement, in Congressman KILBURN's words, "was electrifying." A newspaper in the area described the reaction in the job-hungry town of Norfolk in this way: "The announcement touched off a celebration in Norfolk unparalleled since the ending of World War II. Early in the evening the fire station there began sounding its horn, sirens screamed, church bells rang, and a sound truck moved through the settlement loudly exclaiming the glad news. Some report that there was dancing in the streets, and taverns overflowed for 'a drink to celebrate.'" The election was next day.

A fifth area that requires attention is the strengthening of the congressional power of the purse. We need to do a better job of coordinating congressional performance in raising and appropriating public funds. At present, Members of Congress are faced with individual appropriations bills dealing with the major departments of Government, but there is little opportunity to approach these measures with information on the effect each has on the overall Federal budget or with a thorough picture of overall Federal revenues. In short, we are asked to do the family shopping week after week without adequate information on what the annual income will be or what the total family expenses may amount to.

A sixth problem is the operation and effectivenes of existing laws related to lobbying. Recent hearings by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the representatives of foreign governments suggest strongly that some improvements are essential in both the provisions and administration of our lobby safeguards. The development of this relatively new activity adds another dimension to the practice of lobbying on Capitol Hill.

The Rules Committee also added two problems areas to the resolution. One is the problem of how to settle time-consuming stalemates between the House and the Senate—what kind of formal machinery can be established to solve procedural disputes and to provide a more cohesive legislative process?

Last year, in the 87th Congress, several appropriations measures were tied up for months in a dispute over where meetings of House and Senate conferees were to be held in order to adjust differences in the bills. Another problem, which has been emphasized by Senator CLARK, concerns the appointment of conferees on controversial legislation without regard to their personal position on legislation. Under present procedure, a conferee appointed to represent the Senate's position may have taken an active role opposing that very position on the Senate floor. Even if we assume the best of intentions on the part of such conferees, it is difficult to accept the view that they will be the most effective spokesmen for the Senate's position in conference with the House of Representatives.

The committee's other addition to the resolution is a suggestion that the joint committee study the extension of the services rendered by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, including the furnishing of additional scientific and technological advice and assistance to the Members and committees of the Congress. This added item on the agenda is a recognition of the tremendous growth in legislation dealing with complicated scientific and technological activities.

I hope, too, that Congress will be given an opportunity to vote soon on two additional resolutions reported favorably by the Senate Rules Committee. The first of these would require that all debate, for at least 3 hours each day during a Senate session, be germane to the subject under discussion. At present, the House has a rule of germaneness, but the Senate does not.

A second resolution would permit standing committees to continue in session until completion of the Senate's morning hour, when it conducts routine business. At the present time, an objection by one Member of the Senate forces a committee to adjourn whenever the Senate is in session. This has been used by some Senators to stall committee action on legislation.

A third resolution, which would permit former Presidents to address the Senate upon appropriate notice to the Presiding Officer, has been approved by the Senate and is now a part of its standing rules.

While the most experienced Members of Congress would see a great deal of wisdom in the congressional reform resolution, its passage is not certain. Some Members of Congress have a vested interest in antiquated congressional procedures. For them, power and prerogatives are assured under today's system. This points up the reason for delay in acting on such legislation from within the Congress.

But there is a further handicap. There are no powerful national organizations actively pushing Congress to act on congressional reform. For these reasons, continued and expanded public interest is vital to final enactment of our proposal for a Joint Committee on Organization of Congress.

Congress isn't losing power and prestige because of what it does, but rather because of what it doesn't do. There are some who believe that an inactive Congress is the best Congress, that a Congress that bottles up legislation and therefore doesn't have to vote is the kind of Congress that protects their interests. I believe, however, that we must have a Congress that is not afraid of the issues facing our Nation and is willing to be counted on these issues.

The longer we let Congress half strangle itself in its outmoded procedures, the less significant will its role become in American Government and American life, and fewer and fewer first-rate men and women will be willing to devote themselves to congressional service. Thus, congressional ineffectiveness will feed upon itself.

But in politics, as in nature, a vacuum is abhorrent. The power and the scope of the Presidency will inevitably expand as that of the Congress declines. At some point, the breakdown of Congress could put democratic government in danger—even in the United States of America.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE AND FOREIGN AID

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to an editorial in this morning's New York Herald Tribune concerning Senator JAVITS' amendment to the foreign aid bill calling for the establishment of an Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid. The Senate adopted this amendment by an overwhelming vote.

The actions of the Senate during 3 week's debate on the foreign aid bill indicate a serious dissatisfaction with many aspects of this program as presently conceived and clearly call for a reformulation of this program which is so vital to our national security. The proposal advanced by Senator JAVITS, which springs from a suggestion made by William S. Paley, chairman of the board of CBS, is a very sound one and the advisory committee should in my judgment, play an important role in the shaping of a new and more effective foreign aid program.

The aid program should be made the primary vehicle to demonstrate the great force of private enterprise for creating conditions for human opportunity and dignity and the evolution of stable and democratic institutions in the developing world. The time has arrived to recognize that the potential for the most dramatic contribution to the economic development of the free world lies in creating opportunities for the citizens in the developing nations to apply their own skill and resources in partnership with the private enterprise of the United States and other aid donor countries and without unjustifiable interference and restraint by governments.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the editorial from the New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPPORTUNITY FOR BUSINESS

The administration and the Congress, between them, have made and are making a pretty good hash of our foreign aid program. One laid the paralyzing hand of bureaucratic redtape upon it. The other put the ax to it. The result is something which foreign recipients themselves are now inclined to reject.

In this unhappy and unsavory state of affairs, Senator JAVITS advanced a proposal originally made by William S. Paley, chairman of the board of the Columbia Broadcasting System, in an address to the 49th National Foreign Trade Convention in New York. It is to discover "a formula, or mechanism, or set of ground rules, which will harness the colossal power, imagination and experience of American business and finance to the foreign development task."

The Senate has adopted a proposal by Senator JAVITS, offered as an amendment to the foreign aid bill, to establish an "Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid." It is to undertake the search for the formula mentioned by Mr. Paley.

Proposals for business-government cooperation have been put forward in the past. But, as Mr. Paley points out, "* * * few of the ideas have been translated into action." The way is now being opened for such action, and it would be a tragedy of the greatest proportions if what we might call the Paley-Javits plan does not win energetic support.

The opportunity is an exciting one. For if private enterprise could do in a few foreign nations a mere fraction of what it has done in the United States, new chapters in economic history would be written.

FOOD FOR PEACE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, my attention has been directed to the harvest festival issue of Agricultural Notes, prepared by the Federal Extension Service for national town and church leaders.

The publication comments that now, more than ever before, it is a time to be thankful for what we are able to give and suggests that we stop to think of our good fortune in being able to share our bountiful harvests with peoples around the world.

The brief résumé of the food-for-peace program is a splendid account of the history and accomplishments of that program, which this Congress has made possible so our abundance can be shared, and in which the Members of Congress can take great pride.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert the harvest festival issue of Agricultural Notes at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS THANKSGIVING—GIVE THANKS FOR GIVING

In just a few weeks, families all across rural America will pause to celebrate Thanksgiving. It's a time for counting the blessings of a bountiful harvest. Traditionally, it's a time for giving thanks for what we receive.

Now, more than ever before, it's a time to be thankful for what we are able to give—possibly even more than for what we receive. For the moment, pause to ponder the meaning of the giving in Thanksgiving, while remembering that our thanks is for the most bountiful harvests any nation has enjoyed in the history of the world.

FOOD FOR PEACE: A GREAT LESSON IN GIVING

Nearly a decade ago the people of America set forth on a great crusade against world hunger—a crusade of giving—a sharing of the abundant harvest of American agriculture. Since then, needy people around the world have received more than $12 billion worth of food and fiber from the United States, either as an outright gift or on special concessional sale terms.

This vast program is carried out under authority of Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. It provides authority for concessional sales—and gifts—of surplus U.S. agricultural commodities to friendly foreign nations. This great humanitarian effort to eliminate hunger from the face of the earth has become known around the world as food for peace.

What is food for peace? Food for peace is many things to many people. To a starving child in Pakistan it is life. To a schoolboy in Bolivia it is lunch. To a small girl in Hong Kong it is a bowl of rice. To 92 million people in more than 100 countries around the world it is part of their daily food.

Church members of all faiths support the food-for-peace program through such organizations as Church World Service, Catholic Relief Services, Lutheran World Relief, and the American Joint Jewish Distribution Committee.

Food for peace helps feed children

Food for peace is a great blessing to more than 40 million children in 91 countries who eat food from American farms every day in school lunches. Take the true story of Jose, a thin, undersized boy who did not start school in a suburb of Rio de Janeiro until he was 12 years old. Jose's first year in school was a trying one. He was often sick. He also had to work hard at home, helping to take care of his 13 brothers and sisters. No lunch was served at school that first year. Jose failed to pass first grade.

A school lunch program, using wheat from the Great Plains of the United States and powdered milk from American dairy farms, was started midway through the school term in Jose's second year in school. Jose, who until that time was chronically absent again and who was in danger of having to spend a third year in the first grade, started coming to school regularly. By the end of the school term in December, just 3 months after the school lunch program started, Jose had gained 9 pounds and had grown 2½ inches. He passed into second grade. For Jose, and millions more like him, we can be thankful for our abundance of food—and for the opportunity of giving to those in need.

In some areas of the world the food-for-peace school lunch is the only square meal the child gets all day. It not only increases the child's learning capacity, but also encourages many children to go to school in the first place. Food for peace helps the child while he is young—while he can be helped the most. It also helps children to stay in school, as was the case with Jose.

In Bolivia and Peru, for example, it is estimated that rural school attendance has nearly doubled since the school lunch program began. In June of last year, the United States was helping to feed 11 percent of the school-age children in Latin America—one out of nine. Today, we are reaching about one out of four of those children. Within a year we expect to feed one out of every three school-age children in Latin America. Worldwide, children feeding programs have been increased 13 percent in the last 6 months.

American food is building schools

Food from America is doing more than feeding schoolchildren; it is also helping to build the schools which they attend. For example, on the shore of Lake Titicaco, more than 12,000 feet high in the mountains of Bolivia, 30 small children attend a new school. It was built by their fathers and a handful of Bolivian soldiers—and by the people of the United States.

This new school is a modest adobe brick structure. Building materials for the little school came from the land on which it stands. Chocolate-hued mud was scooped up, mixed with straw from nearby farms and molded into bricks. Rocks from the mountain were hewn by hand and used for the floor. The 10 Bolivian soldiers and 30 fathers who built the school were paid in beans, flour, dried milk and cornmeal—all produced on American farms and donated by the people of the United States. The school at Lake Titicaco is just one of 100 new schools in Bolivia alone made possible by generous giving by American people.

Food for peace gives hope to disaster victims

When disaster strikes, American food is rushed to the scene through voluntary agencies such as Church World Service, Red Cross, CARE, Catholic Relief Services, Lutheran World Relief, and United Nations agencies such as UNICEF and UNRWA. Those organizations have distributed more than $2 billion worth of American foods to victims of hurricanes, floods, earthquakes, droughts, and other disasters.

Victims of a severe earthquake in Iran, for example, were eating American food within 24 hours after the disaster struck, leaving 10,000 injured and 40,000 homeless. Eighteen days later, nearly 1,500 tons of food had been given to 15,000 families in more than 200 villages.

When crops were wiped out by 2 years of drought, flood, and army worms in Kenya, Africa, the American people once again demonstrated their spirit of compassion through giving. Voluntary agencies—using food donated by the American people—supplied local tribes with 34,000 tons of corn, 2,500 tons of dry milk and 1,300 tons of edible oil—about $8 million worth of food. Some of this food was used to pay wages of local workers who rebuilt bridges, roads, and other flood-destroyed public property.

This year, 238 food distribution programs of this type are being carried out through the facilities of 19 relief agencies. These are voluntary groups of Americans—both religious and nonsectarian—whose members and supporters contribute money, time, and labor to help less fortunate people in other lands. These voluntary agencies will distribute more than $300 million worth of American food to nations abroad this year.

Food for peace is paying wages, promoting progress

More than half a million workers—many of them formerly out of work—now receive part of their daily wages in food from the United States. This program, which emphasizes the dignity of labor, is bringing all kinds of local progress in developing nations—the building of roads, irrigation systems, powerplants, public buildings. It is also planting new forests and opening up new areas for settlement. Workers not only get the food they need for their families, they are working to build better communities.

Food for peace is building future cash markets

Biggest food-for-peace shipments are made through special concessional sales to countries still unable to pay dollars for our farm products in the world market. Instead, these countries buy with their own currency. Much of this is granted or loaned back to the country for economic development projects such as building roads, schools, dams, and public buildings. Over $200 million of this soft currency was also used last year to help defray costs of U.S. official activities in these countries, such as market development and military needs.

A certain amount is set aside, however, for promoting further cash sales of American farm products in industrialized nations able and willing to pay dollars for U.S. agricultural products. Food-for-peace generated currencies are being used to promote sales in Europe and Japan, the largest dollar markets abroad. Market promotion activities run the gamut—from food exhibits to paid advertising.

Thus, food for peace is building markets two ways: in industrialized countries through market promotion, in developing countries through economic development.

OTHER PROGRAMS, LIKE FOOD FOR PEACE, FIGHT BATTLE AGAINST HUNGER

Food for peace—though the largest—is by no means the only effort of the American people to share their abundance with hungry people in other lands. The freedom-from-hunger campaign of the United Nations, for instance, is a great joint effort in this struggle against the twin foes of mankind—hunger and poverty. Late this summer more than 1,000 delegates from 100 countries met in Washington, D.C., at the World Food Congress to consider ways to supply food urgently needed in 61 countries of the world.

In addition, the United States has pledged $50 million in commodities and cash to a 3-year multilateral world food program sponsored by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

But food for peace remains the major program for sharing abundant American food supplies with the rest of the world.

(NOTE.—We are indebted to the Office of Information and the Foreign Agricultural Service of the Department for compiling the material for this issue.)

Sincerely,

PHILLIP F. AYLESWORTH,
Program Relationships.

QUALITY STABILIZATION LEGISLATION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, amid the partisan charges and propaganda being

disseminated by special interests against the quality stabilization bill, it is indeed refreshing to come upon a serious, objective and lucid analysis of this vital legislation.

Such an analysis, thoroughly researched and carefully reasoned, was recently presented in a five-part series by Mr. Earl Lifshey, published in Home Furnishings Daily.

No better analyst could be found to study the necessity and meaning of quality stabilization legislation than Earl Lifshey. He is an expert in the highly specialized field of retail economics, and his pinpoint dissection of this complex issue should be read and considered by the interested public and by every Member of Congress.

The question of survival of America's independent retailers is vital to all segments of the national economy. Mr. Lifshey is to be commended for his important contribution toward an understanding of this problem and of quality stabilization's role in solving it.

With unanimous consent, I therefore ask permission to place Mr. Lifshey's analysis in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Home Furnishings Daily, Oct. 14, 1963]

IF YOU ASK ME

(By Earl Lifshey)

(First of a series)

Now the U.S. Senate, which has been pondering legislation in the battle over civil rights, has begun consideration of a proposed law in the battle over some other but proportionately precious rights.

I refer to the battle over the property rights of businessmen engaged in marketing as set forth in the pending quality stabilization bill.

It is a fight about a law with a very elementary, basic objective: To establish and insure the same rights of free enterprise, in the true meaning of that term, to everyone competing in the marketplace for the consumer's dollar instead of permitting only some to enjoy special rights as they do now.

The whole point and purpose of the quality stabilization bill is that simple and fundamental. As a result, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, after extensive hearings, has already reported favorably on it and recommended that it be passed.

Our American sense of fairplay demands that all contestants have an equal opportunity to compete for the winning honors. I know of no one, for example, who has ever advocated eliminating the Queensbury Rules in boxing or playing a ball game without an umpire. Such equality of opportunity and fairplay is as desperately needed in the competition of America's marketplace as it is in the sports stadium.

That may be too much to expect in this day and age. But the very least we can do, it seems to me, is to have the moral integrity and the intellectual courage to put an end to those conditions which permit some to enjoy unfair advantages through special privilege. And that is precisely what the quality stabilization bill is designed to do.

The provisions of this bill are quite simple but since there are still those who appear confused about its terms, let me repeat them in the language of the House Commerce Committee:

"The bill would authorize the owner of a brand name or trademark, if he so desires, to protect his property right in the brand name or trademark by revoking the right of any person to use his identifying marks in the resale of goods if such person has engaged in bait merchandising with respect to such goods, has sold or offered for sale such goods at prices other than those established by the owner, or has published misrepresentations concerning such goods." The committee also spelled out the protection the proposed law affords the consumer:

"In order for the owner of a brand name or trademark to take advantage of this quality stabilization bill, the goods he sells must be in free and open competition with goods usable for the same general purpose and available to the public from sources other than such owner. In other words, the branded goods must be competitive with similar articles on the market.

"This competition protects the consumer from having to pay exorbitantly high prices for branded merchandise because the owner of the brand must set his price as low as possible in order to compete successfully. At the same time, the price set for the branded merchandise would be calculated as to enable the owner and all his distributors, including the local retailer, to make a reasonable profit.

"This legislation, of course, does not guarantee them a profit, but merely offers them the assurance that whatever price the owner of the brand establishes for his wholesalers and retailers will be observed. The owner of a brand name or trademark is entitled to this protection."

It isn't surprising that the discount fraternity, alarmed that their special interests and advantages would be sharply curtailed by the passage of this law, are bitterly opposed to it. What is surprising is the amount of opposition and criticism based entirely on completely unfounded concepts of the bill and utter ignorance of what it would do. Senator THRUSTON MORTON, Republican, of Kentucky, put it well the other day when he declared:

"The campaign against this bill reflects the worst tricks of the professional propagandist: 'Tell a lie—keep repeating it—until finally it is accepted as the truth.' * * * Someone has organized this vicious, high-priced campaign against the quality stabilization bill. A sharp hatchet is being wielded."

[From the Home Furnishings Daily, Oct. 15, 1963]

IF YOU ASK ME

(By Earl Lifshey)

(Second of a series)

"What's yours is mine—what's mine is my own."

Those nine little words sum up the predatory, rapacious philosophy of those retailers, especially the so-called discounters, who are so violently opposed to the quality stabilization bill now before Congress.

Retailers, of course, generally have the right to compete for the customer's dollar at whatever prices they think are to their own best interests. They can, as many do, establish their own private brands for this purpose—and also sell them at prices of their own choosing.

Under our concepts of free, competitive enterprise, no one would deny them those rights—provided the manufacturers of such merchandise are granted the same rights and equal freedom of choice.

Now, however, with certain exceptions, manufacturers who believe they can compete most effectively for their share of the consumer's dollar with a policy of maintained prices are denied that choice. But what is even worse, from the standpoint of elementary justice, is that there is nothing to prevent retailers from using a manufacturer's property—his brand name or trademark—to further their own interest regardless of the manufacturer's wishes or the consequences to his property.

It is that great inequality which the quality stabilization bill is designed to correct. It would replace the badly warped, free-for-all-on-one-side kind of competition with real free and equal enterprise. Achieving that is the real issue of this whole battle. And it is important to always remember that fact regardless of the many deceptive smokescreens of unrelated issues and shameful distortions of facts which the opposition so desperately drags into its arguments.

Meanwhile, the discounters, who invariably like to have their cake while they eat somebody else's, have stepped up their opposition to this legislation. Hardly had the House Commerce Committee announced its recommendation that it be enacted into law when the discounters sounded a call to arms.

Out West, for example, one group calling itself the Allied Consumer Association of California (how those guys love to wear whiskers and masquerade as "consumer" organizations) met and voted to send two delegates to a meeting on the subject in Washington.

Here in the East, another group of discounters, alarmed that the QSB, if passed, would attack the very roots of low-margin retail operations and pose a threat to our industry's survival have formed the Committee for Competitive Prices.

Of course, the QSB isn't a threat to the survival of mass merchandising, and they know it. But it is—and is designed to be—a direct threat to the special privilege of footballing other people's property the mass merchandisers now enjoy, and they know that too.

The Committee for Competitive Prices seems well named. It shows again that while the discounters are obsessed with the price of everything they are concerned with the value of nothing when it concerns free and equal enterprise.

Typical of the kind of attacks the discounters make is an almost-full-page ad which the Shoppers' Mart Discount Stores recently ran in the Denver Rocky Mountain News. The whole upper half is given to a coupon which readers are urged to sign in opposition to the QSB. Quoting an old Justice Department survey which purported to show that "people in States with fair trade laws pay from 19 to 27 percent higher prices," the coupon goes on to state: "I vote against this bill that would raise my cost of living 19 to 27 percent as testified by the Department of Justice."

As the records prove, fair-traded items never have constituted more than a very small—10 to 15 percent—portion of all goods sold, so it requires a special kind of skill to be able to twist that fact into the statement that it increases the cost of living 19 to 27 percent.

But apparently Shoppers' Mart has a lot of such skill for while it is unquestionably a retail operation it claims in big type that "You never pay retail at Shoppers' Mart." The real payoff, however, is the offering of 17 items in the ad in which the store's price is compared with the "fair trade price"—all of which might be very impressive except that Colorado hasn't had a fair trade law for a long, long time.

[From the Home Furnishings Daily, Oct. 16, 1963]

IF YOU ASK ME

(By Earl Lifshey)

(Third of a series)

Remove the identifying trademark from any well-known product and the retailer who was ready to buy it before won't do so now. He has good reason. For the trademark of such a product provides immediate public recognition and acceptance for it; without it all that remains is just so much material of unknown quality and reliability.

And yet retailers, when they buy a well-known branded item continue to assume they do not only have complete ownership of it, but that they are, therefore, rightfully entitled to do with it as they wish—including the right to sell it at or below cost, regardless of the consequences to the manufacturer who owns the trademark in question.

Well, they're wrong * * * dead wrong. That they have been and continue to be able to get away with it doesn't change matters. Nor does the fact that, thus far at any rate, our national laws are inadequate to cover the situation. The proposed quality stabilization bill is designed specifically, among other things, to spell out the ethical and legal principles involved, principles which, it should interest and impress everyone concerned, were enunciated by the U.S. Supreme Court 27 years ago in the now famous case of *Old Dearborn Distributing Co.* v. *Seagram Distillers' Corp.*

The frailties of human nature and the vicissitudes of life being what they are, our laws often lag far behind our requirements. The lack of an adequate and properly effective national law covering this matter of a manufacturer's trademark property right is a case in point. The QSB, as I've indicated, will correct that deficiency—a correction which is long overdue.

It's a very safe bet, you can be sure, that no retailer would stand by and do nothing if and when—heaven forbid—a manufacturer were to take that retailer's private brand line and promote it at cut prices. And the retailer would have every right to stop such abuse of his brand name—his property.

By what law of logic, therefore—if not yet the law of the land—should a manufacturer be denied the same right to protect his brand name, his property, should he require it? The answer, of course, is that he is fully entitled to it and it should not be denied. That is precisely what the Supreme Court ruled in 1936 and since it's of such vital importance, you can read the key excerpts from it right now:

"It is contended that the statute (Illinois fair trade law) is a price-fixing law, which has the effect of denying to the owner of property the right to determine for himself the price at which he will sell. Appellants invoke the well-settled general principle that the right of the owner of property to fix the price at which he will sell it is an inherent attribute of the property itself, and as such is within the protection of the 5th and 14th amendments.

"We find nothing in this situation to justify the contention that there is an unlawful delegation of power to private persons to control the disposition of the property of others.

"We are here dealing not with a commodity alone, but with a commodity plus the brand or trademark which it bears as evidence of its origin and of the quality of the commodity for which the brand or trademark stands. Appellants own the commodity; they do not own the mark or the goodwill that the mark symbolizes. And goodwill is property in a very real sense, injury to which, like injury to any other species of property, is a proper subject for legislation.

"Goodwill is a valuable contributing aid to business—sometimes the most valuable contributing asset of the producer or distributor of commodities. And distinctive trademarks, labels and brands are legitimate aids to the creation or enlargement of such goodwill. It is well settled that the proprietor of the goodwill 'is entitled to protection as against one who attempts to deprive him of the benefits resulting from the same, by using his labels and trademark without his consent and authority.'

"There is nothing in the act to preclude the purchaser from removing the mark or brand from the commodity—thus separating the physical property, which he owns, from the goodwill, which is the property of another—and then selling the commodity at his own price, provided he can do so without utilizing the goodwill of the latter as an aid to that end.

"There is a great body of fact and opinion tending to show that price cutting by retail dealers is not only injurious to the goodwill and business of the producer and distributor of identified goods, but injurious to the general public as well. The evidence to that effect is voluminous."

Well, that's what the Court said.

[From the Home Furnishings Daily, Oct. 17, 1963]

IF YOU ASK ME

(By Earl Lifshey)

(Fourth of a series)

"Some people," wrote that brilliant Polish satirist, Stanislaw Lee, "like to understand what they believe in. Others like to believe in what they understand."

Nowhere is that more evident than in Washington where some officials, speaking with the courage of ignorance, persist in promulgating their particular concept of free, competitive enterprise—even if that concept ends up killing not only the competitors, but their enterprises as well. Their lack of real understanding of the problems of pricing is exceeded only by the amazing conclusions at which they arrive concerning those problems.

Fifty years ago, long before America had learned enough from costly experience in the marketplace to come up with the proposed quality stabilization bill as a fair and practical solution to some of its worst problems of distribution, one of its greatest minds voiced some views on distribution that are even more timely now than when they were written.

"There must be reasonable restrictions upon competition, else we shall see competition destroyed," wrote Justice Louis D. Brandeis in a letter to Robert M. La Follette, Sr., on May 26, 1913. Two years earlier, in a brief to the Interstate Commerce Commission, he declared: "Unrestricted competition, with its abuses and excesses * * * prevents that natural development which should attend rivalry and which gives success to those who contribute most to the community by the development of their own business. * * * It substitutes devious and corrupt methods for honest rivalry * * * its purpose is not to excel but to destroy."

Such lucid logic stands in striking contrast to the testimony of FTC Chief Paul Dixon last week during the Senate Commerce Committee hearing on the quality stabilization bill in which he repeatedly tried to show that the bill would eliminate competition.

One of his objections, for example, is that "It provides for the determination of resale prices by noncompetitive forces," since the bill gives manufacturers that right if they wish to use it. In other words, it's obviously his understanding that once a manufacturer has sold his goods to a retailer he need never give them a second thought, since at that point he has become a noncompetitive force. Such a revelation will come as real news to most manufacturers I know. It shows the conclusions one can reach by believing only in what one understands.

But that's not all, by any means. Mr. Dixon objects to the bill because, in his view, it permits price maintenance by private agreement. Who then, I wonder, should set the proposed retail price on his merchandise if not the manufacturer—the FTC?

He voices a strange concern that the enactment of this bill "may well result in a marked increase in the offering for sale under private labels identical goods to those sold under trademarks." It might help his understanding of the facts if one of his investigators were to poke around the marketplace a little bit on this matter. Then Mr. Dixon would know that the growth of private label merchandising has already reached record proportions.

But private brands, he would learn—and should have known—have developed as they have not because of any national price maintenance law but because of the lack of it. Retailers, so desperate for the vital profit no longer available on price-cut merchandise, have in self-defense been resorting more and more to their own brands and on which they are privileged to maintain prices. By what law of logic, Mr. Dixon, shouldn't a manufacturer be entitled to exercise the same right if he so desires?

The most amazing point in all of the FTC Chief's revealing testimony is his contention that while the public has the right to voice objection to the rates of public utilities, the QSB, which gives manufacturers the right to set retail prices, nevertheless provides "no such protection" for consumers. Does he imply thereby that consumers should have the legal right to approve—or disapprove—the price of branded merchandise before they buy it? Is it his idea, I wonder, to make a public utility out of all consumer goods producers?

Somebody ought to tell that gentleman that consumers need no such Government authorization. They already have it in their freedom of choice. Moreover they judge an article not only on price—as some would imply—but value as well. And from their verdict there is absolutely no appeal—not even to the FTC.

Manufacturers should also enjoy that same freedom of choice, that same liberty. Liberty, we all learned in school is far different from and doesn't mean license. Competition, at least under our concept of free and equal enterprise, many people apparently still have to learn, is far different from and shouldn't mean confiscation. The quality stabilization bill would go far to help establish that distinction.

[From the Home Furnishings Daily, Oct. 18, 1963]

IF YOU ASK ME

(By Earl Lifshey)

(Fifth of a series)

"Americans should be under no illusions as to the value or effect of price cutting."

That warning comes not from a merchandiser with special interests or prejudiced viewpoint. It comes from one of America's most eminent legal minds, the late great Justice Louis D. Brandeis of the U.S. Supreme Court, whose brilliant reputation for lucid logic and sound philosophy is unsurpassed.

But what makes his warning especially significant is that it is as vital and applicable today as when he wrote it nearly half a century ago in an article in Harpers Weekly, November 15, 1915. His views about the property rights of businessmen engaged in marketing—which appear in many of his other articles as well—provide eloquent testimony in support of the basic philosophy of the proposed quality stabilization bill. The character and color of the marketplace has, of course, changed over the years, but the fundamentals between right and wrong are exactly the same, as he so clearly reveals in the Harpers article which follows:

"If a dealer is selling unknown goods or goods under his own name, he alone should set the price; but when a dealer has to use somebody else's name or brand in order to sell goods, the owner of that name or brand has an interest which should be respected. The transaction is essentially one between the two principals—the maker and the user. All others are middlemen or agents; for the product is not really sold until it has been bought by the consumer.

"Why should one middleman have the power to depreciate in the public mind the value of the maker's brand and render it unprofitable not only for the maker but for other middlemen? Why should one middleman be allowed to indulge in a practice of price cutting which tends to drive the maker's goods out of the market and in the end interfere with people getting goods at all?

"The evil results of price cutting are far-reaching. It is sometimes urged that price-cutting of a trademarked article injures no one; that the producer is not injured, since he received his full price in the original sale to jobber or retailer; and indeed may be benefited by increased sales, since lower prices ordinarily stimulate trade; that the retailer cannot be harmed, since he has cut the price voluntarily to advance his own interests; that the consumer is surely benefited because he gets the article cheaper. But this reasoning is most superficial and misleading.

"To sell a dollar watch for 67 cents injures both the manufacturer and the regular dealer; because it tends to make the public believe that either the manufacturer's or the dealer's profits are ordinarily exorbitant; or, in other words, that watch is not worth a dollar. Such a cut necessarily impairs the reputation of the article, and, by impairing reputation, lessens the demand.

"It may even destroy the manufacturer's market. A few conspicuous cut-price sales in any market will demoralize the trade of the regular dealers in that article. They cannot sell it at cut prices without losing money. They might be able to sell a few of the articles at the established price; but they would do so at the risk to their own reputations. The cut by others, if known, would create the impression on their own customers of having been overcharged. It is better policy for the regular retailer to drop the line altogether.

"On the other hand, the demand for the article from the irregular dealer who cuts the price is short lived. The cut-price article cannot long remain his 'leader.' His use for it is sporadic and temporary. One 'leader' is soon discarded for another. The cut-price outlet is closed to the producer; and, meanwhile, the regular trade has been lost. Thus a single prominent price cutter can ruin a market for both the producer and the regular retailer. And the loss to the retailer is serious.

"On the other hand, the consumer's gain from price cutting is only sporadic and temporary. The few who buy a standard article for less than the value do benefit—unless they have, at the same time, been misled into buying some other article at more than its value. But the public generally is the loser; and the losses are often permanent.

"If the price cutting is not stayed, and the manufacturer reduces the price to his regular customers in order to enable them to retain their market, he is tempted to deteriorate the article in order to preserve his own profits. If the manufacturer cannot or will not produce his price to the dealer, and the regular retailers abandon the line, the consumer suffers at least the inconvenience of not being able to buy the article.

"Americans should be under no illusions as to the value or effect of price cutting. It has been the most potent weapon of monopoly—a means of killing the small rival to which the great trusts have resorted most frequently. It is so simple, so effective. Farseeing organized capital secures by this means the cooperation of the shortsighted, unorganized consumer to his own undoing. Thoughtless or weak, he yields to the temptation of trifling immediate gain, and, selling his birthright for a mess of pottage, becomes himself an instrument of monopoly."

WE MUST PRODUCE MORE GOLD

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, for varying reasons and from differing motivations, there is widespread concern both abroad and in the United States about the problem of disappearing supplies of gold.

As chairman of the Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and as a Senator from Alaska, I have been particularly interested in the problem we face in the United States by the virtual disappearance of a gold-mining industry. The facts have been repeatedly recounted.

Solely due to arbitrary actions of the Federal Government it has, for many years, been impossible to operate a profitable gold-mining enterprise. The inflexible price of $35 an ounce which was set in 1934; the fact that the Treasury Department is the only customer for ore; the fact that the gold-mining industry was shut down completely by order of the War Production Board during the Second World War, whereas no other gold-producing nations allied with us in the war effort did so—these are the reasons gold miners can no longer earn a living at the business they know.

Repeatedly, Members of Congress from gold-mining States have attempted to make gold mining once again a flourishing enterprise. During the last session of Congress a great deal of consideration was given to Senate Joint Resolution 44, introduced by Senator CLAIR ENGLE, which would have authorized payment of subsidies to gold miners at a rate of $35 an ounce. In July of this year I held hearings on two measures, S. 1273 and S. 100, which represented different approaches to a solution of problems of the gold miners. Without exception, it was impossible to act on these bills because the opposition of the Treasury Department was so clear as to make a veto inevitable even if legislation could have been enacted.

Despite repeated pleas to the executive branch of the Government for assistance in devising legislation that would meet objections to earlier legislative proposals and aid the gold mining industry, no suggestions whatever have been made that would meet these criteria.

Accordingly, the Minerals, Materials and Fuels Subcommittee has reported to the full Interior and Insular Affairs Committee the proposal of the subcommittee for legislation to aid gold miners. I refer to S. 2125 which I introduced together with Senators BARTLETT, BIBLE, KUCHEL, and METCALF. The principle of S. 2125 is that domestic gold miners are entitled to compensation by the Federal Government for differences in costs of production between those in 1940—our peak production year—and present-day costs. Our premise is that, since the rigid price of gold makes it impossible for gold miners to operate profitably because of the enormous increases in all costs of equipment and operations, the means for equalizing this situation is to allow gold miners to be compensated for the losses they would suffer if gold is to be produced.

While our concern is, of course, directed to the American gold mining industry, we are aware the inflexible price of gold set by the United States is resulting in a potential international shortage of gold.

As evidence of this, I call the attention of the Senate to a very interesting article appearing in the Wall Street Journal on October 23, 1963, describing the difficulties faced by South African producers of gold. It appears that South Africa, which last year produced 25.5 million ounces of gold—as compared with U.S. production of 1.5 million ounces—is now being confronted with the same difficulties resulting from increased costs of operation with no increases in price of product that have virtually destroyed the American gold mining industry.

The Wall Street Journal points out, commenting on the result of a consequent reduction in supplies of gold:

> If so (supplies are diminished), the effects would be felt all over the world. Gold is the ultimate means of financing international transactions, including trade in all kinds of goods and services, and movements of capital investment funds from one country to another. A nation incurring a debt in transactions of any kind with another country usually settles by paying either in gold or in U.S. dollars, which can be turned into the U.S. Treasury in exchange for gold.

While the intricate relationship between gold as a mineral and gold as a symbol of monetary stability greatly complicates solutions to gold shortages, there seems to be no doubt the world may soon be confronted with a real shortage of gold. This would certainly indicate a need to develop supplies of gold known to be available.

Therefore, I believe it is of great importance that legislation be enacted that will have the effect of increasing gold production in the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the article "Gold Gloom" of the Wall Street Journal of October 23, 1963, be printed in the RECORD, as well as the draft of the revised bill, S. 2125, to revitalize the American gold mining industry.

There being no objection, the article and bill were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOLD GLOOM: SOUTH AFRICAN MINING BOOM NEARS END; WORLD TRADE COULD FEEL PINCH—MORE MINES SHUT THAN OPEN AS NEW DISCOVERIES LAG, UNDERGROUND COSTS RISE

(By Ray Vicker)

WELKOM, SOUTH AFRICA.—In the past 67 years, the saying that "there's gold in them thar hills" has come true in South Africa as nowhere else on earth. But, to the possible future discomfort of international trades, there's a big catch to it these days.

The gold is there all right. Each year South Africa digs over half the gold mined in the world, and 1963 will be no exception. Production is expected to set a record for the ninth straight year, at 28 million fine ounces.

But the gold is no longer easy to mine. As rich seams (called reefs) pay out, mines are boosting output by intensive working of thinner, poorer deposits. The high cost of doing this is beginning to take a toll of marginal producers. And no new discoveries have come along to relieve the pressure.

STEEP SLIDE COMING?

Result: With mine closings already outnumbering openings, executives warn production is pretty sure to top out soon. This probably won't happen in 1964; production then is expected to rise to 30 million ounces. But "output should level off in 1965, followed by a steep slide in production" in later years, says W. J. Busschau, chairman of Goldfields of South Africa, Ltd., in Johannesburg.

If so, the effects would be felt all over the world. Gold is the ultimate means of financing international transactions, including trade in all kinds of goods and services, and movements of capital investment funds from one country to another. A nation incurring a debt in transactions of any kind with another country usually settles by paying either in gold or in U.S. dollars, which can be turned into the U.S. Treasury in exchange for gold.

There's no danger the gold supplies on which these money movements are based will shrink. Nearly all the estimated $73.5 billion worth of gold ever mined is still in use, minus only whatever has been lost in shipwrecks or buried and forgotten, and every new ounce mined adds to the total. The metal is so indestructible that the gold in a living American's tooth might well have been mined by the slaves of an Egyptian Pharaoh.

FEAR OF A SQUEEZE

But, even with South African gold production still rising, some monetary authorities fear the increase in world trade and money movements already is dangerously outrunning the increase in the world's reserves of gold and gold-backed dollars. They liken this situation to a poker game in which the players try to raise their bets without having enough chips.

So a leveling of South African production could produce a squeeze. Since 1929 this Nation has dug about a fourth of all the gold ever mined in history, and since 1886 a third. Last year it mined 25.5 million ounces, which went into Government vaults, bracelets and jewelry for Asiatic gold hoarders, and pocket-sized bars for European hoarders. Russia, mining an estimated 6 million ounces, ran a distant second; Canada, mining 4.2 million ounces, was third. The United States, mining 1.5 million ounces, was even more heavily outclassed.

In the past decade, South Africa has come through handsomely with the required production boosts. Last year's output more than doubled the 11.9 million ounces mined in 1953.

But the increases have come largely because of the $1 billion mines have spent developing new properties since World War II, says P. H. Anderson, president of the Chamber of Mines in the Transvaal and Orange Free State mining areas. Much of this has been spent near Welkom (pronounced Velcome), where refuse heaps of 11 producing mines rise today; the mines work big new deposits discovered just before the war.

FEW NEW PROPERTIES

No discoveries of similar magnitude are being made today. In all South Africa, only one new gold mine is starting production, and only two other promising properties are being developed, says H. C. Koch, manager of gold operations for Anglo American Corp. of South Africa, Ltd., the world's largest gold mining company.

So, to maintain output, mines increasingly are being forced to work gold reefs that bear little resemblance to the original South African find of a drifter named George Walker. Mr. Walker in 1886 stumbled over a rock near Johannesburg; bending over to rub his stubbed toe, he saw the gleam of gold.

Today, the gold reef in Anglo American's Western Holdings Mine near Welkom is a 4-inch-wide band of pebbly ore sandwiched between quartzite rock; the band slopes downward at a 45° angle and is now being worked 2,600 feet below the surface. Miners dig on hands and knees in a chamber 3½ feet high called a stope; a visitor reaches them by crawling through a tunnel and past steel pit props that keep the stope roof from collapsing. In helmet light the reef doesn't gleam: it looks like petrified gravel rather than gold.

Nor is this reef the deepest or most expensive now being worked. Crown Mines in Johannesburg has produced more gold than any other mine known to history; since 1897 it has dug over 43 million ounces, or about as much as the whole world produced last year. But to maintain output now it has had to burrow to a reef 10,000 feet below Johannesburg and air condition the working chambers; otherwise the temperature at that depth would rise to 130° and miners couldn't work. Partly as a result, it's losing money. In the first half of 1963 it dug 156,916 ounces of gold at a working cost of $35.17 an ounce—17 cents more than the gold sells for on world markets.

Crown isn't alone. The Rose Deep Mine near Johannesburg dug 12,303 ounces of gold in the first half of 1963 at a still higher working cost of $38.43 an ounce, and also lost money. The City Deep Mine in Johannesburg reported a first half loss of $325,523 on 147,206 ounces of gold mined, which works out to a loss of $2.21 an ounce. At least three other mines also reported January-through-June losses.

The losses already are putting some mines out of business. Three closed last year, even as the industry was achieving a production record, leaving 55 gold mines still producing. Of these, the Ellston Mine will close soon, and six more have announced intentions to shut down this year or next. Once they do, it's doubtful they'll ever reopen; when a gold mine closes water usually floods its shafts and costs of restarting are often prohibitive.

The toll may grow, too. Another eight mines, including Crown, are considered marginal; either they are already losing money or their operations are dropping toward the break-even point. In gold mining this comes when only a fourth to a fifth of an ounce of gold is recovered from each ton of rock removed from the reef.

For the time being, these mines are hanging on, hoping that new efficiencies can reduce costs. But their prospects are dubious. South African gold mining costs have been rising an average of 2.5 percent a year, as gold reefs get harder to work, and few people here expect this process to be reversed—at least not at the older mines. The Chamber of Mines estimates that another 5-percent increase in costs, which at the present rate would come by 1965, could reduce subsequent gold production by 11.5 million ounces a year, presumably by giving the death blow to some mines now at the break-even point.

Unlike other industries, South Africa's gold mines have little chance of a price increase to relieve these cost pressures. True, they have lobbied incessantly for a gold price boost, and the prospect that production will level off or decline without one may give them a new talking point.

But a gold price increase would amount to devaluation of the U.S. dollar, which American administrations have vowed consistently and vehemently not to permit. The U.S. Treasury in effect sets the world price of gold by offering to sell to anyone from reserves at $35 an ounce. An increase in that price would make the dollar worth less in terms of gold, thereby lowering its prestige as a world currency and thus probably its value in relation to other currencies.

The major reason why mine closings haven't already cut South African gold production is that newer mines, such as the ones around Welkom, have been increasing efficiency with new techniques. The principal one is concentrated mining. This means working a relatively small number of stopes intensively at any one time, while leaving others temporarily idle. It cuts costs by reducing requirements for ventilation, mine railway trackage, and the like along with the working area.

Where tried, concentrated mining also has raised output, in part because miners work under closer supervision. Western Holdings, which used to collect ore from 72 stopes at a time, now collects from only 52. But it has raised ore collection per man to 33 tons a month, from 27 previously, and boosted total collections to 200,000 tons a month from the former 175,000 tons.

Improvements in explosives and in ore collection machinery have helped keep total South African output growing, too. African Explosives & Chemical Industries and Anglo American have developed a fuse which permits a series of blasts following each other more quickly, such blasts have a multiplying effect in loosening rock. Some recent series of blasts have dug as much as 9 feet into mine rock; earlier series used to average only 18 inches.

Still, executives expect the closing of old mines which can't use these techniques effectively to outweigh by 1965 the output boosts the techniques have made possible in newer pits. Once this happens, it could take some time for even new discoveries to raise output again, should any be made. With easily minable gold long since worked out, painstaking geological surveys above ground plus extensive drilling are required now to locate ore, and even if finds are made they can take years to develop. Anglo American estimates it would take $70 million today to bring in a new mine with a milling rate of 180,000 tons of ore per month, which is considered an economic size.

So, though not all executives agree with Mr. Busschau of Goldfields of South Africa that a "sharp slide" in output is ahead, even the most optimistic don't expect to duplicate the record of the past decade. "South Africa has doubled its gold production in the last 10 years," says C. B. Anderson, deputy managing director of Union Corp., Ltd., a major mining concern. "We'll never do that again."

S. 2125

A bill to revitalize the American gold mining industry

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, This Act shall be known as the "Gold Mine Revitalization Act of 1963".

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.—(a) For the purpose of aiding and restoring to profitable operation the domestic gold mining industry of the United States the Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed to establish and administer a program to compensate domestic producers of gold for the difference between individual base average costs of production during the fourth quarter of 1939 of currently eligible mines, as determined by the Secretary, and the same or equivalent current costs, similarly determined, of individual operators qualified for assistance under this Act in the fourth quarter of 1963. Where base average costs during the fourth quarter of 1939 are shown to be abnormal because of the occurrence of events beyond the control of the operator, including, but not limited to production stoppages, natural disasters, or unavoidable accidents, such costs shall be reconstructed from the best available data.

(b) In order to assist new domestic gold mining enterprises and stimulate new production, the Secretary is authorized and directed to establish and administer a similar program for mines which have no history of production for the fourth quarter of 1939 nor for the fourth quarter of 1963 by computing a constructive cost of production taking into account production costs of mining gold in the same or adjacent mining districts under similar conditions for said named periods in order to determine the amount of subsidy payments, if any, to which the new mine operator is entitled.

Sec. 3. Costs of Operation Subsidized.—Costs of operating domestic gold mines for which differential payments will be allowed shall include—

(a) costs of all labor including clerical, supervisory, management, administrative, and technical;

(b) costs of amortization of capital investment in equipment and construction necessary to efficient operations;

(c) costs of mine rehabilitation;

(d) costs of transportation of mine products, smelter freight, treatment and deductions;

(e) costs of unemployment compensation and fringe benefits;

(f) costs of supplies, materials, and power;

(g) costs of State, county, and city property taxes;

(h) costs of such other expenses as are usual, customary, and normal according to accepted, sound, modern mining practices.

Sec. 4. Eligibility Requirements.—To qualify for cost differential payments under this program, an applicant shall—

(a) make a showing, by application to the Secretary, that for his next fiscal year, commencing after submission of the application, costs of efficient operation are at a level in excess of an amount at which the applicant can anticipate earning a reasonable profit during the period for which application for assistance is made;

(b) demonstrate existence of financial resources and technical capability sufficient to operate profitably, under the conditions by which assistance under this Act is allowed;

(c) agree that, for the period of time for which assistance is received the applicant will operate gold mining properties in the United States as his principal occupation. No producer shall be qualified for assistance under this Act unless the dollar value of gold sold during the period for which payments are made is 50 per centum or more of the total value of all minerals and metals contained in ores and concentrates produced and sold: *Provided*, That payments shall be made only for the gold produced in the proportion the nonsubsidized value of the gold produced bears to the value of the total amount of minerals sold.

Sec. 5. Amount of Payments Allowable.—Payments under this Act shall be in such amounts as may be necessary to carry out its purpose, except that—

(a) no such payment shall, in any case, exceed the difference between individual base average costs of production of gold during the fourth quarter of 1939 and the same or equivalent costs in the fourth quarter of 1963;

(b) no differential computed under (a) shall exceed, in proportion, the difference between the cost of living index for January 1, 1940, and the cost of living index as of date of application for payment;

Sec. 6. Determination of Eligibility and Negotiation of Agreements.—(a) Producers of gold may apply to the Secretary of the Interior for gold production differential payments under this Act who shall determine (1) the eligibility of the applicant, and (2) amount of payment necessary to enable the applicant to operate at a reasonable profit during the period for which application is made.

(b) Upon determination of eligibility of a producer for payment the Secretary shall enter into a gold production differential payment agreement which shall contain such terms and conditions as the Secretary and the producer shall agree upon, including, but not limited to (1) the manner in which costs shall be ascertained for purposes of making payments; (2) terms and conditions for making payments; (3) conditions under which payments shall be withheld or reduced.

Sec. 7. Board of Gold Differential Payments Review.—(a) There shall be established in the office of the Secretary an independent Board of Review of three members to be appointed by the Secretary, the Chairman to be designated by the Secretary, that shall be responsible for a continuing review of the level of payments under this Act to determine if they are sufficient or in excess of amounts required to accomplish its purposes.

(b) The Secretary shall, by regulation, establish a procedure for review by the Board of Review of applications of producers whose claims are denied, disallowed in part, or reduced. Producers shall have an opportunity to submit reasons in support of their claims before final action of the Secretary.

(c) Members of the Board of Review shall be appointed by the Secretary from among individuals qualified by reason of experience in the mining industry, two of whom shall have had experience in gold mining.

(d) The Board of Review shall be required to meet quarterly. Members shall be paid at the rate of $50 per day for each day services as a Board member are required and shall be reimbursed for actual and necessary travel expenses and per diem in accordance with the Travel Expenses Act of 1949.

Sec. 8. The Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 9. There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, not to exceed an annual amount of $50,000,000.

PROPOSED PROHIBITION AGAINST EXPORT-IMPORT BANK INSURING THE CREDIT OF COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I made before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency in support of my bill, S. 2310, which would prohibit the Export-Import Bank from insuring the credit of Communist countries.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Senator Karl E. Mundt Before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency in Support of His Bill, S. 2310, Which Would Prohibit the Export-Import Bank From Insuring the Credit of Communist Countries

Mr. Chairman, almost since the end of World War II—or for more than 15 years—the United States has been extending programs of military and economic aid to friendly and uncommitted countries—both developed and underdeveloped—throughout the world in an effort to safeguard those areas and their people from Communist aggression, encroachment, subversion, and takeover. During this period, we have expended over $100 billion of the money of American taxpayers, and our aid has gone to more than 100 foreign countries. Even now, we are still continuing to aid more than 100 countries through the expenditure of our resources and the continuing annual cost of this foreign assistance program is still upward of $3 billion a year annually.

The waging of this so-called cold war has been a long, expensive, and exhausting contest for Americans, but it has at least had the redeeming feature of compelling our Communist adversaries to strain themselves to do their best to offset our efforts and to meet the challenge of our American oversea assistance program. Increasingly the Communists have had to divert from their own economy and from the economies of their unhappy satellites, foods and fabrics; grain and machinery; weapons and petroleum; and a host of other products in an attempt to win friends and influence governments, especially in the underdeveloped areas of the world. As a whole family of newly independent nations have come into being, the increasing drain upon the Communist economy and upon that of the United States has become steadily more severe.

In this continuing cold war, however, the superiority of our free way of life and our vastly more productive economic system has begun to make its impact felt throughout the world. We have waged our side of this economic war without destroying our own standards of living while our Communist adversaries have had to deprive their own people of many things in order to have available from their cumbersome and unworkable system of compulsory collectivism the foods, the fabrics, the weapons, and the manufactured goods required to demonstrate to those outside their boundaries their ability to assist their friends and to provide economic support for those whose allegiance they are seeking to acquire.

Mr. Chairman, economic and political conflict is total war in the cold war sense, since every economic, political, and propaganda device is employed to achieve success. A stalemate long continuing in an economic contest between two great segments of the world can result in frustration, destruction, and defeat for both sides of the contest. Unless one side or the other gains an ascendancy, moves forward to victory, and excels the other in success, the steady drain upon its national resources can destroy the capacity of both adversaries either to give assistance to their friends or to provide resistance to their enemies. It can, in fact, seriously weaken its capacity to maintain its own standards of life and areas of opportunity.

CONGRESSIONAL POLICY OPPOSES TRADE WITH RUSSIA

Realizing this fact, Congress, during the past 15 years, has many times expressed itself by legislative actions and by "sense of the Congress resolutions" which make clear the intent of Congress to restrict free world trade with the Communist countries as part of our cold war technique of weakening their capacity to wage economic war successfully or to attain the military strength to risk a hot war.

The Battle Act which restricted the rights of our own citizens to trade with Communist countries and which set in motion a procedure by which we sought to induce our free world friends and allies to join us in such a program of economic pressures is illustrative of the attitude of Congress. The Johnson Act is another case in point. Amendments written into other legislative measures have also emphasized the desire of Congress to provide hope for the success of our cold war tactics by restricting trade to Communist countries which trade in turn would only expand their capacity to continue their cold war operations against us, against our friends, and against the uncommitted nations overseas. Just within the year, this administration has taken commendable executive action to apply new economic pressures on Communist Cuba by denying access to our ports of the foreign ships guilty of trading with our offshore enemy.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, desire for profit—sometimes in the form of thinly disguised human greed—has made it difficult for the United States to enforce this policy of restricting trade with the Communist bloc or even to win the support of the foreign countries which we aid with our foreign assistance programs in the implementation of foreign trade policies whch would lighten the burden of our own foreign assistance contributions by reducing the economic capacity of the Communists to do battle against us and them through conducting cold war economic thrusts of their own. Some of our best friends in other countries have steadily been increasing their economic trade with Russia and her Communist associates. The most recent example which has brought this whole problem into new focus is the gigantic sale of Canadian wheat to Russia—not because the Russians are starving, not because they lack great stockpiles of wheat for military purposes, but because Russia freely admitted to the Canadians that they desire the wheat to fulfill their cold war and trade commitments to Cuba, to other European satellites, and even to other countries which the U.S.S.R. had promised to assist.

It has properly been argued in this country that the United States alone cannot blockade communism or enforce effective economic sanctions against the U.S.S.R. It has been suggested, consequently, that if Canada, our Western Europe Allies, and others are to sell wheat, corn, and other products—both agricultural and manufactured—to Russia, why should we deny ourselves the profit of similar sales? And, Mr. Chairman, when you say it fast and don't think very hard the easy conclusion seems logical. Related, however, to our 15-year-old foreign assistance program and what is to be achieved for the free world by our $100 billion in oversea assistance expenditures, this hasty answer to a serious question raises a number of mighty serious and far-reaching problems.

For example, can the United States afford to continue indefinitely a foreign assistance program which drains our Treasury of several billion dollars every year in an effort to help over two-thirds of the countries of the world maintain economic and military strength enough to prevent Communist aggressors from successfully upsetting their governments or completely taking them over? If we can afford to continue such an assistance program, is it possible for it to achieve the desired results and to succeed, if the important free world countries—the United States included—sell to Russia and to other Communist countries the supplies which they most desperately need in order to give them the strength and economic power to continue to placate their own people while conducting a program of intimidation and aggression which threatens the very nations we are called upon to help because of these Communist attacks against our freedom and our independence? If the answer to the two foregoing questions is "Yes," the big question remains: Is it possible for us ever to succeed in stabilizing the world and relieving our taxpayers of these multibillion dollar foreign assistance programs if we and the free world conduct trade and aid programs which tend to strengthen and assist both sides of the cold war at the same time?

At least as far as the United States is concerned, Mr. Chairman, I believe this is the road to national suicide and to inevitable bankruptcy since we, of course, are the one nation which is making the most significant and important contributions in the area of foreign aid assistance to the free world. I seriously doubt that even the rich and mighty United States of America can forever continue to provide aid for the non-Communist world while at the same time helping to supply the foods, the fabrics, and the manufactured products required to give the Communists a continuing capacity to wage economic war and build up economic strength against us and our oversea friends and associates.

NEEDED: A FREE WORLD TRADE-AID CONFERENCE

It was for that reason, Mr. Chairman, that when a suggestion was first made that the United States abandon its effort to lead the world in the acceptance of a sensible program of restricted trade in connection with Communist countries and that we follow instead the leadership of other countries which are busy stepping up economic trade of all kinds with the Communists I suggested that before departing from a program which we have followed for over 15 years, the President of the United States should call a free world trade-aid conference of the major and developed free world exporting countries and try to decide as a free world team just what our trade-and-aid policy should be.

Such a free world trade-aid conference of the major exporting non-Communist countries should face up to and consider certain obvious facts.

1. Communist aggression is not a threat directed solely against the United States of America—every free world country is considered fair game for the imperialistic designs of the Communists and our problem is their problem just as we have made their problem in this connection a problem of concern to us.

2. Even with its many loopholes and exceptions the past efforts over the last 15 years of free world exporting countries to curtail the shipment of supplies to the Soviet bloc is now beginning to have its impact upon the economies of the Communist world and Russia is beginning to feel the pinch of caring for her own needs while supplying her Communist associates with what they require and have not been easily getting from the free world.

3. Of late years, however, the trade restrictions against the Communists have been increasingly ignored and violated by many free world exporters even though we Americans have faithfully conformed with the program of curbing Communist expansion by denying the Communist bloc essential supplies which it needs.

4. The United States recognizes, however, that it alone cannot operate an effective blockade of Communist trade nor implement an effective program of trade restrictions which could force the Communists to forgo their designs of world conquest in return for becoming an acceptable member of the world trade community.

5. Unless the free world is ready to work some consistent, constructive, and generally applicable policy of trading with the Communists and participating to the extent of its ability in foreign assistance programs designed to strengthen the free world, the United States recognizes that it is futile for us to support such policies alone and it is unfair to our American businessmen and farmers to insist that they—alone—forego trading with the Communist world.

6. The United States also recognizes that trade with the Communist bloc is an effective means of strengthening the capacity of the Communists to press their cold war tactics against our friends and allies as well as against the uncommitted nations through perpetuating the need for our foreign assistance to countries trying to resist these Communist pressures.

7. Since these facts are now self-evident the free world trade-aid conference should join us in developing a common approach to the perils and problems of world communism with the realization that our country alone cannot finance resistance to the dangers their trade with Communists perpetuates and expands.

8. If the rest of the free world will not join us in the trade restrictive programs we have so long supported it must realize we cannot continue our own highly costly foreign assistance programs, and thus some entirely new free world policy toward communism must be evolved and accepted unless the free side of the world struggle is not to abandon each area of the world to its own capacities to resist aggression and encroachment.

Mr. Chairman, I am confident such a free world trade-aid conference would bring about a clear-cut recognition by our associates of all the facts and factors in this struggle for peace and freedom. Out of such a conference should, therefore, come a common and workable approach to the many problems involved in the trade and aid programs of the free world. Only in the absence of such a common agreement and only after our country demonstrates the required world leadership to hold such a meeting should we, in my opinion, surrender the gains we have made in the past 15 years and agree to follow the lead of foreign countries putting desire for profit above all else and insisting on trading with the enemy. Should that be the result, I agree we would no longer serve an effective purpose by denying our American traders the right to sell supplies to the Soviet bloc—but even then, in my opinion, such sales should not be made at the expense or at the risk of American taxpayers.

At this stage of world developments, however, I am confident our best public interest will be served by denying the Export-Import Bank the right to underwrite the credits of the Communist bloc and thus at least limit our trade with Russia and her Communist associates to that which can be paid for in cash or gold or normal commercial credits to be provided by the shippers and their private bankers.

Our cold war tactics which have cost us so dearly for over 15 years are beginning to give some evidence of success in weakening the capacity of the Communist world to meet its needs and to supply its extensive commitments. Clearly in my mind, now is no time for us to abandon a program which promises success.

WHY DO THE RED RUSSIANS WANT OUR SUPPLIES?

Former Ambassador George Kennan put the following words in the Communists' mouths to describe their attitude toward trade with the non-Communist world, and I read a paragraph from his book, "Russia and the West":

"We despise you. We consider that you should be swept from the earth as governments and physically destroyed as individuals. We reserve the right in our private if not in our official capacities to do what we can to bring this about; to revile you publicly, to do everything within our power to detach your own people from their loyalty to you and their confidence in you, to subvert your armed forces, and to work for your downfall in favor of the Communist dictatorship. But since we are not strong enough to destroy you today—since an interval must unfortunately elapse before we can give you the coup de grace—we want you during this interval to trade with us. An outrageous demand? Perhaps. But you will accept it nevertheless. You will accept it because you are not free agents; because you are slaves to your own capitalist appetites, because when profit is involved, you have no pride, no principles, no honor. In the blindness that characterizes declining and perishing classes, you will compete with one another for our favor."

Thus wrote George Kennan about the Soviet attitude in the early days of the Red regime. Forty years later Khrushchev could repeat this diagnosis word for word, as the allies scramble for trade with the Reds.

Mr. Chairman, I propose that we prove to the Communists that they are wrong in their assessment of the morals, the ethics, and the stick-to-itiveness of the free world. Lenin put it even more bluntly when he said in language I have paraphrased, "If the Communists were to hang the members of the free world, capitalists would compete with each other to sell the rope for the hanging." I emphatically deny this Communist criticism of the understandable need and desire of our capitalist economy to produce a profit. Capitalism functions successfully only in a free community and a free world is the first essential to its complete and continued success. I hope our country never produces any evidence to support the blasphemous charges of the Communists.

Lacking the resources and the opportunities to engage in normal trade with the free world the satellites of Moscow are becoming restive and resentful and insisting that the grandiose commitments made to them by Khrushchev be fulfilled. Red China is becoming skeptical of the capacity of Moscow policies and its capacity to continue to beat down and hold back the resurgent nationalism and independence of captive countries.

SHOULD WE RETREAT FROM COLD WAR VICTORIES?

Even Cuba is discovering that the U.S.S.R. is unable to provide the economic and material assistance required to compensate for the errors of Communist dictatorship at home and the curtailed international trade which Cuba has lost with the non-Communist world. After 15 long and expensive years the free world is demonstrating with increasing momentum that freemen can outproduce slaves and that freedom is a way of life that no system of totalitarianism can equal or excel.

So Russia now swallows its pride and comes to the free world with offers to purchase our grain, our products, our machinery, our alcohol, and whatever else she most desperately needs to satisfy her own foreign commitments and to placate her own unhappy people.

Simply stated, Russia has spread herself out too thin. Her cumbersome Communist system of involuntary collectivism is breaking down. She is finally exhausting the usefulness and the aid she obtained by stripping her captive countries of their best productive plants and her emphasis on building a military striking power has deprived her people of the comforts and conveniences which a more diversified economic effort might have produced. Above all, her extravagant promises of assistance to Egypt, to India, to Communist overlords in Asia, to the new independent governments of Africa, are being defaulted so she seeks to obtain from the United States and other free world nations the supplies and products she needs to continue her harassment of the free world and her attacks upon weak governments and underdeveloped areas.

I accept the basic fact that these developments give rise to the need for a new look at world affairs.

Should we continue our efforts to win the cold war?

Should we drive wedges between Russia and her Communist satellites and associates?

Should we bargain with conviction and courage in our cause and compel Russia to make concessions in Cuba, in Berlin, in Asia, and elsewhere as a firm condition precedent to our willingness to sell her what she needs to continue her imperialistic thrust?

Should we utilize our economic productivity and the products which our free way of life produces in abundance as available inducements to win concessions and to reduce the dangers existent in the tension spots of the world?

Or should we simply sell them what they most seriously need for gold—or even worse for credit?

The question of permitting the Export-Import Bank to extend credit insurance to the Communist bloc countries which insurance is guaranteed by American taxpayers is an important and urgent matter which only this committee has the authority and the responsibility to decide through its recommendations to the Senate.

Certain basic and demonstrable facts should be kept before us and before the country concerning the basic factors and the significant ramifications of what is involved in the problem now before this committee.

NO HUMANITARIANISM INVOLVED

1. The sales of wheat and corn to Russia and the Communist bloc do not involve any element of humanitarianism and the relief of starvation and hunger is not involved in any way. Actually, Russia's supplies of stored wheat set aside for possible military conflict are of stupendous size and her current production is meeting her current needs. However, the Russians have made commitments to deliver wheat and grain to some of their satellite countries and unless she produces free world wheat to deliver or to replace her own wheat when delivered abroad she will face a wheat shortage of her own.

2. The sale of wheat for cash or gold or for normal commercial credits extended by the sellers or their bankers is not involved in this decision. Our Government, by executive action, has already made that decision. It is our responsibility to decide only the specific policy of whether the public credit of America—the money of our own taxpayers—should be used to guarantee the repayments of credits extended to Russia and other Communist bloc countries should they default on their obligations for any cause or circumstance whatsoever. What it is proposed to offer them through the Export-Import Bank is such a Government-backed credit guarantee that both principle and interest will be paid by Communist countries. If they default for any reason whatsoever, the American taxpayer pays the Communists' bills.

The President announced his decision to allow the sale of wheat to Russia and its Communist satellites from a prepared statement at his press conference on October 9. He said at that time that he had "concluded that such sales by private dealers for American dollars or gold, either cash on delivery or normal commercial terms, should not be prohibited by the Government."

A moment later the President observed that "having for many years sold them farm products which are not in surplus, it would make no sense to refuse to sell those products on which we must otherwise pay the cost of storage.

"In short, this particular decision with respect to sales to the Soviet Union, which is not inconsistent with many smaller transactions over a long period of time, does not represent a new Soviet-American trade policy."

But when on November 5 an article written by Vincent J. Burke for the Los Angeles Times and the Washington Post appeared, it became apparent to me that the financing arrangement for these sales to the Communist countries does represent a new departure—the U.S. Government and the taxpaying citizens of this country are assuming full credit risk for these sales. Any loss sustained by the seller of the grain or the banks financing the sales by extending credit to Russia, Hungary, or other Communist bloc countries is insured by the Federal Government through its Export-Import Bank. The Federal Government, through the Export-Import Bank, is insuring payment by the Communist bloc countries on terms of 25 percent down and 18 months in which to pay the balance.

I repeat, there is no risk for the shippers or the bankers. Full risk, full guarantee that the grain will be paid for is assumed by the taxpaying citizens of the United States through the wholly American-owned Export-Import Bank.

This guarantee is characterized as a normal extension of credit—as coming within the normal commercial terms the President stipulated in his formal statement.

The Export-Import Bank in its memorandum: Export-Import Bank guarantee of sales to bloc, November 6, 1963 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Nov. 12, 1963, pp. 21576–21577) puts itself on record to that effect:

"The Export-Import Bank stresses that there is nothing new in these arrangements—aside from the fact that a short-term credit risk is being covered with respect to a Soviet bloc country."

I submit to the members of this committee that a complete departure from the established practice of an institution and the embracement by that institution of a technique never before used is not normal.

These are not the President's normal commercial terms. Far from being normal commercial terms the Export-Import Bank has in fact never extended credit or credit insurance to Russia, to Hungary, or to any other Communist bloc country.

They comprise, in fact, an entirely new departure in the credit insurance program of the Export-Import Bank. Since its inception in 1934, I repeat, the Export Bank has never insured a credit risk for Communist Russia or Hungary. Except for Yugoslavia, which both Congress and the White House have repeatedly treated in a special category, insurance of credit risks or direct extensions of credit have not been extended to Communist countries. It has now decided to do so. I submit that decision does not come within normal terms. It constitutes an entirely new use of Government guarantee of credit and establishes a new national policy of far reaching significance which should either be approved or disapproved by Congress. I think it should be disapproved. I do not feel we are protecting the interests of American taxpayers by compelling them to underwrite and guarantee a Communist dictator's credit rating in this manner.

S. 2310 COVERS ALL SALES—NOT JUST WHEAT AND GRAIN

Mr. Chairman, I am not here today to offer resistance to the sale of wheat or of other agricultural or commercial products to Russia nor am I here to protest the sale of those products to Russia's European satellites. The decision to do that has already been made at the administration level by the White House and by our State Department.

I am here solely because I am concerned with the question as to whether it is the right public policy under prevailing world conditions for our Government to compel American taxpayers to underwrite trade with the Communists through the device of guaranteeing the good faith of Communist dictators in meeting their payments of principle and interest.

The Export-Import Bank is a Government institution. Its assets are public assets. Its capital fund and operating expenses are of U.S. Treasury origin. Its charter was written by the U.S. Congress. Every dollar it has, in the last analysis, belongs to the Government of the United States—to the taxpayers of this country.

It is a completely new and unprecedented policy to use public funds to guarantee payment of private commercial accounts owed by Communist bloc countries. In my opinion, that policy is not wise. The purpose of my bill is to give the Senate and the House of Representatives opportunity, directly representing the citizens of this country, as they do, to determine whether or not this is wise policy and to determine whether or not this new policy will stand and become the precedent for a vast new allocation of American guarantees to reinforce and rescue the sagging and staggering economy of Communist countries.

I want to stress again that I do not question the legality of any commercial transaction under this grain sale agreement. I am questioning the wisdom of the policy, whether it is wise and prudent to compel the citizens to assume every type of risk involved in this sale of grain by private traders to a Communist government.

THE JOHNSON ACT DOES NOT BAR SALES FOR PRIVATE CREDIT

The Attorney General of the United States advised the Secretary of State, that, by his interpretation of the law—and his interpretation is what counts—no infraction would be committed by private traders participating under this program within the procedures announced by the Government. Thus the private traders and their commercial bankers have been informed by the Attorney General that they have the legal right to sell their grain and other products to the Communists on credit instead of for gold or for American dollars. However, the private traders and the commercial bankers have too much respect for the interests of their stockholders to be willing to extend their own credit to Communist countries whose records of repayment and of broken promises has been so disappointing and disillusioning. All I ask is that Senators be as alert and energetic about protecting the finances of our tax-paying constituents as these private firms have been in protecting the investments of their stockholders and themselves.

The Attorney General's opinion included this language:

"Sales by private American firms on a deferred-payment basis * * * would not involve the making of 'loans' within the meaning of the act."

And included this language:

"The Johnson Act does not apply to the assignment or negotiation by an American seller, in the ordinary course of business, of contract rights or commercial paper resulting from sales of goods on normal commercial terms."

Mr. Chairman, I have the full text of the Attorney General's advisory opinion here, and I ask that it be inserted in the record of these committee hearings at this point in my statement.

This opinion relieves all American sellers or exporters, commercial banks, or other nongovernmental sources for credit of any reason to refuse to participate in this transaction by themselves extending private credit to the Communists. They are protected against possible future prosecution by this or future administrations for violation of the Johnson Act.

COMMUNISTS ALREADY OWE US SUBSTANTIAL DEBTS

Now I presume the reason that the Export-Import Bank was brought into this transaction to guarantee payment of the obligations assumed by Communist countries for payment for this grain is that no commercial banker or exporter is willing to assume the credit risk of repayment involved in sales to Communist countries. The private exporters and bankers are reluctant to extend their own credit in order to get the profit and income they will receive from these transactions. That is, they must regard the transactions as a bad risk and the Communists as unsafe debtors.

Russia has obligations on loans from the United States which are still outstanding from its World War I loans. The outstanding principal as of last June 30 is $192,601,297.37. Every cent of it has matured. Interest due and unpaid is $428,819,108.19. The total amount in default from those years is $621,420,405.56.

The present government of the Soviet Union insists that these are not its obligations. It is claimed they are the Czarist Government's obligations instead. Yet they were made by the Government of the United States to the Government of Russia, and the entire amount is in default and has been repudiated by the Government of Russia.

There are more modern obligations due us from the Soviet Union, stemming from World War II.

That Government agreed to accept and pay for the "pipeline" lend lease which had been ordered for them and was scheduled to be delivered to them at the end of the war. The amount agreed to was $222,494,574. Of that, $205,709,633 remains due.

Remember, that debt has nothing to do with the main body of lend lease shipped to Russia during the war. Congress appropriated in all about $11 billion and, as yet, no value of what is owed to us has been negotiated with the Russians. Our last offer, in 1960, was something like $800 million to settle it. Their final offer was something like $300 million and they demanded certain other trade concessions, at which point the negotiations broke down. Hungary also owes this country more than $9 million from previous loans or advances.

This is not an admirable credit record. The banker, dealing with the funds of his own bank would be rare who would advance very much money to such a credit applicant. There is the reason the guarantee of the Export-Import Bank has been called for so that public money could be used to guarantee the payments stipulated by these private sales.

There are, it should be emphasized, in connection with this, certain requirements of law placed on the Export-Import Bank which are intended to take the place of, in the running of this government-owned bank, the element of risk which is weighed so carefully by the commercial banker as he determines whether or not to extend a loan.

Let me be specifically clear in what I'm saying. I am not challenging the legality of the act by the Export-Import Bank in extending this insurance guarantee of payment. It might be said, however, that, in view of the requirement of law in this regard, I am expressing doubt as to the judgment shown by the directors of the bank in issuing this insurance coverage.

Section B of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 provides that before the Board of Directors of the bank agree to make a loan there must be reasonable assurance of repayment. This same express provision was not written a second time into the law in 1961 when the insurance program was begun, but neither was there express provision that the basic rules under which the bank operates were being changed. I'm certain that the members of this committee had no intention of relieving the Board of Directors of the responsibility to find that there must be reasonable assurance of repayment before the bank assumes an obligation. This basic rule must apply both to the making of loans and to the issuing of insurance, or there would have been express provision to the contrary. After all, the Export-Import Bank functions as an institution making commercial loans and insuring credit and not as an eleemosynary institution.

I quote from the provision of law, 12 United States Code 635(b):

"Functions as supplemental to private capital; restrictions on loans. It is the policy of the Congress that the Bank, in the exercise of its functions should supplement and encourage and not compete with private capital, and that loans, so far as possible consistently with carrying out the purposes of subsection (a) of this section, shall generally be for specific purposes, and, in the judgment of the Board of Directors, offer reasonable assurance of repayment."

Let me add emphasis. "It is the policy of Congress * * * that loans * * * shall * * *, in the judgment of the Board of Directors, offer reasonable assurance of repayment."

I am certain that this committee intended that that statement of policy was intended to apply to insurance coverage extended by the Bank as well as to loans or that the committee would have specified otherwise.

Mr. W. W. Glick, counsel for the Export-Import Bank, agreed with this interpretation when he appeared before the House Banking and Currency Committee's Subcommittee No. 3 on August 30, 1961, in support of the then pending bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945. Congressman MOORHEAD commented, "As I read section 2(b), it is limited to loans, and not to this new program."

Mr. Glick replied:

"At the end of the section it says, 'and in the judgment of the Board of Directors, offer reasonable assurance of repayment' and the General Counsel's office at the Bank has taken the position formally that this applies to all activities of the Bank: loans, guarantees, insurance, or anything else."

So the Bank Directors were to take into consideration the credit record of the proposed country to be insured—Russia or Hungary or any other satellite nation. Yet they decided to guarantee bank loans of 75 percent of the value of the grain to be shipped for a period of 18 months, the loans bearing 5 percent interest for the banker less a small insurance fee at absolutely no risk to himself. In fact the payment of both interest and principal are insured. The bankers cannot lose. The exporters cannot lose. Only the American taxpayer stands to lose and he assumes the full risk for failure to pay regardless of the cause for such default.

SHOULD AMERICAN TAXPAYERS GUARANTEE CREDITS TO PURCHASE BOOZE FOR KHRUSHCHEV'S SUBJECTS?

Mr. Chairman, once the precedent of guaranteeing and insuring Communist credits by the wholly owned American Export-Import Bank is established, American exports to bolster the Red Russian economy will expand from a trickle to a torrent. Already many new applications for export licenses are appearing. The Russians want fertilizer, machinery, trucks, chemicals—in fact last week we learned they want American alcohol for their production of vodka.

I wonder how many good church people in America will feel if they are required to cosign a promissory note with Khrushchev so he can purchase booze for his people with the public credit of America.

The taxpayers take the entire risk. And I believe Congress could well take exception with the judgment of the Bank's Board of Directors, based on the existing credit record of the Communist purchasers, that these loans have a "reasonable assurance of repayment."

SHOULD AMERICAN WHEAT STRENGTHEN CASTRO IN CUBA?

Now, Mr. Chairman, while we have seen repeated time and again the promise made by Russia that the grain sold to them by the United States will not either go directly to Cuba or to China or to other unintended beneficiaries nor be transshipped once it reaches Russia to any of those other destinations, we have not seen any commitment by Russia that that country will, as a condition to receiving U.S. grain, refuse to honor its agreements or even refuse to make new agreements to supply grain to Cuba, to Red China, and to other Communist areas.

I expect that, even if we give the Russians credit for having the honorable intention of keeping their promise to President Kennedy that American grain will not go to Cuba, the American grain will simply become a substitute in Russia for the Russian grain which has been promised to Cuba and the other Communist countries. The Cubans will eat Russian grain and the Russians will eat American grain bought from American traders on credits at 5 percent interest to American bankers less a small insurance fee paid to the Export-Import Bank on credit terms which are fully and irrevocably guaranteed by the American taxpayers.

The President did not, in his formal wheat sale statement of October 9, even say that Russia had made such a promise not to transship the wheat. As a matter of fact, "administration officials" were quoted in the New York Times of October 3 that they cannot make such guarantees. The Max Frankel dispatch states that, "Privately, administration officials have already indicated they could not control Soviet export policies."

And, in the New York Times of October 11, the William M. Blair dispatch states that Secretary of Commerce Hodges, at the "news conference at which the rules for traders were announced," was "somewhat vague about assurances that American wheat would be used only in the Soviet Union or the satellite countries."

"The United States, he said, would have reasonable assurance because it would require a certification to that effect in sales contracts between private traders and the Soviet buyers and because as much wheat as possible would be shipped in American vessels."

SHIPMENTS NEED NOT BE MADE IN AMERICAN SHIPS

I should note in passing here that this last provision has been changed considerably. Quoting from the Current Export Bulletin for November 13, 1963, issued by the Department of Commerce:

"At least 50 percent of the wheat and wheat flour will be exported on U.S.-flag carriers. If a U.S.-flag carrier is not available at reasonable rates, the exporter must obtain prior authorization from the Maritime Administration to ship less than the 50 percent on U.S.-flag carriers."

So it could well be that less than 50 percent of the grain will be shipped on American vessels and even that 50 percent is now proposed to be shipped at reduced shipping rates which have been established below the prevailing shipping rates through negotiation. But, continuing with Secretary Hodges' October 10 press conference:

"He agreed, however, that the United States had no definite assurance that the American wheat could not be used to release Soviet reserve stocks for shipment to Cuba or other countries."

The way, therefore, seems to be opened for us to make possible the feeding of our enemies in Cuba, in Red China, and elsewhere even if we were all to agree to the shibboleth that Russia is not an enemy since Russia could use at home the specific bushels of wheat we sell her on U.S. Government credit while shipping to our other Communist adversaries the Russian wheat which our American wheat replaces.

A year ago we stood eyeball to eyeball against Cuba. We have since outlawed the loading of ships in American ports which arrive from loading or unloading in Cuba. Now we are opening up a formula of sales for Communist credits which proposes to do by indirection what we have directly been prohibiting by our national policy toward Cuba and Red China.

Russia today is one of the largest gold producers in the world. Perhaps it is the largest. That country is able to market large quantities of this precious metal. Its sales in the past 8 years have been about $200 million worth per year, and its gold reserves are estimated by the London Times to be $9 billion in gold. This information comes from a most interesting article from the New York Times of October 9, written by Clyde H. Farnsworth. He discusses the sale by the Russians of $200 million of gold during 2 weeks of September, at Paris and Zurich largely, this year.

That's their usual annual sales figure. The Russians have plenty of gold. They are able to pay gold in exchange for wheat. In fact the Canadians who initiated the concept of large scale sales of wheat to Russia are receiving 80 percent of these sales cash on the barrelhead in gold.

The American people and their Congress were led to believe that this grain sale would be a commercial cash transaction with private traders and bankers assuming any credit risk in return for a profitable sale and an interest-bearing loan.

AMERICANS BELIEVED SALES TO BE MADE FOR GOLD

In fact, President Kennedy stated that at his news conference on October 9. To the question, after discussing the effect of the Johnson Act, "Do grain dealers take the risk then?", President Kennedy answered, "The grain dealers will take the risk with the private banks."

This was the understanding generally shared by the people and by their representatives in Congress. This is well expressed in the column by Sylvia Porter entitled "Wheat Sales To Aid Balance of Payments" appearing in the Minneapolis Tribune on November 14, 1963.

"The wheat being sold to Russia and the Soviet bloc is to be paid for in gold and hard cash. The sale of 4 million long tons would increase our dollar earnings from wheat by over $250 million, more than 100 percent above 1962's earnings."

"Now that the ground rules finally have been set for sales and shipments of U.S. wheat to the Soviet bloc, let's assume the Kremlin follows through and buys the limit of 4 million long tons President Kennedy has authorized for sale. What would this deal mean to our wheat economy in particular and the U.S. economy in general?

"Far, far more than most Americans realize, says Erwin E. Kelm, president of Cargill, Inc., of Minneapolis, largest grain merchant in this country and the corporation which made the first sale of 100,000 tons of wheat to Hungary last Friday. In fact, some of the economic benefits which Kelm sees stemming directly from these sales well may startle even top experts on wheat and foreign trade. Specifically:

"Benefit: While this one deal would increase our total wheat exports over 1962 by less than 28 percent, it would more than double our dollar sales of wheat compared with last year.

"Explanation: In recent years 70 to 75 percent of all our wheat exports have been so-called giveaway sales. We have been selling wheat through normal commercial channels to foreign buyers, but permitting the countries to pay for their purchases in their own "soft" currencies.

"Our Government has been accepting these soft currencies—of such underdeveloped countries as India, Pakistan, Indonesia—and then has been paying the U.S. exporters in dollars.

We have since learned that it is the Government, through the Export-Import Bank, which will assume the risk. The grain traders will get a profit and the bankers a guaranteed 5 percent interest return less the small insurance fee they pay to have their entire risk against every contingency guaranteed by the U.S. Government.

It is my contention and I hope that it will become the contention of this committee that this specific decision—whether the American taxpayers should assume the entire risk of this purportedly commercial transaction with the Communist countries—is a point which should be decided with no delay by the Congress. I am convinced it should be decided in the negative.

Whatever the decision, however, I feel you must agree with me that it is of such significance to our country's future and to the entire free world that it should be debated and decided by the people's representatives in Congress. It definitely should not be a decision or a policy arrived at by drift or by the adoption of expedients to meet unanticipated conditions. Selling wheat and grain and other supplies for cash on the barrelhead or for gold is one thing—it is a policy about which Americans can and do disagree concerning its wisdom. However, as the negotiations developed it was discovered the shippers would not extend credit and their bankers declined to take the many risks involved in extending credit to the Communists.

SHOULD OUR GOVERNMENT GRANT CREDITS OUR BANKERS REJECT?

So—an expedient was evolved and adopted—to place the public credit of the United States behind the credit extended to the Communists and to guarantee the lending institutions against every possible contingency or loss on the repayment of the money owed by Communist countries to whom sales have been made. Thus we are confronted by a situation not planned in advance. We face a policy established as an expedient to overcome the understandable reluctance of private shippers and bankers to gamble the interest of their stockholders on the bad credit risks represented by the Communists.

Thus, step by step we have retreated from sales for gold or cash to sales on credit guaranteed by American taxpayers. A decision of this importance, Mr. Chairman, I submit should be established after careful congressional consideration of all of its ramifications and not as a patchwork device to promote a single sale or a series of transactions designed to sell a few selected products.

Therefore, my bill S. 2310 would cover credit extensions of this kind on sales of any products since the evidence is already rolling in that this precedent is set and approved for Export-Import credit guarantees for sales of wheat and corn. Suppliers of other products—both agricultural and manufactured—will apply for the same consideration and the same guarantees for an ever-expanding program of increasing sales to Russia and her Communist associates. This, in my opinion, would do violence to our foreign policy and trade programs of the past 15 years and would eventually build up for American taxpayers a vast contingent liability growing out of our guarantees of extension of credit to the Communists for those who sell for private profit such supplies which are desperately needed by the Communists.

THE WHEAT SALES AS ANNOUNCED ARE NOT AT STAKE

Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee approves the passage of S. 2310. Passage of this bill will not interfere in any way with the planned sales of wheat and grain to Russia and her satellites—provided the sales are for cash, for gold or for American dollars, or provided the granting of credit to the Communists is privately extended. It will, however, give us a breathing spell during which time we can explore together—the administration—the Congress—and I would hope the free world exporting nations in conference assembled—just where we want to go now in the establishment of trade and aid programs designed to protect the free world against the continuing threats of Communism. In the meantime it will protect American taxpayers from being compelled to become the cosigners of Communist promissory notes by which they purchase from us an endlessly expanding list of products which they need in order to continue their cruel war of nerves and threats against our Christian civilization.

TEMPORARY INCREASES IN PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 626, House bill 8969, and that it be made the pending business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 8969) to provide, for the period ending June 30, 1964, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO NOON, TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business this evening, it take a recess until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Edmondson in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 625, Senate Joint Resolution 103. It has been cleared on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 103) to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the work of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 103).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 103) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation for the work of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week", approved July 11, 1949 (63 Stat. 409), as amended, is amended by striking out "$300,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$400,000".

COMMITTEE MEETINGS IN BOSTON, MASS., ON NOVEMBER 22 AND 23, 1963

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet in Boston, Mass., during the sessions of the Senate on Friday, November 22, 1963, and on Saturday, November 23, 1963, if the Senate is in session on that day.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the following items printed in the Record at this point:

An article entitled "The Gruening Report" from the October 8, 1963, issue of Near East report.

An editorial entitled "Curb on Arms," from the Washington Post of November 18, 1963.

An article entitled "Coup Progress Hinders Alliance" from the Washington Post of the same date.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE GRUENING REPORT

Senator Ernest Gruening, Democrat, of Alaska, has presented the Senate Committee on Government Operations with a thoroughgoing 472-page report on U.S. aid to 10 Near East countries. The report, resulting from a 2-month tour of Turkey, Iran, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, Israel, Greece, Tunisia, Libya, and Egypt last winter, was prepared with the help of Senator Gruening's legislative assistant, Herbert W. Beaser. It reflects the Senator's experience as a former newspaperman and editor of the Nation.

Along with scathing criticism of U.S. aid practices, the report abounds with constructive proposals for reform. It serves as a handbook on U.S. aid: whether it should be continued; how it can be improved; why it must be improved.

NEW LOOK AT EGYPT

Many visitors to Cairo return singing praise for the graciousness and gallantry of President Nasser. Not so the Senator from Alaska.

"As I stood * * * watching preparations for a major speech by Colonel Nasser * * * and saw the multitude of large posters bearing his picture and I later heard his speech with its slogans and stirring platitudes, I * * * felt that all it would take to have that government become a Communist bloc nation would be to add a few slogans and change a few pictures."

It was clear to the Senator that (1) Egypt has become a socialist police state; (2) Nasser seeks his own personal and Egypt's national aggrandizement, in that order, and (3) U.S. dollars are enabling Egypt to wage war in Yemen, to foment trouble in Jordan and Saudi Arabia, and to arm to attack Israel just as surely as though they were spent directly for that purpose.

Senator Gruening challenged U.S. aid to Egypt, charging our State Department has misjudged Nasser's intentions. He condemned the current official suggestion that Nasser does not really mean his deadly threats against Israel and that Nasser's radio does not really mean to beam violence and revolution into the hearts of the citizens of Jordan and Saudi Arabia.

The Senator took Egypt's ruler more seriously. "Nasser's radio," he wrote, "is the only radio preaching the violent overthrow of other governments."

U.S. AID'ers not only disregard this situation, they abet it. Over $1 million has been obligated through fiscal 1963 to help Egypt build a Telecommunications Research and Training Institute.

RUSSIA AND EGYPT

"When I spoke to Colonel Nasser," writes Gruening, "he stated that after the poor showing made by his soldiers against the English, French and Israelis, his officers had demanded that he accept the offer of Soviet arms."

Thus, Nasser seemed to expect a U.S. Senator to believe that he, the hapless dictator, was forced by his mortified army to become totally dependent on military aid from the Soviet Union. Obviously, he felt that, no matter how clearly he reveals himself as an expert cold war fence-sitter, the United States would accept his explanations. Senator Gruening did not.

SIDE EFFECTS

These are the side effects of U.S. shipments of Public Law 480 food, mainly wheat, to Egypt:

Nasser can divert labor and resources from Egyptian wheatfields to Yemeni battlefields.

Egypt can continue growing cotton to trade for Russian arms.

Other Near East states, usually prone to use U.S. aid to better effect, are forced to divert needed resources for coequal military development with Egypt.

Gruening points out that if Nasser does not receive U.S. wheat, he will either have to grow it himself or import it from another country. It would be difficult to find a country with wheat in sufficient surplus to feed all the Egyptians who survive on U.S. shipments. Thus, Gruening felt that the United States could exercise real influence over Nasser by means of our aid, and he postulated two conditions for its continuation:

"1. Egypt's prompt compliance with the terms of the U.N. settlement of the Yemen dispute;

"2. Egypt's reversal of her present armament policy so as to cease production of missiles, warplanes, submarines, and other implements of war clearly designed for aggressive purposes."

PAT ON THE BACK

Gruening was kinder to U.S. AID'ers in Jordan. With U.S. assistance, King Hussein has instituted social, agrarian, and administrative reforms. By 1967, Jordan expects to increase gross national product by 60 percent, reduce foreign trade deficit by $33.6 million, increase employment by 21 percent.

But Gruening had reservations. We support development of Jordan's tourism without encouraging her to admit thousands of tourists who visit Israel every year. These tourists, potentially a substantial source of revenue, are barred once they have set foot in Israel.

LEBANON AND ISRAEL

With her high literacy rate and stable government, Lebanon has successfully utilized U.S. aid. Senator Gruening commented that because of her farflung trading interests, her support of the Arab boycott stems more from "the profit motive than * * * feelings of Arab unity."

But, the Senator argued, like any country whose major stock is in trade, Lebanon has everything to lose from war.

"What has been said about the success of the AID program in Lebanon," Gruening wrote, "can be said to an even greater degree of * * * Israel." In Israel, AID found cooperative officials, enthusiastic public, and a national willingness to provide counterparts, in effort and personnel, to the U.S. contribution.

ECONOMIC VIEWS

Gruening feels that countries like Lebanon and Israel, which encourage private business, are more likely to utilize U.S. aid in the spirit in which it is given.

He also felt that AID officials were trying too many projects in too many places and too often, simultaneously. To his mind, many projects initiated to stimulate economic diversity will fail because the recipient country is not prepared to follow through with them. He recommended that AID take inventory of its projects with a view to cutting their number.

NEAR EAST PEACE CORPS

The Arab refugee situation, to Gruening, is an economic and social rather than a political problem.

"I think one of the greatest mistakes * * * was to establish an international agency staffed primarily with locally recruited personnel * * *. Most of these locally hired employees are themselves refugees. The feeling still generally prevails among the refugees and the leaders of the Arab nations that any economic rehabilitation and integration * * * would be a weakening of the political strength of the movement to return to what they still consider Palestine. Thus economic rehabilitation has been resisted by the refugees."

GRUENING proposes that these 11,469 refugee employees be placed by UNWRA in outside jobs, given training and financial assistance for resettlement. To replace them would come a "United Nations Middle East Peace Corps * * * composed of volunteers from countries other than the countries involved, * * * to educate and train the refugees, to help them obtain employment in the Arab countries or elsewhere, to assist financially in their resettlement."

The elimination of the identity between bearers of UNWRA relief and carriers of political agitation might encourage economic rehabilitation.

DIPLOMACY WITH BLINDERS

GRUENING forcefully objected when he found that "our representatives stationed in the Arab countries are discouraged from traveling to Israel. Apparently the Arab nations frown upon such travel and the United States has bowed to their wishes."

In Lebanon, the chief of mission advised his staff not to refer to Israel by name. Local diplomatic jargon has a password for that besieged country—"Dixie." GRUENING found only one top U.S. diplomat in the countries he visited who had served in Israel.

Thus, after 2 or 3 years in an Arab country, U.S. personnel returned home "as strong advocates of the so-called Arab point of view and knowing little of the Israel point of view or what is occurring in that country."

CONCLUSIONS

GRUENING set forth 10 criteria for determining which nations should receive aid: Political stability, trained managerial personnel, public enthusiasm for economic growth, budgetary austerity, equitable distribution of the fruits of progress, no "flight of private capital," no commitment to total socialization, no engagement in "unprovoked military attack * * * or in an unnecessary arms buildup for that purpose," a long-range development plan, land and tax reforms.

Syria has broken world records in brevity and variety of governments. GRUENING recommended that aid to that country should stop, pending relative stability.

There will be those to disagree with GRUENING's economic views. But as a clear study of a hard-working Senator's hard work abroad, the Gruening report will be widely considered in discussion of the U.S. foreign aid program.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 18, 1963]

CURB ON ARMS

A cogent case can be made for Senate adoption of an amendment to the foreign aid bill that limits arms assistance to Latin America unless the President feels it is in the national interest or deems it necessary to protect elected governments. The amendment was offered by Senator GRUENING, who has been rightly concerned with the use of U.S.-supplied arms in military uprisings against constitutional regimes.

The boundary between the legislative and executive branches in the conduct of foreign affairs is ill-defined. What seems to us to constitute a clear encroachment is a congressional restriction that gives the President no room for maneuver or that requires him to make an invidious judgment about a foreign country. Many of the amendments adopted last week by the Senate fall clearly into this category.

But Congress has a right to express its considered opinion about the proper use of the appropriations it approves. Mr. GRUENING's criticism of arms aid has broad support. There is evidence that in certain Latin American countries U.S. military equipment has been misused and has done more to strengthen military usurpers than to strengthen free government. But unlike the amendments adopted concerning aid to Indonesia, Yugoslavia, and Egypt, this restriction allows the President to waive the prohibition without making an insulting finding. Why shouldn't the same formula be adopted in other amendments? When the foreign aid bill goes to conference, sensible changes of this nature can still be made.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 18, 1963]

FEW BENEFITS REALIZED—COUP PROGRESS HINDERS ALLIANCE

(By Bert Quint)

MEXICO CITY.—It seemed absurd, but there it was—the Alliance for Progress sticker showing the symbolic hands of the United States and Latin America clasped in friendship—pasted on the troop carriers that patrolled the streets of Tegucigalpa during and after the Honduran coup last month.

Mounted on the vehicles were American-made machine guns, manned by soldiers wearing U.S. camouflage uniforms and proudly displaying badges showing they had been trained at the American antiguerrilla school in Panama. Their job was not to fight guerrillas but rather to keep their own people under control.

In Santo Domingo, white-helmeted police trained by the United States to battle Communist rioters, have been breaking up non-Communist demonstrations ever since a military coup deposed Dominican Republic President Juan Bosch on September 25. Their principal weapon: Made-in-U.S.A. tear gas bombs that have been fired at 15-year-old schoolgirls as well as at older boys.

In Guatemala, Peru, Argentina, and Ecuador in the last year and one-half, the story has been the same. In some cases, the military takeover has been temporary; in others the army still rules openly. But in every instance, American military aid meant to fight communism has been employed to overthrow constitutional governments.

That aid has been given in packages that are bigger every year. In 1952, the total was only $200,000. By 1961, it was more than $90 million per year.

The Dominican Republic, for example, a country of fewer than 4 million persons, received $6.1 million between 1945 and 1962. That does not sound like a great deal, but it must be kept in mind that the country had no use for its armed forces other than to keep a dictator in power. None of the Latin countries really need armies. They are not going to fight each other nowadays and if they did, the Organization of American States would pull them apart immediately.

How foolish this kind of aid is becomes clear when you realize that Mexico, a Latin giant with 37 million population but one which does not go in for military strutting, received only $100,000 more than the little Dominican Republic in all those years.

But these figures are insignificant in comparison with what nations like Brazil ($215.9 million), Peru ($83.6 million), and Chile ($62.2 million) have been getting from the United States in military aid since 1945.

Those three countries, along with Ecuador and Argentina, allot between 21.1 percent and 27.6 percent of their total budgets to defense. Most of the bill is picked up by the United States. Part of what is not paid directly by the United States is obtained by spending money that, if it were not for U.S. economic grants, would have to be used for more fruitful purposes.

Thus, the Alliance for Progress is helping the rebirth of a militarism that had seemed to be on the wane in Latin America.

Not counting Cuba, Latin America—a region of some 200 million population without a real part to play in the defense of the West against the threat of war from the East—has 650,000 men in uniform. To keep them armed and ready (to start or stop revolutions, which is all they are used for) costs $1.4 billion per year. That is $400 million more than the United States contributes for the Alliance for Progress each year.

This means that if the United States forgot about the Alliance for Progress and Latin America forgot about its armies, the Latin people still would come out $400 million ahead.

So far, all the United States has gotten out of its $90 million per year military aid to the area is resentment on the part of those Latins who are pushed around at the end of American rifles, the overthrow of several governments the United States had tried to protect, and a loss of ground to the Communists who thrive on the discontent produced by military dictatorships.

The American attitude, as expressed by Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, is that to reduce U.S. military aid would be to tempt the Communists to take up arms and to increase their guerrilla warfare and subversion.

As for the Latins, while many a president would like to do away with the heavy burden o. a padded defense budget, most of them do not dare tamper with the privileges and the influence of the officers who are the real power in Latin America.

So, except in a few places like Mexico, Costa Rica, and Uruguay, where because of unusual circumstances the armies have been done away with or pared down to the bone, the cycle continues, with the United States continuing to give military aid to countries that do not need it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to discuss at this time the editorial from the Washington Post entitled "Curb on Arms."

The editorialist states:

> But Congress has a right to express its considered opinion about the proper use of the appropriations it approves. Mr. GRUENING's criticism of arms aid has broad support. There is evidence that in certain Latin American countries U.S. military equipment has been misused and has done more to strengthen military usurpers than to strengthen free government. But unlike the amendments adopted concerning aid to Indonesia, Yugoslavia, and Egypt, this restriction allows the President to waive the prohibition without making an insulting finding. Why shouldn't the same formula be adopted in other amendments? When the foreign aid bill goes to conference, sensible changes of this nature can still be made.

What is the insulting finding the Gruening amendment calls for, which seems to disturb the editor of the Washington Post? It is a finding that a country is an aggressor. What is insulting about that? If a country is an aggressor it is that country which is insulting mankind.

I compliment the Senator from Alaska for the wording of his amendment. I say to the editors of the Washington Post that instead of writing this kind of unintelligent editorial they ought to demonstrate they are capable of recognizing that the American taxpayer should not be pouring money into any foreign aid program supporting any aggressor nation. It is as simple as that.

It has been interesting to find the editors of the Washington Post, throughout our historic debate on the foreign aid program, supporting broad, discretionary, unchecked power in the office of the President of the United States.

The type of amendment that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] has proposed this year must be multiplied many times over next year, in case the Foreign Relations Committee brings out of the Foreign Relations Committee next year a bill as unsound and undesirable as the foreign aid bill of this year.

I say to the editors of the Washington Post that a good many of us will be "lying in wait" for that conference report, if the conferees bring back the sort of changes the editors of the Washington Post recommend, because such changes would not be in the public interest.

Mr. President, apropos of the recent and forthcoming foreign aid debate is a "Letter From East Pakistan" by John Owen, which appears in the current issue of the New Leader. Mr. Owen is described as having spent the last 4 years in East Pakistan as a visiting professor at Dacca University, in East Pakistan.

In particular, I call attention to Mr. Owen's dismal account of the lack of impact of American foreign aid upon the poverty and ills that beset this part of the world.

I particularly call the attention of the President of the United States to this letter, because he seems to believe we have a great responsibility to solve the problems of poverty all over the world.

The letter bears out what I argued at length time and time again during the debate; that the wealthy people in the countries into which we are pouring billions of American taxpayers' dollars do very little even to cooperate in trying to solve any of the economic conditions of the masses of their people. Many American apologists for foreign aid have long promoted the romantic concept that American money is a lever that can lift the world. It is not, and Mr. Owen's brief letter is but one exhibit to that effect.

For the benefit of the dogmatists of foreign aid, I read what Mr. Owen, who spent many years in Pakistan, says, in part:

> In the new residential districts, Pakistani landlords are fast growing rich from exorbitant rents charged to Americans employed by the Agency for International Development, the Ford Foundation, and U.S. engineering firms on contract to build dams, bridges, and factories.

Instead of helping the poor, what the foreign aid program does in many places is to make the rich richer. Then the rich use the money they make from the foreign aid program to invest in Swiss and New York banks, instead of in the economies of their own countries.

Mr. Owen also says:

> The sudden injection of millions of dollars in various aid and development projects has disrupted the social structure and economy, producing a new elite of foreign experts who enjoy a level of luxury living they could never afford back home.
>
> The real impact of foreign aid is difficult to evaluate but it would be hard to defend the thesis that East Pakistan's economy or living standards have been appreciably improved by the millions invested thus far. On the contrary, the life of the Bengali farmer is harder than it was 10 years ago, and there is firm evidence that some of the aid funds have been misused.

Later in his letter he says:

> In a very real sense the East Pakistanis today, like their counterparts in West Pakistan, are not a nation but an ill-assorted group of divergent elements divided against themselves, disunited except for a negative attitude to India. Pakistan was not ready for nationhood in 1947, and it is still not ready. President Ayub Khan is the one leader who shows any statesmanship, but he is like a man in search of a country. He is resented by many Bengalis because he is from West Pakistan, and the animosity shown to the West wing in Bengal rivals the resentment against India. The two wings are not in any sense united.
>
> Not a few U.S. aid workers have returned home from East Pakistan in recent months with deep misgivings about the wisdom of giving millions of dollars to a people whose defiant ignorance, fatalism, and extreme backwardness render them painfully ill-equipped to help themselves or face the realities of the 20th century. The outlook for East Pakistan is dark and grim. Quite apart from the Chinese danger only 300 miles to the north, there is no prospect that conditions for the Bengalis will get any better.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Letter From East Pakistan

(By John E. Owen)

Dacca.—East Pakistan today is a region where almost every aspect of life conspires to produce a situation devoid of hope. An impecunious province carved in 1947 out of undivided Bengal, it lies beneath the Himalayas in the Ganges-Brahmaputra Delta between Assam and West Bengal, a low-lying riverine country beset by periodic floods, monsoons, and poor soil.

East Pakistan's population density, over 1,000 persons per square mile, ranks as one of the highest in the world. And the region's 50 million Bengalis have increased in number by almost 25 percent in the last decade, with no sign of any surcease. This factor alone is likely to nullify the benefits of foreign economic aid. Birth control programs have made little headway, especially since the Bengali Muslim has a fatalistic attitude. He believes children are a sign of the blessings of Allah, and large families bestow prestige upon a father.

Floods and cyclones destroy property every year, but no effective steps have been taken to control their damage. Milk supplied by CARE and thousands of woolen blankets donated by the United States for flood victims can be bought openly on the black market. Bengal's upper classes are complacently indifferent to the loss of life and farmlands among the peasants. Flood relief funds are frequently diverted from their rightful beneficiaries.

Since 1947, a new class of rich industrialists from outside the province has built up the jute trade lost to India when the subcontinent was partitioned. The social changes resulting from superimposing technology and industry upon an essentially feudal society have been sufficient to disorganize the life of the province. Dacca, the urban capital, presents a bizarre spectacle of western modernity combining uneasily with the rural East. In 15 years it has been transformed from a sleepy hinterland town to the administrative and commercial center of East Bengal. Refugees from India and an influx of Bengalis from the agricultural districts have swelled the population to over half a million.

Living conditions in Old Dacca are overcrowded and disease is rampant. With more than 12,000 persons per square mile, the area resembles London of 300 years ago before the great fire. An epidemic of smallpox earlier this year resulted in 900 known deaths in 1 month; untold others were not recorded. While the epidemic was raging, the first session of Pakistan's National Assembly, 5 miles away, was engaged in endless speechmaking, but almost the only legislation passed was a bill to raise the stipends of delegates.

Dacca's streets present weird contrasts: bullock carts and Chevrolets, rickshaws and jeeps, a new atomic resarch center and weatherbeaten mosques, an impressive hospital run by American Catholics and roadside lockups where homeopathic "doctors" sell their nostrums. In the new residential districts, Pakistani landlords are fast growing rich from exorbitant rents charged to Americans employed by the Agency for International Development, the Ford Foundation and U.S. engineering firms on contract to build dams, bridges and factories. The sudden injection of millions of dollars in various aid and development projects has disrupted the social structure and economy, producing a new elite of foreign experts who enjoy a level of luxury living they could never afford back home.

The real impact of foreign aid is difficult to evaluate, but it would be hard to defend the thesis that East Pakistan's economy or living standards have been appreciably improved by the millions invested thus far. On the contrary, the life of the Bengali farmer is harder than it was 10 years ago, and there is firm evidence that some of the aid funds have been misused. The Water and Power Development Authority, a multimillion dollar project, is only one of several instances where U.S. funds have not produced the expected results, partly because of large-scale misappropriations.

Corruption in East Pakistan is openly acknowledged and cynically accepted as a governmental way of life; a system of baksheesh, bribery and kickbacks is firmly entrenched. Nevertheless, the disposition of aid funds has not been adequately supervised by U.S. officials. Many of the 500 Americans in Dacca are unhappily aware that their efforts to develop the economy are yielding no tangible results and that the Pakistani authorities, with their practiced skill at grasping every chance to enrich their own pockets, have stolen American money. Nor is there the slightest evidence of appreciation for the millions that have been given. Indeed many Bengalis still find the concept of aid difficult to comprehend and question the motives behind the U.S. program.

Since the end of martial law in 1962, conditions in the province have worsened progressively. An atmosphere of lawlessness exists that the police are powerless to cope with. The last university commencement ceremony had to be canceled for fear of student demonstrations or riots against the Government, and during the academic year 1962–63 classes were in session for only 62 days. The authorities are afraid to act against the students, who represent one of the few literate segments of the population and thus have the potential for wielding influence in their home villages.

Over 80 percent of Bengalis are illiterate. The poverty of the peasants has to be seen to be believed. Their small holdings of rice and jute are uneconomic, rice production has not risen sufficiently to provide adequate sustenance for the peasants and their families, and inflation has brought added hardship. The authorities deny that East Pakistan has a food shortage, but in many villages the situation is so desperate that peasants are eating grass and roots.

There is rising discontent that would probably erupt into violence, were it not for the apathy induced by malnutrition and Muslim fatalism. Many Bengalis have told me that conditions in general were immeasurably better under the British regime, and that personally they are far worse off now than before partition. A severe taxation policy specifies that even the villager who owns a chicken has to pay a tax on it.

Attempts to introduce cooperatives into East Pakistan have met with indifferent results, mainly because the spirit of cooperation has never taken root here. Harsh economic conditions preclude the idea of mutual self-help, and Islam has not fostered attitudes of cooperative endeavor. Outside the family circle, East Bengalis live by a jungle code, pitting their wits against each other rather than against nature.

Islam as practiced in Pakistan enjoins no ethical code that might affect daily dealings between Pakistanis. Its stress is on the outer observance, the five daily prayers, the Ramadan fasting period, and occasional almsgiving. Apart from the apathetic fatalism it engenders, Islam is not a cohesive force in Pakistan. A great gulf exists between the Western-educated intellectual and the peasant, underlining the lack of agreement as to what the true function of Islam should be.

Only two things unite East Pakistan today: a sense of hopelessness concerning the national future, and resentment of India. Many Bengalis privately admit that partition was a profound mistake from which they have gained nothing. When asked what the future of East Pakistan is likely to be, they shake their heads and answer, "God knows."

An undefined segment of Bengalis would prefer to be reunited with India; it looks to Calcutta as its Mecca, a political fact that is disturbing to the authorities in Rawalpindi. "We have to hate India," a Bengali intellectual told me, "for without that we would have no reason to exist as a nation." But Western arms aid to India has aroused bad feeling against both the United States and India among many Bengalis.

In a very real sense the East Pakistanis today, like their counterparts in West Pakistan, are not a nation but an ill-assorted group of divergent elements divided against themselves, disunited except for a negative attitude to India. Pakistan was not ready for nationhood in 1947, and it is still not ready. President Ayub Khan is the one leader who shows any statesmanship, but he is like a man in search of a country. He is resented by many Bengalis because he is from West Pakistan, and the animosity shown to the west wing in Bengal rivals the resentment against India. The two wings are not in any sense united.

Not a few U.S. aid workers have returned home from East Pakistan in recent months with deep misgivings about the wisdom of giving millions of dollars to a people whose defiant ignorance, fatalism, and extreme backwardness render them painfully ill-equipped to help themselves or face the realities of the 20th century. The outlook for East Pakistan is dark and grim. Quite apart from the Chinese danger only 300 miles to the north, there is no prospect that conditions for the Bengalis will get any better.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Senators should not forget that Pakistan is a country into which we have been pouring millions, while it proceeds to negotiate various agreements with Red China.

METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, today I issued a press release in the form of a letter I have sent to Mr. Walter N. Tobriner, president of the Board of Commissioners of Washington, D.C., which contains the first list of questions to which I am asking the president of the Board of Commissioners of Washington, D.C., to obtain answers for me in connection with my preliminary study of the administration of the Metropolitan Police Department in Washington, D.C.

The release that has gone to the press gallery, on page 3, second paragraph, contains a typographical error. The word "neutral" in the fifth line, at the end of the line, should be "mutual," rather than "neutral."

I ask unanimous consent that the press release be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 19, 1963.

DEAR COMMISSIONER TOBRINER: I would appreciate receiving from you at your earliest convenience, answers to the following questions which I shall need in connection with my study of the policies and practices of the Metropolitan Police Department.

1. How much time has Pvt. George Whaler spent during duty hours in any activity other than official police work during 1960, 1961, 1962, and 1963? It is necessary to have the exact dates and amount of time spent, if any, on activities other than official duties whether approved by a superior police officer or not.

2. The same information, as requested above, is needed pertaining to Royce Givens and each member of the executive board and legislative committees of the District of Columbia Policemen's Association.

3. The name, rank, and age of each police officer holding the position of captain or above who has resigned from the Metropolitan Police Department since 1957 on account of disability.

4. Has the District Commissioners' order as reported in the Evening Star of January 4, 1963, pertaining to cracking down on speeding and reckless motorists, been carried out to any appreciable degree?

5. What measures are being taken, if any, by the Metropolitan Police Department to curtail the alarming increase in traffic fatalities on District of Columbia streets?

6. The number of officers holding the rank of captain in the Metropolitan Police Department; their assignments; and the exact nature of the work performed by each such officer.

7. I would like to have furnished to me the real estate holdings of all officers, captain or higher, owning real estate in the District of Columbia; the acquisition date and value.

8. My next question is a very broad one and I recognize that it will probably require several weeks to obtain the detailed information that I seek. However, I am interested in the recruitment policies that are followed in the selecting of members of the Washington, D.C., Metropolitan Police force. Therefore, I would like to have compiled for me a list of the names of the new men added to the Washington Police force during the past 8 years. I want to know from what States they were selected and what their past police experience has been, if any, and a synopsis of their qualifications which formed the basis of their selection, including their educational background.

9. I also wish to have compiled for me a listing of the promotions within the Washington Metropolitan Police Department within the past 5 years. This should be accompanied by a detailed statement as to the promotion policies and the criteria that are used in making promotions in the District of Columbia. Later, I shall submit to you further questions on this subject in respect to the procedures that are followed in conducting that part of the promotion policy that deals with written questions and the part dealing with the oral examination. I have been advised that herein lies an interesting field for study in respect to its possible racial policies.

10. I note from the press that administrative officials in the District of Columbia government, including, apparently, the chief of police, describe the District of Columbia Policeman's Association as a union of policemen which has no official relationship to the chief of police or to the District of Columbia Commissioners.

I desire to have you prepare for me a detailed report covering the past 8 years on any official relationships that have existed between the chief of police and his executive assistants and the District of Columbia Policemen's Association.

I desire to have the same information with regard to any relationships that have existed between the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, including the District of Columbia General Administration, and the District of Columbia Policemen's Association.

For example, I want to know to what extent, if any, the chief of police and his executive assistants and the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners have ever consulted with the District of Columbia Policemen's Association when there has been pending before the Congress any legislation that affects the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department or that affects any other District of Columbia government matter.

As you know, I have been on the Senate District of Columbia Committee for a good many years. To put it bluntly, I have been lobbied time and time again by the District of Columbia Policemen's Association, and I have never been given the impression that the District of Columbia Policemen's Association was acting in a vacuum as far as the mutual interests of the chief of police and the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners were concerned with respect to District of Columbia legislation.

11. Next, I would like to have you obtain for me copies of all speeches, press releases, testimony and public statements that Chief of Police Murray and his subordinates maintaining a position of captain or above, have made during the past 6 years on any and all topics involved in the consideration of legislation in the Congress affecting law enforcement in the District of Columbia. This information should include the statements of the aforementioned police officials in respect to such issues as the Mallory case, the Durham rule, arrests for investigation, the causes of crime in the District of Columbia, and the host of other statements on a myriad of subjects that have flowed out of the executive offices of the Washington Metropolitan Police Department during this period of time.

I need the information requested in the foregoing questions for my preliminary study of a much more extensive study that I intend to conduct next year of the Washington Metropolitan Police Department and its policies.

At a later time, I shall submit to you a series of questions that will deal with some of the race problems in the District of Columbia as they relate to the policies of the Metropolitan Police Department.

As you may know, for many years I worked in the field of crime correction and law enforcement investigation studies. My work on the Senate District of Columbia Committee in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Health, Education,

> Welfare, and Safety causes me to believe that the type of study that I am going to make of the Washington Metropolitan Police Department is long overdue.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to make this comment about future questions the senior Senator from Oregon will be asking the Board of Commissioners, and later the Police Department itself. I propose, in the weeks immediately ahead, by calling for answers to these questions, to obtain the basic material I shall need for a study and consideration preliminary to hearings which I shall conduct in the next session of Congress as chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia that has jurisdiction over the Washington Police Department. I say at the close of my letter today:

> As you may know, for many years I worked in the field of crime correction and law enforcement investigation studies. My work on the Senate District of Columbia Committee in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety causes me to believe that the type of study that I am going to make of the Washington Metropolitan Police Department is long overdue.

Back in 1932 I directed the Oregon crime survey, which dealt in part with police practices and abuses, and I have been associated with similar surveys. While a Special Assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, I directed the five volumes of the work, which was subsequently published, dealing with problems of law enforcement.

Recent developments in the District of Columbia and the various lobbying activities of the chief of police calling for support for the so-called omnibus crime bill, which, in my opinion, has shocking unconstitutional proposals in it, give me great concern as to what is happening in the administration of the Police Department in Washington, D.C.; and I propose to look into it and find out what the facts are.

FOREIGN AID IN CAMBODIA, MALAYSIA, AND INDONESIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, turning to my last item for tonight, news stories on the wire service tickers carry two items about the foreign aid program that concern me very much.

One of them involves Cambodia, which has announced that all U.S. aid programs there are being terminated immediately. The reaction of the United States is clearly one of trying to get Cambodia to change its mind. One of the major objections I have to the present foreign aid program—and it is one I referred to frequently during the recent debate—is that so much of it stems from American insistence that other nations accept our financial and military aid. The Cambodian episode is but another example of this major characteristic of foreign aid—it is extended not so much because other countries want it as it is extended because we want them to have it.

Under those circumstances, it cannot be wondered at that so much corruption and waste results. The recipient need make little effort to maximize the effect of American capital when we are pressing it on him.

The pile of the Comptroller General's critical reports, measuring over 18 inches high, that I used during the course of the debate bears witness to the fact that much of the waste and corruption in the field of military aid—economic aid, too, but particularly military aid—were caused because we forced aid upon countries that did not ask for it and did not want it. It was forced upon them. The results were what we would expect them to be with such aid—they wasted much of it. It led to bribery, to stealing, to pilfering, and to shocking corruption. Of course, that fact has greatly damaged the prestige and image of the United States in those areas of the world. In fact, as we go into some areas of the world we are charged with being both fools and hypocrites.

The second story involves Malaysia and Indonesia. It carries a protest from a Malaysian spokesman charging the United States with a "two-faced" policy of helping Indonesia while we also extend aid to Malaysia. Despite the evidence brought out in the hearings in the House of Representatives that Indonesia was buying jet airliners at the same time it was negotiating for American foreign aid in the same amount, and despite the argument of the President that aid had been cut off to Indonesia, it appears that our aid is actually continuing. The memorandum which I read to the Senate on November 7 indicated that negotiations for certain development loans had been terminated, but that military aid, technical assistance, and food-for-peace sales are continuing.

I do not wonder that Malaysia is charging us with being two-faced, because that is the best description I know for American policy. That is becoming another characteristic of American foreign aid. We are so anxious to have a hand in the military affairs of every nation in the world that we force on them our training programs and military equipment whether they want them or not, and with no regard whatever for the uses to which they will be put. We did that in Yugoslavia. Congress heard throughout the first Eisenhower administration that by giving military equipment and training to the Yugoslav army we were decreasing its dependence upon the Soviet Union and assuring that said army would form ties with the West. What baloney. Congress terminated the military aid program for Yugoslavia; subsequently, we terminated economic aid to Yugoslavia, too, all over vehement protests from "downtown." But the record of history was already clear that Yugoslavia was going to follow policies toward Russia and toward the West that had little to do with whether she received aid from us or not.

Yet we are being fed the same "line" now about Indonesia. The memorandum of the State Department in opposition to the Proxmire amendment states:

> The record of the Indonesian military commends it for U.S. support. Even while Indonesia was receiving upward of $1 billion of military aid from the Soviet Union, the army steadfastly held to its anti-Communist posture. It would be utter folly for us to now abandon Indonesian military.

What record of the Indonesian military commends it for U.S. support? Why, in 1948 it suppressed a Communist uprising. The fact that since then it has embarked on aggressions against the Dutch, and now against Malaysia, apparently is of no concern to the Department of State, and certainly not to the Pentagon. Both these agencies are impressed when a nation can receive Soviet aid and still be anti-Communist.

Mr. President, watch out for two-timers. Do not ever trust them. And two-timing Indonesia cannot be trusted. The Pentagon and the State Department never seem to understand that a nation can also receive American aid and still be anti-American and anti-everything the United States is trying to achieve. Many Pentagon and State Department officials still do not recognize an international streetwalker when they see one.

That is an apt description of Sukarno. They still cannot understand that there are no favors to be gotten from Indonesia that are not available to everyone, Communist and non-Communist alike, so long as the money keeps coming in.

In my opinion, not only the Proxmire amendment but the Gruening amendment will have the result of terminating U.S. aid to Indonesia so long as her aggressive policy toward Malaysia continues. In my opinion, this episode is the best evidence since Congress ended the programs in Yugoslavia that only Congress can provide meaningful and effective foreign aid policy control. The Indonesian case is a good reason for Congress to make an ever more thorough examination of the program in the months ahead in the hope that instead of having to try its best to end aid in a given country where the program is creating trouble, Congress can prevent aid from getting started in such a country.

Mr. President, thus, for the benefit of the publishers and editors of the Washington Post, and for the benefit of those who are trying to defend giving to the President unchecked power in the field of foreign aid, I recommend that they take a good long look at what is happening in Indonesia.

I say to the American voters: "You had better make it perfectly clear that you intend to hold this and all further administrations accountable for any attempt on their part to exercise an unchecked discretion in giving further aid, military or economic, to a country headed by a man like Sukarno, because Indonesia is a serious threat to the peace in Asia, and any further support of it will do greater damage to the prestige and image of the United States in that part of the world."

RECESS TO 12 O'CLOCK NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.) the Senate recessed, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Thursday, November 21, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 20 (legislative day of October 22), 1963:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Maj. Gen. Alva Revista Fitch, O18113, U.S. Army, in the grade of lieutenant general.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10 of the United States Code.

In the grade of lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Cecil M. Childre, 1551A, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Benjamin J. Webster, 974A, Regular Air Force.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be general

Gen. James Francis Collins, O16819, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Lt. Gen. Hugh Pate Harris, O18518, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), in the grade of general.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT].

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 90: 12: *So teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom.*

Most merciful and gracious God, in whose divine keeping and control are our days, we thank Thee for this day which has come as a fresh gift from Thy hands.

May there be nothing in this day's work of which we shall be ashamed when the sun has set or at the eventide of life when Thou dost call us to Thyself.

We are again approaching Thy throne of grace, with our many needs, through the old and familiar way of prayer which is always open unto those who come unto Thee with a humble spirit and a contrite heart.

We are not asking Thee to deal with our beloved country in any preferential manner and that it may become an industrial paradise or an economic Garden of Eden, with plenty to eat, plenty to wear, and plenty to play with, when vast multitudes are finding the struggle of life so difficult.

Give us a large part in building a better world and a finer civilization.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On November 19, 1963:

H.R. 1989. An act to authorize the government of the Virgin Islands to issue general obligation bonds; and

H.R. 5244. An act to modify the project on the Mississippi River at Muscatine, Iowa, to permit the use of certain property for public park purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6518. An act to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. MOSS, Mr. METCALF, Mr. BOGGS, and Mr. PEARSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 129. Joint resolution to amend section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954 to increase the amount available to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator for advances for planned public works.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT RESEARCH

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Government Research be permitted to sit during general debate today and for the balance of the week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the General Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

BAD EFFECT OF DEPRESSED AREA LEGISLATION

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have just been advised that Radio Manufacturing Engineers, Inc., which has one plant in my district in Washington, Ill., and one in Eureka, Ill., represented by my good friend LES ARENDS is pulling up stakes and moving to eastern Tennessee.

Both of these plants are subsidiaries of Electro Voice Co. of Buchanan, Mich., making cartridges on tone arms for phonographs, employing some 150 to 200 persons and have attempted to get defense contracts. Having failed and lost their three last attempts to bid on defense contracts because competitors from so-called depressed areas are given a preference, these plants are being closed and moved to an area in eastern Tennessee so they can get a similar preference and bid more competitively. What is more, under the ARA program, they will get their new plants built for them, in Tennessee, by local entities with Federal funds.

This is a clear-cut case of pirating of industry and points up the folly of so-called depressed areas legislation. I opposed it when it was considered in the House and this is just one good reason for my continuing opposition to the program and I suspect there are many other fine districts around the country being adversely affected by this program.

SEVENTEENTH ANNUAL REPORT ON U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS DURING 1962—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. Doc. 167)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of the United Nations Participation Act, I transmit herewith the 17th annual report covering U.S. participation in the United Nations during 1962.

This record tells the story of deep United Nations engagement in the great issues of the 1960's. It demonstrates that despite the financial irresponsibility of some of its members, the organization has, through executive action and parliamentary diplomacy, played an indispensable role in dealing with an impressive number of the world's problems.

The United Nations political relevance—and its developing capacity for effective action—is indicated by a brief look at several major aspects of world affairs and at what the United Nations did about them in 1962.

GREAT POWER CONFRONTATION

When the Soviet Union sought to alter the balance of nuclear power by installing missile bases in Cuba, the United Nations—as well as the Organization of American States—proved an important instrument in resolving the most dangerous crisis of the nuclear era. The Security Council served as a forum in which the U.S. Government made clear to the world that its actions, taken in concert with its neighbors of the hemisphere, were the reasonable response of rational men to a sudden and unacceptable threat in their midst. The Secretary General, only recently elected to his post after a period as Acting Secretary General, provided a useful point of contact in the early stages of negotiations with the Soviet Union. The United Nations also could have provided an onsite inspection service at short notice had the Cuban Government not refused to cooperate with the world organization, and made necessary a continuation of other means of surveillance in the interest of hemispheric security. Finally, the United Nations provided an appropriate place for negotiating the remaining issues after Soviet missiles had been withdrawn.

It was in 1962 that a major United Nations peacekeeping force in the Congo established a level of internal security which permitted a very substantial reduction in the size of that force. The Central Government of the Congo, assisted by the United Nations, has preserved—in the words of the charter—its "territorial integrity and political independence"—and thereby forestalled a threat to international peace—in the face of three attempts at secession: a Communist-sponsored effort in the north, a local eruption in the interior, and a secession backed by outside interests in the south. Assisted by technical aid from most of the specialized agencies of the United Nations, the Government of the Congo has meanwhile increased its capacity to manage an economy of rich potential in the face of severe difficulties, including a crippling lack of trained manpower and experienced administrators.

In two other fields the United Nations has continued to be a vital instrument to effect a disengagement in important sectors of the great power confrontation. The organization has served as a forum for encouraging an agreement for the cessation of nuclear weapon testing and for promoting progress toward general disarmament. It has served, as well, as a mechanism for negotiating legal principles and technical cooperation in outer space. We must be no less concerned with these persistent efforts to shape the future within the framework of the United Nations Charter than we are with United Nations operations designed to respond to the alarm bells of the present.

OTHER INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS

During 1962 an impending conflict was averted in West New Guinea—the first territory administered by an international organization—by the patient work of a United Nations mediator. In the Middle East the United Nations Emergency Force, the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine, and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees were on the job of removing and reducing tensions, and controlling those that could not yet be removed. In Kashmir, United Nations contingents patrolled under provisions of truce and cease-fire agreements. In Korea, a United Nations Commission stood ready to help in the unification of the country in accordance with resolutions of the General Assembly. Since the end of 1962, the United Nations has begun another work of peacemaking, through an agreement for the disengagement in Yemen of the United Arab Republic and Saudi Arabia.

FINANCING PEACEKEEPING

At the 17th General Assembly the United Nations received and then accepted the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice that peacekeeping expenses of the United Nations in the Congo and the Middle East, earlier approved by the Assembly, are expenses of the organization within the meaning of article 17 of the charter. The failure of member states to pay their related assessments would thus subject them to the loss-of-vote provisions of article 19. The Court's opinion and its acceptance set the stage for what, based on later actions by the General Assembly, promises to produce a sturdier sense of financial responsibility on the part of most of the members.

COLONIAL QUESTIONS

Despite predictions of "another Congo," the United Nations trust territory of Ruanda-Urundi moved peacefully from dependence under Belgian administration to independence as the Republic of Rwanda and the kingdom of Burundi and then to membership in the United Nations. The organization continued to tackle the problems of nonviolent transition as awakening peoples moved steadily toward independence from older colonial patterns. The remnants of the world's colonial past still present some hard cases—the last precisely because they are the hardest—which will test the capacity of the world community, and of the United Nations, to devise the procedures and institutions of peaceful change.

It should come to us as no surprise that the struggle for national self-determination should be so closely linked with other fundamental questions of human rights. It has been so in our own country. As the decolonization process nears an end—with miraculously little bloodshed—men and nations can shift their attention from national freedom to the larger issue of individual freedom.

THE DRIVE FOR MODERNIZATION

Through its specialized agencies and regional commissions—its technical assistance and preinvestment work—its civil role in the Congo—its new projects such as the world food program, the world weather watch, and regional planning institutes—its standard-setting and rulemaking roles in such fields as maritime safety and international radio frequency allocations—its useful reports and its many conferences—the United Nations moved ahead as the principal international executive agency of the decade of development. We continue to believe it possible, through vigorous international cooperation, to achieve an average annual rate of economic growth of 5 percent in the newly developing nations by the end of this decade.

In short, the United Nations in 1962 was confronted—in practical and operational ways—with a broad agenda of the great issues of our time. Like most institutions devised by man, the United Nations exhibited both accomplishments and shortcomings. But despite noncooperation from some members and wavering support from others, the organization moved significantly toward the goal of a peace system worldwide in scope. The United States will continue to lend vigorous support to the building of that system.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The WHITE HOUSE, *November 20, 1963.*

CONTINUING RESOLUTION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention and concurrence of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order on Monday next to take up for consideration in the House a continuing resolution providing for the coming month of December.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to respond to their names:

[Roll No. 208]

Abbitt
Abele
Bonner
Bow
Brotzman
Broyhill, Va.
Buckley
Byrnes, Wis.
Casey

Celler
Cunningham
Dague
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Derwinski
Dingell
Duncan
Gill
Harding
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Henderson
Jones, Ala.
Kee
Kelly
Knox
Laird
Lloyd
Long, La.
McDade
Madden
Mailliard
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Meader
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Minshall
O'Brien, Ill.
Passman
Pilcher
Pillion
Powell
Rains
Randall
Roberts, Ala.
Rogers, Tex.
St. Onge
Shelley
Springer
Stubblefield
Trimble
Tuten
Younger

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. On this rollcall 375 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON RULES, PERMISSION TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. **SMITH** of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

THE LATE MRS. RALPH R. ROBERTS

Mr. **O'HARA** of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. **O'HARA** of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my sorrowful mission to announce to the Members of the House the death on November 18 of Mrs. Eloise C. Roberts, and to express to her bereaved husband, Ralph Roberts, the Clerk of the House, the profound sympathy of all the Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Roberts was a fine and noble woman. She exemplified the finest qualities of womanhood. Although ill for a number of years, her smile, her cheer were ever present, brightening the very air around her and comforting and cheering those within the circle of her presence.

The funeral services will be held at St. Thomas Church at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow. Burial afterward will be in Arlington Cemetery.

Mr. Speaker, I know that in this simple tribute to the memory of a noble woman and of expression of sympathy to Ralph Roberts, I speak for all the Members of the House in expressing these sentiments.

TO AMEND THE ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACT

Mr. **O'NEILL**. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 558 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 777) to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. **O'NEILL**. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and pending that I yield 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. George].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 558 provides for the consideration of S. 777, a bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees.

Mr. Speaker, the basic job of the Agency is to provide the backup support essential to the conduct of the highly complex and technical disarmament negotiations in which the United States has participated since the Agency opened its doors.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of S. 777 is to authorize additional funds to finance the continued operation of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, as well as to make a number of amendments to the Arms Control and Disarmament Act of 1961 in order to facilitate its administration with respect to security clearance of contractors and subcontractors, to make clear that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has no jurisdiction over the possession or use of firearms by individuals, and to impose certain limitations on the obligation and use of funds by the Agency.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 558.

Mrs. **ST. GEORGE**. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 558 makes in order the consideration of the bill S. 777 to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriation and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees.

Mr. Speaker, for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 there is authorized to be appropriated $30 million, as amended by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. As the bill passed the Senate $20 million was authorized, obviously about 50 percent of the original sum has been added which seems considerable.

It is also a rather interesting thing to see the House increase an appropriation made by the Senate. It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, an amendment will be offered to this, and that when the amendment comes up it may be voted down. That is, we will have an opportunity to return to the original Senate bill or even cut that if we think it is necessary.

On the security investigations, section 2 adds a new subsection to the act which provides that in the case of contractors or subcontractors, their officers and employees, a report of investigation conducted by a Government agency, other than the Civil Service Commission or the FBI, may be accepted by the Director when he determines that the completed investigation meets the standards established in the act.

The Director may also grant access for information classified no higher than "confidential" to contractors or subcontractors and their officers and employees on the basis of reports on less than full-field investigations.

Then there is also the requirement of congressional approval for reduction in the U.S. armed services. This is section 3. The House Foreign Affairs Committee retained the language in the present law which requires congressional approval for any action which would obligate the United States to disarm, reduce or limit our Armed Forces or armaments. The Senate bill would have deleted this language and substituted language which would simply require approval to be "in accordance with the constitutional processes of the United States."

In section 5 there is:

> (a) Not more than 20 percent of any appropriation made pursuant to this Act shall be obligated and/or reserved during the last month of a fiscal year.
>
> (b) None of the funds authorized shall be used to support any pending legislation concerning the work of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

It seems that these two last points are well taken and deserving of favorable consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to this rule, which provides 2 hours of general debate.

Mr. **O'NEILL**. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. **MORGAN**. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 777) to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees.

The motion was agreed to.

IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Commitee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 777, with Mr. Thompson of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. **MORGAN**. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, S. 777 authorizes the additional funds which are necessary for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to continue its operations, and amends the Arms Control and Disarmament Act of 1961 in certain respects in order to facilitate the Agency's operations, to remove a possible uncertainty as to its meaning, and to impose certain limitations on the use of the Agency's funds.

The bill is short and most of its provisions are self-explanatory. It provides for no changes in policy, and its provisions reflect no change in our approach to the problems of arms control and disarmament from the approach embodied in the basic legislation which was enacted in September 1961.

Before discussing the detailed provisions of the bill, let me say just a word about the work of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. There apparently are people in the United States who regard the Agency as directing a conspiracy against the security of the United States. I have seen statements which appeared to indicate that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was devoting its money and its manpower to undermining our Defense Department and weakening our military forces.

Let me encourage everyone to keep this fact in mind: The primary job of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is to provide the backup for the representatives of the United States in their conduct of arms control and disarmament negotiations. There is no way in which the Disarmament Agency or the President can obligate the United States to disarm or reduce its Armed Forces without congressional approval. This is clearly stated in section 33 of the act, and the bill before the House today contains an amendment to eliminate the language approved by the Senate which made some changes in the very clear and explicit language which has been in effect since 1961.

Let me state categorically that the President does not have authority to transfer jurisdiction over our Armed Forces from the Department of Defense to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, or for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to transfer American military forces to the United Nations. Let me also state categorically that there is no authority in the act for the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to call out the Armed Forces of the United States.

The bill authorizes an appropriation of $30 million to finance the Agency over a period of 2 years. This authorization would make possible an appropriation of $15 million for fiscal year 1964, which is the sum requested by the Agency. The committee has increased the authorization for 2 years by $10 million, from $20 million—the figure approved by the Senate—to $30 million. The committee has taken this action after detailed study and careful consideration.

The Agency proposes to use $11 million of the $15 million which it has requested to finance research and $4 million to meet its administrative expenses. Both these sums represent substantial increases over the amounts spent for these purposes during fiscal 1963, but it is necessary to recognize that the Agency is new and is only now ready to carry on its normal scale of operations.

I am sure that every member of the Foreign Affairs Committee had reservations with respect to the request for $11 million for research when we first began consideration of the bill. All of us recognized the fact that much of the information which would be used in arms control and disarmament negotiations would involve the capabilities of various types of weapons systems, and we knew that the best source of information on such matters was our own Department of Defense.

We were aware also that control of the use of nuclear devices was a major issue which the Agency has to deal with, and it seemed to be obvious that our Atomic Energy Agency was doing very extensive research in this field. We realized also that the military capability of the Soviet bloc would be of major importance in dealing with arms control and disarmament, and we felt sure that the Central Intelligence Agency is, and must inevitably continue to be, the principal source of information in this area.

Nevertheless, after careful consideration of the types of research which the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is doing and with the research projects which it has planned for the immediate future, the committee is convinced that an authorization of $11 million for this purpose can be justified.

We held several days of hearings on this matter during which we heard from senior officials of the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Agency, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Central Intelligence Agency. We questioned these officials about their own research programs which were related to arms control and disarmament, and we also asked them what they knew about the research program of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and of the procedures for coordinating research in this field.

The result of our questioning satisfied us that there has been no significant duplication of research activities in the arms control and disarmament field, and that the procedures for coordination are well organized and working effectively.

Section 35 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act makes detailed provision for coordination of the work of the Arms Control Agency with other Government departments, and the President has, by Executive order, assigned to the Director of the Agency responsibility for coordination. This Executive order requires that the Director of the Arms Control Agency maintain a continuing inventory of research projects and other activities relating to disarmament matters in order to prevent duplication of effort. As I have already indicated, the testimony of representatives of the Defense Department, the Atomic Energy Agency, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has satisfied the committee that the job of coordination was being done in a satisfactory manner.

Although the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency makes extensive use of the research of the Defense Department and other agencies of the Government, there are many problems which are not of direct concern to anyone else and which it has to investigate for itself. The largest research project in its present program is designated "Project Cloud Gap" and requires the use of Air Force planes and other equipment in order to carry out field tests of disarmament procedures. This particular project will require an expenditure of $2.4 million of Agency funds, and the Air Force will put up approximately the same amount.

It is necessary to recognize that the problems of inspection of forces, weapons and weapons production under an arms control agreement are essentially different from those with which our armed services have to deal. Under an arms control agreement, our authorities would be expected to have the right to make inspections in order to detect violations of the agreement. We have a lot of experience in finding out about the forces and weapons of the enemy when the enemy is trying to keep us from looking. We have to develop new techniques for checking up on forces and weapons in a country which gives us the right of inspection but may be trying to mislead us.

The committee found, as it became more familiar with the nature of the problems confronting the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the job that the Agency has to do, that an expenditure of $11 million for research was necessary. Let me repeat that the committee found no evidence that there has been significant duplication of research activities in the past, and we found that procedures exist which should prevent duplication in the future.

Section 2 of the bill amends the provisions of existing law with regard to security clearance for the personnel of contractors or subcontractors. These amendments do not in any way relax our security requirements or involve letting down our guard.

The first amendment provides that when contractor personnel have been cleared as a result of an up-to-date full field security investigation by the Defense Department or another agency of the Government which is satisfactory to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Agency can accept this investigation rather than require a separate field investigation of the same person.

This amendment will not make it any easier for contractor personnel to gain access to classified information; instead, it, in effect, provides that a person does not have to be vaccinated twice for the same disease.

Section 2 also provides that contractor personnel may be given access to information classified no higher than confidential on the basis of a current national agency check rather than on a full field investigation. I want to repeat that this involves information classified no higher than confidential. Any higher classification will continue to require a full field investigation.

The reason for this exception is that in many cases, such as bidders conferences, a quick clearance for low classification material is essential in order to initiate discussions to see whether potential contractors are interested or qualified to perform a proposed contract research program. There are, of course, many cases in which low classification material is all that a contractor needs in order to do the job which is required. Let me point out also that the authority provided by these amendments is already available to the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense.

You will note at the bottom of page 2 and the top of page 3 of the bill, the language approved by the Senate has been stricken out. The elimination of this language means that the provision contained in section 33 of existing law—"That no action shall be taken under this or any other law that will obligate the United States to disarm or to reduce or to limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States, except pursuant to the treatymaking power of the President under the Constitution or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States"—is continued in effect without change.

The Senate had amended section 33 to limit the required congressional approval of the reduction in U.S. forces or armaments to "the constitutional processes of the United States" and deleted the reference to "further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States." It is the belief of the committee that by retaining, without change, the language in existing law, any action obligating the United States to disarm, reduce or limit its Armed Forces or armaments, must have congressional approval, either in the form of a treaty ratified by the Senate or, in the case of an obligation other than a treaty, by a majority vote of the House and Senate.

Section 4 of the bill imposes two limitations on the expenditure of funds by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The first provides that not more than 20 percent of any appropriation made pursuant to the act may be obligated or reserved during the last month of the fiscal year.

The Agency during fiscal 1963 did obligate most of its funds during the last few months of the year. In justification, the Agency pointed out that the bill containing its appropriations for fiscal year 1963 was not enacted until October 18, 1962, and that its funds were not apportioned until November 16 of that year.

In any event, no one likes to see funds obligated during the last few days of a fiscal year in order to prevent them from being returned to the Treasury, and the committee believes that this is a good provision.

Section 4 also contains the provision that:

> None of the funds herein authorized to be appropriated shall be used to pay for the dissemination within the United States of propaganda in support of any pending legislation concerning the work of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

The Arms Control Agency has among its primary functions under section 2(c) "the dissemination and coordination of public information concerning arms control and disarmament." This amendment is intended to make clear that the dissemination of information concerning disarmament does not include campaigning among organizations or individuals interested in arms control and disarmament to obtain support for legislation recommended by the Agency.

Section 5 of the bill contains language to prevent the Agency from making research contracts with private or public institutions or persons outside the United States. The committee found that in one instance the Agency had entered into a research contract with a British firm. We do not think this is sound policy, and the amendment in the bill will prevent a recurrence of such action.

Mr. Chairman, anyone who studies the law as it exists and the record of the Agency during its 2 years of operation can see for himself that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is performing an essential service in an effective manner. Its original authorization of $10 million, which was made in September 1961, has been used up. There is every reason to believe that the United States will be engaged in almost continuous disarmament negotiations during the years to come just as we have been in the past. In order for us to be able to evaluate correctly the proposals of our adversaries and for us to make sure that our counterproposals do not endanger our own security, we need the technical services of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

I urge the approval of this bill.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. The gentleman says this does not waive any security measures. Up until the passage of the bill, however, the clearance of an individual or a contractor was left up to the Civil Service Commission or to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Is that not correct?

Mr. MORGAN. The Atomic Energy Commission and the Defense Department already have and make use of this authority. The clearance of Agency personnel is not affected. This merely authorizes the acceptance of clearances made by other agencies such as the Department of Defense and the AEC for contractor personnel.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. The gentleman from Pennsylvania just said there was no way the President can disarm without approval of the Congress. Could I ask the gentleman under what arrangements the President acted recently when we agreed in the United Nations that we would not suspend nuclear weapons in outer space on our space vehicles?

Mr. MORGAN. I do not think we agreed. We stated our policy and the U.N. passed a resolution expressing approval of our policy. The U.N. resolution does not constitute an agreement or a commitment.

Mr. STINSON. There was an agreement made at the United Nations providing that no nuclear weapons would be suspended in outer space.

Mr. MORGAN. All the U.N. General Assembly can do is make recommendations to governments. It cannot commit them to act.

Mr. STINSON. Was the Congress consulted on that; does the gentleman know?

Mr. MORGAN. The Congress was not consulted. The President does not have to get the approval of Congress to make a statement of policy.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, many of us, including myself, had great hopes for the future of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency when we voted for the authorization and appropriations for its operation.

After observing the operation of this Agency for 1 year, I am deeply disappointed. Instead of working on plans to represent the interests of America and the free world in disarmament plans, this Agency has apparently been studying reasons for the free world to surrender to the Kremlin to avoid the strife and turmoil that is inherent in freedom.

The annual report of this Agency, submitted by President Kennedy to the Congress, refers to the studies made for the Agency. May I quote verbatim from one of these studies:

> Whether we admit it to ourselves or not, we benefit enormously from the capability of the Soviet police system to keep law and order over 200-million-odd Russians and the many additional millions in the satellite states. The breakup of the Russian Communist empire today would doubtless be conducive to freedom, but would be a good deal more catastrophic for world order than was the breakup of the Austro-Hungarian empire in 1918.

There is purely the philosophy of those who would surrender freedom to Communist tyranny to gain a temporary peace and tranquillity. To me it is unthinkable that we should condone and even encourage the continued police state control by the Kremlin of the millions of captive people of Europe and Asia. Every tyrant through the ages has promised peace if others would surrender to them. Today the Kremlin goal is for the rest of the world to surrender to its rule and then we would have peace, peace with slavery. Mao Tse-tung has the same ambitions, only that we should surrender to him.

Certainly freedom is expensive; freedom through the ages has been reserved for the brave and the daring. Freedom has dangers and uncertainties. If we fear to be free, if we would betray those who died for freedom, if we believe it is better to be Red than dead, if all we desire in the world is the safety of slavery, then I would agree that this could be achieved temporarily by everyone surrendering their freedom to the dictates of the Kremlin.

I am certain, however, that the American people and other freedom-loving peoples have higher dreams and ambitions—even if they must defend them against the forces of tyranny.

The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has spent the American taxpayers' money for such tripe as I pointed out before; that is, the justification and praise of the "Soviet police system."

I voted for this authorization when it came up before, but I certainly did not intend that the American taxpayers' money should be so spent to defend Communist slavery. Now they want to raise the authorization threefold from $10 to $30 million.

Mrs. FRANCIS P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago, in September 1961, the House, by a vote of 290 to 54, passed the Arms Control and Disarmament Act. The purpose of the act was to establish the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to explore, develop, and recommend possible alternatives to the arms race in order to enhance our national security.

I supported that act and the creation of this new agency for peace. The goal for which it was established was reflected in the 1960 Republican Party platform as follows:

> We are ready to negotiate and to institute realistic methods and safeguards for disarmament, and for the suspension of nuclear tests.
>
> We have deep concern about the mounting nuclear arms race. This concern leads us to seek disarmament and nuclear agreements and an equal concern to protect all peoples from nuclear danger, leads us to insist that such agreements have adequate safeguards.

We cannot have adequate safeguards unless we participate knowledgeably in international negotiations dealing with such agreements.

The Arms Control Agency was charged by Congress with the responsibility in this field. It cannot carry out that responsibility unless it has the funds to do the research necessary for informed participation in arms control and disarmament negotiations. This is essential to our national security.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Foreign Affairs carefully reviewed the Agency's research program and concluded that it was justified. It also concluded that there were no duplications in Agency research.

Mr. Chairman, at that time I concurred in that conclusion and supported the recommended authorization of $15 million for each of the next 2 fiscal years. It seems to me that $30 million for 2 years, approximately three-fourths of which would be spent for research, is a rather modest amount.

Mr. Chairman, during the course of the hearings it was brought out that the Agency realistically believes that general and complete disarmament is not presently attainable in today's world. The United States has not entered into any agreements obligating the United States to disarm. I want that to be exceedingly clear to the Members of this body. Indeed, under section 33 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act no such action could be taken without prior congressional approval. The Members will find in Public Law 87-297 these words:

> That no action shall be taken under this or any other law that will obligate the United States to disarm or to reduce or to limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States, except pursuant to the treatymaking power of the President under the Constitution, or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, both the Eisenhower administration and the present administration have found it useful to state that the objective we are working for is a limited arms control measure. Some limited measures have been concluded. We now have a direct communication link between the United States and the Soviet Union. That link can reduce the risk of war in times of crises. Some people think it could increase the danger of war. I do not happen to think so, although I must say I doubt the word of Communist Russia in every instance because they have broken their word in every instance but one or two in lo, these many years.

Mr. Chairman, we have a ban on testing nuclear weapons underwater, in outer space, and in the atmosphere. That ban may begin to clear the air, both literally and figuratively.

Top officials from other Government agencies, including the Department of Defense, pointed out at the hearings that the Arms Control Agency was largely responsible for the "hot line" agreement and the limited test ban treaty.

Mr. Chairman, we now have a United Nations resolution calling on all nations not to place weapons of mass destruction in orbit around the earth. Such a resolution calls upon other nations to adhere to the same national policy we have already announced.

So, there have been accomplishments by this Agency that we created only 2 short years ago. Not monumental accomplishments, but significant steps.

For these I think we can all be grateful—grateful because they do represent progress toward a saner and safer world consistent with the dictates of our national security.

What the committee bill asks us to do is to provide continuing means to pursue this quest for peace in a manner that will safeguard our national interest. That is why I support this authorization and hope it will be supported by my colleagues.

For these I think we can be grateful because they do represent progress toward a saner and safer world. What the committee will ask us to do is to provide continuing funds to pursue this quest for peace in a manner that will safeguard our national interests.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention to an article which appeared in the newsletter of the State Department about this Arms Control Agency. I quote the following:

> Just prior to the creation of the Agency, activities in the arms control and disarmament field had been carried on by the U.S. Disarmament Administration, an element of the Department of State, whose last administrator was Edmund Gullion, now U.S. Ambassador to the Congo. But as the arms race accelerated it became more and more urgent that a separate agency be established which could give to our disarmament negotiators continuity of direction, could administer the political and scientific research needed for developing sound national security policy on arms control and disarmament, and insure the constant and full-time application of U.S. resources toward reducing the danger of war.

One of the important areas in which research has been carried on is the effect it would have on unemployment and on matters that are so close to our hearts these days.

What would be the effect of a general disarmament? We must know. We still have time to plan ahead of time.

I think it is very important, Mr. Chairman, that all of the Members of this body know what they are really talking about. Some are talking about the action taken previously to the creation of this Agency. Dates are things that do matter in the judgment of this legislation and I trust most earnestly every one of you will give careful consideration to the actual facts; that we will not be doing our thinking on what look like facts but we will dig into them; that we will also recognize very, very seriously that nothing is to be done unless by treaty or by the aggressive action of the membership of this House and the other body. I think there are more safeguards in here than many people appreciate.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Ohio mentioned the requirement in this legislation covering congressional approval for any reduction in our Armed Forces raises an issue which has been of concern to me in connection with this act and other statutes as well. This is an especially appropriate bill to invite consideration of this issue which has to do with the constitutional prerogatives of the executive and legislative branches of our Government.

Section 33 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act provides that no action shall be taken under this law that would obligate the United States to disarm or to reduce or to limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States, except pursuant to the treatymaking power of the President or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States.

In other words, the law states that an international disarmament agreement must be accomplished by treaty and I would think that as such it means the advice and consent of the Senate would have to be obtained as against an executive agreement which was approved by the President without such advice and consent. The alternative to a treaty under the existing law would be congressional legislation passed by both House and Senate approving any disarmament agreement.

What concerns me, however, is whether a Chief Executive would recognize that provision of the law.

For example, section 205 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act provides for Senate advice and consent to agreements by the President calling for a program of international cooperation in work done pursuant to the act, and in the peaceful application of the results thereof.

When President Eisenhower signed the National Aeronautics and Space Act in July 1958, he stated that he regarded this section 205 merely as recognizing that international treaties may be made in this field, but not as precluding less formal arrangements for cooperation.

Recently I addressed an inquiry to the Space Administration on this point and was told that the legal determination is the responsibility of the Department of State whether a specific international agreement made under the authority of section 205 should be in the form of a treaty and be submitted to the Senate, for advice and consent, or whether it shall be treated as an executive agreement not requiring Senate action.

In the case of the Space Administration and international agreements that have been concluded to date covering NASA cooperative projects with other countries, a determination has been made by the Department of State that submission to the Senate was not required.

So, Mr. Chairman, I very much doubt if section 3 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act will have much influence on our Department of State. Certainly the language of the Senate bill which refers to constitutional processes of the United States and the reference in the existing law which provides for further affirmative legislation by the Congress would seem to diminish chances of the agreement being referred to the legislative branch.

I certainly prefer the existing language which is restored by this bill but frankly I believe the prerogatives of the Chief Executive were intended to cover foreign negotiations. I believe that a President should not use the Executive agreement but rather should obtain the approval of the Senate and in certain cases the approval of both the House and the Senate.

Of course, the Congress has the power of the purse and that is why when President Kennedy suggested a joint venture with the Soviet Union for a lunar landing, I introduced an amendment to the space appropriation bill banning the use of those funds for such a cooperative proposal without congressional approval. Congress can limit the use of funds and I think we should use that power freely.

I think, Mr. Chairman, of all votes I have been called on to make since I entered Congress 11 years ago, this is the most difficult one for me. As one who believes that the legislative branch is the real safeguard of democracy, I fear such authority in the hands of one man—be he Democrat or Republican. That is borne out by my opposition to President Eisenhower when he opposed the so-called Bricker amendment.

Quite aside from that, however, at the moment I have serious misgivings lest our President be misled into an agreement with the Soviet Union on disarmament.

Mr. Chairman, the Soviet Union follows a policy of deception and until there is more evidence of Russian trustworthiness, I find it difficult to support this program.

The Communists frankly say they will outdo us one way or the other. Since Russia has never kept any of her solemn commitments, she cannot be trusted.

I wish there were some real safeguards and that the Senate would have to approve an international disarmament arrangement. As it is a United Nations resolution could bind us. The outline which the Disarmament Agency has developed for complete disarmament has me worried. I don't favor turning over our arms to a United Nations peace force. The world is not ready for that yet. It may never be.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. We are all troubled about that. Ever since 1933 we have had all too many agreements and not enough treaties. I trust we may find ourselves enforcing this.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, there have been occasions when I have attempted to buy firearms abroad. Even in enlightened countries on our side of the Iron Curtain I have nearly always found the sale of firearms carefully supervised and restricted—so much so in some instances that I did not think it worth the effort to clear the necessary redtape to obtain the weapon I wanted. In many nations of the world there is almost no such thing as private ownership of firearms. It could happen here. This I know is farfetched. Americans are not constituted to take lightly restrictions of their constitutional rights. But, it can happen. How? I think of a number of ways. Congress could enact restrictive gun laws. There might be administration decrees, based on some grant of power to the Chief Executive. Or, the Supreme Court might, by interpretation, rule out private ownership of weapons. A fourth way would be gradual chipping away by State legislatures of the right to own weapons.

The first is least likely. The Congress, being closer to the people and their thinking, is much more responsive to their wishes. The Congress will hardly in our time deprive the people of a right as highly prized as this. But, Congress constantly is bestowing new grants of power on the Chief Executive. And, Chief Executives, no matter who they may be, are constantly seeking or appropriating unto themselves new grants of Executive power. We already have seen farfetched administrative rulings. The Chief Executives, surrounded as they are by advisers—palace guard is another word—whose backgrounds are not necessarily practical, may go even further in the future in this direction than they have in the past.

In the Supreme Court, we see a complete disregard for precedent, a wholesale rewriting of the law, and even of the Constitution. Look carefully at the rulings of that body for the past 10 years. Are they less surprising than a ruling which would limit private ownership of firearms? Do you think a court which ruled out prayer in the schools would hesitate to place a new and restrictive interpretation on the second amendment to the Constitution and to say ownership of weapons is in fact something to be enjoyed only by active and participating members of the militia?

We have before us a bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act. On the face of it, that bill has little reference to the private ownership of firearms. Yet, a great many people, as well as leading sports magazines and sportsmen's organizations, have become increasingly concerned about the possibility that the Disarmament Agency will concern itself directly with private ownership of firearms.

The language, temper and range of the act are idealistic and broad. There have been indications that the Agency, failing to achieve concrete results on the international scene, or in its zeal to show U.S. support for general disarmament, could turn to domestic regulation of firearms in order to show reason for its continued existence. Assurances of officials of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency have not dispelled this fear. After all they can speak only for themselves—not for their successors.

Therefore, magazines like Guns & Ammo, Outdoor Life, Sports Afield, and the National Rifleman, and that great organization of sportsmen, the National Rifle Association, with the support of a host of sportsmen throughout the Nation, want it made absolutely clear that the Arms Control and Disarmament Act does not include the elimination of private ownership of firearms as part of the proposed disarmament program.

As a result, language was offered in the Senate by Senator HICKENLOOPER and in the House by me. Senator HICKENLOOPER's legislation was adopted by the Senate. Identical language by me has received the support of the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], and members of the Foreign Affairs Committee. It is included in the bill before you and is found on page 3, lines 9 through 16. The language is as follows:

> Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to authorize any policy or action by any Government agency which would interfere with, restrict, or prohibit the acquisition, possession, or use of firearms by an individual for the lawful purpose of personal defense, sport, recreation, education, or training.

I have not been happy with the actions taken by the Agency. Although its basic design appeared sound and its purpose commendable, the organization has injected itself into too wide an area of operation. I see very little being done by this Agency which could not be done properly by the State Department and other existing Government agencies. To me, it has simply provided more frosting on the cake and costly frosting at that. It is another layer of officialdom on top of officialdom. Like all newly created Government agencies, it quickly began to expand and pyramid. The bill before you would increase its scope and increase its authorization. To me, it would be preferable to let the Agency die.

As a matter of fact, the entire question of disarmament as now discussed by Government agencies carries dangerous overtones—dangerous to the safety of this Nation and its people. I have before me a little pamphlet entitled "Freedom From War" issued by the State Department. This is Department of State

Publication 7277, released in September 1961. From page 3, I quote in part:

> DISARMAMENT GOAL AND OBJECTIVES
>
> The disbanding of all national Armed Forces and the prohibition of their reestablishment in any form whatsoever other than those required to preserve internal order and for contributions to a United Nations Peace Force;
>
> The elimination from national arsenals of all armaments, including all weapons of mass destruction and the means for their delivery, other than those required for a United Nations Peace Force and for maintaining internal order.

To me, the limited degree of success we now enjoy in our dealings with Russia is due directly and primarily to the fact that the military strength of this Nation is at its highest level since the peak of World War II. To weaken ourselves in the foreseeable future would be a direct invitation for a return to the days of constant harassment of the United States and its allies by the Communists. I need not tell you that there is a great deal of public apprehension over the prospect of surrendering our defenses and our security into the keeping of the United Nations as it is set forth in this booklet.

If the Agency is to be continued, it is very important that the safeguard which I propose be written into this bill.

This is an age of growing restrictions. The trend is toward centralization and control. I do not want to see Congress open the door for curtailment of the right to the possession and use of firearms by law-abiding private citizens. Our forefathers knew what they were doing when they approved the second amendment to the Constitution, which states that:

> A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

Then, as now, an armed citizenry is less likely to be cowed by criminal elements or oppressive government. Rather than restricting freedom, the right to possess arms guarantees it by instilling independence and strength in an enlightened people.

The United States is facing a critical period in its history. The years to come will decide the desperate battle between communism and freedom, individualism and totalitarianism. If we are to win this struggle, we will need to preserve and use every element of strength that is available to us. Americans are fighting and dying in farflung corners of the world. Some of them will survive because of lessons in marksmanship and acquaintance with firearms they gained as boys in a free society. We would be making a fatal mistake if we allowed the right to keep and bear arms to be curtailed. My provision will help guard against this. I am optimistic that it will be enacted into law. This language is vital enough to merit the support of all freedom-loving Americans.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. Of course, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. As an American woman I want to thank you very much for bringing this to our attention. I think it is exceedingly important that we take this into consideration and see to it that our right to bear arms here at home is not curtailed.

Mr. SIKES. I thank the gentlewoman for her contribution. She has made many important contributions to the debate of the House.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. I would like to point out that page 6 of the report in the last paragraph points out:

> Section 3 also amends the law by adding a provision making clear that:
>
> "Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any policy or action by any Government agency which would interfere with, restrict, or prohibit the acquisition, possession, or use of firearms by an individual for the lawful purpose of personal defense, sport, recreation, education, or training."

Mr. SIKES. That is correct. Admittedly, it is broad language which is intended to insure that no Government agency will seek to deprive the private law-abiding citizen of the right to own and use firearms.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I think we can start with the premise here today that every Member of the House is for peace and especially those Members of the House who have served in combat in one of our numerous wars. I cannot think of a single Member, particularly one who has served in combat, who would ever want to see another war. But, of course, there is something worse than war, and that is slavery—slavery of the mind, the soul, and the body; the loss of freedom.

I for one am not ready now nor in the foreseeable future to disarm the United States, to weaken the United States so that we become the prey and slaves of any other power in the world.

This is an unusual bill. In the first place, it comes to the House from the other body, which is often known as the "upping" body. This comes to the House with a $10 million appropriation or, rather, it came before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs with a $10 million annual appropriation for a 2-year period. Believe it or not, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs has become the "upping" committee of the Congress in this instance. It recommends $15 million annually for 2 years. It goes the Senate a total of $10 million better, and for what reason I do not know. As a member of the committee I am unable to understand why.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to my chairman, although he did not yield to me. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman did not mention that 17 Members of Congress introduced bills, and their names are in the report, authorizing the full $15 million.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I read the names and I do not know that having done so it contributes anything in support of the argument that the taxpayers should be compelled to lavish an additional $10 million on this program. This is the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. What is arms control? It seems to me that arms control, to have any meaning, is control of enemy arms, and it is peculiarly the duty and the responsibility of the Pentagon, of our military, to control enemy arms.

I say again that not in the foreseeable future are you going to see disarmament. Yet 2 years ago, late in 1961, there was created this super-duper disarmament agency. Prior to that time we were accomplishing just about as much in the way of disarmament with an expenditure of $700,000 to $1 million a year. We were spending around $1 million a year to discuss disarmament. However, late in 1961 came the creation of this super-duper agency, and in the first year, as I recall, the appropriation for its sustenance was $1.6 million or $1.8 million. Then it took flight. I believe the figure for last year was some $6 million. I do not remember the exact figure. Someone can supply the specific information.

Mr. MORGAN. The sum of $6.5 million is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the Chairman. Yes, $6.5 million for the last fiscal year and now it is proposed to jump this to $15 million. In all conscience, how can you squander the taxpayers' money this way? And what is the money being spent for? Betwen $3 million and $4 million a year is spent on administration. This organization now has some 210 employees. At the proper time I will submit for printing in the RECORD—and I hope you will look at it—the payroll of this superduper organization. Some 28 employees—and remember there are some 210 employees altogether—there are some 28 of them drawing from $14,500 up to $22,500. This is empire building at its worst. This is really a fat payroll for a few chiefs and mighty few Indians.

Mr. Chairman, I submit at this point as part of my remarks, the payroll of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Of course, this does not include a single dollar of the hundreds of thousands of dollars that are spent by the agency for consultants and on so-called research contracts:

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARAMENT AGENCY—PERSONNEL LISTING AS OF AUGUST 31, 1963

UNCLASSIFIED POSITIONS

William C. Foster, Director, $22,500.

Adrian S. Fisher, Deputy Director, $21,500.

Archibald Alexander, Assistant Director, $20,000.

George Bunn, General Counsel, $20,000.

Nedville E. Nordness, Public Affairs Adviser, $20,000.

GS-18

William H. Berman, Deputy General Counsel, $20,000.

Robert E. Matteson, Disarmament Adviser, $20,000.

George W. Rathjens, Deputy Assistant Director, $20,000.

George R. Pugh, Deputy Assistant Director, $20,000.

Robert L. Finley, Deputy Assistant Director, $20,000.

GS–17

Clement E. Conger, Special Assistant, $18,000.

GS–16

Wreatham Gathright, foreign affairs officer, $16,500.

Charles N. Van Doren, Assistant General Counsel, $16,000.

GS–15

Alan F. Neidle, attorney adviser, $14,565.

William S. Gehron, information officer, $15,045.

Emery J. Adams, security specialist, $16,005.

Walter C. Ertel, budget officer, $15,045.

Phillip C. Holt, assistant disarmament adviser, $17,445.

Charles R. Gellner, foreign affairs officer, $16,005.

Vincent Baker, foreign affairs officer, $15,045.

Harland Moulton, foreign affairs officer, $15,045.

Donald Benjamin, foreign affairs officer, $15,045.

Nathan Rich, foreign affairs officer, $15,525.

Evan T. Sage, foreign affairs officer, $16,005.

Larry Holmes, foreign affairs officer, $14,565.

Charles Coleman, physical science officer, $15,525.

Robert H. Ellis, physical science officer, $14,565.

Edward M. Risley, foreign affairs officer, $16,005.

GS–14

Hampton Davis, administrative officer, $13,270.

Albert Christopher, attorney adviser, $13,270.

H. Keith Reinecker, security specialist, $13,270.

M. L. Brockdorff, personnel officer, $13,270.

M. O. Zimmerman, contract specialist, $14,120.

Thomas S. Lough, project officer, $13,270.

Jeremy Blanchet, foreign affairs officer, $13,270.

Henry D. Wyner, economist, $13,695.

Ruth L. Sivard, economist, $13,270.

Leonard S. Rodberg, physical science officer, $13,270.

John R. Hall, foreign affairs officer, $14,970.

GS–13

Mason Willrich, attorney adviser, $11,150.

Douglas Griffiths, contract specialist, $11,880.

Robert Lambert, foreign affairs officer, $11,880.

John W. Syphax, foreign affairs officer, $11,880.

Henry R. Myers, physical science officer, $11,515.

Kurt Kreith, physical science officer, $11,150.

GS–12

Mary G. Russell, secretary, $9,475.

Beatrice Puckett, staff assistant, $10,105.

Lenor Burmaster, foreign affairs officer, $10,105.

James S. Bodnar, foreign affairs officer, $9,790.

Ralph W. Nary, foreign affairs officer, $9,475.

Jean E. Mayer, foreign affairs officer, $9,475.

Richard D. Stoll, physical science officer, $10,420.

Robert Brandwein, international economist, $9,475.

GS–11

David K. Harbinson, attorney adviser, $8,045.

Leona Timko, secretary, $8,045.

Eunice A. Walker, information specialist, $8,310.

Bernice M. Mills, management technician, $8,575.

GS–10

Adeline Chatterton, secretary, $7,535.

Alice O. Whittier, secretary, $7,780.

Olive J. Doherty, secretary, $8,315.

GS–9

Mary M. Fitzpatrick, secretary, $8,025.

June C. Eller, staff aid, $6,900.

Anne Gulasi, secretary, $7,125.

Mary J. Shaffer, mail and file supervisor, $8,025.

Adalyn Davis, foreign affairs officer, $8,025.

Ruth O. Ihara, foreign affairs officer, $6,675.

Elizabeth A. Slany, documents officer, $7,125.

Margaret Johnson, secretary, $7,125.

Sadie S. Kennedy, secretary, $7,575.

Julia E. Barry, secretary, $6,675.

Julia B. Krenzel, secretary, $8,025.

John H. Graves, documents officer, $6,675.

GS–8

Katherine Glazer, secretary, $6,500.

Margaret A. Lersch, secretary, $6,295.

Esther P. McFarland, secretary, $6,910.

Kaye M. Burchell, secretary, $7,935.

GS–7

Patricia M. Williams, secretary, $5,910.

Patricia Kascak, secretary, $6,095.

Marian E. Weimer, secretary, $6,095.

Pauline S. Trapp, secretary, $6,280.

Regina M. Ridder, secretary, $5,725.

Barbara Enuton, secretary, $5,725.

Medora Holm, staff aid, $6,835.

Helen Szpakowski, secretary, $6,650.

Sammie Venable, secretary $6,465.

Margaret Barrett, secretary, $6,835.

Shirley Price, secretary, $6,280.

Susan Edwin, foreign affairs officer, $5,540.

Lorraine McCottry, secretary, $6,095.

Rose M. Hilton, secretary, $6,280.

Marjorie Geigerich, secretary, $6,465.

Elizabeth McDougall, secretary, $5,725.

Jean Cunningham, secretary, $5,910.

Barbara J. Givens, secretary, $6,835.

Dorothy Woosley, secretary, $5,910.

Gertrude Rohrer, secretary, $6,465.

Christine Johnson, secretary, $6,835.

Barbara C. Tewey, secretary, $5,910.

Thomas P. Flaherty, clerk, $5,540.

Jack C. Sando, foreign affairs officer, $5,540.

GS–6

Victoria Gibbons, secretary, $5,205.

Mary F. Allen, clerk, $5,375.

Linda C. Yuzzolin, secretary, $6,055.

Grace B. Knerr, secretary, $5,205.

Patricia Hennessey, secretary, $5,035.

Regina H. Simms, secretary, $6,565.

Henrietta Fliss, secretary, $5,205.

GS–5

Gene M. Krause, secretary, $4,565.

Evalyn W. Dexter, secretary, $4,565.

Paul L. Ishimoto, mail and file clerk, $5,525.

Oliver J. Vosseler, mail and file clerk, $5,045.

Francis Johnson, mail and file clerk, $4,885.

JoAnn M. Rowe, secretary, $4,725.

Peggy J. McFarland, documents clerk, $5,045.

Margaret C. Weedon, secretary, $5,365.

Joan Shepherd, secretary, $4,885.

Cecelia Skeen, secretary, $4,565.

Bonnie Barrett, secretary, $4,565.

Mary R. Grear, secretary, $4,725.

Lorraine Kostelnick, secretary, $5,205.

Marguerite Glenn, secretary, $5,205.

Robert W. Gordon, foreign affairs assistant, $4,565.

GS–4

Susie M. Townsend, clerk-stenographer, $4,110.

Trudy I. Leik, clerk-stenographer, $4,110.

Stephen Pollard, physical science assistant, $4,110.

Roxanne George, documents clerk, $4,110.

Edna M. Jones, clerk-stenographer, $4,110.

James E. Greene, mail and file clerk, $4,250.

Bonnie J. Moreau, clerk-stenographer, $4,250.

Odessa Mitchell, clerk-typist, $4,950.

Patricia Pigza, clerk-stenographer, $4,250.

Lillian Harley, clerk-typist, $5,090.

Nancy Hollingsworth, clerk-typist, $4,530.

Carole Gensh, clerk-stenographer, $4,110.

GS–3

Eileen M. Hall, clerk-typist, $4,030.

Gretchen C. Cooksey, clerk-stenographer, $3,820.

Nancy Bolinger, clerk-typist, $3,820.

Elizabeth O'Brien, clerk-typist, $3,820.

Anita L. Lieber, clerk-typist, $3,925.

David Culbert, clerk-typist, $3,925.

Patricia Hall, clerk-typist, $3,925.

Phyllis Getz, clerk-typist, $3,925.

John Crane, clerk-typist, $3,820.

Patricia DiFura, clerk-typist, $3,820.

Josephine Pluchino, clerk-typist, $4,030.

GS–2

Melvin G. Hall, messenger-clerk, $3,980.

GS–1

Nathaniel Pollard, messenger, $3,455.

PUBLIC LAW 313 POSITIONS

Bennett L. Basore, physical science officer, $20,000.

Alton J. Wadman, physical science officer, $18,500.

Thomas L. Saaty, physical science officer, $18,500.

Lessing Kahn, project manager, $18,500.

Robert Kopp, electronic engineer, $17,500.

Harold Davis, military systems analyst, $17,000.

Robert S. Rochlin, physical science officer, $16,000.

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, RESERVE AND STAFF PERSONNEL DETAILED FROM DEPARTMENT OF STATE—REIMBURSABLE

Jacob D. Beam, Assistant Director, GM.

C. H. Timberlake, disarmament adviser, CM.

Richard B. Freund, Foreign Service officer, FSO–1.

Idar Rimestad, Foreign Service officer, FSO–2.

Samuel De Palma, Foreign Service officer, FSO–2.

Alexander Kiefer, Foreign Service officer, FSO–2.

Stuart H. McIntyre, Foreign Service officer, FSO–4.

William Haynes, Foreign Service officer, FSO–4.

Anthony O'Boyle, Foreign Service officer, FSO–5.

William C. Kinsey, Foreign Service officer, FSO–5.

Thomas R. Pickering, Foreign Service officer, FSO–6.

Curt F. Gross, Foreign Service officer, FSO–7.

Russell O. Prickett, Foreign Service officer, FSO–7.

Alan M. Parrent, Foreign Service officer, FSO–7.

Richard S. Thompson, Foreign Service officer, FSO–7.

Marie deGunzberg, Foreign Service officer, FSO–7.

Robert A. Martin, Foreign Service officer, FSO–7.

William Maddox, Foreign Service Reserve officer, FSR–1.

Jerome H. Spingarn, Foreign Service Reserve officer, FSR–2.

Marion W. Boggs, Foreign Service Reserve officer, FSR–2.

Lawrence D. Weller, Foreign Service Reserve officer, FSR–3.

Philip J. Halla, Foreign Service Reserve officer, FSR–3.

Alexander Akalovsky, Foreign Service Reserve officer, FSR–3.

Thomas C. Irvin, Foreign Service Reserve officer, FSR–4.

Anne W. Marks, Foreign Service Reserve officer, FSR–5.

James C. Kellogg, Foreign Service Reserve officer, FSR–6.

Robert F. Greene, Foreign Service Reserve officer, FSR–7.

Howard W. Catkins, Foreign Service Career Reserve officer, FSCR–3.

Betty A. Peyton, Foreign Service Staff, FSS–5.

Edward C. Mistach, Foreign Service Staff, FSS–6.

Elizabeth G. Drott, Foreign Service Staff, FSS–6.

Francis J. Mullins, Foreign Service Staff, FSS–7.

Rush Voegele, Foreign Service Staff, FSS–8.

Thomas Finnell, Foreign Service Staff, FSS–9.

MILITARY PERSONNEL DETAILED FROM DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—REIMBURSABLE

Edward N. Parker, vice admiral, Assistant Director.

David S. Daley, colonel, U.S. Army.

Pleas E. Greenlee, captain, U.S. Navy.

Paul J. Long, colonel, U.S. Air Force.

Charles W. McCoy, colonel, U.S. Marine Corps.

Kent Parrott, colonel, U.S. Air Force.

Stuart Porter, colonel, U.S. Air Force.

Ira B. Richards, colonel, U.S. Army.

J. Ernest Samusson, colonel, U.S. Army.

R. B. Creecy, captain, U.S. Navy.

Joseph R. Struby, lieutenant colonel, U.S. Air Force.

Arthur H. Sweeney, lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army.

Charles H. Tisdale, commander, U.S. Navy.

Raymond E. Woodstock, lieutenant colonel, U.S. Air Force.

Edward C. Kline, commander, U.S. Navy.

Mr. Chairman, the rest of the money is being spent on what we are pleased, these days, to call research. Let me read to you from one of the pieces of literature that was developed through a contract let by the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The taxpayers of this Nation, in the name of disarmament, are being victimized into paying for this kind of propaganda:

> Whether we admit it to ourselves or not we benefit enormously from the capability of the Soviet police system to keep law and order over their 200 million-odd Russians and the many additional millions in the satellite states.

In other words, the so-called Disarmament Agency is spending the taxpayers' money to hire people to tell us what a wonderful state of affairs it is that the Russian Communists have a police system that is able to keep 200 million people in slavery. I ask you, do you think this is the way that you, representing the taxpayers, ought to be spending their money—for this kind of propaganda?

The Disarmament Agency also tells Americans what they should be prepared for. You will find it in House Document No. 57. It is the three-stage disarmament plan. And after we are disarmed who takes over? Who polices us? Why the polyglot United Nations, of course. This illustration, to be found in House Document No. 57, tells better than words what this Disarmament Agency will get us into if it has its way.

Then you can read in the speeches and statements made by Mr. Foster in one of these disarmament pamphlets how in stage 2—they do not wait for stage 3—how the United States and its citizens will be brought under the International Court of Justice. No longer will Americans be under the jurisdiction of the courts of this country. They will be brought under the International Court of Justice and again under the United Nations. If you want that, continue to build up this organization. I want no part of it.

I say to you here and now that as a minimum this ought to be cut down to the $10 million that the Senate authorized. It ought to be cut deeper than that. It ought to be cut back to $5 or $6 million and then brought back down to $1 million. I am perfectly willing to maintain a small agency capable of discussing disarmament, if somebody wants to discuss it and really means it. But beyond that, this is a snarl and a delusion. It is the creation of another empire, another bureaucracy, at a cost of millions of dollars.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Certainly I will yield to my friend.

Mr. HALEY. I notice in the document to which the gentleman just referred by Mr. Foster and put out by this Agency, that they never refer to nations. They refer to states, which would lead me to believe that this is a movement toward having a United States of the World, rather than the nations of the world. They never refer to the United States as a nation, but merely as one of the states in this scheme.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. Everything you read in these documents put out by this Agency means world federalism; one-world government. It means the destruction of our Constitution and sovereignty.

Another element of this insidious plan would be the end of our concept of civilian control of the military. How many other members of the United Nations, and there are more than 100 of them, hold to this concept? Military dictatorships and military takeovers around the world are a dime a dozen these days. Yet those voting for this bill are voting to promote a disarmament plan that would lodge what would be left of our military forces in an organization, the United Nations, in which scores of nations have become subservient to their military forces.

If we believe in freedom for ourselves and the citizens we represent, how gullible can we be in voting for this bill and the disarmament program that is being promoted?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 777, as amended in the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

As one of the original cosponsors of the legislation which established the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, I have watched its operations with interest over the past 2 years. Its success has been gratifying.

Since its creation, the Agency's research and negotiating efforts have contributed significantly to two agreements which, it is believed, have furthered the cause of arms control and lessened the dangers of nuclear war.

The first of these is the so-called hot line. The need for some form of ready communications between our President and his advisers and the men in the Kremlin became readily apparent during the Cuban crisis of 1 year ago.

In that time of highest tension and impending danger of all-out war, it was recognized that the means were lacking to relay messages quickly and safely between Washington and Moscow. This complicated the dangers of an accidental nuclear exchange.

From that need the "hot line" was developed. Although some have misrepresented the system as a telephone system with our President on one end and Premier Khrushchev on the other, talking face to face, we know that is not so.

The hot line is a teletype system, installed in the Pentagon, which allows fast communications, but rules out the misunderstandings which might result from direct voice transmission.

Although other agencies were involved in the effort to develop this system, it was the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency which formulated the system and carried out the agreement.

A second accomplishment was the limited test ban treaty.

This agreement, banning nuclear explosions in the atmosphere, has been hailed around the world by those aware of the dangers to ourselves and our children of radioactive fallout.

It would be folly to see this treaty as an end to the cold war. But, as our President has said, it can be a step in the right direction.

The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was responsible for the careful advance planning of the U.S. position on the limited test ban agreement.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York, briefly.

Mr. BECKER. Just for the sake of obtaining information, I would like to get some additional information on this point. I do not want to criticize. I just want to get some information.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield for a question.

Mr. BECKER. The gentleman talks about one of the accomplishments of this Disarmament Agency in respect to the nuclear test ban treaty. I think the gentleman mentioned that.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I did.

Mr. BECKER. The question I want to ask that comes to my mind, and I could be wrong, is this: It is my understanding that Mr. Foster and other members of the Disarmament Agency were in Geneva and were attempting to negotiate a test ban treaty with certain controls and inspections and had been there for years.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is correct.

Mr. BECKER. If the gentleman will yield further, then, suddenly, Mr. Khrushchev notifies us that he would sign a test ban treaty and we sent Mr. Harriman to Moscow. It is my understanding that he negotiated the test ban treaty with no controls and no inspections.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is not true.

Mr. BECKER. This is my understanding, based upon what I have read. I do not know where the Disarmament Agency got into the negotiations on the nuclear test ban treaty. I just want to get it straight.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The ACDA laid the groundwork for the negotiations.

Harriman negotiated the treaty, that is true. The gentleman is in error when he says there are no controls and no inspections in the treaty.

Mr. BECKER. There is no inspection in it. That is what the Disarmament Agency was arguing about all the time it was meeting in Geneva.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I would like to refer to testimony in our hearings, page 164, by Mr. Foster with regard to the question that the gentleman poses:

> When the apparent change in state of mind was exhibited by Mr. Khrushchev in his July 2 speech which indicated the possibility of a negotiation of this present treaty, we immediately again called a meeting of the Committee of Principals. It was decided that Mr. Harriman would be sent to Moscow as the representative of the President in view of his many contacts with Mr. Khrushchev, but the drawing up of the instructions, that part of the activity was at our initiation and done by us, of course with cooperation again of the Committee of Principals and finally with the President, and when the mission was selected, my deputy, Mr. Fisher, was Mr. Harriman's deputy. The scientists who went were our scientists. The interpreter was our interpreter, the secretaries were our secretaries, so that we made up some 40 or 50 percent of the delegation and in the drafting committee, Mr. Fisher was the actual member of the drafting committee that worked with the representative of the Soviet Union in the final drafting of the treaty.

Mr. BECKER. I think the gentleman has made my point. We signed an entirely different treaty than was negotiated by the Disarmament Agency at Geneva. I think the gentleman has made the point for me.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I tried to make the point we would not be in any position to negotiate a treaty were it not for the preliminary work going on at Geneva prior to the change of mind of Mr. Khrushchev.

Mr. BECKER. I agree about the change in mind of Mr. Khrushchev on inspections that we fought for for years.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The fact is if it were not for the Disarmament Agency we would be in no position to negotiate any treaty without jeopardizing our position.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I concur with the gentleman from New Jersey in what he has just said. The Agency produced the first draft agreement which was taken by Governor Harriman and his staff to Moscow. It supplied staff and backup information for the negotiators.

But more than that, the Agency was active in the development of the verification system which, in the last analysis, made the test ban treaty possible.

For this treaty is not based on trust—we know better than to trust the Russians—but on technical devices that make possible the detection of any Soviet cheating.

In this way the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency not only contributes to the cause of peace we all avow, but also strengthens the security of our Nation.

The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has conducted its activities on a very limited budget. During its first 2 years, it operated on an appropriation of $20 million, less than the cost of two B-58 bombers.

The bill before us today increases the appropriation to $30 million. There is good reason for this rise in expenditure. Necessarily, the Agency's research program is growing. The first 2 years of its operation were devoted to the development of the basic principles upon which to base a sound and effective research program.

Now, however, more detailed research and analysis is required to provide the technical data necessary for sound U.S. negotiations in the arms control area.

The Agency must research, develop, test, and evaluate verification systems. These systems are complicated and expensive. This is particularly true when the ACDA gets into the later stages involving hardware research and field tests. For example, the largest research project programed for fiscal 1964 will involve $2,400,000 for Project Cloud Gap—a field test of inspection procedures.

Mr. Chairman, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has been the target of much criticism during its first 2 years of operation. After studying these criticisms, the committee came to the conclusion that they were largely based on erroneous information or rank prejudice.

One lesson we have learned since the end of World War II is that peace does not come with the cessation of hostilities. Peace can only result from the conscious exertions of men of good will around the world.

The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency provides our Nation with an effective instrument in the crusade for global peace. It provides us with a symbol by which to show the world that our Nation sincerely is seeking an end to world tensions.

Can we then appropriate $50 billion for the armaments of war, and find $30 million too much to pay for an instrument of peace?

The answer is clear. We cannot refuse this appropriation. Rather, we must remain true to the legitimate aspirations for peace which dwell in the hearts of all true Americans.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, as we consider this bill today many of us have troubled hearts and minds. We are troubled not at the objectives of this legislation but we are troubled at the direction in which it sometimes seems to be leading us.

If Members will refresh their recollections by a rereading of the purposes of the act as it is now written, they will find, I am sure, that it does not envisage a situation in which our country denudes itself of protective armament. Not for an instant would I say a word in support of this legislation if I felt it endangered our national security.

Members should recall that during the debate on a predecessor measure 2 years ago the point was made that we were giving form and substance to an agency already in existence, with the ultimate aim of giving greater congressional control over this agency and at the same time assuring that we were not endangering ourselves as a nation.

Statements have been made—improper, unfortunate, unwarranted, and unjustified statements of the kind the gentleman from Iowa just a few moments ago quoted to us. In my opinion, these are by no means justified by the legislation which is before us.

This Agency was set up, Mr. Chairman, Members will recall, with the purpose of creating an organization which would study, which would prepare, which would be knowledgeable upon matters of international agreements, perhaps eventually leading to disarmament of reasonable and safe degree, and always with safeguards as to our national security.

It was the concept that this Agency should be prepared to advise both the Executive and the Congress upon questions relating to arms control.

I said a moment ago that the legislation which we enacted in September 1961 gave form and control to existing activity. It did just that. There was in the State Department prior to that time an organization which was studying the whole question of agreements leading to arms control.

Our legislative action formalized that organization. Let me remind Members of another thing. When this legislation was before us previously, it was first designated as the Disarmament Agency. As a result of action taken in this body, the words "Arms Control" were added to the title. In fact, we indicated we felt "Arms Control" was a better and a more descriptive name for the organization.

The proposal before us this year was first for a continuing authorization. Neither the other body nor this body found it wise to give that continuing authorization. To demonstrate the fact that we in the Congress felt the need of actively watching the performance of this agency, we put a 2-year limitation on it and that is the bill that is before us today.

We are asked by the terms of the committee bill to authorize the appropriation for a 2-year period of $30 million. This is $10 million higher than was authorized by the other body. In my opinion, $30 million is too much. It ought to be reduced. And at the proper time I will urge the reduction of this to a figure not greater than the $20 million for the 2 years already authorized by the other body.

Keep in mind the fact that for the first 2 years of the existence of this organization, there was an authorization of $10 million which was sufficient to carry it for 2 years and, in fact, there is some of that $10 million unexpended right now, which has been appropriated in a bill which passed this House earlier this year and is now languishing in the other body. But for 2 years $10 million has been sufficient to carry out the activities of this organization. I see no reason, my colleagues, why if $10 million can carry it for the past 2 years, and not from a standing start but as an organization already in being, then why should not $10 million for each of the following 2 years be enough? I think we would be by no means justified in granting the additional amount of money which the Committee on Foreign Affairs saw fit to put in this bill.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, here is a bill which we may vote for with certain misgivings, having in mind it is our function and our purpose most carefully to watch the activities of this agency. But let us not drown the agency with too much money. Let us keep it on a reasonable financial basis and then discharge our congressional responsibility by watching carefully the course it takes in the future. Two years hence we may then again decide what our course of action ought to be.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I think there is not any question that the crying need of the world today is disarmament. As a matter of fact, I voted for the original authorization because I felt maybe this new administration had some new ideas in this field. However, by observing the Agency for some time, and I serve on the appropriation subcommittee handling these funds, I am not convinced that we are making any more progress in this area even though we are spending more money.

I thought it might be appropriate to read something from the UPI wire and get this thing in perspective. I am afraid we do not realize the kind of enemy we are up against. I do not think there is any way that we could possibly trust any agreement with the Soviet Communist bloc at any time at any place. We should be very careful and recognize their objective is our destruction and loss of freedom.

This is the item that came over the UPI wires:

> Moscow.—A top Russian missile general has urged Defense Secretary McNamara and other U.S. officials "to give up their atomic blackmail and threats against the Socialist world" or face the consequences, Moscow Radio said today.
>
> It quoted Col. Gen. Vladimir Tolubko, first assistant commander of Soviet strategic rocket forces as saying:
>
> "American soil would become the theater of military operations from the very first minute of any war imposed on us."
>
> Tolubko was quoted as taking issue with McNamara's remarks about America's supposed nuclear supremacy. The Russian said:
>
> "I would once again like to recall a remark by (Soviet) Defense Minister Marshal Malinovsky that we will retaliate for the number of missiles threatening us with a simultaneous salvo of several times the number of missiles, and by such powerful nuclear explosions that they will really wipe off the face of the earth all the installations and industrial and administrative centers of the United States of America, and completely wipe out the countries that have allowed their soil to be used for American war bases."
>
> Tolubko said McNamara's "boasts" were meant for propaganda and to "soothe" the American public and those in the West who "are learning ever more frequently about the failures of American missile and nuclear rocket tests."
>
> "Meantime, the Western press, which cannot be suspected of sympathy for the Soviet Union, is printing more and more news about the supremacy of Soviet nuclear missiles," he said. "Just 11 days ago the British Institute of Strategic Research again stressed officially that Soviet intercontinental missiles have more powerful engines and bigger warheads than American missiles of the same type. The institute also admits the U.S.S.R.'s supremacy in medium-range missiles."
>
> Tolubko claimed that Russian strategic missiles have no range restrictions and can carry thermonuclear warheads of colossal strength. He also claimed no limit to the destructive power of these missiles.
>
> The Russian general was quoted as saying that Russian nuclear charges and superpowerful rockets "are enough to destroy any country with a few H-bombs."
>
> Tolubko quoted unnamed "American specialists" as estimating that in case of war 263 5-megaton bombs could wipe out 71 large American cities and kill 53 million people.
>
> "We must say these estimates are based on fact," he said.
>
> The Russian said Communist strategic missiles can cross 6,000 miles in 30 to 35 minutes and cannot be intercepted because they are independently controlled and are not linked with any ground radio devices. Tolubko concluded by saying:
>
> "For the sake of all humanity and of maintaining peace on this planet of ours, Mr. NcNamara and his colleagues would have done better long ago to give up their atomic blackmail and threats against the Socialist world, a policy promising nothing good for the aggressor."
>
> The Russian Defense Ministry newspaper Red Star accused McNamara of "boasting too much."
>
> "Would it not be better for him to hold his tongue?" Red Star asked. "No one is frightened by the thunder of such speeches."

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN].

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, one thing that might be interesting is to review the events leading up to the passage of the original bill as it went through the House in 1961. The Senate committee on August 14, 15, and 16 of 1961 held hearings on the bill. On August 24, 25, and 28 and on September 7, 1961, hearings were also held in the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. The Senate passed the bill on September 8, 1961. On September 19, 1961, the House passed the bill, and it then went to conference on the 23d day of September 1961. But on September 20 the United Nations Assembly welcomed the joint statement on agreed principles for disarmament negotiations reached by Presidential Adviser John J. McCloy and Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Zorin.

On September 25, 1961, the President delivered a message to the General Assembly of the United Nations stating the United States program for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world. On the following day he signed into law Public Law 87–297.

At the committee hearing on August 24 the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON], the ranking minority member of our committee, asked a question of John McCloy, and I would like to quote it.

> Do you find that there are many differing views as to disarmament?

Mr. John McCloy said:

> Yes. There are many different views as to disarmament.

Then the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] asked:

> Are you going to propose to draw all those ideas together and work them out?

Mr. McCloy said:

> That is right.

Yet within 32 days after this statement we find the President submitting to the United Nations the proposal on complete and general disarmament in a peaceful world. So there could not have been any consultation by the agency with Members of Congress or with people with divergent views.

It is even more interesting to read a little bit about the proposed treaty which would in three stages disarm the United States and other countries and place the United Nations in such a position that it would have more arms, more men, and more ability to control the destiny of the world. I say this because in the book prepared by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, "Outlines of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World" they state very emphatically that the purpose of the treaty is to enlarge the United Nations peacekeeping organ to such an extent that no other nation, or state, as they refer to it, in the world will have the power to resist. So, as was said earlier as to the possibility of this becoming a one world government or one world organization, certainly the blueprint is here.

The original language in the Senate bill that is before us, S. 777, was changed in committee, and I would like at this time to pay personal tribute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN], who did yeoman work in 1961 to write into the bill language that would in fact save the integrity of the House. Under the provisions that were sent over to us in S. 777, the bill before us today, the House of Representatives basically would have been cut out almost completely from any possibility of having anything more to say on this very vital subject other than the authorization and appropriation of money. I would ask the chairman of this committee, if he does not agree first of all that the basic purpose of the act as it was passed into law in 1961 was that the ultimate goal of the United States is a world which is free from the scourge of war and the dangers and burdens of armaments; in which the use of force has been subordinated to the rule of law; and in which international adjustments to a changing world are achieved peacefully. It is the purpose of this act to provide impetus toward this goal by creating a new agency of peace to deal with the problem of reduction and control of armaments looking toward ultimate world disarmament.

Arms control and disarmament policy, being an important aspect of foreign policy, must be consistent with national security policy as a whole. The formulation and implementation of U.S. arms control and disarmament policy in a manner which will promote the national security can best be insured by a central organization charged by statute with primary responsibility for this field. This organization must have such a position within the Government that it can provide the President, the Secretary of State, other officials of the executive branch, and the Congress with recommendations concerning U.S. arms control and disarmament policy, and can assess the effect of these recommendations upon our foreign policies, our national security policies, and our economy.

Does not the gentleman feel that, with this language and with the limitation provided in section 33, we cannot do anything as far as reducing arms and armament of the United States without a treaty or further legislative action of the Congress; that the Agency should counsel with the House and Senate if they expect to find a sympathetic view for their gigantic proposals?

Mr. MORGAN. Section 33 was added on the floor of the House 2 years ago, and it requires that an agreement must be ratified by the Senate as a treaty or by a majority of both Houses of the Congress.

The Arms Control Agency recognizes that it is dependent on the Congress and is ready to consult with the Congress. They have a very good congressional liaison man and I am sure that he will be glad to arrange consultation with any Member whenever a Member has a question.

Mr. BATTIN. I thank the gentleman. I should like to say to the Members, that if they have the opportunity they should read the report to Congress submitted by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. It is a document of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and it is their report to the Congress, their Second Annual Report from January 1, to December 31, 1962, and reads in part, as follows:

> The two basic general disarmament proposals considered by the Geneva Conference have been the U.S. "Outline of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World" and the Soviet Union's "Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament Under Strict International Control."

Our proposal was made in Geneva to the 18 Nation Disarmament Conference. For those who are interested in constitutional law, and I am sure most of us are, we find that because our Constitution makes treaties the supreme law of the land, we are faced with the question of whether or not, first, the Congress shall have the power to provide for the common defense of this country; because we would be eliminating our arms and leaving ourselves in an indefensible position. Second, the President is Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, but if we do not have an Army and a Navy he has nothing to command. Third, certainly the Congress has the power to declare war. But here again, by building up the U.N., which is the stated purpose under the treaty, to the point where no nation could resist it, it raises large questions, at least in my mind. Fourth, it raises the very controversial question whether or not our judicial powers in the United States should remain in the Supreme Court or whether they should be turned over to an International Court of Justice. I would say again, referring to the report filed by the agency, that the International Disarmament Organization would have tremendous power—and this is the first time this comes into view—

> The International Disarmament Organization, being established within the framework of the United Nations, would conduct its activities in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

We are faced again with the basic concept of what our country, as a sovereign power, is supposed to do. As was said here earlier there is not a soul in this body who advocates that we go to war. Yet because of the votes here in the last 3 years on defense we will do whatever is necessary to defend the United States and have a force big enough to protect us and to keep the peace of the world.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, we voted, I believe, at this session almost $50 billion for military hardware. Even when you say that fast, it is still 50,000 millions of dollars.

Now, Mr. Chairman, today we are considering whether we will spend $20 or $30 million over a 2-year period, as the case may be, to explore paths toward the halting of the expensive and potentially dangerous arms race.

Mr. Chairman, the path to peace is a very difficult and rocky path. I do not charge any Member of this House, nor even intimate, that any Member of this House would not be for peace. But you will not obtain peace without exploring every honorable means consistent with our national security.

Mr. Chairman, we have obtained results from this Agency, modest results, but at least meaningful results.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly have no hesitancy at all in supporting the legislation under consideration.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. Stinson].

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, many statements have been made this afternoon about various Members being for peace and against war. I am sure that we can all agree on that. I certainly am in favor of this philosophy. But the type of peace I think most of us are in favor of, is the old-fashioned American kind which is peace coupled with freedom and not the brandnew Communist kind of peace which results in the complete and total cessation of opposition to the onslaught of world communism.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I cannot think of a single major nation in recent history that has disarmed which has not found itself involved in a war. It seems that as soon as any major nation disarms, there is always an aggressor around which will take the offensive against the nation and involve it in some kind of conflict.

Mr. Chairman, actually, it would seem to me, if we used recent history as an example, that disarmament or arms control can actually result in war.

Two good examples of this are in the period before World War II when the allies disarmed and found themselves attacked by Nazi Germany.

Then, after World War II the United States disarmed and found itself involved in the Korean conflict.

Someday I hope that Socialist aggressions which have plagued the world will be eliminated. Then perhaps it will be safe to disarm. At the present time I believe that the best way to keep the peace which we all want so badly is for the United States to remain so strong that no aggressor will dare to attack us.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to analyze what I believe is a very important document. It is called the blueprint for the peace race. This document is an outline as to how the United States should propose to disarm. This is an official document of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. It was released in May 1962, several months after the Agency was started.

I would call your attention, first, to the foreword of this document, about halfway down the page, where it says:

> President Kennedy on September 25, 1961, presented to the General Assembly of the United Nations the "United States Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World." To provide a more precise statement of the United States approach to disarmament and the manner in which that approach should be implemented, the United States on April 18, 1962, presented to the conference of the 18-nation Committee on Disarmament, meeting in Geneva, an "Outline of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World." Although not a draft treaty, the "Outline" elaborates and extends the proposals of September and provides in specific terms a substantial basis for the negotiation of arms control and disarmament treaty obligations.

This document describes three stages of disarmament, made up of three 3-year periods. On page 7 it goes into a description of stage I, and I would like to call to the attention of the Members that possibly we are into stage I already. I will give you some examples of why I raise this possibility. I might also add that I have not heard of any similar program being put forth by the Russians.

The paragraph entitled "Reduction of Armaments," provides for various weapons to be reduced. It reads:

> (1) Armed combat aircraft having an empty weight of 40,000 kilograms or greater; missiles having a range of 5,000 kilometers or greater, together with their related fixed launching pads; and submarine-launched missiles and air-to-surface missiles having a range of 300 kilometers or greater.

Mr. Chairman, we have now cut back on the RS-70 program and reduced this program to only three prototypes.

We have stopped production of the B-58 bomber. We are also retiring the B-52 bomber 2 or 3 years ahead of schedule. Also the Skybolt missile program has been eliminated. The RS-70, the B-58, and the Skybolt cannot be considered as obsolete.

Perhaps these are examples of disarmament. I read the next paragraph:

> (2) Armed combat aircraft having an empty weight of between 15,000 kilograms and 40,000 kilograms and those missiles not included in category (1) having a range between 300 kilometers and 5,000 kilometers, together with any related fixed launching pads.

Perhaps the early retirement of the B-47 aircraft is an example of this category. We can add the Jupiter and Thor missiles that were taken out of their sites in Turkey and Italy 7 months after they were installed.

Continuing on:

> (5) Anti-missile missile systems, together with related fixed launching pads.

I would direct your attention to the fact that the Nike-Zeus missile has been very materially delayed in development. It is becoming more doubtful every day whether it is going to fly.

Now, I would like to call attention to page 11. This paragraph refers to the production of fissionable materials for nuclear weapons. I understand our plants that manufacture nuclear weapons are going to be reduced by half.

On page 12—"Nuclear weapons test explosions"—as Mr. Foster says, the nuclear test ban treaty has already been accomplished.

Let me go now to page 13, "Prohibition of weapons of mass destruction in orbit." I would point out to the chairman of the committee this has been accomplished in that an agreement was recently reached in the U.N. that provided that we would not orbit nuclear weapons in space. This particular action was agreed to at the United Nations by the U.S. Government without any consent of the Senate or the House.

Then, paragraph No. 2 concerns "Peaceful cooperation in space." This would involve the program that the President has proposed in encouraging Russia to accompany us to the moon.

On page 15 is a paragraph that discusses the "hot line" between heads of government. As we have already discussed, this has been accomplished.

To go back to page 2, the first paragraph, "Military research, development, and testing would be subject to increasing limitations during the disarmament process." I would point out to the Members of the House that since Mr. Kennedy's speech of September 1961 outlining this plan of disarmament, not one single new weapons system has been developed and placed into inventory.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to the last gentleman who said that we are in stage 1 of the disarming process. He gave us his reasons. I think he left out the fact that we no longer make the B-29's or the B-24's, or the B-17's, or the Spads of World War I, the Enfield rifle, and that we no longer wear triangular hats going into battle. The fact that we find some of our weapons are obsolete is not indicative of itself that we are disarming. This "blueprint for the peace race" that the gentleman referred to is not a proposed treaty that was submitted. It was an outline of those proposals that would have to be met before the United States could consider disarming in any phase.

It is not a question of unilateral disarming, as the gentleman would have us believe. On the contrary, it sets forth to all those people who are interested the fact that the United States is prepared to seek peace if the Soviets are prepared to meet the terms that we outline in this blueprint for peace. So that there is great misunderstanding about this whole matter.

I served at the Disarmament Conference last summer along with the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. NORBLAD]. I can say and report to this House that this agency is doing an outstanding job with the weapons at their command, and that any treaty that is brought about will be brought about only if it is done through competency or knowledge that we acquire through research or which we acquire through our own efforts.

I heard my colleague from Iowa say, "Let us not trust the Russians." I agree. I have heard several of the speakers here today say, "Let us not trust the Russians." I agree with this. But I do feel that we should trust ourselves. I think that history and our experience will prove to all of us that it is impossible to trust the Communists, so if we go on that supposition, let us proceed to the next. How are we going to bring about a successful search for peace if we do not possess the knowledge and the competency to bring this about? I think the only way we can do this is by trusting ourselves. We did not trust the Russians when we entered into the test ban treaty but we were prepared to enter into the test ban treaty as a result of the technical proficiency that has been brought about by this country through the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. So today it ought not to be a matter of trust, it ought to be a matter of our own competency in this very technical field.

I heard the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] say he would like to cut this figure down to $1 million. If you want to be against the program, it is certainly one's right to discuss whether or not this whole program should be abandoned. On the other hand, if we should retain this program, than I think we ought to allow the people to perform their job adequately.

The difference involved in the amount of money we are seeking here today is for the basic research contracts that are outlined on pages 19 to 21 here. This is the difference in what will happen if the amount of money is cut out. I wish all Members before they vote on the bill will review that which will be eliminated from this program if we do drastically cut out this amount of money.

Basically, what it does is preclude us from extending our competency in the field of intelligence and research. It affects us in those areas where we can sit down with certain knowledge and tell the Russians we can go this far, or know with certainty whether we can accept the proposals which they submit. I might say that on the blueprint for peace the Soviet Union on many occasions at the conference submitted its plan for total disarmament. We have rejected it because it does not go about it with the degree of security that is necessary to the United States engaging in any negotiations.

I heard it said here this morning that we ought to go along with the Senate's proposal, which is for $10 million, instead of the House version, which is for $15 million. I see no reason at all why we should accept the other body's guidance in this field, since your committee did far more extensive work in the matter before Chairman MORGAN presented this bill to the committee here this morning.

The Senate had 1 day of hearings. The House Committee on Foreign Affairs had 10 days of complete hearings. We not only had the witnesses from the Agency, but we had Mr. McCone, of the CIA, and people from the Department of Defense and we had all of the people who are interested in this important field.

So this bill comes before the Committee of the Whole House today not on the basis of the Senate hearings, but on the basis of the long and tedious hearings that were held by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. I see my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] here. He said the control of enemy arms could be done by the Pentagon. The Pentagon cannot control the enemy arms unless we are engaged in war.

What we are trying to do is to prevent war, but to do that without jeopardizing the security of the United States. The control of the enemy arms can only come about at the negotiating table. I think we owe it to ourselves and we owe it to the world to proceed with knowledge and with competence to find out if we can bring about a disarmament agreement. I want to say there is no one in this room today who thinks this is going to be brought about immediately or in the next 5 years or in the next 10 years or in the next 20 years.

But if we owe anything to our children, we owe them this. We ought to try to do this, but in trying to achieve this goal we cannot jeopardize the security of the United States. It cannot be done by going in with a group of nice fellows who sit down around the table and say, "Well, what are we going to do about disarming?" We must go in with knowledge and with competency and with technical efficiency and superiority so that we can evaluate what we are proposing and so that we can also properly evaluate what we are going to do if the Soviet Union should make some new proposals.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STINSON. Can the gentleman give me one example of where a country has prevented a war by disarming?

Mr. GALLAGHER. What I am trying to do is to present the gentleman with the situation that has developed in our lifetime where we must attempt to find a way to disarm without incinerating the world as we know it today.

Mr. STINSON. But the gentleman cannot give me an example?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes, I can give you an example. The example is the United States—if 100 years from now we still exist, it is because we have found a means to live in peace honorably and with security.

Mr. STINSON. I hope there is no doubt in anybody's mind but that we will still be in existence.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, prior to the creation of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, what little research was done in this highly specialized field was done on a spasmodic, part-time basis by agencies whose primary concerns lay in other directions. The need for coordinated research under a centralized authority was recognized by witnesses who appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee when we considered the bill to create the Agency in 1961. Among those supporting the creation of the Agency were President Kennedy and former President Eisenhower; two former Secretaries of Defense, Thomas S. Gates, Jr., and Robert A. Lovett; a former and the current Secretaries of State, Christian A. Herter and Dean Rusk; Deputy Secretary of Defense, Roswell L. Gilpatric; former Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Dr. Herbert York; Atomic Energy Commissioner, Leland J. Haworth; two former and the current U.S. Ambassadors to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge, James J. Wadsworth, and Adlai Stevenson; former Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther; and the then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer.

During the course of the authorization hearings this year, top officials from other Government agencies such as the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Agency appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee. They testified that there is no duplication of research conducted by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in this field. They supported the work of the Agency and pointed out that it made important contributions to both the hot line agreement and the limited test ban treaty.

The utility of Agency research in the formulation of arms control and disarmament policy has not been restricted to the hot line and test ban. This is true even though the Agency is only 2 years old and its first research contract was entered into on February 6, 1962. According to the Agency, it usually takes 12 months or more to complete major research contracts.

The committee was provided with a number of examples of studies that have relevance to current and anticipated negotiating needs. They all involve problems which must be resolved if arms control and disarmament are to offer a safe route to advancing the national security.

The problems of verification and control are central to the achievement of arms control and disarmament objectives. Accordingly, the Agency has placed greatest emphasis on developing acceptable approaches to these problems. During fiscal year 1962, more than nine-tenths of the Agency's contract effort was concerned with this area of research. There were contract research studies, for example, on the problems of verifying limitations on levels of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles. Such limitations pose a central issue of arms control and disarmament negotiations. The Agency adopted a twofold approach. First, through a contract with the Bendix Corp., research was conducted to identify elements of strategic weapons systems which would be most susceptible of control and verification, and to design specific monitoring techniques. Second, through a contract with a separate group of researchers in the same organization, an effort was made to determine the type and significance of violations that might conceivably take place under an arrangement limiting levels of long-range missiles and bomber aircraft.

As a general principle, the United States has advanced the concept of progressive inspection. This means that the extent of inspection should be related to the amount of disarmament undertaken and the degree of risk which possible violations might present.

During fiscal year 1962, two contract research efforts were devoted to these broader aspects of the verification problem. Under a contract with the Raytheon Co., the concept of progressive inspection by zones was subjected to detailed examination.

Additional consideration of aspects of the broad concept of progressive inspection was assigned to a summer study sponsored by the Agency under a contract with the Institute for Defense Analyses. Twenty-five scholars from the physical sciences, the social sciences, and the law were called on to participate in this examination of verification procedures. The study focused attention on a new approach under which access for inspection would increase in gradual steps as disarmament progresses.

A fiscal year 1963 contract with Sylvania Electronic systems included an analysis of the problems associated with the possible emergence of nuclear delivery systems in space orbit and the monitoring of a ban on such systems.

On September 19 of this year, the Soviet Union suddenly indicated a desire to agree to our longstanding policy of restricting the use of outer space to peaceful purposes. The Sylvania contract study was of assistance in arriving at the determination to support the recent U.N. resolution rather than a binding agreement banning bombs in orbit.

The Soviet Union also indicated an interest recently in the possibility of reaching agreement on establishing observation posts at specified ports, and highway and rail centers. This was proposed by the United States some time ago as a measure to promote confidence and to reduce the risk of surprise attack by detecting, in advance, suspicious military movements and maneuvers of a tactical nature. Such an agreement could lead to changes in Soviet attitudes that might pave the way for future onsite inspection arrangements. It has been the subject of research by Agency personnel and ties in with an Agency contract on "Verification for Retained Levels of Ground Forces, Armament, and Tactical Nuclear Delivery Vehicles."

These are just a few examples of previous research contracts and grants. The proposed fiscal year 1964 research program represents a maturing effort and is even more essential to sound arms control and disarmament policy formulation than past research. Out of the $15 million budget request for the next fiscal year, the Agency plans to allocate $11 million, or almost three-fourths of the total budget, to research. I believe that the committee's recommended authorization of $30 million total for the next 2 fiscal years represents a small investment in the only Agency in Government exclusively dedicated to developing safeguarded alternatives to the arms race. This amount would cover both fiscal years 1964 and 1965 and if half of it is used for the current fiscal year, it would amount to less than two one-hundredths of 1 percent of the annual budget. This is a small amount for a field so important to our national security.

As the President said in his September 20 address to the United Nations:

> There can be no doubt about the agenda of further steps. We must continue to seek agreement on measures which prevent war by accident or miscalculation.
>
> We must continue to seek agreement on safeguards against surprise attack, including observation posts at key points. We must continue to seek agreement on further measures to curb the nuclear arms race, by controlling the transfer of nuclear weapons, converting fissionable materials to peaceful purposes, and banning underground testing with adequate inspection and enforcement. We must continue to seek agreement on a freer flow of information and people from East to West and West to East.

And again he said:

> The contest will continue—the contest between those who see a monolithic world and those who believe in diversity—but it should be a contest in leadership and responsibility instead of destruction, a contest in achievement instead of intimidation. Speaking for the United States of America, I welcome such a contest. For we believe that truth is stronger than error—and that freedom is more enduring than coercion.

Mr. Chairman, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is playing an integral role in achieving this goal.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer].

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be in the public mind at least some miscalculation relative to the extent and the capabilities of the Disarmament Agency to perform certain functions. We heard a lot about instant peace when this Agency was first created—not in just those particular words but in the implications that all we needed was to buy this Agency and we thereby buy peace. What this Agency can do is limited and what it should do is limited. What it should do is not only to initiate itself but to find out what ideas exist that might help to reduce the risk of the world in which we live. We do, in fact, live in a very risky world. It is not an easy job to take such an idea and calculate that, after we have adopted it, that our world is less risky than it was before. Many of these proposals, all good intentions in the world notwithstanding, would leave us with a riskier world than before they were adopted.

So the basic purpose of the Disarmament Agency is that of analyzing, that of evaluation, that of discovering pitfalls that may exist, and by that means to assist us toward a more stable, a more peaceful world.

The Disarmament Agency Act does not efficiently permit the Disarmament Agency to carry out that function. There are defects in the act. I have introduced legislation which I feel would eliminate many of those defects. It is still sitting in committee. So I am going to try to offer amendments to this bill today to get those corrective measures on the law books.

I think one of the most glaring deficiencies in the Disarmament Agency Act is the fact that the semantics of its name are wrong. This Agency cannot at this point, nor can it at any foreseeable point in time, do any real work on disarming this country or the rest of the world. The best that it can do is to work on some arms control measures. Yet we call it a Disarmament Agency—an unrealistic title describing duties that it cannot accomplish. One of the first things I would like to do is to change the title of the Agency or the name of the Agency from the Disarmament Agency to a more relevant title, the "Arms Control Agency."

The next thing I would like to see done, and I will offer amendments to do so, is to keep this Agency from building up a great big staff for research. Why would I like to do that? We all know that in any agency of the Government it is only the most exceptional administrator, who probably has not been born yet, who is going to hire very many people who will argue with him. We know that argument and punching holes in these schemes is the very essence of the Disarmament Agency's or the Arms Control Agency's duties. All you are going to end up with over a period of a few years in a research staff—in-house research—in the Disarmament Agency is a bunch of people who all day long nod at each other and compliment each other on their ideas and compliment the Director on his suaveness and capability. What has to be done is to have this research put out in the universities and other research institutions of this country where you can get a variety of thinking and get arguments on both sides of these issues and end up with the ultimate truth. The only way we will do this is to get this research contracted out. It is still not going to be contracted out wisely unless Congress stays on top of the man who runs the Disarmament Agency and sees that he himself does not pass out those contracts just to those people who will compliment him and agree with his own thinking, but that job is manageable. The job of hiring a lot of like-minded people, putting them on civil service and then trying to get rid of them is not manageable with respect to the diverse type and quality of thinking which should be done in this Agency.

There is another very serious defect in the law that is on the books now. That is, it authorizes the Administrator of the Agency to be sent out to the negotiating tables . Under the act the Administrator is supposed to be directing a top group of thinkers who are coming up with shrewd and logical conclusions. If you put him in the position of going out over the negotiating table and having, in the give and take of negotiations, to take positions that are illogical with respect to the research work that is being done, then in order to accommodate the Administrator's position at the negotiating table, the research has to be compromised, and it is no longer unbiased research. It becomes no more than a brief writing chore to support the public position that has been taken at the negotiating table, even though that position is a very wrong one. The negotiating duties of the Administrator ought to be cut out and I will propose an amendment to do this very thing.

One of the amendments that is already in—and it is a very, very important one—is to prevent this Agency from spending Government money to propagandize the American people. This Agency, as a matter of fact, is supposed to act as an adviser to the President, an adviser to the State Department, an adviser to the agencies of the Government designated by the President. It gives its advice to them and if they do not take it, as things now are it can go to the Treasury and get public funds to propagandize the public to put pressure on the other agencies to get them to accede to the Disarmament Agency's ideas. What logic is there in letting that sort of thing happen? The other agencies of the Government and most other departments are operating under a prohibition against spending public funds for propagandizing the American people. Certainly, if there is virtue and if there is wisdom and if there is good in what the Disarmament Agency has to offer, it does not have to take public dollars to propagandize it to the public.

Another problem that this Agency is suffering is that it really is not an independent agency as it was designed to be. It is housed in the State Department with the Secretary of State and all the Assistant Secretaries of State hovering over it day and night. It depends on the State Department for logistics support. All of this is bound to influence its independent thinking.

Another amendment that I shall offer will take it out from under the hovering wings of the State Department, put it in a separate building, give it logistic support through GSA and have it operate in independent fashion as it should. I do not think that is a very wild notion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer] has expired.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Don H. Clausen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to compliment the gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer] for his forthright and provocative statement here this afternoon. I am inclined to think his comments are the most realistic of all remarks heard during this debate and I wish to associate myself with them.

The problem of arms control is indeed extremely complex. It places a demand on the finest minds in this country—I am not convinced that people with these talents would permit themselves to be placed in an Agency that could conceivably restrict their recommendations. Therefore, I concur in the recommendation to contract with our colleges in this important field—it is worthy of serious thought and consideration. I understand the gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer] will offer amendments to the bill that will carry forth this objective. I will vote for the amendments; if these amendments carry, I will support the bill—if not, I will oppose the bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California [Mr. Cohelan].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, as one of the sponsors of the bill creating the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency 2 years ago, I rise in support of this legislation which is essential if the Agency is to continue its vital work.

As its very able and distinguished Director, Mr. William C. Foster, has pointed out in his second annual report to Congress, this Agency was brought into existence in the belief that arms control and disarmament measures can be acceptable alternatives to a continued arms buildup, and that these alternatives in no way jeopardize this Nation's security interests.

The time for evaluation has been brief. Only a little over 2 years has elapsed. But already the "hot line" agreement and the limited test ban treaty—both steps largely formulated and carried out by ACDA—have, when combined with our continued military preparedness and vigilance, proven the wisdom and soundness of this belief.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that today's world is not only divided by ideology, it is endangered by an arms race involving weapons of such mass destruction that their explosion could virtually end civilization as we know it. In such a world, balanced, phased, and fully safeguarded control of arms cannot only help to insure the maintenance of our national security, but can actually enhance it. There is no contradiction between the aim of achieving peace through such measures and the national determination to maintain the defense of our vital interests as progress on arms limitation is sought.

There is a natural tendency, of course, to conceive of national security as promoted only by a maximization of arms, and disarmament—even mutual disarmament—as contrary to national security interests. To advocate disarmament becomes equivalent to advocating weakness.

But this attitude does not adequately reflect the realities of present day armaments. It does not recognize the dedication to national security of those who believe that some means more realistic than the threat of mutual annihilation may be found to promote such security. And it does not recognize the fact that a continuing escalation of weapons, of counterweapons, and of counter-counterweapons, is scarcely a gain in national or international security.

In the short period since 1945, there have been approximately 30 limited military conflicts, several of which could easily have resulted in the devastation and holocaust of nuclear war. Today we are faced with explosive situations around the world—in South Vietnam and Berlin, in particular. The need is certainly as great now as it was in 1961 for an organization which can insure the constant and full-time application of U.S. resources toward reducing the dangers of war; which can give our disarmament negotiators previously lacking continuity of direction; and which can administer the political and scientific research necessary for developing sound national security policies on arms control and disarmament.

I would like to add briefly, that I am delighted the Agency has taken cognizance of the importance of the economic factors related to disarmament; that they have recognized the United States cannot repose blind faith in the unaided ability of the American economy to adjust smoothly to disarmament and at the same time satisfy neglected demand in the private and public sectors. As the distinguished economist, Paul Samuelson, said recently in commenting on the post-Korean war period:

> Only part of our swords went into plowshares; part went into unemployment and a deceleration of economic growth.

I would encourage that economic planning be made an increasingly important part of our overall disarmament efforts.

It is obvious, Mr. Chairman, that the Agency cannot perform these functions with the $1.67 million remaining under its original authorization ceiling. It should also be obvious that the research essential for successful program development will be crippled unless the full amount approved by the committee is provided. Mr. Foster stated the case quite clearly to the committee when he said, in commenting on the reductions made by the other body:

> A cut of this magnitude in our research program would require us to reduce substantially some high priority projects. It would also require us to eliminate other projects which are important for a comprehensive, coordinated program.

Mr. Chairman, $30 million over a 2-year period is certainly a small price to pay for efforts which can lead to a more peaceful and stable world. It is a price, furthermore, which must be paid, for arms reduction and control are social, economic, and moral imperatives in a world fraught with tensions and an uneasy peace.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL].

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, earlier this year I introduced H.R. 5061 to increase the authorization for appropriations for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The bill provided for an open end authorization, which I thought would be appropriate for an Agency with such a long-term objective as arms control and disarmament. Seeking alternatives to the arms race in order to enhance our security and promote lasting peace will require many years of effort.

Both the Senate and the House Foreign Affairs Committee rejected an indefinite authorization for appropriations and recommended a 2-year authorization instead. The House committee recommended $30 million for the 2-year span of fiscal 1964 and 1965.

It is my firm conviction that it would jeopardize our security should this authorization be reduced further. Almost three-quarters of the funds requested would be spent on contract research. The purpose of this research is to protect our security by preparing us properly for arms control and disarmament negotiations.

Negotiations of this kind will inevitably continue in the future as they have in the past. During this past year, negotiations for which the Agency was in large part responsible produced agreement on a "hot line" to Moscow, a nuclear test ban, and a U.N. resolution calling upon all countries to refrain from orbiting nuclear weapons.

Even limited arms control agreements such as a test ban can have an impact on the military balance of power, particularly if other countries which are parties cheat on the agreement. We must be able to determine if they are cheating. One of the main ways in which research prepares us for negotiations is to show first, what the impact of a particular arms control proposal might be; and, second, whether cheating could be detected by long-distance detection devices—as in the case of the limited test ban treaty—by onsite inspection, or by other means. Most of the research to be conducted by ACDA in this fiscal year is directed toward answering questions of this kind. This is certainly essential to our security.

It is true that the Agency's research program is more extensive than last year but this is to be expected. Now that needs have been identified and evaluated, more detailed research is necessary. The increases in the needs of the Agency can be explained in large part by the increases in the costs of research as it progresses through four typical steps: First, identification of possible techniques of detecting cheating; second, design of a detection system using these techniques; third, design of a model or other method for testing the system; and, fourth, conduct of a field test of the model or other method. Each successive step is ordinarily more expensive. However, every effort must be made to investigate all proposals thoroughly before they are negotiated. Any other course of action would be rash indeed.

The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was created by Congress to fulfill a need that was not being met. Countless Government officials testified in 1961 that a centralized agency specifically devoted to pursuing arms control and disarmament objectives was necessary and that proper attention to these important matters could not be given by other agencies whose primary interests lay in other directions. Indeed, Congress stated in the Arms Control and Disarmament Act that "the formulation and implementation of U.S. arms control and disarmament policy in a manner which will promote the national security can best be insured by a central organization charged by statute with primary responsibility for this field."

If the Agency is going to carry out this responsibility, it must have our support. The sum of $30 million for 2 years is modest for such an important purpose—peace with security. We would be derelict in our duty if we did not support this authorization.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER].

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee bill. Some 2 years ago, a number of us worked for and supported the bill creating the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. We did so because of our deep conviction that there was no longer an alternative to peace. This conviction was evidently shared by most Members of Congress. The bill passed the House by a vote of 290 to 54 and the Senate by a vote of 73 to 14.

Nothing that has happened in the last 2 years has made me feel any easier about the need to make a maximum effort to find a means of keeping the peace.

Let us be clear what we are talking about. We are not talking about appeasement or surrender. We are talking about national security. One part of national security is maintaining an Armed Force that is good enough and powerful enough to discourage a potential aggressor. No less important a part of our national security is the search for ways to lessen the likelihood of war.

There is no point in blinding ourselves to the facts of modern warfare. Once general war breaks out, there is no security. As President Kennedy has said, in less than an hour, 300 million human beings would die in a nuclear war. This is even if our defense system operates at maximum effectiveness. The truth of the matter is that our defense system does not today defend us in the classic sense. That is, it does not offer us protection against the ravages of enemy attack. Instead it depends for its success on the knowledge of any potential aggressor that it will instantly suffer as much or more damage to its homeland as it can inflict on us.

Our military system, if we look at it honestly, is concerned primarily with preventing war. The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has precisely the same task, although it approaches it from another angle. While the military system relies on instilling fear of retaliation to preserve the peace, the Arms Control Agency is engaged in a search for alternative methods, perhaps more certain, more effective, and less expensive. Nothing the Agency is doing in any sense conflicts with the aim of our Defense Establishment. In fact the aim of the ACDA is to supplement and strengthen the goals of the Department of Defense. We need both, for to weaken either the Department of Defense or the ACDA is to weaken our national security and invite disaster.

Important as the work of the ACDA is to our security, however, it operates on an almost insignificant budget. The entire cost of operating the ACDA for a year under the bill now before you would be consumed by the Department of Defense in less than 2 hours, the time allotted for debate on this bill.

To appreciate how important the work of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is to our security, let me mention some of the important things this Agency has done in the past 2 years and some of the problems they are now working on.

We now have in force a treaty with the Soviet Union, to which more than 100 other nations around the world have subscribed, banning the testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, under water and in outer space. This is the first solid agreement with the Soviet Union since the Treaty of Vienna which settled the status of Austria. It is a self-enforcing treaty which removes a source of mounting tension between the two great world powers and at the same time protects the health of citizens of all countries. The ACDA played a leading role in making this treaty possible.

The "hot line," a direct communications link between the United States and the Soviet Union, is another example of the work of the ACDA. Although a small gain in terms of the outstanding differences between ourselves and the Russians, it may nevertheless be of great use in heading off a war nobody wants.

The ACDA also had an important hand in the United Nations resolution, to which the Soviet Union subscribes, against stationing weapons of mass destruction in orbit around the world.

These steps have all played a part in creating a better atmosphere between the world's two superpowers, and this is important. A good atmosphere, however, is a fragile thing, as the Soviet harassment of American troops on the German autobahn over the last few days shows.

Far more important is that the ACDA has been able to remove some of the real causes of controversy between ourselves and the Soviet Union. This is the essential work of the Agency. Our military forces, for all their might, can do no more than prevent the Soviets from trying to settle outstanding disputes on their terms by force. The Armed Forces alone cannot settle the disputes. Yet if these disputes are not settled, they will continue to fester and tension will continue to mount, and, eventually, there will be war. To avoid that possibility, which we all recognize would mean unmitigated disaster for this Nation and the world, we have charged the ACDA with finding nonmilitary ways to settle disputes between this Nation and potential enemy nations.

These alternative methods of maintaining peace must be solid, enforcible steps, protecting American interests and the interests of the rest of the non-Communist world at every point. To do this complicated and delicate task, the ACDA needs the recognition and support of the Congress. For this reason, I urged that the ACDA be made a permanent agency of the Government, and I, and many others, have introduced bills to accomplish this result. I very much regret that the bill before you today does not contain such a provision.

Not only does the ACDA need the confidence of Congress, however; it also needs the funds necessary to carry out the function with which it is charged.

Let me briefly describe some of the crucial tasks the Agency is undertaking, for which the funds sought today would be used.

First. A contract has been awarded to the Bendix Corp. to study ways to determine whether a nation is engaged in the production of nuclear delivery vehicles. This will be useful in deciding whether it is safe and practical to enter an agreement limiting the production of missiles and similar weapons.

Second. A contract has been awarded to the Sylvania Corp. to determine what kinds of observation posts would be needed, and where they would have to be placed, in order to detect preparations for a conventional military strike. This would enable our policy planners to determine the feasibility of an agreement on the placing of observers to prevent surprise conventional attack.

Third. Another contract with the Sylvania Corp., partially completed, provides for investigation into the problems that would be presented in detecting nuclear weapons stationed in space, and in detecting missile flight tests. This information will guide this Nation in its efforts to reach agreements limiting missile flights, and preventing the spread of nuclear weapons into outer space.

These are just a few examples of the uses to which the money we appropriate today will be put. Certainly, the information we learn from these projects, which are being carried out by some of America's leading industrial firms, is important—even essential—to the security of this Nation.

The price tag on this Agency, considering its vital role in the safeguarding of our Nation, is small and the benefits America and the world derive from its work is incalculable. By supporting the bill now before the House, we will demonstrate to the world that the United States is serious about maintaining the peace, serious enough to do the hard work required to make sure that our safety is assured while the causes of international friction are removed.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to say anything about this bill but I felt compelled to speak when I heard some remarks awhile ago that seemed to me to be pointing a finger of treason at both the Eisenhower administration and the present administration. Neither of these great Presidents of our country is going to leave us prone to international or unilateral attack by disarming our country. President Eisenhower created the Disarmament Agency, the nonstatutory Agency which brought forth a blueprint for peace. This was the product of the nonstatutory Agency.

It has been revised since the Disarmament Agency, created by statute, has come into existence. But it has been revised in a more conservative manner, not in a more liberal manner.

Just a little bit about this blueprint for peace. It is my understanding, as I read it, that it is an outline of things that in the opinion of the Disarmament Agency would have to be done if we had worldwide disarmament. Among the things it suggests is that to have worldwide disarmament you would have to have a United Nations police force or some sort of international police force which would be so gigantic, so tremendous, that it would eliminate the thought of any nation going to war. It does not say that this is a possibility. It does not say that our country should go into this. It merely says that it is the conclusion of that Agency, as of today, that they see no way whereby you can have worldwide disarmament without creating an international agency or some other kind of agency of this type which would have the power to crush any war threat which might creep in.

Those of you who may have pacifistic leanings may be very discouraged by this announcement, because this is an announcement that in fact no worldwide disarmament is foreseen. Because, as a matter of fact, you cannot have, according to this "blueprint," a worldwide disarmament, unless you are willing to have a tremendous military force held by some international organization or some heavily armed balance of power or something of that type.

So, Mr. Chairman, realistically looking at this "blueprint for peace," which came originally from the Eisenhower nonstatutory Agency, it does not recommend that these things take place, but merely says these are the things that would have to take place if you were going to have worldwide disarmament.

Mr. Chairman, I may say to the members of the committee that I am an advocate of world peace. I am not an advocate of world disarmament without adequate security for our Nation and never have been. I was the original introducer of legislation creating this Agency. I called it a "Peace Agency." I did not call it a Disarmament Agency. Looking at armaments only is to look at the symptoms and not at the causes. This Agency is to discover and find out and report what can be found out in regard to eliminating war in our time, if it can be done.

Mr. Chairman, the Disarmament Agency has done something in this research by the "blueprint for disarmament," by showing the almost impossible objective that would have to be achieved in order for us to have worldwide disarmament. So, it was in this context that President Eisenhower and President Kennedy operated in suggesting that we look at this thing accurately and for what it is.

Mr. Chairman, I ought to know something about this. I have served for many years on the Committee on Armed Services and I am happy to tell you that this year the arms of the United States are much greater than they were last year, and last year they were much greater than the year before; and the year before they were much greater than the year preceding that. The arms of the United States not only cost more for our country, but they are also producing more in all aspects of defense to our country. No nation is as adequately armed as we are. So, we are not disarming. As a matter of fact, we are much more greatly armed in this country than we ever have been before in history.

If you look at this administration, you will find that while its armaments have increased, the nonarmaments fields in our country's budget have generally gone down. There are, of course, places where many of us would like to see our armaments increased still further. We would like to go forward with the RS-70 or some similar weapons system. I am confident that we will make improvement in these efforts in the future. As these new weapons are perfected, to hold reasonable budget lines, obsolete or outdated weapons will be abandoned; but our overall armament posture should improve through added strength, not by weakening our arms position.

This Agency is a part of our national defense by providing adequate research to prevent us from unwise decisions. It should be maintained. Whether its funds need great increases at this time is another matter which this debate should develop.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL].

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that all this debate about whether or not the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency should receive the comparative pittance of $15 million a year for 2 years fails to take an important point into consideration.

Mr. Chairman, the RECORD shows that in 1961 we passed the act creating the Agency by a vote of 290 to 54. We should remember that in section 2 of that act we stated its purpose as follows:

> An ultimate goal of the United States is a world which is free from the scourge of war and the dangers and burdens of armaments; in which the use of force has been subordinated to the rule of law; and in which international adjustments to a changing world are achieved peacefully. It is the purpose of this act to provide impetus toward this goal by creating a new agency of peace to deal with the problem of reduction and control of armaments looking toward ultimate world disarmament.

We should not forget that both 1960 national party platforms urged that we seek disarmament as a goal. The Republican platform said "We have deep concern about the mounting nuclear arms race. This concern leads us to seek disarmament and nuclear agreements."

We should remember that the first U.S. proposal for general and complete disarmament was made during the Eisenhower administration. On June 27, 1960, the United States made a proposal to the 10-nation committee on disarmament which contained the following:

> The ultimate goal is a secure and peaceful world of free and open societies in which there shall be general and complete disarmament under effective international control and agreed procedures for the settlement of disputes in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

We should remember that the present administration has tried to advance disarmament proposals with the goal described as a free, secure, and peaceful world of independent States adhering to common standards of justice and international conduct and subjecting the use of force to the rule of law.

So far, regretfully, these proposals have made little progress. Part of this is due to Soviet unwillingness to agree to verification procedures we consider essential to safeguarded disarmament proposals. Part of it is due to the fact that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has been put on the defensive in trying to carry out the mandate of the people, as expressed by both political party platforms, by the last two administrations, and by Congress itself. A vocal but small minority has distorted the picture with nonsensical gibberish about disarmament. Too shortsighted to realize that this goal may be the only means of preserving our security, they try to brand safeguarded overtures toward peace with the label of subversion. In effect, they would cut off the left wing of the American eagle, thus dooming it to perish. This type of thinking is unworthy of our credence.

Despite these obstacles, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has, as the Foreign Affairs Committee report stated, "given a fair account of itself since it began operations in September 1961." During the past year, negotiations for which the Agency was in large part responsible produced agreement on a "hot line" to Moscow, a limited nuclear test ban, and a U.N. resolution calling upon all countries to refrain from orbiting nuclear weapons. These are all very limited measures but, hopefully, they could lead to more meaningful agreements.

It seems to me that if we want to demonstrate the sincerity of our oft-repeated convictions so that real progress can be made toward our stated goals, we should give this new agency for peace the support and encouragement it needs. Fifteen million dollars a year for each of the next 2 years is modest indeed for a task so important to our national security. The Foreign Affairs Committee, after extensive hearings, was convinced that the Agency needs this amount. Anything less than this would be falling short of our stated purpose in creating the Agency and inflict the brand of hypocrisy on our goals as a Nation.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I should like to point out that if we are to attain the goal mentioned in the bill, we must do much more than this bill provides. We need to make every effort to create a more desirable image for our country on the foreign front. We need to make crystal clear through what we say and do that we are indeed a peace-loving Nation. This means that we must articulate a foreign policy that makes this clear to the people of the United States and to the people of the world—a foreign policy statement that tells our people and all people—that commits our people and Government to support only those propositions and programs that gradually extend the basic freedom we know so well here in America—will do much to make possible the goals mentioned in the bill we are considering today.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN].

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in enthusiastic support of this legislation to increase the authorization for appropriations for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. In enacting this legislation we will be making it possible for that Agency to render an even more efficient and effective service in the cause of world peace, in the relaxing of international tensions, and in furthering the security of the people of our Nation.

I am particularly pleased to be identified with the measure, not only as cosponsor of the bill before us, my identical legislation being H.R. 3308, but as an original sponsor of the legislation which established the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. I was privileged to have been among the small group of Members of both bodies of the 87th Congress who consulted and drafted the bill creating the Agency in cooperation with the administration, including consultation with the President at the White House.

I can proudly say that this activity on behalf of the Agency is one of the most significant roles of my entire lifetime. It has been a labor of love to work toward the successful establishment of the Agency because no other organization is more directly dedicated to the ideal and goal of world peace. I feel every faith I have had in the concept of this Agency has been fulfilled. Its goals have not been pie-in-the-sky ideals. It has provided the tools and the machinery to lay a firm foundation for world peace. This is what we envisioned. This is what it has been doing—quietly, effectively, and efficiently.

Mr. Chairman, in considering today whether the authority for appropriations of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency should be increased, I think we should look at the record and examine some of the accomplishments which the Agency has succeeded in fulfilling.

First, let us look at a most important development, the "hot line" between Washington and Moscow, which was the first breakthrough in 18 years in the negotiation of measures limiting the risk of war by accident of miscalculation. The Agency was responsible not only for the concept of this measure, but for the detailed preparation for its negotiation and the conduct of the negotiations themselves. Our representatives went to Geneva fully prepared. The numerous technical and drafting problems involved had been well worked out in advance and coordinated with the appropriate branches of the Government. As a result, I believe we can be proud not only of the success of this effort, but of the thorough and well-directed work of this Agency which contributed so heavily to such success.

Next, there was the test ban treaty. As far back as August 1962, this Agency had prepared and offered in Geneva a complete draft treaty banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, outer space, and underwater. This draft was the product of months of effort in studying the effects of each provision on our own national interests as well as on the common interests in reducing radioactive fallout, inhibiting the proliferation of nuclear weapons technology, and taking a first step toward arms control. Here again, there was thorough coordination with all affected parts of the Government in the preparation of the U.S. draft.

Even though this draft treaty met with a chilly reception from the Soviets at the time, the Agency continued to study the myriad aspects of bans on nuclear testing. Hence when it appeared last July that the Soviets were at last ready to negotiate in earnest on this subject, we were not caught by surprise or left to hasty improvisation. Instead, our negotiators went to Moscow fully prepared, and came back with an agreement which satisfied the U.S. Senate after the most detailed and careful scrutiny.

Most recently, the Agency played an important role in the development and formulation of the U.N. resolution calling upon all states to refrain from placing weapons of mass destruction in orbit. In cooperation with the Department of Defense, it had given careful consideration to the consistency of the proposal with our military interests. It had also studied the probable effects of the proposal in international law and on our foreign relations. And it had studied the technical problems involved in determining whether or not other nations were acting inconsistently with the resolution. In short, the Agency made sure that the United States was adequately prepared to introduce and negotiate this resolution with full knowledge of its implications and effects.

It seems to me that these three illustrations demonstrate the importance of the job which the Agency was set up to do and the admirable way in which it has done that job to date. They show that each of the actual agreements reached was merely the top of an iceberg—the part that could be seen. The advance study and preparation which underlay each such agreement, on the other hand, was like the unseen base of the iceberg—much more extensive and essential for support. And it must be remembered that these three agreements were merely first steps. Far more remains to be done in this field. We must not fail to authorize the funds necessary to see that this task is performed as ably and thoroughly as humanly possible. In my judgment, the full amount of the authorization contained in the bill as reported out by the Foreign Affairs Committee is the least we can do for this purpose.

This is good legislation. It is vital. I again urge its overwhelming approval.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY].

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I need a minute. However, I appreciate getting it. This plan is not a disarmament plan and it was never intended to be. If you will read the bill and the program you must finally come to this conclusion and this conclusion alone: It is a plan to turn the armed might of the United States over to the United Nations to establish a world government.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill as amended by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. I would like to make the points in the brief time at my disposal.

We have been talking now for a couple of hours about a relatively small amount of money. This question is going to be asked of each one of us—How much should we provide in this authorization bill for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency? Should it be $10 or $15 million for the current fiscal year? The difference is a relatively small amount. The question is relatively simple.

Much more important than that, and this question has come up in a great many ways, is the problem of our dissatisfaction over the lack of progress, and the difficulty, of dealing in a constructive manner with the Soviet Union.

There is lack of confidence, there is a very real awareness on the part of Members that we are dealing with a country whose courses of action are hard to predict. We are almost more cautious when they expose their friendly side than when they expose their hostile side. We are, unfortunately, dealing with an unreliable nation which gives continuing evidence of still being bent on aggression. The question that many of us ask is whether, under such circumstances, we are being realistic in supporting a program seeking ways in which we might reduce the level and types of arms? How realistic is this? How dangerous is it to talk about disarmament with world conditions as they are today?

No one really argues that the arms race in which we are now engaged is prohibitively expensive. This race constitutes a real, continuing, and probably an increasing danger to the security of all nations. As a consequence there is a realization that the exploration of alternatives is important, and that if we proceed properly we may increase, and not decrease, our own security. The ACDA has become involved in this larger concern. However, I think it should be said that the ACDA is not responsible for any of the decisions which have been mentioned with respect to the elimination or abandonment of certain types of weapons. If there is any unilateral disarmament, and I do not believe there has been, it is not the result of anything that the ACDA represents.

What we must realize is that the ACDA is basically only one small piece of machinery to help us develop more knowledge and understanding of the problems involved in negotiations on topics of arms control.

The gentleman from California put his finger on some of the weaknesses of the ACDA. He also demonstrated its importance as an instrument to help us in our thinking about these problems, in our evaluations, in our concern about possible pitfalls, and the ways in which we may develop a meaningful arms control program.

This brings me to my second point. Are we, as has been charged, squandering the taxpayers' money by suggesting that we spend $15 million for each of the next 2 years for this Agency? Is there any realistic possibility that we may drown the Agency with too much money, as has been charged, if we give it, $15 million instead of $10 million? I think the answers are obvious. Of course we are not going to drown them. We are not squandering the money, whether we give them $10 or $15 million.

However, we should recognize that a reduction from $15 to $10 million would reduce the amount available for research in the current fiscal year by approximately 40 percent. As has been indicated, Operation Cloud Gap alone, the expenses for which are to be shared with the Defense Department, will cost approximately $2,500,000. If we are not to cut the Agency's contribution to that project, and I may say it is a very significant one, the cut from $11 million to $6,300,000 will have to come out of other grant projects. This will mean that the proposed grant research program will have to be cut by something like two-thirds from that which has been requested. Under these circumstances, I think it important that we authorize the full amount which the committee has recommended.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'Hara].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am filled with emotion. I have never learned to lower my eyes from the skies. The years and experiences at times discouraging have never dimmed my faith that that for which we pray can be attained if our faith is strengthened and not weakened by reverses and unflagging courage gives redoubled drive to our efforts.

I have lived to an old age. Three times in the period of my life I have seen the youth of my country march to major wars, and a fourth time to the war in Korea. Even now American youths are fighting and dying in Vietnam, and over the head of all mankind is the ghastly shadow of the nuclear bomb.

Mr. Chairman, I have never lost faith in peace on earth, good will among men. We may not have attained it but, Mr. Chairman, I have the hope and the faith that mankind will attain peace on earth, good will among men.

A few months ago we voted $49 billion for defense. I voted for it. My friend from Iowa [Mr. Gross] voted for it. All voted for it save one Member. We did that because we wanted our country to remain strong. We wanted peace, and to have a defense that we hoped would insure that peace. That was one side of the national security coin.

Let me read very briefly to you from the hearings of our committee. Assistant Secretary Nitze of the Department of Defense was on the stand. He said:

> We consider that money spent to explore arms control proposals in depth well in advance of their consideration at the policy level and in international negotiations is well spent. Arms control is the other side of the national security coin.

Mr. Chairman, how can anyone who voted for $49 billion for defense, one and the most expensive side of the national security coin, withhold voting for $30 million for the other side of the coin? Oh, yes; it may hold just a hope of peace, but with timid hearts are we to run away because there is no guarantee? There is no guarantee that $47 billion for armaments will assure the peace we seek. This is certain, the Disarmament and Arms Control Agency during the brief time of its existence has returned to the American people a greater measure of security than any comparable sum of money ever spent by this Republic. The "hot line" which ended the danger of war by inadvertence or accident, and the test ban treaty, are among its accomplishments.

Two sides to the national security coin. That is not my description. It is not the term of the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that by an overwhelming vote reported out the bill now before you.

It is the term of recognition of the Disarmament and Arms Control Agency by the Department of Defense as a partner and coworker in the noble cause of peace and security. The Department of Defense with $47 billion to advance the cause of peace with security is one side of the coin. Mr. Nitze tells us the Arms Control Agency is the other side of the coin.

What will be the image of our beloved country in the eyes of the world if the side of the national security coin expressive of the hope of peace, peace with security, peace on earth, good will to men, is battered out by destructive amendments? Can anyone on this committee be a party to that and live with his conscience? I am not the judge. The decision is with each of my colleagues. This is the hour of decision. Either we hold to the hope of peace, peace with security, peace on earth, good will among men, or we beat a retreat from the approach to the goal of our prayers, a hopeless retreat of timid souls, afraid of the challenge to this generation, a retreat back into the jungles.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 777. This bill amends the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Act in order to authorize appropriations of $30 million for fiscal year 1964 and 1965, and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees.

I strongly believe that the bill before us today is one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before this session. For the first time in history nations possess the power to annihilate each other and Western civilization. Ever since August 6, 1945, the beginning of the atomic age, effective arms control and disarmament has been the great imperative of mankind. In his eloquent and historic United Nations speech on September 25, 1961, President Kennedy in full realization of this imperative warned the world:

> Every man, woman, and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles, hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident or miscalculation or by madness. The weapons of war must be abolished before they abolish us.

In an effort to achieve the objective expressed by the President, we have recently concluded the test ban treaty. But it must be pointed out that the President's words are just as true today as they were when he spoke of them. As long as the United States, the Soviet Union and others possess nuclear weapons the threat of annihilation "by accident or miscalculation or by madness" is ever present. We need only to remember last year's Cuban crisis or look at recent headlines concerning Berlin to realize just how slender is the thread which holds "the nuclear sword of Damocles."

When I came to the House in January 1961, one of my first concerns was to strengthen the U.S. capability in the field of disarmament. I had the privilege of working closely with the gentleman from Wisconsin, Representative Kastenmeier, and others in the formulation of the peace agency bill which was the prototype for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Act. It is to the great credit of this administration and the 87th Congress that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was established in September 1961. The creation of this Agency put the United States for the first time in a position to approach the vital subject of disarmament with a high level of full-time competence.

Under section 2 of Public Law 87-297—the Arms Control and Disarmament Act—the Agency has four primary functions:

> (a) The conduct, support, and coordination of research for arms control and disarmament policy formation;
>
> (b) The preparation for and management of U.S. participation in international negotiations in the arms control and disarmament field;
>
> (c) The dissemination and coordination of public information concerning arms control and disarmament; and
>
> (d) The preparation for, operation of, or as appropriate, direction of U.S. participation in such control systems as may become part of U.S. arms control and disarmament activities.

The statute plainly contemplated that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency would be the governmental fountainhead for disarmament proposals, disarmament information, and disarmament negotiations. To achieve this goal the Agency operates under a Director, Deputy Director, and four assistant directors who are in charge of the Agency's four operating bureaus. These are: science and technology which sponsors and coordinates scientific research concerning the manifold problems of disarmament; Bureau of International Relations which is divided into two offices, the Office of Political Affairs which is responsible for the day to day conduct of international negotiations, and the Office of Political Research and Analysis which assesses the international implications of arms control and disarmament proposals and examines long-range international developments; Economic Bureau which investigates the economic and social consequences of disarmament; and the Weapons Evaluation and Control Bureau which advises on military weapons systems as they relate to arms control and disarmament. In addition to these Bureaus, the Agency is composed of the disarmament advisory staff which recommends policy, the General Advisory Committee of 15 private citizens appointed by the President, a public affairs advisor who disseminates public information, a reference research staff and an executive staff and secretariat which performs administrative functions.

The Agency as the primary agency of Government responsible for disarmament and arms control has, with a small but dedicated and competent staff, accomplished a great amount in its short history. The Agency has been responsible for three negotiating instruments of great significance: An outline of basic provisions of a treaty on general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world; a draft treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, outer space, and underwater which, with modifications, became the test ban treaty; and a draft treaty banning nuclear tests in all environments. In addition to the drafting of these documents, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has been deeply involved in the disarmament and test ban negotiations at Geneva and deserves a major share of the credit for the test ban treaty. The Agency also deserves high commendation for the successful negotiation of the direct communications line—the so-called "hot line"—between the United States and the Soviet Union.

As we all know, the problems of disarmament and arms control are vast and complex. Before the creation of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency the United States did not have a full scale research program regarding this crucial subject. Trevor Gardiner, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force during the Eisenhower administration, in deploring the then-existing situation stated:

> Most of our notions on the subject of disarmament have been developed by essentially part-time people who are busy with defense, state, or some other interest so that they really do not have the time to think full-time on the subject.

From the very beginning the Agency has been heavily oriented towards research. For the first year of the Agency's operation, fiscal year 1962, Congress appropriated $1,831,000 of which $600,000, or nearly one-third, was budgeted by the Agency for research. In fiscal year 1963 the Agency allocated $4 million, almost two-thirds of its total budget of $6,500,000, for research. The Agency again plans to increase the percentage of its total budget allocated for research. For fiscal year 1964 the Agency has requested, and the Foreign Affairs Committee has approved, $15 million, $11 million of which the Agency plans to allocate to research.

In addition to the research program, the Agency has fulfilled another vital function. The Agency, in conformity to its clear statutory mandate, has served as the all-important arms control and disarmament information center for the general public. Without an informed public it will be almost impossible to negotiate effective agreements in the field of arms control and disarmament. To bring the necessary knowledge to the public the Agency has, since its inception, published a total of 18 documents and has sent representatives to various conferences, forums, and study groups. I can say from personal experience that the Agency personnel are most cooperative and educational in regard to these conferences. Last spring I sponsored a conference on nuclear policy which was attended by over 1,000 people. Two representatives of the Agency, Robert Matteson of the disarmament advisory staff and Dr. Leonard Rodberg, attended that conference and did a splendid job of explaining U.S. policy.

Mr. Speaker, Winston Churchill on February 7, 1934, speaking of World War I, told the Parliament of Great Britain:

> Wars come very suddenly. I have lived through a period when one looked forward, as we do now, with great anxiety and uncertainty to what would happen in the future. Suddenly something did happen—tremendous, swift, overpowering, irresistible.

On September 26, 1961, President Kennedy signed Public Law 87-297, the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, which created an Agency charged with the awesome responsibility to prevent the "tremendous, swift, overpowering, and irresistible" from occurring. I consider this Agency to be one of the most important in the Government. It represents mankind's great hope for peace. It deserves our fullest support. Recently we approved a military appropriation which adds up to more than half our national budget. The nation which can afford to devote half its budget to military defense can afford to devote one-sixtieth of 1 percent of its budget to the ultimate defense-negotiated disarmament. The nation which can afford to spend more than $6 million an hour every day of the year for its military preparedness should be able to spend $15 million per year to prepare for peace.

I urge all my colleagues to take another step in the "1,000-mile journey" to peace and vote for S. 777.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak this afternoon on the importance of giving the strongest possible support to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The Agency wants, and needs, $30 million for 2 years. That is the requested authorization. This represents a cut in what many originally thought would be a minimal amount.

By contrast, Mr. Chairman, it is worth noting that in 2 years we authorize $100 billion for arms buildup and defense.

There is much to be done. The test ban treaty was, in my opinion, a step forward. But it is a gain that can be lost. Much work needs be done on inspection procedures and on problems of readiness. I am satisfied that implications of research effort is guarded against. The $11 million provided for fiscal 1964 is justified. The largest research project programed for fiscal 1964 involves $2,400,000 for Project Cloud Gap—a field test of inspection procedures. A variety of other projects have been programed in order to enable the Agency to deal effectively with both the conception and technical problems inherent in developing an arms control and disarmament program which will assure our national security.

The Agency should, in my opinion, institute studies of the economic impact of any future reduction in arms spending. This is one of the most neglected subjects of our time.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the chairman of the Agency, Mr. William C. Foster, on a job well done.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, as one of the original sponsors of legislation that resulted in the creation, back in September of 1961, of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency within the executive department of our Government I earnestly urge my colleagues here to unanimously approve this measure authorizing an additional appropriation of $30 million for the Agency to continue its operations over the next 2 years.

There can be no doubt that in the short space of the past 2 years this Agency has more than proved its worth and the continuing state of world tension and uncertainty very clearly demonstrates the vital necessity of maintaining the effective operation of this unique unit of government in exploring the paths that may lead to peace through arms control and disarmament.

The culmination of the limited nuclear test ban treaty; the connection of the telephone "hot line" between Washington and Moscow, to eliminate the dangers of accidental warfare and the recent United States-Russian agreement not to orbit nuclear bombs in space are certainly major steps toward our basic objectives of sensibly preventing a world holocaust and promoting honorable peace. That our Arms Control and Disarmament Agency made invaluable contributions to the accomplishment of these objectives is unquestioned. On the basis of the Agency's remarkable record in less than 48 months our only patriotic consideration today, in my humble opinion, should be, not whether this measure ought to be approved, but whether, in the best national interest, we should vastly increase the amount proposed in the bill and provide permanent status for the Agency.

Let me, please, remind you that the Congress is not, by this bill or through this Agency, relinquishing one whit of its constitutional, traditional, or legislative power over U.S. disarmament procedures or treaties. If it did I would not be in favor of it.

Let me further and respectfully observe that when few question an appropriation of some $50 billion for an arms race it is difficult to appreciate how anyone can hesitate over approving $30 million for the pursuit of honorable peace.

When we realize that the destructive power of one thermonuclear bomb surpasses that of all the bombs used in World War II it appears it would be just plain old-fashioned commonsense to encourage an agency of our Government to continue and expand its limited efforts of research and exploration to find ways and means to accomplish honorable peace through a guaranteed system of arms control and disarmament. Penny for penny it could well be the best investment the American taxpayer could make or that we can make for him and the civilized world. Let us then promptly approve this measure without further delay.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of S. 777, to increase the authorization for appropriations for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The Committee on Foreign Affairs recommends $30 million over 2 years, or an average of $15 million per year. No further cut in the authorization should be made.

As one of the original sponsors of legislation establishing the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, I feel that the Agency has given a good account of itself since it began operations in September

1961. During the last year, negotiations for which the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was in large part responsible produced agreement on a "hot line" to Moscow, a limited nuclear test ban agreement, and a United Nations resolution calling upon all countries to refrain from orbiting nuclear weapons.

Mr. Chairman, almost three-quarters of the $15 million per year for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency would be spent on contract research. The purpose of this research is to protect our security by preparing us properly for arms control and disarmament negotiations. Negotiations of this kind will inevitably continue in the future as they have in the past.

Even limited arms control agreements such as a test ban can have an impact on the military balance of power, particularly if other countries which are parties cheat on the agreement. One of the main ways in which research prepares us for negotiations is to show, first, what the impact of a particular arms control proposal might be, and, secondly, whether cheating could be detected by long distance detection devices, as in the case of the limited test ban treaty, by on-site inspection, or by other means. Most of the research to be conducted by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in this fiscal year is directed toward answering questions of this kind.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the bill because the basic job of the Agency is to provide the backup support essential to the conduct of the highly complex and technical disarmament negotiations in which the United States has participated since the Agency opened its doors 2 years ago. I think my colleagues will agree that the results so far are encouraging, and the Agency should receive the increased authorization of $30 million over 2 years.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I trust that the full authorization for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency will be approved overwhelmingly. Certainly, opposition to this request will be founded on tortured logic. After exhaustive testimony, the Committee on Foreign Affairs approved an authorization of $30 million for 2 years, noting in its report that the Agency has "given a good account of itself since it began operations in September 1961," and that "a research program of the magnitude planned for fiscal 1964 can be justified."

Does the opposition propose that we should halt all arms control discussions with other countries?

Discussions have been going on under three administrations since the war. They went on all through the period between the wars. I believe it both essential that they continue and inevitable that they will.

If these negotiations are to continue, does anyone suggest that we go to them unprepared?

If we are going to protect our national interests in these negotiations, we must be prepared to participate in them knowledgeably. We must know how the other side's proposals, as well as our own, would affect the military balance, and whether we could detect cheating. This knowledge cannot come through osmosis—it demands research and study.

Top officials from the Defense Department, AEC, NASA, and CIA as well as the Arms Control Agency testified that there is no substitute for this research and that there is no duplication of it by the various interested agencies.

These officials pointed out that the Arms Control Agency was largely responsible for the formulation of the concepts of the "hot line" to Moscow and the limited test ban treaty. The Agency also supplied backup in terms of staff and instructions to Secretary Harriman in Moscow and to our negotiators at the Geneva Disarmament Conference. Since then we have witnessed the U.N. resolution calling upon other nations to follow our national policy of refraining from placing weapons of mass destruction in orbit. Again the Arms Control Agency was largely responsible with Mr. Foster, its Director, actually conducting the negotiations.

All of these measures and activities are designed to promote our national security through safeguarded alternatives to the arms race. They are designed to lessen tensions and to promote peace.

The opponents of this budget request apparently believe that our negotiators should go to these negotiations unprepared and jeopardize our security. For the sake of a small sum, which the Foreign Affairs Committee believes would be money well spent, they apparently believe that these efforts to promote peace should be crippled. I think this is false economy.

According to the Agency, a reduction of $5 million would result in a 40-percent cut in the contract research budget for this fiscal year since it could not be taken out of fixed operating expenses. It has previously been noted that out of the $15 million budget for fiscal 1964, $11 million is for research and $4 million is for operating expenses.

I have obtained from the Agency a few examples of contract research projects which would probably have to be reduced in size or eliminated. They are:

First. Design of field tests of inspection methods to catch cheating by clandestine production of weapons in violation of a possible ban.

Second. Design of special-purpose inspection and detection equipment.

Third. Research on the problems of organizing and directing on-site inspection teams.

Fourth. Study of new weapons developments which, if placed under control by the United States and U.S.S.R. now, might enhance our security in the future.

Fifth. Evaluation of the impact of arms reductions on unemployment.

Sixth. Independent, outside analysis of new ideas for arms control measures.

Many of these studies deal with our ability to catch cheating under arms control measures. They could become tremendously important to our security if they became relevant to negotiations and we did not know the risks involved. And, suppose we were able to reach agreement on halting production of a particular weapon and no one had figured out how to keep the workers who had built the weapon employed?

Perhaps the budget cutters believe we should negotiate first and then find out—the hard way—if an agreement was in our national interest. I do not think this cart-before-the-horse approach to peace and security represents the thinking of the people of Wisconsin or the rest of the country. I, for one, think that the harm which could result from a failure to approve the full authorization would be grossly disproportionate to the minute saving involved—a saving which would prove harmful to our security and our quest for a safeguarded peace for ourselves and our children.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 777, as reported out by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. As representatives of the people of the United States, we have the foremost duty of doing everything possible to insure world peace. As responsible legislators, we should bend every effort toward the attainment of peace, for without peace all else will end in nothingness. It is a known and conceded fact that a nuclear war, if we ever permit it to come, will mean the end of civilization.

The bill before us provides another step toward the attainment of world peace. The nuclear test ban treaty was a firm step. The establishment of a "hot line" to Moscow, and the United Nations resolution calling upon all countries to refrain from orbiting nuclear weapons were other noteworthy steps. In all of these moves the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was in large part responsible for the successful negotiations. That Agency has proved its worth and ought definitely be continued.

Considering the fact that we have voted $50 billion for defense, the amount here being asked for a peace research agency is a paltry sum. Let it not be said of this Congress that its Members tried to economize on peace.

I urge passage of the bill as recommended by the House committee.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill because, in my considered judgment, it is designed to give stature and purpose to an agency which has neither.

When the resolution to establish this Agency was before us 2 years ago I said to consider disarmament at a time of accelerated arming of our Nation is almost unbelievable. What is needed, I pointed out, is a firm foreign policy so unmistakably clear and firm that no nation will dare challenge us for fear of their own extinction.

Unfortunately, this world is not yet ready for disarmament. Any efforts now on our part to do this will only project the wrong image of U.S. military power, and, further, the administration's failure to assess accurately the present danger of communism's goal of enslaving the world by arms or subversion.

When the world is ready for disarmament we can pass the necessary legislation. Prior to that time we are playing into the hands of the enemy by legislation such as this.

Since I made that statement 2 years ago the world situation has worsened. I cannot agree with the committee's evaluation of the performance of the Agency on page 3 of the report in which it is stated:

> The committee believes that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has given a good account of itself since it began operations in September 1961. The results so far are encouraging.

What results, may I be so bold as to ask?

There has been no lessening of tensions in the world. The Communists have given no indication that they have given up their objective of conquering the world and destroying the United States. The disarmament talks have dragged on month after weary month with the Soviet Union refusing to make any concessions while it continues to destroy U.S. prestige and influence by outlandish statements based on lies and senseless accusations.

Communist aggression has not been halted. It continues its arms buildup in Cuba. It ruthlessly disregarded the treaty in Laos to bring that sad country entirely within the Soviet orbit. It continues to export arms, rebellion and subversion from Cuba to every other country in South America. It has increased pressure on the Western nations in Berlin with the latest outrageous arrogance displayed on the autobahn. American boys are dying in a Communist sponsored war in Vietnam.

While the Communists have stepped up aggressive activities, what have we done? We backed down in Cuba and presented the Soviet Union with a victory. We have turned our heads on the increased Communist revolutionary activities in South America. We signed a test ban treaty which jeopardizes the security of the United States by preventing us from testing in an area in which we must test to stay ahead of the Russians in military power while permitting them to go ahead with the tests necessary to overtake us. We have steadily cut back our military strength by abandoning proper research and development of new weapons and by decreasing our striking force through a systematic reduction of airpower.

In the face of this tragic record of the increasing danger to our security we are now asked to give permanency and stature to an agency closely associated with our failure to maintain our military strength. To take this action will lead to only one result, a further distortion of the image of the United States and an increase in the danger of all-out war. If World War III occurs it will be because of miscalculation, on the part of our enemies, of our purpose and our ability to defend our Nation. To approve this bill and the fallacies contained in the report may well encourage some foolhardy dictator that we lack the will to resist and thus see in this an invitation to attack us. We are in the cold war phase now of World War II and we must not encourage the foolhardy to start a shooting war, thinking we are disarming and weak.

For myself, I will not be a party to any action which, in my opinion, threatens the United States and the lives of our people and, therefore, will vote against this bill.

At the same time I implore the administration, the Congress and the people to take whatever steps necessary to restore the power and prestige of the United States to the proud position it held before the apostles of appeasement began directing our foreign policy. Instead of talking disarmament we should be bending every effort to increasing our arsenal, to developing new and more powerful weapons, in creating an antimissile missile. Instead of supporting an agency and an executive policy which quakes in fear before the sabre rattling of the conniving and ambitious Russian dictator, we should enunciate a firm, bold policy which at the very least would include getting the Communists entirely out of Cuba, ending Communist subversion in the Western Hemisphere and serving notice on the Communist conspiracy that we do have the will and we are prepared to protect our freedom and the freedom of all those who look to us for leadership.

This will be a policy much more likely to insure peace than the timid, defeatist policy we have been following and which this bill now seeks to perpetuate.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 49(a) of the Act entitled "Arms Control and Disarmament Act", approved September 26, 1961 (75 Stat. 639), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In addition, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965, the sum of $20,000,000, to remain available until expended, to carry out the purposes of this Act."
>
> Committee amendment: Page 2, line 1, strike out "$20,000,000" and insert "$30,000,000".

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee a few questions. I voted for this bill when it was first before the House. As a member of the subcommittee on supplemental appropriations and for the Departments of State, Justice, and the Judiciary, I voted to supply the funds for this agency. Now there are some questions I would like to ask with reference to this bill. How many new employees are contemplated here?

Mr. MORGAN. There are approximately 70.

Mr. BOW. Seventy new employees are anticipated. In what grades and in what areas are the 70 employees going to be hired?

Mr. MORGAN. I would not be able to answer the gentleman. I think that would be a matter that would come before the gentleman's subcommittee.

Mr. BOW. The Committee on Foreign Affairs authorized 70 employees and you should have some idea of why they are being authorized and in what areas they are going to be engaged and what they are going to do.

Mr. MORGAN. Of course, with the increase in the amount requested for research, amounting to $11 million, most of the 70 new employees will be in the research field.

Mr. BOW. Can the gentleman tell us what grades they are going to be and what type of research they will handle?

Mr. MORGAN. No, we did not go into that aspect of the program. We looked primarily at the research projects.

Mr. BOW. It would seem to me, if we are going to authorize 70 new employees, and I would point out to the gentleman that in the State Department bill this year there were no new employees in the entire bill, and now we have a bill coming in here for the approval of a new agency where we are authorizing 70 new employees with no knowledge before this committee as to what their grades will be and what they are to do. Are we blindly going to say to this committee, "You can hire 70 people and we do not care what they are going to do and we do not know what they are going to do and just give them a blank check?"

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I am glad to yield to the gentleman. I hope he can give us some information on this.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The basic difference in the amount of money requested is primarily in the field of research. They have testified that there would be no more than 70 new employees added. We are not basically authorizing these new employees, but if they are needed in view of the enlargement of the program, they will be employed. It would be before the Committee on Appropriations where a breakdown would be made in the event of a possible increase in the number of employees.

Mr. BOW. You see—this is the kind of situation we get into. It is one of the reasons we had to raise the debt limitation not long ago to $315 billion, because we merely go along with authorizations, saying that the Committee on Appropriations will take care of it and then after it is authorized, then we are told, "Oh, well, a legislative committee authorized it, and we ought to appropriate for it because the authorizing committee would not ask for it unless they knew what it was going to be used for."

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I will be delighted to yield.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The basic problem and the difference between the $20 million and the $30 million is in the research field.

Mr. BOW. Let us go into that. What is the research; what are we going to do in research that will bring the gentleman from Illinois this peace on earth and good will to men?

Mr. GALLAGHER. If I may point out in the green book those areas that would be eliminated are $6.3 million for research in fiscal year 1964. They are all listed on pages 19 and 21.

Mr. BOW. I know they are listed. You can take names and you can take projects and give them different names. Let us find out actually what they are and what they are going to do. Can the gentleman tell, us, rather than just taking a subject and saying that they are going to put research in this? How are we going to do it? How will it develop?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Your own committee went over some of these programs in the past. Which ones have you vetoed?

Mr. BOW. I say to the gentleman acting upon the authorization of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, last year we granted all of the money that was authorized. We went over these items. But this is a great increase I say to the gentleman. I have asked the gentleman a question, and he is not answering it.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BOW. I do not yield any further to the gentleman unless he is willing to tell us what are the programs and what are you going to have the money for. Do not give us doubletalk but give us facts.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I am giving you the facts.

Mr. BOW. No, you are not giving us the facts but giving us titles in a book. You are giving us reference to a book that has titles in it. I will not yield to the gentleman any further.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment, and would like to point out very carefully to members of the committee that if you desire to vote for economy, in this instance your vote should be "no." You are voting upon the adoption of the committee amendment. By its action the House Committee on Foreign Affairs took the bill that was passed by the other body which provided $20 million for 2 years and increased that amount to $30 million for 2 years. If we vote "no" upon the committee amendment, we are voting to save $10 million, to reduce the amount authorized for the biennium to $20 million, the figure which the Members of the other body thought was adequate and sufficient to carry on this program.

Let us look at what has happened in the past. As I pointed out a short time ago, $10 million was sufficient to carry this program for the first 2 years of its existence. There was left over more than $1.5 million out of that $10 million for appropriation this year. So that approximately $8.5 million carried the program for 2 years. If we vote for the reduced amount, we are giving $10 million for each of the following 2 years. Now, what will that be used for? We are asked to give about $4 million of those $10 million for operations, for the administration of this program, for carrying on the work of the Agency. That leaves, under the reduced figure, $6 million for research. How much have we used for research in the past? In the year just concluded we used not quite $4 million. So I would say to members of this committee, if you vote for the reduced amount you are still giving $2 million more than was used for research in the past fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the amount which the other body found sufficient ought to be entirely adequate so far as we are concerned. I would urge Members to vote "no" upon the committee amendment so that the figure would go back to $20 million for the 2-year period and thereby save $10 million.

It has been said that $5 or $10 million is not a large amount; and perhaps in the context of the amounts which we authorize and appropriate here it is not. But I am sure that the taxpayers of this country feel that $10 million is a very substantial amount, and should be saved. Even with the savings we are providing an amount which is more than adequate for the purposes of this Agency.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to vote "no" upon this amendment.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, a most amazing thing has taken place this afternoon. That is, the amount of excitement that has been engendered by an authorization bill seeking to increase the sum of money for arms control and disarmament from $20 to $30 million for 2 years. I was present when the $50 billion was appropriated for arms and armaments and certainly there was not anywhere near this excitement.

What are we actually doing? We are increasing the amount authorized from $10 to $15 million a year for 2 years; at least we seek to do so. The other body fixed the amount at $10 million. We are seeking to fix it at $15 million.

As a practical matter what is going to happen is that in conference that amount very likely will be split down the middle and so we will wind up with about $12.5 million a year. We are just paring cherries; with all this excitement, it comes to just an increase of $2.5 million. For what? For arms control and for disarmament.

I think that this organization certainly can be trusted with an additional $2½ million a year. Last year I believe they turned back some money that they did not use. I do not think they are going to squander the money simply because we authorize it.

Also remember that the Appropriations Committee is going to go into these items. They are going to determine, I presume, whether or not 70 additional employees are necessary. They are going to determine whether or not any supergrade employees are necessary. So far as supergrade employees are concerned; who would receive from $14,000 to $25,000 a year? They are scientists. You will certainly want people who are worth their salt, and if you are going to get decent people for this organization, you will certainly want to pay them a decent salary.

As to contracts that are to be turned over to colleges and universities; that is done when in the wisdom of the Agency it is determined that it is necessary.

We had an open-skies amendment during Mr. Eisenhower's administration. It was an organization of this type that worked that plan out. What are some of the functions of this organization? They are going to backstop among other things the various ideas submitted for arms control; they are going to backstop the various proposals that are made by different agencies of the Department of Defense. When some subdivision gets an idea for arms control, they submit it to this organization which will review it. This organization is going to determine whether or not there is duplication, whether or not there are three or four or five different groups in the Department of Defense that are working on the same suggestion for arms control.

Certainly these people have to be qualified in order to determine whether or not a proposed suggestion is worth while and unless you have people who know their business they are not going to be able to determine the validity of the various recommendations.

How much in the way of actual money are we talking about? We are talking about $2.5 million a year when you spend $50 billion for defense. I think, when we consider what is involved, we will not want to be penny wise and pound foolish, which we will be unless we vote for the committee amendment. This is a young organization. This organization has not developed to the degree where we have to be disturbed or worried about it. I am certain as time goes on the various ideas and suggestions that are made and the research that is done by this organization will prove worth while. And so I urge you to vote for the committee amendment to increase the authorization from $20 to $30 million for 2 years.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOSMER

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. HOSMER as a substitute for the committee amendment: On the first page strike out line 3 and all that follows down through page 2, line 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That subsection (a) of section 49 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2589) is amended by striking out '$10,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$7,500,000 annually'."

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, when this act was passed, section 49 provided an authorization for the appropriation of $10 million to remain available until expended. It did not put the Agency on any kind of an annual basis. It did not place it in the situation where it would be difficult for it to attempt to balloon itself all out of reason.

Mr. Chairman, the pending committee amendment simply does this: It takes a 2-year period and says that we can appropriate up to $30 million, or $15 million a year.

Mr. Chairman, over in the other body they said, "No, we will take $20 million and let them spend at the rate of $10 million a year, and then when these 2 years are up, we will go into this matter again."

Mr. Chairman, the plain fact of the matter is that you cannot buy peace, you cannot buy peace by hiring researchers.

This Agency in the first year received $1.8 million. In the next year, fiscal 1963, it received $6.7 million. Now, we want to give them a 700-percent increase, up to $15 million, according to the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, that is just ridiculous. You cannot expand an agency in that fashion and you cannot accomplish the peaceful millennium by doing so. Let us put it on an orderly basis.

Mr. Chairman, what my amendment does, is to say that the Agency can get up to $7.5 million annually if it is appropriated. It puts them on a businesslike basis. It will let it hire only a part of these 70 people it wants to hire. A gentleman who preceded me in the well was asked, "Who are they going to hire?" He replied, "Scientific types." I will tell you the type they are going to hire. They are going to hire, in part at least, the type that come in and write papers for the Disarmament Agency and who will tell us that this Nation must not have civil defense because it is provocative to the Russians. How do they reason this strange and curious assertion? They say, "Well, if we spend billions of dollars on civil defense, it must mean we are serious about it."

Now, Mr. Chairman, they said, "Everybody knows that unless the people are in a shelter when the bombs drop, they are not going to be protected. So, if we spend billions of dollars on civil defense, it means that we are planning the first strike, that we are going to know when the war breaks out because we are going to start it, and we are going to have our people in the defense shelters." Therefore, the Russians figure this all out and they become uneasy and look at our civil defense as a provocative act. That is what these so-called scientific types will be telling us.

Mr. Chairman, that is how nutball these people are who are going to get part of this money that you folk are going to authorize today, if you do not accept this substitute amendment. That is how silly it is. They will come in and try to lower the defense capability and safety of the people of this country.

I think it is time this country put its foot on—puts a lid on—this expenditure. A good job can be done with $7.5 million a year. The Agency should be working to protect the people of the United States not only from its foreign enemies but from its domestic idiots. Let us not give them money to spend foolishly or dangerously. This is a very severe task, I grant, that we have before us, and for that reason I ask you, I implore you, I beg you to put sanity in this bill now before the House by putting this reasonable lid of $7.5 million—a million dollars more than the Agency is spending this year—on the appropriation.

If you want to look at it later, if Mr. Foster is able to come up at some later date and with some results that are tangible and some actions that are clearly in the interest and security of the United States some years hence, let him talk to you about it then. But let us not have the kind of speculation we heard earlier in the day when somebody was asked for proof that disarmament ever avoided a war or saved a nation, and the gentleman responded, "Well, if the United States is in existence a hundred years from now this will be the proof."

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment because, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] said, we are quibbling over a very small amount of money in a very important field. A lot of people talk about disarmament.

I am not one of those who optimistically believes this agency or any agency is going to achieve disarmament, at least not in the foreseeable future; but I am very much interested in arms control. We are not talking about weapons that we referred to in previous attempts at disarmament. We are not talking about guns, rifles, aircraft carriers and battleships. We are talking about intercontinental ballistic missiles. If the estimates of the Defense Department are correct about what the Russians have—certainly they know what we have, and if they are correct in their estimates of overkill—there are enough intercontinental ballistic missiles and warheads to equip them to wipe life off the globe several times over. I think the average person just refuses to let this sink into his intelligence because it is almost too horrible to contemplate. But the fact remains it is true.

What we are trying to do here is to spend a few dollars, and I say a few dollars. The increase involved here is $1 for every $30,000 that we have invested in 1 year in these implements of destruction. We are trying to figure out a way to spend a few dollars to limit these weapons.

There is talk about the French force de frappe. I made a speech about it the other day, and I pointed out that if De Gaulle is successful in coming up with one bomb, one bomb that will work, he will have had an expenditure of $2 billion. But by the time he gets that bomb we are going to have over a thousand, and the best estimates are the Russians will have 400 or 500. If this is going to be any deterrent, if this French force de frappe is going to be any deterrent by one single bomb against 1,000 or 450, if that is going to deter anybody from doing something, I would like to have it pointed out.

This shows you how far one nation will go to try to become a nuclear power. I think De Gaulle on balance has been good for France. He has stabilized the French Government and to a large extent the French economy, but it shows you how far afield a fellow can get when he goes into this business of the French economy spending $2 billion to develop a single bomb, which is supposed to give France the status of an important nuclear power.

What we ought to be doing and what De Gaulle ought to be doing, what other nations ought to be doing and certainly what we ought to be willing to spend a few dollars for is to find some way to get rid of these atomic bombs.

I do not think anybody in the Disarmament Agency—Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is its proper title, and as far as I am concerned you can drop the "Disarmament" out any time you want to; it certainly will not make me unhappy—I do not think anybody in that Agency has any visions that the United States ought to disarm or that we are going to get the Russians to disarm along with us if we make the offer.

I do not suppose it is possible to make a political mistake in proposing this, because if we never have a nuclear war the opponents can always say, "Well, it is a waste of money," and so on; but if we do have one all out, you do not need to worry about the political consequences because there will not be any constituents left to complain. It will be that horrible.

To be practical about it, the Senate has voted $10 million. We are asking for $15 million. Anybody who knows anything about the way this place works at all knows that means no more than $12.5 million, or an increase of $2.5 million, and that is a paltry sum compared with what is at stake.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and in opposition to the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] that I waited and waited for some word out of Paris a week or so ago, during the NATO Parliamentary Conference, from somebody in the varied assortment of people who went over there, some word about disarmament, and I did not hear a single word. As a matter of fact, I think probably that so-called Conference concerned itself with the buildup of arms. I do not know. I am not sure that anything was accomplished.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. The speech I just said I made was made there. The gentleman might be interested to know that the chairman of the Liberal Party of England, Lord Ogmore, who happened to be a delegate, said in a later speech it was one of the most powerful heard during the NATO meeting. I did not say that, but he did. I am sure that some people on the other side will not like it. I am not attempting to blow my own horn.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand the gentleman is telling me that somebody in England complimented him on his speech? The gentleman is telling me that?

Mr. HAYS. Yes. Maybe the gentleman would like to compliment me if he would bother to read the speech.

Mr. GROSS. I am still waiting for someone of the assortment of people who attended the NATO Parliamentary Conference to speak up in behalf of disarmament.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] says, in effect, "Vote $15 million. Take the Senate's original figure of $10 million and increase it to $15 million and then go to conference and compromise on something less." This means it is not a question of the Disarmament Agency needing $15 million, according to the gentleman from New York. All they need, he suggests, is

$12.5 million. So blow it up to $15 million today and then kick it down somewhere along the line, and in between, again caught in the middle, is the bedraggled taxpayer.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] spoke of someone being fearful they would drown this Agency with money. I wonder if the gentleman from New Jersey ever heard of any agency or department of the Federal Government being drowned with money at any time, any place, in the modern history of this Government?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman briefly.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Is the gentleman contending that an additional $5 million being spent for research by the ACDA would drown the Agency with money?

Mr. GROSS. I am only repeating the phrase used by the gentleman previously. Of course, it will not drown them. You could not, figuratively speaking—and understand I say figuratively speaking—you could not drown them with $5 million more—because they can drink that much, of whatever the additional $5 million represents.

Now the alleged claim to fame on the part of the Disarmament Agency up to this point is the "hot line" and the nuclear test ban agreement. If I remember the accounts of the Moscow meeting at which the test ban was initialed, I did not see anyone from the Disarmament Agency mentioned—it was all Averell Harriman. He was the whole show as far as the United States was concerned. The Disarmament Agency had little or nothing to do with the Moscow test ban agreement. It was all Averell. Moreover, the Moscow test ban treaty is not removing a single weapon from the Russian arsenal or from our arsenal—not one weapon. That produced no disarmament whatever.

As for the "hot line"—we have had a teletype line into our Embassy in Moscow for years. The so-called "hot line" runs into the Pentagon and thence to the White House. And if anybody thinks Khrushchev is going to plant an operator at his teletype keyboard in Moscow and tell us that he is going to push the button and send his missiles on their way here, they ought to revise their thinking. How anyone can consider the "hot line" any kind of an accomplishment, that merits spending either $5 or $15 million is beyond me.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, in reply to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, let me read to you from the hearings with regard to the Moscow negotiations.

I quote Mr. Foster:

> The scientists who went were our scientists. The interpreter was our interpreter, the secretaries were our secretaries, so that we made up some 40 or 50 percent of the delegation and in the drafting committee. Mr. Fisher was the actual member of the drafting committee that worked with the representative of the Soviet Union in the final drafting of the treaty.

As you can see, Mr. Fisher who is the deputy of Mr. Foster, the Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, was Mr. Harriman's deputy when the mission was selected and he did the actual drafting of the test ban agreement.

Mr. Chairman, the principal question before the House in connection with this bill is the amount of appropriations we authorize for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for the next 2 years.

The Agency asked for a continuing authorization and the budget request for the next fiscal year was $15 million. The other body authorized $20 million for ACDA for fiscal years 1964 and 1965.

The Foreign Affairs Committee approved an authorization for $30 million to finance the Agency's operation for 2 years at the level planned for fiscal year 1964. We did not approve the request for a continuing authorization because we felt that Congress should retain at all times a limit on the development and scale of operation of the Agency.

The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is a very small agency as Government agencies go. Its total personnel presently number a little over 200 and its programed not to exceed 277 by the end of fiscal year 1964. In light of its research, coordinating, and negotiating responsibilities, and the fact that this is the only Government entity devoted exclusively to seeking alternatives to the arms race, I feel that this represents a reasonable and necessary staffing level. Consequently, any budgetary cuts that do take place will have primary impact on the Agency's external research program.

I must admit that both I and many members of the committee initially approached the Agency's requested authorization with serious doubts as to its validity. We questioned both the need for the research planned and whether such research would not duplicate research already being performed by the Defense Department, the CIA, the State Department, and other Government agencies.

Because of these doubts, the Director of the Agency appeared before our committee twice, once in executive session so that we could really probe on these questions. In addition, we heard testimony from officials representing the Defense Department, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I feel that we explored the Agency's research program thoroughly, as well as the overall Government program of research in this area on the matter of waste and duplication.

The overwhelming view of the committee, as a result of the hearings, was that the Agency's research program is not only sound and necessary, but that it does avoid duplicating the research work conducted by other Government agencies. The vote of the committee on reporting the amended bill out also indicates that this evaluation and expression of confidence was shared by members of both parties. As stated in our report:

> The committee believes the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has given a good account of itself since it began operations in September 1961.

On the basis of the detailed testimony presented to the committee during the hearings, the committee has been convinced that the research program for fiscal 1964 is justified. It represents an $11 million effort, almost three-fourths of the total budget request of $15 million. This growth of the research program is commensurate with the increasing demands for information to protect our security through knowledgeable arms control and disarmament negotiations. During much of the first 2 years of its existence, the Agency was developing the basic concepts of a research program. This early work was necessarily exploratory and did not involve much detail. Now that needs have been identified, more detailed research is required to provide technical support for sound U.S. negotiating positions.

The largest research project involves $2,400,000 for Project Cloud Gap—a field test of inspection procedures. The cost will be shared on approximately a 50-50 basis with the Department of Defense. The project involves testing in the field of various concepts of inspection in order to determine the risks and operating difficulties involved.

It takes much detailed information to develop a good verification system. First the key indicators of violations of arms control agreements must be identified. Then a system to monitor those indicators must be designed. Then that system must be tested. This is where the field tests in Project Cloud Gap come in. The elements must be developed and tested.

A variety of other projects involving smaller amounts have been programed in order to enable the Agency to deal effectively with both the conceptual and technical problems inherent in developing an arms control and disarmament program which will assure our national security.

The committee was persuaded that the $10 million which would be available for fiscal 1964 under the authorization passed by the other body is not sufficient to enable the Agency to do an effective research job. It would mean a 40-percent cut in the research program for the next fiscal year, from $11 million to $6.3 million.

The Cloud Gap project would have to be substantially reduced in scope.

Other important projects would either have to be eliminated or curtailed in a manner that would reduce their effectiveness.

The budget reduction would also reduce the grant research program by more than two-thirds. The Agency relies on grant-type research for some new ideas and concepts.

Finally, the testimony brought out that a cut in the research program cannot be measured solely in terms of individual project reductions and eliminations. The entire research program is a coordinated effort. Many projects are related and depend upon the successful conclusion of other projects for maximum effectiveness. This programing would be largely ruined by the mandatory modifications imposed by a smaller budget.

It seems to me that the question boils down to whether or not we want to promote our security by being properly prepared to negotiate measures to slow down the arms race. If we do, I think this comparatively small amount requested by the Agency should be authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THOMSON] for 3 minutes.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I think at long last we are getting down to the meat of this question about what this Agency is doing. I want to say to you that $1 million is a lot of money in the district that I come from. My people there do not want to relate it to the defense budget or to anything else, because every penny, every dime, every dollar, and every $1 million is important to them. The question to me is whether this Agency really needs this money and whether it is justified, and I do not think so, and I rise here in opposition to the amendment of the committee.

This Agency is supposed to be a coordinator and a catalyst, to bring people together and to bring ideas together and so forth. I think it is just the opposite of that. I think if they weed out some of the unnecessary overlap and duplication that they are performing, this Agency could well operate on $10 million a year and possibly a great deal less.

Nobody has said anything about those research contracts, but take a look in the green book that they have told you about. We are not talking about atomic bombs and how to get rid of atomic bombs. We are studying disputes between individuals. And one thing they are studying is the status of indigenous natives in South Africa. Now, I am for eliminating atomic bombs, but how about the problems of the status of indigenous natives in South Africa? I think we could well get along without that one. We would save quite a lot of money.

Then here is another one. The role of electromagnetic and mechanical centers of inspection. This is what they are going to look at. The possible role of aerial photography, radar, and other techniques in inspection and operation which will require extensive analysis.

Well, where is the Department of Defense, where is the CIA, where is the Atomic Energy Commission? Those people are all doing these very exact same things at the present time.

Then here is another one.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. I have only 3 minutes and you had 5.

Mr. HAYS. I want to agree with you about something if you will yield.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. That is such an unusual situation that I will.

Mr. HAYS. I will say to the gentleman that I was unaware of the study about indigenous natives, and I will agree with him that that ought to be knocked out, and I will help to get it knocked out. They ought to discontinue that right now.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Very good. Just vote "no" on the committee amendment.

Here is just one other. Inspection for clandestine military activities. This study will be concerned with the detection of clandestine military activities on a very small scale.

Where is the CIA? Where are the other Government agencies? They are all doing the same thing. I hope you will vote "no" on the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I could hardly believe my ears a few moments ago when I heard some of our colleagues pleading with this House to cut down the amount which the committee has recommended, as an economy measure, an economy vote. Arms control, the nuclear test ban treaty, peace—all the efforts being made by the Disarmament Agency cannot be measured in terms of dollars. What kind of a price tag can you put on the nuclear test ban treaty? How can anyone measure the dollar value of lives that might be saved? A country that today spends far more than 100 times as much as the committee is asking on legalized gambling can certainly afford to gamble $15 million a year or twice $15 million on the Disarmament Agency that might somehow bring us a little bit closer to peace.

The Library of Congress has advised me that since World War II the United States and the Soviet Union have spent over $900 billion on defense, almost $1 trillion, and as a result we have fears and jitters and the threat of mass annihilation.

It has always seemed to me that if we could spend a fraction of this, a recognizable fraction of this on education and the pursuit of peace, perhaps maybe in 10 or 15 years from now our defense would be more secure and our position in world leadership even stronger because of it. If we allow the notion to get abroad in this land that the arts of peace are less important, less worth working for than the arts of war then we will have a very, very difficult time making the journey toward peace to which President Kennedy referred at the time of the ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty. At that time he said:

> Let us—if we can—step back from the shadows of war—and seek the way of peace, and if that journey is 1,000 miles or even more, let history record that in this land at this time we took the first step.

Let history record that in this Congress at this time we are willing to take yet another step.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER].

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that those who want to tear the heart out of the Disarmament Agency have not taken the proper perspective of history. Since the year 1898 this country and every other major power on the face of this world has engaged in disarmament talks, year in and year out, right through World War I and up to the beginning of World War II. And I think that those people who feel that by gutting the Disarmament Agency they can stop the discussion of disarmament are just fooling themselves, because if history is any indication we are going to go on talking about disarmament just as our Nation has talked disarmament for the past half century.

The result will be, if we gut this Agency and cut out this research and deprive the top officials of our executive branch from knowledge that comes from this research, that we are saying that we want our people, we want our representatives to go into negotiations with one hand tied behind their back.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] said that he is in favor of outside contracts to do the research for this Agency. But the truth is that with this amendment you would virtually cut out every outside contract. This would mean that the Agency would be limited practically to its own resources and to the research that could be carried on with its own personnel.

A question was asked about the new personnel, Mr. Chairman. That information is easily available. The new personnel account for only $1.3 million of the increase asked by this Agency. If we cut the Agency's budget back to $7.5 million we are going to cut back this Agency to a point where they are going to have less money for research than they had in the fiscal year 1963.

I would say that there are divided opinions in this House as to whether disarmament is the road to peace.

There are differences whether or not by pursuing this particular path we are going to bring about the kind of security that we want not only for our Nation but for people everywhere—and I would say that I do not happen to be one of those who believes that disarmament is a certain road to peace—I think we may have to first find a way of solving some of the political problems that exist in this world.

But, Mr. Chairman, I say to the members of the committee that if we take away from our people who are responsible for conducting negotiations at Geneva and for conducting negotiations with the Soviet Union, if we take away from them the knowledge and the understanding that can be derived from the contracts for outside research, then you are handicapping them. You are saying that we want them to go into negotiations not well briefed, not thoroughly prepared, but instead on an ad hoc basis.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Morgan] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee amendment and in opposition to the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer].

It has been brought out here today that we are talking about a figure of $15 million. Someone said here a little while ago that we have just appropriated $50 billion for defense. Now, take 24 hours in a day and divide it into $50 billion and you will find that we are spending $6 million an hour for defense.

Mr. Chairman, we are asking here for 2½ hours in the cause of peace. I think this is a very small amount.

As the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green] said, it might be a gamble, but we are gambling small money.

Now in considering the $15 million, the Agency made a good case before the Committee on Foreign Affairs. At the insistence of some of the minority members we called people from the CIA, we called representatives of the Department of Defense, we called them from NASA, and we called them from the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. Chairman, every witness testified that there was absolutely no duplication between their research and the research of the Arms Control Agency and that coordination as being carried out under the Executive order eliminated duplication.

This $15 million has been justified, $4 million for administrative expenses and $11 million for research.

If the committee amendment is voted down and the $20 million figure stays in the bill, we will have only $3.7 million for administration and only $6.3 million for research.

I say this Agency should be granted the full amount necessary to carry out their research program.

The gentleman from Wisconsin in speaking about the natives in South Africa referred to only one part of a contract. He did not indicate the nature of the project as a whole. The contract on that item was Analysis of International Disputes. Only a small part of this contract had anything to do with the African natives that he mentioned. But the contract provided for vital studies dealing with international disputes.

Mr. Chairman, I emphasize that this Agency has proven its worth by the preliminary work it has done. It brought the "hot line" into being and it supplied the information that gave us the nuclear test ban treaty.

Let us vote for the committee amendment and vote down the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Hosmer) there were ayes 66, noes 84.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Gallagher and Mr. Hosmer.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 98, noes 111.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Adair) there were—ayes 73, noes 110.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Gallagher and Mr. Adair.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 108, noes 145.

So the committee amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GUBSER

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gubser: On page 2 line 2 after the word "Act" insert the following: "*Provided*, That of this sum a minimum of $100,000 shall be used to develop at least one econometric model which employs the input-output technique to be used as a tool to define and measure the regional economic dislocation problem caused by time phased cutbacks, stretchouts, and termination of military procurement and to assist in finding ways in which to minimize the adverse effects of such dislocation."

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I am deeply concerned with maintaining a strong military posture for the United States. As an American and as a member of the Committee on Armed Services as well, I am looking forward to the time, which I hope will arrive in the near future, when we can set about an orderly and safe program of disarmament. When this happens we must recognize that the geographical distribution of military contracts is uneven and that readjustments will bring severe hardship to certain areas of the country. This makes it mandatory that advanced planning by Government at all levels and by business firms and labor unions and other private organizations be entered into so that this economic adjustment can be made with a minimum of difficulty.

We now have techniques which can define and measure a potential regional economic dislocation problem and can also provide an adequate tool to efficiently and practicably deal with the problem. These techniques are varied. Some are called computer models, others are called econometric models. It is a technique of input and output analysis developed by economists like Professor Leontief of Harvard and many others. For those of you who are interested I refer you to an article in the Scientific American for April 1961 entitled "The Economic Effects of Disarmament."

In our own area, the San Francisco Bay area, which includes nine of California's counties, 10 percent of the total payroll is in defense industry. There are roughly 1.5 million people employed in all industries in the bay region, and 100,000 are involved with military oriented activities.

My point in offering this amendment is that we have definite and finite techniques developed by leading economists where we can use computer models or econometric models to definitely forecast what the effect of disarmament will be on a regional area and to make predictions as to what can be done to meet that effect. My amendment would make it mandatory that the Disarmament Agency employ this tool on a regional basis.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the Chairman of the committee.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I have examined the gentleman's amendment. I am sure the Agency is already doing studies along this line. I assure the gentleman as far as I am concerned I intend to use my influence to have them continued, but I do not feel that any money should be earmarked for particular studies in a certain area of the country. I am sure that studies along this line are now being made by the Agency.

Mr. GUBSER. I know, Mr. Chairman, that the Agency is interested in this particular type of activity, but this is a tool for arriving at conclusions rather than a research project. I am hopeful that the gentleman would see fit to communicate with the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and urge that they consider the use of such a tool on a regional basis. Would he be willing to do that?

Mr. MORGAN. I will be glad to.

Mr. GUBSER. With the Chairman's assurance that this will be urged upon the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and not wishing to tie the hands of the Agency in particular, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that I be allowed to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. Section 45 of the Act entitled "Arms Control and Disarmament Act", approved September 26, 1961 (75 Stat. 637), is amended by redesignating subsection 45(b) as subsection 45(c) and by inserting after subsection 45(a) the following new subsection:

"(b) In the case of contractors or subcontractors and their officers or employees, actual or prospective, the Director may accept, in lieu of the investigation prescribed in subsection (a) hereof, a report of investigation conducted by a Government agency, other than the Civil Service Commission or the Federal Bureau of Investigation, when it is determined by the Director that the completed investigation meets the standards established in subsection (a) hereof: *Provided*, That security clearance had been granted to the individual concerned by another Government agency based upon such investigation and report. The Director may also grant access for information classified no higher than 'confidential' to contractors or subcontractors and their officers and employees, actual or prospective, on the basis of reports on less than full-field investigations: *Provided*, That such investigations shall each include a current national agency check."

SEC. 3. Section 33 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2573) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any policy or action by any Government agency which would interfere with, restrict, or prohibit the acquisition, possession, or use of firearms by an individual for the lawful purpose of personal defense, sport, recreation, education, or training."

SEC. 4. Section 49 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) Not more than 20 per centum of any appropriation made pursuant to this Act shall be obligated and/or reserved during the last month of a fiscal year.

"(d) None of the funds herein authorized to be appropriated shall be used to pay for the dissemination within the United States of propaganda in support of any pending legislation concerning the work of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency."

SEC. 5. In section 31(2) before the word "private" insert the words "United States".

Mr. MORGAN (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, strike out line 25 down to and including line 8 on page 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 3. Section 33 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2573) is amended by adding at the".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LIPSCOMB

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LIPSCOMB: On page 3, line 25, strike out the words "in support of any pending"; and on page 4, line 1, strike out the word "legislation".

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment to section 3(d) on page 3 is adopted, it would read as follows:

None of the funds herein authorized to be appropriated shall be used to pay for the dissemination within the United States of propaganda concerning the work of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

This amendment would prohibit the dissemination of propaganda on all matters concerning the Agency's work. There seems to be in the Agency an effort to do more propagandizing of the American people. For instance, one of the research projects for which money has been requested is $100,000 for the following purposes. It is entitled "Analyses of Nongovernmental Arms Control and Disarmament Efforts."

They give as justification for this $100,000 as follows:

This group of studies covers the interactions between public attitudes and arms control policy. In the United States, national policy must be consistent with and supported by an informed public opinion. This series of studies is designed both to aid the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in interpreting public opinion and to indicate in what areas the public may be inadequately informed.

Also in the budget which they have requested of this Congress they are asking for three additional public affairs officers with an amount of about $28,000 annual rate increase.

This in no way, in my opinion, will stop the Agency from putting out facts and informing the American public of facts. But it will stop them from putting out propaganda in their own behalf.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. In leaving out the words which you strike out you do not prevent the dissemination of information concerning disarmament and its problems?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. It is my belief that the Agency can put out information which informs the people of facts. It should not continue any propaganda as such. There have been many instances of this Agency and others engaging in actual propaganda.

Mr. MORGAN. If the gentleman will yield further, I am not sure that I understand the intent of the gentleman. This language was put into the legislation in the other body by the senior Senator from Iowa, Senator HICKENLOOPER. The language in the bill is the Senator's identical language. The words that the gentleman from California seeks to eliminate would, in my opinion, remove the intent of Senator HICKENLOOPER's amendment.

During the hearings in the other body Senator HICKENLOOPER and some of the other Senators had been bombarded with letters concerning this legislation, some of it from around the large university areas in California. At that time the Agency denied that they had taken part in any campaign to stimulate correspondence to Members of the other body. However, the Hickenlooper language was the result of that campaign.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. This amendment will in no way prohibit them from doing the necessary work which they have to do. They can still issue their materials overseas, if they so desire.

For instance, they have published a book entitled "Blueprint for the Peace Race," printed in Russian. It is published by the U.S. Arms Control Agency.

If they have the money and want to go to the trouble and have the time and want to make the effort to distribute this "Blueprint for Peace" in Russian overseas, that is their prerogative. But this amendment will eliminate the dissemination of propaganda in their own behalf and prevent the propagandizing of the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is a good amendment and I respectfully ask the consideration of the members of the committee.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. Does the gentleman have a copy of the act before him?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I have the language.

Mr. MORGAN. Section (c) assigns the Arms Control Agency among its functions:

The dissemination and coordination of public information concerning arms control and disarmament.

Now, would the gentleman's amendment abolish section (c) of section 2?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. No, it would not. I am talking about propaganda.

Mr. MORGAN. It would not?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. It would not.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify a misunderstanding on the part of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT]. The gentleman from Florida, I think, is under the impression that this particular book to which he has referred, the "Blueprint for the Peace Race," was from a former administration.

I would like to point out to the gentleman that this book was published in May 1962, some 16 months after the current administration took office.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. If the gentleman will look at what the gentleman from Florida said, as it appears in the RECORD, that is exactly what I said on the floor, and I have not changed it. It is that: "The Blueprint for the Peace Race" as recently issued is the result of the original work of the nonstatutory agency. It has been reissued and revised in the years since that time. I believe it has been revised twice. But every revision has been a revision toward conservatism rather than toward liberalism. Furthermore, this document only shows the bases you would have to have in a world organization with a world peace force. It is not something they can do. It would have to be done by treaty. It came out of the nonstatutory agency. Can anybody deny that is true? I am sure it is true.

Mr. STINSON. It did not come out of the former administration in its present form.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. It has been revised more conservatively under the present administration, but it was originally drawn by the nonstatutory agency.

Mr. STINSON. I would like to call attention to another matter. The gentleman said that military forces that would be created in the United Nations would be created before disarmament. I would like to point out to the gentleman on page 33 of this particular document there is the following:

United Nations Peace Force. The parties to the treaty would progressively strengthen the United Nations Peace Force established in stage II until it had sufficient armed forces and armaments so that no state could challenge it.

Stage I provides for the reduction of weapons. The United Nations Peace Force under this plan would not be created until stage II after our weapons had been reduced.

Now, on page 113 of the hearings our colleague from Florida [Mr. Sikes] made an insertion in the Record which said:

> The United Nations Security Council directs the U.N. military actions, and I presume that this will also be the case with the U.N. Peace Force. I wonder how many people know that since the beginning of the United Nations the Under Secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs has always been a Russian?

The Russian Under Secretaries are listed as follows:

Year 1946 to 1949, Arkady S. Sobelov, U.S.S.R.

Year 1950 to 1953, Konstantine Zinchenko, U.S.S.R.

Year 1953 to 1957, Ilya Tchernyshev, U.S.S.R.

Year 1957 to 1960, Anatoly Dobrynin, U.S.S.R.

Year 1960 to 1962, Georgei O. Arkadev, U.S.S.R.

Year 1962 to 1963, Eugeney D. Kiselev, U.S.S.R.

Year 1963, Vladimir Suslov, U.S.S.R.

The gentleman can see this would be done in stage II after the reduction of the weapons system.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I am glad my colleague from Florida [Mr. Sikes] pointed this out. He points out that it is not likely our Government would agree to any such arrangement. The Disarmament Agency is pointing out the things that would have to take place if you do have a worldwide disarmament. But it does not say it is going to occur.

Mr. STINSON. The U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has been spending the taxpayers' money for printing this in English and also in five other languages and has distributed it around the world as an official U.S. proposal.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. If you are going to have a worldwide disarmament it is going to be a dangerous thing but that is not what this Agency is bringing about. It is advising of facts of their research.

Mr. STINSON. I doubt if it is in that direction. This is an outline of the disarmament plan that was submitted by Mr. Kennedy at the United Nations in September 1961. This is stated very clearly in the foreword of the document.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOSMER

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Hosmer——

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and I will explain the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment is 10 pages long. Will the gentleman be able to explain the amendment in 5 minutes?

Mr. HOSMER. I think I can.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I object to dispensing with the reading of the gentleman's amendment. I think it should be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Hosmer: Page 4, strike out lines 3 and 4 and insert the following:

"Sec. 5. (a) The first sentence of section 31 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2571) is amended by striking out 'disarmament' and inserting in lieu thereof 'arms control.'

"(b) The second sentence of such section is amended to read as follows: 'To this end, the Director is authorized and directed, under the direction of the President, (1) to review and evaluate research, development, and other studies in the field of arms control; (2) to make arrangements by contract, agreement, and grant for the conduct of research, development, and other studies in the field of arms control by United States private or public institutions or persons; and (3) to coordinate the research, development, and other studies conducted in the field of arms control by other Government agencies in accordance with procedures established under section 35 of this Act.'

"(c) The fourth sentence of such section is amended by striking out 'and disarmament' immediately before the colon and in paragraph (a) by striking out 'control, and elimination' and inserting in lieu thereof 'and control'; and in paragraph (d) by striking out 'reduction, and elimination' and inserting in lieu thereof 'and reduction'; and by striking out 'and disarmament' each place that it appears in paragraphs (e), (f), (h), (i), (j), and (k).

"Sec. 6. Section 1 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2551 note) is amended by striking out 'and Disarmament'.

"Sec. 7. Section 2 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2551) is amended to read as follows:

" 'PURPOSE

" 'Sec. 2. An ultimate goal of the United States is a world which is free from the scourge of war and the dangers and burdens of armaments; and in which international adjustments to a changing world are achieved peacefully. It is the purpose of this Act to provide impetus toward this goal by creating a new agency of peace to deal with the problem of control of armaments and their reduction to minimum feasible levels.

" 'Arms control policy, being an important aspect of foreign policy, must be consistent with national security policy as a whole. The formulation and implementation of United States arms control policy in a manner which will promote the national security can best be insured by a central organization charged by statute with support and advisory responsibility for this field. This organization must have such a position within the Government that it can provide the President, the Secretary of State, other officials of the executive branch, and the Congress with recommendations concerning United States arms control policy, and can assess the effect of these recommendations upon our foreign policies, our national security policies, and our economy.

" 'This organization must have the capacity to provide the essential scientific, economic, political, military, psychological, and technological information upon which realistic arms control policy must be based. It must be able to carry out the following primary functions:

" '(a) The evaluation, support, and coordination of research for arms control policy formulation;

" '(b) The accumulation and preparation of data required for United States participation in international negotiations in the arms control field;

" '(c) The accumulation, coordination, and distribution of information concerning arms control from, within, and amongst Government agencies; and

" '(d) The development and evaluation of plans for United States participation in such control systems as may become part of United States arms control activities.'

"Sec. 8. (a) Paragraph (a) of section 3 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2252) is amended by striking out 'The terms "arms control" and "disarmament" means the identification, verification, inspection, limitation, control, reduction, or elimination,' and inserting in lieu thereof: 'The term "arms control" means the identification, verification, inspection, limitation, control, or reduction'.

"(b) Paragraph (c) of section 3 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act is amended by striking out 'and Disarmament'.

"Sec. 9. (a) Section 21 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2561) is amended to read as follows:

" 'UNITED STATES ARMS CONTROL AGENCY

" 'Sec. 21. There is hereby established an agency to be known as the "United States Arms Control Agency'.

"(b) The first two sentences of section 22 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2562) are amended to read as follows: 'The Agency shall be headed by a Director, who shall serve as an adviser to the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the President on arms control matters. In carrying out his duties under this Act the Director shall have advisory responsibility within the Government for arms control matters, as defined in this Act.'

"(c) Section 25 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2565) is amended by striking out ', under the direction of the Secretary of State,', and by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize the Director to establish within the Agency any bureau, office, or division to conduct research activities.'

"(d) The first sentence of section 26 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2566) is amended by striking out 'and disarmament'. The last sentence of such section is amended by inserting 'the Secretary of Defense,' immediately before 'the Secretary of State,'; by striking out 'Disarmament' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Arms Control'; and by striking out ', disarmament,'.

"Sec. 10. Section 34 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2574) is hereby repealed. Section 35 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2575) is hereby renumbered as section 34 and is amended by striking out 'and disarmament.'

"Sec. 11. (a) The second sentence of paragraph (a) of section 41 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2581) is amended to read as follows: 'It is the intent of the section that the Director rely upon the General Services Administration for general administrative services in the United States and abroad to the extent agreed upon between the Administrator of General Services and the Director.'

"(b) Paragraph (f) of such section 41 is amended by striking out 'and disarmament'.

"Sec. 12. Section 43 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2583) is amended by striking out 'and disarmament'.

"Sec. 13. The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 47 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2587) is amended by striking out 'and disarmament'.

"Sec. 14. Section 48 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2588) is amended by inserting immediately after 'international conferences' the following: 'in any advisory capacity'.

"Sec. 15. The title of the Act entitled 'An Act to establish a United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency', approved

September 26, 1961 (75 Stat. 631), is amended to read as follows: 'An Act to establish a United States Arms Control Agency.'"

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I shall be much briefer than was the reading of the amendment. It was necessarily long because it deals with many portions of the Disarmament Agency Act. The amendment is drafted to do four simple things:

First. It takes the word "disarmament" and drops it from the name of the agency and eliminates the function of disarmament from the responsibility of the agency so that the agency is now named and is responsible for arms control.

At such time in the future as disarmament becomes other than a dream, the agency can be shifted to that function. But now the function is arms control and let us make no mistake about it. If we confuse disarmament with arms control, we derogate the actions and the responsibilities and the capability of the agency.

Secondly, this amendment will bar the agency from setting up its own research shop and thereby abrogating this function to an inwardly oriented group of civil servants who cannot be fired. By contrast, it requires the agency to go out on the private market for its research, doing it by contract in a broad fashion so that the best American minds can be brought to bear on this very important problem.

The third thing that the amendment does is to strip the administrator of the Agency of the responsibility to go to the international negotiating table as a negotiator. We already have people in the State Department hired and trained to go to do this work. It keeps him at the side of the table as an adviser, where he should be, and it keeps him as an administrator of an inquiring research agency, which he should be. It avoids the contingency of his taking positions off the cuff and shooting from the hip during negotiations, then having to distort the Agency's research function to support such hasty, illogical, and often mistaken and dangerous positions.

The fourth thing the amendment does is simply take the Agency outside of the influence of the State Department. In the future it would look for its support to the General Services agency rather than to the State Department. It would look for its housing to the General Services Administration rather than the State Department. It is an agency to advise the President and the Secretary of Defense and other agencies of the Government and should not, by any logic or reason, be smothered by the State Department as it is today. That is it.

I think that today the Disarmament Agency is a sick Agency with a dreary past and a dismal future unless we, the Congress, act to reform the charter under which it operates, and unless we do so reform it I see no reason for spending public money to perpetuate it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I hope that I shall not have to use all of my time. I think it is obvious that an amendment of this import which changes many sections of the act and which comprises 10 pages and which is offered late in the day should have been considered in committee. The gentleman did introduce a bill which purported to do many of the things his amendment proposes to do, but he made no attempt, as far as I know, to come before the committee and propose this as an amendment when the committee was considering the bill. I think the House would be well advised not to go this far in changing this whole bill around, because after hearing the amendment read—and I think I am speaking truthfully when I say that not very many people in the House know what the amendment does. The author of the amendment talks about taking the matter out of the State Department and taking the director away from the negotiating table. The director is not at the negotiating table unless the President wants him to be there, and if he needed him there, I think he ought to have the opportunity to have him there. I think the House would be operating in the dark if it adopted this amendment, and I trust that the amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, when legislation to establish the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was before us in September 1961, it was the understanding of the gentleman from Texas and many others that the purpose of the act was to pull together into one office of Government activities that had been conducted, often independently, by a number of separate offices virtually since the end of World War II.

We had engaged, in those years since the end of World War II, in more than 70 conferences in which arms control and related matters were discussed. On some occasions, it was clear, we were not prepared properly to take part in these conferences. Overlapping research activities, failure to coordinate certain background studies, poor communication between agencies and departments—all these were difficulties that the Congress wanted straightened out by putting arms control study and informational work under one agency.

At the time the 1961 legislation was enacted I had strong reservations about the proposed name of the Agency. While realizing that the name was designed to serve our propaganda interests, it was as clear then as it is now that disarmament in this divided world is for the foreseeable future an impossible dream. We have no alternative but to remain militarily powerful. As President Kennedy declared in this Chamber in his state of the Union address on January 14 of this year:

> Until the world can develop a reliable system of international security, the free peoples have no choice but to keep their arms near.

It was my feeling 2 years ago that although we in the Congress, having given careful and thorough study to the matter and having amended the bill to provide maximum protection against unilateral disarmament, understood the objectives of the new Agency, the American public generally might be led to misconstrue its purposes. I crossed my fingers in hopes that the true purpose of the agency would be clear to all. Unfortunately this was not the case. The very fact that the Agency was termed the "Arms Control and Disarmament Agency" led a number of well-meaning citizens to believe, in error, that the purpose of the Agency was to provide for our unilateral disarmament, to strip us of our defenses in the face of a continued and aggressive worldwide threat from the forces of international communism.

The confusion resulting from well-intentioned misunderstanding was then compounded by certain persons who seem to be bent more on downgrading their own Government than in facing constructively the problems with which it must deal.

Many of the Members are aware of the attacks that have been made on the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency—and on the Congress for providing for its establishment—in the months since Public Law 87–297 was enacted. So virulent had some of these attacks become that elements of the press which most usually criticize American involvement in international activities felt some responsibility to set the matter straight for their readers. The publication National Review, while supporting the repeal of Public Law 87–297, told its readers in the June 18 issue that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is not "engaged in the business of selling out U.S. sovereignty, nor has it treaty power, nor the power to effect U.S. disarmament." The National Review article concluded:

> When disarmament comes, it will be important enough to be transacted by the conventional agencies of Government; e.g., the President and the Houses of Congress.

The American Legion magazine devoted much of its September issue to a lengthy explanation of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the legislation which provided for its establishment. The article stated:

> Thus the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is basically a study and informational body. It could not take over operation of American disarmament programs until they were approved by the entire Government, which we shall see includes both executive and legislative branches. Whatever danger of that exists, the law in question does not permit it.

And the article concluded:

> In short, the responsibility for the defense of the United States and the exercise of power either to assure or to undo our security rests today exactly where it did before the Arms Control and Disarmament Act was adopted in 1961. There may be dangers in what people acting in the name of the Agency propose. Their proposals will bear watching. But the circulation of groundless rumors about that Agency and about the law under which it operates does no good. It could have the dangerous result, for our national safety, of causing objective spokesmen for adequate defense to be tarred with

> the same brush as the spreaders of wild tales. That could be a disaster.

So concluded the American Legion magazine article.

Because of the widespread misunderstanding about the Agency and its functions, I am glad the Committee on Foreign Affairs saw fit to amend the bill before us to make clear that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has absolutely no jurisdiction over the possession or use of firearms by individuals. I am glad also that the committee amended section 3 of the bill so as to retain the provision contained in section 33 of existing law, to wit:

> That no action shall be taken under this or any other law that will obligate the United States to disarm or to reduce or to limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States, except pursuant to the treatymaking power of the President under the Constitution or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States.

This language was written into the original act by amendment of the entire House of Representatives. I am pleased that I had a part in helping to draft the amendment and in helping to secure its passage to the original bill. It is my conviction that the language be preserved in any new legislation, and it must be made crystal clear that it is the intention of the Congress that further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States is an absolute condition precedent to any attempt or action to disarm this Nation or to reduce or to limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States. I also approve of the wording in section 4, amending section 49 of the act, by adding a requirement that "none of the funds herein authorized to be appropriated shall be used to pay for the dissemination within the United States of propaganda in support of any pending legislation concerning the work of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency."

As the Committee on Foreign Affairs stated in its report on the bill now before us:

> The basic job of the Agency is to provide the backup support essential to the conduct of the highly complex and technical disarmament negotiations in which the United States has participated since the Agency opened its doors.

It is my considered opinion that the amount of funds recommended by the committee for fiscal years 1964 and 1965 is unjustifiably excessive and far beyond any needs for carrying out the primary purpose of the act in the first instance.

I must say to my colleagues that I cannot support an authorization of this magnitude. In my opinion these amounts would be much better spent for arms increases than for the purposes associated with the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Nothing has occurred to convince me that we are any closer today than we were 2 years ago to an agreement permitting any reduction in our Armed Forces. In the absence of any real easing of international tensions or lessening of the danger to our security, I can see no need to step up the pace of research into matters involving arms control. Perhaps someday the world will see the opportunity for real progress in the field of disarmament. That day is not now in sight. Until it is, it is my conviction that study and informational activities in the area of arms control and disarmament should be continued at no more than minimal level—and every effort must be made to maintain the United States as the best defended, best armed nation in the world.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I was opposed to the bill which created this Agency in September 1961, and I am even more opposed to it today. The people who man this Agency cannot be trusted in their judgment. They have an unreal outlook on world communism and are deluding our people. It is elementary to say that the only way one can make peace and disarmament look plausible is to paint an untrue and unreal picture of our enemies, the Soviet Union and the Communist tyrants. This is exactly what this Agency is doing.

The Washington Evening Star, of June 12, 1963, gives a good indication of this approach. William C. Foster, director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, talking about the test ban, was quoted as follows:

> Mr. Foster believes the Russians sincerely want to end nuclear testing.
>
> "They are logical people," he said. "They know the risks of continued testing. They know testing is expensive."

Mr. Foster has further said that he believes the Communists will keep their word on the test ban. A man with judgment such as this should not be allowed to remain in office let alone get more money and authority to promote these ideas.

In their annual report, the Disarmament Agency included several studies which it would like to pass off as not containing their real views. I disagree. I feel that the reports well present the obvious views of this Agency and they should be studied carefully. Note this quote from the appendix of the report:

> Whether we admit it to ourselves or not, we benefit enormously from the capability of the Soviet police system to keep law and order over the 200 million odd Russians and the many additional millions in the satellite states. The breakup of the Russian Communist empire today would doubtless be conducive to freedom, but would be a good deal more catastrophic for world order than was the breakup of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in 1918.

Note further this statement from the study "Controlling the Police in a Disarmed World," which was also included in the report this Agency submitted in April of this year:

> In addition, to avoid making martyrs of the individuals controlled and thus prevent a surge of national anger against the international police force, the force would be wise to avoid the use of violence against persons wherever possible and to restrict its acts against property to the minimum necessary. Thus weapons that temporarily disorient or incapacitate the victim without killing (like tear gas or vomiting gas, or perhaps newer substances like tranquilizers, hallucinogens, etc.) would be preferable at the first response level of enforcement. Thus also, arrest and imprisonment of violators might be avoided as long as it was possible to end the violation without removing or punishing the violator. And where possible, the destruction or removal of machinery crucial to continuation of the violation (such as critical missile components, rifle bolts, the electric powerlines to a tank factory, etc.) would be preferable to deliberately harming the violating persons.

This type of fuzzy thinking abounds along the New Frontier. The American people cannot trust their basic sovereignty to this Agency nor can it be secure in having men like Walt Whitman Rostow planning our destiny. Mr. Rostow's own words indicate his disposition on our American sovereignty. Writing in his book, "The United States in the World Arena," Rostow put it this way:

> The nature of modern weapons in a context other than American monopoly is a danger to the national interest sufficiently grave to justify acceptance of important constraints on the Nation's sovereignty. Put another way, it is a legitimate American national objective to see removed from all nations—including the United States—the right to use substantial military force to pursue their own interests. Since this residual right is the root of national sovereignty and the basis for the existence of an international arena of power, it is, therefore, an American interest to see an end to nationhood as it has been historically defined.

When I addressed this body on September 19, 1961, warning of the dangers in setting up this Agency I pointed out the direction in which we were heading. Two years later, sad to admit, these plans are fully operative. Recall these words with which I warned this body:

> Another leading member of the Kennedy team recently stated that a U.S. plan for disarmament should contain the following elements:
>
> 1. Complete disarmament of all nations rather than reduction or limitation of armaments.
>
> 2. Permanent world police force under international authority to forestall or suppress any breach of disarmament or other violation of world law.
>
> 3. As a part of the disarmament treaty, a world law, in constitutional and statutory form applicable not only to nations but also to individuals whose activities endanger international peace.
>
> 4. World judicial tribunals to interpret and apply this world law.
>
> 5. Extensive revision of the United Nations Charter which would include—
>
> (a) Universal membership in the world organization.
>
> (b) Revision of voting procedures to assure larger and more powerful nations having equitable voice and vote in one General Assembly with no veto.
>
> (c) One development authority to administer economic and social council among underdeveloped nations of the world.
>
> (d) Executives elected to this Assembly holding much the same relationship to the Assembly as the British Cabinet does to the House of Commons.
>
> (e) Its own revenue system for the world organization to provide operating budgets to sustain the world police force, for the annual cost of operating the limited world organization outlined above, and for proposed development authority.

Now, just how stupid can we get? The first premise is fallacious—that we can get all nations to disarm. Russia does not have any intention to disarm and we should not

> believe this traitor nation if the Reds would say they were willing. Their plan has not changed from communism's inception—eventual subjugation of the world and the establishment of their brand of freedom and workers' paradise. In the first place, they will not disarm because it does not suit their objectives—objectives which those who are supporting this bill either fail to see or do not want to see. Secondly, how can you consider their disarmament while the uneasy tyrant over 800 million oppressed, captured people? The entire record of the Communists is one of lies, deceit, murder, and treachery which makes this gesture verge on the ridiculous. The real danger comes from the strong likelihood that we are foolish enough to proceed with a plan of the type described without Russian participation or based on their fraudulent promises.

I repeat the last sentence:

> The real danger comes from the strong likelihood that we are foolish enough to proceed with a plan of the type described without Russian participation or based on their fraudulent promises.

I was wrong on one score—we are doing both. The evidence presented here today fully justifies this charge and gives great cause for alarm. We are witnessing the unilateral disarmament of this country at the same time we are signing treaties based on the assumption that their word, bloodstained and tarnished as it has been, for some reason is now good and dependable.

I believe that we should not only defeat this bill but, for the good of this Nation and the whole world, scuttle this unfortunate Agency which, operating under the aura of State Department policy, is placing our American interest last and jeopardizing our security in today's troubled world.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, as to the merit of this program I have been greatly disappointed that more study has not been given to the economic impact of reducing military expenditures. Frankly, for years I have urged establishment of a program looking toward private industry meeting the economic impact of disarmament. My idea is to prevent Federal controls in such an emergency by having defense contracts prepared in advance to adjust to a cut in military spending.

As I am informed, three studies of the domestic impact of changes in defense spending are contemplated with fiscal year 1964 funds.

According to information given me these three studies will cost not to exceed $475,000.

Under leave to include extraneous matter following my remarks I include a description of these three studies together with other details of the Agency's projected research programs:

> 1. A joint research effort with DOD to develop the means of measuring and defining the effects of defense expenditures on the economy and the impact of changes resulting from revised military programing, whether or not attributable to arms control and disarmament. After consultation between DOD and ACDA it was decided to pool resources and effort in three related studies through the Bureau of the Census, the Institute for Defense Analysis, and Research Analysis Corporation.
>
> 2. A study of studies for the purpose of developing approaches to the more acute problems of regional economic adjustment to declines in local receipts from defense spending. The project will analyze the short-run and long-run income and employment problems which a community, metropolitan area, State or region significantly dependent on defense expenditures would face in the event of a decline either in the total national level of defense expenditures or in defense expenditures in the applicable area(s) under examination.
>
> 3. A study of the problems and opportunities of the electronics industry under conditions of reduced allocations of national resources to military needs. The study will examine the extent and nature of the dependence of the electronics industry upon demand arising from national defense requirements. It will attempt to identify the industry's output for major types of market (military, industrial, consumer space) and the employment generated by such output.
>
> There has also been planned for fiscal year 1964 a study of the economic impact of specific arms control and disarmament measures in the U.S.S.R., with the purpose of evaluating the significance for the Soviet economy of the release of specific resources through disarmament measures. It is designed to give the United States valuable information for negotiation of these measures consistent with the dictates of our national security.
>
> It may be, that instead of this study, increased emphasis will be placed in the current year on a study of the structure of Soviet industry with reference to the production of specified weapons. This latter study will be designed to provide both specific information useful in the design of an inspection system and an overall summary of resource use by which the economic impact of production controls can be judged. No meaningful estimate of cost is at present possible but it would bring the total cost of fiscal year 1964 economic impact studies to over half a million dollars.
>
> ACDA has also been working with the Department of Defense in order to obtain an amendment of the armed services procurement regulations which would make conversion planning costs allowable as indirect costs under defense contracts with commercial organizations. This procedure should provide an inducement to industry to undertake conversion planning.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the recommendations made by the Foreign Affairs Committee.

That committee reviewed the Arms Control Agency's activities and research program in detail. It heard witnesses not only from the Arms Control Agency but also from the Department of Defense, the CIA, the AEC, NASA, and the public. The committee concluded that the Agency needed $30 million for 2 years or an average of $15 million per year. It has done a thorough and careful job. I think we should accept its recommendations.

Two years ago I urged that creation of this Agency because I felt a central agency was needed to assure that our negotiators at Geneva were thoroughly prepared.

Even arms control agreements such as the limited test ban can have a significant impact on the military balance of power, particularly if other countries cheat on the agreement. In the past, our Government and our negotiators have not always had adequate knowledge of the impact of their proposals and of the techniques for detecting cheating. It is this Agency's job to do just that.

Our Government cannot effectively participate in these discussions unless it is well prepared to answer Soviet arguments and to judge those proposals which could weaken our security and those which would strengthen it. A vast fund of technical information must be available to our negotiators if we are to participate intelligently at the conference table. The Arms Control Agency was created to consolidate and coordinate our research in this field so that this important objective could be realized.

As chairman and vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I have watched the Arms Control Agency at work over the past 2 years. I have had no occasion to doubt the wisdom of my support for the Agency 2 years ago. I do not think it has yet fulfilled all the hopes we had for it, but it could not do that in 2 years. It needs to grow and to gain knowledge and experience.

That is why we are here today—to give it the wherewithal to grow and gain knowledge and experience. Let us not be penny wise and pound foolish. The national security stakes are too high.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the Chair, Mr. THOMPSON of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 777) to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees, pursuant to House Resolution 558, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will read the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Gross moves to recommit the bill, S. 777, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 251, nays 134, answered "present" 1, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 209]

YEAS—251

Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Baldwin
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Bates
Beckworth
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Brademas
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burkhalter
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clark
Cleveland
Cohelan
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Curtin
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Donohue
Downing
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Ford
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Hardy
Harris
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Ichord
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Keogh
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Lankford
Leggett
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Long, Md.
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
Macdonald
MacGregor
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pike
Pirnie
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Secrest
Sheppard
Shipley
Sibal
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Taylor
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Tupper
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Wallhauser
Whalley
White
Wickersham
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Wydler
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—134

Abernethy
Alger
Anderson
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Avery
Baker
Baring
Battin
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Bow
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Bruce
Burleson
Burton
Cederberg
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Collier
Colmer
Cramer
Curtis
Derounian
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Dulski
Findley
Fisher
Flynt
Foreman
Fuqua
Gathings
Goodling
Grant
Gross
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Harrison
Harvey, Mich.
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Horan
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Jarman
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
Kyl
Landrum
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
McClory
McLoskey
McMillan
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Minshall
Natcher
Passman
Pillion
Poff
Pool
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Tex.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scott
Selden
Short
Shriver
Sikes
Siler
Skubitz
Snyder
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Tuck
Tuten
Utt
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Watson
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wyman

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

O'Konski

NOT VOTING—47

Abbitt
Abele
Auchincloss
Bonner
Brotzman
Broyhill, Va.
Buckley
Casey
Celler
Cunningham
Dague
Derwinski
Dingell
Duncan
Forrester
Harding
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Henderson
Jennings
Kee
Kelly
Knox
Lloyd
Long, La.
Madden
Mailliard
Meader
Milliken
Moss
Multer
O'Brien, Ill.
Philbin
Pilcher
Poage
Rains
Randall
Roberts, Ala.
Rooney, N.Y.
St. Onge
Senner
Shelley
Smith, Calif.
Teague, Calif.
Trimble
Westland
Younger

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Casey against.

Mr. Derwinski for, with Mr. Smith of California against.

Mr. Teague of California for, with Mr. Auchincloss against.

Mr. Younger for, with Mr. O'Konski against.

Mr. Rooney for, with Mr. Cunningham against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Multer with Mr. Harsha.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Knox.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Brotzman.
Mr. Trimble with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Jennings with Mr. Lloyd.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Dague.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Harding with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Pilcher.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Henderson.
Mr. Rains with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Shelley.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Forrester.
Mr. Duncan with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Randall.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from California [Mr. Younger]. If he were present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATION TO PROTECT HOME BUYERS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to authorize the payment of certain claims for structural or other major defects in homes covered by Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages.

During the recent hearings by Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Small Business Committee on dual distribution, it has repeatedly come to the attention of the subcommittee that all too frequently the home buyer is confronted with defective equipment and other problems in his new home. Often because of divided responsibility, the home buyer is unable to obtain correction of these conditions.

There can be little question that FHA has been one of the most successful programs in the history of the Federal Government. It has enabled millions of Americans to obtain adequate housing on terms and conditions that were within their means.

However, it is equally clear that many home buyers purchasing under the terms of an FHA-insured mortgage believe that they are receiving protection which is, in truth, nonexistent. The term "FHA insured" unfortunately extends only to the mortgage itself, not to the premises covered by the mortgage. A family which purchases a home is usually making the largest single purchase of a lifetime. Many years of savings are included in the downpayment. This is, of course, followed by 20 to 30 years of monthly payments of principal and interest. These people are entitled to more protection than they are currently receiving in terms of correction of structural or other defects.

"FHA insured" is popularly understood and believed to mean that, since the home has been built to conform to FHA minimum standards and specifications, there is a guarantee that it will be properly and soundly constructed and that the equipment, wiring, and plumbing contained in it will function properly.

In a sense, to give the public less than this places the Federal Government in a situation of engaging in a practice which comes, to my mind, perilously close to what the Federal Trade Commission might well denominate a "deceptive practice," if it were carried on by a firm in the private sector of the economy.

I am proud to join with my able colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rosenthal], and the 11 Members of the Senate who have joined with the Honorable Ernest Gruening, the distinguished Senator from the State of Alaska, in introducing this proposal. Additionally, my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Alabama, Albert Rains, has introduced a similar bill, H.R. 8956. There are certain slight technical differences between these two bills, and the exact consequences of these differences upon the ultimate goals and objectives of the legislation are extremely difficult to determine. However, I have every confidence that they will be resolved to the ultimate good of the consuming public by the very capable members of the Banking and Currency Committee, which has jurisdiction over these bills.

One of the most significant innovations of this administration has been the emphasis which it has placed on informing and protecting the consumer. This proposal carries out the spirit of that portion of the President's consumer message in which he cited the right of the consumer to be informed concerning the goods which he purchases. This proposal, if adopted, would give validity for the home buyers of our Nation to the long-used and misunderstood phrase, "FHA insured."

PROVIDE FOR CIVIL PROCEEDINGS FOR VIOLATIONS OF SECTION 3 OF ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill designed to make section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act a part of the Clayton Act for the purpose of allowing private litigants to avail themselves of this provision of the law as a basis for treble damage actions.

During the 7 months of hearings which my Small Business Subcommittee has held on dual distribution, there have come before the subcommittee many instances where small businessmen have been seriously injured by the practices prohibited by section 3.

The provisions found in section 3 of the present act do to a degree act as a deterrent against sales at unreasonably low prices. However, allowing private litigants to file treble damage actions for such violations would make relief available to individuals injured much more promptly than is the case at the present time. Furthermore, it would enable smaller firms which have suffered economic distress as a result of illegal acts on the part of their suppliers to recover their losses.

The Congress should act to restore to the small businessmen of this Nation that protection which has been removed by judicial interpretation. There is neither logic nor justification for the present situation in which a law violator is or is not subject to liability for treble damages depending upon which section of the act he violates. Passage of this bill will be a step toward making the structure of our antitrust laws more adequate for its vital role in preserving competition within our economy.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am recorded as not voting on rollcalls Nos. 202, 203, and 205. I was unavoidably absent. If present, I would have voted "yes" on all three questions.

MOHOLE PROJECT

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as a result of last week's further investigation by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee on Oceanography into the administration of the Mohole project, the multimillion-dollar program of drilling a hole into the core of the earth, I requested the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman Alton Lennon, of our Subcommittee on Oceanography, to have the staff and counsel check into this matter further to determine the possibility of a conflict of interest involving the former AMSOC technical staff.

Chairman Lennon has informed me that he thought this matter should be looked into further, and that he has requested committee counsel and the committee's technical consultant to review the record and conduct further investigation into the background and surrounding facts and circumstances bearing on the Mohole project, and related matters.

I feel the Mohole project and the clouds of doubt surrounding its administration should be cleared up now, and if there has been any impropriety, then it should be brought to the attention of Congress and dealt with accordingly. The cost of government is high enough when its programs are properly administered, and to allow a possibly mismanaged project to continue at added cost to our Government would be a gross injustice.

SPEED VERSUS JUDGMENT

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include an editorial from the Wall Street Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the legislative process of this and recent Congresses has been dissected and put back together countless times by both the experienced and the casual observer. Constructive criticism is never out of place, but when the volume reaches such a level that inaccuracy and distortion become part and parcel with fact, those who would make a fair judgment are left with little or no perspective. As a contribution to the restoration of that perspective, may I recommend the editorial comment of the Wall Street Journal of November 18 titled, "Speed Versus Judgment."

Speed Versus Judgment

Just the other day Senator Dodd made headlines with a blast at the Senate leadership for inaction on the long list of major legislation—civil rights, taxes, and foreign aid among others—still pending in Congress.

Though he apologized a few days later, his outburst reflected a widespread complaint against the congressional system. It's a complaint heard quite often from the executive branch; at his last press conference President Kennedy showed some disappointment that his legislative program is being held up in Congress. But it is also a complaint frequently made by others, including such critics within the Congress as Senator Clark, of Pennsylvania, who thinks that legislatures at all levels are presently the greatest menace to the successful operation of the democratic process.

The substance of all these criticisms, both old and new, is the charge that the congressional system is just too slow and cumbersome for the challenges of the supersonic age.

Well, we've little doubt that Congress, like every other political institution, can stand improvement. Perhaps, as some say, there is a better basis than seniority for selecting committee chairmen, although no one has really thought of one. And we'd certainly agree that there seem to be more committees in Congress than are absolutely necessary.

But what most of these critics have in mind are not just some changes in the way Congress does things. Their real complaint is that the deliberative process itself is too time consuming.

The first thing to be said about this, it seems to us, is that congressional slowness is vastly exaggerated. When time is of the essence—as, for example, in a foreign crisis—Congress has proved again and again that it can act with dispatch. When it acts slowly it often does so by intent.

To be specific, in the present session Congress has been slow in acting upon such measures as the tax bill and civil rights legislation. Doubtless laws covering both matters would already be on the books if they could be put through a rubberstamp parliament.

But the tax bill, despite the extravagant claims being made for it, has raised much doubt in the minds of Congressmen already concerned about the deficit principle involved. In the case of the civil rights bill, the proposal is a radical change in our methods of dealing with social problems, involving not only philosophical but also grave constitutional questions.

But in no such instance is the delay—if that is the word—the fault of congressional procedures. Nor is it caused just by the obstinacy of Congressmen. The people of the country, too, are divided on each of these questions, and the deliberative process in Congress simply reflects the deliberative debate going on within the country itself.

Moreover, in none of these instances will prolonged deliberation, though it seems excessive to the impatient, endanger the Republic. On the contrary, if we are to have such controversial legislation as the tax or civil rights bills, it is far better that they be exposed to extensive public debate.

For one reason, only in this way can what is finally decided represent a true consensus of the Nation's feelings. For another, only in the sifting process of debate, where both the virtues and defects of a proposal are examined, can the Nation be confident that what it does is wisely done. Though Senator CLARK and those who share his views would bypass all this deliberation in the name of speed, the verdict of history is that nations are not better governed by the wisdom of any one man, whoever he be.

Maybe Congress is sometimes slower than the critics like in approving some of their fancier legislation. But there are worse things than being slow. Like being in a hurry without really knowing enough about the road you're traveling.

BLANKET CENSURE OF CONGRESS FROM MANY QUARTERS

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, in the 10 months I have served here, Congress has come under heavy censure from many quarters. News stories continually raise questions of unethical conduct, conflicts of interest, and abuse of privileges. Cartoonists display the 88th Congress as slothful and totally heedless of national needs. Commentators point accusatory fingers, and psychologists speculate over our syndromes. And, most important of all, my constituents in Georgia ask me, "What's going on up there?"

As a first-term Congressman, it might be considered intemperate for me to speak about this condition. Yet the people are paying me the same salary as the senior Member of this House, and I take my responsibilities as seriously as any other Member.

Mr. Speaker, I am tired of blanket indictments of Members of the Congress. I am weary of the all-inclusive accusation and the general condemnation.

Unfortunately, abuses by a very few Members reflect adversely upon each of us. Many careers of selfless dedication are buried in the welter of comment over a single act of impropriety.

I do not presume to speak for anyone other than myself. Yet, in my view, the duties of the office are too demanding to be evaded by junkets and personal pursuits. The opportunity, in the words of Webster, "to perform something worthy to be remembered" is too challenging to be squandered on ventures of personal gain.

There is much talk of late concerning the proposal that Members disclose their personal interests. I would be reluctant to require that other Members make public their incomes and holdings. However, there is no hesitance in making that disclosure for myself. There is not much to disclose. What small holdings my wife and I have are listed below:

Equity in my home in Atlanta, Ga	$5,000
Equity in my residence in Bethesda, Md	5,000
Patent	300
Savings accounts	505
Checking accounts	560
Cash value of life insurance	3,000
Two automobiles	1,500
Stocks, bonds, mortgages, notes, etc	------

Unfortunately, there are also some liabilities, including a small remainder on my 1962 campaign debt.

Income in 1963, other than my congressional salary and rental from my home in Atlanta, is as follows:

Royalties from my book, "Process and Service"	$132
Legal fee for drawing a will in 1962	50

Mr. Speaker, I consider my duties in Congress to be exclusive of and inconsistent with personal advantage or financial gain. I asked the people of my district to send me to Washington to work for them. I intend to do just that.

YEAR FOR A SHEVCHENKO FREEDOM STAMP—1964

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the ground-breaking ceremonies held in the city of Washington, D.C., on September 21, 1963, for the erection of a statue in honor of Taras Shevchenko have led to widespread interest in the works and significance of this East European freedom fighter. Needless to say, this is all to the good, particularly as it concerns Shevchenko's universal stature as a poet of freedom and the powerful force of nationalism among the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.

THE PRESIDENT AND SHEVCHENKO

The year 1964 will mark the 150th anniversary of the birth of Taras Shevchenko. To prevent the Soviet Russian totalitarians and their puppets from stealing and exploiting Shevchenko to satisfy their own ends, the 86th Congress wisely authorized in 1960 the erection of a statue in honor of this poet of world freedom. On May 30, 1964, his statue will be unveiled in the Capital of both our Nation and the free world.

In addition to the Congress, President Kennedy praised the universal role of Shevchenko and the perpetuating scholarly works of the Shevchenko Scientific Society. On March 25, 1961, the President declared:

> I am pleased to add my voice to those honoring the great Ukrainian poet Taras Shevchenko. We honor him for his rich contribution to the culture not only of Ukraine, which he loved so well and described so eloquently, but of the world. His work is a noble part of our historical heritage.

Only this past March the President had this to say about the world-renowned society that bears Shevchenko's name:

> My congratulations on the 90th anniversary of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, and on your sustained program for support for distinguished scholarship. Among your members have been some of the great names in learning to whom the world owes an incalculable debt. As you move into the decade which will culminate in your centennial, you have our best wishes and felicitations. May you continue to extend the frontiers of human knowledge in the years ahead.

A POET OF MANKIND

Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks one of this city's newspapers has shown a complete lack of knowledge in its editorial comments on Shevchenko. If the editor of an opinion-forming organ is so ill informed, then we can well wonder about some others in our intellectual area. But this is all to the good because it indicates the work that still must be done to disseminate the truths about Shevchenko, Ukraine, the captive nations of Europe, and our allies behind the Iron Curtain in the cause of freedom. This evidence shows how important a Shevchenko stamp is to direct attention to these truths; such evidence in itself justifies a section designated as the Shevchenko Freedom Library in our Library of Congress.

At this point I wish to include the address of the Honorable THOMAS J. DODD which was delivered at the Taras Shevchenko Memorial ground-breaking ceremonies on September 21:

REMARKS OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD

I am honored by your invitation to participate in this ceremony at which the ground is being broken for the erection of a memorial to Taras Shevchenko.

Taras Shevchenko belongs in the first instance to the Ukrainian people. But in a larger sense, he belongs to all mankind. And this I think is the special meaning that succeeding generations will read into the existence of this monument to a Ukrainian poet in the heart of Washington, the acknowledged capital of the free world.

We honor Shevchenko as one of the great poets of all time, as a man who has justly been described as "the last bard and the first great poet of a great new Slavonic literature."

We honor him as a fighter for freedom and as a champion of all the persecuted and oppressed.

We honor him as a universal hero and as one of the towering moral personalities of all time.

The monument for which we are breaking ground today was authorized by a joint resolution of Congress passed on December 13, 1960. While I was only one of a very numerous majority in the Senate who voted for the measure, I am proud of the small contribution I was able to make toward its enactment.

Let me read to you the opening words of this resolution so that you may have a clearer understanding of the motivations which inspired Congress to grant permission for the erection of the Shevchenko memorial:

"Whereas throughout Eastern Europe, in the last century and this, the name and works of Taras Shevchenko brilliantly reflected the aspirations of man for personal liberty and national independence; and

"Whereas Shevchenko, the poet laureate of Ukraine, was openly inspired by our great American tradition to fight against the imperialist and colonial occupation of his native land; and

"Whereas in many parts of the free world observances of the Shevchenko centennial will be held during 1961 in honor of this immortal champion of liberty; and

"Whereas in our moral capacity as free men in an independent nation it behooves us to symbolize tangibly the inseparable spiritual ties found in the writings of Shevchenko between our country and the 40 million Ukrainian nation: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That any association or committee organized for such purpose within 2 years from the date of the enactment of this joint resolution is hereby authorized to place on land owned by the United States in the District of Columbia a statue of the Ukrainian poet and national leader, Taras Shevchenko."

Shevchenko's life was in a way symbolic of the tragedy of the Ukrainian people. He died at the young age of 47; and of those 47 years, he was a serf for the first 24, a conscript in the Russian Army for the next 10 years, and under police supervision for the ensuing 3½ years. All told, therefore, he knew only 9 years of personal freedom.

Although the son of a serf, with little opportunity for formal education, his genius, his soaring spirit, and his unshatterable faith enabled him to take the Ukrainian language, rough-hewn as it was at that time, and convert it into a literary instrument as sensitive and as expressive as any of the great world languages.

Shevchenko had an ardent democratic and revolutionary faith. He called for an end to the degrading institution of serfdom. On the one hand, he appealed to the Ukrainian nobles to renounce their privileges and liberate their serfs; on the other hand he appealed to the peasants to renounce hatred and vengeance. His appeal was for a world of equality and brotherhood, and in his poem, "Epistle to My Country, Living, Dead, and Unborn," he voiced his appeal in these words:

"Brothers, embrace the feeblest among you,
That the mother may smile through her tears."

Shevchenko poured out his greatest passion, however, when he addressed himself to the theme of freedom and of his beloved Ukraine. Although the English translation loses much of the force and flavor of the original Ukrainian, I should like to quote to you a few lines from a song he wrote during his confinement in St. Petersburg:

"It makes no difference to me,
If I shall live or not in Ukraine—
No father will remind his son
Or say to him, Repeat one prayer,
One prayer for him; for our Ukraine
They tortured him in their foul lair.
It makes no difference to me,
If that son says a prayer or not.
It makes great difference to me
That evil folk and wicked men
Attack our Ukraine, once so free,
And rob and plunder it at will.
That makes great difference to me."

Shevchenko to his people was many things. He was a bard in the tradition of the Ukrainian kobzars, who chronicled the heroic deeds of the Ukrainian past. He was a national poet in the unique sense in which Robert Burns is regarded as the national poet of the Scottish people. And, as a freedom fighter and prophet of liberty, Shevchenko was also regarded by his people with something of the special reverence that we in America reserve for Thomas Jefferson and George Washington.

Shevchenko was no narrow nationalist. He was concerned not only over the oppression of the Ukrainian people by Moscow but also over the oppression of the Poles, the Lithuanians, the Georgians, and the other ancient peoples who had been subjugated by an increasingly aggressive Russian imperialism.

He fought for the liberty of all men and the freedom of all nations.

In erecting a memorial to Taras Shevchenko we would be engaging in an action devoid of all meaning if we failed to speak about the plight of the Ukrainian people today and if we failed to honor his lifelong commitment to the freedom of his people by recommitting ourselves on this occasion to the goal for which Shevchenko sang and fought.

It is a great pity that there is no Taras Shevchenko today to write of the agony of his people in inspired verse, to appeal to the conscience of the world on their behalf, and to give once again to the cause of Ukrainian freedom the precious inspiration of the poet's song.

The history of the Ukrainian people has been one of brief but glorious periods of independence and of long centuries of struggle against the tyranny of Moscow, both under the czars and under the Soviets. The Ukrainian people through the centuries have had more than their share of suffering and tragedy. But the agony of the Ukrainian people under the rule of Soviet bolshevism in recent decades surpasses by far the agony they have known under previous despots and conquerors.

I propose to relate this story briefly, knowing that my prose is inadequate to a theme which would have challenged Shevchenko himself.

The chaos and disintegration that reigned in Russia during the latter part of World War I made possible the rebirth of an independent Ukraine, which called itself the Ukrainian National Republic. Because they sought their support, the Bolsheviki promised the right of self-determination to the subject nationalities of the old Russian empire. On December 17, 1917, almost immediately after they seized power, Lenin officially recognized the Ukraine as a sovereign and independent state. Let me quote the words of Lenin on this occasion because they constitute the first of a thousand major acts of perfidy the Soviets have perpetrated over the past four decades and a half.

"We, the Soviet of People's Commissars," said Lenin, "recognize the Ukrainian National Republic and its right to separate from Russia or to make an agreement with the Russian Republic for federative or other similar mutual relations between them. Everything that touches national rights and the national independence of the Ukrainian people, we, the Soviet of People's Commissars, accept clearly without limitations and unreservedly."

One year later, in December 1918, the Soviet presented the Ukrainian Government with an ultimatum; and when this ultimatum was rejected, the Red army swarmed across the boundaries of the Ukraine. The capital city of Kiev fell after a bloody struggle; and the Bolsheviki, when they entered the city, introduced a reign of indiscriminate terror, massacring thousands of innocent civilians on the street.

But this was only the beginning of the struggle. The battle between the people of the Ukraine and the Soviet military forces seesawed back and forth for almost 2 years before the Ukrainian National Republic succumbed to the repeated onslaughts of the far more powerful Red army.

At this point the Ukrainian people entered upon the darkest and most agonizing period in their long and tragic history. The Ukrainians were not only the largest and strongest of all the so-called national minorities in the Soviet slave empire, but they were also the most stubborn and the most militant. Though thousands were executed and scores of thousands were deported, the spirit of Ukrainian independence refused to die.

The agony of the Ukrainian people under Soviet rule reached its zenith during the period of Stalin's forced collectivization. When it became evident that the Ukrainian peasants could not be induced to abandon their farms and enter the collectives by means of persuasion, Stalin decided to resort to organized starvation. In 1932, the entire grain reserve of the Ukraine as well as all other crops that might support the population were removed from the country by Red army convoys. In the mass famine that resulted, it is estimated that 6 million Ukrainians, men, women, and children, lost their lives. In the political terror that accompanied the famine, 80 percent of all the Ukrainian intellectuals were liquidated by the Soviet terror apparatus.

The Ukraine became a desert and a place of pestilence. There were many places where the entire population perished, so that there was no one to bury the dead.

There are those who say that the Soviet regime today is somehow more moderate than the Soviet regime under Stalin. To those who harbor such illusions, I would point to the fact that the project manager in charge of the forced starvation of the Ukrainian people and of the liquidation of the Ukrainian intelligentsia, a man who will forever be identified by history as "the butcher of the Ukraine," was none other than Nikita Khrushchev, the present Prime Minister of the Soviet Union.

But despite starvation and terror, the Ukrainian people remained stubborn and unyielding in their resistance. One wave of terror succeeded another—but still the Ukrainians persisted. During World War II, a mighty Ukrainian insurgent army rose up out of the soil of their tortured land, fighting with incredible heroism against both the Nazis and the Bolsheviki. For years after the close of World War II, the Ukrainian guerrilla army continued to harass the Bolsheviki and even to engage them in fixed battles.

For the Ukrainian people, the life and death struggle with Soviet imperialism has never ceased. Even in exile, the Soviet terror apparatus has pursued the leaders of the Ukrainian resistance movement. Their hired assassins have in recent years murdered Lev Rebet and Stepan Bandera, as they murdered other Ukrainian leaders in exile after the close of World War I.

This is the story of the Ukrainian people's agony and of the unsurpassed heroism they have displayed in the fight for freedom. It is a story to inspire us all—and one which I am convinced will some day terminate in the rebirth of the Ukrainian nation in a world of free and independent nations.

It is a story particularly appropriate to tell at any ceremony commemorating the life and work of Taras Shevchenko.

Speaking at the funeral of Shevchenko in 1861, his contemporary, Kulish, ventured the prediction that "all that is really noble in the Ukraine will gather under the banner of Shevchenko." This prophecy has already been borne out. As they have gathered under the banner of Shevchenko in servitude and suffering, the Ukrainian people will, I am confident, still continue to gather under the banner unfurled for them by their immortal national poet when the light of freedom again shines upon them.

In again hailing the memory of Taras Shevchenko, I can think of no more fitting way of closing my remarks than by quoting a few lines from Shevchenko's prophetic verse.

"When will we receive our Washington,
With a new and righteous law?
And receive him we will some day!"

I look forward to joining you again when this memorial to Taras Shevchenko, poet laureate of the Ukraine and one of Europe's great freedom fighters, is unveiled.

The full import of Senator DODD's address is seen against a brief history of Ukraine. Such a background is provided by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, an outstanding national organization of over 2½ million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry. The Ukrainian Congress Committee is the parent organization of the Shevchenko Memorial Committee of America which was specifically established for the purpose of erecting the Shevchenko statue in Washington. A brief history of Ukraine follows:

BRIEF HISTORY OF UKRAINE

Area: 289,000 square miles (larger than Poland and Yugoslavia combined).

Population: 45 million.

Location: Southwestern part of the U.S.S.R., bounded on the west by Hungary, Rumania, and Poland, on the east by the Don region, on the south by the Black Sea, on the north by Byelorussia, and on northeast by Russia.

Ukraine has had three periods of independence:

1. From the 9th century when its history began under the name "Rus" until the 13th century when the country was plundered and occupied by the forces of Genghis Khan and his Mongol-Tatar successors.

2. During the 17th century when the Ukrainian people overthrew the Polish rulers who had gained control of the country after the Mongol-Tatars were defeated. This independence ended in 1654 when Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky made a treaty with Moscow, on condition that Moscow would guarantee the autocracy of Ukraine. Muscovite troops settled in Ukraine to protect Ukraine from the Poles but actually as occupation troops. During the occupation period the dream of an independent Ukraine was kept alive in literature. A leader in the revival of the spirit of Ukrainian national independence was Taras Shevchenko.

3. In March of 1917 the Ukrainians rose to freedom and established their own independent state by organizing the Ukrainian Central Rada, which became the nucleus of the Ukrainian sovereign state in modern times. On January 22, 1918, Ukraine declared its full independence and, as the Ukrainian National Republic, was recognized by a number of European states, including Soviet Russia. But immediately upon the recognition of Ukraine as an independent state of the Ukrainian people, the Soviet Government dispatched powerful armies against Ukraine, and after more than 3 years of valiant opposition of the Ukrainian nation, the Bolsheviks succeeded in destroying the Ukrainian National Government and its armies and imposing a puppet Communist regime upon the country. In 1923 Ukraine was made an unwilling member of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. But rule over foreign affairs and most domestic matters was taken over by the Soviet Government in Moscow, which was, in effect, the Government of Russia.

The original name of Ukraine was "Rus." The name of the lands ruled by Moscow had been known as the Grand Duchy of Moscow or Muscovy. Peter the Great, the Muscovite empire builder, took over the name "Rus" and called his domain Russia. Ukrainians adopted the name Ukraine, whose origin derives from the Ukrainian word "krai," or country. Since the end of the 17th century Ukraine has been divided between Poland and Russia and later between Russia and Austria until the outbreak of World War I and the establishment of the free and independent state of the Ukrainian people in 1917.

At present Ukraine is nominally an independent state, known as the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and one of the 16 constituent republics of the U.S.S.R., and a charter member of the United Nations. But in reality Ukraine is a colony of Communist Russia, with Ukrainians being the largest captive people behind the Iron Curtain in Europe.

UNITED STATES AND RECOGNITION OF UKRAINE

Mr. Speaker, the questions of "Why a stamp?" and "Why a Shevchenko Freedom Library?" receive further solid answers when one reads the theme developed by the Honorable Alvin M. Bentley at the recent Shevchenko groundbreaking ceremonies. To enlighten further some of our citizens, I submit Mr. Bentley's remarks on the "United States and Recognition of Ukraine," and also a brief biography of Taras Shevchenko, issued by the anti-Communist national American organization, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, and the Shevchenko Memorial Committee of America:

UNITED STATES AND RECOGNITION OF UKRAINE

(Remarks by Hon. Alvin M. Bentley at ground-breaking ceremonies, held on Saturday, September 21, 1963, at the Shevchenko Statue site in Washington, D.C.)

Many people believe that U.S. foreign policy is solely the province of the executive branch of our Government and that Congress confines itself to voting appropriations and ratifying treaties. This is usually the case, but not always. There are occasions when Congress actively asserts leadership in the creation of foreign policy and the passage of Public Law 86-749 was one of these.

In authorizing the erection of this memorial to Taras Shevchenko for which we break ground today, Congress was not only paying tribute which was both well deserved and long overdue to a recognized champion of human liberty and freedom. We are all familiar with the inspiration which Shevchenko, a contemporary of Abraham Lincoln and an admirer of George Washington, has given the people of his native Ukraine and freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

But far more important from your standpoint, Congress in 1960, by the passage of Public Law 86–749, took the initiative in one phase of foreign policy by recognizing the independent existence of Ukraine as a separate entity, a separate people, a separate state. Congress stated and President Eisenhower, by his approval, ratified the recognition of Ukraine and its people as a separate, distinct being and demolished any confusion about Ukraine being a part of Russia except insofar as bondage has created a relationship. Whether the State Department cares to admit it or not, it is now a historic fact that in 1960 the U.S. Government officially recognized the existence of a Ukrainian nation by approving this tribute to the greatest of Ukrainian heroes.

Although many may not have recognized this fact, I did; and that is why I worked so hard for the passage of the bill. The Russians recognized it too, which explains the propaganda attacks on us for having passed this legislation. And I am certain that the people of Ukraine also recognize it and that it will cause the flame of liberty and the desire for self-determination and freedom to burn even brighter in their hearts.

Continued acts of recognition by our Government will help to strengthen this desire for freedom. This is why the passage of House Joint Resolution 174, sponsored by Congressman DULSKI and providing for the issuance in 1964 of a Shevchenko champion of liberty commemorative stamp would be a further recognition of the independent status of Ukraine by the American Government and the American people.

BRIEF BIOGRAPHY OF TARAS SHEVCHENKO

Taras Shevchenko (1814–61) was the greatest of Ukrainian poets.

Of his 47 years, he lived 24 in serfdom, 10 in exile 3½ under Russian police supervision, and only 9 as a man free to come and go as he wished.

From 1840 on, his voice was raised in poetry for human liberty and against serfdom, for national independence of Ukraine and against czarist Russian imperialistic rule, for individualism and against tyranny. He loved his native Ukraine and regarded Russia as a foreign country and a rapacious empire.

During his free years Shevchenko fought for the rights of freedom for all mankind. He met and became friends with Ira Aldridge, a noted U.S. Negro actor who performed in Europe and in czarist Russia. Shevchenko's works have been translated into more than 40 languages.

CHRONOLOGY

In 1814: Born in Ukraine in serfdom (March 10).

In 1838: Freedom from serfdom bought for 2,500 rubles with the help of the painter Karl Bryulov. Shevchenko entered the Academy of Art in St. Petersburg.

In 1840: Published a volume of poems called "Kobzar." Kobzars are folk bards who keep alive the memory of heroic deeds of the Ukrainian past. This book immediately made him the first poet of Ukraine.

In 1841: Published "Haydamaky," his longest and greatest poem.

In 1845: Graduated from the Academy of Art as a free artist. Found a position in the Archeological Commission and settled in Kiev, Ukraine.

In 1846: Took part in the Society of Sts. Cyril and Methodius, organized to propagandize against serfdom and to create a free union of all Slavic peoples under a republican form of government.

In 1847: Arrested by the czar's police and sentenced to serve in penal exile in the czarist imperial army "under the strictest supervision with the prohibition of writing and drawing."

In 1857: Pardoned by Czar Alexander II, but remained under police supervision to the end of his life.

In 1859: Visited Ukraine and freed his family from serfdom.

In 1861: March 9, died in St. Petersburg.

(More details; see "Europe's Freedom Fighter, Taras Shevchenko," a documentary biography of Ukraine's poet laureate and national hero, H. Doc. 445, 86th Cong., 2d sess.)

SHEVCHENKO'S UKRAINE AND GEORGE WASHINGTON

The statue of Shevchenko to be erected in Washington will symbolize an issue far greater than just a statue honoring an immortal figure. Our American tradition clearly rubbed off on Shevchenko and the Ukrainian nation, and it was a most unique historical phenomenon for Shevchenko to lean on our own George Washington. This vitally important aspect was vividly portrayed at the groundbreaking ceremonies by Dr. Roman Smal-Stocki of Marquette University. At this point I wish to include his short address

on "Shevchenko's Ukraine and George Washington," and also a release by the two sponsoring organizations of the statue on the "Significance of the Memorial Statue to Taras Shevchenko, Ukrainian Poet and National Hero":

SHEVCHENKO'S UKRAINE AND GEORGE WASHINGTON

(Opening remarks by Prof. Roman Smal-Stocki, at the ground-breaking ceremony, held on Saturday, September 21, 1963, at the Shevchenko site, Washington, D.C.)

Your Excellency, Most Reverend Archbishop Mstyslav, honorable Senators and Congressmen, Reverend Fathers, fellow Americans of Ukrainian descent, Ukrainian exiles, and distinguished guests:

We have gathered today, from near and far, in the Capital of the United States to break the ground for the monument of the Bard of Ukraine, Taras Shevchenko.

In the dark ages of the Russian czars, in the year 1848, the famous Russian poet, Tyuchev, demanded as natural boundaries of the Russian empire the river and lands from the Nile to the Neva, from the Elbe to China, from the Volga to the Euphrates, from the Ganges to the Danube. He got an answer. Taras Shevchenko condemned Russian imperialism and proclaimed as an ideal for Ukraine, "the new and just law of George Washington."

Shevchenko believed in the ideals of the American Declaration of Independence, the ideals of freedom, human dignity, inalienable rights, and self-determination, not only for Ukraine but for the people of all Eastern Europe.

He fought and suffered for the freedom of all nations enslaved by Russian imperialism, from Finland to the Caucasus, from Poland to the Turkestan, including the oppressed Jews.

But all of us who came to honor Shevchenko cannot help but reflect on the present tyranny, as Shevchenko's American program for Eastern Europe still is not realized. Its final and complete realization is the only way to a true peace in the world.

We are deeply grateful to the American Nation and its Congress which unanimously passed the law calling for the erection of a monument to this fighter for Europe's freedom, in Washington, D.C., the Capital of the greatest democratic power in the world. We are equally grateful to the President of the United States of America and the U.S. Government for promptly endorsing the law.

We are grateful to all our distinguished guests and fellow Americans for coming today to witness the beginning of the construction of a permanent symbolic link of the city of George Washington with Shevchenko's Ukraine and the struggle for freedom of all captive nations, and I implore God Almighty to help us to realize it.

(In Ukrainian). Faithful to the Testamony of Shevchenko we gathered here today to start the construction of his monument—may the spirit of our Father bless our beginning. We remember and will never forget his call: "Fight and you will gain the victory, because you are backed by God, truth, glory and the holy liberty.' (Continuing in English.) Now it gives me great pleasure to introduce our master of ceremonies for this historic event. He is a former captain in the U.S. Army, the supreme president of the Ukrainian National Association, executive vice president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, and executive director, of the Shevchenko Memorial Committee of America: Mr. Joseph Lesawyer.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MEMORIAL STATUE TO TARAS SHEVCHENKO, UKRAINIAN POET AND NATIONAL HERO

The United States and Soviet Russia are waging a serious tug of war over the memory of a Ukrainian poet and national hero who died just over 100 years ago. He is Taras Shevchenko.

In Moscow and Kiev Communist propagandists have been working to prove to 45 million Ukrainians that Shevchenko, the Ukrainian poet-hero of the 19th century, having been a leader in the fight against serfdom, was, thus, a Bolshevik who died before his time.

In Washington, D.C., and elsewhere, those who oppose the Muscovite tyranny emphasize that Shevchenko was a leader in the struggle for human liberty against all forms of tyranny, and sought national Ukrainian independence from Russian rule.

Shevchenko expressed his yearning for Ukrainian independence and for the republican form of government of the United States, in these lines:

"Ah, you miserable
And cursed crew, when will you breathe your last?
When shall we get ourselves a Washington
To promulgate his new and righteous law?
But some day we shall surely find the man!"

Shevchenko's stirring poetry fought the Russian czars who had enslaved Ukraine. He was a true revolutionary for human liberty who, were he alive today, would fight against the totalitarianism and the tyranny of the commissars of the Soviet Union as some poets in the U.S.S.R. are now doing.

ACTION OF THE U.S. CONGRESS

In commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the death of Taras Shevchenko, the U.S. Congress held extensive hearings on Shevchenko's life and works. These concluded with the passage in 1960 of a bill authorizing the erection of a statue of the poet on public grounds in Washington, D.C., "without expense to the United States." President Dwight D. Eisenhower signed the bill into law. Americans of Ukrainian descent have raised over one-fourth of a million dollars to cover the cost of erecting the statue of Shevchenko.

The Russian Communists and their lackeys in Ukraine have launched a wave of bitter attack against the memorial statue to be unveiled at 22d and P Streets NW., Washington, D.C., in May 1964, on the basis that it promotes the independence of Ukraine from Russian overlordship.

In the views of Dr. Lev Dobriansky, president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Communists are fearful of the desire of many Ukrainians to gain independence from Moscow and dread the psychological and political impact of the publicity for Shevchenko arising from the groundbreaking and the unveiling of the memorial statue in the Capital of the United States.

In Dr. Dobriansky's words, "The Communists cannot afford freedom, or even strong publicity about freedom. We in America cannot afford to be without freedom."

The erection of the memorial statue to Taras Shevchenko, Ukrainian poet and national hero, is an expression of American devotion to human liberty and national independence everywhere in the world.

BEYOND PAROCHIALISM

In conclusion, one of the most solid results of this entire Shevchenko project will be the eventual conquest by some of our citizens of their lingering parochialism concerning world figures and world freedom. Such parochialism is inexcusable in these grave days of the cold war and our struggle against Soviet Russian imperialism and colonialism. In this regard I append to my remarks an unpublished letter to the Washington Post, written by a former naval intelligence officer and careful analyst of the Soviet Union, Mr. Donald L. Miller, the editor of Freedom's Facts, a publication of the All-American Conference To Combat Communism:

ALEXANDRIA, VA.,
November 12, 1963.

Mr. J. R. WIGGINS,
Editor, the Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WIGGINS: Your editorials on the Shevchenko memorial statue have raised an issue larger than any with which your editorials have dealt. What image of the United States do we wish to project to the world through the memorials we raise in our Nation's Capital?

Should it be an image of a provincial power with its eyes turned inward upon its own domestic affairs and its own heroes alone? Or, should it not be an image of world leadership ready and willing to support those of every nation who fight in a responsible way for human liberty and national independence?

Our fate is unavoidably intertwined with the fates of all other peoples. We can neither ignore the oppressions they suffer, nor their honest strivings for freedom and from tyranny.

It is in this context that the Shevchenko memorial will be raised on free soil in Washington, D.C., in May 1964. By honoring the ideals and goals of Shevchenko—who is well known to millions of peoples in Ukraine, East-Central Europe, Russia, and the United States—we tell the world that, as the foremost of the free nations, we are leaders in supporting and perpetuating the ideals of human liberty and national independence for all peoples everywhere. What more fitting expression could be found than a poet and artist who fought for freedom with implements of the mind and of the spirit rather than with the sword?

Is it this expression which you, an outstanding proponent of freedom for the press and editor of a major newspaper in a free nation, wish to silence with vague and unsupported charges? Rather, it would seem that someone on your staff has been misled into opposing what many peoples here and abroad clearly recognize as a dramatic expression of America's unshakeable support for human liberty and national independence for all peoples.

Sincerely,

D. L. MILLER.

THE STRANGE CASE OF PROFESSOR BARGHOORN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the strange case of Professor Barghoorn and his vague reports to the press concerning his recent detainment in Moscow have given rise to a great deal of speculation.

His first interview with the press, in New Haven, Conn., created the impression he was unwilling to criticize the Russians for his arrest and detention. This attitude of studied detachment from the real implications of his arrest and detention was accepted as the reaction of a scholar who was overly tired from his recent experiences.

But his State Department press conference in Washington yesterday, as reported by the press has increased the amount of speculation on this strange case. As a recognized leader of thought among the "Sovietologists" and "Kremlinologists," who exercise a heavy influence on our national policy toward the threat of imperial Russia, it was expected that his story would provide sharp and penetrating analysis of his arrest and detention. But the disappointment which followed was exceeded only by the high expectation that he would at least charge the Russians with behavior unbecoming a civilized government and confirm his experience as normal Russian behavior toward all outsiders.

After hedging his Washington press conference answers with such qualifiers as "so far as I recall" and "I am not completely sure" he proceeded to present reasons why the Russian Government should not be judged harshly in his case. He maintained he was treated quite well within the framework of the "Soviet system," that he was not "physically molested," that while he did not sign a confession he did sign a "protocol" of his interrogation by the Russians, that his case might not be typical and accordingly he refused to charge the Russians with a frameup, that no general conclusions should be drawn from his case, and above all, his experience should not be allowed to interfere with a continuation of the Soviet-United States cultural exchange programs. This is indeed strange behavior for a man whose case provided such a public uproar in the United States that President Kennedy suspended negotiations with the Russians on cultural exchange programs and demanded his release by the Russians.

While all discerning people will detect Professor Barghoorn's overboard effort to maintain the image of a detached if not absent-minded professor, the absurdity of his press conference performance calls for a few pointed questions.

Since it is clear beyond any doubt that Professor Barghoorn was not involved in any intelligence activities for the United States, these questions are pertinent and demand forthright answers from the professor before he is allowed to depart the public arena into which he projected himself.

First. Why this studied effort to please the Russians?

Second. Is there a possible connection between this entire episode and the professor's forthcoming book, which suggests it should be read with prudence and forethought to detect the interjection of more Russian whitewash into the academic streams of American life?

The Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality of the Committee on the Judiciary which has been inquiring into the cultural exchange program will request Professor Barghoorn to appear as a witness.

MORE MANAGED NEWS?

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the meanings we ascribe to words to some extent condition our views on important affairs of the day. The history of the cold war, for instance, is partly a history of a battle over the meaning of words.

George Orwell called attention to the importance of managing words in his memorable book, "1984."

The highest form of managed news is managing the meaning of words.

The Richmond News Leader of November 2, 1963, carried the following editorial, which I quote at this point:

LIBERTY, REVISED

> Two of the most interesting people in this Commonwealth, Capt. and Mrs. Robert W. Orrell, of Cardinal, publish an occasional bulletin known as Our Country. This is a literate, stoutly conservative bulletin, written and distributed as a labor of love and a work of patriotism.
>
> In their current issue, Mrs. Orrell writes of some of the strange revisions that have been made in Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. She recently abandoned her dog-eared Fifth Collegiate, dating from 1936 to 1941, in favor of the new Seventh Collegiate. Some old truths, she discovered, have now been rewritten.
>
> In the fifth edition (and in the Sixth Collegiate of 1949 also), liberty was defined in this fashion: "Individual liberty now generally involves freedom of the person in going and coming (personal liberty), equality before the courts, security of private property, freedom of opinion and its expression, and freedom of conscience." The new Seventh Collegiate defines liberty as "the power to do as one pleases * * * the positive enjoyment of various social, political, or economic rights and privileges."
>
> In the fifth edition (and also in the sixth), democracy was defined as a system of government in which the supreme power is "retained by the people." In the new seventh edition, the verb is subtly altered. Now democracy is a system of government in which the supreme power is vested in the people. There is an enormous difference—the difference between owning property by inheritance and merely renting property by lease. How many students, we wonder, ever will pause to puzzle this out? How many will check back to see that once upon a time, in specific and unequivocal terms, liberty embraced "security of private property"? Now liberty, by Webster's definition, involves no more than "various rights and privileges."
>
> In George Orwell's terrifying 1984, the masters of a totalitarian society see to it that all encyclopedias and reference works constantly are rewritten, so that every item inconsistent with the government's policy will be obliterated. The offending items then are dropped down the memory hole. There are times, when these little discoveries of changed definitions creep across the desk, that we suspect Mr. Orwell dated his society 20 years too far in the future.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing suggests that the weather vane of semantics points foul weather. Here we find a strong suggestion that future generations will be conditioned through the changing of important political definitions.

EXTENSION OF FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION LOANS INTO AGRICULTURAL AREAS SUFFERING FROM ECONOMIC DISASTERS

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced to the House of Representatives a bill that would extend Farmers Home Administration loans into agricultural areas suffering from economic disasters.

Presently Farmers Home Administration loans are only available to meet credit needs arising as the result of a natural disaster—emergency loans for economic disaster are not presently authorized.

My legislation would, Mr. Speaker, amend present law to allow the Secretary of Agriculture to make economic disaster loans to relieve severe production losses encountered in a limited area by producers of specified commodities and producers suffering from an economic emergency.

LEGISLATION'S BACKGROUND

Economic disaster loans by the Farmers Home Administration were first authorized by Public Law 81–38, but the areas eligible for such loans were limited to those so declared to be disaster areas by the President under title 42, United States Code, section 1855 and the following.

Public Law 83–727 liberalized this loan authority by allowing emergency loans for any agricultural purpose, a broad definition which included economic disaster. Public Law 83–727 was temporary legislation and was periodically extended up to the time of enactment of the consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961.

In 1959, the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman COOLEY, introduced H.R. 7628, which was known in the 86th Congress as the Allott-Cooley bill. Section 21(a) of that bill—as well as section 301(a) of H.R. 11761 of the clean bill which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] later introduced after the committee had considered H.R. 7628—contained permanent authority for economic disaster loans. H.R. 11761 was passed by the House of Representatives on June 2, 1960. The Senate, however, failed to act on the bill and it died in the 86th Congress.

The language of H.R. 7628 and the Allott-Cooley bill, H.R. 11761, provided as follows:

> (2) That the need for such credit in such area is the result of a natural disaster or severe production loss.

During the 87th Congress the Allott-Cooley bill was revised by the new administration and included as title III of the omnibus Agricultural Act of 1961.

The Kennedy administration bill proposed permanent economic disaster authority. Section 321 of H.R. 6400, by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] carried this language:

> (2) that the need for such credit in such area is the result of a natural disaster, severe production losses, or cultural economic conditions encountered in the area by the producers of specified agricultural commodities and products.

This language was included in the bill H.R. 8230, passed by the House of Representatives on July 27, 1961. The Senate version, S. 1643, carried only authority for natural disaster loans. For the conference the House receded to the Senate on this provision and section 321(a) of Public Law 87-128, which is the present law, limited these emergency loans to natural disasters only.

Section 321(a) of Public Law 87-128 provides as follows:

> (2) that the need for such credit in such area is the result of a natural disaster.

WHAT THIS DOES

The language of my bill is identical to that requested by the Kennedy administration in 1961. It is similar in purpose to that of legislation requested by the Eisenhower administration in 1959 and 1960.

The provision which is the heart of my bill has passed the House of Representatives on two previous occasions—the Allott-Cooley bill in 1960 and as a part of H.R. 8230 in 1961.

In each of the previous instances, the Senate has refused to accept the proposal of the House of Representatives, a version which would have permitted the Secretary of Agriculture to make FHA economic disaster loans.

DANGEROUS DELUSION ON NATO

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Secretary McNamara apparently is suffering under the dangerous delusion that the present NATO structure is strong and durable.

The fact is NATO is built on sand, and the sand shifts with each wind that blows. The free-world alliance is today weaker than at any time since World War II.

Mr. McNamara would be wise to concentrate on building solid unity in NATO, instead of emphasizing a detente with the Soviet Union.

I refer to Secretary McNamara's warning published today that the West should stop "deluding" itself with "obsolete images" that the United States has overwhelming nuclear power and Russia overwhelming armies.

Mr. McNamara's appraisal of the relative strength of NATO and Russia is grossly misleading. NATO today is a rapidly deteriorating paper alliance. Its military might is impressive only when the parts are added together, as they were by Mr. McNamara.

But the parts are not truly unified. They are united only on paper, and in a showdown each member of NATO—ourselves included—will follow the course of action which at the moment seems to be most expedient.

We cannot be certain, under the present NATO framework, that the 15 nations would act together if Khrushchev pushes the button. By contrast, Russian military forces are unified and disciplined under a single command which is not subject to veto or change at the local level.

In nuclear power, we cling to the ridiculous policy of secrecy in dealing with our NATO allies. We deny to the nations to whom we must look if a showdown comes the know-how and weapons which we know the enemy already possesses.

As a minimal first step toward strengthening NATO, we should abandon this obsolete policy and share weapons and know-how with our allies. Right this moment, without further delay, we should provide them with tactical nuclear weapons.

This action would give our allies assurance that at least some of our nuclear power would be at their command in case of trouble.

Under present circumstances, they may properly wonder if we actually would defend their cities with our nuclear power. After all, they can point with alarm and concern to our weak followthrough in Cuba and Berlin, our withdrawal of missiles from Italy and Turkey, and our avid promotion of a nuclear test ban agreement with Russia.

NATO nuclear power is actually U.S. nuclear power and our nonnuclear friends in NATO know it. The other 14 NATO nations have no way to commit or control any part of this nuclear power. We treat them as if they were irresponsible children.

They are at the mercy of our own uncertain national policy and to a lesser degree, we are at the mercy of theirs.

We should replace the shifting sand under NATO with a solid foundation that will stand the test of time.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BROMWELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, November 19, I was unavoidably absent from the House at the time of rollcall No. 207 which was on the public works appropriation. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

A BILL TO PROHIBIT THE IMPROPER USE OF CONGRESSIONAL STATIONERY

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill which would prohibit the improper use of congressional stationery. Recently there has been a great deal of discussion about so-called "conflict of interest" in regard to our public servants. However, there are instances when perhaps the service offered is not in the least improper, yet the means used, in the case of congressional stationery in particular, carries with it certain implication of influence which, in itself, can be improper.

It was recently brought to my attention that former Congressmen have sometimes offered their services to business firms in regard to their dealings with various Government departments and agencies and in doing so used their old official stationery which carries the letterhead of "Congress of the United States," "House of Representatives," or "Senate of the United States." It seems to me that this infers a possibility of influence which an ex-Congressman or Senator should not use.

Therefore, my bill prohibits the use of any envelope, letter paper, or other stationery printed with the name of the "Congress of the United States" or "Senate of the United States" in the solicitation of services for remuneration of any person in connection with any business with or claim against the Congress of the United States or any court, office, department, or agency of the United States. Violation of this would incur a fine of not more than $500, or imprisonment of not more than 6 months, or both.

This bill may only be a small step, but it could be an important one for we must all be concerned with keeping the dignity and integrity of the Congress of the United States at a high level.

While this bill which I am introducing today is not a conflict-of-interest bill as such, I feel strongly that the Congress should face up to its responsibilities in this field and enact some meaningful legislation.

Last August I introduced a bill, House Resolution 498, which would set up a Committee on Standards in the House of Representatives. This committee would receive in confidence complete financial statements from every Member of Congress. If the committee determined that there might be a conflict of interest between the Member's public duties and his private interests, he would be called before the committee to make an explanation. If the committee thereafter found that the conflict had not been explained or resolved, it would make a report to the House containing such financial information about the Member as the committee found results in the conflict of interest. The report might include other information filed with the committee concerning the Member as the committee determined to be in the public interest. This information could be considered by the House in determining the qualifications of the Member to be seated.

A committee along the lines I have proposed would be an effective safeguard against conflict-of-interest problems, but the possible pressures and demagogic temptations of general public disclosure would largely be avoided. The Congress should study, and then act affirmatively on this legislation.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 9140, 1964 PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the conservation and development of this Nation's natural resources is of the greatest importance to all citizens of the United States. I want to commend the members of the Committee on Appropriations and the Public Works Subcommittee on Appropriations for their diligence and laborious effort to bring H.R. 9140 up for our consideration in the House.

The Kansas programs which are included in this bill have evolved through a careful deliberative process starting at the local level, advancing to our Kansas State Water Resources Board, the Kansas Legislative Council, and the Governor, and finally into the legislative process here in Washington. In Kansas we have a deep interest, motivated by experience, to join hands with the Federal Government in the conservation and development of water resources and the planning of protection against disastrous floods.

The 1964 public works appropriations legislation includes $3.8 million for continued construction of the Cheney division, Wichita project, Kansas. This project is a joint development of the Bureau of Reclamation and the city of Wichita. The reservoir project, which is in my congressional district, was authorized by the 86th Congress and first construction funds were appropriated during the 87th Congress. Construction work is progressing and I have been pleased to learn that the costs are running somewhat less than first estimated.

The full realization of the Cheney division Wichita project is essential to the future economic development of the Wichita metropolitan area. It represents the key to the solution of a water shortage which extends over a decade.

This legislation also includes an appropriation of $1 million for initiation of construction of the Marion Dam and Reservoir on the Cottonwood River by the Corps of Engineers. This project was authorized for construction by the Flood Control Act approved May 17, 1950. Preconstruction planning for the Marion Reservoir was initiated in fiscal year 1960.

Orderly construction should continue on the Council Grove Reservoir and Dam with the appropriation of $1,800,000 in fiscal 1964. Construction is underway and completion is scheduled in 1965.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 9140 because it represents a necessary and important investment in the development and conservation of natural resources throughout the Nation.

TFX INVESTIGATION

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Investigations Committee has started public hearings into the Government policy decision to award a $6.5 billion TFX warplane contract to the General Dynamics Corp. when a competitor, Boeing Aircraft Co., placed a bid $415 million lower. Secretary of Navy Fred Korth has already resigned under charges of conflict of interest concerning questionable use of his position to further his banking interests.

Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric is testifying before the congressional investigations committee. He was a partner in a New York law firm, prior to his Defense appointment, which is reported to have received in excess of a quarter of a million dollars in legal fees from General Dynamics, and Mr. Gilpatric was, I understand, in charge of this particular account. A partner of the law firm has been made a member of General Dynamics' board of directors.

Whether Mr. Gilpatric was involved in a conflict of interest regarding the TFX contract may be determined by the special Senate probe. However, both Gilpatric and Korth actively participated in the Defense Department's overruling the unanimous decision of the top leaders of the uniformed services that on the merits the award should go to Boeing.

The public is entitled to know all the facts regarding these conflict of interest charges. Members of Congress should focus attention on the decisionmaking process, itself, to consider what future legislation may be needed to improve policymaking in the Federal Government. I commend the Senate for its attempt to provide the American people with sufficient information in regard to this case and hope all Members will give their full attention to these important hearings.

OCCASION OF THE 45TH ANNIVERSARY OF LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, November 18 marked the 45th aniversary of Latvian independence. It was on November 18, 1918, following the armistice of World War I, that the patriots of Latvia proclaimed their independence from Russia. For 22 years, Latvia flourished as a vigorous, independent nation, until it was once again overrun and suppressed by the Red army of the Soviet Union on June 17, 1940. Few people of the world experienced greater brutality and oppression than the Latvians during World War II.

Despite the horror of those years and the Soviet oppression since that time, the people of Latvia have maintained their desire and longing for freedom and independence. More than 100,000 Latvians left their homeland during World War II to escape to the West. In the two decades since then, Latvians in our country and other nations of the world have continued to celebrate their national holiday of independence even though their brothers at home are no longer free to do so. It was my privilege to participate in these observances this year here in Washington.

Our country has never recognized the Soviet Union's subjugation of Latvia and its sister Baltic republics. We continue to recognize, instead, representatives of the last free governments of these Baltic states, and our Nation is dedicated to a policy of free elections for the people of the Baltic states to determine their own form of government. So long as these and other captive nations are held by Communist Russia against the will of the people, it will be impossible to achieve a lasting peace in Europe. Self-determination for all these captive nations must remain the policy of the United States.

We pledge our continued support for the freedom-loving people of Latvia. We admire their courage and dedication to their ideals, and we will continue to work for the extension of freedom and liberty to all the captive peoples.

THE FOREIGN AID CONTROVERSY

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. DEL CLAWSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, the November 13 issue of the Daily Signal, Huntington Park, Calif., carried an editorial entitled "The Foreign Aid Controversy." I wish to commend this thoroughly objective and dispassionate appraisal of this country's foreign aid effort to the attention of my colleagues. The editorial, I believe, accurately reflects the overwhelming sentiment among people of the 23d District of California. The editorial follows:

THE FOREIGN AID CONTROVERSY

Let's for the moment ignore the panic-button approach to the foreign aid program taken by the Kennedy administration and take instead a reasonable, realistic look at some of the things Congress has done to it.

Have the recent acts of the Senate (and the House) in paring about $1 billion from the President's $4.5 billion request really been so drastic? We think not.

We are convinced, as a matter of fact, that Congress has moved as it has as a direct result of the failure of the Kennedy administration—and those which have gone before it—to use the foreign aid program with even a reasonable degree of judiciousness.

For example, even the normally liberal Senators who are leading the fight for the reductions cannot buy an administration recommendation to give Nasser of Egypt funds to support troops he refuses to withdraw from Yemen.

Neither can they agree to continue aid to Sukarno of Indonesia to finance his sworn aim of destroying the new state of Malaysia.

FRITTERED AWAY

And how can even the most foreign aid minded Senator bring himself to vote to continue aid to President Goulart of Brazil when he has done nothing to keep it from being frittered away in uncontrolled inflation.

We are told by the administration and its supporters that for less than 1 percent of our gross national product we are helping maintain 3.5 million allied soldiers at the periphery of communism at one-tenth the cost of a comparable American force.

But how many of these soldiers are in Communist-dominated Poland? In Yugoslavia? How have we hurt this phase of the program by paring our aid to these tools of the enemy?

There is no evidence that the countless millions of dollars we have poured into Poland and Yugoslavia have accomplished one whit insofar as gaining us the support of Premier Gomulka or President Tito.

NO OTHER CHOICE

We certainly do not advocate that our foreign aid program be terminated. It is time, however, that we stop pouring out dollars in the mistaken belief that the good they do is in direct ratio to the number dispensed.

If the executive branch of the Government, which rightly is charged with the conduct of this Nation's foreign policy, must persist in such an unrealistic approach there seems to be little for the legislative branch to do but to tighten the reins in the only method at its disposal—paring back on the funds.

STATEMENT BY J. EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I consider it highly important to call to the attention of Members of the House of Representatives a statement by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in a New York speech last Saturday night. Mr. Hoover said:

> During the past 2 years, Communist spokesmen have appeared on nearly 100 campuses from coast to coast. Their purpose: To create confusion, raise questions and spread doubt among our young people concerning the American way of life.
>
> If their constitutional right to free speech allows them to use the public school forum to promote the secular creed of Marxism-Leninism which openly and avowedly denies God, does their constitutional freedom of religion also prohibit the rest of us from using the same public school forum to express our faith that God does exist?

Mr. Speaker, every day Members of the House are telling me their mail has increased to major proportions urging they sign Discharge Petition No. 3.

Some Members say they are receiving more mail now on this subject than on any other issue before the Congress. They wonder why.

They are receiving this mail, Mr. Speaker, because of the increasing efforts of millions—an overwhelming majority of the American people—who agree with Mr. Hoover and others that prayer and Bible reading must be returned to the public schools—that our public manifestations of our reliance upon Almighty God must be preserved.

Let me say that discharge petition No. 3 is at the halfway point. As of yesterday afternoon, it bore 108 signatures; 218 are required. The last week has seen a tremendous increase in the rate of signatures.

The American people are really getting busy—they are letting their Representatives know how they feel about prayer and Bible reading in public schools and the protection of the heretofore accepted public manifestations of our reliance upon Almighty God.

In this connection, I insert at this point a letter from an 87-year-old woman who has sent to me a petition signed by 250 of her neighbors—signatures she obtained by walking every step of the way. She is sorry, she says, she cannot drive, at her advanced age, because she would like to obtain more signatures.

The text of the letter, from Elizabeth G. Hardy, 6814 Westmoreland Avenue, Takoma Park, Md., follows:

> TAKOMA PARK, MD.,
> *November 11, 1963.*
>
> Representative FRANK J. BECKER,
> *House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> HONORABLE SIR: When I took the enclosed petition around and heard some of the signers say that the only religious training they got when they were young was from their teachers at school, I felt grateful that I am still strong enough to do this. I do not drive a car. By God's help I have walked from door to door. I am 87 years old. I am afraid to go at night so I missed most of the men and women who work. I covered a small territory. I am sending 250 signers.
>
> I found very few unwilling to sign—most seemed pleased to sign, considered it a privilege. Those who did not sign said they sent their children to their own church schools, mostly Catholic, some Adventists.
>
> I feel sure that if each could speak for himself that an overwhelming majority would vote to put prayer and Bible reading back into our schools.
>
> I do not believe that our Founding Fathers meant that there was to be no religion in the schools but that there was to be no established State faith, as is the case in England.
>
> It seems to me a great shame on America that an atheist can get God out of our schools. We owe every blessing we have to God, even our breath. Why should it be so decided after all these years by the few men who are the Supreme Court?
>
> I heard on a broadcast between a man and a Unitarian preacher that they were going to try to get "In God We Trust" off of our coins.
>
> Will you please, please use all of your influence to get prayer and Bible reading back into our schools?
>
> May God be with you,
> ELIZABETH G. HARDY.

I have instructed my staff to forward her petition to her own Congressman.

GEN. DAVID M. SHOUP

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAGUE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, in a republic of sovereign states such as ours precedents are usually based on formal determinations set forth in constitutions and rules of order. On the other hand, the prestige of this Congress, and indeed of the Nation, draws to an astounding degree upon the traditions that tie us so closely with the great men who have preceded us along this historic trail. By these tokens, then, we have a right to conclude that government will remain sound and effective only so long as those who serve it are honest and dedicated to the highest calling of their profession.

Second only to this privilege of serving in the Congress of the United States is that which came to me some 40-odd years ago when I enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps in World War I. In that short experience I became indoctrinated with the firm conviction that the U.S. Marines are the finest fighting men in the world and throughout the intervening years I have come to appreciate that this esprit and pride stem largely from the devoted service tendered by those who have led the corps as its Commandant. In the forefront of that small but select group of distinguished military leaders stands the incumbent Commandant, Gen. David M. Shoup, and all that I have said about tradition and honor undergirding the prestige of the Nation applies to the enduring contribution made by this heroic and dedicated public servant.

As a humble private first class it was always my lot to quake in the presence of newly minted lieutenants—to say nothing of generals, of whom the Marine Corps of my day had comparatively few. As a result it has been a heartwarming revelation to encounter in General Shoup a down-to-earth professional soldier who early in his career shed all of the pomp and pretense so often associated with high rank. In him we find a man's man, a Marine's marine, a strategist at the top of his profession, but whose formative years were those of a country boy like myself. Admittedly, these are attractive qualifications but what drew me closest to this great American is his deep religious faith and his infectious good humor. Salty of speech, surely, as befits someone engaged in the roughest business in the world, but with it all a gentleman of great kindness with a respect for the other fellow, be he a member of his command, a trusted ally, or an honorable foe.

If there is an accolade of higher priority than our Congressional Medal of Honor I have never heard of it and the impressive factor in the makeup of all those who have received this highest decoration is the matter-of-fact manner in which they went about the tasks that led to the citation for "bravery in the face of danger above and beyond the call of duty." Col. David M. Shoup leading his Marines ashore on Tarawa on that bloody day in November of 1943 had only two things in mind; namely, to dislodge a tenacious enemy and in the process to conserve his beloved troops as much as possible. That he did both attests to his "selfless devotion to duty" and brought to a victorious conclusion one of the bloodiest amphibious battles in all of history. It also elevated his name to the highest level in our Nation's galaxy of heroes and enshrined his name in the hearts of a grateful Nation.

As one who has insisted, perhaps ad nauseam, on a sound fiscal policy and the conservation of our financial and economic resources, I must not overlook one quotation attributed to this forthright leader. Referring to fiscal matters he had this to say:

> I have frequently pointed out our duty to get full value of every dollar we receive from the public. Use the dollar wisely—insure that every dollar does full duty.

There, I submit, is a statement of policy you would expect from a penny-pinching Hoosier and I can tell you that it elevates him to a special place of esteem in the hearts of the frugal Quakers and Pennsylvania Dutch I am privileged to represent.

General Shoup, we are better citizens today and we have a better appreciation of dedicated public service because of our brief association with you. It is our fondest hope that a way will be found whereby your exceptional talents may continue to be made available to a Nation you have already served with such distinction. But as a good friend deeply concerned for your welfare and happiness I hope that you and your beloved helpmate will find a bit of respite from official obligations in the more relaxed atmosphere of a well-earned retirement.

THE MAGNIFICENT MARINE

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, seldom have I addressed this chamber with more pride than I do today, as I rise to pay tribute to the 22d Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, Gen. David Monroe Shoup.

David M. Shoup was born December 30, 1904. On December 31, 1963, just 59 years later, he will retire as one of the most illustrious and most heroic in a long line of great marines. What happened to this man, and how he affected military history in those short 59 years is phenomenal. A brief glimpse into the life of this man will tell us a great deal.

The date is November 20, 1943—just 20 years ago. The commanders in the Pacific have known for some time the direction the war must take if there is to be an American victory. It is decided that the capture of the Makin, Tarawa and Apamama Atolls in the Gilberts is absolutely necessary to capture the Marshalls which in turn was absolutly necessary to win the war. The men of the 2d U.S. Marine Division, who had been at Guadalcanal and who were recuperating from their battles, were designated to take Tarawa, the center of Japanese strength.

On November 20 the marines landed at Tarawa commanded by David Shoup. By November 23 the U.S. Marines had added another chapter in their glorious record, and the Marines had their 25th Medal of Honor winner, David Shoup. In spite of a leg injury and severe shock received in the early stages of the landing, David Shoup kept his men rallied for more than 3 days of the most sanguinary fighting of the Pacific war.

Mr. Speaker, as a former marine raider, I know from personal experience that whenever marines and former marines gather, the job the men of the 2d Marine Division and their commander did at Tarawa is still recalled with awe and pride. This is but one brief chapter in the life of this fine man. He has excelled equally in every job he has undertaken.

It is with enormous pride that I join so many Americans in saying "Well done, General Shoup, and thank you." You have served yourself, your country, your corps and your family well. I know you will wear our pride and our respect for you as gracefully as you have worn the uniform of a U.S. Marine.

GEN. DAVID M. SHOUP—A TRIBUTE

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join with my colleagues in honoring General Shoup today. He has had a distinguished career in the Marine Corps spanning more than 37 years. During this period, he has compiled an outstanding record which resulted in his rise from the rank of second lieutenant to Commandant.

It is particularly appropriate that we honor General Shoup today, for it is the 20th anniversary of the Battle of Tarawa Atoll in which he won the Nation's highest award, the Medal of Honor.

Tarawa was heavily fortified. A Japanese admiral boasted that a million marines could not take the island in a hundred years.

The marines landed on November 20, 1943. The fighting was bloody and bitter. The outcome was in doubt when Colonel Shoup took command of the troops and by his individual gallantry led them to victory.

His citation reads in part:

> Although severely shocked by an exploding shell soon after landing at the pier, and suffering from a serious, painful leg wound which had become infected, Colonel Shoup fearlessly exposed himself to the terrific relentless artillery, machinegun, and rifle fire from hostile shore emplacements and, rallying his hesitant troops by his own inspiring heroism, gallantly led them across the fringing reefs to charge the heavily fortified island and reinforced our hard-pressed, thinly held lines. Upon arrival at the shore, he assumed command of all landed troops and, working without rest under constant withering enemy fire during the next 2 days conducted smashing attacks against unbelievably strong and fanatically defended Japanese positions despite innumerable obstacles and heavy casualties.
>
> By his brilliant leadership, daring tactics, and selfless devotion to duty, Colonel Shoup was largely responsible for the final, decisive defeat of the enemy and his indomitable fighting spirit reflects great credit upon the U.S. naval service.

General Shoup also twice received the Legion of Merit with Combat "V" and two Purple Hearts for his efforts in the war.

After the war, General Shoup served in a number of administrative posts. His superior performance in these assignments led to his promotion to brigadier general in 1953.

I am proud to say that during 1958 and 1959, General Shoup commanded the unit in which I once served, the 3d Marine Division.

On August 14, 1959, President Eisenhower nominated General Shoup to be the 22d Commandant of the Marine Corps. He assumed this post on January 1, 1960.

During his tenure as Commandant, General Shoup has maintained the tradition of the Marines as the best trained and equipped fighting men in the Armed Forces. In addition, General Shoup has stressed the moral and ethical responsibility of each marine. He recognizes that the cold war is largely a struggle for men's minds. Accordingly, each marine, as an ambassador of the United States, must display truth, honor, and steadfastness to the principles of our democracy.

In one address, General Shoup stated the watchword of his term as Commandant:

> Each of us should strive to make sure the Marine Corps will be better because we've been marines.

Throughout his career, General Shoup has dedicated himself to this goal. His words and deeds have been an example and an inspiration to every marine. He has made the motto of the corps, "Semper Fidelis," his personal credo. Throughout his career, he has been "always faithful" to the highest ideals of the Marine Corps.

General Shoup will retire as Commandant next year, but President Kennedy has assured the Nation that General Shoup will continue to serve his country. In these perilous times, we need men with his character and ability. So today, while we congratulate General Shoup on a brilliant career in the Marine Corps, we look forward to his continuing service to the Nation in years ahead.

THE CHICAGO BOARD OF TRADE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Board of Trade is performing a great and important public service in a nationwide advertising campaign in behalf of the American farmer and also in the interest of the consumers of farm commodities. I take this opportunity to congratulate and commend the Chicago Board of Trade upon the unselfish spirit which prompted this campaign to bring true and accurate information to the public concerning the importance of agriculture in the daily lives of all of our people. The very able president of the Chicago Board of Trade, Mr. Robert C. Liebenow, has on many occasions demonstrated his great interest in both the producers and consumers of our Nation. Certainly those of us who are intensely interested in the welfare of our farmers are grateful to Mr. Liebenow and his associates.

Advertisements which have appeared in the Washington Post and the Evening Star, in the Wall Street Journal, Newsweek, U.S. News & World Report, and in other national newspapers and magazines are vital parts of a well-planned program. The advertisements contrast the efficiency of American agriculture with the weakness of Communist agriculture in both Russia and China, a most important factor in world affairs. They also prove that food is a bargain in America, due to the productivity of our farmers. In the advertisements other pertinent facts about farming are emphasized.

The board states that the advertisements are printed:

> In the interest of a better understanding of the American farmer and his dynamic role in helping to provide an ever-increasing standard of living and in contributing importantly to our national security.

Here are two brief quotations from one of the recent advertisements:

> Each Chinese farmer feeds himself and two other persons.
>
> Each Russian farmer feeds himself and six other persons.
>
> Each American farmer feeds himself and 29 other persons.
>
> Over 7 million persons are employed directly in agriculture, more than the combined workers in the automobile industry, transportation, public utilities, and steel. Every year farmers spend more than $40 billion to produce crops and livestock and to buy food, clothing, furniture, drugs, and other articles of everyday living.

The Kellogg Co. of Battle Creek, Mich., one of the leading food firms, also has had an advertising program of wide scope which has emphasized the relative cheapness of American food, with due credit given to our farmers. I think this progressive company is to be congratulated also.

For many years I have tried, and many others have tried, to impress upon the American people the amazing productivity of American agriculture and its significance in terms of national security and cheaper food. A lot of money has been spent on Federal farm programs but, all in all, they constitute one of our best investments. Unfortunately, attention, all too often, has been concentrated on controversies about phases of the programs, and on their cost without regard to the benefits. Consequently, many persons, and in particular city people, have erroneous impressions about agriculture.

The board of trade and the Kellogg advertising programs will help in a badly needed campaign of public education. I am hopeful that other industries and firms will follow their example.

HOME RULE FOR WASHINGTON

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is testimony I presented today to the House District of Columbia Committee supporting home rule for Washington:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, IN FAVOR OF H.R. 5794, NOVEMBER 20, 1963

Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the opportunity to appear today and testify in favor of my bill, H.R. 5794, which would provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives, for the District of Columbia.

During the early days of our Republic there was never any question but that the residents of the District of Columbia, over which Congress—by constitutional mandate—was to have exclusive legislative jurisdiction, would at the same time have the right to elect a local government. It is clearly stated in the Federalist Papers, and I quote James Madison, in Federalist Paper No. 43:

"As the inhabitants will find sufficient inducements of interest to become willing parties at the cession; as they have had their voice in the election of the Government which is to exercise authority over them; as a municipal legislature for local purposes, derived from their own suffrages, will, of course, be allowed them."

The Founding Fathers assumed that no Congress would, under the Constitution, deny citizens living in the Federal district the ordinary and widely respected rights of self-government.

On April 3, 1963, President John F. Kennedy said, in transmitting his home rule message to the Congress:

"We should no longer delay in restoring to the people of the District of Columbia a fundamental right enjoyed as a matter of course by all other Americans—the right to self-government by the elective process."

Mr. Chairman, until 1875 no one seems to have questioned the right of the citizens of the District of Columbia to home rule. We talk a good deal about the fact that our Government is based upon consent; we are always reminding others that freedom is the right to choose. Yet, Mr. Chairman, we have denied the right to choose to a substantial number of our citizens living in the Nation's Capital City where everyone from everywhere can see them. They are not a small group of politically deprived individuals living in an obscure community somewhere deep in the recesses of one of our less populated regions. They are right here in the Capital of the world where the leadership in the struggle for freedom and democracy issues its decisions affecting all of the citizens of the world.

The political status of the residents of the District of Columbia has increasingly become an embarrassment to us. We must find a means of granting to Washington's citizens the same rights enjoyed by all our other citizens.

I would like for a moment to speak of the constitutional issue which is so often raised by the opponents of home rule. The argument is that since Congress, under the Constitution, is to exercise exclusive legislative control over the District of Columbia in all cases whatsoever, that the Congress therefore cannot delegate this authority.

Are we then to believe that each of those Congresses which sat between 1802 and 1875 violated the Constitution by permitting local self-government? Are we then to believe that this Congress is violating the Constitution?

For if the language in the Constitution means precisely what it says, then, indeed, we are in violation of the Constitution, since everything that the District Commissioners or that the Public Utilities Commission does, it does because Congress delegates to them the power to do it.

Ever since I came to Congress I have been an ardent supporter, and I might say in the forefront of the fight for, home rule in the District of Columbia. During the present Congress, I have introduced no less than five home rule bills—H.R. 501, H.R. 502, H.R. 503, H.R. 504, and H.R. 5794—about which I speak today. These bills contain the various proposals which have been urged for home rule in Washington. They vary in detail and include a varying number of rights to be delegated to Washingtonians, but they all adhere to the principle that American citizens have the right to local self-government.

I will support any one of these bills or any other proposal which will give the people of Washington a foot in the door. To use another old cliche "half a loaf is better than none."

I strongly urge that this committee report out to the House a bill returning to them their rights as American citizens at the earliest possible time. Thank you.

PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE PROGRAM

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, just recently on a trip to my district, I had the pleasure and opportunity to visit with a group representing the people-to-people programs of Cartagena, Colombia, and Coral Gables, Fla. This twin-city program, I am proud to say, was the first in the United States.

I was deeply impressed by the spirit and enthusiasm exhibited by the group and, in my estimation, no further proof is needed that the program is working in high gear. Each meeting brings better understanding, a broader base for communication, more interest in each other's lives, activities, and problems and an increasing desire to continue the close relationship.

The people-to-people program's primary purpose is to encourage private citizens to interest themselves in the problems of peoples throughout the world and to join in the mutual struggle against oppression, poverty, fear, and distrust by forming lasting bonds of friendship to further the social, economic, and cultural life.

The achievements of the Florida program are effectively summarized in the following résumé by Robert E. Kingsley, vice president of the civic committee of the people-to-people program for the Southeastern United States.

THE PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE PROGRAM IN SOUTH FLORIDA

From its initiation in this area some 5 years ago, the people-to-people program in south Florida has gained momentum in many constructive channels. Already Latin America-oriented by reason of being the virtual "Gateway of the Americas," our citizens have tended to undertake activities primarily in this hemisphere to promote mutual understanding and friendship and to render assistance at the community level, paralleling the broader efforts of their Government on an international scope.

By offering stimulation and guidance and by sharing experience, one community to another, there has been a steady growth in the people-to-people program which by the middle of this year had produced sister city relationships between 10 Florida communities and their Latin American counterparts, plus 4 more, established with cities in other parts of the free world.

The plan of operation is designed to draw citizens from all walks of life into active participation, creating a resource of varied civic, business and professional talents.

From the initial two-way visits between sister cities, there has developed a broad range of undertakings. In the field of education, Coral Gables supported the exchange of graduate fellowships between the Universities of Miami and Cartagena and for the summer, arranged 2-week exchanges of university students to provide a common ground upon which the young people of both communities might exchange ideas and viewpoints, learn to know each other and form lasting friendships based upon mutual trust and respect. Each community contributed to its sister hundreds of books on its history, culture, and way of life, for distribution to primary and secondary schools.

Cultural centers have been established and plazas have been dedicated in each community to its sister city. In the case of Coral Gables, its "Cartagena Plaza" utilized as motif a replica which it provided of the famous "Old Shoes" of Cartagena, made famous in a poem by one of its great writers.

The people-to-people committees of these two cities were instrumental in getting our State Department to create a binational cultural center in Cartagena.

The attribute of benevolence in people has expressed itself through sharing with the less fortunate such things as vehicles, wheelchairs, artificial limbs, crutches, food and clothing.

The typical social and professional groups existent in most communities have responded individually to this challenge to promote a better way of life for all through people-effort.

Medical doctors and groups of dentists have made trips to sister communities, offering instruction and demonstration of new methods and techniques, taking with them thousands of dollars worth of instruments, equipment, and medicines which they had procured for that purpose.

Sports clubs have arranged exchange visits of teams, Little League ball clubs and other popular events.

This great source, the productivity of people, has begun to be tapped. And throughout the development of the south Florida people-to-people program, valued and practical guidance and assistance have been forthcoming from the officers of our own governmental and civic entities such as Mark Bortman, chairman of the civic committee of the national people-to-people program; the U.S. Information Agency's Office of Private Cooperation; the American Municipal Association; and our own legislative representatives.

Each community has received the dedicated energies, time and experience of its civic leaders, through whose unselfish devotion, with the support and participation of each member, these committees are responding constructively to the challenge of our President to show "what you can do for your country." The Florida communities which have established sister city relationships are: Clearwater, Coral Gables, Fort Lauderdale, Hialeah, Hollywood, Homestead, Miami, Miami Beach, Orlando, Pensacola, Royal Palm Beach, Sarasota, St. Petersburg and Tampa.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CUNNINGHAM (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for November 21 through December 2, on account of official business.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia, for Monday and Tuesday next, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 5 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, for 1 hour, on tomorrow November 21, on the matter of the Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DENTON and to include an article.

Mr. GROSS to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter in the body of the RECORD on S. 777.

Mr. CEDERBERG (at the request of Mr. HARVEY of Michigan) during debate on S. 777 and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HARVEY of Michigan) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MORSE.

Mr. BROCK.

Mr. ROBISON.

Mr. NELSEN.

Mr. MACGREGOR.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HEALEY.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. MURPHY of New York.

Mr. MONAGAN.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 129. Joint resolution to amend section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954 to increase the amount available to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator for advances for planned public works; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 21, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1380. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting an index to our reports issued to the Congress, its committees, and Members during the fiscal years 1956 through 1963, as the result of our audits of various activities conducted by the Department of Defense and its component services; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1381. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a copy of the report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of September 30, 1963, pursuant to Public Law 554, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1382. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "a bill to amend the Flood Control Act of 1962 with respect to the Bradley Lake project, Alaska"; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HOLIFIELD: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. H.R. 8971. A bill to amend Public Law 88–72 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 911). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 569. Resolution for consideration of S. 254, an act to provide for the acquisition of certain property in square 758 in the District of Columbia, as an addition to the grounds of the U.S. Supreme Court Building; without amendment (Rept. No. 912). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 570. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 3742, a bill to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to the transfer of producer rice acreage allotments; without amendment (Rept. No. 913). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7152. A bill to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States

to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in education, to establish a Community Relations Service, to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 914). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 9173. A bill for the relief of the Kensal School District, North Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9174. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose additional duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year in excess of the annual quotas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 9175. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Social Security Act to eliminate those provisions which restrict the right of a spouse or survivor to receive full benefits simultaneously under both acts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 9176. A bill to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to prescribe contract violations which warrant termination of soil bank contracts and the authority of State Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committees to impose civil penalties required by section 123 of the Soil Bank Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9177. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9178. A bill to amend section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9179. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept the transfer of certain national forest lands in Cocke County, Tenn., for purposes of the Foothills Parkway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9180. A bill to amend the act of August 28, 1950, enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish, upon a reimbursable basis, certain inspection services involving overtime work; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9181. A bill to establish penalties for misuse of feed made available for relieving distress or preservation and maintenance of foundation herds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 9182. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 9183. A bill to amend the provisions of section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for the exemption of certain terminal leases from penalties; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 9184. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to revise the pension program for World War I, World War II, and Korean conflict veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. KEE:

H.R. 9185. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Codes of 1939 and 1954 with respect to the apportionment of the depletion allowance between parties to contracts for the extraction of minerals or the severance of timber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 9186. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make economic disaster loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 9187. A bill to prohibit the exportation of the flag of the United States in certain instances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 9188. A bill to amend the provisions of section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for the exemption of certain terminal leases from penalties; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 9189. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 with respect to the procedure for amending orders; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TAFT:

H.R. 9190. A bill to prohibit certain improper uses of official stationery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 9191. A bill to amend the St. Lawrence Seaway Act to provide that the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corp., shall not engage in publicity or promotional activities such as free or paid advertising; solicitation of cargoes; publication of ocean, rail, port, or motor carrier rate or service comparisons; or other activities that are actually or potentially disruptive to the flow of waterborne trade among ports in the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 9192. A bill to regulate the business of debt adjusting in the District of Columbia other than as an incident to the practice of law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 9193. A bill to prohibit any guarantee by the Export-Import Bank or any other agency of the Government of payment of obligations of Communist countries; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 9194. A bill to authorize the payment of certain claims for structural or other major defects in homes covered by Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages, and to require indemnification bonds in the case of certain new construction under Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9195. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by making section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act a part of the Clayton Act, in order to provide for governmental and private civil proceedings for violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 9196. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 9197. A bill to amend the act of August 28, 1950, enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish, upon a reimbursable basis, certain inspection services involving overtime work; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 9198. A bill to amend section 610 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to airline passengers while in flight; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H.J. Res. 806. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H.J. Res. 807. Joint resolution to provide for a study of needed Federal-aid highway programs for 10 years following the termination of the present interstate and defense highway program by requiring the Secretary of Commerce to make a comprehensive investigation and study of highway traffic and needs based upon 20-year projection, and the changes determined necessary in the Federal-aid highway systems as a result thereof, and to report the results of such study and his recommendations for a 10-year highway program commencing June 30, 1972, to Congress; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 9199. A bill for the relief of CWO Stanley L. Harney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 9200. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Uberti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER (by request):

H.R. 9201. A bill for the relief of Capt. Charles H. Glassett, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 9202. A bill for the relief of Wlodzimiesz Cielecki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 9203. A bill for the relief of St. Anastasia's Church, Fort Pierce, Fla.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H.R. 9204. A bill for the relief of Miss Jessie E. Benton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 9205. A bill for the relief of Lina Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9206. A bill for the relief of Ibrihim Zeytinoglu, Zeynep Zeytinoglu, and Fusun Zeytinoglu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9207. A bill for the relief of Julio Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 9208. A bill for the relief of Frances F. Kasmark, Madeline A. Young, and Mildred O. Sacharceski; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TALCOTT (by request):

H.R. 9209. A bill to authorize Col. John F. Wadman, U.S. Air Force, retired, to accept the award of the Croix de Guerre with Palm, and to wear and display the insignia thereof; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

459. By Mr. RYAN of New York: Petition of the Puerto Rican Political Women Association, Inc., on behalf of 144 individuals to increase the personal income tax exemption from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

460. By the SPEAKER: Petition of William E. Townsley, secretary, board of directors, Jefferson County Bar Association, Beaumont, Tex., relative to supporting proposed increases in salaries for designated legislative, judicial, and executive officials as contained in the Udall-Broyhill bill now pending in the U.S. House of Representatives, and urging favorable consideration of any legislation which would effectuate such salary increases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Accomplishments of the ARA in the Evansville, Ind., Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, if called upon to do so, I could fill many pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in describing the accomplishments of the Area Redevelopment Administration in my part of Indiana. I want to be brief, however, and point out only three of the many accomplishments this agency has made in my district.

The first thing that ought to be pointed out is the fact that the city of Evansville, one of the largest cities in the Nation to be placed on the ARA list of depressed areas, is no longer on that list. No one single factor is responsible exclusively for the radical improvement in Evansville's unemployment rate changing from more than 10 percent a few years ago to about 3 percent today. But the people of that city have given some of the credit to ARA. Listen to what the president of Evansville's Future, Inc., a nonprofit organization for community development wrote to ARA last July:

> While we have undertaken the rehabilitation of our community in the spirit and determination of self-help, the assistance which we received from your Administration was important and vital to our progress.

The mayor of Evansville, Frank McDonald, in another statement, dated July 29, 1963, told ARA that his city is now on the road to real progress. He said:

> However, this progress would not have been possible insofar as the construction of needed basic facilities, which in turn provided us the opportunity to gain new industry and new jobs, without the assistance of ARA, and your kind consideration.

From my direct association with the staff of ARA, I know that their first and foremost goal is to repeat the Evansville story. That is, to eliminate depressed areas from their list. I also know that in Evansville and elsewhere in my district, before ARA came into being, I found much unemployment. Seven of the eleven counties in my district were so-called distressed areas. Today, I find new hope, new determination, and positive action.

The families of New Providence, Ind., also know what I mean by these words. In April of last year, the Borden Cabinet Co., located at New Providence, was totally destroyed by a fire. That fire not only destroyed the physical plant of the building but it eliminated in one blow nearly 200 jobs—virtually the entire employment of the town.

As a result of ARA action, however, the town immediately received a grant for a new water system which would help prevent recurrence of the great fire loss, and the company obtained a loan to rebuild the plant, thereby not only providing continued employment for the original workers but also adding an additional 45 new workers. And all of this was accomplished within 90 days after the disastrous April 6 fire.

This type of program kindled the adrenal glands of other communities in Clark County and today several other projects have been instituted. These additional job-creating enterprises have either been approved or are awaiting final action by the ARA at this time.

In another part of my district, in Corydon, in Harrison County, the citizens and the businessmen of that community saw the product of a persistent effort to make a vague industrial project into a concrete enterprise through the ARA's application of the advice and counsel of several Federal, State, and local agencies. After several weeks of analysis and recommendations about supply, market, and management organization, ARA was able to approve a loan application for the Indiana Glass Sand Corp., to develop deposits near Corydon at Elizabeth, Ind. Here is a perfect example of a community knowing for years that its area contained adequate sand deposits, but being unable to exploit the potential in its own backyard.

Without ARA's existence, no organized effort would have been made to initiate this project and to see it through all of the tedious, but necessary steps so often required in the field of economic development. Today, as a result of such persistent efforts by all concerned, Corydon now has a glass sand company directly employing about 30 people and a nucleus around which other plants needing this type of sand can be created.

Second Anniversary of Jacques Loewe Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to salute the Jacques Loewe Foundation in Brooklyn on the occasion of its second anniversary.

We are all mindful of the enormous role played in health care by large hospitals which not only care for patients, but also maintain extensive training and research facilities. While we must not underestimate the importance of these institutions, too often we tend to overlook the contributions of small, voluntary, neighborhod hospitals.

This month, the nonprofit hospital of the Jacques Loewe Foundation, Brooklyn, celebrates its second anniversary under the auspices of the Loewe Foundation, a distinguished medical research organization. Over the past 2 years, this fine hospital has served residents of the Flatbush section of the borough in truly admirable fashion.

The hospital has steadfastly adhered to its pledge to provide "round the clock" emergency medical service, for it is keenly aware of the fact that about 800,000 people live in the immediate service area of the hospital, but there are less than 1,000 care beds available to them.

Since it was acquired by the Loewe Foundation, the hospital, under the expert direction of Administrator Robert Forhman, has seen a steady upward climb in its census in almost every area of activity. In all its efforts the hospital has maintained the highest possible health standards.

In the coming year, a member of every second family in Brooklyn will be hospitalized because of injury or sickness. The hospital of the Jacques Loewe Foundation therefore recognizes the need to expand and modernize its facilities in order to better serve the community.

Mr. Forhman, an astute and knowledgeable administrator, firmly believes that a friendly, personal touch is as vital to a patient's recovery as any other therapy or medication. This approach has therefore characterized the efforts of the entire hospital staff, and, I believe, the institution is to be saluted on its second anniversary for the eminent place it has earned in Brooklyn's hospital community.

Copperhill is Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the State of Georgia is filing a suit before the U.S. Supreme Court making an unwarranted claim to Tennessee territory. I take this opportunity to put Tennessee on record as ready, willing, and able to maintain the right of our citizens to continue living in the finest State in the Union.

Apparently, the Governor of Georgia is trying to attract new industry to his State, and he is not unaware of the existence of our Tennessee Copper Co.—a thriving and progressive business happily located in the rich copper basin of my congressional district. Even so, the people of the disputed area are Tennesseans, and the Volunteer State has pledged to protect them from the present attempt at gerrymandering.

Tennessee was admitted to the Union in 1796 with uncertain borders with eight surrounding States. However, as early as 1817 interested parties from Tennessee and Georgia met and agreed to the present State boundary; it is somewhat south of the 35th parallel which Georgia erroneously claims as the border. I am told the legislatures of both States approved the existing borderline in 1819, thus it is difficult to understand the current distraction from the more pressing problems now facing our States and our Nation.

When the line was drawn, there was no error of surveying; there was no misjudgement—but there was an agreement to the accepted boundary. We fully expect Georgia to live up to its word, and to continue to utilize the more normal and acceptable programs for growth which have made it an outstanding example of our progressive and prosperous new south.

Cleveland's Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, not long ago, there appeared a fascinating and amusing book entitled "Parkinson's Law," in which the author described in humorous vein the often snarled redtape in the modern world. To the lore of the bureaucracy, my distinguished colleague, James Cleveland, of New Hampshire, has added "Cleveland's Law." The enigmatic smiles he describes in his recent congressional newsletter are no substitute for vigorous service on behalf of our transportation systems. The spirit of Cleveland's Law was picked up by the distinguished New Hampshire weekly, the Milford Cabinet and Wilton Journal in an editorial which appeared on November 14. I include an excerpt from Mr. Cleveland's newsletter and the editorial in the Congressional Record:

Cleveland's Law

Over the years I have encountered a bureaucratic phenomenon which, for the benefit of frustrated citizens, I shall attempt to describe. Following the celebrated Parkinson, I shall designate it "Cleveland's Law" for lack of a better term. It goes like this: As a State Senator, when I complained about poor roads in my district, friends in the highway department would produce statistics showing that so few people used the roads that no improvement was justified. When I pointed out that the roads were so bad that no one in his right mind would use them unless he had to, I got only enigmatic smiles. And so it still is. When I ask the FAA for increased navigational aids at Keene, Lebanon, or Berlin, they point out that traffic at those airports is not sufficient to justify improvement. When I reply that traffic is presently discouraged because of this condition—enigmatic smiles. When I ask the Treasury Department to keep the port of entry at Pittsburg open at night, Cleveland's law functions again. "Not enough people use the port to justify improved service." I protest that uncertain service itself discourages use—again, that good old enigmatic smile.

[From the Milford Cabinet and Wilton Journal, Nov. 14, 1963]

Cleveland's Law

Jim Cleveland in his report from Congress last week gives the whimsical title of "Cleveland's Law" to one of the frustrations faced by everyone who deals with bureaucracy. A road needs repairs. It is not repaired because there is not enough traffic to justify the expense. The worse it gets the less traffic there is, so the less reason there is to repair it. Jim cited other examples.

Certainly the decline of the railroads can be attributed in part to "Cleveland's Law." The poorer the service became, the fewer the people who used the railroad, so the less justification for improving the service. The same was true of a number of the buslines that served Milford. As the equipment wore out service became uncertain, fewer people took the bus, and finally the whole venture would be given up.

Or take this simple matter of a stamp vending machine in the Milford post office lobby, such as every other post office of comparable size seems to have. Back a few years when we first started to complain we marched into the post office one day and asked why a stamp machine would not be a reasonable and sensible post office service. The answer? You guess; Cleveland's Law again. "There isn't enough demand to justify the expense." No stamp machine, so nobody uses it, so no stamp machine.

The Florida Keys—Fishermen's Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, through one of my constituents, Capt. Stu Apte, of Big Pine Key, Fla., I have just learned of a very interesting television program which will be presented on ABC television's "Wide World of Sports" this Saturday, November 23—5 p.m., Washington time—and one which will be of special interest to the many sporting enthusiasts here in the Congress.

The program this week will feature championship tarpon fishing from Big Pine Key, one of the Florida Keys' finest angling areas. The show's format is in the form of a contest between two of the Nation's best known fishermen, Al McClane of Field & Stream magazine and Joe Brooks of international fishing fame and a resident of Richmond, Va.

Both of these men raise and land tarpon well over the 100-pound mark and they do this with lightweight fly rods and artificial flies. The show is filmed in color and presents some of the most exciting scenes of big tarpon leaping ever presented to TV audiences.

Tarpon, often referred to as the Silver King, is one of the most sought after of all the keys' more than 600 species of game fish to be found in the waters of the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico. Others include bonefish, dolphin, mackerel, kingfish, marlin, barracuda, snook, amberjack, snapper, and sailfish.

The Florida Keys have been aptly described as bodies of land completely surrounded by fishermen. It is certainly true that the fisherman is king throughout the Florida Keys, and I cordially invite my colleagues and their families to sample the delights of the keys—from fishing and skindiving to golf or water skiing—not to mention the marvelous pollen free weather with refreshing trade breezes and low humidity and year-round temperatures between 65° and 89°.

I am confident that after watching this Saturday's "Wide World of Sports" program, I may look forward to greeting many of my colleagues as they enjoy a winter vacation—even though it may be very brief this year—in the Florida Keys.

Western Connecticut Site Suggested for NASA Electronics Research Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, at my request, Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, Deputy Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, conducted a hearing at which testimony was presented in support of locating the proposed NASA Electronics Research Center in western Connecticut. In the course of this hearing, I had the privilege of introducing several prominent officials and residents of western Connecticut who offered impressive testimony of the advantages of locating the proposed center in the section of Connecticut which I represent.

I am confident that the space agency and the people who staff it would gain measurably from a Connecticut location for this new research center, authorized by Public Law 88–113.

With permission to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the Record a copy of the statement which I made at the hearing:

Statement of Representative John S. Monagan, Democrat, of Connecticut, Fifth District, Before Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, of the Committee for Investigation of Sites for the NASA Electronics Research Center, November 18, 1963

I appear here today to ask NASA to locate its proposed Electronics Research Center (authorized by Public Law 88-113) in western Connecticut.

I am grateful to the agency for giving me and interested citizens and officials from my section of Connecticut the opportunity to come here today to outline the advantages of locating in our section of the State.

We appear before you today with the honest conviction that western Connecticut offers an excellent site for your new facility. In making this claim, we do not desire to appear parochial. We do not maintain that there is any magic line dividing one part of the State from the other. We agree that many other areas in the State would provide desirable locations but these locations will be described and supported by others. We, therefore, wish to make certain that the committee and the agency have clearly in mind the undoubted advantages of the portion of the State from which we come.

We strongly believe that Connecticut and its institutions and people can contribute something to the space agency. We do not view this project simply as one from which Connecticut can gain employment and economic activity, important though that may be. We are confident that the space agency and the people who staff it would gain measurably from a Connecticut location for this new research center.

I should like briefly to set forth some of the advantages of a western Connecticut location.

Waterbury, the center of western Connecticut, is located 1½ hours from New York City and 2 hours from Boston by automobile. It is within 22 miles of the great educational center at Yale University and a comparable distance from Wesleyan University and Trinity College. A slightly larger circle of 130 miles includes Harvard, Princeton, Columbia, and Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and innumerable other important educational institutions.

In addition to the convenient location, in Connecticut, of the institutions which I have mentioned, I wish to emphasize to the committee the existence of another project which will be of vital importance to the scientific municipality. This is the formation and organization of the Associated Universities of Connecticut, a joint enterprise wherein the resources of eight of Connecticut's institutions of higher learning are being joined in a cooperative venture to provide unprecedented educational advantages for scientists and engineers in the increasingly complex industrial society of the future.

Clearly, these educational facilities come within the first requirement which Administrator James E. Webb has set forth as a criterion for the new research center.

The second requirement was the location in an area where the industrial community had allied technical interests and was research oriented. Once again, our qualifications are impressive. Connecticut ranks first in the United States in the number of industrial research laboratories per capita. There are about 360 in Connecticut and they employ about 5,700 engineers and scientists and 6,300 supporting technical personnel. Western Connecticut has 60 research laboratories with a combined technical staff of close to 1,500 research workers. Anaconda American Brass recently built a $1.5 million research center in Waterbury and the U.S. Rubber Co. is now constructing a multimillion dollar management information center in Naugatuck.

The general qualifications of western Connecticut are impressive too. Our electric and water resources are highly developed and this would be an important factor in the consideration of the new agency. We have a reservoir of highly skilled labor that is unparalleled in the country.

Our network of high-speed highways provides quick and safe connection between Connecticut cities and with major metropolitan centers.

Our grammar and secondary schools are excellent and one has only to mention the names of Taft, Hotchkiss, Canterbury, and Kent to realize that our secondary schools rank in excellence with our institutions of higher learning.

Our area has a relatively low population density and thus the dispersal factor would be extremely favorable in comparison to location in a metropolitan area. This would be true both in connection with defense against enemy attack and in insulation against the interference and irritations which would come from a location in close proximity to a major population center.

One vital factor should not be missed. It is the unquestionable fact that Connecticut is a satisfying place in which to live. With its bustling cities and its cool, beautiful, trim, and well managed towns, with its cultural activities, its art galleries, its symphony orchestras, its art festivals, and its magnificent and varied scenery, Connecticut is one of the most attractive residential areas in the whole Nation. Its people may enjoy the advantages of urban and rural living without the crowding and congestion of the large city, while remaining within easy reach of the two major cities of the northeast.

I submit, therefore, that western Connecticut provides to an ample degree the educational facilities, the industrial technology, and the ideal living conditions which are required by the space agency. It is my recommendation and my earnest hope that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration consider favorably our recommendation that its new Electronics Research Center be located in one of the sites in western Connecticut which will be set forth in detail by later witnesses. At my request, material has been furnished by the Connecticut State Development Commission setting forth in detail various recommended sites in western Connecticut and outlining the outstanding qualifications of the State of Connecticut for the location of the center. I ask that this report be made a part of the record and that the committee examine it carefully for the wealth of material and pertinent data which it contains.

I shall now proceed to call upon the various private and public officials from western Connecticut who will present various details of our case.

All of us fully appreciate that the details of site selection may very well be left to another time. We shall feel that we have done our job today, however, if we shall have left with this committee a lasting impression of the outstanding qualifications of western Connecticut for the location of the new NASA Research Center.

An Excellent Book

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am recommending highly to the Congress and the American people an excellent new book, by Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall. This volume is wonderfully welcome to every person interested in our goodly American heritage, and the conservation and preservation of our priceless natural assets. The book contains vital history and real drama.

We conservationists, regardless of region or party, welcome such a heartwarming and well-written book on American history. History is not all dead past and cruel wars, but there can be battles in peacetime for the protection and advancement of our mountains and streams, forests and parks, that can and have been won for the public good and the general welfare of the American people. This is a lasting volume of high merit.

I enclose with my remarks the article from the Washington Post of Tuesday, November 19, 1963, a review by Senator GAYLORD NELSON, of Wisconsin, as follows:

UDALL WRITES A PRIMER FOR WONDERS OF AMERICA

("The Quiet Crisis," by Stewart L. Udall—introduction by President John F. Kennedy.)

If you want your children to grow up and get rich some day by exploiting the things and the people around them, I wouldn't recommend this book. But if you want them to acquire a reverence for the land and the forests and the wild animals, and to be inspired by the great figures of American history who have expressed this spirit in our public life, then I don't know of a better primer.

Interior Secretary Udall, in this terse little book, manages to see and express conservation as a wide-sweeping, all-encompassing part of American history. It is the story of a political, economic and philosophical struggle involving cowboys, Indians, transcendentalists, empire builders, robber barons, bureaucrats and Presidents.

For the most part, it is a sad story of an inevitable tragedy, of how the great American dream of a new empire stretching from ocean to ocean conflicted with many of the scientific principles of conservation. Secretary Udall tells how the new Nation flourished—but only at the expense of the Indian, the buffalo, the virgin timber, the clean water and the precious topsoil.

The heroes of this story are the few strong figures in our history who have had the soul to appreciate the precious things in our environment, and the backbone to fight to save them.

Udall describes what a masterpiece of creation the American continent was when the Pilgrims arrived. Yet it looked "hideous" to them, and they set about changing it. The conflict has continued ever since. The American Indian's concept of the land as something that existed for the enjoyment and sustenance of all had to be eliminated—and so did the Indian. The forests had to be cut down to build houses and make way for farms. The beaver had to be trapped to earn cash from Europe. The thin layer of grass on the great plains had to be plowed under to plant corn. The rivers had to be dammed. The western lands had to be given to the railroads. The gold-rich hills had to be washed away with high-pressure water hoses to bring out the nuggets of wealth.

Almost from the beginning, a few voices cried out in the wilderness. The result was blazing controversy and, in some cases, great victories for the public's stake in its environment.

"Where can I go now, and visit nature undisturbed?" demanded John James Audubon in the 1820's. His book, "Birds of America," was credited with arousing the national conscience and saving many species, and ultimately the founding of the Smithsonian Institution.

Udall's story of tragic waste of priceless assets, mixed with half victories along the way, ends with the grim challenge of the future: The spectre of a population twice as large as today's, empowered by new technology to consume resources at an even greater pace, making a new assault on our battered environment.

The message of "The Quiet Crisis" is obvious. We have only a precious few years left to make a massive effort to the State, local and national level to preserve our fresh water, our soil, our forests and streams, our minerals and even the air we breathe. If we fail to act, these priceless resources may be destroyed forever.

What Do You Say, Orville?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Lyle Johnson of Glencoe, Minn., recently provided the Glencoe Enterprise with a letter including a most probing article written by Senator GOLDWATER. The substance of the Senator's remarks are so important as to warrant the close attention of Congress. Under unanimous consent, I include the article in today's RECORD:

WHAT DO YOU SAY, ORVILLE?

Maybe you have been puzzled as I have about the conflicting stories about our big "Wheat Deal" with Russia. Senator GOLDWATER clears them up very well in this recent article in the Los Angeles Times:

"WHY IGNORANCE ON RED FARMING?

"(By Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona)

"Whether or not the sale of 375 million bushels of U.S. wheat to Russia is consummated, the most startling aspect of the entire incident—the collapse of American intelligence about Soviet agriculture—is due for a thorough public airing.

"It would be unfortunate indeed if the controversy over the sale itself, despite its many explosive features, is allowed to preempt an investigation of this failure. To say that the caliber and expertness of Americans who supposedly toured Soviet agricultural communities were lacking would be ridiculous, for they ranged from Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman on down.

"Admittedly, Mr. Freeman had no farm background when he was appointed to his present office, but as this Nation's No. 1 official in the agricultural field, his exposure to the subject has been complete.

"He recently completed an 18-day tour of Russia and supposedly was shown by friendly officials just about everything there was to see. So impressed was he that he returned to this country bubbling over with praise of the abundance of everything Soviet and the efficiency of Communist methods.

" 'Total production,' he told the Nation at that time, 'has risen considerably. They have the ability to feed their people.'

"Countless other officials of our Department of Agriculture recently have made 'inspection' tours of Russia, and almost without exception, they looked, considered, and arrived at the same conclusion.

"Rosewell Garst, the American farmer who once played host to Nikita Khrushchev and since has been a frequent visitor to Russia, returned recently to report that America's 30-year lead in agriculture has been cut to 8 and added: "The world may be startled at the crop yields in Eastern Europe this year.'

"That statement perhaps was the only correct assessment of the situation to come from any of our touring experts. The world was indeed startled when announcement of the 228-million-bushel sale of Canadian wheat and flour to Russia revealed that for the fifth straight year the Soviet Union had suffered a devastating shortfall.

"Almost immediately, our experts began to rationalize, but their rationalizations pertained only to the efficiency of the Communist agricultural system, not to their own erroneous assessments. The crop failure, they said, would not have happened except for a hot, dry summer.

"But this argument, too, is proof of our inability to evaluate such vital aspects of Soviet economy as its agriculture. Mr. Freeman, Mr. Garst, and the others who returned with such glowing accounts could have found out, simply my making a telephone call to the U.S. Weather Bureau, that conditions in Eastern Europe this past summer made crop failure an almost inescapable probability.

"Actually there were hundreds of other indexes which could have established beyond question that the prospects for a successful wheat season in Russia were practically nil, but these were ignored. Some consideration should have been given to the constant and well-publicized shakeups within the Soviet agricultural program, the shortages of fertilizers and fertilizer equipment which we were being begged to sell to Russia, the known inadequacy of farming equipment and the shortage of repair parts.

"Under these circumstances, it is difficult to conclude anything other than that our experts indeed had all the evidence, but flatly refused to heed it. The entire matter is somewhat reminiscent of the administration's attitude about the presence of Soviet missiles in Cuba—until the eve of the 1960 elections."

We believe you are right, Senator. Speak up some more.

LYLE W. JOHNSON,
Chairman of McLeod County Minnesotans for Goldwater.
GLENCOE, MINN.

U.S. Employment Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on November 18 our distinguished colleague from the 16th District of Ohio, Congressman FRANK T. BOW, presented a significant address in Minneapolis, Minn., on the subject of the proper function of the U.S. Employment Service.

Because this area of Government operations is vitally important, I recommend the address to all Members of Congress and request that it be reproduced here:

ADDRESS OF REPRESENTATIVE FRANK T. BOW AT THE MINNEAPOLIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, NOVEMBER 18, 1963

For the past 30 years, the central issue in American political life has been the proper role of the Federal Government.

There are those who argue that the Federal system is obsolete; that we have reached a point in our development where only a powerful Central Government can deal successfully with our economic and social problems; and that the systems of checks and balances between State and National Government, and between the branches of each, are inefficient and unresponsive to human needs.

I contend that the primary human need is individual liberty, and that individual liberty is assured and safeguarded by our Federal system as it is nowhere else on earth. I insist that the Federal system is serving us well. State and local governments have greatly expanded their activities in response to the new challenges of our times. Competitive free enterprise and individual initiative are playing dynamic roles in the growth and progress of the Nation. The problems of a diverse and complex society are being met and solved by these forces. The only flaw in an otherwise bright picture lies in Washington where an already powerful National Government is continually at work to extend its control over the States, private enterprise and individual opportunity.

Let us apply my description of the Federal system to the problem of unemployment in the United States.

In 1933 we decided to attack this problem as a Federal-State cooperative venture. We established a U.S. Employment Service, financed by a Federal tax on payrolls, to cooperate with State employment services, financed by a State tax on payrolls. It is the function of the Federal agency to supply administrative funds for the State systems. The State funds are used to pay unemployment compensation. This Government effort is supplemented, in the private sector, by the long-established group of businesses devoted to finding jobs for individuals. These employment agencies or placement agencies are operated for a profit, and they perform a useful service to the individual seeking a job and the business, school or industry searching for talent.

There is also a close liaison between the colleges of the Nation and large employers which helps to place each year's new crop of college men and women.

Various professions have special organizations that fulfill this function.

Other Federal, State, and local agencies provide vocational training, retraining, counseling and other services that help to equip individuals to find gainful employment.

This would appear to be an almost perfect balance of National and State Governments, business and individual teamwork to solve a social problem. It should be a good example of how the Federal system should work to accomplish a basic American purpose—the task of helping each person develop his individual ability to the fullest extent.

Unfortunately, it is not working well because the Federal agency concerned is trying to control or eliminate all of the others.

USES ENCROACHMENT

In my remarks I shall try to show you how the U.S. Employment Service is using its control of administrative funds to force the State employment services into new patterns of activity whether they like it or not; how the USES seems bent on putting the free enterprise placement agencies out of business; how it is intruding in the highly specialized fields of college placement and high school counseling: as well as why I believe it has turned its back on its own special responsibility—that of finding jobs for the unemployed, and is driving hard for complete control over the manpower resources of the United States.

In passing, I will mention how the creation of a new bureaucratic empire has brought with it the usual corruption and waste of taxpayers' money.

The USES was established in 1933 and charged with responsibility for finding employment for 13 million Americans who were out of work. That has always been its primary responsibility. No subsequent legislative enactments have given it any additional authority, yet Mr. Robert C. Goodwin, the Director of the Agency reads into the basic law far more than the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the time reveals to the rest of us.

Two years ago the Kennedy administration, properly concerned with the problem of unemployment, asked for a large increase in funds for the USES and for the administration of the 50 State employment agencies as part of his major attack on that problem. Most Members of Congress agree that the continued joblessness of 5 percent of our labor force is an intolerable condition that demands remedy. We went along quite willingly with the suggestion that USES should tackle the job. The record of the past 2 years indicates that our confidence was misplaced. USES did not use the additional money to redouble its efforts in behalf of the 4 million chronically unemployed Americans. Instead, it launched the drive for manpower control that I have outlined for you.

BUREAUCRATIC EXPANSION

An example of what happened to the physical operation of the USES and the State agencies has been disclosed in Cleveland, Ohio.

Cleveland is one of 55 major metropolitan areas where USES asked the State agencies to abandon the traditional concept of a public employment service preoccupied with the problems of the unemployed, and develop a new image.

Administrators and employees were told that "we must reorient our program thinking, widen our perspective, and greatly improve our operating effectiveness. We must operate as the manpower agency, concerned with all aspects of human resource development and utilization in the labor market and the economy. It is intended that the employment office in each locality will become the community manpower center."

And part of the job was to provide "spacious, well-lighted and well-furnished quarters which will be attractive to professional applicants."

In Cleveland, Ohio, this meant that the employment service would be divorced from its longtime partner, the office for unemployment compensation. Historically, the two have operated in the same quarters, utilizing some of the same personnel, so that the unemployed worker who registered could draw his compensation and look for job openings at the same place. Now the employment service moved downtown, to spacious, well-lighted quarters where professional people might feel at home. Symbolically and as a matter of fact, the employment service turned its back on the unemployed.

The new and more spacious quarters needed new and more numerous employees. Throughout the country 4,700 people were added to the payroll. Cleveland hired 88. So far as I know, this was the greatest contribution the employment service made toward solving the unemployment problem in that city.

The 88 new people were divided into several small bureaus, each with a supervisor, with nothing much to do.

In private industry I believe it is the custom to hire a new man or woman only when the workload grows to the point that it cannot be handled satisfactorily by the old staff. In the bureaucracy, the opposite is true. As Mr. Goodwin told the Appropriations Committee last spring, his first job was to expand the staff by 4,700 jobs; the second job was to find work for these people to do. And in Cleveland, Mr. Goodwin's regional director put it this way:

"We knew that these 88 new people wouldn't immediately have enough work to earn their keep. They might be sitting around and worrying about it. But we are building a potential, and you have to start somewhere."

CORRUPTION UNCOVERED

What happened in Cleveland may be known to you by now. A new State director, Willard Dudley, was not impressed by the tremendous staff. He began to investigate and he found that some of these people were falsifying records to justify their jobs. The regional director said they didn't have to justify their jobs, but these were people less sophisticated in bureaucracy, and so they began to make false claims that individuals had been placed in jobs when, in fact, they were still unemployed.

This is great personal tragedy for the Government employees whose sense of insecurity in what they knew were featherbedding jobs caused them to make false statements. And it was an even greater tragedy for the unemployed whose records were falsely altered. It meant that they were no longer considered for job openings, because when one of these clerks wrote "hired" on an individual's card, that card went into an inactive file and the Government agency could make no further effort to place him.

Mr. Ward A. Riley, the civil servant in charge of the Cleveland office, dismissed the entire affair by saying that the falsification in Cleveland was really nothing new. He told a reporter that "you will find that in every employment office in the country. * * * It's been the pattern everywhere since 1930."

When the USES talks about the number of job placements, take the statistics with a grain of salt. No one knows how many people actually were placed. No one knows how many people were placed for only 1 day's work—perhaps as a circus roustabout—and went into the agency records as a "hire." And no one knows how many of these job placements involve the same individuals. One employment service official in Ohio placed his three sons in a total of 140 different jobs in the space of a year and claimed 140 placements on his record. We do know that even with the inflated claim of new placements for 1962, the total was about the same as placements 10 years ago.

The Cleveland case is an example of what happens when bureaucracy grows like Topsy. Disquieting as it may be, the overall program of USES and what it intends to do to the American way of life is far more alarming.

MANPOWER MONOPOLY

Let me give you now a brief outline of how USES is planning to become the manpower monopoly of the United States, with a manpower center in every community.

The new USES offices are designed to serve managerial, professional, sales, clerical, and technical personnel whether or not they are already employed. Men and women are urged to come in and discuss their ambitions with employment counselors. They are urged to become job applicants. Columns of newspaper advertisements are devoted to seeking applications for well-paid jobs. In short, the employment service is using the taxes you pay as a businessman to encourage your employees to leave your payroll and find greener pastures.

These are people who do not need taxpayer help to find work. They can find it for themselves, or they can use the services of a private enterprise placement agency if they wish, but they do not need public assistance. To the extent that they are receiving public assistance—as part of the USES campaign to establish itself as the manpower center of the community—the unemployed are being neglected.

USES also solicits employers and in some areas virtually strong-arms them in an effort to have them list job openings only with the public employment services. They want a closed shop from industry. List all of your job openings with us and hire only people that we refer to you is the theme of this campaign. Again, money and effort are being diverted from the unemployed who need help.

USES wants to take the place of the union hiring hall and some unions are agreeable to shifting this burden onto the Government agency.

USES officials believe that no person should be required to go to a fee-charging agency in order to get a job. The answer, of course, is that no person is required to do so. But the fee-charging private enterprise placement service is a legitimate American business and the Government has no right to try to destroy that business as USES is now trying to do.

USES is muscling in on the annual conventions of professional associations and societies, which have always been the scene of bargaining for jobs. The members of these associations are capable, learned, and self-sufficient individuals. They can look out for themselves. Yet USES is establishing placement bureaus at such conventions. To the extent that it uses its money and effort for this purpose, it is neglecting the problems of the needy unemployed.

COLLEGE PLACEMENT

USES is interfering in the college placement system of the United States. Most colleges operate placement services and most large companies have college recruiting departments. They have long experience in fitting the right graduate to the right job. But to the dismay of the college officials and of the company officers concerned, USES is trying to take over this field of endeavor.

As David H. Morgan, director of college relations for Dow Chemical Co., said recently, the USES might possibly, after many years and many millions of dollars, provide a college placement service that was minimally adequate, but it cannot provide a service as satisfactory to the graduate, the college, and the company as is in effect today.

Mr. Morgan listened to some of the theories of USES officials and expressed alarm that their placement activities might lead them into undergraduate counseling and control of college curricula, and he expressed horror at the thought that this counseling and control might then extend into the high schools so that every boy and girl would have his career established under the careful guidance of some bureaucratic representative of Uncle Sam.

I have news for Mr. Morgan. High school guidance and counseling services are already being provided by the public employment service. I contend that USES has neither the legal authority nor the technical competence to do the job. It is a job for which other agencies of Federal, State, and local government already are responsible.

OUR LIBERTY THREATENED

Where does all this lead? What happens when USES and its State affiliates become the one and only manpower center for the United States?

It means that in my high school and college work I must accept the guidance of a Government employee or risk his displeasure. His displeasure may mean that I will be numbered among the forgotten unemployed, because his colleagues control employment. They have forced private agencies out of business and closed down the college placement services. They have won agreement with employers that only those who are referred from the public agency may be hired. And what happens if I wish to change jobs and better myself? Must I justify my reasons to a clerk in the Government service and win his approval before I can be referred to a new position? And, if I am an employer, must I accept whomever is sent to me to fill a job or risk the displeasure of the bureau?

If you know what is going on in Federal Government today you can add one more dimension. Federal employment today is based largely on political reliability. If USES becomes the manpower center of the community, will I need the okay of the chairman of the political party in power before I can get one of the better jobs?

This is where we are heading if we permit the public employment service to grow unchecked.

The statements of Mr. Goodwin and Mr. Levine, his assistant, and the statements and writings of dozens of other officials in the agency substantiate my conclusions. If any further proof is needed, I refer you to House Joint Resolution 607 recently introduced in the House of Representatives which would give congressional authorization to the activities I have described today.

As I indicated in my opening remarks, this is the story of a major breakdown in the Federal system, brought about by the determination of the men in one Government bureau to take over all services in a major area of American life. The unfortunate side effect has been that the agency established for the specific purpose of finding jobs for the unemployed has turned its major attentions from that responsibility and is engaging in a great many functions that are not its responsibility.

A narrow view might describe the problem as of concern only to the private enterprise placement services that are threatened by Government competition. The fact is that similar problems confront the broadcasting industry, the newspaper industry, meatpacking, and one could go on. Thus it becomes a problem for all of us who are interested in the continued development of the Federal system of Government and in the preservation of the personal liberty and opportunity which only the federal system can guarantee.

Immigration Legislation Need for Changes in Our Present Immigration Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the President on his proposals to Congress for major changes in our present immigration laws. This legislation should be one of our first orders of business when the second session of the 88th Congress convenes in January 1964. My deep interest has led me to cosponsor the administration bill. My bill is H.R. 7830.

The chief purpose of the bill is to eliminate the discrimination inherent in the national origins system. No one can seriously deny that this system does discriminate unfairly against many people of the world whose friendship we want and seek by other means. As President Kennedy remarked in his immigration message, the national origins quota system is an anachronism in today's world and its use today "is without basis in either logic or reason." Whatever basis in logic or reason it might have once had, it is now outmoded, out of date, and out of step with our national sentiments and objectives. The President's recommendations, incorporated in my bill, represent for the first time in many years, specific proposals to abolish the national origins quota system.

Much of America's strength can be attributed to the diversity of our population. Immigrants from many lands contributed to this country's growth and prosperity. Our present national origins quota system is based on the composition of our country in 1920, and as the President pointed out, "It neither satisfies a national need nor accomplishes an international purpose." The present system results in hardship because some of the nations most favored with quotas have few would-be immigrants, while other nations with vast numbers seeking admission have smaller quotas. About 60,000 quota numbers go unused each year, while tens of thousands from less favored lands must wait indefinitely. Our American heritage demands an immigration law inspired by a humanitarian spirit—not discriminatory immigration laws that bar entry to the United States on the basis of race or national origin.

In place of the national origins quota system, our new bill would write provisions into the immigration law allowing for the selection of immigrants based primarily on the qualifications of the immigrant. During a 5-year phaseout period the national origins quota would be reduced at the rate of 20 percent annually. After this 5-year period, no preference would be given to the inhabitants of one country over another. All quota immigrant visas would be issued on a first-come, first-serve basis to all eligible immigrants, subject only to the limitation that immigrants from no one country could use up more than 10 percent of the total worldwide quota at the expense of potential immigrants in other countries. Every immigrant would still have to meet the rigid personal qualification requirements in order to gain admission. No paupers, no subversives, no convicts, or others of undesirable character would be allowed in under the bill. The overall quota would be increased slightly, from around 157,000 to around 165,000. This does not represent opening the floodgate.

Under our present quota system, Great Britain is allowed to send us over 65,000 quota immigrants a year, if that many wish to come, which they do not. At the same time, the quota for Greece is 308. Thus, the present system denies entry to the 309th quota immigrant from Greece, while many thousand quota visas go unused under the British quota and those of other countries. In 1962, for example, only 23,447 quota immigrants entered the United States under the British quota. This means that over 40,000 British quota visas were unused that year.

The system proposed as a replacement for national quotas would give first priority to persons of useful skills and attainments on the basis of ability to add to our national welfare. Second priority would be given to persons whose immigration would reunite a family; to the unmarried adult daughter, for instance, of parents already in the United States. Other prospective immigrants would be given consideration on the basis of priority of registration.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to mention the main provisions of the bill. I see no threats to our national welfare or economy in the bill. It simply provides for a more sensible method of allocating immigrant visas than exists under present law. I hope the Congress will act on this important legislation early next year.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I insert here a summary of the major provisions of the proposed new immigration bill, prepared by the State Department:

SUMMARY OF THE MAJOR PROVISIONS OF THE IMMIGRATION BILL

I. ABOLITION OF THE NATIONAL ORIGINS SYSTEM

1. The basic purpose of the bill is to abolish the national origins system, and to allow immigration on a first-come, first-served basis within preference categories.

2. The transition to the new system will take place gradually, over a 5-year period. The quota of each country will be reduced by 20 percent the first year, 40 percent the second year, etc.

3. The present total quota of about 157,000 will be increased by 8,000 to enable raising of minimum quotas from 100 to 200.

4. During each of the first 5 years, the pool created by the annual 20-percent reductions, together with all unused numbers from the previous year, will be allocated to immigrants from oversubscribed areas.

5. At the end of the 5-year period, all national quotas will have been abolished and all quota numbers will be in the pool. Numbers from the pool will then be allocated on a first-come, first-served basis within preference categories:

(a) First preference will be given to those whose skills are especially advantageous to the United States.

(b) Second and third preference will be given, as before, to close relations of U.S. citizens and resident aliens.

(c) Remaining visas will be allocated as follows: up to 50 percent among other relatives of U.S. citizens and resident aliens; up to one-half of the remaining visas to immigrants filling a particular labor shortage; the remainder to "new seed."

6. An Immigration Advisory Board is established, composed of two members appointed by the Speaker of the House, two by the President of the Senate, and three by the President. This Board is to advise on immigration matters and to help to implement the new legislation.

7. During and after the 5-year period, the President may, after consultation with the Board, utilize up to 50 percent of the pool:

(a) To avoid undue hardship resulting from the quota reductions; and

(b) In the national security interest.

8. After consultation with the Board, the President may also utilize up to 20 percent of the pool for refugees.

9. No more than 16,478 visas (10 percent of the total) may be allocated to any quota area except under the President's authority to utilize numbers from the pool.

II. OTHER PROVISIONS

1. The so-called Asia-Pacific triangle is eliminated. Persons of Asian stock will come in under the quotas of their places of birth rather than those of their remote ancestry.

2. Immigrants eligible for nonquota status must apply as nonquota immigrants. The fee provisions are revised, however, to make the total cost to a nonquota or preference immigrant the same as the cost to a nonpreference immigrant.

3. Nonquota status is extended to all parents of U.S. citizens as well as their spouses and children.

4. Nonquota status is also extended to natives of all independent Western Hemisphere countries.

5. A simplified petition procedure is established for first-preference skilled workers. The Attorney General need only determine that an opening exists in a field rather than that a particular employer has an opening.

6. The fair-share law is amended to eliminate any reference to the United Nations High Commissioner in order to avoid dependence on external limitations and to liberalize the law.

7. The definition of the western border of the Middle East in the Refugee Relief Act is expanded from Libya to Morocco.

8. The Secretary of State is granted discretion concerning the time and manner of visa fee payments.

9. The Secretary of State is also granted authority to terminate registrations of applicants who have declined visas and to require reregistration by applicants.

10. Issuance of visas is permitted to certain mentally ill persons and epileptics.

11. Consular officers are granted authority, in borderline cases, to require certain student and visitor nonimmigrants to post bonds.

A Debt of Ignorance and Unpreparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz made a memorable address when he highlighted the 75th anniversary banquet of the International Association of Machinists in Seattle, Wash., September 21.

Many valuable points were stressed, but one, in particular, cannot be overemphasized. He said:

> I hear about not passing debts on to the next generation. The one debt I don't want to see us pass on to the next generation is the debt of ignorance and unpreparedness which will mean they can't make their own way. That's the one thing we can't do as far as this next generation is concerned.

Then Secretary Wirtz proceeded to call meaningless the 5½-percent unemployment rate in the Nation unless one also recognizes that "unemployment in this country for people with education of less than a seventh grade level is 9½ percent and unemployment for persons with a college education or more is 1½ percent."

Secretary Wirtz also called attention to the founding of the International Association of Machinists in "that locomotive pit in Atlanta 75 years ago" and saluted the organization as "builders of democracy's past and who are today the architects of its future."

I was not able to attend this 75th anniversary banquet. However, my colleague from the State of Washington, Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, was in attendance.

Our Washington machinists have told me many times of their appreciation that Secretary Wirtz could be with them and deliver this powerful message.

I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Wirtz' address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY'S MANPOWER PROBLEMS

(By the Honorable W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of the U.S. Department of Labor)

The most serious economic fact in this country today is the fact that 4 million people who want to work are being denied the opportunity to do so. You are pointing out that the effect of this is exactly the same upon the economy as if the whole country were to come to a halt with no production, no service, no profit, no pay for a 3-week period out of the year. You are pointing out that with 4 million people in this country unemployed, the result is exactly the same in its effect as the loss of from $30 to $40 billion in the growth of our gross national product and you are saying there is no excuse for this and we must do something about it. And you are pressing in connection with this problem on all three of the principal action fronts across which it seems to me we must move if we are to achieve the goal and the purpose of full employment. Senator JACKSON has already referred to these briefly and I would develop them only slightly more.

You have said, in the first place, with a voice loudest of all of those and clearest in American labor, full employment in this country is dependent upon development of substantially larger markets for American products. You have led the fight for the development of the export trade of this Nation. You fly over your national headquarters in Washington every day, and I think you are the only union in the country who does, the "E" flag for exports conferred by the Department of Commerce.

At your 25th quadrennial convention in St. Louis in 1960 you debated whether you were to follow the protective line, whether you were to hide behind the maginot line of protective tariffs. And then President Al Hayes convened the session in Washington in 1962 and you decided after 3 days of debating this problem that you would not follow that line and you announced a positive world trade policy for labor. You have recognized that every $1 billion of exported goods from this country means about 150,000 more jobs for men and women in this country, and you have realized that as the work force grows at the rapid rate at which it is now growing we are dependent for full employment upon the development of larger markets in the world as a whole. You have spoken the truest voice of labor's interest in the enlarged welfare of the whole Nation when you have adopted the kind of policy you have with respect to the development of our foreign trade.

Second, there is the importance, to which Senator JACKSON has also already referred, of the tax reduction program. We will not have full employment in this country unless we can put the economy to a pace which it has not yet achieved. We recognize fully that this is almost entirely a matter for domestic private development and yet we know, Senator JACKSON has pointed out, that it is important that the economy be freed of the fetters which now bind it in the present tax system. It is essential to the development of full employment in this country that there be that invigoration of the economy which will come from the release of another $11 billion of consumer purchasing power. And when I see men of smaller minds saying that it's only a little bit for each of a great many people in this country, I can only point out that it does mean that another $11 billion will be spent through consumer channels in this country and that that will mean an uncountable number of additional jobs.

I can't tell you how many the economists figure out with their accelerators and their multipliers, and so on and so forth, what it will mean—I don't know how many more jobs it will mean. You can't tell for sure. I say to you as sternly as I can muster the facts that it is essential to full employment in this country that this step be taken. I think it is essential that it be taken this year. It seems to me there is a crisis before us which must be met and met quickly. I can only express as strongly as I possibly can the view which the President of course put so much better on Wednesday night when he said that we have got to face immediately the problem of developing 10,000 new jobs a day in this country. That's 10 million new jobs in the next 2½ years and it is essential to this that we put into the purchasing power of this country the benefits of this tax program, that we stimulate investment in production by passing the new tax reduction program.

Now the third point, the one upon which you have placed most emphasis recently and the one which I should like to develop in just a little more detail this evening. The third point is that you are facing squarely in this organization the issue of the relationship between men and machines. At your golden anniversary celebration 25 years ago you said this, "Gold and silver are still, as in the past, the important precious metals but iron and steel have crept into the lives of men until today they seem to rule the world." Today, at your 75th anniversary it seems that machines are creeping into the lives of men and sometimes that they are asserting dominion over the future.

The answer of the International Association of Machinists is again in the finest tradition. It is not that automation should be opposed for it cannot be opposed. It is rather that, as President Hayes has put it, "We welcome automation because we know that it can improve and enrich the lives of workers both on and off the job." But even more importantly, automation is obviously the means by which we can eventually release mankind all over the world from the grip of historic scarcity. You insist at the same time and with equal vigor, and again in President Hayes' words, "The purpose of technological progress must be the advancement of the welfare of people as a whole and not the means of making a portion of our citizenry expendable." You insist, and properly, that replacing a man with a machine is not progress unless there is an opportunity given that man for other kinds of work. You agreed, a little more lightly, that necessity is the mother of invention but you insist that invention should not be the mother of necessity.

As I read last night President Kennedy's magnificent speech yesterday at the U.N., I thought of how much of a parallel there is today between the central international and domestic issues of our times. In both areas, in the area of international relationships or the area of war, in the area of domestic concern or the area of work, the science of things has moved way out in front of the science of people. The question today is whether we are going to know how to use the scientific knowledge that has suddenly been thrust upon us. "The question about the new instruments of war," President Kennedy said, "is whether we can be as bold and farsighted in the control of them as we have been in their creation."

And this is the central question, too, about the new instruments of work. Here, unlike the other area, the answer cannot be to stop their use. It must be rather to use them to the full and to do those things which will permit this, and at the same time to increase people's standards of living and their freedom and their usefulness. Now this isn't just going to happen. I don't propose to engage in debate or controversy about whether automation produces more jobs than it destroys. There can be only one answer to this question and that is, that there are going to be more jobs in the future than there are now. We are not going to put up with the present situation. There are between a million and a million and a half more people in the work force every year. In addition, there must be the cutting down of the present figure of unemployment, and in addition to that we must provide jobs for those whose places are taken by machines. There is only one answer to this and this is, that we are going to do it. And if the question is about how, I say that we will get there, not for the passing of any magic wand or the supplying of a single answer but by attending to the various parts of this problem which present themselves. The approach through the development of foreign trade is one, the approach through the stimulation of the economy through the tax reduction and other similar programs is another, and a third of great importance and one which falls particularly within the area of concern and responsibility of the Department of Labor is through the development of a training program which will bring people in this country into a position to make use of the new opportunities and to fill the new demands of the technological world. And I would like to talk just a little more about this.

Thirty days from today 800,000 people will be at different jobs from the ones in which they are today. Thirty days from today 400,000 of them will be doing something different from what they are doing today. Most of the retraining job is going to have to be done privately, but another substantial part of it has got to be done publicly. And when I say publicly, I mean to include the whole educational system as we now have it and know it. I say to you in complete humility with whatever license the spending of most of a lifetime in teaching gives me, that I think the educational system in the country today is falling every day further behind the demands of the new world of work. I think it for these reasons: it used to be all right to train everybody for college and not to worry too much about those who, taking that training, didn't go on to college and who went out into the world of work without any usable skill. That didn't matter too much before because there were unskilled jobs for those boys and girls to do. Today there aren't. The one thing which is clearest about automation is the machines are from here on out going to be doing the unskilled jobs and there isn't going to be anything for the boy and girl without a usable skill to do. It has become silly business to say that a boy shall stay in school until he is 16 and he may then drop out. It would only make sense if we were to say in his interest and in that of society, "you must stay in school until you have a usable skill and then you may move out into the world." I don't propose new laws, I only propose to try to make it clear what is involved as far as this situation is concerned and the good sense of this country will do the rest. I wish I could say to every boy and girl in this country, "If you drop out of school you are making a $50,000 mistake because that's what it amounts to. Our figures show that with a usable skill your average earnings will be $50,000 more than without a usable skill." I wish I could say to every boy and girl in the country, "If you drop out of school, if you try to move into the world of work today without a usable skill, you're going to cost the rest of the country about a thousand dollars a year the rest of your life in unemployment insurance, in welfare benefits, in institutional care of one kind or another."

I wish we could make clear what the arithmetic of the economics of this thing are: 700,000 boys and girls out of school and out of work today, and most of them are just starting lives of uselessness and unemployment. We could salvage this group at a cost today of about $1,000 to $2,500 apiece. That's what it would cost to pick them up and to give them the usable skills which they need. If we do do that, our figures show they will, within an average of 3 to 4 years, return the full cost of that program in the taxes which they'll pay on their higher incomes and they'll make the additional $50,000 during their lives. If we don't do that, then it will cost us as a society another $1,000 a person the rest of those people's lives.

I hear about not passing debts on to the next generation. The one debt I don't want to see us pass on to the next generation is the debt of ignorance and unpreparedness which will mean they can't make their own way. That's the one thing we can't do as far as this next generation is concerned. I wish there were some way of driving home the fact that what automation clearly means is that no longer is there going to be a place for the person without a skill, the untrained person. At the other end the situation is one of equal need pressing immediately upon it for larger and larger numbers of people with special skills, training, and professional competence of one kind or another.

You hear that unemployment in this country is 5½ percent. The figure is meaningless. The unemployment in this country for people with education of less than a seventh grade level is 9½ percent and the unemployment for people in this country with a college education or more is 1½ percent. Unemployment is becoming daily in this country a matter of lack of education, of lack of preparation and we've simply got to do something about it, and we've got to do it fast. Because, where before, as I have said, the untrained person could be taken up in an unskilled job, no longer is that opportunity available.

The two figures that can haunt me and keep me awake at night are these: That there are in the adult work force in this country today 3 million people with educational attainment levels of less than a fifth grade education. That's one. And the other is that in the next 30 months 5½ million young men and women will be moving into the work force, and 2 million of them will have less than a high school education. And there aren't jobs for those people. Now we've got to move in on this, we've got to move in on it rapidly. If we do, then I think that the problems of automation technological development will be met. If we don't, then not only will there accumulate this scrap heap of uneducated people behind us, but there will not be the people we need trained for the highly technical jobs which the new technological age demands.

I make the argument for the Manpower Development and Training Act and for the amendments of it which are now before the Congress. I think there should be a Youth Employment Act which is presently before the Congress for consideration. I think we must do a good deal more about vocational education of one kind or another. I make most strongly the argument that we recognize that eventually this is something which must be done through the education, general educational system in this country and the sooner we face up to that necessity and demand the better. It's got to be full employment.

You have talked to me about the problem of collective bargaining, the problems we have had this year, the headaches which we have had. You have had them in this area and they have been all over the country. You asked whether collective bargaining is going to work better in the future or not, as they did at the press conference this afternoon. There is only one answer to that and that is, that if we get full employment collective bargaining is going to work. If we don't get full employment, it's probably not going to work.

This country is concerned properly and deeply today about the problem of equal employment opportunity especially among the races. There will be equal employment opportunity in this country when there is full employment in this country. We're getting the problem of discrimination licked. But we won't be able to realize on our gains until we achieve that purpose. Well, I don't mean to go on at great length about what in a way is obvious and yet I suppose the exploration of the obvious is sometimes the healthiest thing for us. I hope that I can leave in your minds an attitude toward automation and technological development which includes no element of fright because I am not frightened about it, which includes every element of optimism about the future of automation and about the things that machines can bring. Because they are, again in the words of the President's speech last night, they add up to this: "Never before has man had such capacity to control his own environment, to end thirst and hunger, to conquer poverty and disease, to banish illiteracy and massive human misery. We have the capacity to make this the best generation of mankind ever in the history of the world or, he added, the last."

These machines could be the instrument of our release as human individuals, they could be the instrument of the destruction of opportunity, on the other hand, for a great many people. It's important that we realize that the science of things has gotten so far out in front of the science of people. It's important that we realize how little most of us can know from here on out about the mysteries of science. It's important that we realize that from here on out we will be living, all of us, just a single spark away from destruction and that those forces will be in the hands of people with whom we can't even communicate, the scientists. And yet, there is nothing in the world which suggests that we cannot be as imaginative in our capacity as citizens as we are in our capacity as scientists. There is everything to suggest that if we put ourselves to it, we can use the new instruments which are being developed for our benefit, that we can remain the masters of them and that they will never become the masters of us.

Finally, I say this, we have got to face up to the fact that the principal difficulty we have in this country doing anything about 5 or 6 percent unemployment is that the other 94 percent of the people of this country are doing so well. We will begin to meet our problems when, and only when, we decide as a nation, not as an administration but as a nation, to start doing the things which we want so much to do and which, if we do them, will give us the full employment needed as an element in our program.

I turn again, in conclusion, to the men who gathered that night in that locomotive pit in Atlanta 75 years ago. They were thinking mainly and naturally of getting more for themselves by getting more from the company which had just that day reduced their wages. Our thoughts tonight, 75 years later as we look ahead, are about how we can improve our own positions by now making the whole system work better by strengthening and claiming more of the markets of the world, by pushing the opening doors to the universe, by making machines that instrument of man's fulfillment.

It's been for me a very real pleasure to be here in Seattle just to say "happy birthday" to you and to the International Association of Machinists. But beyond that, it's not just a matter of pleasure or happiness, it's a very real honor to come here to salute the members of a union who have been the builders of democracy's past and who are today the architects of its future. Thank you very much.

The Federal-Aid Highway Program After 1971

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 launched the greatest public works program in history: Completion of the 41,000-mile national system of interstate and defense highways by the year 1972. We are now approaching the halfway point in this great program, and it is time for us to begin considering the nature and extent of the highway program to follow it.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 did not occur over night. It was the product of extended congressional consideration of detailed and exhaustive studies and reports prepared over a period of many years. The first basic investigation of the feasibility of a nationwide network of superhighways was the result of a congressional directive enacted in 1938—some 18 years before the 1956 act.

The Federal-aid highway program to follow our present interstate highway program must be based upon thorough, comprehensive studies and analyses. Preparation of these will take time, and additional time must be allowed for congressional consideration. Recognizing these facts, I and several of my colleagues have introduced measures to require comprehensive studies and recommendations concerning the highway program after completion of the present one.

The first of these measures was introduced by my able and energetic colleague, the gentleman from Florida, WILLIAM C. CRAMER. Subsequently, at a meeting of the American Association of State Highway Officials, Mr. CRAMER spoke on the subject, "The Federal-Aid Highway Program After 1971." His cogent and well-reasoned remarks are recommended to the attention of all Members. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. CRAMER's speech:

THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM AFTER 1971

(Remarks of the Honorable WILLIAM C. CRAMER at the annual meeting of the American Association of State Highway Officials, Portland, Oreg., October 22, 1963)

It is always gratifying to me to attend these annual meetings of highway officials. This is partly due to the fact that I thoroughly enjoy them and the opportunity to renew old acquaintances. But, more important, I find that your meetings, without exception, are vastly educational and of real help in viewing highway matters in their proper perspective.

The number and scope of subjects discussed in your committee sessions, the enthusiastic and almost never-ending exchange of information and views concerning problems of common interest, are impressive and inspiring. After attending a meeting of AASHO, I always return to Washington much better informed about the highway program, with a greater insight into the problems which must be solved, and with the renewed conviction that highway officials in the main are able and conscientious.

At the meeting this year much attention will be devoted to the progress and status of the Interstate Highway program. This is appropriate because half of the time allotted for completion of the program will have elapsed before your next meeting, your 50th annual convention, in Atlanta, Ga., next year. For my part, I am confident that the interstate program can be completed in 1972, as contemplated by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956. It will not be easy. It cannot be done without the full and dedicated efforts of all concerned. But it can be done. The official policy statement of AASHO adopted in Miami Beach, Fla., last year, included a reassurance to the Congress that the individual State highway departments have the ability to efficiently complete the interstate program within the planned time schedule. This reassurance is encouraging. I can assure you that the Congress, convinced of the importance of completing the program on schedule, is closely observing the progress of the program and will not be tolerant of any undue delay.

With this in mind, I believe that it is extremely important to give serious thought to the highway program after 1972. It is not too early to do this. Federal Highway Administrator Rex Whitton has pointed out that to complete the interstate program on schedule, the final construction contracts should be awarded in 1970, that the final design work and right-of-way acquisition should be underway no later than 1968, and that the last of the studies on route location should be winding up right now.

The necessary and orderly continuation of the highway program after fiscal year 1971 requires that construction planning, traffic surveys, and route location studies be commenced in the near future, so that there will be a firm program for continuation of highway improvement to take up where the present program leaves off. The nature and extent of the future highway program must, of course, be determined by the Congress, but we must have such a program. Without it the abrupt substantial reduction in the amounts expended for Federal aid highways would cause a severely adverse impact on the Nation's economy. A temporary suspension followed by later acceleration of the highway program would necessitate slow and costly replacement of staffs and equipment inventories. And, in the meantime, our transportation needs would continue to grow.

Whatever decisions are made as to the nature and extent of the Federal-aid highway program after 1971, they should be based upon detailed and comprehensive studies. And enough time should be allowed for these studies to insure their accuracy and reliability. We certainly want to avoid recurrence of problems such as those which arose in the early years of the Interstate program. You will recall that the original money authorizations for completion of the Interstate System, set forth in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, were based upon cost estimates submitted to the Congress in 1955. Later estimates, prepared in 1957, and submitted to the Congress in 1958, showed that the cost of completing the Interstate System would be some $10 billion more than shown in the 1955 estimates—and a financial crisis resulted. A number of factors contributed to this increase, but one of the basic causes was the fact that simply not enough time had been allowed for preparation of the 1955 estimates. The 1955 estimates necessarily were hurriedly put together, without time for the careful and comprehensive cross-checking which is so essential to insure accuracy and reliability.

Also Congress, which will have to make the final decisions, must be given time for its deliberations. To illustrate, let me briefly trace the origin and development of the Interstate System over the period from 1938 to 1956—some 18 years.

In 1938, the Congress directed the Bureau of Public Roads to investigate the feasibility and cost of constructing six superhighways across the Nation. The report of this investigation, submitted to the Congress in 1939, found that the construction of such highways was feasible and desirable.

In 1941 the President appointed the National Interregional Highway Committee to continue the investigation. The report of this Committee, transmitted to the Congress in 1944, reiterated the importance of an interregional system of highways and strongly recommended prompt beginning of its construction.

That same year, 1944, the Congress authorized the designation of a "National System of Interstate Highways," but no funds were then earmarked for its construction. In 1947 the Bureau of Public Roads announced the designation of interstate highway routes totaling 37,681 miles. In 1948, the Congress directed a study of the status of improvement of the National System of Interstate Highways. A report of this study was submitted to the Congress in 1949, under the title "Highway Needs for the National Defense."

It was not until 1952 that funds were authorized specifically for expenditures on the interstate system only, and then in the token amount of $25 million annually. In 1954 this authorization was increased to just $175 million annually, and the Federal share of the cost of interstate highway projects increased from 50 to 60 percent. In 1955 a report entitled "Needs of the Highway Systems, 1955–84" (which I earlier referred to as the 1955 cost estimates) was submitted to the Congress. The report, together with the so-called Clay committee report ("A 10-Year National Highway Program") submitted the same year, culminated in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956, which launched our present interstate highway program.

In all, a total of about 18 years elapsed between submission of the report "Toll Roads and Free Roads," and enactment of the 1956 act. Of course, there were several intervening factors, including World War II and the Korean emergency, and I am not implying that so long a time would be taken again. But this does illustrate the necessity for beginning comprehensive studies of future programs well in advance of the time action must be taken.

Now, let us consider for a moment what such studies should encompass.

The 1963 policy statement of AASHO recognized the need for further evaluation of the size of and justification for Federal aid to the ABC programs, and the possible future extension of the interstate highway system. Following adoption of this policy statement, I introduced House Joint Resolution 464 to direct the Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with other agencies and the State highway departments, to make a comprehensive investigation and study of highway traffic and needs, and to submit to the Congress by January 1966, a report and recommendation for a 10-year highway program commencing with fiscal year 1972.

The investigation and study would cover the following general matters:

1. Types and volumes of estimated highway traffic as projected for 20 years;

2. Any changes (including the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of highways) which may be necessary in the Federal-aid highway systems needed to accommodate such traffic;

3. The cost of such changes;

4. The extent of Federal participation in the cost of such changes;

5. Methods for financing such Federal costs; and

6. Methods of apportioning Federal-aid highway funds among the States.

Comprehensive studies of these general subjects would involve many subsidiary items, and some of these are spelled out in the resolution. They include: examination of highway classifications, the possible creation of new Federal-aid highway systems, the possible extension of the Interstate System, and examination of the many problems resulting from the construction of toll facilities.

With the report and recommendations resulting from these studies before it, the Congress will be able to proceed to determine the future Federal-aid highway program on the basis of accurate, factual, and reliable information. But, even if the report is submitted in 1966, as provided in House Joint Resolution 464, the Congress will not have very much time for its deliberations. In 1966, the Congress should authorize funds for the ABC programs for fiscal years 1968 and 1969, and by that time we should have some fairly definite plans for the highway program after 1971.

A few additional comments as to who should make the investigations and studies we have been discussing. It has been suggested that they be undertaken by a congressional committee. I feel very strongly that the investigations and studies should be undertaken by the State highway departments and the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Bureau of Public Roads which for years has been the Federal agency chiefly responsible for the development of the Federal aid highway program. In any event, whoever undertakes the project will have to rely almost entirely on the State highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads for the information necessary to support the ultimate decisions. I simply do not believe that any congressional committee has the time, the staff, or the specialized knowledge required to accumulate and evaluate the tremendous amount of facts and data which must be considered. Obviously, the investigations and studies must and will be carefully reviewed by the committees of the Congress before decisions are made. But the Congress should devote its time to the making of decisions and ask the highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads to gather and submit the necessary background information.

It is pertinent to note the fact that in 1953, the House Committee on Public Works adopted a resolution reading, in part, as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives through its Subcommittee on Roads is authorized and directed to make a comprehensive study and review of the highway problem. In the conduct of the study the committee shall seek the counsel and advice of responsible Federal, State, county, and city officials, and other individuals and organizations qualified to advise them in their respective fields."

Pursuant to this resolution, the Subcommittee on Roads held extensive hearings over a period of several months during 1953. I am sure that this national highway study, and the testimony presented at the hearings, were of inestimable value to the committee and to the Congress in considering subsequent legislative proposals. However, they did not result in a final decision as to what action should be taken to meet the urgent need for an accelerated highway program to overcome the serious deteriorations and deficiencies in our highway systems. One year later, in 1954, the Congress directed the Secretary of Commerce to make studies on several aspects of the highway problem. It was not until the Congress had received and considered these and other reports and recommendations that positive action was taken for the completion of the Interstate System: enactment of the 1956 act.

I hope that we can learn from history. I hope that we will start now to make the comprehensive studies necessary to determine what our highway program will be after 1971. And I hope that the primary responsibility for undertaking these studies and the development of appropriate recommendations will be placed upon and accepted by the proper parties: the State highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads.

Before closing, I would like to make very brief mention of one more subject: that of mass transit. We hear a great deal about this nowadays, and particularly about the competition between the highway interests and the mass transit interests. There should be no such competition, in the sense that there must be a winner and a loser. If there is such competition, the real loser will be the American public.

We are dedicated to solving the transportation problems of the Nation. We know, beyond any doubt, that an extensive network of highways is now and will continue to be essential to our economy and well-being. It is possible that mass transit facilities would serve to alleviate transportation problems in many urban areas, and, to the extent that this is true, I recognize the need for transit facilities in appropriate areas.

Studies and consideration of the need for mass transit facilities as well as highways are necessary and desirable. But such studies and consideration must not be used as an excuse for delaying highway construction. They must not be permitted to develop into planning controversies or disputes as to priority for funds.

A good example of what should not but can happen is found in Washington, D.C., where desperately needed highway projects are being delayed because of the morass of mass transit proposals. Plans for interstate highway routes in the District of Columbia include a bridge across the Potomac River—the so-called Three Sisters Bridge—and an inner loop to carry traffic around the congested downtown area. The bridge and inner loop are key parts of the Interstate System in the Washington area, and their selection was based upon exhaustive studies and planning continuing over a period of several years. Recommendations for construction of the Three Sisters Bridge date back to at least 1953.

In 1960 the Congress created the National Capital Transportation Agency, and directed it to prepare a transit development program. In May of this year, the President transmitted the transit development program to the Congress and recommended its adoption. However, in addition to this, the President also recommended that appropriations for the Three Sisters Bridge and certain essential parts of the Inner Loop be deferred pending a "careful reexamination of the highway program of the District of Columbia in the light of the transit development program and the social, economic, and esthetic impact of highways on the Nation's Capital."

The recommendations of the President were based upon the report of the National Capital Transportation Agency. I have studied the report and supporting material with considerable care, and have not been able to find any indication that the Agency gave adequate study or consideration to the critically important aspects of the need for highways for national defense and interstate transportation. Furthermore, the law specifically required the Agency to cooperate and coordinate with other agencies on arterial highway matters, and specifically stated that responsibility and authority for location, design, construction, and operation of highways shall remain with the agencies having jurisdiction. Despite this, testimony before committees of the House showed that the Agency did not cooperate, did not coordinate, and did not solicit or accept the views or assistance of the highway agencies.

Notwithstanding these and other shortcomings in the report of the National Capital Transportation Agency, several essential parts of the Interstate System in the District of Columbia which have already been exhaustively studied and which have already been delayed too long are being further delayed pending additional studies. I cite this as an example. We must not permit the 41,000-mile national system of interstate and defense highways to be subordinated to mass transit proposals and localized problems of urban planning and improvement. We cannot do this unless we are ready to abandon the goal of completing the Interstate System in 1972.

Mass transit facilities are not a substitute for, nor do they eliminate the need for, adequate highways. In any given area the question of whether provisions can and should be made for mass transit is one which must be decided upon on its own merits. I am unalterably opposed to proposals to delay needed highway projects pending studies of the feasibility of mass transit facilities, or to defer needed highway projects to enhance the financial feasibility of mass transit schemes, or to divert highway user revenues to finance mass transit facilities.

The continuing need for highways has been established. Let us proceed with the construction of those highways. If the need for mass transit facilities in particular areas is established, let the local communities provide for such facilities, without interfering with the highway program.

Ladies and gentlemen, let me express again my pleasure at being able to participate in the 49th annual meeting of AASHO.

SENATE

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1963

(Legislative day of Tuesday, October 22, 1963)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. HERBERT S. WALTERS, a Senator from the State of Tennessee.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God of men and of nations: We come to Thee with deep gratitude for our surpassing heritage. We ask that Thou wilt so undergird us that we shall never be disobedient to the heavenly vision of a righteous nation with freedom and justice and opportunity to all.

Forbid that in dangerous days such as these the precious oil of our national unity should be spilled upon the ground, to ignite selfish fires. Rather, may it still feed the flame of liberty's torch as it enlightens the whole darkened earth.

In a revelation that may startle us and open our eyes to the solemn facts of these volcanic days, make clear to us that the massed difficulties besetting us are not so much political and economic as they are moral and spiritual; and that in all our baffled search for solutions, only by fresh awareness of Thee can the present social decay, which threatens the inner life and the outer strength of the Nation, be changed to decency and righteousness.

We lift our prayer in the Saviour's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C. November 21, 1963.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. HERBERT S. WALTERS, a Senator from the State of Tennessee, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WALTERS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, November 20, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 777) to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, it was ordered that there be a morning hour, with statements limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. DIRKSEN, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Rules and Administration was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. DIRKSEN, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

H.R. 8667. An act authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins (Rept. No. 648).

INTERNATIONAL AIR TRANSPORTATION RATES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (PT. 2 OF S. REPT. NO. 473)

Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Commerce, reported an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the bill (S. 1540) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the regulation of rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, and for other purposes, and submitted a report thereon, which amendment and report were ordered to be printed.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The following executive reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. JACKSON:

Paul H. Nitze, of Maryland, to be Secretary of the Navy.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

William P. Bundy, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

Robert H. Charles, of Missouri, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of four officers for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army in the grade of brigadier general. I ask that these nominations be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations were placed on the Executive Calendar, as follows:

Col. Alfred Carlisle Harrison, Adjutant General's Corps; Col. Erwin Case Hostetler, Adjutant General's Corps; Col. Robert Louis Stevenson, Adjutant General's Corps; and Col. Thomas Roberts White, Jr., Adjutant General's Corps, for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, in addition, I report favorably 1,432 officers for promotion in the Navy in grades not above that of captain and 822 officers for appointment and promotion in the Marine Corps in grades not above that of lieutenant colonel. Since these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk, for the information of any Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations ordered to lie on the desk are as follows:

Billy J. Adams, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the U.S. Navy;

Nita B. Warner, and sundry other officers for permanent appointment in the Marine Corps; and

Dennis L. Pardee, and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Marine Corps.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CHURCH (for himself and Mr. JORDAN of Idaho):

S. 2326. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate the Nez Perce National Historical Park in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHURCH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 2327. A bill to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, in order to promote the development of coal on the public domain; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MOSS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 2328. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to provide that it shall be a misdemeanor for any contractor receiving an operating differential subsidy under title VI or for any charterer of vessels under title VII to engage in certain discriminatory rate setting practices; and

S. 2329. A bill to amend section 18(b)(2) of the Shipping Act, 1916, to require the publishing and filing of economic justification along with the publishing and filing of tariffs in certain cases; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROXMIRE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

DISCHARGE OF FINANCE COMMITTEE FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8363, THE TAX BILL

Mr. CLARK submitted a resolution (S. Res. 226) to discharge the Committee on Finance from the further consideration of H.R. 8363, the tax bill, which was ordered to lie over 1 day under the rule.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Clark, which appears under a separate heading.)

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7063, THE STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1964

Mr. CLARK submitted a resolution (S. Res. 227) to discharge the Committee on Appropriations from the further consideration of H.R. 7063, the State, Justice, and Commerce Appropriation bill, 1964, which was ordered to lie over 1 day under the rule.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Clark, which appears under a separate heading.)

NEZ PERCE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, IDAHO

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the last century had barely begun when President Thomas Jefferson dispatched the explorers Lewis and Clark to the far Northwest; their monumental trek to the western ocean gave this Nation a valid claim to the Oregon country. However, had not the explorers been befriended by the Nez Perce Indians in what is now Idaho, they might have failed to complete their journey.

In 1836, after helping Dr. Marcus Whitman take a wagon across the Continental Divide—thus blazing the way for the Oregon Trail migrations to the Northwest—Henry Harmon Spalding opened a Presbyterian mission at Lapwai among the Nez Perces. Spalding brought the first printing press to the Northwest.

Not far from here, gold was discovered in 1860; the mines became a magnet for new population, led to the creation of Idaho Territory in 1863, provided gold for a hard-pressed Federal Treasury, and thereby helped to preserve the Union.

The great Chief Joseph and the Nez Perces of the "nontreaty" bands fought magnificently for their homelands in 1877, and their retreat is an epic tale. The Nez Perce war did much to stir the conscience of the American public with respect to our mistreatment of the Indians.

Mr. President, I mention these seemingly unrelated historical events because they are, indeed, related. They are related by geography in one area of northern Idaho, and related by the same historic genre, the Winning of the Great West. Unfortunately, the last vestiges of these momentous events have been nearly obliterated by the mindless pressures of settlement and civilization.

Because these valuable and significant sites are so located and so related, it has been proposed that they be preserved under a single responsible jurisdiction, properly identified and correlated for public viewing and appreciation. Department of Interior, national park and State officials, historians and other specialists have personally visited the sites and voiced approval of such a project. Chambers of commerce, civic organizations, and newspapers in the area have endorsed it.

After extensive study, a bill has been drawn to accomplish this laudable objective. It does not call for the creation of a large national park, but for the designation and appropriate development of the scattered historical sites in this one area, to be administered by the National Park Service. Only a small amount of land would be required for administrative use and site preservation.

Mr. President, I realize that much important legislation is before this session of the Congress, but since this year—1963—is the Territorial Centennial of Idaho, and it was this very area which gave birth to the Territory, I think it is most fitting for the bill to be introduced in this sesssion, even though action upon it cannot come until next year. So, on behalf of myself and my colleague, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to create the Nez Perce National Historical Park, and I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed in the Record at the conclusion of these remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2326) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate the Nez Perce National Historical Park in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Church (for himself and Mr. Jordan of Idaho), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, it is the purpose of this Act to facilitate protection and provide interpretation of sites in the Nez Perce country of Idaho that have exceptional value in commemorating the history of the Nation.

Sec. 2. To implement this purpose the Secretary of the Interior may designate as the Nez Perce National Historical Park various component sites in Federal and non-Federal ownership relating to the early Nez Perce culture, the Lewis and Clark Expedition through the area, the fur trade, missionaries, gold mining and logging, the Nez Perce war of 1877, and such other sites as he finds will depict the role of the Nez Perce country in the westward expansion of the Nation.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Interior may acquire by donation or with donated funds such lands, or interests therein, and other property which in his judgment will further the purpose of this Act and he may purchase with appropriated funds not to exceed 1,500 acres of land, or interests therein, required for the administration of the Nez Perce National Historical Park. The Nez Perce tribe's governing body, if it so desires, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, is authorized to sell, donate or exchange tribal owned lands held in trust needed to further the purpose of this Act.

Sec. 4. (a) Indian trust land and sites in Federal ownership under the administrative jurisdiction of other Government agencies, not to exceed 1,500 acres overall, may be designated by the Secretary of the Interior for inclusion in the Nez Perce National Historical Park with the concurrence of the beneficial owner or agency having administrative responsibility therefor, but such designation shall effect no transfer of administrative control unless the administering agency consents thereto, except that the Secretary of the Interior shall be responsible for interpreting the historical significance of the site and providing such services to the public.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior may enter into cooperative agreements with the owners of property which under the provisions of this Act may be designated for inclusion in Nez Perce National Historical Park as sites in non-Federal ownership, and he may assist in the preservation, renewal, and interpretation of the properties, provided the cooperative agreements shall contain, but not be limited to, provisions that: (1) the Secretary has right of access at all reasonable times to all public portions of the property for the purpose of conducting visitors through the property and interpreting it to the public, and (2) no changes or alterations shall be made in the properties, including buildings and grounds, without the written consent of the Secretary.

Sec. 5. When the Secretary of the Interior determines that he has acquired title to, or interest in, sufficient properties or determines that he has entered into appropriate cooperative agreements with owners of non-Federal properties, or any combination thereof including the designation of sites already in Federal ownership, he shall by publication in the Federal Register establish the Nez Perce National Historical Park and thereafter administer the Federal property under his administrative jurisdiction in accordance with the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), as amended and supplemented.

Sec. 6. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act the Secretary of the Interior may contract and make cooperative agreements with the State of Idaho, its political subdivisions or agencies, corporations, associations, or individuals, to protect, preserve, maintain, or operate any site, object, or property included within the Nez Perce National Historical Park, regardless as to whether title thereto is in the United States: *Provided,* That no contract or cooperative agreement shall be made or entered into which will obligate the general fund of the Treasury unless or until Congress has appropriated money for such purpose.

(b) To facilitate the interpretation of the Nez Perce country the Secretary is authorized to erect and maintain tablets or markers in accordance with the provisions contained in the Act approved August 21, 1935, entitled, "An Act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes" (49 Stat. 666).

Sec. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, in joining in the sponsorship of this bill setting up the Nez Perce National Historical Park in our State of Idaho, I not only am pleased to do so as a Senator from that State but also from a very personal point of view. I have lived most of my life in the Nez Perce country, and it gives me a great deal of personal pleasure to have a hand in protecting for posterity some of the rich historical background of this region. It is wonderful country.

Because this is my home country, and I might be inclined to overstate the case today I have chosen not to put my feelings in my own words, but instead to quote Mr. Alvin M. Josephy, Jr., board of editors, American Heritage magazine.

Mr. Josephy, who first saw this Nez Perce country from an airplane, says this:

> My immediate, grand impression was of having come on one of the most spectacularly rugged and beautiful parts of the United States, but also one which—because of the difficult terrain that limited the building of main arteries of transportation—was, to Americans from elsewhere in the country, one of the least known sections of the country.

His impression was quite accurate, in my opinion. Mr. Josephy continues:

> As I began to read the chapters of the dramatic and adventurous history that had occurred in this majestic area, I was also impressed with how close the people of the countryside that extends around Lewiston still are to their frontier and pioneer heritage—how little the physical look of the land and the features of canyon, prairie, and mountain life generally have changed since the days of the earliest white arrivals. Here one could read of the thrilling incidents of the Lewis and Clark journey and see much of the country still looking just as the explorers described it in their journals. One could follow Washington Irving's gripping narratives of the Astorians and Bonneville struggling through the mighty Snake chasm, and gaze upon the same scenes, still almost untouched by man. The settings of the accounts of Alexander Ross, the fur trader; of David Douglas, the great Scottish botanist; of Jedediah Smith, Joe Meek, and "Dock" Newell; of the Missionaries Samuel Parker and Spalding; of soldiers, gold miners, and settlers; of the great Chief Joseph and his Nez Perces; and of many other persons who etched Northwest history, all remain so unchanged that the land itself brings their glorious epics vividly to life.
>
> Nowhere else in this country, in fact, am I aware of a large region whose overall story can be interpreted so compactly in a setting that has so little changed under the advance of civilization.

Mr. President, if our great Nez Perce country can arouse such feelings in a man who is a stranger to that section, you can imagine how we Idahoans feel about it. We love that country, and we are extremely proud of it also. I feel that basically all Idahoans join today with the two Senators from Idaho in backing this bill which, in essence, does two things: First, protects and preserves the history of the Nez Perce country for posterity; second, while at the same time commending this section to the rest of the Nation saying, "Come to Idaho and see one of our great contributions to the history of our Nation."

MAXIMUM COAL ACREAGE HOLDINGS UNDER MINERAL LEASING LAW

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, in the past few years this country has witnessed a growing use of coal to generate electric power. Many new processes are now under development which will require even greater supplies of coal if they are to be successful. We are moving toward supplying electricity directly to large metropolitan areas by use of transmission lines from coal-powered generators located at the mouth of a mine, or by sending coal through a slurry pipeline to the metropolitan area for power generation there, or the use of the integrated train to transport coal.

These new uses envisioned for coal, combined with the accelerated expansion of our power needs, have made it desirable to take a new look at the maximum coal acreage which may be held, under the mineral leasing law, in any one State by any one person, association, or corporation.

I have done so, and have concluded that the present maximum of 15,360 coal acres is too low to provide the larger operations which the new processes will require. I feel it desirable to increase to 46,080 coal acres the maximum number which may be held by any one concern in any one State.

This change can be thoroughly justified. The type of capital investment required for the large operations which will be developed in the future under the new processes can best be encouraged by establishing enough acreage in one holding to justify long-term leases. Once a market is established, the smaller concerns already operating in the area would be ready for supplementary supply. Thus increasing acreage for the large operator should increase opportunity for the smaller operator, also.

The Mineral Leasing Act has been amended a number of times in the past to increase individual holdings of coal acreage, in order to meet changing conditions. The original figure under the 1920 act was 2,560 acres.

I therefore send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase the maximum coal acreage which may be held under option or lease or both combined, by a person, association, or corporation, under the Mineral Leasing Act, in any State, to 46,080 acres.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2327) to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, in order to promote the development of coal on the public domain, introduced by Mr. MOSS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, TO REDUCE INDIVIDUAL AND CORPORATE INCOME TAXES—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 329)

Mr. RIBICOFF (for himself, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. SCOTT) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 8363) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce individual and corporate income taxes, to make certain structural changes with respect to the income tax, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1964—CHANGE OF CONFEREE

On motion of Mr. MAGNUSON, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MONRONEY was appointed a conferee on the part of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8747) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, vice Mr. ROBERTSON, who was excused.

LABELING AS TO STATE OF ORIGIN OF IRISH POTATOES SHIPPED IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] be included as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2247) to require that Irish potatoes sold or shipped in interstate commerce be labeled as to State of origin.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

U.S. ADMIRALS AND GENERALS FROM MONTANA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in reading the Montana newspapers lately, I was happy to note that Rear Adm. Edwin S. Miller, of Missoula, Mont., is the new commander in chief of cruiser-destroyer flotilla 7, which is a part of the Pacific Fleet.

I am also happy once again to call the attention of the Senate, on behalf of the State of Montana, to the fact that the commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet is Adm. Ulysses S. G. Sharp, Jr., who hails from Chinook and Fort Benton, Mont. Therefore, I point out that it is indeed noteworthy and significant that from a State with a population of less than 700,000 have come these two distinguished admirals of the U.S. Navy, who are performing such meritorious duties in the field of the Pacific—in other words, the Pacific Ocean and the Pacific area; and I am proud that both of them hail from the State which I have the honor and privilege to represent in this body.

There are few, if any, landlocked States in this Nation which can boast of a more outstanding group of rising U.S. naval officers than can the State of Montana. Earlier this year, I brought to the attention of the Senate the fact that no less than 13 admirals and generals who served in World War II and postwar years hailed from the Treasure State.

The latest in this select group to bring high honor upon himself is Rear Adm. Edwin S. Miller, of Missoula. Admiral Miller, a veteran of 30 years of distinguished service in the Navy, recently assumed command of cruiser-destroyer flotilla 7 in ceremonies held in Subic Bay, in the Philippines. In his new post, he will be responsible for the operations of more than 30 cruiser and destroyer type vessels.

Admiral Miller deserves the best wishes of all of us for achieving this honor, and I am confident that he will discharge his new duties with the competence and devotion to duty which have characterized his career to date. I extend to him my sincerest congratulations.

Admiral Miller is an exception among Montana's admirals only in that he does not hail from the Fort Benton area. This small community on the banks of the Missouri River has produced the remarkable total of four admirals, plus one Army general and one Marine Corps general. One of these, full Adm. Ulysses S. G. Sharp, Jr., was recently named commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet.

INCREASE IN AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS TO THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 627, Senate bill 2267, and that it be made the pending business. I do so with the full approval of the distinguished minority leader. I ask that it be considered at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 2267), to amend Public Law 88–72 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill, S. 2267 was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 101 of Public Law 88–72 is hereby amended by striking the figure "$172,562,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$190,507,000".

Sec. 2. Section 101(d) of Public Law 88–72 is amended by adding at the end thereof:

"Project 64–d–10, occupational health laboratory, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico, $1,650,000.

"Project 64–d–11, high temperature chemistry facility, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico, $1,435,000.

"Project 64–d–12, plutonium research support building, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico, $655,000.

"Project 64–d–13, radiochemistry building, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, California, $5,900,000.

"Project 64–d–14, hazards control addition, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, California, $1,000,000.

"Project 64–d–15, plant engineering and services building, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, California, $1,400,000.

"Project 64–d–16, west cafeteria addition, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, California, $255,000.

"Project 64–d–17, craft shop addition, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, California, $200,000.

"Project 64–d–18, developmental laboratory, Sandia Base, New Mexico, $3,780,000.

"Project 64–d–19, explosive facilities, Sandia Base, New Mexico, $540,000.

"Project 64–d–20, classified technical reports building addition, Sandia Base, New Mexico, $500,000.

"Project 64–d–21, control point additions, Nevada Test Site, $630,000."

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The amount that this authorization requires in the way of an appropriation was in the bill that was considered by the House and deleted, I presume, without prejudice, because that amount would not be authorized.

The bill is a supplemental authorization for 12 additional construction projects which are proposed in the bill. These projects would modernize and make more effective our laboratories and the critical analyses that have to be made with reference to underground testing connected with the nuclear test ban treaty agreement, which applies to environments in the atmosphere, underwater, and in space.

Therefore, in explanation of the bill, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record excerpts from the report that appear on page 1 as "Summary of the Bill," including the "Background" on page 2, and then skipping the section headed "Hearings" down to "Comments by the Joint Committee," and through page 3 to page 5, ending with the words "the test ban treaty safeguards."

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

This bill amends Public Law 88–72, the Atomic Energy Commission, fiscal year 1964 authorization act, by providing a supplemental authorization of $17,945,000 for the construction of 12 new facilities, necessary for the nuclear weapons development program.

This bill is in two sections. Section 1 increases the total authorization contained in section 101 of Public Law 88–72 by $17,945,000. The amended authorization figure is $190,507,000.

Section 2 contains a line item listing of 12 construction projects to be added to section 101(d) of Public Law 88–72, under the heading "Atomic weapons." The total estimated cost of these projects is $17,945,000.

BACKGROUND

On October 16, 1963, the Atomic Energy Commission transmitted to the Congress a proposed bill amending Public Law 88–72, the Atomic Energy Commission fiscal year 1964 authorization act, by providing a supplemental authorization of $17,945,000 for 12 new construction projects for the nuclear weapons development program.

The proposed legislation was introduced by Senator Pastore (by request, S. 2267) on October 29, 1963, and by Representative Holifield (by request, H.R. 8971) on October 30, 1963.

Hearings were held before the Subcommittee on Legislation on October 31, 1963, as summarized in the next section of this report.

On November 20, 1963, the Subcommittee on Legislation met and approved, without dissent, H.R. 8971 and S. 2267 with the recommendation that they be reported favorably by the full committee.

On November 20, 1963, the full committee met and voted to approve the bills without amendment and adopt this report thereon.

COMMENTS BY THE JOINT COMMITTEE

A. Safeguards in connection with the nuclear test ban treaty

On September 10, 1963, in connection with the Senate debate on the ratification of the limited nuclear test ban treaty, the President wrote to Senators Mansfield and Dirksen, the Senate majority and minority leaders, outlining a program of safeguards designed to minimize the risk inherent in the limited nuclear test ban treaty.

In pertinent part, the President outlined the following safeguards in connection with the treaty:

* * * * *

"Underground nuclear testing, which is permitted under the treaty, will be vigorously and diligently carried forward, and the equipment, facilities, personnel, and funds necessary for that purpose will be provided. * * *

"The United States will maintain a posture of readiness to resume testing in the environments prohibited by the present treaty, and it will take all the necessary steps to safeguard our national security in the event that there should be an abrogation or violation of any treaty provision. In particular, the United States retains the right to resume atmospheric testing forthwith if the Soviet Union should conduct tests in violation of the treaty.

"Our facilities for the detection of possible violations of this treaty will be expanded and improved as required to increase our assurance against clandestine violation by others.

* * * * *

"This Government will maintain strong weapons laboratories in a vigorous program of weapons development, in order to insure that the United States will continue to have in the future a strength fully adequate for an effective national defense."

Similar assurances were given to the Congress in communications from the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

B. Implementation of safeguards

It is the committee's view that the implementation of the safeguards enumerated by the President is a matter of utmost importance for the future security of the Nation. With this background in mind, the committee carefully considered the request for the 12 additional construction projects proposed in this bill. In addition the committee received testimony concerning a reprograming of AEC operating funds designed to provide an additional $109 million for activities related to the implementation of safeguards for the remainder of fiscal year 1964.

After intensive hearings, the committee is of the opinion that the proposed amendment to Public Law 88–72, in conjunction with the additional operating funds which will be provided for the weapons development program, represents a sound initial program for the implementation of safeguards to the extent described below.

1. Maintenance of Strong Weapons Laboratories

The committee believes that the maintenance of adequate modern facilities at our nuclear weapons laboratories is perhaps the most essential of the safeguards proposed by the President. Nuclear weapons development is a complex and vitally important scientific endeavor in which the United States must rank as second to none. The maintenance of modern laboratory facilities is necessary in order to attract and retain those competent scientists who can help to assure U.S. leadership in the nuclear weapons field.

In furtherance of this objective, this bill provides for the replacement and modernization of facilities which are currently inadequate to permit the full utilization of the highly specialized scientific talents of laboratory personnel. Such projects as 64–d–11, high-temperature chemistry facility at Los

Alamos Scientific Laboratory; 64–d–14, hazards control addition at Lawrence Radiation Laboratory; and 64–d–18, development laboratory at Sandia Base, should contribute significantly to the productivity and vitality of our nuclear weapons laboratories.

2. Readiness for the Resumption of Atmospheric Testing

The committee wishes to emphasize the importance of maintaining a state of readiness for the resumption of atmospheric testing on short notice should further tests in the atmosphere be deemed essential to our national security or in the event of a violation of the nuclear test ban treaty by the Soviet Union.

In this connection, project 64–d–13, radiochemistry building, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore, Calif., will provide necessary facilities for analysis of material. As noted by the AEC:

"This project is needed to provide immediate improvements to the physical plant of the Laboratory (Livermore) with a view to insuring a high level of nuclear weapons research and development progress coupled with the readiness to resume full scale weapons testing in the atmosphere at short notice."

Data presented to the committee indicates that this project is required for the radiochemical analysis workload of the test program. There is at present a shortage of laboratory space for chemistry activities.

3. Continuation of a Comprehensive and Aggressive Underground Nuclear Testing Program

The committee strongly endorses a program of vigorous underground nuclear testing. In this connection, project 64–d–21 will help to increase the rate and efficiency of our underground weapons tests and improve the collection of test data. The AEC has stated that these facilities are necessary for the safe and effective conduct of intensified nuclear weapons activities at the Nevada Test Site.

4. Nuclear Weapon Test Detection

As further tangible evidence of the Joint Committee's deep interest in assuring the full and effective implementation of the test ban treaty safeguards, a special ad hoc subcommittee visited installations in the worldwide nuclear weapon test detection system, early this month. Upon returning from this extensive inspection trip, Chairman PASTORE stated:

"We have returned from our inspection with a feeling of greater assurance in our ability to detect a violation of the test ban treaty should such a violation occur. However, improvements are being, and must continue to be, made. * * * Generally speaking, certain improvements can be accomplished through additional research and development and augmentation of the existing systems, and we have been assured that this is currently under consideration within the Department of Defense, the AEC, and other executive agencies."

Although this supplemental authorization bill does not include additional funds for research and development in the test detection field, nor for additional test detection facilities, which is the prime responsibility of the Department of Defense, the Joint Committee intends to follow closely further developments in this field. In a classified report on its recent inspection trip, to be issued shortly, the committee will review our overall test detection requirements and include certain recommendations for improving our detection capabilities.

As noted above, in addition to the authorization for capital facilities requested in this bill, the Atomic Energy Commission stated that, through the reprograming of operating funds, an additional $109,800,000 would be added to the operating budget for fiscal year 1964 for the weapons development program. These additional funds, coupled with the capital facilities proposed in this bill, should provide for an accelerated nuclear weapons program, designed to effectuate the test ban treaty safeguards.

THE SUPREME COMMITTEE FOR LIBERATION OF LITHUANIA

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, three times within 25 years the Soviet Union invaded, terrorized, and oppressed the peaceful little Baltic nation of Lithuania. Each time Lithuanians fought so valiantly for freedom that the Soviets resorted to extreme measures to gain control. In two cases, 1919 and 1940–41, the Russians were expelled. But, unhappily, in 1944 Red Russia returned and little Lithuania fell.

After great expenditures of time and money in a one-sided battle, the Communists have convinced many people that Lithuania asked to be incorporated into the Soviet Union. That is not a fact, and we must refute that great lie here and now, lending our voices to those necessarily faint protests from Lithuanians themselves. It has been impossible for Lithuania to speak for herself, because Russia exercises absolute control over the territory of Lithuania. There is no free exchange of information or freedom of speech for Lithuania. Until 2 years ago no outsider could even visit Lithuania. Even now such visits are carefully controlled. This adds another proof of the involuntary servitude of Lithuania to communism plain enough for anyone to see.

Lithuania has not been completely unrepresented to the free world however. There is a loyal group of Lithuanian people in the United States who have been doing everything they can to protest Soviet action. They are fighting to regain the independence and freedom of Lithuania. This group is the Supreme Committee for Liberation of Lithuania, founded in 1943 by underground resistance groups, and celebrating its 20th anniversary in New York, November 23 and 24.

The members and supporters of the committee have shown amazing courage and loyalty in the face of overwhelming hardships. I am sure they only desire the greatest peace and welfare for their people. On the occasion of their 20th anniversary, on behalf of the people of Ohio, I express felicitations to those brave Lithuanians who in 1940, and especially in 1944, stood intrepidly against the Russian Red giant.

THE TAXPAYERS HAVE A RIGHT TO KNOW—PROPOSED PAY INCREASES FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND OTHERS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on two previous occasions, I spoke on the floor of the Senate vigorously opposing the proposed salary increases for Federal judges, Cabinet members, and Members of the Congress contained in the pending omnibus salary increase bill. This particular section of the bill is highly controversial, as it should be. Usually, when controversial bills are before the Congress, Senators receive both "pro" and "con" mail in great volumes. The "pro" mail on the proposed increases for judges, Cabinet members, and Members of the Congress is extremely conspicuous by its absence, at least in my office. I am certain that the taxpayers cannot comprehend the philosophy of the Congress in professing economy and tax reduction and encouraging labor and industry to hold the line on wages and prices, and then, in the second breath, exclaiming that elected and appointed Federal officials should have their salaries increased substantially.

Mr. President, the proposed bill would increase the salaries of Congressmen and Senators from $22,500 to $32,500 per year, a net increase of $10,000 per year. While it is a matter of public record, it is little known among constituents throughout the country that Congressmen and Senators, in addition to their annual salaries, are accorded at the expense of the taxpayers numerous fringe benefits. I wish to point out:

First. That $3,000 of a Senator's salary is deductible for income tax purposes.

Second. That each Senator may be reimbursed annually for two round trips to and from his home State.

Third. That each Senator is allowed a stationery account of $1,800 per year, and that at the close of a fiscal year, he may claim any unexpended balance in cash for his personal use.

Fourth. That each Senator may receive an allowance of $1,200 per year for office rental in his home State. This sum may be used to defray rental expenses of a combination office in which the Senator may engage, as an example, in private practice along with serving his constituents in an official senatorial manner.

Fifth. That the retirement pay of a Member of Congress is fixed at the rate of 2½ percent of his salary for each year of service. A Member of Congress who has served 20 years would, under the proposed pay raise, become entitled to a retirement pay of 2½ percent a year, which is 50 percent—20 times 2½ percent—of his new salary of $32,500, equaling $16,250 per year; instead of 50 percent of his old salary of $22,500, equaling $11,250 a year. Based on the present salary of $22,500, if a Member of Congress should retire at the end of 12 years, his monthly pension would be $562.60, while under the pending bill providing for $32,500, should he retire at the end of 12 years, he would receive 30 percent—12 times 2½ percent—of his new salary, equaling $812.50 per month, which is a $249.90 per month increase.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the annuity title requirements for Members of Congress, prepared for the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, may be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Civil Service Retirement Act—Annuity title requirements for Members of Congress

Type of annuity	Present law		
	Minimum age at separation	Minimum service	Special requirements
Immediate unreduced	62	5 years	None.
	60	10 years as a Member	Do.
	Any age	5 years	Must be disabled.
Immediate reduced	55	30 years	None.
	Any age	25 years	Any separation except by resignation or expulsion.
	50	20 years or 9 Congresses	Do.
	(1)	(1)	
Deferred unreduced	Any age	5 years	Begins at age 62.
	do	10 years as a Member	Begins at age 60.
Deferred reduced	do	20 years, including 10 as a Member.	Begins at age 50.

[1] No provision.

Note.—Life insurance and health benefits continue after retirement if Member retires on immediate annuity, after 12 years of service or for disability.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, it is true that Senators pay into the retirement fund 7½ percent of their salary, which is matched with an equal amount of 7½ percent by the Federal Government. The portion of the pending bill providing $10,000 increases in salaries for Senators and Congressmen is estimated to cost $5.4 million annually. This figure does not include Cabinet officers, judicial employees, and Federal judges, as well as all others that are covered in the proposed bill. It is interesting to note that the amount the Federal Government will be obligated to provide to match the 7½ percent paid into the fund by Congressmen will total $405,000 annually. A similar added obligation on the part of the Federal Government would apply to salaries of all except judges covered in the bill. The judges pay no part of their salary into the retirement fund. They, at a certain age with a certain minimum period of service, can go on the inactive list and receive full pay for the balance of their lives. They do not retire but go on the inactive list supposedly subject to call for special assignments. Therefore, it is a misnomer to label the proposed salary increase bill as costing $600 million; it will cost the taxpayers much more than that.

Mr. President, passage of this salary increase bill, as drafted, is a flagrant breach of prudence. It would require the Federal Government to substantially increase its contributions to the retirement fund, which is already in a very precarious position. I want to point out that as of June 30, 1963, the unfunded liability of the civil service retirement fund, in which the Senators participate, was $34 billion. I am informed that if the pending salary increase bill passes, it will result in an increase of about one-half billion dollars to this unfunded liability.

It is estimated that the general pay increase of 1962 added $1.9 billion to the unfunded liability, bringing it up to the June 30, 1963, figure of $34 billion.

In 1921, when this fund was first established, the unfunded liability was $249 million. Since that time, as a result of the Federal Government's failure for long periods of time to provide for its matching contributions and its negligence in making adequate appropriations to take care of the added cost of pay increases and pension liberalization, the unfunded liability has steadily increased to its present figure.

It is true that this unfunded liability is an obligation of the Federal Government, but in the final analysis, it is a commitment by the Federal Government affecting every Federal taxpayer in the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the growth of the unfunded liability, prepared by the U.S. Civil Service Commission, Bureau of Retirement and Insurance, may be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Growth of the unfunded liability

[In millions]

Fiscal year	Unfunded liability as of June 30	Includes increase—				Remarks
		Due to act of—[1]	Amount	Due to act of—[1]	Amount	
1921	*$249					*Initial unfunded liability.
1922						
1923						
1924						
1925	*287	R Sept. 22, 1922	(?)	P Mar. 4, 1923	(?)	*Same valuation assumptions as in 1921.
1926	355	R, I July 3, 1926	$50			
1927	393					
1928	406					
1929	404					
1930	*730	R, I May 29, 1930	*327			*Also includes effect of revised valuation assumptions.
1931						
1932						
1933						
1934	1,000	R June 30, 1932	94	R June 16, 1933	$61	
1935	*1,174					*Same valuation assumptions as in 1930.
1936						
1937						
1938						
1939						
1940	*1,573					*Reflects changes in valuation assumptions.
1941						
1942						
1943	*2,921	R, E Jan. 24, 1942	(?)			*Estimates for 1943–46 were overstated in view of later cutback of employment from World War II levels.
1944	3,083					
1945	3,314					
1946	3,516					
1947	*2,866	R Feb. 28, 1948	1,238	I Feb. 28, 1948	224	*Act of Sept. 30, 1947, based on 1940 valuation assumptions.
1948	4,328					
1949						
1950	4,839	I July 6, 1950	130			
1951	4,875					
1952	4,938					
1953	*9,912	I July 16, 1952	28			*Reflects changes in valuation assumptions, including reduction of interest rate from 4 to 3 percent.
1954	10,583					
1955	11,971	I Aug. 31, 1954	223	E (*)	429	*Career-conditional appointment system.
1956	13,838	P June 10, 1955 June 28, 1955	821	I Aug. 11, 1955	440	
1957	17,951	R July 31, 1956	3,565			

See footnote at end of table.

Growth of the unfunded liability—Continued

[In millions]

Fiscal year	Unfunded liability as of June 30	Includes increase—			Amount	Remarks
		Due to act of—[1]	Amount	Due to act of—[1]		
1958	*27,451	P May 27, 1958 June 20, 1958	1,841	I June 25, 1959	$104	*Reflects revised assumptions in 1958 valuation which fully took into account liberalization pay increases, and other factors affecting unfunded liability since prior valuation in 1953.
1959	28,363					
1960	31,143	P July 1, 1960	1,700	E July 1, 1960	100	
1961	32,547	I July 31, 1961	330			
1962	33,660					
1963	38,681	P Oct. 11, 1962 R Oct. 11, 1962	2,125 1,100	I Oct. 11, 1963	575	
1963	*34,060					*Reflects change in valuation interest rate from 3 to 3½ percent.

[1] See below:
R = Retirement Act liberalizations.
I = Increases in existing annuities.
E = Extensions of coverage.
P = Pay acts (classified and postal).

Source: U.S. Civil Service Commission, Bureau of Retirement and Insurance, July 10, 1963.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, for many years Congress has been shirking its responsibility to put the civil service retirement system on a sound actuarial basis, and yet now it is proposed that a move be taken to further increase this unfunded liability.

In his special message to the Congress dated February 20, 1962, the President recommended that salary increases for Federal employees be effective in three annual stages beginning in January 1963, which meant that the full impact of the costs would be absorbed into the Federal budget through 3 fiscal years.

Not only does this bill violate the recommendations of the President, but for the first time in history, if this legislation is approved, one pay increase would be superimposed on another pay increase which is not yet in effect.

The bill passed by the House will entail a cost of $60 million more than the President's recommendation. In the first four postal levels and the first five classified levels, the cost of the increase has been raised $200 million over the cost of the President's program; but reduced by $140 million in the top levels embracing the grades from 9 and up; thus leaving a net increased cost of $60 million over the President's recommendation.

The forces of inflation are pent up and ready to break loose. Evidences are appearing of a wave of action that will add inordinately to the cost of producing goods in our country. Demands are being made for a 35-hour week, which the President and the Secretary of Labor feel will not be to the economic advantage of the citizenry as a whole. With these forces in operation, it is wholly inadvisable for Congress to give pay increases of the type contemplated for Congressmen, judges, Cabinet members, commission and board members, and others; moreover, it is not fair to give a general pay increase in excess of what the present law provides.

A QUIET DEATH FOR DRUG PROBE?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I cannot believe that the Senate's preoccupation with its own ethical shortcomings, however appropriate and timely, will divert our attention from the equally serious charges of misconduct by drug manufacturers.

Yet, yesterday's Herald Tribune predicts just such imminent burial of the drug investigation. William Haddad of the Tribune staff quotes an anonymous Senator's prediction that the Baker affair will furnish a smokescreen to cover the premature demise of the drug investigation:

> Everyone's just waiting for things to quiet down here. Newspapers are notorious for getting interested in something else. You've got Bobby Baker to play around with now, and who's going to care about us?

We are investigating ourselves. We are continually looking for flyspecks on the ethical balance sheets of our most prominent executive officers. But we are unaccountably diffident in investigating charges of the most flagrant and immoral practices in a critical private industry.

It is charged—and a prima facie case has been made—that there exists an international cartel which has succeeded in establishing unnaturally high price levels for drugs.

It has been charged—and again there appears to be substantial supporting evidence—that American drug companies have participated in a "concerted and malicious campaign" to forestall the sale of low-cost, generic-name drugs in Latin America.

Tomorrow the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee is scheduled to meet to determine the fate of the drug investigation. Now under subpena by the subcommittee are the records of several major drug companies. There is reason to believe that these records will reveal the internal mechanism of the international cartel, including the secret code utilized in pursuing the ends of the cartel, and actual price-fixing agreements on major drugs.

If the subcommittee decides to terminate the investigation and if the subpenas are lifted, these records, if they exist, can be destroyed with impunity.

Mr. President, the people of the United States will not be diverted from the pursuit of the facts about drug prices. If this investigation is killed, I predict that its ghost will return to plague those who presided at its execution.

Mr. President, I am particularly concerned about this problem because the latest news from my State of Oregon is that druggists are refusing to fill prescriptions of patients on welfare, because the State is falling behind in paying for those prescriptions. The high cost of drugs is one of the things that entails a very unusual financial crisis in our State.

Only last week the fifth biennial convention of the Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, reflected the great public concern which has been aroused over the drug price disclosures.

> We ask the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly—

The IUD resolved—

> to publicly examine the grave charges of the existence of a drug cartel which allegedly fixed prices to an excessive level in South America and had sabotaged efforts to bring drugs within the reach of South American workers.

This resolution and the expectation of the American public at large must not be disappointed.

WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, an excellent article summarizing the report of the Task Group on Coordinated Water Resources Research of the Federal Council for Science and Technology appears in the current edition of Science magazine. I ask unanimous consent that the article, written by Dr. Roger Revelle of the University of California and former science adviser to the Secretary of the Interior, be inserted in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

Of special interest to me was Dr. Revelle's discussion of the need for coordination in the field of water resources. He points out that some three dozen bureaus or equivalent units in seven major departments and independent agencies of the Government are engaged in water resource research. He calls for concerted efforts to achieve effective coordination among these various governmental units.

The Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations is at the present time conducting a study of interagency coordination in the field of environmental hazards. One such hazard is the problem of water pollution. As Dr. Revelle points out:

> Various noxious substances are being dumped into our rivers, lakes, and estuaries. The long-term effects of many of these on human health and welfare are unknown.

A strong Federal water pollution control program is now in operation. The

Senate, under the leadership of the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], has passed S. 649, which further improves and strengthens this program. But I submit, Mr. President, that until we adopt a national goal with respect to stream protection the excellent programs Congress has adopted will not realize their full potential.

In December 1960 at the National Conference on Water Pollution a distinguished panel of experts in this field recommended that the goal of pollution abatement should be to—

> **Protect and enhance the capacity of the water resource to serve the widest possible range of human needs, and that this goal can be approached only by accepting the positive policy of keeping waters as clean as possible, as opposed to the negative policy of attempting to use the full capacity of water for waste assimilation.**

Another panel of experts at that same conference expressed a similar idea in different terms—

> **We recommend the adoption of a national credo, to be given as wide and consistent publicity as is feasible. The content of the credo would be: (1) Users of water do not have an inherent right to pollute; (2) users of public waters have a responsibility for returning them as nearly as clean as is technically possible; and (3) prevention is just as important as control of pollution.**

The time has come for the various Federal agencies involved in water resources development and pollution control in particular to establish a truly national clean water program—coordinated for efficiency and economy and directed toward a national goal toward which all can aspire—the positive goal of keeping water clean as opposed to the negative policy of tolerating all but the most hazardous levels of pollution. In so many circles, both in and out of Government, the policy has been to use the full capacity of water for waste assimilation.

It is not enough to be against pollution. That is the concept of control—of repairing damage already done. We must be for clean water. That is the concept of prevention. Technically we know enough to accomplish this goal. The question is whether we are willing to do what needs to be done. Dr. Revelle's article shows how physical, biological, engineering, and social sciences can help solve the problem.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATER-RESOURCES RESEARCH IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—PHYSICAL, BIOLOGICAL, ENGINEERING, AND SOCIAL SCIENCES CAN HELP SOLVE A PROBLEM OF GROWING DIMENSIONS

(By Roger Revelle)

Water is the most abundant substance in the part of our planet that is accessible to man. Nearly all our planet's water is salty, and this is perfectly satisfactory for the creatures that live in the sea. But land plants and animals must have fresh water. They can live only because the sun continually distills pure water from the ocean and some of this distillate is carried in the air as vapor until it condenses and drops on the land. The flux of water from the ocean into the air, onto the land, and back to the sea, is called the hydrologic cycle.

Although the hydrologic cycle is exceedingly complex in detail, in general we can think of the water particles as following one of three paths. (i) The larger part of the water that falls on the land surface passes back to the air, either directly by evaporation or through the bodies of plants in transpiration. It may recondense and fall again on the land, or it may fall in the ocean. (ii) A smaller part of the water that reaches the land surface remains in liquid form and either sinks into the ground or stays on the surface. This liquid water runs downhill or flows underground until it is gathered by rivers that carry it back to the sea. (iii) A very small fraction is taken up in the bodies of plants and animals. Some of this fraction is broken down by plants, which use its hydrogen in forming their tissues. The hydrogen is later recombined with oxygen in animal and plant respiration, and the water thus produced is returned to the air.

The time required for water particles to travel through the hydrologic cycle varies widely. A particle evaporated from the ocean near shore may fall as rain in a coastal region, evaporate again almost immediately, and return to the ocean as rain within a few hours. Water falling as snow in the mountains may remain for months (or, in glaciers, for centuries) before it melts and runs off. Water that sinks into the ground may remain there a few years or many millennia before reappearing on the surface to complete its journey to the sea. Thus, enormous quantities of fresh water are stored underground. In the United States the volume of underground fresh water is probably at least 10 times the average annual precipitation of 30 inches.

The amount of water evaporated each year from the oceans would be sufficient, if it were carried to the continents and uniformly distributed, to cover all the land with more than 100 inches of rain and snow. This is three times the potential annual evaporation from land surfaces. The fact is, however, that the average depth of rainfall over the oceans is much greater than the average over the continents. On about a third of the land areas of the earth the annual precipitation is less than the potential evaporation. Life is possible in these arid regions only because water is carried to them from nearby mountains, where rain and snow exceed evaporation, and because precipitation in the arid lands occurs sporadically, so that some of the water can be caught and stored by plants, or in the ground, before it can evaporate. Even in humid regions the hydrologic cycle slows down and speeds up from time to time, causing periods of drought to alternate with floods. If we can think of the hydrologic cycle as nature's plumbing system, it must be admitted that from man's point of view the pipes are erratically arranged and the valves capriciously managed. Man is slowly becoming more skillful at forecasting fluctuations in this system; someday he may be able to improve the arrangements.

WATER SUPPLY OF THE UNITED STATES

The United States, exclusive of Alaska and Hawaii, has a surface area of about 2 billion acres. On the average, nearly 5 billion acre-feet of water per year falls on this area. Seventy-one percent of this water evaporates or is transpired back to the air near the place where it falls. The remaining 29 percent runs off or sinks into the ground and is eventually gathered by streams. A quantity equivalent to about one-fourth the streamflow (345 million acre-feet, 7 percent of the total annual precipitation) is diverted from rivers or pumped from wells for human use. Something less than half the water withdrawn from rivers and from the ground is used for irrigation; an equal quantity is used for industrial cooling, washing, and waste removal; and the remainder, less than a tenth, is used for municipal and domestic purposes. Between one-third and one-fourth of the amount withdrawn (2 percent of the total precipitation) is consumptively used; that is, returned as vapor to the atmosphere. The rest of the amount withdrawn is returned to streams directly, or is allowed to sink into the ground, whence eventually it flows back to the rivers.

Forty percent of the total precipitation returns to the air by evaporation and transpiration from crop and grazing lands and from forests and is thus "consumptively used" in the sense that it sustains most of our national production of food, fiber, wood, and paper. With our population doubling every 40 to 50 years, and with the corresponding increase in the demand for agricultural and forest products, one might suppose that in the near future the need for water for agriculture would exceed the total annual supply. However, the present efficiency of use of the water that falls on croplands and forest lands is low. Part of it falls at seasons other than the growing season and descends into the water table, because there are no plants to take it up. During the spring and summer, precipitation exceeds potential evapotranspiration over a large part of the cultivated land. Hence, even if the intensity of cultivation were greatly increased, the water supply would still be adequate. In cultivated areas where potential evapotranspiration exceeds precipitation, advances in agricultural technology are making it possible to grow more productive crops with the same amount of water.

The portion of the total precipitation that returns directly to the air is highly variable, both in time and in space. Per unit volume, its contribution to man's requirements is far less than that of the fraction that runs off or sinks into the ground, because to a considerable extent this latter fraction can be controlled by man and distributed in accordance with his needs. It can, moreover, be used to generate hydroelectric power. The energy dissipated by the 1,400 million acre-feet of water flowing in U.S. rivers each year is about 2.5 trillion kilowatt-hours, equivalent to a fifth of the total energy consumed in our industrial society. About 13 percent of this 2.5 trillion kilowatt-hours is now used to generate power. One of the objectives of water-resources research is to find ways of reducing the proportion of water that evaporates or is transpired near the place where it has fallen and to increase the proportion that descends into the water or is gathered into controllable streams.

COSTS OF WATER STRUCTURES

At present, only about 27 percent of the total precipitation is carried to the sea by streams. But this is still an enormous quantity, a thousand times greater than the quantity of any other material used by man, with the exception of air. Consequently, it is not surprising that the structures required to capture, regulate, transport, treat, and distribute water, though low in unit cost, are very expensive overall. In large modern systems water can be transported for about 0.1 mill per ton-mile, one one-hundredth the cost of transporting coal or natural gas. Nevertheless, the annual capital expenditure for water structures in the United States currently is of the order of $10 billion.

A committee chaired by Abel Wolman has estimated that, in the absence of technological or economic changes, by the year 2000 it may be necessary to withdraw from streams and from the ground 1 billion acre-feet per year, equivalent to about 75 percent of the total streamflow, in contrast to the 25 percent that is withdrawn at present. To obtain, as an assured supply, such a large fraction of the total runoff would require disproportionately more expensive structures for storage, regulation, transportation, distribution, and drainage. If surface storage were used, the required storage sites would intrude on areas already intensively occupied or needed for urban and industrial development. The total capital cost would be several hundred billion dollars, and annual charges would be of the order of tens of billions. Clearly, we need technological and economic developments that will lead to marked reduction in requirements for water withdrawal, to lowering of the unit costs of water structures, and to greater utilization of underground storage. Otherwise, both the economic and the social costs of meeting future water needs will be painfully high.

Because of the great differences in precipitation and in present and future demand in different regions, and of the high costs of transporting water over long distances, the water problems of the United States are essentially regional ones. In parts of the arid Southwest, water stored underground is now being mined at an alarmingly high rate, and new sources must soon be found to supply even the present population. In several humid regions of the country the volume of water required to dilute sewage approaches, and in some places already exceeds, the amount of water in the rivers during times of low flow. Requirements for controllable water may exceed average river and underground flows by the year 2000 in southern California and the Great Basin; in the Delaware-Hudson, upper Arkansas-White-Red Rivers, Great Lakes, and western gulf regions; and in the upper Missouri, Rio Grande-Pecos, and Colorado River Basins. The total deficit in dry years may be 100 million acre-feet per year. Unless significant improvement in the efficiency of water use can be made, expensive water-transportation systems will be required to meet the needs of these regions.

NEEDS FOR RESEARCH

The problems involved in developing water resources can be grouped in five categories: (i) Regional water-resources planning for optimum development and beneficial use of controllable supplies; (ii) increasing the supply of water for beneficial use; (iii) increasing the efficiency if use; (iv) maintaining and improving the quality of water; and (v) preventing damage by water.

To attack these problems we need more information than we now possess, greater understanding of natural processes in the hydrologic cycle and of the relations between human being and water, and more powerful methods for analyzing existing information.

Regional water-resources planning: The central problems in regional water-resources planning are those of distributing controllable water supplies in ways that will be economically and socially most beneficial, and of choosing from among different alternatives the most satisfactory means of providing the needed supplies. Solution of these problems requires (i) appraisal of the quantity, quality, and variability of all the water moving in the hydrologic cycle, and of the possibility of achieving different degrees of water control; (ii) projection of changes in demand and of the effects of various possible uses on quantity and quality; (iii) economic and social evaluation of the benefits of various possible uses; (iv) estimation of the costs of alternative methods for augmenting, regulating, transporting, and distributing controllable water supplies; and (v) design of compatible systems for use and reuse of the available water.

Appraisal requires a long series of measurements of precipitation and streamflow at a network of points throughout the region, together with knowledge of rates of evaporation from different surfaces, rates of transpiration from natural and farm plants, and the relation of streamflow to time, rate, and duration of precipitation. It also requires accurate descriptions of the location, storage capacity, transmissibility, and rates of recharge of the underground reservoirs (including the accelerated rates that might be achieved artifically) and data on the salt content of existing underground waters. The effect on downstream river flows of pumping ground water must be estimated, as well as the rates at which ground-water levels will be lowered by given rates of pumping.

Useful projections of future demand and of changes in quantity and quality of supply are difficult to make because development of water resources sets in motion a chain of events that will itself change both demand and supply. Irrigation, urbanization, industrial expansion, and road construction will alter the preexisting relationships between precipitation, runoff, and underground flow. Technological advances in the use and reuse of water will affect future demand, as well as future quantity and quality. Broadscale investigations of these interactions are needed.

Methods for evaluating benefits and estimating costs can be greatly improved through combined engineering and economic research and the application of modern methods of analyzing highly complex systems.

Improvement in the design of compatible systems requires more knowledge than we now possess of the needs of different water users.

Increasing water supplies: Our concern is to increase the supply of fresh water that is controlled and distributed. This can be done in three ways: by constructing works that will make it possible to use more of the now-controllable water; by increasing the fraction of the total precipitation that can be controlled; and by increasing the total supply of water.

More of the controllable water can be used if it is stored until it is needed. This can be accomplished by construction of dams and conveyance channels for surface storage and distribution or by installation of wells and artificial-recharge facilities to utilize underground storage. Surface storage has some advantages: hydroelectric power as well as water can usually be obtained, gravitational energy can often be employed to convey the water to the point of use, and lakes back of the dams can be used for recreation and other purposes. In many circumstances, however, surface storage has disadvantages. Valuable lands may be flooded, some of the stored water is lost by evaporation, and the costs of construction are high.

There are also serious obstacles to the utilization of underground storage. The water may be degraded through mixing with saline waters or through the dissolving of soil and rock salts. It is hard to increase the rate of recharge of many underground reservoirs because of the limited size of recharge areas or the difficulty of increasing flow through the unsaturated zone above the water table. Pumping costs may be high if the water table is deep. Suitable aquifers may not exist where they are needed. Pumping from underground storage may seriously reduce the river flows available to downstream users. Where underground storage can be utilized, however, evaporation losses are negligible, very little land need be withdrawn from other uses, and capital costs are comparatively low. Because of the advantages of underground storage, particularly in combination with surface reservoirs, vigorous research is needed to overcome the obstacles. The prospect of obtaining valuable results from such investigation is good.

The use of controllable water can often be increased through construction of canals and aqueducts to transport water from surplus to deficit areas. Engineering research on design, materials, and construction methods, aimed at reducing the costs of storage and transportation works, could result in large savings.

In some cases, the use of controllable supplies can be augmented by protecting the fresh water from mixing with saline or otherwise degraded waters, such as acid mine waters. Methods for accomplishing this need to be improved.

In arid regions the runoff from a large area must be concentrated to provide water for a relatively small fraction of the land, and techniques are needed to increase the proportion of total precipitation that can be controlled. Development of such techniques requires research on means of reducing the evaporation from reservoirs and snowfields, on means of increasing the runoff from mountain areas (for example, by modifying the plant cover so as to reduce evapotranspiration), and on methods for increasing the recharge of valley aquifers.

In the long run, it will be necessary to increase the total supplies of fresh water over large areas of the United States. For the near future, however, attempts to increase total supplies must be judged, economically, in competition with the transportation of water from surplus to deficit regions. Research and development on increasing total supplies are of two kinds: attempts to modify precipitation patterns by exerting control over weather and climate, and development of more economical methods of converting seawater or brackish water to fresh water. The ability to control weather and climate, even to a small degree, would be of the very greatest importance to human beings everywhere. Whether a measure of control can be obtained will remain uncertain until we understand the natural processes in the atmosphere much better than we do now. As for desalination, this could be accomplished more economically than at present if the amount of energy required to separate water and salt could be reduced or the cost of energy could be lowered. Research on the properties of water, salt solutions, surfaces, and membranes is fundamental to the desalination problem. So is research aimed at a great lowering of energy costs.

Increasing the efficiency of use: Through research and development, ways are being found to increase the efficiency with which water is used in agriculture, particularly in irrigation farming. For example, new mulching methods are already being applied to reduce evaporation from soil surfaces, thereby making more water available to crops. Through research on the physiology of water uptake and transport in plants, and on plant genetics, evapotranspiration from crop plants could probably be lowered without a proportional reduction in growth rates. Through development of salt-tolerant crops, the amount of irrigation water required to maintain low soil-salt concentrations could be reduced. Seepage losses from irrigation canals and percolation from farm fields could be lowered through the development of better canal lining and through improved irrigation practices. Losses from canals would also be reduced if we could learn how to control useless water-loving plants that suck water through the canal banks and transpire it to the air. For both irrigated and nonirrigated agriculture, improvements in the forecasting of precipitation, snowmelt, and streamflow would help farmers adjust times of field preparation, planting, and cultivation, so as to take maximum advantage of the available water supplies. Reliable river forecasts are necessary, also, for efficient operation of most water-control structures.

Equally pressing problems exist for industrial and municipal users. As the costs of high-quality water go up with increases in the cost of waterworks, methods for reusing water and for using water of lower quality for cooling and other special purposes will have to be improved. Especially important, because of the large quantities of water involved, is the development of methods of waste treatment that require less water for dilution of treated effluents and oxidation of organic residues. Otherwise, expensive structures for river regulation will be needed to provide water for waste disposal during low-flow periods. Complete treatment of waste water to make it reusable for all purposes is also a significant research goal.

Maintaining and improving quality: All naturally occurring water contains some dissolved and suspended materials, though ground water contains little of the latter. The concentration of dissolved impurities is increased as water flows over the surface and underground, both because it picks up materials in solution and because, when it flows on the surface, some of the water evaporates. When a major part of the water is used consumptively, as in irrigation agriculture, the return flows may be highly saline, and downstream uses may be seriously curtailed.

In our industrial civilization, nearly all wastes are eventually committed to flowing water. As a result, various noxious substances are being dumped into our rivers, lakes, and estuaries. The long-term effects of many of these on human health and welfare are unknown.

Every housewife is aware of some properties of water—its color, odor, transparency, taste, hardness, saltiness, foaming qualities, and temperature. Farmers, engineers, and public-health workers are concerned with the dissolved-oxygen content; the acidity; the composition and concentration of dissolved salts, plant nutrients, and potentially toxic substances; and the amounts of suspended matter, especially disease-producing bacteria and viruses and abrasive particles.

In attempting to maintain and improve the quality of water, we must first determine the quality requirements for different kinds of uses. We know, of course, that the water which comes in contact with human beings should not carry disease organisms or dissolved substances that will be injurious. Water used for recreation must not be esthetically unpleasant. Water that serves as the habitat of fish and other creatures must be suitable for them. Water used for industrial purposes must be relatively free of damaging chemicals and abrasive particles. Water for agriculture must not contain dissolved salts or toxic substances that will damage crops or livestock. But these general statements can be made specific only through careful analysis of the needs of users and through studies of the biological and other effects of the great variety of substances that are now being added to our water supplies—detergents, pesticides, chemical fertilizers, synthetic plant hormones, wastes from chemical processing, and others.

Because these substances are so varied and because some of them are potentially harmful even in very low concentrations, we must develop sensitive and rapid methods of analysis and biological assay in order to find out just what substances are present in our water supplies, where they come from, how they interact, and what happens to them as the water moves on the surface and underground. We must, in addition, develop means of removing injurious materials from water, or of preventing them from entering our water supplies.

Prevention of water-caused damage. Before man intervenes, moving water is usually in a state of near-equilibrium with its environment. But this equilibrium is radically altered by human action, and our American landscape is scarred with the results. Clearing of forests, improper cultivation of farmlands, or overgrazing of rangelands may produce a gullied and deeply eroded landscape in a few decades. Road construction and reshaping of the natural surface in building suburbs may spread a torrent of mud over once-green fields. The building of breakwaters may destroy beaches and form unnavigable bars. Waste dumped into a stream may turn a clear, fish-filled reach of water into a stinking, algae-choked desert. Works designed to regulate the movement of water may themselves have marked and unpredicted effects. Construction of a dam may produce drastic downstream erosion or, alternatively, a river channel choked with sediment. Rapid headward erosion may result from the draining of marshes. Structures for flood protection may actually increase the damage from occasional very severe floods, even though they eliminate the dangers from frequent smaller floods.

Damage from storm surges and floods could be greatly lessened through improved forecasting of their occurrence, extent, and intensity. Improvement of forecasts requires greater theoretical understanding of the meteorologic, hydrologic, and physiographic conditions that produce floods and surges. This understanding is essential also to improvement in the design of protective works. In planning for flood protection the engineer has many alternatives—for example, upstream control of the runoff from small watersheds; construction of large downstream reservoirs; building of levees and protective embankments; improvement of river channels; construction of diversion and drainage channels; and restriction of the use of areas likely to be flooded. Choice of the best and least expensive combination of these alternatives depends on adequate knowledge both of the particular situation and of the general principles of flood behavior. Physiographic, meteorologic, and hydrologic research to gain this knowledge can be expected to pay for itself many times over in lowered construction costs and reduced damage.

The development of economical methods of reducing erosion in small upstream watersheds must be based on research into the relationships of precipitation, topography, kinds of soil, plant cover, and runoff, and on the mechanisms of suspension and transport of soil particles by running water. Similarly, the lives of storage reservoirs could be lengthened, and the number of unwanted changes in river channels reduced, if we had greater understanding of sediment transport in rivers. Comparative studies of river ecology and of the sequence of biological changes produced by different pollutants are needed to establish realistic standards for pollution controls and to lessen pollution damage.

ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Under the Constitution, by tradition, and because of the national interest, the Federal Government has many kinds of responsibility for water resources. As manager of the national forests and all other Federal and Indian lands, it conserves and develops the water resources of these lands for livestock grazing, timber production, outdoor recreation, fish and wildlife conservation, hydroelectric power, and irrigation agriculture, and maintains them as the principal watersheds for adjoining regions. It protects these lands, which cover about a quarter of the entire area of the country, from erosion, floods, and other water damage.

The Federal Government has responsibilities for all navigable coastal and inland waters, including related nonnavigable river reaches and tributaries. It has joint control, through treaties with Canada and Mexico, over the development and use of international streams. Public works for the development of these waters are large items in the Federal budget. They include projects for flood control, navigational improvements in rivers and coastal waterways, and watershed and shoreline protection, as well as hydroelectric power, drainage, conservation storage of industrial and domestic water supplies, pollution abatement, maintenance of recreation areas, and other aspects of river-basin development.

The Government delivers much of the water for irrigation agriculture in the 17 Western States. Federal water investments in this largely arid region include projects for storage, transportation, distribution, and drainage of agricultural waters, for hydroelectric power generation, for flood control, and for other purposes.

Because many river basins cross State lines, the Government has had to assume growing responsibility, as water supplies have become scarcer, for participation in river-basin planning. The pollution of interstate river waters is becoming increasingly serious in many regions, and the Government has begun to take vigorous control measures.

In cooperation with the States, the Federal Government surveys the Nation's water resources, including the water carried in rivers and available from underground. It measures and forecasts precipitation, snowmelt, evaporation, runoff, riverflows, floods, and storm surges.

To conserve and augment the Nation's fish and wildlife population the Government acquires wet lands, establishes refuges, maintains hatcheries, and constructs waterways for fish migration. It attempts to keep the effects of water pollutants on fishes, birds, and mammals to a minimum.

The Government is virtually the sole producer of one of the most potentially dangerous of water pollutants—radioactive wastes—and it maintains a careful surveillance over the behavior of these materials in rivers, aquifers, and coastal waters.

To carry out these responsibilities efficiently and economically, the Federal Government must undertake a wide range of investigations and research. Nearly all aspects of this research ultimately provide results of broad applicability throughout the country. Consequently, the Government has long supported and conducted water-resources investigations for the benefit of all levels of government, and of private industry in many sectors of the economy. A Task Group on Coordinated Water-Resources Research was established in 1962 by the Federal Council for Science and Technology, to find ways of improving this research program. The following is a condensation of its conclusions and recommendations.

TASK GROUP CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the short period of its existence, the task group was not able to develop a satisfactory basis for evaluating or comparing research projects in different fields, or even in the same field. For the present, we must depend on the judgment of the responsible agencies. With adequate staff resources, a future water-resources research coordinating committee should, in time, be able to develop criteria for evaluating the components of the national program.

The task group did arrive at general conclusions in four areas: program deficiencies and opportunities; manpower needs; coordinating mechanisms; and legislation.

Program deficiencies and opportunities: Deficiencies in intramural and extramural education and training, in research on ground water (including the infiltration processes and soil-plant-water relationships), and in socioeconomic research are so evident that we can immediately recognize the need for increased effort in these fields. Similarly, the opportunities for water-quality research are so great, and the demand for results so pressing, that the level of sustained effort should be sharply raised.

Manpower needs: Shortages of qualified personnel now exist in many areas of water-resources research. Steps will have to be taken to increase the number of people qualified to carry on the research programs. The scientific fields involved are much broader than physical hydrology and include many of the physical and biological sciences as well as social sciences and engineering. The universities need help in attracting graduate students to research and training bearing on water resources. To accomplish this the Federal agencies should make grants to, or contracts with, universities so that they can strengthen their graduate research and training programs. The following steps should be taken.

(1) The Federal agencies engaged in water-resources research should be authorized and given funds to use a variety of educational-assistance measures to strengthen the training and research capabilities of the universities in the disciplines bearing on water resources, and to attract increasing numbers of graduate students. Such measures to promote training at the graduate level include training grants, facilities grants, research fellowships, and institutional grants. For example, the Department of Agriculture does not have specific statutory authority to award fellowships, training grants, or grants for educational facilities, except for a small number of postdoctoral associateships. In certain other agencies, the authority may exist, but programs have not been initiated. In others, one or another of these measures is being utilized on a modest basis. There is need for a Government-wide concerted effort, in which all these measures are fully utilized.

(2) Institutional grants to strengthen and encourage interdisciplinary water research programs should be made on a selective basis to those educational institutions where sufficient competence is available in the physical and biological sciences, engineering, and the social sciences.

(3) To improve the skills of Government employees already engaged in water research, the Government Employees Training Act and other procedures for inservice training should be more fully utilized by the Federal agencies, and adequate funds should be provided for this purpose. Centers should be established at universities in different regions of the country to provide interdisciplinary training in water-resources research both for young graduate students and for selected Federal career employees. This effort should be coordinated with the grant programs referred to above.

(4) Increased support of research at the universities is needed to further research in water resources as well as to attract needed manpower. It will be necessary to strengthen the extramural research efforts of Federal agencies along the lines already initiated by the Public Health Service. Adequate authority and direction should be provided for this purpose. The restraints that now prevent the Department of Agriculture from using its research-grant authority should be removed; the Weather Bureau should be given sufficient funds to launch a significant extramural research program in cooperating universities; the Department of the Interior needs authority and appropriations, broadly applicable to its water-research responsibilities, to make grants and contracts for a wide range of extramural research in support of its missions; and there should be clarification, where needed, of the authorizations in this area held by other agencies, such as the Corps of Engineers.

(5) Cooperative arrangements between Federal research establishments and the universities should be strengthened and extended so that the outstanding scientific competence of men and women in the Government agencies may contribute to the training of new scientists. Needed measures include arrangements for government scientists to teach and engage in research at educational institutions and increased opportunity for graduate-thesis work at Government laboratories under arrangements with the universities.

(6) In establishing a balance and relationship between inhouse and extramural research, it must be kept in mind that the Government agencies have an indispensable place in basic research on water. There is a need to strengthen their research, to upgrade the quality of their scientific efforts, and to insure effective guidance of their overall research programs. Accordingly, funds should be provided to strengthen the inhouse research competence of the Federal agencies, particularly their basic research programs.

Coordinating mechanisms: The water resources problem facing the Nation is one of growing dimensions. An accelerating research effort spanning the physical, biological, engineering, and social sciences is required if we are to gain the knowledge necessary to direct a very expensive, continuing investment in public works. The number of scientists, engineers, and other specialists who are able and willing to do creative research in water resources is dwarfed by the research needs, and the fiscal resources that can be applied are strained by other priority needs of our society. The diversity of the technical problems and the limits on human and material resources call for a carefully planned and executed research effort that is scientifically sound and properly balanced to meet both short-term and long-term needs.

Some three dozen bureaus or equivalent units in seven major departments and independent agencies of the Government are engaged in water-resources research. Their responsibilities and missions overlap, in part because of the pervasive nature of water resources problems. The situation calls for concerted efforts to achieve effective coordination and for such clarification of responsibilities as may be necessary to make the most effective use of public and private resources.

Some coordination of agency research activities in water resources has already been accomplished at laboratory and management levels. To meet the demands for future research progress, coordination must be effective at all levels. The task group recommends consideration of the following:

(1) Measures to improve communication among scientists, engineers, and other specialists engaged in water resources research, including interdisciplinary conferences in fields related to water resources; support of scientific journals and meetings aimed at furthering and facilitating the rapid exchange of information among water scientists; and the preparation of technical reviews and bibliographies. Consideration should be given to the establishment of specialized information clearinghouses. The Science Information Exchange of the Smithsonian Institution may be able to make an important contribution here.

(2) Measures to improve communication among technical directors and program managers, including the circulation of comprehensive and timely information on water-resources research efforts currently underway throughout the Government. There is need, also, for regular coordination of technical activities on a more systematic basis, through meetings of scientists and engineers from the various water resources agencies.

(3) Clarification of agency responsibilities for water-resources research should be approached on the basis of a division of technical effort among the agencies, in the light of their principal operating and research responsibilities. Recognition of technical leadership in different research areas by different agencies should be given on this basis through the Federal Council for Science and Technology. The agency (or agencies) so identified would be technically responsible for the adequacy of coverage of the work in a particular research category, would keep itself informed of related work and competence in other organizations, and would draw upon such competence to the maximum extent possible.

(4) The responsibility for encouraging interagency planning and coordination of research should be assigned to the Office of Science and Technology and the Federal Council for Science and Technology. Coordination should be accomplished through a coordinating committee on water-resources research, which would identify technical needs in various research categories; devise programs and measures to meet these needs; review the overall program; look for desirable allocations of technical effort among the agencies; review the technical-manpower base of the program; recommend management policies; and generally facilitate interagency communication at management levels. Provision should be made for involving in the committee's deliberations both technical personnel and managerial personnel conversant with the operational problems and needs. The committee should be assisted by technical panels having competence in the various research categories.

(5) The coordinating committee should have a chairman of senior standing, of rank comparable to that of an assistant secretary.

(6) A small full-time analytical staff should be established in support of the work of the coordinating committee. The staff should be responsible for systematic analyses in water resources which will be of aid in planning the Federal water-resources research program, and for the development of criteria for evaluating research projects. Funds should also be provided, where necessary, to draw on analytical competence outside the Federal Government.

(7) There is need for a continuing independent mechanism, representative of the views of the scientific and engineering community, to advise the Federal Council in identifying longer range objectives and needs in water-resources research and education. The National Academy of Sciences should be requested to consider means whereby overall Government planning in this field could be aided, and exchange of views between the Government and the academic community could be provided.

Legislative aspects: New legislation is needed to strengthen the contributions that the universities can make to research and graduate education in water resources.

(1) All agencies concerned with water resources should be able to contract with, and make grants to, any universities, whether or not they contain water-research centers, for research projects in support of agency missions.

(2) It is desirable to develop new centers for water-resources research in many universities and to strengthen existing centers and programs.

(3) To develop new centers and strengthen existing ones, some Federal support to each such center on a continuing basis is necessary, in addition to the support provided under recommendation 1. Responsibility for deciding how this supplementary support would be used should be left to the universities.

(4) Support to centers should be (i) in part on the basis of a relatively small formula amount to one or more designated research institutions in each State to establish or strengthen their capacity for water-resources research and (ii) in part on a matching-fund basis, consideration being given to the research potential of the institution.

(5) New legislation should give one agency the administrative responsibilities for carrying our recommendation 4(i) without superseding authorities presently vested in the several agencies.

(6) Similar authority is needed for carrying out recommendation (4)(ii). The administrative responsibility should be vested in one agency, which should seek appropriations for this purpose, but the grants should be made in consultation with the other agencies having interests in the field of water resources, and these agencies should participate in the drawing up of rules, regulations,

and criteria for evaluation. Such consultation and coordination could be accomplished through the proposed coordinating committee on water-resources research.

(7) All agencies concerned with water resources should be able to make arrangements with educational institutions to permit Government scientists and engineers to teach and engage in water-resources research at those institutions.

PURCHASE OF AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT WOULD SAVE AT LEAST $100 MILLION ANNUALLY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, today's Chicago Sun-Times carries an important editorial which points out that the proper organization of the Federal Government's use of electronic data processing equipment could save the taxpayers at least $100 million annually.

The editorial urges the adoption of the recommendations of the GAO that this equipment be purchased rather than leased. I think this is an urgently needed reform, Mr. President, but there is more to the recommendations of the Comptroller General which would give us additional savings. At a minimum, for example, there should be competitive bidding under a central Government authority, most likely the General Services Administration, in most purchase and lease arrangements for this equipment. Also, we should probably institute a central automatic data processing service for all activities of agencies which do not require an individual setup in the agency itself, instead of the current practice of allowing each agency to establish its own data processing office, thus unnecessarily duplicating very expensive leasing arrangements.

Mr. President, on May 21, following testimony by Comptroller General Campbell before the Subcommittee on Defense Procurement of the Joint Economic Committee, of which I am chairman, I introduced S. 1577, a bill to put into effect his recommendations of ways to develop some economies in the procurement and management of this type of equipment. The Government now spends an estimated half billion dollars on this equipment annually, and I believe institution of these reforms can save a significant portion of this amount.

Mr. President, this bill is now pending before the Government Operations Committee and it is my understanding that most of the agency reports on this legislation are now in. I hope very much that the committee will be able to go into this question at an early date, and I am glad to see this interest in these reforms on the part of the Chicago Sun-Times.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Nov. 21, 1963]

IT'S ONLY (YOUR) MONEY

Since June 1962, the Comptroller General of the United States, through the General Accounting Office, has been issuing reports calling the attention of the Government to the excessive costs in leasing electronic data processing equipment.

There have been 12 such reports. Each report specifically told how the Government could have saved money by purchasing, rather than leasing, the equipment.

The total sum that could have been saved amounts to $6,696,600.

On March 6, 1963, the GAO released a report of a study made of the financial advantages to be gained by purchase of the equipment rather than leasing it.

The study showed that a potential savings of $148 million could be realized in a 5-year period if only half of the 1,000 electronic data processing systems then installed or planned for installation on a lease basis by June 30, 1963, were to be purchased rather than leased. A further saving of $100 million annually would be realized after the initial 5-year period.

The Comptroller General also advised, in view of the tremendous amount of such machinery used in Government operations, that a central authority be established to make the decisions on procurement and utilization of this equipment. To date the suggestion has not been acted upon.

Recently Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, in his speeches against the foreign aid bill referred to the examples of waste turned up by the GAO and warned his fellow Senators that the American public would not long stand for such mismanagement.

If everyone in Washington paid close attention to the recommendations made by the Comptroller General the taxpayer would get far more value for his tax dollar.

WAR, PEACE, AND THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES—ARTICLE BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY AND SUMMARY OF MEETINGS AT THE CAPITOL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, for many years, as my colleagues know, I have been interested in the U.S. Government making fuller use of the sciences of man.

These sciences include not only the study of the human body, but of the human mind, not merely the examination of man, the single individual, but man, as a member of many groups.

Of all the sciences of man, none, unfortunately, has received less attention than the so-called behavioral sciences.

This is, of course, a paradox. The greatest problems facing the world—problems of war and peace—are rooted in men's behavior toward one another. We cannot solve these problems until we know more about man, as a member of groups and of nations, and until we put to work what we already know.

I have, therefore, encouraged all of the Federal agencies with possible interests in the behavioral sciences to draw to an increasing extent upon their insight and findings.

Earlier this year, it was my privilege to address what is known as the presidential session of the Convention of the American Orthopsychiatric Association, a great organization which brings together a wide variety of competences and interests for efforts on broad national and international problems.

In the current October 1963 issue of the American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, I was happy, on the invitation of the association, to contribute a special article, elaborating on my address. This article concentrated on the role of the behavioral sciences in international affairs, particularly in preserving the peace.

In the article, I refer to two meetings which I had arranged at the Capitol on August 21, 1963. There, eight distinguished social psychologists discussed with Members of Congress and their staffs what their disciplines can contribute and have already contributed in war-peace research. I had arranged these conferences in conjunction with the Committee on Psychology in National and International Affairs of the American Psychological Association. These two 1963 meetings were, in turn, a followup on a somewhat similar, informal meeting which I had held in 1962 also, as chairman of the Senate Government Operations Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations. This subcommittee has been interested since 1958 in maximum efficiency in Governmentwide science programs of all types.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD: the text of my article in the American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, and a summary of the August 21, 1963, morning and luncheon sessions, as prepared by staff of the American Psychological Association.

There being no objection, the article and summary were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR, PEACE, AND THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, chairman, Subcommittee on Disarmament, U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Washington, D.C.)

What is the foremost problem facing the American people?

This question has been answered in many public-opinion polls. Invariably, the American people have responded, prevention of world war III, or, in different words but with the same idea, preserving the peace.

That answer is absolutely sound. Peace is indeed the supreme challenge. This Nation is determined to meet the challenge successfully. We do not, of course, wish peace at any price; we are confident that peace is attainable with honor and with freedom.

U.S. INVESTMENT IN SECURITY

For attainment of the goals of peace and of a better world for the family of man, this Nation has spent vast sums in material resources. And in the Korean conflict, it expended incalculably higher sums in the form of human lives—in killed and wounded.

Each year, the Congress has been voting—with the strong support of the American people—$50 billion for military defense alone and billions more for oversea aid, not to mention sums for international diplomatic, intelligence, and information activities.

The investment has, by and large, been judicious; it has paid off; it will continue to pay off. No man can set an economic value on the deterrence of a world war, or of a so-called brushfire war; nor can a value be placed on less dramatic achievements such as enabling a single developing nation (much less several dozen) to build, in security, the foundations for freedom and plenty.

Rightly, we are dissatified with some aspects of our investment in security. Some mistakes have been made. The errors have been fewer in number than might have been expected, but they are nonetheless reason for constant effort to appraise, to correct and to improve.

Research is the key to progress in security. By means of what the military terms "research, development, testing and evaluation," the weapons of war are constantly refined. The goals are: (a) to maximize those weapons' value as a deterrent to an aggressor, and (b) if worse comes to worst, that is, if an aggressor strikes, to vanquish him.

Mankind devoutly wishes that worse will never come to worst. The traditional concept of victor and vanquished has lost much of its meaning because of the nature of potential thermonuclear (and bacteriological, chemical, radiological) warfare. It comes as no surprise that Nikita Khrushchev, for all his loudly proclaimed assurance of Communist victory in the event of all-out war, has realistically told Communist China that victory would mean little on a largely incinerated planet.

Weaponry fulfills its greatest value if it serves to make unnecessary its own use.

The ultimate "weapon" is, of course, man himself. He is both the target of weapons and the wielder of weapons. Peace begins or ends with him and, specifically, in his own mind.

It is, therefore, one of the most regrettable and ironic facts of our time that, while we feverishly refine the weaponry of war, we do so little to perfect the instruments of peace, through better knowledge and utilization of man himself, and of his mind, in particular.

THE LOPSIDED IMBALANCE IN RESEARCH

Let us be specific. Let us ask in what fields we are basically making our war-peace research investment.

The answer, in simplified but accurate terms is: For research on weaponry, over 99 percent; for research on human factors that will determine war or peace,[1] less than 1 percent.

Available statistics are less exact than one might wish, particularly because breakdowns are not maintained for "war-peace research" as such, in any agency or in the Government as a whole. Somewhat differing sets of figures must therefore be used, and definitions tend to vary between them. But latest Federal figures do show for the 1962 fiscal year: Total expenditures for U.S. Government research and development for national defense,[2] $7.7 billion; total expenditures by the Department of Defense for research alone (that is, excluding development),[3] $1 billion; and total expenditures by the Department of Defense for research in the psychological sciences alone (an undetermined portion of which might be classified as actual war-peace research),[4] $18 million.

The Department of Defense is cited, since it is the only substantial source of support of war-peace research involving human factors; no other Federal, or, for that matter, non-Federal, source spends as much as $1 million for this purpose.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration is increasing its support of the psychological sciences; NASA's share of the governmentwide total for the psychological sciences increased from 2 to 12 percent between the fiscal years 1962 and 1963. However, little, if any of this NASA research, could be construed as designed to solve problems of preventing World War III. Similarly, the largest Federal supporter of research in the psychological sciences—the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—is almost exclusively oriented to civilian, that is, medical, phases.

Clearly, the ratio between behavioral sciences research and physical sciences research on war and peace is lopsided in favor of the latter, the so-called hard sciences. This imbalance is unfortunate. It is correctable; it must be corrected; a more appropriate distribution of research effort must be made.

This will take some doing. For one thing, it will take much more understanding by all concerned. Fortunately, no psychiatrist or psychologist need be reminded that, as a matter of procedure, we must first trace the origins of the problem, namely, the reasons for the imbalance, if we expect to work our way out of it.

The origins are many; most are obvious; a few are relatively subtle. All can bear consideration. It cannot be assumed that the cards have been stacked in favor of the physical sciences.

Actually, there are many factors that might have accounted for a much higher ratio of war-peace research in the behavioral sciences. We must understand the respective strengths and weaknesses of the behavioral sciences.

FACTORS FAVORING USE OF THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

1. No one in our land would dispute that the American people do want peace and are prepared to explore every reasonable avenue toward peace.

A few jingoists notwithstanding, we are fundamentally a nonmartial nation, a live-and-let-live people, even toward our severest adversaries, a try-anything people.

There are good reasons for our behavior. We are, generally, the best informed people on earth, and we know what war would mean. No nation has more to lose from global war than ourselves, for we enjoy more precious values than any people.

The postwar years have witnessed the growth of a vast, multifaceted peace movement in our country. Literally hundreds of oragnizations have been formed, consisting of scientists, clergymen, teachers, housewives, and a myriad of other groups, representing virtually every segment of our society. Many of these organizations have sought new ways to strengthen the peace, to reduce tensions, to find honorable solutions to war-breeding crises, to open international lines of communication on a people-to-people basis.

2. The behavioral sciences do have a great deal to contribute to peace, as well as to victory. We learned the latter fact in World War II.

Our Government successfully used psychological, sociological, anthropological and other skills to a greater extent than ever before. In our Armed Forces, behavioral sciences proved helpful in selection, training, motivation and leadership and in healing the ill.

In dealing with our enemy, psychological warfare played an important role. Specifically, behavioral science assisted in several major and successful policies, such as the decision at the start of the military occupation of Japan not to force the abdication of the emperor.

Since World War II, the behavioral sciences, despite minimal Federal support, have sharpened their insight, skills, and tools. One of the most striking examples is brilliant interdisciplinary research involving computers; here, psychologists have fused their skills with those of physicists and other electronics experts, engineers, mathematicians, and others in opening up incredible new frontiers in man-machine collaboration for a variety of missions. In many other areas behavioral science studies have afforded helpful insight into innovative paths in international relations.

3. The American people are experiment minded, science minded, and psychiatry minded. No nation has expended more funds, energy or manpower in utilizing knowledge of the human mind to enrich the lives of the well and to restore the lives of the mentally ill. Moreover, the lore of psychology and of psychiatry has, to a considerable extent, entered into our entire culture.

Our people are potentially far more receptive to bold new ideas for use of the behavioral sciences than is sometimes realized; the Congress is no exception. On August 21, 1963, the latter fact was proved once again, when, at a luncheon meeting I had arranged at the Capitol, eight distinguished social psychologists spoke on as many aspects of their disciplines in war/peace research. A dozen Members of the Senate and House demonstrated deep personal interest in the discussion. Although no one would presume that the Senators and Representatives present necessarily represented the views of the Congress as a whole, their warm reception of the varied scientific views did confirm the deep potential for favorable response in the legislative branch to well-prepared presentations of this nature.

4. In the highest offices of our land there has been greater interest across the board in the behavioral sciences than at any previous time in our history. The President has time and again signified his personal interest. A report by a panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee under the chairmanship of Prof. Neil Miller offered a bold outline for national strengthening of the behavioral sciences.[5] Thanks to the interest of the President's science adviser, there has been set up for the first time a standing committee on the behavioral sciences in the interagency Federal Council for Science and Technology.

There are also other factors that might have contributed to a better showing by the behavioral sciences in the Federal ratio on war/peace research. But the factors militating against such a showing have clearly proved far more compelling. The relative weight of these negative factors has not been established by any scientific study, but a listing may underline their cumulative impact.

FACTORS AGAINST USE OF THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

1. Military preoccupation with firepower: Military strength has been traditionally equated with strength in military hardware (accompanied, to be sure, by strength of troop morale). Military science has, of course, evolved in the nuclear space age, but deterrence is still overidentified with firepower—with the quantity and quality of bullets, shells, explosives, and other lethal or disabling agents that can be delivered against an enemy in a given period of time under given circumstances.

It is perfectly understandable that past habits of thinking should persist, but it is also dangerous. Past military experiences are now partly inapplicable in the changed world of the hydrogen bomb. For now, brainpower must be so utilized that we need never use H-bomb firepower, if at all possible.

For example, it is universally recognized that if weaponry is to be effective as a deterrent, it must be "credible" to a potential aggressor; but how, I ask, can we really know what is credible in a foreign national's, far less an elite's or a nation's mind, if we make inadequate use of professionals skilled in such problems as perception?

2. Popular preoccupation with gadgetry: The military's preoccupation with hardware

---

[1] Excluded here is research on civilian problems, or on routine military personnel and other problems that cannot, except in the most indirect sense, determine the prevention of war.

[2] U.S. Bureau of the Budget, 1962. The Budget of the U.S. Government, Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1963. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.: 328.

[3] National Science Foundation. Federal Funds for Science, XI. (NSF-63-11) Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.: 29.

[4] Ibid., 31.

[5] Miller, Neil, Apr. 20, 1962. Strengthening the Behavioral Sciences. The White House. Reprinted in Science 136 (3512): 233-241.

does not originate in a vacuum. As a nation we are superbly gifted in engineering skills. We are hardware oriented, gadget minded. We often equate science with machines—materiel equipment contraptions into which you insert fuel, then press a button, and steer or race. Pushbutton war, pushbutton victory, instant, uncomplicated solutions—these concepts appear to be preferred by many people. Unfortunately, solutions to the fundamental problems we face are very complex and do not lend themselves to a pushbutton approach.

3. Limited military view of behavioral science: The Advanced Research Projects Agency and the Army, Navy, and Air Force have funded a relatively small number of behavioral science studies on war/peace issues. The Office of the Secretary of Defense has demonstrated a small degree of interest.

In certain machine-related spheres, civilian and military leaders of the Armed Forces have made brilliant use of some behavioral scientists. A notable example is in command-control studies on man-machine relationships in the North American Air Defense Command System and in the entire incredibly complex mechanism for responding to real or suspected attack by an aggressor.

The Department of Defense (DOD) has employed awesome ingenuity and resources in preparing against every physical contingency of global war. It has not matched that effort with comparable ingenuity and resources in research to prevent this lightning-fast machinery from ever having to be used in the first place.

DOD support of war/peace research in the behavorial sciences is thus limited in breadth, depth, and resources, and heavily weighted on the applied research side. An observer in the legislative branch gets the uncomfortable feeling, too, that, even for the few but often brilliant research studies underway, the ultimate payoff may be limited because there may be no climate of receptivity for action on the conclusions. Yet research for its own sake is just about the last thing the researchers or any thinking citizen would want.

4. Limited civilian view of behavioral sciences: In civilian agencies the picture is, with some exceptions, no brighter. Since its creation by Public Law 87-297, enacted September 6, 1961, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA) has had difficulty in surviving, let alone in realizing its hopes for a bold, across-the-board research program. Thus far, ACDA has put virtually all its research eggs in the physical sciences basket. My suggestion in mid-1962 to both that Agency and DOD for setting up the equivalent of a DOD-ACDA Advisory Council on Behavioral Science Research met with quick endorsement in principle but very slow implementation (and for a variety of reasons).

Neither the Department of State nor the U.S. Information Agency could be accused of indifference to the behavioral sciences, but neither agency appears to have distinguished itself from this standpoint. In fairness to both, neither specific mandate nor funds from the legislative branch exist for this purpose. Nonetheless, more could have been done and should have been done, even in the present circumstances, by these agencies.

In the Agency for International Development, behavioral science has a small foothold; in the Peace Corps, a relatively unique, substantial, and welcome role.

In all the aforementioned civilian agencies but the Peace Corps, it is difficult to escape the feeling that behavioral science is way out in left field while the ball game is being played in the infield.

5. Controversy implicit in behavioral sciences: Keeping behavioral sciences in the outfield often appears to agency officials to be the safest thing to do. Officials cannot help but be aware that behavioral science research may stir up controversy. A physicist's speech on electronic particles or a biologist's speech on ribonucleic acid is unlikely to be debated on the floor of Congress; not so a behavioral scientist's paper on, say, United States-Soviet "mirror image" suspicion.

Congress not only reflects, it also leads the Nation. Throughout the length and breadth of our land, different individuals, groups, cities, States and regions can and do react strongly to theories or findings by those who study man in action. But if timidity as to potential controversy should throttle the freedom of behavioral science, it would be a sad commentary for science and for our Nation.

6. Scientific preoccupation with quantitative measures: It is not just a hostile or indifferent layman who disputes the behavioral sciences' increased role, it is many a physical scientist as well. Few informed observers need be reminded that many physical scientists—in and out of Government—view with disdain what they regard as the "soft" sciences. The classic debate on this subject has been reiterated too often to require elaboration here. The literature is filled with discussion as to the problems, feasibility and desirability of further quantifying the amazingly complex and interacting variables of human personality. Suffice it to say that some of the leading figures in the physical sciences remain unconvinced that much can be gained from utilizing the "nonscientific" or "prescientific" behavioral disciplines.

7. Layman's do-it-yourself psychology: Popular opinion, referred to earlier, plays a further role in the underdeveloped character of the behavioral sciences. A popular belief seems to be that so-called commonsense is often just as reliable as some expert's theories. The generality is not always without substance.

Even stronger than commonsense is the insight of the learned amateur. While he may have gathered his knowledge avocationally and informally, he may often bring to bear considerable insight on a behavioral science problem. A little knowledge can be a dangerous thing, however. A lucky, occasional guess by a novice offers little basis for sustained reliance. Amateur psychology has its limitations, to say the least.

Few laymen would claim to be able to explain, much less build, an atomic bomb. But many laymen profess to know most of what they need to know about Soviet psychology. How often have we heard that it's all very simple, that human nature is the same the world over, or that there's nothing so mysterious about Castro, or Mao Tse-tung, or Ho Chi Minh. How often have glib vendors of cure-alls told us they have sized up the foe and have just the right answer for dealing with him. Certainly, every American has a right to his opinion. But it is hazardous if that opinion is based on blind indifference to the difficult, complex nature of so many of the problems with which behavioral science deals.

There is no justification for making a needless mystery out of Communists or communism—a mystery that allegedly can be solved only by Kremlinologists or some other professional "cult." But there is no justification for downgrading men and women who have devoted lifetimes to acquiring excellence in their chosen professions and who have much unique and specialized knowledge and insight to contribute.

8. Pessimism and fatalism about negotiation: Sometimes the behavioral sciences are rejected simply because, oddly enough, diplomacy itself is rejected outright.

For an optimistic people, it is surprising how often we allow a few fatalists to darken our outlook. Perhaps it is because so often some of our people have built hopes too high, have seen them dashed and have then been swung to an opposite extreme.

Fortunately, fatalism about the so-called inevitability of world war is still the exception. It would be the height of folly to succumb to such fatalism; it has neither justification nor rationality. As William Faulkner rightly stated when he received the Nobel Prize, "[We] decline to accept the end of man." We insist that man can work out, must work out, will work out an answer to his fate other than becoming radioactive cinders.

Fatalism, or its sisters-in-gloom, is often seen in less extreme form. There is, for one thing, considerable pessimism about the likelihood of successful negotiations with communism. The Soviet record of treaty violations certainly offers no basis for euphoria as to the U.S.S.R. fidelity to present or future commitments. But scholarly analysis of the Communist record [6] does bear out that, particularly in certain areas, it is possible to negotiate successfully. Success is achieved in the sense that an acceptable instrumentality is devised that satisfies our respective minimal national interests, and the instrumentality is observed (often because it is limited in scope and duration or because it is largely or wholly self-enforceable, or both). But even if the Soviet record on keeping commitments showed less promise than what little it does offer, we dare not throw up our hands and resign ourselves to permanent disagreement, for we already live somewhat tenuously in a hair trigger balance of mutual terror. Somehow, negotiation must be made to succeed. The alternative to competitive coexistence may be mutual (near or complete) annihilation.

Fortunately, the plain facts are that (a) it is not in Moscow's interest to let peaceful accommodation with the free world fail; (b) many leaders of the Soviet Union, not merely Khrushchev, do recognize that fact; (c) the people of the U.S.S.R. want passionately to ease tensions and be relieved of the crushing burden of the arms race; (d) it is definitely not in Peiping's interest (all of her bellicose propaganda to the contrary notwithstanding) that world war III break out; and (e) it is essential, and it is certainly not impossible, to convince Peiping of that fact, provided we use more of our wits and less of our emotions.

This does not mean that we need sacrifice in the slightest our deepest convictions about the record or the intentions of the Chinese Communist Government, for example. Nor does it mean that we propose to deceive ourselves into thinking that dealing with the Soviet Bear and the Peiping Dragon will be anything less than hazardous. Communism being what it is, we can expect from our adversaries the unexpected, the devious, the cunning, the ruthless, the cynical.

But we, being what we are, can be tough without being rigid; we can seek accommodation without risking appeasement; we can place hope in negotiations without underestimating its potential pitfalls. All the while, we can call upon a body of expertise that our adversaries lack in anything like the breadth or depth of our expertise on human behavior. This expertise is an important national asset—an underdeveloped asset.

Inflexible dogmas of totalitarianism have, by comparison, tended to stunt the behavioral sciences in Soviet society, just as officially decreed Lysenkoism has for so long stunted its genetic science.

Behavioral science is America's special strength. It is our task to capitalize on it far more than ever before.

9. Unsatisfactory communication by behavioral scientists: Finally, behavioral scientists must recognize that they themselves

---

[6] Triska, J. F. and R. M. Slusser, 1962, "The Theory, Law and Policy of Soviet Treaties," Stanford University Press, Stanford, Calif.; 397 pages.

may have contributed to their present problem.

Although many behavioral scientists are nominally expert in the science of communication, their discipline as a whole has not always done a satisfactory job of communication. It has not, by and large, "told its story" effectively to those who need to know it: to the Congress, to civilian and military leaders of the Armed Forces, to other officials of executive agencies, and to opinion-makers throughout the Nation, generally—for example, newspaper editors and the like.

As in the case of many other specialties, the specialists—the behavioral scientists—find that the public has a somewhat distorted image of what the specialty really is, does, knows, seeks, and the specialists' own technical jargon may serve, not to clarify, but to confuse, particularly the layman.

Meanwhile, poor communication perpetuates itself, and many more regrettable conditions as well. A vicious circle develops.

Because behavioral science has, heretofore, not effectively communicated to the Senate and House of Representatives—to congressional committees, subcommittees and Members—the Hill has had little reason to alter a widespread, somewhat negative image.

Because there is genuine concern as to possible adverse congressional reaction and little expectation of popular support, executive agency heads are often reluctant to program increased budgets for intramural or extramural research by behavioral scientists.

Because Federal resources are few and encouragement rare, behavioral science has been unable to attract or retain as many specialists in war/peace research as are necessary, or to train an oncoming generation of scientists in adequate numbers.

Because agency heads have few behavioral science personnel and few such consultants (who are usually, in any event, far removed from day-to-day operations), the specialists are unable to contribute effectively to major policy decisions. They operate on the periphery and for usually relatively narrow tasks. Sometimes, very frankly, it almost seems as if their very presence in an agency serves merely as a sop to the profession.

Because intramural personnel and consultants are themselves "in the outfield," it is difficult to arouse enthusiasm and elicit broad cooperation from colleagues in universities, in private practice and in other areas who might be genuinely interested in rendering assistance.

Because agency policy officials do not bother to communicate to the scientific community the actual day-to-day, short- or long-range needs, the research applications that are received, or the ideas or papers, often seem to insiders to be impractical or marginal. Actually, in my judgment, it is remarkable how good some of these submissions are, despite the lack of two-way communication.

Fortunately, communication has recently been improved to a considerable extent; but it has still not attained a fraction of the necessary effectiveness.

CONCLUSIONS

It is clear that all those interested in assuring proper use of the behavioral sciences have their work cut out for them. This is not a task for "George," the other fellow; it is your task and mine, as well as that of every interested scientist, scientific organization and layman.

Some improvements in the numerous factors here described on both sides of the picture appear to be in the making; more are necessary. But no single action or series of actions by any one source, either the President or the Congress, can upgrade the role of the behavioral sciences; a complex of actions is necessary from a complex of sources and on a continuing basis.

The goal is not just more research, but better research, more effective research, more research that is put into action and more feedback from experience in action to ongoing research.

The ultimate goal is more than survival, more than peace; it is a better world.[7]

Such a world is ours for the making. Never in man's experience has he been so much the master of his fate—of nature and of himself.

Never before has his mind held within its control the destiny of all that he holds dear.

SUMMARY OF PRESENTATIONS AT INFORMAL MEETING ON "SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT," CALLED BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, AUGUST 21, 1963

Senator HUMPHREY's opening remarks stated, "The reason for this meeting is simple: The greatest issue confronting mankind is, of course, the preservation of peace, security, and freedom.

"I have asked Members of the Senate and House to join with me in hearing from eight distinguished behavioral scientists as to: (a) What they are doing in this field of preventing war, and, (b) what they propose this Nation, particularly the Federal Government, should do that it may not now be doing in their field of competence."

Senator HUMPHREY went on to emphasize the underuse of psychological insight into war and peace, to underscore the fact that the Government is definitely not doing enough by way of use of the behavioral sciences in international relations, and to ask such questions as: "Are psychology and related disciplines contributing what they can and should contribute to the cause of peace? If not, what should be done and how? What should be the priorities? What research and demonstration programs? What policy changes in day to day or emergency diplomatic procedure, etc.?"

The meetings were held in two sessions: One from 10 a.m. to 12 noon in room 1318 of the New Senate Office Building; the other from 12:30 p.m. to 4 p.m. in room S–120 of the Capitol. The congressional and staff participants at the mid-morning meeting were: Senator Gaylord Nelson, Congressman John Brademas, John Hayward from Senator Cannon's office, Sue Rosenfeld from Senator Keating's office, William Stover from Senator Randolph's office, Herman Schwartz from the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, Julius Cahn from the Senate Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, Muriel Ferris from Senator Hart's office, Alfred Partoll from Senator Cooper's office, Ellery Woodworth from Senator Brewster's office, Burt Ross from Senator Kennedy's office, Allen Lesser from Senator Javits' office, Stephen Horn from Senator Kuchel's office, Stanley Newman from Congressman Ryan's office, Owen O'Donnell from Congressman Fascell's office, and Jan Altman from Congressman Macdonald's office.

At the session in the Capitol Building were: Senators HUBERT HUMPHREY, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, JACOB JAVITS, FRANK MOSS, GAYLORD NELSON and Representatives GEORGE MILLER, CHET HOLIFIELD, WILLIAM FITTS RYAN, JAMES FULTON, JOHN BRADEMAS, CLAUDE PEPPER, JOSEPH KARTH, ROBERT KASTENMEIER, plus Julius Cahn and John Reilly from the Senate Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations.

The eight psychologists present at both sessions were: Drs. Urie Bronfenbrenner (Cornell), Harold Guetzkow (Northwestern), Edwin Tollander (State University of New York at Buffalo), Donald Michael (Peace Research Institute), Thomas Milburn (U.S. Naval Ordnance Test Station), Gardner Murphy (Menninger Foundation), Charles Osgood (University of Illinois), and Lawrence Solomon (American Psychological Association central office).

Approximately the same material was presented by each speaker in the morning and in the afternoon sessions. Therefore, for this summary, the presentations of each psychologist shall be combined into a single statement, regardless of the session in which it was presented.

Dr. Thomas Milburn contrasted two extreme points of view regarding psychology's contribution to the study and resolution of international problems: that psychology has no contribution to make whatsoever; and that psychology has the answers to all of our problems. Rejecting both of these extremes, Dr. Milburn stressed the fact that all individuals base their behavior and planning upon some form of implicit social theory and that it is one of the aims of psychology to test these theories for their value as valid bases for action. Most of the contribution from psychology today, therefore, is in the nature of information retrieval; that is, applying what we already know about human behavior to some of the situations currently confronting us. The behavioral sciences are now better, in many respects, than intuition in helping one to deal effectively with complex situations. Soon, with further research and study, the behavioral sciences will surpass intuition in all respects.

Dr. Milburn briefly described Project Michelson, a large-scale Department of Defense research project in the behavioral sciences including some 30 or more studies of the concept of deterrence and its related aspects. This project is utilizing 18 different approaches to this general problem area in order to seek out the convergence of results. Some of the findings to date, which stress the many changing patterns of compliance and hostility between the United States and the U.S.S.R. over time, are:

(1) There is a reciprocal relation between the Soviet Union and Communist China in terms of their aggressiveness; that is, when one is high, the other is low, and vice versa.

(2) The mirror image phenomenon holds for the motivation of the United States and U.S.S.R., but not for the tactics; that is, they attribute the same motives to us as we attribute to them, but this does not hold true for the mutual perception of tactics.

(3) The proliferation of nuclear weapons tends to lead to a diffusion of Eastern and Western blocs.

(4) American allies feel better about missiles at sea than they do about missiles in foreign bases.

Dr. Urie Bronfenbrenner, just returned from an extended stay in the Soviet Union, spoke in some detail about the development of "The new Soviet man"; that is, he reported his findings on the new school systems developing in Russia and their emphasis on the formation of a Soviet morality and character in the children of Russia today.

Dr. Bronfenbrenner pointed out that since "wars begin in the minds of men" there is a great need for the study of the mental processes occurring in nations which face potential conflict. Little or nothing is being spent by the U.S. Government on behavioral science research in this area. And at the same time as our research activities are lagging, the Soviet Union is undertaking a broad-scale, intensive program to inculcate a social morality and a Soviet character in its schoolchildren, utilizing techniques and concepts which we study relatively little in this country. Two new kinds of schools are being opened in the Soviet Union: boarding schools and prolonged day schools. In these settings the objective of the program undertaken is to get the group (and all Soviet society is organized around large or small groups of one kind or another) to take over the upbringing of the child. The emphasis is upon living in a collective and the motivation for the inculcation of discipline is group approval. Following the teachings of Makarenko, this educational system, incorporating some of the major findings in the behavioral sciences, promises to produce a new breed of Soviet citizen who will pose a potential challenge to the ability of our future citizens in their efforts to deal and relate effectively with the U.S.S.R. in years to come.

---

[7] For an elaboration of overall goals for the behavioral sciences, see HUMPHREY, HUBERT H., "A Magna Carta for the Social and Behavioral Sciences." Reprinted from American Behavioral Scientist, February 1962, together with CONGRESSIONAL RECORD statement of Feb. 19, 1962, and issued as release S 2–10–62.

See also, HUMPHREY, HUBERT H. 1963, "The Behavioral Sciences and Survival." American Psychologist 18(6); 290–294.

Dr. Charles Osgood directed his remarks to the disparity between technological advance and social-cultural advance in this nuclear age. He emphasized that only a very small fraction of our total defense budget is being spent on the study of such "soft" variables as "human nature," "thinking," "conflict resolution," "trust," "cooperation," etc. Deploring this state of affairs, Dr. Osgood pointed to his own research on the "soft" variable "meaning" and indicated that such seemingly nebulous variables are, indeed, amenable to scientific study and quantification. Sixteen different language cultures are being studied in a cross-cultural project designed to clarify the nature of the "meaning" of various concepts, as this varies from culture to culture, and to seek for the common dimensions of meaning which are shared universally by all cultures.

Dr. Osgood emphasized that while we are building our weaponry for "deterrence"—for the purpose of not using it—we are not expanding sufficient effort, time, or resources on seeking ways of avoiding the use of our deterrent weapons. Such a search for alternatives, perforce, requires the interdisciplinary approach of the behavioral sciences.

Dr. Harold Guetzkow discussed the use of gaming and simulation techniques as social science approaches to the study of international relations. He cited military and business gaming as predecessors and then detailed three kinds of simulation techniques: all-computerized, man-computer combinations, and all-man. Dr. Guetzkow briefly described the internation simulation technique which he has developed and then reported some of the findings to date. In a study of effects of the proliferation of nuclear weaponry in a simulated, "testtube" world, the weakening of bloc alliances was predicted in 1960, as is now confirmed by the course of events in the "real" world and as was reported by Dr. Milburn during this meeting.

Another study utilizing the internation simulation explored the effects of "rigidity" versus "flexibility" as personality characteristics of decisionmakers. On the basis of a personality test, the participants in the simulation were selected so as to have some whose personalities were very "rigid" and some whose personalities were very "flexible." It was demonstrated that "flexible" decisionmakers did considerably better. Their "worlds" had fewer wars, and more peaceful international relations, and such decisionmakers were better able to extricate themselves effectively from crisis situations than were their "rigid" counterparts.

Again, Dr. Guetzkow underscored the need for Congress to exercise its power and demand an increase in the use to which agency people are putting the behavioral sciences. He argued that without pressure and initiative from Congress, policymakers in the agencies will be too timid to utilize the newer behavioral sciences approaches to resolve current and anticipated problems of public policy.

Dr. Donald Michael concerned himself, in his remarks, with the problems of manpower utilization and funding. The usefulness of an increased utilization of behavioral scientists in the area of national and international affairs is twofold: (1) The contribution of empirical data on human behavior which these scientists can make should lead to a more valid basis upon which to make policy decisions involving human beings; and (2) the behavioral scientist can point out important variables in complex situations which may be overlooked or misjudged by those not trained in the behavioral disciplines.

Dr. Michael cited two examples of suggestions coming from behavioral scientists during World War II which, based upon scientific understanding of human behavior, lead to an effective course of action: (1) The recommendation to take Japanese prisoners, and (2) the recommendation not to depose the Emperor.

Dr. Michael pointed to three pressing needs today: (1) the need for more behavioral scientists to work on problems of national and international concern; (2) the need for vital areas of research to be pinpointed and clarified; and (3) the need to provide incentives for work in this area, such as the opportunity to publish (restricted in some cases by security regulations) and the opportunity to work on a wide range of subject matter (that is, not only "fire house" research aimed at the answer to a single, circumscribed question, but long-range basic and applied studies). There are people ready to work on these problems; in universities, industry, and private research institutes. There are users of this research; peace action groups and Government agencies and departments. There is a need for increased funding to further the utilization of this manpower and to increase the communication of findings to the potential users. There is a need to inform the research community more broadly and more systematically of the studies they might do.

Dr. Gardner Murphy cautioned against over- or under-selling the problem of the utilization of the behavioral sciences. We need to know how to take steps to mobilize resources to bring them to bear upon policy problems and we need to know how to do research of an applied nature, developing a long-range capability to utilize our potential. Behavioral scientists are interested in long-range knowledge of human nature. We need guidance from policy people to help make our findings relevant to Government decisionmaking. He specifically invited Congressmen to make use of the facilities of the APA Committee on Psychology in National and International Affairs and offered this service as available on a continuing basis.

In response to Dr. Bronfenbrenner's presentation, Senator HUMPHREY suggested, as a possible research project for psychologists, a study of the relationship between puritan morality and Soviet morality. In response to Dr. Murphy's appeal, he suggested that what he personally would need from psychologists would be statements concerning specific lacks in agency programs and interests; specific programs of action, projects, etc.; a party platform on behavioral sciences in international affairs.

Dr. Edwin Hollander did not make a formal presentation. He chaired the morning meeting and directed the interchange of ideas, questions and answers between the participants and the speakers.

In the luncheon session, Hollander introduced the speakers by a brief statement of the scope and intent of the behavioral sciences and pointed out the research emphasis they brought to bear on problems of international tension reduction. The variety of ways that such complex problems could be stated and studied, he said, would be indicated by the several presentations to be made. While such behavioral science activity could not be a full solution to these matters, he added that it was an important complement to the more traditional lines of study and action usually followed.

Dr. Lawrence Solomon prepared this summary statement of the proceedings. Any further inquiries for information, clarification, consultation, or continuing contact with any of the speakers should be directed to him as Executive Secretary, Committee on Psychology in National and International Affairs, American Psychological Association, 1333 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

THE U.N.'S VITAL ROLE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday the President of the United States submitted to the Congress the 17th annual report of the U.S. participation in the United Nations.

His report summarized the many ways in which this complex but effective institution has proven to be a valuable instrument in reducing world tensions and enhancing world welfare. The United States has been deeply committed to this international institution since its inception. In a sense, it is a child of American idealism. It is a tribute to that idealism to note that we have not thrown up our hands in despair at U.N. growing pains. Despite the shortcomings inherent in any organization combining members from vastly different political, social, and economic milieu, the record has justified our confidence and encouraged hope for greater accomplishments in the future.

The lead editorial in today's New York Times makes a sound assessment of the U.N.'s vital role in American foreign policy and world peace. In stressing that role, it pinpoints the weaknesses which threaten its continued performance: First, attempts to weaken the important executive function which makes the U.N. a significant force in world affairs and second, reluctance of some of the member nations to meet their financial obligations.

I want to take this occasion to urge that we fight these twin destructive tendencies so that the U.N. may continue its important functions: in meeting immediate crises in planning for a future where commonly accepted rules and standards for resolution of national differences reduce their incidence; and continuing and expanding its cooperative assault against the common enemies of mankind; disease, poverty, and ignorance.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the New York Times be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE U.N.'S VITAL ROLE

The importance of the United Nations to American foreign policy and to world peace was emphasized anew yesterday by President Kennedy in his report to Congress. Most Americans unquestionably join in this endorsement, dismissing with contempt the extremist attacks on the world organization and even on its humanitarian enterprises such as the Children's Fund.

The United Nations, which celebrated its 18th birthday recently, is still an adolescent. Even its occasional excesses and crises may be regarded as growing pains to be overcome as it develops in experience and stature. It has already proved itself to be an indispensable outlet and safeguard for more than a hundred nations, large and small, old and new, whose multiplying delegations now burst its headquarters at the seams. And a score more are still to come.

The United Nations is important first of all as a forum which, if it did not exist, would have to be invented. It is the closest approach yet to a parliament of man where all nations can freely present their cause and seek the support of world opinion. It is a place for parliamentary diplomacy, to deal with the problems endangering world peace.

The most important function entrusted to the United Nations is that of guardian of the peace, to preserve peace where possible, to suppress aggression by force if necessary. Its means for doing so are still rudimentary, and the ambitious provisions of the charter for a United Nations force remain unfulfilled. But the United Nations was able to organize resistence to Communist aggression in Korea and to send peacekeeping forces into the Middle East and the Congo. Unfortunately, this decisive executive function is now in process of an erosion which must be reversed to save the United Nations from the fate of the League of Nations. A world peace force is one key to disarmament; it is essential to keep the peace in a disarmed world.

It is ironic that a world which now is able to spend hundreds of billions of dollars for armaments finds it difficult to provide a few million dollars to sustain even the existing United Nations peace forces. President Kennedy rightly castigates the financial irresponsibility of countries that refuse to pay all their assessment for such forces, notably the Soviet bloc and France. But castigation is not enough; it must be followed by United Nations action to bring the delinquents to book on the principle of no representation without taxation. That is the essence of the United Nation's financial crisis, which will come to a head next year. On the outcome of it may depend the life or death of the United Nations itself.

MINNESOTA—MIDWEST IS FRONT RUNNER IN ELECTRONICS—AN OUTSTANDING ADDRESS BY GOV. KARL F. ROLVAAG

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, from time to time, it has been my pleasure to point out the excellent contributions by the State of Minnesota to American scientific and engineering advances.

I have done so not merely as a matter of personal pride in the accomplishments of my State; such pride is well justified. But there is a far greater significance to Minnesota's scientific and technical contributions.

This Nation is aided immeasurably by tapping the talents and skills of every region and every State. The upper Midwest has its vital contribution to make. Minnesota and its neighbors are ready, willing and eager to do their share. Minnesota's inspiring record of technical achievement in war and in peace speaks eloquently for both the past, the present, and the future.

Toward the end of last month, an outstanding statement of this subject was presented by a great and well-qualified public official. I refer to an address by the Governor of our State—the Honorable Karl F. Rolvaag—before the National Electronic Conference, as presented on October 29, 1963.

Governor Rolvaag pointed out the splendid assets which Minnesota brings to the Nation's scientific and technical problems—its superb educational, tradition and institutions, its advanced system of State, municipal and private services, its dynamic business community, its invigorating climate and recreational advantages, whether for sports or culture, and other natural and human endowments.

Governor Rolvaag's statement proceeded with a summary on what Minnesota is accomplishing in the vital field of electronics. He noted that:

> In Minnesota electronics and related science industries employ 50,000 persons, with an annual payroll of $260 million.

He looked, however, to larger opportunities and needs for the future.

He spoke frankly of the regrettable imbalance in the national allocation of Federal scientific grants and contracts. He noted my personal efforts to help "fortify the idea industry all across the Nation."

Governor Rolvaag stressed the need for sound, broad-gaged criteria in the allocation of Federal research and development contracts. He suggested:

> Perhaps, it should be required that the proposed contractor submit a plan for the utilization of research results beyond the immediate fulfillment of the contract.

He asked:

> What about a massive research program in the nonmilitary problems of life? Our mass transit problem, our air pollution, our water pollution problem, our pressing human welfare problems—mental illness, mental retardation, the control of our patterns of land use?

Governor Rolvaag's statement is another fine demonstration of the enlightened leadership which Minnesota State and local officials are providing to our citizenry and to our Nation—a leadership that is concerned not only with things but with human beings and with the Nation's frontiers.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this fine address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNESOTA—MIDWEST FRONTRUNNER IN ELECTRONICS—KARL F. ROLVAAG TALK BEFORE NATIONAL ELECTRONICS CONFERENCE, CHICAGO, ILL., OCTOBER 29, 1963

Dr. Von Tersch, distinguished guests, friends, I come to you today from Minnesota, honored by the recognition to my State implicit in your invitation. We have an exciting success story to tell and one that means much to me, as a citizen and as a Governor. Our flourishing electronics industry in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area has not only brought new technical advances, it has bolstered our economy, provided jobs, induced new talents in many disciplines to settle in Minnesota—it has given impetus to community development. It has improved the welfare of the people of my State in many ways.

But in the recounting of our successes, we find new challenges, new problems, new areas of human endeavor half done—half met and difficult questions to which all of us, the scientists and the industrialists, as well as the political leaders and social scientists, must seek answers in joint action and joint planning.

Tritely, but surely, these are times of unprecedented change. We are literally being thrust forward on the crest of a wave of scientific knowledge. It is a new, startling revolution, a technological, electronic revolution that in its far-reaching effects dwarfs the great industrial revolution of the 19th century.

Ponder if you will the fact that 90 percent of all scientists who have ever lived in the world are living today. Our accumulated scientific knowledge doubles every 10 years. Coupled with advancing knowledge is the rapid population expansion bringing with it enormous need for new jobs and for a healthy expanding economy. One thing, one factor stands out clearly: the only way we can cope with this new world is by recognizing that our chief hope is in human resources—brains and ideas. We built this Nation by heavy dependence on abundant natural resources—the mine, the field, the forest. All too often it was a reckless dependence. In Minnesota, we were no different. In the first century of our existence we relied on seemingly endless beds of rich iron ore, millions of acres of pine forests, and farmstead after farmstead of rich black soil, to provide the backbone of our economy. Today, the natural resource in this economic reliance is diminishing in importance, and the growth of our economy depends more directly on human resources, on the adaptability of people in devising technical solutions to the problems of our industrial urbanized life.

The implications of this massive shift of values are of profound importance.

In Minnesota we confronted this new realization with a set of existing conditions which proved to be of great significance to us. First, we had at hand a sturdy population with high aspirations and unusual capacities. In selective service rejections based on literacy, generally regarded as a broad measure of quality, Minnesota has for many years had one of the best records. Consistently, less than 6 percent of those considered for the draft have been rejected—a record of education attainment shared by very few States.

Second, we had—we have—a stimulating, exhilarating climate, and vast outdoor recreation reserves, a needed source of strength and renewal—of re-creating—for the modern man. For example, 90 percent of all Minnesotans live within 10 minutes of a body of water of fishing and swimming quality.

Third, Minnesota's public services are extensive and of high quality—our transportation, our public schools, our urban centers, our public health and welfare services—all measure up to what thoughtful, intelligent people expect that their government should provide—though, I must add, we strive vigorously to improve these services.

Fourth, we are proud of a cultural community life which gives recognition and encouragement to the arts. The recent arrival of the Tyrone Guthrie Theatre adds further luster to an already rich array of cultural institutions and activities—the Minneapolis Symphony Orchestra, the St. Paul Civic Opera, the St. Paul Gallery and Theatre, the Minneapolis Institute of Art, the Walker Art Center, and many other concert and theater and dance groups.

Fifth, we had, as an integral part of our business community, several dynamic industries, including one of the most important electronics companies in the Nation; namely, Minneapolis-Honeywell, a company with alert management which had, both during and since World War II, been an important supplier of extremely sophisticated control systems for the military. Honeywell has long recognized the need for large investment in research and new product development, a fact which has given it a position of national leadership in industry.

Sixth, and most important—though one must add that all these things are intertwined and interdependent—it is hard to imagine one of them without the supportive existence of all the others—we had developed one of the great universities of the country.

Over and again, as one searches out the factors which appear to result in the magical fusion of brains and industry, one finds that the essential ingredient is a recognized university, a center of brainpower, a supply of talented, educated people, a creative source of new ideas. Some special assets exist at our University of Minnesota. It is highly accessible (the crowded, urban campus, with its endless traffic and parking problems turns out to be a boon in its proximity to our industrial areas). Another special attribute of the University of Minnesota is that it has not been fragmented by misguided political parochialism; one university, under one board of regents, serves the entire State, through several campuses located throughout the State.

Another important consideration is the status of our university. Under our State constitution, it is, in effect, independent of any branch of State government. It has its own budget, appropriated, it is true, by the legislature but not under administrative or executive control. It has its own governing body, and operates with a unique freedom from political pressures. The result has been beneficial to its growth and development.

Another facet of the University of Minnesota that has a direct bearing on this discussion is its affiliation with the famed Mayo Clinic, which operates, in fact, a graduate school of medicine under the dean of the university graduate school. This relationship has resulted in one of the great medical schools of the country, and has played an important part in the development of a climate of scientific research.

I should add here that our great university is only part of the higher education picture in Minnesota. We take special pride in the recognized high quality of the 14 private liberal arts colleges. These colleges have outstanding facilities and are pace setters in the Nation when it comes to counting up distinguished alumni, fine faculties and extensive libraries. They are a major strength of our interdependent structure of higher education institutions in the State. So are also the five State colleges—now six, as a result of action by our legislature last spring. This education undergirding, this steady supply of qualified liberal arts graduates from these 20 colleges is a basic and essential part of the strength of the university and its graduate schools.

Up to now I have merely recited key facts—I have listed the tools, the ingredients available to us as we undertook to meet the challenge of the technological revolution; to make the fullest possible use of the burgeoning science of electronics and aerospace. An area—or a State, or a region—might well have all these ingredients and still not manage to stay on the crest of the wave. Many new elements had to be added. In Minnesota these things have happened.

First, the traditional role of the university—as conserver of knowledge, transmitter of knowledge, and assembler of knowledge—while still very important, was a role which had to be enormously expanded.

Leaders like Dr. William G. Shepherd, formerly head of electrical engineering and now the university's academic vice president—Dr. Shepherd and others recognized that the university must be geared to the community. (May I point out that I refer here to the technical, the scientific, the engineering schools of the university, though, of course, the same responsibilities for a close relationship with the community are shared by schools in the areas of the social sciences and the arts.)

If science and basic research are going to be translated into products that can be marketed, if the engineers who have cast their lot with industry are going to stay abreast of the expanding knowledge, if the exchange between both the academic and the industrial leaders is going to be nourished and made fruitful, if the "fallout" from university learning is going to "nucleate" into new business enterprises—then surely the university must assume new positions of leadership. I am proud to say this has been the pattern in Minnesota.

One of the major accomplishments of this joint university-business effort—and I must here emphasize that it is as important for leaders in finance and management sectors of our economy to participate in joint university-business endeavors as it is for the academic leaders—one of the major accomplishments has been the evening graduate school, where now some 142 men from 10 companies are doing advanced work. The cost is high in terms of dollars and since the legislature as yet has made no provision for this kind of program, the whole effort is underwritten by the participating industries.

In addition, top researchers, scientists, and engineers of the many new electronics and related industries in the Twin City area are attending weekly seminars at the university electrical engineering school, adding to and refreshing their knowledge.

Other steps had to be taken, if we were to realize our potential—as a breeding ground for the new electronics industry. Experience on the east coast and west coast had clearly shown the need for an applied research institute and in the past year we in Minnesota have seen the development of such an institute. In the North Star Research & Development Institute, in Minneapolis, we have established the vital connecting link between town and gown. Through the brilliant leadership of J. Cameron Thomson, with full cooperation from the business and university communities, the North Star Research Institute has been set up with a twofold purpose: to serve the current practical needs of industry for research-team assistance, and to lead industry in its own development, to pioneer new areas of necessary corporate business activity. Let me elaborate on the goals of this new research institute. Not only is it geared to develop new products and processes, it will scrutinize management and marketing methods, find more efficient ways of producing goods, and determine marketability of proposed products. It is also concerned with improvements in the scientific education of students.

Although an independent corporation, the institute shares with the University of Minnesota the common goal of the advancement of science; it is in fact a new faculty emphasizing disciplines in which there was a void. Close professional ties are maintained with the university staff and university scientific and engineering specialists are available to work with North Star on research problems of mutual interest.

This effort is still in its infancy, but, patterned as it is, on the great research institutes of Stanford and the Cambridge-Boston area, we are confident that it will be of enormous value and importance.

A vital factor in our success story—in perhaps all the success stories being told today about the phenomenal growth of the electronics and related science industries—is the part played by the Federal Government. Whether one likes it or not, this is an established fact. When the new frontiers of knowledge altered military planning—when the Defense Department shifted emphasis from heavy tanks and guns to missiles and space exploration, when the Government itself became the chief investor in research and development in this country (it is now estimated that 70 percent of all research and development being done in the United States today is financed by the Government)—when these things happened, the impact on the various segments of our national economy, including Minnesota, was immeasurable.

In the main, the Federal research and development dollars went to the institutes, the industries, the universities where there was an accumulation of talent and know-how and past proven ability to deliver the goods. They also went to those areas of the country where people were prepared and aware and alert to the changing conditions. Compared to the giants of California and the east coast, we know we in Minnesota, we in the Midwest, are only sharing a fraction of that research money—only a fraction of what we could use effectively—both to acquire more knowledge and to apply that newfound knowledge to industrial use of benefit to us and to the whole country. Make no mistake about it. In spite of our very limited share in Government research and development moneys, we have become a frontrunner in the electronics industry.

Today in Minnesota the electronics and related science industries employ 50,000 persons, with an annual payroll of $260 million. In the words of Dr. L. V. Berkner, president of the Graduate Research Center of the Southwest, "the growth of science-oriented industry in Minneapolis-St. Paul grew from nothing to $700 million annually in a decade."

Minneapolis-Honeywell, and Minnesota Mining, our two leaders, have steadily expanded and diversified. In 1952, Remington Rand Univac established a major plant in St. Paul. As it happens these companies provided a spinoff of management and scientific talent—ambitious, brilliant, and imaginative men who have ventured as entrepreneurs on their own, in numerous small companies. Control Data, founded in 1957, is an exciting example. So is the E. F. Johnson Co. of Waseca. There are many other companies like these.

In 1958, IBM completed its ultramodern plant in Rochester. Within the past 12 months, one of the Nation's fastest growing electronics companies, Litton Industries, opened a new subsidiary, Duluth Avionics, at Duluth. Litton has also purchased the aerospace research facilities of General Mills, and recently opened another center at Hibbing, Minn. The total number of electronic and related industries in the past 7 years has grown from less than 90 to 140. The Twin Cities area is one of the fastest growing metropolitan centers in the Nation and there is no question but this is due in large part to the new boom in electronics and the large amount of business it generates in the way of subcontracts, equipment purchases and general services.

But we are aware of the many remaining problems and challenges. Let me review some of them for I know they are shared in part or in their entirety with much of the Midwest. Just a few minutes ago I referred to the impact that the Federal research and development program has had in influencing growth patterns in the new electronics industries. I recognize that the Department of Defense must assume the responsibility for placing contracts with the lowest responsible bidder.

But I am suggesting now that perhaps another criterion should be considered, in defining what brings the highest yield to the good of the Nation. Perhaps it should be required that the proposed contractor submit a plan for the utilization of research results beyond the immediate fulfillment of the contract. Have we depended too much on happenstance, on haphazard spillover? A breakthrough on how to control the flight of a satellite might, for example, become marketable as a computer system to regulate seat reservations on an airliner. Or, the intricate sophisticated instrumentation developed to regulate a Gemini has implications for a computation on highway construction. With all our brains are we not in a position to make these kinds of things happen by plan rather than by fortuitous circumstance?

Let's go even farther. What about a massive research program in the nonmilitary problems of life? Our mass transit problem, our air pollution, our water pollution problems, our pressing human welfare problems—mental illness, mental retardation, the control of our patterns of land use. If this country is to continue as a strong, free, growing vital world leader, we must seek knowledge on all fronts. We must seek it with giant steps, giant steps taken rapidly, surely and with plan and purpose. The private sector of business and industry and the public sector as well must invest far more than ever before in examining and finding ways to apply our new electronics and aerospace science to the pressing problems of civilian life.

Perhaps most important of all, and I am pleased that my good friend and fellow Minnesotan, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY is bringing this matter to the national attention, through the investigation he is currently conducting into the role and effect of technology on the Nation's economy—perhaps most important of all would be a conscious, carefully developed plan on the part of the Federal Government to use the research and development dollar to fortify the idea industry all across the Nation.

Boston and California have no corner on the brains of this Nation. One-third of the Ph. D.'s in the physical sciences come from the Midwest. There is no reason why we shouldn't attract some of the bright and daring engineers and scientists now taking up base positions on the west and east coasts. If we fail to attract them it's because we have not been sufficiently aggressive in seeking to attract technologically based industries and adequately financed research centers which will provide the opportunities which our most highly trained scientists seek. I remind you that of the 11 high-energy atomic accelerators in the United States, only 1 is in the Midwest, at Argonne National Laboratory in Chicago. It is not only discriminatory that these facilities should be concentrated elsewhere, it is unwise as a national policy. If brains are today our greatest resource, we must nurture them in every geographic area of the Nation. We must provide the research facilities which will make it possible to vastly expand opportunities for graduate study and research in solid state physics and the other basic sciences in the center of the continent, as well as on both coasts. Instead of 20 great universities in the Nation, we should have 100 or 150. Instead of concentrating the billions of research and development moneys, we should use them judiciously to give life and vigor to the newly developing research institutes, to industry, to universities and to colleges all across the land.

Let me touch on a few other matters before I close. We in Minnesota have had a taste of success. We like it. And frankly we want more. We know some of the things that must be done, and one to which we give top priority rating is the improved education of our young people. The change that electronics and related science industries have brought about are nowhere felt more keenly than in the labor market. The high school graduate needs at least a year and preferably 2 years of post-high school training in order to qualify as an electronic technician. Work experience is a vital part of education, a part that has somehow been separated from present-day schooling. We must regear and expand our school programs and we must get on with it with the greatest dispatch possible, if we are to provide the competent foremen, trained technicians, the programers, and machine operators so essential to this technological revolution. As it happens, Minneapolis is the home of one of the outstanding private trade schools in the Nation—the Dunwoody Institute. It cannot begin to meet the demands being put upon it and we know that our public area vocational schools and community colleges must get renewed support. I have just named a new State junior college board of 5 leading citizens which will coordinate the 11 existing 2-year community colleges in our State and will, I hope, develop and promote the new curriculums our times demand. Further, they are charged with site selection responsibility for four new junior colleges authorized by the last session.

I have underlined in these remarks the need for a close relationship between the scientific academic leaders and the business community. In Minnesota we have gone far in that direction, but I plan and hope to see us go much farther. To that end I am naming a Minnesota Science-Industry Advisory Council to continue and strengthen that exchange. Dr. Shepherd, our university academic vice president, has already agreed to serve as honorary chairman. I am calling on the members of the committee to evaluate existing university-business relationships, to advise my office as to impending problems and to intensify those programs which have already proved so effective. We will wish to publicize our industrial potential nationally, to tell the success story of the electronics industries, to insure continued expansion, and to make our voices heard in the determining of national policies which so deeply affect that expansion.

Finally, may I come back to my own role as Governor. As I see it, it is the Governor's serious responsibility to develop public understanding of the new revolution in science. He must help create public readiness and alertness to make positive constructive use of that revolution, to turn it to our gain. He must insure vigorous support for the valued institutions which are the instruments of implementation, to protect the great gains already made. In sum, he must make sure in every way possible that our State government is a participant and a leader in the development and progressive use of man's increasing knowledge, and that we shall continue to provide an intellectual climate where free investigation, searching inquiry, and extensive scientific research will flourish.

GRAIN TO THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I do not believe that the American people have been sufficiently alerted to all of the facts of the sale of American grain to the Soviet Union and other Red bloc countries. This is due at least in part to the fact that more and more in our formulations of public policy, we are overlooking the fact that we are in a highly unconventional struggle with a nation and ideology dedicated to freedom's destruction everywhere. Indeed, there seems to be a strangely erroneous feeling in our policymaking councils and elsewhere that the cold war is drawing to a conclusion, that we can now peacefully coexist with Communists.

This amounts to a policy of self-induced hypnosis.

To the Soviets, peaceful coexistence is another instrument in an extensive arsenal for troublemaking and expansion.

Further, there seems to be a lack of understanding among certain people of the fact that political considerations have overriding importance in all Kremlin decisions, whether it be the shipment of missiles to Cuba, or the purchase of grain from the United States.

And deception, duplicity, and default have been the mainstays of Soviet diplomacy for decades. Whenever we study a Soviet maneuver on the world chessboard, we invariably find one or more of these elements. And the game they are playing is for keeps. They have not renounced their intention to bury us.

> The Russian bear is certainly capable of anything, as long as he knows the other animals he has to deal with are capable of nothing.

If we continue the current trend of one-way concessions, the wheat deal being the latest, the Russian bear may believe just that about the United States. The peril of such a belief in this nuclear age would be incalculable.

Yet, our Government reportedly agreed with the Soviets on what the New York Times has termed "ground rules for the sale of wheat to Communist bloc nations." Final terms for the Soviet deal are still under negotiation, but the first sale to a Communist country—100,000 tons to Hungary—has already been made.

If we were dealing with truly peace-loving nations, trade with them would be natural and normal. But this is not the case.

Even in the present state of protracted conflict, if the Soviets were to make some concession in return—and if they really needed the wheat, they might be expected to do so—there might be some real justification.

But, instead of granting concessions in return for this sale, the Soviets have been turning up the cold war thermostat by obstructing our vital land access route to Berlin, and announcing in Izvestia that "The problem of stationing troops in Cuba is a problem between the Soviet Union and Cuba."

In 1938, the British tried talk and concessions with Hitler at Munich. We know what resulted.

Also in the thirties, we sold scrap iron to Japan, iron which became armaments destined to cost the lives of many Americans.

Armaments are not manufactured from grain, but our bailing the Soviets out of their agricultural problems will certainly aid them to keep their armament industry operating full blast.

Grain purchases may be just the beginning. Vneshnaye Torgovle, a Soviet trade publication, has said:

> Soviet import organizations could place orders in the United States for one to one and a quarter billion dollars worth of various types of goods, especially complex machinery.

By selling the Soviets grain, we not only permit them to maintain their high priority on heavy industry and armaments, but we are also opening the door, if only a crack, for trade in many items including strategic materials.

Why, our manufacturers are asking, can we sell the Soviets grain which props up their armament industry, and not other products?

But the Soviet objective is not long-term trade. It is, instead, as the Wall Street Journal has pointed out:

> To speed Soviet industrial development by buying goods and techniques Russia might take years to develop for itself.

Their real objective, in other words, is to live and grow stronger outside the free world until they can control it.

Why should we aid them in that objective, particularly at the expense of the American taxpayer?

This wheat will be subsidized by the American taxpayer, for it is to be sold at what the President has termed "the regular world price."

As an example of what this means, the October 9 price at Gulf ports for hard winter wheat No. 1 was $1.77½ cents a bushel. Because of price supports, this was 56 cents under our domestic price. Our Government makes up the 56-cent difference so that our exports can be competitive.

Why should we not allow the law of supply and demand to function? It seems to me that if the Soviets really need the grain, they will pay our domestic price. As of now, they have no other place to go. The United States has a very great part of the world market.

Though they may have a grain shortage, I have heard of no gold shortage in the Soviet Union such as would prevent payment in this medium.

Furthermore, though American shippers are being limited to a ceiling charge of $18 per ton, negotiations continue over whether or not 50 percent of the grain will go in American-flag ships. I have introduced a Senate resolution which calls for the "mandatory participation of U.S.-flag vessels in the delivery of not less than 50 percent of the cargoes."

I hope that the administration will stand firm on this.

The initial decision of the administration to underwrite the credit risks involved has been suspended due to the timely intervention of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt]. This matter is now being considered by the Banking and Currency Committee and it is my hope that we can make this suspension permanent.

We in the Congress are doing what we can to put some backbone in the U.S. position. But what about the administration? A State Department source has been quoted as saying that "ploys and moves and countermoves" can be expected from the Soviets before final completion of a deal.

What are our "ploys, moves and countermoves"? Do we have any?

It is time that the "cloud nine" thinkers were turned over to the meteorologists for analysis.

If we must grant concessions, it is time we demanded concessions in return, to the betterment of the U.S. economy.

It is time we stopped praising adversaries like Khrushchev, and slandering friends—when the "chips are down"—like De Gaulle. It is time we stopped bolstering regimes such as that of the butchers of Budapest, and pampering the Nassers, Titos, and Sukarnos. It is time that we stood up and acted like a great and powerful nation confronted with a deadly menace to everything which it holds dear. It is time, in short, that we not only desire but deserve by our actions the respect of our fellow men.

AMA TACTICS IN OPPOSING HEALTH CARE FOR AGED UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in today's New York Times there is an account of an extraordinary device which is allegedly being employed by the American Medical Association in its no-holds-barred campaign to defeat the President's proposal for health care for the aged under social security.

According to the article by Mr. Damon Stetson, officials of the AFL–CIO have charged that the AMA has engaged in an "absolute fraud" in distributing a phonograph record which purported to be a transcription of a speech by a district director of the United Steelworkers.

The AMA's American Medical Political Action Committee, it is said, began distributing the phonograph record a few months ago to medical groups and community organizations, representing it as the actual transcription of a speech by Mr. Paul Normile, of Coraopolis, Pa. The record, according to this article, portrays a coarse, offensive, and gangster-like union official through choice of words, voice-quality, and other techniques. In addition, the record is accompanied by a folder of printed material, signed by the chairman of the AMA's Political Action Committee, which describes the alleged transcription as characteristic of the "high pressure methods" which the AFL–CIO "resorts to in its effort to dominate Government at every level within the United States."

Independent observers report that there is no doubt that this record is pure fabrication. Actually, they say, it is obvious that the alleged transcription is faked. For example, persons not affiliated with the labor movement who know Mr. Normile, after listening to the record, have stated that the voice could not possibly be Mr. Normile's. Moreover, linguistics experts have studied the voice and found it to be wholly unlike Mr. Normile's.

And then, Mr. President, the recording bears numerous statements that no Steelworkers Union official would probably make because they have no relation to reality. For example, the speaker, who is supposed to be a Steelworkers Union official—Mr. Normile—refers to "shop stewards." But anyone familiar with this union knows it has no "shop stewards" by that name. He also refers to the "SWW," purportedly the "Steelworkers Women," but no such auxiliary exists. And at another point, so I am told, the speaker threatens his listeners that they must contribute money to support the effort to enact the Anderson bill or they would be put on the "graveyard shift." This in itself would seem to indicate a badly done forgery because, Mr. President, the workshifts in the steel industry are rotated. There are other obvious disparities between the record and the actual facts which appear to show this to be crass propaganda.

Now, Mr. President, this is a development of deep interest to the Congress. It is well known that the AMA, even before it came into the open with its political action committee, has one of the most powerful lobbies patrolling the Halls of the Congress. In fact, its report to the Congress, required by law, of its expenditures for lobbying purposes shows that they may have been the highest among all lobby groups.

Now, Mr. President, if this most powerful and best financed lobby in the country, in its opposition to health care for the aged, is resorting to such tactics such as has been alleged to influence action on this legislation, I think we ought to know the full facts about it, and I think the Congress has an obligation to investigate this matter. We should call the AMA lobbyists before the appropriate committee immediately and ask, first, if this record has been distributed by the American Medical Political Action Committee—AMPAC; second, whether this is a forgery; third, if so, who is responsible; and, fourth, what action, if any, the American Medical Association proposes to take in this matter.

Mr. President, I understand that these records were sent through the U.S. mails and that recipients have made available the postmarked evidence to appropriate officials. It may well be that a violation of Federal laws involving the mails has occurred. In this case the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may wish to investigate.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the New York Times article to which I have referred, a statement by David J. MacDonald, president of the United Steelworkers of America, and the text of the printed matter attached to the AMPAC record, and the text of the statements made by the voice on the record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 21, 1963]

MEANY CHARGES FRAUD BY AMA—SAYS VOICE IN RECORDING ON CARE OF AGED IS FAKED

(By Damon Stetson)

The American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations challenged the tactics of the American Medical Association yesterday in the continuing battle over methods of providing health care for the aged.

George Meany, president of the labor federation, accused the medical association of absolute fraud in distributing a phonograph record purported to be a transcription of a speech by a district director of the United Steelworkers.

Meanwhile, this official, Paul Normile, of Coraopolis, Pa., announced that he had filed a $400,000 damage suit in Federal court in Washington, charging the AMA with fraud and libel.

Mr. Meany told 1,000 delegates to the labor federation convention here that the AMA had recently formed the American Medical Political Action Committee. He said this had been set up to oppose the efforts of the labor organization to obtain legislation providing for health care for the aged through social security.

A few months ago, he said, the new medical organization began distributing the phonograph record to medical groups and to community organizations. He said the record was presented as the actual transcription of a speech by Mr. Normile at a political education meeting of the steelworkers in western Pennsylvania.

Actually, Mr. Meany said, Mr. Normile never made any such speech and neither did anyone else involved in the federation's committee on political action. The record, Mr. Meany said, is an absolute fraud.

NO RIGHT TO FORGERY

"The AMA has a right to oppose the King-Anderson bill (for hospital care through social security), which we are supporting, or they have got a perfect right to oppose any plan that we may support," Mr. Meany said, "but they do not have a right, in my book, to forgery or fraud or any of these methods."

There was no immediate comment from the medical association about the record or the suit. A spokesman at AMA headquarters in Chicago said the association would withhold comment until officials could learn details of the suit.

Later yesterday, Mr. Normile appeared with David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers, at a press conference at the Americana Hotel, where the labor convention was held. Mr. Normile denied that the voice on the record was his or that he had made any such speech.

The record was played at the press conference, as was a tape recording of Mr. Normile's voice. Mr. McDonald said it took no expert to recognize that the purported speech by Mr. Normile was an electronic fabrication.

The printed material on the folder containing the record said the medical association's political committee had obtained the transcription from a labor union member "who opposes, as many members of the labor movement do, the high-pressure methods which COPE (committee on political education) resorts to in its effort to dominate government at every level within the United States."

The voice on the record, represented as Mr. Nomile's, said doctors "got brains for pills, but they're too damn dumb to kick in" to political action committees of the medical profession.

The printed material over the name of Donald E. Wood, M.D., chairman of the board of directors of the American Medical Political Action Committee, suggested that those hearing the transcription would agree that membership in AMPAC was essential to the maintenance of freely practiced medicine.

PRIORITY URGED FOR BILL

David E. Feller, counsel for the steelworkers' union, said legal papers in the lawsuit of Mr. Normile would be served today upon Dr. Wood. The physician is expected to testify on health care for the aged before a House committee in Washington.

Following Mr. Meany's discussion of Mr. Normiles suit at the convention, the delegates adopted unanimously a resolution urging that first priority for social security legislation be given to enactment by this Congress of the King-Anderson bill. The measure would provide hospital and related health insurance for the aged under social security.

STATEMENT BY DAVID J. MCDONALD, PRESIDENT, UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA

I have the utmost respect for our doctors. As practitioners of the healing arts, they have set high standards of ethical conduct which have earned them the esteem of their fellow citizens throughout the land.

Therefore, it comes as bitter medicine to learn that an agency of this great profession would countenance the political malpractice so evident in this completely spurious recording. I know that the AMA opposes medicare, which our union supports. I recognize that the American medical profession has a right to its political views but I am shocked that this organization would stoop to this kind of tactic.

It takes no expert to recognize that this purported speech of an executive board member of our union is an electronic fabrication. It smacks strongly of the photographic fakery practiced years ago.

I believe that Paul Normile is fully justified in seeking redress against the authors of this obvious fraud.

I have directed counsel for the union to give him all appropriate assistance in exposing it and stopping the further distribution of the record and printed copies of the spurious text.

TEXT OF PRINTED MATTER ATTACHED TO AMPAC RECORD

A WORD FROM AMPAC

The record you are about to play is the transcription of a meeting held early in 1963 by the AFL–CIO's Committee on Political Education (COPE) in Allegheny County, Pa. The speaker is Paul Normile, COPE chairman of the Allegheny Labor Council and director of District 16, United Steelworkers.

AMPAC obtained this transcription from a COPE member—a man who opposes, as many members of the labor movement do, the high-pressure methods which COPE resorts to in its effort to dominate government at every level within the United States.

To those who doubt that COPE is in dead earnest in pursuit of its purpose, this transcription will provide food for thought, for it demonstrates beyond any argument the dedication, financial commitment, and political muscle of an organization that has had a tremendous impact on the course of American politics. A text of the record is printed on the inside back cover.

Having heard the record, we think you'll agree that membership in AMPAC and your own State's medical political action committee is essential to the maintenance of freely practiced medicine under a system of constitutional government.

Sincerely,

(S) DONALD E. WOOD, M.D.,
Chairman, Board of Directors, AMPAC.

FIRST SPEAKER. Okay, quiet down, fellows. I want you to meet one of our own, Paul Normile. He's director of District 16, USW, and the new voted chairman of COPE, Allegheny County Labor Council. Let's hear what Paul has to say.

PAUL NORMILE. Brother COPE leaders of District 16: Our kick-in tab for 1963 is 146,000 bucks. Now, that's a buck for each USW rank-and-filer in the Allegheny County Labor Council. No ifs, ands, or buts. We get a buck from each worker during April at the gate, same as always. This'll give us 110,000 to 112,000 bucks right off the bat. For those that don't want to give, you shop stewards can always let them know there's still a graveyard shift.

They'll kick in. By May 30, we have to send national COPE $73 grand. Now there's 340 of you COPE stewards in this room today. Your tab for 1963 COPE is $15 apiece. Rubin (?) will pass among you and take up the collection. And, Al, you let me know who doesn't kick in. I've got to have 5,000 bucks when I leave here today. Gents, JOE CLARK needs our help in the Senate. We're going to team up with Paul Hilbert. As you all know, he's COPE director of district 15. We're going to put another good Dem in the Senate with JOE next year. We'll let you know about this when we're ready. In May, we've got to help JOE push his medicare bill in the Senate. Now, we told you before about the docs and their PENNPAC/AMPAC. I can tell you now, the docs are too high class to play this game. They got brains for pills, but they're too damn dumb to kick in. That's one thing they got—money. But there's only about 10,000 of them in Pennsylvania. Best we can find out, their PENNPAC is getting more active than ever before. We don't know how big they are, but we'll keep saying they're kicking in 500 bucks apiece for their PENNPAC, and hope the hell they don't. Get that $146,000, and we'll knock them out. Remember, the docs got an uphill fight. If 50 percent of their 10,000 kick in, they've still got to put up 30 bucks apiece to match us. But remember, they don't get together like we do. They won't do it because they're too fat and happy. We're watching the big docs real close. And remember, our committees are working hard to dump the lousy Congressmen in the 18th, 22d, and that doc in the 24th District. I'm going to turn it back to Jim now, who's going to tell you about recruiting 800 more women for the spring teeoff on SWW/Steelworkers Women.

WHEAT LEGISLATION NEEDED

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I have just been advised that the National Grange, meeting in Portland, Oreg., has adopted a preliminary report from its agricultural resolutions committee which calls for the enactment of a wheat program "designed to return to producers a parity of income from wheat marketed for primary purposes. This would be accomplished through the Grange-developed voluntary domestic parity plan, using a certificate plan that would permit growers to produce and compete for secondary markets."

Mr. President, this is the seventh resolution adopted by a State or National farm group which, in effect, endorses the voluntary wheat certificate plan which I introduced for myself, Senator YOUNG of North Dakota, Senator BURDICK, and Senator MCCARTHY on July 29.

The Missouri Farmers Association and wheatgrowers in Kansas, Nebraska, Oregon, Washington, and Oklahoma have, I am advised, adopted resolutions approving a voluntary wheat certificate plan.

I am especially gratified, Mr. President, that these groups are making it clear that they support and desire a wheat program effective on the 1964 crop. If the law as it stands today is not amended, the price support for wheat will drop from $2 per bushel to $1.25 on the 1964 crop and farm income will fall—unnecessarily, in my judgment—by more than $600 million.

It is, of course, pleasing that these groups have agreed with my judgment on the merits of the particular plan which will best meet the criteria established by the President. Those criteria are: First, increased farm income; second, lower Government costs; and, third, continued reduction of surplus stocks.

But I want to repeat, as I have said often before, the most urgent and important matter now is that we have a program for 1964, and that we not let the income of tens of thousands of wheat producers drop disastrously because of congressional failure to act in time on a new program.

We are now beginning to hear from the grassroots. It is clear that the "No" vote in the referendum last May was not a vote against all wheat programs, as some would interpret it. The wheat producers in the West are showing that they are virtually unanimous in their desire for legislation. They must, however, make their voice heard more clearly in Washington if we are to enact a good program early in 1964.

WEST VIRGINIANS EXPRESS TRIBUTE TO NATURAL BEAUTIES IN ANNUAL MOUNTAIN STATE FOREST FESTIVAL

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, every year when the change of seasons brings to West Virginia its vibrant mantle of autumnal color, when the mountains burst forth in all their magnificent glory, a tribute is expressed to nature. The beauty of the woodland is dramatized and the need for conserving nature's abundant gifts is stressed in this recognition of the end of a season of growth and the beginning of a season of dormancy.

It was my pleasure, Mr. President, to attend this celebration, known across the country as the Mountain State Forest Festival, which is held annually in my hometown at Elkins, W. Va. In 1963, West Virginia's centennial year, we celebrated the 27th forest festival from October 3 to October 6, during one of the most glorious periods of foliage displays in memory.

These words, which I have written, express the wonder we sense at this time of year:

Autumn Days

Autumn days are wonder days
  With colors red and gold,
Summer is gone; fall is here
  And the year is growing old.

And often do I like to think
  That God, with mystic hand,
Has reached down from heaven
  And painted all the land.

Events included exhibits, parades, concerts, a pageant entitled "A State Is Born," an old-fashioned riding tournament, and feats of physical endurance, such as woodchopping, and related skills. One of the highlights was the coronation of Queen Silvia XVII, Miss Ann Clayton Bradt, of Martinsburg, and the presentation of her court.

The appearance of many dignitaries added to the festivities. The Honorable Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior, addressed those attending the distinguished guests banquet, while Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, Hon. Harley O. Staggers and Hon. Ken Hechler participated in various events.

Officials of the State of West Virginia who took part were: the Honorable W. W. Barron, Governor, who crowned the queen; Hon. Joe F. Burdett, secretary of state; Hon. John H. Kelly, State treasurer; Hon. Hulett Smith, commissioner of the department of commerce; Dr. Warden Lane, director of the department of natural resources; Chauncey Browning, Jr., commissioner of public institutions; and Hon. Julius Singleton, speaker of the house of delegates.

The festival was also graced by the participation of many other celebrities. Eleanor Steber, noted leading soprano of the Metropolitan Opera, a native of Wheeling, W. Va., was soloist at the coronation. Our fellow townsman Phil K. Harness was director general of the Mountain State Forest Festival and was given able assistance in planning and organizing by the Honorable Garland F. Hickman, mayor of Elkins, and W. Grady Whitman, president of the festival association.

Musical entertainment was provided by the excellent Metropolitan Police Band from Washington, D.C., and the Elkins American Legion Post Highlanders Bagpipe Band.

A TRIP TO RUSSIA

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, Dr. John F. Fox, of Honolulu, is the distinguished head of Punahou School, a leading private school in Hawaii. Dr. Fox was recently a member of a group of Honolulu residents who made a tour of the Soviet Union. I ask unanimous consent to include his highly readable report on that tour in the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Report of a September 1963 Trip to Russia

(By John F. Fox)

When a Russian visits an American city he might just as well be a man from Mars, for we are accustomed to suspecting all Russians in the United States of espionage. Although an American tourist in Russia sticks out like a sore thumb, except for the rather considerable language barrier he is readily accepted. At least that was my experience. I did not feel the hostility my previous reading about Russia had caused me to expect. Because they were punished for too much fraternization during Stalin's regime, the Russian people are still reluctant to demonstrate their hospitality for foreigners in public.

After a 17-day sojourn in the Soviet Union—with travel by jetplane from north to south Russia, including Moscow, Leningrad, the Black Sea cities of Yalta and Odessa, and Kiev in the Ukraine—I believe a non-Russian-speaking American receives a much better reception in Russia than would his counterpart from Russia in the United States. Whereas 17 members of our Honolulu touring group left Russia after visiting Moscow and Leningrad, Boyd MacNaughton, E. E. Black, and I spent an extra week visiting southern Russia. At no time were we followed. We were not restricted as to what we could see or visit on our own aside from the official guided tours.

There were a few pulse-raising incidents at the time of my departure from Russia which gave me some internal excitement. A delegation of some 15 tall, pompous, bemedaled, high-ranking army officers stood at the plane's entrance engaged in earnest conversation with a man in civilian clothes (I later learned he was Russia's Ambassador to Austria). Then, at the plane ramp, two Russian officials were making another check of passports, although we had just come through passport control only a few minutes before. After my passport was approved, I walked up the ramp to the Austrian plane bound for Vienna and the free world breathing a deep sigh of relief. Russia was behind me. I felt I had learned much about the differences between the Russian and the American way of life, but I was glad to get out.

To go within 2 hours' time by plane from Russia, where people have virtually no comforts, luxuries, or attractive consumer goods, to Vienna, Austria, and then on to France, where stores and markets are literally overflowing with top-quality consumer goods and luscious foods, is like going from the darkness of night to the sunshine of a day in Hawaii. I have a haunting memory of the long lines of plainly dressed Russians waiting to buy plums, undersized green apples, and overripe tomatoes to carry home in their string bags.

Now, I have no desire to return, except possibly 5 or 10 years hence to satisfy my curiosity as to the extent of Russia's progress which—barring war—I think they are certain to make.

Although interesting and fascinating, the Russian cities we visited have no fun or gaiety whatsoever. Ernie Albrecht said, "Moscow is the No. 1 dead town after dark in the world."

Yes, 800-year-old Moscow is a dull city with huge, drab, slab-type buildings of unimaginative design. Restaurant interiors are uninspiring. Nowhere is there class, elegance, or luxury. Life in Moscow is grim. Nevertheless, Moscow is the heartland of all Russians and the Communist world, and its center is the Kremlin.

In making a report of the impressions gleaned on my short stay in Russia, I am thoroughly aware, if I write anything favorable, that rabid anti-Communists (those who want only hateful things said about Russia) may say: (1) That I was "brainwashed"; (2) that I was "taken in" by the guides who permitted me to see only the best of everything; (3) that I am a leftwinger, a fellow traveler, or a Communist sympathizer. I have no sympathy for either communism or socialism. I am not a liberal who believes avowed Communists should be tolerated in America. I believe in the superiority of capitalism over communism and socialism. I am not a political analyst, but I am a sociologist-educator who has tried to gain some understanding of world political factors.

The brevity of our trip permitted no deep, thoroughgoing, analytical studies. I am presenting my findings for what they are—impressions only. Before going to Russia I had expected to find only shortcomings in the Communist system by comparison with our American system of free enterprise. I was surprised. I found many good things in Russia that one could praise. Obviously, I found much to criticize, and I can summarize my major criticism in one sentence: By comparison with an American, the Russian citizen has but very little personal freedom of choice. My report will attempt to point out what I consider to be the good and the bad.

Toward the end of our stay in Russia, one of my traveling companions characterized the Russian people he observed as busy, hard working, prosperous, sincere, happy, and full of hope for the future. The other didn't agree that all he saw were hard working. He said too many workmen on building projects stood around and puttered, that Rusians talk too much about a 5-hour workday, and that all are looking forward to retiring and getting paid for it. This indicates that two people can view the same situation and form totally different conclusions, much like the fable "The Blind Men and the Elephant." We tend to see only those things that support our preconceived ideas. It is not easy for Americans to form an objective picture of Russia, because we have considered her people to be our political and military enemies.

THE GOOD LIFE

The 1917 Russian revolution was caused by the cruel, slavelike working and living conditions of the masses imposed by the czars. Since then the Soviets have utilized science to move its working class society from a stagnant, backward status to a position of world leadership that is second only to America's. While the Russian worker's lot, since his peasant days, has improved immensely under socialism, whether the continuing betterment will be enough to satisfy his future wants—by comparison with our comforts in America—is a challenge that will continue to confront Soviet leaders.

Except for a dire shortage of good quality consumer goods—most store windows display only canned foods—I found Russia to be much more prosperous than I had imagined it would be. Everything, however, is standardized and controlled from the top. One sees the same menus in northern Russia, the same kinds of new apartment buildings and the same type of school buildings, that he sees in southern Russia. If one wants an out-of-the-ordinary consumer product—better than that pleasing to the average workman—he must pay dearly for it. Ordinarily work clothes are not expensive. It is when you want better quality that the price jumps four or five times.

The long-sacrificing Russian consumer, who has had to rein in his personal wants, is now beginning to develop an appetite for the luxuries of life enjoyed by America—automobiles, quality clothing of good style, tender steaks, refrigerators, radios, TV's, dishwashing machines, etc.—at prices he can afford to pay.

Since profit on consumer goods is not essential, the state artificially fixes the prices of luxury items at a level far beyond the means of all but a small percentage of the Russian people in order to conserve funds for heavy industry, armament, and space research. By comparison, in America's competitive marketplace, the consumer has the last word on prices.

American jazz, movies, tourism, autos, and Coca Cola used to be the major ingredients of foreigners' knowledge about the United States. Today American tourists, who are easily spotted, are stopped on Russia's streets by groups of small boys, and sometimes young adults, and asked for chewing gum, ballpoint pens, American "cig-a-letts," button-down-collar shirts, nylon shirts, and nylon socks. Since these articles are not made in Russia (except for strong cigarettes) they have considerable trade appeal with Russian youth, who offer to exchange cheap lapel buttons, which seem to be made by the millions in every conceivable style.

An American advertisement recently summarized the situation: "All people really need is a cave, a piece of meat, and possibly a fire. The complex thing we call civilization is made up of luxuries." The question is: How much longer will Russian people be willing to sacrifice?

Russia's lack of the amenities showed up in every bathroom in every hotel where I stayed, no wash basin plugs, no soap, slick toilet paper, and tired towels.

The prices in Gum Department Store, Russia's leading store, are fantastic. Good shoes cost from 30 to 40 rubles (1 ruble—$1.11), so do men's trousers. An ordinary suit costs 150 to 200 rubles, and overcoats cost 100 to 250 rubles. Only a few months ago a ruble was worth only 11 cents. In revaluing their currency, they raised it to a rate where the value of a ruble, probably for prestige purposes, would exceed that of an American dollar.

I met a young man, on vacation in Yalta, who has visited the United States many times in connection with the promotion of Russian athletics. He said, "Within 10 years we will catch the United States in everything, food, good clothes, autos, and technology in all forms, just as we have already surpassed you in sports." If he is right, then the success of communism will be assured, for the people will be satisfied that their government is just as effective as is capitalism in providing the material possessions that make for the good life.

Authoritative predictions indicate that, by 1970, half the income of Americans will be "discretionary," that is, income that doesn't have to be spent on the necessities of food, shelter, and clothing. That is the goal the U.S.S.R. must also reach if it is to catch America.

We are spending a minimum of $60 billion annually for armaments and foreign aid to defend the free world against communism. Let us assume that Russia is spending an equal amount.

If there is a big thaw in the cold war and Russia can afford to channel her heavy expenditures for armament and the promotion of international communism into the production of good quality consumer goods, within the price range of the average Russian, thus making her people happy, Russia should be better able to dispute America's world leadership position.

AN OPINION

Until the 1917 revolution Russia was Europe's most backward nation. Cut off from life outside Russia, almost two generations of Russians have grown up with but little contact or knowledge of what conditions are like in the free world. The easing of travel restrictions—American tourists and permission for Russians to travel abroad—is changing the picture. Until recently, the Russian consumer didn't miss what many generations before him never had. Since the Soviet regime seems to be working reasonably well, the Russians seem to have faith in their governmental system, and since there seems to be no danger of its collapsing from within, it is apparent that we must work out a means of coexistence with Russia, as President Kennedy is trying to do.

The important thing for us to realize is that Russian communism is not the abysmal failure we would like. Russia is not standing still. It is not falling behind. It is going ahead. It is in our own best interest to find a peaceful working arrangement with Russia, for there is no known defense against nuclear destruction.

We should not make the mistake of downplaying the power and potential of Russia. We need to know more about Russia, unless we are willing to face mutual suicide. Such understanding could be the key to our own survival.

INITIAL IMPRESSIONS

On the way in from the airport to the center of Moscow, I noticed:

1. The beautiful forests of white-trunked, tall birch trees and the green farmlands bordering the wide highway. By comparison, our visitors see the worst part of Honolulu in making a similar trip.

2. The forlorn looking, unpainted wooden farmhouses outside Moscow city limits that had as many as 10 to 20 TV antennas on the roof, each antenna indicating the presence of a different family, with all sharing the same bath and kitchen facilities. These houses, however, are rapidly being replaced.

3. The thousands of tall, plain, prefabricated, apartment buildings of 5 to 12 stories, each containing 80 to 150 or more 2- and 3-room apartments.

If an apartment building has only five stories it is a walkup. If it has six or more, it is serviced by a single elevator. E. E. Black, who was unimpressed with the industry of Russian construction workmen said, "No wonder they don't work hard. They have to conserve their energy so they can climb the stairs when they get home."

4. The heat: The weather was a hot 80 degrees, much too warm for the heavy suits and top coats we had brought at the insistence of our travel counselors who had advised us that it would be cold in Moscow in September. During the entire trip—from North to South Russia—the weather was as hot as Honolulu in mid-July. The sun glared mercilessly. There was no rain, and the clouds were few.

5. Several advanced-type hydrofoils skimming speedily along the Volga Canal.

6. An attractive pioneer camp (for Communist indoctrination of children), which the guide said was not in session now because school had started the previous day.

7. Magnificent superhighways. I was amazed at the clean, broad boulevards in the center of Moscow, all of which seemed to be capable of handling 10 times the automobiles and motor scooters now using the streets. Most of the streets have room for 8 to 14 lanes of traffic. Unlike Hawaii, Russia is certainly a place where the capacity of the highways exceeds the traffic demand.

8. A later observation on our plane trip to Leningrad. The Moscow Airport building for domestic travel is an all-glass modernistic affair. Inside the building there was demonstrated the great contrast that typifies Russia's scientific and peasant areas. The large waiting room was packed with a conglomerate of peasant-type Russians, ranging from tall, high-cheek boned Mongolians to small, wispy, brown Uzbeks, in their varying native costumes. There were shawled farm women and rubber-booted men—with their bundles and boxes sprawling around them—waiting to take the most modern jet planes to their destinations.

ARCHITECTURE

There is a decided lack of imagination in the architecture of the apartments, all of which are row-type buildings with square lines. Later on, I learned that this is the pattern throughout Russia. The housing need is so great that basic designs are prepared and reproduced on a prefabricated basis throughout the entire nation.

Thirty years ago, Moscow was a city of 1.5 million people. Now it has 6.3 million. Adequate housing is the most acute problem. Although 80,000 new apartments have been built in Moscow in recent years, with hundreds more completed each month, the population is increasing even more rapidly.

Val Ossipoff, obviously disturbed by Moscow's poor architecture, asked Cultural Minister Boris Krilov what he considered to be the best type of architecture in the city. He replied that the subways, in his opinion, were the best, for every station was different and a work of art. The other outstanding example, he said, was the Palace of Congress inside the Kremlin walls, which we later saw, and we agreed that it is an attractive building. The Kremlin itself, largely constructed in the 16th century, has many beautiful buildings. Moscow's Bolshoi Theater, built in 1924, is also well done. It is a shame that Moscow's new buildings show none of this artistry of design.

Around many of the huge buildings one sees wire nets, some 10 feet wide, encircling the entire structure about 10 feet up from the ground. Reason—to catch falling tiles from the sides of the building. At the close of the war when much construction was needed in Russia, to replace damaged buildings, it was hurried and not well done. Walls were not pointed up and waterproofed so that they were impervious to the entrance of water which entered, froze, and caused the outer surfaces to crumble. The nets are necessary to keep the tiles from falling and hitting passers-by on the head, much as we fear falling coconuts in Honolulu. The masonry stone work lining the canal sides is well done, and all 410 bridges crossing the Volga River are exceedingly well constructed.

ELEVATORS

There is a vast contrast between the way elevator service is viewed in Russia and the United States. Moscow's 27-story Ukraine Hotel, with 1,026 rooms and accommodations for 1,500 people, is rated as the largest hotel in Europe. I had a room on the 22d floor. When I wanted to go down to the lobby, experience taught me to push the down button and then take a seat, for the average waiting time was 10 to 20 minutes. Once in the elevator, another 10 or 20 minutes was consumed in going either up or down—so one learned to think twice to be sure he had not forgotten anything when leaving his room for the descent to the lobby.

By contrast, on my return from Russia, when I checked in at New York's Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, I was assigned to room 13Y. After reaching the room I called a friend to tell of my arrival. When he inquired my room number and I replied "13Y," he said I must be in the basement. I replied, "No, I think I'm on the second floor."

A few seconds later I started for the lobby newsstand to get a paper. Instead of taking the elevator I thought I would walk down one flight of stairs. I walked down two flights—no lobby. I asked the floor clerk where the lobby was, and she said, "Take the elevator." I was amazed to find I was on the 13th floor.

In leading U.S. hotels one waits only a few seconds for an elevator, and, once it arrives the elevator goes up or down the 13 stories in 10 seconds or so. Elevator service quality just about summarizes the difference between Russia and the United States in all areas outside science and nuclear developments.

Although the Ukraine Hotel was built only 6 years ago, the wedding cake type architectural style and poor maintenance makes it appear to be 40 or 50 years old. Because of its extreme height, many of the rooms do have beautiful views of the city. My fellow Honolulans criticized Russia's lack of communication with the outside world, saying that the Hotel Ukraine's archaic type of architecture is something that America would have built 75 years ago, that because of its desire for isolation, Russia has always lagged behind the rest of the world.

BEAUTIFUL CITIES

On the other hand, MacNaughton, Black, and I agreed that, with the possible exception of Washington, D.C., there are no American cities as beautiful as Kiev and Leningrad.

In a democracy you have to compromise between an ideal city plan and what taxpayers are willing to pay for. In order to have a beautiful, well-planned city, history proves that you need either a dictator or a king who can order a beautiful city laid out, although it is an expensive plan, and who has the power, without interference, to say that this is the way it is going to be. In such a situation there is no opportunity for a taxpayers' association to complain and whittle down a grandiose plan.

Kiev, the founding of which dates back to the seventh century, has been pillaged and rebuilt several times. Russia's capital for 300 years, it is now the provincial capital of the Ukraine (44 million).

Leningrad was originally a swampy marsh land in the Neva River Delta that was drained and laid out in 1703 by Peter the Great as Russia's "window into Europe," with access to the Baltic Sea. Thereafter, it became the home and burial place of all the czars. With 56 parks, Leningrad is a much more substantial and better looking city than Moscow. Leningrad people, Russia's most Europeanized inhabitants, consider themselves to be culturally superior to the rest of Russia.

DINING

Our first meal in Russia was a poor excuse. Confronting us, as soon as we sat down, were plates, each containing a slab of good, cold, boiled ham, a large bowl of cored, but overripe tomatoes, plates of sliced bread, both white and black (I liked the black bread), and a plate of crisp pastry. The second course was a slice of sturgeon covered with a cream sauce and three cold, boiled potatoes. Since we had heard that Russian meals had several courses, hardly anyone ate his potatoes. When the next course proved to be only coffee, we realized the meal was over, so some of us quickly returned to our plates and polished off the remaining potatoes. There was no dessert.

If it is possible to mutilate food, Russian cooks will do so. There is heavy emphasis on starches, creams, sugar, and bread, accompanied by an equally huge serving of delicious butter. More than half of each plate served in a hotel is occupied by potatoes, usually of a poor, french-fried type. The result of such a starchy diet, with a deficiency of protein, may be easily observed by the large stomachs of both males and females—particularly at bathing beaches. While the fish is good, the meat is invariably tough. Perhaps Russia's choicest foods are caviar, sturgeon, shashlik, sour cream, yogurt, and borscht, at least I thought so.

Although the Government says that all citizens are to take calisthenics twice daily—and these are given over the radio—the average person doesn't look to be in very trim shape, probably because the high-starch, low-protein diet provides too great a handicap.

THE PEOPLE

After a few days in Moscow we Honolulans agreed that the following adjectives described the average Russian encountered on the street: unsmiling, bland, impassive, drab, colorless, plodding, disciplined, and poorly dressed. Most seemed to be of the peasant type, with rather flat, plain-featured faces. Because Russia consists of more than a hundred different nationalities whose origins spring from a score of civilizations, there are no typical Russian faces. The average Russian is neither as sophisticated nor as softened by modern comforts as is the average American, and it shows in his face.

We realized, in making this snap judgment of the people, that we were a bit spoiled by living in Hawaii where there are smiling countenances everywhere. An explanation might be that Moscow residents are ordinary city folk who feel the pressures and anonymity of a large city. For example, the subway passengers in New York City are also a drab, unsmiling lot.

Later on, we saw an entirely different group of attractive, well-dressed people at the ballet and opera, and our opinions of the people began to be revised upward.

On our trip to the Black Sea, the workers' vacation area in the Crimea section of southern Russia, once the playground of the czars, there was some improvement over Moscow, but not much. To stand on the ocean front boardwalk in front of our Yalta hotel and observe the swarms of people walk by with hardly a handsome, attractive or smiling face, was a bit depressing.

Across from the hotel there was a pebbly beach—no sand—absolutely filled with thousands of the most misshapen men and women with the biggest opus I have ever seen. Yalta is the Hawaii of Russia and 2 million workers flock to it from all over the country for their summer vacations. Since Russians are quite prudish about street dress, even in summer resort areas, no shorts for men, and no shorts or slacks for women, it was quite amusing to see the fattest men and women on the beach wearing scanty bikinis. When I commented on this to our guide, she inquired, "Don't fat women swim in the United States?" I replied, "Yes, but they don't wear bikinis."

DISCIPLINE

I saw no evidence anywhere, except an occasional drunk, of misbehavior or immorality. Russia is really a puritanical society where disorderliness is simply not permitted. Except for a few policemen on traffic duty in the heart of Moscow and others keeping the lines to Lenin's tomb straight, one seldom sees a law enforcement officer. Either the Russian people are better disciplined than we are, thus reducing the need for ever-present policemen, or they are afraid of the ensuing punishment if they do misbehave.

Russia does have a civil patrol of citizens with red armbands who serve as volunteers to help the police preserve law and order. When they see misbehavior, they take the culprits to the police station—and I understand it is unheard of for a miscreant to refuse to go.

Moscow is a very clean city. One sees no litter in the streets or in the subways as in the United States. We were told the people took pride in their cities and wanted to keep them clean.

Russian people queue up for everything. They stand in line when purchasing anything, even for the services of a taxi.

When riding hotel elevators, however, many Russians act like cattle. When the elevator stops at their floor, they elbow their way out without a word.

At a rather high-type hotel dining room in the Crimean summer and health resort of Yalta, I observed a large crowd standing outside waiting for the dinner bell. When it rang, the lines broke, and huge men pushed their way in ahead of others who had waited in line longer than they had. Fights almost started. There was much jerking and pulling. I was told there were not enough places inside for all to eat at the first seating. In the best hotel dining rooms, men dress in their shirt sleeves, no ties and no coats, much as one would expect factory workers to be dressed. At ticket counters, I have had Russians jump in ahead. Good manners are certainly not a part of the average man in the Soviet Union.

THE WORKER

All Russian men and women—except physicians—work 7 hours a day 6 days a week for a total of 42 hours. In 1965 the workweek will be reduced to 35 hours.

The manager of the Moskovich auto plant explains the terms of employment: "Boys and girls are trained to do practical work in the 9th, 10th, and 11th years of education in technical schools. They are then assigned by the state to the different plants. They do not look for work on their own.

"No one is forced to stay and work in our plant who wishes to leave. No one, however, is ever fired by the administration without the consent of the union because of incompetence, laziness, or skipping work, for we have ways of improving them. The same with drunks. We send them to medical centers to be cured. Sick workers are sent to convalescent homes, with the factory paying 70 percent of the cost and the worker only 30 percent. There are many additional fringe benefits and bonuses. Medical and dental care, for example, is completely free. One percent is taken out of the worker's salary for trade union dues."

Since the cost of housing, with free gas and electricity, is restricted to no more than 4 to 5 percent of a worker's income (the Russian average monthly salary is $100), he pays only $3 to $5 a month for living quarters. A similar apartment in Honolulu would cost from $110 to $150. Remember, too, that both husband and wife work full time. Therefore, the standard of living is somewhat higher, because of the fringe benefits, than one would think. Almost all Russian workers have enough money left over, if they are satisfied with merely the basic essentials, to go out and enjoy an occasional dinner and a modest evening on the town. Because all Russians are entitled to retirement pensions, very few feel the necessity of saving money for a rainy day.

Men factory workers retire at 60, while women retire at 55. One hundred twenty rubles (about $145) is the maximum retirement income. From 60 percent to 90 percent of a person's earnings during the last 3 years determines the rate of retirement pay.

I was surprised one night around midnight when I saw plump, older women working at common manual labor, rebuilding macadam roads with shovels, picks, and heavy equipment. It seemed to me they should have been at home taking care of their families.

HEALTH

Russia says there are twice as many physicians in the U.S.S.R. as in the United States. The mortality rate is 7.4 in Russia as opposed to 9.4 per thousand in the United States. They say the proportionate number of hospital beds in Russia is higher than in the United States. The Russian life expectancy age, due to better diet, sanitation, and health measures, has been raised from age 32 in 1917 to 70 today. Medical service is free to all Soviet citizens.

Seventy percent of all physicians are women, who, Russians feel, are better than men. The medical courses comprise 6 college years. Physicians work only 5 hours a day, while everyone else works 7 hours a day.

Dr. Isaac Kawasaki, Honolulu physician, inquired of Minister Krilov, "When you get sick how do you get a doctor?" Krilov replied, "Each region has its own hospital which will send a doctor to call on sick people if they are unable to come to the hospital directly. If they are dissatisfied with the services of a doctor, a citizen is free to go to his political leader and tell him that he wants a consultant."

All of the beautiful palaces in the good climate, Black Sea area, formerly owned by the Russian nobility, were nationalized and are now used for workers' convalescent homes. There are 164 sanatorium and holiday homes in the Crimea.

People who are convalescing are sent to these homes by trade unions who pay two-thirds of the cost while the worker pays one-third. The monthly cost is probably about $200. There is a 24-day limit. Whereas convalescent homes are for sick persons only, healthy vacationers go to rest homes that are not staffed with doctors or equipped for the ill.

Although the fine modern convalescent home we visited in Yalta looks like a former palace, it isn't. It was built by the Soviet Government in 1955. The architect employed the wedding cake type of architecture which we understand will not be used any more because of its excessive cost. Instead, a more functional type will be used.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

A man, working alone or at most assisted by his wife and children, can work individually for private profit at occupations such as shoe repair (or any kind of a repair shop), bootblack, and dressmaking. A person may also sell merchandise for profit as long as he made it himself.

All collective farmers, in addition to their work responsibilities as members of their village farm groups, have 2-acre plots of land immediately behind their cottages where they are permitted to raise vegetables, fruit, chickens, and pigs for sale and profit.

I saw several beautiful speedboats in Yalta, Russia's summer resort on the Black Sea, which the owners were operating for tourist sightseeing and private profit.

Soviet philosophy, however, permits no person to hire another person to work for him and pay him a wage. To do so, would mean exploitation—that is, one person would be using the labor of another person for his private benefit.

CAPITALISM, COMMUNISM, AND INCENTIVES

Our capitalistic society believes that the state exists to serve the individual while Russia believes the opposite. Capitalism believes that the individual has rights, dignity, and abilities that can be developed best under a system of free enterprise. On the other hand, communism feels the group is more important than the individual. The group meetings, group work, group ownership, and group belief of communism repel us because we feel that not only the individual's rights, but his very being are violated, compromised, and then destroyed.

During the 1917 revolution and thereafter, the czar, the aristocracy, the bourgeoisie, and the farmers were killed and their property confiscated. All land and practically everything else now belongs to the state. The individual, however, is permitted to own his dwelling (but not the land)—if he can save enough money to afford it—and he can sell it at a profit, if he is lucky enough. He cannot speculate in real estate, however, that is, buy and sell a house in which he does not live.

Beginning with 1930, Russia has completed six 5-year plans of economic development. The present 7-year plan will end in 1965.

Our guide in Yalta said to us in all sincerity: "Our goal for reaching Marxism communism is 1980. Then the present difference in pay between workers of all classes will disappear. The mental worker, such as a scientist, and the manual laborer will receive exactly the same benefits from the state; that is, in accordance with his need. Russians do not work for their own personal benefit, but for the benefit of all society, and this means the Communist Party."

A university-educated young woman in the Odessa Intourist Bureau office asked "Do you prefer capitalism to communism?" To my "yes" reply, she asked, "Why?'

Before I left Hawaii for Russia, I had read that President Eisenhower once had difficulty answering this question on a philosophical basis with a Russian general, so I was prepared. I replied: My chief objection is that, by comparison with an American the Russian citizen has very little personal freedom of choice. U.S. capitalism has given our people the highest standard of living in the world.

"We believe that man will strive hardest to produce when there is competition, when he is permitted to make a profit, where the farmer owns the land he tills, and where there is a minimum amount of government interference in business.

"Your Communist leaders thought the elimination of private ownership of land and the means of production would remove class distinctions. By paying vastly different salaries, however, you have created as many social and economic classes, if not more, than we have in America.

"If Russia really believes that the incentive to do one's best comes from pride in one's work, the collective satisfaction of the group in meeting its quota, and the feeling that he is serving the welfare of the state, why don't you pay workers 'in accordance with their need,' the Marxian Communist goal, instead of basing their salaries, as we do in the United States, on the value of their production?"

I don't believe Russia will ever pay workers in accordance with need, and I doubt that the Soviet leaders believe it either. Without the incentives of higher remuneration and greater benefits which make it possible for an individual to compete and win more material goods than his fellowman, creative leadership, and the inventive genius that any society needs will not be forthcoming.

E. E. Black said: "It takes the old incentive of the profit motive to make a fellow do his best work. If the administrator of the Moskovich auto plant who makes $330 a month were offered $500 a month if he put out more automobiles, I bet he would try much harder and think of more ways to increase production. You have to have at least one spark plug in the organization in the position of leadership, a man who has the ideas and the incentive for keeping everybody on his toes.

"When everyone works for the government, as in Russia, it just isn't possible for them to be motivated to the same degree that a man will be who is working for his own profit. The Russian deal is regimented and controlled from above. This plan simply cannot develop initiative."

I see very little difference between the use of incentives in Soviet Russia and in our capitalist society where the profit motive is all important. Some say that we have creeping socialism in America. If we are moving to the left, then Russia is certainly moving to the right, for she is adopting many of the techniques of our capitalistic system.

There are only two major ways of getting ahead financially in Russia. First, through education to become a top-salaried scientist. Secondly, through the Communist Party to become a political leader.

All Russian adults—both men and women—must work. Otherwise, they do not eat. The following rates of pay indicate the class distinctions that have developed in Russia. Unskilled laborers receive about $60 monthly, secretaries about $80, government clerks, foremen, technicians, and skilled factory-workers between $100 and $250, industrial managers, plant directors, engineers, scientists, novelists, actors, dancers, artists, from $300 to $2,500—plus bonuses of up to 40 percent of their regular salary for meeting or exceeding production quotas.

At the top class rung are the Soviet party leaders. Although they dare not take large salaries, they get the cream of everything—Russia's best limousines with chauffeurs, luxurious housing (both city and summer vacation homes on the Black Sea), household servants and unlimited expense accounts.

Workers with salaries below $60 monthly pay no income tax. Those who earn $100 pay about 5 percent income tax. Since the top income tax is 11 percent (there is an extra tax on couples without children), Russia's top classes can keep most of their money and pass it on to their children, for there is no inheritance tax. Thus, rich people can be sure that their children will also be rich, thus creating a new and self-perpetuating aristocratic class.

TIPPING

In Soviet Russia, because tipping is considered to be a capitalistic, demeaning device, it is taboo. On the other hand, I found workers would accept tips if they were alone at the time the tips were proffered, as my lady barber did smilingly and with alacrity.

When a tip was offered by a Honolulan to a porter who had carried his bags aboard the ship we were taking from Yalta to Odessa, he refused it. I believe he did so simply because there were three other Russians standing around watching. I think he would have accepted the tip had he been alone.

Meal service is very slow in Russian hotels. On many occasions we experienced long waits for service and a frequently indifferent attitude. Usually an hour and a half to two hours are required when an individual orders a meal on his own. The waitress doesn't hustle, probably because she is working for the government and tipping for good service is not customary. Our guide said: "It is difficult for us to persuade competent people to become waitresses. The work is too menial, and is attractive only to the less intelligent and unindustrious."

COLLECTIVE AND STATE FARMS

I visited a state farm outside the city limits of Moscow and a cooperative farm near Kiev in the Ukraine. A state farm differs from a collective farm in two ways:

1. State farms were started from scratch after the revolution on land seized from the czars and wealthy land-owning groups, whereas the collective farms are on lands that originally belonged to the farmers themselves who were permitted to remain.

2. All state farm employees work for and are paid fixed monthly salaries by the Government, which also owns all of the buildings and farm equipment.

A cooperative farm is composed of a group of farmers who have united and pooled their efforts. In a sense they are private enterprisers. Although all of their group-produced output is sold to the state, the profit is divided among the participants.

I was told at both farms that the state farm system was more efficient, but the cooperative farmer has refused to give up the little freedom that he still has in selling produce from his own garden.

Pig raisers at the "White House," the state farm outside Moscow, received $140 per month last year, while the vegetable growers got $110. Cooperative farmers—at least at the Kiev farm I visited—averaged only $80 monthly last year. This does not include the extra income each farmer earned through selling produce on the open market in the larger Soviet cities from his private 2-acre plot adjacent to his home. It is reported that some collective farmers spend more time cultivating their own gardens than working in the Government fields. Although these private plots represent less than 4 percent of Soviet land, they supply about 80 percent of the nation's eggs, 60 percent of the potatoes, and 40 percent of the meat. Many farmers have been accused of speculating, buying up produce and selling it at extravagant prices, but in food-short Russia they are getting by with it.

The state farm aims to supply Moscow with vegetables and pork. Last year 33,000 tons of vegetable waste were brought from Moscow to feed the pigs. In turn, pig manure is used to fertilize the farm's vegetable crops. This farm showed none of the poor harvest effects that the cold winter and excessive drought brought this year to Russia's grain farms.

The Kiev cooperative farm visit was a sad affair. At least 2 inches of dust overlay all of the land. The stalks of corn in the field were pygmy sized. Explanation—only 13 inches of rain in the past year. I saw cattle grazing in dry, brown fields, yet I could see nothing green for them to eat.

Although the restaurants at which we ate were plentifully supplied with bread, I was told by two young Egyptians who were studying navigation at the University of Odessa that bread was unavailable in many of the villages outside the large cities. Therefore, I was quite prepared to understand, later on, the announcements of Russia's purchases of great quantities of wheat and other grain from Canada and the United States, and Khrushchev's caution that the nation must economize on bread.

I was told that whereas the Ukraine had formerly served as Russia's breadbasket, the opening of millions of acres of irrigated virgin land in Kazakhstan (central Russia) had relieved the pressure on the Ukraine for the major share of the burden of feeding Russia's burgeoning population.

Now, I suspect the Kazakhstan venture has not been successful, for Khrushchev is now saying that increased production should be realized through intense fertilization and irrigation rather than by opening up and cultivating more virgin lands. Russia has a climate problem—high winds and lack of adequate rain—that means crop failures will be a continuing problem. Russia does not have the ideal farm conditions that produce bumper crops in Midwest America.

RELIGION AND THE PARTY

Cultural Minister Krilov explains the attitude toward religion: "While the state has absolutely no supervision or contact with the church, it does teach through the schools that religion is poison. Anyone who wishes to worship in church, however, is free to do so. The church is losing in strength. We believe that our people owe allegiance to the Soviet Union, not to the church." Since this is the official viewpoint, it is unlikely that any Russian, who aspires to climb the official Communist Party ladder is likely to be caught inside church.

We visited a Russian Orthodox Church in Leningrad on a Sunday morning. I was surprised and impressed to see an attendance of 2,000 or more adults, most of whom were 50 years old and up. There was a sprinkling of young people, but not many.

There were beautiful voices in the choir and they sang without an organ. While the music was underway, I observed many of the women coming up, whose husbands, I imagine, had been killed in the war (there are 23 million more women than men in Russia). All stopped in front of every icon placed at different stairway levels and kissed them with tears in their eyes. They displayed a deep reverence, much more so than any church group I have ever seen anywhere. Our clergyman companion said he wished his congregation were equally devoted. They seemed to be more Catholic than the Catholics in America. Perhaps they are more reverent and appreciative of the church than they would have been had religion not been taken away from them and then restored.

Because of the dwindling congregations, most old churches are either standing idle or have been turned into museums. Nevertheless, Russia is certainly not now a godless country, for the older people demonstrate their firm belief in God and in the church.

Since schoolchildren, however, are taught that there is no immortal God, that the God whom they must serve is Lenin and the Communist Party, I do not see how the church can exist more than another generation or two. Since no infidel nation has ever survived, it will be interesting to see if Russia does.

CENSORSHIP

Two things are taken for granted in Russia—severe winters and censorship. No literature critical of the Soviet state is permitted to be published. There are three capital punishment crimes in Russia: (1) Accusations against the government; (2) speculating with currency; and (3) killing or raping.

Although it is a common understanding in the United States that incoming and outgoing mail is read and censored, according to our guide, there is no censorship of mail in the U.S.S.R. On the other hand, an American who has lived in Moscow for 25 years, said that Russia now does only spot checking and censoring of mail.

A news representative said that, in his dispatches, he could not imply that other countries were under Red direction, could not use the expression "Red satellite," could not criticize Khrushchev, or he would be asked to leave the country.

Our U.S. Embassy in Moscow has 90 employees. There are 250 Americans in Moscow, considering that each Embassy employee has an average of two dependents. Because their social life is restricted, they have formed their own American Club for evening entertainment.

A young Embassy worker told me that, because he was an Embassy employee, it was possible for him to get out and meet the Russian people, a fact which he regretted very much. He felt he was shadowed.

Enjoying as much personal freedom as we do, we would consider Russians to be veritable slaves living dull lives. They are not free even to be mildly bad, should they choose to be.

Culture is a state goal. All agencies of mass communications are controlled by the state—radio, TV, newspapers, magazines, the type of evening entertainment (most of which is ballet or opera), and literature. Russia prohibits the importation and sale of foreign newspapers, except those of a leftwing variety, in order to prevent the spreading of political ideas different from those held by the Communist Party.

Although there are no nightclubs, the young people may dance at inexpensive, state-subsidized coffee clubs, which close at 11 p.m. For 4 cents they are served an apple and a cup of coffee—enough for the evening. Only classical or high quality music is permitted on the radio, TV, and by dance orchestras—no rock 'n roll, no hillbilly, and no jazz.

Cultural Minister Krilov said: "Russia is working hard to try to improve children's musical tastes. The Robert Shaw Chorus of 40 voices was a very popular exchange program from the United States, and so were the Ice Capades and the whole series of sporting events. Benny Goodman was not well received, and we did not want Louis Armstrong." I understand Goodman, instead of playing the modern jazz liked by youth, played the original type jazz which was unknown and not understood by the Russians.

Mr. Krilov may be right, for the ballet and operatic performances of "Giselle," "Scheherazade," and "Faust" provided the preliminary background I needed for complete enjoyment of the ballet, "Swan Lake," my last night in Moscow. It was a stupendous artistic production from which I received a real thrill and that is something, because the esthetic arts, generally speaking, are not my cup of tea. Since ballet and opera, however, are about all that is available in Russia for evening entertainment, perhaps if I were a permanent Moscow resident, I might, in time, become a ballet enthusiast.

The Intourist guide asked me why America was so unwise as to permit the publication of a book so rotten as "Peyton Place." She said obviously it would be read by young people who are not mature enough to take such an immoral book in stride.

Are Russians free to travel? Minister Krilov said: "700,000 Russians leave the Soviet Union each year for travel abroad. Since rubles are not recognized or accepted in the United States it is difficult for Russians to travel in the United States. The Russian who wants to go to the United States, brings his rubles in to the Intourist Agency, the only department which has American dollars (which it gets from incoming U.S. tourists)—and he is permitted to buy a trip to the United States, if the agency has enough American dollars. There is no prohibition whatsoever on travel by Russian citizens."

Apparently, there has been a thaw permitting persons other than party members to travel abroad, for an American, highly placed in Moscow circles, said that responsible Russians who could be expected to return were now free to travel. The Soviet citizen has an obligation to serve the state, therefore he cannot move away from Russia. Birth control is prohibited in Russia, for they feel the more people they have the stronger the state will become.

Although Intourist guide service was available for our use in Moscow, Leningrad, Yalta, Odessa, and Kiev, whenever we wanted, we were free to visit wherever we wished without being accompanied by a guide. For example, Gerald Fisher and I wanted to visit an evening youth coffee club, Patrice Lumumba or Friendship University (Russia's counterpart of our East-West Center), and the American Club. We were told they were not on the Intourist visiting list, but we could try on our own. We did, and we were well received.

I never had the feeling that we were restricted, followed, censored, or subjected to propaganda of any kind. Once, when we were taken to the Industrial Exhibition there was a roomful of propaganda praising Russia's growth in electrification, agriculture, and industry—but we recognized it as such and moved on rapidly.

FRIENDSHIP UNIVERSITY

Currently there is a hassle as to the administrative relationship that should exist between our East-West Center and the University of Hawaii. Should the Center be autonomous? For light on this question, and because he is a member of the East-West advisory board, Gerald Fisher and I visited Moscow's Friendship University (also called Patrice Lumumba University) after we had received the following explanation from Minister Krilov:

"Patrice Lumumba is a self-autonomous university. It has no connection with any other institution. Its admission, procedures, and administration are entirely removed from the Government. They may do whatever they wish.

"The university was organized by the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. All students take a 4-year course, except in the medical department where it is 5 years. The university's work is based on the wave of liberation which these countries have experienced. The curriculum covers engineering, agriculture, medicine, mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, economics, law, history, and the Russian language. Because these countries are backward, it is not easy for a bright student living there to get a good education. Education is the main problem for all underdeveloped countries. The university does not accept students from Europe or the United States."

The director of the university told us: "There are 2,600 students from more than 80 countries at Patrice Lumumba. Each student receives a stipend from Russia of $100 a month, plus free housing, medical care, medicines, and warm clothing, when he first arrives. He spends perhaps $50 a month for meals. Dinner, for example, probably costs about 60 kopecks (65 cents). Our biggest problem is to find adequate places for Lumumba students to live."

Fisher and I concluded, after a casual observation, that the university appeared to be doing a good job with first-rate equipment housed in dilapidated buildings. While most of the students appeared to be Negroes from Africa, there was a sprinkling of Indians, Cubans, and others of light complexion. All students seemed to be busy and happy, although I understand some of the African students are now complaining they are not accepted socially by the Russians. This is understandable. In U.S. universities enrolling considerable numbers of foreign students there are always problems of adjustment and criticisms which are reported in the newspapers. It has happened, for example, in our East-West Center, at both the Los Angeles and Berkeley campuses of the University of California.

AUTOMOBILES

While there are concentrations of automobiles around the hotels, there are never very many on the streets. Generally speaking, they resemble U.S. car models of some 10 years ago, though Russia's most popular car, the Moskovich, which anyone with $3,600 cash may buy, is a bit smaller than our smallest U.S. made compact.

Although cars are not sold on the installment plan, things are looking up for the industry. In 1958, the Moskovich factory produced 50,000 cars. This year, the figure is 75,000. In 1965, the goal will be 100,000.

The low purchasing power of the average Russian makes it difficult for Moskovich to dispose of all their production within the country. The manager said, "We are now exporting autos to more than 40 countries, largely in Europe and Asia. I was told by a Canadian that a new Moskovich could be bought for $1,900 in Canada. This is merely another example that prices set for consumer goods in Russia are artificially contrived by the state, and that when Soviet goods are sold in the free marketplace they have to be priced realistically to enable them to compete for consumer favor.

The Segal is the biggest and best auto made in Russia. It is not sold to ordinary citizens. It is reserved entirely for diplomats and Communist Party officers.

On our 50-mile ride in the Crimea, from Simferopol to Yalta, we were chauffeured in a large, comfortable sedan. Boyd MacNaughton, after studying the auto, said the front end was copied from our 1958 Buick, while the rear half was copied from our Chrysler of the same year. E. E. Black commented on the wide but rough roads, that he thought Russia could benefit by sending some of their engineers to the United States to learn how to make smooth road beds.

Although Moscow is almost as large as New York City, traffic noise is negligible. There are but few automobiles, the boulevards are spacious, and the blowing of horns is not permitted inside the city. Only ambulances and fire engines may do so.

TAXICABS

The state subsidizes taxicabs, probably because most citizens cannot afford to buy autos for their own transportation. Although there are never enough cabs to meet the demand, four persons may ride in a cab for 2 or 3 miles for a total charge of about 65 cents. A similar ride almost anywhere in the United States would be $4 or so. The problem is, first, to locate a cab, and, second, to find a cab driver who is willing to pick you up. Because a taxi driver is paid according to the mileage he drives, whether he has a passenger or not, we hailed many passing empty cabs without success.

WATER FOUNTAINS

Early September was hotter in Russia than summer in Hawaii. It was thirst-producing weather. During my entire time in Russia, I never saw a single drinking fountain anywhere. Instead there are vending machines that sell a kind of fruit juice water for a few pennies. The juice is dispensed automatically by inserting the appropriate coin into one of two glasses which remain permanently in the drinking receptacle.

If one wishes a drink, he can rinse his glass beforehand in a spray of cold water. There is no such thing as disposable paper cups. There are always a few flies around the glasses and machines. This was the most unsanitary and unclean device I saw in Russia. It looked like a wonderful opportunity for mouth-borne diseases to go on a rampage once an epidemic got underway. Certainly this is practice that would not be condoned in our health-conscious United States of America. So far as I know, no Honolulan, regardless of thirst, could bring himself to drink from the public glasses of the vending machines.

It is interesting, however, at this point, to tell about an experience that Gerald Fisher and I had in the Gum Department Store. We noticed several counters where they were dispensing champagne. Since it was just before the dinner hour, I suggested to Jerry that we have a drink, which we did. After receiving the champagne glasses from the clerk, we retired some 10 yards away to relax while we imbibed. Within a couple of minutes, however, we were somewhat embarrassed to notice the line of customers waiting for their champagne, as well as the clerk, turn and stare as us. Jerry realized before I did, that we had stopped the selling of champagne, that they were waiting for us to return the glasses in order that they might be rinsed and filled with champagne for the next customers. A long line of would-be champagne customers was being serviced with only six or seven glasses. It was good champagne, but we weren't pleased to find out we had participated in the community glass idea.

GERMAN REUNIFICATION

I don't know whether or not Russia's leaders can be trusted, whether they are sincere in wanting to end the cold war and cooperate with us, as Minister Krilov told us they were, in various world ventures—the peaceful exploration of space, utilization of atomic energy, food problems, etc.—but I do believe the Russian people want no part of another war. They have had enough.

The Russian people, I believe, like the American people and want to be friendly. Several Russians went out of their way to say to me, "We like Americans, but we don't like Germans." Russia has been invaded repeatedly and devastated by war more than any other country in the history of the world. Three times in recent history—the Franco-Prussian 1870 War, World War I (1914), and World War II (1939)—Russia has suffered at the hands of Germany. It is difficult for us to understand Russia's hatred for Germany and their intention to keep it divided, for, with the possible exception of Pearl Harbor, we have never had to repel an invader.

Fear of Germany underlies Russia's enslavement of almost 100 million Eastern Europeans in the Communist buffer nations of East Germany, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Czechoslovakia. Our goal is to free these peoples of Russian occupation forces, but we don't know how to do it without the serious risk of war.

When Russia was overrun by Germany in World War II, 25 million people were killed, including 80 percent of their former 6 million Jewish population. Hitler's legions were within 6 miles of Moscow, Russia's principal city and capital.

Leningrad, the No. 2 city, was under siege for 900 days. A million people died, 600,000 by starvation and 400,000 through warfare. Although every fifth building was absolutely destroyed, and all others severely damaged, the Germans did not destroy a single one of Leningrad's 620 bridges, which link its 101 islands together at the mouth of the Neva River, for Hitler was sure he would take the city after a short siege. After the German defeat, printed cards were found inviting people to a victory celebration at the Astoria Hotel 2 weeks after the attack began.

Our Intourist guide at Kiev said: "We hate the Germans because almost every Russian family had a member killed by them during the war. All Germans are Fascists at heart. They executed 150,000 Kiev Jews without reason, including women and small children. They destroyed almost 50 percent of our living space. We think that West Germany is spoiling to start another war. We understand that former Hitler generals are being reinstated in the army and in the Central Government."

When our guide was asked if the Russian hatred for Germans extends to East Germany, she replied: "No, they are a people's democracy like Russia." We next asked if she thought Stalin was as bad as Hitler. She considered for a moment and then replied: "Yes, I believe he was, but history has since proved that Russia needed a dictator at that time."

Other Russians, with whom I talked, said that a reunified, strong Germany, if it gets the hydrogen bomb, would again—as it has three times in the past—go on a rampage and try to whip the world. For that reason, I think it is most unlikely that Russia will ever agree to a plebiscite, self-determination vote by the people who live in East Germany.

While in Europe, I also talked with a few intelligent citizens of Poland, Holland, France, Yugoslavia, Austria, and England. Except for the Germans themselves, I found no one who favored the reunification of Germany. All want it to remain divided as East and West Germany and so militarily weak that it will never again be powerful enough to seek world domination.

A business man in Poland said: "Since we are a weak nation bordering Russia, we have no choice with whom to side in the cold war. Because we are 95 percent Catholic and Russia is atheistic, we don't like to be under her domination. Yet, history will show you how we have suffered repeatedly from Germany's attacks in the past and why we regard an alliance with Russia as the lesser of the two evils."

Apparently, our U.S. leaders are dedicated to a reunification of Germany as a capitalistic and free world bulwark against the further spread of communism.

KHRUSHCHEV (PRONOUNCED KROO-SHOFF)

According to Americans now living in Russia, Khrushchev is a much better leader—more tolerant, far-seeing, and world peace seeking—than he has been pictured in the United States. While they doubt that he can always be trusted, they say he is certainly a great improvement over his predecessor, despotic Stalin.

A well-informed U.S. press official said: "Since Khrushchev succeeded Stalin in 1953, there has been a great liberalization in Russia. If Khrushchev passes on, Russia's liberal movement probably will continue. Russia will not return to the days of Stalin's terror. Stalin was an uneducated ruffian. He was more repressive and more murderous than a czar. Russian people think it is too bad he didn't die 10 years ago. Khrushchev accomplishes his goals through the force of his personality. He is a smart politician. He persuades, whereas Stalin got his way through force and wholesale executions."

"Khrushchev's split with Communist China in renunciating the doctrine that war is inevitable and that coexistence between countries of differing social and economic systems is not only possible, but essential, is most reassuring, as is the nuclear test ban treaty. Khrushchev wants a Russia so strong that she will never have to suffer from war again. As long as he is Russia's premier, I think world peace is possible. My chief concern is that his successor might want to scrap the coexistence policy, thus endangering world peace."

I asked our Moscow guide what she thought of China's refusal to sign the nuclear test ban treaty. She replied, "We think China is 'nuts.' We don't want China to engage in ventures which could draw us into a war with the United States. Our split with China is real. We don't intend to give them any of our resources and deprive our own people at the same time. We have 3,000 miles of common border with China, and we fear that they will eventually try to send their surplus population, which is increasing by 15 million a year, into Siberia."

Khrushchev's statement to the United States that "We will bury you," so I was told by Russian-speaking Val Ossipoff, is actually an inaccurate translation of what he meant. His goal and what he intended, says Ossipoff, is to "overwhelm us economically and productively."

Russians believe that communism is preferable as a worldwide system because they feel it promotes peace, whereas capitalism, in their opinion, promotes the competition which causes wars.

Obviously, the Communist Government has brought a lot of peasant people up from dirt and has raised their standard of living. Before the 1917 revolution the illiteracy rate was 65 percent. Now they claim it is almost nil. The Russian people are sacrificing today for a brighter tomorrow. Ultimately, they sincerely believe that Americans will want to become Communists, but they want to win us of our own free will, and without the necessity of war. The question is, which will be the surviving economic system, capitalism or communism?

Despite his peacemaking overtures to the United States, it seems obvious that Khrushchev will continue to do what he can to influence undeveloped countries and others that have recently achieved independence to choose communism rather than capitalism. I say capitalism rather than democracy, for Communist nations refer to their systems as people's democracies.

Because our goal is our type of freedom for all people everywhere, we run head on into potentially explosive situations with Russia in almost every undecided nation—Vietnam, Korea, and the emerging African countries. A Russian asked me, "How can the United States support a Vietnam regime that persecutes religious groups?"

The implementation of our respective competing objectives—communism and capitalism—could be the spark that could start a nuclear war, witness Cuba where it was difficult for Russia to back down without losing face. I asked our Moscow guide, "Why did you send those missiles to Cuba?" she replied, "To keep the United States from invading Cuba."

Where possible, throughout the world, Russia will undoubtedly continue to attempt to install Communist regimes, and, once they are operating, they will furnish technical and military support to defend them.

The Berlin wall and his refusal to permit a self-determination vote in East Germany indicate Khrushchev's inconsistency. When Minister Krilov was asked by William Ewing, "Why the Berlin wall?" he replied, "That was East Germany's decision, and we did not interfere. They did it to prevent the intrusion of spies from West Germany." The real reason for the wall, we think, was to keep East Germans who hate communism from escaping to West Germany. When Ewing countered, "Will the wall come down?" Krilov responded, "I think it will."

U.S. FINANCIAL HELP

Everyone likes Santa Claus, but sometimes people resent the fact that others are able to give the help they need. Although free Europe owes her present economic prosperity to America's postwar generosity, many countries do not seem to be grateful for this help. Nevertheless, we cannot withdraw from helping Europe for it could fall under Russian domination.

Austria, like Russia, was impoverished by World War II. With U.S. aid under the Marshall plan, Austria has bounced back. Vienna is prosperous and looks it. Austrians are anxious to express their thanks for U.S. help.

I have made three trips to Europe—1958, 1960, and 1963. Like other visitors, I have been struck with Europe's steady increase in prosperity. Each year Europe seems more like America; the people are better fed, better dressed, better housed, and, above all, better automobiled. In Austria, for example, the number of automobiles has increased 10 times in the past 10 years. For 16 years—from 1945 to 1961—the Austrian economy grew at the rate of 12 percent a year.

A similar situation prevails in France. In fact, Nice and Paris—the two cities I visited—look as prosperous, if not more so, than most American cities.

Yugoslavia, which has received $2½ billion U.S. aid, in prosperity seems to be halfway between Russia and Austria. We must remember, however, that Yugoslavia is still classed as a backward, undeveloped nation. Whereas the czars held back the development of the common man in Russia, the Turks did the same thing with Yugoslavia for more than 500 years. With U.S. help, real progress is being made in Yugoslavia, and the people go out of their way, when they learn they are talking with Americans, to express their gratitude for U.S. help. This is not to say that Yugoslavia is a modern nation, for it is not. I saw hundreds of workmen doing backbreaking labor with picks and shovels to dig a new road through a hill that automated or bulldozing-type U.S. machinery could do in a few hours.

The two greatest wrongs in the United States, according to the Russians with whom I talked, were our Negro and unemployment problems. A recent report to Congress stated that automation was eliminating jobs in the United States at the rate of more than 40,000 a week. When persons, 50 or so years old are thrown out of work by automation, it is difficult for them to learn a new skill or begin a new life in strange areas. While 5 percent of our labor force is unemployed, there is no unemployment in Communist Russia or Socialist Yugoslavia. They spread around the available work and resist automation if it displaces workers for whom there are no alternate jobs.

While France is prosperous and has undoubtedly progressed by leaps and bounds since World War II, she got her initial help from the United States, a fact that she now seems to resent as aloof President Charles de Gaulle charts a world course that is intentionally independent, so he says, of both Colossi—the United States and Russia, an example of which was his contempt of the atomic test ban treaty.

What counts for the average man is how well he is living. And, in spite of a 25-percent rise in French living costs since 1958 (wages have climbed higher), Frenchmen are for the most part living very well indeed. Store windows display luxury items of the highest quality, and street markets, like the horn of plenty, have a veritable cornucopian display (much like a U.S. supermarket) of luscious meats, seafoods, cheeses, vegetables, fruits, household articles, and clothing. One such heavily stocked street market in the Neuilly district of Paris was more than half a mile long—and I walked the entire district completely fascinated and impressed by the quality of the merchandise offered.

When I inquired of quite intelligent Yugoslavians why there wasn't a political candidate to oppose Dictator Marshal Tito, they were unanimous in their following replies, and I believed their sincerity: "Tito is wonderful. He is making a modern, educated nation out of our backward people. There is no one who could oppose him. Our big worry is how he can be replaced with as good a leader when he dies." Apparently, he is a much-loved leader with no enemies, a rarity among dictators.

EDUCATION

In Russia, schools and children come first. In no country in the world—not even the United States—is education accorded the place of honor that it receives in the Soviet Union. The Russians have made a fetish of education, realizing its represents their best hope for reaching their goals in the future. Because education is the only key to personal advancement in the Soviet Union—aside from becoming a Communist Party official—parents do everything possible to assure a university education for their children.

After a good look-see at the Russian schools, it is my opinion that America's schools are superior in buildings, equipment, quality, and training of the teaching staff, curriculum, guidance, and attention to the needs of the individual child. In incentive and desire to learn, however, the average Russian students is decidedly superior. Everywhere there is evident a real seriousness of purpose. The difference, I think, lies in the national attitude toward education.

Russia views each child in terms of his potential contribution to the needs of the state. A talented youngster receives a free university education in order that he may be able to serve the nation.

Russia is a hungry nation. There is a national urgency for top-quality education, for Russia is challenging the United States for world leadership. There is a genuine thirst for knowledge and an enthusiasm for education in Russia that is difficult for a visitor to comprehend. Russia's drive for world supremacy is supported by the education of each citizen, at government expense, to the extent of his capacity to learn.

On the other hand, America is an affluent nation. Most of us are not hungry, and neither are our children. It is practically impossible for an American child, surrounded as he is by the comforts and luxuries of life, to develop as much drive as a Russian child in taking advantage of the wonderful educational opportunities that are available.

Although the salary and the lot of the American teacher have improved markedly in recent years, he simply is not accorded the highly respected professional status—by comparison with the other U.S. professions—that his counterpart receives in Russia.

After World War II, when complete defeat was narrowly averted at the hands of Germany, Russia decided that a scientific industrial revolution was the only way it could survive as a nation. For the past 20 years, therefore, science education has received top priority. About 57 percent of all Soviet college students are in the science-engineering curriculum, compared with 24 percent in the United States. All of Russia's human, economic, and industrial resources have been mobilized to produce battalions of scientists and engineers who, in turn, have built and operated the economy, developed space rockets, done nuclear research, and developed industrial machines. Last year more than 120,000 Soviet men and women earned a bachelor's degree in engineering alone, three times the U.S. total.

Russia subscribes to all American science magazines. It is easier for an American scientist to subscribe to the Russian abstracting service and read the English summaries of the science research done in America than it is for him to get this same information through reading American periodicals.

INCENTIVES

Russian schools use a system of material rewards—selection by competition, marks, payment by results—in accordance with achievement that struck me as being more in line with a capitalistic rather than a communistic society. Students are graded on a 1 to 5 basis; the lowest 2 percent achievers fail. Pictures of the best students and also of teachers whose students achieve top records are placed on the honor roll bulletin board for all to see. If the pupils are unusually successful in national examinations, the teacher receives a bonus. If there is excessive student failure the teacher may be demoted or fired.

THE SCHOOL YEARS

Russian education begins with nursery school. Since nearly all parents work—both father and mother—the child is sent to nursery school at age 2. The Moskovich auto plant that we visited operated nursery-kindergartens for children of their employees.

After kindergarten, the child goes to an 8-year school, where attendance is compulsory. If he does not have the kind of intelligence that insures his selection for the university preparatory course in grades 9, 10, and 11, he may either quit at the end of grade 8 and go to work or enter a polytechnic school to prepare for factory work. About one-third of Russia's youngsters finish, compared with two-thirds in the United States. In order to combat "a lordly contempt" for physical labor, in 1958 Khrushchev introduced a 2-year practical work requirement—in a factory, mine, farm, or public service—as a part of secondary education. This comes at the end of grade 11, when all students, with the exception of those exceptionally talented in mathematics and physics, get their 2-year job assignment. Thereafter, they enter the university, if they can pass the entrance examination. The math-science geniuses are permitted to skip the practical work and enter specialized university courses immediately after finishing grade 11. The course of university training is 5½ years in science and 5 years for the humanities.

We send more high school graduates to college than Russia does, but I think this is due to the fact that parents foot the college bill in the United States and also to the fact that we have many "slow" students entering low-standard colleges. Because Russia pays all college expenses for its students, it weeds out all but the best. Since there are no religious private schools, colleges, or universities in Russia, a parent dissatisfied with the state's schools is not free to choose an alternative as in America.

Gerald Fisher and I visited an 11-year school in Moscow, with 1,600 students, approximately 120 at each grade level—Leninski Prospect, School No. 192.

We were not restricted as to what we might see in the school. The teachers were most cordial. We experienced no resentment or coolness due to our representing a capitalistic nation. After we arrived we told the principal what we did want to see, and we changed this from time to time during the day, so teachers did not have much advance warning before our arrival. We visited classes of all grade levels, grades 1 through 11.

I have read statements of visitors to Russia saying that Soviet children are better-behaved and healthier than American students. While I am not prepared to agree to such a wide-sweeping evaluation, I do want to say that I have never seen anywhere better behaved children than in school No. 192, or in the other Russian schools I visited later on. Classes were conducted on a traditional—not progressive—basis. There was no doubt that the teacher was in charge, for she dominated the situation. All students seemed eager to learn and to conform with the teacher expectation. The majority of the children were attractive, smiling, clean, neatly dressed and groomed, and responsive. Jerry and I agreed that, in looks at least, they compared favorably with Punahou students.

The school, a five-story building built in 1960, without an elevator, could easily be taken for a 30-year-old building. Obviously, it was a rush job and they were short of good building materials. I understand it is exactly like hundreds of other school buildings that have been recently erected. All Russian elementary and secondary education is centralized in Moscow. Everything is standardized and nationwide: subjects, time allotments, methods, and textbooks.

The classrooms in school No. 192 were well-lighted, warm and sunny, and there were double windows for insulation.

Most of the girls wore blue skirts, white blouses, and the red kerchiefs of the Young Pioneers. Others wore black uniforms, topped by red kerchiefs and white collars. The attire of the boys resembled U.S. students except for the red kerchiefs, which all wore.

We found that there is very little difference between a Russian and an American school. Standard class size in this school is 35 to 40, as it is throughout Russia. All upper grade students are expected to do 3 hours of homework each night.

A 7-year English language sequence begins in grade 5 where the work is entirely oral with pictures. "This is a pencil." "This is a book," "Give it to me," "Show it to the class," "This is a dog," "Altogether, students, say 'this is a pencil'."

The eighth grade students were in their 4th year of English, and the book is entirely in English with no printing in Russian at all. They were asked to get up and tell jokes to the class in English. Here is a Russian joke in the eight grade English textbook.—Lady: Are these eggs good? Shopkeeper: Oh yes, they are from the country. Lady: Yes, but what country?

Obviously, I don't understand Russian humor.

Before leaving the English class I spoke slowly to the pupils and they answered in English. The English teacher asked me to send them some good English literature books for use, and I promised that I would.

If a student is talented in foreign language, after finishing grade 11, he is encouraged to enter an Institute of Foreign Language or Philology to prepare for teaching or for Government diplomatic service.

We passed by a boarding school for 800 students, outside Leningrad, where all instruction is carried on in English. Students enter at age 7 and stay 11 years. Parents with low salaries pay nothing for the education of their children in this school. Parents who earn 220 rubles per month pay 40 ($45) rubles per month, or 20 percent of their salary for the education of their children in boarding school. Usually, trade unions pay 60 to 70 percent of the total expenses of children in boarding school.

Chemistry instruction begins in grade 8 in School No. 192 and continues every year thereafter for students who wish to major in it. A similar program is offered in physics.

There is no intelligence testing and no ability grouping. If a child is slow Russian philosophy believes that if a teacher works hard enough with a child he will become as good as the fast. Bright students are invited to remain after school to attend academic clubs that will extend their education.

Teachers of the kindergarten and through grade 3 are only high school graduates, but from grade 4 on, all teachers are required to be university graduates. All teachers are required to retire at age 55 on a pension that ranges from 60 to 90 percent of their average salary for the last 3 years.

Russian schools have the same feeding problem we face in the United States, that is, how to make one dining room serve lunch for 1,600 students. The Moscow schools set aside a lunch period of only 15 minutes for each group. At 10:30 a.m. the lunch program was launched for grades 1, 2, and 3.

SPORTS

It was somewhat of a surprise to me to note the extent to which the Russians emphasize sports, considering the stress they also place on scholarships. They do everything they can to develop students into well-rounded persons. They have built huge, beautiful stadia in every Russian city in their effort to develop world champions in every sport.

Scholarship is a matter of overwhelming the free world economically, while winning the Olympics is a matter of winning world prestige.

Many Americans think if one stresses athletics it must be at the expense of scholarship. In Russia it just isn't so.

INDOCTRINATION

All Russian children, ages 9 to 13, join the Young Pioneers, the badge of which is a red kerchief. They swear to the oath "to love the Soviet Union, to live, and to study and to fight according to the teachings of Lenin and the Communist Party." All Young Pioneers (40 million) attend meetings outside of school during the school year and during the summer all go to camp where they are taught Soviet ethics.

At age 15, they graduate into the Komsomol and Young Communist League (20 million). Those who are serious about communism become party members at age 18. Only 10 million, or 4 percent, of Russia's 225 million population are members of the Communist Party. This does not mean that the others are anti-Communist, but merely that they are not politically minded.

In grade 11, all Russian children take a full year's indoctrination course in Marxism-Leninism. In addition, emphasis is

> placed on Communist theory in all high school history courses.
>
> EXCHANGE
>
> Fifty students are supposed to come from the United States each year on exchange with students from Russia. While in Russia they are distributed among 15 to 20 universities where they study for a period of 10 months. This year the United States sent only 38 to Russia, whereas the United States accepted 43 of the 60 U.S.S.R. candidates who had applied for education in the United States.
>
> The studies Russian officials prefer their students to study in the United States are: language, history, political economy, medicine and physics.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

TEMPORARY INCREASE IN PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. H.R. 8969 to provide, for the period ending June 30, 1964, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8969) to provide, for the period ending June 30, 1964, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INCOME TAX CREDIT FOR COLLEGE EXPENSES—AMENDMENT

(AMENDMENT NO. 329)

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment to H.R. 8363, the tax bill. This amendment provides an income tax credit on the first $1,500 of tuition, fees, books, and supplies to anyone who pays these expenses for a student at an institution of higher education. The amendment is cosponsored by Senators Robert C. Byrd, Howard W. Cannon, Thomas J. Dodd, Peter H. Dominick, Ernest Gruening, Hubert H. Humphrey, Kenneth B. Keating, Edward V. Long, Winston L. Prouty, Jennings Randolph, and Hugh Scott.

Proposals for tax relief for the costs of higher education have been made many times before both in the Senate and in the House of Representatives. As a matter of fact, my distinguished colleague, Tom Dodd, was one of the first Senators to introduce a bill of this type. This year 19 Senators have introduced such bills and 2 others did so in the 87th Congress. Six of these are members of the Finance Committee. In the House similar bills have been introduced by 101 Members, 9 of whom serve on the Ways and Means Committee.

Obviously there is a broad range of support for these proposals, yet up to now the tax-writing committees with jurisdiction of this issue have not given serious consideration to a college tuition-tax relief proposal.

I believe this is the time for Congress to give serious consideration to this proposal. A major tax bill is now pending before the Senate Finance Committee. This bill, and the one passed last year, constitute a major revision of our income tax laws. Last year's bill made substantial provisions for tax relief when investment was made in new plant and equipment. My amendment to this year's bill provides tax relief to the middle-income salaried taxpayer who needs it and extends this relief on just as sound a basis as the relief extended in last year's bill. Investment in the education of college students is just as entitled to a tax credit as investment in a new plant and equipment.

The amendment I submit today is a new proposal, containing features not previously advanced in earlier bills; yet it draws upon the best ideas in the bills that many of us have introduced earlier this year. I have had the helpful cooperation of all the cosponsors of this amendment as we jointly developed a proposal that was best suited to reach the objective we all sought.

The principal features of the proposal are as follows:

First. The amendment provides an income tax credit on $1,500 of tuition, fees, books, and supplies for a student at an institution of higher education. The credit is subtracted from the amount of taxes which are due, at the bottom of the income tax form, after all deductions and exemptions have been taken into account and after the appropriate tax rate has been applied. Thus, each dollar of tax credit is a dollar actually saved by the taxpayer.

Second. The credit is computed as follows: 75 percent of the first $200 of expenses, 25 percent of the next $300, and $10 percent of the next $1,000. For example, expenses of $300 would result in a credit of $175, while expenses of $1,500 would result in a credit of $325.

The sliding scale formula has been adopted to equalize the benefit of the credit with respect to students at private and public colleges. Tuition charges average a much smaller amount at public colleges than at private colleges. On the other hand, the nontuition expenses such as room and board are a much larger percentage of the total college costs at a public college than they are at a private college. The credit does not apply to room and board expenses. Therefore, the fairest way to equalize the benefit between public and private college students is to provide a larger percentage of credit on the first few hundred dollars of tuition expenses.

Third. The credit is available to anyone who pays for the tuition expenses—parents, students, or any other person who pays for a student's higher education.

Fourth. There is a limitation on the credit so that it gives less dollar benefit to upper middle income groups and no benefit to high income groups. The credit is reduced by 1 percent of the amount by which the taxpayer's adjusted gross income exceeds $25,000. In other words, for every $5,000 of adjusted gross income above $25,000, the credit is reduced by $50. As a result, the taxpayer earning $40,000 gets less benefit than the taxpayer at the $10,000 or $20,000 level, and the taxpayer at the $60,000 level gets no benefit at all.

This proposal is primarily a tax measure and only secondarily an educational measure. It is not intended as a substitute for any other form of aid for higher education. Naturally, I hope it will help many taxpayers provide a college education for their children or for themselves. But I frankly recognize that the amount of the credit will not make the decisive difference for a majority of taxpayers as to whether or not they can afford the costs of a college education. It will be helpful to all such taxpayers, but probably not decisive for many of them.

That is why I say it is advanced primarily as a tax measure, because I believe the heavy burden of a college education is just as entitled to be lessened through our tax laws as the heavy burden of medical expenses or casualty losses. College costs hit a family in a comparatively short span of years and hit with an impact that hurts. A $3,000 college expense is a staggering burden for a man earning $8,000, $12,000, or $15,000. It is no answer to say the cost can be anticipated. Medical expenses too can be anticipated, yet our tax laws even provide tax relief for the cost of health insurance.

In the past, two main arguments have been directed at this type of proposal. One has concerned high-income families and the other low-income families.

First. It has been argued that tax relief proposals do more for upper-income taxpayers than for middle-income taxpayers and that the benefit is wasted on those in really high income brackets. My amendment meets that objection head on. Because the credit has a limitation based on income, the upper-income family actually gets less benefit than the middle-income family, and the high-income family gets no benefit at all.

Second. It has been argued that tax relief proposals do nothing for the very-low-income brackets who pay no taxes. The answer to this argument is not to reject tax relief for the middle-income families who need it, but to provide scholarship aid for students from the low-income families. Most scholarship assistance now goes to families below the $7,000-income level. And more such aid is needed. But this type of aid rarely helps those in the middle-income brackets. Yet their burdens are heavy and they are entitled to some relief. In fact, the middle-income families for years have been helping the scholarship families through increased tuition payments that help provide the colleges with student aid funds. It is time these middle-income families got some needed help.

A scholarship proposal should certainly not be opposed because the middle-income families get no benefit from it. By the same token a tax relief proposal should not be opposed because the very-low-income groups—the nontaxpayers—get no benefit from it. Both approaches are necessary and desirable.

I will urge the Finance Committee to add this amendment to the pending tax bill, and if that effort is not successful, I will offer the amendment on the floor so that all Senators may have an opportunity to express their views on this proposal.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment lie on the table for 1 week so that additional Senators may join as cosponsors, and also that the amendment and a table showing the dollar benefit of the credit at various levels of tuition and of income be printed at the conclusion of my remarks together with a column by Charles Bartlett from the Washington Evening Star of November 14, 1963.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received and printed, and, without objection, will lie on the desk as requested; and, without objection, the amendment, table, and article will be printed in the Record.

The amendment (No. 329) was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

At the proper place in title II of the bill insert the following new section:

"Sec. —. Tax Credit for Expenses of Higher Education.

"(a) Allowance of Credit.—Subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 (relating to credits allowable) is amended by renumbering section 39 as 40, and by inserting after section 38 the following new section:

"'Sec. 39. Expenses of Higher Education.

"'(a) General Rule.—There shall be allowed to an individual, as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year, an amount, determined under subsection (b), of the expenses of higher education paid by him during the taxable year to one or more institutions of higher education in providing an education above the twelfth grade for himself or for any other individual.

"'(b) Limitations.—

"'(1) Amount per individual.—The credit under subsection (a) for expenses of higher education of any individual paid during the taxable year shall be an amount equal to the sum of—

"'(A) 75 percent of so much of such expenses as does not exceed $200,

"'(B) 25 percent of so much of such expenses as exceeds $200 but does not exceed $500, and

"'(C) 10 percent of so much of such expenses as exceeds $500 but does not exceed $1,500.

"'(2) Proration of credit where more than one taxpayer pays expenses.—If expenses of higher education of an individual are paid by more than one taxpayer during the taxable year, the credit allowable to each such taxpayer under subsection (a) shall be the same portion of the credit determined under paragraph (1) which the amount of expenses of higher education of such individual paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year is of the total amount of expenses of higher education of such individual paid by all taxpayers during the taxable year.

"'(3) Reduction of credit.—The credit under subsection (a) for expenses of higher education of any individual paid during the taxable year, as determined under paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection, shall be reduced by an amount equal to 1 percent of the amount by which the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer for the taxable year exceeds $25,000.

"'(c) Definitions.—For purposes of this section—

"'(1) Expenses of higher education.—The term "expenses of higher education" means—

"'(A) tuition and fees required for the enrollment or attendance of a student at a level above the twelfth grade at an institution of higher education, and

"'(B) fees, books, supplies, and equipment required for courses of instruction above the twelfth grade at an institution of higher education.

Such term does not include any amount paid, directly or indirectly, for meals, lodging, or similar personal, living, or family expenses. In the event an amount paid for tuition or fees includes an amount for meals, lodging, or similar expenses which is not separately stated, the portion of such amount which is attributable to meals, lodging, or similar expenses shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"'(2) Institution of higher education.—The term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution (as defined in section 151(e)(4))—

"'(A) which regularly offers education at a level above the twelfth grade, and

"'(B) contributions to or for the use of which constitute charitable contributions within the meaning of section 170(c).

"'(d) Special Rules.—

"'(1) Adjustment for certain scholarships and veterans' benefits.—The amounts otherwise taken into account under subsection (a) as expenses of higher education of any individual during any period shall be reduced (before the application of subsection (b)) by any amounts received by such individual during such period as—

"'(A) a scholarship or fellowship grant (within the meaning of section 117(a)(1)) which under section 117 is not includible in gross income, and

"'(B) education and training alowance under chapter 33 of title 38 of the United States Code or educational assistance allowance under chapter 35 of such title.

"'(2) Noncredit and recreational, etc., courses.—Amounts paid for expenses of higher education of any individual shall be taken into account under subsection (a)—

"'(A) in the case of an individual who is a candidate for a baccalaureate or higher degree, only to the extent such expenses are attributable to courses of instruction for which credit is allowed toward a baccalaureate or higher degree, and

"'(B) in the case of an individual who is not a candidate for a baccalaureate or higher degree, only to the extent such expenses are attributable to courses of instruction necessary to fulfill requirements for the attainment of a predetermined and identified educational, professional, or vocational objective.

"'(3) Application with other credits.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) to the taxpayer shall not exceed the amount of the tax imposed on the taxpayer for the taxable year by this chapter, reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under this subpart (other than under this section and section 31).

"'(e) Disallowance of Expenses as Deduction.—No deduction shall be allowed under section 162 (relating to trade or business expenses) for any expense of higher education which (after the application of subsection (b)) is taken into account in determining the amount of any credit allowed under subsection (a). The preceding sentence shall not apply to the expenses of higher education of any taxpayer who, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, elects not to apply the provisions of this section with respect to such expenses for the taxable year.

"'(f) Regulations.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.'

"(b) Clerical Amendment.—The table of sections for such subpart A is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 39. Expenses of higher education.

"Sec. 40. Overpayments of tax."

"(c) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1963."

The table and article submitted by Mr. Ribicoff are as follows:

Dollar benefit under Ribicoff amendment providing tax credit on 1st $1,500 of tuition, fees, books, and supplies at an institution of higher education

	Adjusted gross income up to—							
	$25,000	$30,000	$35,000	$40,000	$45,000	$50,000	$55,000	$60,000
Tuition per student:								
$100	$75	$25	0	0	0	0	0	0
$200	150	100	$50	0	0	0	0	0
$300	175	125	75	$25	0	0	0	0
$400	200	150	100	50	0	0	0	0
$500	225	175	125	75	$25	0	0	0
$600	235	185	135	85	35	0	0	0
$700	245	195	145	95	45	0	0	0
$800	255	205	155	105	55	$5	0	0
$900	265	215	165	115	65	15	0	0
$1,000	275	225	175	125	75	25	0	0
$1,100	285	235	185	135	85	35	0	0
$1,200	295	245	195	145	95	45	0	0
$1,300	305	255	205	155	105	55	$5	0
$1,400	315	265	215	165	115	65	15	0
$1,500	325	275	225	175	125	75	25	0

[From the Washington Star, Nov. 14, 1963]

Aiding College Students' Parents—Rising Sentiment for Tax Relief Plan Encourages Sponsors Led by Ribicoff

(By Charles Bartlett)

Not rich enough to be important to the Republicans or numerous enough to count heavily with the Democrats, the middle class is sometimes overlooked by Congress. But a gesture in that direction is developing with the momentum for a proposal to give tax relief to the parents of college students.

The accumulation of sentiment for this concession has encouraged an optimism among its sponsors that it may be inserted, over the opposition of the administration, in the new tax law.

The key figure is Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, who was unable to sell the proposal to the White House when he was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare but is propounding it now from the vantage point of his seat on the Senate Finance Committee. Some 21 Senators, ranging from BARRY GOLDWATER to KENNETH KEATING to HUBERT HUMPHREY, have similar aims, and Senator RIBICOFF is working to coordinate their support.

If the proposal is accepted by the Senate, it should fare well in the Senate-House conference on the tax bill because 101 Congressmen, including 9 members of the House Ways and Means Committee, have indorsed similar legislation. Its prospects will not be impaired by the fact that the Nation is nearing a time when 7 million students will be enrolled in colleges and universities.

The administration's opposition to this specialized tax relief has many roots. The Treasury dislikes it because it will cost between $400 and $600 million in revenue dollars, a loss that cannot comfortably be added to the loss of $11 billion contemplated in the general tax reduction. The tax purists do not like it because it is a step away from their objective of pruning the gimmicks out of the tax laws.

The education groups are opposed because they fear that its enactment will shatter their hopes of securing a Federal program of undergraduate scholarships to match the present program of Federal loans. Scholarships seem more desirable than tax relief to many because they will facilitate the studies of deserving students while tax relief will shed its benefits equally upon the promising and the unpromising.

The more liberal advocates of the tax concession do not advance it as an alternative to other means of assisting higher education but as a means of relief for parents squeezed by the high cost, as much as $3,000 a year, of sending a child to college. They argue that such relief is consistent with the present philosophy of the tax laws, which grant deductions for each child and for special burdens arising from illness and other adversities of nature.

Most of the present Federal loans and private scholarships are awarded to students from families in the low and lower middle income groups, and the tax proposal is frankly tailored to reach higher in the economic spectrum. The bill that Senator RIBICOFF is circulating would make the maximum benefit, a $325 tax credit, available to parents with incomes as high as $20,000. The benefits scale off at this point—a $40,000 income would allow a maximum of $175 and a $60,000 income would secure no relief.

Basic college costs—for tuition, books, fees, and supplies—vary enormously between private and public institutions. The figure for the University of Chicago, for example, is $1,548, against $271 for UCLA. But Senator RIBICOFF is proposing, to avoid discrimination, to give a $225 credit to the first $500 in expenditures and only an additional $100 for the next $1,000.

By making his relief a tax credit instead of a deduction, by emphasizing the first $500 in costs, and by tapering off the benefits to the higher incomes, Senator RIBICOFF has tried to meet objections that his bill would favor the rich.

But he still must persuade the Senate that his $325 tax credit will significantly relieve the burdens upon parents who can afford to send their child to college or significantly affect the decisions of those who are uncertain. The proposal will hang upon the question of whether its individual equities will compensate its total cost.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I commend the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] for his leadership in advancing this important amendment, and I am most pleased to join with him as a cosponsor.

This vital question of using the income tax structure to provide needed relief to those who bear the heavy expenses of getting an education nowadays has received my attention for many years. In both the 87th and now, the 88th, Congresses, I introduced separate bills for according relief through the device of a new itemized deduction, similar to existing deductions which, in my judgment, serve far less lofty goals than developing the full educational potential of the Nation's youth. Of course, I have not been alone in presenting such proposals. As every Senator is aware, there has been for years a plethora of bills, in the Senate and also in the other body, many of them markedly similar to one another in both form and objectives, for tax relief to students and parents of students.

Until now, I think it is fair to say that these separate efforts, working in a common direction, have not had success principally for two reasons—First, because of the strong and persistent opposition of the Treasury Department, and, with respect to certain proposals, other executive Departments; and secondly, because with Senators and House Members going their separate ways on differing bills, there has been little unified and concerted effort to pool these bills, compose the differences in form and approach, and work out a common denominator amendment acceptable to all who have taken an interest in the problem.

I am, therefore, heartened by the fact that the amendment which is being offered today by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] has attracted the support of 12 cosponsors—or, at least it was 12 at last report—and, of course, we are very hopeful of gaining additional support as work on the tax bill makes further progress.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The Senator from New York has played a very vital role in the consideration and formulation of this proposal to amend the tax measure. He has been one of the pioneers in this approach. It was the feeling of many of us that we would further the interest of such a program if we could get together to work toward a common goal, which we have done, as reflected in the proposed amendment today. I commend the distinguished Senator from New York for his leadership, and his valuable contribution to the amendment as it is drafted today.

Mr. KEATING. I am grateful to the Senator. We have worked together. He, as a member of the Finance Committee, is in a key position to advance this proposal, and I know he will pursue it with his characteristic vigor.

With the amendment lying at the desk, it is hoped there will be additional support and that its cosponsorship will increase. I am confident it will, as work on the measure progresses.

Let me say for the RECORD that the presentation of this amendment has followed only upon a most careful and fruitful conference among interested Senators to exchange their ideas and arrive at a mutually agreeable solution, and while probably no one of us considers the amendment that has been worked out to be the perfect or ideal solution from his own viewpoint, it is nevertheless a workable solution which I believe has every chance of finally being enacted. I for one pledge my full and enthusiastic support.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] has diligently discussed the main provisions of this amendment, and I would like to add only a few brief observations. There are two respects in which I believe this amendment improves greatly upon previous proposals. First, the sliding-scale credit will be available to a taxpayer whether the expenses incurred are for himself or for any other individual. I have noted reports in the press which have inaccurately characterized this and other similar proposals as providing tax relief to "parents of college students," and have received a number of letters from New Yorkers who are supporting themselves while attending, for example, graduate schools and who have criticized the unfairness of letting parents take a deduction or credit for paying their children's way through college but denying the same treatment to self-supporting students.

Let me make it perfectly clear right now that the sliding-scale credit of this amendment—and, for that matter, the deduction provided for in my own previous bills—will be available to anyone who picks up the tab for higher educational expenses, whether it be his own, his children's, or, under the precise language of this amendment, "any other individual." This means that if Uncle John wants to help his nephew through State university, Uncle John gets a credit under this amendment, the exact amount to depend on Uncle John's income, subject, of course, to being prorated if others in the family are also trying to help the nephew out. On the other hand, if Uncle John, a college graduate, decides to go back to State university himself for a Ph. D., Uncle John can get a credit on his own account.

In my judgment, this is an extremely meritorious provision which will encourage investment in higher education; and from the Nation's standpoint, from the standpoint of upgrading the educational background of our citizens and developing their full potential, it could not matter less who is footing the bill for whom. The point is, the investment is being made, someone is paying for it, and the tax treatment we are proposing will lessen the burden and thereby promote the investment in the first place.

Secondly, while a majority of previous proposals have been limited to tuition and enrollment fees only, this amendment would extend also to fees, books, supplies, and equipment which are required for courses in instruction in higher education. It is common knowledge, for example, that at the college and university level, science courses require the payment of heavy laboratory fees over and above the regular tuition payments for the courses themselves. These fees are usually intended to cover the cost of providing consumable supplies and equipment used by the student. They are as much an integral part of science studies as classroom course lectures, and for that reason there is no logic in not covering these expenses in the same way as the basic tuition will be covered.

Likewise, as everyone knows, textbooks and other required literature for course work do not come cheap. Some students, depending on their courses of study, may run an annual book expense of several hundred dollars. This amendment will permit the required book expense to be taken into account when calculating the credit, and it will authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to make regulations which would presumably see to it that only bona fide purchases for prescribed books will be allowed.

On the other hand, Mr. President, this amendment falls short in one major respect of what I would consider an ideal bill. Only the expenses of higher education are covered, entirely omitting the expenses paid to educational institutions at the 12th grade and lower. My own bill this year—S. 1236—included tax relief for just these expenses, and it is a source of regret to me that primary and secondary school education is not being given what I feel is it's due in this amendment.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I share the Senator's concern, because I too have introduced a bill providing tax relief for the expenses of private elementary and secondary education. I believe such a provision should be a part of any overall program of Federal aid to education at the elementary and secondary level. I expect to stay with the issue to which the Senator refers during the coming years. I would hope that if there should be a general aid-to-education bill, this type of measure would find support in the Senate.

However, we are now trying to deal with the field of higher education and I believe the proposal for tax relief in this field should stand on its own merit.

The Senator from New York can be assured, however, that tax relief for parents of students in private primary and secondary schools will be given consideration as a separate issue, and that we will stay with that issue.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut and the assurance that he will work with me and others who are interested in trying to effect something along these lines in the future. I believe that such an amendment has merit. It would be an amendment to include expenses to which parents are put in sending their children to schools below college level.

For reasons I previously stated, the thrust of our efforts was to reach agreement on an amendment which many Senators could join irrespective of the provisions of separate bills which had been introduced earlier, and I could not in good conscience jeopardize such efforts by insisting upon the inclusion of provisions which are considered controversial by some and bound to lose adherents for an otherwise worthy and acceptable amendment.

Again, Mr. President, let me say that I join in this amendment wholeheartedly with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff]. I completely share the intention to press for its approval by our Committee on Finance as part of the pending tax revision bill, and, if that effort should fail, for its adoption as part of the same bill when it reaches the Senate floor. Too long has effective relief for educational expenses been neglected in our tax laws, and in my judgment, now more than ever is the right time to act.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I am glad to yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The concept of a sliding scale was taken from a bill previously proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey] and one proposed by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], though Senator Goldwater is not a cosponsor of this amendment. Therefore it is apparent that that type of measure can gain widespread support, since Senators from different parts of the Nation and Senators of different philosophies have indicated support for this approach.

Mr. KEATING. I am glad to hear the Senator say that. Perhaps the bill could properly be called the Ribicoff-Keating-Humphrey-Goldwater bill. Having said that, I should say that it ought to have widespread support in the Senate, if four Senators of different philosophies have stated their adherence to the sliding scale principle. We can, therefore, look forward to big things for this amendment.

I close as I began, by complimenting the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I thank the Senator from New York.

ARMED SERVICES CHESS TOURNAMENT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the American Chess Foundation in cooperation with USO groups throughout the country is again sponsoring championship chess matches for servicemen throughout the United States. Preliminary plans have now been drawn up for the 1964 competition to be held in Washington, November 7 to 14, 1964.

The enterprise and initiative of the American Chess Foundation and the USO in promoting this annual event deserves the full support and commendation of all those who are acquainted with this tournament. The United Service Organizations, Inc., better known as USO, has served American servicemen in war and peace through the years. Cooperating with its member agencies—the YMCA, the National Catholic Community Service, the National Jewish Welfare Board, the Young Women's Christian Association, the Salvation Army, and the National Travelers Aid Association—the USO's derive their support primarily from the voluntary contributions of the American people.

The American Chess Foundation is a nonprofit educational organization with headquarters in New York City. Chess is a stimulating as well as highly entertaining form of recreation activity and I think we can all take pride in the high level of performance exhibited in the tournament.

The results of the 1963 competition have recently been announced. Top honors this year went to an Air Force Chess team and to several individual Air Force players.

Mr. President, I certainly wish the American Chess Foundation and the USO, as well as competing members of the services, good luck and a fine tournament in the coming year. I ask unanimous consent to have printed following my remarks in the Record excerpts from a recent announcement of the 1963 winners.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Chess in the Armed Forces—Air Force Wins 1963 Championship

An Air Force chess team, selected in a tournament at Wright-Patterson AFB 6 weeks ago, demonstrated the value of such preliminaries by compiling the three top scores in the fourth annual Armed Forces chess championship tournament at the Lafayette Square USO Club in Washington, D.C., October 12–19, 1963.

Chief M. Sgt. Irvin J. Lyon of Keesler AFB, Miss., became the new chess champion of the Armed Forces with a 7½-point total for the nine rounds of play under the Swiss system. His victory brought the Thomas Emery Championship Trophy back to the Air Force, which last held it in 1961. The Army has had it since the 1962 tournament.

The championship was in doubt through the last round. The new champion had to clinch his claim to the title by taking the final match from Marine Gunnery Sgt. Walter W. Clark of the USMC Reserve Training Center, Philadelphia, and the final standings in which Airman Robert E. Bailey of Tyndall AFB, Fla., was second with 6½ points and 2d Lt. Peter H. Gould of Lackland AFB, Tex., was third with 6 points, were not determined until the last round. Bailey took a draw with Comdr. Eugene Sobczyk of Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Wash., and Gould turned back Specialist Laszlo Incze, of Fort Richardson, Alaska.

The Coast Guard, in the annual competition for the first time, took fourth place honors. Stewardsman Zacarias S. Chavez of the cutter *Nemesis* out of St. Petersburg, Fla., was given an edge over Clark in the final ratings. Each had 5½ points.

Others in the 16-man tournament were finally rated as follows:

6. Pvt. Gerald R. Ronning, Fort Lewis, Wash., 5.

7. Airman Richard C. Moran, Sioux City Air Force Station, Iowa, 5.

8. Private Melvyn Feuerman, Army Proving Ground, Dugway, Utah, 4½.

9. Comdr. Eugene Sobczyk, Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, 4½.

10. WO John M. Yates, Army Electronic Proving Fround, Fort Huachuca, Ariz., 3½.

11. Pvt. Peyton D. Philley, Fort Shafter, Hawaii, 3½.

12. Lt. (jg.) Gail S. Kujawa, TacCon 13, San Francisco, 3½.

13. Sp. Laszlo Incze, Fort Richardson, Alaska, 3½.

14. Airman Vernon O. Bragg, Elmendorf AFB, Alaska, 3½.

15. Aerographer's Mate Edgar G. Atkinson, Jr., Naval Air Station, Norfolk, 3.

16. Capt. H. Leonard Jones, Jr., Naval Hospital, Philadelphia, 1½.

At the American Chess Foundation awards dinner in the Sheraton-Carlton Hotel, October 19, the Thomas Emery championship trophy was presented to Brig. Gen. Henry C. Huglin, Air Force member of the honorary committee for the chess program, and silver cups were given to Lyons, Bailey and Gould, by Foundation President Walter J. Fried, of New York.

An award for most brilliantly played game was presented to Stewardsman Chavez by the tournament director, Everett M. Raffel. Gunnery Sergeant Clark was recognized for the most improved play compared with his showing in last year's matches, and Private Ronning received a special award for outscoring his Army teammates.

Chavez, Clark, and Sobczyk also received special awards from Navy Times Editor John Slinkman, and all 16 finalists were given the new Thomas Emery silver medallion for superior skill and outstanding sportsmanship.

The annual chess competition is sponsored by the American Chess Foundation and is conducted with the cooperation of the Department of Defense, U.S. Chess Federation, United Service Organizations (USO), and the education and recreation authorities of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. The foundation is a nonprofit educational organization with office at 1372 Broadway, New York City.

TEMPORARY INCREASE IN PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8969) to provide, for the period ending June 30, 1964, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the pending bill—H.R. 8969—would authorize increasing the Federal debt by $6 billion in the coming 7 months. The present statutory limit on the debt is $309 billion. The bill before the Senate would raise the limit to $315 billion through June 29, 1964.

I voted against this bill in the Finance Committee yesterday. I shall vote against its passage today. It is in view of my opposition to the bill that, as chairman, of the committee, I have asked the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] to manage the bill on the floor.

I am voting against the bill as an indication of my opposition to the new and dangerous fiscal policy now being undertaken by the administration. The policy calls for Federal tax reduction and increased Federal expenditures at the same time, with planned deficits throughout the foreseeable future.

Tremendous increases in the Federal debt are obviously the keystone on which this fiscal adventure must depend. This bill to borrow money at the rate of nearly $1 billion a month through next June is the first of a new series of debt increases which admittedly will continue for a minimum of 3 years.

Both the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Budget have testified that the deficits planned under their policy for tax-reduction-and-expenditure-increase will run to $9 billion this year, nearly $9 billion next year, and still more billions in the third year.

The Secretary of the Treasury said there might be still another deficit in the fourth year. Dr. Arthur Burns, former chief of White House Economic Advisers, has raised the question as to whether deficits under this plan might run until fiscal year 1972.

But for the first 3 years of which Secretary Douglas Dillon and Budget Director Kermit Gordon were certain, the cumulative deficits would total upwards of $25 billion. This would run the Federal debt to some $330 billion.

This bill to raise the debt limit contemplates enactment of a tax bill with first-year corporate and individual tax reductions effective from January 1, 1964. The $6 billion to be borrowed under the pending bill would be used to meet the deficit created by both tax reduction and expenditure increase between now and the end of June.

The Government's witnesses have testified that in this period it would be necessary to borrow $1.8 billion to cover the revenue loss from tax reduction, and that the remainder would be necessary to meet increased expenditures.

The proposed tax reductions total $11 billion over a 2-year period, and there is unanimous agreement among Dr. Walter W. Heller, present chief of the Economic Advisers to the President, Budget Director Gordon, and Treasury Secretary Dillon that Federal expenditures should rise in terms of billions a year.

The expenditures have been rising on an average of more than $5 billion a year for the past 3 years. Expenditures this year will approach $98 billion. The Government's witnesses would not predict how much the increase for next fiscal year, beginning July 1, will be, but there was no doubt that increased expenditures were planned and expected.

Appearing before the Finance Committee, on either the tax bill or this debt limit bill, these Government witnesses have been read the preamble to the tax bill relative to Federal expenditures, as adopted by the House of Representatives, and asked how they would construe it.

The preamble reads:

> It is the sense of Congress that the tax reduction provided by this Act through stimulation of the economy, will, after a brief transitional period, raise (rather than lower) revenues and that such revenue increases should first be used to eliminate deficits in the administrative budgets and then to reduce the public debt. To further the objective of obtaining balanced budgets in the near future, Congress by this action recognizes the importance of taking all reasonable means to restrain Government spending and urges the President to declare his accord with this objective.

I think it is fair to report that the reaction of Secretary Dillon, Mr. Gordon, and Dr. Heller to this preamble was that they would construe the language to mean that they reduce the increases, not cut expenditures.

On the contrary, witness after witness before the Finance Committee on the tax bill has testified in favor of reducing Federal expenditures, or at least holding them to present levels. This was the position of the Businessmen's Committee organized to favor the tax reduction on this basis.

The Washington Post, in an editorial of November 19, 1963, said in part:

> In his zeal to gain support for the tax bill, Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon has made statements which are being broadly construed as invitations to make deep cuts in appropriations.

But then the Post editorial pointed out that Chairman Walter Heller of the Council of Economic Advisers "set the issue straight, when he told the Senate Finance Committee that, while he favors prudence, he is opposed to reductions in Government expenditures."

The Post concluded with its own view to the effect that "other administration officials would be well advised to emulate Dr. Heller's candor and fight this issue through."

Frankly, there is no official disposition among Government spokesmen on this bill, or the tax bill, for reduction in Government expenditures. Careful examination of their language invariably reveals that they speak of controlling increases.

And in view of the testimony I have heard in connection with this bill to authorize more debt, and with the tax bill, it is my intention to watch the President's budget in January closely, and to read the fine print.

If there were any intention constructively to reduce expenditures or to hold increases down, the necessity for this bill could be avoided. Beyond this, it would be contrary to the new fiscal policy of reducing taxes and increasing expenditures at the same time, and paying for both from the proceeds of increasing the debt.

The policy is based on the theory that reducing taxes, increasing expenditures, and going deeper into debt will raise the gross national product high enough some day to produce enough revenue to balance the budget.

This usually is expressed in terms of "stimulating the economy." How much the economy will be stimulated by the proposed tax reduction is questionable. As it is proposed, the tax reduction per taxpayer would average $110 a year, or about $2 a week.

We are dealing here with the fiscal integrity of the United States. Lurking in the background of continually rising debt is always the threat of inflation. These are vital to our well-being. I shall not gamble with them.

Moreover, it seems to me that to adopt this policy of increasing the debt as long as anyone can predict to finance rising Federal expenditures and reduction in taxes at the same time, in the hope of more revenue, is a dangerous gamble.

Such a proposition is new and untried. No administration in the history of the Nation, until now, has ever proposed that we should borrow money to pay for the planned combination of cutting taxes and increasing expenditures simultaneously.

The situation has been bad enough, just meeting the increased expenditures. This is the fifth request in the past 25 months—since June 1961—to raise the statutory debt limit. And since that time the actual debt under the limit has been increased by some $18 billion.

Now—with the Federal debt standing at more than $307 billion—it is proposed that we should start raising the debt at the rate of $850 million a month to cover both a tax cut and increased spending.

There is one basic reason for Federal taxes. That reason is to meet Federal expenditures. Federal taxes are too high. They are too high only because Federal expenditures are too high. No one wants them reduced more than I do. But I know the bills have to be paid—and that includes debt. We are piling up debt for future generations to pay.

If nonessential expenditures were reduced, there would be no question about tax reduction. But I cannot vote to increase the debt to pay for tax reduction without expenditure reduction.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. To what extent is it necessary to increase the debt limit in anticipation of the passage of the tax bill?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. To the extent of $1.8 billion.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, in anticipation of a tax cut——

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Yes, although it has not yet been passed.

Mr. ELLENDER. It has not yet been passed; but in anticipation of a tax cut, which doubtless will reduce our revenues, it is now proposed to increase the debt limit to the extent of aproximately $1.8 billion?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, first, let me state what a great privilege I consider it to be to serve on the Finance Committee under the chairmanship of the distinguished and able senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. It has been my happy privilege to have known him personally for many years, even prior to the time when I came to the U.S. Senate; and during these many years I have learned to have for him the highest respect and the greatest admiration and deep affection. He is an outstanding chairman. Certainly he is fair and objective. He has taken a firm view in regard to fiscal responsibility in the Government, and has maintained that position, so far as I know, throughout the time he has been either chairman or a member of the Finance Committee. For that, I am certain that every member of the committee honors him. Certainly I do.

Mr. President, in pursuance of the task he has assigned to me as one of those who are in favor of extension of the debt limit ceiling, I wish to inform the Senate that I am hopeful that it will pass the bill which, by majority vote, has been reported to the Senate from the Finance Committee.

As everyone knows, the permanent debt ceiling is set at $285 billion and it has been at that level since the fiscal year 1960.

Since the establishment of the latest permanent debt limit in 1960, it has been necessary on several occasions to provide additional temporary allowances over and above the permanent ceiling. The debt limit has been changed six times between 1954 and 1960; it was changed annually in 1960 and 1961; last year we changed it twice; and this year we have changed it three times, taking into account the action provided by this bill. So the course now proposed does not represent a radical departure from the practice we have followed for the past several years.

In 1960, Congress set the permanent debt limit at $285 billion. At the same time it established the present permanent ceiling, at the insistence of the then Secretary of the Treasury, the very distinguished Robert H. Anderson, Congress raised the debt ceiling, on a temporary basis, to $295 billion. In the following year, 1961, the temporary debt ceiling was decreased to $293 billion.

In the following year, 1962, the ceiling was raised twice, first by $13 billion to $298 billion. Then the second time, it was raised by an additional $2 billion, to a level of $300 billion.

For the fiscal year 1963 we increased the debt limit to three different levels in two different actions. For the first part of the year through March 31, it was increased to $308 billion; for the period from April 1 through May 28, it was set at $305 billion; and then for the period from May 29 through June 30, it was raised to $307 billion.

For the fiscal year 1964, we have already dealt with the debt limit twice; and this is the third time. On the two previous occasions we set the debt limit, first, for the months of July and August at $309 billion; and in the second action we continued the same $309 billion level through November 30 of this year.

Under the present action, we seek to provide a debt limit for the rest of the fiscal year 1964—that is, through June 30, 1964.

The pending bill provides for an extension of the $309 billion ceiling for the remainder of the fiscal year, and at the same time provides an additional $6 billion leeway through June 29, to provide for variations in receipts and expenditure levels during this period of time.

Although your committee believed that the present temporary debt limitation of $309 billion was adequate for the end of the fiscal year 1964, it is obvious that for the interval between November and the end of June, a higher debt limitation must be provided. A higher debt limitation during this interval is required because of differences in the seasonal patterns of the collection of receipts and the payment of bills owed by the Government.

Table 5 in the Senate committee report, which shows the variations, by months, in the cumulative excess of expenditures over receipts, demonstrates this need. This table presents on a monthly basis the actual cumulative excess of expenditures over receipts for the fiscal year 1963 and either the actual or the estimated figures for the fiscal year 1964.

It should be noted, in table 5, that although the fiscal year 1963 ended with a deficit of $6.2 billion, nevertheless, at the end of January 1963, and also at the end of May 1963, the deficit was $4.5 billion above this level.

This demonstrates how this deficit can and does fluctuate—within the year in question—by reason of variations in the excess of expenditures over receipts.

Similarly, this table shows that the deficit as of the end of May 1964, is expected to be $3.8 billion above the deficit at the end of June, or the deficit for the entire fiscal year 1964. The excess of expenditures over receipts for the fiscal year 1964 actually is expected to reach its peak, not at the end of May, but, rather, in the middle of June 1964, just before the large quarterly corporate and individual tax payments are received by the Treasury. At that time the excess of expenditures over receipts is expected to be more than $6 billion higher than the deficit estimated for the end of the fiscal year 1964.

A majority of the committee believes that this clearly shows the need for the $6 billion leeway to cover seasonal fluctuations in receipts and expenditures. But, encouragingly enough, it also indicates that such an amount is not required at the end of the fiscal year. This is why we are asking that the debt ceiling be raised until June 29 of 1964, one day short of the end of the fiscal year. The $6 billion provides the Treasury Department with essential leeway which it has to have in order to be able to responsibly manage the Government's debt.

In any case, under existing law, the debt ceiling as of November 30 reverts to the permanent ceiling of $285 billion. This would occur on the very day when the debt outstanding is expected to be $308.8 billion, unless Congress takes action to pass the pending measure.

Clearly this would be an intolerable situation from the standpoint of our debt management, and one which we, as responsible representatives of the people cannot permit to happen.

If Congress should fail to pass the pending measure and if the debt limitation were allowed to revert to $285 billion, all types of fiscal subterfuges would, of necessity, have to be followed, in order to meet the requirements of what would then be the law. Let me list some of them.

First. We could decrease the volume of Treasury bills outstanding, by rolling over fewer of these bills as they come up for refunding. This would have the effect of decreasing the short-term interest rate. This, in turn, would mean that funds for short-term investment would flow abroad, in order to obtain the higher interest rates available there. This certainly would have an adverse effect upon our balance of payments.

Second. We could invest trust fund receipts in issues already available in the market, rather than in new special nonmarketable obligations which is the usual procedure. This would seriously disrupt the bond market since these purchases would be concentrated in long-term securities in order to obtain the interest rates necessary for the trust funds.

Third. We could delay the investment of trust fund receipts. This would be a highly questionable practice since it forces the Secretary of the Treasury in effect to choose between his trusteeship of the trust funds and his more general stewardship of the financial affairs of the entire Government. In any event, this would deprive the trust funds of the interest income which they now receive and it would be necessary subsequently from the general funds, by appropriations, to make up this loss of the trust funds. These trust funds include social security, highway trust fund, civil service trust fund, railroad retirement, and others.

Fourth. Another expedient would be to draw down the cash balance in the Treasury to a very low level, concentrating this balance in deposits in a few large banks rather than spreading it among 11,578 commercial banks throughout the country. This could be expected to have a serious impact on the supply of credit in the areas in the country from which the accounts are withdrawn.

Fifth. We could have some of the Government corporations, such as FNMA, borrow directly from the public rather than through the Treasury, and thus with respect to a portion of the debt escape the statutory limitation. Borrowing in this manner is more expensive than borrowing in the usual manner and therefore in the long run would cost taxpayers more. Moreover, it is in the nature of back-door financing.

Sixth. If we were right up against the debt limitation, it would also be necessary to terminate payroll deductions for savings bonds. This certainly would be used only as a last resort since once these deductions are terminated, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to get them going again in the same volume later on.

Seventh. We could delay the payment of contracts, Government salaries, or grants to States, and so forth. In other words we could just not pay our bills. This, of course, would represent a hardship to all of those involved and also seriously injure the confidence in the U.S. Government.

Eighth. If the debt ceiling reverts to the $285 billion level which it will on December 1 if this bill is not enacted, it would be necessary actually to retire trust fund obligations probably to the extent of $20 billion or more. This would mean the loss of interest on these trust funds and place the present trusteeship arrangement under a cloud. Moreover, the interest lost to the trust funds as a result of such an action surely would have to be made up for out of general funds at a subsequent date.

Congress has pursued this course of considering the debt limitation three times this year instead of once, because of the fact that when the limit was considered previously, hardly any of the appropriation bills had been acted upon. There was the added fact that consideration is being given to a tax reduction and reform proposal and when the debt limit was previously considered, this tax measure had not as yet been considered even by the House.

The uncertainties which existed on two prior occasions that the debt limitation was considered made it practically impossible at those times to provide a debt ceiling which was meaningful for the entire fiscal year of 1964.

Today many of these same uncertainties exist, although the picture has improved to a marked degree.

In many respects we now have more information as to the probable level of receipts and expenditures in the fiscal year 1964 than is generally true when a debt ceiling is established.

Six of the twelve major appropriations bills have already been passed by both Houses of Congress; three of the remaining six have been passed by the House.

Probably more important, however, is the fact that 4 months of fiscal year 1964 have already elapsed. In view of this, it is possible to make better revenue estimates for the current fiscal year than is usually the case. Receipts in the fiscal year are largely based on corporate profits for the calendar year 1963, which is already more than five-sixths over.

In addition, receipts for the current fiscal year depend on the level of personal income in the fiscal year 1964 and here we have had 4 months of actual experience.

On the expenditure side, the fact that 4 months of fiscal year have already elapsed also gives us greater knowledge about the expenditure level than is frequently true when debt ceilings are established.

In the Finance Committee yesterday a motion was made to reduce this temporary debt ceiling from the $315 billion to $313.4 billion, or a reduction of $1.6 billion. This was defeated on a close vote of nine to eight.

The argument in favor of the decrease was ably made by the Senator from Delaware and others, for it was based on the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury when he appeared before the committee last Monday in support of the $315 billion debt ceiling, when he said, and I quote:

> Our current estimates of fiscal year receipts take into account the impact of the tax program passed by the House of Representatives in September and now being considered by your committee.
>
> We estimate that this program, with the rate reduction becoming effective on January 1 of next year, would entail a net revenue loss of $1.8 billion during fiscal 1964 after allowing for the stimulus to the economy and the larger base taxable incomes that would result.

At a later point in his testimony he said, and I quote:

> I should point out that the tax program, because it affects revenues only with a lag, has very little bearing on the amount of our cash needs through mid-March when borrowing needs are seasonally high.
>
> It would add approximately $1.6 billion to our needs by June 15 when the debt will reach its peak for the year. The primary effect of the tax bill on fiscal year 1964 revenues would come through the proposed reduction in withholding rates.

It was on the basis that the Senate was not going to pass a tax bill this year that the amendment was offered to reduce the amount of the debt ceiling. It was argued that even if a tax bill were passed that we would not need a debt ceiling as high as $315 billion, but that it could properly be reduced by $1.6 billion. In addition, the argument was made that if the Senate passed a tax bill prior to the expiration of fiscal 1964 an amendment could be added in the tax bill to increase the debt ceiling to an amount to cover the temporary loss of revenue resulting from the passage of the tax bill.

I was pleased when the majority of the committee rejected these arguments, for if the committee took this action it would be a sharp and startling announcement to the business community of America that the Finance Committee did not believe there would be a tax bill this year or anytime soon—at least that would be the general conclusion.

We know that today corporate profits are high, personal income high, and the economic indicators are all generally very favorable, but it is the opinion of the majority of the members of the Finance Committee that one of the basic reasons for this favorable business climate is the anticipation of a tax cut, and that to in effect write into this debt ceiling legislation an announcement to the effect that we are not going to have a tax cut would have a serious and devastating effect upon the economy of the Nation.

And further, it is entirely conceivable that because our business is based so much on confidence in the future, that if this announcement in effect were made in this debt ceiling legislation, that there would be no tax bill, it could conceivably—in a short space of time—reverse these very favorable trends which we now see, reduce our revenues, and make a further increase in our debt necessary.

No Senator should ever lose sight of the fact that the debt limit is an authority to the Treasury to borrow money to finance the expenditures authorized by the Congress to the extent that those authorizations exceed budget receipts. The debt limit is therefore not an effective means for limiting expenditures. The Government has to meet its obligations where the Congress has previously made the appropriations. We must always remember that except in the area where the Executive is Commander in Chief he has no authority to ignore the injunctions of the Congress and to withhold the use of the moneys appropriated for programs which have been adopted. In effect, to say that the President has the power to withhold funds which have been appropriated would give him an item veto of appropriations of the Congress, which up to this point we have never seen fit to give him, and which I do not think we should give him.

For all these reasons the Finance Committee in its wisdom and, I believe, the Congress in its wisdom should, on the basis of fiscal and financial responsibility alone, overwhelmingly approve the pending bill. In doing so, we will avoid a conference with the House, because it is identical to the measure as passed by the House and avoids fiscal chaos by giving to the Secretary of the Treasury the flexibility needed for responsible management of the Government debt.

THE AMERICAN TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CO.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], who will answer the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], for allowing me to take a few minutes to call to the attention of the Senate one of the most extraordinary demonstrations of what we call people's capitalism in this country, in the recapitalization of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., which was announced in this morning's press

This company, in size and capitalization, is equivalent to the size of some of the largest governments on earth. The capitalization of its stock is today in the area of $35 billion, which is equivalent to the gross national product, for example, of Italy.

One other significant factor is that the company has 2.2 million stockholders. It has almost three times as many stockholders as employees, and of those employees, 730,000, about one-half are stockholders.

These are extremely significant facts, especially today. America holds out the hope and expectation to its working people, and to the working people of the world, that they can get two things which communism cannot give them:

One is ownership.

The other is credit.

The great demonstration of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. lies in the first area; that is, the area of ownership, demonstrating that in our country every worker can have a working participation in the profits of business. So the old ideas of an exploiting, managerial class living off the backs of workers is completely invalidated by the triumph of the people's capitalism in the private enterprise system, such as the A.T. & T. typifies this morning.

In the field of credit, no people on earth enjoy a higher standard of living than do we, largely attributable to consumer credit which is readily available to every American who works for a living. It gives him the benefit of the finest material attributes of life, such as homes, automobiles, and appliances—almost anything he wants.

This is a potent and powerful example for the world, and a strong confirmation to us that we, too, have a system capable of having the most revolutionary impact upon mankind.

It is sometimes thought that our system is general in application, and widely diffused in terms of the parts which make up the whole and their importance to the individual—to his dignity, his future, and his well-being.

Then along comes a development like this one, which demonstrates the size, the power, and the pervasive influence of one great company, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., which demonstrates in a most dramatic way the effectiveness and the power of our system.

One of the great failures of government is a failure to utilize this system fully. For that reason I was particularly gratified when the Senate on November 8 overwhelmingly approved my amendment for an Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in the foreign aid program. We are utilizing the private enterprise system in a most inadequate way in respect to foreign and domestic policies of the United States. Particularly in regard to foreign aid, we need to undertake a great shift of the program onto the private enterprise system.

The kind of development typified by American Telephone & Telegraph Co.'s action yesterday confirms the vast resources and success in the utilization of these resources which inheres in our system.

This action, which may soon be forgotten, represents one of the greatest validations, in terms of the so-called common man—the man on the street, the man who works for a living at a modest salary—of the power and effect of this system, greater than anything I have seen demonstrated in years.

The time has come for all of us to reaffirm in our minds that the greatest potential for the economic betterment of our own people as well as the peoples of the developing world lies in creating the maximum opportunities for the individual. It is incumbent on Government to create the necessary climate for fullest development of the strengths of the free enterprise system in the best interests of our people and Nation.

It is particularly significant to American workers and American legislators that this company has had a real triumph, signalized by this news today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that various news items with relation to this subject may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 21, 1963]

A.T. & T. To Split Stock and Raise Its Dividend to $1—Directors Lift Annual Rate 40 Cents and Plan Offering of New Shares to Holders—News Enlivens Market—New Capital To Be Used for $3.25 Billion Expansion of Phone System

(By Gene Smith)

The American Telephone & Telegraph Co. announced yesterday that it would split its stock 2 for 1 next June.

The company also announced a 10-cent increase in its quarterly dividend, which had been 90 cents a share, and said that it would make a rights offering next March of 1 share for each 20 shares now held.

American Telephone, the world's largest corporate entity, had assets of $26.7 billion at the end of 1962. It has 2,225,000 stockholders.

The company linked the stock split, dividend increase and rights offering—all designed to attract more stockholders—to its need for large amounts of capital.

BIG EXPANSION PLAN

The company said it would spend $3.25 billion in 1964 to expand and improve its nationwide telephone system. This would be the largest construction program in the company's history.

The effect on the stock market was as dramatic as the jarring ring of a telephone in a quiet room. What had been a lethargic market burst into hectic trading when the news was announced at 12:30 p.m. The New York Stock Exchange's high-speed tickers fell behind the pace and sales were reported on an abbreviated basis.

"T"—the symbol for A.T. & T.'s stock—quickly rose to 137½ and then backed off to about 137¼. Around 2:30, "T" again came to life near the historic high of 139⅞. Once this was finally reached, a string of 4,800 shares raised it to 140, the record high for the world's most widely held issue.

STOCK RISES SHARPLY

It closed at 139⅝, up 7⅝ on the day. A total of 367,700 shares of A.T. & T. stock changed hands yesterday. Based on the 244,665,914 shares outstanding as of November 15, this meant a rise in the market value of $1,865,577,000 for the day.

The offering of additional stock will entitle the shareholders to buy about 12.25 million shares of "T" on the basis of 1 new share for each 20 shares held on the record date, February 18, 1964.

Rights to purchase these shares will be mailed early in March, and the subscription period will expire next April. The purchase price, to be determined by the board shortly before the offering, is expected to be somewhat below the market price at that time.

The proposal to split the stock will be submitted to stockholders at the annual meeting on April 15, 1964, and the additional shares will be distributed late in June, 1964.

DIVIDEND UP 40 CENTS A YEAR

After the split, the new dividend will be at a new quarterly rate of 50 cents a share on the split shares. This would be equivalent to $4 a share annually on the present shares instead of the $3.60 rate that has prevailed since the July, 1961, payment.

Next year's construction outlays of $3.25 billion will compare with $3.1 billion it will have spent this year. Only General Motors has ever spent more than $1 billion in any single year. A.T. & T. first spent $2 billion in 1956 and has since spent that much and more every year. In 1962 its outlays reached $3 billion.

The A.T. & T. stockholder can learn much from past experience. For instance, on December 31, 1960, the company announced a similar 1-for-20 offering. The record date was February 23, 1961, and subscription rights expired on April 14 of that year. That offering involved 11,191,112 shares, of which 99.9 percent were taken.

The market price in December 1960 was between 94 and 108½. In April, it was in the range of 120¼ and 130. The offering price was set at $86 a share. The $965 million raised at that time made it the largest private financing in American business history.

NEW RECORD EXPECTED

Now, with roughly 20 million more shares outstanding, coupled with the fact that the offering price should be somewhat higher, it is likely that A.T. & T. will have broken yet another corporate record of its own and of all industry.

As for dividends, A.T. & T. set its famous $9-a-share-annual payment rate May 17, 1921.

This remained a fixture of the American business scene until July 10, 1959, when the annual rate was changed to $9.90 a share following a 3-for-1 stock split in April of that year.

Based on the shares following the split, the payment was thus at a quarterly rate of 82½ cents a share. On May 17, 1961, the dividend was raised to 90 cents a share quarterly, or $3.60 a share. It would also be equal to $10.80 a share before the 3-for-1 split in April 1959. Yesterday's action means that the pre-1959 shares would now be receiving dividends at a rate of $12 a share annually.

Some idea of the gargantuan size of the A.T. & T. can be seen in a few comparisons with General Motors and other giants. The company's total assets at the end of 1962 were $26,716 million, nearly triple General Motors $9,147 million. Its stockholder family, now numbering more than 2.2 million, is double that of General Motors and more than the total of the next three companies—General Motors, General Electric, and Standard Oil (New Jersey).

Its stockholder family has increased every year since the end of World War II. There were 695,000 owners of "T" as of December 31, 1946. Ten years later, it had grown to 1,492,000 and at the end of last year there were 2,210,000 shareholders.

Based on yesterday's closing price of $139½, the market value of A.T. & T. common stock was $34,161 million. By comparison, as of October 31, the total common stock value of all public utilities listed on the big board was $86,326 million, and the overall market volume for both domestic and foreign common stocks on the big board was $399.25 billion. Again, for comparison, the total national debt reported yesterday morning by the Treasury Department was $307,735 million.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 21, 1963]

SPENDING MARKS GROWTH OF A.T. & T.—OUTLAYS OF COMPANY SINCE 1946 TOTAL $29 BILLION

The announcement by the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. yesterday that it planned to spend at least $3.25 billion on construction next year dramatizes the fantastic growth of the company in the last few decades.

Since 1946, the world's largest corporate enterprise has expended more than $29 billion for construction purposes, such as new plants and equipment.

Since 1920, the number of telephones in the Bell System, which comprises American Telephone & Telegraph and its principal telephone subsidiaries, have increased from 8 to 76 million in 1962. Of this total, nearly 44 million telephones were added since 1945.

This growth is continuing undiminished this year. Recently, Frederick R. Kappel, chairman of the company, disclosed that in the 3 months ended August 31 it added about 550,000 telephones.

EARNINGS RATE OUTLINED

During the last 21 years, earnings of the company have increased at a rate equivalent to 9¾ percent compounded each year, while net income rose at the rate of almost 13 percent yearly.

Among the top 10 companies in the list of the favorite securities of investment companies ranked by size of dollar investment, A.T. & T. was second in rate of growth in net income over the last 10 years, and third in rate of growth over the last 20 years. Only the net income of International Business Machine Co. grew faster than the Bell System's earnings during both periods.

Keeping pace with this rate of growth was the company's shareholder list and stock outstanding. At the end of 1962, the company had 2,210,671 holders of its common stock, or an increase of 223.2 percent since 1945. As of November 15, 1963, the concern had 244,665,914 shares outstanding, or more than four times as many as at the end of World War II. Over 7 million shares were issued last year, mostly as a result of the employees' stock plan.

The A.T. & T. share owner list more than doubles the stockholder list of such large concerns as General Motors, the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, the General Electric Co., United States Steel, Ford Motor Co., and Bethlehem Steel.

American Telephone & Telegraph stock has long been known as the widows' and orphans' favorite. Most new owners typically start with modest holdings, and in recent years about three-quarters of the new accounts in the issue have been opened with 30 shares or less.

The company's revenues and earnings in the 12 months ended August 31, also have shown continued gains. Operating revenues advanced to $9,343,885,000 from $8,822,666,000 in the preceding 12 months. Net income rose to $1,489,074,000 from $1,410,248,000 a year earlier.

In October the Army disclosed it had awarded the largest single missile contract to Western Electric Co., A.T. & T.'s manufacturing arm. The contract for $213,385,000 is for intended research and development work on the Nike-X antimissile missile.

American Telephone is far more than a telephone wire network and service company. Its Bell Telephone Laboratories, the largest scientific research group in the world, employs about 12,000 scientists, engineers, technicians, and associates. Its research programs encompass not only projects in the communications field, but also in mathematics, physics, chemistry, metallurgy, electronics, and other fields.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 21, 1963]

BULLISH EFFECT SEEN FOR MARKET—PHONE COMPANY STOCK SPLIT IS GREETED WARMLY

(By Alexander R. Hammer)

The small investor as well as leading Wall Street brokerage houses agreed yesterday that the American Telephone and Telegraph stock split would have a bullish effect on the stock market.

In fact, more than one board watcher who was interviewed in brokerage firms around town commented that the split would "inspire other blue chip companies to do the same and move the general market into higher ground for months to come."

A typical comment came from a dress manufacturer who was watching the tape at Springarn, Heine & Co., 530 Seventh Avenue: "Stocks like the Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) and General Motors may now follow the lead of A.T. & T. and split, thus enabling many small investors to buy the shares."

The dress producer, who declined to identify himself, said that A.T. & T. is a major factor in the Nation's economy and whatever it does usually affects the market as a whole. "This definitely is a shot in the arm for the market," he said.

DESCRIBED AS STIMULANT

Sydney Weiss, an officer in a textile processing firm, said the "split will give the market a short-term stimulant and will especially help the communication issues." He said he owned some A.T. & T. stock but didn't plan to buy any more for the time being. Mr. Weiss was interviewed in the offices of Newburger, Loeb & Co., 525 Seventh Avenue.

Officials of brokerage firms were also optimistic over the market's future as a result of the A.T. & T. split. Robert B. Johnson, director of research of Paine, Webber, Jackson & Curtis, said "the action will be bullish for the short-term and its influence should carry well into the coming year."

CONFIDENCE IS AIRED

At Bache & Co., Monte Gordon, director of research, had this to say: "The split highlights the flood of dividend increases which have been coming in the last few weeks and which we expect will continue and also points to the basis for a market recovery."

At the board-room of Sartorius & Co., with offices in the Astor Hotel, Julius Charnow, a real-estate operator, said that the telephone company's action would have a good long-term effect on the market in general. Mr. Charnow added that the split "should encourage investors to stick to true-blue proven securities."

"It's marvelous," commented Warren O'Hara, a theater manager for Leland Heyward, the Broadway producer. He said that he paid $113 for the stock 3 years ago. It closed yesterday at 139⅝. Mr. O'Hara was confident that the market as a whole would benefit because of the split.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 21, 1963]

STOCK SPLITS SET CORPORATE TREND—ACTION USUALLY LEADS TO AN INCREASE IN SHAREHOLDERS

(By Elizabeth M. Fowler)

In these days of catering to stockholders, American corporations have become stock-split conscious.

That was evident yesterday when the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. opened a package of Christmas cheer for its shareholders that included a dividend increase and a two-for-one stock split.

The New York Stock Exchange defines a stock split as a distribution involving 25 percent or more. It calls anything below that level a stock dividend.

They like to increase their shares through splits for several reasons. Generally, more shares at lower prices mean more stockholders. An ample supply of shares helps keep prices stable. Companies also believe that it is human nature for stockholders to favor the products of the companies whose shares they own.

On an idealistic plane, company officials like to say that, in a democracy, the ever-growing army of shareholders is an important bulwark. American shareholders total about 17 million persons, and splits could increase the total.

A stock split does not mean that a shareholder owns more of the company. But it tends to have a psychological effect. A stockholder who owned 100 shares likes the feeling of owning 200, even if the outstanding stock of the company increases, from 1 to 2 million.

Furthermore, he has heard the idea that companies don't usually split their shares unless earnings prospects are bright. Also, an increased dividend often accompanies a stock split.

Much of the experience with stock splits came in 1959 when a record number of companies split their shares, about 20 percent more than in 1962.

THE 1963 TOTAL NOT BIG

This year the number has not been large as the market recovered from the 1962 break. Moody's Investors Service reports that, through November 18, the stock split of the companies whose records it follows totaled only 201, compared with 315 for all of 1962.

Among the more important stock splits, Moody's cites Chrysler, American Sugar, Cleveland Electric, Deere & Co., Singer Manufacturing, all of which split two for one, the most popular ratio.

It cited Lockheed Aircraft's split of four for three; Syntex, three for one, and Colgate Palmolive, five for four.

The bullish effect of stock splits can be seen in the case of Chrysler.

Before its first two-for-one split, in May, a share could have been bought for 73⅜ on December 31, 1962. The same Chrysler shareholder would now hold two shares worth a total of $170 at yesterday's closing price. Furthermore, the dividend rate was kept at 25 cents a share, so he would now receive 50 cents a quarter.

The company has recently decreed another two-for-one split, effective early next year, and again a 25-cent-a-share dividend.

One Wall Streeter who has long advocated more stock splits, Harold Clayton, of Hemphill, Noyes & Co., said the announcement by A.T. & T. could lead to a boom in stock splits for 1964.

He said that in September 1958, several months before A.T. & T. announced a three-for-one split, the stock sold at about 175 and rose. At the peak of the market in December 1961, it sold at 139⅞, the equivalent of 419⅝. Yesterday A.T. & T. closed at 139⅝, or 418⅞ for three shares.

"That amounted to a $17 billion increase in the value of A.T. & T. stockholders' shares," he explained. Other companies hastened to split their shares.

He says that not only will the split announcement encourage many other companies to do the same but that, in 2 or 3 years, "We will see yearly trading on the New York Stock Exchange of 2 billion shares."

So far in 1963 1,015,821,000 shares have changed hands. In 1929 a record of 1,534 million shares were traded.

TEMPORARY INCREASE IN PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8969) to provide, for the period ending June 30, 1964, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in connection with the bill under consideration, the purpose of which is to increase the debt ceiling to $315 billion until next June, I have listened to my good friend the Senator from Florida and the arguments he has made. I have listened with interest to his prediction that a catastrophe will occur if the Senate does not act prior to November 30 and thereby permit the debt ceiling to return to $285 billion.

The Senator emphasized how unrealistic such a suggestion would be and how impossible it would be to obtain that objective. I agree fully with that. No one is suggesting that we permit the debt ceiling to go back to $285 billion. That would, in effect, be a repudiation of $20 billion to $25 billion of our outstanding debt.

The minority leader very ably pointed this out in the Finance Committee when the committee was discussing the bill. I thought he made a rather constructive suggestion—that Congress should face the facts and stop kidding the American people about the ceiling going back to $285 billion at any time in the foreseeable future.

At that time, the minority leader, as a member of the Finance Committee, suggested that we provide a permanent debt ceiling of $300 billion, which at least would be a realistic recognition of the true situation. I have not discussed this with him today, but the minority leader is now in the Chamber. I am sure he still feels the same way about the subject.

In order to prevent such a catastrophe from occurring—as predicted by the Senator from Florida—and so that we can assure the American people that the catastrophe will not occur, would my friend, the Senator from Florida, who is in charge of the bill, be willing to accept an amendment to this bill increasing the permanent debt ceiling from $285 billion to $300 billion? This would put it on a realistic basis so that the American people would not be kidded about what is to be done.

Furthermore, this is directly in line with the arguments by the Senator from Florida in support of the bill.

Before I proceed further with my remarks, I wonder if the Senator from Florida would accept an amendment to carry out that objective.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in response to the able Senator from Delaware, this question was discussed in the Finance Committee. It has been under discussion for some time. I do not have the authority to accept such an amendment, and I would not on this occasion do so here on the floor.

I could not accept an amendment to make the debt ceiling permanent at any figure—$315 billion, or $290 billion, or whatever figure might be suggested by my friend the Senator from Delaware or the able Senator from Illinois.

I agree to a large extent with what the Senator has said. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has at times made the same point.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes. The Senator from New Mexico and I have offered this suggestion on preceding occasions.

Mr. SMATHERS. There should be a time when we can consider the debt ceiling only once a year, whether the ceiling we consider is permanent or temporary. However, it should be clear that a permanent ceiling which does not face realities, such as one of $300 billion, is no better than a temporary ceiling, since we would still have to raise it every year. In addition, there is an advantage in a temporary ceiling in that it gives us an opportunity to review our overall budget and fiscal situation. Frankly, I do not believe the majority of the members of the Finance Committee would wish to proceed by raising the permanent ceiling. Also, if we did so, we would not know what figure to insert for the debt ceiling. Our future debt position is too uncertain.

I agree that it should be above $285 billion. Some Senator suggested it ought to be $300 billion. I believe the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] suggested $300 billion. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] wished to make it $315 billion.

Realistically, we know that the costs of the Government will go up in some respects, and we shall have a deficit next year. A realistic permanent ceiling probably should be set even higher than is now suggested but I do not know how much higher.

I do not believe we have the information to realistically deal with a permanent ceiling at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I thank my friend, the Senator from Florida, for his statement, but I regret that he will not accept the suggestion. It merely demonstrates what I have said before. The reason we are continually faced with these threats of dire catastrophies every 60 days is that the administration and those who support the bill under consideration love to travel every 60 days from crisis to crisis. They thrive on it. They have rejected time and time again an opportunity to put the national debt on a realistic basis.

I have regretted the fact that it is necessary for Congress to consider increasing the debt ceiling to cover the expenditure policies of an administration, especially when that administration has no desire whatever to curtail its spending. Quite the contrary, it boasts of the fact that it can plan deficits and create an ever greater and greater debt.

The mere fact that today the administration rejects an opportunity given by those of us who would like to curtail the spending, to raise the figure of $285 billion to a more realistic basis, completely explodes the argument which was made before that they are so greatly concerned about what might happen. If the administration is concerned about what might happen let us correct this situation so that such a catastrophe can never occur.

The reason we are again today being asked to provide the extension is that the administration rejected and urgently asked the Senate to defeat a proposal which was approved by a majority vote of the Committee on Finance in June, and which would have extended the debt ceiling for a full year. Then it would not be necessary every 60 days to act in the face of an emergency with people saying, "If we do not act today we will invalidate $20 to $30 billion worth of bonds."

I say again that the only explanation I have of this situation is that there is an administration in the White House which is so fiscally irresponsible in the management of the debt that it loves to have these emergencies arise every 60 days to give it something to talk about.

They either ignore or do not realize that they are tinkering with the solvency of our Government.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate the Senator's yielding to me.

The Senator stated, I believe—if he did not, it is fact—that this is the third time this year that we have been faced with a request to increase the debt limit.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is the third time since June.

Mr. CARLSON. It is interesting to glance at the bill. I have made a little analysis of the bill. I shall read sections of it. It reads in part as follows:

> During the period beginning on December 1, 1963, and ending on June 30, 1964, the public debt limit sets forth in the first sentence of section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended—

This is supposed to be a figure of $285 billion, which the Senator from Delaware has mentioned, and which I think we all agree is completely unrealistic. We do not repeal it; it is still a part of the law. The next part of the bill reads:

> shall be temporarily increased to $309,000,000,000.

One would think that would be another temporary debt ceiling. It is, but many persons try to leave the impression that we are going to have a $315 billion debt limit available to deal with. It is referred to as "another temporary increase."

I analyzed the figures, because I found them interesting. We put that temporary amount on top of the permanent amount. Then, as if that does not confuse the people enough, we confuse the people more by stating:

> Because of variations in the timing of revenue receipts, the public debt limit as increased by the preceding sentence is further increased through June 29, 1964, by $6,000,000,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes. This is a temporary increase on a temporary increase of what was a temporary increase on the permanent debt. This is silly. I hope someone can unravel that—I cannot.

Mr. CARLSON. It works out as follows: We would have a $309 billion debt limit until June 30, 1964, but from December 1 to June 29, 1 day before, another $6 billion would be added.

This bill is a measure to increase the borrowing authority of the Government next year to $315 billion. It is not necessarily what we call an increase of the debt limit. We give the Treasury $309 billion. First it is $285 billion. Then it is $309 billion. Then we let them borrow $6 billion temporarily.

We should be honest about this. The Senator from Delaware has said we might make the limit $300 billion and make it somewhat realistic.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator. I would support such a proposal. I see no reason for expending about two pages of printer's ink to confuse the American people about the fact that we are today creating a new peak in the debt limit. We should be a bit more honest. This bill raises the debt limit to $315 billion. Whether it is raised on a temporary increase on a temporary increase on what was a temporary increase basis is only secondary.

I repeat, the reason we are faced with this proposal every 60 days is that the administration rejected a proposal of the Finance Committee that it should be done for a full year. The administration would rather have emergency after emergency, every 60 days. I do not know whether it has a package of speeches written which they want to use or not. Those speeches must be mimeographed—they all sound alike. It is the same argument we received on June 30. It is the same argument we received on September 30. It will be with us again next year. I think they should face the problem and stop fooling around trying to fool the American people.

I want to add one additional suggestion to the list of suggestions that could be used by the administration to control the debt. The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] listed 10. I want to add one more step that could be taken in connection with the public debt, and that is that the administration could stop spending so much until such time as revenues equaled expenditures. That suggestion has not been mentioned here. As I see it, it has not been thought of even as a remote possibility on the part of anyone connected with this administration.

Yet if we examine the record going back to 1933 we find that only six times has our Government lived within its income.

I joined the chairman of the committee in complimenting Mr. Heller for his honesty when he appeared before our committee and frankly admitted that the administration had no intention of reducing spending. Not only that but he said they intended to increase expenditures by $4 to $6 billion each year for the next several years. I disagreed with his reasoning, but I did compliment him for his honesty in acknowledging their spendthrift policies.

Expenditures under this administration as projected for the next year will be $98.4 billion, which is an increase of $21 billion over what was spent in 1960.

I think it is high time to stop and examine the question of how long we can continue building up the deficits.

I have tabulated the deficits for the past 4 years, including the 1964 estimates. In the first 4 years of this administration—and I hope the only 4 years—it has spent $28 billion more than its income. A deficit of $28 billion in 4 years is an average of $7 billion a year. That is $600 million a month. It means that every hour, 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, this administration is going into debt to the extent of nearly $1 million. It is spending approximately $1 million per hour, 365 days a year, over and above its income and is boasting about it.

The former Director of the Budget, Mr. Bell, said, "We planned it that way. We planned these deficits." Yes, apparently they hope to spend more and more.

Moreover, to correct this deficit, salary increases for Government employees are proposed with increases of about 40 or 50 percent for the top executives, who are responsible for the debt. In addition, it is proposed to cut taxes.

This is the first time in the history of this country that an administration has proposed to solve the debt problem by increasing the debt, increasing salaries, and cutting taxes, while at the same time the administration is accelerating spending and operating at a deficit running close to $1 billion a month.

Of this proposed increase in the debt ceiling, $1.8 billion is to raise the ceiling so that the Government can borrow money to finance the proposed tax cut for the first 6 months of next year. This will not finance the tax cut for the full year. The full effect of the tax cut will not take effect until after June 30 of next year. Therefore, if the tax cut bill goes through they will be back in June asking for another increase in the debt ceiling by another $5 to $8 billion to finance the full effect of the proposed tax cut for the remainder of 1964. Yes, they admit they plan to borrow the money in order to make a tax cut.

The administration has no plans to curtail expenditures. Spend—spend—borrow—borrow—and get elected is the motto on the New Frontier. Of course the benefit of a crisis now and then is not ignored. Someone has said that this is the first administration that could move from crisis to crisis without ever having a policy.

The other day I said that it used to be rather popular for a public official, when making a speech on the platform, to say that all he was or ever hoped to be he owed to his mother. We shall have to change that. We shall now hear men going around the country boasting that "all I am enjoying today, or all I ever hope to enjoy I owe to my grandchildren."

It is about time to add a "grandchild" amendment to some of the appropriation bills.

In order that the American people may understand exactly what is being proposed by financing a tax cut on borrowed money I suggested in committee that the request with respect to the debt ceiling be reduced by $1.6 billion.

The figure of $1.6 billion has been accepted by the Director of the Budget and the Secretary of the Treasury as the amount necessary to take care of financing the proposed tax cut for the first 6 months of next year. I suggest that the authorization be reduced by that amount; and if the tax bill were reported and passed we could then add a new section to the tax bill increasing the national debt limit by the amount necessary for the Treasury to have the authority to borrow the money to finance the tax cut. Then when Congress voted on the tax cut the American people would know exactly how it was going to be financed; they would know it would be financed on borrowed money. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Budget rejected that request. They want the money in advance to enable them to borrow the money to finance the tax cut. My suggestion is that when the tax bill is before us we add a new section so that the debt ceiling can be increased by whatever amount is necessary for the Treasury Department to borrow the money to finance the tax cut. In that way the people would find out who Santa Claus was. Then when each taxpayer takes credit for the tax cut he can at the end of the year look at his children and say, "This is your gift to me—you will be paying for this 50 years from now."

To carry out this objective, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 2, it is proposed to strike out the figure "$6,000,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof the figure "$4,400,000,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The purpose of the amendment is to reduce the requested increase in the debt ceiling to the exact amount which both the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Budget agreed would be required without a tax cut bill passing. Then, if and when the tax cut passes we can add a new section to that bill increasing the debt sufficiently to take care of the loss in revenue.

This is a fiscally responsible proposal, and I hope the Senator in charge of the bill will accept the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, when the distinguished Senator from Delaware speaks about grandchildren, he touches a tender spot. I recall being on the platform at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel several years ago, to help raise money for the great party with which I am identified. On that occasion there were three Governors on the platform—one from the State of the Presiding Officer [Mr. RIBICOFF], one from New York, and one from New Jersey. I believe it was the Governor of Connecticut who, in the course of his short speech said:

> Would it not be wonderful if we could have our unborn grandchildren here tonight so that they might see what fun we are having spending the money that they will have to pay back.

Therefore, my good friend from Delaware touches a sensitive nerve when he talks about children, grandchildren, and even unborn grandchildren.

I think of the public debt in terms of a great national escalator. I shall never ride on an escalator again without thinking about the public debt. It has been escalating far beyond my memory.

Back at the turn of the century, when life was sweet and not fast and furious, our debt was $1,200 million. In 10 years it had reached $25 billion. It dropped to $16 billion in 1930. That is about the only descent on the escalator that the debt ever accomplished, because progressively every decade it went up, and by 1943 our debt went over the $100 billion mark.

By 1944 it went above $200 billion. In all candor, one must admit that we had to win a war. But it has continued to go up. In 1950 it reached $257 billion. By progressive stages it now will go to $315 billion.

It is said that this is a temporary ceiling. We started with the temporary ceilings in 1954. Therefore we have had about 10 temporary increases.

I believe the temporary ceiling is going to be like the popular song that Eartha Kitt used to sing some years ago: "Annie Doesn't Live Here Any More." The $285 billion as a permanent ceiling does not live here any more, either; it is going to go indefinitely higher.

If anyone has any doubt about it, I suggest that he listen to a few lines from the gospel. On page 22, as recorded in our hearings, I am shown as addressing a question to the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury. I said:

> Assuming your deficit in 1964, 1965, 1966 in the range of what you anticipate, what kind of a ceiling would you have to request, let us say, after the date of June 29 next year and June 30, 1965, and June 30, 1966?

On the basis of the deficit that the Secretary himself estimated for the committee, he finally answered this question of mine:

> The debt ceiling could conceivably rise to $330 billion?
>
> Secretary DILLON. It could conceivably for 1966; yes.

I do not believe that is the jumping-off place. It is going to go up. This is an escalating debt. Unless Webster is wrong, escalation really means to go up, even though in department stores one can go up or down on an escalator. Escalation, however, still means going up. This is going up, because no one believes that the cold war will come to an end very quickly, and no one believes that there will be a precipitous drop in our defense spending. Therefore, I anticipate that it will rise even beyond the figure of $330 billion.

I do not believe that we are afraid of debt anymore. I remember my frugal old mother, who shied away from debt as if it were a leprous thing. Even Jefferson, from the home of a great Commonwealth that gave us our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance, knew of the danger, because he wrote a letter to Governor Plummer of his State, 147 years ago, in which he said:

> I place economy among the first and most important of Republican virtues, and public debt as the greatest of the dangers to be feared.

Mr. President, a debt is a speculation on time and future. When a young man borrows to go to college, it is a speculation on his future. When a person buys a house, a mortgage is placed on it. That is an incumbrance. It is a speculation involving the ability to hold a job and pay off the mortgage, and have a habitation of his own. That is testimony to the deep, abiding, acquisitive instinct in all people.

That is why we are essentially a Nation of homeowners.

However, when a person incurs a debt he ought to think of it rather fearfully, as something to be paid off. Today I do not believe people generally seem to fear debts.

Perhaps that is why they receive no response from this or any other deliberative branch, thinking that perhaps the debt ceiling will somehow discourage greater and greater spending. When the press picked up an observation I made in committee the other day about being realistic in setting the permanent ceiling at $300 billion, which is realistic ceiling in terms of the future, as I see it, I received a good many letters, some from good friends of mine, fairly scolding me about it, and saying, "How careless of you to think of the debt at a $300 billion level."

If the Secretary of the Treasury is correct, by 1966 fiscal year the spread between the permanent ceiling and where we will be then will be $45 billion.

Now let some miracle man, some genie, drop from the planet Mars this minute, catapult himself through the gorgeous ceiling of this Chamber, and give us the magic word as to how, in the foreseeable years of the lifetime of anyone now living, we shall ever retrieve enough difference between expenditures and revenue to keep the debt within reasonable bounds. That was the reason for suggesting that perhaps the people back home believe that if we set the ceiling and keep it there, it will act as a curbstone on the top of expenditures to hold them down.

I have seen no such force. I have seen no such reflection in the expenditure field as a result of such a debt ceiling. I am disinclined to delude people. I am disinclined to disillusion them, too. But I like to be realistic, because we are confronted with estimated deficits by no less an authority than the Secretary of the Treasury, who gives us the figures and says, "Conceivably, yes, by fiscal 1966, the debt could rise to $330 billion."

I try to scare people. Once in a while I tell them the story about the chap who got off on the wrong floor in the Peoria Hospital. He got off on the floor where the babies were sequestered in a room, in baskets, with tags on them. Some were squalling and bawling, some were whimpering, some were smiling a little. He looked at them for a moment. Then came a nurse. She had a long, dour visage.

He said, "Nurse, what are those little brats squalling about?"

She said, "Well, Mister, if you were out of a job, and you owed your proportionate share of $1,700 of the public debt, and your pants were wet, you would squall, too."

But somehow or other, we do not squall about the debt any more. We allow ourselves to be deceived a little by our hopes that somehow we will get out of this well, after all.

When I was a very junior Member of Congress long ago, a former minister told me this story, while we were sitting in the front row of the House of Representatives:

He said, "The teacher said to Johnny, 'A cat fell into a well. The well was a hundred feet deep. Suppose the cat climbed up 1 foot, then fell back 2 feet after every time it had climbed 1 foot. How long would it take to get the cat out of the well?'

"Johnny went to work with his slate. Thirty minutes later the teacher came down the aisle and said, 'Johnny, how are you getting along?'

"'Well, teacher,' he said, 'if I have about 15 minutes more and can have additional slate and pencils, I think I can land that cat in hell.'"

So we climb up a little and fall back. We climb up, and we fall back twice as much as we climb up. The result is what? An escalating debt. There it is for all the world to see. Somehow, the debt holds no terror. It gives us no sense of apprehension. Yet, I think it should.

That is all I have to say. I shall vote for the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. But I add this conclusion. We must pay our bills. Either we pay or we repudiate. One can find comfort in fighting against the debt ceiling; but I do not think it is realistic, because if ever we have to repudiate our bills, what do we think would happen to the credit of this country when we marched to the bourses and the areas of commerce in all sections of the earth? I would not like to be around, very close, when, as the French say, the denouement came—and it will come inevitably, if ever we undertake to repudiate the debt and face realism. I wish the situation were more realistic. I would be willing to see our permanent ceiling go at least to $300 billion and then say to the people, "Somehow, we will try to contrive not to delude you any longer, regardless of what the economic or political implications might be."

That is the whole story. Unless other Senators have something to contribute, I believe Senators are ready to vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on my amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long]. If the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] is absent due to a death in the family.

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "nay," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay," and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Masachusetts would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] is paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maine would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea," and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 44, as follows:

[No. 250 Leg.]

YEAS—35

Aiken
Beall
Bennett
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Fong
Hickenlooper
Holland
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kuchel
Lausche
McClellan
Mundt
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—44

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church
Clark
Douglas
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Moss
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Randolph
Ribicoff
Smathers
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Walters
Williams, N.J.

NOT VOTING—21

Allott
Case
Dodd
Edmondson
Engle
Ervin
Goldwater
Hruska
Kennedy
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
McGee
Mechem
Miller
Morse
Morton
Muskie
Simpson
Stennis
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

So the amendment of Mr. Williams of Delaware was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I regret that the Senate has rejected this amendment. Had it been accepted I would have voted for the bill extending the debt limit since, regardless of my criticism of expenditures, I realize that once these expenditures are made they must be financed.

I am, however, strongly opposed to the administration's plan to finance a $10 billion tax cut on borrowed money. Everyone recognizes that in the face of the administration's position, wherein they flatly refuse to reduce spending, there is no possible manner whereby a tax cut can be financed except by raising the debt limit and borrowing the money.

At the present time we are operating at a deficit approximating $1 billion per month. Expenditures this year will be $21 billion higher than they were just 5 years ago. Our projected deficit for the current fiscal year is nearly $12 billion.

In the face of these statistics it is fiscally irresponsible for the administration to propose salary increases, larger Federal grants for every segment of our economy, and an annual increase in spending of nearly $5 billion. On top of all of this they now promise a tax cut and openly admit that they are financing this tax cut with borrowed money.

The Senate, by its vote, has just indicated its willingness to go along with this plan to raise the debt to finance this tax cut. Therefore, I know of no other way to protest this action than to cast a negative vote on the final passage of this bill.

I have prepared a table showing the record of expenditures and deficits for the past 64 years, or since 1900.

This chart shows the tax increases, tax reductions, and rates of unemployment for each of these years with such statistics broken down by administrations.

I have credited the years 1947 and 1948 to the Republican Party since President Truman disclaimed any responsibility for the 80th Congress.

This chart shows that over 95 percent of our national debt has been created under Democratic administrations.

It shows that of the 10 tax reductions since 1913, 8 were given to the American people by the Republican Party.

Of the 25 balanced budgets since 1900, 22 were under the Republican Party. In only 3 years since 1900 has the Democratic Party ever lived within its income.

Of the 15 tax increases since 1913, 13 were put on the American taxpayers by the Democratic Party.

Futhermore, the record shows that the average unemployment in the 34 years in which the Republican Party had control of the Government was 5.6 percent of the labor force as compared to an average unemployment rate of 8.5 percent for the 30 years in which the Democratic Party controlled the White House.

All of these statistics, along with notations as to their sources, appear in this chart.

I ask unanimous consent to have this table printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Year	Administrative budget (millions) [1]						Civilian labor force (millions) [2]			Percent of total labor force unemployed	Individual tax rates [3]		National debt (billions) [4]	Gross national product in current dollars (billions) [5]
	Receipts	Expenditures	Republicans		Democrats		Total	Employed	Unemployed		Increase or decrease	1st bracket rates (percent)		
			Surplus	Deficit	Surplus	Deficit								
Republican:														
1901	$588	$525	$63						0.7	2.4			$1.2	
1902	562	485	77						.8	2.7			1.1	
1903	562	517	45						.8	2.6			1.1	
1904	541	584		$43					1.4	4.8			1.1	
1905	544	567		23					1.0	3.1			1.1	
1906	595	570	25						.2	.8			1.1	
1907	666	579	87						.6	1.8			1.1	
1908	602	659		57					2.9	8.5			1.1	
1909	604	694		89					1.8	5.2			1.1	
1910	676	694		18					2.1	5.9			1.1	
1911	702	691	11						2.2	6.2			1.1	$36.2
1912	693	690	3						1.9	5.2			1.1	39.8
Democrat:														
1913	714	715				(6)			1.6	4.4	First enacted	1.0	1.1	40.0
1914	725	725				(6)			3.1	8.0		1.0	1.1	39.0
1915	683	746				$63			3.8	9.7		1.0	1.1	40.5
1916	762	713			$48				1.9	4.8	Increase	2.0	1.2	48.9
1917	1,100	1,954				853			1.9	4.8	do	2.0	2.9	61.1
1918	3,630	12,662				9,032			.5	1.4	do	6.0	12.4	77.1
1919	5,085	18,448				13,363			.9	2.3	Decrease	4.0	25.4	84.9
1920	6,649	6,357			291				1.6	4.0		4.0	24.2	91.9
Republican:														
1921	5,567	5,058	509						5.0	11.9	do	4.0	23.9	70.3
1922	4,021	3,285	736						3.2	7.6		4.0	22.9	75.0
1923	3,849	3,137	713						1.3	3.2	Decrease	3.0	22.3	86.2
1924	3,853	2,890	963						2.4	5.5	do	2.0	21.2	85.9
1925	3,598	2,881	717						1.8	4.0		1.5	20.5	94.5
1926	3,753	2,888	865						.8	1.9	Decrease	1.5	19.6	98.6
1927	3,932	2,837	1,155						1.8	4.1		1.5	18.5	96.5
1928	3,872	2,933	939						2.0	4.4	Decrease	1.5	17.6	98.8
1929	3,861	3,127	734				49.1	47.6	1.5	3.2	do	.5	16.9	104.4
1930	4,058	3,320	738				49.8	45.4	4.3	8.7	Increase	1.5	16.1	91.1
1931	3,116	3,577		462			50.4	42.4	8.0	15.9		1.5	16.8	76.3
1932	1,924	4,659		2,735			51.0	38.9	12.0	23.6	Increase	4.0	19.4	58.5
Democrat:														
1933	1,997	4,598				2,602	51.5	38.7	12.8	24.9		4.0	22.5	56.0
1934	3,015	6,645				3,630	52.2	40.8	11.3	21.7	Increase	4.0	27.0	65.0
1935	3,706	6,497				2,791	52.8	42.2	10.6	20.1	do	4.0	28.7	72.5
1936	3,997	8,422				4,425	53.4	44.4	9.0	16.9		4.0	33.7	82.7
1937	4,956	7,733				2,777	54.0	46.3	7.7	14.3		4.0	36.4	90.8
1938	5,588	6,765				1,177	54.6	44.2	10.3	19.0		4.0	37.1	85.2
1939	4,979	8,841				3,862	55.2	45.7	9.4	17.2		4.0	40.4	91.1
1940	5,137	9,055				3,918	55.6	47.5	8.1	14.6	Increase	4.4	42.9	100.6
1941	7,096	13,255				6,159	55.9	50.3	5.5	9.9	do	10.0	48.9	125.8
1942	12,547	34,037				21,490	56.4	53.7	2.6	4.7	do	19.0	72.4	159.1
1943	21,947	79,368				57,420	55.5	54.4	1.0	1.9	do	19.0	136.6	192.5
1944	43,563	94,986				51,423	54.6	53.9	.6	1.2	do	23.0	201.0	211.4
1945	44,362	98,303				53,941	53.8	52.8	1.0	1.9	Decrease	23.0	258.6	213.6
1946	39,650	60,326				20,676	57.5	55.2	2.2	3.9		19.0	269.4	210.7
Republican (80th Cong.):														
1947	39,677	38,923	754				60.1	57.8	2.3	3.9		19.0	258.2	234.3
1948	41,375	32,955	8,419				61.4	59.1	2.3	3.8	Decrease	16.6	252.2	259.4
Democrat:														
1949	37,663	39,474				1,811	62.1	58.4	3.6	5.9		16.6	252.7	258.1
1950	36,422	39,544				3,122	63.0	59.7	3.3	5.3	Increase	17.4	257.3	284.6
1951	47,480	43,970			3,510		62.8	60.7	2.0	3.3	do	20.4	255.2	329.0
1952	61,287	65,303				4,017	62.9	61.0	1.9	3.1	do	22.2	259.1	347.0
Republican:														
1953	64,671	74,120		9,449			63.8	61.9	1.8	2.9		22.2	266.0	365.4
1954	64,420	67,537		3,117			64.4	60.8	3.5	5.6	Decrease	20.0	271.2	363.1
1955	60,209	64,389		4,180			65.8	62.9	2.9	4.4		20.0	274.3	397.5
1956	67,850	66,224	1,626				67.5	64.7	2.8	4.2		20.0	272.7	419.2
1957	70,562	68,966	1,596				67.9	65.0	2.9	4.3		20.0	270.5	442.8
1958	68,550	71,369		2,819			68.6	63.9	4.6	6.8		20.0	276.3	444.5
1959	67,915	80,342		12,427			69.3	65.5	3.8	5.5		20.0	284.7	482.7
1960	77,763	76,539	1,224				70.6	66.6	3.9	5.6		20.0	286.3	503.4
Democrat:														
1961	77,659	81,515				3,856	71.6	66.7	4.8	6.7		20.0	288.9	518.7
1962	81,409	87,787				6,378	71.8	67.8	4.0	5.6		20.0	298.2	553.9
1963	86,400	92,600				6,200	[7] 75.1	[7] 70.8	[7] 4.3	[7] 5.7		20.0	304.8	
1964	[8] 86,900	[8] 98,802				[8] 11,902						20.0	[8] 315.6	
Total			21,999	35,419	3,849	296,888								
Less surpluses				21,999		3,849								
Cumulative deficits, each party				13,420		293,039								

[1] Source: Budget, fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, p. 422.

[2] Source: 1901 through 1928: P. 215 of "The Measurement and Behavior of Unemployment" by National Bureau of Economic Research, Princeton University Press.
1929 through 1946: P. 206 of "Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1959."
1947 through 1963: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

[3] Source: Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

[4] Source: Budget, fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, p. 422.

[5] Source: "Facts and Figures on Government Expense, 1962-63," Tax Foundation, p. 49.

[6] Less than $500,000.

[7] July 1963.

[8] Estimate.

NOTE.—Variations in totals result from rounded figures.

Statistics assembled by JOHN J. WILLIAMS, U.S. Senator, September 1963.

RECAPITULATION, 1900-64 (64 YEARS)

	Republican (34 years)	Democrat (30 years)
Balanced budgets	22	3
Unbalanced budgets	12	27
Cumulative deficits (billions)	$13.4	$293
Percent of national debt	4.4	95.6
Average unemployment (percent)	5.6	8.5
Tax reductions	8	2
Tax increases	2	13
Depressions	1	0
Wars	0	3

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this questions the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARLSON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], is absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson]. If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea," and the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis] is paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maine would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay," and the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 26, as follows:

[No. 251 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Aiken
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Cannon
Clark
Cooper
Dirksen
Douglas
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hill
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Keating
Kuchel
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Moss
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Symington
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—26

Bennett
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Cotton
Curtis
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Hickenlooper
Holland
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
McClellan
Mechem
Pearson
Proxmire
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—24

Allott
Anderson
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Case
Church
Dodd
Edmondson
Engle
Goldwater
Hayden
Hruska
Kennedy
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
McGee
Miller
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Muskie
Simpson
Stennis
Yarborough

So the bill (H.R. 8969) was passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Inouye in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGING

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the AFL–CIO convention in New York has passed an extraordinarily fine resolution with respect to the report on medical care presented by the National Committee on Health Care of the Aged. This distinguished committee was organized at my suggestion last year on a bipartistan, nonpolitical basis with members representing business, insurance companies, the medical profession, and hospitals. Its recommendations have aroused widespread interest and the statement that was adopted unanimously by the Fifth Biennial Convention of the AFL–CIO on November 20 commending the work of the national committee and urging that its report be given careful consideration by the House Ways and Means Committee is most significant and welcome. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REPORT OF NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON HEALTH CARE OF THE AGED UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE FIFTH BIENNIAL CONVENTION OF THE AFL–CIO, NEW YORK CITY, NOVEMBER 20, 1963

After the defeat of the Anderson-Javits amendments to the welfare bill of 1962 in the Senate which would have provided hospital and related services to the elderly through the social security and railroad retirement systems, Senator Jacob K. Javits, of New York, suggested the formation of a bipartisan, nonpolitical task force to make a fresh and independent review of the issue. In response to this suggestion, the National Committee on Health Care of the Aged was formed. The committee was made up of 12 nationally recognized leaders in the fields of medicine, education, industry, and insurance under the chairmanship of Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, president of the University of

Oregon, and formerly Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

After 14 months of intensive study, the committee made public its report on the eve of the opening of this Fifth Biennial Convention of the AFL–CIO. On the day following its release it was formally received by President John F. Kennedy at the White House.

The AFL–CIO is pleased that this report recommends the social security method for basic institutional care of the elderly. The report also indicates how social insurance and private insurance can complement each other in meeting the problems of financing health care for the aged: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the AFL–CIO commends the National Committee on Health Care of the Aged for the effort and time devoted to the study of this problem and for the imagination and courage with which its members developed their proposals. The fact that their recommendations are unanimous commends them to serious and careful study by all who are interested in this problem; be it further

Resolved, That the AFL–CIO, with a view to facilitating the reporting of a sound and workable hospital insurance bill, urges that the report of this committee be included in the proposals to be considered by the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives in the hearings now being conducted.

AMENDMENT OF THE SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 617, S. 298, which is to be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 298) to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Small Business Investment Act Amendments of 1963".

SEC. 2. The second sentence of section 302 (a) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "$400,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$700,000", by striking out "three years" and inserting in lieu thereof "five years", and by striking out "1961" and inserting in lieu thereof "1963".

SEC. 3. Section 303(b) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) To encourage the formation and growth of small business investment companies, the Administration is authorized (but only to the extent that the necesary funds are not available to the company involved from private sources on reasonable terms) to lend funds to such companies either directly or by loans made or effected in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate on an immediate or deferred (standby) basis. Such loans shall bear interest at such rate and contain such other terms as the Administration may fix, and shall be subject to the following restrictions and limitations:

"(1) The total amount of obligations of any one company which may be purchased and outstanding at any one time by the Administration under this subsection (including commitments to purchase such obligations) shall not exceed 50 per centum of the paid-in capital and surplus of such company or $5,000,000, whichever is less.

"(2) All loans made under this subsection (b) shall be of such sound value as reasonably to assure repayment.

SEC. 4. Section 306 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 306. Without the approval of the Administration, the aggregate amount of obligations and securities acquired and for which commitments may be issued by any small business investment company under the provisions of this Act for any single enterprise shall not exceed 20 per centum of the combined capital and surplus of such small business investment company authorized by this Act."

SEC. 5. The last sentence of section 308(b) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows: "Such companies may invest funds not reasonably needed for their current operations in direct obligations of, or obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States, or in insured savings accounts (up to the amount of the insurance) in any institution the accounts of which are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation."

SEC. 6. (a) The Small Business Investment Act of 1958 is further amended by adding at the end of title III a new section as follows:

"CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

"SEC. 312. For the purpose of controlling conflicts of interest which may be detrimental to small business concerns, to small business investment companies, to the shareholders of either, or to the purposes of this Act, the Administration shall adopt regulations to govern transactions with any officer, director, or shareholder of any small business investment company, or with any person or concern, in which any interest, direct or indirect, financial or otherwise, is held by any officer, director, or shareholder of (1) any small business investment company, or (2) any person or concern with an interest, direct or indirect, financial or otherwise, in any small business investment company. Such regulations shall include appropriate requirements for public disclosure (including disclosure in the locality most directly affected by the transaction) necessary to the purposes of this section."

(b) That part of the Table of Contents of such Act which describes the matter included in title III is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 312. Conflicts of interest."

Mr. SPARKMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader about the program contemplated for the remainder of the day, and also for Friday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by my distinguished colleague the minority leader, the pending business is one of two small business bills which it is hoped will be disposed of this afternoon. It is my understanding that an amendment will be offered by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] on which the yeas and nays will be requested. I hope not too much time will be spent in the discussion on both sides, because of the fact that five or six of our colleagues have a very important engagement this afternoon and must catch a plane by a certain hour. I am sure there will be as much cooperation as possible.

Tomorrow the Senate will consider the Library bill and also the bill from the Committee on Commerce having to do with the amendment of the Federal Aviation Act of 1954 to provide for the regulation of rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, and for other purposes.

It is anticipated that on Monday next the Banking and Currency Committee will report the Mundt bill one way or another. The Senate will take it up as soon as it possibly can. I would express the hope and anticipation that the Senate would dispose of that measure one way or another not later than Wednesday afternoon next.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 298) to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a little more than 5 years ago, Congress passed legislation establishing a new and pioneering program designed to provide equity capital and long-term capital for small business.

As early as 1950, a group of us introduced legislation to achieve this goal, but it took us 8 years to receive the testimony and the counsel we needed to convince our colleagues that this genuine financing need could be met by private institutions, licensed and regulated by the Federal Government.

When we passed the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, there was no question but that an "equity gap" existed; but we certainly could not be certain that the small business investment company concept would be an effective instrumentality for filling that gap.

During 1962, the Select Committee on Small Business held a series of public hearings throughout the United States to examine at firsthand how the program was operating. We wanted to determine whether this new plan had the potential for a full scale onslaught on the unfilled capital needs of independent business concerns capable of sound growth.

At the conclusion of its hearings and studies, the committee concluded that "unquestionably, the SBIC's presently in operation have proved that Congress chose a suitable vehicle for supplying the equity capital needs of small businesses."

Our committee report went on to state that the program was not "out of the woods." Therefore the committee called for changes in the legislation under which the program operates in these words:

> If the program is to hold onto the gains it has made and if a suitable climate for needed growth is to be provided, the Congress must provide legislative improvements.

With this backing, I introduced two bills in the early days of the 88th Congress. One of them, S. 298, is before us today. This bill, in its original form, was cosponsored by 16 members of the Select Committee on Small Business. With certain modifications, it comes to the Senate with the backing of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, following consideration by that group's Small Business Subcommittee.

Although I personally would have preferred the bill as it was introduced, I believe that the committee's amendments had sound justification and that the passage of S. 298 is definitely in the interest of America's small businesses—and, more importantly, in the public interest generally.

The first significant change made by the bill raises from $400,000 to $700,000 the amount of subordinated debentures, which the Small Business Administration may purchase, in a small business investment company. However, SBA may still buy these debentures only on a matching-dollar basis. That is, no SBIC may sell $700,000 of its debentures to SBA until it has raised at least $700,000 of private capital.

Furthermore, the SBIC must repay these debentures over a period of years, and, during the time it holds them, it pays interest to the Federal Government at the annual rate of 5 percent. Thus, this is no gift. I predict that the record will show that there will be very few losses on these debentures and that the excess of interest received by SBA over the cost of the money to SBA will result in a profit to the agency.

Why should we increase this amount, one may ask.

It was the finding of the Small Business Committee that running an SBIC properly is an expensive business which requires an extensive portfolio if all the costs are to be met. Therefore, by encouraging SBIC's to raise their private capital from $400,000 to $700,000, we help them reach the point where they are economically viable and self-sufficient.

The SBIC program needs these added Federal funds at this time. I believe that this will encourage private investors to invest their funds in SBIC's. According to the most recent information available, by June 30, 1963, the total private money that had been invested in SBIC's was $487 million and the total Government money amounted to $140 million. Thus, there is almost $4 in private money invested in SBIC's to every $1 of Government money invested.

The additional amounts which this bill provides would make it possible for private investors with $700,000 to form an SBIC and sell $700,000 of its subordinated debentures to SBA and borrow an additional $700,000 from SBA under section 303(b) of the act. This would make a total of $2,100,000 in funds available to operate the SBIC. With this amount of money available for lending SBIC's of this size would be able to hire competent management that is so necessary to the successful operation of an SBIC.

In the second place, despite the newness of the program, most SBIC's are reaching the point where they are fully invested and must await repayments from their early transactions before they can proceed with the task of providing further assistance to qualified small businesses. By the passage of S. 298, we will enable some SBIC's to put more dollars immediately in the hands of small business and encourage other SBIC's to raise their private capital to take advantage of the 1963 amendments, thereby giving them greater resources for investing and lending in such concerns.

The second major provision in S. 298 restores section 306 of the act to its original form. The 1958 act wisely provided that no SBIC might lend or invest more than 20 percent of its capital or surplus in any one small business. This safeguard guarantees a measure of diversification in the portfolio and generally follows the rules covering other financial institutions. More importantly, under the original act, SBIC's could invest only in small businesses as defined by the SBA.

It may be well to place in the Record the SBA definition of "small business concern" for purposes of the SBIC program, which is as follows:

> The size standard set by SBA for small businesses eligible for SBIC financing is that the small business concern does not have total assets exceeding $5 million, net worth exceeding $2.5 million, nor average net income after Federal taxes for the preceding 2 years in excess of $250,000.

In addition, of course, the small business concern must be "independently owned and not dominant in its field" as provided in the Small Business Investment Act.

In 1961, however, a further restriction was imposed: one which limited to $500,000 the amount of funds which an SBIC could invest in any one firm, without SBA approval. The advocates of this proviso hoped that it would discourage larger investments and thus encourage the financing in smaller amounts.

While I was in agreement with the desirability of stimulating investments and loans to smaller business firms, I felt that this negative and restrictive method would do more harm than good. I believe that my objection has been proven correct. All the evidence points to a significant diminution of private capital subscribed to the SBIC program and, thus, a hurt to all worthy and qualified small businesses needing long-term funds.

The Senate Small Business Committee reached the same conclusion in its report submitted to the Senate on April 25 of this year. Senate Report 161 carries this conclusion:

> After considering all the factors bearing upon the present dollar limitation contained in section 306 of the act and after examining the record of the industry, your committee is compelled to the conclusion that this limitation will impede the flow of capital and credit to deserving small businesses, that it is not needed, and that its continuation as a part of the statute is not in the best interest of the American small business community.

As I said, this bill restores the act to its original form; that is, it will limit an SBIC to investments in small concerns as defined by SBA, and it will limit any such investment to an amount which does not exceed 20 percent of the SBIC's capital and surplus.

Mr. President, if a concern meets the definition of "small business concern" used by SBA, there should be no arbitrary limitation on the amount of financing it is eligible to receive from an SBIC other than the present 20 percent of the SBIC's capital and surplus. The size standard set by SBA for small businesses eligible for SBIC financing is that the small business concern does not have total assets exceeding $5 million, net worth exceeding $2.5 million, nor average net income after Federal taxes for the preceding 2 years in excess of $250,000. This limitation on the size of businesses to be aided by the SBIC will assure that financing is not made available under the program to large businesses.

Within this size limitation there are many small businesses which require heavy capital outlays. A machine shop, for instance, may be small as far as total assets and number of employees are concerned, but to replace or acquire needed equipment will, in many cases, require more than $500,000. Also, small business concerns which require heavy capital outlays are often those concerns which have great potential for growth. This growth will create jobs and add to our national economic well-being. This bill would permit that type of company to receive aid from an SBIC without the restriction presently found in the act.

Mr. President, small business has suffered because of this $500,000 limitation. Often an SBIC cannot make a second loan to a small business concern because to do so would exceed its permissible limit under the regulation. While SBA regulations permit SBIC's to participate in providing financing to small concerns, an outside participant may not be available at the time such additional financing is needed. Also participations have proved very burdensome and have not been used to a very great extent. This limitation denies to many small businesses the aid which they should have under the act.

Mr. President, another section of this bill would amend section 303(b) of the act to provide SBA with express authority to lend funds to SBIC's in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate on an immediate or deferred basis. SBA does not now have explicit authority to make participation loans with banks and other lending institutions. However, the Comptroller General has ruled that SBA has implied authority under the act to enter into participation agreements. Under this ruling by the Comptroller General, SBA has developed a standby agreement which is now being used. Under this plan a bank makes a loan to an SBIC with the understanding that it may call upon SBA at any time for the full amount of the outstanding principal. This bill gives SBA specific authority to make participation loans with banks or other lending institutions under their present standby plan or under other plans, such as guarantees, which SBA may develop. This should encourage banks and other lending institutions to participate to a greater extent in the financing of SBIC's.

The Small Business Investment Act of 1958 recognizes that it is not always possible for SBIC's to keep all of their money fully invested in eligible small business concerns. Accordingly, SBIC's were authorized under the act to invest funds not needed for their current operations in direct obligations of, or obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States. SBIC's were permitted by SBA to acquire interest-bearing certificates of deposit in commercial banks. SBA ruled, however, that SBIC's are precluded under the Small Business Investment Act from placing funds in savings and loan associations through the purchase of share accounts in such associations. Another section of this bill would amend the act to include among the ways SBIC's may invest funds not reasonably needed for their operations in insured savings accounts in institutions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. The bill would, however, limit such investments to the amount insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

Mr. President, in September the committee held hearings on the question of conflicts of interest in the SBIC program. Our attention had been called to reports that this might develop into a dangerous problem for the program.

SBA now has implicit authority and has exercised the authority to issue regulations regarding conflicts of interest in the SBIC program. However, as a result of the hearings, the committee amended the bill to provide a specific directive to SBA to issue regulations for the purpose of controlling conflicts of interest.

The amendment provides that where an activity of an SBIC is involved, SBA shall issue regulations to govern transactions involving conflicts of interest of any officer, director, or shareholder of any SBIC, or any transaction with any person or concern in which any interest is held by any officer, director, or shareholder of any SBIC. It is expected that other possible areas of conflict of interest will be covered also. The amendment also provides for public disclosure of these transactions. The methods of disclosure will be left to the discretion of SBA.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I urge the immediate and favorable consideration of S. 298. Taken in conjunction with the SBIC tax bill, S. 297, and with various administrative changes, I sincerely believe that this legislation will give a greatly needed boost to the SBIC program and that the SBIC's, in turn, will buttress the imaginative, ambitious, fiercely competitive, American small businessman to contribute his full share to the Nation's sound economic growth.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate the Senator's yielding to me at this time, because I must attend a committee meeting. As the ranking minority member of the committee, I merely wish to say that I have cosponsored the pending bill with the chairman of the committee. I believe that the Small Business Investment Act which we passed in 1958 has worked well. What the Senator from Alabama is trying to do through S. 298 is to make the Small Business Investment Act more feasible and practical. I understand that losses under the act have been practically nil. One of the purposes of S. 298 is to permit an increase in the amount of subordinated debentures which the Small Business Administration can purchase from a small business investment company. This will serve to help the general small business situation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator has well stated the case. So far as the Government is concerned, there have been no losses.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to insert a short statement at this point?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Saltonstall

As a cosponsor of S. 298, it is my intention to vote for this bill as well as its companion bill, S. 1309.

I have consistently supported the small business investment company program, initiated by the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. I believe that this program has served a constructive and real purpose in providing long-term loans and equity capital to the small business community.

The need for a program of this nature was recognized by the Congress when it passed the Small Business Investment Act. The need for this program still continues. So long as this situation exists, it is only logical and proper that all reasonable assistance should be given to the program. This is necessary if it is to discharge its functions in the manner prescribed by the Congress.

It is my view that S. 298 provides a remedy for certain deficiencies which presently exist in the law. These tend to inhibit the proper discharge of this program. The experiences gained through the operation of the program have given rise to the need for S. 298. It is for this reason that I have cosponsored this measure.

I am particularly impressed with the need to extend the minimum capitalization of investment companies so that they may have sufficient capital available for lending purposes as well as operating costs. I think it reasonable to consider that this can be accomplished through the provision of S. 298 which authorizes an increase from $400,000 to $700,000 in the amount of debentures which the Small Business Administration is authorized to purchase from a small business investment company.

It is my hope that S. 298 will prove sufficient to permit the small business investment company program to discharge adequately its functions.

I feel that S. 1309, as a companion to S. 298, should be passed. Furthermore, it is hoped that the $34.3 million to be authorized under S. 1309 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of both S. 1309 and S. 298 can be absorbed in the present Small Business Administration appropriations bill currently pending before the Senate Appropriations Committee.

I am also impressed by the provision of S. 1309 which amends section 7(b)(2) of the Small Business Act. This provision would enlarge the scope of disaster loan authority of the agency. I think it is only realistic to recognize that economic injury can be sustained by a small business from many causes other than drought or excessive rainfall. I believe that small business should be entitled to assistance under the criteria of this provision of S. 1309.

I believe, furthermore, that section 3 of S. 1309 properly provides a remedy to the Federal Government for injury sustained when any property mortgaged or pledged to the Small Business Administration as security for a loan is misappropriated. I think this section is essential as needed security against such conduct.

For these reasons, I am of the opinion that these two measures should be passed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 327, and I ask that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it may be printed in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, so ordered.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the Record, is as follows:

On page 5, strike out lines 1 through 9, as follows:

"Sec. 4. Section 306 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

" 'Sec. 306. Without the approval of the Administration, the aggregate amount of obligations and securities acquired and for which commitments may be issued by any small business investment company under the provisions of this Act for any single enterprise shall not exceed 20 per centum of the combined capital and surplus of such small business investment company authorized by this Act.' "

On page 5, line 10, strike out "Sec. 5" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 4".

On page 5, line 19, strike out "Sec. 6" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 5".

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the amendment would retain the present provision in the law which requires small business investment companies to keep half their investment portfolios in loans of $500,000 or less. Under present regulations, a small business investment company may invest the other half of its investment portfolios in loans of any size it wishes.

Mr. President, it should be recognized that the Senate unanimously adopted this amendment last year, with a view then that it would be completely restrictive, that is, that there would be no loans of more than $500,000. A subsequent interpretation by SBA held that half of the portfolio of an SBIC could be in big loans of $1 and $2 million, and some SBIC's have made loans of that size and some even bigger loans.

The pending bill eliminates this limitation entirely. There will be no limit if the bill is passed without the Proxmire amendment. My amendment would retain the limitation in its present form.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In the first place——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me say, first, before I yield, that, of course, no SBIC loan can exceed a 20-percent limit on the capital surplus or the SBIC, which in the case of one of the large California SBIC's, would mean that it could not make a loan bigger than $6 million, and in other cases there would be a limit of $1, $2, $3, or $5 million. There is a second theoretical limitation. SBIC loans can only be to firms that meet SBA size standards; that have less than $5 million in assets, and so forth. But these limitations are utterly ineffective. One firm in Chicago, with about 159 branches, received more than a million dollars in an SBIC loan. My amendment does not prevent an SBIC from making some big loans.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. First, in connection with the Senator's statement that the $500,000 limitation was accepted unanimously, the Senator will recall that it was a compromise which was arrived at in committee.

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I say, at that point, to the distinguished Senator from Alabama, that perhaps there a compromise was reached, but, as I recall, there was no real opposition from anyone on the floor; in conference a compromise was indeed reached.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Even in committee the figure that was arrived at was arrived at by compromise.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Perhaps it was. The concept of the limitation seemed to have been generally agreed upon.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In the second place, when the Senator speaks of a $6 million loan, it must be a loan to a small business, and a small business within the definition in the act must be one with net worth not exceeding two and a half million dollars. I cannot conceive of anyone lending a company more money than its net worth. Therefore, there are limitations.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There are limitations; however, certainly in cities of almost any size except megalopolis, a firm that has $5 million in net assets, with a net worth of two and a half million dollars, is the biggest firm in town. That is big business. The law now provides that the size of any loan by SBIC's may not exceed 20 percent of the SBIC's capital surplus. Since only 30 SBIC's have capital surplus of two and a half million dollars or above, the removal of the $500,000 limitation will assist only the 39 largest SBIC's, of a total of 678 which are active. The big SBIC's have a large proportion of all SBIC capital.

I once worked for an investment banking firm in New York. The reason why an investment bank prefers a big investment is that if it makes one $1 million investment, it must investigate the credit of only one company; and there are expenses for only one investment.

If they invest the same $1 million in 10 $100,000 investments, they have to investigate 10 companies, and have almost 10 times the cost of investigation.

Therefore, there is a built-in inducement for the SBIC's to make large investments. I recall, too, that one very frank and honest and most successful head of an SBIC, one of the largest SBIC's in the country, said to me that if we passed the bill introduced by the Senator from Alabama without the Proxmire amendment, every loan his company would make would be a loan of more than $500,000.

I believe this amendment is a very moderate amendment.

The smaller firms, the firms that would get loans of less than $500,000, are the firms that the law is designed to benefit. Congress provided lucrative tax benefits for the small business investment companies. When this law was enacted, we provided substantial benefits, which have been described by one outstanding magazine as permitting a firm which is breaking even because of the tax advantages, or which makes two investments, one of $100,000, which doubles in value, another of $100,000 which disappears entirely and fails totally, and the firm breaks even in that way, nevertheless, because of tax advantages the SBIC law enables that firm to make a return of 17½ percent to the stockholders. That is the kind of tax advantage we provide for the SBIC's.

We also provide a substantial amount of Government money, and the bill provides even more Government money than before.

Under those circumstances, with the advantage of special tax privileges, special tax advantages, which enable the SBIC's to operate with Government money at low interest rates, it seems to me that Congress should require that the SBIC service small business. That is the purpose of extending such benefits. We should do this at least to the extent of requiring that half of the portfolio be in loans of $500,000 or less.

Under the interpretation of present law by the Small Business Administration, about 10 percent of the money furnished by SBIC's has gone into loans above $500,000. Yet these loans have gone to only one-half of 1 percent of the total firms borrowing from SBIC's, obviously, the biggest of the technically small business operations.

If the $500,000 limitation is removed entirely, from 30 percent to 40 percent of the total investments of SBIC's may go to larger firms in the form of loans in excess of $500,000. I believe the present proportion is about right. I should like to see a little more go to small firms. But it cannot be said that the big firms are starving, when they constitute only one-half of 1 percent of firms borrowing from SBIC's but get 10 percent of all the money, or 20 times as much as the average smaller firm.

I should like to reiterate and reemphasize the colloquy I had with the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. He argued that the bill does not really remove the limitation, because two limitations remain in the bill. One is that the loan may not exceed 20 percent of capital and surplus. The second is that the loan may not be to a firm which does not comply with Small Business size standards.

The first limitation is not a limitation for big SBIC. One SBIC I know of can lend 20 percent of $30 million or $6 million in one loan because that is their capital in surplus. A good friend of mine is the head of an SBIC in New York having $18 million in capital. It can obviously make a $3,600,000 loan, if my amendment is defeated.

So far as small business is concerned, the record is replete with loans that have been made to firms that have nationwide sales, that have hundreds of employees—and the number varies from 150 to 1,000, depending on the industry in which it is located. Such a firm can do a very substantial business indeed compared with 95 percent of American business. I argue that at least half the portfolio of those companies should be invested in the 99½ percent of firms that require less than $500,000 in loans.

I conclude by saying that to permit SBIC's to make loans of any size, with no limitation, cannot really help small business firms.

The overwhelming majority of the firms in America that we recognize as small business cannot be helped, because more of the funds in the program will be made available to the bigger firms, and that much lost to the smaller business.

If any of us were operating such an SBIC, we would operate it for profit. So we would invest in big loans to large firms that cost less to investigate per dollar and are likely to be more reliable.

Unless some effective requirement is tied to the tax privilege and the Government money that is loaned, the intent of Congress will be frustrated.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

If the Senator from Alabama would agree, I would suggest that, for the purpose of having 19 or 20 Senators come to the Chamber, so that the yeas and nays might be ordered, there be a live quorum call. If he would agree to that, we would be ready to vote a couple of minutes after the live quorum was developed. Or does the Senator from Alabama wish to speak further?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder why the Senator suggested a couple of minutes later? Why not immediately?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is satisfactory.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I did not plan to speak.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I assumed that the Senator might perhaps wish to speak further. But if he does not, it is satisfactory to me to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the situation, with the understanding that what I am about to propose will not be considered as a precedent, I ask unanimous consent that the years and nays on the Proxmire amendment be ordered. But this is not to be a precedent.

This is an unusual circumstance; otherwise I would not have asked unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be ordered. This procedure is not to be considered as a precedent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the yeas and nays are ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Wyoming

[Mr. McGee], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] is absent because of illness in family.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is absent due to illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] and the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] are detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 49, as follows:

[No. 252 Leg.]

YEAS—31

Anderson
Beall
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Church
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Douglas
Fong
Gore
Hickenlooper
Kuchel
Lausche
McGovern
McIntyre
Mechem
Metcalf
Monroney
Mundt
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Proxmire
Russell
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—49

Aiken
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Clark
Cooper
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McNamara
Moss
Pell
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Tower
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—20

Allott
Bennett
Case
Dodd
Edmondson
Engle
Goldwater
Gruening
Hruska
Keating
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
McGee
Miller
Morse
Morton
Muskie
Simpson
Stennis
Yarborough

So Mr. Proxmire's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment to the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it the understanding of the Senator from Alabama that the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] has an amendment that he desires to offer to the bill?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The amendment of the Senator from Michigan refers to the bill S. 1309, which will be considered next.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I understand that there will be no further yea-and-nay votes today.

Mr. President, I wish to ask some questions of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I shall be happy to respond to questions from the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Do I correctly understand that the bill would increase from $400,000 to $700,000 the amount of subordinated debentures which SBA can purchase from an SBIC?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Originally it was $150,000?

Mr. SPARKMAN. When the act was originally written.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In 1958.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. We have escalated from $150,000 to $400,000, and now it is proposed that up to $700,000 of Government money be authorized under section 302 of this program.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct. Before the Senator from Wisconsin gets away from that point, I should like to call his attention to the comment I made in my direct statement, that by raising the amount of debentures that could be sold, the authorization would be accompanied with a requirement that the SBIC's should raise that much more money; that is, to get the benefit of the full $700,000, a company, would have to have $700,000 of its own money in hand. Then it could sell subordinated debentures in the amount of $700,000 to the Small Business Administration. Then the company could borrow a like amount from SBA which would make a total of $2.1 million. That would be in a fund for lending. In that way, it would bring in a great deal of private money to build up the net assets.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Consider the case of a firm that from 1958 to 1961 had $700,000 of its own money—SBIC money. It could get $150,000 of U.S. Government money plus $425,000 of section 303(b) money, which totals $575,000 of U.S. money. But under the provisions of the bill before us now, today, a firm with only $700,000 of its own money would be in a position to borrow $1.4 million of money from the Federal Government, and would have a 2-to-1 ratio of Federal money compared to less than a 1-to-1 ratio from 1958 to 1961. Do I understand correctly?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me call attention to the fact that $700,000 of that amount is secured by debentures of the company. It is not an open loan. So I believe we need to keep that point in mind.

The Senator is correct so far as his figures are concerned.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Would not more Government money go into the program now under the bill than was in the program before, so that it would increase the present ratio of less than $1 of Government money for each $1 of SBIC money—assuming a $700,000 commitment by the SBIC—to $2 of Federal money to $1 of private money?

Mr. SPARKMAN. We have maintained the same ratio. But the figures of the Senator are correct, if we count the debentures as being Government money.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Under section 303 (b), this bill would increase the limitation for SBA loans from 50 percent of capital and surplus, or $4 million, to 50 percent of capital and surplus, or $5 million, whichever is greater. Do I understand correctly?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder if the Senator would mind repeating that question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Do I understand correctly that the bill would increase the amount of SBA loans to SBIC's from $4 million to $5 million under section 303(b)?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The law at the present time provides that an SBIC may borrow from SBA under section 303(b) of the act an amount not to exceed 50 percent of the capital and surplus of the SBIC, or $4 million, whichever is the smaller. This bill would increase that $4 million limitation to $5 million. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may clarify one thing?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. A while ago there was discussion about the increase in the amount of Government money which might go into the SBIC. I am not certain that I made it clear that, regardless of the figures which have been cited, the proportion of Government money to private money has remained the same throughout.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as I understand the situation, this is one of the most rapidly growing agencies of the Government. It has grown at a fantastic rate.

People talk about the increase in Government spending and the increase in bureaucracy, but seldom do they focus on the benefits which business receives. A small segment of small business is involved, because only 1 firm in 200 in this country has ever borrowed from the Small Business Administration.

Despite this, we have witnessed a situation in which the Small Business Administration from 1953 to 1963 grew from 432 employees in 1953 to 3,239 employees in 1963, an increase of 775 percent. This compares with a decrease during that same period of time in the total overall number of Federal employees from 2,558,000 to 2,527,000. Whereas the Federal Government maintained almost complete stability during the past 10 years, as to the number of Federal employees—there have been some fluctuations, but almost complete stability—the so-called small business sector has not been doubled, tripled, or quadrupled, but has been increased, in number of employees, sevenfold.

The Senator from Wisconsin, like all other Senators, is for small business. But the soaring cost of the promotion of business I think has been overlooked by those who call attention to the growth of the Federal Government. The growth of the Federal Government during the past 10 years, has been dwarfed by the explosive growth of subsidies for water carriers, subsidies for airlines, and subsidies to business.

On the basis of the discussion on the previous amendment, we have observed that these loans go more and more to the larger so-called small business firms.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator's figures are correct, but I believe they should include a bit more information.

Prior to the creation of the Small Business Administration we had the Smaller Defense Plants Administration. The SDPA was organized during the Korean war to help small business in the defense program. It was purely a defense organization, and almost entirely limited to that.

In 1953, in the 83d Congress, the Small Business Administration was made a permanent agency and given the broad power of lending to small businesses throughout the country.

Mr. PROXMIRE. What year did it become permanent?

Mr. SPARKMAN. 1953.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Very well.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to correct that. I said it was made permanent in 1953, but it was not. The Small Business Administration was created in 1953. It was made permanent in 1958.

Later we added to the functions of the Small Business Administration the job of administering disaster relief in this country. Everyone who knows what has happened over the past years knows that this has been a considerable load to carry. The Small Business Administration was given that job.

Congress has enacted other laws with reference to various programs in Government contracting, subcontracting, and so forth. That added a personnel need. Other activities and functions have been given to the Small Business Administration as time has gone along.

When the SBIC was organized in 1958, the administration of that program was given to the Small Business Administration.

We cannot eat our cake and have it, too. If Congress provides new functions, somebody must administer those functions. If it happens to involve an agency such as the Small Business Administration, of course it is necessary to employ additional personnel to take care of the functions which have been added.

This is getting a bit ahead of the game, but there will be under consideration in a few minutes, I hope, another bill in this field. The Senator from Michigan will offer an amendment to that bill to extend the disaster relief program. The Senator from Wisconsin, as I understand, will support that amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, indeed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It will not be possible to administer that program without some additional personnel. It may not require as many as a half dozen, but certainly it will require some more.

So it goes. As we add burdens and responsibilities to the Small Business Administration, we should expect the number of employees to continue to grow.

We ought to keep those factors in mind when we discuss the phenomenal growth which the Small Business Administration has had.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his comments, but I should like to invite his attention to several things.

It is true that in 1953 there were 432 Small Business Administration employees. However, every year there has been an increase, and usually a big increase of 100 or 200 employees sometimes more, year after year.

First, the number was 432; then it was 601; then it was 736; then it was 821; then it was 1,161; then it was 1,471; then it was 2,013.

And so on, until the past year, when it was 3,239.

It is true that if we provide for some kind of assistance to the beleaguered fish industry, it might be necessary to employ another person. I do not believe it will be necessary. I believe the Small Business Administration should be well enough staffed now to handle the relatively small and temporary situation in which the fish industry now finds itself.

I should like to invite to the distinguished Senator's attention the statistics in this regard. In 1954, $275 million was authorized by the Federal Government for the revolving fund of the Small Business Administration. The next year it was $275 million. Then it was $375 million. Then it was $455 million. It has climbed, year after year, until there has been a 600 percent increase since 1954, so that now it is $1,666 million.

During the same time, the Federal Government has increased its spending from $73 billion to $92 billion.

Many editorials have been written deploring the increase of spending by the Federal Government. Most Senators would like to keep spending as low as possible.

I invite attention once again to the fact that the people of America who denounce subsidies the most, who believe this and feel this most strongly—who are opposed to the expansion of a Federal bureaucracy the most, who are opposed to Federal subsidies the most, are the small businessmen. One might say all businessmen, but especially the small businessmen. I have talked with thousands of them in my State who are opposed to the growth of the Government.

Yet we see that the agency which purports to represent the small businessman primarily is probably the fastest-growing agency in the Government in terms of personnel, in terms of money, in terms of the involvement of the Federal Government in what is going on.

On the basis of everything I have seen and all my talks with small businessmen, they do not want bureaucracy to grow, even if they receive some benefit from it.

Only one out of every 200 small businessmen has had an opportunity to borrow from the Small Business Administration. That is one half of one percent. The other 99½ percent have not borrowed from the Small Business Administration. This does not mean that we should abolish it. The SBA performs some very useful functions. I am in favor of continuing it. But I am opposed to this bill and the next bill that will come up today because I think the agency is growing too fast. If we mean anything we say about keeping Government spending under control and keeping bureaucracy from growing so great, we should keep this SBA bureaucracy from growing.

May I ask the Senator from Alabama if there has not been this 600 percent increase in the revolving fund of the SBA between 1954 and last year?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. The Senator has given correct figures. However, again, I think there is an explanation. When SBA started in 1953, it was provided with a revolving fund to take care of business loans and loans for disasters caused by floods and other catastrophes. Also an amount was provided in the law to make it possible for the Small Business Administration to contract with the Government for prime contracts and then perhaps subcontract them out to a pool of small businesses that might be formed. That fund has never been used.

Later, the Small Business Act was amended to include disaster loans to small businesses which have suffered severe economic injury because of the injuries done their customers by drought and heavy rainfall in the area where the small business is located, also the act has been amended to permit disaster loans to any small business which has suffered substantial economic injury as a result of its displacement by a federally aided urban renewal or highway construction program.

There has been spent for disaster relief a total of about $155 million. That is SBA's part.

In addition, there has been participation by banks.

Still later, in 1958, the SBIC program was put into effect and a revolving fund was created for it. This is included in the large figures toward the end of the total which the Senator quoted.

We must remember that these programs require money. They are not grants—grants have been minimal in the Small Business Administration. These are loans that are paid back, generally at a rate of interest that is favorable. Business loans carry a rate of interest of 5½ percent. Disaster loans carry a lower rate—3 percent, as I recall—in keeping with the decree of Congress. But the money is put out in loans, and it is being paid back with interest, and a very fine record is being made.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Alabama that nobody has worked harder on small business legislation or more effectively or more faithfully than has the Senator from Alabama. He has done a wonderful job. He is certainly Mr. Small Business in the Senate. He has accomplished much. He has been very fair to me. I have had the duty, as chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, to handle a situation that is becoming increasingly uncomfortable for me. The Senator from Alabama has been wonderful in cooperation. He has beaten me every time we go to the mat, whether it is in subcommittee, in the full committee, or on the floor. He is going to beat me today. But I want to make it clear that I oppose the provision in S. 298 that would increase the amount of subordinated debentures that SBA will buy and the size of the loans that SBA will make, as well as loans that are over $500,000, with which my amendment, which was rejected a few moments ago dealt.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful to the Senator from Wisconsin for his comments. I know he has worked hard, and I know he has been sincere in his efforts with reference to small business. I have differed with him on several occasions, but I have enjoyed working with him. I am a member of the subcommittee over which he presides. Also, in the Select Committee on Small Business, we work diligently and periodically throughout the year, as he knows, in studying those problems. There has been a high degree of concord of opinion in that committee on both sides. There is no partisanship in that committee. Almost all of the reports which we have rendered since 1950 have been unanimous.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the Senator will yield at that point, perhaps that is the difficulty. I think it is fine to achieve unanimity, but I feel that in this area we need a little more inquiry and criticism in order to evaluate the program on the basis of differences.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We do not handle the specific items the Senator is discussing; we handle principles and policies. Where there is a point at issue, we handle it.

The Senator from Wisconsin heard the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who is the ranking minority member of the committee, speak with reference to S. 298. He is one of the sponsors.

Practically the entire membership of the Small Business Committee joined in sponsoring the bill. We did it based upon hearings and studies by the committee.

I say to the Senator from Wisconsin that, regardless of our differences, we have usually—in fact, in most instances—ironed out our differences. We have not gone to the mat in many matters. I have enjoyed working with the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I point out that this business subsidy powerhouse is a real streamroller. In most areas we hear the distinction made between liberals and conservatives and Republicans and Democrats on spending; but when they get together on the Small Business Committee and the Banking and Currency Committee in matters relating to business, the sky is the limit. There are very few limitations on business. When we enter the area of welfare, or foreign aid, there is criticism. We even hear criticism in the field of defense these days. But when it comes to business, no. I do not believe that is helpful. Business does not want it that way. It wants a much slower pace in expansion of a bureaucracy which is supposed to serve small business.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. There is probably no subcommittee in the Congress in which there has been a more constructive spirit of cooperation and lack of partisanship than on our subcommittee. I think both S. 1309 and S. 298 reflect that spirit of compromise.

Legislation has been described as the art of the possible. We have brought about in the subcommittee a meeting of minds of those of diverse political persuasion. That fact stands as a tribute to all members of the committee, including the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Alabama.

For that reason, I hope S. 1309 and S. 298 will stand in their present posture.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator very much for his remarks. I am grateful. He certainly is a cooperative, as well as an intellectually, brilliantly qualified member of the Banking and Currency Committee.

The final comment I wish to make is that this country is probably more fully "banked" today than it has ever been before. There are more large and eager-to-loan banks, and they are more aggressive than they have been in a long time. The banking system in my State, and those in most States of the Union, has greatly improved. Under those circumstances, with the availability of capital, we should be a little more careful than we have been in the past in the rapid expansion of the Small Business Administration and its many functions.

Eugene Foley, Administrator of the SBA, is a fine Administrator. He has been in office a very short time, but he has rendered a fine service, as did his predecessor, John Horne.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 298) was passed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 618, S. 1309.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1309) to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 4(c) of the Small Business Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "$1,666,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,700,300,000"; and

(2) by striking out "$341,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$375,300,000".

SEC. 2. Paragraph (2) of section 7(b) of the Small Business Act is amended to read as follows:

"(2) to make such loans (either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate on an immediate or deferred basis) as the Administration may determine to be necessary or appropriate to any small business concern located in an area affected by a disaster, if the Administration determines that the concern has suffered a substantial economic injury as a result of such disaster and if such disaster constitutes—

"(A) a major disaster, as determined by the President under the Act entitled 'An Act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes', approved September 30, 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1855–1955g), or

"(B) a natural disaster, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 (7 U.S.C. 1961); and"

SEC. 3. Section 16 of the Small Business Act is amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:

"(c) Whoever, with intent to defraud, knowingly conceals, removes, disposes of, or converts to his own use or to that of another, any property mortgaged or pledged to, or held by, the Administration, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both; but if the value of such property does not exceed $100, he shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both."

AMENDMENT OF ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 777) to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees, which were, on page 2, strike out lines 22 over through and including line 7 on page 3, and insert "Sec. 3. Section 33 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2573) is amended by adding at the"; on page 3, line 22, strike out "in support of any pending"; and on page 4, line 1, strike out "legislation".

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], I move that the Senator concur in the amendments of the House.

Mr. President, I believe the Senate should accept the House amendments.

One of them would retain the language of the existing law concerning the approval by Congress of any agreement which would obligate the United States to disarm or to reduce or limit its Armed Forces. The Senate accepted this language 2 years ago by an overwhelming vote. Since the other body has accepted the Senate amendment to reduce the Agency's authorization to $20 million for the fiscal years of 1964, 1965, I see no reason why we should insist on our amendment on congressional approval of arms control and disarmament agreements.

The other amendment adopted by the House would prohibit the dissemination of "propaganda" within the United States concerning the work of the Arms Control Agency. The Senate's language was somewhat narrower. It limited the prohibition to propaganda in support of "any pending legislation" concerning the work of the Agency.

I believe we can accept this amendment also. In doing so, we should understand that the Agency can continue its program of informing the American public about its activities.

The able chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Dr. Morgan, made this clear yesterday to the Members of the other body. As he said, this amendment would not eliminate the existing authority under section 2(c) of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act for the dissemination of "public information" concerning arms control and disarmament.

The distinction is between propaganda and information. This is a distinction with which the Committee on Foreign Relations has long been familiar. What concerns the committee are efforts by agencies of the executive branch to use the public media to put heat on Congress to pass particular legislation or to approve a particular treaty. On the other hand, the committee believes the American people have a right to know the positions which our Government is taking in the arms control and disarmament field, and the reasons why we are taking these positions. For this reason, the word "propaganda" must be narrowly construed so that the American people will not be deprived of information from any appropriate medium about arms control and disarmament activities.

With this understanding, I urge the Senate to adopt the amendments of the other body. This will give the Agency a new 2-year authorization to seek safeguarded alternatives to the arms race.

Mr. President, we all know that negotiations in this field will continue. We all know that even a measure like the limited test ban treaty can have an impact on our national security, particularly if other countries cheat. This Agency must be continued to do research so that our negotiators will be prepared to judge proposals, to determine what impact they would have on our national security, and to find out whether cheating could be detected.

By our vote today we will continue for 2 years the Agency which, more than any other, was responsible for the "hot line" to Moscow and the test ban treaty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Fulbright

The House made two minor changes in the Senate bill. The first of these restores, with one small change, the present language of the proviso in section 33, which states "that no action shall be taken under this or any other law that will obligate the United States to disarm or to reduce or to limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States, except pursuant to the treatymaking power of the President under the Constitution or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States." The Senate would have changed the last phrase to read: "except in accordance with the constitutional processes of the United States." The existing language has worked effectively and I see no objection to keeping it. It has always been understood by the committee and the Senate that major agreements, such as the recent limited nuclear test ban treaty, would be submitted as treaties whereas minor agreements, such as the "hot line" would not.

The Senate bill made the proviso applicable only to action taken under the Arms Control and Disarmament Act; the House bill continues the existing law which makes the proviso applicable to actions taken under other laws as well.

The second minor change occurs in the provision limiting the use of funds for propaganda. As passed by the Senate, it read: "None of the funds herein authorized to be appropriated shall be used to pay for the dissemination within the United States of propaganda in support of any pending legislation concerning the work of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency." The House proposes to strike the words "in support of any pending legislation." Here again, I see no objection to the House change. In fact, the original language considered by the committee was virtually identical to that agreed to by the House.

The committee's concern and intent was set forth in the report as follows:

"The committee is fully aware of the constitutional right of citizens to petition their Government. It is concerned, however, that tax funds gathered from all the citizens not be used, directly or indirectly, to encourage expressions of particular groups of citizens simply because those groups support positions taken by the Government agency. Mr. Foster testified that he personally did not promote these exertions on behalf of the bill and that he did not know who did. The provision recommended by the committee would therefore merely insure that the Agency will not participate in a public campaign on behalf of its own legislation. The committee does not intend by this language to restrict Agency officials from addressing public affairs groups and others on the general subject of arms control and disarmament or to undertake similar activities."

The following statement from the report of the Foreign Relations Committee dealing with an earlier limitation on propaganda activities of the International Cooperation Administration is equally applicable, I think, to the pertinent provision of S. 777: "It is admittedly difficult to draw a hard and fast distinction between information and propaganda so as to fit all possible cases. But the problem, in the committee's view is more theoretical than real * * * '[G]eneral propaganda' should be very narrowly construed and should not inhibit action through all appropriate media to make more information about the program available to the American people," (S. Rept. No. 412, 86th Cong., p. 39).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota to concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1309) to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the bill would increase the authorization of the Small Business Administration's revolving fund for use in its programs under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 by $34.3 million. This brings the total authorization for these programs to $375.3 million and the total authorization for the Small Business Administration's revolving fund to $1,700,300,000. The Small Business Administration estimates that this increased authorization will enable it to operate the Small Business Investment Company program and the lending program to State and local development companies through fiscal year 1964.

SBA now has authority to make loans to small businesses which have suffered severe economic injury because of the injury done their customers by drought and heavy rainfall in the area in which the small business is located. Section 2 of the bill would broaden this authority so as to include all types of natural disasters. These disasters must be declared by the President or Secretary of Agriculture under their statutory authority to make such declarations. There have been many cases where small businesses have suffered such economic injury because of disasters other than drought and heavy rainfall. Last winter, for instance, the citrus fruit crop in Florida was severely damaged by freezing. Many small businesses in the citrus fruit area dependent on the fruit growers were injured economically because of this natural disaster. There is no valid reason why small businesses should not be permitted to obtain disaster loans for economic injury resulting from disasters such as this heavy freezing as well as for floods, hurricanes, fires, or earthquakes.

The bill also provides the Federal Government with power to bring criminal charges against any person who, with intent to defraud, knowingly steals any property mortgaged or pledged to the Small Business Administration as security for a loan. This provision is the same as the authority now held by the farm credit agencies for similar offenses against property used as collateral for their loans. This provision would not preempt the States from taking action under their own laws.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 318. Joining in the sponsorship of this amendment are Senators Humphrey, McCarthy, McNamara, Nelson, and Proxmire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 4, line 8, insert "(a)" after "Sec. 2.".

On page 5, strike out line 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(7 U.S.C. 1961);"

On page 5, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

(b) Section 7(b) of such Act is further amended by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and by adding after paragraph (3) a new paragraph as follows:

"(4) to make such loans (either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate on an immediate or deferred basis) as the Administration may determine to be necessary or appropriate to assist any small business concern in reestablishing its business if the Administration determines that such concern has suffered substantial economic injury as a result of the inability of such concern to process or market a product for human consumption because of disease or toxicity occurring in such product through natural or undetermined causes."

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I believe my colleagues are aware of the unfortunate botulism episode which resulted in the October 25 action by the Food and Drug Administration recommending against consumption of smoked fish caught or processed in the Great Lakes area.

Due to our highly developed means of communication, the word of this warning instantly spread across the Nation. Unfortunately, the whole story was not always covered; namely, that the warning did not apply to fresh, frozen, canned, or pickled fish from the Great Lakes area.

As a result, the effect of this action by the Food and Drug Administration—in substance highly desirable from the standpoint of the public welfare—was to bring about an instantaneous and almost total shutdown of the commercial fishing business in the Great Lakes area. Twenty thousand men have been reported to be out of work, of whom 8,000 are citizens of the State of Michigan. And because the warning applied to fish caught anywhere but processed in Great Lakes plants, the effects of the shutdown extended to processors and retailers all over the Nation.

Those of us who represent the States most affected took such immediate action as could be devised to help straighten out the situation. The FDA was requested to—and did—clarify its recommendation, making clear that the warning applied only to smoked fish.

Standards were developed for preparation of smoked fish in a manner that could be certified as healthful; these, however, present many problems for the industry in terms of producing a tasty, attractive product, and research is continuing. Additional impetus has been given to research into the origin and development of type E botulism, a subject in which our knowledge is extremely limited.

In spite of these and other efforts, the distress in the industry is still very, very acute. Small business concerns which must meet fixed obligations and which are for the time being without income, are desperately in need of assistance. Low interest, long term loans such as those available to other segments of our economy who suffer disaster, would help tide them over.

Our amendment would add a fourth category of small business concerns which would be available for disaster loans if the Small Business Administration determines "that such concern has suffered substantial economic injury as a result of the inability of such concern to process or market a product for human consumption because of disease or toxicity occurring in such product through natural or undetermined causes."

Our intention is that these loans would be available to those small concerns—from the commercial fishing companies to the processors and the retailers—engaged in the marketing and processing of the fish; and that it would not be necessary to show that every fish was diseased, but that the inability to conduct their business was because of disease or toxicity occurring in the product in general.

Mr. President, we have tried to word this amendment in language that would not open up a Pandora's box. We have tried to make it very specific. But this industry is indeed experiencing a severe disaster, and we believe it should be eligible for disaster loans on a par with the assistance so understandably offered to those who make their living from the products of the soil.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have discussed the amendment with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey]. I have some reservations about it, because I am not certain what its full implications are. Nevertheless, as I told the Senator from Michigan when he first spoke to me about it, and also the Senator from Wisconsin, my inclination was to accept the amendment and to take it to conference. I presume there will be a conference. Of course, the House may accept it as it is.

Mr. HART. I hope the House will accept it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. So far as I was concerned, I told those Senators that I would be willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. HART. If there is no objection, I ask that there be printed at this point in the Record selected letters written to me by persons who are directly affected. These letters, in simple but very eloquent language, express the extreme difficulty in which a great many very good citizens find themselves. The situation has been created not at all from any failure on their part, but from some mystery of nature.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Alpena, Mich.,
November 15, 1963.

Attention Senator Hart.

Dear Sir: I am a commercial fisherman on the Great Lakes and since this outbreak of botulism I have had to lay my boat up.

I employ three men that each average $4,500 a year. These men are only skilled in fishing as I am. We are unable to find any job fishing. My equipment is valued at $25,000, and is my whole life's earnings and savings and is now laying idle.

I am past 40 years old and quite unable to start learning a new trade and support my family at the same time without any income.

If we could get a subsidy now like the farmers get when their land is laying idle would help.

Sincerely yours,
Mr. Donald Carpenter.

Oscoda, Mich.

Dear Sir: I am pleading for my family's livelihood due to the recent misrepresentation of botulism to the public. We, the commercial fishermen and thousands connected, are in great hardship.

I am in danger of losing my home and unable to put any money aside for the winter months when we freeze up.

There are no available jobs and no one to watch my fishing equipment if I leave to go look for a job elsewhere. Also, there is no possible way of selling my fishing equipment (boat, nets, etc.) so that I could start someplace else.

I have all my life invested in fishing and have never done anything else except my service hitch.

I have never asked for help before and wouldn't now if there were any other way.

Would you please try to help pass bills S. 627 and S. 978? I know I need the help and so do many many others.

I am strictly a chub fisherman and chubs are only used for smoking. So you can see how bad it is with us. Please help us all.

Sincerely,
Emil Vetter, Jr.

Oscoda, Mich.

Dear Sir: We thank you for your interest in the fishermen's (chub fishermen) problems.

We read your enclosure, S. 1309, and although we don't pretend to understand all the insert (A); strike out line 3 and adding to other parts, we do get the general idea in your paragraph (4).

The Small Business Act—S. 1309—would be very helpful to us to keep our business going until something is worked out with the botulism. Please help to get the low-interest loans through before it is too late. We need them now, not in 6 months; that may be too late.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. EMIL VETTER, Jr.

FAYETTE, MICH.,
November 12, 1963.

Senator PHILIP A. HART,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you in regard to the commercial chub fishing industry that has come to an end, due to what we think was given too much publicity by the Pure Food and Drug Administration.

I am 52 years old and have been fishing chubs most of my life, now that chub fishing has come to an end I have no way of making a living for my family.

I owe money on my boat and nets and am afraid I will lose what I have worked for most of my life.

Although we are not farmers of the soil we are farmers of the sea and think that we should get some assistance to see us through this crisis. I surely hope as do many others that are in the same fix I am in that you will do your utmost to help the commercial chub fishermen that were put out of business.

With great respect.

Yours truly,

NORMAN CASEY,
Commercial Fisherman.

ALPENA, MICH.,
October 29, 1963.

DEAR SENATOR HART: I am in the commercial fishing business, fishing chubs from Lake Huron. These fish are used solely for smoking purposes and since the deaths due to botulism found in some smoked fish, all chub fishermen have had to stop operations, and are in a state of emergency. This affects chub fishing in all the Great Lakes.

I am asking that you do all you can to speed up the testing being done by the Food and Drug people and the University of Michigan in their effort to find what caused the botulism.

In the meantime, my income has stopped, as has all the other fishermen in this area.

Something needs to be done quickly, before we lose everything. I am making payments on my home, furniture, and car, besides all the current bills for living expenses and these must be paid regardless. I paid $10,000 for my steel fishing boat and it has taken 20 years to build up my business. A man past 45 cannot get another job even if there were some.

I understand bill No. 627 is for emergency measures and I urge you to do what you can to help it pass. I hope you will give this your immediate attention.

Yours truly,

FRED J. LANG.

BARK RIVER, MICH.

DEAR SIR: I am writing in regards to the publicity that fish have gotten from all the papers over the deaths from smoked fish. And as near as I get it if the people had handled the fish like any food should have been there would have been no disease in that. But the way it was put to the people it is going to be hard to overcome and a lot of fishermen are out of business and some may never get back. As near as I get it, there are 20,000 men out of work from this unnecessary scare. Fishermen like myself with little schooling and know no other way of making a living are hurt bad. And am asking the men that can do help clear this up if it can as I do not believe the fishing industry deserved this blow.

Yours truly,

ELMER LARSON.

P.S.—It would be a blessing if commercial fishermen would be eligible for marine hospital care. Would like to see the bill passed on this.

TAWAS CITY, MICH.,
October 29, 1963.

Senator PHILIP HART,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HART: I have been a commercial fisherman all my life and at 47, it would be impossible for me to get employment that would keep 10 children and make necessary payments. What the Pure Food and Drug Department has done to us in the smoked fish deal by misinforming the press can never be rectified. It has killed us.

We need help from the Government immediately, to save us or we will lose everything we have worked for all our lives.

Yours truly,

EMERALD LABLANCE & SONS.

P.S.—Please vote for bills S. 627 and S. 978.

OSCODA, MICH.

DEAR SIR: I am the wife of a commercial fisherman writing to you for your help in the passage of bills Nos. S. 978 and S. 627.

The botulism scare hit us right at the time when we make our winter stake. Not only can't we put any money aside for the winter when we freeze up, we're already one house payment behind and likely to lose our home before things clear up.

I even had to help my husband pull his nets out of the water as we couldn't pay a hired man when we can't sell the fish.

Please help us desperate wives. We're scared.

My husband has his whole life in his fishing and needs help to keep it.

Please help soon.

Very sincerely,

Mrs. EMIL VETTER, Jr.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am delighted that the Senator from Michigan took the initiative to propose an amendment to the bill. I had occasion to speak to some fishing industry people in Wisconsin about 10 days ago. They are in serious difficulty. Their businesses, which have been established for many years, are on the verge of failure through absolutely no fault of their own. Their business is a very hazardous and tough business indeed—and highly competitive. Those men have been offering marvelously wholesome and healthful food, and now, because of an action by the FDA, and because of one or two incidents that occurred which had no connection with them, they find that their whole future is seriously prejudiced, and that they may lose their business or their jobs. Their whole livelihood depends on this business.

There is reason for accepting the amendment. I wish to say once again, because of the great efficiency of Mr. Foley, that I hope this matter can be taken care of without an increase in the number of employees or in the appropriations for the SBA, because this is a relatively small operation and involves only a temporary situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I said I had discussed the amendment with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. I do not want that statement to be understood as meaning that he was in complete agreement with the amendment. I believe that he, too, had some reservations about it. But at least he was aware of the fact that the amendment would be offered and that I intended to accept it and take it to conference.

Mr. HART. On behalf of the Senator who joined with me in offering the amendment, I thank the Senator from Alabama for his willingness to accept it.

The Senator was gracious enough to speak about 2 weeks ago concerning the Great Lakes fishing industry. Based on that experience, anything that can be done to keep Great Lakes fishing alive is worthwhile.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute as amended.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1309) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF LIBRARY SERVICES ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 570, S. 2265.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2265) to amend the Library Services Act in order to increase the amount of assistance under such act and to extend such assistance to nonrural areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, no action will be taken on the bill tonight. It will be the pending business.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, AND SECTION 18 (B) (2) OF SHIPPING ACT, 1916

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I introduce two bills and ask that they be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

S. 2328. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to provide that it shall be a misdemeanor for any contractor receiving an operating differential subsidy under title VI or for any charterer of vessels under title VII to engage in certain discriminatory rate setting practices; and

S. 2329. A bill to amend section 18(b)(2) of the Shipping Act, 1916, to require the publishing and filing of economic justification along with the publishing and filing of tariffs in certain cases.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the shocking differentials in ocean freight rates which have been imposed upon American carriers have discriminated against our entire economy. In my opinion it is a prime explanation for the chronic balance-of-payment difficulties which we have experienced.

How can we possibly improve our export position when the freight rates being charged are so substantially in excess of those paid by exporters from other nations.

It is virtually impossible for American producers to compete effectively in foreign markets when foreign producers can enter those markets at substantially lower costs.

This discrimination has been extremely severe in the case of Great Lakes shipments. Let us examine the facts. It costs $52.75 a ton to send beer from Milwaukee to Germany, but only $32 a ton to send German beer to Milwaukee—only a little more than half as much as to send Milwaukee beer to Germany. Bicycles from Milwaukee to Amsterdam cost $41.72; only $17.50 in the reverse direction—only a little more than a third as much.

An automobile from Milwaukee to England—and Ramblers are produced in Milwaukee—costs $27.50 per ton. An English car to Milwaukee costs only $16.10 a ton. Even books from Milwaukee to England cost $58 and only $29.40 from England to Milwaukee. Many similar examples could be given.

Why have these conditions come about? The answer is that these rates are set by international shipping conferences and American lines are consistently outvoted by foreign lines.

Therefore, foreign lines are, in effect, establishing economic policy for the United States. The Federal Maritime Commission has authority to disapprove these rate disparities but incredibly no actions have ever been taken under this authority.

The two bills I am introducing should go a long way toward correcting this situation. The first bill would require the publishing and filing of economic justifications for any rate disparities which are proposed. Thus, a burden of justification will be placed upon steamship conferences and steamship lines to explain why discriminations exist.

My second bill would forbid American taxpayers' dollars being used to support conference agreements which establish rates discriminatory to American exporters. Under this bill a penalty would be provided for any subsidized line if it continues as a party to any agreement under which discriminatory rates are set. The bill specifically states that rates must be comparable.

U.S. taxpayers are paying almost $300 million a year to subsidize an American fleet. The only purpose of this subsidy is to make the American fleet competitive with foreign fleets.

If, with the subsidy, we cannot carry American exports for the same price as comparable foreign ships, our subsidy program is a failure.

Thus, my bill should either save the American taxpayer money or should improve our balance of payments by establishing competitive conditions under which American exports can be carried in American ships.

Mr. President, we are all concerned about our adverse balance of payments. The administration has initiated a number of measures designed to rectify our adverse position. The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 was a notable step in this direction. Other actions include extending the charter of the Export-Import Bank, developing programs of education and assistance to American exporters, encouraging sales of raw material, such as cotton, and so on. However, as pointed out repeatedly in the recent hearings of the Joint Economic Committee, one major difficulty in correcting this imbalance is the handicap our domestic producers suffer as a result of outdated shipping practices.

Today I have introduced bills designed to update our transportation policies. I believe that new legislation aimed at the transportation and delivery of our exports is a necessary extension of other proposals designed to increase U.S. exports.

FREIGHT-RATED DIFFERENTIALS

The recent hearings of the Joint Economic Committee contained numerous examples which revealed that it costs 25 to 50 percent more to ship many American products to Europe or Japan than it costs to ship similar European or Japanese products to this country. The effects of these disparities on our balance of payments were well illustrated before the committee on October 10 by Mr. Arthur Dodge, Jr., vice president of the Dodge Cork Co., of Lancaster, Pa.:

> Of great concern to us is the fact that eastbound transatlantic ocean freight rates for products we manufacture are generally 40 percent higher than the rates for the same products for westbound shipments.

In the case of cork bottle stoppers, Mr. Dodge indicated that the rate from the United States to Europe was $238 per long ton, while the rate from Europe was only $72 per long ton. Commenting on the effect of this disparity, he stated:

> By redesigning the closures to be used, we are saving the bottlers as much as $6 per thousand closures compared to the cost in Europe of closures for identical packages. For the first time we can now see a potential market in Great Britain and Europe of over $100,000 per year for these items. We are in contact with firms abroad who want to buy from us. However, a freight disparity of 330 percent is a major barrier to achieving this potential business.

Mr. Dodge's example is not unique. On many American products the outbound freight rate is substantially higher than the inbound rate. Nor are these disparities confined to the Atlantic ports, or to the gulf ports, or to the Pacific ports, or to the Great Lakes—they apply to all. The hearings of the Joint Economic Committee contain numerous examples of the disparities on the Atlantic, gulf, and Pacific. I asked the staff of the committee to obtain from the Federal Maritime Commission some rates from the Great Lakes to Europe. There are of course, some disparities in the reverse direction. I see no reason why they should exist in either direction.

METHODS OF DETERMINING RATES

For the most part, ocean freight rates are set by steamship conferences composed of lines offering scheduled sailings over a particular trade route. In most cases, foreign lines outnumber U.S. lines. These monopolistic conferences, in order to operate in U.S. foreign commerce free from antitrust laws, must obtain approval of their actions from the Federal Maritime Commission. The Commission can refuse exemption from the antitrust laws whenever a conference agreement is detrimental or prejudicial to the foreign commerce of the United States. By this method the Commission has the means needed to disapprove these rate disparities.

Unbelievably, the Federal Maritime Commission has not acted previously in this area but, partially as a result of the Joint Economic Committee's investigation, a new Chairman has been designated and he has initiated programs designed to eliminate rate disparities. In order to expedite the Commission's investigation, some of the burden of proof of these disparities should be placed on the participants—the steamship conferences and the participating lines.

Therefore, I am introducing an amendment to section 18(b)2 of the Shipping Act of 1916, to require the publishing and filing of economic justification for rate disparities along with the publishing and filing of the rates themselves. Currently, section 18(b)2 requires steamship lines and conferences to file their rates with the Federal Maritime Commission. It is the purpose of this amendment to impose on the conferences and lines the burden of justification for rates which appear to discriminate against American exporters.

THIRD-COUNTRY DIFFERENTIALS

The Joint Committee's hearings also revealed that it costs considerably more on a per-ton-mile basis to send U.S. exports to South America and other foreign countries than it does to ship comparable products from Europe and Japan to these same countries. Mr. Robert R. Clark, vice president of FMC International, stated this problem very accurately. Mr. Clark stated:

> To further substantiate what the committee has already revealed, I have submitted a report as part of my testimony, which embraces 138 different rates on 7 chemical commodities to 10 third countries from the United States and Europe. Page 2 of this study shows that the average rate from Europe to 10 countries to be 154 cents per 100

> pounds; whereas the average rate from the United States is 233 cents per 100 pounds. Page 3 of this study shows on a cents-per-50-tons-per-nautical-mile basis that the average rate from Europe to 10 countries is 23.7 and from the United States, 50.6.

It does not take many examples to show the effects on the U.S. balance of payments or upon U.S. industry in general of freight rates which are double those of our major foreign competitors.

One significant example was brought out by Mr. Thomas A. Arnholz, president of Chemoleum Corp., in his testimony before the Joint Committee:

> An importer in Brazil at this time has the option of buying potassium muriate, a basic fertilizer, from this country at a price of say $31 per ton f.o.b., or at $32.50 from Europe. The conference freight rate from this country to Santos, Brazil, is $14.85; from Europe to Santos it is $12.00. This means the delivered Santos price from this country is $45.85 as against $44.50 from Europe. This relatively small differential is decisive and the importer will buy in Europe.

This is a particularly important example not only because the distance from Europe is longer to Santos than it is from the United States, but because these rates exclude loading and port charges. In other words, it costs $2.85 more just to carry a commodity from the United States to Santos than it does to carry this commodity from Europe, even though it is 500 miles farther from Europe.

Mr. Arnholz's example is pertinent for another reason—perhaps the most important of all. The rates from the United States to Brazil are set by a steamship conference with 14 active participating lines. Two of these lines are American, three are Latin American, and nine are European. Out of these nine European lines, which can obviously control the rates from the United States to Brazil, seven of these have a competitive service from Europe to Brazil and, therefore, have an interest in building up European exports. Not long ago when the rates from the United States to Brazil increased on potash, exports decreased from 2,100 tons a month to 800 tons per month.

LEGISLATION ON SUBSIDIES

I am also introducing an amendment to the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 which forbids American taxpayers' dollars being used to support conference agreements which establish rates discriminatory to American exporters. This amendment provides a penalty for any subsidized American line if it continues as a party to any agreement under which rates established for shipments between any U.S. port and a foreign port are higher on a mileage basis than the rates established for comparable shipments between such foreign port and another foreign port. The amendment specifically states that shipments must be comparable; that is, the same commodity moving in comparable volume over the two routes. Moreover, the rates exclude handling and stevedoring costs.

U.S. taxpayers are paying almost $400 million a year to subsidize an American fleet so that it is competitive with foreign fleets. If, with a subsidy, an American ship cannot carry an American export for the same price as a comparable foreign ship can carry a comparable foreign export, the subsidy is a failure.

There is other evidence to question the subsidy or at least the management of the subsidy program by the Maritime Administration. Since the passage of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, over $2 billion in direct subsidy has been paid. Yet, the percentage of oceanborne freight carried by American ships has markedly declined. The oceanborne freight of the United States has grown from 100 million tons in 1946 to 285 million tons in 1960, but the portion carried by U.S.-flag vessels during this period has declined from 65 to 35 million tons.

A preliminary investigation of the Maritime Administration's management of the subsidy has revealed shocking results.

Prior to the Joint Economic Committee's hearings in June, it was the policy of the Maritime Administration to require American-subsidized lines to be members of steamship conferences or lose their operating subsidies. This policy was pursued even though these conferences are predominately foreign controlled and charge excessive rates on our exports. As a result of the committee's recommendations, this policy has been abandoned.

The unwillingness of the Maritime Administration to shift subsidized carriers from inactive to active trades was also revealed. In 1957, the Maritime Administration entered into a 20-year contract with a steamship line to subsidize approximately 150 sailings a year between U.S. North Atlantic ports and the Caribbean, primarily Venezuela. At the time of contract negotiation, the volume of U.S. Atlantic trade to Venezuela was 845,000 tons—with the subsidized line carrying 362,000 tons, or 41 percent. To meet this trade volume, the Maritime Administration required three sailings a week by the subsidized operator. However, since 1957, the volume of trade has declined by 58 percent, and the volume carried by the subsidized operator has declined from 362,000 tons to less than 120,000 tons—a decrease of 69 percent. Such a decline would call for a reduction in subsidized service by at least two-thirds. But no such reduction has taken place—the ships are sailing with less than 33 percent of their weight capacity utilized.

The cost of the Venezuelan-North Atlantic subsidy, on a yearly basis, is approximately $6 million for the operating subsidy and $2 million for the construction subsidy—a total of $8 million per year. The remaining 14 years of this contract will cost U.S. taxpayers $112 million. Even if the volume of trade does not continue its steady decline, it will amount to only 1.5 million tons over the next 14 years. If no reduction in service occurs, the taxpayer will continue to pay the astronomical figure of $72 per ton in subsidies.

NO SUBSIDY CHANGES TO DATE

Section 606 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 gives the Maritime Administration the authority to change a subsidy contract or reduce subsidy payments when it determines that a change in the subsidized service is required as a result of trade changes after the effective contract date. The act clearly gives the Maritime Administration ample authority to reduce the subsidy on the Venezuelan trade route by two-thirds. But the Maritime Administration has not inaugurated a proceeding under section 606 in this case. In fact, it is my understanding that the Maritime Administration has never, on its own initiative, inaugurated a proceeding under this section to review any contract. The facts in the United States-Venezuelan trade case clearly indicate that of the remaining $112 million subsidy payments to be paid, $75 million is for empty space. This certainly calls for immediate review and action by the Maritime Adminstration.

The Venezuelan trade is but one example of the inflexibility of the Maritime Administration's subsidy policy. It shows that the Administration has not acted to reduce subsidized service when the trade clearly calls for a reduction. On the other hand, the Maritime Administration has failed to respond to increases in trade volume and to shift the underutilized ships to these routes. In 1952, exports from the U.S. gulf to Japan were 905,000 tons—one U.S.-subsidized operator carried 518,000 tons, or 57 percent, of this trade. In 1962, this total trade figure increased 189 percent—to 2,618,000 tons—but the one U.S.-subsidized operator carried only 670,000 tons, or 26 percent.

Even more startling is the Pacific coast-European trade route, where the volume of trade has increased from 567,000 tons in 1952 to 1,300,000 tons in 1962. Yet the percentage of U.S. carriage has declined from 14 to 1 percent because of the lack of subsidized carriers on this trade route. Figures for the Atlantic coast-Far East trade route are similar.

This is but a brief description of the lack of flexibility of our subsidized fleet. In a trade area where the tonnage has drastically declined, two-thirds of the subsidized space is empty. Yet in other trade areas where our foreign commerce has substantially increased, our subsidized fleet has not. This may be a primary reason for the decline in the percentage of U.S. foreign commerce carried by U.S.-flag ships. In 1950, U.S. flags carried 39 percent of our total foreign commerce; in 1962, only 12 percent; currently, the figure is less than 10 percent. This is very significant in terms of our balance of payments. Approximately 73 cents of every freight dollar leaves the U.S. economy and is a deficit to our balance of payments if the commerce is shipped on a foreign-flag vessel. However, if the commerce is shipped on an American vessel, 77 cents of each freight dollar stays in the U.S. economy. This dramatizes the need for flexible and efficient management of our subsidy program.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE SENATE ESTABLISHMENT REVISITED

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, Senators will recall that, last February, I spoke on three different days and at some length on the Senate Establishment, what it is, how it operates, and its responsibility for preventing the Senate from acting on the President's program. I desire to return to this subject today. I call my remarks "The Senate Establishment Revisited."

During the consideration of the foreign aid bill, which, at long last, the Senate has passed after mutilating many of the provisions recommended both by the President of the United States and by our own Foreign Relations Committee, there occurred one of the frequent nongermane discussions for which the Senate has so long been notorious. The discussion was initiated during the evening of November 6 by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. That evening and the next day, the discussion was participated in by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]; the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]; the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]; the two Senators from New York [Messrs. JAVITS and KEATING]; the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]; the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]; the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]; and the Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. These able Senators speculated as to what is wrong with the Senate, why we are still here in the middle of November, when, had we dealt expeditiously with the proposed legislation before us, we might well have adjourned no later than the end of July.

Various explanations were given for the unhappy condition in which we find ourselves. I should like to present to my colleagues and to readers of the RECORD my own analysis.

First, let me dispose of some contentions which I do not believe give an adequate explanation of the present situation. It was said by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]—although later he apologized for his remarks—that the leadership on both sides of the aisle had failed in their duty because they did not bring the Senate in early and keep it in late, in order to dispose of the business before it. But, as several Senators pointed out, the calendar is practically up to date, and there can be no very good reason for long floor hours when there is nothing ready for floor consideration.

It is now 4 o'clock; and, so far as I am advised, this speech is the only thing keeping the Senate from taking a recess or adjourning for today, because there is no measure on the calendar, ready for action, and sponsored by Senators who are in Washington and are ready to take it up.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There are measures ready for action; but the Senator from Pennsylvania indicated that he wished to speak this afternoon. So we held up other procedures, in order to enable him to make his speech. However, there are measures which could be taken up.

Mr. CLARK. I apologize to the Senator from Montana. Let me ask whether it is desired to take up those measures later today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; but we do this as a courtesy to the Senator from Pennsylvania, who waited for a long time in order to permit us to handle the other bills which we have handled today. I make this statement for the RECORD.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana is most courteous, as always.

Let me say that I, for one, have no desire to return to the days prior to 1961 when the majority leader spent his time, as described by Newsweek last week, in "back-slapping, chest jabbing, and arm twisting." I do not share the nostalgia of the Senator from Connecticut for "an orchestra leader" who "it is alleged stood up and blended into a wonderful production all the discordant notes of the Senate." Those days are gone, I hope, forever. Let the dead past bury its dead.

I am content with—indeed, I am proud of—our present Democratic majority leadership.

Second, it was suggested by the Senator from Oregon that the reason for our difficulties is because major pieces of proposed legislation have not reached the floor of the Senate. This of course is true. But this is the symptom, not the cause, of our senatorial "mononucleosis." The Senator from Oregon stated that this was not the fault of the majority leader, and with this I agree.

It is true that many of the major bills which we should have passed long ago have not as yet come out of committee. But the committees in default are only three in number: Finance, Appropriations, and Judiciary. Much proposed legislation has not only come out of other committees, but also has been passed by the Senate. It is now either awaiting action in the other body, or is bogged down in conference, because of disagreement between the two Houses. In the former category are the youth opportunities bill, the area redevelopment amendments, the mass transit bill, the extension of the juvenile delinquency bill, and the amendments to the Manpower Retraining and Development Act. Among the latter are the educational vocational bill and several of the major appropriation bills. The higher education bill is the only major measure which has been passed by both Houses, and has been agreed to in conference, but, for tactical reasons, has been held up on the Senate calendar.

Incidentally, I am in accord with those tactical reasons. As a prospective member of the conference committee, I believe we should come to an agreement with the House before we undertake to have this body pass the higher education bill.

All these measures are part of the President's program; but the Senate cannot be blamed for the failure to enact them. We have done our job. The difficulty lies on the other side of Capitol Hill. And it must be said that, other things being equal, the world would not come to an end if all these bills were not passed until next year. What, then, is holding us here in November, when we should have adjourned in July as the law requires, for the La Follette-Monroney Reorganization Act of 1946 calls upon Congress to complete its legislative business, including the major appropriation bills, and to adjourn by the last day of July? Every Senator knows why we are still here. It is our failure to pass, months after we were required by law to do so, 8 out of the 12 regular appropriation bills.

It is our failure to act on the President's civil rights bill.

It is our failure to act on the President's tax bill.

It is our unconscionable delay in not acting on the foreign aid authorization bill until November 15.

Who is to blame for this failure of the Senate to perform its constitutional duty? It is not the leadership. It is the Senate establishment. It is the small bipartisan group which does not want anything to happen, and which, I regret to state, appears quite content to have congressional government break down.

We can blame the House for some of this; but we must blame ourselves for a good deal of it, too. Let us look at the record.

A heavy burden of responsibility, in my judgment, lies on the senior Senators who are the chairmen and the ranking Republican members of the Finance, Appropriations, and Judiciary Committees and subcommittees, where appropriation bills, the civil rights bill, and the tax bill are bogged down, and have been bogged down for months. This is the group which opposes both the program of the President of the United States and the planks in the Democratic platform adopted at the Los Angeles Convention in 1960, and this also includes a group which is opposed to many of the planks of the Republican platform of 1960. It is a bipartisan group which is preventing the badly needed Senate reorganization which will enable us to perform our constitutional duty.

Let me be quite specific: The reason why we are still in session in the middle of November, and the reason why, in all likelihood, we shall remain in session for the balance of 1963, is the control of these key committees by this small group of men, who seem determined to obstruct the program of the President of the United States. One might say that the ruling cliques in the Finance Committee, the Judiciary Committee, and the Appropriations Committee constitute the Senate establishment's nests of opposition to the program of the President. These men are conducting a sitdown strike against the people of the United

States. In February I said this would happen. I say in November that it has happened.

It was suggested, during the discussion I referred to, that it was the job of the leadership to blast out of committee the bills which constitute the program of the President and to see that they got promptly to the floor, for action. But I suggest that this is not within the power of the leadership, because the leadership does not control the establishment. Indeed, there are some who think the establishment controls the leadership, although I do not agree. I believe the leadership is anxious for action, but is unable to obtain action. In my view, the reasons are: First, a complete breakdown of Democratic Party discipline; second, an unwillingness to use the weapons of power which lie ready at hand for a majority of the Democrats, acting in conference; and third, our failure to discipline Democratic members of the establishment for their failure to support the program of our President and the principles of the Democratic Party to which they profess to belong.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] suggested, during the course of the discussion, that none of us has the facts, other than the simple fact that, when he spoke, it was the 7th of November and major proposed legislation had not yet come to the floor. I suggest that we have the facts, and that the reason why this vital legislation has not come to the floor is that the establishment—on both sides of the aisle, and in the House as well as in the Senate—does not want to have it come to the floor, and is in a position to prevent it.

Let us first consider the status of civil rights legislation. It is said that we must wait for the House to act. Why must we so wait? Is it not because the Judiciary Committee refuses to complete its hearings on the President's proposals and the leadership is unwilling or unable to make a bipartisan effort to require the chairman and the other establishment members of that committee to terminate their hearings and report a bill to the floor?

To be sure, the Commerce Committee has voted to report the public accommodations title of the President's bill to the floor but, for tactical reasons, the leadership does not wish the report to be filed lest some of us who would like to anticipate the House action by starting a debate in the Senate might call the subject up for floor action.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe that the Senator from Pennsylvania wishes to be fair. He mentioned the fact that for tactical reasons the leadership does not like to do this, that and the other thing. I recall that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, in the forepart of his speech, made the statement that, for tactical reasons of which he approved, he was unwilling to bring a conference report on higher education to the floor at this time.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Just as I would respect the Senator's reasons in respect to that report, I assume he would respect the leadership's reasons in the matter of civil rights legislation because of the circumstances and the facts as they actually are.

Mr. CLARK. I certainly do respect the leadership's reasons. I respect them highly. I am not sure I agree with them.

The Commerce Committee is not controlled by the establishment. It is responsive to the administration, and I suggest that perhaps the action of the leadership in encouraging that committee not to complete its report and place the bill on the calendar is not entirely wise.

However, there is also a fair employment practices title, drafted in accordance with the President's civil rights message which has been reported favorably from the Subcommittee on Manpower and Employment of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which subcommittee I chair, without a dissenting vote. There is some hope that this bill can be voted out and placed on the calendar before the House bill reaches us.

The full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will meet to consider the subject next Tuesday, in the hope that the bill can be reported to the Senate and placed on the calendar. I have made a commitment to the chairman of the committee that I would not call the bill up, once it reached the calendar until the bill came over from the House of Representatives. I do that for tactical reasons, because I should like to get the bill on the calendar, and I do not believe I can do so in any other way. I am not even sure I can do it that way.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator, being an astute parliamentarian and a student of the rules and regulations of the Senate—and I mean that sincerely—realizes, of course, that even though he would make a commitment not to call up a bill such as the one that he has mentioned—the FEPC bill—there would be nothing to stop any other Senator who knew the bill was on the calendar from calling it up. Is that not correct?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is quite correct. Again, I am not sure that would not be a good thing, but I made the commitment for myself hoping to get the bill out.

It is also true that the chairman of the Education Subcommittee, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who has jurisdiction over the educational title of the civil rights bill, has expressed his intention of holding hearings on that title as soon as he can dispose of the education bills for which he is responsible and now that the foreign aid authorization bill, in which he took an active part, is out of the way.

But all of this could have been done months ago. The hard fact remains that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and his establishment colleagues have so pickled the remainder of the President's civil rights bill that it will never see the light of day unless both the leadership and a majority of the Democratic conference are prepared, through a motion to discharge, to exercise the power of party discipline which is unquestionably theirs and which they are understandably loath to exercise.

Let us turn to the tax bill. We all know what has happened there. After what seemed like interminable delay, the Ways and Means Committee of the other body finally brought out a tax bill differing drastically from the original recommendations of the President, but nevertheless, ultimately in form apparently satisfactory to him, even though most of the tax reform he advocated was stricken out of the measure. But the bill was not intercepted when it reached the Senate from the House, as I believe it both could and should have been. It was sent to the Finance Committee, where it is undergoing slow strangulation; and the small minority of Finance Committee members who desire to bring the bill promptly out of committee have been frustrated in their efforts to pry it loose. The chairman of the Finance Committee and its other establishment members seem determined to prevent the bill from being brought to the floor in time for action this year.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In fairness to the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], I wish to make a statement. The Senator from Pennsylvania considers him to be a member of the establishment, I believe.

Mr. CLARK. A charter member. In fact, a "card-carrying" member.

I share the high regard the Senator from Montana feels for the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. I do not happen to agree with the Senator from Virginia in respect to this particular proposed legislation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I do not rise to defend the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. He can do that for himself, in his own good time and in his own way. But, I do rise to make the record clear as to what his intentions were.

On at least four—possibly five—occasions prior to the time the tax bill was reported from the House Ways and Means Committee, the chairman of the Finance Committee came to me over a 4- or 5-month period to ask if there was some way in which the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee could speed up his consideration of the tax bill so that the Senator from Virginia could undertake hearings in the Finance Committee.

Strangely enough, on all those occasions, he told me that he thought about 6 weeks of hearings would be enough.

I point out that it took at least 8 months—perhaps a little longer—for the bill to reach the Senate from the House.

I also point out that on the basis of what I have read in press reports, there is a strong possibility that instead of the hearings being concluded on December 13, as had been announced previously, they may well be concluded on the 6th or on the 9th of December instead, indicating a desire to shorten the period, and I would guess, to bring the hearings within the 6-week span of which the distinguished chairman has consistently spoken.

I, too, am sorry there is no tax bill this year. I do not anticipate that there will be one, in view of the strong possibility that even if the hearings close on the 6th or the 9th of December, there will not be time to complete a markup; because, if my understanding is correct—and I do not pry too much into these affairs, though perhaps I should—there is a wide divergence of opinion in the committee itself.

So, I believe that the Record should be made clear as to what the intent of the chairman of the Finance Committee had been, insofar as I know personally over the past 4 or 5 months or so.

When he made these statements to me, he made them voluntarily on all except one occasion, and on that occasion I raised the question with him.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator may well be correct. In fact, I do not controvert any factual statement he has made.

The Senator will recall that I, among many Senators, urged the Senate Finance Committee to start hearings on the tax bill concurrently with the hearings in the House Ways and Means Committee. I even suggested the possibility that they hold joint hearings in an effort to expedite the bill and get it through the Senate this year.

The distinguished Senator from Virginia was unwilling to do that.

The statement is sometimes made, "There was no bill on which we could hold hearings." But the administration witnesses clearly could have been called on the basis of the President's message, as they were called in the House on the basis of the President's message. Other interested individuals could have come in to testify. This is a procedure which is utilized every day in the year by the Senate Appropriations Subcommittees, which always have preliminary hearings before a bill comes to the Senate from the House, so that the matter can be expedited when the bill reaches the Senate.

This must be a question of judgment. I am not looking into anybody's motives. I merely say that, in my opinion, the Senate action on the tax bill has been unduly delayed.

I make the further point that, though I may not be correct in the assumption, people who should know have told me in the past couple of days that the leaders of the establishment have decided it would suit their purposes better to bring the tax bill before the Senate before the civil rights bill is taken up, hoping in that way to be more effective in opposition to the civil rights bill, which of course, it is their perfect right to oppose under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The latter could well be true; I do not know. I am in full accord with what the Senator said about committees meeting simultaneously or together. At the beginning of this session, while I was at a breakfast meeting, at which the chairmen of the House Committee on Ways and Means and of the Senate Finance Committee were present, I made that very suggestion, and I want the Senator to know that I was put in my place in a hurry.

Mr. CLARK. I have no doubt that the Senator was. I shudder to think what would have happened to me if I had been at that meeting. It is perhaps fortunate that I was not.

I venture to say that when the bill is reported, unless there is a determined filibuster—a filibuster might well come from some liberal Senators, as well as from some conservative ones—that bill will pass the Senate by a vote of well over 2 to 1. And so, again, a little group of establishment members is able to repress the will of the Senate, the will of the President and the will of the people of the United States.

Let us turn to the appropriations bills. Each year the Congress must enact 12 major public appropriations bills. Under the terms of the La Follette-Monroney Reorganization Act, we are required to finish this work, and all our other legislative work, and adjourn not later than the last day in July. Yet as of today—and it is now late in November—only four of them have been passed and sent to the White House. The other eight are stuck in the House, stuck in the Senate, or stuck in conference. And there is little hope, in my opinion, that they can all be passed before the end of the year.

What is the reason for this extraordinary and arrogant avoiding of the clear provisions of the law? Some say it is laziness. Others point to chaotic disagreements between House and Senate conferees. Three appropriations bills have been held up because the authorization bills have not been passed.

Still others suggest that the conservative majority on the Appropriations Committee of both the House and the Senate are content not to take up and pass these bills because each of them, to some extent at least, in accordance with the program of the President, will contain more money than the corresponding appropriation bill for the preceding fiscal year. Thus it is that the Treasury is protected from what are thought to be extravagant expenditures at the expense of services needed by the American people in a wide variety of categories.

Finally, some believe that the appropriations bills are being deliberately delayed by Members of the congressional establishment of both Houses in order to use this delay as a weapon in an effort to prevent enactment, in the foreseeable future, of either the tax bill or the civil rights bill, or both.

Here is a list of the appropriations bills, with a notation of the current status of each. I ask unanimous consent that the list may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

1. Agriculture: Passed both Houses but still in conference.
2. Legislative: Finally out of conference and about to come up on the floor.
3. State, Justice, Commerce: Passed the House June 18 but not yet reported to the Senate.
4. Foreign aid: Waiting in the House for a conference agreement and approval of the conference report on the authorization bill.
5. Military construction: Finally passed the House, November 18.
6. Public works: Finally passed the House, November 19, but not the Senate.
7. District of Columbia: Finally passed both Houses, awaiting conference.
8. Independent offices: just passed the Senate, awaiting conference.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I conclude that there has been a deliberate slowdown—perhaps a sitdown strike—by the Senate establishment, with the cooperation of their colleagues of the House establishment, to frustrate the will of the President, of the Congress and of the people of the United States. If these appropriations bills, if the tax bill, if the civil rights bill were permitted to come to a vote on their merits in both the House and the Senate, they would promptly be enacted into law. This could and should have been done months ago.

The constitutional crisis which this situation creates is a challenge to the ingenuity, to the vigor of every Congressman and every Senator who desires to break this roadblock to progress and to enable the Congress of the United States to perform its clear constitutional duty.

How can this be done? There must be both a long-range and short-range program. I list some needed steps in the order of their urgency:

First. We should immediately discharge the Finance Committee from further consideration of the tax bill, passed by the House, bring it to the floor, and pass it. I send to the desk a resolution to this effect and urge my colleagues to support and pass it. I hope the leadership will, in due course, be prepared to support it, also.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am not prepared to support it. I believe in proper procedures. I believe that, for a bill of this magnitude, 6 weeks is not too long. I regret that the bill will not be passed this year, but I do not intend to go against procedures which have proved themselves against the passage of time and which, while they may need some improvement, nevertheless should not be overturned in this manner at this time and on this occasion for this purpose.

Mr. CLARK. I say to my good friend the majority leader that, in my opinion, our best chance, and perhaps our only chance, of getting a tax bill in the foreseeable future—and I am thinking in terms of next year, before we go to the national convention—is to bring it out of the Senate committee or to substitute on the floor of the Senate the House-passed tax bill, and to pass it exactly as the House passed it. If the bill is passed in different form in the Senate and is sent to conference, I leave it to the imagination of my listeners as to when any kind of bill will come from the conference and be passed again in both the House and the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and printed, and will lie over under the rule.

The resolution (S. Res. 226), submitted by Mr. CLARK, was ordered to lie over under the rule, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 8363, the tax bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, second, we should immediately discharge the Appropriations Committee from further consideration of the State-Commerce-Justice bill which has been stuck in committee since June 19. I send to the desk a resolution to this effect and again urge my colleagues to support and pass it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and printed, and will lie over under the rule.

The resolution (S. Res. 227), submitted by Mr. CLARK, was ordered to lie over under the rule, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 7063.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I point out that the chairman of that particular subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee has a number of other functions, in addition to presiding over the appropriations subcommittee for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and related agencies.

The Senator forgets Mr. Valachi. The Senator forgets the TFX hearings.

Mr. CLARK. And Billy Sol Estes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And Billy Sol Estes. The Senator forgets that the Senator to whom he refers is a member of at least four other subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee. He is chairman of the Committee on Government Operations. He has other responsibilities and duties.

Although I think it has taken too long to report the bill, nevertheless I believe the Senator ought to be given a little more time, in view of the circumstances involved. I am quite sure neither that bill nor, to the best of my knowledge, any other bill, is being held up because of dilatory tactics or because of a deliberate effort to delay.

Mr. CLARK. I respectfully disagree with the able majority leader. I point out that by law that bill was required to be passed by the 30th of June. It came to the Senate on the 19th of June.

I appreciate that part that the able Senator who is the chairman of the subcommittee has other responsibilities, but I suggest to my good friend the majority leader that this is a question of a priorities.

I am not one to pass adverse judgment on this floor against a Member of the Senate who is not present, but it occurs to me that perhaps the highest priority involved was to get that important appropriation bill through, and to forget Billie Sol Estes, the TFX, Mr. Gilpatric, and Joe Valachi until the appropriation bill had been passed; which, I say again, could have been and should have been done by the 30th of June.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is easy to criticize a chairman of a committee, especially if one does not have the responsibilities which that chairman has. I would not single out this particular appropriation bill, because, if my recollection serves me correctly, there are still those which have not left the House and which must yet be considered by the Senate. How would the Senator handle those, in view of the fact that he is trying to discharge from the jurisdiction of the duly authorized subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee a measure on which hearings have been held until recently and which measure will be marked up this coming week and probably be reported out thereafter?

Mr. CLARK. I think the answer is obvious—we cannot do anything about undue delay in the other body. All we can do is do our duty here.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CLARK. In a moment.

I respectfully say to the Senator from Montana that he is in error when he says it is easy to criticize on the floor a member or chairman of an appropriation subcommittee. It is not easy. It is one of the most difficult things. It has, perhaps justly, caused me to be categorized by Mr. James Reston as the most unpopular Member of the U.S. Senate. But I have my duty to do. I do not think anything has been more distasteful for me to do than to make this speech, except perhaps the three speeches I made early this year.

Now I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. First, let me say that I do not agree with Mr. Reston at all. The Senator from Pennsylvania may not be one of the most popular Members of the Senate, but he is certainly not, by any means, the most unpopular. I would put him in the middle category, with the majority leader.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is very kind. Anytime he puts me in the same category with the Senator from Montana, I shall be happy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Popularity does not win ball games.

Mr. CLARK. And "nice guys" do not win, either.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is true.

Mr. CLARK. But I do not believe that. I think "nice guys" do win.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is speaking of faults of the Senate and of its procedures. I do not think the fault lies with the Senate, or even with its procedures to the extent he states. I think the fault lies with Senators.

The Senator will find, if he goes over the record of the Senate, a high degree of absenteeism, especially on the Democratic side of the aisle, on the side which is supposed to be in control. The Senator will find that, instead of the rules and regulations being at fault, Members of the Senate are at fault because they will not answer telegrams urging them to return for consideration of important legislation, they will not remain on the floor and participate in debate, they will go their own way, in their own good time, and no penalties can be inflicted. Why are not more Senators here this afternoon to listen to the excellent speech by the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Because they could not care less.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. In just a moment. I am reminded by the Senator from Montana of a quotation from Julius Caesar. I think it was Cassius who said:

> The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars,
> but in ourselves, that we are underlings.

Perhaps it is.

If the Senator from Montana will take a look at the Journal of the first Senate of the United States, in 1789, which was compiled by the first Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. William Maclay, the Senator will find that there was critical absenteeism in that Senate, in the first session. It took 3 months to develop a quorum. It continues on to this day. So this could properly be called an inbred disease of Senators, which probably will not change unless there is a change in human nature.

I yield now to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thought the Senator might want to have a fact which I may be able to contribute. I have served on the Appropriations Committee for a long time. Last year the chairman of the committee in the other body saw fit to place in one bill objectives which had always, since I had been in the Senate, been in two different bills. The State, Justice, and Judiciary bill had been handled by the able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. The bill on Commerce and related agencies—and there were many related agencies—I happen to have handled for some years.

For some reason the chairman of the Appropriations Committee in the other body joined those two bills, both large, important measures involving long hearings.

The Senator from Arkansas has had to stand up to that very much increased responsibility and also those very much lengthened hearings required under that arrangement. In fairness to all concerned, that statement should appear in the RECORD.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is aware of the fact, is he not, that the bill came over from the House on the 19th of June? When was the first hearing called for in the Senate? If the Senator does not know, I will tell him—the 8th of November.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida is on six subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee, one of which is this particular subcommittee. The Senator from Florida has worked pretty hard on his subcommittee assignments. He has had an opportunity to attend only two or three of the hearings on this particular subcommittee. I know the Senator from Arkansas has had one of the heaviest burdens in the way of hearings, not only in connection with the Appropriations Committee, but the Government Operations Committee and the special duties that have been involved there this year, in connection with agricultural irregularities, which have been mentioned by the Senator from Pennsylvania, and which certainly justified a full and careful inquiry for the protection of all concerned, both executive and legislative, as well as ordinary citizens involved in the matter.

I have not had the pleasure and privilege of listening to all parts of the Senator's discussion, but I hope he will realize the fact that the Senator from Arkansas is a most heavily burdened Senator in connection with hearings that he is required to carry on.

I have one further comment. I have no criticism of the Senator. I have not heard all his statement, but, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I thought I should make the statement that the double burden on the Senator from Arkansas in connection with the hearings this year is a heavy burden.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his comments.

To continue with my statement:

Third. The leadership should request the administration supporters of the civil rights bill on the Judiciary Committee to attempt to bring the President's civil rights proposals out of committee and to the floor. If this effort fails, a discharge resolution should be filed.

Fourth. The joint leadership should give notice that it intends, in January 1965, to discipline, through party action, those members of the establishment on both sides of the aisle who, in the case of the Republicans, frustrate the program of their party or, in the case of the Democrats, refuse to support either the candidate of their party for the Presidency or the platform on which he runs in 1964. This discipline should include refusal to support for committee seats or chairmanships those Senators who are unwilling to support the platform of the party in the area of the particular committee's responsibility. In the meanwhile, the provisions of the Proxmire resolution of November 8, calling on the leadership in both Houses to schedule legislation for consideration next year, should be carried into effect.

Fifth. The rules of the Senate and some of the rules of the House must be changed promptly so that both bodies may act on the program of the President when a majority is ready for action.

Sixth. Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, providing for a study of congressional reorganization now on the calendar, should be called up for action, amended to restore authority to recommend changes in the rules, procedures, and floor action of both parties as contemplated by the 30 Senators who originally sponsored it, and passed.

Seventh. The Senate should pass in stronger form Senate Resolution 89, now on the calendar, requiring a rule of germaneness while the pending business is before the Senate for action.

Eighth. The Senate should pass in strengthened form Senate Resolution 111, now on the calendar, permitting Senate committees to sit while the Senate is in session.

Gentlemen, it is later than we think. The bricks and mortar of which the Houses of Congress are built are cracking and falling out of place under our eyes. The American people are becoming disillusioned with the legislative performance of the Congress. They are demanding both action and reform. We must act to restore the efficacy of congressional government before the legislative branch of our Federal Republic destroys itself because we were unwilling to save it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we have been listening to the fifth or sixth in a series of discourses on the Senate establishment. I anticipate this is not the last we will hear about it. I am quite certain other Senators will have something to say about it.

RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, under the order previously entered.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), under the previous order, the Senate recessed until tomorrow, Friday, November 22, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT].

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Proverbs 14: 34: *Righteousness exalteth a nation; but sin is a reproach to any people.*

Almighty God, as we go forth into the hours of this beautiful day, may we seek to identify and unite our desires and wishes with Thy divine will, pledging ourselves to make it the constant and controlling thought of our minds and hearts.

We rejoice that our beloved Nation was not founded by atheists and agnostics, or by pagans and infidels but by God-fearing men and women who placed the altar of faith and prayer at the very center of their life.

Grant that we may authenticate and bear witness to the grandeur and glory of the ideals and principles of our Republic by incarnating and making them regnant in our daily life.

We pray that our chosen representatives may be men and women who abhor dishonesty and hypocrisy and may the legislation which they propose and adopt never run counter to that which is honorable and righteous.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8747. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House upon the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 103. Joint resolution to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the work of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF NOVEMBER 25

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring as to the legislative program for next week, and, if it is in order, in view of the fact that next week is Thanksgiving week, if the acting majority leader can give us any information as to what we might expect for the week following next week.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman as to the schedule for next week, we have programed legislation for Monday and Tuesday. There are two matters to be considered, one having to do with the continuation of appropriations for the month of December, which we will consider in the House on Monday, and the Senate then has to consider it, and there is the debt ceiling legislation which is now being considered in the other body. We hope both matters can be disposed of before the end of Tuesday.

Monday is District day, but there are no District bills to be considered. As I said a moment ago, Monday we will take up the continuing resolution on appropriations for the month of December.

We have also scheduled for Monday five printing authorizations from the Committee on House Administration, which are as follows:

H.R. 8751, to print certain proceedings of the AMVETS as a House document.

House Concurrent Resolution 230 and House Concurrent Resolution 231, authorizing the printing of 5,000 copies each of two committee prints entitled "Tax-Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Their Impact on Our Economy," for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business.

House Concurrent Resolution 237, providing for the printing of additional copies of the Supreme Court opinions involving the offering of prayers and reading from the Bible in public schools.

House Resolution 518, to print as a House document the handbook entitled, "The U.S. Courts."

We will also consider the bill H.R. 8971, the supplemental authorization of appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for the fiscal year 1964. We hope to consider that by unanimous consent.

On Tuesday we have scheduled S. 254, providing for acquisition of certain property in square 758 in the District of Columbia, as an addition to the grounds of the U.S. Supreme Court Building. This will be considered under an open rule, with 1 hour of general debate.

There is no further legislative business scheduled for the week, although conference reports will be in order at any time.

I am unable to announce the legislative program for the following week, although I have been informed informally that the cotton bill will probably be considered in the early part of that week.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman says he thinks the cotton bill will be considered?

Mr. BOGGS. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. How early in the week might that come?

Mr. BOGGS. My information at this time is that it will be considered on Tuesday and Wednesday.

Mr. HALLECK. In view of the situation for next week, would it be expected that there will be a session on Friday of next week in order to adjourn over until Monday?

Mr. BOGGS. Yes, but simply for that purpose.

Mr. HALLECK. I wonder if I might suggest to the acting majority leader that he might get that permission now.

Mr. BOGGS. I so request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman withhold that request?

Mr. BOGGS. I think the problem we are confronted with, if I may say to the distinguished minority leader, is the difficulty in connection with the continuing resolution and the debt ceiling. It is conceivable we may have to be here to consider conference reports and final legislative action on those two matters.

Mr. HALLECK. On Friday of next week?

Mr. BOGGS. I would hope not. But that is the problem we are confronted with.

Mr. HALLECK. I made the suggestion, Mr. Speaker, only because I remember one time we had objection here to adjourning over Thanksgiving Day, and I think if it could be worked out now, it would seem to me it would serve a good purpose. But, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the suggestion.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank my colleague.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Speaker pro tempore may be permitted to extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NINETY-FIFTH BIRTHDAY OF JOHN NANCE GARNER, FORMER SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, 95 years ago tomorrow John Nance Garner, the fourth of his name, was born in a log cabin near a small Texas border town neighboring what is now my State and congressional district, then the Choctaw Nation, Indian territory.

Since the House will not be in session tomorrow I am taking this time today to extend heartfelt birthday greetings to this great American who by any standards was one of the most illustrious men ever to serve in the House of Representatives. In doing this I know I express the views of every Member of the House.

When John Garner came to Congress he was destined to become the 39th Speaker of the House of Representatives and the highest ranking Democrat in the Nation at the time of his election to that office. Had he remained in Congress he undoubtedly would have established a record of tenure in the speakership that would not have been matched in a thousand years.

John Garner became Vice President of the United States and at the end of his service in that high office had broken the record up to his day for the longest continuous service in the chairs of the highest parliamentary bodies of this country. As Vice President during the surging days of the New Deal he of course became a historic figure but it was his service in the House of Representatives more even than in the Vice Presidency that stamps his career as one of the most important in American history. His 46 years in public life embrace service as a Representative, majority whip, minority leader, as well as Speaker and Vice President. He served as ranking member of two powerful committees, the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Garner has lived a life phenomenal both as to public service and private activity. His service in the House dates back to the beginning of this century and all those who knew him, including the few remaining Members of the House of Representatives who served with him, are delighted that this great Texan, like the immortal record which he wrote in the House of Representatives, lives on and on.

When he retired in 1941 he said that he hoped he might spend half his years in public life and the remaining half in private life. "I am going home," he said, "to live to be 93 years old."

Mr. Garner is a modest man and perhaps deliberately underestimated his potential for longevity. And I am delighted that he did. I hope his prediction misses its mark by many, many more years. I extend my congratulations to the distinguished former Speaker and Vice President and wish him many happy returns of the day.

OLD-AGE MEDICAL CARE

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, after reviewing the testimony on the King-Anderson bill now being heard before the Ways and Means Committee, I am convinced more than ever that I am right in my opposition to this legislation. I think the testimony given today by a distinguished American, Dr. Edward R. Annis, president of the American Medical Association, very accurately sums up my position on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD the testimony given by Dr. Annis as part of the speech.

STATEMENT OF DR. EDWARD ANNIS, AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Dr. Edward R. Annis, of Miami, Fla., and I am president of the American Medical Association. I am here to present the views of the medical profession on H.R. 3920.

The American Medical Association opposes this measure.

Our objections to this bill are manifold. We disagree with its basic philosophy. We oppose its method. We are deeply concerned over the effects it would have upon the Nation's standards of health care.

H.R. 3920 would transfer to the Federal Government at a single stroke the responsibility for the purchase of specified hospital and related benefits for all persons over 65, regardless of their desires or their economic need. There is no justification for the use of tax funds collected from workers at the low end of the income scale to pay these expenses for the entire elderly population, including the self-supporting and the wealthy.

More than 60 percent of the 17½ million aged, or about 10 million, have already protected themselves through insurance from the cost of illness. No one disputes the fact that some elderly people require help in meeting their medical expenses. But the means for assisting them already exist through the Kerr-Mills law.

The need for H.R. 3920 has been exaggerated before the American people in the campaign to secure its passage. Now, let us examine some facts and figures which we believe demonstrate why this is so.

ECONOMIC CONDITION OF THE AGED

Proponents of this bill support their case with three parallel claims:

1. That debilitating illness is universal among the population aged 65 and over. This is false.

2. That economic deprivation is a general characteristic of the elderly. This is false.

3. That these conditions demand a massive rescue operation by the Federal Government. This is false.

For years, the American people have been bombarded by such statements as: The monthly income of the great majority of the aged is little more than a social security check. Yet, the Government's own figures show the annual income of persons over 65 is $35 billion. Only one-third of this comes from social security payments.

The aged are portrayed as a group too impoverished to pay for medical care. But the Government reports that persons over 65 paid $5.4 billion for medical care in 1961. Nearly three-fourths of this sum was paid from private sources.

CHRONIC ILLNESS

King-Anderson proponents have also sought to perpetrate a false picture of the aged as universally frail and feeble, constantly ill, and doddering from one visit to the doctor to the next. Why, they declare, older people visit doctors 36 percent more often than younger people. What does this mean precisely? It means a difference of 1.8 visits per year—an average of 5 visits for the younger population compared with an average of 6.8 for those over 65, hardly a significant margin.

Repeatedly, supporters of this legislation have asserted that four out of five older persons have one or more chronic illnesses. The word "chronic" has an awesome sound. It is intended to convey an impression of an array of serious afflictions causing an intolerable financial burden for the elderly.

But "chronic" defines duration, not severity. It includes such nondisabling afflictions as nearsightedness and partial hearing loss.

Evidence does indicate that four out of five among the aged have one or more chronic conditions. The same evidence indicates that less than 4 percent of the more than 17 million over 65 are confined because of chronic illness, and only about 15 percent of the noninstitutionalized experience any significant limitation of activity because of these ailments.

The fact is that the vast majority of the aged enjoy reasonably good health, and really poor health is concentrated among a relatively few. While the aged are more susceptible to chronic conditions than the population as a whole, they are less likely to suffer acute illness or to require surgery.

HOSPITALIZATION

The aged who enter hospitals will stay, on the average, about twice as long as younger people, about 15 days against 8.4 days for the population as a whole. The average for the aged, however, is pushed up by a minority who, because of extremely poor health, remain hospitalized for long periods. The U.S. Public Health Service has reported that 10 percent of the aged account for 39 percent of the total days of hospitalization for this age group. The same 10 percent also account for about 38 percent of expenditures.

INCOME OF THE AGED

Supporters of H.R. 3920 also play unceasingly on the theme of the near-hopeless financial plight of the aged. Among the claims: More than 50 percent have incomes below $1,000 a year, and the incomes of aged families are only half as much as for younger families.

These are deceptive statistics. Included among those with incomes of less than $1,000 are wives who have zero income even though the family income may be $5,000 or $10,000 per year. It would be just as accurate to say that almost 60 percent of all persons under 65 have incomes of less than $1,000, too. For there are millions of younger people, as well as older, who are unemployed and unemployable, such as infants, schoolchildren, wives, and the sick and disabled.

Economic comparisons based on gross income figures of aged and younger families are no less misleading. Thus, we often hear the statement that the median income of younger families in 1960 was about $5,900 as against about $2,900 for aged families.

It would appear to be elemental that a family's financial condition depends not on income alone but on the number of people to be taken care of, as well as other inescapable demands on the income.

REDUCED DEMANDS ON INCOME

The President's Council on Aging has estimated that the special tax advantages enjoyed by older Americans will save them approximately $775 million in 1963. Moreover, many of the aged have retired and thus escape expenses for transportation, lunches, clothing, and other needs incident to employment. Most of them no longer have children to educate. Their housing costs are lower. A recent survey by the University of Michigan Survey Research Center disclosed that 64 percent of the aged were homeowners; among younger Americans, 53 percent were homeowners. But 53 percent of all the aged owned their homes mortgage free, compared with only 18 percent among younger Americans.

Federal taxes will not take a bite out of the older family's income in the vast majority of cases, but they will reduce the younger family's $5,900 income to about $5,170. The average older family is composed of 2.34 members, the average younger family of 3.97 members. Thus, the tax-free income of the older family in 1960 was $1,240 for each member, only $60 less than the $1,300 after-tax, per member income of the younger family. And educational costs alone could have wiped out that differential.

There are other facts bearing on this question worthy of the committee's attention. For example:

1. The income of families headed by an older person rose 4.5 percent between 1960 and 1961, or more than twice as much as the 2.1 percent increase for all U.S. families.

2. Although the elderly have increased in number, the proportion who must rely on old age assistance programs for their basic necessities has declined in the past dozen years from more than 23 percent to slightly more than 12 percent.

3. The aged who need help in meeting medical bills are receiving it. Government figures show that more than $1.5 billion in public funds was paid out for this purpose in 1961.

REPORT OF COUNCIL ON AGING

Even the President's Council on Aging was able to delineate a remarkable record of economic improvement among the aged in its May 14, 1963, report, "The Older American," and the group forecast continued improvement in the future.

The Council pointed out that in 1950 there were 12.3 million Americans over 65 with a total income of $15 billion, but by 1961, with the number of aged at 17 million, their income had jumped to $35 billion.

Furthermore, the Council noted that practically everyone is becoming eligible for social security; the checks will grow larger because they will be based on higher average earnings; private pensions will add more and more to the income of the aged as today's workers reach retirement age.

Clearly, we are dealing with a diminishing problem which belies the crisis propaganda of the forces behind the King-Anderson proposal. We submit, Mr. Chairman, that the factual evidence wherever it can be gathered reduces to absurdity the claim that everyone becomes ill and destitute and dependent on the Government when he becomes 65. The argument is exploded both by the financial condition of the aged and by the demonstrated ability of these Americans to handle the problems of their later lives as they have in their earlier years.

KERR-MILLS

In our discussion of the economic condition of the aged as a group, as a single segment of the population, we do not argue for a moment that all of the elderly are without financial problems. We know a significant number of Americans over 65 require financial help from some source to meet medical expenses.

The fact is we cannot generalize about our senior citizens, or about people in any age group. The problems of the aged—whether they involve health or finances, jobs or recreation—are those of individuals, not of an entire mass that has passed a certain birthday.

Some elderly—about 2¼ million—are on public assistance for all their needs. Some over-65 Americans are wealthy and well-to-do. In between these two extremes is the vast majority of our older people, with incomes and financial resources ranging from low to modest to comfortable. Some poor people are extremely healthy, and some wealthy people are invalids.

RECORD OF PROGRESS

When this committee held hearings in 1961 on King-Anderson legislation, the Kerr-Mills statute was only a few months old. It was too soon to make a reasonable evaluation of its effectiveness. Now there is a record on which to base a valid judgment. It is a record of progress which simply cannot be denied.

All the more remarkable, the implementation of the law by the States and their initiation of new programs has proceeded in the complete absence of encouragement by the executive branch. The law has never been liked by those who want the Government to assume total charge of medical care.

Beneficiaries under the Kerr-Mills law fall into two groups:

The needy who are already on public assistance for the other necessities of life.

The near-needy, those ordinarily self-supporting but who do not have the resources to cover the extra expense of serious or prolonged illness.

Twenty-nine going MAA programs within 3 years after the Federal law was passed clearly shows State support of the Kerr-Mills law. And, when we recognize that State legislatures do not, ordinarily, have annual sessions, and that they must study the problem locally, develop eligibility standards, decide what services to cover, develop cost estimates, establish administrative staffs and procedures, and obtain approval of the State plan from HEW, the record of implementation becomes more impressive.

In addition to the MAA programs now in operation in 29 States, and in Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and the District of Columbia, 2 more programs are scheduled to begin this year (Iowa and South Dakota), 3 to begin in January (Kansas, Nebraska, and Virginia), and 2 more in July 1964 (Minnesota and Wisconsin). Thus, within 7 months, programs will be in operation in 36 States and 4 other jurisdictions—40 out of the 54 possible programs. Is this a lack of acceptance?

OAA GROWTH

Nor has the growth of Kerr-Mills been limited to enactment of MAA legislation. Added impetus has been given to old-age assistance programs under the act; that is, improvement of health-care programs for the needy elderly who are totally dependent on public assistance.

Vendor payment medical programs for OAA recipients are now in effect in all 50 States and the 4 other jurisdictions; 9 States and 2 jurisdictions which had no vendor payment programs prior to Kerr-Mills have since begun them; 27 States and the other 2 jurisdictions have increased coverage, or benefits, or both, under Kerr-Mills encouragement. Only 14 States have made no significant changes in OAA vendor payment programs. Many of these already had sufficiently broad programs to meet their needs.

INDIVIDUALS HELPED

Today, hundreds of thousands of needy and near-needy older persons across the Nation are receiving medical, hospital and nursing home care through MAA and OAA. Testimony before this committee on Monday disclosed that 451,000 aged received help during the 1963 fiscal year under the MAA program.

Another 2¼ million aged persons, one out of every eight, were on State OAA rolls. Thus, they were assured of medical care benefits from these programs as the need arose.

During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962, according to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, $350.7 million in OAA funds and $194.8 million in MAA funds—over half a billion dollars—were spent in vendor payments for health care.

KERR-MILLS FLEXIBILITY

The flexibility of Kerr-Mills is one of its most significant features, permitting individual States to broaden and improve their programs as experience shows changes to be desirable. This would not be possible under a monolithic national program, administered from Washington and treating all the Nation's elderly alike.

The wisdom of the Kerr-Mills approach has already been demonstrated. Since their original enactment of MAA programs, 15 States have liberalized eligibility requirements and 4 other States are considering such action. Benefits have been increased in 16 States. Some States have improved their programs more than once. In only one State, West Virginia, has there been any significant cutbacks.

CHARGES AGAINST KERR-MILLS

Nevertheless, despite this record, the attacks on Kerr-Mills continue. They invariably follow three lines:

1. Little new aid is being given; the States have merely shifted the cost of their old programs to the Federal Treasury.

This is demonstrably false. Monthly vendor payments for health care under OAA and MAA have increased by $41 million since enactment of Kerr-Mills.

2. Five States are receiving the bulk of Federal funds for MAA; therefore, little is actually being accomplished in the other States.

It happens that these States contain about 60 percent of the aged in the States with MAA programs in effect. They also have higher hospital costs and had well-organized welfare medical programs which allowed quick implementation of MAA. Even so, the percentage of MAA funds now going to these States is decreasing as new MAA programs begin and older ones in other States gain experience. In September 1962, it was 88 percent; in July 1963, it was about 77 percent; and the Secretary of HEW acknowledged in his testimony Monday that it is now 73 percent. Moreover, the argument of "disproportionate" distribution of funds is meaningless unless the Kerr-Mills critics would have, for example, Hawaii with 31,000 total aged receive as much in Federal matching funds as New York which has almost 2 million over 65.

3. The means test is degrading and discourages older people from applying for help.

The steadily mounting number of older people being aided by Kerr-Mills destroys this argument. A means test is an established procedure in this country for protecting tax funds from waste and abuse. At least 10 Federal programs, besides Kerr-Mills, require a specific means test. Many labor unions deny strike benefits to their members unless need can be shown.

AMENDMENTS PROPOSED

However, we do not claim the law is perfect as it stands. It requires adjustment to make it more effective, and the AMA board of trustees has recommended that Congress amend it in several respects. These recommendations are:

(a) Removal of the requirement that both old-age assistance (OAA) and medical assistance for the aged (MAA) programs be administered by the same agency;

(b) Provide flexibility in the administration of the income limitations proposed under State law so that a person who experiences a major illness may qualify for benefits if the expense of that illness, in effect, reduces his money income below the maximum provided;

(c) Include a provision in the law requiring State administering agencies to seek expert advice from physicians or medical societies through medical advisory committees; and

(d) Provide for free choice of hospital and doctor under State programs.

Several States have already revised their benefit standards and their eligibility requirements. We believe this pattern will continue.

PRIVATE VOLUNTARY EFFORTS IN BEHALF OF THE AGED

In this testimony, we should also like to touch briefly on an important matter too often ignored when extension of Federal welfare is being considered. This is the contribution made by private citizens and groups, at the local level, toward solving the problems of our older citizens.

The individual, generously working in his home community to assist the less fortunate, is the backbone of our humanitarian and realistic system of helping those who need help. In recent years, there has been a notable increase in the number and scope of these projects designed to help the aging in a variety of ways.

The Nation's total nursing home capacity has been doubled, largely under private auspices, and special housing developments for the aging are being offered on an increasing scale. Literally, thousands of voluntary groups in communities across the country have instituted rehabilitation programs to assist older people toward productive and enjoyable lives.

Other programs include recreation activities for older persons, nursing care in their homes, homemaker services, hot meals supplied in their homes for those unable to cook, and even the simple, humanitarian gesture of friendly visitors to break the loneliness of the confined.

PERIL OF FEDERAL INTERVENTION

Perhaps we would only realize the full impact of voluntary, private, unselfish efforts on the local level, if suddenly they were to stop. Could they ever be replaced?

Passage of the King-Anderson type of program will discourage, psychologically and practically, these voluntary programs by placing the Federal Government in a dominating role. It will diminish the motivation for charitable contributions and will cause many Americans to feel there is less need for them to give of their talent and time to help the needy. If the incentive toward voluntary private efforts is curbed, the loss to our older persons will be incalculable.

COST OF H.R. 3920

From the beginning, proponents of King-Anderson have dwelt heavily on the theme that the social security tax increases to be levied on the Nation's workers and employers to pay for the health care of everyone over 65 would be "infinitesimal." Fractions may sound like small amounts. They are not. We are dealing with a double boost in payroll taxes of major dimensions. The rate would go up and the base would be increased. All future rises in the rate would be applied to the higher base. With increases already scheduled in the law, wage earners making $100 a week or more (almost half the work force) would be paying 46 percent more social security tax by 1968 than they are now, not an inconsiderable sum.

RISING TAXES

The heaviest proportionate burden would fall on the moderate and low income families. The $5,200 a year clerk would be taxed as much as the $50,000 corporation executive. Thousands of workers who do not earn enough to pay a Federal income tax would be required to meet this new burden, thereby further reducing their take-home pay.

But this would not be the end of it. The Department of HEW has acknowledged in its actuarial study No. 57 that periodic tax increases will be necessary in a rising economy to keep the program solvent. Indeed, the bewildering array of cost estimates which have been presented to the American people raise grave doubts as to how far the initial tax boost will go toward supporting the program even to start. As developed in testimony before this committee on Monday, the tax rate will have to be increased by 1 percent, rather than by one-half percent, or by twice the amount proposed in H.R. 3920.

The truth is the ultimate cost of the program cannot be determined until the added use of the Nation's health care facilities under a program of "free" Government benefits is learned from experience.

CONFUSING ESTIMATES

Meanwhile, we are painfully aware that the Government's estimates bear little relation to reality. The starting cost of the program was set at $1.7 billion by HEW experts in their testimony Monday. But other HEW figures show that $2.8 billion was spent in 1961 for precisely the same services to the same segment of the population.

If, as seems far more likely, the estimates on which the proposed tax increase is based are unrealistically low, today's workers face the grim prospect of higher and higher taxes to protect the social security fund from an impossible new burden.

Any way they are examined, the facts before us today shatter the arguments that this program is so well-intentioned, and would be so inconsequential in cost, that no one in good conscience can possibly object to it. This is a proposal of limitless proportions. It would open the way for the Government to fasten a burden of taxes and controls on present and future generations of Americans from which they would never escape.

MEDICAL PROGRESS AT STAKE

Proponents of H.R. 3920 and similar legislation choose to ignore the temporary, transitional nature of the economic problems involved. Instead, they would impose a permanent pattern of taxpaid, Government-regulated health care—a pattern inherently subject to inevitable expansion.

Such expansion would lead to a deterioration of the quality of health care—disrupting the voluntary relationship between the patient and his physician, and imposing centralized direction which would frustrate the striving for professional excellence. It would bring about a decline of professionalism and create a form of medicine strange to these shores. It would result in a loss of able entrants into the health care field because of Government controls over medicine.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, we believe that this legislation is not only unnecessary, but also dangerous to our American system of medical care.

We urge you to help preserve the vitality, promise, and potentiality of that system.

We urge you to reject H.R. 3920.

And now with your permission, Mr. Chairman, Dr. Welch will continue our presentation.

PROPOSED DR. GODDARD MEMORIAL STATUE IN MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, my home State of Massachusetts is justly proud of the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard, the rocket pioneer, who was born and spent most of his life in our State.

Dr. Goddard began his historic experiments in rocketry and jet propulsion while chairman of the physics department of Clark University in Worcester, Mass.

As far back as 1914, he patented two inventions which are still basic to rocketry. In 1919 he wrote a paper for the Smithsonian Institution entitled "A Method of Reaching Extreme Altitudes." And in 1926 he fired the first liquid-propelled rocket.

Over 40 years ago, Dr. Goddard was writing about interplanetary navigation, multiplestage rockets, jet propulsion, use of solar energy and a landing on the moon—scientific problems which still intrigue us today.

Goddard patents are still in use on every rocket that leaves the earth. Scores of them were approved during his lifetime and 131 after his death.

This remarkable inventive genius is such an inspiration to our Nation today, Mr. Speaker, that I have deemed it appropriate for the Government to erect a memorial in his home State and have filed legislation to achieve that purpose.

The bill is numbered House Joint Resolution 787, and is a short one, which I request be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. I am delighted that my good friend, the gentleman from California, Congressman George P. Miller, the chairman of our House Committee on Science and Astronautics, has approved the legislation and has filed a companion bill. I am hopeful that we can adopt the bill at the current session.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I would like to recommend to the membership and the country a new biography of Dr. Goddard entitled "This High Man" and written by Milton Lehman. This is an inspiring story of a lifetime of courage, persistence and dedication.

Every legislator, every citizen and every student challenged by the frontiers of science should read this remarkable story.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall erect in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts an appropriate memorial to the late Doctor Robert H. Goddard, former professor of physics at Clark University in Worcester, Massachusetts, and the father of American rocketry.

The memorial shall comprise an appropriate bronze statue of the inventor and his early rocket, in a park setting, and may be in the vicinity of his first launchings in central Massachusetts or adjacent to a science facility in Massachusetts carrying on the type of aeronautical research in which the late Doctor Goddard was engaged throughout his life. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall request the advice and comment of the Commission of Fine Arts with respect to the design and setting of the statue.

The memorial shall give appropriate recognition to the two Goddard patents of 1914 which were basic to the future of rocketry; to the world's first liquid-fuel rocket flight from a farmyard in Auburn, Massachusetts, on March 16, 1926; and to other pioneering efforts advancing his country's achievements in rocketry and supersonic flight.

Sec. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution.

NO FREEDOM OF CHOICE

Mr. WAGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a newspaper article.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I have on a number of occasions assailed the vindictive civil rights bill with the sound argument that it removes from among our rights, one of the most precious of all, the freedom to choose.

Certainly the truth of my argument has been borne out in a recent news story which disclosed that all the military dead at Fort Hood, Killeen Base, and Gray Base in Texas, regardless of their race, are handled now by a Negro undertaking establishment in Temple, Tex.

The Dallas News commented that "the Federal Government's campaign to erase every vestige of segregation in the military now includes the dead." This is an acid but truthful charge.

If ever there was a time when a human should have the right to choose, it certainly is at that sad hour when he must provide for the remains of his loved ones. But that right, too, has now been given away.

I believe this story appeared in the newspaper on Veterans Day. It is a questionable tribute from the administration to our honored dead that will, I believe, be remembered for a long time.

I ask unanimous consent to insert this article in the Record.

At Fort Hood, Gray Base—Negro Funeral Home Handles Military Dead

Dallas.—The Dallas News said today that all the military dead at Fort Hood, Killeen Base, and Gray Base are handled now by a Negro undertaking establishment at Temple.

"The Federal Government's campaign to erase every vestige of segregation in the military now includes the dead," the account from Fort Hood said.

"Gone is the old system of having an officially designated white funeral home for white soldiers and a Negro funeral home for Negro personnel.

The News said that since early August, "all the military dead, regardless of rank, race, or sex," have been handled by the Hornsby Funeral Home in Temple, 36 miles east of Fort Hood. The News said the Hornsby firm became the official mortuary contractor for the central Texas military complex by submitting the lower bid.

Only two funeral establishments in the area bid. Wayne Frank of Lampasas, the other bidder, commented:

"There is no business of a more personal nature than the funeral business. If there ever was a time when personal choice should apply, it is in time of death. I don't believe the public is aware of this situation or the concern and ill feeling it could cause."

The wife of B. K. Hornsby, owner of the Negro place in Temple, asserted that white funeral homes have been handling Negroes and added:

"I don't see anything wrong with it being the other way around. I don't think we'll have any trouble."

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations have until midnight Friday to file conference reports.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FASCISM COULD RISE FROM LEFT

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the Congressional Record an editorial column, "Fascism Could Rise From Left," which appeared in the November 17, 1963, edition of the Tallahassee Democrat, one of Florida's outstanding daily newspapers.

The writer of this column, Malcolm B. Johnson, has always had a very sane and stable approach to the problems of our time. He is one of the most highly respected journalists in the South.

This column has particular merit. I hope each of my colleagues will read "Fascism Could Rise From Left" which follows:

FASCISM COULD RISE FROM LEFT

(By Malcolm B. Johnson)

There is sometimes a glimmer of suspicion, among those of us who fret about our national drift to socialism, that we may be baying on a false trail.

You can make something of a case for feeling that the bunch in charge in Washington is pushing us more toward a type of fascism—if, indeed, it is leading us anywhere except to a domestic confusion and international subjugation from which the Lord only knows what will emerge.

"Aha," comes the cry from our friends who call themselves liberals. "The old boy finally is coming around to our alarm lest the conservative right take over and install a Fascist regime."

Not so. If there are seeds of a Fascist regime in our Nation today, they are sprouting in the fields of the left, nourished by activists who worship the welfare state—just as they grew there for Hitler and Mussolini and Peron to cross-breed into governmental monstrosities.

In a current issue of Human Events (a publication of the so-called "Radical Right") Editor James Wick deals with the similarities between the Frontier-Deal welfare state of our country and the something-for-everyone handouts by which the Fascist dictators of a generation ago rose to power.

He makes the point that if it weren't for the hideous persecutions and maniacal blood purges, those social programs on which Hitler, et al., gained popularity would fit very neatly into the package so brightly beribboned by our own political do-gooders—benefit payments to all who falter in the work-a-day world; and a better life for everyone through central government administration of all education, production, and distribution under the eye of some core of intellectually elite.

THE DIFFERENCE

Terse definitions for most political terms come hard—especially where you are dealing with an ideology as vague, vagrant, opportunistic, and transient as the fascism which terrorized the world for only about 20 years.

But if you erase all such common denominators as method, personal dictatorship, and national ambitions, you arrive at a distinction between fascism and socialism about like this:

Socialism aims at total ownership of all property by a central government which would control production and distribution on a formula of taking "from each according to his ability" and giving "to each according to his need." Fascism started out on that theory, too, under both Hitler and Mussolini, but in the end it settled for leaving property in private hands while setting over it an almost unlimited government control.

Our constitutional guarantees of private property rights would seem to operate to favor at least a temporary phase of fascism on the road to socialism—and that may be the reason we have so few successful tendencies to seize private property for the specific purpose of nationalizing its production. (There is more validity to a protest that our Government takes too much property under the constitutional power to condemn with just compensation, and that it then is too eager to put it into productive competition with private enterprise.)

LOOK AROUND YOU

You need look no further than your own street to find examples of Fascist-style regulation, supervision and control of private affairs: wage and hour laws, payroll deductions, production controls, crop acreage limitations, dictation of what may or must be broadcast, income tax tyranny that makes every man risk law violation on his return, efforts to control private patronage and choice of employees—administrative supervision at a hundred places.

Most of this supervision and regulation comes by decree from some administrative board with a growing disregard of statutory law. Much of it is promulgated with a disdain for appeals to the courts, and some with the hearty consent of a judiciary that seems to have joined the executive branch in bypassing Congress and the intent of the Constitution in its rush to serve a new social philosophy.

Much of it comes, it is true, at the urging of businessmen and property owners who seek shortcuts to profit or economic survival through politics instead of the marketplace. Much of it comes, also, from the yearning of citizens for a better life in the name of compensation and benefits that aren't earned by effort.

That, also, is in the pattern of Fascist conquests. Conservative businessmen took favors from government or accepted burdens of regulation in the belief that simultaneous controls of labor were worth it. The Socialists and Communists pushed reforms of their liking in the confident belief that inevitably Fascist government would fall to them. They thought they could substitute socialism for fascism, once democracy had fallen.

WHY WATCH THE LEFT?

But, since both the conservative right and the liberal left show up in implementing roles for what may be a historic replay of Fascist conquest, you ask, "Why should the watch be maintained on the left?" Simply this:

That's where the activists are. That's where you find all those who want an administrative board to bypass Congress. That's where you find pleas for the court to overlook the plain language of the law and the Constitution and decree a new philosophy. That's where you have militant organizations in action—striking, picketing, demonstrating, agitating, pushing, resisting. That's where you have the greatest tolerance of government by bureaucratic decree, controlled by whim and shifting circumstances, which is the basic ingredient of tyranny.

For all the talk of thunder on the right by those bigoted liberals who call anybody a Fascist who doesn't agree with them, there is hardly a whisper, comparatively, from the right. Aside from a few fragments of crackpot groups like Rockwell's American Nazis, the most militant bunch is probably the Birch Society, which emphasizes protest, petition, and letterwriting to hold the status quo of the Constitution—not picketing and parading and litigating to get around its terms.

As long as we maintain our separation of powers between State and Federal Government, and between the three coordinate branches of Federal Government—legislative, judicial, and executive—it is unlikely that any man can rise in this Nation to lead us either to totalitarian fascism or socialism.

But if they can destroy the States as free-functioning governments, or if they can reduce the elected Congress to the position of a nonentity by a power combination of the executive and the judiciary, it could be done. Look, now, and see what direction such efforts are coming from.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include three articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, surely there is no organization in the United States which has been more critical of Congress at various times than the National Association of Manufacturers. Thus I think it may be of interest to my colleagues to know that this leading organization of industrialists has given its endorsement to the principle of pay increases for Members of Congress and the top-level officers of the Federal Government.

In its November 8 issue the NAM News, published by the National Association of Manufacturers, made the following observation:

> Congress last year raised most Federal salaries under a bill with the fancy title: "Federal Salary Reform Act."
>
> At that time the administration, and probably most Congressmen, knew that the most needed reform was to establish a logical salary relationship between Government and private employment at the policymaking level. To have brought legislative salaries just a bit more into line with what the policymakers in industry are paid would have cost about $7 million. To have brought top executive and judicial jobs into line would have added something like $25 million more.
>
> But did the bill do this? Certainly not.
>
> What it did do was raise salaries across the board except at the important policymaking levels.
>
> The basic policies of this country are made by Members of Congress. Others in the Government either execute or enforce these policies. So there has developed a pattern under which very few Federal Government officials are paid more than a Congressman, whether they be in the executive agencies, independent agencies, or the courts.
>
> If a business were losing money because costs were too high, it might consider hiring some new department heads to cut costs—pay them well for doing it and thus balance the budget.
>
> But not Government.

Mr. Speaker, I do not mean to suggest that the National Association of Manufacturers supports all features of the Federal pay legislation now before the Congress. It does not. But the NAM does support pay increases for Members of Congress, the top officials of the executive agencies and the judiciary. I think this support is significant and should quiet some of the fears of my colleagues that a vote for an increase in congressional pay would arouse the ire of responsible citizens and organizations everywhere.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to the outstanding support given Federal pay legislation by the American Bar Association. In its November issue the American Bar Association Journal published both an editorial and an excellent article supporting this legislation.

Finally, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial appearing in the New York Times giving strong support to Federal salary legislation.

Mr. Speaker, without objection, I insert these three items at this point in the RECORD.

[From the American Bar Association Journal]

Our association for years has urged the importance of adequate compensation for members of the Federal judiciary. Judicial salaries have lagged considerably far behind compensation in private employment, although there is no service in private employment of comparable importance to the Nation or to the administration of justice.

The President's Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems recently made its recommendations to the President. The panel was composed of recognized leaders in industry, labor, education, and the professions. In recommending increase in pay for the three branches of Government, the panel report stated:

"There stands out in boldest relief the need for excellence in all three branches of our Government. That excellence will neither be obtained quickly, nor will it be retained for adequate periods, until we compensate our top officers on a basis commensurate with the complex and difficult roles assigned to them.

"The Federal Government will always be able to command the services of persons who recognize their obligation to give of their time and talents to the Nation. It should not, however, be at a competitive disadvantage with other forms of public service in attracting the best talent. We are convinced that our top salary structure no longer provides positive encouragement to men and women of the highest ability, dedication and conviction about the American way of life to accept Federal appointments in either the executive branch or the judiciary, or to seek Federal elective office with assurance that the financial demands upon them can, in most instances, be met from their salaries."

Since 1919, salaries of Federal judges and of Members of Congress have been closely related to each other. Since the last congressional-judicial pay raise in 1955, no readjustment has taken place to meet the rising cost of living. This means that, in effect, the real earnings of Federal judges and Congressmen are less than they were 8 years ago.

In response to a plea by President Kennedy and in order to rectify this and other inequities, H.R. 8716 has been introduced by Congressmen MORRIS K. UDALL, Democrat, of Arizona, and JOEL T. BROYHILL, Republican, of Virginia, as a conscientious attempt to reform judicial and congressional salaries. Some Members of Congress may be reluctant about voting for pay increases to become effective with the convening of the next Congress. They are naturally concerned lest there may be some criticism from their constituents. Rather than criticism, however, there should be widespread support for those who face their responsibility to solve this urgent problem.

In the past, salaries of Federal judges have set a standard for salaries of judges of State courts. But many States are reappraising the disparity between the incomes of successful practicing lawyers and their judges, and are increasing judicial salaries.

The legislation now before Congress is consonant with the unanimous action of the house of delegates of the American Bar Association recommending that the Congress substantially increase compensation of the Federal judiciary and examine its own pay scale.

A discussion of the pending legislation entitled "Udall-Broyhill Bill Gives New Hope for Judicial and Congressional Salary Reform," appears below. It was written by Bernard G. Segal, chairman of our association's standing committee on judicial selection, tenure and compensation. Mr. Segal was Chairman by appointment of President Eisenhower of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries. His article is authoritative and should be read by every member of the bar and by every Member of Congress for the light it casts upon the serious problem now facing our Nation involving compensation of those who bear major responsibility in Government.

As Mr. Segal points out, "That present judicial and congressional salaries are unconscionably low measured by any appropriate standard cannot be doubted, and every responsible group which has addressed itself to the subject has unequivocally reached this conclusion."

We are wholeheartedly in agreement with the position taken by Mr. Segal in his article, and we cannot too strongly urge upon the Members of Congress that they vote to support this vital pending legislation.

It is the primary responsibility of the lawyers of America to work constantly for improvement in the administration of justice and for a better government. The need for increasing the compensation of those serving on the Federal Bench and in Congress has been proved. The remedy is at hand. Leadership of the bar is urgently needed to bring about public understanding and support.

UDALL-BROYHILL BILL GIVES NEW HOPE FOR JUDICIAL AND CONGRESSIONAL SALARY REFORM

(Salaries of the Federal judiciary and Members of Congress are wholly inadequate and grossly inequitable when judged by any comparisons or standards. Although every group or person who has studied the problem has reached this conclusion, little has been accomplished because of Congress historic reluctance to raise its own salaries, to which judicial compensation has been traditionally related. Mr. Segal writes of the new salary increase bill and calls for its enactment)

(By Bernard G. Segal)

On October 7, 1963, Congressmen MORRIS K. UDALL, Democrat, of Arizona, and JOEL T. BROYHILL, Republican, of Virginia, introduced H.R. 8716, a bill of extraordinary importance to the citizens of the United States.[1]

If enacted this omnibus salary bill will increase the pay of approximately 1,750,000 officials and employees of the Federal Government. As to those in the classified services, it marks the culmination of 6 years of intensive study by the Government of long-needed salary reforms, and it carries forward the program started in the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962.[2] As to top-level officials and employees, the bill is also an effort to reduce the inequitable disparity which has developed between their compensation and that of others in the Government service.

H.R. 8716 constitutes a conscientious attempt to meet the plea by President Kennedy in his special message of February 20, 1962, to Congress for "Federal pay reform, not simply a Federal pay raise."[3] At least as to employees in the classified services, it endeavors to meet the President's call for increases which would establish salaries reasonably comparable with those prevailing in private enterprise for the same levels of work, insofar as this is possible, and to establish realistic and appropriate salary relationships President's comments concerning the salary systems by following the principle of equal pay for equal work, with distinctions in pay consistent with distinctions in responsibility.

In his message President Kennedy also pointed out the critical necessity of providing adequate salaries for Government employees in top career positions in the classified services, but he also noted that appropriate increases in these salaries would boost the pay of many civil servants to levels above those of their chiefs in Cabinet, sub-Cabinet and similar positions. "I recognize," President Kennedy continued, "that the salary level of these top executives has been quite properly related in recent years with the salary level of the Congress; and both are, in my opinion, inadequate." In view of the fact that at least since 1919 salaries of Federal judges and of Members of the Congress have been in direct relation to each other, the President's comment concerning the salary level of the Congress necessarily apply to the judiciary as well.

Accordingly, titles III and IV of the Udall-Broyhill bill provide long overdue increases in the salaries of Members of the Congress and Federal judges, respectively, and it is to these particular phases of the bill that this article relates.

HISTORY OF JUDICIAL AND CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES

By any standard the present salary scale of members of the Federal judiciary and of the Congress is wholly inadequate and grossly inequitable, and this condition has existed for many years.

One of the reasons for this situation is the extreme infrequency with which adjustments are made in their compensation. Since 1789 adjustment have come, on the average, only once in every 20 years. Since 1891, when uniform salaries were established for the first time for all U.S. district judges,[4] judicial salaries have been increased on only five occasions—an average of once every 15 years. And congressional salaries have been increased on only four occasions since 1866—an average of approximately once in every 25 years.[5]

Because under the Constitution they are charged with the responsibility of fixing their own salaries, Members of Congress have always displayed a natural reluctance to increase their compensation. One of the side effects has been a similar infrequency in the review of judicial salaries. Thus, the congressional salary enacted in 1866 remained at $5,000 for a period of 41 years, until it was raised in 1907 to $7,500, and the Supreme Court salary of $10,500 fixed in 1873 remained at that figure until it was increased by $2,000 in 1903, 30 years later.

The chart below reflects the changes in congressional or judicial salaries beginning with the year 1891.

---

[1] The bill has been referred to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

[2] 76 Stat. 843 (1962), 5 U.S.C. 1171.

[3] 1962 U.S. Code Congressional and Administrative News 4114, 4118.

[4] 26 Stat. 783 (1891). Prior to establishment of uniform salaries in 1891, salaries of district court judges varied from State to State and ranged from $3,000 to $5,000. This system of differentials stemmed from the Judiciary Act of 1789. As new States came into the Union, salaries for the district judges were provided for in the individual statutes setting up the district courts in those States. Increases were also granted on an individual basis; see, e.g., 1 Stat. 423 (1795) and 2 Stat. 121 (1801).

[5] A fifth increase, granted in 1873 by the 42d Congress (17 Stat. 486), was repealed less than a year after its enactment by the 43d Congress.

Year	District court	Court of appeals	Supreme Court [1]	Members of Congress
1891	$5,000	$6,000	[2] $10,500	[3] $5,000
1903	6,000	7,000	12,500	------
1907	------	------	------	7,500
1911	------	------	14,500	------
1919	7,500	8,500	------	------
1926	10,000	12,500	20,000	10,000
1946	15,000	17,500	25,000	15,000
1955	22,500	25,500	35,000	22,500

[1] The Chief Justice receives additional salary of $500.
[2] First provided in 1873
[3] First provided in 1866.

In 1949 the Commission on Organization of the executive brance of the Government, headed by former President Hoover and popularly known as the Hoover Commission, made extensive recommendations for increases in salaries of officials and employees in the executive departments. Recognizing the dislocation the proposed increases would cause in the traditional relationship between these salaries on the one hand and congressional and judicial salaries on the other, the Hoover Commission felt impelled, despite the fact it was outside its assignment, to urge that congressional salaries be increased by $7,500 (60 percent) and Justices of the Supreme Court by $10,000 (40 percent), with corresponding increases to other Federal judges. Despite the tremendous prestige and public acceptance of the Hoover Commission, Congress failed to act on either recommendation.

In 1949 the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association had endorsed the recommendations of the Hoover Commission,[6] and in 1951 it again adopted a resolution recommending increases in Federal judicial salaries.[7] In 1953 the board of governors approved a recommendation of the association's standing committee on judicial selection, tenure and compensation endorsing a bill introduced by Senator PAT MCCARRAN, Democrat, of Nevada, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, providing increases of $10,000 a year for Members of the Congress and Federal judges, except that an increase of $14,500 was prescribed for the Chief Justice.[8] Since then the American Bar Association has been in the forefront of efforts to achieve more realistic compensation for these important officials of our Government.

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL AND CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES

By 1953 congressional leaders concluded that if action on congressional, and therefore judicial, salaries was to be taken within a reasonable period of time, the support of an independent study by a nongovernmental source would be necessary. Public Law 220, approved August 7, 1953, created the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries "to determine the appropriate rates of salaries for justices and judges of the courts of the United States and for the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Members of Congress in order to provide fair and reasonable compensation to such officials."[9]

Under the act the Commission was required to be composed of 18 voting members, including, in equal numbers, leading figures from labor, from agriculture, and from business and the professions. Six members of the Commission, including the Chairman, were to be appointed by the President, six by the Chief Justice, and three each by the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House. There were also to be nine advisory members, three each from the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the Federal judiciary.

The material assembled by the Commission and its recommendations constitute the most appropriate springboard for any current consideration of judicial and congressional salaries. Although performed in a relatively short period, the work of the Commission was extensive. It was aided by an excellent staff assembled from various departments of the Government by authority of President Eisenhower. Seven task forces, consisting of members of the Commission and technical staff employees, were appointed by the Chairman, and they conducted detailed inquiries into assigned areas relating to the Commission's activity.[10]

The Commission invited the views of all proponents and opponents of salary increases, communicated with the editors of 10,000 newspapers, magazines, and other publications and conducted lengthy public hearings in Washington. A large number of leaders from agriculture, labor, business, education, the professions, the Government, and other groups appeared and testified. Many more citizens—important leaders of organized groups and interested individuals—sent written communications for the record.[11] The mass media devoted a great amount of space and comment to the work and recommendations of the Commission, and hundreds of editorials in newspapers and magazines in almost every State were devoted to the salary question. With rare exceptions, these witnesses, groups, editors, and other commentators supported the work of the Commission and urged adoption of their recommendations. The American Bar Association and, at its instance, many State and local bar associations were active in conducting local campaigns to educate the public. Tremendous grassroots support for substantial salary increases resulted. Alerted to the need, the public reaction was impressive and reassuring.

CONCLUSIONS REACHED BY THE COMMISSION

In its published report,[12] the Commission specifically found that the scale of judicial and congressional salaries had not kept pace with the growth of the duties and responsibilities of these offices; that the differences between salaries paid to Federal judges and Members of the Congress and those paid in private enterprise were grossly disproportionate; that the salaries of members of the judiciary and of the Congress had lagged far behind salary adjustments granted most officials of the Federal Government and had fallen substantially below historic differentials; that judicial and congressional salaries were and for a long time had been grossly inadequate; that these salary rates tended to confine these high positions to persons of independent wealth or with outside earnings; that while there is no exact formula by which salaries of Federal judges and Members of the Congress can be determined, any of the accepted job evaluation criteria established that existing salaries were inadequate; and, finally, that the net cost to the Government of increasing salaries of the Federal judiciary and the Congress to reasonable amounts would be comparatively inconsequential. Significantly, every one of the Commission's findings, made 10 years ago, applies with equal force today.

The Commission recommended salaries of $40,000 for the Chief Justice of the United States and $39,500 for the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court; $30,500 for judges of the U.S. courts of appeals; and $27,500 for judges of the U.S. district courts and Members of Congress.[13]

Hearings on the proposed legislation were conducted by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, headed by the late Senator Estes Kefauver, Democrat, of Tennessee.[14] One of the witnesses was Morris Mitchell, the then chairman of the association's standing committee on judicial selection, tenure, and compensation, who reported the association's strong endorsement of the Commission's report. The Chairman of the Commission informed the subcommittee of the widespread support for the Commission's recommendations in the form of communications, editorials, personal visits and telephone calls from all over the Nation, with only the barest sprinkling of adverse comment.

From many discussions over a period of several months with a large number of Senators and Congressmen, the writer can personally attest the fact that a majority of the Congress considered, as did the Commission, that the Commission's recommendations were conservative. The Senate Judiciary Committee concluded that:

> "There is no question but what the work of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries was thorough and its findings and recommendations based upon sound and logical conclusions. * * *"[15]

Nevertheless, when legislation was finally enacted on March 2, 1955, providing judicial and congressional salary increases, the recommendations of the Commission were cut by approximately one-third. The salaries adopted by Congress were $35,500 for the Chief Justice and $35,000 for Associate Justices, $25,500 for judges of the courts of appeals, and $22,500 for judges of the district courts and Members of the Congress.[16] And there have been no changes in these salaries since that time.

JUDICIAL AND CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES TRAIL OTHERS

The historic differentials between the salaries of Members of the Congress and the Federal judiciary, on the one hand, and other Government officials and employees, on the other, have been drastically altered even since the Commission's recommendations were arrived at in 1953.

---

[6] 74 A.B.A. Report 288 (1949).

[7] 76 A.B.A. Report 125 (1951).

[8] 78 A.B.A. Report 179 (1953).

[9] An act to provide for the creation of a Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries, and for other purposes. Public Law 220, 83d Cong., 1st sess. (1953). 67 Stat. 485.

[10] The areas of investigation assigned to the task forces were: (1) Salaries of the Vice President, Speaker of the House and the Members of Congress, (2) comparative salaries in business, (3) standard of living evaluation, (4) comparative salaries in the professions and agriculture, (5) comparative salaries in the field of labor, (6) retirement benefits, staff expenses, office and other services furnished by the Federal Government, and (7) salaries of the Federal judiciary. "Judicial and Congressional Salaries, Reports of the Task Forces of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries Pursuant to Public Law 220," S. Doc. No. 97, 83d Cong., 2d sess. (1954).

[11] Hearings before the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries pursuant to Public Law 220, S. Doc. No. 104, 83d Cong., 2d sess. (1953).

[12] Report of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries, H.R. Doc. No. 300, 83d Cong., 2d sess. (1954).

[13] Whenever salary figures for judges of the court of appeals are referred to hereafter the reference should also be read to include judges of the Court of Claims, of the the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and of the Court of Military Appeals. Whenever salary figures for district judges are referred to, the reference should also be read to include judges of the customs court and of the Tax Court and district judges for Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

[14] Hearings on S. 165, S. 462, and S. 540 before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 84th Cong., 1st sess. (Comm. Print, 1955).

[15] Judicial and Congressional Salaries, report of the Committee on the Judiciary, S. Rept. No. 25, 84th Cong., 1st sess. 4 (1955).

[16] Act of Mar. 2, 1955, cf. sec 1, 69 Stat. 9.

Since the last judicial-congressional salary increase in 1955, employees in the classified services of the Government have received six salary increases: 7.5 percent in 1955; 8.1 percent in 1956; 10 percent in 1958; 7.7 percent in 1960; 5.5 percent in 1962; and 4.1 percent to become effective January 1, 1964. These aggregate more than 51 percent. The effect of these increases has been to narrow drastically the differential between the maximum salaries in the classified services and judicial and congressional salaries. The establishment in the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 of the present classified rates in an effort to achieve a degree of comparability between classified salaries and salaries in private enterprise—a long overdue and badly needed reform—without any concurrent adjustment of judicial and congressional pay has created a completely illogical and wholly untenable situation.

Recognizing the substantial disparity between Federal career salaries and salaries in private enterprise, the Kennedy administration committed itself in 1962 to the principle of comparability between pay for classified Government employment and the average pay for similar work in private enterprise. While there are, of course, no positions outside Government which are truly comparable to membership in the Congress or on the Federal bench, nevertheless the discrepancy in levels between judicial and congressional salaries and salaries for positions in business, the professions and other private enterprise requiring similar ability, maturity and character, and entailing large responsibilities is far more extreme than the discrepancy with respect to classified employees.

This conclusion is borne out by the findings of the President's Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems, headed by Clarence B. Randall, former chairman of the Inland Steel Corp., which submitted its report to the President on June 12, 1963. The Randall Panel was composed of 11 leaders in industry, labor, education, banking, government, the judiciary, and the military, each of whom had won distinction in his own field.[17]

Figures compiled for the Panel by the Bureau of the Budget and the U.S. Civil Service Commission indicated that the median salary for the top executives of approximately 1,150 corporations in manufacturing, retail trade, banking, rail and air transportation, gas and electric utilities, mining, and life insurance ranged from $91,000 in manufacturing firms to $53,000 in insurance companies. Substantial disparities were found to exist in numerous other fields as well.

Moreover, even the historical relationship between salaries of Federal and State court judges has been radically altered. Traditionally, salaries of Federal judges have set the standard for State court judges. This is no longer so. Today, many State court judges receive salaries in excess of those of judges of U.S. district courts and courts of appeals. Thus, Federal district judges in California, Georgia, Illinois, Maryland, New York, and Pennsylvania receive lower salaries than State trial court judges in those States. Similarly in California, Illinois, Michigan, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, State appellate judges receive salaries greater than those of judges of the U.S. courts of appeals.[18]

In Pennsylvania, for example, the chief justice receives $33,000 a year. The chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, presiding five blocks down the street at hearings on appeals from all Federal courts in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, receives $25,500—$7,500 a year less. Judges of the Pennsylvania Superior Court, an intermediate State appellate court, receive $5,000 a year more than the chief judge and the other judges in the U.S. court of appeals. And judges of the Philadelphia courts of common pleas—a State trial court of general jurisdiction—receive higher salaries than the judges in the U.S. district court sitting in the same city.

The President's Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems submitted its report in June of this year. It concluded that if we are to attract qualified people to the Congress and the Federal judiciary, salaries must be raised substantially. It recommended the following increases and strongly urged the President to throw his full support behind them: $60,500 for the Chief Justice and $60,000 for the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court; $45,000 for the judges of the courts of appeals; $35,000 for the judges of the district courts; and $35,000 for Members of the Congress with $5,000 deductible for income tax purposes.[19]

Title III of the Udall-Broyhill bill provides salaries of $35,000 for Members of Congress. Title IV establishes salaries of $50,500 for the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and $50,000 for the Associate Justices, $40,500 for judges of the courts of appeals, and $35,000 for judges of the U.S. district courts.

It is of course apparent that the Udall-Broyhill bill prescribes compensation below that recommended as recently as June of this year, except in the case of district judges, as to whom the suggestions are adopted. It is significant, too, that if the 1954 recommendations of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries were increased commensurately with the pay raises received by employees in the classified services since the date of the report of the Commission, even without regard to the additional salary hike provided by the Udall-Broyhill bill for such employees, the resulting salaries for Members of Congress and the Federal judiciary would be substantially higher than those prescribed in the pending bill.

One of the striking points made by the commission in 1954 was that the number of persons affected by salary increases for the Congress and the Federal judiciary is so small that the resulting impact on the national budget will never be very great. This is demonstrated by the approximate annual cost of the increases provided in the Udall-Broyhill bill, which would be $6,700,000 for Federal judges and the same amount for Members of the Congress. The total cost of these increases would represent only about 2½ percent of the aggregate annual cost of the Udall-Broyhill bill and just a little over one-hundredth of 1 percent of the proposed Federal budget for 1964.

However concerned we may be—and, of course, all of us are—with the urgency of decreasing the expenditures of the Federal Government, this consideration should have no application here. The cost of these increases is minimal, especially when contrasted with the substantial promotion of the public interest which would be achieved.

IT'S NOW TIME TO ACT

That present judicial and congressional salaries are unconscionably low measured by any appropriate standard cannot be doubted, and every responsible group which has addressed itself to the subject has unequivocally reached this conclusion.

In a canvass of 677 important leaders of American life by the National Civil Service League just this year, it was found that 88 percent of the 387 national leaders in business, education, journalism and the professions whose replies were tabulated expressed the view that Members of the Congress should receive salaries of $30,000 or more, as contrasted with the present rate of $22,500. Only 33 of the 677 individuals canvassed suggested that congressional pay should not be increased.

The Congress has shown no reluctance to raise the pay of Government employees in the classified services, the postal services and the military services, as well as in other branches. Its failure to act with the same promptness and zeal for the public interest and the same spirit of fairness with respect to congressional salaries, and therefore judicial salaries, which are now by many years of tradition considered together, is due to the difficult position of Members of the Congress in exercising the constitutional mandate that they determine the amount of their own salaries. History has demonstrated, as recently as 1955, that the fears of some Members of Congress that a vote for a congressional pay increase would have adverse consequences at the polls are completely unfounded.

It is here that the citizens of the Nation must move in. They must make clear that they do not seek inequitable and unreasonable financial sacrifices by their public servants. Newspaper and magazine editors, columnists and the television and radio commentators can once again perform the magnificent task they did in 1953 and 1954 in informing the American public of the need and justification for salary increases. And as in the past, the real inspiration must come from the organized bar at national, State, and local levels, and the American Bar Association, which has already launched a vigorous campaign, must provide the leadership.

Federal judges and Members of the Congress prize the opportunity for service and the prestige of their offices. They do not expect the same financial return as they could earn in private life. But the sacrifice is too great.

---

[17] Besides the chairman, the members of the Panel were Gen. Omar D. Bradley; John J. Corson, of the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University; Marion B. Folsom of the Eastman Kodak Co.; Theodore V. Houser, former chairman of Sears, Roebuck & Co.; Robert A. Lovett, of Brown Bros. Harriman; George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations; Don K. Price, Jr., of the graduate school of public administration, Harvard University; Robert Ramspeck, former Member of Congress from Georgia; Stanley F. Reed, Associate Justice (retired) of the U.S. Supreme Court; and Sydney Stein, Jr.

[18] These facts are confirmed in the Randall Panel report. See also, "A Survey of Judicial Salaries in the United States and Canada," 45 J. Am. Jud. Soc. 231–263 (1962).

[19] Although the statutory duties of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries did not include consideration of benefits for widows and dependents of Members of the Congress and the Federal judiciary, the Commission strongly urged consideration of its task force report on that subject in order that appropriate legislation providing such benefits be enacted. At that time there were no benefits whatever provided for widows and dependents of members of the Federal judiciary. Since then legislation has been adopted for contributory annuities in the case of widows and dependents of Federal judges (28 U.S.C. 376) and for annuities for widows of Justices of the Supreme Court (28 U.S.C. 375). Although the payments to widows of Presidents of the United States and of Justices of the Supreme Court were at one time fixed at the same amount—$5,000—when the allowance for Presidents' widows was raised to $10,000, the allowance for Justices' widows was not increased. The Randall Panel recommended that Congress take appropriate action to bring up to date the legislation providing annuities for widows of Supreme Court Justices. There can be no doubt that the present provisions for widows and dependent children of other members of the Federal judiciary also are deplorably low. The situation calls for immediate correction.

With this Nation's claim to leadership in the world community resting upon ordered liberty under law, there are no positions in this Nation or anywhere else, outside the Presidency itself, which are of greater importance or involve more critical duties than those of Members of the Congress and judges in the courts of the United States. The duties of these high officials are vastly greater today in time consumed, energy required, and responsibility imposed than they were even a decade ago. It would be the poorest kind of economy to make these positions unavailable to qualified individuals merely because of financial considerations.

It must be our solemn objective to assure that the Nation's topflight leadership shall continue to be available in the Halls of Congress and on the Federal bench and that inadequate compensation shall never constitute a bar to any American citizen who is qualified to fill those high posts.

Congressmen UDALL and BROYHILL merit commendation and appreciation for their courageous sponsorship of H.R. 8716. The Udall-Broyhill bill deserves the support of the citizens of the Nation. It should be passed now.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 12, 1963]

THE BEST IN FEDERAL SERVICE

Congress is making a gingerly—almost reluctant—approach toward removing one of the chief roadblocks against the entry of highly qualified personnel into top positions of the Federal service.

This obstacle is the unattractiveness of the salaries paid at the most responsible levels of Government. Such salaries are low not only by the standards that prevail in the higher echelons of private industry but also in comparison with the earnings of top-ranking officeholders in many State and municipal agencies, philanthropic organizations, and even some universities.

Chicago's superintendent of schools, for example, receives $48,500 a year and the general manager of Los Angeles Water and Power Department gets over $40,000. But Federal officials with vastly greater responsibilities receive perhaps as much as $25,000 (which is the salary of Cabinet officers). It is not surprising that Washington is constantly plagued by the difficulty of recruiting and keeping persons of competence in key posts.

A bill now before Congress seeks to make the Federal Government more competitive in attracting top talent by providing for increases of $5,000 to $10,000 for many responsible officials. Cabinet officers would receive $35,000; the Vice President and the Justices of the Supreme Court, $45,000. In many cases the salary increases are less generous than those recommended earlier this year by the study committee headed by Clarence Randall. Nevertheless, the House bill is a step, if an inadequate one, in the right direction.

The cost of this badly needed structural reform would not be great. The Randall Committee estimated that its recommendations would involve a total annual cost of only $20 million. But these needed high-level increases have been combined in this bill with a general wage increase for almost 2,500,000 Federal workers, a much more expensive matter, the merits of which ought to be argued separately.

Congressmen appear afraid to pass this bill because it provides for raising their own salaries, by $10,000, to $32,000. They worry about taxpayer vengeance at the polls—needlessly, we believe. Congress has had no pay raise in almost a decade. We doubt that there would be any significant public objection to a pay increase for Congress, especially if it were to be accomplished—as Senator KEATING suggests—with conflict-of-interest legislation applicable to Members of Congress.

MEMORY OF "BLACKMAIL" OFFER OF CUBAN PRISONERS FOR TRACTORS REVIVED

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include several excerpts from Dr. Milton Eisenhower's latest book.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, 1961, I spoke out on the floor of the House against the tractors-for-prisoners deal. I followed up these remarks on June 5, June 26, and again on June 27, including a sermon pointing up the fact that "there is nothing in the Christian doctrine that would countenance such behavior."

Mr. Speaker, in reviewing my remarks on June 5, I note that I stated:

> I predict Castro will refuse the offer of the committee for he knew precisely what he was asking for in the first instance—heavy duty machines to build up his defense establishment.

The Washington Daily News, on November 18 and 19, 1963, ran two excerpts from Milton Eisenhower's book "The Wine Is Bitter," concerning those sections covering this unhappy situation. The second excerpt includes the following sentence:

> On Friday, June 23, at 11:26 a.m. (34 minutes before the deadline), Fidel Castro rejected our offer.

Mr. Speaker, I included in my speech, appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 9, page 11220, a letter from Attorney General Kennedy and a statement of President Kennedy. The President said in part:

> This Government is thus putting forward neither obstacles nor assistance to this wholly private effort.

The Attorney General's letter concluded:

> The President has stated his sympathy with the humanitarian objectives of the committee and the intention of the Government not to interfere with or put obstacles in the way of a legitimate private, humanitarian effort. A copy of the President's statement is attached. In view of the foregoing, I do not believe any violation of the Logan Act is involved.

After "the whole affair began to take on ominous overtones," Milton Eisenhower wrote to the President:

> He [Castro] insists that we accept the principle of indemnification for damage done in Cuba, and that he will accept only what the 10 prisoners with whom you asked us to meet told us he wanted; namely, heavy D-8 type bulldozers which are war materiel, possibly for trade with the Communist bloc.

As a result of that letter, Mr. Eisenhower received a call from Secretary of State Dean Rusk. Mr. Eisenhower states:

> He [Rusk] agreed wholeheartedly that our committee should restrict its activities to the single narrow field of fundraising and assured me that the State Department would guide us in our actions thereafter.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to call attention to the Eisenhower book because it points out vividly that the brothers Kennedy have no regard for the truth or the law and there is no telling what type of hoax they will attempt to pull over the eyes of the public prior to the next election. Under unanimous consent, I include the two articles, but I do take issue with the last paragraph of the second excerpt. Perhaps Mr. Eisenhower will file an addendum to his book.

[From the Washington (D.C.) News, Nov. 18, 1963]

"NOW I BEGAN TO FACE THE AWFUL TRUTH"

(By Milton S. Eisenhower)

(First of two-part series)

One Friday evening in May 1961, at about 7 o'clock, I was sitting in my library at home with a few friends when my telephone rang. The White House operator, whose voice I readily recognized, said that President Kennedy was calling.

I was surprised. Having run errands for four Presidents—two Republicans and two Democrats, beginning with Herbert Hoover—I might have been expected to be available to the new administration. But I had strongly opposed the election of President Kennedy.

When the operator put President Kennedy on the phone, he came immediately to the point. "I want to ask you for some help," he said.

I find it nearly impossible to refuse the President of the United States any request, and I replied instantly: "I'll do whatever I can."

He explained that Fidel Castro was sending 10 prisoners to the United States to negotiate for the release of more than 1,200 of their compatriots who had been captured in the abortive Cuban invasion. The U.S. Government felt a moral obligation to help these men. It could not deal with Castro, however, for we had withdrawn official recognition of his regime.

The President, therefore, wanted to establish a committee of private citizens for the sole purpose of raising private funds to buy the tractors that Castro demanded in exchange for the captives. In this way, Americans could perform an act of justice. The late Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt and Walter Reuther had agreed to serve on the committee and now he was seeking two Republicans. He wanted George Romney, president of American Motors, and me to help.

He would explain the matter to the American people the next day. And our committee would meet with the Cuban prisoners on Monday.

I told the President I would help.

At about 11 o'clock that evening, Walter Reuther called me. He expressed satisfaction that I serve on the Tractors for Freedom Committee. He said something that was to keep me awake most of the night.

"As I understand it," he said, "this is to be a wholly private effort and we aren't to mention that the President has asked us to undertake this."

"Now, wait a minute, Mr. Reuther," I replied, "private citizens cannot meddle in foreign affairs. We must have the President's authorization for this." For us to have dealt with Castro without Government authorization would have been a violation of the Logan Act.

"We have no worry on that score," Reuther answered. "I talked this over with Richard Goodwin, who is Special Assistant to the President, and everything is all right. In fact, the State Department is going to help us in every way it can. We've even been assured that we will get tax-exempt status."

This would allow donors to deduct their gifts from their incomes in computing taxes.

Sunday, May 21, as I remember it, was a day of anticipation and telephone calls. I talked with Mr. Reuther and Mrs. Roosevelt to arrange our meeting in the Statler Hilton in Washington for the next morning. (When Romney declined, the President requestioned Joe Dodge, former Director of the Bureau of the Budget in the Eisenhower administration and a Detroit banker, to become the fourth member of our committee, but he would not be available until later in the week.)

We also drafted a telegram to Castro, stating that we were prepared to meet with the 10 prisoners, now in Miami, and negotiate with them for the proffered exchange—unless Castro advised us to the contrary.

Sunday's news carried no word from Kennedy.

At 11 o'clock the next morning our committee met for the first time. Mrs. Roosevelt was named honorary chairman, Reuther and I, cochairmen, and Dodge, treasurer.

Mr. Kennedy's assistant and personal representative in this matter, Richard Goodwin, was also present and briefed us on the Government's involvement. He assured us of every cooperation: The Secretary of the Treasury would arrange for tax exemption on gifts; the Government had arranged transportation for the prisoners; we could be assured that our fund-raising efforts had the full approval of the Government; the Logan Act was not at issue.

Castro's original offer had used the word "bulldozers," but it had been made in a speech to farmers in a context that could only mean he wanted agricultural tractors.

We met with the prisoners and they repeated that he wanted bulldozers, but they could not say for certain just what Castro would accept. They pointed out that he had been irritated by the use of the words "trade" and "exchange." He insisted that he was demanding indemnification.

The whole affair began to take on ominous overtones.

We gave the prisoners a letter stating that we would undertake to raise the funds for 500 agricultural tractors for Cuba on the condition that we receive a list of the prisoners for verification. We also decided to send a committee of agricultural experts to Havana to work out the details on the type of tractors to be traded. We repeated this in a cable to Castro.

I was beginning to be angry. President Kennedy had not explained our position as mere fund-raisers in support of a governmental policy as he had led me to believe he would.

Then the first rumblings of criticism that would soon engulf the Tractors for Freedom Committee were heard on Capitol Hill: Senator BARRY GOLDWATER and Indiana's Senator HOMER CAPEHART denounced our effort as giving in to "blackmail."

It seemed crucial to me that the President speak out at once.

Before he did, on Tuesday, May 23, the lid blew off.

Congress was furious and demanded that Secetary of State Dean Rusk say whether the administration approved of our efforts to trade tractors for prisoners. Members of the President's own party were foremost among the critics.

I knew from long experience, of course, that the President of the United States is subject to constant pressures about which most of us know nothing. I realized it was unfair to judge him without knowing exactly what motivated him. I had been told that he would make it clear to the public the Government's role in our effort.

Not only had he remained silent; he apparently had not even bothered to call in congressional leaders from both parties to brief them on the plan—an action which might have done much to forestall criticisms in Congress.

My chagrin solidified into a frustration. I was considering more than my own position and that of the university which I represented; I was thinking of the adverse effect that opposition in the United States would have on the committee's effort to raise money and on the attitudes of Latin Americans who had begun to admire our unselfish and humanitarian response.

At this point, I considered resigning from the committee. Only the dreadful thought that my resignation might contribute to—or seem to contribute to—the failure of our effort stopped me. I did not want on my conscience the fate of those 1,214 Cuban prisoners who perhaps faced death due to our fumbling management of the invasion.

The Wednesday afternoon papers carried a statement by President Kennedy. I turned to it eagerly. Then my heart fell. It was not the one I had been waiting for.

He called upon Americans to contribute funds and said, speaking of the prisoners, "If they were our brothers in a totalitarian prison, every American would want to help." He also said, "The U.S. Government has not been and cannot be a party to these negotiations * * *" and the Government is "putting forward neither obstacles nor assistance to this wholly private effort."

Now I had to face the awful truth. Though the President had personally asked me to help, and though I had understood this fact would be proclaimed to the public—our task being only to raise funds—I now realized, in chilling clarity, that the President intended to maintain the fiction that all aspects of the case, from negotiation to critical decision, from raising funds to actually freeing the prisoners, were private.

What, then, about the Logan Act? Was the Government's posture assumed because of the unpopular reaction to the trade? Or was the intention from the first to keep the Government aloof?

Could I possibly have misconstrued the President's conversation with me, and Goodwin's repeated assurance that our activity was fully sanctioned by the Government?

Despite the heavy criticism, Americans were sending gifts to Post Office Box "Tractors for Freedom" in Detroit. Several thousand letters, some of them no doubt critical, had piled up.

Walter Reuther issued a statement thanking donors for their generous support. We had not yet actually launched a fund drive, for we still awaited word from Castro. We had no funds and no staff. The letters lay unopened in the "Tractors for Freedom" box of the Detroit post office.

Exactly a week had passed since President Kennedy had called me. It seemed like a year. I had been bombarded with viciously critical letters and phone calls.

On this dismal note, 10 Cuban prisoners, honor-bound to return to Havana after a week, left Florida to join their imprisoned fellow freedom fighters.

[From the Washington (D.C.) News, Nov. 19, 1963]

THE BITTEREST LETTER I'VE EVER WRITTEN

(By Milton S. Eisenhower)

(Second of two-part series)

On June 1, 1961, the Tractors for Freedom Committee received a cable from the prisoners' representatives in Havana stating they had delivered to Castro our message that we would undertake to raise funds for 500 agricultural tractors for Cuba on condition that we received for verification, a list of the prisoners to be exchanged. They urged that we send a delegation to Havana to negotiate.

Mr. Reuther and Mr. Dodge met with five agricultural experts in Detroit on Friday and prepared a tentative list of the equipment we would be willing to exchange for the 1,200 prisoners. The list was sent to Castro in a cable which also pointed out that since we had had no official word from him since our inception, we would expect to hear from him by noon on June 7.

On Tuesday, June 6, shortly after midnight, I received a copy of a cable from Castro. His response was sheer propaganda and hedged on details. He repeated his demands for indemnification. Then he stated that he could not negotiate by cable and suggested that either Mrs. Roosevelt or I meet him in Havana.

At this point, I sent President Kennedy the bitterest letter I've ever written. I informed him that I could serve as a member of the Tractors for Freedom Committee only so long as I felt the committee could help the country.

I wrote: "The public should have been told from the first, and should even now be told, that the foreign policy decision was governmental—only fundraising being private. But now the response from Castro, in his cable of today, indicates that he will not negotiate with respect to tractors. He insists that we accept the principle of indemnification for damage done in Cuba, and that he will accept only what the 10 prisoners with whom you asked us to meet told us he wanted; namely, heavy D-8-type bulldozers which are war materiel, possibly for trade with the Communist bloc. He has attempted, by flamboyant countercharges, to broaden the matter to include negotiation for the exchange of prisoners; those he mentions in the United States are imprisoned Communists or criminals. On all these points, our private committee is not a competent agency. These demands, if recognized at all, call for serious attention by appropriate Government officials and by them alone. Our committee cannot properly carry on an exchange of cablegrams with Castro on such matters without stepping beyond the grounds of the single fundraising task you asked us to assume."

My letter continued: "On this fundamental point, Mr. Reuther and I are in disagreement. He believes we should continue our cablegram discussions with Castro * * *. My belief is that if we did so, we would be moving into the area of governmental responsibility."

My letter to Mr. Kennedy found its way to the desk of my friend, Secretary of State Dean Rusk. He called to thank me for writing. He agreed wholeheartedly that our committee should restrict its activities to the single narrow field of fundraising and assured me that the State Department would guide us in our actions thereafter.

Reassured by this call from Secretary Rusk and by his personal approval of a proposed message, I agreed finally to another cable to Castro: It restated our original offer and dismissed most of Castro's reply as propaganda. We said we were prepared to ship 100 agricultural tractors to Cuba within 2 weeks, provided he would then release one-fifth of the prisoners. We offered to send our agricultural experts to Havana, to arrive on June 12.

From the moment of the public announcement (that the Tractors for Freedom Committee had been formed), my office was deluged with mail. Phones rang continually, at all hours of the day and night. Events repeatedly overtook us, and orderly planning was virtually impossible.

Decisions requiring the agreement or consent of all four members of the committee had to be made one after another, and so we had to neglect other important duties to be available by telephone or to attend hastily called meetings—midday in New York, midnight at a hotel in Washington, one evening at my home.

New problems arose so quickly, decisions had to be made so rapidly, that in many cases we barely had time to pen notes on the backs of envelopes of what we must do next.

During this frenetic period, I ate many sandwich lunches at my desk, and got my sleep in catnaps. It was a grueling period, made no easier by the fact that we were constantly subjected to vitriolic and unrelenting criticism.

My office estimated that in the first few days only one in every 10 letters had a kind word to say for the committee's effort and of course none of the writers, at this point, knew that the President had asked me to undertake the task.

Later on, a few more letters and calls offered support or sent contributions (which I forwarded on to the post office box in Detroit). But it is fair to say there was no peace for any of us that hot summer. The whole project seemed interminable, exhausting.

Overnight we had found ourselves in verbal combat with a most unscrupulous rascal, adept at dirty tricks and infighting.

All four of us had gotten more than we had bargained for: With an impossible effort to negotiate with a ruthless dictator before us, from behind we were beset by ridicule and misunderstanding of our motives on the part of the American press and public. My frustration in this situation was almost overwhelming.

Our four agricultural experts returned from Havana with Castro's impossible new demands. Now these were for $28 million in cash, credits, or tractors (in contrast to our offer for $3 million worth of tractors). To me, this meant the end of the whole affair.

After the experts had concluded their report to the Tractors for Freedom Committee and excused themselves, the members wrestled with the problem of what to do.

Walter Reuther felt that a last specific offer should be made with a 48-hour deadline.

Mrs. Roosevelt, after expressing her disapproval of the invasion, unhappiness about the present situation, but deep concern for the prisoners, insisted that any wire to Castro must make clear that his demands for $28 million were impossible, wholly outside his original proposal. Nor, she felt, did the committee have the authority to deal with it.

Joe Dodge felt the same concern for the prisoners and their families but was wary of sending another cable. He also repeated his fear that the bad publicity our effort had evoked might make it impossible to raise even the few million dollars needed to buy farm tractors.

I was opposed to restating our offer to Castro. So the committee adjourned without reaching a decision. Later after much debate, we agreed to send one more cable.

The last-chance cable was unequivocal. We stated our original offer of 500 agricultural tractors for 1,214 prisoners. We gave Castro a deadline of noon, June 23, to accept it; if he rejected the offer, our committee would dissolve. It was "fish or cut bait."

On Friday, June 23, at 11:26 a.m. (34 minutes before the deadline), Fidel Castro rejected our offer.

"Your committee lies when it states that Cuba has changed its original proposal," his cable began. He covered the tired ground of indemnification, $28 million, an equal number of potential prisoners, and the cowardly invasion of Cuba. He termed our final offer ridiculous. And he concluded, to our dismay, with the promise that he would authorize the delegation of prisoners to go to the United States again and explain the facts to the American people.

Here was proof that he wished to keep his foot in the door, that he was still looking for a propaganda victory.

The Tractors for Freedom Committee issued a press release which began by stating that it "deeply regrets that Dr. Fidel Castro has seen fit to renege on his offer to exchange 500 tractors for the lives of some 1,200 freedom fighters." It concluded: "As a result of Dr. Castro's action the decision of the committee is to disband and return all contributions without putting them to the use for which they were so generously, genuinely, and unselfishly intended."

And so ended the most exasperating, frustrating, and enervating 6 weeks of my life. Even now I am not sure I can assess the experience objectively or accurately.

Several things are obvious:

Castro's inhuman proposal that men be traded for machines did more to discredit him in Latin America than anything the United States could have done.

The real victims in this sordid affair were not nations but the captives themselves—men tormented by the hope of freedom and crushed by the inevitability of their fate.

The incident lost its original humane focus and became a propaganda struggle which the United States desperately needed to win.

The American people demonstrated again their unique generosity (despite all the criticism, a grocery store owner pledged 10 percent of his day's receipts, a shipping company offered free transport for tractors, a tractor company offered to produce them without profit; thousands of people sent in contributions). Some Americans, however, displayed a shortsightedness and a callousness, as did a good many of their leaders, though I must temper this criticism by saying that had they been told the truth from the beginning their atttiudes might well have been different.

Finally, Castro clearly demonstrated his adherence to the Communist dictum that life is governed by a materialistic absolutism and that lies pave the road to salvation so long as they serve the Communist cause.

Fortunately, the terrible mistakes made in the Cuban invasion, and the clumsy fumbling displayed in the tractors for prisoners deal, have not characterized other efforts of the Kennedy administration in the Latin-American area. From the moment that President Kennedy called the ambassadors of the Latin-American republics to the White House early in 1961 to formulate an Alliance for Progress, our efforts to seek justice for the underprivileged of Latin American through collective action have been constantly and earnestly pursued.

SECRETARY FREEMAN RESPONDS TO HOG PRICE QUESTIONS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, November 18, I quoted in my remarks on the floor of the House an Associated Press report, in part, as follows:

> Hogs are an important source of farm income. * * * An Agriculture Department report issued Monday showed prices for the country as a whole in mid-September averaged $15.40 a hundred pounds, $2.70 lower than a year ago.
>
> But the reduction in the hog price tells only a part of the story of dwindling returns from hog raising. Profits are determined by prices farmers have to pay for corn—as well as prices paid for hogs.
>
> In mid-September this year the national average for corn prices was $1.21 a bushel. * * * The administration is moving quietly to correct this situation by bringing about lower corn prices—and thereby reducing hog production costs.
>
> Without public notice, it has resumed offering Government-owned surplus corn on the market to compete with supplies held by farmers and dealers.
>
> Officials hope and expect that within a month or so, corn prices will drop to the 1962 level of around $1.07 a bushel. Government sales coupled with the movement of new corn into the market, they said, should bring this about.

In response to my remarks on that occasion I am this morning in receipt of the following letter from the Secretary of Agriculture:

> DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
> *November 20, 1963.*
>
> DEAR CONGRESSMAN CANNON: Upon my return today from a meeting of the Food and Agriculture Organization in Rome, I noted your remarks on farm income and your references to newspaper stories in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for November 18.
>
> I want you to know that I am extremely concerned about the current and prospective decline in the incomes of our farmers. I have on many occasions made it clear that our efforts in the Department of Agriculture have been directed toward raising farm income generally, not reducing it. This continues to be our objective.
>
> Nearly every action we have taken with regard to prices and incomes for major commodities has supported farm incomes. Early in 1961 we moved to improve feed grain prices and incomes while reducing surpluses at the same time. Soybean price supports were raised in order to expand acreage, and soybean income rose by some $400 million in 1961.
>
> As a result of these and other actions, net incomes of farmers in 1961 and in 1962 were nearly 10 percent higher than in 1960. We look upon this improvement in net income coupled with the reduced surpluses of feed grains and wheat as very significant developments of the past 2 years.
>
> This year farm income is expected to be some $400 million lower than last year. This is primarily the result of somewhat lower cattle prices which in turn are largely due to increased beef production. Even though overall income from farming will be down somewhat, income per farm will be at about the same level as in 1962. Per capita income of people living on farms, however, including nonfarm as well as farm sources will be 3 percent higher this year than in the 1963 record of $1,436 last year. We expect that per capita incomes of people living on farms will be about as high next year as this year as programs to improve the nonfarm job opportunities of rural people continue.
>
> It is important to recognize that the projected decline in farm income next year is almost entirely the result of an expected drop in wheat prices in the last half of 1964 because of the wheat referendum. Receipts from other farm products will be up about the same amount. But the continued rise in production costs paid by farmers will reduce incomes compared with this year.
>
> Because we have made our objectives in regard to farm income so clear, I am surprised and puzzled by the recent article in the Washington Star referring to lower corn prices. I want to assure you that the Department of Agriculture is not proposing "to hammer down the price of corn in order to make hog raising profitable." I know too well that cheap corn means cheap hogs, as you indicated in your remarks.
>
> Any charge that corn prices are unusually low or have been reduced directly as a result of actions by the Department of Agriculture is completely without foundation. Department officials hope and expect corn prices to strengthen, not to go lower.
>
> At Chicago yesterday, No. 2 Yellow corn was 6 cents higher than a year ago. In October, U.S. farmers averaged $1.08 per bushel for corn, 6 cents above October 1961 and 1962. These higher prices prevail in spite of a record crop this year, and despite excellent harvesting conditions putting a

heavy volume of corn on the market. Higher prices for corn this year may add some $400 million to the value of the 1963 crop, compared with the 1960 crop of about the same size, but for which farmers received an average price just below $1 per bushel.

Contrary to the report that the Department "is moving quietly to correct this situation not by increasing the price of hogs but by lowering the price of corn and thereby reducing hog production costs," we have in fact put far less corn and other feed grains into the market so far this fall than we have in recent years. On November 18, 942 cars of corn arrived in Chicago. Only five cars were sold by CCC that day in Chicago. It is the current crop, not CCC sales, which are the major factors in the market today.

Compared with the last 2 years, CCC sales the past several months have been moderate, and have been made largely to fill export demands. Last year, CCC sold 131 million bushels of corn for all purposes from August through October. This year, CCC sales have been only 66 million bushels. Only twice from August to the present time have weekly corn sales this year exceeded sales last year.

We expect corn prices this year to be materially stronger than last year. Under the provisions of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, which established the feed grain program for the 1963 crop, the Department of Agriculture is authorized to sell CCC corn to redeem feed grain program payment-in-kind certificates only at prices above the current loan rate. I have informed the Congress that CCC minimum sales prices will be even higher than required by law by the amount of carrying charges during the marketing year. Because of the amended sales provisions of law and Department sales policies applicable to this year's crop, we expect less CCC corn to be placed on the market during the early months of this marketing year than in recent years. As a result corn prices should average higher this year than last year, adding stability also to hog markets.

If you have further questions on these matters, please call on us.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

Mr. Speaker, I have the highest regard for Mr. Freeman, the Secretary of Agriculture, and for the admirable manner in which he is administering his duties in that important and difficult position. He is one of the great men of the Nation.

But he is surrounded by a hard-shelled bureaucracy which has from time to time shown their lack of interest in providing for the farmer his fair share of the national income.

In the 78th Congress I found it necessary to include in the RECORD quotations from newspapers in which high officials in the Department of Agriculture had expressed—as in this instance—the hope that farm prices would be lower. On that occasion—as in this—I contrasted the different attitude of Department of Agriculture officials with the attitude of Department of Labor officials toward wages and adverse labor conditions.

The Department was established to serve American agriculture and if in the present slump of farm prices—when all other prices are steadily rising—they can not express to the press a sympathetic attitude toward those they are paid to serve—they should resign and seek more congenial fields.

DAIRYMEN'S PROTEST

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WHARTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, in the early days of this Congress, assurances from the Secretary of Agriculture were received which indicated that dairy legislation would be included among the "must" list of the administration. The intervening 11 months have disproven this pledge and for all intents and purposes, we must now return to our constituent dairymen empty handed and explain that the glib rhetoric of January was forgotten by midsummer. Granted, cursory hearings were held on both sides of Capitol Hill; however, no plausible solution has been advanced by the administration. To this end, I have introduced a stopgap measure designed to remove at least one of the glaring monstrosities which have contributed to the highly undemocratic process by which orders are amended. The law now provides that a cooperative may cast a single vote for each and every one of its membership. Elimination of the bloc voting provision by enactment of my bill, H.R. 9218, would insure each farmer a real voice in the regulation of his livelihood.

The 28th District of New York is included in the confines of Federal Milk Marketing Order No. 2, and shortly a referendum vote on an amendment will undoubtedly be accorded near unanimity. Will a co-op in representing the producer, miss such an opportunity to pass along to the farmer the cost of hauling his product to market? Presently, milk is priced f.o.b. at the dairy doorstep. The proposal to require the farmer to absorb the hauling charge of approximately 10 cents per hundredweight would not be allowed if the farmer was given a say-so and pure democracy prevailed. However, the anomaly of the system which has given the co-op the right to vote its members' share, is now certain to require that same farmer to pay a charge which is really one which the corporation should continue to pay.

Certainly every Member of the House of Representatives who is devoted to protecting democratic principles should join me in urging the Agricultural Committee to act promptly on this bill.

MORTGAGE GUARANTY INSURANCE CO.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, I returned to Washington from São Paulo, Brazil. I had been in that country attending the Inter-American Economic and Social Council meeting. I went there at the invitation and urging of the Department of State which was anxious that the Committee on Ways and Means be represented. The majority leader had also personally urged that I accept the invitation.

The night before I was preparing to leave for the conference, I began to receive questions from the press concerning my role in a tax problem which involved an insurance company in my State and also concerning the circumstances under which I later bought stock in that company. I answered their questions. I delayed my departure the next day to the last minute in order to continue to respond to questions from the press. Before I left, I instructed my assistant to continue to supply all the information available to the press and to open my complete file on these matters if requested. This was done during my absence. This I did in full confidence that I had done nothing improper or wrong.

I did not, of course, have the opportunity to read the press coverage of this matter while I was out of the country, but, as the House knows, I have been the subject during my absence of numerous news stories and severe editorial attack. My first task, when I returned here, was to bring myself up to date on the attacks and to make certain inquiries. I apologize to the House for the time it has taken me to appear before you to set forth the facts and the full history of my participation in these matters. The delay has been occasioned only by a desire to have every possible bit of information pertinent to this case to put before you so as to lay the matter to rest for once and for all.

This House has had an opportunity to come to know me. I am entering my 20th year of service here and my 24th year as a legislator. I have devoted full time to my legislative duties. I gave up the active practice of law when I first took my oath of office here. I have not had outside business or legal interests while I have been here. I have tried to uphold the highest ideals and maintain the highest ethical standards while serving in this body. Prior to last week, I think I can honestly say, there has never been the slightest word of criticism concerning the way I have conducted myself, morally and ethically, in this or any office. The House itself can be the judge of the reputation I held when last I stood before it.

The House is also in a position to assess the reputation I hold today. And, since I cannot mince words with you who know me best, let us recognize at once that my character and reputation, but, for the last 10 days, my sole assets as a public servant, have been gravely, perhaps irreparably damaged by what certain elements of the press has said and spread about about me throughout the land.

I have been prosecuted, judged, and hung by a powerful part of the public press. I have been condemned, in my absence from this country on the Nation's business, on the basis of information I freely gave and openly furnished, and before I could rise to defend myself. I have been judged editorially on the basis of certain news stories which are replete with speculation, innuendoes, false quotations, misinformation, uninformed information, and malicious material out of context.

I have been so judged by certain parts of the press even though the press was fully aware that the most precious thing I possess, my reputation, was at stake. I have been so judged on the basis of a single incident, without regard for a record of conduct in public office which I place against that of any man in public life.

I have suffered; my family has suffered; my friends and my party have suffered. Because injury is often measured by the small things as well as the great, let me tell you that even the faithful woman who was caring for my children in our absence last week was called a liar by a member of the press when she told him I was not home—to the deep hurt of everyone in my family. In fairness to that reporter, he had the decency to apologize when he learned the truth, but no apology can make amends for his original thoughtless behavior.

I am prepared today to answer to the charges and attacks which I have undergone in the past 10 days. I am prepared today to begin the long, hard task of repairing the damage which has been done to me. I am asking you, my colleagues, to hear the evidence.

I begin by making certain categorical denials of charges which have either been made, or intimated, in the press:

I categorically deny any wrongdoing, or intention of wrongdoing, on my part, in connection with the tax case involving Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Co., and my subsequent purchase of stock in that company.

I deny that I have engaged in any unethical conduct, or that I am guilty of any conflict of interest.

I deny that I obtained preferential tax treatment for the insurance company or any other taxpayer.

I deny that I have used "pressure" or threats on the Treasury Department or the Internal Revenue Service to obtain preferential tax treatment, or any other kind of treatment for this insurance company.

I deny that I received any payoff from the taxpayer in this case or in any other case I have worked on.

The first aspect of this matter I wish to clarify is the tax case involving the Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Co.

This phase should be of concern to every Member of this body, because one of the remarks I made to the press is that I did not do anything in this case that any other Congressman would not do for a constituent or a business in his State that had a tax problem. The U.S. News & World Report comments that—

> This statement raises the question about whether it is common practice among Members of Congress to use pressure or influence to get changes in tax rulings or rules in other agencies of Government that give special favors for individuals or business enterprises in their States.

Each Member, therefore, ought carefully to listen to what I did on this case, and make a judgment for himself whether it is the way he would have handled it or any other similar case which may come across his desk. For, if you reach the conclusion that my statement—"that I did not do anything in this case that any other Member would not have done"—was correct, then you will be in jeopardy to the public charge of using improper pressure every time you try to correct what you believe is a wrong being done to a resident of your State.

At the heart of this case is a tax ruling by the Internal Revenue Service.

Throughout the discussion of this case by the press, there is evidence of a complete misunderstanding and misrepresentation of what a tax ruling really is.

A tax ruling by the Internal Revenue Service is its interpretation of what a tax law passed by this Congress means and requires in regard to a specific case before it. It is an interpretation made by experts—dedicated men—in the light of knowledge and experience, but it is, in many cases and understandably so, biased toward the tax collector, or the Federal Government. Let us get this clear.

An interpretation of the tax laws by Internal Revenue Service is not something handed down from Mount Sinai, immutable and invariably correct. It has no greater standing in law than the interpretation of the taxpayer who is understandably biased toward himself, until the differing interpretations—one by the tax collector and the other by the taxpayer—are tested in a court of law.

There is one essential difference, however. Too often, the IRS interpretation operates with the force of law, simply because the taxpayer cannot afford, for one reason or another, to bring his differing view before a court of law. If the taxpayer finds the game is not worth the candle, he must abide by the IRS ruling, even though he feels it is wrong. Some people seem to think that what the IRS believes is the law in every case—its interpretation and its ruling—actually is the law. But it is not. It is still only an interpretation.

There is absolutely nothing wrong for a taxpayer to seek, openly and aboveboard, to have the IRS change its view as to the interpretation of the law. If he can convince IRS he is right, IRS will change its interpretation and the change will affect all taxpayers in an identical situation. The taxpayer, when that fails, also has every right to go into court or, and this is important, to seek corrective legislation from the Congress.

A Member of Congress, when there is brought to him what he believes is an inequitable interpretation affecting a taxpayer or class of taxpayers, has and must have, the right to request a review of an IRS interpretation, with the view toward changing it, in order to determine the necessity of starting on the long, legislative process. He must have that right in connection with the interpretation by an agency of any law. The essential element is that he exercise that right openly and aboveboard.

With that background, let us consider the case here in question—the tax problem confronting Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Co. late in 1959.

The problem involved an IRS interpretation of whether certain premiums were earned or unearned for tax purposes. The taxpayer had not only sought to change that interpretation once, he had tried twice and had both times been denied.

MGIC was a new company engaged in a new field of insurance—privately insuring lenders against losses arising from the nonpayment of loans on residential property. The company was pioneering anew in a field which until then was largely monopolized by the Federal Housing Administration—FHA mortgages. Because it was new, operations in this field raised new questions which required new interpretation. IRS had given its opinion that the taxation of premiums paid into a contingency reserve by the company, as required by Wisconsin law, were taxable as current income.

Let me explain the situation briefly because it is crucial to understanding this case.

In addition to normal reserves, an insurance corporation of this type was required under Wisconsin law for the protection of the insured to set aside as "contingency reserve" 30 percent of the premiums on mortgage loan insurance when the mortgage was for less than 80 percent of the appraised value of the property, and 50 percent of the premiums where the initial mortgage was for 80 percent or more of the appraised value. The premiums put into this reserve had to be maintained there, under State law, for 15 years. The company could use the funds for only one purpose—to cover extraordinary losses as the result of widespread mortgage defaults as in the event of a depression.

The tax question involved here was whether the premiums put into this contingency reserve would be considered as earned in the year the premium was paid, or as earned after they could be withdrawn from the reserve and used for general company purposes when they then would be taxed. IRS had ruled that the tax had to be paid currently on premiums as income even though the company could have no use of the money until the expiration of 15 years. If the IRS interpretation prevailed, the company would have had to cease opeartions or so reduced their operations as to make the continuation of the business pointless. The company obviously could not pay taxes at a 52-percent rate on such a large proportion of its premium income when that income was not available to pay such taxes for 15 years. It could not do so and still stay in business.

That was the problem which faced the insurance company when, in December 1959, Paul J. Rogan, an officer of the company and an old friend, sought my advice and assistance as the Wisconsin Congressman on the Committee on Ways and Means. The company confronted an IRS interpretation of the law, which if not changed, would mean it simply could not operate. Any interpretation of the revenue laws which could lead to this result, I immediately felt, was suspect on its face and must be thoroughly explored.

But, I did not rely on my own judgment, or the company's judgment. Before doing anything, I requested the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation for an opinion. I wanted to have their expert advice—advice any member of the tax-writing committees must have in the complex field of taxation. I wanted their advice on two matters.

First, was the IRS interpretation consistent with the law? Was their opinion right or wrong, based on the wording of the code?

Second, if the Service was right in its interpretation of the law, was a revision of the law itself justified?

On January 11, I received an exhaustive study prepared by Mr. Russell M. Oram, of the committee staff. It had been submitted by him to Mr. Colin Stam, the chief of staff of the committee, and transmitted by Mr. Stam to me. I include the full text of this study and other material in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The staff study concluded, on the first point, that the question of whether the IRS interpretation was consistent with the law, and therefore correct, could not be resolved with any real certainty. The study did say, however:

> On the basis of these decisions (which it cited), it would appear that MGIC would have a reasonable chance of winning a decision if the issue were taken to the courts.

On the second point, as to the justification for legislation, the study first discussed the possibility of relief through litigation. It said:

> Even though MGIC appears to have a fair chance for relief through litigation, the company says it is not practicable to litigate this issue; in the event IRS is sustained, the taxpayer would be unable to meet the liability incurred during the pending of litigation.
>
> In view of this very real difficulty, the study goes on to say, and because it can be argued that the viewpoint of the courts in the decisions in the *Early* v. *Lawyers Title Insurance Company* and Massachusetts Protective Association cases is an intrinsically correct and reasonable viewpoint, legislation such as MGIC requests might be desirable.

Further in the matter of whether legislation was justified, the report goes on to say:

> Taxation is a practical matter. Here the inescapable fact seems to be, as MGIC has stated, that it is simply impossible for a mortgage insurance company to pay income taxes at the rate of 52 percent on money which is not available to pay such taxes, or for any other purpose, until 15 years have elapsed. Legislatively, we are here confronted with a condition, not a theory. Confronted with a somewhat similar situation in the past, Congress granted relief.

Citing the change in law with respect to the deferral of the reporting of income on the sale of personal property sold on the installment plan, the study goes on:

> Congress provided that such dealers could defer the reporting of this income until the installments were received, thus postponing the tax until the money to pay the tax was received. The study says, what MGIC now asks is in some degree similar, since it asks that it be permitted to pay the tax when the money to pay it is released from the legal restrictions.

Let me emphasize that point. The company did not seek to avoid tax. It simply asked that it be allowed to pay the tax when the premiums were available for company use.

The study concludes with this point:

> Fifteen years is a long time for the Government to wait for its tax, but it would seem that if MGIC (and any other mortgage insurance companies subject to similar regulations) is to survive, legislation of the type requested would be necessary (assuming that litigation will not solve the problem).

That was the advice I received from the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation—Congress' tax experts.

In effect, this report told me that IRS might be wrong in its interpretation. It agreed that litigation was not practical. It said that, if the IRS persisted in its interpretation, legislation would be necessary if the company was to survive and if the insurance of mortgages by private companies was to continue.

Now, it is axiomatic to me, as I believe it is to every Member, that our tax laws must be so written and administered as to permit legitimate businesses to operate in accordance with sound accounting practices and, in the case of insurance companies, in accordance with State laws designed to protect the insured. No government can raise revenue from a business if a tax law makes it impossible for the business to operate.

Based, therefore, on the joint committee study, I called the problem to the attention of the Treasury Department, sending them a copy of the staff analysis, asking them to check into this problem for the purpose of determining whether or not it could be solved administratively or, in other words, by a change in the ruling. I asked, in effect, for a determination of whether it was felt that the law required an interpretation which had such a self-defeating effect. At the same time, I also asked the staff of the joint committee to prepare appropriate legislation.

Now, let me digress for a minute in order to deal with certain newspaper attacks.

The New York Times, in accusing me of obtaining preferential tax treatment, states:

> Mr. BYRNES cannot even claim he was providing assistance to a constituent (because the insurance company is located in Milwaukee).

Does the Times contend that a Congressman must limit his interest and activity only to matters of his district? I am a Representative from Wisconsin, and I take it that that means my responsibilities are to the whole State as well as the district. I hope it is never said of me that, when faced with what I believed to be a tax inequity no matter where it arises, I failed to meet my responsibility, as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, to try to correct it.

I had, of course, a prime and compelling interest in this problem because it involved a Wisconsin company fighting for its life, but my efforts in the past have not been limited exclusively to Wisconsin taxpayers.

We were faced with a somewhat similar problem not long ago in the case of the American Automobile Association and its affiliated State organization. After some years of litigation, including appeals to the U.S. Supreme Court, it had finally been decided that the AAA was currently taxable on gross dues received without any provision for its obligation to provide road service and other features for its members over a period of years. In the 87th Congress, I introduced a bill to remedy the situation and it later became Public Law 87-109. I have not yet been attacked for my efforts in that case, but that is probably because I have not revealed publicly until now the fact that I have been an AAA subscriber and member for at least 20 years.

Prior to that case, there was a problem with respect to—of all things—prepaid newspaper and periodical subscriptions. When the IRS sought to tax currently the gross subscriptions received by a few publishers without recognition of their liability to supply papers over the subscription period, the Congress enacted remedial legislation. That legislation overturned one of those sacred IRS interpretations. The provision now appears as section 455 of the code and was enacted in the 85th Congress.

I would be interested to learn if the New York Times, the guardian of legislative morals, attacked the enactment of this law for the benefit of a few publishers as preferential tax treatment.

In neither of these two previous cases, of course, was the problem as acute, or as inequitable, or as self-defeating in terms of the Federal revenue, as the problem confronting the mortgage insurance business. Those taxpayers were not threatened with extinction.

I felt strongly that the mortgage insurance business was entitled to the same consideration with respect to the treatment of its premiums that had been accorded to the AAA and certain publishers. Even more compelling, I felt it was entitled to the same consideration with respect to premiums placed in reserve as is granted to other types of insurance. The mortgage insurance business was clearly being subjected, in my judgment, to discriminatory and confiscatory tax treatment.

So, I vigorously pushed for a review of the tax service's interpretation of the law. I thought this matter should be settled promptly, either by administrative action or by action of the Congress. I wrote several letters to the Treasury Department which were then, and are now, a matter of public record as far as I am concerned. I conferred on several occasions with Treasury officials informally or on the phone. I dealt only with the merits of the case. Then, on March 10, I introduced a bill, H.R. 11033, which had been drafted by the joint committee staff. I wrote the Secretary of the Treasury, explained the urgency of the matter and my efforts toward administrative solution, and asked that he expedite a report on the legislation so that it could be started on its long legislative journey at the earliest possible time.

That is a complete summary of what I did to help solve this urgent tax problem. I have told the press that I did what any Congressman would do under the circumstances. But, I do not presume to speak for any other Member, and whether you would have done differently is a matter for your own determination.

I do want you to know, however, so you may gage your future actions, I have been accused of "pressure," "influence," and "threatening tactics" for what I did in this case.

For the life of me, I cannot figure the basis for these charges, but most of them seem to center around my introduction of the bill. It is intimated and insinuated that the entire Treasury Department, including all the Revenue Service, got scared to death when I introduced that bill and, to save their very lives, granted administrative relief.

I was proud to introduce the bill and I was prepared to throw this question into the full light of public discussion and debate, and advocate its passage with all the strength at my command, because I believed I was right.

Why should the Treasury be afraid? What threat could a bill introduced in the U.S. Congress constitute to that Department or the Government? In what way was this improper?

Those who have charged me with pressure, or threats, because I introduced a bill and, in effect, told the Treasury to "fish or cut bait" should have the common courage to explain and prove their damnable accusations.

For, if the day ever comes, my colleagues, when you cannot drop a bill in this hopper for fear you will be accused of improper activity, or of threatening tactics, then God help the United States of America.

This tax matter was ended, as far as I was concerned, on March 25 when I received a letter from the Under Secretary of Treasury advising me that the Internal Revenue Service had come to the conclusion that appropriate allowance for contingency reserves of the type proposed to be covered by my bill could be made under existing law and that, accordingly, legislation would not be necessary. The taxpayer would avoid no tax; he would pay the tax, however, when the income became available to him—when it was released from the statutory reserve in 15 years. And, remember IRS made the final determination.

Now, as far as I was concerned, that ended the matter.

What I had done, in my opinion, was an essential part of my duty as a Representative in Congress from Wisconsin and as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. What I had done I had done openly, prepared to fight in public for what I believed right. There was no thought in my mind that I had acted improperly. Indeed, I looked with great satisfaction and pride on the part I had played in helping to bring a clearly inequitable and discriminatory tax problem to successful solution.

The immediate result, of course, was to permit this company to stay in business. You should also know that it has since permitted the formation of five other companies to operate in this field, one in Louisiana, two in North Carolina, one in South Carolina, and one in Wisconsin. I also understand a company is being formed in Iowa. It has thus resulted in new jobs in Wisconsin and elsewhere. It has assisted the housing industry and families who want to own a home. It has brought revenue to the Treasury which it otherwise would not have.

So, I say to this House, in answer to charges that this was special interest legislation, preferential tax treatment, favoritism, and a new loophole, those charges are false, and they are false on their face because their makers have not even taken the trouble to examine the merits of the issue. For what I did in this case, I would be willing to answer in any forum. There is nothing I did in this case which I would now change in the slightest.

A source of great shock and regret to me, however, is that I unknowingly laid open to attack, by writers of the New York Times, one of the few truly great and dedicated men I have known. Colin Stam, the chief of staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, has been brutally attacked—and I use the word deliberately—for the part his staff played in this case. It is startling to see a congressional staff member attacked for fulfilling his statutory function by responding to a request for information and opinion on the need for legislation in a complex tax matter. Such an attack should not go unrecognized by the taxwriting committees of this Congress. For the present, I want to say to the House that the bounds of fairness and decency have been badly overreached when a man as scrupulously honest, as faithful, as impartial, and as valuable as Colin Stam is carelessly and viciously impugned for performing the duties delegated to him by Congress. If the net results of this kind of attack is to impair the freedom of congressional staffs to advise Congress on technical and complex matters, then, Mr. Speaker, the legislative process will indeed have suffered a grievous blow.

A final word on this tax case. I state categorically that I had no understanding, expectation or desire for any reward or favor of any kind for my participation in the case. Anyone who says otherwise is a liar. My reward was ample. It was the satisfaction which comes from making the tax laws workable, equitable, productive, and stimulating to the economy.

I let you judge my statement that "I did not do anything in this case any other Congressman would not do for a constituent or business in his State that had a tax problem." I think you would. One wonders what makes this "holier than thou" part of the press tick.

Permit me now to turn to the matter of the investment I later made in the Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Co. First, let me say, at no time, during my work on the tax case, was there any discussion with anyone about investing in the company, nor had anyone suggested that I do so. The idea of investing in the company never entered my mind. The fact is that, at this time, I owned no stocks of any kind.

But, in September 1960, about 6 months after the conclusion of the tax matter, I was at home in my district preparing for an intensive reelection campaign in that presidential year when I received a long-distance phone call from Paul Rogan, whom I have already mentioned. He urged the purchase of some stock in the Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Co., which he said was available as a splendid investment. Mr. Rogan in addition to being an officer in the company, was a former commissioner of insurance in Wisconsin, and, above all, a very close and good friend. I had every faith in his integrity and his judgment. He told me that the company was enjoying a splendid growth record, that he foresaw the early possibility of a considerable increase in the value of the stock, and that, in his opinion, this purchase would represent a sound investment which would substantially increase in value over the years. As events turned out, he was eminently right. Although this stock certainly could also have gone down, it has had a fabulous rise.

Based on his judgment and his judgment alone, I agreed then and there to purchase some of the stock. As I recall, no specific number of shares was discussed, nor was the price of the stock specifically mentioned. Acting on the spur of the moment, I told him I could manage a purchase involving around $2,000 and to go ahead and get me the stock and I would settle with him when the purchase was closed. Later, by letter dated September 16, addressed to my home in Washington, my wife and I received stock certificate No. 803 for 80 shares of Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Co. with a par value of $10 per share, and stock certificate No. 771 for 20 shares of Guaranty Insurance Agency with a par value of $5 a share. The shares of the companies were apparently offered only in units consisting of four shares of MGIC common stock and one share of agency common stock. At this time—mid-September—I was still in Wisconsin, and Mrs. Byrnes and the children were in Washington. It was some days after the letter arrived, in talking with Mrs. Byrnes, that she told me that the letter had come to the house from MGIC, enclosing certain stock certificates. I then related to her my conversations with Mr. Rogan and what I had agreed to.

I was at this time engrossed in my congressional duties and a very heavy campaign schedule which kept me constantly on the road right up to election day. As soon as the election was over, I got in touch with Mr. Rogan with respect to the price of the stock, and I gave him my personal checks totaling $2,300 in payment of the stock. One check was drawn on the Sergeant-at-Arms account in the sum of $1,300, and the other check was drawn on the Kellogg-Citizens National Bank of Green Bay, Wis., in the sum of $1,000. These checks were made payable to Paul Rogan. He had taken care of the purchase. These checks are available for examination at my office. Here are the checks.

As I have said, I made no independent investigation of the stock before I purchased it. I was unaware that there was any market for the stock existing at the time I purchased it. I did not see a prospectus or have any other information relative to the stock. I did not contact a broker. As far as I was concerned, I was buying stock which the corporation was authorized to issue. I assumed that I was buying it along with others to whom it was then being offered at the same price. I had complete faith in Mr. Rogan, and I had no reason to think that I was engaged in anything other than acquiring an interest in a relatively new company based on the recommendation of a friend who had a special knowledge of the insurance business and of the company's operation and prospects. As far as I was concerned, it was purely and simply a long-term investment on terms, which I was told and believed, were very good, even though speculative.

Efforts have been made by the press to tie this purchase to the tax case that I had worked on earlier in the year. Let me make this perfectly clear. As far as I was concerned, the purchase had nothing to do with the tax matter. Neither Paul Rogan nor the company were in any way obligated to me as far as I was concerned. The tax case was closed. I believed then, as I believe now, that Paul called my attention to this opportunity because of our longstanding friendship. I did not then, nor do I now, consider it unethical or a conflict of interest for a legislator to make a bona fide investment in a company which he had openly, legitimately and honestly helped in the past, completely in keeping with the performance of his official duties. That is what I had done in this case.

Let me also make this clear. I am not suggesting that Members of Congress can ignore conflicts of interest. They must constantly and scrupulously avoid it. If I had held stock in this company when their tax case was being pursued, I would have felt dutybound to divorce myself from any phase of this problem. But, when I was working on that case, I was not a stockholder and had no intention of becoming one. I say further that, since becoming a stockholder, I have done absolutely nothing with respect to any matters they may have been interested in either before the Congress or any other place in Government.

So that you may have the full record of the developments with respect to the MGIC stock, I should report that on October 3, a letter was received at my home in Washington, while I was in Wisconsin, advising that the old certificates of shares were being canceled and new shares of stock were being issued on the following basis: The outstanding shares of $10 par value common stock of Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Co. were reclassified into 10 shares of a newly authorized $1 par value common stock, and 6 shares of the new MGIC common stock were being issued for each share of $5 par value common stock of Guaranty Insurance Agency, Inc. On November 17, and after my return to Washington, I sent the old shares of stock to the transfer agent, the First Wisconsin Trust Co., for cancellation and issuance of certificates of the new shares.

Then, on April 10 of 1962, I received from the corporation a stock dividend equivalent to 1 share of common stock for each 20 shares owned. This dividend brought my total holdings to 966 shares. Other than this stock dividend, no other dividends have been paid by the company since I have held the stock.

I have sold no shares. I have received no cash dividends. And, while the papers refer to the profit I have made, let me point out that I have not received one red cent up to this time as a result of this investment. Every bit of profit is a profit on paper only and no one knows what is going to become of that.

That, then, is the story of my participation in the tax case and in the purchase of stock of the company.

That is the story of what I did in the tax case and why. That is the story of my purchase of the stock and the information I had when that purchase was made.

I see absolutely nothing wrong in any part of it.

Upon my return to Washington last Sunday, I found that certain press accounts of this matter stated that I had received special consideration with respect to the price at which the stock had been sold to me, and that there was a market in this stock at that time in which the price was considerably higher than I had paid.

These allegations were at variance with what I understood the situation to be. Let me make clear again that when I was offered the stock, I had absolutely no knowledge that there was a market or that I was receiving any special treatment by the company in selling it to me.

These allegations, as you can well understand, were very disturbing to me. On Monday morning, therefore, I contacted Mr. Rogan and also retained an attorney in Milwaukee, Roger C. Minahan, to investigate and advise me as to the facts that existed in September 1960, when I purchased the stock. It has been the development of this information that has delayed my laying this matter before you.

I believe I now have the facts as best they can be determined by me. I have learned that, at that time, no real market had been established, but there were some isolated transactions in the stock at substantially higher prices than I had paid. There was no unpublished information as to such transactions, however, until the latter part of October 1960, when quotations began to be published in the Milwaukee Sentinel. Prior to that time, the only way information could be obtained was by contacting local brokers to ascertain whether they had any knowledge of any trades. I have also learned that there were a limited number of transactions, from July through September, with the prices ranging between $8.70 per share to $23.37 a share. Knowledge of such transactions, in the absence of inquiry to brokers familiar with such transactions and publication of quoted trades, was not, however, available to the public.

With respect to the stock held by the company and which they were authorized to sell, I have learned, as a result of this investigation, that the company was restricted in the price at which it could be sold. Under State orders of registration and the prospectus filed with the SEC, these shares could not be offered at any price other than $2.50 per share, on the adjusted basis. That is the price at which the shares were sold to me. Charges that these shares were sold to me at a price considerably less than than that at which the company was selling shares to others are absolutely false.

All shares of this issue sold by the company were sold at the $2.50 price—as adjusted—as required by law. My shares, through Mr. Rogan, had been bought from the company.

To my complete dismay, I have also learned that the shares sold by the company were supposed to be restricted and limited to selected executives of mortgage lending institutions. I did not fall in that category. It should be said that the company admitted this violation to the SEC when it applied successfully for a subsequent authority to issue additional stock. It admitted that it violated this restriction with respect to other sales of the stock covered by this particular registration.

I cannot avoid the fact, therefore, that the company extended a preference to me which was supposed to be available only to executives of mortgage lending institutions and that the price of this restricted stock was considerably less than the price at which the stock was being sold in isolated private transactions.

These facts should have been disclosed to me at the time the offer was made to me. They were not. I had no knowledge of them then, nor did I have knowledge of them until I began an investigation of this matter earlier this week.

It can be said, and those who want to crucify me will say it, I am sure, that I could have discovered these facts if I had made the same investigation in September 1960, that I have made within the last few days. The fact is, however, that I did not; it never occurred to me to do so. I had confidence in Mr. Rogan who advised me of the availability of the stock. I had confidence that the company had the right to sell the stock to me. I believed it to be a bona fide, legitimate transaction.

I swear, before my God and this House, that had I known of these facts, I would not have purchased the stock.

Now I have told you all I know about these matters, all I know about the tax case, all I knew at the time I purchased the stock, and all I have been able to learn since my return about the kind of stock I purchased.

I must now make a most difficult decision. The decision involves the stock now in my possession. When I purchased the stock I believed sincerely that there was nothing improper in my doing so on the basis of the information I then had.

Information I have recently obtained makes it clear to me that if I had had that information in September 1960, I would not have purchased the stock.

Should I keep the stock since it was acquired legally and, as far as I knew at the time, it was a bona fide legitimate purchase of a speculative stock?

If I do retain it, certainly that part of the press that sits as self-appointed judges will continue its condemnation of me and, by innuendoes and implications, will continue to damn me falsely as a Congressman who accepted a gift and made a profit in repayment for unethical actions in aid of the company.

Should I sell the stock, keeping from the proceeds only my original purchase price and dispose of the remainder at no profit to myself, as the next best thing to never having entered into the transaction in the first place—as the only way I can now reflect what I would have done if I had known at the time of the purchase what I know now?

If I do that, I have been warned, that part of the press that sits as self-appointed judges will interpret this action a confession of guilt of their entire indictment. That such action will be taken as proof that I acted improperly in the tax case, proof that my stock purchase was a conflict of interest which I should have recognized, proof that my standards are so low as to make me unfit for further service in this House.

What would you do, my fellow colleagues?

Because I knew that any action I would take would reflect not only upon me but upon this entire House, I have sought advice from my dearest friends and closest associates. Their opinions differ, as the opinions of honest men always differ.

But late last night, as I was working on this presentation in my office, it became crystal clear to me that this was a decision which could be made only by myself, in the light of all I have been taught and all that I am, and that it could be made only on the basis of what I felt was right, regardless of what interpretation might be placed upon it. I can live with criticism; that is something I can fight if, in my heart, I know I am right. But I cannot live with a conscience which tells me I once had an opportunity to make amends for an honest error and failed to take it.

I will, therefore, as soon as arrangements can be made, sell all of the Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Co. stock in my possession. I will retain from the proceeds my original purchase price and I will donate the remainder to Scholarships, Inc., of Green Bay, Wis., a charitable organization which provides higher education for deserving students in my hometown who could not otherwise afford to go to college.

I do this to remove the slightest possibility of doubt that I would knowingly profit from any transaction which, on the basis of all the facts, was not regular and aboveboard in every way. I do it without impugning the motives or ethics of anyone else who may have bought or sold this stock. I do it in keeping with my conscience, and I do it in simple justice to this House.

But that does not end this matter.

If I have had a responsibility to reconstruct and amend a 3-year-old action on the basis of what I now know, then the self-appointed judges of the press have the responsibility, it seems to me, to examine its actions of the past 10 days to determine if it, too, has acted in keeping with the highest standards of its noble profession.

I address myself particularly to the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Milwaukee Journal, and the Madison Capital Times, as well as to any other newspaper and magazine and writer who has seen fit to pass moral judgment upon me before I could testify on my own behalf.

I wonder if the part of the press that has been so quick to judge and condemn will be as willing to admit that it has erred.

They have been willing to try to tear me to shreds on conjecture, innuendo, partial information, and misinformation. Will they be just as willing to correct the impressions and false charges they have made?

I say to them: If I could afford, in terms of wealth and of pride, to do what I have done today, then in all fairness to me and my family, you can afford to report my side fully by printing in its entirety the statement I have made here today.

I say to them: You have a responsibility to produce proof before you print such a permanently damaging statement as Byrnes "succeeded in obtaining preferential tax treatment for a mortgage insurance company."

I say to them: You have a responsibility to explain what you mean and prove what you say when you print that I used pressure or threatening tactics upon an agency of the Federal Government; I say you have a responsibility to check, and investigate, and confirm before you broadcast to the world the statement that if my "standard were to be taken as a model, private companies would have an open invitation to spread favors in Congress." I say you have the responsibility to be sure of your facts in every respect before you imply that my conduct and my beliefs mean that financial payoffs for political favors are accepted as right and proper. I say you have the responsibility, in common decency, to look at the whole man and the whole record, and all of the facts, before you include me among the "sleazy fixers who are periodically discovered beneath upturned rocks around Washington."

For my actions, I am prepared to answer in any place; I hope the press is prepared to do the same.

I would add a personal note and then I am through, with an apology for the long period I have been compelled to interrupt the business of this body.

I have been with you for close to 20 years, and I never thought I would have to reveal personal matters to you in defense of my reputation and character. But I have been particularly deeply and grievously hurt by the words of one columnist and what I have to say is necessary.

Richard Starnes, writing in the Washington Daily News, after discussing this case, states that the "Bakers and Byrnes get rich."

I do not know the Bakers and I would not presume to comment for them. For the Byrnes', I can say this:

After almost 24 years of public life, I do not consider myself a rich man. I own no stocks or bonds, except those I will shortly sell at no profit to me. I have no outside connections or financial interests. I have no savings accounts. I have a few thousand dollars in checking accounts. I have a mortgage on my home and a few other debts which, fortunately, are not large. And, outside of furnishings and other personal effects, that is all I have. It is not a record, I submit, of a man who has gotten rich during 25 years of public service.

Frankly, I watched the growth of the insurance company from time to time and the appreciation of its stock with more than a casual interest. It was the only really profitable monetary investment I have ever made. In 2 years, my oldest boy will be ready for college; the other five children will follow him almost yearly thereafter. I confess I had visions that, with prudence, this investment would go a long way toward educating my children.

But, Mr. Speaker, the faith of my children that their father was willing to answer in any place for anything he had ever done is more important to them than any college degree. The conviction of my wife that I have acted honorably is more important to her than any easing of her future sacrifices. The respect of this House and my friends means more to me than any worldly wealth.

For, if my children's faith is lost, if honor is gone, if I no longer have your respect, then I have lost everything. If what I have said and done here has served, to a small degree to reestablish that faith, that honor, and that respect, then I have lost nothing. Then, I am indeed a rich man.

[Memorandum from Russell M. Oram to Mr. Colin F. Stam, Chief of Staff]

Proposed Amendment to Section 832, January 6, 1960

Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Co. requests, through Representative John W. Byrnes, an amendment to section 832 which would permit a company writing mortgage insurance to deduct additions to a reserve for contingencies required by the State regulatory body. You asked me to analyze the factual situation and comment on the proposal.

THE FACTS

Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Co. (subsequently referred to as MGIC) is engaged in the business of insuring mortgage lenders against loss for a premium of one-half of 1 percent of the principal amount of the mortgage for the first year and one-fourth of 1 percent for each subsequent year, where the mortgage is less than 80 percent of the appraised value of the property. (Higher premiums are charged when the mortgage is 80 percent or more of the value of the property.) A mortgage insurance company guarantees the mortgage lender against any loss by reason of nonpayment of the obligation by the borrower and concurrently guarantees the borrower against any personal liability for deficiency judgment in the event of foreclosure. MGIC was licensed by the State of

Wisconsin to do business as a mortgage insurance company early in 1957. It is the only such company now operating. It operates in Wisconsin and is licensed to do business in 32 other States. It is subject to the statutes of Wisconsin and to the administrative regulations of the Wisconsin Insurance Commission. The Wisconsin laws and regulations control the operations of this company in the other 32 States in which it may do business.

The pertinent regulations, section 3.09 of the Wisconsin administrative code, provide that the company shall establish the usual unearned premium reserve based upon time; that is, if an annual premium is received on June 30, one-half of this premium will be unearned on December 31. The regulations also require a mortgage insurance company to set aside as a contingency reserve 30 percent of its earned premiums with respect to mortgages where the mortgage was at its inception less than 80 percent of the appraised value of the property and 50 percent of the earned premium where the initial mortgage was for 80 percent or more of the appraised value of the property. Amounts so set aside must be retained in the reserve for a period of 180 months (15 years). During that period they can be used only to cover extraordinary losses (in excess of the normal losses incorporated in the premium rate formula) which exceed 10 percent of the earned premiums for that year.

Section 832, as presently written, provides for the deduction (in effect) each year of the net addition to only two reserves; the reserve for unearned premiums and the reserve for unpaid losses. MGIC has contended that the additions to the required contingency reserves amounting to 30 percent or 50 percent of gross premiums earned are deductible as unearned premiums. The Internal Revenue Service has ruled that these contingency reserves are not reserves for unearned premiums and therefore additions to such reserves may not be deducted under section 832. Therefore, MGIC now advocates an amendment to section 832 which would include such contingency reserves as "unearned premiums" for a mortgage insurance company if they are required by State law or regulation.

DISCUSSION

Probably a legislative amendment for the benefit of one taxpayer would not be deemed necessary or desirable if that taxpayer could obtain the relief it seeks through litigation. The first question to be considered, therefore, is whether the Internal Revenue Service's ruling that the 30 percent and 50 percent portions of earned premiums required to be set aside in contingency reserves are not deductible would be upheld by the courts.

It does not seem possible to give a categorical answer to that question. On the surface, the ruling of the Internal Revenue Service appears to be correct. Certainly the 30 percent or 50 percent of premiums required to be set aside in a reserve for 15 years unless they are earlier used to cover extraordinary losses do not constitute "unearned premiums" within the ordinary meaning of those words. "Unearned premiums" is a phrase constantly used and well known in all insurance business. As the Internal Revenue Service states in its ruling, Revenue Ruling 55-693 (C.B. 1955-2, 284) an "unearned premium" is "that portion of the premium which the company has not yet had time to earn or, more precisely, that portion paid by the policyholder which must be returned on cancellation of the policy, and which is in direct proportion to the unexpired time which the policy is to run." Premiums received by MGIC are annual premiums, insuring the mortgagee against loss for 1 year thereafter, or 10-year premiums, insuring the mortgagee against loss for 10 years. The statutes and regulations of Wisconsin provide that MGIC can view 50 percent of the aggregate of annual premiums received in a year as unearned at the end of the year, or it may treat as unearned nine-twelfths of annual premiums written in September, six-twelfths of annual premiums written in June, etc. Ninety percent of a 10-year premium is reported as unearned at the end of the year when the premium is received, and smaller specified percentages at the end of each subsequent year. The Internal Revenue Service concedes that these are "unearned premiums," and there is no dispute about that, but the question is are these the only "unearned premiums" within the meaning of section 832, or may the 30 percent and 50 percent additional portions of the premiums which must be set aside for 15 years be also viewed as "unearned premiums" within the intent of Congress.

MGIC contends that the 30 percent or 50 percent segregations of premiums are "unearned premiums" within the meaning of section 832, citing two circuit court decisions interpreting prior statutory language which is similar to that of section 832.

One decision is that in *Early* v. *Lawyers Title Insurance Co.*, 132 F. 2d 42. In that case the taxpayer issued policies of title insurance for a single premium, payment of which insured a mortgagee against loss by reason of a defective title or prior lien for the duration of the mortgage period, or a property owner against any such loss at any time. Applicable Virginia law required the taxpayer and similar companies to set aside 10 percent of each premium in a special reserve for the protection of policyholders. The company could gradually withdraw for its general purposes up to half of the amounts set aside during the first 5 years, and could so withdraw the other 5 percent at the expiration of the mortgage period if a mortgagee was insured, or at the end of 20 years if the property owner was insured. Amounts so set aside were to be treated in all respects as unearned premiums.

The Government contended that title insurance premiums were earned when received, citing *American Title Co.* v. *Comm.*, 76 F. 2d 332, which so held. The court agreed that this was ordinarily so, but held that in this case the 10 percent items set aside constituted "unearned premiums" within the intent of Congress. It said that the premium was earned in the sense that the insured could not demand return of any portion of it, but it pointed out that there was a time element to be considered, during which the company had a continuing liability. It said: "If the (Virginia) statute had provided that 10 percent of the premiums collected should be held for the benefit of policyholders for a fixed period and should belong to the company only after it had carried the liability for that period, it could hardly be contended that this portion of the premiums are earned within the meaning of the Revenue Act until the expiration of the period; but that is precisely the effect of the Virginia statute" (in treating these amounts "for all purposes" as unearned premiums). The Virginia statute gives to those portions of the premiums "all the attributes of unearned premiums; i.e., it withdraws them from the power of the company to use them for the general purposes * * * until the risk shall have been carried for the periods that the statute provides. Until this period has expired the company has no more control over them than * * * a fire insurance company has over the portion of its premiums applicable to an unexpired risk."

Several other court decisions, however, have held that portions of premiums for title insurance required by State laws to be set aside in reserves are not deductible for income tax purposes. In *City Title Ins. Co.* v. *Comm.*, 152 F. 2d 859, for example, it was held that "the existence of a reserve, or the mere fact that it was required by a State statute, cannot justify the deduction taxpayer claims." In distinguishing *Early* v. *Lawyers Title Ins. Co.*, the court said: "Funds in that reserve were primarily to be held for a limited period, after which they were released and then became free assets, i.e., 'earned premiums' subject to the Federal tax. But no one can tell whether the funds in this reserve will ever be released and become free assets." And in *Title and Trust Co.*, 15 TC 510, affd. per curiam 192 F. 2d 934, the Tax Court said: "Deductibility of the statutorily prescribed reserves out of title insurance premium income thus turns on whether the local statute calls for a mere insolvency reserve of indefinite duration or whether the required reserve is established by segregating a portion of the premium income for a specified period when the risk of loss is presumably greatest. In the latter instance, the reserve becomes taxable income to the company when it is released for general corporate purposes at the expiration of the prescribed period." These decisions indicate that, for a title insurance company at least, amounts required by State law to be set aside to meet risks covered by the insurance are deductible for income tax purposes if they are set aside for a specified period of time and then are released for the general purposes of the company; whereas they are not so deductible if the reserve continues indefinitely and there is no time period. In other words, such reserves can be viewed as "unearned premiums" only if they will be earned at the end of some specified period. The Internal Revenue Service contends, however, that this doctrine does not apply to a mortgage insurance company because, while the risk covered by a title insurance premium exists for a long time, a mortgage insurance company receives annual premiums to cover the risk for each year so that the ordinary reserve for unearned premiums completely covers the unexpired period of risk.

MGIC counters this argument by referring to the decision of the circuit court in *Massachusetts Protective Association* v. *U.S.*, 114 F. 2d 304. There the court allowed deductions to a company writing noncancelable health and accident insurance even though the premiums were paid annually, as in the case of MGIC. The court said: "As long as these reserve funds must be held to provide for expected insurance liabilities in the future on these noncancelable health and accident insurance policies and are not to be used for the general purposes of the company, they are not earned premiums within the meaning of Congress. * * * The test is not whether the part of the premium set aside in the reserve * * * belongs to the company in the event of cancellation or lapsing of the policies, but whether that amount is such part of the company's gross income as Congress considered should be treated as net income for the purposes of taxation." That decision was in 1940; subsequently Congress provided explicitly in the law for the deduction of additions to reserves for noncancelable policies where the premiums were the same year after year but the risk tended to increase with the age of the insured.

On the basis of these decisions it would appear that MGIC would have a reasonable chance of winning a favorable decision if the issue were taken to the courts. While it is true that the mere fact that the State law requires that 30 or 50 percent of earned premiums be set aside in a special reserve for a period of 15 years would not in itself make the additions to this reserve deductible, the reasoning in *Early* v. *Lawyers Title Insurance Corp.* indicates that these amounts would constitute unearned premiums, since they are set aside for a limited time and then become available (if not used to meet extraordinary losses) for the general purposes of the company. The fact that the company receives annual premiums and not a single premium is offset by the fact that the policies are noncancelable, so that provision must be made for an increased risk which might occur in the future at a time when, because of the noncancelable feature of the policies, larger premiums could not be charged to offset the larger risk.

Even though MGIC appears to have a fair chance for relief through litigation, the company says that "it is not practicable to litigate this issue; in the event the Internal Revenue Service is sustained, the taxpayer would be unable to meet the liability incurred during the pending of the litigation." In view of this very real difficulty, and because it can be argued that the viewpoint of the courts in the decisions in the *Early* v. *Lawyers Title Insurance Corp.* and Massachusetts Protective Association cases is an intrinsically correct and reasonable viewpoint, legislation such as MGIC requests might be desirable.

In weighing the desirability of such legislation, however, we are confronted with a dilemma. Essentially the reserves which MGIC is required to set up and maintain are pure contingency reserves. They do not represent any present risk nor do they, as in the case of reserves for noncancelable health and accident insurance, represent the setting aside of part of a higher than necessary present premium to meet a risk which on the basis of statistical analysis will very probably, if not certainly, come into being in the future. Rather, these reserves are intended to cover the possibility, although not necessarily the probability, of a substantial economic depression similar to (although perhaps not quite so drastic) the depression of the 1930's, which could cause extraordinary failures by mortgagors to meet their obligations.

Historically, deductions have never been allowed for reserves for contingencies, whether these reserves are voluntarily set up by the taxpayer or whether they are required by State laws or regulations. Banks, for example, are required by law to maintain a certain portion of capital and surplus to growing deposits, yet they have never been allowed to deduct amounts set aside from earnings to provide this necessary surplus. Life insurance companies are required by law to set aside a small percentage of their investment income as a contingency reserve against possible market decline in the value of their securities, yet even in the recently enacted life insurance provisions they are not allowed to deduct additions to such a reserve. Philosophically, it seems wrong to allow deductions against current income to meet future obligations which may never occur. Many organizations have from time to time requested deductions to cover reserves for various possible, but not probable, contingencies. For example, casualty insurance companies have, on several occasions, asked for the deduction of additions to fairly substantial reserves to meet possible extraordinary losses which might result (but so far have not) from cyclones, catastrophic fires, etc. Our staff, the Treasury staff and the congressional tax committees have, so far, not been willing to concede the desirability of present deductions to take care of hypothetical future losses of that type.

There is one exception to this rule. In the life insurance legislation of last year the life insurance companies are permitted to exclude from taxation 50 percent of their net underwriting income so long as this 50 percent is retained in the business for the protection of the policyholders, and taxes on this 50 percent will be imposed only if and when the companies pay out these funds in dividends or otherwise to their stockholders. It is true that in the life insurance field the 50 percent of untaxed underwriting income is 50 percent of a relatively small net income after the deduction of all expenses, whereas in the case of MGIC the reserves set aside are 30 percent to 50 percent of gross premium receipts. It is also true that life insurance is far more complex than mortgage insurance.

The chief argument against legislation of the type requested by MGIC would seem to be that it might open the door to a flood of requests from many types of taxpayers for the allowance in their cases of additions to reserves for various contingencies. Even though abandonment of a long-established rule of income taxation in a single case might be deemed necessary because of the peculiar circumstances in that case, it might be feared that in this area, as in other areas in the past, an isolated and reasonable deviation from accepted principles in one case would be followed by much less justifiable deviations in the same area with respect to other types of taxpayers.

On the other hand, "taxation is a practical matter." Here the inescapable fact seems to be, as MGIC has stated, that it is simply impossible for a mortgage insurance company to pay income taxes at the rate of 52 percent on money which is not available to pay such taxes or for any other purpose until 15 years have elapsed. Legislatively we are here "confronted with a condition, not a theory." The premium rate schedule provided by the Wisconsin regulations applicable to MGIC provides only a narrow margin of 2½ percent of the premiums, exclusive of the 30 to 50 percent which must be retained for 15 years, as profit for the company. Clearly, the company could not pay a tax of one-half of the 2½ percent plus a tax of one-half of 30 or 50 percent of gross premium receipts out of its free income. Nor, presumably, could it pay taxes representing so large a portion of gross receipts out of capital. Confronted with a somewhat similar situation in the past, Congress granted relief. Sellers of personal property on the installment plan would, under the generally required accrual method of accounting, have had to report as income gross profits based on sales, although they would not be collected under the installment plan until subsequent years. Congress provided that such dealers could defer the reporting of this income until the installments were received, thus postponing the tax until the money to pay the tax was received. What MGIC now asks is in some degree similar, since it asks that it be permitted to pay the tax when the money to pay it is released from the legal restrictions. Fifteen years is a long time for the Government to wait for its tax, but it would seem that if MGIC (and any other mortgage insurance company subjected to similar regulations) is to survive, legislation of the type requested would be necessary (assuming that litigation will not solve the problem).

Text of Wire Sent to the Editor, Milwaukee Journal, on November 18, 1963, by Representative John W. Byrnes

I was shocked to read, upon my return to Washington from Brazil yesterday, the story which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal of November 10, 1963, headlined "Firm Did Him a Favor, Byrnes Says of Stock," dealing with my purchase of stock in the Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Co.

I refer particularly to the following quotation and the manner in which it was made the principal emphasis of the story:

"I certainly recognize that what the company did was a favor to me. In part it is true that the company's friendship toward me was based on what I had done for them in the tax case."

This verbatim quotation, directly attributed to me, falsely represents my views and I disclaim it. In the view of the following facts, I can only assume that it was used by the Journal in its lead and in its headline in an effort to place me in as damaging a light as possible.

(1) I do not believe, and hence it was impossible for me to say to your reporter that I felt, at any time, the company was doing me a favor by selling me the stock based in any way upon what I had done in the tax case. If I had believed that, I would never have purchased the stock.

(2) I do believe, as I told your reporter, that Paul Rogan was doing me a favor, on the basis of a longstanding friendship, in calling my attention to what he felt was an excellent investment opportunity. I believed then, as I believe now, that Mr. Rogan would have done the same thing for me, if I had done nothing in the tax case.

(3) This belief of mine is indicated in the following direct quotations attributed to me by the Journal reporter in his notes which he has willingly furnished to me:

"There was no deal with the company regarding my efforts in the tax ruling.

"I suppose this was a favor. I certainly recognized that Paul Rogan was doing me a favor.

"I was simply dealing with a good friend."

The above attributed quotations were omitted from the Journal's story, even though they were directly related to the principal emphasis placed upon the story by its lead and headline.

(4) In a covering letter to my assistant, the Journal's reporter states that his notes represented answers to questions he asked me during a telephone interview. My purported answers appear, in part, in his notes and in the Journal story, but the questions do not appear, thus distorting the attributed quotations.

(5) Thus, the impression is given that the quotations are from a complete statement made by me, when in fact, they were obtained during the course of a lengthy telephone discussion of the case. The fact is that I discussed this case with the Journal reporter on the phone on some four or five occasions, during which questions were asked and answers given in no particular order. No mention is made of the fact that the reporter did not inform me he was seeking verbatim quotations for attribution. Neither did the reporter ask me to verify the accuracy of such quotations as he had transcribed.

(6) The reporter's notes in my possession are extremely brief in the light of the numerous questions asked and answered in the interviews. If they purport to give the full substance of our interview, they are incomplete, consist of attributed quotations the accuracy of which cannot be verified, and were selected out of context from long conversations which, if printed accurately and in full, would fully have represented my views.

(7) The Journal, after receiving the attributed quotation from its reporter, made no effort to verify independently its accuracy prior to printing, even though it must have been fully aware of how damaging it would be to my reputation and character. This is true, in spite of the fact that the Journal and its reporter were in contact with either myself or my assistant until press time, and the city desk did, in fact, call my assistant to check on a wire report it had received from another newspaper on another aspect of the matter.

(8) The damaging headline and lead used in the Journal story is not only contradicted by quotations the Journal did not use, as cited above, but also by other quotes which the Journal did use, and I refer to the following:

"They (the firm's officials) had no obligation to me whatsoever. Paul (Rogan) knew that and anyone else I've dealt with knows that.

"I have to confess that the only rationale I was operating on was the assumption that they were doing something that was perfectly legitimate and above board."

Again, neither the Journal nor its reporter made any effort to clear up this self-evident contradiction in the information it had available.

(9) Prior to leaving for Brazil, I talked to dozens of reporters and gave them the same information I gave to the Journal reporter. In no other story printed as the result of these interviews have I been able to find any direct or indirect quotation which is remotely similar to the quotation which appeared in your paper.

To sum up, the partial, inaccurate and distorted quotation by itself, and also in the light of the Journal's treatment of it, has done me a grave disservice. It misrepresented my view on a vital point to your readers. It has been used by other newspapers, including the New York Times, to condemn me editorially.

I therefore request the Journal to print this statement, in fairness to me, at the earliest possible date in a position as prominent as that given to the original story and that it take such other action as it may feel warranted in the circumstances.

JOHN W. BYRNES.

GOVERNMENT AND THE NEW SCIENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SIBAL] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time today to put before the House and the country some observations and comments on the urgent subject of Government and science. We are in the beginnings of a new science and it is essential that we in Government understand it and utilize it. Upon our success in doing this depends the future of the country.

Earlier this year, I took the floor to explain a bill I had introduced, H.R. 6866, which is designed to equip the legislative branch with tools it needs to meet the challenge of the new science. This bill would provide Congress with independent, continuing advisory staffs of scientists and technologists. The interest that has been shown in this bill both among scientists and people in Government has been broad and heartening.

Similar legislation has been introduced in the Senate by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] with whom I have discussed the subject.

My bill is to have public hearings December 4 before the Subcommittee on Accounts of the House Administration Committee under the able direction of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL], chairman of the subcommittee.

In advance of these hearings, I will set forth today the background of the bill and show why I believe the development of a new science makes it imperative that we keep in step through legislation such as this.

Science, like truth, is indivisible. It cannot be broken into compartments or into isolated, separate branches. All science today is closely interrelated and cannot successfully be treated otherwise. The importance of this concept to the Nation cannot be overstated. Nor can the importance of science itself to the life of the Nation.

The nuclear test ban treaty was hammered into being largely because of growing recognition of the hazards of radioactive isotopes, which, when discharged into the air and the oceans by atomic explosions, enter our food and drink and so into our bodies.

Opponents of the treaty based their arguments on the scientific handicaps which a test ban might place upon those charged with our country's defense.

In each case, science was the pivot around which the arguments wheeled.

Science, in both basic research and applied technology, is directly responsible for our crisis in agriculture—the surpluses and the $5 billion a year it costs us to maintain them. Through science, we have learned to draw the maximum from each acre of cultivated soil while dramatically reducing the amount of human labor required to do it.

Some of our railroads are in deep financial trouble because they have overlooked the fact that science and technology could have helped them to forecast changes in transportation and helped them to prepare for new requirements.

Major portions of our fishing industry are weak and sickly because they do not use the tools of science and technology, although the fishing fleets of the Soviet Union flourish because they do.

Cities, counties, States, and whole geographic regions of the country are running out of drinking water and now look to science to provide economical means of drawing fresh water from the seas.

Although it is a time of general prosperity, more than 5 percent of our available working force are unemployed. This imposes a heavy expense on the public purse and undermines the national morale. This condition arises in large measure because this is the age of the computer, the servomechanism and other ingenious devices and techniques which devour the jobs of the unskilled and have written "obsolete" across the face of much of our economic tradition.

Children and adults die before their time because we do not yet have scientific answers for the cause, prevention, and cure of an army of afflictions and diseases.

Such a list could go on and on. The point is that everything we see and use, our clothes and food; our automobiles and other means of transportation, their fuels and lubricants; the houses we live in; our means of communication, all are products of our scientific revolution. Far from being an abstract subject, science affects the national safety, our economy, our mode of living, and our very lives.

For this reason, it is the intimate concern of Congress and would be even if no funds were involved. But funds are involved in tremendous quantity. During the current fiscal year, the Federal Government will spend $15 billion on science.

As we in Congress allocate these enormous resources, it is essential for us to grasp the import of the new science and to remember that it is indivisible and cannot be sorted into self-sufficient compartments.

This is an unfamiliar attitude for us because we have been taught to regard science in segments. We studied our biology, chemistry, physics, botany, zoology, geology, astronomy, or mathematics, as separate subjects when we were in school.

This was a logical approach and conformed to existing knowledge at the time. The sciences began with description, as they had to. A fish, for instance, must first be described because, if two marine biologists are talking about a specific fish and one thinks it is a salmon and the other a trout, the discussion would be ludicrous.

At the descriptive stage, divisions in science are natural and useful. One who studied fish became an ichthyologist, little concerned with other scientific fields. Likewise, one who dealt with plants became a botanist; an astronomer dealt with stars and planets; a physician with the health of man, and so on.

But description is only the first stage—the bare awakening that a field of study is to become a science. The next stage is measurement, because if there is no measurement there is no science. Inevitably, each discipline began to make measurements. The chemist would measure the intensity of a color; an ichthyologist the sizes of fins; the botanist the dimensions of leaves and plants and flowers; the astronomer the size, color, and motion of the stars.

Today, however, science has passed through these crude, intermediary stages of description and measurement and is working down to the level of the basic units of mass such as the molecule, the atom, and the subatomic particles. It is dealing with the basic units of energy, of time, and of space. This is the new science to which I refer.

In the course of this development, it has become apparent that each of the seemingly different disciplines of science have the same basic common denominators. At this level of study is found the basic warp and woof of the universe and all disciplines are interrelated parts of it.

Attempts to maintain the old divisions in the face of what we know today are self-defeating. They result in duplication, are expensive in time and money, and erect invalid barriers among dependent disciplines.

When science is treated as one, however, massive advances are made. It is of great significance that last year's Nobel prize for medicine was awarded, not to a physician, but to two physicists and a biologist.

Another illustration of the point is found in Great Britain where the man who is contemplated to become the head of all the British Government's defense research is a professor of anatomy.

Recognizing the new science brings us up against a difficult and sensitive area in Government, an area where traditions and vested interests run deep. This is the realm of the Federal department. The Federal Government is a network of departments in which there is, and cannot help but be, redundancy and waste.

We, in Congress, tend to be unaware not only of the amount of science which is being supported by the Government, but also of its quality, both good and bad. None of us is surprised to know that scientific research is being conducted by the Defense Department, the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Institutes of Health, or the National Science Foundation. But a surprising number of other agencies are involved in research. Among them are: The Bureau of Printing and Engraving, the Bureau of Mines, the Federal Trade Commission, the Library of Congress, the Small Business Administration, the Farmers Cooperative Service, the Bureau of Public Roads, the Bureau of the Census, the Post Office Department, the Department of Labor, the National Park Service, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, and the Veterans' Administration.

Congressional treatment of these agencies is not in concert with the times. Our system of committees sustains the no longer valid concept of a divided science. My own committee, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, is deeply concerned with science, as are, obviously, other committees, such as Armed Forces, Science and Astronautics, and Appropriations.

But all other committees are also deeply concerned with science and must recognize the new science if they are to do their jobs efficiently and economically. Foreign Affairs, Government Operations, Education and Labor, Banking and Currency, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Interior and Insular Affairs, Post Office and Civil Service, Public Works, Veterans' Affairs, House Administration, Small Business, District of Columbia, Ways and Means, Rules, Judiciary, all of them have a high stake in the new science. To the extent that we in Government fail to recongize it, to that extent we do the country a dangerous disservice.

Yet, the truth is that in both Congress and the executive, we have failed to acknowledge the new science and adapt ourselves to it. Throughout the Government, in the departments and on Capitol Hill, we continue to treat science as broken into compartments. And, further, we in Congress let the executive take the lead because we have no independent sources of guidance of our own.

These divisions in Government are a hangover from the days when science could be divided neatly into compartments and parceled out among the departments on the basis of simple description or obvious mission—to chart the coasts, to aid agronomy, to supervise mines, to develop standards of various sorts, and the like.

Today, however, the problem of charting a coastline has grown from a matter of simple geography to include geodesy and geophysics.

It is inseparable from geology and volcanology. It must take into account theories of continental drift, the action of the Humboldt Current and the Gulf Stream; it must consider climatology and, hence, meteorology. Such new fields as bioclimatology and biogeography must play a part. Geodesy myst become concerned with questions of earth's earliest formation and cannot ignore seismology nor studies of gravity and cosmology, which seek to understand the origins of the universe.

Cosmology cannot be limited to this planet alone but must cross the borders of astronomy in full array to trace the origins of the stars, to probe thermonuclear reactions within the interiors of the stars, to study the creation of elements, and such esoteric subjects as the study of subatomic particles.

Where then does geodesy stop? The answer is that it does not. Like all science, it is a continuum. Its work requires the use of artificial satellites and a great supply of other costly implements, which are the necessary tools of the new science.

In Congress, we tend to treat these matters as mysterious, and subjects into which we cannot delve very deeply. There is not a scientist in Congress but, if we are to do our jobs, we must have a basic understanding of what is happening in science.

There is no reason why we cannot do this. In our work, we have to learn about a host of subjects in which we have not had primary scholastic training. We legislate on problems of military strategy, aviation, taxes, foreign affairs, commerce, public health, and so forth. It is also our obligation to insure that this country's science and technology be the finest the world can produce. It is entirely within our capabilities to do this well.

We must maintain close supervision of all governmental scientific and technological policies, not in the sense of tyrannical control, for we must not strangle the very aims we seek to foster, but rather as enlightened stewards of the public interest.

The bill, which I have introduced, would create an independent cadre of scientific advisers and consultants available to all Members of Congress. Such a cadre is imperative for the attainment of fiscal responsibility, which we in the Republican Party have rightly made our watchword.

Fiscal responsibility means abolishing waste and redundancy. It means an incessant attack on the operation of Parkinson's law, which describes the unchecked growth of bureaucracy. But it means more than this.

It means not only how and where to cut spending, but, just as importantly, how and where to spend wisely. It means cutting with a scalpel, not a cleaver. It also means promoting essential work and promoting it in the right way.

Committing public funds to explore the unknown involves an investment that is so vital to the national welfare that it requires our closest attention.

We cannot afford the meat-ax technique on funds for basic research. We cut it at our peril.

For this reason, the national welfare requires us to reject some of the current efforts being made in Congress to limit basic research. These efforts are being led by some Members who feel they are exercising good stewardship by insisting on line-item budgets for all scientific activities. By definition, however, there cannot be line-item control over pioneer investigations. To attempt it is to nullify the very creativity which we are trying to encourage.

Many agencies of the Federal Government have been assigned special functions of applied research as differentiated from basic research. These agencies, indeed, absorb by far the greater portion of our scientific budgets. For them, budget control, good planning, and intelligent review of projects is not only possible but mandatory, and line-item budgets are appropriate for them.

Our particular care must be not to extend the line-item approach to basic research, which takes but a small fraction of the money we spend on science. We must always take pains to insure that this small fraction of the budget is committed unreservedly to those vaulting minds, those uninhibited developers of new knowledge who will create the resources of tomorrow.

We have resisted this attitude toward basic research in the United States, and we have been very lucky it has not cost us more than it has. We even tend to scoff at what we cannot see, especially when someone wants a dollar to look for something he cannot even prove exists. We tend to ask, "Who cares what makes grass green? Where's the profit in that?"

In truth, the most vital resources of any country today lie not in what is buried in its soil but in the creativity inherent in the trained brains of its people. There are not many Christopher Columbuses or Albert Einsteins, and we must guarantee the ones we have an opportunity to shape the future. Our enemies do so.

There is a sort of informal organization I have heard of. It holds no meetings, collects no dues, and has no officers. Its members are scientists and technologists who become members automatically by asking, "What do you think the chances are today of getting the Federal Government to support a couple of fellows working on something in a bicycle shop in Dayton, Ohio?"

Historically, we have been tardy in recognizing our inventors and scientific geniuses. They have succeeded, where they have succeeded, in spite of public apathy and even contempt.

We think sentimentally today and with affection of the pioneers of the past but in their day most of them were thought to be fools or worse.

I grant that the very adversities which they had to overcome may have served as a valuable spur to the work of these extraordinary men, but we can no longer depend on this. For one thing, research is too expensive today and too interrelated to be carried out on grit and intellectual stamina alone. The day of the "loner" in science is past.

The threat to them today expresses itself at the congressional level by demands for line-item control of basic research. Some of us in Congress feel we must insist that our creative scientists delineate, item by item, dollar by dollar, their plans for exploration for 1 or 3 or 5 years ahead and, furthermore, to state what they will find at the end of that time.

However well intentioned this point of view may be, its effect on science is pernicious. It is like saying to Columbus: "Bring me a tobacco leaf, an Indian, and a piece of the Indies and then I will finance your trip."

We are in desperate need of explorers who have the courage, dedication, and motivation to probe the unknown. If they could tell us in advance what they were going to find, they would not have to explore.

We must give them the freedom and opportunity to create. Fiscal responsibility means not only knowing how to conserve money and prevent its waste, but also how and where to spend it wisely. Our pioneers have an importance to the population out of all proportion to their numbers. We ignore them at our peril.

We ignored Dr. Robert Goddard, our great rocket pioneer, but the Nazis did not. They started rocket work in 1931 and, although their rocket men also faced long years of governmental indifference, they developed the V-2 on the basis of Goddard's work. General Eisenhower tells us that if the V-2 had been put into operation 6 months earlier than it was, he would have had to cancel the invasion of Normandy. That is how close a call we had that time.

Over the years, we have created Federal agencies whose function is to stimulate science. Their budgets have fattened and Congress has become increasingly concerned and has tried to obtain that limiting control over them which would actually prevent them from carrying out their assignments.

In the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health, for example, there are staff people who are afraid of us. They are afraid to support much basic exploratory research lest Congress attack them for "wild-eyed, blue-sky" wasting of public funds. This is a costly approach which we dare not continue.

Albert Einstein for years was considered one of the wildest eyed inhabitants of the blue sky. He appeared to do nothing, to create nothing, to perfect nothing, but merely wrote cabalistic signs on blackboards and the backs of envelopes. In fact, he altered the history of the world.

In our support of basic research, we must take care that research devoted to applications of known principles does not soak up funds and talent needed for basic research, which grows more costly every year. For example, in much basic research today there are important events which must be measured occurring in a billionth or a one-hundredth of a billionth of a second at the subatomic level. Equipment needed to measure just one such event is enormously expensive.

Yet, a survey of governmental programs in science today reveals a frequent misuse of funds on unnecessary programs at the expense of basic research.

For example, there is a program sponsored by Federal money which will, in effect, test virtually any substance to see if it is effective against cancer. There is no selectivity. Anything sent in will be tested.

By the end of this year, about one-quarter of a billion dollars will have been spent on this program. More than 170,000 compounds have been tested in what is one of the most unscientific approaches that can be imagined. Yet a willing Congress has provided the funds for it. The directors of the program admit that very little has come from this enormous effort. At the time it was initiated and subsequently up to today, scientists have deplored this type of shotgun approach and have pleaded for a more rational way. The program's defenders insist that it should continue because by sheer happenstance they may discover something useful against cancer.

Perhaps so, we all certainly hope so, but we should also ask whether this enormous program has not drained off sums that would have been better applied to fundamental studies on the prevention and cure of this dread disease.

Somehow, we in Congress must obtain the knowledge that will show that "trying things for cancer" is not good stewardship of the public welfare if it means we close off opportunity for those who want to carry out fundamental studies.

To my personal knowledge, there are scores of qualified scientists who want to do fundamental exploratory research but who are denied the opportunity because laboratory space and money are so heavily committed to the pragmatic, the applied, and the shotgun type of research.

Until the Congress has continuing access to scientific resources of our own, we will necessarily go on stumbling in the dark, expensively, dependent on luck, and subject to the fads of the moment. It is up to us to take the initiative. If we fail, we will be overtaken and overcome. It cannot be said of us, "They also serve who only stand and wait."

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S POSITION IN THE CASE OF PROFESSOR BARGHOORN PROVED SOUND BY SUBSEQUENT EVENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy's judgment and strategy in the matter of the strange arrest by the U.S.S.R. of Prof. Frederick Barghoorn, of Yale University, has been proven sound by subsequent events.

The President's position was strongly supported by educators throughout the Nation and on campuses from coast to coast.

Although Professor Barghoorn has now safely returned to the United States, the whole episode can hardly be washed away and forgotten. American citizens, including our exchange scholars and scientists, are not pawns of capricious games of the Soviets.

I am especially pleased to note the comments of a number of leaders in Delaware's educational community who strongly supported President Kennedy in his stand on this matter. Prof. Paul Dolan, a distinguished political scientist and senior member of the Department of Political Science of the University of Delaware, for instance, summed the matter up in this way:

> The arrest of Professor Barghoorn was a most reprehensive act, particularly in view of the fact that he received a visa from the Soviet Government to reenter their country after there had been some question as to his writing and general statements about conditions in Russia. Such action is tantamount to enticement and it would appear as if a trap were being set.
>
> Professor Barghoorn is an eminent political scientist, and as such, he must of necessity write about the things and conditions he sees and to draw conclusions therefrom regardless of whether it happens to please those in authority or not. Much of the same is done in our own country by such lesser qualified persons as Madame Nhu, yet no action is taken against them. Is what we have seen by Professor Barghoorn's apprehension a manifestation of the basic difference between Russia and the United States with respect to freedom of inquiry? If so, then the hope which many had that Russia was advancing away from her police statism is dashed.
>
> The cultural exchange program which many persons in both countries were promoting as one good way to insure world peace is placed in dire jeopardy by this unwarranted action. Men of intellect and particularly the professorial group must be encouraged to pursue the truth and not to be beholden or subjected to the whim of authority. If the U.S.S.R. is to take its proper place among the civilized nations of the world after its long dark years of terror and police rule, then it should renounce once and for all any attempt to interfere with the pursuit of intellectual truth by those trained to make the pursuit.
>
> If, for some reason, Dr. Barghoorn was persona non grata to the Russian Government, the thing to do would have been to cancel his visa—not to have arrested him.

I include articles from the Evening Journal, of Wilmington, Del., and the New York Herald Tribune which explore aspects of this bizarre case:

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Evening Journal, Nov. 20, 1963]

BARGHOON CASE ILLUSTRATES PROBLEMS OF COEXISTENCE

(By Charles Bartlett)

WASHINGTON.—Prof. Frederick Barghoorn was not a spy and his misadventure in the Soviet Union served to cast some new light on the current nature of East-West relations.

Counterintelligence services expand their watchfulness in a time like this because the danger of espionage grows as the ice of hostility melts. The KGB appears to have made an honest mistake in seizing upon some incautious remarks by the professor as a basis for his arrest.

The magnitude of their mistake was brought home to the Soviet Government by the earnestness of President Kennedy, by the cancellation of the cultural exchange negotiations, and by Robert Kennedy's conversation with Soviet Ambassador Dobrynin. Close study of the temperament of the professor, far from ideally suited for espionage must also have convinced the Russian security people that they were wrong.

The swift backdown by Nikita Khrushchev, who was willing to suffer a loss of face, appears to have been prompted by a desire to preserve the new atmosphere, although the future of tourism and of the cultural exchanges was also at stake. Face is an important element of the dealings between major countries and Khrushchev's readiness to deport the professor without the face-saving procedures of a trial may be seen as a hopeful barometer of his intentions.

The incident, coming on top of the mixed atmosphere of the November 7 ceremonies in Moscow and the trouble on the Autobahn, serves to point up the inevitable inconsistencies which will characterize the efforts to expand the areas of agreement.

The basic character of the present period is that neither side has deep confidence in the other's intentions and the efforts to reach agreement will not interfere with the deadly earnest game of espionage and counterespionage on both sides. When spies are operating, spies will be caught but these activities should not ruffle the basic atmosphere. They have become so accepted a part of international life that it is considered bad taste to discuss them in diplomatic conversations, except for the periodic transfers of captured agents.

The doublehanded nature of the present phase is also reflected in the fact that both President Kennedy and Chairman Khrushchev will be required to make shows of toughness from time to time. Neither man can afford at this point to commit himself completely to the pursuit of peace.

The Soviets will utilize an occasional spy case or similar demonstration of Western perfidy in order to sustain their people's dedication against capitalism. The Soviet press, while reflecting a hopeful view of President Kennedy and future relations, frequently emphasizes the existence of "aggressive circles" within the United States. The Big Lift military exercise was called a strategy of intimidation, the NATO bloc is usually described as "aggressive," and the autobahn incidents were a test of nerves perpetrated by Washington.

Russian officials constantly remind their people that their objectives are the liquidation of capitalism, the expansion of communism, and the maintenance of peace. President Kennedy must similarly conduct himself as a relentless anti-Communist who is nevertheless ready to examine the opportunities for improved relations.

The President's license to pursue peace is paradoxically enhanced by his opportunities to show stiffness, as in the Barghoorn case or last year's Cuban crisis. He gains support as a peacemaker by demonstrations that he is tough and resolute.

A mixed pattern of behavior is expected on both sides of the Iron Curtain for the period ahead. The pragmatic advantages of living in peace will be struggling with the ideological differences, which remain unchanged. The most realistic hope is that time will permit the inconsistencies of the present to become the base of a hopeful future.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Nov. 20, 1963]

Story of Russian Villainy—Yale Professor Tells How He Was Framed

(By Douglas Kiker)

Washington.—"A youngish-looking man, a complete stranger, approached me carrying what looked to be a roll of newspapers. He asked, 'Are you an American citizen?' I said 'Yes.' Then he pushed toward me this roll of papers."

This was the way it all began for Yale Prof. Frederick C. Barghoorn, who came here yesterday to tell State Department officials the story of his arrest and imprisonment by Russian security agents.

"I thought it was some sort of propaganda matter, so I unwittingly—or foolishly—took it," Dr. Barghoorn told newsmen at a press conference here.

He managed to get a look inside the papers, he said, and found material "that looked like photographs, although I don't know anything about military matters."

Almost immediately, two men appeared out of the shadows and "hustled me off in an auto," he said.

He was imprisoned, charged with being an American spy, and it took direct and personal pressure from President Kennedy to set him free after 16 days.

It was 7:30 in the evening of October 31 and Dr. Barghoorn—due to leave Moscow for Warsaw the next morning—had just been dropped off outside the Hotel Metropole by a U.S. Embassy car driven by a Russian employee.

Dr. Barghoorn, it is known, is convinced the chauffeur saw the arrest, but so far as it is known the man never reported it to Embassy officials.

After his arrest, the Yale Russian specialist—who has visited the Soviet Union almost yearly since 1958—was taken directly to a Moscow police station, handcuffed and questioned for about 5 hours.

He was accused specifically of photographing Russian missile sites during his current trip, it was learned, and the intelligence agents who grilled him produced several "witnesses" who testified in his presence that they had seen him doing it.

It is known that Dr. Barghoorn did not carry a camera into the Soviet Union.

From the prison he was taken to 2 Dzerzhinsky Street and into Lubyanka, the Soviet's principal political prison and headquarters of the KGB, Russia's secret police organization. He arrived there about midnight.

There things got a little rougher for him, although he said here yesterday that he was "not physically molested in any way."

But he was crammed into a narrow cell, where there was a cot and a chair, and was told he was not allowed to lie on the cot between 10 a.m. and 6 p.m.

And from then on he was questioned almost constantly by the KGB.

They charged he had been on spying missions during his previous trips to Russia in 1958, 1959, and 1961. And they charged that he had been an intelligence agent in West Germany in 1951.

LISTED AS AGENT

Yesterday, Dr. Barghoorn told reporters that this came as a complete surprise to him. At that time, he said, he had been employed by the U.S. State Department to interview political refugees from Iron Curtain countries and to ask them "political and sociological questions." He learned later, he said, that he had been listed as an "intelligence officer" in the department's biographic register.

The KGB questioned him closely about that work. They even asked him about cocktail parties he had attended then in Frankfurt and Bad Nauheim, and wanted to know why he had spent so much time at those parties talking to certain people there—people whom Dr. Barghoorn couldn't remember.

At one point during this questioning, it is known, one of the KGB men informed him he could be executed if found guilty of espionage.

Dr. Barghoorn said yesterday he was worried, naturally, during this period. He asked to see U.S. Ambassador Foy D. Kohler, but the request was never granted.

Although he signed no confession, Dr. Barghoorn said, he did sign what the Russians called a protocol of his questioning by interrogators. He was not told he was being set free until they took him from his cell last Saturday, he said.

CARRYING NOTEBOOKS

At his press conference yesterday, which was held before batteries of television cameras and platoons of reporters, Dr. Barghoorn said: "It's true I go about talking to people and taking notes inside Russia." He patted his coat pocket. "In fact, I have some of the notebooks in my pocket right now."

He said he hoped "this experience I have had will not destroy the possibilities of continuing the United States-Soviet cultural exchanges program."

His special field of political science, he said, naturally is a sensitive one, and he suggested that nervous Soviet security men might have seen his note gathering as reasons for suspicion.

But he firmly denied he had any intelligence assignment of any kind and, because of no military experience, wouldn't recognize military information if he saw it.

Dr. Barghoorn was asked if his arrest could have been ordered by a minor functionary in Moscow, rather than high officials of the Kremlin?

"Possibly," he replied.

"Probably?" asked a reporter.

"I would not go so far as to say that," the professor replied.

How did he feel while held incommunicado in prison?

"Naturally one is worried," he said. "I felt I had not committed espionage and that as the facts became known the situation would work itself out. Of course, my feelings were mixed, and they changed from time to time."

Before his arrest, Dr. Barghoorn said, he had no reason to fear impending trouble. "I felt my trip had been quite successful," he said.

Before meeting reporters, Dr. Barghoorn conferred voluntarily with Soviet expert Llewellyn Thompson and others at the State Department.

THE NATIONAL WATERWAYS CONFERENCE, INC., REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3846 has been reported to the House (H. Rept. 900), as amended by Committee Print No. 8 by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. This is a measure to establish a land and water conservation fund introduced by the distinguished and able chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, myself, and a number of others.

It is not my purpose to discuss all the details of this important measure, but I am greatly disturbed by various and sundry documents, as well as letters that I have been receiving, which purport to interpret the bill. One of the most recent analyses of this legislation was published by the National Waterways Conference, Inc., on October 29, 1963. When I read this report from such a responsible organization, I was much concerned. In rereading Committee Print No. 8 and House Report No. 900, I felt that my interpretation of the measure and theirs was at such great variance that some good might well be served by indicating this difference in order to clarify this proposal prior to formal debate.

The National Waterways Conference states at the outset:

> Any proper aspirations which may be credited to it (H.R. 3846) could be accomplished under existing law without saddling the country with a vast, new back-door taxing and back-door spending mechanism.

I have read the bill with great care, and I am unable to determine where any new tax has been imposed as a result of the bill. There is now a 4-cent tax on fuel used by motorboats, 2 cents of which is refundable if the motorboat user petitions for that refund, and the remaining 2 cents is credited to the highway trust fund. If the 2 cents which is reclaimable by the motorboat user is not reclaimed by him—this amount also is credited to the highway trust fund. The only change that the present measure would make in regard to this existing tax is to allocate these moneys to the proposed land and water conservation fund, rather than the highway trust fund. It is my understanding that this procedure has been approved by the Ways and Means Committee, and no objection has been voiced by the Department of Commerce, inasmuch as this represents an extraordinarily small proportion of the highway trust fund.

As to the second allegation that backdoor spending is involved, I find this, too, to be completely without foundation. In section 3 of Committee Print No. 8, entitled "Appropriations," there is the following language:

> Moneys covered into the fund shall be available for expenditure for the purposes of this act only when appropriated therefore.

Unless I am unable to read properly the English language, this means to me that no moneys can be disbursed from the fund unless the usual appropriations procedure is followed. The principal difference is that the moneys would be appropriated from a specific fund rather than the general fund of the Treasury. I am therefore unable to find the National Waterways Conference interpretation to be accurate.

I should like to deal with the critisms based on the National Waterways Conference interpretations of the bill.

> 1. Too much latitude: Through undefined fees and user charges on undefined recreational land and water facilities, it would create over 10 years a fund of $2 billion to be used as the President and Secretary of the Interior may determine.

It is difficult for me to understand why such a charge is made. Before any moneys would be appropriated, a complete justification must be made during the usual budgetary processes. The measure not only insists by section 3 quoted above that the usual appropriation procedure be followed, but section 4 further provides that "there shall be submitted with the annual budget of the United States a comprehensive statement of estimated requirements during the ensuing fiscal year for appropriations from the fund."

This appropriate retention of the control by the Congress can in no way be interpreted as granting the President or any administrative jurisdiction within the executive branch of government complete and total latitude in expending these moneys on anything they wish without accountability.

> 2. Double taxation: Compelling a handful of Federal agencies to sell facilities which the people already own, to those who may be able to afford to pay for them—and exact a $500 fine and/or 6 months in durance vile for any who may trespass without benefit of fee.

First, there is no provision in this legislation for selling any facilities. It is assumed that the reference here is to the proceeds from surplus property which would be credited to the land and water conservation fund. Those who support the legislation contend that this is transferring capital from an area where it is no longer needed to an area where it is needed badly. I find in my analysis of the bill the imposition of fees exaggerated in terms of what the bill actually provides.

Fees for recreation have been charged for many years on areas owned and operated by the Federal Government. This is a fact today, in such areas as our national parks and monuments, certain developed areas within the National forests, certain Federal recreation areas at Federal water development projects like Lake Mead and Hoover Dam. Yellowstone National Park, for example, assessed its first fee in 1915. If one wishes annual access to this park today under existing statute, the fee is $6 a car per year. Entrance fees were established in Grand Canyon in 1926. The philosophy of these fees has extended since 1915 that while the establishment of a park or recreational area is a general public benefit and is primarily financed by proceeds from all the taxpayers, those who do enjoy the special benefits should pay a modest and reasonable fee for that privilege. More recently, Congress stipulated in title V of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1952 (5 U.S.C. 140), that services which are rendered to special beneficiaries by Federal agencies should be self-sustaining to the fullest extent possible. The implication that this is a new terror with which we are confronted does not appear warranted.

> 3. Too much power: There is no restriction to prevent this or some future President from declaring any land or waterway liable to user fees (tax), if they be under some Federal authority—and if not, to use the funds the bill provides to go out and buy them.

In the first place, no fees of any kind can be charged for the nonrecreation use of waters, of reservoirs, canals or waterways that are part of the Federal navigation system. In short, there is not only a failure to provide the authority the National Waterways Conference suggests, but there is a specific exclusion of such authority. The implication here is that the President can charge fees on any land and waterways in which he feels it to be appropriate, and without any consultation or limitations. It is beyond my comprehension how one can carefully read this act and come to such conclusions. The limitation on fees and Executive authority represents a significant part of the bill. For example, no entrance or admission fees could be charged at any area, except where the area is administered by a Federal agency, where the recreation facilities or services are provided at Federal expense, and where the land or water area is primarily for scenic and recreational enjoyment. All of these three conditions must be present before fees can be charged.

As a result, no fee could be charged on any Federal recreation area that has been leased to a State or private organization for operation of the resources. Additionally, there is no authority for Federal hunting or fishing licenses. No charges can be made for activities not related to recreation. No fee can be charged for travel over any part of a Federal highway aid system. No fees can be charged over roads commonly used by the public, even though much of the travel is within a fee designated area. No fee could be charged for a person traveling to and from his property which may be located in a Federal recreation area. No fee could be charged where more than half the lands for a particular area have been acquired by contributions from a State or locality, unless special consideration is given by the Governor or his representative. It should also be understood that no entrance or admission fee is required to the national forests, public domain lands and other Federal wild lands, except where substantial recreational developments have been provided at Federal expense. Thus, the overwhelming percentage of the Nation's public lands will continue to be open to the public without the necessity of a fee.

Such a reading of the bill seems to refute completely the argument that the President is free to indulge a whim or caprice in designating an area for a user fee. As to the allegation that if the land is not under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, the President can simply buy it is without foundation, since any such intent must stand the test of the usual review of the appropriation procedure.

> 4. Abridgement of historic policy: The charging of fees (tolls), for recreational use of the waters is in complete conflict with historic policy and repeated congressional intent, and would make more difficult future resistance to commercial tolls, despite language in the House measure that prohibits this construction. In fact, the President's campaign pledge promised his adherence to the toll-free principle.

This, too, was startling inasmuch as the National Waterways Conference had just concluded under the discussion of "too much power" that there is no restriction to prevent the President from declaring any land or waterway liable to user fees. They now contend that the present measure "would make more difficult future resistance to commercial tolls, despite language in the House measure that prohibits this construction." Now either the President is inhibited by the language of this bill, or he is not. It cannot be contended on the one hand that there is no restriction to prevent the President from issuing such fees, and then contend on the other hand that the restriction is not strong enough. What they are contending is that future Congresses might establish a system of tolls on the waterways. I cannot say whether some future Congress would pass a statute to effect such a requirement, but I would strongly oppose such a move. The past charges that have been made on the national parks, many of which contain lakes, have not resulted in any precedent for such tolls. At Lake Mead, which is a widely used recreation area and whose principal attraction is the water area, fees have been charged for some years and this has not constituted any precedent for the establishment of tolls. Why this should now be introduced as relevant, I do not know. The present legislation makes this no more apparent, or no more near to realization, than the longstanding practice of charging fees just mentioned. The President's campaign pledge to a toll-free principle is not affected, nor should it now be questioned.

> 5. Self-defeating: As with most propositions of this sort, there exists an underlying virtue—conservation and provision of recreational facilities for the people, but user fees would restrict, not increase, use. Allocation of funds for land acquisitions and improvements could easily be justified by anticipated fees, thus hampering development of facilities of equal or greater importance, but with less popular appeal at a given time.

In reading this analysis, I felt that in view of the experience of the agencies with fees in the parks and other recreational areas, that it should be able to be determined whether an increase in fees have had the stultifying effects as suggested. For example, the experience of the National Park Service has been exactly contrary to the contention that an increased fee means a reduction in use. Fees were raised significantly in the early 1950's to units of the national park system, yet visitations have practically doubled from 1952 to 1962. Also, from 1960 to 1963 visitations have increased about 25 percent. When the total population increase from 1960 to 1963, which is estimated at 10 million, is compared to the approximate increase of 20 million visitations to the national park system—some perspective is given to the demand for outdoor recreation.

This is true in almost every area where fees are charged, whether they are charged by the Federal Government or by States and localities. The explanation appears reasonably simple—for when the American public goes camping, they want conveniences such as running water, sanitary facilities, showers, and on occasion laundry facilities. Most feel that the benefits far exceed the modest fees charged.

> 6. Uneconomical: Collection of fees would be burdensome, costly, and inefficient. There is the problem of persons entering designated land or water areas from other areas by swimming, hunting, boating, hiking, etc. The amount collected per user, and in so many diverse locations, would be small in relation to the enormous cost of salaries and all the rest.

At this point of reading the criticisms of the proposed legislation, I began to wonder whether the critics had actually read the bill as passed out of committee and/or where they have been for the last 50 years. In the first place, there has been a longstanding practice that fees charged for any use of the public lands cannot be collected unless it is economical to do so. This Bureau of the Budget policy has been in existence for many years, since only a small percent of the total Federal cost can be allocated to administrative costs. In addition to this well-defined administrative practice, the bill adds the further protection:

> All fees established pursuant to this subsection shall be fair and equitable taking into consideration direct and indirect cost to the Government, benefits to the recipient, public policy or interest served, and other pertinent factors.

Certainly, the public interest would not be served if the cost of collections were higher relative to the amounts collected. The various branches of Government have been collecting fees for grazing, recreation, mineral, timber, and special use fees for decades. To assume that this would be a brandnew experience presenting insurmountable administrative difficulties is to argue from ignorance of well-defined historical practices. The problem of policing enforcement and administrative complexes has not been insurmountable during the longstanding administrative history of our many Government land agencies.

> 7. Unjust: The power to set fees under this measure is without practical limit, being based upon Federal costs "direct and indirect," as determined by the President and/or the Secretary. No provision is made for public hearings or judicial review in respect of user charge determinations. Only as the hapless poacher(s) stands in Federal district court can fee level validity be examined.

The only new authorization is the annual entrance fee and this establishes a maximum of $7. Thus, the statement that the power to set fees is without practical limit is incorrect. The determination of other fees would be the same as they have been for years. To the best of my knowledge, no one has strongly protested that the fees charged for recreation developments on public lands has been excessive. There has been far more comment that such fees are too modest and too small, in terms of the facilities provided. Where was the National Waterways Conference in 1915 when fees were established in Yellowstone Park? No provision was then made for public hearings or judicial review. Considering the fact that this practice now has continued in the national parks for some 48 years and that no great public clamor for judicial review to protect the rights of individuals has resulted appears to answer effectively such charges.

> 8. Administrative jumble: It would put Government agencies in the policing and tax collecting business. Except possibly for the National Park Service, none is equipped for this work nor should they become so. Added would be the Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Bureau of Reclamation, Forest Service, Corps of Engineers, TVA, and the U.S. section of the International Boundary and Water Commission (United States and Mexico).

In attempting to respond to item 6 above, it was pointed out that the Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, and other Government agencies have been collecting fees for products and services for many years. This is not new in terms of their present duties, and they are well established to perform this function. It would appear that this is another instance in which the critics of the measure are not conversant with land practices and the functions of the several land agencies, nor are they conversant with the specifics of H.R. 3846 as amended.

> 9. Inequitable: Enormous land and water acquisitions under the act, as well as grants to the States (with concomitant erosion of States rights), would result from fees charged against fishermen, pleasure boat operators, and other users in areas thousands of miles from such acquisitions, and injure State tourist industries wherever these depend upon Federal holdings.

It is obvious that the Governors or other responsible officials in 46 States do not agree either that this constitutes an erosion of States rights or that the State tourist industry would be injured. In my own State, we have found quite clearly that the better the recreation facilities, the greater the tourist attractions. In addition, the land and water conservation fund is not limited to land and water acquisition, but is available also for planning and development of recreation resources. It is hard to see how the States could be placed in a worsened position by receiving Federal grants-in-aid.

> 10. Cost-benefit ratio concepts undermined: In consideration of the complex, multiple-purpose aspects of modern water resource development, a dollar emphasis on only two, recreation and conservation, would jeopardize all future projects, while weakening traditional cost-benefit formulas.

This argument appears to be a non sequitur, if the argument suggests that the consideration of recreation has a tendency to unbalance the reservoir programs. If all water users are to be considered in planning water impoundments and the recreation benefits are high relative to the cost of producing them, then there is little question as to the desirability of such benefits. How this would weaken the traditional cost benefit formulas is not indicated. Only recently, the administration has proposed to the Congress that policies and guidelines be provided by statute to include recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement. Instead of jeopardizing future projects, the inclusion of recreation features often lends feasibility to the project, where none existed prior to including such features.

> 11. Collectivism? The bill provides for use of fee money for acquisition of non-Federal lands "within wilderness, wild, and canoe areas of the national forest system and within other areas of that system which are primarily of value for outdoor recreation purposes." Under the multiple-use concept of national forest management, virtually all national forest areas and inholdings can be considered of value for outdoor recreation purposes.

Once again, it is necessary to refer to the bill which states:

> There shall be submitted with the annual budget of the United States a comprehensive statement of estimated requirements during the ensuing fiscal year for appropriations from the fund.

In short, the acquisition of inholdings simply by the motion of the Executive is not possible. There is indeed within the concept of the Multiple Use Act passed by the Congress an ability to determine primary uses on forest land, without refuting the multiple-use concept. This primary use may very well allow and be compatible with other uses, though at the same time it is possible to determine primacy of forest use. The Forest Service, in their original analysis as to their part of the proposed program, has indeed separated lands needed for recreation from lands of a more general purpose character. Just what the term "collectivism" means, when related to the criticism thereof, is considerably vague.

12. Public lands already huge: Out of a total Federal landownership of 772 million acres, 34 percent of our Nation's total land area, the national forest system embraces over 186 million acres in Federal ownership. This should be ample for meeting the outdoor recreation demand—adequate development is needed, not more land area.

This criticism fails to grasp the problem of needed recreation areas. The problem is not one of total acres, but of effective acres. Obviously, most of the recreation land is where people are not. Few places are near enough to metropolitan areas for weekend family trips. The tendency for greater migration to metropolitan areas further aggravates the problem. It is therefore important to acquire these effective acres before competing uses and/or soaring costs place them beyond our reach.

13. Unneeded delegation of powers: Special acts of Congress have been enacted for numerous forest acquisitions. This year Congress appropriated $320,000 for land acquisition under seven special acts in addition to the $962,000 appropriated for land acquisition under the Weeks law. The Forest Service also has the authority to exchange national forest land for State and private lands within the boundaries of national forests.

Apparently little analysis was undertaken to determine the meaning behind the appropriations cited in these land acquisitions. In the first place, these appropriation figures have little to do with the acquisition of important recreation areas. These, of course, are figures for total acquisitions, not just recreation acquisitions. They include acquisitions for timber, grazing, watershed, and wildlife and recreation. Of the $320,000 cited for land acquisition, surely the critics must be aware that $250,000 of this amount was limited to the acquisition in one national forest where the primary value is the protection of the water supply for a large city. Thus while the figures are correct for land acquisition, they are not helpful or accurate in determining recreational purchases.

14. Further existing latitude: The Weeks law (act of March 1, 1911), authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture, with the approval of the National Forest Reservation Commission to purchase lands "within the watersheds of navigable streams as in his judgment may be necessary to the regulation of the flow of navigable streams or for the production of timber." It further provides that such lands may be divided into national forests in ways deemed best for administrative purposes. National forest boundaries can, and have been, created and extended—thus increasing inholdings—by administrative order of the Secretary of Agriculture, by Executive order, and by Presidential proclamation.

It is not clear precisely what this statement strives to convey. Apparently it is a recitation of the Week's law which provides for the acquisition of inholdings in the national forest system. If this argument means to suggest that the present legislation conveys acquisition authority for the Forest Service or any other Federal agency, this of course is incorrect. A reading of the bill will reveal this almost immediately. The problem has not been the authority for the Federal agencies to acquire inholdings—the problem has been the availability of funds. A land and water conservation fund could therefore provide the moneys under the conditions of the usual appropriations procedure. The volume of total inholdings in the national forest system is not necessarily related to the specific recreation inholdings which need to be acquired. Perhaps the only relevant detail is that these key recreation inholdings represent only about 10 percent of the total inholdings. Additionally, it has been pointed out in the testimony of the Forest Service that of the key recreation inholdings which need to be acquired 84 percent of them are located in the East. It should be further emphasized that in terms of the present legislation there is no way for the Executive to act without the consent of Congress since national forest acquisitions must be determined annually by the Congress.

FINAL COMMENTS

It is often the case that when a measure of some complexity reaches to floor of Congress there are so many incorrect references made to it that the bill is prejudiced before the debate. I am not suggesting that there will not be pros and cons as to the advisability of enacting this legislation. I do feel it incumbent, however, upon all Members of the Congress in considering this most important bill to determine what the bill provides and what it does not provide. It is doubtful whether the publication and dissemination of information which are patently incorrect as to fact, aid the legislative process.

RESULTS OF A SURVEY AMONG CHICAGO AREA DOCTORS ON MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call my colleagues' attention to an interesting survey which I have just completed among 4,740 Chicago area doctors, which shows 60 percent of the doctors believe that most of their aged patients can afford to pay their entire hospitalization from their own financial resources and that 24 percent of the doctors believe only a few of their patients can afford adequate hospital care from their own financial resources.

However, the same survey showed that 82 percent of the doctors said they find it necessary to reduce their normal fees for aged patients because of their aged patients' poor financial condition. Thirty-six percent of the same doctors answered "yes" when asked if any of their aged patients declined to follow their professional recommendations for hospitalization because they felt they could not afford the care or would have to seek public assistance to get it.

The survey also showed that 64 percent of the doctors said their aged patients require help from relatives to pay their medical bills.

This survey was conducted through a questionnaire containing 26 questions which was mailed to 4,740 doctors in Chicago whose names were taken from the Chicago Classified Telephone Directory.

The group included many suburban doctors who have their offices in Chicago. I received 970 replies, which is a 20.5-percent response to the total questionnaires mailed.

Anyone who has had any experience with public opinion surveys will agree that this is an unusually large response to a public opinion questionnaire. I am extremely pleased with the large response.

I shall include at the conclusion of my remarks, the original questionnaire which I mailed to the doctors and a breakdown of their replies.

I had also sent the doctors a condensed memorandum which listed the highlights of the three proposals now receiving most serious consideration in Congress to provide hospital care for the Nation's senior citizens.

The first proposal is the Bow bill, H.R. 21, which would provide medical and hospital care by subsidizing voluntary health insurance premiums through Federal income tax credit to senior citizens.

The second proposal is the King-Anderson bill, H.R. 3920, which is President Kennedy's proposal to extend social security benefits to people over 65 to cover hospital care.

The third plan is the existing law, known as the Kerr-Mills bill, to provide health care for the near-needy aged through a program of State and Federal matching funds.

The results of the survey were tabulated by the International Business Machines Corp. Computer Service Bureau. Each doctor received a specially prepared reply card which was designed for computer computation.

The survey showed that 41 percent of the doctors favor the Kerr-Mills bill, 15 percent favor the King-Anderson bill, 20 percent favor the Bow bill, 16 percent favor none of these proposals, and 6 percent failed to express an opinion.

However, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that 27 percent of the doctors favor extending social security benefits to include hospital care if a medical commission of physicians from private practice, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, were to administer the entire program. Sixty-nine percent said they were opposed to such a plan and 4 percent expressed no opinion.

Perhaps even more significant, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that 38 percent of the doctors indicated they would favor extending social security benefits to include hospital care for the aged if this entire program were administered by Blue Cross; 57 percent opposed even this plan and 5 percent declined to express an opinion.

It would not surprise me, Mr. Speaker, to see Congress adopt a compromise bill which would retain the social security approach with the Government serving only as a collecting agency and Blue Cross administering the entire program, with probably some form of needs test to insure against exploitation.

Mr. Speaker, I was impressed by the fact that 65 percent of the doctors said they would have no objection to treating patients in their hospitals if the patients' bills were being paid as part of social security benefits.

This is interesting in view of the doctors' strike in Canada some time ago against a Government-sponsored hospital program for the aged. It would appear that our American doctors have no such intentions. I also noted with interest that 63 percent of the doctors said "yes" when asked if self-employed physicians should be covered under social security as are other professionals.

Mr. Speaker, the survey also showed 54 percent of the doctors believe their patients would buy less costly supplemental private health insurance to pay other medical bills if their basic hospital costs were included in social security benefits.

Regarding the 36 percent of the doctors who answered "yes" when asked if their aged patients ever declined to follow their professional recommendations for hospitalization because they feel they cannot afford such care, 30 percent of those replying "yes" said that between 0 and 20 percent of their patients declined such advice; 9 percent said between 21 and 40 percent take this attitude; 4 percent said 41 to 60 percent of the patients refuse to folow their doctor's advice; 1 percent listed the figure between 61 and 80 percent; 1 percent estimated the number between 81 and 100 percent of their aged patients declined their advice and 55 percent of those who said "yes" to the original question, would not estimate what percentage of their aged patients decline their doctors' advice for hospital care.

It is interesting to note that 64 percent of the doctors said they find it necessary to varying degrees not to charge their patients any fee at all because of their patients' poor financial conditions. However, 53 percent said such waiver of fees occurs seldom; 10 percent said often; 6 percent said very often; 1 percent said almost always, and 30 percent declined to estimate how often.

When asked what percentage of their aged patients have some form of private insurance to help pay hospital costs, 9 percent of the doctors said between 0 and 20 percent of their patients have such insurance; 10 percent of the doctors estimated between 21 and 40 percent; 18 percent estimated the number to be between 41 and 60 percent; 31 percent estimated 61 to 80 percent of their patients have some form of insurance, and 28 percent estimated that between 81 and 100 percent of their patients have such insurance. Four percent failed to reply. This would indicate that while in some areas a large percentage of senior citizens have private hospital insurance, there are equally large pockets where oldsters do not have such insurance.

Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to give the results of this survey to the House Ways and Means Committee now holding hearings on the medicare program.

As far as I know, this is the most extensive survey undertaken by a Member of Congress to determine the views of doctors in a large metropolitan community.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this survey will be of substantial value in trying to develop a workable program of hospital care for our Nation's senior citizens.

I am very pleased with the candor which such a large cross section of doctors displayed in replying to this questionnaire. I sent the questionnaire to every doctor in Chicago because it would not have been possible to determine which doctors lived in my own district or treat patients who are residents of my district.

I am particularly impressed that 94 percent of the doctors replied "yes" when asked if they approved of my effort to obtain their views on this very important subject in this manner. Four percent said "no" and 2 percent failed to reply.

Mr. Speaker, we here in Congress have heard all sorts of arguments for and against this legislation. We have also heard all sorts of things about the Nation's doctors and their attitude toward this legislation. This survey clearly shows that the doctors have their own views on this problem. I am extremely proud of the large response to the questionnaire. It demonstrates that the doctors want to be consulted on this very vital issue. And this is quite proper. After all, this legislation will affect their profession.

This questionnaire clearly demonstrates that a substantial segment of the medical profession rejects the extremist view of both sides. Somewhere between the extreme views of the advocates of this program and the opponents of this program lies a solution which will be acceptable to all. I believe this survey will help find that solution. For this, I am grateful to the doctors who were kind enough to participate in the survey.

Mr. Speaker, the replies of the doctors follow:

Doctor's Replies to Questionnaire

[Replies in percentage]

1. What percentage of your patients would you estimate are 65 or over?

None	10
0 to 20 percent	46
21 to 40 percent	28
41 to 80 percent	14
81 to 100 percent	2

2. What percentage of your aged patients can afford to pay their entire hospital bill from their own financial resources?

All	8
Most	60
Few	24
None	3
No reply	5

3. What percentage of your aged patients have some type of private insurance to help pay hospital bills?

0 to 20 percent	9
21 to 40 percent	10
41 to 60 percent	18
61 to 80 percent	31
81 to 100 percent	28
No reply	4

4. What percentage of your aged patients have some type of private insurance to help pay for your services?

0 to 20 percent	18
21 to 40 percent	14
41 to 60 percent	23
61 to 80 percent	26
81 to 100 percent	15
No reply	4

5. In a typical case of one of your aged patients with private health insurance, what percentage of the total hospital is covered?

0 to 20 percent	4
21 to 40 percent	6
41 to 60 percent	18
61 to 80 percent	42
81 to 100 percent	24
No reply	6

6. What percentage of the surgical cost does this insurance normally cover?

None	2
0 to 25 percent	9
26 to 50 percent	33
51 to 75 percent	41
76 to 100 percent	8
No reply	7

7. What percentage of nonsurgical physician's services does this insurance normally cover?

None	8
0 to 25 percent	25
26 to 50 percent	26
51 to 75 percent	25
76 to 100 percent	7
No reply	9

8. Is it ever necessary for you to reduce your normal fee for aged patients because of their poor financial condition?

Yes	82
No	13
No reply	5

9. If your answer to the above is yes, how often:

Seldom	44
Often	29
Very often	6
Almost always	6
No reply	15

10. Is it ever necessary for you not to charge your patients any fee at all because of their poor financial condition?

Yes	64
No	31
No reply	5

11. If your answer is yes to above question, how often?

Seldom	53
Often	10
Very often	6
Almost always	1
No reply	30

12. Do you find the number of your aged patients whom you charge less than your normal fee is:

Increasing	15
Decreasing	11
No significant change	62
No such patients	6
No reply	6

13. Do any of your aged patients require help from relatives to pay medical bills?

Yes	64
No	8
Don't know	23
No reply	19

14. Would you please estimate the percentage who require such help.

None	11
0 to 25 percent	48
26 to 50 percent	13

51 to 75 percent	6
76 to 100 percent	3
No reply	19

15. What percentage of your aged patients, if any, have all or part of their medical bills paid by public assistance (old-age assistance (OAA) or the Kerr-Mills program of medical assistance for the aged (MAA))?

None	57
0 to 25 percent	32
26 to 50 percent	3
51 to 75 percent	1
76 to 100 percent	0
No reply	7

16. What percentage of your aged patients are in nursing homes?

None	38
0 to 10 percent	53
11 to 20 percent	1
21 to 30 percent	1
31 to 40 percent	1
No reply	5

17. In Illinois, the Kerr-Mills program does not pay for nursing home care. Do you think it should?

Yes	64
No	27
No reply	9

18. Do any of your aged patients decline to follow your professional recommendation for hospitalization because they feel they cannot afford the care or would have to seek public assistance to get it?

Yes	36
No	55
No reply	9

19. If your answer is yes, what percentage?

0 to 20 percent	30
21 to 40 percent	9
41 to 60 percent	4
61 to 80 percent	1
81 to 100 percent	1
No reply	55

20. If social security benefits included payment of basic hospital costs of the aged, do you think your patients would buy less costly supplemental private health insurance to pay other medical bills?

Yes	54
No	37
No reply	9

21. Would you favor extending social security benefits to include hospital care if a medical commission of physicians from private practice, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, were to administer the entire program?

Yes	27
No	69
No reply	4

22. Would you favor extending social security benefits to include hospital care for the aged if the entire program were administered by the Blue Cross?

Yes	38
No	57
No reply	5

23. Do you believe self-employed physicians should be covered under social security as other professionals are?

Yes	63
No	34
No reply	3

24. Would you have any personal objection to treating patients in your hospital if their bills were being paid as part of their social security benefits?

Yes	30
No	65
No reply	5

25. Which of the following, in your judgment, would best serve the hospital needs of those of your aged patients who do not have sufficient private resources and who for various reasons cannot get private hospital care insurance?

Kerr-Mills bill	41
King-Anderson bill	15
Bow bill	20
Neither	16
No reply	8

26. Do you approve of my effort to obtain your views on this very important subject in this manner?

Yes	94
No	4
No reply	2

Mr. Speaker, following is the actual letter with the questionnaire which I mailed to the doctors in the Chicago area:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 30, 1963.

DEAR DOCTOR: Legislation concerning health care for the aged—normally 65 or older—is before the House Ways and Means Committee. I do not think any action will be taken by the committee this year other than to hold hearings. Nevertheless, a clear understanding of all viewpoints—in general and in detail—is vital if the committee and we here in Congress are to make a sound decision on this matter.

I am sure you agree, and it is in this belief that I ask you to take a few minutes from your very busy schedule to help me gather information which, I can assure you, can prove very helpful to me in making a final judgment on these various proposals.

I would appreciate it if you would answer the attached questions on various aspects of this issue. The questions are designed so that your response will take a minimum of time, but of course I will be happy to receive any additional views you might wish to offer on the subject. I have made an honest effort to keep these questions objective, but since they will be tabulated by machine, the multiple choice answers had to be limited to a maximum of five choices.

The enclosed reply card has been specially designed to permit machine tabulations. Please do not write anything on either side of the reply card. If you wish to include additional remarks, please do so on a separate sheet of paper which I would urge you to include in a stamped envelope addressed to my Washington office, together with the reply card.

In order to include as many replies in the tally as possible, may I request you to return the reply card no later than November 15, 1963. I will be very happy to send you the results of this poll if you will be good enough to indicate where you want such results mailed.

For your information I include a brief summary of the King-Anderson bill, the Kerr-Mills program (as it applies in Illinois), and the Bow bill, since these are the three main bills in the current discussion.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,
ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,
Member of Congress,
11th District, Illinois.

THE THREE MAJOR PROPOSALS

BOW BILL (H.R. 21)

This would provide medical and hospital care by subsidizing voluntary health insurance premiums through Federal income tax credit.

Eligibility: A credit against income taxes could be claimed by (1) anyone 65 or over whose annual income doesn't exceed $4,000 a year and who pays premiums for and is a beneficiary of a qualified health care program; (2) relatives and former employers who pay premiums for a health care program for a person 65 or over.

Benefits: Qualified plan must be guaranteed renewable, not exclude preexisting conditions and provide basic benefits of at least (1) major medical benefits with payment made, after an annual deductible of not more than $200, of at least 75 percent of hospital and various medical costs, or (2) a plan providing a hospital room and board charges for up to 90 days a year; payment of $120 for hospital ancillary services; surgical fees; physicians services to $75 a year and $6 per day room and board convalescent care to $186 per year.

Under the plan, there will be no assurance that such plans would be available and no requirement for government to do anything if plans do not become available or are too high priced.

Administration: By the U.S. Treasury Department through private insurance plans.

Financing: Persons with a tax liability of at least $150 ($300 for a couple) would deduct this amount from Federal income tax to pay insurance premiums. Those with smaller or no tax liability would receive medical care insurance certificates for the difference between tax liability and $150. To claim credit, tax returns would show evidence from an insurer that a policy meeting Bow bill standards had been issued.

KING-ANDERSON BILL (H.R. 3920, S. 880)

This is President Kennedy's social security health insurance plan which would pay for institutional, home services, and diagnostic services, but not private doctor fees.

Eligibility: All persons 65 or older entitled to monthly social security or railroad retirement benefits and 2½ million 65 or older who do not now qualify for such payments.

Benefits: (1) Inpatient hospital services for up to 90 days per benefit period with deductible of $10 a day (minimum of $20) for first 9 days, unless beneficiary elects either up to 45 days with no deductible or 180 days with deductible equal to average cost of 2½ days of hospital care; (2) Nursing home services furnished, after transfer from hospital, in facilities affiliated with hospitals for up to 180 days per benefit period; (3) 240 home health visits including visiting nursing care, therapy, part-time homemaker services; (4) Outpatient hospital diagnostic services as required, but subject to $20 deductible for services furnished within a 30-day period.

Administration: Under established social security or railroad systems, with States and national accrediting bodies used in determining eligibility of providers to participate and private organizations performing functions related to providers of services.

Financing: A Federal social insurance trust fund would be maintained through an increase in social security taxes of one-fourth of 1 percent on employers and on employees (with two-fifths percent for self-employed persons) and increase in amount of earnings taxable from $4,800 to $5,200. Benefits provided to persons not covered by social security or railroad systems would be paid from general tax revenues.

KERR-MILLS (MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE AGED)

This is a system of Federal matching grants to provide medical care to the near-needy aged. It became law in 1960. Federal grants to State-administered old-age assistance systems provide for welfare cases, while MAA helps those who are otherwise self-supporting but who are unable to pay medical bills. MAA became effective in Illinois on August 1, 1961.

Eligibility: To be eligible for MAA in Illinois (1) a single person must have an annual income of $1,800 or less, plus the amount equal to health insurance premiums; a couple must have $2,400 or less, plus $600 for each dependent living with the couple. Contributions from responsible relatives are included in income. (2) A single person must have assets of less than $1,800 or $2,400 for a couple, plus $400 for each dependent living with the couple. Excluded from assets are the value of real estate, if a single family dwelling, clothing, personal effects, automobile, life insurance with a face value of $1,000 or less, and tangible personal properties used in earning income with a value of $1,000 or less.

Any assistance received in the program constitutes a claim against the estate of the person who received the assistance.

Benefits: (1) Inpatient hospital services for acute illness; accidental injury, surgery, chronic conditions requiring limited period of hospital care, or for diagnostic procedures that can be carried out only in a hospital. Approved by county Medical Advisory Committee required for extension beyond 2 weeks. (2) Physician services provide medical or surgical care in hospital; home and office visits during a 30-day period immediately following release from a hospital. Home visits for acute illness, one per day for 1 week and, for chronic illness, two per month. Office visits for acute illness, six per month, and for chronic illness, two per month. No nursing home or dental care, prescribed drugs, or other services provided.

Administration: Administered by the Illinois Public Aid Commission through its 102 county departments of public aid.

Financing: Federal Government provides 50 percent of the cost of operating MAA in Illinois and the rest is State funds.

Comparison chart of the major health plans

	Bow	King-Anderson	Kerr-Mills (in Illinois)
Eligibility	Every person 65 years or older with annual income or resources of less than $4,000.	All over 65 including those eligible for social security or Railroad Retirement Act benefits.	Aged persons on public welfare rolls; single persons with $1,800 annual income or less and married couples with $2,400 annual income or less who are unable to pay medical bills.
Benefits	Per day limit on hospital, convalescent home charges; covers services of physicians, surgeons.	Hospital, nursing home care; physician services, diagnostic care, and drugs furnished by hospital; home health services.	Includes 14 days in hospital, with physicians' care, diagnostic services, drugs; home and office doctor visits.
Financing	Deduct $150 from income tax ($300 for couple) to pay health insurance premiums.	Through an increase in social security payroll and self-employment payments.	State and United States share equally costs of care and administration.
Administration	U.S. Treasury Department	Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Department.	By State public aid commission through counties.

Questionnaire

Complete the enclosed specially designed computer card by punching out with a paper clip or any sharp object the blank which best describes your view.

1. What percentage of your patients would you estimate are 65 or over? (a) None; (b) 0 to 20 percent; (c) 21 to 40 percent; (d) 41 to 80 percent; (e) 81 to 100 percent.

2. What percentage of your aged patients can afford to pay their entire hospital bill from their own financial resources? (a) All; (b) most; (c) few; (d) none.

3. What percentage of your aged patients have some type of private insurance to help pay hospital bills? (a) 0 to 20 percent; (b) 21 to 40 percent; (c) 41 to 60 percent; (d) 61 to 80 percent; (e) 81 to 100 percent.

4. What percentage of your aged patients have some type of private insurance to help pay for your services? (a) 0 to 20 percent; (b) 21 to 40 percent; (c) 41 to 60 percent; (d) 61 to 80 percent; (e) 81 to 100 percent.

5. In a typical case of one of your aged patients with private health insurance, what percentage of the total hospital bill is covered? (a) 0 to 20 percent; (b) 21 to 40 percent; (c) 41 to 60 percent; (d) 61 to 80 percent; (e) 81 to 100 percent.

6. What percentage of the surgical costs does this insurance normally cover? (a) None; (b) 0 to 25 percent; (c) 26 to 50 percent; (d) 51 to 75 percent; (e) 76 to 100 percent.

7. What percentage of nonsurgical physician's services does this insurance normally cover? (a) None; (b) 0 to 25 percent; (c) 26 to 50 percent; (d) 51 to 75 percent; (e) 76 to 100 percent.

8. Is it ever necessary for you to reduce your normal fee for aged patients because of their poor financial condition? (a) Yes; (b) no.

9. If your answer to the above is yes, how often? (a) Seldom; (b) often; (c) very often; (d) almost always.

10. Is it ever necessary for you not to charge your patients any fee at all because of their poor financial condition? (a) Yes; (b) no.

11. If your answer is yes to above question, how often? (a) Seldom; (b) often; (c) very often; (d) almost always.

12. Do you find the number of your aged patients whom you charge less than your normal fee is: (a) Increasing; (b) decreasing; (c) no significant change; (d) no such patients.

13. Do any of your aged patients require help from relatives to pay medical bills? (a) Yes; (b) no; (c) don't know.

14. Would you please estimate the percentage who require such help. (a) None; (b) 0 to 25 percent; (c) 26 to 50 percent; (d) 51 to 75 percent; (e) 76 to 100 percent.

15. What percentage of your aged patients, if any, have all or part of their medical bills paid by public assistance (old-age assistance (OAA) or the Kerr-Mills program of medical assistance for the aged (MAA))? (a) None; (b) 0 to 25 percent; (c) 26 to 50 percent; (d) 51 to 75 percent; (e) 76 to 100 percent.

16. What percentage of your aged patients are in nursing homes? (a) None; (b) 0 to 10 percent; (c) 11 to 20 percent; (d) 21 to 30 percent; (e) 31 to 40 percent.

17. In Illinois, the Kerr-Mills program does not pay for nursing home care. Do you think it should? (a) Yes; (b) no.

18. Do any of your aged patients decline to follow your professional recommendation for hospitalization because they feel they cannot afford the care or would have to seek public assistance to get it? (a) Yes; (b) no.

19. If your answer is yes, what percentage? (a) 0 to 20 percent; (b) 21 to 40 percent; (c) 41 to 60 percent; (d) 61 to 80 percent; (e) 81 to 100 percent.

20. If social security benefits included payment of basic hospital costs of the aged, do you think your patients would buy less costly supplemental private health insurance to pay other medical bills? (a) Yes; (b) no.

21. Would you favor extending social security benefits to include hospital care if a medical commission of physicians from private practice, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, were to administer the entire program? (a) Yes; (b) no.

22. Would you favor extending social security benefits to include hospital care for the aged if the entire program were administered by Blue Cross? (a) Yes; (b) no.

23. Do you believe self-employed physicians should be covered under social security as other professionals are? (a) Yes; (b) no.

24. Would you have any personal objection to treating patients in your hospital if their bills were being paid as part of their social security benefits? (a) Yes; (b) no.

25. Which of the following, in your judgment, would best serve the hospital needs of those of your aged patients who do not have sufficient private resources and who for various reasons cannot get private hospital care insurance? (a) Kerr-Mills bill; (b) King-Anderson bill; (c) Bow bill; (d) neither.

26. Do you approve of my effort to obtain your views on this very important subject in this manner? (a) Yes; (b) no.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein, notwithstanding the fact that the cost is estimated by the Public Printer to be $225, the remarks of the President of the United States in my district as of Monday, last.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

IMPACT OF IMPORTS AND OTHER FACTORS AFFECTING U.S. LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, U.S. livestock producers have faced almost steadily declining prices throughout most of this year, and the outlook, according to the Department of Agriculture, is for marketings to continue into 1964 at a rate which will further weaken prices. This poor prognosis for the livestock industry comes in the face of an Agriculture Department prediction that U.S. beef consumption in 1963 is expected to set a record high of about 95 pounds per person, up from 89 pounds last year. There has been much concern—and not a little controversy—over the reasons for this disruption in the livestock market. The increased imports of beef is very prominent among these reasons; and there are other factors on the horizon which influence the vitality and operation of the livestock industry.

In the 5-year period, 1957–62, imports of beef and veal into the United States more than tripled; imports rose from 395 million pounds in 1957 to nearly 1.5 billion pounds in 1962. In the first 8 months of this year, beef and veal imports of 1.2 billion pounds were more than 17 percent above the first 8 months in 1962. This flood of imports appears to have resulted from modification in late 1958 of the United Kingdom-Australian Meat Agreement, under which most Australian beef exports had been sent to the United Kingdom. Since that time, shipments of Australian beef into the United States have risen from 18 million pounds in 1958 to 445 million pounds in 1962. At the same time, shipments from New Zealand rose from 184 million pounds to 214 million pounds. Together, these two countries accounted for nearly 46 percent of all U.S. beef and veal imports last year, compared with only 22 percent 5 years earlier. Current livestock expansion in Australia indicates there will be little or no letting up on the part of that country in their shipments of beef in the immediate future. Imports from Ireland of 71 million pounds of beef and veal last year were more than three times those of 1957. Increased imports from these three countries offset by a wide margin declining imports from such traditional United States suppliers as Canada, Mexico, and Argentina.

Beef and veal imports: United States, by selected country of origin, 1958 to date [1]

[In millions of pounds]

Year	Imports, by country of origin, product weight						Total imports [2]
	Canada	Mexico	Argentina	Ireland	Australia	New Zealand	
1958	53.6	75.0	216.7	23.8	17.7	183.7	909
1959	22.6	48.9	128.6	42.0	224.0	161.6	1,063
1960	18.9	39.1	52.7	52.8	144.7	130.7	775
1961	32.3	53.4	65.2	64.4	233.9	154.4	1,037
1962	19.4	59.3	55.9	70.7	444.9	213.6	1,445
1963 (January-July)	11.1	39.8	53.5	40.0	253.0	138.3	907

[1] Includes quantities of other canned, prepared, or preserved meat not elsewhere specified. Assumed to be mostly beef.

[2] Carcass weight equivalent.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Of themselves, these figures mean little; but when imports are compared with total U.S. beef and veal production, one can easily see that the volume of imports has reached such proportions as to be of real concern to the livestock industry.

U.S. imports of cattle, calves, beef, and veal, compared with production, 1957–63

[In millions of pounds]

Year	Imports			U.S. meat production [2]	Imports as a percentage of production
	Meat equivalent of live animals	Meat	Total [1]		
1957	221	395	616	15,728	3.9
1958	340	909	1,249	14,516	8.6
1959	191	1,063	1,254	14,588	8.6
1960	163	775	938	15,835	5.9
1961	250	1,037	1,287	16,341	7.9
1962	280	1,445	1,725	16,311	10.6
January–August 1962	132	893	1,025	10,895	9.4
January–August 1963	118	1,086	1,204	11,386	10.6

[1] Canned and other processed meats converted to carcass weight equivalent.

[2] Total production, including an estimate for farm slaughter.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

A large percentage of these imports is composed of lower grade beef used in the processed meat industry. Thus far in 1963, more than 80 percent of beef imports are of the lower grade, boneless variety. In addition, some 14 percent of 1963 imports are of canned beef. Prior to 1957, canned beef, mainly from South American countries, made up 72 percent of total beef and veal imports. But, as transportation and handling facilities for frozen products developed, imports of boneless beef took on increasing importance. Some of the boneless beef is suitable for uses other than in processed meat products, its quality comparing generally with lower grades of domestic beef. Thus, there is increased reason for believing there may be a higher rate of substitution at the retail level between these lower grade beef imports and the better cuts of domestic beef than was formerly the case.

U.S. selected beef and veal imports, carcass weight equivalent

[In thousands of pounds]

Year	Fresh and frozen	Canned	Boneless	Total beef	Total veal	Total beef and veal
1954	7,520	168,784	12,537	230,608	1,048	231,656
1955	6,112	172,498	28,674	228,761	275	229,036
1956	5,140	143,999	36,894	210,553	245	210,798
1957	32,863	188,624	128,520	390,338	4,878	395,216
1958	58,880	224,606	414,488	895,542	13,506	909,048
1959	39,136	187,441	680,317	1,047,053	16,138	1,063,191
1960	14,685	151,538	556,765	760,235	15,275	775,510
1961	25,096	188,563	764,905	1,020,650	16,474	1,037,124
1962	18,767	166,238	1,187,632	1,419,547	25,511	1,445,058
1963 (January-August)	12,255	148,626	876,756	1,073,423	12,100	1,085,523

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture has maintained for some time that these imports do not directly bear on the prices received for fed cattle. A recent study of beef imports by the Department indicates that fed-cattle prices depend largely on the volume of fed-cattle slaughtered, since this class of cattle accounts for the principal part of total domestic commercial slaughter. For example, the study indicates that in the 1948–62 period, a 10-percent increase in supplies of lower grade beef—including both domestic cow beef and imports—caused prices of Choice steers to decline 3 percent.

However, the American National Cattlemen's Association maintains that such imports have a direct impact on cattle prices. The answer must be found—perhaps on one side or another of these two divergent findings, or perhaps, somewhere between them.

The Department of Agriculture has concluded that the sharp drop in fed-cattle prices last winter and spring was associated with an upturn in fed-cattle slaughter. Last November—a year ago—the average price for Choice steers in Chicago was $30.13 a hundred; thereafter, prices fell to a low $22.61 a hundred in May—a decline of almost 25 percent. By July, prices rose to $24.72, but have weakened since; in late October they were under $24. Fed-cattle prices are expected to average below the first quarter of 1963, when Choice steers at Chicago averaged $25.28. Good feeder steers at Kansas City were selling at

$25.74 a hundred a year ago; prices there have fallen to $22.92 in October. In the same period, Kansas City prices of Choice feeder steer calves fell from $30.88 per hundred to $27.05. There is good reason to believe that marketings in this quarter will be about 15 percent more than a year ago, and 7 percent above the third quarter of this year.

Selected prices per 100 pounds of cattle, by months, 1962 and 1963

Month	Chicago				Kansas City			
	Choice steers		Utility cows		Good feeder steers		Choice feeder steer calves	
	1962	1963	1962	1963	1962	1963	1962	1963
January	$26.39	$27.27	$14.87	$15.07	$23.75	$25.14	$27.19	$29.50
February	26.76	24.93	15.26	15.00	23.91	24.42	28.70	29.68
March	27.31	23.63	15.97	15.52	24.52	24.00	28.80	29.18
April	27.45	23.77	16.06	15.74	24.78	24.18	29.50	29.48
May	26.02	22.61	15.91	16.31	24.37	23.74	28.98	28.96
June	25.25	22.69	16.42	16.26	24.66	24.18	28.96	29.21
July	26.50	24.72	15.31	15.33	24.80	24.77	29.29	29.42
August	$28.19	$24.60	$15.20	$15.65	$24.77	$24.15	$29.04	$28.66
September	29.85	23.94	15.65	15.10	25.51	23.56	30.06	27.91
October	[1] 29.50	24.18	[2] 15.31	14.71	[2] 25.43	22.92	[2] 30.53	27.05
November	30.13		15.22		26.28		30.88	
December	28.91		14.91		25.74		30.20	
Average	27.67		15.51		24.88		29.34	

[1] 3-week average.
[2] 4-week average.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Number of cattle slaughtered under Federal inspection, by class and percent each class is of total United States, by months, 1962–63

Month	Steers				Heifers				Cows			
	Number		Percentage		Number		Percentage		Number		Percentage	
	1962	1963	1962	1963	1962	1963	1963	1963	1962	1963	1962	1963
	Thousand head	*Thousand head*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Thousand head*	*Thousand head*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Thousand head*	*Thousand head*	*Percent*	*Percent*
January	999	1,021	56.1	56.9	383	382	21.5	21.4	383	373	21.5	20.8
February	870	891	59.3	57.2	310	351	21.1	22.5	274	302	18.7	19.4
March	991	995	60.1	58.7	346	393	21.0	23.2	297	291	18.0	17.2
April	924	1,049	60.7	60.7	307	378	20.2	21.9	274	283	18.0	16.4
May	1,063	1,155	60.2	61.6	350	401	19.8	21.4	330	300	18.7	16.0
June	1,065	1,083	62.0	61.8	337	354	19.6	20.2	295	298	17.2	17.0
July	1,031	1,079	58.4	58.7	358	395	20.3	21.5	353	345	20.0	18.0
August	1,012	1,106	54.1	58.2	413	418	22.1	22.0	421	359	22.5	18.9
September	847	1,039	51.2	56.8	419	411	25.3	22.5	371	364	22.4	19.9
October	936		49.3		469		24.7		473		24.9	
November	841		49.9		384		22.8		443		26.3	
December	868		55.6		344		22.0		336		21.5	
Total	11,447		56.3		4,420		21.7		4,250		20.9	

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, the livestock sector of our farm economy is extremely important; in 1962, sales of some $20 billion of livestock products accounted for more than half of total farm income. In my own State, sales of livestock products accounted for 54 percent of all farm income, and cash receipts from sales of cattle and calves of nearly $537 million accounted for 40 percent of Kansas farm income—nearly as much as Kansas farmers received for all the crops grown in that State. No other single commodity produces a larger slice of U.S. or Kansas cash farm receipts than does cattle and calves.

Recently, representatives of the American National Cattlemen's Association went to Australia and New Zealand seeking some agreement under which producers in those countries might reduce shipments of meat to the United States. I believe that organization is to be commended for its leadership in this problem. But they are facing a formidable situation, for the U.S. market is a rich one, and highly attractive to Australian and New Zealand producers, whose traditional United Kingdom market has been curtailed.

It would appear that some positive action on the part of the Government to bring about an agreement limiting imports of beef is in order. Under section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, the President is authorized to negotiate with foreign governments to limit their shipments if it is found their exports of agricultural commodities to the United States are detrimental to our producers. It would seem that those countries which are unloading large quantities of beef on the U.S. market would be receptive to such limitations, particularly if they realize the United States could, in the final analysis, regulate its own international trade in meat. We cannot afford to stand by and permit these imports to jeopardize such an important sector of our farm economy.

Within the past 2 months attention has been called by representatives of the livestock industry to a proposal by the U.S. Department of Agriculture to establish new beef grading standards, including cutability standards. If adopted by the Department, these regulations would become mandatory for the packing industry.

In addition to the evaluation of a beef carcass as Prime, Choice, Good, and so forth, there would be established cutability designations ranging from 1 to 5. The number 1 would identify carcasses of the highest retail cutout yield and value, and the number 5 would identify those of the lowest.

It has been pointed out that the current proposal is similar to last year's dual grading experiment which was discontinued on June 30, 1963. The only difference seems to be that the cutability designations have been reduced from six to five, and the regulation would become compulsory for anyone requesting Federal carcass beef grading.

Mr. Speaker, there was virtually unanimous opposition to the dual grading proposal from the livestock industry and now this industry, which faces serious problems in the year ahead, has expressed opposition to the proposed cutability designations.

Unless the Department of Agriculture can demonstrate specific advantages to the consuming public, it would appear that this form of Government interference with the right of industry to merchandise its products should be discouraged.

Finally, another factor affecting the livestock industry is the tendency of retail prices to lag behind the fluctuations in live animal and wholesale prices. This delay in passing on to the consumer lower prices hampers increased consumption and further weakens the economic position of the cattlemen.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a matter for congressional or Federal action. Indeed our free enterprise system has demonstrated its ability to promote and merchandise products and goods to the benefit of the consumer. In the case of the food industry, I was informed earlier this year by the National Association of Food Chains and the National Association of Retail Grocers that over the years there

have been over 400 instances in which requests from producers to give additional promotional effort to their products have been honored.

Although there are many other food items competing for the consumer dollar, including pork, lamb, poultry, and so forth, this seems to be an appropriate time for the retail food industry to come to the assistance of the livestock industry and encourage the public through promotion and lower prices to increase its consumption of beef.

Yesterday the U.S. Department of Agriculture released the demand and price situation for 1964 and reported:

> Despite higher consumption, cattle inventory is increasing and will provide the basis for even larger beef supplies in 1964. The inventory on January 1, 1964, will be close to 107 million head, up 3 percent from a year earlier.

In view of this outlook which is coupled with a prediction of further weakened prices, it is essential that the matter of imports and all other factors affecting this vital segment of the U.S. farm economy be given serious attention by every Member of Congress and those responsible for farm policy in the executive branch of the Federal Government.

MIDWEST SOYBEAN FARMERS GET BACKLASH OF FUMBLED RUSSIAN WHEAT SALE

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, midwestern farmers are feeling the backlash of the administration's proposal to sell American wheat to Russia.

Soybean producers in Illinois and neighboring States surprisingly are receiving about 20 cents per bushel less for their record soybean harvest than they were a week ago because of the "off again, on aagin" Kennedy inspired wheat negotiations between the Russian purchasing mission and U.S. exporters.

Although wheat was the commodity in which the Russians were reportedly most interested, some U.S. exporters got the idea that they would also take vast quantities of soybean oil. These exporters bought huge amounts of vegetable oils in anticipation of the business, running the price up by about 25 percent. The business failed to develop, and soybean oil and cottonseed oil prices collapsed this week, pulling soybean prices down with them. In the process, one of the largest soybean oil exporting firms in the country was forced into bankruptcy when the value of its inventory of vegetable oils plummeted overnight.

All of this is illustrative of the hazards of conducting negotiations on the Russian wheat deal under a heavy cloak of secrecy. Moscow has been putting out more information on the progress of the talks than has Washington. This is becoming more or less standard procedure in most United States-Russian negotiations.

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, total American soybean stocks will just meet domestic and export requirements, without any sales to Russia. Farmers who are now marketing their soybean crop were enjoying excellent prices until the reported breakdown in United States-Russian food negotiations torpedoed them.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman was asleep at the switch again as soybean prices were derailed. His Commodity Exchange Authority, which is supposed to police the Nation's markets, was apparently either unconcerned or unaware of the dynamite-laden situation which was building up in the soybean oil and cottonseed oil markets. There is no record that it undertook any investigations, arrived at any conclusions, or issued any warnings to the public or the trade.

The irony of it all is that the administration's trade deal with Russia, which was put forward as a great boon to wheat growers, has thus far succeeded only in creating chaos in the commodity markets and penalizing soybean producers more than any other group.

INVESTIGATION NEEDED

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been directed to formal charges which have been filed against the Department of Agriculture by Mr. Adrian Roberts, vice president, American Federation of Government Employees, AFL–CIO, alleging unfair labor practices by the Department of Agriculture. It appears that the Department of Agriculture has granted union recognition to the Organization of Professional Employees of the Department of Agriculture, which, it is contended by Mr. Roberts, is "sponsored, controlled, and assisted by agency management." The AFGE vice president states that the recognition of such employee organizations constitutes a violation of Executive Order 10988 which established the procedures under which the departments and agencies of the Government grant recognition to Federal employee organizations.

The AFGE contends that, in effect, the Department of Agriculture is sanctioning and recognizing a company union.

These unfair labor practice charges against the Department of Agriculture are serious. The Executive order which apparently sanctions the recognition of the so-called company union is based upon an Executive order of President Kennedy which does not have the authorization of the Congress. In view of the grave nature of these charges against the Department of Agriculture and the absence of congressional authorization of policies and practices with respect to Federal employee organization representation and recognition, I am requesting the Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee to investigate these charges, as well as the entire operation of Executive Order 10988.

KYL HOME RULE BILL CLEARLY CONSTITUTIONAL

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I support the Kyl bill to give back to Maryland most of the present District of Columbia, and Attorney General Robert Kennedy's doubt over the proposal's constitutionality is irreconcilable with his support earlier this year of similar legislation.

In testimony before the House District Committee yesterday, the Attorney General referred to the measure sponsored by Representative JOHN KYL, Republican of Iowa, as a "red herring." According to the Washington Evening Star, he dashed cold water on it by stating that, in addition to "raising a number of thorny practical problems, there is serious question as to the measure's constitutionality."

If the Kyl bill is of dubious constitutionality, then so is S. 815, a bill to adjust legislative jurisdiction over certain Federal enclaves.

On Tuesday, August 20, 1963, the Senate Committee on Government Operations held hearings on this bill. I quote directly from the hearings report, page 3:

> Senator MUSKIE. The bill was introduced in this Congress by Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, chairman, Senate Committee on Government Operations, on February 18 of this year. It was submitted as an administration bill and at the request of the Attorney General of the United States. It is identical to legislation originally drafted by the staff of the Committee on Government Operations with the cooperation of the Department of Justice, in order to implement recommendations contained in a report by the Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction Over Federal Areas Within the States.

The Attorney General referred to in the Senate hearings as the sponsor of S. 815 is, of course, the same person who now questions the constitutionality of the Kyl bill.

S. 815 would authorize the head or other authorized officer of any department or independent agency of the Federal Government to relinquish to the State in which any Federal lands or interest therein under his custody are situated, such measure of legislative jurisdiction as he may deem desirable.

The exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government over the areas involved in S. 815 is derived from the very same language of the U.S. Constitution that applies to the District of Columbia.

There are over 5,000 such areas in addition to the District of Columbia. Forty-two areas of these areas are larger than the District of Columbia. More than a million American citizens live in these areas—and this figure does not include the population of the District of Columbia—and their citizenship is adversely affected, in much the same way as the citizenship of District residents.

For example, in my home State of Illinois, there were 251 installations under the total exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government, and involving a total acreage of 122,873 as of June 30, 1957. Pages 30 and 31 of the hearings give a tabulation for all States, with a grand total of 5,050 installations in all, encompassing 8,062,387 acres.

S. 815 would authorize the restoration to the States legislative jurisdiction with respect to qualifications for voting, education, public health and safety, taxation, marriage, divorce, descent and distribution of property, and a variety of other matters, which are ordinarily the subject of State control.

Curiously, the Attorney General voiced no doubts over the constitutionality of S. 815. Indeed, the bill was backed by the administration and sponsored by the Attorney General himself.

The same hearings carry testimony that 31 State Governors and 29 State attorneys general endorsed the purpose of the bill. In the words of Deputy Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, the bill is needed because:

> The Federal Government has been acquiring and retaining too much legislative jurisdiction over too many areas as the result of the existence of practices founded on conditions of a century ago and more.

Katzenbach himself cited in his testimony the constitutional authority, which is article I, section 8, clause 17. He testified:

> That clause provides that the United States shall have exclusive jurisdiction over the seat of government of the United States, and that it shall exercise like authority over lands acquired by it elsewhere for governmental purposes with the consent of the State involved. It is well known that under this clause the Federal Government exercised within the District of Columbia all the powers of government, not only the usual Federal powers but also those which ordinarily are reserved by the Constitution to the States. It is not so well known that under the same clause it has assumed similar State-type powers over more than 5,000 individual areas of land scattered throughout the United States, making of these areas Federal islands, sometimes called enclaves, in which the surrounding State can exercise no authority—legislative, executive, or judicial. For most purposes such an enclave is not considered a part of the State within which it is located. For most puropses the million persons who live in such enclaves are not considered residents of the State within which they live.

Furthermore, there are at least 29 instances in which the Federal Government already has retroceded areas to States—in addition to the well-known retrocession of the Virginia area of the District of Columbia. These are listed in the Senate hearings.

I am at a loss to understand why the Attorney General should doubt the constitutionality of retrocession in the Kyl bill while endorsing it in S. 815.

To me, the Kyl bill is not only sound constitutionally, but sound in every other way. It is the only bill I have ever seen which would truly grant home rule to residents of the District of Columbia. It would grant them full citizenship, a chance to vote for Governor, State legislators, U.S. Senators, U.S. Congressmen, as well as U.S. President and Vice President.

Best of all, it would enable them to assume the full responsibilities and opportunities of local self-government. They would have the opportunity and the responsibility to deal effectively and directly with the vexing problems of crime and education. Their own backyard problems would truly become their own backyard opportunities. I am confident they would measure up.

The Attorney General's doubt over constitutionality can be dismissed. Now, how about the unnamed "thorny practical problems" to which Mr. Kennedy alluded? Perhaps they are lacking in substance just as the constitutional one.

COMMITTEE FOR LIBERATION OF LITHUANIA

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURPHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Committee for Liberation of Lithuania is commemorating its 20th anniversary this year. The Lithuanian people began their struggle against foreign occupation immediately following the Soviet invasion.

The story of the conquering and repression of Lithuania by the Soviet Union is well known. The Congress of the United States itself has unearthed substantial evidence of executions, mass arrests, and deportations to Siberian concentration camps, subversion and cruelty of every kind during the Soviet incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet empire. During this time and ever since, the Communists have maintained the ridiculous fiction that Lithuania voluntarily joined the Soviet Union.

Anyone can investigate the events since 1940 and discover that not only did not the Lithuanians voluntarily give up their freedom, but that they actually resisted communism in every possible way.

One of the leading groups in this resistance has been the Supreme Committee for Liberation of Lithuania. The committee was formed in 1943 and still exists as vivid refutation of the Communist propaganda.

While it is difficult to get any information about conditions or events in the Soviet empire, we are convinced that Lithuanian dislike for communism is as strong as ever.

Therefore, there is a great need for a democratic resistance group and the supreme committee fulfills that need. The committee celebrates its 20th anniversary in New York City, November 23 and 24. Twenty years is a long time to maintain hope and resistance. But there has never been a greater need for hope and resistance, or chance for success than now. We wish the supreme committee happy 20th anniversary and success in the near future.

SMALL BUSINESS SUBCOMMITTEE SUGGESTION PROMPTS GENERAL MOTORS TO ADOPT NEW POLICY

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the introduction, consideration, and passage of legislation, there is another important way in which Congress serves the Nation.

An outstanding example recently occurred as an outgrowth of the 7-month hearings on dual distribution held by Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Small Business Committee. The subcommittee, under my chairmanship has conducted a broad survey of problems encountered by small businessmen as a result of dual distribution and related practices.

One of the industries from which testimony was received was the appliance industry. Representatives of the National Appliance, Radio-TV Dealers Association testified concerning a number of problems within their sector of the economy. One of the major points made by them was that frequently builders purchased appliances from manufacturers at a greater discount than that received by retail dealers for the same number of units. These appliances are sometimes diverted into the retail market and sold by the builder in competition with the retail dealer, rather than being installed in homes or apartments constructed by the purchasing builder.

Recently, I have been informed by the General Motors Corp., the manufacturer of Frigidaire appliances, that Frigidaire Sales Corp., a wholly owned subsidiary of General Motors Corp., intends, subject to Federal Trade Commission approval, to have each builder who purchases appliances agree in writing that the Frigidaire appliances he purchases will in fact be installed in the new construction described in the purchase order, and that any appliances not actually so installed will be resold to the Frigidaire Sales Corp.

This action on the part of General Motors and the Frigidaire Sales Corp. is a direct result of a suggestion made by my esteemed colleague on the subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma, the Honorable TOM STEED. While it by no means solves all of the very serious problems existing in the distributive portion of the appliance industry, still it is a definite gain for the small businessman, and I believe that General Motors Corp. and my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED], are to be warmly commended for this step.

This is a specific example of how the Congress may perform a public service other than through the enactment of legislation. The subcommittee's actions in determining the areas of the economy in which dual distribution problems exist, inviting in appropriate witnesses, and providing a forum for them, culminated in Mr. STEED's very excellent suggestion. This has resulted in private industry finding a solution to the problem without the necessity of Government regulation, control or intervention.

This, of course, is always the most desirable of all possible solutions. It is my hope that the Federal Trade Commission will grant speedy approval to this proposal and that other manufacturers will adopt similar safeguards.

The hearings on dual distribution have covered over 40 industries. In the vast majority of these, many problems of this general nature were pointed out to the committee. We shall continue to hope that this voluntary approach on the part of industry will result in more examples of self-correction by manufacturers and others of trade practices which are injurious to our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I include the letter from the General Motors Corp. to me, as chairman of Subcommittee No. 4, in the RECORD at this point:

GENERAL MOTORS CORP.,
Detroit, Mich., November 18, 1963.

Hon. JAMES R. ROOSEVELT,
Chairman, Subcommittee No. 4, House of Representatives, Select Committee To Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Problems of Small Business, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The purpose of this letter is to submit for the consideration of Subcommittee No. 4 comments of General Motors Corp. with respect to testimony before the subcommittee on September 16, 1963, by Mr. Earl T. Holst, president of the National Appliance & Radio-Television Dealers Association, and Mr. William Burston, merchandising manager of the National Retail Merchants Association, with respect to merchandising practices in the sale of major home appliances by Frigidaire Sales Corp., a wholly owned subsidiary of General Motors Corp., specifically with respect to direct sales to builders.

Frigidaire Sales Corp. purchases major home appliances such as refrigerators, ranges, washers, and driers and so on, from Frigidaire division of General Motors Corp., the manufacturer, and resells these Frigidaire appliances to dealers and to some extent directly to builders, performing the same function as a distributor in operating through local branch offices in the larger cities.

* * * * *

Messrs. Holst and Burston, in their testimony, objected to appliance manufacturers and distributors making direct sales to builders under two distinctly different circumstances:

1. They objected to all direct sales to builders, including those in which the builder installs the appliance in a new apartment house, new residence, or new trailer, because the dealer is bypassed and misses the opportunity to make a profit on reselling to builders.

2. They also objected to direct sales to a builder who does not install the appliance in new construction, etc., but on the contrary resells the appliance as such either to a consumer or to a dealer. They pointed out that this is possible because builders purchasing directly from manufacturers customarily pay prices which are 10 percent or more below the prices to dealers.

As to the first objection of bypassing dealers on sales to builders for installations, General Motors is sympathetic with the position of the dealers. For many years, Frigidaire Sales Corp. experimented with various plans for providing financial assistance to dealers in obtaining builder business but none of these plans has been entirely successful. Thus, at the present time, Frigidaire Sales Corp. feels that it must sell directly to builders or lose altogether a substantial volume of sales.

* * * * *

As to the second objection, we agree with Messrs. Holst and Burston that the practice of builders reselling appliances into retail channels is highly undesirable and should not be condoned by appliance manufacturers.

* * * * *

Consequently, General Motors has decided to take a further step to minimize builder resales. We have concluded that it would be desirable to have each builder-customer agree in writing that the Frigidaire appliances he purchases will in fact be installed in new construction described in the purchase order and that any appliances not actually so installed will be resold to Frigidaire Sales Corp. It is proposed to add such a specific agreement to builder order forms. This proposal is consistent with the suggestion in one question asked by Representative STEED:

"Mr. STEED. But you know of no situation where the builder has to guarantee the manufacturer that these units actually are going into the homes he is building. Once they sell them to him, they don't care what he does with them.

"Mr. HOLST. That is my opinion. Now I think probably they handle it—when we ask them, of course, they say, 'We know where each one is going. They are for a certain housing project for these houses.' But we also know that many of them don't end up there." (Daily Transcript, p. 1866.)

However, the antitrust laws are in a state of uncertainty at the present time with respect to imposing even apparently reasonable restrictions on resales by a manufacturer's customer. Although it appears to us that the proposed agreement would be perfectly legal under existing case law, General Motors is reluctant to assume the hazard or more narrow interpretations by the courts or the Federal Trade Commission in the future, including extending the so-called per se rule into this area. Therefore, before adopting this additional safeguard, we are asking the Federal Trade Commission for an advisory opinion with respect to this proposed agreement.

Very truly yours,
PHILIP J. MONAGHAN,
Vice President.

SHEVCHENKO—A VOICE AGAINST OPPRESSION

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the unprecedented groundbreaking ceremonies for the Shevchenko statue last September 21 emphasized several themes that are close to the heart of every freedom-loving American. These themes are universal freedom, the liberation of the captive nations, and the abolition of all forms of oppression. For the millions of Americans who are familiar with Ukraine's poet laureate, Taras Shevchenko, the forthcoming erection of a statue in his honor will permanently symbolize the power and greatness of these themes. For those who still are not acquainted with the historic works of this early European freedom fighter, the statue will serve as a beacon of enlightenment, particularly with regard to the captive nations and oppressed people who are today under the heel of Soviet Russian colonialism.

FOR THE OPPRESSED EVERYWHERE

The universality of Shevchenko's stature is not only well certified by his poetic message of freedom but also by historical fact. In the mid-19th century the poet courageously advanced the cause of freedom in Eastern Europe just as the Pole Mickiewicz, the Hungarian Petöfi and others did in central Europe—indeed, as our Lincoln did here. It is no wonder, then, that knowledgeable leaders and citizens in many countries have honored the name Shevchenko and all that it implies for the advancement of world freedom. As in so many other respects, Moscow and its puppets have propagandistically seized upon this symbolic name to deflect its powerful freedom message. But the informed and the intelligent in the free world have stymied this attempt to exploit and defile the name of Shevchenko. For example, the Canadian Prime Minister John J. Diefenbaker had this to say about Shevchenko in 1961:

> A century has passed since the death of Taras Shevchenko, the great Ukrainian poet, and it is most fitting that a monument in his honor is to be erected on the grounds of the Manitoba Legislature. As a poet he not only enriched the literature of his people but inspired them with new hope for freedom. What he sought for them he sought no less for the oppressed everywhere in the world.

SHEVCHENKO'S INSPIRATION FOR FREEDOM

The all-important fact for us today is that the Shevchenko statue will symbolize the deep-rooted concern of all Americans for the liberation and freedom of all the captive nations in the Soviet Russian empire. Moscow knows this all too well, if some of our citizens still do not. However, a full account of the record groundbreaking ceremonies in Washington should convince even the skeptical that a profound source of inspiration for freedom resides in the moving spirit of Shevchenko. This account is given in accurate detail in the October 1–15, 1963, issue of the authoritative periodical

"The Ukrainian Bulletin." I request that it be printed as part of my remarks:

GROUND-BREAKING CEREMONY AT SHEVCHENKO MONUMENT SITE DRAWS OVER 2,000 PERSONS TO WASHINGTON—SPOKESMEN OF U.S. GOVERNMENT AND CONGRESS TAKE PART IN HISTORIC OBSERVANCE—UKRAINIAN NATIONAL ANTHEM PLAYED BY U.S. NAVY BAND—SIGNIFICANCE OF SHEVCHENKO AS SYMBOL OF HUMAN FREEDOM AND FOE OF TYRANNY STRESSED BY SPEAKERS AND THE PRESS—"SHEVCHENKO FREEDOM AWARDS" PRESENTED TO U.S. LEGISLATORS

WASHINGTON, D.C., September 21.—"In authorizing the erection of this memorial to Taras Shevchenko for which we break ground today, Congress was not only paying tribute which was both well-deserved and long overdue to a recognized champion of human liberty and freedom * * * but far more important from your standpoint, Congress, in 1960, by the passage of Public Law 86–749, took the initiative in one phase of foreign policy by recognizing the independent existence of Ukraine as a separate entity, a separate state. Congress stated and President Eisenhower, by his approval, ratified the recognition of Ukraine and its people as a separate, distinct being and demolished any confusion about Ukraine being a part of Russia except insofar as bondage has created a relationship. Whether the State Department cares to admit it or not, it is now a historic fact that in 1960 the U.S. Government recognized the existence of a Ukrainian nation by approving this tribute to the greatest of Ukrainian heroes."

These were the opening words of the Hon. Alvin M. Bentley, former Congressman from Michigan, and one of the original sponsors of the Shevchenko statue bill, at the solemn ceremony dedicating the site of the Shevchenko monument in our Nation's Capital.

Mr. Bentley was one of many guest speakers at this historic and unique observance, attended by a crowd estimated by police officials at well over 2,000 persons. The overwhelming majority of those attending were American citizens of Ukrainian descent hailing from many States of the Union, including California and New Mexico.

The official ceremony began at 2 p.m. at the Shevchenko monument site on P, 22d and 23d Streets NW., where a special stand had been erected by the U.S. Department of the Interior. The stand was decorated with American and Ukrainian national flags, a portrait of Taras Shevchenko and the trident, the Ukrainian national state emblem.

SHCHE NE VMERLA UKRAINA

Prof. Roman Smal-Stocki, of Marquette University in Milwaukee, Wis., president of the Shevchenko Memorial Committee of America, opened the official observance in a brief address stressing the importance of this historic event linking the free America with the enslaved Ukraine. He then introduced Joseph Lesawyer, supreme president of the Ukrainian National Association, and executive vice president of the UCCA, and executive director of the Shevchenko Memorial Committee, to act as master of ceremonies. Mr. Lesawyer then asked the audience to rise for the playing of the Ukrainian and American national anthems.

The tense and patriotic crowd was deeply moved when the U.S. Navy Band, under the baton of Lieutenant Stauffer, played "Shche ne vmerla Ukraina," ("Ukraine Has Not Died"), perhaps for the first time in history that a band of a U.S. Government department played the national anthem of Ukraine, a captive nation, not recognized by the United States at this time. Then the U.S. Navy Band played the American national anthem, following the protocol of the State Department that the foreign anthem should precede the American anthem on such occasions.

Subsequently, the Most Reverend Mstyslav, archbishop of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the United States, delivered a prayer-invocation.

MESSAGE OF GOOD WISHES FROM PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Thereafter a series of speakers delivered speeches underscoring the historic significance of the groundbreaking of the Shevchenko site in Washington, the capital of the free world:

Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and vice president of the Shevchenko Memorial Committee of America; the Hon. Sutton Jett, Director of National Park Service, representing Secretary of the Interior Udall, who is now on an extensive official trip through Africa; Mr. Thomas J. Dodd, Jr., son of U.S. Senator DODD, of Connecticut, who read his father's penetrating address; Hon. Alvin M. Bentley, former Congressman from Michigan; Mr. Robert C. Horne, of the Department of the Interior; the Honorable Charles A. Horsky, representing the White House, who brought a message of good wishes and success from President Kennedy.

Among those who were asked to make brief addresses were three Canadians of Ukrainian descent: the Honorable Paul Yuzyk, Canadian senator of Ukrainian descent, currently a member of the Canadian delegation to the U.N., headed by Lester Pearson, Prime Minister of Canada; Dr. J. Martyniuk, representing the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, and Harry Poworoznyk, representing the Ukrainian National Federation. Messrs. Ivan Hrehorashchuk and Michael Mushynsky, representing the Ukrainian Central Representation in Argentina, were also among the guests at the dedication. The Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate, and several other important guests, including officials of the U.S. Department of the Interior and Dr. Eugene Prychodko, the representative of Dr. Stepan Wytwytsky, President of the Ukrainian National Republic in exile, were also introduced at the observance.

William Shust, a prominent Broadway and TV star, and Joseph Hirniak, a veteran Ukrainian stage actor, recited fragments from Shevchenko's "It Is the Same to Me," and "Haydamaky," respectively.

The impressive and inspiring ceremony climaxed with the actual groundbreaking on the site performed by Suton Jett, Director of National Park Service, Prof. Roman Smal-Stocki and Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky. The shovel used at the ceremony was the same that was used at the groundbreaking of the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial.

Finally, Shevchenko's powerful "Zapovit" ("The Testament"), sung by the Ukrainian "Kobzar" Chorus under the direction of Prof. Anthony Rudnytsky and the entire audience, concluded the ceremony, whereupon the Reverend Theodore Danusiar, pastor of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Washington, delivered the prayer-benediction.

UKRAINIAN-AMERICAN YOUTH COME IN FORCE

One of the most welcome features of this significant event was the participation of the Ukrainian-American youth in large numbers, both at the groundbreaking ceremony and at the concert and banquet. Members of PLAST and SUMA organizations in their uniforms formed an honor guard at the site; the UYLNA (Ukrainian Youth League of North America), SUSTA (Federation of Ukrainian Student Association of America), ODUM (Union of Ukrainian Democratic Youth) just to mention a few, as well as the Ukrainian American War Veterans, were well represented either by their executive boards or a substantial number of their membership.

GALA CONCERT AND BANQUET

At 6 p.m., the Mayflower Hotel was the scene of a virtual invasion, as a crowd of over 1,000 people rushed to the doors of the Grand Ball Room to take their places at the tables.

The concert began with the rendition of the American national anthem by the Ukrainian "Kobzar" Chorus of Philadelphia under the direction of Prof. Anthony Rudnytsky. The chorus also sang "Rejoice, Ye Fields" by Mykola Lysenko, and the cantata, "The Kerchief" by Lev Revutsky, with soloists Maria Murowana, Eugenia Wasylenko, Omelan Tatunchak and Volodymyr Polishchuk. Martha Kobyrn-Kokolsky, soprano of the New York City Center Opera, sang "Days Are Passing, and Nights Are Passing" by Mykola Lysenko, and "Rejoice, Ye Fields," by Anthony Rudnytsky. Pianist Roman Rudnytsky, the son of Anthony Rudnytsky, played the Shevchenko Suite, op. 38 composed by Borys Latoshynsky, "The Ukrainian Dance" composed by Anthony Rudnytsky, and a selection by Liszt.

Mr. Joseph Hirniak recited "Should We Not Leave, My Poor One," in Ukrainian and William Shust recited "Hamaliya" in English, both poems of Taras Shevchenko. The concert concluded with the singing of the Ukrainian national anthem by the "Kobzar" chorus and the audience.

The banquet began with the invocation by the Reverend Theodore Danusiar, pastor of the Holy Family Ukrainian Catholic Church in Washington, whereupon Prof. Roman Smal-Stocki opened the program and called upon Stephen J. Jarema, executive director of the UCCA, to serve as master of ceremonies. Speakers at the banquet were Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, president of the UCCA, Congressmen Thaddeus J. Dulski of New York and Michael A. Feighan of Ohio, the Honorable Quentin N. Burdick, U.S. Senator from North Dakota, Senator Paul Yuzyk of Canada and Col. William Rybak, chairman of the Washington branch of the UCCA, who spoke in English, and Valentin Simianciv, chairman of the Shevchenko Memorial Committee in Washington, D.C., and Dr. Jaroslaw Padoch, supreme secretary of the UNA, and secretary of the Shevchenko Memorial Committee, who addressed the guests in Ukrainian.

Among the honored guests at the head table, in addition to the speakers were many Congressmen and U.S. Government officials and their wives: Rev. Bernard Braskamp, Chaplain in the House of Representatives; the Honorable Michel Cieplinski, the State Department; the Honorable Raymond L. Freeman, the Interior Department; Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain, U.S. Senate; the Honorable J. Kajeckas, Minister of Lithuania; Harry Lielnors and John Lund, "The Voice of America"; the Honorable Albert H. Quie; the Honorable Don L. Short; the Honorable A. Spekke, Minister of Latvia; the Honorable K. W. Stinson; Walter Zachariasiewicz, National Democratic Committee; the Honorable Leonard C. Staisey, State senator from Pennsylvania; Leo Mol, sculptor of the Shevchenko monument and Radoslav Zuk, architect.

SHEVCHENKO FREEDOM AWARDS

Subsequently, Professor Smal-Stocki and Professor Dobriansky presented special Shevchenko Freedom Award plaques to three outstanding American legislators in recognition of their efforts on behalf of the Shevchenko memorial movement and the captive nations in general: the Honorable Michael A. Feighan of Ohio, the Honorable Thaddeus J. Dulski of New York and the Honorable Alvin A. Bentley of Michigan.

The banquet concluded with a prayer-benediction by the Reverend Yuriy Huley, pastor of the Ukranian Orthodox Parish in Washington, D.C.

EXTENSIVE COVERAGE IN THE PRESS

The dedication observance of the Shevchenko site was extensively covered both in the capital press, and throughout the country. Several reports appeared in the Washington Post, the Washington Star, on the Washington TV and radio stations, and in the New York Times, the Buffalo Courier-Express, the Cleveland Plain Dealer, and others which carried UPI articles on the dedication of the Shevchenko site.

The Washington Post of September 23, 1963, had an editorial regarding the Shevchenko statue. A special press conference was held at the Mayflower Hotel on Wednesday, September 18, at which Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky and Walter Dushnyck were the spokesmen for the Shevchenko Memorial Committee.

Julian Revay, director of the Shevchenko Memorial Committee, and Walter Dushnyck, member of the executive committee, worked in close cooperation with the Washington committee, helping in the preparation of this outstanding event of the Ukrainian American community.

The entire observance at the Shevchenko site, the concert and banquet were filmed by George Tamarsky and Yaroslav Kulynych, professional Ukrainian film makers.

WASHINGTON COMMITTEE WORKED HARD

It should be stressed that the local committee worked very hard to make the dedication as successful as possible not only in selling tickets for the concert and banquet, but also making arrangements, setting up stands, together with the police department of the District of Columbia, selling commemorative buttons, Shevchenko kits, and the like. The committee members are: Valentin Simianciv, Yaroslav Shaviak, Walter Zadoretsky, Dr. George Starosolsky, Theodore Caryk, Miss Vera A. Dowhan, Col. William Rybak, Nicholas Mendrych, Bohdan Maksymchuk, Serhiy Zapolenko and Mykola Stawnychy; Stephen S. Skubik, Volodymyr Mayevsky, Victor Cooley, Ivan Korzh, Yurij Kapustiansky, Lubomyr Dzulynsky, Tamara Vitkovitsky, Ihor Vitkovitsky, Oleksa Povstenko, Bohdan Skaskiv, Mykhailo Kushnir, D. M. Corbett and Miss Nadia O'Shea.

SHEVCHENKO AND SHAKESPEARE

Mr. Speaker, lately there have been some unwholesome editorials concerning the Shevchenko statue, which surpass anything most of us have read for their ignorance and intolerance. These inconsistent editorials scarcely do credit to a newspaper that prides itself for its liberal thought. Jefferson once said, "When the press is free and every man able to read, all is safe." In this sole case we wonder how free this press is when most of the letters replying to the vicious and intolerant attacks of its editorials are suppressed and not published. On November 14, my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, included these intemperate editorials in the RECORD. With reference to the first one on "Poetic Injustice," I wish to introduce here a typical, well-written, but unpublished letter to the editor of the Washington Post, titled "Shevchenko and Shakespeare."

SHEVCHENKO AND SHAKESPEARE

(By Vera A. Dowhan)

An editorial appeared in your paper entitled "Poetic Injustice" in which the writer expressed dismay over the act of erecting a statue in honor of Taras Shevchenko, while no such monument, in his opinion, exists for Shakespeare. It is also his opinion that Shevchenko is not known to the majority of Americans, and we therefore assume, not worthy of the honor of having a statue in the Nation's Capital. I should consequently like to offer some information about this great humanitarian and to make some pertinent comments.

Taras Shevchenko (1814–61) occupies undisputed first place in the pantheon of Ukrainian cultural creators as an unsurpassed poetic genius, gifted painter, thinker, and freedom fighter, which cannot be too often or too strongly emphasized. Of his 47 years, he lived 24 in serfdom, 10 in exile, 3½ under Russian police supervision, and only 9 as a free man. He was neither bloodthirsty nor was he a military man, gaining the title of freedom fighter through his pen. Endowed with a stupendous power in his use of words, he wrote sincerely from experience and knowledge, his words reflecting his neverending opposition to tyranny in all its forms. Throughout his works he championed the rights and liberties of all men. Shevchenko's contribution in writing reaches far beyond the Ukrainian ethnic and cultural boundaries. In opposing Russian tyranny he fought for the freedom, justice, and equality of not only the Ukrainian people but for all oppressed non-Russian peoples struggling for their God-given rights. He fought for Jews, Moslems, and other persecuted minorities under the power of the czarist regime of his time. Shevchenko was one of a whole group who signed a protest in defense of opposed Jewry. By signing his name, Shevchenko risked immediate retaliation by the police. His action was undeniably an act of moral courage.

Shevchenko's works have been translated into more than 40 languages, including Russian, Polish, Bulgarian, Serbian, Czech, German, French, Italian, and Swedish, besides English. "The Kobzar," a volume of poems, marked an epoch in modern Ukrainian literature and preserved for posterity the memory of the heroic deeds of the Ukrainian past. "Haydamaky" is his longest and greatest poem, a masterpiece of Ukrainian epic poetry. In this work he symbolized the struggle of the Ukrainian people against foreign oppression. In "The Caucasus" he sympathizes with the continuing sufferings of the human race in its struggle for liberty. "A Dream" is a satire in which he sees himself transplanted in a dream from Ukraine to St. Petersburg, witnessing the Ukrainian people's struggle for their rights and liberties. In "God's Fool" he expresses his yearning for Ukrainian independence and for a republican form of government patterned after that of the United States, in these lines:

> "Ah, you miserable
> And cursed crew, when will you
> breathe your last?
> When shall we get ourselves
> a Washington
> To promulgate his new and
> righteous law?
> But some day we shall surely
> find the man!"

"Testament" and "Neophytes" demonstrate Shevchenko's idea of love and mercy—the highest level of human sentiment. These are but a few of his works.

When Ira Aldridge, an American Negro, who was one of the most prominent Shakespearean actors of the time, appeared in the leading part of "Othello" in St. Petersburg, Shevchenko was present at the performance. He was overwhelmed by the great tragedian and, upon meeting, a deep friendship was cultivated between the two artists. They were often found together at the home of Count and Countess Feodor Tolstoy, a gathering place of cultured writers who appreciated the real value of art, literature, and freedom. The friendship of Shevchenko and Aldridge has been immortalized by Taras Shevchenko's noted pastel portrait of Ira Aldridge.

It may be true that, until the ceremonies of this past weekend, Shevchenko may not have been familiar to many American people, though he was indeed well known in literary circles. However, I feel that, as a result of the significance and prominence of this entire movement, Taras Shevchenko will at last take his rightful place in the literary world, and that Americans, too, will thirst for knowledge of this Ukrainian genius.

In providing the site for the Shevchenko statue in our Nation's Capital, the U.S. Congress and the Government have demonstrated their farsighted understanding and wisdom, and captive Ukrainian people with Ukrainians the world over will be ever thankful for this outstanding recognition. It seems only appropriate that a statue be erected in this city to Taras Shevchenko, who looked toward Washington in his struggle for freedom and independence for his people to be built on the same foundation as ours fortunately was. Over 1 million Americans of Ukrainian heritage have contributed in every conceivable manner toward this preservation of his memory.

I cannot agree that we do not yet have a comparable token to Shakespeare. We are fortunate to have here in Washington the Folger Shakespeare Library. This privately endowed library, opened in 1932, has the largest collection of Shakespeareana, being particularly proud of its Tudor and Stuart collections. Also, for the past 2 years, Washington has presented the summer Shakespeare Theater on the Washington Monument Grounds under the auspices of the District of Columbia Recreation Department, featuring both professional and local theater groups. The author of the previously mentioned article seems, therefore, to be unaware of the tributes which have already been made, and continue to be made, to William Shakespeare. No doubt more could be done. Yet, Shakespeare is primarily a literary figure. The statue of Taras Shevchenko will immortalize the struggle of the whole of mankind for freedom and will, I hope, provide inspiration to all people.

A LIVING SPIRIT OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

Despite Shevchenko's universal poetry and humanism, we must never lose sight of his paramount importance for us today. And that is his powerful symbolism of freedom. He is a living spirit not only for the 40 and more million Ukrainian people but also for all the captive nations in Europe and Asia. This chief point was well expounded in the address delivered by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky at the ground-breaking ceremony held on the Shevchenko Memorial site on September 21. Dr. Dobriansky, who is a professor of Soviet economics at Georgetown University and also president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, titled his address "Shevchenko, a Living Spirit of the Captive Nations." I wish to append this address to my remarks:

SHEVCHENKO, A LIVING SPIRIT OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

(An address by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor, Georgetown University, president, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America)

Reverend clergy, distinguished guests, and fellow Americans, as we today break this ground for the memorial honoring Taras Shevchenko, many of our fellow citizens throughout the land will doubtless crave to know more about this historic occasion in the order of who? when? what? and why?

Before our Representatives in the 86th Congress passed the Shevchenko memorial resolution—which is now Public Law 86-749—they, too, quite properly asked who? when? what? and why? The fact that we are solemnly assembled here today to make this indelible imprint in the annals of our Nation's history, suggests in itself the satisfaction with which the elected representatives of our people received the answers to these questions. Indeed, in its wisdom Congress determined that the 150th anniversary of the birth of Shevchenko—Europe's freedom fighter and champion of liberty—could nowhere be more appropriately observed than in the free environment of our Nation's Capital, the capital of the free world.

Who was Shevchenko? He was a Ukrainian, a serf, a poet, a painter, a patriot, a nationalist, a humanist. He was a contemporary of Lincoln the Emancipator and Marx the humanist, and like them despised slavery, oppression, Russian and other forms of imperialism and colonialism. He was the earliest of the freedom fighters in the czarist Russian empire—fighting for the freedom and independence of his Ukrainian nation, for the freedom of all other captive non-Russian nations in that empire, yes, even for the freedom and independence of the Russian nation from centuries of barbaric native rule, in substance the same as found in the Soviet Union today.

When did all this transpire? Living in the period of 1814-61, Shevchenko lived during the reigns of Alexander I, Nicholas I, and Alexander II—all of them able predecessors of this century's Soviet Russian imperiocolonialists, from Lenin to Khrushchev. Then, as now, historic non-Russian nations were under the heel of traditional Russian imperialism. Then, as now, Western Europe was under the threat of Russian expansion and domination. Then, as now, imperialist Russian penetration of our hemisphere was attempted, but perhaps with less success. Aside from the trappings of "The Third Rome," Pan-Slavism, and communism, the continuum of imperialist Russia's policy of conquest and colonial exploitation affected Shevchenko as it affects us today. His contemporary, Marx, the humanist, saw Russia as did he: "Its methods, its tactics, its maneuvers may change, but the polar star of its policy—world domination—is a fixed star."

Now what does Shevchenko mean to us Americans who have received him as our own? His poems and his prose, which stand as classics in world literature, have made him the poet laureate and national leader of Ukraine, the largest captive non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain today. Few nations of the world possess their own single poet laureate who has captured the soul and the heart of a complete nation.

His literature of freedom has three dimensions that reflect his own background as a serf, a patriotic nationalist, and a humanist; and each must not be confused with the other. As a serf, he knew oppression, poverty, and exploitation, and his pen labored in the defense of the rights of Jews, women, and the downtrodden, regardless of color, creed, or origin. As a patriotic Ukrainian, he saw his people under the foreign Russian yoke, and his pen labored in the defense of a nation to be free and independent. As a humanist, he had deep compassion for all mankind, and his pen labored in behalf of all the enslaved nations and peoples in Eastern Europe and central Asia.

Ponder well, my friends, these three dimensions: civil liberties and the detestation of exploitation and poverty; national self-determination and independence; and a humanistic interdependence of peoples. Despite much uncritical talk about liberalization in the Soviet Union today—in reality the primary Soviet Russian empire—on each of these levels the negation of freedom persists as it did in Shevchenko's time. The oppression of Jews, discrimination against dark-skinned central Asiatics, the continuous genocide of the Ukrainian Catholic and Orthodox churches, russification in the Baltic States and in the Caucasus, the absence of free press and free speech, Moscow's complete domination over the captive non-Russian republics and its colonial economic exploitation of their resources for global pursuits that have nothing to do with the basic aspirations and hopes of the non-Russian captives—these and many other negations of freedom scarcely add up to any substantive liberalization.

Why, then, do we honor Shevchenko in this capital of the free world? The answer to this should be obvious now. Shevchenko is not only of the past; he is very much steeped in the present and projected into the future. The memorial to be erected here will not only honor this early East European freedom fighter, upon whom our own American tradition rubbed off, but it will also be a tangible and everlasting expression of him as a living spirit of the captive nations today. It will be a monument to truth and freedom—to the truths about the captivity of the 45-million-Ukrainian nation, about the captivity of the many other captive non-Russian nations both within and outside the Soviet Union, about the truths of Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism, about the freedom and independence drives of all these captive peoples, who truly are our natural allies in this titanic struggle between a communism-masked imperialist system and the free forces of the world.

In his American University address last June the President said: "Let us reexamine our attitude toward the Soviet Union." In the spirit of Shevchenko we agree. Let's begin to see it for what it is—not a nation, not a normal and conventional state, but a basic colonial empire of over a dozen captive non-Russian nations. Before the U.N. General Assembly in September 1961, the President stressed: "Let us debate colonialism in full—and apply the principle of free choice and the practice of free plebiscites in every part of the globe." Again, in the spirit of Shevchenko, we agree. Let us as free and courageous men do it. For, as so often in the past, only disaster will befall those who would accommodate, by the approval of silence, the Soviet Russian imperiocolonial system that extends from the Danube to the Pacific and into Cuba. Shevchenko, like his contemporary, Abraham Lincoln, also knew that mankind cannot remain half slave and half free. His monument here will thus be a memorial not of past deeds or even of present inspiration as much as of the future and its liberation and independence of the Ukraine and all the captive nations.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. McDowell, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. Saylor, for 45 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Pucinski, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Morris (at the request of Mr. Haley), for 60 minutes, on Monday, November 25, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Dent.
Mr. Taft.
Mr. Pelly.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 103. Joint resolution to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the work of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, November 25, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1383. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1964 in the amount of $3,014,235 for the legislative branch and $92,687,000 for the executive branch (H. Doc. No. 174); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1384. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of the orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1385. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POOL: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 5128. A bill to extend the benefits of the civil service retirement and group life and health insurance programs to certain legislative employees, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 915). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Twelfth report of the Committee on Government Operations on military construction projects (Rept. No. 916). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H.R. 9210. A bill to authorize modification of the existing project for the Manasquan River and Inlet, N.J., in the interest of navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 9211. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 9212. A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 9213. A bill to promote ethical standards of conduct among Members of Congress and officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 9214. A bill to prohibit any guarantee by the Export-Import Bank or any other agency of the Government of payment of obligations of Communist countries; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 9215. A bill to prohibit any guarantee by the Export-Import Bank or any other agency of the Government of payment of obligations of Communist countries; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.R. 9216. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose additional duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year in excess of annual quotas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELTNER:

H.R. 9217. A bill to amend section 7701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax status of certain professional associations and corporations formed under State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 9218. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 with respect to voting rights of producer cooperatives; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 9219. A bill for the relief of Szmul Icek Cynowicz, Frida Cynowicz and Ora Cynowicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 9220. A bill for the relief of Elisabete Maria Fonseca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 9221. A bill for the relief of Constantine George Xindaris and his wife, Ismini Xindaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

461. The SPEAKER presented a petition of John Kennedy, Cadiz, Spain, relative to a redress of grievance relating to action taken by the Veterans' Administration and legal guardian which forced him to lose a large sum of money, which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Cruel Hoax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 21, 1963

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States has great responsibilities to the unemployed millions of our Nation. The fulfillment of these responsibilities was placed in jeopardy by the recent disclosure of irregularities in the Cleveland, Ohio, office of the Ohio State Employment Service—OSES. The problem involves the Federal Government because Federal funds are used to pay the expenses of the operation of OSES.

Reports from Cleveland indicate that it was common knowledge that job placement records were being altered. Eight people signed affidavits admitting that they falsified records. One person admitted giving orders to alter the records. Nothing in the record suggests that the Cleveland incident is an isolated case. On the contrary, there is reason to suspect that the "Cleveland techniques" are being used in other local offices from coast to coast. The falsification of records existing in even one office is an intolerable situation and represents a cruel hoax upon the people who turn to Government service personnel and place their confidence in the U.S. Employment Service and affiliated State agencies.

The circumstances surrounding this specific case justify a congressional investigation to determine the degree such practices are common to the USES in all parts of the United States. In the House of Representatives, jurisdiction of Department of Labor matters rests with the Education and Labor Committee. Therefore, today I have sent a letter to the chairman, the Honorable ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, requesting the Special Subcommittee on Labor be authorized to conduct an extensive investigation into the operations of the USES offices. A comprehensive report by such a subcommittee would allow Congress to fulfill its responsibilities in this field.

Earlier this year I introduced a bill which would take USES off college campuses, where it does not belong. It is my firm belief that USES should stay in the field for which it was created—that of helping the unemployed in this country find jobs.

Hundreds of millions of dollars have been appropriated annually to aid the unemployed. Congress has tried to attack this problem through training programs, educational programs, and insurance programs, and there is no room for "featherbedding" on agency staff jobs when the stakes are so high. Every single dollar should be spent to aid those in need.

The citizens of Ohio are not proud of what has happened in our State, but they look to the Congress as well as the State to guarantee that such shenanigans will not be tolerated in Ohio or any other State. The employees of a governmental agency have deceived both the Congress and the people who pay the bill.

The letter to Representative POWELL follows:

NOVEMBER 21, 1963.

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Recently there have been stories in the press about the Cleveland office of the U.S. Employment Service falsifying its records to maintain a larger staff.

With the unemployment problem in the United States today being of prime concern to all of us, it is vital that agencies such as USES concern themselves with fighting this important problem, not with the building up of their own bureaucracy. The situation in Cleveland should be explored and therefore I am asking you to authorize an investigation by the Special Subcommittee on Education and Labor. I would suggest that the subcommittee attempt to determine the degree to which such practices are common to the USES offices all over the country and then to submit a report to the full committee containing their findings and recommendations.

I know you share my views that it is the duty of the Congress to keep a watchful eye on all departments and agencies of the Government, and, therefore, I urge you to authorize the inauguration of such an investigation immediately.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT TAFT, Jr.

Law Is No Assurance of Prior Congressional Approval to Disarmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 21, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss one aspect of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act.

During the debate on S. 777, the legislation to authorize funds for the Agency and amend the act, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. MORGAN] in his opening statement said that there is no way in which the Disarmament Agency or the President can obligate the United States to disarm or reduce its Armed Forces without congressional approval. He said this was clearly stated in section 33 of the act.

The ranking minority members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON] spoke in the same vein. She

told the House that the United States has not entered into any agreements obligating the United States to disarm. She said under section 33 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act no such action could be taken without prior congressional approval and she quoted from the law which reads:

> That no action shall be taken under this or any other law that will obligate the United States to disarm or to reduce or to limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States, except pursuant to the treatymaking power of the President under the Constitution, or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, in the debate on the bill I indicated that I disagreed, spelling out the fact that this provision gave no assurance Congress would be consulted, because an international executive agreement, unlike a treaty, requires no advice or consent of the Senate. Whereupon Mrs. BOLTON agreed, saying that ever since 1933 we have had all too many agreements and not enough treaties.

Mr. Speaker, the existing Arms Control and Disarmament Act—and I repeat this—states that no action shall be taken under this or any other law that would obligate the United States to disarm or to reduce or to limit our Armed Forces or armaments except pursuant to the treatymaking power of the President under the Constitution, or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by Congress.

What has concerned me, as I explained in my colloquy with Mrs. BOLTON is whether a Chief Executive would ever follow that provision of law but instead would execute an executive agreement which does not require congressional approval. I explained what has happened under section 205 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act which likewise provides that a program of international space cooperation must have advice and consent of the Senate. However, as I said, when President Eisenhower signed that act in 1958 he stated that he regarded this provision merely as recognizing that international treaties may be made in this field. He said this did not preclude less formal arrangements for cooperation.

In this connection, the Space Administration in answer to my inquiry has said that the legal determination would be up to the Department of State as to the form of an arrangement. It could be under section 205 with Senate approval or by executive agreement not requiring such approval.

As a matter of fact all NASA cooperative projects with other nations to date have been without Senate advice and consent.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I very much doubt if section 3 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act has or will have much influence on our Department of State.

I believe, of course, when Congress writes a law calling for a treaty or for congressional approval, a President should follow it, but Presidents are jealous of their prerogatives. However, Congress does have power to limit use of administrative funds so an appropriation bill can be effective unless it comes too late. That is why, when President Kennedy suggested a joint venture with the Soviet Union for a lunar landing, I introduced an amendment to the space appropriation bill limiting the use of funds for that purpose unless such a program first had been approved by Congress. I did not want to wake up some morning and find some arrangement for such an expensive and unwise venture was an accomplished fact under an executive agreement.

I wish there was some real safeguard in the Disarmament Act. Frankly, I am fearful many persons and Members of Congress erroneously may feel that section 33 contains such a safeguard.

The extension of the Arms Control Act as passed yesterday, in my opinion, contain some new limitations which meet with my approval but I want to restate what I said during debate with regard to the requirement of congressional approval of an international agreement. The fact is this provision could be meaningless. Let us not delude ourselves about that.

Tribute to Gen. David M. Shoup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 21, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in paying tribute to a great marine—Gen. David M. Shoup—who will soon retire after 38 years of duty.

General Shoup has been a Marine officer since 1926 and has a truly remarkable record of service culminating in his nomination and service as the 22d Commandant of the Marine Corps. He has taken on a bewildering variety of assignments and has superbly performed each one.

Less than a year after becoming a Marine officer and while attending a Marine Corps school, he was assigned to an expeditionary force in Tientsin, China. Later he served in the Marine detachment on the U.S.S. *Maryland* which, 12 years later, was to provide fire support for an assault which he himself commanded.

His assignments during the 1930's included further duty in China, at Shanghai and with the U.S. legation in Peiping, and a number of duties at home. He was a company officer at San Diego, an instructor at Quantico, and he served on temporary duty with the Civilian Conservation Corps.

With the coming of World War II it was inevitable that General Shoup would be in the thick of action. Even before the Pearl Harbor attack he was decorated for service with the 1st Marine Brigade in Iceland.

We all know of the great record of the Marine Corps in the Pacific theater, and General Shoup personally helped to make it one of the great military campaigns in history. General Shoup became operations and training officer, and then commander of the 2d Marine Division as it prepared for the assault on the Tarawa Atoll. During the period of training in New Zealand he was an observer of an Army assault in New Georgia, receiving the Purple Heart for wounds received.

On November 20, 1943, 20 years ago, General Shoup went into action with his own division. He had not recovered from his previous wound, and was wounded again going ashore at Tarawa. But for 2 days he led the attack, exposing himself to fire, against fanatic opposition. During this attack he showed tactical skill and daring, and what every fighting marine would like to be remembered for, the ability to lead men in offensive combat. The Congressional Medal of Honor that he earned was the 25th of the war for the Marines. Subsequently he saw action at Saipan and Tinian.

After the war and up to the time of his assignment in 1959 to the highest post in the Marine Corps, General Shoup again performed a wide variety of duties, at home and abroad, including such jobs as logistics officer, commanding officer of the Pacific force, division chief of staff, basic training school commander, Fiscal Director, and Inspector General of the Marine Corps. During his career, General Shoup has commanded the 1st, 2d, and 3d Marine Divisions.

Judging from this record we can assume that General Shoup's retirement will be active and productive. He deserves our lasting gratitude for a job well done.

President Kennedy in Tampa, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 21, 1963

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, November 18, 1963, President Kennedy visited my congressional district. He is the first President of the United States to appear in the Tampa Bay area of Florida while President.

President Kennedy's visit was enthusiastically received by a very large turnout, probably numbering into the hundreds of thousands.

While in Tampa, the President addressed four gatherings. One of these was the Florida State Chamber of Commerce, composed of leading businessmen from throughout the State. During his appearance before the chamber of commerce he delivered a speech saying that his administration is neither probusiness nor antibusiness, but pro-the-public interest. He called for the passage of a tax cut as has been previously passed by this House and discussed four questions that he said are frequently asked him by the business community. At the conclusion of his formal address he answered questions proposed from the floor, touching on such questions as the civil rights bill now pending in the House.

For those who were unable to hear his address, I wish to insert at this point in the RECORD a verbatim transcript of his speech and of the question and answer period that followed his speech.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S ADDRESS TO THE FLORIDA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm delighted to be here at this distinguished gathering. I came at the suggestion of the senior Senator of Florida—Senator (GEORGE A.) SMATHERS who represents this State with distinction and also his—of course the majority whip in the Senate and therefore speaks for the United States.

So, I'm glad to come here as the son of two citizens of Florida—my mother and father—come here with your Governor, Farris Bryant, who has helped make the decisions which I think will make progress in Florida possible not only now but in the future.

And I'm glad particularly to be here with this group who played such a leading role—Tom Flemming and others—in securing the passage of the bonds which will make it possible for Florida to have the kind of educational system which is necessary for leadership in this State and country.

I said before and in the presence once of the Governor that I felt that the extraordinary progress which California had made in many technical and engineering fields was due to the emphasis which that State had put on higher education.

COMMENDS SCHOOL PLAN

And I think the effort which this State is making to make your schools and colleges and universities as good as they possibly can be, to make it possible for you to take care of the twice as many boys and girls who will be trying to get into our colleges in 1970 as were in 1960 because this group which ordinarily might not be regarded as free spenders supported this great State effort. I want to commend you.

A little more than 1 year ago, when our bill to grant a tax credit for business investment was before the Congress, Secretary of the Treasury Dillon was on a plane to this State, and he found himself talking to one of the leading Florida businessmen about the investment tax credit.

He spent some time, he later told me, explaining how the bill would help this man's corporate outlook and income, and the businessman was most impressed.

And, finally, as the plane landed at Miami, he turned to Secretary Dillon and said:

"I'm very grateful to you for explaining the bill. Now, tell me just once more, why is it I'm against it?"

That story is unfortunately not an exaggeration. Many businessmen who are prospering as never before during this administration are convinced, nevertheless, that we must be antibusiness.

With the new figures on corporate profits after taxes having reached an alltime high—running some 43 percent higher than they were just 3 years ago—they still suspect us of being opposed to private profit.

With the most stable price level of any comparable economic recovery in our history, they still fear that we're promoting inflation.

RECOUNTS PROGRAM

We have liberalized depreciation guidelines to grant more individual flexibility, reduced our farm surpluses, reduced transportation taxes, established a private corporation to manage our satellite communications system, increased the role of American business in the development of less developed countries, and proposed to the Congress a sharp reduction in corporate, as well as personal income taxes, and a major deregulation of transportation.

And yet many businessmen are convinced that a Democratic administration is out to soak the rich, increase controls for the sake of controls and extend at all costs the scope of the Federal bureaucracy.

The hard facts contradict these doubts. This administration is interested in the healthy expansion of our economy. We are interested in the steady progress of our society. And it is in this kind of program in my opinion in which American business has the largest stake.

Why is it that profits are at an alltime high in the Nation today? It is because the Nation as a whole is prospering.

It is because our gross national product is rising from $500 to $600 billion, a record rise of $100 billion in 3 years—36 months.

It is because industrial production in the last 3 years has increased 22 percent and personal income by 15 percent.

It is because, as the Wall Street Journal pointed out last week, the United States now leads most of Western Europe in the rate of business expansion for the first time in many years. In the last 18 months, our gross rate exceeded that of France or Germany.

It is because, as Fortune magazine recently pointed out, corporate profits in America are now rising much faster than corporate profits overseas.

It is because these profits have not been eaten up by an inflationary spiral and finally it is because we have reversed the dismal trend toward even more frequent recessions, which are the greatest enemy of profits.

By next April, with the indispensable help of the pending tax cut bill, the United States will be sailing with the winds of the longest and strongest peacetime economic expansion in our Nation's entire history.

I do not say that all this is due to the administration alone, but neither is it all accidental.

The fiscal and monetary policies which we have followed are the key element in whether the economy moves toward a path of expansion or restriction. In the last 3 years American business and industry have directly benefited from a host of our legislative and administrative actions which increased corporate cash flow, increased markets at home and abroad, increased consumer purchasing power and increased plant modernization and productivity.

And still other steps have been taken to curb the wage-price spiral—the first 6 months of 1963 there was less time lost in strikes than any time since the Second World War—to hold down the cost of credit and to bring more harmony into industrial relations.

I do not say that these actions were taken for the benefit of business alone; they were taken to benefit the country. Some of them were labeled probusiness, some of them were labeled antibusiness, some of them were labeled both by opposing groups. But that kind of label is meaningless. This administration is pro-the-public-interest.

Nor do I say that all these policies could please all American businessmen all of the time. So long as the interests and views of businessmen frequently clash with each other, no President could possibly please them all.

Most businessmen, though perhaps not most business spokesmen, are associated with small business. They ask the Government for assistance—to protect them against monopoly, to assure them of reasonable credit, to enable them to participate in defense contracts. And both large and small business work with the various arms of the administration every day on trade, transportation, procurement, balance of payments, and international business affairs.

They do not show the hostility which is so often described, or find that our policies and personnel are so incompatible with their own.

Businessmen are welcome at the White House. And I welcome the chance to address business meetings such as this. Not because I expect that it will necesasrily affect the results of elections, but I do think, I do think it can affect what this country does and how it moves ahead and whether we're going to be able to find jobs for all the people that need them, and whether we're going to build the kind of a country in which all of us can take pride and credit. And that's the kind of cooperative effort which I invite from businessmen and from other interested citizens.

QUESTIONS ANSWERED

If we can keep open the channels of communication this country can make progress ahead. To further that understanding I would like to answer four questions that I'm most frequently asked by businessmen or written about or written to.

The first and most frequently asked question is:

Is the Federal Government growing so large that our private economy is endangered?

My answer to that is no. The Federal Government has been growing for 175 years. Our population has grown even faster. Our territory and economy have grown and become more closely linked.

The size of our business, labor, farm, and other establishments and organizations has grown. Above all, our responsibilities around the world have grown, and our stake in the world peace has grown immeasurably.

Life itself is more complex. And the American people in the 20th century have come to expect more from governmental action. But there has been no sudden spurt in the growth of Government under this administration.

Leaving national security outlays aside, Federal civilian expenditures today, when measured, as they should be measured in a growing economy, as a percentage of our national output, are no higher than they were at the end of the Second World War. A mere 5 percent of our gross national product is not a threat to our economy.

The real growth, and this will not come as a surprise to your Governor, the real growth in government has been at the State and local levels. Between 1948 and 1962, while Federal civilian expenditures were rising by 65 percent, State spending, on the average across this country, rose by 227 percent, from less than $10 billion in 1948 to over $30 billion in 1962.

RISE BY STATES

Florida's State expenditures in that same period rose by 270 percent, or more than four times as fast percentagewise as the Federal budget; Georgia by 331 percent; Ohio by 300 percent; Kentucky by 431 percent.

The Federal Government has no desire to expand the size and scope of its activities merely for the sake of expansion. Many tasks could never have been taken on by the Congress had they been able to have been fulfilled at the State and local levels.

And this administration has made efforts to transfer to private ownership many of the financial assets held by the Government, to substitute private for public credit, to reduce farm surpluses, to dispose of excess commodities and to make our transportation system less restrictive. This is a far cry, I believe, from a government too big for the economy.

"NO" ON DEBT AS DISASTER

And secondly, I am asked, are not continuing deficits and the mounting national debt certain to drive us into bankruptcy? And my answer to that is "No."

Once again we must look at these facts in perspective. From 1948 to 1962 the total Federal debt increased less than 20 percent. We had the Korean war, all our obligations abroad, a tremendously growing country, tremendously growing population. The Federal debt grew by less than 20 percent while the average for all the States was 500 percent.

But taking only the 4 years from 1958 to 1962 the Federal debt rose only 8 percent while State debt as a whole went up 41 percent.

Obviously, neither the States nor the Nation are teetering on the edge of bankruptcy as the result of these debts. In 1945 our national debt was 120 percent of our gross national product. Today it's 53 percent. Next year it will be 52 percent.

At a time when our debt has gone up by the percentage I have described our gross national product is double, and therefore as this country moves to a trillion-dollar economy, which we're moving toward, quite obviously as long as we maintain these proportions, the fiscal credit of the United States will still be secure. While the Federal net debt was growing less than 20 percent in these years, total corporate debt, not my debt, your debt, was growing by nearly 200 percent and the total indebtedness of private individuals rose by 300 percent. So who is the most cautious fiscal manager?

You, gentlemen, or us?

CALLS FOR TAX CUT

It is true that the pending tax cut will add to this debt by temporarily reducing Federal revenues, but the purpose of the tax cut is not to produce a deficit but to boost the economy. A full employment economy is the only way to balance the budget. A recession-ridden economy—recessions occurring every 24 or 30 or 32 months, on the other hand, are a guarantee of chronic higher deficits and continually deeper debt.

We must remember that in 1958 President Eisenhower sent up a budget to the Hill which was balanced in surplus by a half a billion dollars. A a result of the deficit of the recession of 1958 that budget ended up that year unbalanced $12.5 billion.

The greatest enemy of the balanced budget is a recession and it is to prevent a recession and to provide for economic growth and provide for the jobs for the 10 million people who are coming into the labor market in the next 2½ years that I strongly believe in the tax cut very quickly, and not too far away.

And third, I am asked why can't this administration cut Federal expenditures. And my answer is that we have cut. I recommended an additional $620 million in reduction in this year's budget since first submitting it last January. Domestic civilian expenditures—excluding national defense, space, and interest on the debt—domestic civilian expenditures were budgeted below the level of last year, a feat rarely accomplished in the last 15 years.

CONTRACTS SPENDING

Once 16 percent larger than State and local expenditures, our Federal civilian expenditures are now 43 percent smaller. What all this suggests is not that the States have been less prudent than we've been but this country is growing and the needs are growing.

You here in Florida and this chamber know it very well, or you wouldn't have supported a $75 million debt obligation on the people of Florida. You can't tell the children of this State that they can't go to college in 1970 because you didn't take the decisions in 1963 and what we're trying to do in this State is what we're trying to do across the country.

What we have to do is be prudent, responsible, selective, make our judgments about what is really necessary and valuable and what can be put aside. That, it seems to me, is the essence of responsible management by the National Government, by the State government, by the local community, and by private business.

We reduced the number of Federal employees serving every 1,000 people in this country. There are no more people today working for the Federal Government than there were 10 years ago. Federal employment has not increased in the last 10 years. There are less people working today for the Federal Government than there were a year ago, but it will go up, because this country grows. The question is, in what proportion. But I can assure you that there will be less Federal employees serving every 1,000 people next year than there were this year.

PENTAGON SAVINGS

Secretary McNamara has instituted cost reductions, for example, in the Pentagon which will save a billion dollars a year, and finally save $4 billion a year. We are constantly reexamining these programs to determine what can be done.

But many of those who call for larger expenditures are forgetting the growth of our population and the complexities of our problems. And economy advocates from Florida are not opposed to the cross-Florida barge canal, which was so strongly supported by your Governor and by me, or the State's effort at Cape Canaveral or the Tampa Air Force Fuel Annex.

They talk instead about midwestern feed grain programs and far western reclamation projects. But out West the economizers talk about the Tampa Air Force Fuel Annex, and so the argument goes on across the country.

And fourth, and finally, the question arises, will the fiscal policies of the Government lead to inflation? And my answer to that is no. The danger of inflation arises when the level of total and private demand presses against our productive capacity. We are far from that today. Total output in this country would have to increase by $30 billion to reduce unemployment to 4 percent. Our productive plant, still, as all of you know, is still well below what you could produce operating at maximum capacity. Idle men and machines allow plenty of room for decreased taxes and increased demand without the risk of inflation.

The tax cut, moreover, can be expected to stimulate productivity and growth and thus add to our productive potential, lessening the danger of inflation. It's long been believed that a budget deficit automatically means inflation. The facts indicate otherwise.

INFLATION FEAR DISCOUNTED

The record peacetime deficit of 1959 produced no inflation then or subsequently, nor have the deficits of recent years. In fact, most of our post-war inflation occurred in the year of budget surpluses, 1947, 1948, 1951, 1956, and 1957. Recent scattered price increases have caused concern and stimulated fear that expanded demand would lead to inflation. But the wholesale price index so far shows little or no reflection of these increases.

Some prices have been reduced and most prices have not moved. Many of the increases have been in the price of raw materials, which have declined, and inasmuch as the trend of such prices have been stable or downward for a number of years, some recovery is not unexpected. But the abundance of the world's raw materials would indicate that even here we do not have to fear serious inflationary pressures.

QUOTES DICKENS

Moreover, the current remarkable stability of labor costs per unit of output clearly indicates that such price increases as have occurred do not reflect a general upward surge of costs.

I realize that there are some businessmen who feel only they want to be left alone—that Government and politics are none of their affairs—that the balance sheet and profit rate of their own corporations are of more importance than the worldwide balance of power or the nationwide rate of unemployment, but I hope it's not rushing the season to recall to you the passage from Dickens' Christmas Carol in which Ebenezer Scrooge is terrified by the ghost of his former partner, Jacob Marley. And Scrooge, appalled by Marley's story of ceaseless wandering, cries out, "But you were always a good man of business, Jacob." And the ghost of Marley, his legs bound by a chain of ledger books and cash boxes, replied:

"Business? Mankind was my business. The common welfare was my business. Charity, mercy, forbearance, and benevolence were all my business. The dealings of my trade were but a drop of water in the comprehensive ocean of my business."

Members and guests of the Florida State Chamber of Commerce, whether we work in the White House or the State House, or in a house of industry, or commerce, mankind is our business and if we work in harmony, if we understand the problems of each other and the responsibilities that each of us bears, then surely the business of mankind will prosper, and your children and mine will move ahead in a secure world, and one in which there is opportunity for them all.

Thank you.

QUESTION-AND-ANSWER PERIOD

Question. (By James H. Covey, Jr., president of Greater Tampa Chamber of Commerce.)

Answer. Mr. President, as you can see, we have an avalanche of questions.

[Question not heard because of interruption on air.]

We have, however, in association with other countries of this hemisphere joined together in an attempt to isolate the bias of communism and in that regard he have achieved some measure of success. Only five countries in this hemisphere now recognize Cuba. In 1959 the trade of the free world with Cuba was about $1.3 billion. Now, in 1963, there has been an 80 percent reduction in that trade. There has been, for example, in the first 10 months of 1963, a 60 percent reduction as compared to 1962 of the number of free registry, free-world-registered ships, and now with the recent order put out by the Greek Government, which, with British traders, were the great free world traders with Cuba, we're going to find a further sharp reduction.

In addition, while there is a good deal of discontent and turmoil and danger in Latin America, I do not think that there is any doubt that Fidel Castro as a symbol of revolt in this hemisphere has faded badly. Every survey, every report and I think every newspaperman, every publisher would agree, that because Mr. Castro has embraced the Soviet Union and become—and made Cuba its satellite, that the appeal he had in the late fifties and early sixties as a national revolutionary has been badly damaged and scarred.

THE WHEAT DEAL

Question. How will the recent wheat deal with Russia affect our economy and would it lessen the U.S. problem of surplus grain?

Answer. Yes, it would. Even though—even with the deal, if it goes and it amounts to 2.5 to 3 million tons, we would still have a surplus of 750 million bushels of wheat, which is still a substantial surplus. But it would affect—we now carry about a billion, and of course we pay the charges for the maintenance of that surplus. In addition, if the sale were consummated we would provide $200 million to our balance-of-payments account, which is important. It would make our carrying charges of our surplus less; it would provide a higher price for wheat, which otherwise would be depressed because of excess production next year. And therefore, if we can work the deal out—and that still is in question—I'm for it.

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Question. Thank you, Mr. President. What is the outlook for your civil rights program and, sir, why are you pushing it so vigorously?

Answer. I think that—first, I think that—while I know that this program has not gotten great support here in Florida, I think you gentlemen should recognize the responsibility of the President of the United States. His responsibility is different from what your responsibility may be. This country—I carry out and execute the laws of the United States; I also have the obligation of implementing the orders of the courts of the United States, and I can assure you that whoever is President of the United States, he will do the same, because if he did not, he would begin to unwind this most extraordinary constitutional system of ours. So I believe strongly in fulfilling my oath in that regard.

Now, we have proposed legislation, the most controversial section of which deals with so-called public accommodations. The bill which came out of the judiciary committee which is now before the—going to be before the House shortly, has the following provisions in it on public accommodations.

It provides that lunch counters shall be open to all citizens regardless of their race, their creed, or their color. And so shall hotels, motels, theaters except in the case of rooming houses where they are owner-occupied and with 6 rooms or less. Now, you gentlemen may not regard that—you may regard it as an intrusion on your property rights, but you should remember that over 33 States stretching back to 1875 had provisions like this. Many States have much stronger provisions.

In addition, some States have provisions making segregation compulsory, which is not new, and I really believe that after the events of the past 6 months that all of us regardless of our own personal views, must recognize that if we're going to have domestic tranquillity, if we're going to see that our citizens are treated as I would like to be treated and as you would like to be treated—that they have to meet a standard of conduct and behavior but they're not automatically excluded from the benefits which other citizens enjoy merely because of their race, their creed, or their color.

It is my view of what our responsibility is in 1963. The Congress, of course, must make the final judgment. What the Congress passes I will execute. We will know in the next 2 or 3 months what judgment the Congress will reach. But I believe that it's going to be with us long after I've disappeared from the scene. No country has ever faced a more difficult problem than attempting to bring 10 percent of the population of a different color, educate them, give them a chance for a job, give them a chance for a fair life. That's my objective, and I think it is the objective of the United States, as I have always understood it.

CANDIDACY IN 1964

Question. Thank you, Mr. President. Sir, I think about half of the people here would like to know when will you announce that you're a candidate for the presidential election of 1964.

Answer. Well, I don't know which half.

Question. You have nothing to say on this about that?

Answer. I was a candidate so early in 1959 I'd keep it and——

Question. Mr. President would you comment on the scope and role of the proposed Domestic Peace Corps?

Answer. Well, I'm not sure Congress is going to pass it. It only passed the Senate by a very close vote. What our hope was that—there are so many places in mental institutions, Indian reservations, parts of eastern Kentucky, for example, where there are high unemployment rates, where counties don't even have food distributed. There are some of our islands in the Pacific where we, for example, have had a bad epidemic of paralytic polio which could have been avoided—it seems to me—if perhaps the Government had been more alert.

But there are these areas that sort of—poverties—islands of poverty in the United States and it was our hope that we could enlist men and women of any age to serve perhaps a year or two at very limited compensation and that they would inspire others in the community working with the voluntary associations and with the local government and the State government and the National Government to try to serve as a catalyst to try to do here at home what the Peace Corps is doing abroad. It's new, we may not get it now, but we will sometime, because I don't think that there's any doubt that there's a strong streak of idealism in this country, a strong desire to serve and as long as we're going to serve in the far corners of the world, I think we also might give them a chance to serve here at home.

Question. Because, sir, that your schedule is a tight one and because you answered so many questions in your remarks, I would, this one is from a little girl who asks, simply, Why didn't you bring Caroline?

Answer. Well, she liked it as the White House, but, we're getting used to Florida. I want to express my thanks to all of you. You've been very generous and I hope that—I'm very grateful to you for your invitation. I hope that any time you have any thoughts about how we can improve our operations that you write and that if you don't write to me that you will write to Senator SMATHERS because I find that he disposes of the messages very quickly from Florida. Thank you.

SENATE

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 1963

(Legislative day of Tuesday, October 22, 1963)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all men, in all our groping amid the mists of the valley of doubt, we turn to Thee as to the shadow of a great rock in a weary land. In this and every moment of sincere devotion, may there come to us, as alone we face Thee, the solemn realization that we cannot make ourselves one with other men until there is no happiness of others in which we are not glad, nor any wound of others in which we are not hurt, and that, whether we will or not, we are in very truth members one of another in this strange bundle of humanity.

In these changing days, when on the earth Thou art making all things new, deliver us, we pray, from the web of outgrown precedents and from the sophistries of mere party shibboleths. May those who within these walls grapple with the thorny problems of this generation, girded by Thy might, find the courage to fly, the urgency to run, and the patience to walk.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, November 21, 1963, was dispensed with.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, it was ordered that there be a morning hour, with statements limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with that of William P. Bundy, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with that in the Department of Defense, will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William P. Bundy, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert H. Charles, of Missouri, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

THE MARINE CORPS AND THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps and in the Navy, which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

CONSIDERATION ON MONDAY OF NOMINATION OF PAUL H. NITZE TO BE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, it is anticipated that, barring unforeseen events, it is quite possible that the nomination of Paul H. Nitze, of Maryland, to be Secretary of the Navy will be brought up around the hour of 2:30 on Monday next.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

S. 1533. A bill to amend the act of July 24, 1956, granting a franchise to D.C. Transit System, Inc. (Rept. No. 655);

S. 1964. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, to increase the fee charged for learners' permits (Rept. No. 654); and

S. 2054. A bill to eliminate the maintenance by the District of Columbia of perpetual accounts for unclaimed moneys held in trust by the government of the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 653).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

S. 1024. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay relocation costs made necessary by actions of the District of Columbia government, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 652).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

S. 1406. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Junior College Division within the District of Columbia Teachers College, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 656).

By Mr. HARTKE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

H.R. 3190. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, relating to devises and bequests by will (Rept. No. 657).

By Mr. HARTKE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

H.R. 4276. An act to provide for the creation of horizontal property regimes in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 658).

By Mr. McINTYRE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

H.R. 3191. An act to exempt life insurance companies from the act of February 4, 1913, regulating loaning of money on securities in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 650); and

H.R. 7497. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia relating to annual statements and for other purposes (Rept. No. 651).

By Mr. McINTYRE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

H.R. 5338. An act to enact the Uniform Commercial Code for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 649).

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN BYRNES AND MORTGAGE GUARANTY INSURANCE CORP. STOCK

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in my judgment Representative John Byrnes emerges from the Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Corp. development as a man whose honor and honesty have been sorely tested and has met the test with flying colors, and he has earned the right to have his denial of any wrongdoing in the MGIC case believed fully.

On Thursday he said he did not know at the time he purchased unlisted and rarely traded MGIC stock that he was buying it at a privileged low price.

Certainly his more than 20 years of unblemished and honorable service in responsible public office in Madison and Washington entitle him to have his solemn word believed.

Representative Byrnes' action in donating the entire profit from this stock, more than $20,000, to a scholarship fund in Green Bay represents an extraordinary sacrifice for a man of modest means.

All the top public officials in this country who have never made mistakes could easily have a convention in any convenient telephone booth without crowding it.

What shows the real character of a man is not the impulsive, unguarded mistake he may make on inadequate information, but his reaction to that mistake. In this case, Representative Byrnes has reacted magnificently.

As a citizen of Wisconsin, I am proud of what John Byrnes has done. I say this as one who has clashed vigorously with Mr. Byrnes in past political campaigns. My confrontation with him in the 1958 campaign, that culminated in a 1-hour television debate in Green Bay, was one of the toughest and bitterest in my experience; and I anticipate that we shall continue to clash and disagree in the future, for he is a militant and highly partisan Republican, and I am proud to be a Democrat.

But his long and always honorable career, his statement of Thursday, and his action in donating so much of his assets to education should convince any reasonable man of good will that John Byrnes is a man of integrity.

At a time when the morality of Congress is undergoing serious and proper inquiry, the statement and action of Representative Byrnes should help to restore a measure of respect for Congress, because of the realization that it has a Congressman who has the sensitive conscience to respond with the sense of honor that John Byrnes has demonstrated.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] made a statement, the other day, on television, in response to a question asking whether, in his judgment, morality in the country and in the Congress was declining. The Senator from Illinois is a man of fine ethical standards and has a vast knowledge of history. He said that, in his judgment, morality has without question improved.

If we compare these times with any period of history, it is clear that morality is indeed on the upswing; and I think it is also clear that there is frank recognition of the necessity for a high standard of morality in the Government and in Congress. I believe that Congress and our American society with all our serious problems deserves to be put into an honest and realistic perspective and not constantly downgraded and criticized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, speaking for myself, in my judgment the maudlin performance yesterday in the House of Representatives only lacked Nixon's dog "Checkers." It only adds up to the fact, so far as I am concerned, that someone was caught with his hand in the cookie jar, and now wants the American people to believe that he was taking the cookies only for children and the benefit of charity.

THE WORK OF THE SENATE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, this morning there appears in the press an article which includes the following:

> The debate over "what's wrong with Congress" broke out again in the Senate yesterday, but there were only two or three Senators around to hear it.

The headline of the article indicates that this legislative position developed because of Senate absenteeism, including absences yesterday.

I was not in the Chamber at the time in question.

I started at 6 o'clock yesterday morning to work on a statement to be made on the Senate floor today on the problem of the unfavorable balance of payments.

I then went to my office, took many phone calls, and rushed through as much of the mail as possible, until a meeting of the Senate Armed Services Committee at 10 o'clock. At that time it was necessary for me to be on hand promptly to present to the committee one of my constituents who has accepted a position at the secretariat level in the Department of Defense.

As soon as that meeting was over, I went to the hearing on education of the Aeronautics and Space Committee, to listen to Director Webb and Dr. Wiesner testify on the impact of education in the NASA program.

This meeting lasted until lunch, at which time I met with some constituents, to discuss the statement in question. This lunch was interrupted several times by rollcall votes, which I answered.

As a result, I was somewhat late to keep two scheduled office engagements; and at 2:30, at the request of one of my senior colleagues, I chaired the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Senate Appropriations Committee, where I was at the time of the colloquy in question between the majority leader and the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Later, I came back to my office, and left at 6.30.

Then I went home, met my wife, and joined the president of the Missouri Association of Mental Health, to go to the annual dinner of that organization, along with a group from my State.

That would seem a typical Senate day. I have entered any of the various colloquies about what is or is not wrong around here. But I hope the newspaper article I have mentioned does not give the impression that all but some three Senators were loafing on the job. This work here is at least as long, in hours and effort, as any I have done either in private business or in the executive branch.

ARGENTINE CONFISCATION OF OIL WELLS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Argentine Grab," which was published last night in the Washington Star.

I am always delighted when I find it possible to agree with the Washington Star. That has happened twice in 30 days. I believe the Star deserves great credit for the editorial, which points out again that the chief thing wrong with the Alliance for Progress happens to be the Latin American countries themselves. Two notorious examples are, of course, Argentina and Brazil. Neither country has submitted a plan that entitles it to cooperation on the part of the United States in respect to carrying out the Act of Punta del Este and the commitments that were made for cooperation in the Act of Punta del Este that would qualify Latin American neighbors for aid under the Alliance for Progress program.

The editorial speaks for itself. I shall have something to say on the subject next week, when I will have completed my analysis of the legal situation in the Argentine, which I am satisfied does not bear out the claim of the President of Argentina, or the Foreign Minister of Argentina, that the oil contracts were illegal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Monroney in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Argentine Grab

As a sovereign land, Argentina has every right to be as foolhardy as it seems to be in annulling its contracts with U.S. and other foreign oil companies. It has every right, too, to take over the affected properties and nationalize them, even though such action is likely to be hurtful to the country in the long run.

But Argentina, despite its sovereign privileges, has no right whatever to do this unless it intends to offer prompt and just compensation to all the companies involved. As to that, President Illia and some of his colleagues in Buenos Aires have been far from reassuring. They have assailed the contracts as having been "illegal" from the start, and they have intimated that there will be precious little indemnification for the seized properties. If that proves to be the case, then the Illia regime will be guilty of a kind of international plundering rather like Fidel Castro's in Cuba.

Obviously, as numerous Members of Congress have been quick to emphasize, any such conduct (Peru is on a similar course) should be answered, despite Argentine warnings against it, with a total cutoff of our country's economic aid to Argentina. This aid now amounts to almost $80 million a year. Certainly its continuation would be a monumental absurdity if the Illia government (there is still a possibility, as President Kennedy and others hope, that the issue will be resolved satisfactorily) simply confiscated the oil companies, without adequately indemnifying them in a fair and honest measure.

Not only Argentina is involved here. The whole inter-American Alliance for Progress is involved. If the Illia regime fails to offer just compensation for its grab, and if the Peruvians follow suit, the Alliance, which is in grave trouble already, will almost surely fall flat on its face. And deservedly so.

OUR SPIRITUAL HERITAGE—RESOLUTION OF KIWANIS INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the cornerstone of the American life rests on a strong spiritual foundation. One cannot read the early history of our Nation without sensing a silver thread of deep spiritual conviction through the various steps taken to secure our Declaration of Independence—our Constitution and the formation of our Union of States.

Thomas Jefferson made four explicit references to our dependence on God in the Declaration of Independence, which is the charter of our freedom.

In the first sentence he wrote: "to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them."

In the second sentence: "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights"—

In the next to last sentence: "appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world."

And in the last sentence: "with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence."

One of the most encouraging things that I see in America today is the growing number of people who are coming to associate our cherished freedom with our inherited faith.

Many will recall that in the midst of framing the great instrument; namely, our Federal Constitution, it was Benjamin Franklin who said:

> If it be true that not a sparrow can fall to the ground without His notice, how can we hope to see a new empire arise without His aid.

At a meeting of the Kiwanis International Council, representing the leadership of Kiwanis Clubs throughout the Nation, the council adopted a resolution entitled "Our Spiritual Heritage." This resolution, nonpartisan and nondenominational in character, represents the very real concern of many people in this Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Our Spiritual Heritage

The United States of America is a nation founded upon belief in God and maturing under a trust in God. In return for that trust, He has blessed us beyond all other nations and protected us from our national follies and errors.

From Him we have derived certain inalienable rights, among which are personal and religious freedom. We in turn have shared those with all who have come to the golden door seeking personal, religious, or political freedom. We have guaranteed religious freedom by providing that there shall be separation of church and state while at all times being committed to belief in God and His will.

Whereas there are those who would have us interpret "freedom of religion" as freedom from religion, "separation of state and church" as separation of state and God; and

Whereas certain individuals and groups seeking to deny the dependence of this Nation and its people on God have embarked on such campaigns as to effect removal of "under God" from the Pledge of Allegiance and "In God we trust" from our coinage: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President and the Congress of the United States be solemnly requested to reaffirm recognition of the spiritual heritage of this Nation and its people and to oppose and prevent further attempts however well intentioned which tend to deny our national and personal trust in God or to remove God from the corporate body of our Government.

PROBLEMS OF NATIONAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR RANDOLPH

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as the senior Senator from Oregon, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to extend to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Roads of the Senate Committee on Public Works, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] my appreciation for the most informative address which he presented before the 49th annual convention of the American Association of State Highway Officials in Portland, Oreg., on October 22, 1963.

In particular, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator for the very kind remarks he made in referring to our joint work on the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in bringing into being as much as we can of the President's comprehensive education program. I want him to know that the success of educational legislation in this and the next session of the Congress will be due in no small part to the sage advice and wise counsel which he gives to the subcommittee in our deliberations. His help in conference with our House counterparts has been invaluable.

I know that I can count on him in the days and months ahead when we turn our attention to those parts of the President's program which are directed toward providing our public elementary and secondary schools with needed Federal aid.

In the 87th Congress the Senate passed a general Federal aid to public schools bill with the strong support of the Senator from West Virginia. He and I have heard the testimony on the sections of S. 580 in this session which pertain to our elementary and secondary public schools. I know that he will join with me in executive sessions to see what we can bring before the Senate in the 88th Congress to bring to the boys and girls of America what we consider to be their rightful patrimony.

Mr. President, in making these remarks I had intended to confine myself to an expression of appreciation to Senator RANDOLPH for his able exposition on the 1963 amendments to the Federal-aid highway program, but I could not help at the same time expressing to him my tribute for his devoted service to the cause of education.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address to which I have referred by the most distinguished Senator from West Virginia be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH

Mr. Mackie, Mr. Whitton, colleagues and members of the American Association of State Highway Officials, I am deeply grateful for this opportunity to come before you to discuss some of the problems and hopes that we share in regard to America's highway program.

Under the very able leadership of Senator PAT MCNAMARA, our Public Works Committee will continue to work to advance the programs in which Senator Robert Kerr and his predecessar, Senator Dennis Chavez performed such significant roles in shaping. And it is my hope and belief that we will build new programs on the foundations which they helped to create.

During the past year—for the first time since the enactment of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956—the Congress has had a respite from passing highway legislation of major significance or of controversial nature.

Our 1963 amendments to the Federal aid highway program, which have passed both bodies of Congress and were sent to the President on October 17, are largely of a housekeeping nature. Among these amendments was the bill sponsored by the junior Senator from Oregon, the gracious Mrs. NEUBERGER, to extend for 2 years the measure to control outdoor advertising. Though Oregon's able senior Senator, WAYNE MORSE, is not closely identified with highway legislation, I would note for this group that he has been most active in leadership in areas that serve all America, particularly in education, having successfully guided to passage in the Senate within recent days the vitally needed vocational education and higher education measures.

There are two provisions in the 1963 act which should be of particular significance to the members of AASHO.

The first of these is the removal of the year 1975 as the design date for projects on the Interstate System. Congress instead established a 20-year date from the time of approval as the date for which interstate projects must be designed—that is, in terms of accommodation of projected traffic loads.

The second amendment to which I would draw your attention is one that I was privileged to introduce. That provision, in effect, raises highway development projects to an equivalent status with highway research, and will allow the States to be reimbursed up to 1½ percent of their apportioned funds for development work as they have previously been for research. It is our hope that this will enable the States to pursue a more active program in the development of new methods and materials for highway construction and maintenance.

With reference to our Federal aid highway program in general and the Interstate System in particular, I believe it is accurate to state that we now have a mature and tested partnership between the Bureau of Public Roads, your State highway departments, and the roadbuilding industry. I hope we may also agree to include the Congress in that partnership. There must be a greater degree of confidence as well as cooperation by the Federal authorities in working with State highway officials.

This partnership is reflected in the continued progress of the Interstate System, as evidenced by the fact that more than 14,800 miles of the 41,000 Interstate System are now open to traffic, and construction is underway on another 5,300 miles. Of the 14,829 miles of highway open to traffic as of June 30, 9,526 miles meet the 1975 geometric design standards, while 3,009 miles are capable of handling current traffic but will need additional improvement to bring them up to standards for 1975. Toll roads, bridges and tunnels incorporated in the system totaled 2,294 miles; and preliminary engineering or right-of-way acquisition is underway on another 11,308 miles.

Project obligations reached a record high of $4.9 billion in fiscal 1963, of which about 60 percent were on the Interstate System and 40 percent for projects on the Federal aid primary and secondary systems and their urban extensions.

So much for the present development of our highway programs. I am aware that AASHO is a forward-looking organization and that you gentlemen are also concerned with the future. And whenever I am with highway officials or road builders, there is always the spoken or unspoken question of, "After 1972, then what?" Of course, we cannot wait until 1972 or 1970 or even 1968 to begin planning for future needs after the completion of the presently authorized Interstate System.

Though I cannot speak for the Congress as a whole, nor even for the Senate or the Senate Public Works Committee, there are two areas of need that particularly interest me, and both are the product of long-term population movements of the American people.

The transformation of America during the 20th century from a primarily rural and agrarian society to an urban-industrial one is the product of many forces, but probably foremost among these have been the development of the automobile and the attendant progress in highway construction, especially since World War II.

The report of the Bureau of Census in 1960 revealed that almost 70 percent of Americans live in metropolitan areas. By 1980, according to forecasts by the Urban Land Institute, our population will be nearly four-fifths urban. The institute further predicts that metropolitan areas will absorb all of the 70 million population growth in the decade 1970–80.

Within this overall migration pattern from rural to urban areas there is also, especially within the past decade or so, the centrifugal migration from the central city to the suburbs. Recent studies of the University of Michigan indicate that for every family that desires to move closer to the central city, four families are looking toward the suburbs. As incomes rise, families want more space, more privacy, better homes, and better schools.

With this movement, the new technologies are also encouraging industry and business to move to the suburbs. Thus, in many instances, the economy of the central city is being threatened. This centrifugal movement, and the threat to the downtown areas of many of our cities, in my opinion, will define a large part of our highway needs for the remainder of this decade and the next. There must be greater accessibility between the suburbs themselves and between the suburbs and the central city.

This will require a balanced program of arterial and circumferential highway construction and mass transit development. And in this respect, I would linger a moment on the presumed conflict between the private automobile as a means of urban transportation and the mass transit. I daresay many of you have in recent months been examining the transit versus freeway discussion in the District of Columbia for some indication of official Federal policy regarding urban transportation. Recent events should assure you that the Congress will not view with approval any extremist effort to promote a subsidized mass transit program at the expense of highways which are self-financing. This conflict will be settled not on philosophic grounds but on sound factual determinations of cost and relative utilization and efficiency of the various modes of transportation.

And in this regard, though I acknowledge the value in a given situation of mass transportation, I would not underrate the capacity and imagination of our highway planners and engineers to devise new plans and designs to meet the problems created by our population growth and centralization. A recent study in the District of Columbia is highly revealing in this respect. This study demonstrated that on Wisconsin Avenue, in upper Georgetown (a highly congested area), a few simple steps such as better traffic and pedestrian rules and the painting of lane lines could increase the capacity during the peak hour from 1,000 vehicles per hour to 1,300 or 1,600. Further modifications, including a flexible timing system, reversible lanes, and channelizing traffic at major intersections, would increase the capacity to 2,600 vehicles per hour. All of this could be done with virtually no expenditure of additional funds. But with added costs, principally for building grade separations, the peak traffic capacity could be increased to 3,600 vehicles per hour. Doubtless, many of you are familiar with such examples in your own States.

With reference to the contribution of freeway construction to intersuburban traffic and the central city, a highly instructive example is provided by Route 128, the circumferential highway around Boston. From 1950 to 1960, the population of New England grew about 12.8 percent; that of Massachusetts, about 9.8 percent; and the suburbs of Boston, 17.6 percent. And, the suburbs of Boston continued to support the central city, as indicated by the fact that in 1954 the metropolitan industrial market of Boston ranked ninth among American cities, and by 1958 the Census of Business reported it as eighth, ranking behind San Francisco and Detroit.

Needless to say, I do not ascribe this dynamic condition solely to the existence of Route 128. However, it was a major factor in the economic resurgence of Boston. Not only did new firms from outside New England locate on Route 128; established firms from the downtown area moved there and still maintained their accessibility to the central city. This latter aspect was revealed in detailed studies of those companies which relocated, and in which it was found that the travel time of their old employees was not increased, even though the distance between their homes and the new plant was greater. It is worth adding that the firms which relocated from downtown to Route 128 experienced a net increase in employment.

I have offered these two examples from Boston and Washington, D.C., to indicate what I believe to be both the challenge and opportunity for highway construction in the coming years. And I have little doubt that the Congress will take note of these facets of our highway needs after the urban studies and plans which were called for in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962 are well developed in 1965.

A second major area of our highway needs growing out of the trend toward urbanization and suburbanization is that of getting our city dwellers out of the cities and providing more ready access to the rich and varied recreational opportunities of our resources of woodland and shore. It is my hope that we may soon direct our attention to a connected system of scenic and recreational highways, utilizing the already extensive system of some 25,000 miles of forest highways, and exploring further the implications of scenic highways for the shores of our Great Lakes and coastal regions as well as our mountain ranges and great river valleys. With this end in view, I shall soon introduce with Senator PHILIP HART, of Michigan, a Senate resolution to authorize a Public Works Committee staff study of the potentials of such a system, the recommended design standards and alternative methods of funding.

These are but two of the areas where our highway program of the future might be concentrated to fulfill the needs of the American people. And I am confident that the imagination and capacity for innovation among our highway officials, at both the Federal and State levels, will be more than equal to the task ahead.

THE NEED FOR A VOCATIONAL EDUCATION BILL

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, last Thursday the Secretary of Labor, Willard Wirtz, told delegates to the fifth constitutional convention of the AFL-CIO that to fail to act on educational and other legislative programs dealing with youth will be "to pass on to the next generation the one debt it cannot possibly afford—which is its own lack of education and training." It is with a similar conviction that I have given my wholehearted support to the education bills that have come before us this year.

As Secretary Wirtz pointed out, education is at the root of our ability to meet the changing needs of a developing labor market. There is, he said, "no reason to be afraid of machines." But, he added, there is "great reason to be concerned about how hard it is to get people who are educated and trained to see what machines are doing to people who are not educated and trained." Meeting the challenges of automation and advancing technology may well require a thorough reexamination of our entire educational system.

The types of problems which our future workers will face were well summarized in a recent article by Lewis F. Nicolini, director of the Indiana Employment Security Division. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Nicolini's article, entitled "Tomorrow's Work Force," which appeared in the November 1963 issue of the Hoosier Schoolmaster, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the same November issue of the Hoosier Schoolmaster, by Mr. William W. Runge, on the subject of vocational education.

What these articles point out is that we must make intensive efforts to give our young people more realistic and varied educational opportunities if we are to meet the real needs of our society. This body took a limited step in that direction when it passed the Vocational Education Act last month. That bill is now in conference and I hope that we will have a report soon.

A better vocational education program is not going to solve all our labor market problems; but, as Mr. Runge points out, it can make an important and vital contribution. I said when we passed the vocational education bill last month that I did not think it went far enough, and my views have not changed. I sincerely hope that those of my colleagues who are serving as conferees on this bill will heed Mr. Runge's warning that we are here engaged in a "race against obsolescence," and that they will do all they can to have a strong bill reported back to the Congress soon. We need this bill, and we need it soon.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOMORROW'S WORK FORCE

(By Lewis F. Nicolini, director, Indiana Employment Security Division)

Advancing technology in the coming years will require new skills and accentuate the need for prejob training. Numerous workers may be stranded because they will not have the labor skills needed on tomorrow's jobs. Because young people will be forming a larger part of Indiana's population, their futures will be tied closely to the demands and opportunities of the changing labor market.

During the year 1950, about 53,100 Indiana residents passed their 18th birthday. Ten years later, in 1960, the age of 18 was reached by 72,000. Next year, another 86,000 young people will be 18 years old. By 1965 the figure will jump to 93,000; by 1970, to 99,900.

These are the young people who will compose our future labor force and the ones for whom employment must be waiting when they finish their high school or college studies. These are the people who must have the knowledge and training the labor market will require.

Year by year the demand changes; new occupations are born, others grow obsolete. Economists predict that employment will continue to grow faster in the service industries than in factories.

Because improved machinery and methods are increasing individual output, proportionately fewer workers will be needed to produce manufactured goods. As standards of living become higher, people seek more and more services. This desire widens employment opportunities in the service industries.

The changes in tomorrow's occupational demand will result from several major causes—the continuing shift from an agricultural to a predominantly industrial economy; the rapid expansion in research and development activities; the accelerated pace in the application of technological improvements; the growth in size and complexity of business organization; the increase in paperwork and recordkeeping among all types of enterprises; and the need for more and more educational and medical service.

Fewer job opportunities will exist among the manual occupations than will in professional, technical, office, and sales occupations. The jobs in tomorraw's manual occupations will call for skilled craftsmen, not unskilled workers. Skilled operators for all types of factory machines will be wanted, tool and die makers will be needed, and trained maintenance mechanics should have no employment problems.

The demand for individuals trained in professional and technical operations is expected to be 60 percent higher in 1970 than in 1960. These are the occupations which require the longest educational period but the young people who have been educated as engineers, scientists, and technicians will likely move quickly into careers.

By 1970 employment opportunities for managers, officials, and clerical and sales workers will be more than 30 percent more numerous than in 1960. This type of employment will require high school and college training.

Technological change will force us to adopt higher standards of instruction at and below the high school level. At all ages, those students who do not plan to enter college must be given more realistic educational opportunities. The traditional type of training will be inadequate. Experimentation with new ideas, new materials, and new tools must be encouraged.

Unless realistic educational opportunities are provided, we will face increasing problems caused by high school dropouts. Many young people, realistically appraising the ordinary academic high school as not meeting their needs, are reluctant to enroll in vocational schools because of the stigma attached. We must stop using vocational departments as "dumping grounds" for those students who do not show either interest or talent for academic studies.

The values of technical training must be honestly acknowledged and these values must be made evident to those youngsters whose interests and aptitudes lie in this direction. The caliber of instructors and the quality of facilities must be just as high for vocational students as for others.

We must reevaluate cooperative education in our high schools. Cooperative high schools, when properly established, deserve the understanding and the esteem such schools enjoy at the college level.

Since the end of World War II, and particularly since 1958, the occupational composition of Indiana's labor force has been undergoing rapid changes. This development has brought on the recognition that workers of all ages and skills must undergo continuous educational retraining. The need for more technical schools and especially for more short courses is apparent. These courses must both complement and supplement the courses now offered in our established schools. The National Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 has barely touched on this problem. At best, this program should serve as a catalyst in getting the State to face up to the problem and the need of continuous training.

The components of Indiana's future labor force are the students of today and tomorrow. The schools they attend, the teachers who instruct them, the career counseling they receive are among the most basic preparations for entrance into wage-earner status. Their educational opportunities and attainments will determine their individual success and the tempo of the State's economic activity.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

(By William W. Runge, personnel department, Steel Industries, Inc.)

Actually, we all seem to expect too much from what we call vocational education, perhaps because we know too little about it and understand less. It is not a panacea; it is not a place for the retarded only; it is not something distinct from the school. Rather, it is an essential element of any well rounded school program.

Too many persons connected with education have considered vocational education as industrialists have looked at it in plant training—a problem exists so we provide training of any kind to solve it.

Both require an objective and a comprehensive plan to reach that objective. Therefore, with proper consideration of what we are looking for, we should divide vocational education into its two logical parts—part of the high school curriculum and as a post-high-school education and training area.

In the high school we must make further progress in getting away from the notion, idea, and misconception that vocational training is the place to put our youngsters who have no interest in or not sufficient intelligence for an academic course. Make no mistake about it—modern industry requires brains in all areas to operate efficiently and profitably. It requires intelligence, education, and training to operate a million-dollar press, and industry requires all three.

In the average high school program, we cannot and should not expect the high school graduate to be a proficient tool and die maker, printer, machinist, or skilled craftsman. Instead, we should concentrate on acquainting him with the tools, techniques, and terminology which are basic in a particular occupation. Just as in football, we are giving him the basic and necessary fundamentals which will some day make him a professional.

Vocational education has used effectively the system of advisory committees to assist in planning the training desirable in an occupation or in an industry. The committees have worked well where the committees are well informed and interested. These committees could be of special value in helping determine the future needs of employees in an industry or in an occupation. This would have a tendency to eliminate or at least minimize training today for a job which will not exist for the student when he or she graduates.

Counselors and student advisers must also take a new look at the student and at the possibilities of vocational education. The student who has the background and ability for meeting the complexities of modern industry upon graduation from high school is not a reject from society, but is really a most essential part of it.

Adult vocational education, in its own area, has been as effective as the energy devoted to it and the use being made of it. More emphasis should be placed on a "want to" attitude on the part of participants to replace the "have to" one that is all too prevalent today.

Basically, we should follow two concepts in this area of adult vocational training. First, we must know the occupation, its present requirements and those requirements which will be a part of its future. Secondly, we must know the student and his area of deficiencies, for the job now, and the job 5 years from now. Then we utilize vocational training as the blending unit between the two.

In all areas, educators and industrialists must recognize and remember that it is the combination of education, training, and experience that makes vocational training most effective. Dropping any one element is detrimental to the student and the program. Here we give reason to the training and effectiveness to the experience, using the education as the foundation for both the training and experience.

Industrial training directors and their counterparts in the school system should coordinate their efforts most closely. Both are working toward the same objectives with similar means. Though the industrial training director is undoubtedly more seriously concerned with the profitmaking aspects of training and education, this aspect should not be foreign to the teacher and school administrator.

Vocational education could well borrow from the training director his philosophy that training is the race against obsolescence. Working closely together toward their common goals, they can raise the stature of vocational training to the position it should occupy in the schools, helping industry, the service trades and construction, as well as manufacturing, to win this race that is most important to the future of the economy of the United States.

INDIANA FARMERS LEAD THE NATION

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, in the last 30 years Indiana, like the rest of the United States, has changed from a rural to an urban economy. The result has been that Indiana now is primarily a hard goods manufacturing State. A total of 41 percent of Indiana's income comes from manufacturing, compared to only 29 percent for the country as a whole.

Naturally, this industrial rise was accompanied by a sharp drop in the agricultural segment of the Hoosier economy. Between 1955 and 1960 alone agricultural employment in Indiana dropped 20 percent. Today only 6 percent of the Indiana income comes from the farm. This situation has caused some experts to claim that the importance of agriculture in Indiana is slowly decreasing.

My sentiments, however, are quite different. As someone who was raised on a farm, studied agriculture, and then worked my own farm in Vigo County, I know that it is foolhardy to claim that the importance of agriculture is on the wane. Feeding our people can never decrease in importance. If it does, then the entire country will be in serious trouble.

I believe I am wholeheartedly supported in this view by the Indiana farmers themselves, who despite a severe summer drought, made Indiana the No. 1 farm State in the Nation as far as corn, wheat, and burley tobacco are concerned. These several achievements were listed in an editorial, "Our Hoosier Soil," which appeared in the Indianapolis News on November 18, 1963.

First, Indiana led the Nation in corn production with an average of 87 bushels an acre, beating former champion corn-producing States such as Iowa and Illinois.

Second, Indiana farmers also produced more corn than ever before—a total of more than 400 million bushels.

Third, Indiana led the Nation in wheat production with an average of 41 bushels an acre.

Fourth, although not a "tobacco State," Indiana still can look forward to the best acreage of burley tobacco in the country—2,100 pounds an acre.

Fifth, the State's soybean yield tied an existing record.

Sixth, a Hoosier farmer, Charles N. Fisher, of Shelby County, was named international corn king at Toronto, Canada, marking the 31st time in 41 years that an Indiana farmer has won this honor.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, "Our Hoosier Soil," be printed at the conclusion of my remarks, as well as two newspaper articles describing the success of Hoosier corn farmers. They are, "Expect Record Corn Harvest in Indiana," an Associated Press story from Washington that appeared in the Terre Haute Tribune on November 13, 1963; and "Smart Farmers Is Explanation for Indiana's Top Corn Yield," a United Press International story from Indianapolis by Boyd Gill that appeared in the Marion Leader-Tribune on November 16, 1963.

I am very proud indeed of our Hoosier farmers. Their initiative and willingness to use new techniques has made us keenly aware that, although the number of people on the farm may be declining, the ability of each farmer to produce more food is increasing. Not only are less farmers feeding more people, but they are feeding us better food. In this way, they are bringing honor to Indiana and the United States.

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Indianapolis News, Nov. 18, 1963]

OUR HOOSIER SOIL

Despite a late summer and autumn drought, our Hoosier soil has produced food of quality and in quantity probably surpassing anything of the kind the world has ever seen for a given area.

A season-end U.S. crop report confirms that Indiana farmers not only have had their best production year ever, but lead the whole Nation.

On top of that comes the news from Toronto that a Hoosier has been named world corn king for the fifth time at the Royal Agricultural Winter Fair there. It is no novelty for Indiana farmers to raise the best corn anywhere, but it is something new for this State to emerge with acreage yields topping those of all other States.

Here is how this State shapes up as the best in this country agriculturally in 1963:

1. The Hoosier corn harvest has jumped to an unprecedented 87 bushels an acre average, besting former champion States like Illinois and Iowa.

2. The total corn output for Indiana is predicted at more than 400 million bushels, another peak.

3. Indiana this year took over national wheat blue ribbon honors with 41 bushels an acre.

4. The State's soybean yield is a record-equaling 28 bushels an acre for a bumper production of nearly 79 million bushels.

5. Although Indiana is not known as a "tobacco State," its crop prospect this year for burley is 2,100 pounds an acre, the best in the United States. The State's tobacco crop will add up to nearly 17 million pounds.

6. Charles N. Fischer of Shelby County again brought the best corn sample of all to the international fair at Toronto, which has replaced the former Chicago Hay and Grain Exposition as the place where corn kings are crowned.

His display of specially developed hybrid yellow ears was typical of Hoosier corn quality, which is why agriculturists the world over come to this State for their seed. Since Peter J. Lux of Shelby County won the first world title in 1919, at least 31 of the 41 world corn quality winners have been from Indiana.

Those who may think that because the rise of our urban centers and manufacturing has placed Indiana among the "industrial" States, our farming has become a secondary wealth producer, should look at the 1963 crop statistics.

[From the Terre Haute Tribune, Nov. 13, 1963]

EXPECT RECORD CORN HARVEST IN INDIANA

WASHINGTON.—Indiana farmers will harvest a record corn crop of 400 million bushels, the U.S. Department of Agriculture predicts.

The Department said Tuesday in its November crop forecasts that the Indiana yield would be approached only by Illinois, with a predicted yield of 85 bushels an acre.

The predicted Indiana yield would be 5 bushels above the record, set last year, and 2 bushels above the September and October forecasts.

The crop of 400 million bushels would be far above the record, set at 356,796,000 bushels in 1960, before the feed grain program reduced acreages.

Although the corn crop seemed unaffected by the prolonged drought, the Indiana soybean crop appeared to be suffering somewhat. The Department reduced its soybean yield estimate 1½ bushels to a record equaling 28 bushels an acre for a total production of 78,848,000 bushels.

The tobacco crop prospect remained at a record 2,100 pounds an acre, which would mean a harvest of 16,800,000 pounds.

[From the Marion (Ind.), Leader-Tribune, Nov. 16, 1963]

THOUGH EXPERTS HEDGE—SMART FARMERS IS EXPLANATION FOR INDIANA'S TOP CORN YIELD

(By Boyd Gill)

INDIANAPOLIS.—Let's don't divulge the secret to the corn growers of Illinois and Iowa and the wheat growers of Kansas that Indiana farmers led the Nation in grain yields this year because they are smarter than their neighbors.

You can't get the agronomy experts at Purdue University or the county agricultural agents to say in so many words that clever farmers account for the alltime record corn-belt estimated yield per acre of 87 bushels in Indiana this year. Or for the fact Indiana's 41-bushel-per-acre wheat yield this year also was the Nation's best.

But the evidence stands out, in the experts' tactful explanations for the bumper crops, that Hoosier grain growers more quickly accept scientific recommendations for improvement in their farming practices.

"I don't know why it is we have such good fortune," said Gerald Miller, an extension agronomist at Purdue, when asked why Indiana's corn yield was better than Illinois' and Iowa's—States which produce many more millions of bushels than we do.

Then Miller went on to explain that there were numerous factors. Warm temperatures came in May, earlier than usual. Rainfall in June and July was above average. Temperatures were lower in July and August than usual.

Actually, Miller said, the yield might have been greater than 87 if it hadn't been for the late August and September dry spell.

But Miller said other factors included abundant use of fertilizer, improved hybrids, insect control, disease control, and weed control.

This is where the Hoosiers seem to outshine their neighbors.

For instance, Indiana farmers used 469,000 tons of fertilizer in 1961, Miller said, compared with 430,000 tons for Illinois, despite the fact Illinois has far more acres of cropland—if only because the State's area is more than 50 percent greater than Indiana's.

Charles J. Murphy, assistant county agent in Marion County, believes the heavy application of commercial nitrate fertilizers is a keystone in the corn growing accomplishments of Hoosiers. Murphy said nitrates used at planting time absorb moisture from the air even in periods of skimpy rain.

"Indiana farmers are eager to keep that soil fertile," Murphy said.

Miller said the best-in-the-Nation wheat yield was explainable by the increased use of nitrogen and speedy adaptation of new varieties of seed proved best for this area.

"A recent survey showed that more than 94 percent of the Indiana wheat acreage was planted in recommended varieties that mature earlier, yield higher, grow to a shorter height and therefore come up to a better stand, and resist disease," Miller said. "Of the total acreage, 55 percent was in the Monon variety which has only been in use since 1959."

Miller modestly declined to guess whether Indiana growers' rapid acceptance of new varieties and fertilizing procedures was due to their being "smarter" or to Purdue's salesmanship.

He implied that that old saw about corn needing hot, dry summer nights for rapid growth was slightly outdated. All right, maybe, for May and June.

"But we get best results when temperatures in July and August are lower than normal," Miller said.

PROGRESS IN THE PRESSING POPULATION PROBLEM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a thoughtful article entitled "The Population Problem," written by William E. Moran, Jr., for the National Catholic Welfare Council News Service, appeared in the Washinton, D.C., Catholic Standard on Friday, October 4, 1963. The author is dean of the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service, vice president of the Catholic Association for International Peace, and a member of the board of trustees of the population reference bureau.

Mr. Moran writes, in part:

> We live in a tight little world which, through technological developments, has become so small that here are no longer any faraway places. We'll either make it a decent place in which all can live or we'll suffer the consequences.

Later he points out:

> There is serious question whether the Alliance for Progress or other development efforts can hope to succeed if population growth in these countries continues at present levels. If these efforts don't succeed, the prospects for peace in the world are not good.

It is pertinent that in reporting on the progress of the Alliance for Progress meeting in São Paulo, Brazil, this week the impact of Brazil's population growth cycle was noted. According to a news story appearing in the New York Times, Tuesday, November 12, 1963:

> Brazilian economists say that Brazil's annual rate of population increase, 3.2 percent, will exceed the growth in grosss national product for the first time this year.

Mr. Moran has hopes that the Ecumenical Conference now meeting in the Vatican will have some of the answers to questions concerning the population problem for members of the Catholic Church.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Mr. Moran's article and the news story to which I have made reference be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Catholic Standard, Oct. 4, 1963]

THE POPULATION PROBLEM

(By William E. Moran, Jr.)

Twentieth-century man has witnessed such great strides in overcoming disease as to put in motion a rapid expansion of population in the world. More people live longer. Birth rates have not declined to compensate for this greater rate of survival. Nor do they show any promise of doing so in the absence of positive efforts to that end.

Responsible individuals and groups are concerned over the problems posed by the rapid and continuous expansion of population.

CHURCH'S POSITION

The position of the Catholic Church on this question is not clear. The church is often accused of being opposed to any efforts to cope with it. It now appears reasonably certain that this question will be one of those discussed at the second session of the Vatican Council.

Throughout most of man's tenure on this planet he faced a bitter struggle to survive. As many children as possible were necessary if man was to continue. War, famine, plague, and pestilence ever threatened to wipe him out.

In the Western World he started just a couple of hundred years ago to overcome these problems. Improved production methods, expanded trade, and attendant specialization overcame food shortages. Then scientists began to find out how disease was transmitted and how it could be prevented. Famine, plague, and pestilence became less and less important as inhibitors of population; the Western World's population grew. This presented no immediate problems. The industrial revolution required more people and new lands were available to take up any excess population.

DISEASE CONTROL

In this century the situation has changed. Simple and inexpensive methods of controlling debilitating and killing diseases have been devised and applied throughout the world. In spectacular cases, such as that of Ceylon, the application of such methods has resulted in the decline of the death rate by almost one-third in a single year (1946–47).

With this control of death, net rates of increase are climbing in all the underdeveloped countries to points where population can be expected to double in 20 to 25 years. Between 1950 and 1961, the world population grew by 560 million persons, which is greater than the total population of India. In the face of such massive growth migration is no answer.

There is much talk about a population explosion. Statisticians compute the date at which men will have standing room only or be standing on each other's shoulders. Others, in response, argue in gross terms about our productive capacity and insist there isn't any problem. As optimists, they argue for a so-called positive approach, even including the export of excess population to outer space. But, there are real and immediate problems arising from the growth of population which can't be ignored or wished away.

We live in a tight little world which, through technological developments, has become so small that there are no longer any far away places. We'll either make it a decent place in which all can live or we'll suffer the consequences. The people in the poor countries are aware of the possibility of a surcease for their misery and are demanding a better life. The people of the rich countries have accepted a responsibility to help them find it. The responsibility to do so is nowhere better stated than in Pope John's encyclical "Pacem in Terris."

In some countries, such as India and Egypt, population in relation to land already is so great that Herculean efforts at development threaten to succeed only in maintaining the growing population at the existing miserable level. There is some doubt if even that will long be possible if population growth isn't curbed.

DIM FUTURE

Savings and foreign help, which might be used to improve standards of living, go for the essential needs of children. Today's and tomorrow's improvements have to be put off. There is a serious question whether the Alliance for Progress or other development efforts can hope to succeed if population growth in these countries continues at present levels. If these efforts don't succeed, the prospects for peace in the world are not good.

The problems aren't all overseas. Serious problems result from population growth here at home. Our society has changed. With urbanization, mechanization, and improved social legislation, children represent charges on the family for a long period of time. The responsible middle class family must expect to provide education beyond high school. It must count on an expenditure per child of $20,000 to $30,000, depending on the extent to which public or private facilities are used.

With all its affluence, even the United States has not eliminated poverty from its own society. A Presidential commission recently came to the conclusion that 32 million of our people live below the poverty line.

These underprivileged, who have the least access to information and advice on regulating birth, are reproducing rapidly. They have trouble now finding employment because we already have little room for the uneducated and unskilled in our society.

Their children, an increasing number, are not receiving the kind of preparation and education which will make them productive and happy members of society.

PARENTS' RESPONSIBILITY

The Catholic church is often berated as being the institution standing in the way of facing up to the problem because of its position. Oddly enough, despite these charges, the church hasn't yet any clear, formal position, except a clearly stated opposition to the use of medical and chemical contraceptives, abortion and sterilization.

Catholics, laymen and clergy, have studied the problem over recent years and there have been papal statements on some aspects. As a result there are suggested Catholic positions concerning the responsibilities of parents concerning family size, acceptance of continence and the rhythm method for controlling birth, and recognition of the nature of the population problem.

But, since no dogmatic pronouncements have been made and there is conflict in the various studies and approaches, there are no clear guides available to Catholics as they face this problem. This lack inevitably is accompanied by the danger of apathy and withdrawal where Catholic participation in an area is badly needed.

What can one hope for as the council considers this problem? Here are some questions for which answers are needed:

Does the church agree that rapid population growth is one of the serious problems facing the world, a real problem meriting study and action?

Does the church see any objection to demographic, sociological, and eugenic studies, even if they may lead to options or suggest courses of action not acceptable for Catholics?

Do Catholics have the right in a plural society to impose their moral standards on others of differing views? Do they have the right to insist that since they do not approve of the use of contraceptives they should not be made available upon request under government programs, at home or abroad?

What methods now known for regulating or inhibiting reproduction are licit? What guidelines in theology or the natural law would apply to the acceptability of methods which might be developed?

[From the New York Times, Nov. 12, 1963]

ALLIANCE REPORT SHOWS LATIN STAGNATION IN 1962

(By Tad Szulc)

SÃO PAULO, BRAZIL, November 11.—Economic growth rate slowed last year, reflecting stagnation in the region, according to the annual report of the Alliance for Progress.

The 300-page report, will serve as the basic document for consideration at the Alliance Conference that opened here today. The finance and economic ministers attending will vote on the report's conclusions and recommendations later this week.

A key aim of the Alliance is to bring about a 2.5-percent annual increase in Latin American per capita income. But the report showed that the 1962 figure ranged between six-tenths of 1 percent and 1 percent, a drop from 1961 levels.

This deterioration was primarily a result of developments in Argentina and Brazil, the report said. These countries jointly account for about half of Latin America's population and industrial and agricultural production.

The income growth rate in 10 of the 19 Latin American countries in the Alliance exceeded the 2.5-percent goal, though the hemispheric average was pulled down by economic crises in Argentina and Brazil.

Argentina's gross national product in 1962 was 3.4 percent below the 1961 level, the report said. Brazil's growth rate fell sharply in 1962 from the record 7.7-percent increase in 1961.

The decline in Argentine production was linked to a general depression and to the country's long political crisis.

In Brazil, the phenomenal growth cycle that began in the late 1950's came to a virtual standstill in 1961 through a combination of inflation and political unrest.

BRAZIL TO FALL BACK

Brazilian economists say that Brazil's annual rate of population increase, 3.2 percent, will exceed the growth in gross national product for the first time this year.

This means that Brazil, faced by a cost-of-living increase of more than 100 percent, will see her per capita income receding in 1963 instead of growing.

Economists here thus believe that 1963 figures for all of Latin America will continue to reflect stagnation. No 1963 figures were included in the report circulated today.

The report stressed the growth in the 10 Latin Republics that met or exceeded goals, including 6 of the 7 countries that have submitted national development plans to the Alliance's economic review panel. The objective of the U.S.-sponsored Alliance is social and economic reform in Latin America.

The most notable 1962 improvements were reported in Nicaragua, which had a 7.2-percent increase in per capita income, and in Panama, Haiti, El Salvador, Colombia, and Venezuela.

Venezuela achieved a 3.9-percent increase in per capita income and a 7.1-percent rise in gross national product, despite political unrest aggravated terrorist activities.

These gains were achieved in the face of a decline in petroleum revenue.

Venezuela raised her agricultural production by 11 percent in 1962, compared with 2 percent in 1961, when land reform measures began operating effectively. She doubled the increase in her overall industrial output.

In Brazil, by contrast, industrial production remained stationary, while the increase in farm output dropped from 8 to 1 percent.

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS FOR MENTALLY ILL

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, a bill to protect the constitutional rights of the mentally ill, numbered S. 935, has been favorably reported by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights to the full Judiciary Committee. As a member of that subcommittee I supported the bill.

In my opinion S. 935 is a landmark measure guaranteeing the civil rights of those hospitalized for mental illness. Although the bill applies only to the District of Columbia, it is the subcommittee's hope that it will serve as a model for adoption by the States or for the revision of State mental health laws.

Significant progress has been made in this century in the fields of psychiatry and sociology, making possible a clearer understanding of the problems of mental illness and the development of more effective treatment. Yet, age-old superstitions and social ostracism linger in the intricate and often unfair legal policies and practices regarding the mentally ill.

These problems have become increasingly serious and are expected to worsen. Studies show that in the United States today about 18 million persons, or about 10 percent of our total population, have been or may be committed to a mental hospital. Estimates are that 1 out of every 12 children born today will at some time in his life be treated in a mental institution.

In my own State for example, it has been estimated that between 12 to 15 percent of the population, or about 78,000 to 97,000 people, are mentally ill and require professional help.

The subcommittee's study of the legal status and the deprivation of constitutional rights of those alleged or adjudged mentally ill is the first congressional look into these problems.

Our study revealed innumerable cases in which the rights of the mentally ill have been unreasonably restricted, their interests inexcusably neglected and ignored, and due process unconstitutionally denied.

Many witnesses testified that institutionalized mental patients often receive only custodial care. Failure to supply psychiatric treatment to a person who has been placed in a mental institution and denied his liberty is, the subcommittee rightly concluded, tantamount to a denial of due process.

Once a patient is found by a court to be mentally ill, in many States he loses his citizenship status. He loses his rights to vote, to hold a driver's license, to dispose of property, to execute instruments, to make purchases, and to enter into contractual relationships. Such automatic deprivations of rights are often unfair and unjust, because, according to the weight of psychiatric authority, many persons who are in need of hospitalization are able to carry on their business affairs and exercise their citizenship rights.

To protect these and other rights of the mentally ill against unconstitutional encroachments, S. 935 proposes to:

First. Restore the legal capacity and citizenship status of those adjudged mentally ill.

Second. Simplify commitment procedures with adequate judicial protections for the person committed.

Third. Protect the patient's rights to notice, hearing, and appeal, to counsel, and to a jury trial where he is hospitalized under a court order.

Fourth. Guarantee the hospitalized patient the rights to receive treatment and to communicate with any person or agency outside the hospital.

Fifth. Provide that no mechanical restraints be used on a patient unless they are medically prescribed, properly recorded, and reported.

Sixth. Outline simplified release procedures.

I am convinced that this legislation is meritorious and should be enacted by the Senate and brought to the attention of the proper officials of each State.

COST ADVANCES

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to inform the Senate that hearings have been scheduled by Congressman SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, chairman of the Accounts Subcommittee of the House Administration Committee, on H.R. 8066 introduced by Congressman WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, and H.R. 6866 introduced by Congressman ABNER W. SIBAL. Congressman WIDNALL's bill is the companion bill to the measure I introduced into the Senate to establish a Congressional Office of Science and Technology. The bill which I introduced, S. 2038, has been cosponsored by 15 Senators of both parties. The interest and support which my proposal and those of Congressmen SIBAL and WIDNALL have received is an indication, I believe, of the increasing uneasiness and concern over the relations between the scientific community and the Federal Government. This support for the proposal also indicates the strong desire within and without the Congress to improve the scientific capability of our legislature.

Let me urge all who are interested in this matter to let Chairman FRIEDEL know by letter or statement. Let these hearings reflect the desire of legislators and scientists alike to see that the Congress is adequately advised on science.

This year we in the Congress were called upon to appropriate close to $15 billion of public funds to be used for scientific research and technical development. The Congress, with its responsibility for the control of the public purse, must decide what expenditures are required in the public interest. It must decide which expenditures have priority, which do not. It must decide this, there is no choice. Either the Congress decides on a rational basis which projects are more important as a matter of conscious policy, or, by its inaction and ad hoc decisions, it will build its policy in an irrational and irresponsible manner.

Decisions in the field of science, as the years go by, become more pressing, more numerous and more significant to the future of our society.

This struggle to evolve sensible, valid standards for decisions on the allocation of our scientific resources is not limited to the United States alone. Every industrialized country in the world must make these decisions, on the east side as well as the west side of the Iron Curtain. Chairman Khrushchev's apparent vacillation on the Soviet objectives in space is one example. Another can be found in an article which appeared in this week's Economist, of London. I ask unanimous consent that this article may be made a part of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

In the age in which we live, a nation's most valuable assets are its trained minds. The above article illustrates what decisions must be made if these assets are to be well used: How far should the state's investment in pure research extend; to what extent is the state's security and survival involved in this so-called pure research; how is the state to allocate its skilled minds between pure and applied work; is it the state's responsibility to see that these minds have the utmost and almost unlimitedly expensive equipment needed for their research. As the years go by, as such questions are answered, I am convinced increasing amounts of money will be diverted from other domestic projects into scientific channels. Will these decisions and these diversions be made responsibly by a responsible Congress?

This is why I believe so strongly that Congress must improve its ability to cope with these technical questions; this is why I believe the Congressional Office of Science and Technology is so badly needed.

Since the bills to establish such an office have been introduced, the proposal has received much attention from the scientific community. It has been endorsed by technical and scientific journals. I have received many, many letters of endorsement from scientists, professors, and executives in the research and development industries.

I was most pleased to learn recently that the bill has received the formal approval of the American Society of Civil Engineers.

I am hopeful that other endorsements and expressions will be received by the House Administration Committee's Accounts Subcommittee at its hearings on December 4. It is not only of importance to the Congress that it improve its understanding of science; it is also of great importance to the scientific community. As the work of science becomes more sophisticated and complex, as it becomes more difficult for the science community to explain itself to the Congress, scientists are increasingly anxious that the Congress improve its preparation for and comprehension of those technical matters which come before it. And of course it is of the greatest importance to the Nation and to the free world that channels of communication between the Congress and the sciences remain open, clear, and vital.

A clear and straightforward account of my proposal, S. 2038, and a discussion of it was published in the November issue of Aerospace Management magazine. I ask unanimous consent that it may be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAS CONGRESS LOST CONTROL?

(By Charles R. Wilhide)

(Investigations, allegations, and resultant reverberations threaten to turn the Nation's R. & D. effort into a political football. Controversy centers on the adequacy of Congress to cope with technical decisions.)

The President asked for over $17 billion to support R. & D. programs in the budget he submitted last January. Congress had the power to appropriate or deny the funds. They haven't done either yet. They're still pondering. Each year their task gets tougher and they ponder longer, because the budget gets bigger and projects more complex. The task is getting so tough that there is growing concern over the capabilities of the committees and subcommittees of Congress to intelligently allocate R. & D. money. So, investigations, allegations, and suggestions abound.

The National Association of Manufacturers (NAM) feels the executive branch has an unfair advantage over the legislative branch and has called for a group of scientists to advise Congress on the validity of certain budget requests.

Dr. Jerome Wiesner, who heads the Office of Science and Technology, which advises the President on scientific matters, agrees the Congress needs help.

Representative H. W. SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia, is sponsoring a move for a sweeping investigation of scope, cost, and conduct of research programs operated by the Government or with Government funds.

Senator E. L. BARTLETT, Democrat, of Alaska, has offered a bill (S. 2038) which would set up COST (Congressional Office of Science and Technology) to give the legislative branch the expert advice it needs to intelligently pass on the budget.

On the other hand, Herbert Roback, veteran staff administrator of the Military Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, makes a stanch defense of the present structure of Congress. He contends Congress can obtain all the information it needs—if—it wants to use and exert all the powers available to it. Roback is also leery of abdicating "policy" prerogatives to the scientific mind.

BARTLETT SHAKEN

The Alaskan Democrat's interest in R. & D. stems from an experience that shook him early this year—shortly after his appointment to the Appropriations Committee in the Senate. In one meeting, over a billion dollars in R. & D. programs for Health, Education, and Welfare was given the "OK" by the committee in just 30 seconds.

Senator BARTLETT began asking: "What is redundant?" "What is unnecessary?" "What is duplication; and what is vital?" He found little if any expert advice available. In his view, if Congress is to continue to discharge the duties ascribed to it by the Constitution, then it must have information available to it. And the source of this information, in the opinion of the Senator, must be answerable only to Congress. In an address to the Senate he said, "If democracy and representative government are to prevail in this Nation, it is necessary that the Congress understand the importance of these decisions (concerning programs and funds for science and technology) and that it have a role in making them."

BARTLETT'S BILL

Carrying his concern into action, Senator BARTLETT introduced his bill (S. 2038) to establish a Congressional Office of Science and Technology (COST).

The bill calls for the two such offices to be set up, one for the House and a similar one for the Senate. There is precedent for the action since a legislative council is already in existence as a bicameral structure serving both bodies of the Congress.

Senator BARTLETT's bill calls for a director who will employ assistants and other employees who would be charged with these duties: (1) Upon request, to advise and assist any member or committee of either House with respect to matters relating to science and technology; (2) to make studies concerning matters relating to science and technology as may be directed by either House; (3) to maintain a register of scientific and technological consultants who have indicated a willingness to advise and assist committees and Members of either House; (4) to transmit to committees of either House, reports concerning significant scientific or technological developments which pertain to their jurisdiction.

In more personal terms, Senator BARTLETT wants the COST people to be physically located within Congress, to be known and trusted by the legislators, and to know how the Congress operates. He wants something like a "devil's advocate"—a scientist who must depend on Congress for his compensation and advancement. BARTLETT feels that such a man is in an excellent position to give the proposals of other scientists a searching and informative examination and then relay his opinion to the men who have the responsibility for appropriating funds.

NOTHING WRONG—ROBACK

Staff Administrator Roback was a defender of the present staff structure long before the Bartlett bill. And he continues to do so. He offers some persuasive arguments for maintaining the present setup and points out some of the pitfalls which a scientist serving as a member of a congressionally controlled body, is going to encounter.

First of all, Roback feels that there must exist an air of faith by the Congress in the various witnesses and agencies which must present their budget requests. In his opinion, the agency budgets are carefully prepared by experienced and conscientious people who are also working for the good of the country. He puts high reliability on the various checks and balances already in existence to prohibit the occasional budget padder or "pet project" type from ever getting his budget request approved.

Roback makes the point that a one-time authorization given to enabling legislation is no longer sufficient. "The legislative committees insist upon participating more systematically in policy formation by requiring yearly authorizations." Thus, for example, NASA and DOD must appear before a minimum of four committees—two in the House and two in the Senate—before their budgets are approved. The two Armed Services Committees must hear the requests as well as the two Appropriations Committees.

Roback has sympathy for the high-level Government witnesses who must spend hours, days, or even weeks before congressional committees repeating testimony, putting up with delays, or just sitting when members of the committees answer rollcalls. But Roback says, this indicates that the burden of proof rests upon the witnesses and in this way Congress continues to exert control.

As a matter of fact, Roback contends that Congress has just as much control over its various functions as it ever did. He feels that when Congress wishes to exert its control it can do so—and rapidly. And he feels no new committees are needed.

There are 21 committees and 125 subcommittees in the House of Representatives. There are 18 committees and 100 subcommittees in the Senate. There are seven joint committees and their assorted subcommittees. Roback thinks that's more than enough to do any job presented to Congress.

The Staff Administrator of the Military Operations Subcommittee thinks the resources available to Congress for expert advice abound throughout the country. In this contention, he is joined by some pretty powerful interests, some of which are included in the various research outfits that have mushroomed since World War II. Among the "resources" available according to Roback, are the Office of Science and Technology—a part of the Executive Office of the President—the National Science Foundation, the National Academy of Science plus the civilian counterparts—any one of which Roback expects would be happy to make its staff and functions available to Congress.

Roback says that a Congressman who really wants to check any testimony he hears, can get in touch with several eminent experts in the field in a very short time and check it out to his own satisfaction. This would provide the "devil's advocate" role propounded by Senator BARTLETT.

POLITICAL SCIENTISTS

Roback also wonders at the ability of the congressionally responsible scientists to survive in the acknowledged political atmosphere upon which Congress is founded. He points to this trap: "With this complex committee structure and distribution of legislative work in the Congress, a small central group of scientific advisers could not hope to respond to the numerous, frequent and recurring or continuous legislative demands for information and advice on scientific affairs. And, on the other hand, if the scientific experts were attached to separate committees and subcommittees, it would not be practical except in limited and informal ways (and this is a point of importance to Senator BARTLETT) for the staff expert on one committee to assist another committee. The consequences would be either that the scientific experts would have to build up a big bureaucracy of their own in the legislative branch, which the Congress would not sanction, or they would be bypassed in the hurry and scuffle of legislative work." This latter point was underlined by some letters received by Senator BARTLETT on his proposal but overcome by the need for expert advice of a continuous nature.

Roback does not feel advisory scientists—of the type BARTLETT proposes—would be comfortable in a political environment. He feels that in the rough and tumble atmosphere of congressional life, the scientific talent would go to waste or the natural scientists would soon become "political" scientists. In this he is joined by others outside of Congress who feel that the establishment of a scientific office beholden to Congress, would increase the hold some people think the scientific community already has on the decisionmaking process in Washington.

In this latter field, Senator BARTLETT and Roback and the factions each represent agree. They are both concerned about the inroads in the policymaking field made by the scientific community. Both have suggested remedies for correcting such encroachment. Senator BARTLETT would do it by establishing an office reporting only to the Congress with the purpose—although not put so bluntly—to examine scientific proposals under a congressional microscope. Roback would do the same thing by utilizing already existent resources.

Nimrod: A Scientific Object Lesson

(Much is heard about the frighteningly high cost of some of the equipment currently used in research. Here is a case in point.)

The Atomic Energy Research Establishment at Harwell is surrounded by a wire security fence, but visitors approaching from Didcot station who drive past the main entrance will reach a new drive that winds along the outside of the fence to a complex of buildings that has taken 7 years and £34½ million to build and where close on 1,000 people work. These are the minions of one machine, the only one of its kind in Britain. It is a 150-foot diameter, £11 million, 7,000-million-electron-volt "proton synchrotron" called, heaven alone knows why, Nimrod. It was completed, and started up for the first time in September.

A proton synchrotron's uses are understandably limited. It is a research tool of unwieldy dimensions that is used by the most highbrow and "way out" physicists to study what would crudely be described as the atoms within atoms. There is much more to an atom, the layman may be surprised to learn, than the ordinary run-of-the-mill atomic scientist ever bothers about. For practical purposes; i.e., making bombs or nuclear power stations or creating radioactivity, the nucleus of the atom can be regarded very much as a blackberry, a conglomeration of virtually identical particles distinguished only by the fact that some carry an electric charge and some do not. The whole of atomic engineering rests on this concept.

Show the same nucleus to a high energy physicist, who is to the atomic scientist what a dry fly man is to the boy on the pier, and the effect is like putting a drop of pond water under a microscope. That nucleus and its relatively stolid "elementary" particles becomes a teeming mass of worlds within worlds, inconceivably minute fragments of matter that appear and die all within millionths of a second. This is the regimen of the proton synchrotron and its kind. These are the machines by which scientists study this subworld within the atom, a subworld that so far as anyone can see is of no practical importance. But that does not make it any the less absorbing for scientists who are interested in probing the structure of matter. Such men cannot turn their interest off with a switch just because their discoveries have ceased to be "useful," any more than a jigsaw puzzle addict can give up before the last pieces are in place, even though the picture can be clearly made out without them.

The dilemma facing the Government is how far to pander to the scientific curiosity of this tiny elite by giving them the tools they need at what must inevitably be the cost of other equally deserving, but perhaps less intellectually exciting branches of research. Britain has, after all, a great tradition in nuclear physics, began by Rutherford at the beginning of the century and carried on by such names as Cockcroft. And nuclear physics, at the "high energy" end of the scale where these subparticles are studied, continues to be one of the growing points of science that attracts the best minds. If Britain opts out, because the cost of research is becoming too high, these men will not turn to study other things. They will pack their bags and travel wherever the kind of work that they want to do can be done.

High energy physics cannot be conducted without tools like Nimrod. To study these obscure particles, physicists rely on hitting fragments of atoms so hard that the particles burst out and are tracked for one flying moment on film, by computers, in fantastic bubble chambers filled with liquid gas * * * there are many techniques. But the force required to strike a nucleus this hard cannot be obtained with a hammer's blow. Scientists acquire it by firing nuclear particles into a circular vacuum and racing them round it at steadily increasing speeds, gaining acceleration inside the field of mammoth magnets. Out of these they emerge, in the case of Nimrod, with the force of 7,000 million electron volts behind them. Nimrod's magnet weighs 7,000 tons; the particles that it accelerates will have circled its 150-foot diameter vacuum tube 2 million times in less than 1½ seconds. The difference between this and primitive man swirling a stone round his head in a sling is largely one of scale. It seems to be one of the rules of nuclear research that the smaller the object studied, the larger the apparatus required.

It is a bald fact that this key branch of pure science, high energy physics, has been sliding downhill in Britain ever since the war for want of such equipment. Ten years ago, it was already clear that the smaller existing machines had reached the limit of their usefulness. Scientists needed higher powers and greater forces than they could provide. It is true that the Government was contributing heavily (£1.7 million a year) to the cost of running a machine nearly four times Nimrod's size at Cern in Geneva; but it is less easy than it sounds for visiting professors to have access to Cern, and it is obvious that a part share with the rest of Western Europe in one enormous machine goes almost nowhere toward meeting the needs of British universities. The Government faced a clear choice. Either this country opted out of high energy physics entirely, as it has already largely opted out of space, and shut its eyes to what, for all its apparent remoteness from ordinary reality, is one of the fastest-growing and most exciting fields of science, or it had to authorize the construction of a monster machine of uncertain price which, on the basis of quantity surveying alone, could not possibly cost less than £7 million and was probably going to cost a great deal more. It decided to authorize the machine.

Nothing smaller than Nimrod seemed likely to be useful; nothing like it had ever been built in Britain before. Considering the hazards, work went smoothly. The ring-shaped vacuum tube was the only component to cause real trouble and the only one for which the Atomic Energy Authority, as designer, had, much against its will, to place a development contract, with the result that it lost control over the tube's costs. Nimrod, completed and working no more than a year behind schedule, is likely to have cost £11 million, which is not so far more than the original shot-in-the-dark of £7 million, which made no allowance for contingencies. In one way and another, the men who designed Nimrod have reason to feel thy did a good job.

But a machine of this kind cannot be dumped in a field and left to fend for itself. Ancillary research equipment is needed, buildings and engineering shops and canteens are required and offices. Staff has to be taken on and wages paid. From the start of the project in 1957, up to the end of the current financial year (by which time Nimrod will have been working for just 6 months), the Government will have paid out a total of £34½ million on the venture. From now on, its yearly running costs (which will inevitably include much new equipment) are not likely to fall much below, say £8 to £10 million. Admittedly, Nimrod is to serve all the universities, but what does this mean? That something between 7 and 10 experiments might be conducted simultaneously, which is not a very large number, and produces a ratio of 100 men, scientists, engineers, electronics experts, and the like, to each single experiment.

Most of Nimrod's 900-strong staff (which will eventually rise to about 1,000) are there to keep the machine in sweet running order and to help visiting professors with their experiments. Whether it is overstaffed is beside the point. The dominating feature is the vast cost of getting this establishment, the National Institute for Research in Nuclear Science, onto its feet. Here is a clear case of research yielding steadily diminishing returns, in the sense that each advance in knowledge in this chosen field becomes increasingly more expensive to obtain. Yet who is to say that sheer knowledge is not worth this price, who is to say that this is not just the kind of exercise that rich countries can afford to indulge in for the benefit of the whole world? Who is philistine enough to say that the Government should not have bought this pig-in-a-poke, for scientists have never pretended that Nimrod was anything other than this?

But even scientists think that Britain has now gone about as far as a country of this size can go. Nimrod is expected to remain scientifically useful for 10 years, and they do not then expect a bigger successor to be built, unless some radical breakthrough in design brings higher powers within their reach without proportionately higher cost. But some decisions have to be taken sooner than that. Cern, in Geneva, is asking member governments whether they will finance the construction of a 300,000 million electron-volt machine costing a minimum of £120 million to build and £20 million to run in the first year, increasing subsequently at 10 percent per annum, of which Britain would be expected to provide, as at present, a quarter of the cost. At this point, even the most enthusiastic high energy physicist may ask himself whether Britain can afford such an outlay on one so very specialized field of pure science. The Government's own scientific advisers have come very close indeed to saying that at this table Britain should not play unless and until the Government has first provided "the relatively small sum needed to satisfy the legitimate needs of the rest of scientific research in universities." And without Britain, it is doubtful whether the Cern machine would get built. These are not easy decisions; they will become more rather than less frequent, so we had better get used to discussing them.

PLIGHT OF THE FISHING INDUSTRY

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the U.S. Senate, and particularly the Senate Committee on Commerce, has not been unmindful this session of the serious condition of our fishing industry. Numerous legislative proposals have been advanced with the strong support of the chairman of the committee and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Senator Warren G. Magnuson. This effort has been very carefully reviewed by the junior Senator from Alaska in his speech before the 16th annual session of the Gulf and Caribbean Fisheries Institute held in Miami, Fla., on November 11.

Senator Gruening also establishes very clearly the need for a 12-mile fishing zone.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator Gruening's speech be included in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Our Fisheries Need Greater and Firmer Support and a 12-Mile Limit

(Speech by Senator Gruening given at Miami, Fla., Nov. 11, 1963)

Friends and members meeting at the 16th annual session of the Gulf and Caribbean Fisheries Institute, a little over 4 months ago, I introduced a bill in the Senate which sought to extend our fishing limits from the present and traditional 3 nautical miles from our coasts to 12 miles, and at the same time avoid some of the conflicting views and interests among our diverse American fishing groups.

The reason for this precaution was that we are not—and when I say "we" I mean our fishermen and those concerned with our fishermen—are not entirely united on the desirability of extending these limits an additional 9 miles, although I am convinced that a substantial majority of them are.

So, the bill provided that whenever the Governor of any State or territory alleged, by petition to the President, that the fishing by nationals of other nations in some or all of the coastal waters lying within the 12 miles of the shores of such State or territory was of such intensity or magnitude, or of a character to endanger the fishery resource within that area, the President should appoint a factfinding board which would investigate the allegations of the Governor and report within 90 days; that if the report sustained the contention of the Governor, as it probably would, the President could prohibit by decree the fishing of these nationals in the waters of that State up to 12 miles or he could provide other regulations which would limit the extent of their fishing, the type of their gear, and establish other restrictions that seemed necessary.

One purpose of introducing this legislation was to call attention to the need of action regarding the obsolete 3-mile limit.

In my remarks to the Senate I referred to that 3-mile limit as an "albatross hung around every fisherman's neck." For I am saying to you very frankly that I am in favor of the 12-mile limit for the entire United States. I think it is overdue. The 3-mile limit is an outmoded conception dating from the days of the cannon that shot round iron balls whose effective range was estimated to be approximately 3 miles. In other words, the 3-mile limit was a development of a national defense measure which had nothing whatever to do with fishing. For long the 3-mile limit was common to all nations with seacoasts.

While there has been a lot of discussion concerning these limits for years and the pros and cons of changing them, there has been no concerted action. International conferences to change these limits have never developed a sufficient agreement to make possible multilateral action or universal action. So what actually has happened recently is that individual nations have taken it upon themselves to extend these limits to whatever seemed to them to be best for their nationals, and varyingly to hope and assume that each could make its prescription prevail on others. But, Uncle Sam, being generally good natured and perhaps in his maturity a little timid, has hesitated to take such action partly because of concern for international relations, but also because there were differences of opinion in our own fishing family.

These differences of opinion have become less and less valid because they were largely based on the desire of some of our fishermen to fish as close to the 3-mile limits of other nations as possible and did not wish to stimulate those nations into retaliatory measures if the United States proclaimed a 12-mile limit for itself. That situation has been rapidly disappearing as other nations have acted or claimed extensions of their fishing areas, and I suspect that before long we shall move closer to unanimity among American fishermen in supporting a 12-mile limit for our fisheries.

Let it be understood that this is for fisheries only and that is what our discussion is about, because there are some military or naval aspects, and extension of the limit to 12 miles for purposes other than fishing clash with some conceptions of our Defense Establishment.

Actually, the United States has in the past been a retarding agent in promoting change.

When the Hague Codification Conference met in 1930 under the auspices of the League of Nations, the United States favored continuation of the 3-mile limit which was then supported by the United Kingdom and by its former colonies or associates in the British Empire—Canada, India, Ireland, and South Africa, as well as by the Netherlands, Greece, Denmark, and China. Favoring 4 miles were Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Iceland. Six miles was sought by Italy, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Brazil, and Colombia. Portugal reached for 12 miles. No agreement was reached at this Conference.

Another conference, after long preparation in which 86 nations were represented, met in 1958, known as the Geneva Conference of the Law of the Sea. At that gathering 21 countries, including the United States and the United Kingdom, claimed 3 miles. In that category were also Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Cuba, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, France, Japan, Jordan, Liberia Malaya, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, Poland, South Africa, and Tunisia. Again Norway and Sweden, Finland, and Iceland favored 4 miles. Cambodia claimed 5 miles.

Twelve countries claimed 6 miles—Ceylon, Colombia, Greece, India, Iran, Israel, Portugal, Spain, Thailand, Uruguay and Yugoslavia. Mexico claimed 9 miles and Albania 10. By this time, 11 countries were claiming 12 miles—Bulgaria, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Indonesia, Libya, Rumania, Saudi Arabia, the Soviet Union, the United Arab Republic, and Venezuela. Chile, Costa Rica, Salvaor, and Peru put in a claim for 200 miles, while Argentina, Korea, Nicaragua, and Panama sought to claim their continental shelves. At this conference, Soviet Russia and the Arab bloc insisted on 12 miles, while the United States and the United Kingdom led the fight for the status quo—namely, 3 miles. Late in the Conference the U.S. delegation offered a compromise. It proposed a 6-mile limit with an additional 6-mile contiguous zone in which the coastal nation would have exclusive fishing rights, subject only to "historic rights" for countries whose nationals had fished in the area for the 5 previous years. This compromise failed to receive the two-thirds vote required for adoption as a Conference recommendation.

Two years later, in 1960, there was another conference—the Second Geneva Conference on the Law of the Sea. This time the Conference began with the proposal that failed in the closing hours of the 1958 conference, with the added qualification that after an initial 10 years the right of the states to fish within 12 miles would end unless bilateral treaties could meanwhile be negotiated. In this Conference the proposal fell short of one vote of the necessary two-thirds. With 82 nations voting and 5 abstentions, the proposal received 54 votes to 28 against. A shift of 1 vote would have made it 55 for to 27 against, the needed two-thirds majority. But let us remember that even after such a favorable vote there would be no compulsion for nations to carry out the findings of the Conference. A subsequent treaty with each nation, or a multilateral treaty of ratification, would have been needed and there was no guarantee or certainty that this would follow and that such treaties could be successfully negotiated.

This brief summary of recent history on the extent of territorial waters will give an idea of the difficulty of arriving at international agreement. The United States has been making efforts to secure such agreement. This is a praiseworthy objective—if attainable.

The United States has, in recent years, been suffering from what might be termed a power inferiority complex. Because we are powerful, we hesitate to assert that power. We demur at asserting it because of a well-intentioned and idealistic desire to show the world that we believe in negotiation, arbitration and decisions arrived at by mutual consent, if possible, of vexatious international problems. That is a fine ideal and a high purpose, which I applaud and which some day may prevail in the world. There is an old saying to the effect it is well to have a giant's strength but it is tyrannous to avail oneself of it. Well, neither is it desirable to have Lilliputians truss up and hamstring the giant through unwillingness on his part to use his giant's strength to protect his nationals' interest. For indeed events are outrunning the worthy high purposes but languid action of some aspects of our national policy. While the United States is striving for international agreement, other nations are going it alone.

On June 4 last, Canadian Prime Minister Lester Pearson, addressing the Canadian Parliament, declared that the time had come to "take firm and national action to protect Canada's fishing industry." Commenting on the growing number of foreign fishing operations which threatened to deplete his nation's offshore fishery resources, Canada's chief executive declared:

"The Canadian Government has decided to establish a 12-mile exclusive fisheries zone along the whole of Canada's coastline as of mid-May 1964, and to implement the straight baseline system at the same time as the basis from which Canada's territorial sea and exclusive fisheries zone shall be measured."

I can only applaud Canada's action as a vigorous move to protect its nationals' fishing interests.

Other nations, too, are moving—and moving unilaterally. Ecuador—little Ecuador—a country with no great political stability and seeking our financial aid under Uncle Sam's generous foreign assistance program, and receiving it—to date to the extent of $152 million—seized two American fishing vessels and arrested their crews, although they were fishing more than 12 miles from shore, since Ecuador claimed exclusive fishing jurisdiction up to 200 miles. The crews were brought into the harbor and kept imprisoned on their vessels for 3 weeks, a plain, unmitigated outrage. Then the two ships were fined $12,086 and $14,186 respectively.

We may well contrast the absence of vigorous action by our State Department in this case with its action in Alaska, where it insisted that the crews of the Japanese vessels arrested by Governor Egan, when they were caught fishing within 3 miles of Alaska's coast, be released without trial, although in their case they could only have been fined for failure to having fishing licenses and for violation of the conservation practices prevailing in our waters.

There have been other cases in Ecuador and similar to these of harassment of American fishing boats off the shores of other Latin American countries, and it is high time that we had a clear-cut understanding as to what they may and may not do, and not be subject to the arbitrary, brutal, and ruthless maltreatment to which these American fishermen have been subjected. Submission to such maltreatment does not instill respect either for the country guilty thereof or for the United States which accepts it passively.

As you know, I was asked to present a written copy of this address, which required my writing it a week in advance; and when I wrote it, I said, at this point: "I expect that this issue will come up in the current debate on foreign aid and that legislation will be proposed to obviate such occurrences in the future."

Well, it has come up. It took place on the floor of the Senate on Wednesday and Thursday November 6 and 7. At that time, an amendment to the foreign aid bill, sponsored by the two California Senators—Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, Republican, and Senator CLAIR ENGLE, Democrat—provided as follows:

"No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any country which (1) has extended or hereafter extends its jurisdiction for fishing purposes over any area of the high seas beyond that recognized by the United States, and (2) hereafter imposes any penalty or sanction against any U.S. fishing vessel on account of its fishing activities in such area. The provisions of this subsection shall not be applicable in any case in which the extension of jurisdiction is made pursuant to international agreement in which the United States is a party."

The amendment was vigorously supported both by my colleague, Senator BARTLETT, and by me. It was opposed by the leadership on both sides of the aisle, but it passed by a vote of 57 to 29.

An unusual parliamentary situation developed. It is customary, immediately after a vote has been taken, for the leader on the winning side to move for reconsideration of the bill and then have another Senator similarly on the winning side, to move that the move for reconsideration be laid on the table. The purpose of this is to make the decision final and not to permit reconsideration at a future date.

Before the move for reconsideration could be offered by Senator KUCHEL in behalf of the Kuchel-Engle amendment, Senator LONG of Louisiana obtained the floor and spoke very emphatically against the amendment. He succeeded in swinging a few votes but not sufficient to prevent the motion for reconsideration to be laid on the table.

The amendment, of course, will still have to be approved in conference, since it is not in the House version of the bill, and I think you can be reasonably sure that strong efforts will be made by the opponents to secure its deletion in conference.

But there is more than that to prompt the United States to act. Foreign fishing vessels in increasing numbers are also appearing off our shores, in waters traditionally fished by American vessels. They have been off the Atlantic coast from Maine to Florida and off our gulf coasts.

Soviet Russia is going after the fisheries all over the world with effectiveness, determination, and ruthlessness that threatens our fisheries and the livelihood of our fishermen. The Japanese likewise have become more and more aggressive. In 1956 the United States ranked second only to Japan as a fishing nation. By 1961, 5 years later, the United States had dropped to fifth place among nations in the size of its catch. We are now behind not only Japan, but behind Soviet Russia, Red China, and Peru. That is not a position of which we should be proud. Nor is it a trend that we can or should continue to tolerate.

While the world's annual fish catch has doubled in the last 15 years, the U.S. share of that increase has been negligible. But what has increased is our fisheries importation, which has, since 1940, grown approximately 400 percent. A determined national policy, geared to the national interest, could rectify that condition.

To be sure our dilemma is a complex one and I shall shortly touch on some of its problems and proposed remedies. But among the remedies which will be decidedly beneficial is the extension of our fishing preserves at least to the 12-mile limit with appropriate baselines between headlands.

The bill, S. 1816, of which I spoke earlier, cosponsored by Senator Ed Muskie, of Maine—thus evidencing support from our easternmost and westernmost States—has not been acted upon. The reason for the delay is, in part, the desire of the State Department to complete negotiations with some of the nations which are already asserting, or preparing to assert, exclusive control of coastal waters beyond the 3-mile limit. Among these is Canada, whose announced purpose to extend its limits to 12 miles next May would—unless we reach an agreement—deprive some of our American fishermen of long-frequented fishing grounds.

Central and South American nations have made similar departures, and while our Government has "reserved all its rights," as the diplomatic phrase goes, it remains to be seen just what those reservations of our rights mean. In any event, I am convinced that we cannot wait much longer before taking action ourselves.

The urgency for action is brought home to us particularly in Alaska by not merely the invasion of our waters by Japanese and Russian fishing fleets, but their actual penetration inside the 3-mile limit and the taking of fish inside it. One may suspect that the Russians are there also for purposes of observation.

In the summer of 1962, Gov. William Egan, of Alaska, apprised of Japanese fishing vessels moving into the waters of Shelikof Strait, a body of water lying between Kodiak Island and the mainland, long fished exclusively by Americans, wrote a vigorous protest to the State Department requesting effective action to prevent the Japanese incursion. Hearing nothing, he followed this up with a telegram. Still getting no response, he telephoned and got the Acting Secretary of State on the line. This was, the Acting Secretary said, the first he had heard of the difficulty. The best Governor Egan could exact from him was the promise to send an observer. Governor Egan was caustic over the phone. But, more important, defying precedent, he decided to act. He sent the Alaska National Guard to board two Japanese vessels clearly within these waters, arrested the captains and crews, and ordered them brought to court.

This forthright action was displeasing to the State Department, and produced an editorial in the Washington Post, the Capital's only morning daily, highly critical of Governor Egan. It pointed out that he had improperly taken upon himself a Federal function and chided him for not knowing the limits of a State Governor's authority.

However, his action received the virtually unanimous and enthusiastic support of the people of Alaska. In fact, there are many who believe this brought about his reelection in 1962. The pioneer spirit, still characteristic of "the last frontier" takes many forms. Governor Egan's pioneering received the hearty approval of Alaska's congressional delegation.

At the request of the State Department, the offending Japanese fishermen were released. Actually, there was at the time no penalty for the violation of our 3-mile limit. But the captain and crew could have been fined for not having an Alaska fishing license and for violation of conservation regulations related to the type of their ship's gear, for their nets were fine meshed and take everything, old and young, large and small.

Since that time, I am happy to report, legislation has been introduced in Congress to provide fines up to $10,000 and imprisonment up to 1 year for the violation of our coastal waters; that is, penetration by foreign vessels within the 3-mile limit. It, S. 1988, has passed the Senate, in large part due to the efforts of Senator Warren Magnuson, chairman of the Commerce Committee, and of my Alaska colleague, Bob Bartlett, and is awaiting action in the House, where I am confident it will also be approved. If the United States extends its fishing limits to 12 miles, these penalties will apply without need of any amendatory legislation.

The need for both the penalties and the extension is further demonstrated by actions of the Russian fishing fleet. Soviet vessels have repeatedly, under cover of morning fog, penetrated inside our 3-mile limit. Russian whaling vessels have taken whales well within it, and have been observed doing it. When detected by plane, they have often not moved, and only with the approach of our Coast Guard vessels have they moved out. Hitherto they have had nothing to fear. The Coast Guard vessel merely escorts them outside of the 3-mile limit. Actually, if S. 1988 becomes law, we shall need faster vessels because as of now they are not fast enough to catch the Russian ships. I have repeatedly requested the administration to station faster vessels—a destroyer or two—in Alaskan waters to overtake and apprehend such violators. Up to now, we are limited to escorting them outside our waters and then making a protest to the Russian Foreign Office.

So far, I have not secured compliance with these requests for destroyers or faster ships. I shall continue to make them. I have pointed out the uselessness of diplomatic protests made after such violations. Enactment of S. 1988, to impose fines up to $10,000 or a year's imprisonment, or both, will have a deterrent effect provided also we can catch the culprits. Otherwise, the Russian practice of fish-and-run will continue. I wonder, parenthetically, what would happen to American fishing vessels if they should similarly venture into Siberian waters. My guess is that our fishing vesels would never be heard from again.

Indeed, there is real danger that unless the Federal Government acts decisively, the State of Alaska may again feel impelled to act, as it did in the case of the Japanese fishing vessels in the summer of 1962.

Telegraphing the State Department on August 2, last, Governor Egan called attention to the presence of four Russian whalers within the 3-mile limit, giving their exact location. One whaler, he reported, had a freshly killed whale on a harpoon line, another whaler was preparing to fire. They were spotted by an experienced aircraft pilot and his passengers. Although the noise of the plane caused the whales to sound, the whalers made no effort to leave the area. This was but the latest of a number of confirmed observations of Russians fishing actively.

After urging the strongest possible representations to Russia and greatly augmented patrols, Governor Egan added that the State of Alaska had no desire again to take unilateral action and was aware of the delicate international situation but "cannot stand idly by in face of repeated violations of its territorial waters."

But there are still other problems with the Russians which will not be solved by the 12-mile limit and baselines alone and the penalties for their violation.

In Alaska we have, in recent years, developed an entirely new and desirable fishery product—the king crab. This is a large animal—its mature specimen measuring from 3 to 5 feet in diameter. The meat in each of its six claws is a meal. This new industry has been developed over the last decade largely through the enterprise and initiative of two Alaskans, brothers, Lowell and Howard Wakefield. Alaska king crab has become a nationally known delicacy and is increasingly marketed. It is caught by traps or pots which are lowered to the sea bottom from the crab fishing vessels and hauled to the surface and placed aboard.

For two successive seasons Russian trawlers cruising outside the 3-mile limit have torn up these traps. Governor Egan met with the victims at Kodiak last month and their testimony was to the effect that the Russians were deliberately dragging through the crab fishermen's gear, each of whose pots were clearly marked by a buoy. The Russians went back and forth through this area. One fisherman lost three pots on one day, five on the next, and two subsequently. As these cost about $200 apiece, he felt he could no longer set out his crab pots. Others gave similar testimony. Our crab fishermen, in effect, have been driven off their fishing grounds and deprived of their livelihood.

Another fisherman, coming alongside a Russian trawler, observed large quantities of king crab on its decks. There were many female and immature crabs and none of these were thrown off, as our conservation practices require.

In a letter to the President last month, Governor Egan reported these facts to the President. He had counseled the fishermen fully to document and report their gear losses and encounters with the Russians and to avoid any incidents which would prejudice their cause. He was evidently apprehensive that some of them, inflamed by the deliberate and insolent invasion of their grounds and destruction of their property, might be tempted to take the law into their own hands. (Violence against Japanese seal poachers flared over half a century ago, when Alaskans did take the law into their hands.)

"I believe the evidence conclusive," Governor Egan wrote the President, "that the Russians are driving American fishermen from their traditional fishing grounds and ignoring the fundamental requirements of king crab conservation."

So even the 12-mile limit and the establishment of base lines will not be enough. The United States should reserve its continental shelf—subject only to such bilateral treaties as serve the interests of both our fishermen and of the nation with which we treat. But even that will not be enough unless our Government takes a firm stand in behalf of our fishermen's rights and is prepared to back it up.

We have the largest defense budget in our history. We claim, and have, the most powerful military machine in the world—Army, Navy, and Air Force. We justify it and Congress votes it cheerfully in order to stop the advance of Communist imperialism all over the world. A large part of our defense effort, in dollars, material and manpower, is spent far from our shores, in distant parts of the world. Is it not inconsistent and inexplicable that we do not put out the same effort at home; that we do not stop the economic aggression on our very coasts?

It is high time we did so.

Such action, however imperative, will not solve all our fishery problems, for we must also meet the competition of other nations' subsidized fishing vessels and efficient floating factories. The Congress is moving in this direction with legislation to authorize the Government to pay a subsidy of 55 percent of the cost of new fishing vessels. This is proper and realistic, since our fishery interests are obligated to build in American shipyards. When we have modern ships and equipment, we will be able to compete on the high seas, though that will not solve the problem of foreign vessels disregarding conservation practices and taking immature fish.

Other legislation is giving us increased funds for research.

I sponsored a bill in the 87th Congress which would have turned over one-third of the proceeds from the Kennedy-Saltonstall Act to the States to be used by the State fishery authorities for whatever purpose they deem best. The funds were allocated to the States on the basis of fishery landings. The bill ran into some objections and did not pass.

In a modified form, sponsored by my Alaska colleague, BOB BARTLETT, along with 30 other Senators, of whom I was one, it has been introduced in this Congress and has already passed the Senate. It is S. 627, and I am confident it stands an excellent chance of passage in the House.

In addition to that, we now have an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act which includes fish products and fish protein concentrate as part of the food for peace program. Senator BARTLETT of Alaska was one of the prime movers in securing this desirable amendment. When we overcome the stubborn resistance of the Administrator of the Food and Drug Administration, who objects to the domestic sale of fish protein concentrate on esthetic grounds, we will also increase our domestic market substantially for fishery products.

Indeed, it is high time that we began to give consideration to those who produce food from the sea comparable to what we give those who produce food from the land.

We are spending billions of dollars annually to help the farmer with price supports and storage of surpluses—but we have done next to nothing for the fisherman. We have never subsidized our fishermen for the fish they do not catch. We have no sea bank comparable to the soil bank. To quote President Kennedy's clarion call: "Let us begin." Well, we are just barely beginning in ship construction and research. We must do much more to regain our lost position.

But we can, and I believe we must, protect our coastal waters and their fisheries. Although there are some differences between the views and interests of our own fishermen, I am convinced that the preponderant national interest will be served, as I have said, by extending our fishing waters to at least 12 miles and by including the Continental Shelf for crustacea and shellfish, and by being determined to enforce our rights within these areas. A vacillating, a weak-kneed, a soft policy will lead only to continuing and further encroachment. The United States has abundantly shown its generosity, its empathy, and its willingness to help other nations. Our foreign aid program has for years included projects to assist, to rehabilitate, to support the fisheries of a score of foreign nations.

It's high time we stood up for our own.

VARIOUS PROPOSALS SUGGESTED TO REMEDY THE CONTINUING PROBLEM OF BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in my previous two statements on the balance-of-payments deficits of the United States, I presented an analysis of the present fiscal position of our country as a result of the continued accumulation of deficits, and the causes of this unusual weakness, in an otherwise strong U.S. economy.

My conclusions were that the United States has become a debtor nation on current account, and that we have lost much of our economic leverage and bargaining power—an unfortunate attrition of one of the important attributes of world leadership—in fact, one of the main attributes of national sovereignty in matters of economic policy.

I believe we have lost flexibility, and mobility of economic power as an instrument of foreign policy; in fact, we are continuing our application of economic and military expenditures abroad as if there had been no change in our position; and we are actually doing this at the expense of borrowed money, mainly from Western Europe.

If this situation continues, ultimately we may well be subjecting ourselves to whatever disciplines the European nations wish to impose upon us.

To me, it is becoming steadily more clear that it is only a matter of time when we shall have to retrench. Otherwise we will either precipitate a financial crisis, or, in effect, go more and more in hock to other countries.

And this development could, of course, affect our capacity to "hold the line" against the advance of Communist ideologies.

An analysis of the causes of these continued deficits indicates that two principal reasons for them are: First, a structural change in our commodity import-export relationship, leading to a loss of our proportionate share of world trade; and second, the continued heavy expenditures of money on Government programs abroad for military and economic aid and operations. To these should be added the heavy net cost of tourist expenditures.

Today I would address myself to various remedies that have been proposed to control and reduce these deficits, and their probable effectiveness; viewed not theoretically, but realistically, in the light of present-day historical facts.

In the old days, the classical, traditional solution of the balance-of-payments deficits advocated by economists was as follows: Balance-of-payments deficits cause a flow of gold. This in turn diminishes bank reserves, and necessitates curtailment of credit. The latter is achieved through increasing interest rates to discourage borrowing, and therefore retard expansion, of business. This in turn should lead to a slowdown of business development, unemployment, and hopefully through competition and price cutting, lower prices of goods. When that happens, imports are thereupon diminished, and exports increased, because of more favorable competitive pricing.

On the other hand, the countries which receive the gold of course increase their reserves. Therefore, they can then lower their interest rates and cause "inflationary expansion." This automatically increases their prices.

Thus, while the deficit countries force their prices down, the surplus countries are confronted with rising prices.

The result, according to this theory, is that the surplus countries diminish their exports, and increase their imports, while the deficit countries increase their exports, and diminish their imports; the result is a new balance between imports and exports; and therefore the deficits disappear.

This was the generally accepted 19th century economic theory, when the gold standard was universal, and bank rates were automatically responsive to the diminution, or increase, of gold reserves.

Now it is interesting that this theory is still advanced, today, by the Committee on Economic Development; and also by many of the bankers and economists in Europe as well as in the United States.

But because these people do not dare to actually follow this classical economic theory to its logical conclusion—unemployment, price declines, economic recession—they now also talk about price stability.

It is now obvious that, neither politically nor economically is a forced deflation acceptable as a means of rectifying the balance-of-payments deficit.

On the other side of the ocean, the European countries are engaged desperately in trying to insulate their economies from price inflation resulting from increased dollar and gold reserves, plus credit availability.

Primarily because of a shortage of labor, these countries are not altogether successful, but they are doing their best to control inflation, through high interest rates and enforced wage stability. They have no intention of pricing themselves out of world markets by any automatic operation of the gold exchange standard.

Neither the United States, therefore, nor the payments surplus countries of Western Europe, are willing to act according to the precepts of "classical economic theory." Accordingly, we cannot expect an automatic adjustment of the balance-of-payments position of the United States through the lowering of prices here, and the increasing of prices abroad, certainly not within the forseeable future.

Ancillary to this theory is the so-called export drive. Creation of a larger export surplus is considered the best of the primary solutions of our balance-of-payments deficit. In arithmetical terms, this means, in effect, that we should increase our exports unilaterally, without a corresponding increase of imports, by about $3.5 billion a year to meet the costs of our foreign aid and military expenditures abroad.

What are the chances of so increasing our exports?

In terms of our trade relationships, the world may be divided into three categories of countries. First, there are the Iron Curtain countries, spread from the boundaries of West Germany to the Sea of Japan and China, containing over a billion people, more than one-third of the worlds' population.

Our trade with them heretofore has been minimal. Except for the currently discussed wheat sales, which very possibly would be temporary, there is not much we sell to them, or that they are inclined to buy from us, in commodities we are willing to sell. In fact, unless the West is willing to extend credit to them, or willing to buy goods from them, their ability to buy from us would be restricted to their accumulated gold reserves, an unknown quantity.

Trade with this area is likely to remain marginal, at least until there is a greater cooperative spirit, and a more normal trade relationship. This condition could only develop if we were willing to buy from these countries enough of their products for them to get the foreign exchange with which to buy our products.

But what could they sell to the West, in quantity, unless it be oil; and that we are trying to prevent.

Net increases in exports in this area, except temporarily, as mentioned, do not show any real promise of making a substantial contribution, over the long pull, to our balance-of-payments position.

A second category of countries are those in the underdeveloped area, in the Southern and Eastern Hemispheres. But these countries just do not have sufficient exchange earnings with which to buy an increasing amount of U.S. products. In fact, their earning power has, by and large, been diminished, because of lower raw material prices. The only way, therefore, that we can expect to export to these people, over and above their current earnings, is through grants and credits; and the only way this could be translated into exports, is to require U.S. procurement. Even in this latter case it would not mean that we would have any net increase in cash sales; in fact, the record shows that our overall foreign aid is still about $1.2 billion short of being covered by commensurate exports.

The third category of countries are the industrialized countries, those of Western Europe, and Japan, Canada and Australia. This category should be divided into two subgroups, namely, those which have chronic balance-of-payments deficits within the United States, and those that are accumulating surpluses.

Canada and Great Britain are both suffering from balance-of-payments deficits. They both are looking for ways to diminish their imports. These two countries, together, account for about 25 percent of our total exports; and, therefore, are not available to increase our total net earnings through "export drives."

This leaves those industrialized countries which have surpluses with the United States, in the main the Common Market countries of Western Europe. We already export more to these countries than we import from them, our total exports in 1961 amounting to $3.5 billion. If this export drive, as a solution to our balance-of-payments deficits, is to be practical, one must be able to prove that there is a possibility of increasing our exports to said countries, net, in the amount of $3.5 billion, an almost 100-percent increase over their current purchases from the United States.

Of the $3.5 billion U.S. exports to the Common Market countries, almost one-third, that is, $1.1 billion, is in agricultural products, with $1.6 billion in manufacturing.

What are the possibilities of such an unprecedented increase in exports to Western Europe?

To ask this question is indeed to answer it, because we all know that in the field of agriculture these Common Market countries have adopted, or are adopting, a policy of self-sufficiency, threatening our markets not only in poultry exports, which amount to but $50 million a year business, but also in wheat and other cereals, a $500 million business.

France desires, naturally, to become the breadbasket of Europe. Her present policy, with a variable levy at port of entry which equalizes international and European support prices, plus a dollar-a-ton surcharge, combined with a high price-support program, can in the end only close these markets to us once and for all.

As I see it, the best we can hope for, in spite of the optimistic predictions made last year during the debate on the Trade Expansion Act, is a market access agreement for a short time, maybe 3 years.

Instead of an increase in sales, therefore, again as I see it, we can hope only for a standstill agreement, for a period; and, after that, a diminution of our markets for farm products in Western Europe.

The only real chance of changing this gloomy prospect would be a dramatic reversal of agricultural policy in Europe, but we may have lost the economic and diplomatic bargaining power necessary to bring this about.

It is true that we have been expanding our sales of manufactured products to Europe; but there again there is a shift from end products to machinery; and when the retooling of European industries is completed, we shall probably be confronted with a diminution of manufactured exports as well.

In any event, the self-sufficiency program of France is as equally applicable to industry as it is to farming. Only recently the French Government threatened to withdraw from the Coal and Steel Community unless their other partners in the Common Market agreed to an increase in tariffs on steel products.

All intelligence reports from Geneva, Paris, and Brussels indicate that the Common Market countries have no intention whatever of making any unilateral concessions to give us a net increase in exports to them. In fact, we understand they have now adopted a procedural position that the high tariffs of the United States must come down, first, by a greater proportion than average tariff rates. The talk is for the United States to reduce these so-called high tariff disparities by 50 percent, while the rest of the commodity lists would be reduced by only 35 percent, both in the Common Market and in the United States.

There is some indication that perhaps our U.S. Government negotiators are beginning to yield to this reality. As indicated in the summary of the White House Conference on Export Expansion, we are now talking about obtaining balanced results in these negotiations.

This report says the United States "should conclude its negotiations on the basis of granting, and receiving reciprocal benefits, that is, the 'balanced result.'" Is this another way of saying that we are not going to fight for any unilateral concessions in order to increase our exports "in the net" as a contribution to our balance-of-payments deficits?

Have we given up the idea, so often advanced by the Joint Economic Committee, that we should get some unilateral concessions reversing and making up for the tolerance we have shown over the years toward the discriminatory practices of European countries toward American products? A "balanced result" is not going to give us the increase of exports that we need to make a net contribution to our international deficit.

It may be said that we need not sell all of the additional $3.5 billion's worth of goods to Western Europe to balance our international accounts. We could take away, in part, European and Japanese markets in third countries, such as, for example, South America, and Africa.

Historically, Africa has bought only about 15 percent of its imports from the United States. Its traditional ties have been with Europe. With the former French African colonies affiliated with the Common Market as associate members, with free trade privileges both ways, and the British desperately needing to maintain their export outlets in their traditional economic sphere in that continent, the prospects of increasing cash sales from the United States to that area are slim.

South America is a battleground for exports between Japan, Europe, and the United States. But with the price differentials existing between U.S. products and our foreign competitors, with South American countries transferring their purchases from us to credit and foreign aid accounts under the Alliance for Progress, along with their continued desire to establish their own manufacturing industries, any chance we might have to capture enough additional markets there to increase our net cash sales do not appear optimistic, certainly not enough to make a substantial contribution to the $3.5 billion of balance-of-payments deficits.

In facing this growing problem realistically, we might as well admit that most of the Far East and southeast Asia are customers for relief, rather than prospects for additional cash sales.

Reluctantly, therefore, I come to the conclusion that our major reliance upon an export drive as a solution of our balance-of-payments deficits is a strategic error, not because it is not desirable, but because it does not offer any realistic solution in the foreseeable future.

The United States has already lost 5 years—since 1958—in making our plans along the lines of this approach, with scant success.

As justification for this position on my part, witness the fact that our cash commodity export surplus was down to $1.9 billion in 1962, and this after all the hortatory speeches and propaganda aimed at getting American industry export minded.

In the past two talks that I have made in recent days with respect to this increasingly serious problem of continuing unfavorable balance of payments—continuing loss of gold—I presented first, "The Balance-of-Payments Deficits," and second "The Causes of Balance-of-Payments Deficits."

Today I have addressed myself to the "Various Proposals Suggested To Remedy the Continuing Problem of Balance of Payments."

My next talk—fourth of this series of five—will have to do with the various monetary devices that have been suggested as possible solutions for this problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF LIBRARY SERVICES ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. S. 2265, to amend the Library Services Act in order to increase the amount of assistance under such act and to extend such assistance to nonrural areas.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, provided that in doing so he does not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

SEQUEL TO THE REVISITATION OF THE SENATE ESTABLISHMMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, yesterday, I listened with great interest to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. As the Senator knows, there are many specific questions which he raises and interpretations which he gives to events in the Senate with which I disagree most emphatically. There are many remedies which he suggests for the procedural dilemmas in the Senate which I believe and have so stated, may be, if not worse than the disease, ineffective. Nevertheless, I do want the Senator from Pennsylvania to know that I personally appreciated his frank expression of his views. I regret that there were not very many Senators on the floor to hear these views because what the Senator from Pennsylvania did in this statement, as he has done in others, was to deflate any tendency toward complacency in this body. There is always room for improvements. There is always need for change to keep up with the changing times. And, again, while I will not subscribe at this time to any of the specific suggestions of the Senator from Pennsylvania, they are, in my opinion, worthy of consideration by every Member of this body.

It is my intention, in line with my statement to the Senate on November 18, after an interview with the press on this subject, at which time I stated:

> I want the record to be clear and complete as to my attitude on the questions which have been expressed of late on this Senate and its leadership. This interview may not be the last word which I shall have to say on the subject.

It is my intention to make reference to the state of the Congress, the Senate, and its leadership in rather extended remarks on Monday next. I shall, on that occasion, do something which I rarely do and that is to request a live quorum prior to my remarks, because I believe some of the things which I have to say are or should be of interest to the Members of this body.

For the purpose of these remarks, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the morning hour on Monday next that there be a live quorum and that I be recognized after it is established. It will take about an hour to say what I have to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield to the minority leader as much time as he desires.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, I had an opportunity to examine the remarks of the distinguished Senator from the Keystone State [Mr. CLARK]. I am distressed, of course, that he did not have a large and attentive audience that would give him the old "huzzah" when he made a point, but I go on the theory that one gets an audience if he deserves one. That statement can stick for whatever it is worth. I have never had any difficulty in that respect. I have never felt the necessity of invoking a live quorum in order to get Senators to listen to me. When that day arrives, I shall conclude for myself, in prayerful contemplation, that perhaps what I have to say is not worth listening to.

The Senator from Pennsylvania said in his statement of yesterday that this rather meager role of achievement is due to failure to act on the President's civil rights bill. There is no failure that I know of. The House has taken no action.

I wish the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to hear what I am about to say.

A civil rights bill was introduced in the Congress in January of 1961, sponsored by a distinguished Member of the House and a distinguished Member of the Senate. If I remember correctly, the sponsor was the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. But what happened? The White House disclaimed and disdained the bill. It was not until the 19th of June 1963, a long time afterwards, that we finally received the President's message, and the administration bill.

I do not believe there has been a lack of diligence on our part. Everyone know that the issue is shot through with emotionalism and, to say the least, it is controversial. It is controversial in my book. I so informed the President of the United States. I believe on four different occasions I visited the White House to discuss the problem with the President. I knew how I felt, and I am confident that the President knew how other Members of this body felt; and I am certain that the distinguished Senator from the great Keystone State knew how we felt about it.

Now, when controversy comes, do we blink at it, or do we work on it, and see what we can finally make of it?

I was willing to accept seven or eight titles of the bill. Since then, three additional titles have been added to the bill. Two of them are distinctly controversial. Overnight we do not pick a proposal like that out of the air, pitch it into the well of the Senate and say, "Now vote on it.

I have said a hundred times that our Government is much like an old scow. It does not move fast; it does not move very far at one time: but it does not sink.

All we have to do is look at the number of countries that have gone in for precipitate, capricious, and expeditious action—as the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania would have us do—and we find the moldering bones of those countries dotting various fields in the world.

Mr. President, I am in no great hurry. I recall the story about Phillips Brooks, the great minister, when a friend came into his study one morning and found him pacing up and down. The friend said, "Dr. Brooks, what is the matter with you?" "Why," he said, "I am in a hurry, and God is not."

If we will only take our time in a free country we will preserve a free society. I do not intend to be panicked by the frustrations of my lovable, genial, and amiable friend from the great Keystone State.

The Senator says:

> It is our failure to act on the President's tax bill.

The message was available to the House for 8 months. Later we received it. We have had it for a month. Does anyone say that the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has been lacking in diligence? I have just come from the committee. I try to be diligent. The hearings have been in progress day after day—hearing two witnesses, three witnesses, five witnesses or six witnesses. One cannot cavalierly deal with people who prepare presentations and come from afar, representing organizations and groups. One cannot say, "Sorry, but you can have only 10 minutes to testify on the tax bill."

Our State has a chamber of commerce, which is the largest chamber of commerce in any State of the Union. It is a really dynamic organization. I do not know its total membership, but it is in the thousands. It pays a tax expert, and pays him well. That tax expert is sent here, with the statement, "You present our case to the Finance Committee of the Senate."

What shall we say to a high-grade man who has paid a great deal of attention to all aspects of the tax bill? Shall we say to him, "We are sorry; you may be a taxpayer; your members may be substantial taxpayers, and they may feel agrieved, but all you will be allowed will be 10 minutes." Is that the way to conduct a free constitutional government? Not in my judgment.

The distinguished Senator from the Keystone State said:

> It is our unconscionable delay in not acting on the foreign aid authorization bill.

Where is my dynamic antagonist from Oregon? I should like for him to answer that.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator repeat the statement?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will read it again, so that the Senator may understand its full significance. He said:

> It is our unconscionable delay in not acting on the foreign aid authorization bill until November 15.

Is the Senator from Oregon the unconscionable offender about whom he is speaking?

Mr. MORSE. Am I mistaken in the belief that the Senator from Pennsylvania disagreed with me on the foreign aid bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I leave it to the Senator to answer the question.

Mr. MORSE. I believe that answers the question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then I must address myself to the distinguished Senator from the greatest unfrozen State in the Union.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. He had something to say about the foreign aid bill.

Mr. GRUENING. I know of no unconscionable delay in the discussion of the foreign aid authorization bill. I believe that for the first time in many years the Senate attempted conscientiously to assert, indeed to recapture its constitutional authority and to play the part it is entitled to play as one branch of the Congress responsible for all authorizations and appropriations of public funds in cutting down some of the waste and exercising control over some of the errors that had characterized some of the functioning of the foreign aid administration. As a result of that debate, which lasted 3 short weeks, a much better bill emerged, and those in charge of the foreign aid program were given notice that they must further improve its administration if they expect to gain approval in the next Congress.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Could the Senator not send our friend from Pennsylvania a postcard and let him know what are the facts?

Mr. GRUENING. I find that the Senator from Pennsylvania and I do not agree on all aspects of our foreign aid program. He appears to like it as it is. I feel it can be greatly improved. It has been.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I have not sent the Senator a post card, but I sent him a telephone message, to see whether he could come to the Chamber to listen to my good friend the Senator from Illinois. He might wish to say something.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Why not provide him with a seeing-eye dog?

Mr. President, I was just about ready, as I was coming in this morning, during the 45 minutes it takes to come in from where I live, to let my system fill with bile, and then I was going to address myself——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe in all fairness it should be brought to the attention of the Senate that at the present time the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is engaged in carrying out his public responsibility, and is presiding over a meeting of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. I was about to say that before I concluded my brief remarks.

The Senator is a living example of what happens in the Senate. That hearing involves a highly controversial measure of the most urgent nature, which the majority leader and I and other Senators tried to shape into a "package" and get it out of the foreign aid bill and over to the Committee on Banking and Currency for hearings and consideration, where it properly belongs. The Senator is there, and rightfully so.

When the Senator undertakes to look around the Chamber and say, "I see so many unoccupied seats," it seems to me——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe I was the one who made that statement, and not the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, so what responsibility there is is mine.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But when the distinguished majority leader says it, his heart is full of compassion, his soul is contrite, his mind is humble, and he does not use that as a springboard to reform the Senate.

I noticed also that the Senator made at least eight recommendations as to what should happen in this august body.

The one that intrigued me the most was No. 4. He said:

> The joint leadership should give notice that it intends, in January 1965—

He really meant 1964, I am sure—

> to discipline, through party action, those members of the establishment—

Whatever that is—

> on both sides of the aisle who, in the case of the Republicans, frustrate the program of their party or, in the case of the Democrats, refuse to support either the candidate of their party for the Presidency or the platform on which he runs in 1964.

If our distinguished friend from the Keystone State has his way, Senators are to be subjected to some condign punishment or discipline. They must vote for the man who is nominated in the convention and stand up later and enthusiastically espouse the platform, or the Senator from Pennsylvania insists that the majority leader punish and discipline them. That is a great big mouthful of chewing tobacco to chew, I would say.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I say to the Members of my own party that the Senator from Pennsylvania insists, in the case of Republicans, that if they frustrate the party program it is my business to discipline them.

I wonder what the Senator from California will say, when I come to him with the big bullwhip which is in my office, the badge of authority gained when I sat where he sits, to say, "I am going to crack the whip. Get in line."

What does the Senator think he will say to me, if we disagree?

These are pretty words on paper, but we do not live in a vacuum, Mr. President. We are people. We react as people. We have all the virtues, all the vices, all the foibles of people.

I love the little package describing how we are going to make Senators behave, if anyone does not walk the chalkline.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there are people in this country who believe that the Congress is a totally unnecessary appendage of our Government, indeed a hindrance in that it is a cause of delay. They seem to believe its only purpose is to frustrate the President and that it seldom represents the views of the party in power.

I do not believe that that theory has been better expressed than when the Senator from Pennsylvania expressed it in his statement. If the Senator's concept is the proper way for the Congress to operate, then the Congress is a totally unnecessary appendage and should be abolished to prevent the waste of tax money.

For reasons of history or sentiment we might keep the Capitol, for the purpose of permitting visitors and sightseers to come in and view where the Senate once sat. In order to preserve as much of a realistic atmosphere as possible, we could provide light bulbs at seats once occupied by Senators. We could have different colors for representing those who would have been Democrats in the last election, according to a computing machine that would analyze the returns, and the light bulbs which represented the Democrats would be controlled by a switch in the White House, and, when the President decided that something should be done, he could draw up an order and press the buttons to light the bulbs that represented the Democratic Members of the Senate. Then he could sign the bill and say, "I hereby enact a new law."

I suppose that the lights that represent the Republicans would be handled from the Republican National Committee, and an arrangement could be made between the White House and the chairman of the Republican National Committee, so that the chairman could press the button that reflects the votes of the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY

Republican Members on a particular issue. Perhaps it would not require more than two or three people to see how the Republicans had voted or if the President had had the votes of all the Democrats.

Ever since I can remember, in the political life of this country the Republicans have had better discipline than the Democrats. The Republican leaders have been able to keep their Members more nearly in line, not by means of a bullwhip, but in some other manner.

I do not think any Democrat has any reason to apologize because at times we have faltered in presenting a solid front.

Will Rogers on occasion said he was not a member of any organized political party—he was a Democrat. Perhaps our party sometimes meets that description.

A constant effort is being made by certain political groups, such as the Americans for Democratic Action and others, to discredit the Congress no matter what it does. Unless the Congress is completely submissive to their demands, they think we ought to be abolished or our powers should be curtailed or extremely limited.

Congress has managed to stay afloat over the years as the tide of history has ebbed and flowed. We have had strong Presidents that made Congress look bad, and perhaps made it look useless. We have had Congresses which have infringed upon the prerogatives of the executive branch of the Government. There have been times when strong Presidents and strong Congresses did not agree. Then the country moved like a scow afloat, and as the Senator from Illinois said, our movement has been slow. But it has managed to stay afloat.

It will be the task of historians to record the events of today. I resent the Senate being constantly attacked about conditions over which it has no control.

In the first place, the Constitution clearly provides for tax bills to originate in the other body. It is equally clear that the Senate has a right—indeed a duty—of conducting hearings to determine what if any amendments should be made to the bills that originate in the House.

I have not heard any of those who wish to reform the Senate complain that the other body took from 7 to 8 months to study and consider the tax bill. However, they expect a submissive and compliant Senate to rush the bill through with few if any questions despite the fact that it is very clear that any such action on the part of the Senate would make this body completely subservient to the House and to the executive branch in the vital matter of tax legislation. To deny the Senate the right of hearings is to place the Senate in an inferior position.

Let us take a brief look at the situation with respect to the appropriations bills. Those who denounce the Senate have manifested little interest in protecting the prerogatives of this body. The House has consistently asserted a right not given it by the Constitution of originating all appropriations bills as well as tax bills.

With one possible exception, the appropriations bills that have come to us have been given immediate attention. Those who denounce the Senate for the delay in the appropriations bills fail to mention the fact that the Members of the other body who control the destiny of appropriations bills have been quoted as saying that the delay that they have caused in the consideration of appropriations bills has reduced Government spending by many hundreds of millions of dollars, and there is possibly much substance in this statement, but the point I make is that Senators blame the Senate for delays for which the House claims credit.

I must say that if some of those who apparently desire to weaken the Senate would extend their interest to protecting the prerogatives of the Senate, we would have better legislation. We would also have much more expeditious handling if the Senate originated one-half of the appropriations bills.

It goes unmentioned, Mr. President, that the Senate has passed a number of important measures that are found in the President's program that are languishing in the other body. In this category are the area redevelopment bill, the mass transit bill, the amendments to the Securities and Exchange Act, the water pollution control bill, the National Service Corps, and the youth employment legislation as well as the so-called wilderness bill.

Each of these bills has been in the hands of the other body for some time, but detractors of the Senate never mention the fact that these bills have been cleared by this body.

Rumor has it that the other body has not considered these bills because the leadership and the administration fear that the House of Representatives will reject them.

Nevertheless, the charge of irresponsibility is leveled at the Senate and there is no criticism of the failure of the House to consider these bills though, under their rules, they could undoubtedly bring them up at any time.

The charge of ineffectiveness is leveled at the Senate by Senators when the facts show that the Senate is not blocking these bills. The failure of the other body to consider these bills is to me a clear indication that there is a great body of public opinion in this country that does not approve of many of these bills that the Senate has passed. Critics nevertheless continue to blame the Senate, evidently on some fantastic theory that changes in the rules of the Senate will pass bills through the House of Representatives.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Before I respond to the Senator from Georgia, let me read the peroration from the great speech that the Senator from Pennsylvania delivered in the Senate yesterday afternoon. This is something of a warning, because notice is properly served therein. He said:

> Gentlemen, it is later than we think. The bricks and mortar of which the Houses of Congress are built are cracking and falling out of place under our eyes. The American people are becoming disillusioned with the legislative performance of the Congress. They are demanding both action and reform. We must act to restore the efficacy of congressional government before the legislative branch of our Federal Republic destroys itself because we were unwilling to save it.

Is there not a magnificence about those words?

Mr. RUSSELL. Those words are ringing words, but the author overlooks the fact that the American people, if they are dissatisfied, have an opportuity every 2 years to make a change.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The words have the ring of Websterian authority.

It is some years since I sat on a fragment of granite in a little country in northern Africa. There was a great scooped-out area, where once stood the amphitheater of ancient Carthage, against which Cato the Censor leveled his shaft:

> Carthago: delenda est. Carthage must be destroyed.

As I sat there in Carthage, a little boy came up to me. He spoke a little pidgin English, and he wanted to sell me what purported to be an ancient coin.

I said, "Son, where is the country that was once here?"

He said, "No country."

I said, "But there was a great country here once. It produced great leaders like Hamilcar and Hannibal."

"No country."

It had all been leveled clean; and everything that might have been an eternal monument to the glory of Carthage had also been leveled. All one sees now are a few jagged fragments of granite.

There I sat.

Why did that country disappear? It had no free society, such as ours, in which we can have at each other, without any restriction on freedom of speech and expression, and in which the humblest citizen can take his Senator to task, when he comes home, and ask him, "I demand to know how much General Motors stock you have." That is in line with the resolutions that are pending in the Committee on Rules and Administration.

So long as we preserve that sense of freedom and perspective, this country will last.

I now come to the second part of what I wish to say. In 1836, the 24th Congress was in session in Washington. It was a great Congress. Andrew Jackson was in the White House. Van Buren was Vice President, and James K. Polk, from the great State of Tennessee, was the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Who sat in the Senate? There were such men as Henry Clay, of Kentucky; Benton, of Missouri; Buchanan, of Pennsylvania; and Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts. James Buchanan, of Pennsylvania, of course, later became President of the United States.

In the House of Representatives sat John Quincy Adams, Franklin Pierce, of New Hampshire; Judah Benjamin, of Louisiana; Cameron, of Pennsylvania; Seward, of New York. Where were the Texans? Sam Houston, of Texas, also sat in the House, as did Chandler, of Michigan.

Those men left a durable imprint upon the pages of our history.

What was said of that Congress? This was the 24th Congress. Let me give

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Senators a choice item that was published on March 14, 1836, in the New York Herald. This is 127 years ago:

> What, then, is the cause? It is wholly produced by the indolence, the folly, the party spirit of Congress.

That was a contemporary feeling, at a time when great men were walking in these halls.

On March 25, 1837, the Baltimore Republican and Commercial Advertiser said:

> A more weak, bigoted, persecuting, and intolerant set of instruments of malice and every hateful passion were never assembled in a legislative capacity in any age or any land.

That was a description of the 24th Congress, when the real greats were sitting here and in the House.

That is pretty strong stuff. Andy Jackson was in the White House. I used to receive an inspiration, when I lived in the central part of Washington, because every time I saw him on his charger in Lafayette Park, I doffed my hat and said, "Great old Andrew. How he served his country."

There were crises in the 1850's. We were confronted with a domestic crisis. There was a depression. There were many jobless.

Harpers called it "A gloomy moment in history." Men talked of grass growing in the streets and the end of the Republic.

Our distinguished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] said:

> The bricks and mortar of which the Houses of Congress are built are cracking and falling out of place under our eyes. The American people are becoming disillusioned with the legislative performance of the Congress. They are demanding both action and reform. We must act to restore the efficacy of congressional government before the legislative branch of our Federal Republic destroys itself because we were unwilling to save it.

Let us look back to 1857. Buchanan was in the White House, and Breckinridge was Vice President. James Orr, of South Carolina, was the Speaker of the House. In the Senate sat men like Douglas and Trumbull of my State of Illinois. There sat here also Robert Toombs of the State so ably represented by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. There also sat here Sumner, of Massachusetts, and Hannibal Hamlin, of Maine.

They all left their mark on the pages of history.

There also sat here Chandler, of Michigan; Cameron, of Pennsylvania; Andrew Johnson, of Tennessee. Andrew Johnson was a tailor, whose wife taught him to read and write. He became Vice President and later President of the United States.

Also, in the House, sat Justin Morrill, of Vermont, the author of the famous Land Grant College Act. Also Giddings of Ohio, Sickles—General Sickles—of New York; Lovejoy of Illinois, the great liberator.

Mr. President, we cannot disdain people like that.

Those were great Congresses.

Now let us take a look at what was said about them.

The North American and U.S. Gazette for September 15, 1857, had this estimate:

> How can we expect integrity and uprightness in our legislatures or in Congress when the barrooms and bullies furnish the candidates?

Today there is a great deal of talk about integrity. Here was an editorial smash:

> How can we expect integrity and uprightness when the candidates or bullies come from barrooms?

I quote now from the Philadelphia Pennsylvanian of September 12, 1857:

> Had we more statesmen and fewer mere politicians, the country would not have been reduced to its present distressing and humiliating condition.

That was in 1857. We now go to 1873. That was the year of panic and of Black Friday. I noted in speeches made by some Representatives on the aid program, after the House had completed action on the bill, the reference to Black Friday.

I refer to October 1873, when Black Friday occurred. I read words that were current then, taken from editorials:

> Crisis, ruin, disaster, destitution, panic, anxiety, gloom, tottering Republic.

I could read other descriptive words.

The same words will be found today in any current newspaper. They may be juxtaposed or rearranged a little differently. But in the year of 1873, when Congress was in session, James G. Blaine, the "Plumed Knight," was the Speaker of the House, and he delivered a grand speech. Grant was in the White House. In the Senate sat Sumner of Massachusetts; Carl Schurz, of Missouri, a close personal friend of Abraham Lincoln; Roscoe Conkling, of New York; John Sherman, of Ohio; and Justin Morrill, who had moved from the House to the Senate.

In the other body sat Alexander Stephens, from the State of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. Along with him sat Garfield, of Ohio, who became President; Randall and Strawbridge, of Pennsylvania, and many others of note. Also in the Senate sat Logan—John A. Logan of Civil War fame, who came from Illinois, as did Richard Oglesby.

John Ingalls, of Kansas, who had such a facility with words, was another. His pentameters were almost poetic. There were many others.

How did that Congress rank? Let us take a look. On December 18, 1873, a prominent newspaper, the New York Daily Graphic, said:

> It is generally conceded that the Congress has depreciated within 20 years.

Said the Carthage, Ill., Gazette, on November 29, 1873:

> If Congress will only let things work themselves straight, the whole community will be better off.

Let me find the choice one. Here it is. It is from the New York Post of September 27, 1873:

> We are not certain that it is not possible to make the situation worse, and Congress would speedily reach that result if that be possible.

That is a great estimate of that Congress of long ago.

I continue with the record. We come now a little closer to contemporary history. We come to the year 1893. There was a European crisis; a threat of war. There was talk of anarchy and depression. There was distrust. There was gloom. Men were blowing out their brains. Men were jumping out of windows as the market crashed back in 1893.

Cleveland was in the White House, the only President who was elected twice not consecutively. He was elected against the desires of his own party machinery. I have always had great admiration for Grover Cleveland. How he was castigated.

In the seat of the Presiding Officer of the Senate, believe it or not, Adlai Stevenson was sitting—the grandfather of one who was twice a candidate for the Presidency on the Democratic ticket. Along with him, Charles Crisp, of Georgia, was Speaker of the House. Look through the rule book and see how many durable rulings Charlie Crisp left on the pages of the history of this Republic.

In the Senate sat Bankhead, of Alabama; Leland Stanford, of California, after whom that great school is named; Shelby Cullom, of my State; Allison, of Iowa; Lodge, of Massachusetts; George Frisbie Hoar, of Massachusetts; Aldrich of Rhode Island; and, of course, Charlie Curtis was around.

Champ Clark was in the other body. So was Frederick Gillette, who later became Speaker. That was a great Congress. But let us see what Leslie's Weekly said when it was quoting the Louisville Courier-Journal. This is a quotation that must be written down on the tablets of love and memory, because it is a dandy. It was written only 66 years ago. This is what was said:

> The U.S. Senate is revealed as the most ridiculous deliberative body that human indulgence has yet permitted to evolve itself out of an originally good institution.

We will have to exert ourselves to improve on that. I do not believe that those who have a facility with words could do much better. That statement meant that the Senate was the most ridiculous deliberative body of any time or generation.

But let us see what else was said.

On October 16, 1893, the New York World said:

> There was a day in the history of the Senate when brains had at least an equal show with lungs.

The New York Evening Telegram, on November 3, 1893, said:

> Congress has finally shown that it has the courage of the President's convictions.

Then I ought to add, from the New York Advertiser of January 29, 1894, because it is so much to the point:

> What Congressmen need most is a new set of spines.

On February 27, 1894, the New York Tribune wrote:

> Congress is the greatest timekiller of modern days.

Could we ask for anything better? Could we ask for anything more pertinent? Could we ask for anything that is more "on the nose"?

I shall finish this speech at some other time, when I am really steamed up. I have just come from the Committee on Finance and from the Subcommittee on Internal Security. I did not quite expect that this text would be uttered here and that it would excite me a little, because usually one ought to prepare for this sort of thing. I ought to get out my track shoes; I ought to take a few swimming lessons; and then I ought really to wrestle with the Devil, as Jacob did with the angel of old. So I will spare Senators all that and save the rest.

We hear criticisms about archaic and obsolete machinery, and about delay, as though we operated in a vacuum. The Republic is still pretty robust, and the Senate is also rugged and robust as it addresses itself, day after day, to its duties.

I make one special comment, on absenteeism. I must apologize to my distinguished friend from Philadelphia [Mr. Clark] for not being present yesterday. I left word with the Senate staff to call me the minute my friend prepared to readdress himself to the question that he so aptly entitled "The Establishment Revisited." I have his speech before me. I read it this morning. It delighted me no end. I shall read it again, particularly the Senator's eight points.

Then, of course, I shall address myself to the defeat of all those things—not all, but most of the things—that the Senator is seeking to achieve, because I do not believe they would serve a good purpose. I do not believe they could enhance or expedite legislation. I believe it would be imprudent and unwise for the Senate to adopt the Senator's suggestions, particularly the one that puts me in a difficult position. The Senator from Pennsylvania said, among other things, that the leaders must now discipline their party members if they get off the beam. I have a big whip over in my office. It came from the Argentine when I was the minority whip. I could bring it over here and give it a crack; but I wondered what would happen to me after about the first crack. I am delighted that this is still a great body of thinking people, who stand up to their consciences and convictions, for therein reposes the great and shining durable hope of the Republic.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I think the Record should show that I was presiding this morning—at the request of the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson]—over the hearing being conducted by the Banking and Currency Committee on the so-called Mundt bill to prohibit the Export-Import Bank from guaranteeing the sale of wheat to Russia. Shortly before that hearing closed, and when the final witness was still waiting to be heard, I was advised that the Secretary of the majority had telephoned to inform me that my dear friend, the Senator from Illinois, was making a few comments about the speech I made on the floor yesterday afternoon.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania bear with me at this point? In my remarks I made it abundantly clear that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania was engaged in a committee hearing on a most important and, in fact, a most urgent piece of proposed legislation which we took out of the foreign aid bill and sent to the Banking and Currency Committee; and I salute him for his diligence in addressing himself to it.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his unusually kind words, for which I am very grateful.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am always kind.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Illinois is correct; he is always kind. That is one of his most endearing characteristics.

Therefore, Mr. President, because I was presiding over that very important committee meeting, I was unable to be in the Senate Chamber to hear the remarks of the distinguished and able Senator from Illinois. I look forward to reading them in the Record at my first opportunity, and then I shall determine whether it is desirable for me to make any further comment.

For the moment, I make only two: First, if there had been a sensible rule of germaneness, I would not have been able to make that speech at all.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No doubt that is why the Senator from Pennsylvania is against the rule.

Mr. CLARK. I understand that. This is what might be called not only a tactic of delay, but the tactic of delay.

I understand that later in the afternoon the Senator from Illinois intends to submit an amendment which would almost cripple the bill, by confining its application to cities with a population of 100,000 or less. If that amendment is adopted, I shall consult with the Senator from Oregon, to determine whether we should submit a further amendment to restrict the application of the bill to cities and towns with a population of less than 100,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no amendments of my own to submit; but some Members of the Senate are unavoidably absent, and I was asked to submit one amendment or perhaps two amendments. So in my official capacity I shall do so with all the vigor and enthusiasm I can summon.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his exposition of his position; and since he has undertaken indirectly, but by implication, to refer to the President of the United States, I wish to call to his attention a comment, made by a previous President of the United States, which I think should apply with equal validity to both the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Pennsylvania. That was the comment by former President Harry S. Truman, "If you cannot take the heat, stay out of the kitchen."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Has the Senator from Pennsylvania ever seen the time when the Senator from Illinois ever walked out because he could not take the heat?

Mr. CLARK. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And not to the knowledge of anyone else, as well.

I suggest that the Senator from Pennsylvania save his remarks, because this is an incentive to me to deliver chapter No. 2 with embellishments, although I do not know when I can get around to it in the course of a busy day.

Mr. CLARK. Perhaps the Senator from Illinois would entitle his remarks "The Senator from Pennsylvania Revisited."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sorry that I did not call the distinguished Senator here; but I point out that this morning I did him the honor of disengaging my mind for a while from the all-important and urgent tax bill, in which he is so much interested, in order to read the great truths he uttered yesterday in the Senate—where I presume they were effective, because there have been some responses.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Illinois did, indeed; and I am deeply flattered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; indeed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am very much interested in the whip which I understand the Senator from Illinois received from Latin America. As somewhat of an amateur cattleman, I ask whether it would be proper to describe it as a bullwhip.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. A good many years ago, when I was serving as the Republican whip, a friend thought I should have a badge of office. So he and some of his friends scoured all the Georgetown stores, and found this whip. Someone curled it up and sent it to me, and it is in my office. But I have never used it; it does not become me. I prefer to find refuge in the couplets of Tennyson in which he refers to kindness as a weapon.

Mr. MORSE. I have been through the Chicago stockyards a number of times, and I suspect that the official name of the whip the Senator has is a "bullwhip." I think the Senator from Pennsylvania should be very much interested in it, and I am not so sure that I may not seek to borrow the whip—not ask for it as an outright gift—from the Senator from Illinois, because I have news for the Senator from Pennsylvania: In connection with my cattle business, I name most of my bulls after U.S. Senators; and only yesterday a bull called Morse-Joe Clark was reserve grand champion at the Eastern National Livestock Show, the largest livestock show on the east coast. It might be helpful if the Senator from Illinois would make his whip available to me, for the training program on my farm.

I had one bull that I called Morse-Dirksen, but I sent that one to the stockyards. [Laughter.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I can only conclude this rather desultory discussion by saying, "O for more bull."

Mr. MORSE. I hope the Senator from Iilinois will lend me his bullwhip.

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief comment on the subject which has been under discussion.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, as I suspect other Senators did, I came to the floor not knowing that the distinguished Senator from Illinois would address himself to the remarks made yesterday by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

It happened that yesterday I was on the floor and heard much of the speech made by the Senator from Pennsylvania; and today I arrived in the Senate Chamber when the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] was discussing the Presidency of Andrew Jackson and was commenting on the giants who then served in the Senate and the giants then to be found in the House Chamber.

I wish to suggest that we speak a little further about the situation in 1837, and then contrast it with the situation in 1963. In 1837, the giants in the Senate were "in business" when they knew their position on the tariff, on the opening of the public lands and—by that time, I take it—on patronage. In those days, what was done in Washington affected very few people in the country; Washington was remote from the constituents of Members of Congress. Indeed, few were concerned with what was done here. Our country was remote from the rest of the world. Slavery confronted those giants, but that problem was very slow in maturing in the Senate. If the Senate rules were slack in 1837, what of it? Issues then developed very slowly, and the rules the Senate then had were adequate for the purpose of making a delayed response.

But consider the situation in 1963: I am sure history will record that there are giants in the Senate today, too; but today the action taken by Congress affects intimately the life of virtually every American, and does so in a very direct fashion. As a result, the demands by constituents on the time available to a Senator can be virtually overwhelming, unless he makes a conscious decision that he will permit such demands to go only so far, and no further.

If we do not stop it, there will not be time available fully to understand and confidently take a position not only on the three or four issues that confront us but the infinite litany of issues that confront us, most of which are charged with dynamite.

The world in 1963 is a very tiny place. Time runs faster now than it did in the period the Senator from Illinois was first discussing when I came into the Chamber. It is a tougher day and a tougher age. The demands on us as individuals, and the Senate as an institution, are vastly heavier than in the period so interestingly discussed by the Senator from Illinois. I suggest that he should, as a result of his comments this morning, encourage each of us to ask seriously the question: Is it not crystal clear that the Senate must change its rules? Reform is an offensive word to some. But we should change the rules in order that we can respond in a fashion that will justify us to the people of America and serve well America's contribution in a troubled world.

It is not merely rule XXII which clearly should be changed in order that a majority of the Senate can sooner or later make a decision. It includes, in my judgment, a change in the rules with respect to the obligation that should be assumed by Congress to act within a suggested 6-month period, I believe it was, but to act affirmatively or negatively on measures recommended by the President of the United States, whoever he may be, and whenever he may do so. Those issues which he suggests should have a legislative response, yes or no.

Clearly, the need for a rule of germaneness in the Senate is evident. Witness the fact that, under a rule of germaneness, I am supposed to be talking about an amendment to the Library Services Act. If there were a rule of germaneness, there might be many Senators in the Chamber, because I am sure that many are interested in the Library Services Act; but they know the odds are great that if they came over here they would hear a great deal of talk about many things that have nothing to do with the Library Services Act.

I suggest that we need to change the rules with respect to the powers of committee chairmen. I used to believe it was the rule of seniority that caused the trouble. I had not been here long enough then to have enough seniority to assert my position. Now that I have some seniority, I suspect it is as good a system as any to develop committee chairmen.

We need Senate rules to operate within the committee rules, whoever the chairman may be. Whatever his attitude with respect to a piece of legislation or a colleague on the committee may be, action sooner or later, up or down, will have to be taken.

The Senator from Pennsylvania recommended joint hearings. Surely we can improve our procedures in this area, which will be to the benefit of all Senators, but most importantly to the country.

For the life of me, I do not see why it would not be desirable to establish a working schedule for Congress, with certain tasks to be performed in the first 3 months, and certain others to be done in the next 3 months. Surely the Senator from Illinois, who can so fascinatingly discuss American history, could come forth with a suggestion that might be helpful in this area.

As to the business of "How many shares of General Motors stock do you own?"—which I believe was the question the Senator from Illinois asked—a constituent should not be obliged to run us down in the middle of a campaign and ask that question. Sources of a Senator's income in addition to his salary, should be available on the public record. I intend, whether the Case-Clark resolution is adopted or not, to make this disclosure. The only people I will disappoint will be my creditors.

Mr. President, I had no intention—and obviously had no preparation—when I came into the Chamber, to comment on the subject I have discussed. Indeed, I believe I have behaved, as junior Senators are supposed to behave, by saying very little about anything in my first term. But it seemed to me that this point of view should be added to the record following the delightful discussion by the Senator from Illinois.

This has nothing to do with the leadership. This has to do with the operation of the Senate.

To me, each one of the suggestions on the rules that I have commented upon makes sense, and I hope to be here long enough to see them enacted.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Will the distinguished Senator from Oregon yield, so that I may address a comment to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MORSE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] for the strong support of the proposed rules changes which I have been advocating. I believe he has put his finger on the critical point of what I and many other Senators, including the majority leader, are trying to do.

It is, as the Senator from Michigan says, "later than we think." Historically, it is interesting to read about criticism of the Senate, running back through history, some of which the Senator from Illinois gave us the benefit this morning.

Yesterday, I had occasion to remark that absenteeism among Senators has been chronic since the very first Senate. It took the first Senate 3 months after it was supposed to assemble to establish a quorum so that it could even start business. But what the Senator from Michigan says is that times have changed. In the old days we could afford the delay and some of the behavior which caused great criticism in the press at that time. But today we no longer can afford it. Therefore, I believe the Senator from Michigan has put his finger on the most important point in the problem which confronts us.

The second point I should like to make to the Senator from Michigan, while the majority leader is on the floor, is that unfortunately I did not hear the majority leader when he spoke earlier today, as I was otherwise engaged. But he handed me a transcript of his remarks which shows that he said that he will be making a very important speech on Monday about the organization and the procedures of the Senate.

I hope all Senators will be present to listen. I shall do my best to be present, although the Banking and Currency Committee is having an executive markup session on the Mundt bill, but perhaps we can make some arrangements by which we can be here, because I certainly want to be present.

I also hope that the Senator from Montana, in preparing his remarks for Monday, will give some thought to what the Senator from Michigan has said, and the purport of the resolution introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin a few days ago, as to why we could not, for next year, do some prior planning a little better than we did this year, and make some effort to make a schedule so that

Senators will have some understanding as to when we will be here, when we will be voting, and what will be brought up.

I know how difficult that will be. It may be so difficult that it will be almost impossible, but I believe we could well make a much stronger effort than we have made before.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for yielding to me.

AMENDMENT OF LIBRARY SERVICES ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2265) to amend the Library Services Act in order to increase the amount of assistance under such act and to extend such assistance to nonrural areas.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a series of amendments to S. 2265, relating to the effective date provisions of the bill, and I ask unanimous consent that they be agreed to en bloc, and that the text of the bill, as amended, be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

The amendments considered and agreed to en bloc are, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 10 through 18.

Page 3, lines 6 through 8, strike out "Effective in the case of allotments from appropriations for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1963, section" and insert in lieu thereof "Section".

Page 3, line 19, strike out "Effective July 1, 1963, clause" and insert in lieu thereof "Clause".

Page 4, lines 2 and 3, strike out "Effective in the case of payments from allotments for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1963, sub-" and insert in lieu thereof "Sub-".

Page 4, lines 11 and 12, strike out "Effective in the case of payments from allotments for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1963, sub-" and insert in lieu thereof "Sub-".

Page 10, strike out lines 21 through 25.

Page 13, strike out "Sec. 10." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 11." and before line 1 insert the following:

"EFFECTIVE DATES

"Sec. 10. The amendments made by sections 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6, subsections (c), (e), (g), and (h) of section 7, and section 9 shall apply with respect to appropriations made after the enactment of this Act, or allotments or payments from such appropriations, as the case may be."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the need for these amendments was brought to the attention of the committee by a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under date of November 12. In his letter, Mr. Cohen says:

> S. 2265, as reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, includes effective dates which were, we believe, set on the assumption that the legislation would be enacted before July 1, 1963. In view of the fact that June 30, 1963, has already passed, we believe some adjustment is necessary in the effective date provisions.
>
> Enclosed for your use is a draft of amendments to S. 2265, making an appropriate adjustment in the effective date provisions. Generally, as a result of these amendments the new provisions would be applicable only with respect to funds which are appropriated, or allotments or payments from funds which are appropriated (as may be suitable), after enactment of S. 2265.
>
> We believe it would be desirable for this amendment to be made as early in the consideration of the bill as is feasible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an explanation of the amendments.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Explanation of Amendments to S. 2265 (Library Services Bill)

As the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare stated in reporting S. 2265, amending the Library Services Act of 1956, the bill contains essentially the language of title VI–C of S. 580, the National Education Improvement Act of 1963. The latter bill was introduced in January of this year and its provisions were drafted to become effective generally on July 1, 1963. The July 1, 1963 effective date provisions were carried over into S. 2265. In its present form, therefore, the amendments which S. 2265 would make to the existing law might be construed to apply to all appropriations and allotments therefrom made for the current fiscal year, including those made before its enactment.

Now that the current fiscal year is so far advanced, enactment of the bill with retroactive July 1, 1963 effective dates could cause considerable difficulty. Thus the appropriation for the current fiscal year of $7,500,000 (the amount now authorized to be appropriated) has already been made as have the allotments to the States from this appropriation. Under existing law State use of these allotments is conditioned on a minimum State expenditure for rural library services of $40,000. The bill would increase this minimum to $100,000. We want to make sure that this and other provisions of the bill are not construed to apply to appropriations and allotments made before the bill is enacted.

The amendments to the bill which I am here proposing would make the bill's provisions applicable only with respect to appropriations made after enactment of the bill and to allotments or payments made from such appropriations. With these amendments a State's eligibility for Federal funds already appropriated and the amount thereof for which the State is eligible, would be determined by existing law.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this afternoon the Senate starts discussion of the so-called library bill. I hope it can be disposed of this afternoon. I do not intend to speak at great length with respect to it.

The bill has great support in the Senate. Several Senators have asked me to notify them during the course of the debate, so that they may make brief supporting statements in connection with the bill. Among the first will be the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre] after I finish my brief explanatory statement on the bill.

The public library has become an essential resource in the educational, cultural, scientific, and business progress of our Nation. Although first of all a responsibility of the local and State governments, the public library is of concern likewise to the Federal Government. The national Government should assist in seeing that our public libraries are financed and equipped to perform effectively and adequately their functions to the people of the United States.

In order that this objective may be accomplished, at least in part, I support the enactment of S. 2265, the Library Services and Construction Act. This legislation proposes to eliminate the restrictive 10,000 population limitation which prevails under the present Library Services Act, and to make all places eligible regardless of population; to increase the current $7.5 million authorization for library services by $17.5 million in fiscal year 1964, all to be matched; and to provide for $20 million in fiscal year 1964 in matching grants to States to assist in the construction of much needed library buildings. In each of the next 2 fiscal years, the authorization would be for such sums as the Congress may determine.

The basis for these proposals to help the States in strengthening their public library services and facilities rests primarily upon the 7-year successful operation of the Library Services Act of 1956 which has benefited the dwellers in the small towns and farming communities. Among other things, this legislation brought 38 million rural persons new or improved public library service; made 10 million books and other reading materials available to them; stimulated an increase of 92 percent in State appropriations for rural library services, and a 74-percent increase for local.

Oregon has advanced its public library program under the Library Services Act of 1956. More than 290,000 rural residents of 12 counties in the State have received extended or improved public library service as a result of the legislation. Bookmobile demonstrations have been, and are being held in many counties. State appropriations for library operations in rural areas in fiscal year 1963 were 58.6 percent greater than in fiscal year 1956, the year preceding the Library Services Act. Local public library funds have increased 43.7 percent in the same period.

The Library Services Act has done a good job of closing the gap for the rural population, but serious deficiencies exist for the Nation as a whole. For instance, 18 million persons still have no access to public library service; and 110 million have access only to libraries which are inadequate according to minimum standards. The existing deficiency in the amount of operating expenditures for public libraries is likewise extremely serious. In 1961, the amount spent was $285 million; the total should have been $480 million for the year to meet the minimum standards for adequate library services as formulated by the American Library Association. Thus, there is an operating gap of $195 million in expenditures for services. This bill proposes that the Federal Government authorize a matching grant of $25 million to help erase the existing deficiency.

Although, as has been noted, Oregon has been progressing in its library development, one-fourth of the population, nearly 400,000, has no local public library service. It has been reported that the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

book collections in many Oregon libraries of all sizes are shabby and dated, and the hours of service frequently are so few that the material is for all practical purposes inaccessible. A survey in 1962 described the financial situation in these words:

> In 1961, the public libraries of Oregon expended $3 million. This was at least $1¾ million less than required for reasonable service. The libraries were probably deficient by at least $7 million worth in book collections and audiovisual equipment. This estimate does not include buildings and strictly capital assets. Neither does the estimate (according to the survey) include the cost of bringing service to the one-fourth of the population now without library service.

The condition of public library buildings throughout the Nation is deplorable. The buildings are old, lack usable space, and do not meet the functional requirements of modern library service. In many cases, the public libraries are using former schools, churches, homes, department stores, and other makeshift facilities for their physical plants. The Office of Education has estimated the median age of public library buildings as 53 years for the country as a whole. It has been said that the only type of public buildings in use older than the public libraries are the penal institutions. The Office of Education has calculated that $280 million is needed to eliminate the present backlog.

In Oregon, a survey found that only 4 of the first 24 buildings financed through Carnegie funds in the early part of this century have had additions or extensive remodeling. And there have been no Carnegie funds available for many years.

As has been said, the Library Services Act of 1956 has served well a segment of the population—the rural community. But many new developments have taken place during the past decade which have altered greatly the significance of the public library for the average citizen, the businessman, the housewife, the student, the scientist, and others.

Let us look at a few of these changes. In the first place, no matter what the size of the town, city, or county, the public library is called upon to meet demands for information from an increasingly more highly educated clientele ranging from the average student and the man seeking to educate himself, to the researcher. In the interest of national progress and security, their needs must be met.

Next, the great explosion in population growth which has hit the metropolitan districts, with their sprawling fringe and suburban areas, has created serious problems for public libraries, whether central or satellite, city or town They are being asked to give effective library service to large numbers of persons who live outside the normal taxing boundaries, and even beyond the State.

Under the Library Services Act, as it now exists, Federal funds may not be used to help to relieve this critical condition which affects a vast percentage of our population. In Oregon 45 percent of the population is urban according to the Library Services Act definition. Thus nearly half the people of the State may not benefit from the present Library Services Act.

Further, owing to the new methods of independent study and research, high school and college students are overwhelming public libraries to obtain books and periodicals not available in their inadequate school or college libraries.

And still further, planning for efficient adequate library service to reach all people in all places has shown that a system of interrelated independent libraries must be set up. This joint cooperative network must not be restricted by a 10,000-population limitation, but allows for an economical pooling of resources, personnel, and buildings. It will enable the tax dollar to go further.

The public library is an agency for education and for continuing education during the lifetime. Although it is achieving much, it still shows glaring deficiencies, and these are compounded by the developments just enumerated.

For these reasons I urge the enactment of S. 2265, the Library Services and Construction Act. This legislation will relieve States of the present hampering effects of the population limitation and will provide them with a modest additional sum of $17.5 million for the further stimulation of local support for services—a sum which undoubtedly will pay dividends far beyond the initial Federal investment. Finally it will offer an equally modest amount of $20 million in fiscal year 1964 to be matched by the States to help bring public library buildings into proper adjustment with the needs of modern times.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there appear excerpts from the committee report on S. 2265 consisting of the tables appearing on pages 6 and 7, showing the State-by-State Federal allotments and matching expenditures under each title of the bill, as well as the section-by-section analysis which appears on pages 8 through 11 of the report.

There being no objection, the tables and analysis were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Federal allotments and matching expenditure from State and local sources, under fiscal year 1964, public library services

	Total Federal allotment [1]	Matching expenditure from State and local sources	Federal share (percent)	State share (percent)
Aggregate United States (excluding Canal Zone)	$25,000,000	$26,187,509	----------	----------
50 States and District of Columbia	24,557,134	25,959,366	----------	----------
Alabama	454,452	234,112	66.00	34.00
Alaska	124,540	187,512	39.91	60.09
Arizona	241,289	200,794	54.58	45.42
Arkansas	293,816	151,360	66.00	34.00
California	1,805,367	2,886,335	38.48	61.52
Colorado	290,309	313,746	48.06	51.94
Connecticut	375,081	665,654	36.04	63.96
Delaware	148,424	301,346	33.00	67.00
Florida	637,260	507,450	55.67	44.33
Georgia	527,841	300,405	63.73	36.27
Hawaii	168,658	178,732	48.55	51.45
Idaho	172,392	116,662	59.64	40.36
Illinois	1,193,838	1,736,545	40.74	59.26
Indiana	605,896	581,204	51.04	48.96
Iowa	399,202	340,472	53.97	46.03
Kansas	336,386	293,197	53.43	46.57
Kentucky	429,650	232,981	64.84	35.16
Louisiana	453,397	259,828	63.57	36.43
Maine	205,168	145,187	58.56	41.44
Maryland	436,435	516,480	45.80	54.20
Massachusetts	658,637	864,223	43.25	56.75
Michigan	948,841	1,006,323	48.53	51.47
Minnesota	470,415	411,834	53.32	46.68
Mississippi	336,335	173,263	66.00	34.00
Missouri	568,713	563,505	50.23	49.77
Montana	$173,214	$141,149	55.10	44.90
Nebraska	253,134	227,926	52.62	47.38
Nevada	130,954	236,481	35.64	64.36
New Hampshire	165,853	145,316	53.30	46.70
New Jersey	758,265	1,135,504	40.04	59.96
New Mexico	203,189	140,616	59.10	40.90
New York	1,920,933	3,249,815	37.15	62.85
North Carolina	594,357	325,273	64.63	35.37
North Dakota	168,622	97,848	63.28	36.72
Ohio	1,153,175	1,264,383	47.70	52.30
Oklahoma	352,626	249,536	58.56	41.44
Oregon	291,908	296,972	49.57	50.43
Pennsylvania	1,328,187	1,357,189	49.46	50.54
Rhode Island	193,257	189,809	50.45	49.55
South Carolina	358,519	184,692	66.00	34.00
South Dakota	173,838	113,260	60.55	39.45
Tennessee	487,040	262,022	65.02	34.98
Texas	1,139,425	891,636	56.10	43.90
Utah	196,636	150,962	56.57	43.43
Vermont	142,303	102,962	58.02	41.98
Virginia	530,427	380,960	58.20	41.80
Washington	409,583	448,362	47.74	52.26
West Virginia	301,862	181,736	62.42	37.58
Wisconsin	528,780	502,785	51.26	48.74
Wyoming	135,813	141,696	48.94	51.06
District of Columbia	182,892	371,326	33.00	67.00
American Samoa	27,176	14,000	66.00	34.00
Canal Zone	----------	----------	----------	----------
Guam	32,274	16,626	66.00	34.00
Puerto Rico	354,933	182,844	66.00	34.00
Virgin Islands	28,483	14,673	66.00	34.00

[1] Distribution of $25,000,000 with basic allotment of $100,000 to each State, District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, and $25,000 to other outlying parts; remainder distributed on basis of total population, Apr. 1, 1960.

NOTE.—The Federal amount to outlying parts of the United States shown on this table excludes Canal Zone; the amount for library services and construction shown on the summary table for the "National Education and Improvement Act" dated Jan. 26, 1963, included Canal Zone.

Federal allotments and matching expenditure from State and local sources, under fiscal year 1964, public library construction

	Total Federal allotment [1]	Matching expenditure from State and local sources	Federal share (percent)	State share (percent)
Aggregate, United States (excluding Canal Zone)	$20, 000, 000	$20, 950, 000		
50 States and District of Columbia	19, 645, 707	20, 767, 486		
Alabama	363, 561	187, 289	66. 00	34. 00
Alaska	99, 632	150, 010	39. 91	60. 09
Arizona	193, 031	160, 635	54. 58	45. 42
Arkansas	235, 053	121, 088	66. 00	34. 00
California	1, 444, 293	2, 309, 067	38. 48	61. 52
Colorado	232, 247	250, 997	48. 06	51. 94
Connecticut	300, 065	532, 524	36. 04	63. 96
Delaware	118, 739	241, 076	33. 00	67. 00
Florida	509, 808	405, 959	55. 67	44. 33
Georgia	422, 272	240, 323	63. 73	36. 27
Hawaii	134, 926	142, 965	48. 55	51. 45
Idaho	137, 914	93, 330	59. 64	40. 36
Illinois	955, 070	1, 389, 235	40. 74	59. 26
Indiana	484, 717	464, 963	51. 04	48. 96
Iowa	319, 361	272, 377	53. 97	46. 03
Kansas	269, 109	234, 557	53. 43	46. 57
Kentucky	343, 720	186, 385	64. 84	35. 16
Louisiana	362, 718	207, 862	63. 57	36. 43
Maine	164, 135	116, 150	58. 56	41. 44
Maryland	349, 148	413, 184	45. 80	54. 20
Massachusetts	526, 910	691, 379	43. 25	56. 75
Michigan	759, 073	805, 058	48. 53	51. 47
Minnesota	376, 332	329, 467	53. 32	46. 68
Mississippi	269, 068	138, 611	66. 00	34. 00
Missouri	454, 971	450, 804	50. 23	49. 77
Montana	$138, 571	$112, 919	55. 10	44. 90
Nebraska	202, 507	182, 341	52. 62	47. 38
Nevada	104, 763	189, 185	35. 64	64. 36
New Hampshire	132, 682	116, 252	53. 30	46. 70
New Jersey	606, 612	908, 402	40. 04	59. 96
New Mexico	162, 551	112, 493	59. 10	40. 90
New York	1, 536, 747	2, 599, 853	37. 15	62. 85
North Carolina	475, 486	260, 219	64. 63	35. 37
North Dakota	134, 898	78, 278	63. 28	36. 72
Ohio	922, 540	1, 011, 506	47. 70	52. 30
Oklahoma	282, 101	199, 629	58. 56	41. 44
Oregon	233, 527	237, 579	49. 57	50. 43
Pennsylvania	1, 062, 550	1, 085, 751	49. 46	50. 54
Rhode Island	154, 606	151, 848	50. 45	49. 55
South Carolina	286, 815	147, 753	66. 00	34. 00
South Dakota	139, 070	90, 608	60. 55	39. 45
Tennessee	389, 632	209, 617	65. 02	34. 98
Texas	911, 540	713, 308	56. 10	43. 90
Utah	157, 309	120, 760	56. 57	43. 43
Vermont	113, 843	82, 370	58. 02	41. 98
Virginia	424, 341	304, 767	58. 20	41. 80
Washington	327, 666	358, 689	47. 74	52. 26
West Virginia	241, 489	145, 389	62. 42	37. 58
Wisconsin	423, 024	402, 228	51. 26	48. 74
Wyoming	108, 651	113, 358	48. 94	51. 06
District of Columbia	146, 313	297, 060	33. 00	67. 00
American Samoa	21, 740	11, 199	66. 00	34. 00
Canal Zone				
Guam	25, 820	13, 301	66. 00	34. 00
Puerto Rico	283, 947	146, 276	66. 00	34. 00
Virgin Islands	22, 786	11, 738	66. 00	34. 00

[1] Distribution of $20,000,000 with basic allotment of $80,000 for the 50 States, District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, and $20,000 to other outlying parts; the remainder is distributed on the basis of total population, Apr. 1, 1960.

NOTE.—The Federal amount to outlying parts of the United States shown on this table excludes Canal Zone; the amount for library services and construction shown on the summary table for the "National Education and Improvement Act" dated Jan. 26, 1963, included Canal Zone.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF ACT TO NONRURAL AREAS

This section (like each of the other sections of the bill) amends the Library Services Act. At present the Library Services Act is applicable only to rural areas, which are defined in the act to exclude any town having a population of more than 10,000 persons. This section strikes out "rural" and "to rural areas" wherever it appears in the act so that after the amendment becomes effective the act will be applicable in urban areas just as it is in rural areas. Under subsection (f) these amendments will be effective after June 30, 1963.

SECTION 2. EXTENSION AND INCREASE OF AUTHORIZATION

This section increases the authorization of appropriations in the act from $7,500,000 to $25 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for each of the next 2 fiscal years such sums as Congress may determine.

SECTION 3. INCREASE IN MINIMUM ALLOTMENTS—AVAILABILITY OF ALLOTMENTS

The present law guarantees a minimum allotment of $40,000 to each State, except that the minimum allotment to Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands is fixed at $10,000. Subsection (a) of this section raises this amount to $100,000 in the case of each State, and $25,000 in the case of Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

Subsection (b) provides that the allotment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, will be available not only during the fiscal year 1964, but also during the next fiscal year.

SECTION 4. DEVELOPMENT OF LIBRARY SERVICES FOR ALL

The present law requires that to be approved a State plan for library services must provide policies and methods which the State library administrative agency certifies will assure use of funds to maximum advantage in the further extension of public library services to rural areas without such services or with inadequate services. This provision is changed by section 4 of the bill to require that the plan provide policies and methods for giving consideration to the educational needs of people of all ages, including students.

SECTION 5. INCREASE IN MINIMUM STATE EXPENDITURES REQUIREMENT

Section 6(a) of the present act requires each State to have available for expenditure under its plan at least $40,000 ($10,000 in the case of the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, or Guam). These minimums are increased to $100,000 and $25,000, respectively, by this section. This change would become effective in fiscal year 1964.

SECTION 6. PAYMENT PROCEDURE

Section 6(b) of the present act directs the Commissioner to make an advance estimate of the amount necessary to pay the Federal share of the total expenditures for carrying out an approved State plan. He then certifies such amount to the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury, then prior to audit and settlement by the GAO, pays to the State the amount so certified, with appropriate adjustments on account of prior overpayments and underpayments. In no event may an amount paid exceed the balance of the State's allotment available for such purpose. The bill amends this provision to provide, consistently with present payment procedure, that the Commissioner will make advance estimates of State entitlements and that the amount so estimated will be paid in installments and at such time or times as the Commissioner may determine, after necessary adjustment on account of any previously made overpayment or underpayment.

SECTION 7. LIBRARY CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

Subsection (a) of this section inserts a new title in the Library Services Act which provides for grants for the construction of public libraries. The present law contains no comparable provision.

Section 201 of the proposed new title authorizes the appropriation of $20 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and such sums as Congress determines for the next 2 fiscal years for making payments under approved State plans for the construction of public libraries.

Section 202 of the proposed new title provides that the sums appropriated under section 201 will be allotted among the States on the basis of their relative populations, except that each State will be first allotted $80,000 ($20,000 in the case of Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands). The State's allotment will be available for payments with respect to projects approved during the year allotted, except that the State's allotment for fiscal year 1964 will remain available for an additional fiscal year.

Section 203 of the proposed new title provides for the submission of a State plan for construction of public libraries. These State plans must set forth criteria and procedures which are designed to insure that priority will be given to projects for facilities to serve areas having, in the judgment of the State library administrative agency, the greatest need for additional facilities and which give particular consideration to projects for facilities to help achieve the objective of developing library services to satisfy the need of students of all ages for useful and readily accessible library services and materials.

The plan must give assurances that agencies whose applications are denied will be given an opportunity for a fair hearing. The plan must also provide that laborers and mechanics employed on these projects will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act. The Contract Work Hours Standards Act will also, by its own terms, apply to such laborers and mechanics. In addition, the State plan requirements of section 103 of the act requiring administration by the State library administrative agency, requiring procedures to assure fiscal responsibility, requiring reports from State agencies, and requiring that services be provided free of charge are all incorporated by reference.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Section 204 of the proposed new title provides for payments to States of the Federal share of the costs of constructing projects under the State plan.

Subsection (b) of section 7 of the bill amends section 9 of the act (containing definitions) to add a definition of the term "construction." This term is defined to include expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings and the initial equipment of any such buildings; and to include architects' fees and the costs of acquisition of land.

Subsection (c) of section 7 is a conforming amendment to the redesignated section 104 of the act in line with the deletion of the rural-area limitation made by section 1 of the bill.

Subsection (d) of section 7 amends the present payment provisions of the act (redesignated as sec. 104) so as to make the allotments to States made under the library services provisions of the act available also for paying the Federal share of the total of the sums expended by the State and its political subdivisions for administration of the State construction plan.

Subsections (e) and (f) of section 7 make technical conforming amendments.

Subsection (g) adjusts the withholding provisions of the act so as to take account of the new construction title, and deletes the present judicial review provision relating to withholding which is now covered by the more comprehensive provision of section 8 of the bill.

Subsection (h) of section 7 adds a new section 303 to the act relating to reallotments. Under this section any State's allotment, either under titles I or II, which the Commissioner determines will not be required for the period for which it is available will be available for reallotment to other States in proportion to the original allotments for such State. However, appropriate adjustments will be made to insure that no State will be realloted money which it does not need or will not be able to use.

SECTION 8. HEARINGS AND JUDICIAL REVIEW

This section adds a new subsection to the section of the act relating to administration, which prohibits the Commissioner from finally disapproving a plan, or any modification thereof, without affording the State notice and opportunity for a hearing. If a State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's action with respect to the approval of its plan or with respect to his withholding of funds under section 301, the State may appeal to the appropriate U.S. court of appeals. The court will then review the Commissioner's action. In such a proceeding the finding of the Commissioner as to the facts if supported by substantial evidence will be conclusive. The judgment of the court of appeals will be subject to review by the Supreme Court as in other cases.

SECTION 9. EXTENSION TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

This section amends the definition section of the act to include the District of Columbia within the meaning of the word "State." The effect of the amendment is to extend the benefits of the act to the District of Columbia.

SECTION 10. CHANGE IN TITLE AND SUBTITLE

Subsection (a) of this section amends the short title of the act so that hereafter it will be cited as the "Library Services and Construction Act." Subsection (b) amends the title to read "To promote the further development of public library services."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there be printed an article entitled "Little Libraries Can Be Big," written by Mr. Robert B. Downs, dean of library administration at the University of Illinois, who is also president of the Rotary Club of Urbana, Ill. Mr. Downs has been president of the American Library Association and has acted as an adviser on libraries in Japan, Mexico, and Turkey. The article originally appeared in the March 1963 issue of the Rotarian magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITTLE LIBRARIES CAN BE BIG

(By Robert B. Downs)

(NOTE.—Is your town's library two generations behind the times? A noted librarian suggests that it may be and tells how.)

The little red schoolhouse, with its one room and one teacher, exists almost solely today in sentimental memories. We have long since come to realize that large consolidated units, providing better prepared teachers, greatly improved physical facilities, and extended terms, are essential to a strong educational system.

Thousands of the public libraries of my country, the United States, unfortunately, are still at the one-room schoolhouse stage in their development—at least two generations behind modern concepts of librarianship. So completely inadequate is the service they attempt to render to their communities that they would scarcely be missed if they closed their doors permanently.

Consider, for example, the latest figures reported from New Hampshire, where the first American public library was established, in 1833. The vast majority of the libraries of the State serve populations below 2,000—a total of 160 libraries in 154 communities. Annual budgets for the purchase of books ranged from $2,291 down to zero. Sixty libraries spent less than $200 for the year and 30 less than $100. In larger communities, 57 libraries, serving populations between 2,000 and 10,000, noted book expenditures as low as $35 for the year, and none was sufficient to provide a representative sample of the vast wealth of published material currently available.

Another New England State, Massachusetts, with the highest per capita support for public library service in the country, not long ago reported that more than one-half of the public libraries of the State were operating on budgets of less than $6,000, and were open to the public less than 20 hours a week.

The statistics are equally disturbing for the wealthy State of Illinois. Of the State's 499 public libraries, 115 are open less than 20 hours a week, and 38 are open less than 10 hours a week. Also, 155 libraries spend less than $1,000 a year for all purposes. Even worse, about 2¼ million Illinois citizens have no public library service available to them.

Looking at the country as a whole, one finds that some 6,000 libraries—70 percent of the 8,190 public libraries in the United States—serve fewer than 10,000 people each, and 1,139 libraries are in communities under 1,000 population. Of the total group, 3,653 libraries are open less than 24 hours a week. Curiously, the very small libraries are concentrated in the north-central and northeast areas, while there are relatively few such libraries in the South and West. The explanation, apparently, is that small association or subscription libraries had their earliest beginnings in the Northeast, and from these social libararies, dating back, in some instances, to the 18th century, stem a large proportion of our present-day independent public libraries. Where public library service came late to a region, as it did in the South and West, the modern concept of large units of service was accepted when the first public libraries were organized.

The typical small public library never has and never can, standing alone, offer any real range of library services. Its tiny budget makes impossible the employment of a professionally trained librarian. With so little annual replenishment, its book stock becomes outdated and stagnant, relying chiefly upon gifts. In a recent article, the State librarian of Minnesota concluded that "The average newsstand of paperback books holds a better collection of general reading interest than the small library has ever had on its shelves." Good library service is impossible under such conditions.

Why do we have such a "cultural lag" in public-library growth, in contrast to the giant strides forward made by the public schools? The difference may be accounted for in part by the attitude of parents, who demand the best possible schools for their children, regardless of cost, while failing to recognize that libraries are also of basic significance as educational institutions, for all ages.

An important factor, too, is local pride and conservatism. Some citizens see signs of creeping socialism whenever State or Federal plans for local improvements are suggested. A certain amount of sentimental attachment grows up around old outmoded Carnegie library buildings and there is resistance to their replacement by vastly superior modern structures. The librarians, usually without any professional training, are, despite their starvation budgets, likely to be stubbornly jealous of their independence and individuality, uninterested in uniting with other libraries to form stronger systems, or in serving anyone beyond their immediate clienteles.

One of the most regrettable aspects of the present national picture is that there are still at least 25 million people, principally in farm areas and rural communities, totally without public-library facilities, and another 18 million receiving inadequate service. The U.S. Office of Education places the figure even higher, estimating that "about 128 million of our people have inadequate library services or none at all, and approximately half of these are in urban areas." If we accept this statement, less than one-third of the Nation's nearly 190 million people are receiving satisfactory library service.

The skeptic may ask, "Does it matter?" Americans are living at such a swift, staccato pace that it is suggested that the leisurely luxury of reading an entire book is old fashioned. With 56 million television sets, 170 million radios, and the increasing popularity of such leisure-time pursuits as bowling, boating, golf, and travel, it would appear superficially that there is no time left over for reading.

The truth is that the United States is one of the most literate nations that ever existed. Less than 4 percent of its people lack the ability to read. The annual bill in the United States for all books, magazines, and newspapers stands at $3½ billion. Expenditures for books last year represented an increase of 11 percent over the year before—the ninth such increase in succession. Paperback sales volume has reached 1 million copies a day. Circulation of magazines has risen 30 percent in the past decade. The percentage increase in the purchase of books and in the circulation of books through libraries has remained more than three times the rate of increase in population. A recent survey of 100 libraries in communities with more than 50,000 people reveals that book circulation has risen 29 percent in the last

5 years. Furthermore, basic changes in reading habits are taking place. Television programs have largely replaced books for the avid fans of blood-and-thunder mysteries, westerns, and light love stories, while the demands on libraries are shifting toward art, music, political affairs, and technology.

There can scarcely be any argument about the importance of reading in times like these. The population explosion, so much in the limelight, is matched by the explosion of knowledge. We are expected, as intelligent, responsible citizens, to know much about the newly emerging nations of Asia and Africa, about the conquest of space, the issues of the cold war, common world markets, racial problems, the impact of automation, and many other subjects vital to a democratic government. But beyond these everyday, practical needs, well-equipped, well-manned libraries serve broader purposes. As eloquently stated by J. Frank Dobie, famous Texan author, "Books, and therefore libraries, contain the inherited wit, wisdom, humor, life, cream of all the jests of all the centuries during which man has left a record of what he's thought and done. The 'immortal residue' of the human race lies in books. The great reason for reading books and valuing libraries is to have life more abundantly, to think more justly, to be in love more delightfully."

Conceding, then, that books and libraries in some form will continue to be fundamental to our culture and civilization, what are the ingredients required in libraries to serve all the people? We have seen that it is a practical impossibility to provide full scale, really adequate library service in an area with a small population. With a minimum of 50,000 or, better still, 100,0000 population, either in a compact city or scattered over a large, thinly populated geographical area, served by a centralized library organization, topnotch library service can be provided at a reasonable cost per capita. A single budget is better able, for example, to employ professional librarians and to purchase more books and better books at greater discounts and with less duplication than can be acquired by several smaller budgets of the same total value.

For these reasons, there is a marked trend throughout the country toward creating regional libraries and other consolidations. Even the county in many instances is too small a unit for economical operation, and several counties often enter into compacts for establishing a regional system. Another favorite device is for city public libraries to contract to provide library service to rural areas—a plan followed, for example, by the Milwaukee Public Library and nearby rural communities.

Mergers, central administration, and regional libraries do not mean, of course, that books are removed from the smaller localities and placed in some remote storehouse. The consolidations have resulted, on the contrary, in the creation of many new community libraries, library branches, library stations, and book deposits. To extend library service into rural areas never before reached, bookmobiles are in wide use, taking books direct to farmers and their families.

A noteworthy advantage of the regional plan for the small library is that it obtains immediate access to much more extensive book resources. It is no longer dependent solely upon the limited number of books to be found on its own shelves. Books not in demand are withdrawn and new collections added on a rotating schedule. What usually happens after a small library joins a multicounty system is illustrated by the case reported a few months ago of a Minnesota library; as soon as necessary improvements were made in its quarters, service hours, and book collection, the circulation of books increased 10 times over any previous period of use. All the evidence seems to support the judgment of the editor of the Library Journal when he referred to "the awful waste and futility of the very small public library trying to operate alone." Under the happiest circumstances, the small library is steadily losing ground in its efforts to provide minimum library service to the community. It cannot escape the fact that basic library service costs more than the small community can afford to pay. Several thousand small communities must be persuaded, therefore, that library service in their present shoestring isolation is simply unfeasible.

The rapid growth of regional and cooperative library systems in the past few years is due in considerable measure to the Federal Library Services Act, passed by Congress in 1956. Supplementary funds provided to State agencies under the legislation are designed primarily to strengthen public libraries in communities under 10,000 population. Stimulated by these grants in aid, accomplishments have been phenomenal, State library agencies have been strengthened, municipal and county libraries organized into coordinated systems, and numerous workshops and institutes for the education of librarians held. Specific achievements include, too, new or improved service for 34 million rural people; an increase of 75 percent in State funds for the development of service in rural sections; an increase of 50 percent in local appropriations for rural libraries; the placing in service of approximately 250 new bookmobiles; and the addition of more than 6 million books to the resources of rural communities. Each State has developed its own solutions to the problem of bringing books and library services to people, with advice and guidance, but not interference or tight control, from the Federal Library Services Branch.

Bookmobiles continue to play a big part in county and regional library service, especially sparsely populated areas. The earliest vehicle of the type dates back to the beginning of the present century when Washington County Library (Maryland) began a horse-drawn mobile service. The impact of the bookmobile in isolated areas is tremendous. Through use of the bookmobile, library service is now being provided for the first time in such areas as southwestern New Mexico, where the population is little more than one person per square mile. In Kentucky, a citizens' campaign resulted in the purchase of a new bookmobile for every county in the State.

A handicap to the development of all types of libraries is the acute shortage of professional librarians prevailing since the end of World War II. There are now about 59,000 practicing librarians in the United States. An additional 10,000 are needed to fill vacant positions, and 14,000 to staff new programs for library development. The personnel shortage remains a major concern of the profession.

American public libraries are internationally recognized as the most progressive in the world. They are unique among society's educational forces, serving as school and college for millions, and bringing tangible benefits to industry, business, and the professions. But they are not yet good enough, and the goal of making them better ought to receive a high priority throughout the Nation.

WHAT CAN WE DO?

Is your town's library up to par? Does it need help? The following suggestions explaining what Rotarians can do to better their library system" come from the American Library Association (50 East Huron Street, Chicago 11, Ill.), which reminds us that National Library Week in the United States will be April 21–28:

1. Invite your town's librarian or a library board member to talk to the club about the aims and purposes of the library and its relation to the community. Or give the librarian the topic "How I Can Help You in Your Business."

2. Sponsor a panel discussion on the library system and how to improve it. Consider a regional library system.

3. If a regional library system is being installed, tell the people about it; help educate them about its uses and advantages.

4. Support with money a library project. (In Jamestown, N.Y., where six members of the library board are Rotarians, the Rotary Club one year sponsored a lecture and bought phonographs for the library with the proceeds; another year a travel-lecture series netted $1,200 for record shelving; when $310,000 was needed for a library addition, Rotarians headed and helped staff the fund-raising and building committees.)

5. Encourage Rotarians to use the library. One way: Each week the librarian can furnish a little display of books related to the speaker's topic, to be placed in the meeting room.

6. Order from the American Library Association (50 East Huron Street, Chicago 11, Ill.) the free booklet "How Does Your Library Stack Up?" (The ALA has just completed a 2-year "Project To Aid Trustees and Librarians in Small Communities in Improving Library Service," with Donald E. Wright as director. Under the project, a series of do-it-yourself pamphlets on basic subjects such as book lists, program outlines, reference procedures, budgets, press releases, and training of volunteer help has been distributed to all public libraries in U.S. communities of less than 10,000.)

Alert librarians, like enterprising businessmen, work hard at getting "new business"—new "clients." In some towns, reading lists have been distributed through churches as well as schools; through groceries, slipped into paper bags; banks have distributed reading lists on financial subjects; farmers have been informed of books on agricultural subjects through the newspapers. Libraries try to fill the special needs of their communities and enrich the cultural life by sponsoring discussion groups, film programs, concerts, and forums on local issues.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, we have here a bill which seeks to provide educational services for all Americans, irrespective of whether they live in a thriving metropolis such as Chicago, Ill., New York City or in a little rural area. The Nation has a great stake in the development of the potentialities of the brainpower of its citizens. To paraphrase the great statement of Jefferson, we cannot expect, in a free society, to have political enlightment without education.

Let us take note that this bill is really a bill that seeks to make available educational facilities that millions and millions of Americans need, no matter where they live.

It is a modest program that we are asking the Senate to approve this afternoon. It is a program which comes to the floor of the Senate from the committee with an overwhelmingly majority vote—not an unanimous vote, but an overwhelmingly majority vote—from both sides of the table, Democratic and Republican.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

When we are investing Federal funds to assist the States to match those funds with State money, we are investing in one of the greatest resources of this country; namely, the brainpower of our citizens.

I urge the passage of the bill.

Mr. President, I had agreed to call for a quorum call so that other Senators who wish to speak in support of the bill may do so.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] is present. He has a speech to make in support of the bill. I do not yield to him yet, but——

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. Let me finish my sentence. I shall yield the floor in just a moment so the Senator from Vermont can speak in his own time. But I first yield to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this is a program in which our State has been greatly interested. We have had a very fine rural library service. We have fine leadership in it. It is a program I am pleased to support, and I always have, because it is of great value to our rural communities.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator sincerely for his support. I only wish to add a point that I desired to make at the time of my formal presentation. I will tell the Senate why we need improved libraries in our cities and towns—because a great many of the libraries in both our public and private elementary and secondary schools are totally inadequate as a pattern. For proof, one need not go a stone's throw away from here. It is one of the deplorable situations in Washington, D.C.

School after school the country over does not have a library. There are some schools which have small and inadequate libraries, but are staffed voluntarily by mothers of affiliated parent-teacher associations, who are not trained librarians. Senators ought to talk with some of them.

If it were not for the public libraries that are available in the District of Columbia as well as the great national libraries not available in other parts of the country, the situation here would be even more deplorable than it is.

When we urge passage of a public library bill this afternoon, we are seeking to strengthen the educational facilities of our public and private schools in America. It should take little argument to convince the Senate that this is a bill in the public interest and that it should be passed as it came from the committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I commend the Senator from Oregon for what he has just said in regard to the library system. When I was Governor in the thirties, and also when I was Governor in the forties, we in South Carolina created and put into effect a library system. We have been handicapped so far as money is concerned. We have not had a sufficient amount to do the work needed. This bill will help us to do the work which should be done. Everybody does not have an opportunity to go to college, but when a library system exists that is within reach of all the people, we help them to educate themselves.

Some of the best educated men I have met during my life had never entered a college, but they were readers of a wide variety of subjects and were acquainted with the libraries and the books that were published, and they were able to receive an education in that way.

This bill will do much to educate the people and build up the brainpower of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator. I could not agree with him more completely.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The proposed legislation which has been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and which is being handled by the astute Senator who now directs its consideration in this Chamber, is one of the most important measures we shall consider during the first session of the 88th Congress. It is not as glamorous as are some bills. It does not have the same wide appeal as do some other proposals. But, basically, as indicated by the cogent remarks of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], and by the very helpful and reasoned presentation by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], we realize that the inquiring mind and the search for the truth are compensations which come to the boy and the girl, the man and the woman, who use the facilities of our libraries.

In West Virginia in recent days an honor has come to our library at Buckhannon and to the librarian in that community.

Mr. President, the Charles W. Gibson Public Library has been selected by the Book-of-the-Month Club, Inc., to receive a State award of $1,000. Located in Upshur County, the library and its diligent staff are being justly recognized for their efforts to improve and expand existing facilities.

It is a privilege to extend heartiest commendations to the librarian and staff of that public library. The honor which they have won is abundantly deserved, and has brought credit to themselves, their community, and to the State of West Virginia.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record at this point a message of congratulations sent to Miss Dora Ruth Parks, executive secretary of the West Virginia Library Association.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Labor and Public
Welfare,
November 22, 1963.

Miss Dora Ruth Parks,
Executive Secretary,
West Virginia Library Commission,
Charleston, W. Va.

Dear Miss Parks: Mr. Harry Scherman, chairman of the board of the Book-of-the-Month Club, Inc., has just informed me that the Charles W. Gibson Public Library has been selected for a State award of $1,000.

The service which our public libraries offer to the communities of West Virginia is undoubtedly one of the most vital aspects in improving the growth and development of our human resources. The role of exposing our youth and our older folk to the wisdom of the ages and to the knowledge found only in literature, is met in considerable degree by our city and county public libraries.

The Charles W. Gibson Public Library, its staff and the community of Buckingham are to be commended for their efforts to improve the facilities for the citizens of Upshur County and the area. I join with the Book-of-the-Month Club in extending my heartiest congratulations for this achievement.

With all good wishes, I am,

Very truly,

Jennings Randolph.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I add my commendation to what the Senator from Oregon has so well said. I strongly support the provisions of the bill. Its enactment will meet a real need.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I say to the people of West Virginia that Senator Randolph, as a member of my subcommittee, has worked shoulder to shoulder with me as we collected the evidence and listened to the testimony in support of the bill. He was of great help to me in the subcommittee and a great help to me when the bill was presented to the full committee, which resulted in the overwhelming majority vote by which the bill was reported to the Senate. I thank him.

The people of West Virginia have a right to be proud of the way in which he valiantly fights for measures in the public interest. They are, as he knows, in the interest of the people of his State, and those of every other State. They are measures which develop the resources of this country.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I would like to express my full support for the amendments to the Library Services Act, S. 2265, now before the Senate.

It is, I believe, a much more important piece of legislation than is generally realized. And while its passage may not arouse the fanfare that surrounds some of the other matters on which we pass, that should not obscure the fact that the condition of our public library system is of deep interest and concern to millions of Americans.

The reason for the interest is obvious. In a nation where opportunity is largely dependent upon skill, the facilities for training skilled persons are of the first importance. And libraries are an integral part of a community's educational resources.

The public library in the United States is, in fact, a basic educational agency. Taken in its widest sense, education includes the intellectual, cultural, scientific, business, and community development of our Nation. And the public library plays an essential role in servicing all those needs for all segments of our population.

Children love libraries and they use them to stretch their imaginations and to build lifelong habits of good reading. Students crowd into our public libraries for independent study and for wholesome recreational reading.

Housewives and mothers can get the practical information they need as shoppers and consumers to raise a happy and healthy family.

Businessmen have learned the dollar-and-cent value of up-to-date and accurate information on markets, merchandising, suppliers, and office practices. Those who have retired can continue to make their lives rich and productive through the pleasures of reading.

These kinds of people, and many, many others, look toward good, free public library services conveniently available to them.

Their interest in adequate public libraries, therefore, is coupled with a deep concern for the present state of our public library system. And with good reason, for large parts of that system are afflicted with inadequate resources and an outmoded physical plant.

The realization of this fact is not confined to experts in the field. This can be seen in a recent survey in depth of more than 5,000 people by a New York and New Jersey planning organization.

The study indicated that both city and suburban dwellers ranked the adequacy of public libraries fourth highest on a list of 32 community goals that people believe very desirable.

Good libraries ranked right behind good schools, clean air, and personal safety in order of importance.

More than 65 percent of those interviewed said adequate public libraries were very desirable, and many were dissatisfied with existing conditions.

To me this is a clear indication of a widespread sense of dissatisfaction among many of the 130 million Americans that the American Library Association estimates are without access to adequate library facilities.

Some progress has been made in recent years toward correcting this situation, but not nearly enough.

In my own home State of New Jersey, the programs carried out under the Library Services Act since 1956 have been helpful. For example, the Tricounty Library Services Center, servicing Cumberland, Gloucester, and Salem Counties, has increased the number of volumes available to rural families in this area by 43 percent. And the number of loans from 1958 to 1961 has gone up by 64 percent.

But considering the needs of the entire State, this is a very limited achievement.

New Jersey now has a total of 199,000 persons with no public library service. In addition to these, millions of residents have access only to substandard libraries with inadequate book collections and untrained personnel.

There is also the problem of library buildings, important if these institutions are to perform their needed functions. The typical New Jersey public library building remains the familiar Carnegie edifice, most of which were planned and erected between 1896 and 1923.

An accurate description of these buildings would inevitably include such observations as: advanced age, lack of space, inflexible interior arrangements, construction which is difficult and expensive to repair or remodel, and maintenance costs which are extravagant by today's standards. If we consider the population growth since 1923 it is clear that these buildings are totally inadequate to house the needed books and provide readers with the space to use them.

Nor are these conditions peculiar to New Jersey. They are to be found in varying degrees throughout the Nation.

But under the present law, the overwhelming majority of the population is ineligible to participate in or benefit from Federal programs aimed at alleviating the situation.

In New Jersey, for example, the provision of the law limiting it to communities of less than 10,000 disqualifies 75 percent of the population, about 3 million of whom live in areas with inadequate public libraries.

The bill under consideration this afternoon is designed to correct this gross inequity in the law, and would, for the first time, help our hard-pressed cities and fast growing suburbs meet the demands of their ever better education and more mobile populations for cultural and scientific resources.

The original Library Services Act was a sound measure and was successfully implemented, so far as it went. Now let us extend its benefits and give the millions of people in our cities and suburbs a fair break.

For here we are, in the middle of the 20th century, the richest nation in the world, yet our cities and many of our suburbs are literally starved for the fundamental amenities and public services that people deserve in this day and age.

Mr. President, in view of the significance of the public library in our national life and because of the imperative need of closing the gaps now existing between the libraries we could maintain and those we actually do, I strongly urge enactment of this bill.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I support S. 2265 and for a number of reasons. However, I think the paramount reason is that the act has done so much for my own State of Vermont. I feel that we can all agree that the effective programs carried out under the act in our respective States are programs that we wish to see continued and broadened until we achieve the goal of adequate library services.

Through the matching funds system the States have participated willingly, resulting in increased circulation of books, and better coverage per capita than has ever been achieved. In fact, the circulation of books from the Free Public Library Commission has increased more than 25 percent in Vermont since the inception of the act in 1956.

Large new bookmobiles purchased under the act now reach many people who would otherwise have no readily accessible library facility. More professional staff people have been added as a result of the availability of funds, and workshops have been conducted to teach useful and necessary library skills.

But the obvious progress that the act has stimulated to date merely serves as evidence that our approach to the great needs for improvement in library services and facilities has been sound. The road is long, but the goal is worthy. We must have adequate library service in our Nation.

Education is, indeed, a perpetual process. Minds must continue to assimilate information, and this information must be continually updated and accurate.

Our libraries, and the services they render are the key to the continuing self-education process that should take place throughout the life of every American. There are few programs in which we can more readily observe an excellent return for the tax dollars spent.

In this age of rapid technological advance our people must be increasingly informed to be employable. Therefore, in effect, we are attacking our problems on many fronts when we invest in the library improvements that evolve into the knowledge of our Nation.

It is well that this year's bill expands the concept of the original act by including funds for the construction of library buildings. As the program begins to flower to its full effectiveness, and library services become more nearly adequate, it is clear that an expansion of the physical plant is closely correlated with the overall success of the program.

This bill is beneficial to Vermont in still another way. It will include about one-third of my State's population which was previously left out of the bill's language.

No, Mr. President, we cannot deny the 18 million Americans who have no readily accessible library service, nor can we deny the 110 million who have access only to libraries which are inadequate by minimum standards.

When viewed from the State level the ratios of inaccessibility and inadequacy are quite parallel. Therefore, in the interest of the people of Vermont and the United States in general, I am happy to support what I consider to be a superior piece of legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR COOPER

The Library Services Act has been one of the Government's most effective and rewarding programs, and I am glad to support the legislation before us today which would expand the services of this act. S. 2265 authorizes $17.5 million for fiscal year 1964 for matching grants to States to expand the program to urban as well as rural areas. This $17.5 million is in addition to the $7.5 million already authorized and appropriated by Congress for fiscal year 1964 for extension of the present program, which was begun in 1956. In addition, this bill would authorize $20 million for fiscal year 1964 for matching grants to States for public library construction. Such sums as Congress may determine are also authorized for 1965 and 1966.

The Library Services Act has been of inestimable value to our Nation. It has particularly benefited my own State of Kentucky, and I support it, because it provides educational opportunity to millions of our people and an opportunity for self-development and the inner satisfaction that comes from knowledge of great literature. I speak of its development in Kentucky, because I am sure it is typical of other States. Because areas of Kentucky were remote until recent years, and because of the lack of tax funds, educational opportunity was inadequate in some areas. This act, which brings library services to rural areas, has been particularly effective.

I want to give credit to a number of Kentuckians who worked for years to develop an improved library system in our State. Frances Jane Porter and Margaret Willis, with the Kentucky Extension Department, recognized the great need of our State 20 years ago and worked to improve the libraries. With the founding in 1948 of "The Friends of the Kentucky Libraries," real progress began. The "Friends," under the leadership of Mrs. George Gray, worked with the State extension division, and provided and encourage the use of six bookmobiles. At that time, Kentucky was 38th among the States in money per capita being spent for library services, and 40th in percentage of people being served. As the six bookmobiles originally provided became more in demand, the need for more became apparent.

Mr. Harry Schacter, of Louisville, evolved the plan which created the Kentucky bookmobile project. This organization aimed to raise $300,000 for the purchase of 100 bookmobiles, stocked with books. Counties to be served were asked to raise funds to hire drivers and maintain the trucks, and the State government was asked for an appropriation of $200,000 a year for administration of the program and for the purchase of more books. The Governor of the State, Hon. Lawrence Wetherby, acted as honorary chairman of the project, and Mrs. Barry Bingham, wife of the editor in chief of the Louisville Courier-Journal, led the campaign to a remarkable success. By September 1954, 84 of the new bookmobiles were ready to begin work in the counties.

Even with this encouraging beginning, Kentucky needed more libraries and better services, which it was not able to fulfill.

The Library Services Act was conceived by the American Library Association to fill needs such as those faced by Kentucky. For 10 years legislation was introduced into Congress—legislation which I cosponsored in 1953, but it was not until 1956 that the legislation was enacted—and the Library Services Act became a reality.

In my own State, the act amplified the work which had been done by the Friends of the Kentucky Libraries, and the Kentucky bookmobile project. Four strong regional libraries were soon established, two others were established later, and services for over a quarter of the people in the State have been improved.

But these steps forward have not brought an end to the needs of Kentucky libraries. In 1961, Kentucky still had 233,044 people without public library service—189,545 in rural areas and 43,499 in urban areas. Kentucky's population is changing from rural to urban, and in the last census some towns formerly eligible under the Library Services Act became ineligible because of population growth. Many of these places are the logical center for a multicounty library development, but have a serious lack of local funds. Library usage is increasing faster than local and State support. The trend of population not only leaves the rural areas less able to adequately support their library services but increases the pressure on the smaller urban places which are also demanding library services.

These are the reasons I support the legislation before us today. I believe that with the relatively small appropriation of $17.5 million annually for expansion of this program to urban areas, and $20 million for library construction, we can add to a program which has been effective, beneficial, and directed to one of the most basic needs of our Nation—the need to help all our citizens receive an adequate education.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for an emergency?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Holland in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the pending measure there be a time allocation of 1 hour on each amendment and 1 hour on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? Does the majority leader desire to have included the regular provisions as to germaneness?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The regular provisions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to interrupt a moment to say that if ever there was an hour when all Americans should pray, this is the hour.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I agree with the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it it so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, reduced to writing, is as follows:

Unanimous-Consent Agreement

Ordered, That, effective upon determination by the majority and minority leaders, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 2265) to amend the Library Services Act in order to increase the amount of assistance under such act and to extend such assistance to nonrural areas, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

WHEAT BILL—UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am about to make a unanimous-consent request on the advice of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency [Mr. Robertson] and with the full concurrence of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. Dirksen]. The Mundt wheat bill, so-called, will come before the Senate on Monday. I understand that the committee has concluded its hearings, that the report will be ready on Monday morning, that the committee will meet at 10 o'clock to report the bill, and that as soon thereafter as is expeditiously possible that afternoon it is the intent to have the bill taken up provided something unforeseen does not develop.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that 8 hours be allocated for the consideration of that bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is for an 8-hour time limit on the Mundt bill. Is that on the bill only, or does the request include all amendments?

Mr. MANSFIELD. On the bill. I know of no amendment to be offered, nor does the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is for 8 hours on the so-called Mundt bill, with the usual provisions to be included in the unanimous-consent agreement. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and consent is given.

The Chair would like to have the Record show the time at which each of the unanimous-consent agreements would become effective.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The time cannot be stated at the moment; but when the Senate again meets to resume its regular business, it is anticipated that the bills will be taken up in the order listed. That is all I can say now. I believe the Senate will have to trust the leadership in using its discretion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May the Chair make a suggestion?

Mr. MANSFIELD. We would be pleased to have the suggestion of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair suggests that the unanimous-consent requests include provisions that the two leaders fix, in each case, the hour at which the unanimous-consent agreements shall become operative.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is a good solution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and with that understanding the agreement is entered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If amendments should be offered to the Mundt wheat bill, I suggest that the rule of germaneness apply and that not more than 1 hour be allotted to each amendment, 30 minutes to a side, to be included in the 8-hour limitation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the supplemental agreement is entered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, reduced to writing, is as follows:

Unanimous-Consent Agreement

Ordered, That, effective upon determination by the majority and minority leaders, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 2310) to prohibit any guarantee by the Export-Import Bank or any other agency of the Government of payment of obligations of Communist countries, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited not to exceed 1 hour to be taken from the 8 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 8 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from time to time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

RECESS SUBJECT TO CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess pending developments.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reconvened at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. Holland in the chair).

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 253 Leg.]

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Clark
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kuchel
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Mundt
Nelson
Neuberger
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] is absent because of death in family.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is absent due to illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case] the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper and Mr. Morton], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] is absent because of a death in his family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

PRAYER FOR THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after discussing the tragic situation which now confronts the Nation and the free world, the distinguished minority leader and I felt it only appropriate and proper that, in view of the tragic circumstances which have arisen and the extreme danger which confronts a good, a decent, and a kindly man, it would not be inappropriate for the Chaplain of the Senate to deliver a prayer at this time in the devout hope that he, the Governor of Texas, and others will recover. On the completion of that prayer, I shall move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Holland in the chair). The Chaplain of the Senate.

Chaplain Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We will first stand for a moment of silent prayer.

Our Father, Thou knowest that this sudden, almost unbelievable, news has stunned our minds and hearts as we gaze at a vacant place against the sky, as the President of the Republic goes down like a giant cedar green with boughs goes down, with a great shout upon the hills, and leaves a lonesome place against the sky. We pray that in Thy will his life may still be spared.

In this hour we cry out in words that were uttered in another hour of deep loss and bereavement: "God lives! And the Government at Washington still stands."

Hold us, we pray, and the people of America, calm and steady and full of faith for the Republic in this tragic hour of our history.

God save the state and empower her for whatever awaits for the great world role she has been called to fill in this time of destiny. Amen.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, November 25, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 22 (legislative day of October 22), 1963:

Department of Defense

William P. Bundy, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Department of the Air Force

Robert H. Charles, of Missouri, to be an Assistant of the Air Force.

U.S. Army

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Alfred Carlisle Harrison O311380, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. Erwin Case Hostetler O336226, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. Robert Louis Stevenson O343589, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. Thomas Roberts White, Jr., O348796, Adjutant General Corps.

In the Marine Corps

The nominations beginning Nita B. Warner to be lieutenant colonel, and ending Lew E. Tingley to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 12, 1963; and

The nominations beginning Dennis L. Pardee to be captain, and ending Leland G. Anderson to be captain, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 12, 1963.

In the Navy

The nominations beginning Billy J. Adams to be lieutenant commander, and ending Edward J. Koehne, Jr., to be lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 8, 1963.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOM,
November 25, 1963.

I hereby designate the Honorable JIM WRIGHT to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Revelation 14: 13: *Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord from henceforth, yea saith the spirit that they may rest from their labors and their works do follow them.*

Most merciful and gracious God, we humbly acknowledge that in the life of each of us there are times of events and experiences when all our thoughts and feelings seem to impose silence.

As we assemble for prayer at this noon hour, we are not turning our eyes upon the ground whence no help can come but we are lifting them heavenward and unto Thee.

We thank Thee for the life and character and service of John F. Kennedy who walked and worked with us here in this Chamber and who now dwells with Thee in heavenly blessedness for thou hast opened unto him the gateway to the larger life and received him into Thy nearer presence.

Thou didst not loose him when Thou gavest him to us and so we have not lost him by his return to Thee and even though his sun went down while it was yet day we believe it has risen for him in eternal glory.

On this day, when his body is being carried to Arlington National Cemetery, we are not saying "Farewell" but only "Goodnight" for this is our faith that someday we shall dwell together in hallowed union and be forever with our blessed Lord in that fairer land whose language is music and where there is eternal joy.

We pray that Thou wilt give unto the members of his bereaved family and friends and to President Johnson and Speaker MCCORMACK and to all the Members of Congress that strong faith which does not murmur or complain but which trusts and ties in courageously and confidently with the consolations of Thy grace and love and will enable them to carry on in faithfulness and fortitude.

Hear us through the merits and mediation of our blessed Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, November 21, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8969. An act to provide, for the period ending June 30, 1964, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 298. An act to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958;

S. 1309. An act to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes; and

S. 2267. An act to amend Public Law 88–72 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 777. An act to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the security procedures for contractor employees.

The message also announced that Mr. MONRONEY had been appointed a conferee on the bill (H.R. 8747) entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes," in place of Mr. ROBERTSON, excused.

TRANSFER OF BUSINESS TO TOMORROW, NOVEMBER 26

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order for today shall be in order on tomorrow, and that special orders in order for today shall be transferred to tomorrow and shall precede those presently scheduled for tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PRINTING OF EULOGIES TO LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the eulogies to our late President delivered in the rotunda on yesterday be printed at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

There was a sound of laughter; in a moment, it was no more. And so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

There was a wit in a man neither young nor old, but a wit full of an old man's wisdom and of a child's wisdom, and then, in a moment it was no more. And so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

There was a man marked with the scars of his love of country, a body active with the surge of a life far, far from spent and, in a moment, it was no more. And so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

There was a father with a little boy, a little girl and a joy of each in the other. In a moment it was no more, and so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

There was a husband who asked much and gave much, and out of the giving and the asking wove with a woman what could not be broken in life, and in a moment it was no more. And so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands, and kissed him and closed the lid of a coffin.

A piece of each of us died at that moment. Yet, in death he gave of himself to us. He gave us of a good heart from which the laughter came. He gave us of a profound wit, from which a great leadership emerged. He gave us of a kindness and a strength fused into a human courage to seek peace without fear.

He gave us of his love that we, too, in turn, might give. He gave that we might give of ourselves, that we might give to one another until there would be no room, no room at all, for the bigotry, the hatred, prejudice, and the arrogance which converged in that moment of horror to strike him down.

In leaving us—these gifts, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States, leaves with us. Will we take them, Mr. President? Will we have, now, the sense and the responsibility and the courage to take them?

I pray to God that we shall and under God we will.

BY CHIEF JUSTICE WARREN

There are few events in our national life that unite Americans and so touch the heart of all of us as the passing of a President of the United States.

There is nothing that adds shock to our sadness as the assassination of our leader, chosen as he is to embody the ideals of our people, the faith we have in our institutions and our belief in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

Such misfortunes have befallen the Nation on other occasions, but never more shockingly than 2 days ago.

We are saddened; we are stunned; we are perplexed.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, a great and good President, the friend of all men of good will, a believer in the dignity and equality of all human beings, a fighter for justice, and apostle of peace, has been snatched from our midst by the bullet of an assassin.

What moved some misguided wretch to do this horrible deed may never be known to us, but we do know that such acts are commonly stimulated by forces of hatred and malevolence, such as today are eating their way into the bloodstream of American life.

What a price we pay for this fanaticism.

It has been said that the only thing we learn from history is that we do not learn. But surely we can learn if we have the will to do so. Surely there is a lesson to be learned from this tragic event.

If we really love this country, if we truly love justice and mercy, if we fervently want to make this Nation better for those who are to follow us, we can at least abjure the hatred that consumes people, the false accusations that divide us, and the bitterness that begets violence.

Is it too much to hope that the martyrdom of our beloved President might even soften the hearts of those who would themselves recoil from assassination, but who do not shrink from spreading the venom which kindles thoughts of it in others?

Our Nation is bereaved. The whole world is poorer because of his loss. But we can all be better Americans because John Fitzgerald Kennedy has passed our way, because he has been our chosen leader at a time in history when his character, his vision, and his quiet courage have enabled him to chart for us a safe course through the shoals of treacherous seas that encompass the world.

And now that he is relieved of the almost superhuman burdens we imposed on him, may he rest in peace.

BY SPEAKER McCORMACK

As we gather here today bowed in grief, the heartfelt sympathy of Members of the Congress and of our people are extended to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy and to Ambassador and Mrs. Joseph P. Kennedy and their loved ones. Their deep grief is also self-shared by countless millions of persons throughout the world, considered a personal tragedy, as if one had lost a loved member of his own immediate family.

Any citizen of our beloved country who looks back over its history cannot fail to see that we have been blessed with God's favor beyond most other peoples. At each great crisis in our history we have found a leader able to grasp the helm of state and guide the country through the troubles which beset it. In our earliest days, when our strength and wealth were so limited and our problems so great, Washington and Jefferson appeared to lead our people. Two generations later, when our country was torn in two by a fratricidal war, Abraham Lincoln appeared from the mass of the people as a leader able to reunite the Nation.

In more recent times, in the critical days of the depression and the great war forced upon us by Fascist aggression, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, later Harry S. Truman appeared on the scene to reorganize the country and lead its revived citizens to victory. Finally, only recently, when the cold war was building up the supreme crisis of a threatened nuclear war capable of destroying everything—and everybody—that our predecessors had so carefully built, and which a liberty-loving world wanted, once again a strong and courageous man appeared ready to lead us.

No country need despair so long as God, in His infinite goodness, continues to provide the Nation with leaders able to guide it through the successive crises which seem to be the inevitable fate of any great nation.

Surely no country ever faced more gigantic problems than ours in the last few years, and surely no country could have obtained a more able leader in a time of such crisis. President John Fitzgerald Kennedy possessed all the qualities of greatness. He had deep faith, complete confidence, human sympathy, and broad vision which recognized the true values of freedom, equality, and the brotherhood which have always been the marks of the American political dreams.

He had the bravery and a sense of personal duty which made him willing to face up to the great task of being President in these trying times. He had the warmth and the sense of humanity which made the burden of the task bearable for himself and for his associates, and which made all kinds of diverse peoples and races eager to be associated with him in his task. He had the tenacity and determination to carry each stage of his great work through to its successful conclusion.

Now that our great leader has been taken from us in a cruel death, we are bound to feel shattered and helpless in the face of our loss. This is but natural, but as the first bitter pangs of our incredulous grief begins to pass we must thank God that we were privileged, however briefly, to have had this great man for our President. For he has now taken his place among the great figures of world history.

While this is an occasion of deep sorrow it should be also one of dedication. We must have the determination to unite and carry on the spirit of John Fitzgerald Kennedy for a strengthened America and a future world of peace.

ADJOURNMENT AS A FURTHER MARK OF RESPECT FOR THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 571

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.,

Resolved, That the House of Representatives has learned with profound regret and sorrow of the tragic death of the late President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, illustrious statesman and leader in the Nation and in the world.

Resolved, That as a token of honor and in recognition of his eminent and distinguished public services to the Nation and to the world the Speaker of the House shall appoint a committee of one hundred Members of the House to join a similar committee appointed on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral services of the late President.

Resolved, That the House tenders its deep sympathy to the members of the family of the late President in their sad bereavement.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the late President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the several resolving clauses are agreed to.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. By direction of the Speaker, and by unanimous consent, the Chair appoints the following Members of the House to attend the funeral services:

Mr. McCormack
Mr. Albert
Mr. Halleck
Mr. Boggs
Mr. Arends
Mr. Vinson
Mr. Cannon
Mr. Martin of Massachusetts
Mr. Patman
Mr. Smith of Virginia
Mr. Colmer
Mr. Mahon
Mr. Cooley
Mr. Grant
Mr. Keogh
Mr. Kirwan
Mr. Poage
Mr. Sheppard
Mr. Thomas
Mr. Brown of Ohio
Mr. Gathings
Mr. Jensen
Mr. McMillan
Mr. Mills
Mr. Kilburn
Mrs. Bolton of Ohio
Mr. Bonner
Mr. Harris
Mr. Rivers of South Carolina
Mr. Philbin
Mr. King of California
Mr. Whitten
Mr. Abernethy
Mr. Auchincloss
Mr. Dawson
Mr. Feighan
Mr. Fisher
Mr. Hoeven
Mr. Holifield
Mr. Horan
Mr. Madden
Mr. Morrison
Mr. Murray
Mr. O'Konski
Mr. Winstead
Mr. Andrews of Alabama
Mr. Rooney of New York
Mr. Beckworth
Mr. Chenoweth
Mr. Wilson of Indiana
Mr. Fogarty
Mr. Sikes
Mr. Chelf
Mr. Corbett
Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin
Mr. Fallon
Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania
Mr. Miller of California
Mr. Morgan
Mr. Powell
Mr. Price
Mr. Rains
Mr. Teague of Texas
Mr. Gary
Mr. Norblad
Mr. Thompson of Texas
Mr. Bennett of Michigan
Mr. Blatnik
Mr. Burleson
Mr. Donohue
Mr. Evins
Mr. Riehlman
Mr. Tollefson
Mr. Abbitt
Mr. McCulloch
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania
Mr. Aspinall
Mr. Bates
Mr. Bolling
Mr. Elliott
Mr. Ford
Mr. Willis
Mr. Saylor
Mr. Zablocki
Mr. Ayres
Mr. Curtis
Mr. Schenck
Mr. O'Hara of Illinois
Mr. Boland
Mr. Broyhill of Virginia
Mr. Frelinghuysen
Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Hosmer
Mr. Johansen
Mr. Macdonald
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey
Mr. Burke
Mr. Conte
Mr. Keith
Mr. Morse

ADJOURNMENT

The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late President the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the foregoing resolution and as a further mark of respect to the deceased President, the House stands adjourned until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 26, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1386. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the Eighth Special Report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems on the operations and policies of the international financial institution of which the United States is a member, for the 2-year period April 1960–March 1962, pursuant to the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, as amended, and of the International Finance Corporation, the International Development Association, and the Inter-American Development Bank in accordance with the reporting requirements in the acts providing for U.S. participation in these institutions (H. Doc. No. 175); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

1387. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 4, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on an interim hurricane survey of Chesapeake Bay, Md. and Va., authorized by Public Law 71, 84th Congress, approved June 15, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 176); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1388. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting reports of the number of officers on duty with Headquarters, Department of the Army, and the Army General Staff on September 30, 1963, pursuant to section 3031(c) of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1389. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics), relative to describing the status of the facts relating to the construction of a dam immediately below the confluence of DeLuz Creek with the Santa Margarita River on Camp Pendleton, San Diego County, Calif., pursuant to section 7 of an act of July 28, 1954, 69 Stat. 575; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1390. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting a proposed amendment to the concession contract with the Majestic Hotel Co., pursuant to 67 Stat. 271, as amended by 70 Stat. 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1391. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting a proposed amendment to the concession contract with the National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Inc., pursuant to 67 Stat. 271, as amended by 70 Stat. 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1392. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting two reports concerning claims processed by the Department of the Army during fiscal year 1963, relating to the Federal Tort Claims Act, and claims settled under the Military Personnel Claims Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

[*Submitted November 25, 1963*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of November 21, 1963, the following reports were filed on November 22, 1963:

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Thirteenth report of the Committee on Government Operations pertaining to conflict of interest in defense contracting and employment; without amendment (Rept. No. 917). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Fourteenth report of the Committee on Government Operations pertaining to availability of information; without amendment (Rept. No. 918). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Fifteenth report of the Committee on Government Operations pertaining to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 919). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Sixteenth report pertaining to window dressing in bank reports; without amendment (Rept. No. 920). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Seventeenth report pertaining to consumer protection activities of State governments; without amendment (Rept. No. 921). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

Mr. MONAGAN introduced a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 808) to create a John F. Kennedy Memorial Commission; which was referred to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. BELL introduced a bill (H.R. 9222) for the relief of Mrs. In Ha Cho, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

AMENDMENT OF SENATE JOURNAL AND CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the sudden and tragic death of the President of the United States since the adjournment of the Senate on Friday last made it highly important and desirable that certain action should be taken by the Senate prior to 12 o'clock noon today—the hour to which the Senate on Friday adjourned.

That action, with which Senators are familiar, was taken at an unofficial meeting of Members of the Senate called by the majority leader and the minority leader for 10 o'clock a.m., today. In order that such proceedings may be given full legal effect, I submit the following unanimous-consent request; namely:

That the Senate Journal and the permanent edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, respectively, for Friday, November 22, 1963, with respect to the order and motion for adjournment until Monday, November 25, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon, be amended, at the appropriate places, therein, to provide that, instead of an adjournment until noon, the Senate adjourn until 10 o'clock a.m., on said day; and

That the informal meeting of the Members of the Senate, above indicated, be deemed to have been a duly authorized session of the Senate, and the action taken therein is hereby validated and approved as a part of its official proceedings of today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The proceedings of the informal meeting are as follows:

An informal meeting of Senators, called by the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], was held at 10 o'clock a.m., in connection with arrangements for the funeral ceremonies for the late President of the United States, John F. Kennedy.

The meeting was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of the living and of the living dead: As in this hour we bow in the shadow of a people's grief, Thou dost hear the sobbing of a stricken nation. But we come with the comfort that Thou knowest what is in the darkness, and that the darkness and the light are both alike to Thee.

For the stewardship in the brief but epochal years of the young and gallant captain who has fallen at his post, we give thanks to Thee, the Master of all good workmen. In the profile of courage, of vision, and of faith which John F. Kennedy etched upon the darkened sky of these agitated times, in his exalted place of leadership, we behold the image of our America which alone will make sure the survival of our freedom.

And now that the valorous sword has fallen from his lifeless hands, he seems to be calling to us in the unfinished tasks which remain.

> Others will sing the song
> Finish what I began
> What matters I or they
> Mine or another's day
> So the right word be said
> And life the purer made.

In the Nation's poignant loss, may there come to those whose hands are at the helm of this dear land of our faith and love the vision which fortified Thy prophet of old as he bore witness:

> In the year that King Uzziah died I saw the Lord high and lifted up.

So in this year of a tragic death, may there be granted to us a vision of the preeminent spiritual verities which abide and undergird and outlast the life and death of any mortal servant of great causes who toils for a while in these fields of time in the sense of the eternal, and then falls on sleep.

We pray in the name of the risen Christ who hath brought life and immortality to light. Amen.

DEATH OF JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY, 35TH PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, due to the sudden and tragic death of the President of the United States, a former colleague of ours in this body, it has been necessary to call this extraordinary meeting of the Members of the Senate before the hour formally appointed upon the adjournment of the Senate last Friday.

Mr. President, the Senate has assembled today to remark for the RECORD the death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States.

I shall be brief, for his life, too short, shut off too soon, speaks for him.

In these last hours, a profile in courage has emerged from the emulsion of his death. And the tears of those who knew him and those who did not know him will fix that profile forever in the experience of the Nation and the world.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy's courage was the human courage, the courage which all must have merely to live in this world, in the ever-present shadow of death. It was the special courage to defy the cold hand of death when it reaches out too eagerly, as twice it did—in the wounds of the war and in the grave illness of his Senate years. It was the quiet courage to accept death's finality when it would be denied no longer.

And his was an extraordinary courage. It was the courage to believe in, with all his heart, and to dedicate himself to, the attainment of the proposition that Americans—all Americans—are born with an equal right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

His was a universal courage. It was the courage of one who had bled in war to seek, unashamed, a peace of decency among all nations. It was the courage to join, before all else, the family of man and, in the joining, to affirm, before all else, the integrity of human life in the face of the powers of violence to destroy and desecrate it.

This is the profile of the man who walked among us not long ago on the floor of the Senate. This is the profile of the man who emerged to reawaken the Nation to its finest meaning. This is the man who struck new sparks of hope in a world dark with unspeakable fears.

His death, Mr. President, has fused the many faces of courage into a single profile of courage set in the enduring frame of faith and reason. This is what we have of him now. It is so little to have, and yet so much.

In a moment, I shall send to the desk a resolution of regret on the death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. But that will not be the end. It will not be the end of our responsibility, of our debt to this decent man, this American who gave of himself until there was no more to give.

We will find, in his death, the strength to do what must be done to bridle the bigotry, the hatred, the arrogance, the iniquities, and the inequities which marched in the boots of a gathering tyranny to that moment of horror.

We will find, in his death, the strength to renew our faith in what is good in ourselves and in one another throughout this Nation.

We will find, in his death, the strength to follow the paths of reason on which he walked, until they lead us out of the morass of an all-consuming and cynical self-concern.

We will find, in his death, some of his love and reverence of life, some of his humility, some of his patience and forbearance, some of his wisdom, and some of his humor. And, so strengthened, we will join with the President in forging a new decency at home and a reasoned peace in the world.

God willing, these things we shall find, or God help us all.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution which I submit on behalf of the 100 Members of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 228) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has learned with profound sorrow and deep regret of the tragic death of Hon. John Fitzgerald Kennedy, late the President of the United States, and a former Representative and former Senator from the State of Massachusetts.

Resolved, That in recognition of his illustrious statesmanship, his leadership in national and world affairs, and his distinguished public service to his State and the Nation, the Presiding Officer of the Senate appoint a committee, to consist of all the Members of the Senate, to attend the funeral of the late President at noon today.

Resolved, That the Senate hereby tenders its deep sympathy to the members of the family of the late President in their sad bereavement.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives, and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the late President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy lingers in this forum of the people. Here we knew his vigorous tread, his flashing smile, his ready wit, his keen mind, his zest for adventure. Here with quiet grief we mourn his departure. Here we shall remember him best as a colleague whose star of public service is indelibly inscribed on the roll of the U.S. Senate.

And here the eternal question confronts and confounds us. Why must it be? Why must the life of an amiable, friendly, aggressive young man, moved only by high motives, lighted on his way by high hopes, guided by broad plans, impelled by understanding and vision, be brought to an untimely end with his labors unfinished? And why, in a free land, untouched by the heel of dictatorship and oppression, where the humblest citizen may freely utter his grievances, must that life be cut short by an evil instrument, moved by malice, frustration, and hate? This is the incredible thing which leaves us bewildered and perplexed.

One moment there is the ecstasy of living when one can hear the treble cries of scampering children over the White House lawn, the pleasure of receiving a Thanksgiving turkey which I presented to him but 3 days before the evil deed, the pleasure of conversation over many things, including his hopes for the future, the exciting fact of sunshine and green grass in late November, the endless stream of citizens coming to the President's House, the strident voice of the city rising from the hum of traffic, the animation of saluting crowds, and then the sudden strangling death rattle of dissolution. Who shall say, save that there is a divinity which shapes our ends and marks our days?

As the tumult and grief subside, as the Nation resumes and moves forward, and his own generation measures his works and achievements, what shall we say who knew him well—we in this forum, where he spent 8 years of his life—we who knew him best not as Mr. President but simply as Jack?

We saw him come to this body at age 35. We saw him grow. We saw him rise. We saw him elevated to become the Chief Magistrate of this Nation. And we saw him as the leader of both branches of this Republic assembled to deliberate over common problems.

In this moment when death has triumphed, when hearts are chastened, when the spirit reels in sheer bewilderment, what do we say now that the Book of Life has been closed?

Let me say what we have always said when he was alive, gay, happy, friendly, ambitious, and ready to listen.

He had vision that went beyond our own. His determination to effectuate a test ban treaty is a living example.

He was his own profile in courage. His unrelenting devotion to equality and civil rights attests that fact.

He was devoted to our system of constitutional government. His attitude toward the separation of church and state looms like a shining example.

He had the great virtue of spiritual grace. If at any moment he may have seemed frustrated over a proposition, it was so transitory. If he showed any sign of petulance, it was so fleeting. There were no souring acids in the spirit of John Kennedy.

If at any moment he may have seemed overeager, it was but the reflection of a zealous crusader and missioner who knew where he was going.

If at any moment, he seemed to depart from the covenant which he and his party made with the people, it was only because he believed that accelerated events and circumstances did not always heed the clock and the calendar.

If his course sometimes seemed at variance with his own party leaders or with the opposition, it was only because a deep conviction dictated his course.

On the tablets of memory, we who knew him well as a friend and colleague can well inscribe this sentiment:

"Senator John Fitzgerald Kennedy, who became the 35th President of the United States—young, vigorous, aggressive, and scholarly—one who estimated the need of his country and the world and sought to fulfill that need—one who was wedded to peace and vigorously sought this greatest of all goals of mankind—one who sensed how catastrophic nuclear conflict could be and sought a realistic course to avert it—one who sensed the danger that lurked in a continuing inequality in our land and sought a rational and durable solution—one to whom the phrase 'the national interest' was more than a string of words—one who could disagree without vindictiveness—one who believed that the expansion of the enjoyment of living by all people was an achievable goal—one who believed that each generation must contribute its best to the fulfillment of the American dream."

The universal expressions of anguish and agony which will well up in the hearts of people in all parts of the earth this day will linger on the evening breeze which caresses the last resting place of those who served the Republic, and here in this Chamber where he served and prepared for higher responsibility, the memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy will long linger to nourish the faith of all who serve that same great land.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 228) was considered and unanimously agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair appoints the entire membership of the Senate as a committee to proceed to the bier of our late President John F. Kennedy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask Senators to join the leadership and proceed in a body to the bier on which our late departed colleague is now resting.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as previously ordered, the Senate will meet at 12 o'clock noon. I now move that this extraordinary meeting of Members of the Senate be now adjourned.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 19 minutes a.m.) the informal meeting of the Senate was adjourned.

The Senate proceeded in a body to the bier of the late President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal, as amended, be approved as if read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS DURING ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that committees of the Senate be permitted to file reports, with minority or individual views thereto, if appropriate, during the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late beloved President of the United States, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 noon, tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 26, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

◆

SENATE

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Father of men and nations: Thou knowest that on these black-bordered days our heavy hearts have been saying, "Earth's joys grow dim, its glories pass away."

But we turn to Thee who art from everlasting to everlasting, grateful that a riderless steed, upon which millions have gazed with appalled eyes, is not a symbol of a leaderless nation, and that history assures us that in every crisis, Thou dost raise up men to carry on Thy mission for the redemption of humanity.

We are heartened to know that when any leader falls, Thy truth goes marching on—always.

At this noontide which succeeds the day of mourning, when the Nation stopped to weep and ponder, we turn to unfinished tasks with a new assurance of the invincibility of righteousness and truth. Like a rainbow arching the darkened sky will be the remembrance that to America in her shocked grief, there hastened the highest spokesmen of the world's nations, speeding around the earth to stand together in a temple of divine worship, witnessing to an essential kinship with the eternal principles to which this Republic, under any leader, is dedicating her might.

And now as these heralds of good will return across the long miles to their own capitals, we would lift to Thee, with hearts strangely moved, the poet's prayer—

> The tumult and the shouting dies;
> The captains and the kings depart;
> Still stands Thine ancient sacrifice,
> An humble and a contrite heart;
> Lord, God of Hosts, be with us yet,
> Lest we forget, lest we forget!

Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of the late President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 777. An act to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriation and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees;

H.R. 2837. An act to amend further section 11 of the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. 311); and

H.R. 8969. An act to provide, for the period ending June 30, 1964, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

AMENDMENT OF LIBRARY SERVICES ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement granted by the membership to the leadership, I move that Calendar No. 570, Senate bill 2265, be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2265) to amend the Library Services Act in order to increase the amount of assistance under such act and to extend such assistance to nonrural areas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent, debate on the bill is limited.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think it appropriate that I address to the distinguished majority leader an inquiry in regard to the schedule for today and tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes without having that time charged to the time available under the agreement in connection with the library services bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is anticipated that at the conclusion of the consideration of Senate bill 2265, to amend the Library Services Act, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 639, Senate bill 2310, to prohibit any guarantee by the Export-Import Bank or any other agency of the Government of payment of obligations of Communist countries. That is the so-called Mundt bill, which some 10 days ago the leadership promised the Senate it would bring up either yesterday or today; and, in keeping with that promise, we shall do so today.

To Senators who have asked about the meeting held yesterday by the Banking and Currency Committee, that also was done on the basis of a specific pledge which had been made; and I should like to inform Senators that if any responsibility rests on anyone for the holding of that committee meeting on yesterday, the responsibility is mine. I thank the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, for attending to his duty and doing what the Senate had a right to expect.

After conferring with the distinguished President pro tempore, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], I announce that it is anticipated that tomorrow the Senate will take up the conference report on the legislative appropriation bill, H.R. 6868. It is hoped sometime, either today or tomorrow, the Senate will take up the aviation bill, which will be in charge of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

EULOGIES ON DECEMBER 11 IN HONOR OF THE LATE PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Wednesday, December 11—2 weeks from tomorrow—be set aside for eulogies to be delivered by Members of the Senate in honor of our late departed President and our former colleague in this body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is the hope of the leadership that the Senate will remain in session long enough today and tonight to do a good day's work, and that tomorrow the Senate will be able to clear up the odds and ends, and that on the basis of having the Senate complete its work and having the calendar fairly clear, the Senate will be able to go over to Friday, for a pro forma session, and from Friday to the following Tuesday. The President should have a little time to put his blocks in order, so to speak; and this arrangement would give him the respite which he would need. However, this arrangement is dependent upon the Senate's completing the business which it must transact.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it the expectation of the Senator from Montana that the action of the Senate on the Mundt bill will be completed today?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That bill will be taken up today. It has already been threshed out quite thoroughly in the committee, and it is our hope that not all of the time available under the unanimous-consent agreement will be used. However, that will be for the Senate to decide.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I state frankly that I suggested to the majority leader that the Senate hold a late session today, if necessary, for the purpose of completing today its action on the so-called Mundt bill, because I am confident that after having announced that the Thanksgiving recess would begin tomorrow afternoon, some travel commitments have already been made. So that measure should be disposed of today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I agree.

I am undetermined as to when to have the Senate take up the Nitze nomination. It was anticipated that it would be brought up yesterday. However, because of the tragic circumstances, of course that was impossible. So it will remain in abeyance for either this week or the next.

Mr. DIRKSEN. With respect to the nominations, a little while ago, it was asked whether they now are moot. However, my understanding from the Parliamentarian is that they continue and are subject to action by the Senate, unless they are withdrawn by the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

MEETING OF BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE YESTERDAY TO CONSIDER THE MUNDT BILL

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I acknowledge with thanks the compliment paid to me by the distinguished majority leader.

At 9 o'clock yesterday morning, after I learned that the Senate would meet at 10 a.m. to make arrangements to attend the funeral of the President, I telephoned the clerk of the committee and suggested that he send to all members of the committee notices that the committee would not meet. However, he said he had received from the majority leader word that he thought that inasmuch as the Senate had asked that the committee meet then, we should do so.

I then checked with the office of the majority leader, and that word was confirmed. So the committee met, and reported the bill, as it was requested to do; also, there was laid on the desk of every Senator a record of 275 printed pages of testimony which the committee believes fully covers the pros and cons of the Mundt bill.

As chairman of the committee that met under those adverse circumstances to order the bill reported, I wish to unite with the minority leader in expressing the hope that even if the Senate must remain in session until late tonight, it will finish consideration of the bill. I believe, first, that quite a vital issue is involved; and second, we all know that from the standpoint of those anxious to see the deal made, the Export-Import Bank will not insure $1 of future grain shipments until we have voted. Therefore, I believe that the Senate should act promptly both from the standpoint of those who wish to see the shipments made and also from the standpoint of those of us who take the position that even though it would hurt the farmers and others, we do not wish to start a program of giving aid to Communist nations. We must go on record on that issue.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Virginia will bear with the leadership, the Senate will remain in session late tonight.

TRIBUTE TO RADIO AND TELEVISION INDUSTRY

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to express deep appreciation for the sensitive and magnificent coverage of the tragic events of the past 4 days devoted by the television industry and by the radio industry of the United States.

I do this, first, out of deep gratitude; and second, because heretofore I have been a critic of the programing and commercialism of television and radio. The action of the industry in the last few days has been one which I admire and appreciate very deeply.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator from Oregon yield me one-half minute?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to report to the Senate that the Senate will meet in this Chamber tomorrow. At this moment I do not know the exact time, but the Senate will leave its Chamber probably at 12:10 or 12:15 o'clock, for the purpose of proceeding in a body to the other Chamber to hear the President of the United States address a joint meeting of Congress.

AMENDMENT OF LIBRARY SERVICES ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2265) to amend the Library Services Act in order to increase the amount of assistance under such act and to extend such assistance to nonrural areas.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage of the bill (S. 2265).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

CHANGE IN UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as I read the unanimous-consent request, I believe it is not correct. The unanimous-consent request on Friday last was that there would be 1 hour on the bill and all amendments thereto. The way the unanimous consent now reads, there will be 1 hour on each amendment and 1 hour on the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the original intent of the proposal be adhered to; namely, 1 hour on the bill and all amendments thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, under the time limitation, I must proceed with the bill. I cannot take up my hour with extraneous matters, and I hope Senators will understand that as Senator in charge of the bill, my responsibility is to the bill. It will not take me very long. I shall try to accommodate Senators as rapidly as I can, but I should like to dispose of the bill, because the Senator from Texas is entitled to have as much time as I myself under the unanimous-consent agreement.

LEGISLATION RELATING TO ASSAULT ON PRESIDENT OR VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I know that every Senator will wish to join in one or more of the bills introduced, but there is one thing which I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate, and that is that I hope there will not be a race of investigations. The past weekend has been a miserable nightmare. Many events have occurred concerning which the American people are entitled to an accounting.

I express the hope that the majority and minority leaders of the Senate and of the House and the President will get together to decide on one responsible national investigation to account to all the people, and that there will be no unseemliness in the Federal Government, with various committees racing to investigate that subject.

I believe that would be a contribution to dignity and propriety, to which we are entitled, the model of which for this country was Mrs. Kennedy. I hope it will be done.

I shall study the various bills, as will other Senators, and join in one or more of them, as I believe to be proper, as a lawyer.

The important thing, in my opinion, is to keep the investigation on the plane and level of dignity and support for our Nation's prestige in the world, for the dignity of our President, and for the dignity of our deceased President—for which Mrs. Kennedy led the way.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, there is, at the desk, a bill along the line of the measures under discussion, after talking with all members of the Committee on the Judiciary. Senators will find the bill at the desk. It has been introduced on behalf of the Judiciary Committee to make it a Federal offense for anyone to kill or assault the President or the Vice President of the United States.

We are all interested in this subject, and the Judiciary Committee will be glad to hear from all Senators in regard to it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Make It a Federal Crime," published in the Washington Post of November 26, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MAKE IT A FEDERAL CRIME

Certainly the law should be amended to made the assassination of the President a Federal crime. It is ironic indeed that the criminal who murdered President Kennedy violated only the law of Texas. Actually his foul deed was a crime against the Nation—one of the most serious crimes against the Nation in this century.

As the law now stands, severe penalties are prescribed for felons who murder or attack Federal judges, U.S. attorneys, FBI agents, postal inspectors, Secret Service officials, customs agents, and various employees of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture. But this law for the protection of officers and employees of the United States does not, strangely enough, cover the President or members of his Cabinet.

Presumably the need for Federal law in this field has not previously been emphasized. When Lincoln was assassinated, the country was still under martial law. The assassin of President Garfield was prosecuted in the District of Columbia and the assassin of President McKinley in New York. There is a strong presumption that Texas would have convicted Lee Harvey Oswald of the slaying of President Kennedy if Oswald himself had not been killed as he was being transferred to the county jail. But the serious bungling of this vital case by the Dallas police constitutes a strong argument for the direction of such delicate operations by the FBI from the very beginning.

The events in Dallas have shown all too clearly that Federal officials should have been in charge of the police work from the beginning. High crimes against the Nation cannot be safely left to investigation and prosecution by local officials of the community in which such crimes happen to take place. As soon as Congress resumes its operations, Representative Richard S. Schweiker, of Pennsylvania, will introduce a bill to extend the protection of section 1114, United States Code, to the President and Vice President. We hope that it will be given prompt attention by the Judiciary Committees and that they will also include within the terms of the bill other officials in the line of succession to the Presidency. Perhaps agency heads, their deputies and Members of Congress should also be included.

AMENDMENT OF LIBRARY SERVICES ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2265) to amend the Library Services Act in order to increase the amount of assistance under such act and to extend such assistance to nonrural areas.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on resuming debate on the library services bill, S. 2265, I should like to briefly recapitulate the major points in its favor:

First. The original format of S. 2265 was title VI–C of S. 580, the administration's comprehensive education bill.

Second. Hearings before the committee were held in connection with S. 580 and much support to title VI–C—now S. 2265—was heard from a great variety of witnesses. Page 3 of the committee report sets forth pertinent references to the hearing record which, in my judgment, can be most helpful to Senators.

Third. The bill was reported with bipartisan support from committee. It has received support on the floor of the Senate from Senators on both sides of the aisle representing a diversity of geographical areas.

Fourth. The library services which we seek to strengthen by this bill perform valuable educational functions for all citizens of all age brackets. At a time when our public school libraries and our private school libraries in many, many cases are inadequate, children of both educational systems must necessarily turn to the public libraries. Our public libraries are crowded in afternoons, Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays because our school libraries cannot provide them wtih the research tools they need to acquire a good education.

Briefly, if enacted the bill would amend the Library Services Act of 1956 to increase Federal assistance available for the improvement of our public and community libraries. It would achieve its objective by removing the present limitation which restricts assistance to any areas of under 10,000 population. In order to serve all sections of the country, including the large metropolitan areas, the bill would increase the present $7.5 million authorization by $17.5 million so that $25 million in matching grants on a per capita income equalization formula would be available for this year and such sums as the Congress may determine for subsequent years.

Title II of the bill would provide, on a similar matching formula, $20 million for this year in matching funds for the construction of public community libraries and for each of the next 2 years such sums as the Congress may appropriate.

Evidence presented to the committee indicated that of all the public buildings of our local government public libraries were most in need of renovation, repair, and replacement. Since the great benefactions of Andrew Carnegie in the early part of this century first made possible these repositories of knowledge on a widely distributed basis throughout the country, little has been done.

In closing, Mr. President, I urge that the bill as reported by the committee be passed without crippling amendments which would seek to limit the scope of the program. To single out any population area of our country on the basis of drawing an invidious distinction between our rural citizens and our urban citizens in my judgment is unwise and such an amendment ought not to prevail.

I feel very strongly that in this area of public service we should make available to all our people, despite their residence or other extraneous consideration, access to the best which has been thought and said in man's history.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Record, at the conclusion of my opening remarks, material in regard to the technical aspects of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The material submitted by Mr. Morse is as follows:

EXHIBIT XLII

DEFINITION OF "PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICE" AND TYPES OF EXPENDITURES UNDER THE LIBRARY SERVICES ACT

Allotments of Federal funds to the States under the Library Services Act are made "to promote further extension by the several States of public library services to rural areas without such services or with inadequate services."

Public library service includes collecting, organizing, making available, and stimulating the use of printed, audio-visual and other types of material having cultural, educational, and informational value to individuals and groups. Such services are provided free to all residents of a community, district, county, or region and are financially supported in whole or in part from public funds. The extension and improvement of public library service requires the training of librarians and library assistants, advisory and consultant services by experienced librarians, the dissemination of information on the values and results of good public library service and the purchase of equipment to operate library service programs such as bookmobiles.

Nearly all States use their Federal allotment for two major purposes; the strengthening of the resources of the State library extension agency to improve and extend their services to rural areas, and, for grants, demonstrations, and related activities at the local, regional, or State level. Expenditures of Federal and State and local matching funds are budgeted and reported under the categories of salaries, books and other materials, equipment and all the operating expenditures.

Expenditures for salaries are made at both the State and local levels. A significant proportion of State level salary expenditures has been devoted to hiring field consultant librarians who work directly with rural librarians, library board members, and governmental officials to improve small public libraries. Other major categories of salary expenditures are: The employment of trained and experienced librarians to head local demonstrations of larger unit library organizations; to head and staff new county or multicounty public libraries; and, to provide professional staff specialists in such subjects as childrens' library work, adult education, and reference and information services, who share their special skills with librarians in rural areas. Some salary expenditures have gone to highly specialized, temporary librarians who are hired for specific purposes, for example: To conduct a statewide survey of existing library conditions and to make recommendations for their improvement; to conduct statewide conferences and workshops on topics of concern to rural librarians; and, to carry out management analyses of the administration and operation of both State library extension agencies and local library systems in order to assure maximum efficiency and economy.

Expenditures for books and other library materials under the Library Services Act from 1957 to 1963 have been sufficient to purchase more than 14 million volumes. These expenditures include not only books, pamphlets, periodicals, reference works, and documents, but also educational motion pictures, phonograph recordings and transcriptions, microcards and microfilms and related media which help meet the informational needs of library users.

The most prominent item of equipment frequently purchased with Federal funds is the bookmobile. By the end of fiscal year 1963, more than 350 new bookmobiles were purchased and placed in rural service under this program. These units, which operate in all seasons in all geographic areas of the country, can carry from 2,500 to 5,000 volumes and cost between $10,000 and $25,000. Other equipment which is essential to the operation of public libraries include such items as: Machines for catalog card reproduction; microfilm copiers and printers; audiovisual projection and playback equipment; dictating machines; pasting, binding, lettering, and other book processing devices; data processing equipment for inventory, circulation, and catalog control; and book trucks, shipping containers, card catalog cabinets, and related items. Nonspecialized equipment needed for library use under the various State plans includes desks, tables, typewriters, duplicators, delivery trucks, etc.

Expenditures classified as "all other" include a greater variety of items and services than the three mentioned above. Most contractual services fall into this category: Heat, light, custodial and maintenance costs, machine lease or rental, including teletypewriter facilities, and certain costs of the centralized processing of materials. In addition to these, many States spend funds in this category for the training of needed librarians and library assistants; scholarships to graduate library schools; conferences, workshops, and other training activities; field travel; the publication of manuals, syllabi, newsletters, etc.; postage and mailing; research studies into problems affecting rural library services; payment to urban libraries for the extension of specified services to rural areas; production of library training films; insurance; rent; purchase of preprinted catalog cards; book and periodical binding, etc.

THE LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT (S. 2265)—ALLOTMENTS AND MATCHING EXPENDITURES

The Library Services and Construction Act of 1963 (H.R. 4879 and S. 2265) would provide Federal funds as matching grants to the States for the further extension of library services to areas without such services or with inadequate services and for the construction of public library buildings.

From the amounts appropriated for title I (maximum authorization $25 million), the Commissioner shall allot $25,000 each to the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa and $100,000 to each of the other States and the District of Columbia. The remainder of the appropriation shall be allotted to each State in the same proportion as the population of the State bears to the total U.S. population according to the most recent decennial census. The same procedure is followed in making allotments under title II (maximum authorization $20 million) except that the basic grant is $20,000 each for Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, and $80,000 for each of the other States and the District of Columbia.

Allotments to the States under title I must be matched with funds from State and local sources. The percentage of matching funds required is that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 percent as the per capita income of the State bears to the per capita income of the United States. One exception to this procedure is that the Federal percentage (share) shall in no case be more than 66 percent or less than 33 percent. The basic fiscal requirements to be met by the States are (1) sufficient matching funds to enable the State to receive at least the basic allotment; (2) total State and local funds of an amount not less than the amount actually expended in areas to be covered by the plan in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963; (3) an amount available for expenditure for public library services from State sources which is not less than that actually expended in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963. The same procedure is followed in computing matching expenditures under title II except that the funds eligible to be included would be those used in the construction of public libraries.

A partial[1] listing of communities not now serviced by the Library Services Act is shown on the following table of urbanized areas according to population, 1960

Rank	Urbanized area	Population
1	New York-northeastern New Jersey	14, 114, 927
2	Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif	6, 488, 791
3	Chicago-northwestern Indiana	5, 959, 213
4	Philadelphia, Pa.-New Jersey	3, 635, 228
5	Detroit, Mich	3, 537, 709
6	San Francisco-Oakland, Calif	2, 430, 663
7	Boston, Mass	2, 413, 236
8	Washington, D.C.-Maryland-Virginia	1, 808, 423
9	Pittsburgh, Pa	1, 804, 400
10	Cleveland, Ohio	1, 784, 991
11	St. Louis, Mo.-Illinois	1, 667, 693
12	Baltimore, Md	1, 418, 948
13	Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	1, 377, 143
14	Milwaukee, Wis	1, 149, 997
15	Houston, Tex	1, 139, 678
16	Buffalo, N.Y	1, 054, 370
17	Cincinnati, Ohio-Kentucky	993, 568
18	Dallas, Tex	932, 349
19	Kansas City, Mo.-Kans	921, 121
20	Seattle, Wash	864, 109
21	Miami, Fla	852, 705
22	New Orleans, La	845, 237
23	San Diego, Calif	836, 175
24	Denver, Colo	803, 624
25	Atlanta, Ga	768, 125
26	Providence-Pawtucket, R.I.-Massachusetts	659, 542
27	Portland, Oreg.-Washington	651, 685
28	San Antonio, Tex	641, 965
29	Indianapolis, Ind	639, 340
30	Columbus, Ohio	616, 743
31	Louisville, Ky.-Indiana	606, 659
32	San Jose, Calif	602, 805
33	Phoenix, Ariz	552, 043
34	Memphis, Tenn	544, 505
35	Birmingham, Ala	521, 330
36	Norfolk-Portsmouth, Va	507, 825
37	Fort Worth, Tex	502, 682
38	Dayton, Ohio	501, 664
39	Rochester, N.Y	493, 402
40	Akron, Ohio	458, 253
41	Albany-Schenectady-Troy, N.Y	455, 447
42	Sacramento, Calif	451, 920
43	Springfield-Chicopee-Holyoke, Mass.-Connecticut	449, 777
44	Toledo, Ohio	438, 283
45	Oklahoma City, Okla	429, 188
46	Omaha, Nebr.-Iowa	389, 881
47	Hartford, Conn	381, 619
48	San Bernardino-Riverside, Calif	377, 531
49	Youngstown-Warren, Ohio-Pennsylvania	372, 748
50	Jacksonville, Fla	372, 569
51	Bridgeport, Conn	366, 654
52	Honolulu, Hawaii	351, 336
53	Salt Lake City, Utah	348, 661
54	Nashville, Tenn	346, 722
55	Richmond, Va	333, 438
56	Syracuse, N.Y	333, 286
57	St. Petersburg, Fla	324, 842
58	Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood, Fla	319, 951
59	Tampa, Fla	301, 790
60	Tulsa, Okla	298, 922
61	Grand Rapids, Mich	294, 230
62	Wichita, Kans	292, 138
63	Wilmington, Del.-New Jersey	283, 667
64	New Haven, Conn	278, 794
65	Flint, Mich	277, 786
66	El Paso, Tex	277, 128
67	Mobile, Ala	268, 139
68	Allentown-Bethlehem, Pa	256, 016
69	Trenton, N.J.-Pennsylvania	242, 401
70	Albuquerque, N. Mex	241, 216
71	Des Moines, Iowa	241, 115
72	Wilkes-Barre, Pa	233, 932
73	Tucson, Ariz	227, 433
74	Davenport-RockIsland-Moline, Iowa-Illinois	227, 176
75	Spokane, Wash	226, 938
76	Worcester, Mass	225, 446
77	South Bend, Ind.-Michigan	218, 933
78	Tacoma, Wash	214, 930
79	Canton, Ohio	213, 574
80	Fresno, Calif	213, 444
81	Scranton, Pa	210, 676
82	Charlotte, N.C	209, 551
83	Harrisburg, Pa	209, 501
84	Newport News-Hampton, Va	208, 874
85	Shreveport, La	208, 583
86	Chattanooga, Tenn.-Georgia	205, 143
87	Orlando, Fla	200, 995
88	Baton Rouge, La	193, 485
89	Utica-Rome, N.Y	187, 779
90	Austin, Tex	187, 157
91	Pomona-Ontario, Calif	186, 547
92	Little Rock-North Little Rock, Ark	185, 017
93	Peoria, Ill	181, 432
94	Fort Wayne, Ind	179, 571
95	Erie, Pa	177, 433
96	Corpus Christi, Tex	177, 380
97	West Palm Beach, Fla	172, 835
98	Knoxville, Tenn	172, 734
99	Rockford, Ill	171, 681
100	Savannah, Ga	169, 887
101	Charleston, W. Va	169, 500
102	Lansing, Mich	169, 325
103	Stamford, Conn	166, 990
104	Lawrence-Haverhill, Mass.-New Hampshire	166, 125
105	Huntington, W. Va., Ashland, Ky.-Ohio	165, 732
106	Columbia, S.C	162, 601
107	Reading, Pa	160, 297
108	Charleston, S.C	160, 113
109	Columbus, Ga.-Alabama	158, 382
110	Binghamton, N.Y	158, 141
111	Madison, Wis	157, 814
112	Jackson, Miss	147, 480
113	Duluth Minn.-Superior, Wis	144, 763
114	Evansville, Ind	143, 660
115	Montgomery, Ala	142, 893
116	Lorain-Elyria, Ohio	142, 860
117	Bakersfield, Calif	141, 763
118	Waterbury, Conn	141, 626
119	Stockton, Calif	141, 604
120	Amarillo, Tex	137, 969
121	Lincoln, Nebr	136, 220
122	Lubbock, Tex	129, 289
123	Saginaw, Mich	129, 215
124	Winston-Salem, N.C	128, 176
125	Pensacola, Fla	128, 049
126	Greenville, S.C	126, 887
127	New Bedford, Mass	126, 657
128	Atlantic City, N.J	124, 902
129	Roanoke, Va	124, 752
130	Fall River, Mass.-Rhode Island	123, 951
131	Augusta, Ga.-South Carolina	123, 698
132	Greensboro, N.C	123, 334
133	Ogden Utah	121, 927
134	Topeka, Kans	119, 500
135	Beaumont, Tex	119, 178
136	Lowell, Mass	118, 547
137	Galveston-Texas City, Tex	118, 482
138	Joliet, Ill	116, 585
139	Port Arthur, Tex	116, 365
140	Waco, Tex	116, 163
141	Kalamazoo, Mich	115, 659

See footnote at end of table.

A partial[1] listing of communities not now serviced by the Library Services Act is shown on the following table of urbanized areas according to population, 1960—Con.

Rank	Urbanized area	Population
142	Ann Arbor, Mich	115, 282
143	Macon, Ga	114, 161
144	Lexington, Ky	111, 940
145	Portland, Maine	111, 701
146	Springfield, Ill	111, 403
147	Brockton, Mass	111, 315
148	Cedar Rapids, Iowa	105, 118
149	Pueblo, Colo	103, 336
150	Waterloo, Iowa	102, 827
151	Wichita Falls, Tex	102, 104
152	York, Pa	100, 872
153	Colorado Springs, Colo	100, 220

[1] Urbanized areas in excess of 100,000 population.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, and that the time necessary for the call of the roll be not charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPENSES OF COMMITTEE ATTENDING FUNERAL OF THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may act on a resolution without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the solution (S. Res. 229), as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed to attend the funeral of the Honorable John Fitzgerald Kennedy, late President of the United States of America, on vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and unanimously agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF LIBRARY SERVICES ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2265) to amend the Library Services Act in order to increase the amount of assistance under such act and to extend such assistance to nonrural areas.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes on the bill.

Mr. President, this amendment to the Library Services Act makes some rather substantial and, I think, significant changes by striking out all previous references to "rural areas," thus opening the bill to all urban areas, in direct contradiction of the original purposes of the act.

Further changes were made by increasing the authorization from $7.5 million to $25 million for 3 years at a time of budget deficit and a plea for a tax cut.

It would add a new $20-million 3-year program of Federal financial assistance to construction of public libraries—a field that has been carefully and correctly avoided by the Federal Government heretofore.

The original act was envisioned as a 5-year pilot program to improve library services in rural areas suffering from inadequate library service.

The present bill radically departs from the intent of the original law in these ways:

The program is proposed to be extended into all rural and urban areas, whether or not they have inadequate library services at this time.

The Federal Government becomes a party to library construction which previously had been scrupulously left with State, local, and private philanthropic efforts. Thus, it is possible that the Federal Government will now be enabled, through a Washington bureaucrat, to decide and to dictate: what towns and cities will get libraries and library improvements; how big libraries will be, and who will be the librarians; and even perhaps, ultimately and eventually, what books would be provided under the authorization for Federal financial assistance for libraries.

When the program was begun, the committees of the Congress expressly noted that they did not expect it to be continued beyond 5 years; but, instead, expected it to stimulate local and State library services. Now, in connection with this bill, it is contended that the local, State, and private facilities have not done and cannot do the job; and it is asserted that only the Federal Government can do the job of maintaining the American library system. We are asked to open the door to a system of Federal libraries, controlled by the Federal Government at some possible future day.

What is being said, in effect, is that library needs have not been met through local initiative and responsibility. I think it is presumptious to say that only the Federal Government can recognize the need of local communities in this respect, and that only the Federal Government is able to meet those needs.

Our very fine system of public libraries throughout the country has largely been the result of community and philanthropic efforts, and has not come under the auspices of the Federal Government.

We often hear talk in this body about the State and local governments having failed to meet their educational responsibilities. Our system of free public education was initiated by people acting as citizens of communities and States.

There are fine library facilities in the country that have been the result of local initiative.

I suspect that Andrew Carnegie would hardly be enraptured with the idea of the Federal Government taking over the library and book field. This is one area of communication that the Federal Government should stay out of. I, therefore, urge defeat of the pending measure.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield such time as he needs to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE].

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I strongly support the enactment of S. 2265, which would remove the restrictive population ceiling of 10,000 from the present Library Services Act; increase the authorization for services from $7.5 to $25 million; and in addition would provide $20 million in matching grants for greatly needed public library construction.

We are living in a complex and rapidly changing age. It is an age built upon the creation, the collection, and the rapid dissemination of accurate information. At the very heart of this communications chain stands the American free public library which collects and makes available books and other materials to all who have need of them. A good public library provides the necessary continuity in our democratic tradition and serves as the springboard into the future growth of the individual and of society.

On every single issue of major importance, our citizens turn to their public library. If they are to make intelligent choices and decisions in their daily lives, they must be provided with information which is pertinent, dependable, and up to date.

I am proud of the achievements in New Hampshire under the present Library Services Act. More than 320,000 rural residents in my State have received new or improved services under this program. Four new bookmobiles have been purchased and are, at this moment, making good reading available to widely scattered residents on farms and in small communities. Using grant funds as well as local appropriations, 32 small libraries are now cooperating in a book purchase pool. This greater buying power plus the elimination of unnecessary duplication assures the most efficient and economical use of funds.

New Hampshire has been able to apply Library Services Act funds directly into an efficient on-going program of statewide library development, but two limitations in the present program have hampered and restricted progress. S. 2265, the Library Services and Construction Act, will remove both these limitations. First, it will extend benefits to urban as well as rural areas. This means that for the first time the well-developed libraries in such places as Laconia, Concord, Dover, Keene, Manchester, Nashua, and Portsmouth can be incorporated into a comprehensive plan which will make all the library resources of the State more widely and conveniently available. By building on present strengths, the quality of the library services extended to rural and suburban areas will be of much higher quality.

Second, S. 2265 will provide matching grants to stimulate the more rapid construction of public library buildings. A 1961 survey showed that thousands of New Hampshire residents were forced to use libraries which are obsolete, overcrowded, poorly equipped, and in some cases, downright dangerous. Approximately 65 percent of the public library buildings in New Hampshire were constructed before World War I and they have in common a high architectural resistance to modernization or expansion. Many libraries have had to reduce or seriously limit their service to students because there is just no room for all those who need space to choose and to use library books and other materials. S. 2265 will give New Hampshire communities a new incentive to correct these serious limitations.

New Hampshire librarians, library trustees, educators, and others have been giving serious study to library service improvement. This bill will assist them greatly in offering the public services which are so much in the national interest.

I am in complete agreement with our able State librarian, Mrs. Mildred McKay, who recently said:

> Libraries in New Hampshire have been brought to an important threshold of development, through the impetus of Federal assistance under the Library Services Act. It is appropriate, in my opinion, that the Federal Government continue to expand its share in the development of library services for all of the people of this country, if they are to fulfill with wisdom their responsibilities as citizens.

I urge, therefore, the prompt enactment of S. 2265.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Texas. One hour is available for debate on the entire bill and amendments to it. I should like to ask the Chair how much time remains on each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-four minutes remain on the bill. Divided between both sides, that means that 17 minutes are available to each side.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have used more time than the opposition has used this morning.

Mr. TOWER. The Senator from Oregon has used more time than we have.

Mr. MORSE. I have used a little more time than has the opposition, but not much more. I suggest that whatever time I have used should be charged against the 30 minutes on my side, and that whatever time the Senator from Texas has used be charged against the 30 minutes on his side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian will have to recompute the time allotment in the absence of agreement between the two sides as to how much time has been used.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, what is the total time that remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-four minutes remain.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 20 minutes of the remaining time be assigned to the opposition and 14 minutes be assigned to Senators who are in favor of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. I appreciate the generous gesture of the Senator from Oregon. I do not know that we will use all the time available to us. I should like to make some time available to Senators who wish to speak against the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] proposes to strike out title II of the bill, as follows:

TITLE II—PUBLIC LIBRARY CONSTRUCTION

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 201. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, the sum of $20,000,000, and for each of the next two fiscal years such sums as the Congress may determine, which shall be used for making payments to States, which have submitted and had approved by the Commissioner, State plans for the construction of public libraries.

Allotments

SEC. 202. From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 201 for each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall allot $20,000 each to Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, and $80,000 to each of the other States, and shall allot to each State such part of the remainder of such sums as the population of the State bears to the population of the United States, according to the most recent decennial census. A State's allotment under this subsection for any fiscal year shall be available for payments with respect to construction projects approved, under its State plan approved under section 203, during such year or (but only in the case of a State allotment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964) the next fiscal year.

State plans for construction

SEC. 203. (a) To be approved for purposes of this title a State plan for construction of public libraries must—

(1) meet the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), (4), and (5) of section 103(a);

(2) set forth criteria and procedures for approval of projects for construction of public library facilities which are designed to insure that priority will be given to projects for facilities to serve areas having, in the judgment of the State library administrative agency, the greatest need for additional facilities and which give consideration to the educational needs of people of all ages, including students;

(3) provide assurance that every local or other public agency whose application for funds under the plan with respect to a project for construction of public library facilities is denied will be given an opportunity for a fair hearing before the State library administrative agency; and

(4) provide assurance that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction projects assisted under this Act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality, as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a–276c–5); and the Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this paragraph the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

(b) The Commissioner shall approve any plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a) of this section.

Payments to States

SEC. 204 (a) From its allotment available therefor under section 202 each State shall be entitled to receive an amount equal to the Federal share (as determined under section 104) of projects approved, during the period for which such allotment is available, under the State plan of such State approved under section 203.

(b) The Commissioner shall from time to time estimate the amount to which a State is entitled under subsection (a), and such amount shall be paid to the State, at such time or times, and in such installments as the Commissioner shall determine, after necessary adjustment on account of any previously made underpayments or overpayments.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I believe that most Members of the Senate will recall that when the act was originally passed, the Senator from Colorado was one of the sponsors and at that time spoke at some length in support of the bill.

At that time we were told that what was needed was a 5-year program, and the extension of library service into rural areas. Having lived in a rural area for most of my adult life, I could understand the need and the demand for such service.

When the original act expired, those who were interested in the bill came to Members of Congress—and I must say that I was well acquainted with the original act, because at that time I was a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—and told us that if they could have another extension, that would be the last.

I wish to make my own position on this subject very clear. I am speaking upon the pending amendment. Because I have encountered some difficulties with the technique of drafting another amendment, I may withdraw the pending amendment and offer another as soon as it is available. However, I wish to speak on the bill, and then on the pending amendment.

Two things about the bill concern me. First, the appropriation for this year would be $25 million and, as I read the bill and as I understand it—and I believe I do understand it—it is an open-end authorization for the next 2 years. If I am not correct about this I am perfectly willing to have Senators who are members of the committee correct me. However, I am sure that I am correct.

I firmly believe that if we are to have an informed citizenry, books and other reading material must be available for our people.

I have spent more of my younger life in a library than almost anywhere else, and have been a voracious reader from the time I was 8. Therefore, I can fully appreciate what library facilities mean to our boys and girls, and also to adults.

Last week I had a long talk with Mr. Gordon Bennett, State librarian of the State of Colorado. He promised to provide some figures for me, but they are not available to me as yet. However, he informs me that on a population percentage basis the use of our libraries is increasing.

Much of the "pulp" that is now published under the guise of books is not worth the paper on which it is printed.

I believe the purpose of the bill is good. It is necessary for the welfare of the people that they have access not merely to technical information, but to good, well-written information in every conceivable category. To the average person, such reading is available only at a library.

I have been deluged with letters and telegrams, and even telephone calls, from people in my own State, and also from outside my State, to support the bill.

To me, the real question is: Which way shall we proceed? Frankly, I shall never support, in any instance, an open-end authorization, such as the bill provides. To me, it is inconceivable that Congress, particularly in view of the situation in which the Nation finds itself today, in which we shall face another $9 billion deficit by July 1, perhaps more if some budget-balancing activities do not take place, and if the tax bill should be passed later this year, should make open-end authorizations. Particularly in view of the unsettled conditions that may prevail for a while as a result of the tragic events of the last few days, it is not unlikely that there may be a deficit of from $9 billion to $13 billion in each of several years to come.

I cannot and do not follow the philosophy that we can spend ourselves into prosperity by borrowing from ourselves. Much has been said in recent days about the great need for growth of the gross national product. In this particular year it has reached a new high level. However, I do not agree that we will necessarily follow a wise course merely by calculating the percentage of our national debt as compared with our population and the percentage of the gross national product as compared with the national debt. From my point of view, that does not make sense.

As to what should be done about the bill under consideration, I should like to pose a query to the Senator from Oregon. I am sorry to say that I have seldom been able to change his mind; nevertheless, he always listens with affability and courtesy. I should like to ask him a question and have him answer it on my own time: Would he accept an amendment which would place a limitation in the bill for certain years? The bill already provides $25 million for this year; but would he agree to a limitation of $25 million on the amount to be authorized for each of the next 2 years?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado first yield to me?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. TOWER. I join the Senator from Colorado in urging the distinguished Senator from Oregon to accept this most constructive amendment. I believe it would remove much of the objection to the measure.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. ALLOTT. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator's proposal to provide $25 million for each year of the 3-year period?

Mr. ALLOTT. That is what I meant. I wish to make it perfectly clear that, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations and as one who has to wrestle, week in and week out, month in and month out, with the problem of trying to conserve dollars to meet all the needs that confront the Government, I was trying to guard against any open-ended authorization, to which I would object on principle.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator agree also to a provision for $20 million for the construction fund in each year?

Mr. ALLOTT. I had not come to that provision yet.

Mr. MORSE. Let us consider it now. The Senator has said that I never change my mind. He and I, through mutual understandings, have often solved problems in what we considered to be the public interest. I will accept $25 million a year for each of 3 years for library services and $20 million a year for each of 3 years for library construction.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am deeply appreciative of the Senator's proposal.

Mr. President, I presented the amendment now being considered before receiving my formal amendment. I should like to withdraw the pending amendment. I ask the Chair, as a parliamentary inquiry, if I would have the right to offer this amendment again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Colorado withdraws the amendment, he will have the right to reoffer it.

Mr. MORSE. I think we can save the remaining time we have. With the approval of the Senate, I should like to modify the bill along these lines, so as to provide $20 million a year for each of 3 years for library construction and $25 million a year for each of 3 years for library services.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment I have offered, and now offer an amendment which would correct the open-end authorization. So far as I am concerned, if the limitation is made on the construction facilities as well as on the services——

Mr. MORSE. That is what I am proposing.

Mr. ALLOTT. I would have no objection.

Mr. MORSE. I propose to modify the bill by providing $20 million for each of 3 years for library construction, and $25 million for each of 3 years for library services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 2, it is proposed to strike out "such sums as the Congress may determine," and insert in lieu thereof "not to exceed $25 million".

Mr. ALLOTT. If Senators will turn to page 5 of the bill, line 12, I would be prepared to offer a subsequent amendment, in line 12, to read: "for each of the next two fiscal years a sum not in excess of $20 million" instead of the words "such sums as the Congress may determine,".

Mr. MORSE. I would accept that amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may include my second amendment with my first. Then I would be prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, has the amendment been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Colorado has no further amendment, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I yield back the remainder of my time, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I rise in support of Senate bill 2265, to amend the Library Services Act.

Public libraries are an essential concomitant of civilization. They signify and provide education in a new dimension. They supplement the grade schools and the high schools. They supply education to adults who are beyond the reach of our formal educational institutions—beyond the schools, because, obviously, "grown ups" are far beyond school age; beyond the universities, because adults are engaged in earning a livelihood, and have family responsibilities.

So the libraries furnish information and education to our adult citizens who cannot otherwise obtain them.

If there is one thing which is axiomatic about our democracy it is that it can function well only if we have an informed electorate. Informing the electorate is an increasingly difficult task, in view of the increasing complexity of the problems confronting Government and society in general. Libraries are one partial answer to the problem of informing the public, and making people knowledgeable concerning issues on which they will be expected to vote.

A good local, a good municipal library will have—or should have—an ample supply of current magazines. Many persons subscribe to a few magazines but few persons can afford the gamut of contemporary publications which treat of the great variety of current problems—economic, social, political, and technical. Senate bill 2265 will be helpful in assisting the libraries to render a better, more complete, more diversified service.

Furthermore, I think it important for people in a free society to learn early to love and to use books. Once they learn that, their lives will be enriched. A person who is at home with books, who is a reader, will never be wholly lonesome. A good book is a good companion. We should do our utmost to inculcate the love of books, and their use.

In Alaska, with its many small, scattered, isolated communities, a local library is, and should be, an indispensable adjunct to the better life. In Alaskan communities, the majority of which are isolated as no other American communities are, in that they cannot be reached by either highway or railway, a library is a link with the outside world—a link which its people sorely need.

Our 49th State has done well within its limited means, in its efforts to supply such library services. I have only praise for those efforts, but more is needed and can be put to the finest possible use.

The proposed amendment to the Library Services Act will help improve the existing services not only in Alaska, but elsewhere throughout our Union.

I hope the Senate will act favorably on this measure.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. TOWER. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to express to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] my appreciation, because I feel that as a result of the amendment as modified, the bill will receive better consideration in the House of Representatives, for I believe the Members of the House share my view that Congress should never pass an open-end authorization bill. So I appreciate very much the consideration which has been given to the modified amendment.

Mr. President, I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. Do I correctly understand that the modified amendment has been adopted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Chair.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say to the Senator from Colorado that I believe that by means of the agreement which has been entered into and by means of the adoption of these amendments, the bill has been strengthened.

Mr. President, in brief rebuttal to the statement made by the Senator from Texas—who said that under the bill the Government would have more control over the libraries than it would have had in the absence of the bill—I wish to state that the present law will not be changed in that respect in any way. The existing law reads as follows:

> SEC. 2. (b) The provisions of this Act shall not be so construed as to interfere with State and local initiative and responsibility in the conduct of public library services. The administration of public libraries, the selection of personnel and library books, and, insofar as consistent with the purposes of this Act, the determination of the best uses of the funds provided under this Act shall be reserved to the States and their local subdivisions.

That is the law now, and it will remain the law. It will not be changed in any way by means of this bill. This measure will not provide the Federal Government with any more administrative authority over the internal administration of the public libraries than did the 1956 act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in the RECORD certain material which I did not have to use in the debate; and I ask that it may be edited by me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The material submitted by Mr. MORSE is as follows:

NEED FOR EXPANDED LIBRARY SERVICES AND LIBRARY CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE WITHOUT POPULATION LIMITATIONS

The complex and rapidly changing demands now being placed on all American public libraries can be effectively and economically met only by fully involving every existing library resource. The key to providing library services of excellence to our rural and suburban areas is the large well-established library in urban centers. Three and two-tenths percent of all our libraries in urban areas serve 44 percent of our population, or about 80.4 million citizens.

The rapid growth of our urban and urban fringe areas and the amazing mobility of American families both demand public library services of consistently high quality throughout the country. The student, the research worker, and the professional specialist, regardless of where they live, all look toward the comprehensive collections of our urban libraries. To exclude these large libraries would be uneconomical and inefficient.

A recent study of reference users at the Boston Public Library, for example, revealed that about one-half were not residents of the city but lived in the smaller surrounding communities. Spot checks in the main reference libaries in New York, Philadelphia, and St. Louis have indicated an identical situation.

Newark, N.J., a city of over 400,000 persons recently sampled about 20,000 users of the main city library. Of this number, 50.8 percent were nonresidents of the city and a substantial number of these were from out-of-State communities. The college students in the sample represented 175 different institutions of higher education in 30 different States. Students of all ages, both resident and nonresident, accounted for 64 percent of the total sample.

Facts like these, repeated in all of our large urban libraries, show conclusively that library users will go to whatever library seems most likely to have the material they need. Library users are treating all American public libraries as if they were part of one unified system. By completely removing any artificial limitation of population, we are recognizing the essential unity of all public libraries of whatever size. Only in this way can we assure the maximum economical use of all available resources.

The Los Angeles County Librarian recently noted, "Library service is as unique governmentally as the public schools, and as an educational facility it merits special identification for its financing. In metropolitan regions it should properly function on as broad a basis as water supply, air pollution control, public transportation, and other area-wide utilities and facilities that overlap jurisdictional boundaries and call for coordinated master planning."

To exclude libraries serving more than 100,000 persons from participation in the Library Services Act would be to deny library planners access to the greatest and most valuable resources available to them.

If population limits are placed on title I and II of S. 2265 they would adversely affect well over 150 communities in 37 States.

Let me cite just a few of the cities of our country which would be discriminated against if the limitation were adopted:

In Alabama, the cities of Birmingham, Mobile and Montgomery; in Arizona, Phoenix and Tucson; 14 cities in California, including both San Francisco and Los Angeles; Miami, Tampa, Jacksonville, St. Petersburg in Florida; Atlanta, Columbus, and Savannah in Georgia; Chicago, Peoria, Rockford in Illinois; Minneapolis, St. Paul, Duluth in Minnesota; Omaha and Lincoln in Nebraska; Oklahoma City and Tulsa in Oklahoma; Norfolk, Richmond, Portsmouth and Newport News in Virginia; Seattle, Spokane, Takoma in Washington.

The population limitation strikes at the very heart of the purposes of the administration's comprehensive education bill as it affects the desired improvement and expansion of our public library system. It would eliminate from the benefits of the act over 50 million people.

The variety and magnitude of resources and services demanded of public libraries today makes it impossible to plan adequate service programs without considering the need for good physical facilities. Title II of S. 2265 would authorize allotments for the construction of public library buildings. This provision is based on two well-tested principles: first, the preparation by each State of a State plan, and, second, the requirement for State and local matching expenditures.

The average age of public library buildings is estimated at 53 years. Fifty-three years ago our population was about 92 million; today it is about double that figure. Even if library use were unchanged, a 53-year-old building would be completely unable to house the needed materials and to provide users with sufficient space to consult them. The growth in the number and in the demands of students alone have severely overtaxed the ability of these outmoded buildings to provide needed services. This modest incentive from Federal funds will give localities the needed encouragement to meet their needs for better libraries.

The Library Services and Construction Act is a partnership program in which the Federal Government joins with State and local units to provide all citizens with good libraries. Our need to produce well-informed citizens capable of making sound and mature decisions is of nationwide concern. The act specifically provides that State and local initiative and responsibility in the conduct of public library services shall not be interfered with, and reserves to the States and their local subdivisions the administration of public libraries, the selection of personnel and of library books, and the determination of priorities for the best use of funds. This bill will stimulate and provide matching financial support which will enable State and local library agencies to implement their own decisions and priorities.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield back the remaining time under my control.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and request that the time required for it not be charged to the time available to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish Senators to realize that we have modified the bill so as to eliminate the so-called open-end authorization section, by providing, for public library construction, an authorization of $20 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and an authorization of $20 million for each of the next 2 fiscal years; and for library services, an authorization of $25 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and of not to exceed $25 million for each of the next 2 fiscal years, rather than to have the bill provide an open-end authorization; namely, "such sums as the Congress may determine" which was in the bill as it came from committee.

I think these amendments strengthen the bill and place Congress in a position to determine, following the end of the 3-year period, the further amounts of money it will then need to authorize.

Although some may prefer the so-called open-end authorization, there is no doubt that the amount of authorization which has been agreed to will be exceedingly helpful to the program, and, I believe, will make a fair adjustment of our differences.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I wish to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas has pointed out to me that there is in session a meeting of Republican Senators which makes it necessary that a little time be provided. Senators on this side of the aisle are often in a similar position. Therefore, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and request that the time required for it be not charged to the time available to either side under the agreement. This will be a live quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered their names:

[No. 254 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent because of illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). A quorum is present.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, before the Senate proceeds to a third reading of the bill, in fairness to my colleagues—I do not believe any more amendments are to be offered; and I certainly hope not—I want Senators to know that the Senate has agreed to an amendment to eliminate the open-end authorization and in substitution therefore to take the same figures for each of 3 years. I believe that strengthens the bill. The figures are $20 million for each of 3 years for construction and $25 million for each of 3 years for library services.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is there any distinction between helping urban areas, as compared with rural areas?

Mr. MORSE. None.

Mr. PASTORE. None whatsoever?

Mr. MORSE. None whatsoever.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, will the distinguished Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon for his leadership in this field.

LIBRARY SERVICES ACT NEEDED IN TEXAS AND IN THE NATION

Madam President, as a cosponsor with the distinguished chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, the chairman of the Education Subcommittee and with many other additional colleagues in the Senate of the original extension of the Library Services Act in 1960, I rise with enthusiasm today in support of S. 2265, a bill to amend the Library Services Act so as to extend its benefits to all the people of the Nation and to authorize funds for the construction of public library buildings. I commended the senior Senator from Oregon and the senior Senator from Alabama for their leadership in this field. It is one I have long supported and worked for.

An investment in public libraries is an investment in the intellectual resources of our Nation. The library is a great storehouse of man's accumulated knowledge and the foundation of an informed people. Citizens of all ages may educate themselves on a continuing basis through use of a well-stocked library and the services of trained librarians. A good library offers free access to the tools for intelligent decisionmaking—and both small and far-reaching decisions are important to all our lives.

The current Library Services Act recognizes this and has as its purpose the extension and improvement of public library services in rural areas through incentive grants to the States. Under this act, in Texas some 82,000 rural people now have public libraries where there were none prior to the Library Services Act program. In addition, over 500,000 rural residents in 34 counties have improved or extended service. Texas has purchased five bookmobiles and these are operating in multicounty demonstration areas. Two of these multicounty bookmobile demonstrations have resulted in locally supported bookmobile services and the first county appropriations for such service. Local funds for public library service in rural areas of Texas have increased 113 percent since 1956. Unquestionably this increase is partially due to the stimulation of the Federal grant program. This record of accomplishment in Texas is reflected throughout the country.

We are proud of these gains in Texas but we recognize that we, like the rest of the Nation, must take many more giant strides forward to reach the goal of excellent public libraries for every citizen. Throughout the United States 18 million people still have no public library; this includes 850,000 citizens in Texas. One hundred and ten million Americans have access only to weak, substandard libraries. Two-thirds of the population of Texas has inadequate service.

According to the Library Services Act definition of rural communities—that is, those of less than 10,000 population—two-thirds of my State's population is in urban areas which cannot now participate in the present program. The bill before you now contemplates expansion of the present act to nonrural areas, so that public library deficiencies may be reduced wherever they exist.

Moreover, if the upgrading of public libraries is to be faced realistically, the problems of rural libraries cannot be divorced from those of town and city libraries. Activities of all sorts in sparsely populated regions are linked inevitably with the trading centers in the medium-sized and larger towns. Library services have this same necessary relationship. As the farmer feeds his resources into the town and city, so the city feeds back its strength into the rural community. The bigger and more widely representative book collections, the films and records and materials of the urban public library should be available for the increasingly complex reading interests and needs of the town's rural neighbors. Yet the town and city public library is not now able to meet the need of its immediate constituency, much less to fan out its collection throughout the countryside. The proposed amendment would ease the way for urban and rural cooperation for the benefit of residents of both areas.

It should be remembered that such a partnership is and will continue to be a voluntary arrangement dependent upon the individual choice of the communities involved. Expansion of the Library Services Act in this fashion simply removes the present limitation to populations of 10,000 or less so as to allow cooperative development of rural and nonrural libraries where the communities find this relationship advantageous.

It is essential also that urban libraries be helped. The big population growth is in cities and suburbs, causing heavy demands on libraries. More than 60 million people in metropolitan areas have inadequate public library service.

Just this year the Texas Library Association drafted a plan for statewide library development. This plan points out that:

> Recently, Texans began to realize that industry employing highly educated people hesitates to locate in Texas because of the lack here of superior libraries and strong graduate programs in universities.

We want to attract industry and we want our libraries to be able to provide the services needed. This bill will help to build and strengthen the needed collections in urban libraries.

Related to the need for improved services is the equally pressing demand for adequate public library buildings. A modern library requires a well-planned building that is large enough to house books, staff, and users. Under the present Library Services Act the use of funds for the purchase or erection of buildings is not allowed.

It is now estimated that the median age of existing public library buildings is 53 years. The typical American public library building remains the familiar Carnegie edifice, most of which were planned and erected between 1896 and 1923. An accurate description of these buildings would inevitably include such observations as advanced age, lack of space, inflexible interior arrangements, construction which is difficult and expensive to repair or remodel, and maintenance costs which are extravagant by today's standards. If we consider the population growth since 1923 it is clear that these buildings are totally inadequate to house the needed books and provide readers with the space to use them. In just the one decade from 1950 to 1960 the number of frequent users of public libraries in the Nation increased by 2 million. The impact of population combined with recent changes in educational methods has produced conditions in which many public libraries are finding it necessary to turn away students as the available space becomes filled beyond capacity. Larger as well as more efficient public library buildings have become essential.

The provision in this act for library construction is based directly on the principles of State plans and of State and local matching expenditures which have proven their effectiveness in the administration of the present grant program. The allotments for construction would be made to the States in proportion to their total population and would be matched by the States on the basis of their per capita income. For Texas, the maximum grant, based on population, would amount to $911,540 and would require matching expenditures based on per capita income of $713,308. This can prove an effective incentive to the further improvement of my State's public library facilities.

Our generation has learned that the need for educational opportunities of excellence does not stop with a degree, a diploma, or a certificate. Today's research is making yesterday's facts obsolete. Today's technology has abolished thousands of yesterday's jobs. Every significant social, educational, and economic trend in this country today is rapidly increasing the Nation's need for citizens who are better and more fully informed. The need for inservice training, job retraining, and the creation of new skills is more crucial today than ever before. Our formal educational system, at all levels, is placing new emphasis on individualized learning and independent study. The increased pace of Western civilization is producing a geometrically expanding body of knowledge which simultaneously creates a new urgency for rapid, accurate retrieval of recorded information. Good public libraries, stocked with currently useful materials and manned by well-trained librarians, have a central role in helping the individual to cope adequately with the demands today's society presents.

S. 2265 would assist our public libraries to rise to the needs of people in a complex and fast-moving world. I urge its passage with all haste to enrich the individual opportunities of every citizen.

Mr. McCARTHY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. Madam President, I commend the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for its study of the library situation and for reporting the bill, S. 2265, to expand the Library Services Act of 1956. I support the committee bill and urge its adoption.

The Congress has demonstrated its concern to assist the educational effort of the Nation through a number of grant programs to the schools. Seven years ago we made a limited effort to assist the development of rural libraries. This bill expands the Library Services Act of 1956 by removing the limitation of assistance to areas of less than 10,000 population and by increasing the matching grant authorization. It also authorizes a new step in meeting the need for improved library facilities through a program of matching grants for public library buildings.

The amendments provided in this bill represent a somewhat delayed recognition of the importance of public libraries in the broad educational effort of the Nation. Statistical data are inadequate to prove the value of libraries in assisting citizens both in their individual development and as informed citizens in a democracy, but at this time in history it is almost a self-evident proposition. Democratic government presupposes that the great majority of citizens be informed, but it also requires that the sources of truth be available to them.

Formal education ends for a majority of citizens before or about the time they become eligible to vote. Their continuing development is largely a matter of personal commitment to a variety of cultural and informal educational facilities. Much of this, of course, they secure through their personal resources, but the sources of knowledge which they need to draw on multiplies each year. It is impossible for the individual to secure for his personal and family use the wide variety of books, magazines and other educational and cultural materials now available and needed. Public libraries have an important role in providing citizens with materials for free inquiry and for cultural development and enjoyment. The committee hearings and report show the neglect of the public library systems and the need of a special effort to improve them. The experience gained through the very limited steps taken in the Library Services Act of 1956 is valuable in demonstrating how a modest program of grants can produce substantial improvement.

Reports which I have received from Minnesota show that 544,000 rural people have received new or improved library services as a result of the 1956 act. More than 80,000 of these citizens had no public library service before enactment of this legislation. Several county library systems have been established, and others have been enlarged and strengthened. The number of books loaned more than doubled between 1956 and 1960, and has continued to grow. The act of 1956 encouraged the Minnesota State Legislature to enact the first State-aid program for public libraries in the history of the State.

The present act has not and cannot provide all the assistance required. Minnesota public library facilities are near the national average, but it is estimated that over 600,000 citizens in the State still have no available public library service and at least an equal number have inadequate facilities.

I believe it is desirable to remove the 10,000 population limitation in the present act. Many of the smaller cities are, in fact, economic and social centers of surrounding rural communities. One effective and economical means of improving rural services would be to work through existing facilities in these smaller cities, now excluded from participating. This will give the States and the local communities greater freedom to make their own evaluation of how best to meet rural needs and, if they desire to do so, to work with these existing libraries in smaller cities to provide better services for citizens in the surrounding countryside.

The amendments provided in S. 2265 are constructive proposals to meet these needs in Minnesota and similar situations in other States throughout the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record an article on Minnesota libraries by Hannis S. Smith, director of the Library Division of the Minnesota Department of Education. It was published in the March 1963 issue of the quarterly, Minnesota Libraries. This article, while not directly related to the proposal before the Senate, summarizes the trends and needs in Minnesota.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minnesota Libraries, Mar. 1963]

PUBLIC LIBRARY STATISTICS, 1962

(By Hannis S. Smith)

Public library service in Minnesota continues to show steady growth, but since 1960 it has grown more rapidly than usual. We can measure this by public library use and public library expenditures. Both of these show 1961 and 1962 increases much above recent averages, and recent average increases have been higher than the historical averages. Let us take a closer look at these developments.

PUBLIC LIBRARY USE

Mr. and Mrs. Average Minnesotan have always been good readers, library users and have encouraged their children to use libraries. Higher than national average figures would be expected in Minnesota since library use is definitely correlated with the extent of education. As our average educational level continues to rise, so will library use. Specifically, the total number of books borrowed from public libraries in Minnesota was nearly 15 million. This is between four and five books for every person in the population, and approaches six per capita for the population of an age which can be expected to be able to read.

The most important aspect of the 1962 figures is the rate of increase. While slightly lower in percentage than the 1961 increase, it is still far above the average for the last decade. This column in 1958 discusses the slump which appeared in library reading during the 1940's, calling it the "TV slump." Whatever the cause, it appears to be a thing of the past. And the increase in use is at a growing rate, now around three-quarters of a million books a year.

While it is not always possible to read the "tea leaves" of statistics with complete accuracy, we can still initiate some interpretations based on earlier studies and come out with some apparent implications of what is happening. It seems clear to this writer that the studies of library use made in the 1920's and 1930's are no longer adequate guides for library planning. The library profession has used these as guides for planning library facilities and services with considerable satisfaction for many years, but there are strong indications that we are beginning to need more space for seating the public, and more and more varied materials, than our fairly recent standards indicate. And if this trend continues, we are going to require more librarians than even the "exaggerated" estimates made some years ago on the basis of the standards.

LIBRARY AVAILABILITY

Library use appears to be definitely correlated with the quality of services available: Where the service begins to meet standards of quality, the quantity of use is relatively high. The word relatively is used to indicate what kinds of libraries should be compared with each other. The places where unexpectedly high rates of use appear are, generally speaking, places that extend library services free to a much larger population than their own taxing areas. This is repeatedly pointed out to the responsible library boards as being illegal, but it is still practiced in some places.

The gradual geographic spread of county and regional library systems, strengthening the small local libraries and providing direct service to rural populations, is serving two purposes: (1) It is improving the service to the villages and cities, and (2) creating a service for the rural area. The regional and county library statistics show that where these libraries are well supported and organized to extend readily available services throughout their territories, their rates of use approach, reach, or in some cases exceed the State average. This is indeed success for a rural system; especially so when we consider the distance many people must go to get service.

Although the figures now show only 19 percent of the population of the State without public library service, there are at least as many (650,000), if not more, people whose services are less than adequate. The general practice throughout the country is to regard a given population as served if there is a public library established to serve it which has any money to spend (not necessarily tax funds). Anyone who has visited any of the small, poorly supported public or county libraries knows that the population to which they are responsible is not really served in any meaningful sense. Perhaps we should work out a stricter and sounder definition for "population served." The 10 cents per capita minimum which we use for association libraries is, of course, meaningless now regardless of its previous validity.

Of the 205 different public libraries or library systems, only 17 systems meet the minimum standards for adequacy of service. But it should be stated at once that these 17 library systems are responsible for serving about half the entire population of the State. This is added evidence in favor of the continued spread of regional library systems into the presently inadequately served and unserved areas.

LIBRARY EXPENDITURES

Adequate library service costs money. It is normal to expect that, as the quality of library service is improved and the availability of adequate service spreads, there will necessarily be an increase in the amount of money spent. For the State, per capita expenditures for public library service rose from $1.75 in 1961 to $1.89 in 1962. For the population served the 1961 figure was $2.17 compared with $2.33 for 1962. The total sum in 1962 was just under $6.5 million.

To use entirely theoretical considerations, if the presently unserved areas and their enclaves of service of varied degrees of adequacy or inadequacy, were all organized in ideally large units for public library systems, how much more would have to be spent in Minnesota to bring all service to an adequate level? Of course, no absolutely accurate figure can be quoted, but certainly a reasonable estimate can be made. Assuming that the $3 per capita and 100,000 population or more are still valid, modern public library service for everybody in Minnesota would call for an additional expenditure of just over $4.5 million more than was spent in 1962. This appears to be a large sum, but in reality the public library is one of the least expensive of all publicly supported institutions in proportion to the amount of service rendered. Insofar as can be ascertained, public library expenditures have never exceeded one-half of 1 percent of public expenditures in the United States, and in Minnesota for the last periods for which the figures were available public library expenditures amounted to just under one-half of 1 percent of all public expenditures of the State and its political subdivisions combined.

The approximately $11 millions required for adequate service throughout Minnesota would still amount to less than 1 percent of 1960 public expenditures in the State.

BOOK COLLECTIONS

While the book collections of the county and regional libraries are growing at a rapid rate (doubling in the last 5 years) they are still not large enough to meet current demands. And in the metropolitan areas they are not growing much more rapidly than the population.

However, it is encouraging to note that book expenditures are a rising percentage of total library expenditures, having risen from an average of 16 percent per year for the last 10 years to 19 percent in 1962. The 1962 figures do not reflect the reimbursement grants from State aid to any extent.

The great need for more and more books, however, remains the basis for the State aid book grants for properly qualifying library systems.

THE SHADOW OF THE FUTURE

Last year this column pointed out the decline in the small public libraries sector of the statistics. The 1962 statistics appear to contain a slight reversal of that decline. This is deceptive. In reality, the more nearly completeness of the 1962 figures is the real difference, and such increases as appear are really due to the presence of more libraries reporting rather than any increase in the activity or support of the small libraries.

But that is not a shadow. The solution to the problem is known and needs only to be applied. The regional systems are the obvious answer.

But there is a shadow beginning to show. It lies in the possibility that the librarians, library trustees, and the public officials responsible for public library establishment and support are underestimating the demand which the general public will call upon the public library to meet in the very near future. We have already discussed the trend toward the extinction of the small public library when it can fulfill none of the demands which its public makes upon it. Such threat as may reside in the shadow of the future—a general underestimation of the potential public use of libraries—may lie in the direction of a breakdown of existing facilities and personnel under the strain of an overburden of work.

Mr. BARTLETT. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

SEWARD'S LIBRARY IS NO FOLLY

Mr. BARTLETT. Madam President, sometimes here in the Senate, with the full and magnificent facilities of the Library of Congress at our disposal, we forget how valued, how useful, how loved libraries are in small towns across the Nation. This is especially true in the more remote parts of the Nation where often the library serves as a connecting link between the community and the world of ideas beyond its borders.

Often a community must make sacrifices to obtain and to keep its library. These sacrifices are always willingly made, cheerfully carried out. Nowhere have I read a better account of such community effort to preserve its library than in a recent story which appeared in the Anchorage Daily Times of November 15. The city of Seward, Alaska, is to be congratulated for its efficient work in behalf of its local library. I ask unanimous consent that this article may be printed in the RECORD in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Alaska? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1).

Mr. **BARTLETT**. Madam President, citizens in Seward who have worked so hard to make their library an active, lively service are representative of other citizens in other cities across Alaska. They have done much to assist the intellectual life and the education efforts of the cities in which they live. They have received significant assistance in their work from the Library Services Act. This act has served to encourage the establishment and growth of libraries in our smaller communities across the country.

For this reason I am pleased to cast my vote today for the extension of the Library Services Act, S. 2265.

EXHIBIT 1

A COMMUNITY EFFORT

SEWARD.—Seward's Community Library, dedicated 15 months ago, is a project to which the entire town has contributed its dreams, money, and hard work. When Mrs. Viola Swetmann snipped the traditional ribbon, it marked the climax of a community endeavor which began in 1930.

The library, located in a converted store on two lots obtained from the General Services Administration, cost the people of Seward $27,500. They raised the money themselves. The total is made up from dollar donations, from $3,000 in prize money donated by the woman's club, from proceeds of bake sales, benefit shows, kids' circuses, from pennies and dimes dropped into "library jars" and from family and business contributions.

Collecting the money was only a part of getting the job done.

The library board located and purchased the store building for $25,000. This left about $2,500 to convert a store into a library

So the work continued. Youngsters cleaned out the store building. Their fathers stacked the heavier lumber removed from the building for use later. Volunteers installed tile, painted, built a porch, and repaired the roof.

Plumbers, carpenters, houeswives donated their skill and time. Building firms provided materials for nothing or far below cost.

One 70-year-old woman did most of the interior paint trim.

When it came time to move from the old library, located in the basement of the bank building, the men provided pickup trucks and station wagons and helped with the heavier items. Women and children boxed the books and the children carried the small objects.

And the community's participation in its library has not ended. The city council pays all utilities and part of the operating costs. The garbage collector picks up the trash without charge. Local housewives join in mending books and acting as part-time librarians.

There are more than 10,000 volumes in the new library. About 1,100 persons make use of it and more than 1,400 books and periodicals are checked out each month.

Hanging in the library is a roll of honor. It carries the names of 430 persons, families, organizations, and business firms which contributed money. A labor roster, bearing the names of 56 adults and 94 children, lists those who contributed more than 2,000 hours of their time and efforts.

Seward is the only city in the western part of the Nation which is a candidate for the All-American City award this year. Material in this article was collected by Cecil A. Horton, of Seward. The All-American Cities competition will be held next week in Detroit.

Mr. **HARTKE**. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **MORSE**. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. **HARTKE**. Madam President, the Library Services Act has been a great assistance in the development of more extensive and more adequate library service in many areas of the country. The changes made by the proposed amendments to the basic act will improve the situation further. The report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare makes clear the need for the kinds of changes they recommend, and adoption of these changes will benefit every section of the country. I want to tell Senators something of what the act has done for Indiana and of the unmet needs it will help to fill if changes are made as proposed in the bill before us.

First, let me point to some of the more salient items of the committee's findings as to the Nation's total needs. Since the exhaustion of Carnegie funds 40 years ago, the physical facilities of the Nation's libraries have deteriorated. Only 4 percent of all public library buildings have been built since 1940. Those built earlier are nowhere near meeting the modern functional designs of good library practice. The need for a program to encourage the States to aid, through matching funds, in the building of new libraries is apparent, and even though the $20 million proposed in this bill is small—about 10 cents per person when spread throughout the Nation—at least it is a start.

Removal of the limitations of the Library Services Act to services in communities below 10,000 in population will make possible the upgrading of facilities and materials with special benefit to the growing throngs of high school and college students in our expanding educational program so vital to the advance of the country. The schools are so hard pressed by increasing numbers that their own library resources have difficulty keeping pace with more than minimal demands. The book collections of public libraries need to be increasingly comprehensive, but the cost of books and materials has increased twice as fast as consumer prices in the past 15 years, as the report makes clear.

The report of the committee indicates also that there are still 18 million persons in the United States without access to public library service. In 1961, the year when Indiana came into the program for the first time, the State was reported to have a million people without library services. Of these, there were about 20,000 in urban areas as defined by the bill, that is, in communities of more than 10,000 population. In the whole State, another 300,000 people were served by overcrowded, understaffed, obsolete libraries, many of them open only very limited hours and with very few current or near-current book acquisitions.

As I said, Indiana did not take advantage of the Library Services Act until 1961, so that whatever it has achieved as a result of its participation has been done in a very brief space of time. But already, as of June 30, 1963, over 80,000 people in our State have been reached for the first time with library services, and service to 380,000 more has been improved. The bill before us increases authorization for the services now performed under the act. But with the more limited funds and in the limited time of only the past 2 years, Indiana has achieved a gain which is worth noting. According to a specialist in this law and its operations in Indiana, there has been imaginative and flexible use of the basic act's provisions, particularly in an unusually extensive use of so-called contract plans for library extension programs.

Take for example Franklin County, in which is located the town of Brookville. Brookville's population is about 2,600. Library Services Act funds have enabled the town's library to reach out into the surrounding county area with bookmobile service. For the first time in history everyone in the county now has a chance at public library services.

Akron is an even smaller town, with population less than 1,000 in the 1960 census, but it also has a public library. Through the aid of Library Services Act funds this small-town library has actually been able to establish the equivalent of branch libraries to serve Lake Township and Perry Township. Without such funds such a development would be impossible.

The Indiana State program has been unusually successful in securing the wide cooperation and involvement of local people, both professionals in the library field and nonprofessional library trustees. The Committee on Library Development of the State Librarians' Association has served as an advisory group in the screening of plans and in the development of local service. It includes such diverse representatives as members of the State small libraries' organizations, the State association of library trustees, professional workers in larger libraries, and in general a cross section of interested people. Their approach has been flexible rather than doctrinaire. And the results illustrate the imagination which can be exercised under the Library Services Act program.

I am thinking particularly of the instances of joint operation of a program, such as the bookmobile project in Newton and Jasper Counties. Here three small local libraries have joined forces—Lake Township, Rensselaer, and Brook. The township has a scattered population, Brook less than a thousand people, and Rensselaer over 5,000. But working together the three libraries are serving the whole area of the two counties, Newton and Jasper, with bookmobile service.

An even wider degree of cooperation, fostered and supported by the possibilities opened up by the Library Service Act and its availability of funds, is that of no less than six cooperating libraries operating bookmobile service in still two more counties, Stark and Marshall. The 6 libraries are in communities ranging from 700 to 7,500 in size: Hamlet, Knox, North Judson, Bremen, Culver, and Plymouth. In this program there is reciprocal borrowing—any library card for one library is honored by the others One result of this flexibility is the opportunity these libraries have for supplementing each other. One, for example, may form a considerable collection of recent books in space science which would be available not only to its own immediate borrowers but to others in the entire two-county area, while another may have a specialty of biographies. In such cooperation, encouraged by the act, lies greater strength and expanded service.

These programs and these reciprocal services would not be undertaken without the Library Services Act funds which make them possible. In most of the instances where libraries are involved in contract service of this kind, where they are under contract with the State library for the program, and in turn are tied through it to the Federal matching grant program, the project term is for a definite and limited period, most often 3 years. Usually by the time of termination of the program the results of the service and the demand for its continuation brings an expansion of local involvement. The fact that this actually happens, as it is the intention of the bill to achieve, is reflected in the figures which the committee report cites on the rise in funds for local rural library services by 72 percent between 1956 and 1962.

Says the committee report:

> Leadership capacity, of the State library extension agencies has been increased through the adding of new staff and the introduction of new methods.

This is most important, and it has proved a benefit to Indiana as to many other States. Most libraries in communities under 10,000 have no professional trained librarian. Many depend on volunteer part-time services, especially in the smallest communities. For such libraries, and such volunteers, the task of cataloging and processing properly is difficult or impossible if professional standards are applied. Some of the Library Services Act funds in Indiana have gone into providing regional library technical processing centers to do this kind of professional work, cataloging books for the small libraries. This has greatly lifted the standards of library care in these small communities.

In addition, funds have been used for the award of graduate scholarships specifically to train people in rural library work; currently there are two such scholarships under the Indiana program. Also, there are training activities for nonprofessional librarians and library board members. For example, some time ago under State auspices and with aid from LSA funds, a State meeting drew over 100 library trustees from rural libraries throughout the State. The kind of stimulation for hometown activity on the library front which such a situation provides is most important, and inevitably results in an increase of funds and services from local sources, not to mention the upgrading of quality in the service made available. In addition, another use of funds provided under this act has been in the extending of in-service on-the-job training to upgrade the capabilities and professionalism of the librarian in the small library.

Extension of the program's availability to libraries beyond the 10,000 population limitation, in addition to the direct effects on their own development, will aid in the extension of programs such as those we have been witnessing in the under-10,000 areas. I have spoken of the cooperative programs worked out by as many as six libraries in a continuous geographical area. But there has been no incentive, because they are barred from it, for the larger libraries in towns such as Bedford, with 13,000 population, or Crawfordsville with over 14,000, or my own city of Evansville with nearly 150,000, to bring their resources to the assistance of the smaller neighboring communities which may be without library facilities.

By discarding the population standards we are not only helping to assist the larger libraries to upgrade their services directly, but we are giving them a greater incentive to serve as the big brothers with a helping hand for the small libraries at which the act was originally aimed. Now, since the libraries in the larger towns cannot benefit either directly or indirectly from LSA funds, their only spur to aid the weaker ones is the sense of professional responsibility which their librarians have. But these stronger libraries, only 6 percent of which in Indiana are completely urban, can by the changes proposed be drawn into the total program increasingly to the benefit of all, especially where the contract services program, in which Indiana is particularly strong, is made a major part of the State approach.

In Indiana there are 246 public libraries. Eighty-three percent of them are in places of less than 10,000 population, and so are eligible for the benefits of the program at present within its limitations. This may sound like a discrepancy, since I have said that only 6 percent are completely urban. But it is not, because there is a third category of 11 percent, a sizable number, 27 to be precise, which are in towns above 10,000 population but which serve some rural areas as well. I expect that Indiana is not alone in this, that there are some places in nearly every State if not all which are limited in their expansion of service to adjacent rural areas by the present population restriction.

Extension of the services and the funds as contained in the amendments before us, which are based on the careful testimony of expert witnesses and a judicious analysis by the committee in its best judgment, will aid in strengthening the best defense of our democracy, the enlightenment of its people. We need this bill, and not just for Indiana. But when we are talking in national terms, the specifics get vague. The examples I have given of the services involved here, and of the values in the program, are not unique. The same thing more or less is happening because of this program in Ohio and Montana and Alabama and Texas and all the other 50 States. Its expansion will be a benefit to all of us. I hope that its importance is recognized and support given for it by the overwhelming majority of this body.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, I am delighted that the Senator from Oregon has brought the bill before the Senate. I hope very much that it will be passed.

When my wife was a Member of the House of Representatives, in 1945 and 1946, she was the House sponsor of the original Library Extension Act, along with the great Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill]. I have a deep family interest in this measure.

May I ask if it is true that the bill would extend services to underprivileged areas of cities as well as to the countrysides?

Mr. MORSE. That is true. It would extend services to all areas.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is extremely important. It gives me an added pleasure to support the measure which the great Senator from Alabama and my wife started 18 years ago.

Mr. MORSE. I consider it an honor to bask in their reflected glory, because it is a great pleasure to know that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill] and Mrs. Douglas introduced the bill previously.

Mr. HILL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. HILL. In my many years in Congress, I have not had a finer, abler, or more effective colleague than the then Congresswoman from Illinois, Mrs. Emily Taft Douglas.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I wish to associate myself with that fine tribute to Mrs. Douglas. I also wish to thank each of the Senators who have supported the bill, beginning with the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] who spoke just a minute or so ago. I wish to express my appreciation to the able Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre] for his support of the committee bill and for his kind expression regarding my work on it as chairman of the education subcommittee.

On last Friday, my good friend, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston] and my very able colleagues on the subcommittee the distinguished Senators from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], Vermont [Mr. Prouty] gave effective support to the bill, as did the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] with whom I also serve on the committee. I thank them and my good friend, the very able and distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] who, with the very able Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson] also gave this bill their effective support.

Madam President, today, we have heard excellent statements from both Senators from Alaska in support of the bill. I am indebted to them and to my subcommittee associates the hardworking Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the very able Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. Their fine statements demonstrate the bipartisan support of the bill.

We have also heard today from many other able and distinguished Senators, among them the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE].

I thank them all, and I thank the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] fpr his helpful colloquy on the bill. I hope that I have not overlooked the contribution of any Senator to passage of this bill. Each has demonstrated that it is public interest legislation. If I have done so inadvertently, I want them to know that I, nonetheless, am deeply appreciative of their help with this bill.

Madam President, I am ready to have the third reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2265) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator from Oregon yield me 1 minute?

Mr. MORSE. I yield 1 minute to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe I should invite attention of Senators to the fact that this is the third education bill of major importance which has been considered by this body this year. Once again we have seen a display of the great skill and sound generalship of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon.

If the bill passes the Senate and is passed in the other body as well and becomes the law, it will be another milestone to mark the progress in education, which the Senator from Oregon has engineered so ably and so well.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I very deeply appreciate the words of my majority leader. I yield back the remainder of the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been used or yielded back.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] is necessarily absent, and if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 7, as follows:

[No. 255 Leg.]

YEAS—89

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—7

Curtis
Goldwater
Hruska
Mechem
Simpson
Thurmond
Tower

NOT VOTING—4

Cotton
Dominick
Engle
Russell

So the bill (S. 2265) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

EXTENSION OF ACT TO NONRURAL AREAS

SECTION 1. (a) (1) Section 2 of the Library Services Act is amended by striking out "rural".

(2) Section 3 of such Act is amended by striking out "rural".

(b) Section 4 of such Act is amended by striking out "rural" wherever it appears therein.

(c) (1) So much of section 5(a) of such Act as precedes paragraph (1) is amended by striking out "to rural areas".

(2) Paragraph (3) of such section is amended by striking out "rural".

(d) Section 8(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "in rural areas".

(e) Section 9 of such Act is amended by striking out paragraph (e) and by striking out "; and" at the end of paragraph (d) and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

EXTENSION AND INCREASE OF AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 2. Section 3 of the Library Services Act is amended by striking out "is hereby" and inserting in lieu thereof "are"; by striking out "nine succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "next six fiscal years"; and by inserting ", for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, the sum of $25,000,000, and for each of the next two fiscal years a sum not to exceed $25,000,000," after "$7,500,000".

INCREASE IN MINIMUM ALLOTMENTS; AVAILABILITY OF ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 3. (a) Section 4 of the Library Services Act is amended by striking out "$10,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$25,000", and by striking out "$40,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$100,000".

(b) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The allotment to any State under this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, shall be available for payments to such State with respect to expenditures under its approved State plan during such year and the next fiscal year."

DEVELOPMENT OF LIBRARY SERVICES FOR ALL

SEC. 4. Clause (3) of subsection (a) of section 5 of the Library Services Act is amended by striking out all that appears after the word "advantage" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and will give consideration to the educational needs of people of all ages, including students;".

INCREASE IN MINIMUM STATE EXPENDITURES REQUIRED

SEC. 5. Subsection (a) of section 6 of the Library Services Act is amended by striking out "$10,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$25,000", by striking out "$40,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$100,000", and by striking out "June 30, 1956" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1963".

PAYMENT PROCEDURE

SEC. 6. Subsection (b) of section 6 of the Library Services Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Prior to each period for which a payment is to be made under subsection (a), but not less often than semiannually, the Commissioner shall estimate the amount to which each State will be entitled under subsection (a) for such period; and the amount so estimated shall be paid, in such installments and at such time or times as the Commissioner may determine, after necessary adjustment on account of any previously made overpayment or underpayment under this section."

CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

SEC. 7. (a) The Library Services Act is further amended by inserting "TITLE I—PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICES" after section 2, by redesignating sections 3, 4, 5, and 6, and references thereto, as sections 101, 102, 103, and 104, respectively, and by inserting after such sections the following new title:

"TITLE II—PUBLIC LIBRARY CONSTRUCTION

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 201. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, the sum of $20,000,000, and for each of the next two fiscal years a sum not in excess of $20,000,000, which shall be used for making payments to States, which have submitted and had approved by the Commissioner, State plans for the construction of public libraries.

"ALLOTMENTS

"SEC. 202. From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 201 for each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall allot $20,000 each to Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, and $80,000 to each of the other States, and shall allot to each State such part of the remainder of such sums as the population of the State bears to the population of the United States, according to the most recent decennial census. A State's allotment under this subsection for any fiscal year shall be available for payments with respect to construction projects approved, under its State plan approved under section 203, during such year or (but only in the case of a State allotment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964) the next fiscal year.

"STATE PLANS FOR CONSTRUCTION

"SEC. 203. (a) To be approved for purposes of this title a State plan for construction of public libraries must—

"(1) meet the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), (4), and (5) of section 103 (a);

"(2) set forth criteria and procedures for approval of projects for construction of public library facilities which are designed to insure that priority will be given to projects for facilities to serve areas having, in the judgment of the State library administrative agency, the greatest need for additional facilities and which give consideration to the educational needs of people of all ages, including students;

"(3) provide assurance that every local or other public agency whose application for funds under the plan with respect to a project for construction of public library facilities is denied will be given an opportunity for a fair hearing before the State library administrative agency; and

"(4) provide assurance that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction projects assisted under this Act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality, as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a–276c–5); and the Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this paragraph the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve any plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a) of this section.

"PAYMENTS TO STATES

"Sec. 204. (a) From its allotment available therefor under section 202 each State shall be entitled to receive an amount equal to the Federal share (as determined under section 104) of projects approved, during the period for which such allotment is available, under the State plan of such State approved under section 203.

"(b) The Commissioner shall from time to time estimate the amount to which a State is entitled under subsection (a), and such amount shall be paid to the State, at such time or times, and in such installments as the Commissioner shall determine, after necessary adjustment on account of any previously made underpayment or overpayment."

(b) Section 9 of such Act is further amended by redesignating paragraph (d) as paragraph (e) and inserting after paragraph (c) the following new paragraph:

"(d) The term 'construction' includes construction of new buildings and expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings, and initial equipment of any such buildings; including architects' fees and the cost of the acquisition of land; and".

(c) Subsection (f) of the section of such Act herein redesignated as section 104 is repealed.

(d) Subsection (a) of such section 104 is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new sentence: "From such allotments, there shall also be paid to each State for each such period the Federal share of the total of the sums expended by the State and its political subdivisions during such period for administration of the plan of such State approved under section 203."

(e) Subsection (e) of such section 104 is amended by striking out "Act" and inserting in lieu thereof "title".

(f) Such Act is further amended by inserting "TITLE III—GENERAL" above the heading for section 7 and by redesignating sections 7, 8, and 9 as sections 301, 202, and 304, respectively.

(g) The first sentence of such section 301 is amended by (1) striking out "administration of the State plan" and inserting in lieu thereof "administration of a State plan"; (2) by inserting "applicable" before "requirements of this Act"; and by (3) inserting "(or, in his discretion, that further payments will not be made with respect to portions of or projects under the State plan affected by such failure)" before "until he is satisfied". The second sentence of such section is amended to read: "Until he is so satisfied, no further payments shall be made to such State for carrying out such State plan (or further payments shall be limited to parts of or projects under the plan not affected by such failure)."

(h) Such Act is further amended by inserting after such section 302 the following new section:

"REALLOTMENTS

"Sec. 303. The amount of any State's allotment under section 102 or 202 for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for the period for which such allotment is available for carrying out the State plan approved under section 103 and section 203, respectively, shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments for such year to such States under such section 102 or 202, as the case may be, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the amount which the Commissioner estimates the State needs and will be able to use for such period of time for which the original allotments were available for carrying out the State plan approved under section 103 or 203, as the case may be, and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States not suffering such a reduction. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection from funds appropriated pursuant to section 101 or 201 for any fiscal year shall be deemed part of its allotment for such year under sections 102 and 202, respectively."

HEARINGS AND JUDICIAL REVIEW

Sec. 8. The section of the Library Services Act herein redesignated as section 302 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d)(1) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this Act, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

"(2) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under title I or title II, or with respect to his final action under section 301, such State may appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

"(3) Upon the filing of the petition referred to in paragraph (2) of this subsection, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently, but until the filing of the record the Commissioner may modify or set aside his order. The findings of the Commissioner as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

"(4) The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Commissioner shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Commissioner's action."

EXTENSION TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Sec. 9. Clause (a) of the section of the Library Services Act herein redesignated as section 304 is amended by inserting after "a State," the following: "the District of Columbia,".

EFFECTIVE DATES

Sec. 10. The amendments made by sections 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6, subsections (c), (e), (g), and (h) of section 7, and section 9 shall apply with respect to appropriations made after the enactment of this Act, or allotments or payments from such appropriations, as the case may be.

CHANGE IN TITLE AND SHORT TITLE

Sec. 11. (a) The first section of the Library Services Act is amended by striking out "Library Services Act" and inserting in lieu thereof "Library Services and Construction Act".

(b) The title of such Act is amended to read "To promote the further development of public library services."

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, once again I extend to the majority leader my sincere thanks for his unfailing cooperation with the committee during the handling of this bill. I also thank every member of the committee for the wonderful cooperation they extended in the presentation of the bill. I thank the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] for helping to arrive at a necessary adjustment of the bill that made it possible to dispose of it completely and quickly.

I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill (S. 2265) was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2267) to amend Public Law 88–72 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7431) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. NATCHER, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. CANNON, Mr. WILSON of Indiana, and Mr. WYMAN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 809) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 238) establishing that the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on November 27, 1963, at 12:30 o'clock postmeridian, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 809) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

GOVERNMENT GUARANTEES OF CREDIT TO COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement reached last Friday, and after consultation with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I ask unanimous consent to call up Calendar No. 639, S. 2310; and that it be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2310) to prohibit any guaranty by the Export-Import Bank or any other agency of the Government of payment of obligations of Communist countries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator suggest the absence of a quorum? I do not see the distinguished Senator from South Dakota in the Chamber.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask unanimous consent that, without losing my right to the floor, I may yield to the Senator from California, to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the Senator from Virginia wish me to yield to him?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am seeking recognition. I assume, since a bill is before the Senate, Senators who favor the bill should be heard first.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am perfectly willing to yield the floor to permit the distinguished Senator from Virginia to proceed. I had felt, since the report of the committee was adverse, that it was up to those of us who are opposed to the bill to present the report of the committee.

However, I am perfectly willing to yield to the able chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, and to have him recognized on his own time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I appreciate the Senator's courtesy. I ask for some time from the minority leader. I should like to have 10 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, as the distinguished Senator from Alabama has said, the Committee on Banking and Currency, by a vote of 8 to 7, recommended that the bill do not pass.

However, no substantive report, setting forth either the majority or the minority views, was filed, due to limitations of time.

As I shall say before I conclude my remarks, the committee did not take time to consider the amendment which was subsequently offered, at my suggestion, by the patron of the bill.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will pass the bill, S. 2310, and keep the Export-Import Bank from using taxpayers' funds to guarantee loans and credits to the Soviet Union and other Communist countries.

The issue this bill presents to the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the country is a vital one, but fortunately a simple one. The issue is not the credit worthiness of Communist countries; it is not the desirability of reducing grain surplus; it is not the desirability of helping our balance of payments. The real issue is whether the U.S. Government and the people of the United States should help to provide food and other commodities to the Soviet Union that would strengthen the power of communism to attack us. To that question I think that the Mundt bill is the right, although not the complete answer.

If self-preservation requires self-denial on our part of profits from trading with the enemy, we should insist that our NATO allies do likewise.

During the consideration of the foreign aid bill on the Senate floor, Senator MUNDT introduced an amendment to prohibit the Export-Import Bank from guaranteeing credit for the shipment of grain to the Communist bloc. A move to table this amendment failed—40 Senators, who presumably opposed the principle of the Mundt amendment, voted to table the amendment; 46 Senators voted against the motion to table.

Under an unanimous-consent agreement on Friday, November 15, Senator MUNDT withdrew his amendment and introduced, as a separate bill, S. 2310 applying to guarantees by the Export-Import Bank of credit on shipments to all commodities to the Communist bloc.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement the bill was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee for hearings and committee consideration, with the agreement that it would be reported to the Senate, favorably or unfavorably, by Monday, November 25. The committee held hearings on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, November 20, 21, and 22, at which Senator MUNDT and Senator FULBRIGHT represented ably the opposing views in the Senate. The administration views were fully and ably presented by Secretary of the Treasury Dillon, Under Secretary of State Ball, President of the Export-Import Bank Linder, and Under Secretary of Commerce Roosevelt. In addition, members of the public appeared to testify for and against the bill. Most of the members of the committee participated actively in the questioning. The hearings have been printed and are available for the Senate and the public.

The committee met on November 25 and in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement the bill was ordered reported by a vote of 8 to 7, with a recommendation that it do not pass. A copy of the 275 pages of printed hearings is in the desk of every Member. In my judgment, the Committee on Banking and Currency has fully and capably discharged its responsibility to the Senate and to the country.

The Export-Import Bank was created in 1934. Never before has the Bank assisted in the shipment of goods to a Communist country, with the single exception of Yugoslavia—obviously a special case. In 1963, almost 30 years after the creation of the Bank, it is for the first time helping in the export of grain to Hungary and it is participating in the negotiations leading to the sale of millions of dollars of wheat to Russia. And this is not the end. Administration witnesses left no doubt that if the Mundt bill is not passed, these grain sales will be a precedent for Government guarantees of credit on sales of industrial and commercial goods to the Communist bloc.

I am convinced that we should continue the present policy of denying Government aid to Communist countries.

In my judgment that issue is fundamental. Russian leaders of the Communist bloc have expressed themselves time and time again as determined to conquer the free world by force or by subversion. I see no indication of any change in their intentions. I am convinced the dividing line between the free world and the Communist world is as definite and distinct as the Berlin wall. Religion, a free enterprise society, personal freedom, responsibility, and our democratic way of life lie on one side. Atheism, Marxism, and slavery lie on the other.

I expect the cold war to continue until the masses of the Communist bloc will no longer submit to that type of dictatorship. I have no question that in the long run the free world will win. Religion, a free enterprise society, personal freedom, responsibility, and our democratic way of life will in the long run be victorious. But for us to furnish aid to the dictators and relief for downtrodden masses behind the Iron Curtain is but to postpone the ultimate victory of a free world.

The breakdown in Russia's agriculture may be the first crack in the communistic-dictatorial system. Russian military might is dependent on Russia's entire economic system. Soldiers who cannot eat cannot fight. Industrial workers who cannot eat cannot make planes, tanks, submarines, and munitions of war; and if the Russians must divert more of their manpower to agriculture they can only do so by diverting them from the army or from factories and plants. Only those with short memories have forgotten how American farmers were urged to increase their production during wartime, not only in order to supply food for the military and the industrial population but also in order to supply alcohol—the raw material for synthetic rubber, explosives, and other materials of war.

If the Mundt bill is passed, we will make it clear that we do not intend to use Government assistance to build up the economy of Russia and the Communist bloc. If we pass the Mundt bill, we will show that we will not use the U.S. Government aid and the taxpayers' money to build up the Russian communistic system of atheism, Marxism, slavery, and dictatorship. If we pass the Mundt bill, we will show that we as a Christian nation are dedicated to the preservation of a free enterprise society, personal freedom, and our democratic way of life.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. With great respect, I ask the able Senator from Virginia if it is not true that countries in Europe, and also Canada, are selling grain heavily to Russia, even in some important cases to Communist China?

Mr. ROBERTSON. My answer to the question is: Yes, it is true. Canada, especially, is selling hundreds of millions of dollars worth of grain to Russia. However, Canadian ports will soon be frozen over, and it is essential, because the grain shortage is so acute, that the Communist countries have access to our grain, which can be moved overseas at all times of the year.

When the issue was raised at the hearings that Germany would buy our wheat, process it into flour, and make a big profit from selling it to the Russians, I stated that our former Chief of Staff and former Commander in Chief, General Eisenhower, had recommended that four or five of our divisions be withdrawn from West Germany. I said at the hearings that we could say to West Germany: "Cooperate with us in our dedication against increasing the strength of the Communists and stop trying to make a few extra dollars from the sale of flour; otherwise we will withdraw four of our divisions. Then, you will have to use your own manpower and your own money to provide for the defense that we are giving you."

I have said, as Senators have just heard, that the Mundt bill is only a partial answer. But it is at least a step, and a big one, in the right direction. It is also a step, as a matter of principle, which will involve some sacrifice. I realize, as the point was raised in committee, that the bill could include tobacco, and Virginia would be interested. We do not raise much wheat, but the Mundt bill covers everything. I voted for it, knowing that it would apply to tobacco and other agricultural products which Virginia grows.

As a matter of principle, I did not want to see our Nation reverse the stand it has traditionally taken, which is that we should not aid a Communist country—unless, of course, we are convinced that the cold war is over. But, as I indicated, I do not believe it is over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Virginia has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes more to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It is well known that a larger share of the U.S. taxpayers' money, a larger percentage of gross national product and national income, is spent for defense than in the case of any of the other countries of the free world.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is true.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If we plan to continue, in effect, to support bank freedom in Europe, the Middle East, and the Far East in the future, as we do today, how can American business, in the long run, be competitive with the economies of the countries that we are assisting, unless we provide American industry and American agriculture with the same rights that the other countries, our allies of the free world, provide their agriculture, their industry, and their banks?

Mr. ROBERTSON. There can be no doubt that by using new, modern machinery, bought with our money, foreign competitors are now, with cheap labor costs, putting us at a disadvantage in world trade.

There can be no doubt that there is a market, both in Red China and behind what we call the Iron Curtain—that is, the Soviet bloc countries—but I do not admit that because we could make money and help our businessmen to compete successfully, we should put the love of money above a consideration of our national survival.

If we are willing to deny ourselves and to sacrifice for our ultimate security, we can make the same demand upon all our allies—and there are many ways in which we could enforce that demand.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from Virginia is a patriotic member of this body. Our physical strength can only come from our economic strength.

Our primary need now would seem to be to overcome our continuing unfavorable balance of payments. The proposed sale of wheat to Russia would help correct that situation. I, too, was worried about the thought behind the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota because I thought all payment was to be in gold. I now understand that only 25 percent will be in gold, the other 75 percent coming fairly rapidly, the first payment in 6 months, the next in 12 months, the third and final payment in 18 months. This would appear to be pretty normal.

I differ with the Senator from Virginia in this respect: I do not consider the proposed transaction to be something which would be done solely for American business or banking or agriculture. The truth is, Russia does not have to worry about the soundness of its money as much as we do. As someone has well said, in a totalitarian state the coin of the realm is the order of the dictator. If we continue our present policy, we will put our farmers, businessmen, and bankers at a disadvantage, and will further unfavorably affect the balance-of-payments problem.

In my opinion, the balance of payments is the second most serious situation this Nation faces today. If we do not enter into such transactions, but our allies do, we could damage our capacity to defend ourselves against communism, because we would be damaging the source of our defense strength—our economy.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The distinguished Senator from Missouri may recall that for 10 years I served on the House Committee on Ways and Means. During that time I took it upon myself to lead the fight in behalf of the Hull reciprocal trade agreements program. I spent 10 years intensively studying foreign trade. Our trade with Russia during that time did not amount to a hill of beans. We bought a little gold and some furs from Russia. From the Pacific Northwest, we obtained a little timber and manganese.

For many years, our biggest customer was Great Britain. That situation lasted until she was brought to her knees by the expense of World War I. Then Canada became our biggest customer.

Russia and the Balkan countries that now lie behind the Iron Curtain have never figured in our trade to any appreciable extent.

Japan has been our biggest consumer of raw cotton. Germany, France, and other Western European countries are large customers of this country.

As I have said, for many years Great Britain was the largest customer. Later, Canada became the largest one. But the countries of the Russian bloc have never figured largely in our foreign trade. Now it is proposed to sell to them 12 percent of our accumulation of wheat. Probably it will be a "one shot" agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time the Senator from Virginia has yielded to himself has expired.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes longer.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, we might drop back to a position worse than the one we were in before. In the meantime, as I have pointed out, a sale of wheat to Russia may be just the first step on the way to sales of direct munitions of war to Russia. Who would wish to sell scrap iron or other materials which could be shot back at our boys?

AMENDMENT NO. 326

Mr. President, at this time I yield to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], who wishes to discuss an amendment to S. 2310, No. 326, which he offered at my suggestion. The Senator from South Dakota will now explain the amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, before the hearings were held, at the request and suggestion of the chairman of the committee, I offered this amendment, a copy of which is now on the desk of each Senator. It is a clarifying amendment.

As the chairman of the committee has pointed out, the amendment would put into legal language exactly what the Attorney General held in his opinion of October 9, so that either the adoption or the rejection of the amendment would make no change in the existing situation. In short, this measure would provide a stable set of rules; and all should understand that amendment No. 326 would not in any way involve an extension of trade with Russia. The amendment was offered at the suggestion of the chairman.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, as I have indicated, yesterday the committee acted under the terrible emotional strain of one of the greatest tragedies the American people have ever been called upon to face. It did not take into consideration the fact that the Senator from South Dakota had, at my request, submitted this amendment to deal with the situation which faces us, in that the Attorney General has ruled in regard to the Johnson Act, which provides that the United States cannot make loans to the governments of countries which are in default on their World War I obligations to the United States or their other obligations to the United States. The Attorney General ruled in effect that the extension of credit under normal commercial terms would not come within the provisions of the Johnson Act. I thought that was a correct ruling; but, after all, this opinion does not amend the law; it is not binding on the courts; it would be binding only upon those who now serve in the office of the Attorney General. So I thought it better to make it crystal clear, by an act of Congress, that if private firms do engage in this trade—for certainly it is better to have private enterprise, rather than the Government, do it—they will not be in violation of the Johnson Act.

I hope the Senator from Alabama will be willing to accept this amendment. It merely affirms the correctness of the ruling by the Attorney General and writes it into the law. If the bill is passed, this amendment should be included; rejection of the amendment would cast doubt on the correctness of the ruling by the Attorney General.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I understand that the Mundt amendment has to do with the extension of credit for such transactions. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Virginia would be opposed to the sale of wheat to Russia, even on a cash basis?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. Although I am not unmindful that, under such a policy, eventually Virginia could be helped by such sales of tobacco, I still maintain my position—unless we wish to admit that by engaging in such trade, we would not be dealing with an enemy. But if that nation is a friend, why do we continue to have a $50 billion defense budget?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I noticed in the hearings, however, there was testimony that we have consistently been selling $1 million or $2 million, or perhaps more, of hard items to Russia. If it is not sensible for us to sell those items to Russia, why does not the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee introduce a bill to prohibit all trade with Russia? In short, let us have the policy set forth clearly, in terms of either black or white.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It is already set forth in clear language in the Export Control Act and the Battle Act—trade that the President finds would help to strengthen the military or economic potential of a Communist country is illegal.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Under that law, it would be legal for them to be sold commodities which the administration says would not help them in this way. But if wheat would be helpful to them, even though it may not be so helpful as to call for denial of an export license, then our Government should not finance it.

Mr. MONRONEY. However, the Senator from Virginia has said that he is opposed to any sales—either cash sales or on credit—to Russia of commodities that will help Russia. If the Senator from Virginia is opposed to such trade with Russian, and if we support his view, we should be consistent. However, our country has been carrying on many millions of dollars worth of trade with many of the Iron Curtain countries, principally Russia. The proposed sale would amount to approximately $200 million worth.

The Senator from Virginia will have a difficult time if he tries to convince me that such a sale of wheat would be the sale of a strategic item. Wheat is a most important article of ordinary trade.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does the Senator from Oklahoma maintain that to feed an army would not help it?

Mr. MONRONEY. It is true that armies have to be fed; and armies will be fed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Can the Senator from Oklahoma say that help to the people who are under Castro would not help Castro?

Mr. MONRONEY. The armies will be fed, even if wheat has to be denied to every civilian in Russia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes; and if that happens, the civilians will turn on the army, and there will no longer be an army, and there will be a dead dictator.

But it cannot be argued that our Government has thus far officially reversed its position that materials which would be of substantial aid to a Communist country should not be sold to countries behind the Iron Curtain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time the Senator from Virginia has yielded to himself has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma 5 additional minutes, with the understanding that a little time be left, in which I can ask him a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

I wish to ask this question: Under the Battle Act, is wheat classified as a strategic item?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not think it is.

Mr. MONRONEY. It is not; and it never has been.

Mr. ROBERTSON. But it was not contemplated that it would be proposed that $250 million worth of U.S. wheat be shipped to Russia.

Mr. MONRONEY. If the Senator from Virginia wishes to be consistent, he should oppose any trade with any Communist bloc country. However, to take the position that we cannot sell wheat to Russia, even though wheat has never been declared by the Battle Act to be a strategic material, would interfere with the sale of a commodity which we desperately want to sell.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I do not propose to be pushed into a "whittle or cut" argument about minor details. My position is that never before have we engaged in trade with Communist countries, of commodities that would be of material help to them. But now it is proposed that we engage in such trade, and furthermore that it is proposed the Export-Import Bank, a wholly owned Government agency for the first time in 30 years, would help to finance it and would take all the financial risks.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield briefly to me?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I concur with the Senator from Virginia in that change of policy. I should like to develop two questions. Do I understand correctly that by law it has been the policy of the United States not to sell strategic materials to Russia, or to any other Communist country?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. Has it not also been the policy of Congress not to sell subsidized grain to Communist countries?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. Until the present time the executive branch of the Government has accepted that policy?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. When the President first mentioned the desirability of letting Russia get the $250 million worth of grain, he said he would ask Congress to approve it. Then he found he would be drawn into a very bitter debate as to whether we would do it or not, so he decided to do it himself.

Mr. COOPER. One further question: Until the present time, has it not been the policy that the Export-Import Bank shall not guarantee the sale of commodities to Communist countries, with the exceptions the Senator noted?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. The Export-Import Bank has never financed any sales to any Communist country except Yugoslavia.

Mr. COOPER. Do I correctly understand that despite the arguments made about sales to Russia by other countries, or the advantages or the disadvantages that may come to the United States from the sale, what we are really dealing with is a change of policy, and that the Senator is discussing it in that context?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is absolutely true. So far as I know, the Russians would pay for the wheat. I do not question that. It all depends on whether it would be to their advantage to do so. I believe they might pay. The transaction would help us get rid of our wheat. It would also help the balance-of-payments problem, which I have studied. It is a serious problem.

Mr. COOPER. I sat as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I attended the hearings, and afterward I spoke on the subject in the Senate. I thought such a change of policy was proposed, and that it deserved the full consideration of the administration, our allies, and the entire Congress, to see what its implications would be. I object to it, because I believe it would result in a change of policy based upon an isolated case without full consideration having been given to it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I appreciate the views of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. President, I call up the Mundt amendment to the bill and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert a new section as follows:

SEC. 2. The sale of any product by any individual, partnership, corporation, or association within the United States to any foreign government or political subdivision thereof, or any organization or association acting for or on behalf of such government or subdivision, on a deferred-payment basis shall not be deemed a loan to such foreign government, subdivision, organization, or association within the meaning of section 955 of title 18, United States Code, and the negotiation or assignment by any individual, partnership, corporation, or association within the United States, in the ordinary course of business, of contract rights of commercial paper resulting from any such sale shall not be deemed a sale or purchase of the bonds, securities, or other obligations of such foreign government, subdivision, organization, or association within the meaning of such section, if the terms applicable to such sale, negotiation, or assignment are comparable to those generally prevailing in commercial transactions of a comparable character.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I hope that the leadership will accept the amendment because, in my judgment, to reject it would cast doubt upon good legal opinion.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In order to make the RECORD clear, I wish to ask the Senator from Virginia, chairman of the committee, one question: The Senator will recall that the Attorney General issued a ruling regarding the matter. Do I correctly understand that the Mundt amendment is completely in line with the ruling of the Attorney General?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It follows the ruling exactly.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to be certain that the acceptance of the amendment by the Senate would not in any way negate the ruling the Attorney General has made.

Mr. ROBERTSON. On the contrary, the amendment would give the ruling 100 percent approval. It would write it into law. The President needed the advice of his Attorney General before he could recommend that we sell wheat on credit to the Soviet Union. A $250 million deal is not a small deal. The question arose as to whether the transaction would come within the previous prohibition against loans to a nation in default, because Russia is billions of dollars in default. The Attorney General said that the credit arrangements proposed for the wheat deal did not violate the provisions of the Johnson Act. When I propose to join in the Mundt recommendation by saying, "Let private banks finance it," I want to make it crystal clear to the banks that no one hereafter could come in and indict them for doing so.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to ask this question: Would adoption by the Senate of the amendment in any wise void the ruling of the Attorney General, regardless of what happens to the amendment—whether it be accepted by the House or any other action is taken on it, whether the bill is killed or passed, or whatever becomes of it?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It certainly would not affect it. It would merely write it into law, if the amendment is accepted and the Mundt bill passes. And even if the Mundt bill does not become law, acceptance of the amendment by the Senate will show that the Senate agrees with the Attorney General's ruling.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is what I wish to be certain of. I want the RECORD to show that I have not consulted with either the majority leader or other members of the Banking and Currency Committee. But, under those circumstances, when it merely seeks to write into the law what the Attorney General has said, and would not negate or void the Attorney General's ruling, but would indicate our approval of the ruling regardless of what happens to this proposal, I see no reason why it should not be accepted. I am certain that in the committee we would have discussed it along that line. With that assurance, I believe the committee would have accepted it. In the haste in which we were operating, we all forgot.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. As chairman of the Subcommittee on International Finance of the Banking and Currency Committee, I understand the Senator in charge of the bill to indicate his intention of accepting the amendment, to which I have no objection. However, that acceptance would not change in any way his determined opposition to enactment of the Mundt bill as amended.

Mr. SPARKMAN. My acceptance of this amendment would not, of course, affect in any way my opposition to the Mundt bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The committee has reported the bill adversely. I should like to make it plain that the sponsors of the bill desire to include the amendment in the bill for reasons which only to them are sufficient and satisfactory. Their attitude toward the bill demonstrates their intent, but it does not represent any expression by the Senate—whatever may be the vote on the bill or the amendment—that the Attorney General's opinion is not enough, standing alone, and that this provision must be placed in the bill. The legislative history is clear, as far as those of us who are against the bill are concerned.

As far as the Senate is concerned, if it votes down the bill, the Attorney General's opinion is sufficient and adequate to enable banks to engage in the kind of short-term commercial financing proposed for these grain sales, without fear of prosecution under the Johnson Act.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe the Senator has stated exactly the effect of the statement of the Senator from Virginia concerning reaffirmation of the opinion of the Attorney General.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to yield to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], who has been waiting for some time to be recognized, and then I will yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would ask this question: Why do we not make the sale for gold?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Why do we not make the sale for gold?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder if the Senator from Missouri would withhold that question for a moment until I can discuss it a little later. I should like to bring it up then.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I must leave the Chamber now.

Mr. SPARKMAN. A discussion of the subject will probably open up a broad area of debate; but I should like to make a brief statement: I do not wish to take time to answer further questions on it. The reason we are not selling for gold—all cash paid, 100 percent—is that the private grain dealers and the negotiators from the Russian Government negotiated what are called reasonable trade terms.

My SYMINGTON. By "reasonable trade terms" does the Senator mean so much off for cash, as we discover many times when we make a purchase?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Reasonable or usual trade or commercial terms means the kind of terms as to down payments, the duration and amount of the installments to be paid, the rate of interest on postponed payments, and so on. The terms of the negotiations are identical with the terms that the Canadian Government negotiated, but when the time came to make the first payment, instead of making it 25 percent, they paid 80 percent. We do not know how much they will pay us when they make the first down payment. It is up to them, except that they must pay at least 25 percent. Those were the terms negotiated. They are identical, item by item, with the terms negotiated with the Canadians.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. What the Russians probably did, then, was to pay more cash in advance in order to earn a discount.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not to earn a discount; the statement was made that they intended to save that much interest.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is the same thing.

Mr. SPARKMAN. All right—if the Senator wishes to call it a discount, but really it would be a saving of interest. That is correct, and it is entirely possible they may do the same thing with us.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator has said that they did it to save money?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am impressed with the necessity for our Government to trade as much as our allies trade with Communist countries. But I do not see why we cannot get paid in gold, especially if we give a large inducement of some kind—such as say 2 percent off for cash. The Senator and I have paid many a bill in that way. Why do we not get the gold?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The transaction was not negotiated by the Government.

This was negotiated by private grain dealers.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does that mean they get a "cut" on it?

Mr. SPARKMAN. They may get a profit on it, because they buy at the best price they can.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I should have said profit.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Naturally, they are in business to make a profit.

I believe the people of the country applauded the idea, when President Kennedy announced it first in the conference he held, saying that the sale would be handled by private dealers.

We believe in the private enterprise system. It was announced that this transaction would be handled by private dealers, rather than on the basis of a government-to-government loan.

Mr. SYMINGTON. So do I. But there is no risk here to the contractor who makes the profit, and the theory of capitalism is risk capital. It would not be a government-to-government loan. It would have been a government-to-government sale. The impression I had was that the sale would be for gold.

Mr. SPARKMAN. This is the deal negotiated, so far, by the private negotiators. It is in line with commercial trade generally, and its terms are identical with the terms negotiated between the Russians and the Canadians.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I now yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Alabama for yielding.

I should like to have a more clear understanding of the amendment which has been offered to the bill by the Senator from South Dakota. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, the Johnson Act of 1934 is not applicable to a public corporation created by or pursuant to special authorizations of Congress.

When Mr. Sauer talked with us, it was my understanding that the banks in New York which were to make the loan could not make it under the Johnson Act, because Russia had failed to pay all its debts under lend-lease. Therefore, it was necessary to obtain a guarantee from the Export-Import Bank. By guaranteeing the transaction, the Export-Import Bank would get five-eighths of a percent as its return.

Do I correctly understand that the section 2 of the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota states, in effect, that a commercial transaction of an ordinary character would not be considered a loan, and, therefore, if the Export-Import Bank guaranteed the credit of the banks in New York on an ordinary commercial transaction as such, that could be done under the section 2 as proposed by the Senator from South Dakota; but, if the amendment were not agreed to and if the bill introduced by the Senator from South Dakota were passed as is, the Export-Import Bank would be prohibited from doing anything in the nature of help on the wheat sale?

Have I made myself at all clear?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am not sure the Senator has correctly stated the situation. I invite the attention of the Senator from South Dakota to my reply.

My understanding is that the opinion of the Attorney General was to the effect that the private banks could have extended the commercial credit or participated in the usual forms of bank financing of commercial credit. I ask the Senator from South Dakota if that is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In other words, the private banks could have participated in such a deal. I ask the Senator to read the testimony by Mr. Linder, the Chairman of the Export-Import Bank. A reading of the testimony will show this, because Mr. Linder tells of some 2 dozen or more banks throughout the country he talked with to determine if they could combine to form a "pool."

We must remember that this involves a large amount of credit, and that a number of banks would be required to pool their resources in order to make such a loan. Mr. Linder was not able to form such a pool.

In fact, it was necessary to do this before there could be eligibility. Under the law the Export-Import Bank is not supposed to make loans the commercial banks are willing to make.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It can guarantee credit.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is what is suggested in this case.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. When the banks would not make the loan, the banks came together and said to Mr. Linder, "We will make the loan if you will guarantee the credit."

That is what the proposal is.

The amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota, simply stated, would write into the law, in the event the bill were passed, the provisions of the Attorney General's decision. I ask the Senator from South Dakota if that is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. That is a very lucid explanation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Thank you.

Mr. MUNDT. Let me say to my friend from Massachusetts that this amendment has no bearing on the transactions of the Export-Import Bank. Those are covered by the text of the bill, S. 2310.

The amendment, which really is the Robertson amendment, because it was suggested by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, is precisely what the distinguished Senator from Alabama has stated—only that and nothing more.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Before I yield, and before moving on to another question, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the opinion of the Attorney General, which is to be found on pages 27 et sequitur of the hearings.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OPINION OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
October 9, 1963.

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This is in response to Under Secretary Ball's letter of September 23, 1963, requesting my opinion concerning the application of certain Federal statutes to sales of U.S. wheat and other agricultural products to the Soviet Union and Eastern European bloc countries. I understand that the precise form which these sales might take has not been determined, but that in any case they would be made for U.S. dollars, gold, or convertible currencies at not less than world market prices, and would not involve extensions of credit except within the range of those commonly encountered in connection with other commercial sales for export of the commodities involved. I have reviewed the relevant statutes and have concluded that they present no legal obstacle to such sales.

I. THE JOHNSON ACT

The Johnson Act, 18 U.S.C. 955, prohibits certain financial transactions by private persons in the United States involving foreign governments which are in default in the payment of their obligations to the United

States. The prohibited transactions include the making of "loans" to, and the purchase or sale of "bonds, securities, or other obligations" of, foreign government which is within the statutory category.[1] The Under Secretary's letters states that the Soviet Union is a government in default for the purposes of the act.

It is, of course, apparent that if the proposed sales of agricultural products to the Soviet Union should be made entirely for cash, no question under the Johnson Act would be presented. Moreover, since the act is expressly made inapplicable to Federal corporations, it would not apply to sales that might be made by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The latter is a corporation created by act of Congress (62 Stat. 1070, as amended, 15 U.S.C. 714), empowered to procure agricultural commodities for sale to foreign governments and to export or cause such commodities to be exported (62 Stat. 1072, 15 U.S.C. 714c). It should also be noted that, as provided by section 11 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 529, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 635h), the Johnson Act does not apply to persons acting for or participating with the Export-Import Bank in any transaction engaged in by the Bank. The Bank itself, as a corporation created by act of Congress (12 U.S.C. 635), is exempted from the operation of the Johnson Act. Accordingly, the act would not interfere with export sales in which the Bank participated by issuing a guarantee of payment of the purchase price or otherwise. Nor would it apply to private insurance companies, acting through the Foreign Credit Insurance Association, which might participate with the Bank in the issuance of such guarantees. The Under Secretary informs me that such guarantees are a common feature of similar export transactions with other foreign governments and their agencies.

There remains for consideration the propriety under the Johnson Act of possible sales by private American firms on a deferred-payment basis. It is my opinion that such sales would not involve the making of "loans" within the meaning of the act. This view is consistent with the position taken by this Department under Attorney General Cummings (37 Op. Atty. Gen. 505 (1934)), and more recently in Assistant Attorney General Katzenbach's letter of January 19, 1962, to the General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture. The term "loan" in ordinary commercial usage denotes a contract by which one delivers a sum of money to another, and the latter agrees to return at a future time a sum equal to that borrowed, with or without interest. See, *e.g., In re Grand Union Co.*, 219 Fed. 353 (C.A. 2, 1915); *National Bank of Paulding* v. *Fidelity & Casualty Co.*, 131 F. Supp. 121 (S.D. Ohio 1954). The right to defer payment for goods sold is not a loan but credit. See, *e.g., Dunn* v. *Midland Loan Finance Corp.*, 206 Minn. 550, 289 N.W. 411 (1939); *Bernhardt* v. *Atlantic Finance Co.*, 311 Mass. 183, 40 N.E. 2d 713 (1942); Whitney, Modern Commercial Practices, section 12 (1958). And the payment of consideration by a third party for an assignment of the buyer's obligation does not constitute a loan to either the buyer or the seller. See *Oil City Motor Co.* v. *C.I.T. Corp.*, 76 F. 2d 589 (C.A. 10, 1935); *G.M.A.C.* v. *Mid-West Chevrolet Co.*, 66 F. 2d 1 (C.A. 10, 1933); *Dunn* v. *Midland Loan Finance Corp., supra;* 6A Corbin, Contracts section 1500 (Rev. ed. 1962). Accordingly, neither sales transactions by American exporters on a deferred-payment basis, nor payments made to such exporters by third parties in return for an assignment of the right to payment in connection with such sales, are "loans" to the purchaser of the exported goods in the ordinary sense of that term in legal and commercial usage.

Nor would the forms of credit transactions in which private exporters commonly engage in connection with export sales on credit, involving the assignment or negotiation of contract rights or commercial paper, violate the Johnson Act's prohibition against the purchase or sale of the "bonds, securities, or other obligations" of the governments to which the act refers. Since the right to receive payment in connection with export sales is not normally received by the seller in the form of bonds or securities, the issue presented by such transactions is whether they would involve the purchase or sale of "other obligations" within the meaning of the statute.

Although the assignment or negotiation of a contract right or commercial document resulting from the sale of goods on credit can be broadly termed a "sale" of the buyer's "obligation," it is not, in my opinion, proscribed by the Johnson Act. The act is a criminal statute and therefore must be construed strictly, "lest those be brought within its reach who are not clearly included," *United States ex rel. Marcus* v. *Hess*, 317 U.S. 537, 542 (1943); *United States* v. *Resnick*, 299 U.S. 207 (1936); *Kraus & Bros.* v. *United States*, 327 U.S. 614, 621–622 (1946). For that reason and the reasons indicated hereafter, it is my view that the act must be interpreted, in accordance with the rule of ejusdem generis, to relate only to sales of bonds and securities and "other obligations" of like nature. The distinction here made is essentially that made in connection with both Federal and State enactments in the field of securities regulation: Between obligations which are covered because they are, or are likely to be, widely distributed among members of the public, and obligations which are not covered because they are issued in the ordinary course of trade and normally move exclusively within the relatively restricted channels of banking and commercial credit. See, e.g., Securities Act of 1933, section 3(a) (3), (4)(1), discussed in House Report No. 85, 73d Congress, 1st session (1933) 14 (exemption for "short-term paper * * * of a type which rarely is bought by private investors"), and 1 Loss "Securities Regulation" (2d ed.) 566 et seq., 653 et. seq. (exemptions for short-term paper and for nonpublic offerings); California Corporation Code section 25102(b) (c) (exemptions for "Bills of exchange, trade acceptances, promissory notes, and any guarantee thereof, and other commercial paper issued, given, or acquired in a bona fide way in the ordinary course of legitimate business, trade, or commerce," and for promissor notes "not offered to the public or * * * sold to an underwriter for the purpose of resale").

The foregoing interpretation of the Johnson Act is the necessary result of application of the reasoning employed by Attorney General Cummings in construing the act shortly after it became law in 1934 (37 Ops. Atty. Gen. 505, supra). That opinion, rendered at the request of the Secretary of State, reads in part as follows (id. at 512):

"The committee reports (S. Rept. 20 and H. Rept. 974, 73d Cong.) recite that the bill was introduced following an investigation by the Senate Committee on Finance and the revelation therein that 'billions of dollars of securities * * * offered for sale to the American people' were overdue and unpaid; that some of these 'foreign bonds and obligations * * * were sold by the American financiers to make outrageously high profits'; and stated a purpose 'to prevent a recurrence of the practices which were shown by the investigation to be little less than a fraud upon the American people * * * to curb the rapacity of those engaged in the sale of foreign obligations.'

"This, I think, is indicative of a purpose to deal with such 'bonds' and 'securities' and with 'other obligations' of like nature observing the rule of ejusdem generis—that is, obligations such as those which had been sold to the American public to raise money for the use of the foreign governments issuing them—not contemplating foreign currency, postal money orders, drafts, checks, and other ordinary aids to banking and commercial transactions, which are 'obligations' in a broad sense but not in the sense intended. It was obviously not the purpose of the Congress to discontinue all commercial relations with the defaulting countries."

Direct recourse to the legislative history of the act confirms that both distinctions here made—that between loans and commercial credit and between securities and commercial paper—reflect accurately the intention of Congress and the policy it sought to implement. As noted by Attorney General Cummings, it was obviously not the purpose of the Congress to interfere with the ordinary incidents of trade relations with the defaulting nations as distinguished from participation by them in the capital markets of the United States. Moreover, the debates provide numerous indications of Congress familiarity with the distinction between traffic in "bonds [and] securities" and commercial dealings. A parallel was drawn with the recently enacted securities acts in terms of the need to protect unsophisticated investors (78 Congressional Record 6048, 6052). Reference was also made to section 5 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act (47 Stat. 7 (1932)), which expressly prohibited the making by the RFC of "advances * * * upon foreign securities or foreign acceptances," or drafts and bills of exchange secured by goods in transit to Europe. See 78 Congressional Record 6051. The contrast in the language of the two acts, together with the context in which the Johnson Act was passed, makes it clear that the Johnson Act does not apply to the assignment or negotiation by an American seller, in the ordinary course of business, of contract rights or commercial paper resulting from sales of goods on normal commercial terms.

---

[1] 18 U.S.C. 955 provides:

"Whoever, within the United States, purchases or sells the bonds, securities, or other obligations of any foreign government or political subdivision thereof for any organization or association acting for or on behalf of a foreign government or political subdivision thereof, issued after April 13, 1934, or makes any loan to such foreign government, political subdivision, organization or association, except a renewal or adjustment of existing indebtedness, while such government, political subdivision, or organization or association, is in default in the payment of its obligations, or any part thereof, to the United States, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

"This section is applicable to individuals, partnerships, corporations, or associations other than public corporations created by or pursuant to special authorizations of Congress, or corporations in which the United States has or exercises a controlling interest through stock ownership or otherwise. While any foreign government is a member both of the International Monetary Fund and of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, this section shall not apply to the sale or purchase of bonds, securities, or other obligations of such government or any political subdivision thereof or of any organization or association acting for or on behalf Development, this section shall not apply to of such government or political subdivision, or to making of any loan to such government, political subdivision, organization, or association."

It should be understood that the types of transactions discussed above would violate the act, regardless of their purely formal characteristics, if used as a subterfuge to evade it. Thus, for example, extensions of credit for an inordinately long period might be used as a device to circumvent the prohibition against loans. This question need not be considered in detail here since you inform me that any extensions of credit that may be involved will be within the range of those commonly encountered in commercial sales of a comparable character. Subject to that qualification, I conclude that none of the transactions outlined in your letter would be prohibited by the Johnson Act.

II. SECTION 2(C) OF THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1961

Section 2 of the Agricultural Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 294; 7 U.S.C. (supp. IV) 1282 note), declares it to be "* * * the policy of Congress to—

* * * * *

"(c) expand foreign trade in agricultural commodities with friendly nations, as defined in section 107 of Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1707), and in no manner either subsidize the export, sell, or make available any subsidized agricultural commodity to any nations other than such friendly nations and thus make full use of our agricultural abundance."

The adoption of this declaration of policy followed the announcement by the Department of Commerce in June 1961 of a change in existing export licensing policy to permit the sale of subsidized surplus agricultural commodities to the Eastern European Soviet bloc. The announcement indicated that consideration would be given to approval of export licenses for shipment of such commodities, including commodities acquired directly or indirectly from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, to the Soviet Union and other Eastern European countries, provided the commodities were sold for convertible currencies (hearings before the House Select Committee To Investigate and Study the Administration, Operation, and Enforcement of the Export Control Act of 1949, and Related Acts (87th Cong., 1st sess.), p. 109).

Section 107 of Public Law 480 (Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 457; 7 U.S.C. 1707)), referred to in the declaration of policy, defines the term "friendly nation" to mean "any country other than (1) the U.S.S.R., or (2) any nation or area dominated or controlled by the foreign government or foreign nation controlling the world Communist movement." Public Law 480 authorized, inter alia, export sales for soft currencies and for long-term credits. See United States Code 1701, 1731. Sales of this character are authorized only with respect to "friendly nations," as defined in the act, but no restriction is imposed on commercial sales for cash or short-term credits.

During consideration by the House of the bill which became the Agricultural Act of 1961, Representative LATTA, referring to the change of policy announced by the Department of Commerce, proposed adding to the declaration of policy already contained in section 2(c) the language: "and in no manner either subsidize the export, sell, or make available any subsidized agricultural commodity to any nations other than such friendly nations." He objected to selling subsidized agricultural commodities to the Soviet bloc—even sales not involving any element of assistance under Public Law 480—because sales at the world market price would, in his view, give bloc countries the benefit of subsidies paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation to American producers and exporters.[2] He urged that this was objectionable "in view of the world situation." After some debate as to the meaning and desirability of the amendment, it was adopted (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 10, pp. 13746–13748). The conference committee accepted the amendment (H. Rept. 839, 87th Cong., 1st sess., p. 28).

It is clear that the policy declaration contained in section 2(c) does not have the legal effect of prohibiting commercial sales of subsidized agricultural commodities to bloc countries at world market prices for U.S. dollars, gold, or convertible currencies. Declarations of policy in legislation, like preambles and other introductory material, do not alter specific operative provisions of law. *Sinclair Refining Co.* v. *Atkinson*, 370 U.S. 195, 202 (1962); *Lauf* v. *E. G. Shinner & Co.*, 303 U.S. 323, 330 (1938); *Price* v. *Forrest*, 173 U.S. 410, 427 (1899); *Yazoo R. Co.* v. *Thomas*, 132 U.S. 174, 178 (1889); Sutherland, "Statutory Construction" (3d ed.), section 4820. This rule is particularly relevant where, as here, the declaration of policy was not contemporaneous with the enactment or amendment of any of the basic pertinent statutes: the Export Control Act, the Agricultural Act of 1949, and the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act.[3]

I have examined the history of the declaration with care and find no indication that Congress itself viewed the amendment as more than an expression of its policy, to be given consideration by the Executive in making decisions within the framework of authorizations and prohibitions established by prior law. Representative LATTA, who sponsored the declaration himself stated that its purpose was to have the Department of Commerce know "what the sense of this Congress is" with respect to the transactions in question (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 10, p. 13746). And Representative HOEVEN, one of its supporters, pointed out that the amendment "pertains only to the policy section of this bill" (id. at 13747). At no point in the legislative consideration of the declaration was any effort made to revise or to repeal the statutes that would have to be deemed amended if the policy were to be given binding legal effect.

The Congress could, of course, have embodied its policy in a provision of positive law to which the executive branch would have been bound to adhere. That it did not choose to do so is significant, not only in establishing that section 2(c) is without legal effect but in determining its proper interpretations and application as policy. Congress evidently contemplated that situations might thereafter arise in which the considerations of policy to which it was directing attention should not be decisive; that it would be necessary for the executive to consider and appraise the policy thus declared and to determine whether its application would serve the national interest in particular situations. Both Congress and the courts have traditionally sought to avoid restricting the executive unduly in matters affecting foreign relations because of the need for flexibility in this area and the fact that the Constitution entrusts the external affairs of the Nation primarily to the executive. *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Export Corp.* 299 U.S. 304, 319–321 (1936); *Chicago & S. Air Lines* v. *Waterman S.S. Corp.* 333 U.S. 103, 111–114 (1948). If, therefore, the executive branch should determine that permitting the sales in question would serve the national interest at this time, its action would not only be lawful but consistent with the intention of Congress as to the manner in which section 2(c) was to be interpreted and applied.

III. THE BATTLE ACT

I agree with the Under Secretary that the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (65 Stat. 644, as amended; 22 U.S.C. 1611 et seq.) (the Battle Act), presents no legal obstacle to sales of agricultural commodities to Eastern European bloc countries. The Battle Act was designed to supplement the Export Control Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 7, as amended; 50 U.S.C. App. 2022–2032), which authorizes the President to "prohibit or curtail the exportation from the United States * * * of any articles, materials, or supplies * * * except under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe." Pursuant to the Export Control Act, a comprehensive system of export licensing was set up to control the shipment of commodities from the United States to foreign countries. See House Report 318, 82d Congress, 1st session (1951). The Battle Act added to this system of regulation a mechanism for inducing other countries to embargo the shipment to the Soviet bloc of "arms, ammunition, and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value and items of primary strategic significance used in (their) production." See Senate Report 698 82d Congress, 1st session (1951). The act provides (sec. 103. 22 U.S.C. 1611(b)) for the termination of all military, economic, or financial assistance to any nation upon the recommendation of the Administrator of the program, subject to review by the President in certain instances, if it "knowingly permits the shipment to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination," of any of the embargoed materials. The act contains a further declaration of policy regarding the export, by countries receiving assistance, of other commodities "which in the judgment of the Administrator should be controlled." Section 201, 22 U.S.C. 1612. If a country receiving assistance from the United States does not effectively cooperate in controlling exports of such commodities, all military, economic, or financial assistance is to be terminated upon a determination by the President of noncooperation. Section 203, 22 U.S.C. 1612b.

---

[2] Under sec. 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 1055, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 1427), the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to sell subsidized agricultural commodities owned or controlled by it for export at less than the domestic price. Representative LATTA stated that under the Department of Commerce proposal "the American taxpayer will now (be) picking up the difference between the world price and the domestic price. * * * The exporter would charge this difference to the taxpayer" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 10, p. 13746). In fact, as noted by Chairman COOLEY of the House Agriculture Committee in debate on the floor of the House, since the commodities in question are surplus, the American taxpayer in each case has already "picked up" not merely the difference between the world price and the domestic price, but the entire amount of the domestic price. Export transactions can be said to involve a "subsidy" only because the losses incurred in maintaining the domestic price support program are not deemed realized until a sale occurs. The net result of export transactions, therefore, is to reduce the loss to the taxpayer by the amount of the world market price (id. at 13747).

[3] Export Control Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 7, as amended, 50 U.S.C. App. 2021 et seq.) (authorizing the President to regulate exports, including their financing, transportation, and other servicing); Agricultural Act of 1949, sec. 407, supra (CCC authorized to sell agricultural commodities for export at less than support prices; Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, sec. 5, supra (CCC empowered to procure agricultural commodities for sale to foreign governments, and to export such commodities, or cause them to be exported, and to aid in the development of foreign markets for these commodities).

As indicated by the above summary of its provisions, the Battle Act did not purport to regulate private U.S. shipments to Soviet bloc countries, which were already subject to regulation under the Export Control Act. The Battle Act relates, rather, to trade with the Soviet bloc by countries receiving aid or assistance from the United States. Moreover, the transactions to which this opinion relates would be purely commercial in nature from the standpoint of the purchasing countries, and would, therefore, not involve "economic or financial assistance" within the meaning of the Battle Act. The Commodity Credit Corporation assists exports of agricultural products through the payment to U.S. exporters of subsidies designed to eliminate the impact on such exporters of the domestic price support program and thereby enable them to compete on an equal basis with foreign exporters. However, as the Under Secretary's letter states, the only "assistance" involved in the payment of such subsidies redounds to the benefit exclusively of U.S. producers and exporters.

As to both points, the following colloquy between Senator Sparkman, the floor manager of the Battle Act in the Senate, and Senator Kem, who advocated a more stringent bill, is instructive (Congressional Record, vol. 97, pt. 8, p. 10675):

"Mr. Sparkman. I should like to say that it does not make any difference what the United States is receiving (from the U.S.S.R.). That is not the question. The question relates to trade between Soviet countries and countries to which the United States intends to extend help.

"Mr. Kem. Exactly.

"Mr. Sparkman. Either economic or military. It has nothing to do with trade between the United States and Russia or any other country.

"Mr. Kem. I did not intend to imply anything else."

Accordingly, it is clear that the act has no application to the contemplated transactions.

IV. THE EXPORT CONTROL ACT

The Under Secretary's letter properly states that in any event the export of agricultural products to the Soviet Union and to bloc countries would require the issuance of licenses in accordance with the export control regulations promulgated pursuant to the Export Control Act of 1949, supra.

I am not aware of any other Federal statutes relevant to the problems involved. Accordingly, it is my opinion that the transactions described in your letter could be accomplished in conformity with the laws of the United States.

Sincerely,

Robert F. Kennedy,
Attorney General.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I now yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am not clear yet as to the purpose of section 2 as offered by the Senator from South Dakota, which is being discussed in connection with the Attorney General's ruling. Very frankly, I have not yet had an opportunity to read the ruling.

Are not the pertinent words of the section 2 proposed by the Senator from South Dakota found beginning with the last word on line 7, page 2, and including lines 8 and 9?

Perhaps I do not read the language correctly, but if I do, it provides that the Export-Import Bank can go forward with the transactions if the transactions are considered to be comparable to those generally prevailing in commercial transactions of comparable character, not being a loan.

In other words, if this transaction involves a credit risk of a bank in New York, and the Export-Import Bank guarantees the credit risk, would that be a commercial loan or a guarantee of a commercial transaction?

Mr. MUNDT. I believe I can make that clear.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I believe what has confused the Senator from Massachusetts is a reading into the language of the amendment of the words "Export-Import Bank," which is not involved. The Senator will notice that this language refers to an assignment by an individual, partnership, corporation, or association within the United States—not to a Government association like the Export-Import Bank. I believe that has confused the Senator.

The amendment deals only with private financial institutions which export or which finance exports. It does not involve the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I ask the Senator from South Dakota a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is saying that the Export-Import Bank, under the terms of its act, is prohibited from making the guarantee, but an individual bank can do so if the transaction is comparable to an ordinary commercial transaction.

Mr. MUNDT. That is exactly correct. That is the ruling of the Attorney General. It will be even more correct if we adopt the Robertson amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I thank both the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator wants his amendment adopted, I personally have no objection to accepting the amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I call for a voice vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt].

The agreement was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I shall speak briefly on the bill. As I see it, there are really two questions involved.

The first question is, Do we want to sell grain to Russia and to other Communist countries? I can understand the argument of those who are against the sale of grain and other commodities to Russia and other Communist countries. I can understand their favoring this bill and being opposed to going through with the so-called grain deal.

If we are not opposed to the sales in principle, it seems to me the next question is one of terms—whether or not the terms upon which the sales are to be made are adequate.

A few minutes ago I explained that the terms under this particular bill were made by private grain dealers with negotiators from Russia. They happened to be the identical terms the Canadians agreed to, except that the Canadian rate of interest was slightly higher, or was supposed to be. I do not know that we were given the exact rate.

Again, I say that what the Canadians and Russians agreed to as to downpayments and installments is a moot question, since the amount the Russians actually paid down was 80 percent, and not the 25 percent the agreement called for. We were told that the Russians decided to make a larger downpayment than the agreement required in order to avoid that much of a payment of interest.

Our terms were 25 percent cash, 25 percent at the end of 6 months, 25 percent at the end of 12 months, and the final 25 percent at the end of 18 months.

It would require a considerable time to deliver the grain. I understand that the grain is supposed to be delivered by May 31 of next year. Consequently, the second payment may become due before all the grain has been delivered, assuming that delivery is started soon.

I had felt that Senators who opposed the bill opposed it on the ground that it would not be good business to extend credit to the Soviet countries. But the chairman of the committee, who sat through all the hearings and heard all the witnesses who come before the committee, stated today that credit worthiness is not the issue.

I want Senators to remember that statement—credit worthiness is not the issue.

He argued that the real issue is the building up of the economic strength of Soviet Russia and the Communist countries.

It has been brought out that several years ago, when conditions were more tense than they are now, and the prohibited list of goods for shipment to Communist countries was established, neither wheat, corn, grain of any kind, or any other food commodity was included in that list. That fact should be added to the statement.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. If it were a question of withholding wheat from Russia or the Communist bloc countries for security reasons, I think all Senators would vote unanimously to withhold it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. But it is a fact that Russia can get all the wheat she wants from Canada, Australia, and other countries.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And is getting it.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Last year the wheat acreage in this country was the lowest since 1904. The acreage this year is the second lowest. It was 400 million bushels below the record.

I hold in my hand a publication entitled "Wheat Pool Budget," published in

Calgary, Alberta, Canada. Let me read from it:

> The wheat crop, according to the November estimate, is at an all-time high of 723,442,000 bushels, of which the Prairie Provinces accounted for 703 million bushels.

Further, the article states:

> This year's huge prairie wheat crop was grown on the second largest acreage ever sown. The area sown to wheat on the prairies this year is set at 26,996,000 acres, second only to the 27,750,000 seeded in 1940.

We in the United States are going out of the wheat business. We have no other crops that we can substitute for our loss in wheat acreage. Canada is increasing her acreage and is marketing her wheat. This is what is happening with our allies. Germany, France, Italy, and Canada are getting rich with our one-nation blockade of Russia and bloc countries while we sit back and refuse to sell even nonstrategic goods.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I was happy to note that the Senator from North Dakota made a statement in the beginning that this policy was proving to be a bonanza for Canada and Australia. Toward the end he mentioned our Western European Allies.

If we do not sell the wheat to the Soviet Union—and I may say the chances are doubtful at best—we can expect continued increasing storage costs, and an increase in the drain on our gold, and that wheat sales will probably be increased to a country like Western Germany, which is always finding fault with this country in our trade policies. We should determine what our own trade and foreign policy will be.

What will West Germany do? What she is doing now. She will continue to buy our wheat, mill it into flour, and not only sell it to the Soviet Union and the satellite states, but sell it and machinery to Communist China as well. But we will pay the price.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Either the Senator from Montana or the Senator from North Dakota gave the figures the other day. Does either Senator have the figures showing the amount of trade between West Germany and East Germany?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I have that figure. It amounts to about $1½ billion a year.

Mr. SPARKMAN. About $1½ billion a year.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes; about one-third of it with East Germany. The interesting thing is that the influence of West Germany on East Germany is something that should impress us. If we talk about a squeeze on Berlin, I think we should talk to East Germany. She would be able to tell us much about it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But trade between Western Europe, the Soviet Union, Communist China, and the satellite states, amounts to between $4 billion and $5 billion.

Mr. JAVITS. It is about $6.7 billion. It amounts to $2.9 billion in imports and $3.8 billion in exports.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sorry the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is not present, now that we are talking about building up the economic strength of the Soviet Union. Who is building it up? West Germany, a country we have been underwriting, is doing it. We are maintaining six divisions there today, that are helping to drain our gold. We strangle ourselves and say, "No trade with the Eastern bloc." Yet we sell products to West Germany, whose economy we have been largely supporting, and then we see West Germany do $1 billion worth of trade a year with East Germany; and the Western bloc generally, or Western Europe, which we have supported in the past, and with which we are still allied, is building up the Soviet bloc economy by doing trade of more than $6 billion a year. So how can it be said that we are building up the economic strength of Russia by selling merely $250 million worth of grain to her out of our overflowing storage bins, while our friends in Western Europe, whom we are defending with six divisions there and with an outpouring of gold year after year, are trading to the extent of nearly $7 billion a year?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. While the Senator from North Dakota is on his feet, I hope we may have an explanation of the mechanics involved. Who is negotiating with the officials of the Soviet Union on the sale of wheat? Does the Government own the wheat? I hope the RECORD will show, because I have heard some rumblings to the effect that someone expects to make a big profit by acting as a broker. I think the RECORD should be made abundantly clear as to the mechanics involved.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. I wish to yield further to the Senator from North Dakota in connection with the article he wishes to place in the RECORD.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an article entitled "Wheat Pool Budget," published in Canada, printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Wheat Pool Budget, Nov. 15, 1963]

RECORD WHEAT OUTTURN

A revised estimate of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics has pushed Canadian wheat production to an even higher level than the record forecast a month ago.

The wheat crop, according to the November estimate, is at an alltime high of 723,442,000 bushels, of which the Prairie Provinces accounted for 703 million bushels (Saskatchewan, 493 million; Alberta, 149 million; and Manitoba, 61 million).

The previous Canadian record wheat crop was harvested in 1952 and totaled 703 million, with the prairie crop amounting to 678 million bushels.

This year's average prairie yield of 27 bushels per acre is just slightly above the 26.7 bushel average harvested in 1952 and the 26 bushels per acre in 1915.

Alberta's wheat crop of 149 million is well below the record 180 million harvested in 1940 and has been exceeded in 9 previous years. The provincial average this year of 25.1 bushels per acre has also been surpassed quite a number of times, with the all-time high average still being the 31.1 bushels per acre harvested in the long-to-be-remembered year of 1915.

The Saskatchewan average yield of 27.5 bushels per acre was the best ever harvested in that Province, though it was only slightly ahead of the 1952 average of 27 bushels per acre.

This year's huge prairie wheat crop was grown on the second largest acreage ever sown. The area sown to wheat on the prairies this year is set at 26,996,000 acres, second only to the 27,750,000 seeded in 1940.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Years ago sales of wheat were handled on a nation-to-nation basis. About the second Eisenhower term, under Secretary Benson, that policy was changed, and thereafter it has been handled through the private grain trade. The wheat is taken from the Commodity Credit Corporation, and they are paid in kind for any export subsidies involved. With respect to dairy products, and some other commodities, the sales are still made on a nation-to-nation basis. However, what I have described has been the policy for the past 6 or 8 years, and the grain sales are handled by the private grain traders.

Mr. PASTORE. Who owns the wheat? If the Russians, for example, were to buy a million bushels of wheat, where would that wheat be? Would it be on a farm or would it be in storage? If so, would it be in Government storage?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. If no wheat were available on the cash market, a part of it would come from Government stocks.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Government own it?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The Government owns most of the wheat—over 1 billion bushels.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Government has paid for it.

Mr. PASTORE. Who would make a profit on the deal?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The private grain trade, no doubt, make their customary profit.

Mr. PASTORE. Who is the private grain trade?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. About four or five international grain traders, I would say. I do not recall who all of them are. There are not many companies in the international trade. They include Cargill, International, and the Bunge Corp.

Mr. PASTORE. How much a bushel do they charge?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I do not know what their charge is. On a big sale like this, I suppose it would be less, but their profit would still be sizable.

Mr. SPARKMAN. They do not charge the Government anything. The Government took the grain into storage.

I should like to yield to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. PASTORE. I should like to understand who makes what.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the grain dealers have shaved their commission to very little or nothing, so as to make it possible to sell the wheat to Russia. I was informed, about 2 hours ago, that it would be cheaper to handle it this way than if the Government itself made the sale directly. That is what I was told about 2 hours ago, when I tried to get the information on this sale.

Mr. PASTORE. Do I correctly understand that the wheat is owned by the Government, and that it is in storage? Further, am I to understand that the brokers involved will get into this transaction and that they will make a commission on what they sell?

Mr. KEATING. What bothers me is that this is a sale by the Government to the exporters and a resale by them to Russia.

Mr. PASTORE. I am trying to find out what the mechanics are.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Senator from North Dakota to check me on this statement, to see if I am correct. When a farmer who grows wheat wants to take advantage of the support program, he puts his wheat into Government storage. The title to that wheat is still in the grower of the wheat who put it there. If the farmer does not take back that wheat within 12 months, title passes to the Government. I believe the Senator from North Dakota said that probably about 300 million bushels of wheat were in such storage.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. About $300 million worth, or about 150 million bushels.

Mr. SPARKMAN. About 300 million bushels——

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. No; dollars.

Mr. PASTORE. About 150 million bushels, I understand the Senator from North Dakota to say.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes; and involving about $300 million. It includes not only wheat, but also some other farm commodities.

Mr. SPARKMAN. About 150 million bushels. I am talking about the wheat that is in Government storage, and still belongs to the farmers. I understand there are about 300 million bushels of such wheat.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The Federal Government owns more than a billion bushels.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am trying to ascertain the amount that the growers have in storage as to which title has not passed, and which they can withdraw at any time.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. It is my guess that it is about 300 million bushels.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That belongs to the private growers of the country.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. These people will buy from producers who have the wheat in storage. It would take about 150 million bushels to fill the order that we are talking about.

Mr. PASTORE. It will be our responsibility——

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. And they, in turn, sell to the grain dealers at the best price they can get. The grain dealer negotiates with the Russians at the best price that he can get. It is a typical free enterprise system of doing business.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Why is it that the exporter would buy from the private grain owner rather than from the part of the grain in storage which is owned by the Government?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the chairman of the committee could probably tell us that. However, there is a set of conditions which must be met before the Government can release the grain into the open market for unrestricted use. The requirement is 105 percent of the support price plus the carrying charges.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, it is to the advantage of the exporter to buy that part of the wheat to which title has not yet passed to the Government, and that is the reason why the Senator from Alabama——

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not say positively that it would be to his advantage. It would be to the advantage of the private grower to withdraw his wheat and have it on the market. The private buyers will go to the free market before they try to buy it from the Government.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The grain trade will buy it wherever it can buy it the cheapest.

Mr. KEATING. Is the wheat commingled? Is the Government-owned wheat commingled with the other wheat?

Mr. McCARTHY. Some of it is, and some of it is not.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The farmers can redeem that wheat under loan within a year. If they do not do so, the title passes to the Government. The Government owns more than a billion bushels outright.

Mr. PASTORE. In other words, this transaction is no different than any other transaction that has been going on. Is that correct?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. It is exactly the same policy that has been followed for 6 or 8 years.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The same policy that is followed in selling wheat to West Germany.

Mr. PASTORE. If any of these countries were to buy wheat, the sale would be handled in precisely the same way?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. By the same people?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. No matter how bad the credit risk might be, with respect to many of the smaller, independent, new nations, so long as they are not Communist nations, the accounts would be readily insured by the Export-Import Bank. Is that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not also correct to say that we have allowed the newer nations to buy wheat for local currencies under the Public Law 480 program, and have sold hundreds of millions of dollars worth of wheat for approximately 10 to 15 cents on the dollar, spendable income, for local currencies, valueless to us, and then had the money loaned back to the country, with which they could do their WPA work?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think the Senator has correctly described the situation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I read the opinion of the Attorney General in response to a letter written by Under Secretary of State Ball, the sales "would not involve extensions of credit except within the range of those commonly encountered in connection with other commercial sales for export of the commodities involved."

If the bill introduced by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] were not passed, the Export-Import Bank would be permitted to guarantee the credit of the New York banks and would get five-eighths of 1 percent for doing so.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the bill introduced by the Senator from South Dakota were passed, the Export-Import Bank or any other agency of the Government would be prohibited from doing anything with relation to the undertaking.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct. He has made reference to the Johnson Act. I was about to call his attention to the fact that the Export-Import Bank itself was made immune from the Johnson Act by section 11 of the Export-Import Bank Act. That section provides that, in spite of the Johnson Act, any person, including any individual, partnership, corporation, or association, may act for or participate with the Export-Import Bank in any operation or transaction.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wanted the Senator to be certain of that.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Alabama answered in the affirmative when the Senator from Massachusetts said that the Mundt Act would prohibit the Export-Import Bank from doing anything in connection with trade. That is not entirely correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I did not understand the Senator's statement.

Mr. MUNDT. There could be the extension of credit and the insurance of trade, or the amount of trade. "Not anything" is all-embracing.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I did not understand the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts to be quite so broad.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, the Export-Import Bank can either make loans or insure or guarantee credit. Those are different functions.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Under the opinion of the Attorney General, we know that there are the safeguards of the Johnson Act, the Battle Act, and the Agricultural Act. Also, there are the safeguards of the Export Control Act.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So if the credit is to be guaranteed, there will still be those other acts that will keep trade with the countries behind the Iron Curtain under severe restriction.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. We should remember that none of the wheat can be shipped out without export licenses issued under the Export Control Act. Export licenses cannot be issued and will never be issued until the transactions have cleared all the hurdles to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In deciding whether to vote pro or con on the Mundt bill, am I correct in considering the problem in this way: First, the transaction is a commercial transaction, as to which there is a reasonable expectation that it will be completed without any risk to our Government. Second, should we, by passing the bill, further restrict our possible trade with the Soviet Union and other Iron Curtain countries, particularly in view of other acts limiting our trade, such as the Johnson Act and the Battle Act?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator's act and the Battle Act?

The Senator's question covers exactly question covers exactly the two points I made in the beginning of my remarks. I believe the Senator from Massachusetts had temporarily left the Chamber at that time. I said there are some who do not believe we ought to carry on any trade at all with the Eastern bloc countries, and that I could see some logic in their opposing the consummation of the grain transaction. However, if we are willing to have some trade between the West and the East, the second question is: Is this particular transaction creditworthy? I like that term. The chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, in supporting the Mundt bill, used that term. I believe the Senator from Massachusetts was in the Chamber when the Chairman said, in effect, "I want to make it clear in the beginning that creditworthiness is not an issue in this case."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt] was in the minority leader's room when the question was discussed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It was stated that under the credit clause of the Export-Import Bank, the Federal Government has not lost a cent under insurance.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Under insurance. I believe it was said that there had been a loss of $100 or $200 occasionally, but that the total amount of loss by the Export-Import Bank was only $1,000 or $2,000, at the most, during the 29 years of the Bank's operation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It was my understanding that Mr. Sauer said there had been no direct loss, but that there had been a loss of perhaps $2,800 on insurance guarantees, but none on the credit guarantees.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As I recall, it was said that there were some small items of $100 or $200 at a time, which may have totaled as much as $1,000 or $2,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. First, it is necessary to determine whether there is a credit risk that the Export-Import Bank is able to take; and second, whether we want to permit some trade with Russia. Perhaps a third element would be whether we want to dispose of some surplus wheat.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Massachusetts has put his finger on the three questions that might be asked. He speaks about a credit risk. The chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, who is opposed to the sale, sat throughout all the hearings, heard all the testimony, and heard the officials of the Export-Import Bank testify how they weighed the credit risk. Yet he began his speech by saying, in effect: "I want to make it clear that creditworthiness is not an issue in this case."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If credit risk is not an issue, the only question is whether such trade with Russia should be permitted.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. The chairman of the committee argued that such trade should not be permitted, on the ground that it would build up the economic strength of Russia.

The Senator from Massachusetts took part in a little exchange a few moments ago with the majority leader and with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] in which it was said that the value of the trade that is being conducted between West Germany and East Germany and Eastern Europe, and between West Europe and East Europe, is about $7 billion a year.

Also, it should be remembered that the United States has six divisions in West Germany and that we are sending a stream of gold and dollars over there, which affects our balance-of-payments deficits and our reserve of gold in this country. Nevertheless, our Western Allies are selling or trading with the Eastern European bloc to the extent of $7 billion a year. Yet it is said that the United States should not trade with the Eastern European bloc.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The U.S. trade with the Eastern European bloc is not valued at more than $30 million a year.

Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. JAVITS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield? If so, to whom?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield first to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that the Export-Import Bank has not been insuring sales to Iron Curtain countries for a long time?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It has insured three or four sales to Hungary rather recently. But before that it had not insured such sales.

Mr. HOLLAND. There has been an expansion of grain sales to Hungary amounting, in the past few weeks, to a total of about $25 million.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The loans to Yugoslavia were direct loans.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is correct that the Export-Import Bank has not been insuring loans based upon sales to the countries behind the Iron Curtain for a long period of time, is it not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not since the Bank was created. I am not certain whether the Bank was ever asked to make such loans. Most of the trading has been in small amounts, and guarantees and insurance by the Export-Import Bank may well not have been necessary.

Mr. JAVITS. U.S. exports to the Soviet bloc in 1962 amounted to $125 million. To the U.S.S.R., our exports amounted to $15 million. Total trade with the Soviet bloc, both exports and imports, has amounted to less than $200 million.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Our trade has been so slight that the banks themselves could finance it.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Alabama admits that if the Export-Import Bank insured time payments on the proposed sales, that would be a departure from a policy which has existed ever since the Iron Curtain was created?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask another question: How does the distinguished Senator differentiate between Cuba and Russia, in connection with this matter? We do not permit anything—whether strategic or not—to be sent to Cuba; and we do not permit ships of our allies which have landed anything in Cuba to come into our ports. How does the distinguished Senator from Alabama differentiate between our letting down—as proposed—the bars, in terms of trade with Russia and countries behind the Iron Curtain, and our absolute prohibition of trade of any sort with Cuba?

Mr. SPARKMAN. First of all, we do not have with Cuba the diplomatic relations which we have with Russia, Hungary, and various other Iron Curtain countries.

Second, I intended to state later in my remarks—although I might not have time, for I must yield to other Senators—some facts in regard to how carefully the Export-Import Bank has examined the question as to the creditworthiness. It was so careful about that, that I believe the Senator from Florida heard the Senator from Virginia said that creditworthiness is not at issue.

Mr. HOLLAND. I did not hear him say the credit risk was good. He only said that creditworthiness was not involved.

Mr. SPARKMAN. He said, "I believe creditworthiness is not involved in this case."

Mr. HOLLAND. I agree that he said that. But he did not say that the Export-Import Bank had determined that the credit risk was a good one.

Mr. SPARKMAN. A few minutes ago I said I intended to discuss the testimony, to show how carefully the Export-Import Bank examined this question, and that its representatives talked with the head of the export insurance organization in the United Kingdom that has been trading on credit terms with Russia for the past 10 years, and without the loss of a single dime or a default of a single dollar; and they talked with the export exchange officials of Canada, in regard to the Canadian trade, and with the corresponding officials of other countries. The Export-Import Bank has made a careful survey. It has an Advisory Committee, which is composed of some of the best business leaders and industrial leaders in the country. The Advisory Committee was in session in October; and after a long, full, and careful discussion of the facts in this case, the Advisory Committee voted in favor of going through with the proposed transaction and granting credit. I believe that the Board of the Export-Import Bank is honest, careful, prudent, able, and businesslike. That Bank has been functioning for 29 years, and has done billions of dollars' worth of business; and during all that time it has made a profit of nearly $2 billion. It has paid into the U.S. Treasury about $1 billion, and has retained, and today has a reserve of, $840 million. It seems to me that is good business; and if I were connected with a bank with a board of directors who were able to carry on business of that kind, I would be willing to listen to them when the time came to determine creditworthiness.

Mr. HOLLAND. I agree that the Export-Import Bank has done its work well. I only hope that in formulating the policy the executive branch and the legislative branch will do their work equally well.

With great apprehension I heard the Senator say that we should go into this business because Canada is going into it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator did not hear me say that.

Mr. HOLLAND. And that the friendly nations were doing it, too.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; I said we were selling grain to West Germany and other Western European countries which, in turn, were selling it and its products to Russia. All I said about Canada was that the terms of the sale of the wheat—which were negotiated by private grain dealers in the United States with grain dealers in Russia—were almost exactly the same as those negotiated with Canada.

Mr. HOLLAND. But we are outbidding Canada, because we are fixing a 5-percent rate of interest, whereas Canada fixed the rate of interest at 5½ percent.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is because the prime rate of interest in Canada is higher than it is here.

Mr. HOLLAND. But does the Senator from Alabama think that merely because Canada sells to Red China, we should do the same?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; and I did not connect that sale with this proposed sale, although I did say something about the futility of our not selling wheat to Russia when we were selling it to Western European countries which, in turn, sell to Russia; and I said this sale would be on the same terms as those sales.

Mr. HOLLAND. But we are proposing to outbid them by one-half of 1 percent interest.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As I have said, that is merely because our prime interest rate is lower than Canada's.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I raised the question of Canadian sales, because since Canada is willing to sell to Russia all the wheat Russia needs, the question is not whether Russia will get the wheat she needs.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct; and I recall that previously the Senator from North Dakota brought up that point.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to submit the figures in regard to the trade with West Germany, and also in order to help settle the question in regard to sales of strategic goods. The figures I shall submit are for 1962, the latest available.

West German exports to the Soviet bloc in 1962—and including exports to Red China, and so forth—were $750,400,000, of which $214 million went to East Germany and $536,400,000 went to other Soviet-bloc countries.

West German imports from the Soviet bloc in 1962 were $740,800,000, divided as follows: From East Germany, $228,600,000; from other Communist-bloc countries, $512,200,000.

Total West German trade with East Germany in 1962 was $442,600,000; in the same year, total West German trade with other Communist-bloc countries was $1,048,600,000.

As for U.S. trade: In 1962, U.S. exports to the Soviet bloc amounted to $125 million.

In 1962 U.S. imports from the Soviet bloc amounted to $82 million.

In short, the total 1962 trade between the United States and the Soviet bloc—both exports and imports—amounted, in round figures, to approximately $200 million.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I appreciate the helpfulness of the Senator from New York in placing those figures in the RECORD.

In order that the area of the debate may be narrowed, I wish to ask a question. The Senator from Virginia said this bill would lead to the sale of munitions. But did not the Secretary testify that the curbs we have placed on the sale of strategic goods to our allies are working very well?

Mr. JAVITS. But we are not talking about that. We are talking about a policy under which we do not sell strategic goods to the Communist-bloc countries, but the western European countries do. So the question is, To what extent, if any, shall we go into the proposed arrangement on normal terms?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think the Senator is entirely correct.

We have not had a great deal of trouble in following our policy of not selling strategic goods to the Communist bloc. Even in the days of the Korean war, we got along fairly well with our laws in connection with sales of strategic goods, although there were some differences of opinion as to what constituted strategic goods. For example, we held to the position that medical supplies were strategic goods; but the British did not. I think there are a few similiar items. But generally speaking we have done quite well in the matter of sales of strategic goods. This measure does not deal with the sale of strategic goods; it deals with the sale of grain and similar commodities.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me some of the time which is under the control of the Senator from South Dakota? I believe that arrangement would be fair to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator from South Dakota will do so, that will be very kind.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield up to 5 minutes to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. The distinguished Senator from Alabama has said that the projected extension of credit to the Soviet for the purchase of wheat was very carefully considered by the blue ribbon advisory board—and it is a blue ribbon advisory board.

But there is a point in Mr. Linder's testimony that I think would tend to show that perhaps otherwise was the case. I should like to read the testimony of Mr. Linder when he was questioned by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], which appears on page 173 of the hearings:

> Senator DOMINICK. Now, Mr. Linder, you are aware, are you not, of the provisions in the Agricultural Act of 1961, in which Congress sets out its position against the sale of subsidized agricultural commodities to the Communist bloc?
>
> Mr. LINDER. I have heard little about it this morning, sir. I can't say that I was familiar with it before then, but beyond that, I have no comment.
>
> Senator DOMINICK. This also came up in 1961, during the time while the act was being amended and while you were being examined concerning this friendly foreign nation problem.
>
> It would appear that the Commerce Department made the statement that export licenses for sales of agricultural products were being considered.
>
> The Congressman from Ohio, Mr. Latta, immediately introduced his amendment as part of the preamble of the Agriculture Act of 1961, and it was adopted by Congress to show it was the policy of Congress not to sell subsidized agricultural commodities to the Communist bloc.
>
> Now, you say you were not aware of this until this morning?
>
> Mr. LINDER. I was not aware of it until this morning.
>
> Senator DOMINICK. Was this fact brought to the attention of your Board members?
>
> Mr. LINDER. No, it was not part of any discussion I had.
>
> Senator DOMINICK. Was it brought to the attention of any members of the Advisory Board?
>
> Mr. LINDER. No, it was not.

So it seems to me that a very important element in the consideration of the extension of credit was left out in the discussions with the advisory board. Certainly, the proposal does represent a major policy reversal. I believe it is really contrary to the spirit, if not the letter of the Latta amendment. Mr. Linder had no knowledge of it, and the advisory board apparently had no knowledge of it, and that point was not considered when they were carefully deliberating the proposed deal.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I promised I would yield to the Senator from South Dakota. I yield to him.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I desire to make two or three brief observations. I was not privileged to be present at the hearings of the Committee on Banking and Currency. If I am incorrect in my observations, I wish that the Senator from Alabama, who is doing such an excellent job of explaining the issues involved, would correct me.

My first assumption, based upon what I have been able to learn from the hearings and the testimony submitted by the executive offices of the Government, is that if the bill now before the Senate is passed, the chances for wheat and other agricultural trade with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union would be killed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In instances in which large amounts of commodities would be involved, the chances certainly would be killed. Relatively small amounts could still be handled.

Mr. McGOVERN. I know that at the present time we are not only selling some agricultural commodities, but we are also selling textile machinery, farm machinery, and other things to the Soviet Union. But certainly any substantial transaction would be blocked by the bill.

The second observation I should like to make is that it is generally agreed by both the proponents and the opponents of the bill that it would be in our economic interest to participate in the transaction. It would be of great benefit to American agriculture. No one denies that. It would be of great benefit to the taxpayers who are paying the cost of keeping the commodities in storage. It would certainly be a great contribution to our balance-of-payments problem, as the Senator from Missouri has brought out. So it seems to me that the question turns on what our attitude will be toward the Soviet Union. I believe that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations put that issue as sharply as I have seen it or heard it stated. His comments were picked up in part by the Washington Post in an editorial that appeared on Monday. In quoting the Senator from Arkansas, the editorial stated:

> The issue involved in this bill, he said, is "whether we are to regard the Soviet Union as an implacable enemy for all time and for all purposes, or whether we are to regard it as a powerful and dangerous antagonist whom we can and should influence in various ways with a view toward inducing it to abandon its aggressive designs."

The whole thrust of the foreign policy of our late beloved President Kennedy was to take that latter course, and to try in some way to get us off a course that may lead us into a nuclear war—into a major catastrophe—and to move instead in the direction of a more hopeful and a more peaceful world. Certainly, no one can deny that international commerce between even competitive and rival nations is one useful way to build a more peaceful world.

On Sunday at the Capitol the Chief Justice, when he was speaking about the President's death, made the following observation: "but we do know that such acts are commonly stimulated by forces of hatred and malevolence, such as today are eating their way into the bloodstream of American life."

I fear that that same kind of hatred is a reflection of the relations that exist among the countries of the world. To whatever extent we may take even a small step in the direction of reducing hatred and tension in the world, it seems to me that we will be making a contribution that is even more valuable than the dollars involved in the transaction.

The Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBERTSON) spoke of the danger of giving food to armies, pointing out that armies march on their stomachs. The point is that we are not at war with the Soviet Union. We are not are war with Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland or Yugoslavia. We may disagree, as we do disagree, with their form of government. We are not at war with those countries. If we ever do get into a war with the Soviet Union, it will be all over for most of us before we have an opportunity to mill a bushel of wheat or even make a loaf of bread. It will mean the end of the societies in both our countries.

It seems to me that what we need to do in these very crucial and dangerous times is to take advantage of every opportunity that is presented to us to relax some of the tensions and dangers that threaten to destory us all. In my view, that is the crucial issue which is involved in what we are debating today.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe the Senator from South Dakota has made a very fine contribution to the debate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am conderably disturbed by the whole situation. I do not know whether the Senator from Alabama has the same recollection that I do about the subject. But when the wheat deal with Canada first arose, there was no solicitation on the part of any Iron Curtain countries to buy wheat from us. But immediately certain of our people rushed into the market of trade and began to solicit the sale. The sale was not solicited by the Iron Curtain countries, but it was solicited by certain private agents in this country attempting to drum up a deal whereby we could sell wheat to the Russians.

Mr. President, no one wishes to get rid of our surpluses any more than I do—in a wise and a constructive way. I was given the assurance, and it was my firm understanding after this transaction had milled and developed for a substantial period of time, even before the Russians, so far as any answers to any questions I asked them were concerned, had still not asked for any kind of proposal for the sale of wheat. The deal was being generated here, in Minneapolis, and in other places. I was assured that the Russians and the Iron Curtain countries with Russian support had the cash and the resources to pay for the wheat on the barrelhead, and that it would be a cash transaction with the United States for the sale of the surplus wheat.

I labored under that assurance until about a day or two before the Senator from South Dakota introduced his bill. So to my astonishment I found that the rules of the game had been changed somewhere, somehow, and we proposed to guarantee the credit of these companies with Government credit for 75 percent of the purchase to the Export-Import Bank.

I was utterly astounded, because that was exactly the opposite from my understanding.

With the understanding that it was to be a sale for cash, and under reasonable and proper conditions of movement—shipping and otherwise—I said, "I can go along with that." I thought it was a "plus" in the movement of the surplus.

We have reached the point where one wonders. There are two issues involved, from my standpoint. It is not merely a question of a sale for cash. I have already said I would favor that. That was my understanding of what was to be done.

Now there is involved a question of the U.S. Government guaranteeing the credit. That would be fine for the New York bankers. It would be wonderful for the march of trade. The bankers would lend the money, would take no risks whatsoever, and would collect the interest. It would be wonderful for them. There would be no risk, and it would be a good business deal.

There is one other factor involved. There is the question of ocean freight rates, which I understand is involved in the negotiation. If we are so concerned about doing business in the world market under normal trade and credit condition terms, why do we not permit the Russians or the Iron Curtain countries to ship the wheat in bottoms at the most advantageous price for us? Why do we insist that they must pay a substantial percentage more for freight rates, and compel them to ship in more expensive bottoms than they would otherwise do?

Those are the two factors involved.

I believe we should approach the credit situation cautiously. I am against putting the Federal Government's credit behind this commercial transaction, under all the circumstances.

I agreed that I could go along with the sale for cash on the barrelhead, because it had been represented that Russia and the Iron Curtain countries had gold, convertible dollars, and foreign exchange, and could pay for it.

Why should we put American Government guarantees behind this transaction in order that certain grain dealers and banks may make a profit out of it? I do not know why. If they want to enter into the transaction, let them take the risks involved. Let them stand behind the credit which they so loudly say is completely good.

Those are the two points involved.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I shall answer very briefly.

About the ships, I believe it has long been a policy in this country—I know there is some provision in law relating to it—to require 50 percent of certain cargoes to be carried in American bottoms.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Just a moment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am not saying that that applies to this particular transaction, but there is such a law in connection with certain things we ship. I do not know whether it applies in this instance or not.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That does not apply to the normal commercial trade. It applies to Public Law 480 transactions, in connection with which we are giving things away.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There are some other areas in which the program applies, also.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Other aid programs.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But we are not to pay that differential in shipping. The Russians are to pay it, they accept it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is one of the stumbling blocks.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is one of the hard points of negotiations.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is a stumbling block.

Mr. SPARKMAN. With reference to the public guaranteeing this transaction, I remind Senators that the guarantee is based on a premium which has proved over a period of 29 years to be safe, sound, and profitmaking.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator is in error.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. May I pursue this subject?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator said that this program has been proved over a period of 28 or 29 years.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Twenty-nine years.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I hope the Senator does not mean to rely upon that statement, because we have not been dealing with Iron Curtain countries for 29 years.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am not talking about dealing with Iron Curtain countries.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. We are dealing with credit.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me deal with the credit.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The credit of Iron Curtain countries.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will wait a moment, I shall return to the question of the credit. I have discussed it a half dozen times this afternoon.

With reference to the guarantee, and speaking only of the guarantee, it is based on the payment of a premium, like insurance. The premium is five-eighths of 1 percent, which will go in payment for the risk.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understand.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will repeat the statement I made a few minutes ago. Over the 29 years that the Export-Import Bank has been operating it has proved its program of guarantees and its program of insurance. It has proved to be profitmaking.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if I may pursue this subject a little further, because it is quite important, the insurance phase of the program has been in effect for only a few years, not for 27 or 28 years.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish someone would check this statement. I believe I am not mistaken.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. May I pursue the question a little further?

Mr. SPARKMAN. If I am not mistaken, the insurance or the guarantee power has been in effect for the full time under section 2(a). But perhaps the power was not very extensively exercised.

Mr. BENNETT. The insurance program began in 1953.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Very well.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I wish to make one additional statement. The fact that the Export-Import Bank has over a period of years had a good record with certain creditors does not guarantee that it will have a good record with other creditors. That argument to me is not at all sound.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Iowa will listen, I will state what I have stated about three times already this afternoon. I am sorry the Senator was not in the Chamber.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have been present.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I refer the Senator to the testimony of Mr. Linder, Chairman of the Export-Import Bank. He tells how he went about examining the creditworthiness of this transaction.

If the Senator from Iowa had been present when the chairman of the committee spoke——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I was present.

Mr. SPARKMAN. He spoke in behalf of the Mundt bill.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I was present when the Senator spoke.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator was not present when the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson] started, he said, "Creditworthiness is not involved in this case." The Senator from Virginia sat and listened to the testimony of Mr. Linder.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. He did not say, by that statement, that the credit was good.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, at this point I should like to read into the Record what Mr. Linder said in response to a question I asked him:

> At this point, you may ask a pertinent question. In making its decision, did the Bank's Board give adequate consideration to the credit risk involved in these sales? The answer is yes, the Board did find "reasonable assurance of repayment" as is required by the Export-Import Bank Act. We knew that these countries had been doing business with the free world for a long time and we had no reason to believe that they have ever failed to meet their commercial—I emphasize commercial—obligations.
>
> Mr. Chairman, if I may, I should like to interpolate in my statement at this point to reply to a question which I understand was asked of Secretary Dillon yesterday in respect as to whether the Bank's Advisory Committee had considered the desirability of our issuing a guarantee or financing the proposed sale of grains, I would like the members of the committee to know that the Advisory Committee met on October 14, 1963. Present were Messrs. Carl J. Gilbert, chairman of the Billette Co., and a director of Morgan Guaranty Trust Co.; Luis F. Corea, senior vice president of Riggs Bank, but a member of the Committee in his capacity as president of the Bankers Association for Foreign Trade; David M. Kennedy, chairman of the board of the Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago; Philip W. Pillsbury, chairman of the board of the Pillsbury Co., Minneapolis; Mr. Ralph T. Reed, chairman of the executive committee of the American Express Co.
>
> Those were all present. Other members of the Committee were absent. They were:
>
> Mr. William Biggs, vice president of the Bank of New York; Dr. James A. McCain, president of Kansas State University; Mr. Wilfred J. McNeil, president of Grace Line, Inc.; and Mr. Nat Goldfinger, director of the Department of Research, AFL–CIO.
>
> I would summarize their judgment by saying that after extensive discussion our Advisory Committee felt that the Bank's facilities should be used to assist in financing these grain sales. If you wish, I have before me a copy of that section of the minutes of the meeting prepared by its chairman and I will be pleased to read it to you.

It is on the next page.

I ask unanimous consent that the extract from the minutes of the Advisory Committee, found at page 166 of the hearings, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> After extensive discussion, the Committee felt that the Bank's facilities should be used to finance the exporters of wheat to Russia. Considering the magnitude of the transactions, and the unusual risks involved, it seemed highly unlikely that commercial banking credit would be available except (a) in token amounts on a pro bono publico basis; or (b) in respect of the earlier maturities.

Mr. SPARKMAN. May I say one other word in answer to the Senator from Iowa? The Senator made another point, with respect to the method of payment; he thought the payment was to be in gold. I will admit that, judging from some of the newspaper stories, that would appear to be true. The other day I read President Kennedy's statement in his news conference of October 10. I think it was the first time he had dealt with the subject. Secretary Rusk was before the committee and spoke on this point. I think members of the committee will remember that he said it would be in gold, dollars, or normal commercial terms.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. What are "normal commercial terms"?

Mr. SPARKMAN. He said the period was not to exceed 3 years.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is the same basis upon which I thought the sale was to be made. What are "normal commercial terms"?

Mr. SPARKMAN. He said not to exceed 3 years

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Normal commercial terms are loans arranged through private banking facilities without government guarantees. Are they not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not think so. That is the definition of the Senator from Iowa; that is not my definition. Normal commercial terms are terms followed normally by the Treasury.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. With Federal guarantees of ordinary commercial transactions?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It may be. They are terms that have been used over the years.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Alabama does not need any assistance. He has done an extraordinarily fine job.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to yield the floor to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas and let him speak on the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; the Senator from Arkansas has spoken too much during the past few weeks. I merely wished to supplement what the Senator had said. I do not believe the Senator put in the Record a list of the countries—some 18 of them—that have the equivalent of or what is similiar to the Export-Import Bank, which is used for the same purposes. I do not believe the Senator put that list into the Record.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; I did not.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It appears on page 92 of the hearings. I ask unanimous consent to have that list printed in the Record at this point, to show that it is not a unique operation that the Export-Import Bank engages in.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> There are no fewer than 19 entities abroad which provide export credit insurance or guarantees for exporters in their respective countries. These are as follows:
>
> COUNTRY AND ENTITY
>
> Australia: Export Payments Insurance Corp., Sydney.
>
> Austria: Oesterreichische Kontrollbank A. G., Vienna.
>
> Belgium: Office National du Ducroire, Brussels.
>
> Canada: Export Credit Insurance Corp., Ottawa.
>
> Denmark: Exportkreditraadet, Copenhagen.
>
> France: Compagnie Francaise d'Assurances pour le Commerce Exterieur, Paris.
>
> Germany: Hermes Kreditversicherungs A. G., Hamburg.
>
> India: Export Risks Insurance Corp., Ltd., Bombay.
>
> Israel: Israel Foreign Trade Risks Insurance Corp., Tel-Aviv.
>
> Italy: Instituto Nazionale delle Assocurazioni, Rome.
>
> Japan: Export-Import Bank of Japan, Tokyo.
>
> Netherlands: Nederlandsche Creditverzekering Maatschappij, N.V., Amsterdam.
>
> Norway: Garanti-Instituttet for Exportkreditt, Oslo.
>
> Spain: Compania Espanola de Seguros de Credito y Caucion, S.A., Madrid.
>
> Sweden: Exportkreditnamnden, Stockholm.
>
> Switzerland: Geschaftsstelle fur die Exportrisiko arantie, Zurich.
>
> Union of South Africa: Credit Guarantee Insurance Corp., Ltd., Johannesburg.
>
> United Kingdom: Export Credits Guarantee Department, London. Trade Indemnity Co., Ltd., London.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it is worth reading into the Record, in connection with the point made by the Senator—although I know he is familiar with it—a statement from page 163 of the hearings, to show the normalcy of the operation:

> One of the traditional activities engaged in by Eximbank involves the export of U.S. cotton. For example, in each of the past 12 years Japan has purchased U.S. cotton through credits extended by the U.S. commercial banking system on the guarantee of Eximbank. For the past several years these cotton sales have averaged $60 million per year. This year's arrangements were made in July past. It was agreed that the customary term of 1-year repayment would obtain. Interest was fixed by Eximbank at 4½ percent per annum.

We were talking about this being a great concession. In this case it was 4½ percent per annum.

I continue to read:

> Eximbank then approached 22 U.S. commercial banks designated by the borrower and offered them the alternative of issuing the credit without our guarantee or making the credit with our all-risk guarantee.
>
> We would have been delighted if the banks had been prepared to extend the entire credit without our guarantee and retain the full interest of 4½ percent. In fact, however, only five commercial banks throughout the country were willing to advance $7.1 million without our guarantee and thus earn the full rate of interest, while 17 commercial banks which took the balance of $52.9 million insisted upon the guarantee of Eximbank. This latter group, of course, received a lower rate of interest, the difference being our compensation for the issuance of our guarantee.

Very clearly this is a case directly to the point made by the Senator from Iowa—whether or not this system of guarantees of rather substantial exports is in the normal course of trade. I think it clearly is, the only exception being, as has already been pointed out, that in this case it involves Communist countries. But it is the normal course of trade to extend guarantees on similar terms.

There is a variation in interest in the case of Japan, but in a case like Japan, financially strong though she is, the Bank still requires a guarantee in order to make a loan to engage in trade.

So the Senator from Alabama is certainly on sound ground when he says this is what is contemplated by the phrase "normal commercial terms."

That there has been a misunderstanding is not due to what the President said, but due to the inadequacy of the reporting in the press.

I shall conclude by saying that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] has presented the essential points of the case in an unanswerable way.

I believe the point made by the Senator from South Dakota is also extremely significant.

It is a great mistake for the Congress, particularly in times like these—and I do not mean because we have a new President; I said the same thing and would have said the same thing before the tragedy of the past few days—to tie the hands of the Executive, who is responsible for our foreign relations, in such a way. I think it would be an inhibition on his freedom of action in dealing with a large part of the world—not merely Russia, but the other countries of eastern Europe—and would put him under a great handicap in his efforts to try to loosen the ties that have heretofore bound, and still bind those countries to Moscow, as well as with respect to the President's freedom to deal with Russia herself.

If we are to hold the President responsible—and the country does—for the conduct of our foreign relations in the broadest possible sense, because he is given that function under the Constitution, it would be a great mistake for us to interfere with his freedom of action and then hold him responsible for failure to improve our relations in those areas.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And to improve the deficit in the balance of payments.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am speaking aside from that point. That aspect is discussed by many persons, but I am talking about the other aspect of the question.

To put it another way, if we reject the bill, it will not result in a mandate to the President to go forward under all circumstances. All it does is leave him some discretion. It is still problematical whether the negotiations can overcome the difficulties in the matter of shipping rates and other conditions.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Arkansas may have heard the majority leader, at the beginning of the discussion, say that it was not at all certain that the deal would go through.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is not at all certain.

Let me read from page 171 of the hearings. This was an exchange between the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] and Mr. Linder:

> Senator Clark. In fact everybody in the Western World is extending these normal credits to the Russians to advance trade on what you say is the normal commercial term, which in this case would be 18 months, and the experience with respect to repayment has been good?
>
> Mr. Linder. That is correct, sir. As a matter of fact, they have extended substantially longer terms than we are discussing.

There has been evidence and there has been discussion in the papers that recent negotiations in Europe among Western European countries were concerned with reaching some concession, a 5-year extension of credit by the Western European countries. We are not advocating that. That is true, of course, of all the Western countries.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Just above the part that the Senator was quoting, Mr. Linder, made this answer to a question from the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark]:

> I would say that at the present time, West Germany has credits outstanding on terms up to 5 years, and possibly longer.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We are asking for 18 months, with 25 percent down, and 25 percent every 6 months.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Congress almost daily complains of the Executive usurping its power. I believe this is a clear example of the Congress seeking to infringe upon Executive power in negotiations as a part of our foreign relations with respect to trade.

It would be quite proper for Congress, if it wished to do so, to adopt the broad principle that hereafter we shall have no trade of any kind, and break relations with these countries. That would be the establishment of a policy. However, to interfere in this manner with the executive department's freedom of action, is, I believe, indefensible. It is an indefensible way to approach the problem. If that is what they want to do, they should be honest about it and say, "Let us break relations with the Communist bloc countries, and have no trade with them at all."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, inasmuch as the debate is getting unnecessarily complicated, I should like to simplify it by asking two or three questions of the Senator from Alabama. What is the function of the executive branch of the Government in consummating the sale of grain products to Communist countries or Eastern European countries? What is the responsibility of the Executive in that connection?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Insofar as it involves a foreign policy position or a foreign policy matter, that is a power that resides in the executive branch.

Mr. AIKEN. In the executive branch of the Government?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator consider that the President has control over the operations of the executive branch?

Mr. SPARKMAN. He is the head of the executive branch.

Mr. AIKEN. Would it be possible for the President of the United States to order a cessation of business with European countries or to refuse to permit consummation of deals with Eastern European countries?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I assume he would have that power. Of course, he would have to consider that he might meet a great deal of opposition. After all, the President must more or less keep in step with public opinion.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Alabama believe that President Johnson would use that power to the detriment of the United States?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I certainly do not.

Mr. AIKEN. What does the Senator believe will be the opinion of foreign countries in the event Congress deprives President Johnson of that power, or undertakes to deprive him of that power?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I started to say "undertakes to deprive him of that power." In that event, I believe they would view our action as weakening the power of the President.

Mr. AIKEN. Would it not be a vote of no confidence in President Johnson?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. It could be construed that way.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Would it be played up in any country which had a tendency to be hostile or disapproving of our form of government?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. The Senator's reasoning is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. I think that is the principal issue before us now.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe that is the point the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] was dealing with. It involves the power of the Executive.

Mr. AIKEN. It is a question of whether we will give President Johnson, in his first week in office, a vote of confidence or a vote of no confidence, at a time when the administration has not had a chance to even get its chair warm.

We should have enough confidence in President Lyndon B. Johnson to feel that if he saw trade with any country becoming detrimental to the United States, he would take steps to stop that trade, and to take any other steps that would be necessary. I for one am not going to belittle the President of the United States, and I am not going to belittle Lyndon B. Johnson by giving him a vote of no confidence and say to him that he will not stand up for his own country and do what is right. Therefore, I shall vote against the proposal of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from Vermont. He has well stated the case. I have served for 27 years with Lyndon Johnson. I served with him in the House, and I served with him in the Senate. Of course I have served in the Senate while he was the Presiding Officer of the Senate in his office of Vice President, and now I serve under him in his capacity as President of the United States.

Based upon the close connection I have had with him and all that I have known about him, I have absolute confidence in him. As great as was the tragedy of President Kennedy's taking, I have often thought how fortunate it was that we had a man so well prepared to take over the reins of Government.

I agree with the Senator from Vermont. I do not intend to give a vote of no confidence to President Johnson. Of course, I supported the proposed sale under President Kennedy too.

By the way, later in the debate, I trust the majority leader will speak on this matter and that he will state the position of both President Kennedy and President Johnson. Of course, we know what President Kennedy's position was. I believe we all know, even without being told, what the position of President Johnson is.

We should be holding him up and giving him encouragement as he performs the constitutional duty of setting the course of the foreign policy of this country. That duty belongs to the President of the United States. When a foreign policy question is involved, as there is here, it is the function of the President of the United States to perform that duty.

On October 10 of this year President Kennedy sent a letter to the Vice President of the United States, as President of the Senate, in which he discussed the proposed sale of wheat. I wish to read the terms he talked about. I understood it was to be gold on the barrelhead, cash in dollars. I wish to read what the President of the United States said when he communicated with us the first time, on October 10, 1963. He said:

> These sales would be concluded by private American grain dealers for American dollars or gold, either cash on delivery or under normal commercial credit terms.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to finish this point; then I shall yield. That is what the President of the United States said. That is the first thing that came before us. Instead of offering what somebody else may have said or what a newspaper headline may have said, why do we not quote what the President of the United States said with respect to the terms under which the sales would be made? They are exactly the terms which have been brought before us. In his news conference, held, if I recall correctly, on the same day, he said the same thing. Not only that, but when Secretary Rusk testified before the Committee on Foreign Relations, he said the same thing.

Mr. AIKEN. He said the wheat would be sold either for cash or on normal terms, that there was no intention of offering extraordinary credit.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. As I recall, someone asked what the term of credit would be, and I believe he said it would not be more than 3 years.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As we were told, the terms were to be 25 percent cash and 25 percent every 6 months, in three installments.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is what we were told by the witnesses who appeared before our committee.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Inasmuch as my senior colleague is the one who has made the argument about the understanding with respect to credit terms, and since he is not at present in the Chamber, perhaps I should say something about this subject. I, too, understood that the sales would be for gold or hard dollars or on a regular commercial credit basis. I simply wished to confirm what the senior Senator from Iowa quoted the President as having said.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I call the attention of Senators to the fact that the statement is found on page 25 of the hearings, in the very first paragraph. I thought Senators might wish to read it for themselves.

Mr. MILLER. I do not have any qualms about that; but I share the reaction and the shock of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] when we learned that the Export-Import Bank would possibly underwrite some of the long-term credit or commercial credit.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Short-term credit.

Mr. MILLER. Let us call it normal commercial credit. I venture to say that while the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Arkansas may have had a crystal-clear image of what was behind the normal commercial credit transaction, hardly one in a thousand taxpayers would have so understood it. I think that was the point the senior Senator from Iowa was making, and that is the point I wish to make.

It is most unfortunate that anyone should suggest that because one might support the bill introduced by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt], he therefore does not trust the President. That is an old cliche, and every Member of the Senate knows on what shifting sands such a specious argument rests. I propose to support the bill of the Senator from South Dakota, and my support of the President will be just as good as the support of Senators who make such a specious argument, if not better. I hope we will not hear any more of that in the Chamber, this year or any other year.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator from Iowa hurry, because I have been using a great deal of my time. No time has been yielded by the other side, except perhaps 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from South Dakota assured me that he would yield as much time as might be necessary for me from the time available on his side. Is the Senator from Utah in control of the time on the side of the proponents of the bill?

Mr. BENNETT. I assume that I am.

Mr. MILLER. Will the Senator be willing to yield 5 minutes with that understanding?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, first may I ask how much time remains on the side of the opponents of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The opponents of the bill have about 130 minutes remaining.

Mr. SPARKMAN. To be perfectly frank, although I understand that 8 hours has been allocated for the consideration of the bill, I had hoped it would be possible to reduce that amount of time by one-half, and that we could probably finish with the bill in about 4 hours. If the time were to be reduced to 4 hours, I would have about 10 minutes remaining on my side.

Does the Senator from Utah wish to ask me questions?

Mr. BENNETT. I wish to place some figures in the Record.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have finished my remarks.

Mr. BENNETT. I should like to ask the Senator some questions.

Mr. SPARKMAN. May I yield to the Senator from Utah for that purpose, and then yield the floor?

Mr. MILLER. Very well.

Mr. BENNETT. My question relates to the statement made by the Senator, a statement which has run through the debate all afternoon; that is, whether the sale was to be for money. Just before I rose, the Senator from Alabama quoted from the hearings a statement in a letter dated October 16, which the President wrote to the Vice President, saying that the sale would be for cash or on ordinary commercial terms.

I have in my hand the New York Times of October 10, which contains a verbatim report of the President's news conference on that day. One of the questions, No. 19, related to the wheat deal. I shall not read all of it, but at the end the questioner asked:

> Do grain dealers take the risk then?

The answer was:

> The grain dealers will take the risks with the private banks.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. So the President left out of his statement any reference to Federal guarantees.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. I only talked about whether the terms would be cash on the barrelhead, in gold or dollars. That was the proposal. But the President did say, in the same news interview, that it would be gold or dollars, cash on delivery, under normal trade conditions.

Mr. BENNETT. That is not in the interview. That is in the letter.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; and it is in the interview, too, because I read it only a few days ago, not necessarily in the New York Times, but probably in the Washington Post. The President made the same statement: For American dollars or gold, either cash on delivery or under normal commercial credit terms. I am sure that was his answer.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah should say, perhaps, that this question, asked by a reporter, clarified the question of what were "ordinary commercial terms"; the President stated:

> The grain dealers will take the risks with the private banks.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; and that was explained by Mr. Linder, who said that if the credit could be obtained, then the Export-Import Bank would not step into the picture at all.

Mr. Linder said that when the Export-Import Bank was approached, he talked with the presidents or the chairmen of the boards of the 12 largest banks in the United States, and they said they could not handle the deal. In other words, the Export-Import Bank was not qualified to enter the transaction until after that. The Export-Import Bank, under section 2(b), is required to supplement and encourage and not compete with private capital. If the banks can do it unassisted, the Export-Import Bank cannot get into the matter at all.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not true that when American banks finance exports by other countries to Eastern European countries, including Russia, some Government agency, similar to our Export-Import Bank, in each of those countries insures the financing by our banks for the export of commodities by other countries to Russia and other Eastern European countries?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; we were told that practically every country that engages in a sizable amount of export business has established an agency similar to our Export-Import Bank, and that some of them actually use our banks to finance the transactions.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. Much of the wheat that is being exported to Russia and other Eastern European countries is being financed by U.S. banks, if we were correctly informed; but the insurance is offered by the agencies of the other governments, not by the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Vermont has just raised an interesting question. It is answered by Mr. Linder on page 171 of the hearings.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. The reason why I yield to the Senator from Vermont was that I thought he probably would read it.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Linder said:

> The experience of the British, French, and the German governmental export credit insurers, who have insured credit sales to bloc countries for quite a few years, has been excellent.

I think this is interesting:

> Payments have been prompt, there have been no delinquencies, and, of course, there have been no defaults.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; the Senator from Kansas is correct.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Earlier this afternoon—this is a point which I think should be brought out—it was said that privately owned grain amounted to some 300 million bushels. I refer Senators to the Record of November 15, page 21943. There the Senator from Alabama will find that I quoted from a U.S. Department of Agriculture Research Service statement. I said:

> In its "Wheat Situation," also referred to as the "1964 Outlook Issue," released on September 5—well before any determination of a United States-Soviet wheat deal—USDA's Economic Research Service noted the "free" or privately held supply of old-crop wheat on July 1, 1963, was about 4 million bushels.

It was not 300 million bushels.

If that is so, would not that make considerable difference in the advantage of the wheat sale, insofar as storage costs are concerned?

Mr. SPARKMAN. If I correctly understood the Senator's statement, it would make a great difference in relieving our Government of storage costs, because more of the Government's own wheat would be taken to fill the order, and therefore that much storage would be eliminated.

Earlier in the afternoon we discussed this question with the Senator from North Dakota, and I think there must be some error in the figure the Senator from Iowa has given. I think it depends on the definition of the term "free wheat." The point is that the farmers who harvested their wheat—and, of course, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson] knows much more about this than I do—in May or in July——

Mr. CARLSON. In June.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The wheat produced by those who took advantage of the Government's support price went into Government storage—not under sale contracts, but under Government storage contracts, by which they retain title for 1 year.

Mr. AIKEN. With only 400 million bushels available, we shall be short.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. But if, instead of 400 million or 200 million bushels of free wheat in storage, there were only 4 million bushels——

Mr. SPARKMAN. But I am sure the 4-million-bushel figure cannot be correct. As I have said, I think much depends on the definition of "free wheat." I think the Senator from North Dakota gave a better figure when he said there are about 300 million bushels.

Can the Senator from Kansas help us in this connection?

Mr. CARLSON. I assure Senators that the wheat in storage is much more than 4 million bushels, even though the figures used vary.

Mr. MILLER. I was quoting from the figures set forth in the September 5 issue of the 1964 Outlook, published by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, which notes that:

> The free or privately held supply of old crop wheat on July 1, 1963, was about 4 million bushels.

That is not my figure; it has been supplied by a Government agency.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But that figure would not include this year's crop. I am sure there is some mistake.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I do not want anyone to gain the impression that we do not have substantial quantities of wheat for our domestic consumption or great quantities of wheat for export. If we sell 300 million bushels of wheat to Russia and to the satellite countries, we shall still have 750 million bushels on hand on July 1 of next year. So there will be plenty of wheat.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield briefly to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I have received an interesting telegram from Clifford Hope, who, I think, is somewhat familiar with the wheat situation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. If anyone in the United States is familiar with it, Cliff Hope is. As the Senator from Kansas knows, I had the pleasure of serving in the House of Representatives with him and with Clifford Hope. Mr. Hope is one of the finest Members ever to serve in the House of Representatives. He was a very fine chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and he knows agriculture.

Mr. CARLSON. He is nationally recognized as one who not only knows agriculture, but also is sympathetic with its problems. As the Senator from Alabama has said, Clifford Hope was chairman and ranking member of that committee for 30 years in the House of Representatives.

Only 10 minutes ago I received the following telegram:

> GARDEN CITY, KANS.,
> *November 26, 1963.*
> Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
> *U.S. Senate,*
> *Washington, D.C.:*
>
> Sales to Russia and other countries in Eastern Europe as proposed will practically double our dollar sales of wheat. This is important and desirable from standpoints of expanding foreign trade, improving balance-of-payments position, and cutting Government expenditures. It will enable us to reduce wheat carryover to manageable proportions and give U.S. wheat producers their share of the world's cash wheat market. Hope you will oppose Mundt bill and any other measures which will prevent use of Export-Import Bank insurance on dollar sales.
>
> CLIFFORD HOPE, Sr.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter received by me from the Kansas Association of Wheat Growers.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> KANSAS ASSOCIATION OF WHEAT GROWERS,
> *Dodge City, Kans., November 21, 1963.*
> Senator FRANK CARLSON,
> *Senate Office Building,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of our executive board of directors I wish to notify you that the members of the Kansas Association of Wheat Growers at convention in Dodge City on November 7, 1963, reaffirmed their stand on wheat sales to Russia.
>
> To reiterate, our policy stands thus: "We recommend a reappraisal of our Government's position with regard to sale of wheat to Russia. We believe that U.S. wheat should be sold to any purchasers willing to pay in cash, taking into consideration maintaining the security of the United States and the promotion of world peace and understanding."
>
> We wish to further commend you for your stand on this vital matter.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> JIM GUNN,
> *Executive Secretary.*

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, how much time has been used thus far?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCINTYRE in the chair). One-hundred thirty-two minutes remain under the control of the Senator from Alabama; 203 minutes remain under the control of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am about through.

Mr. MUNDT. Then I suggest that the other side now use some time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Very well.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] wishes to ask a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; and at this time I yield briefly to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Texas.

The Senator from Alabama will recall that I wished to ask him another question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sorry I overlooked it.

Mr. MILLER. I have been listening to this debate, and I am not yet sure on what premise the Senator from Alabama has based his case. He has pointed out, with considerable emphasis, that the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee said credit worthiness is not at issue in this case. I take it that so far as the Senator from Alabama is concerned, that is not an argument either for or against this proposal.

Is this a case in which the Senator is stating that the policy should be a firm extension of credit guarantees by the Export-Import Bank, merely because it is necessary to do so in order to have credit available to those of our allies who are selling to the Soviets? Is that the main thrust of his argument; or is it that this is only the general proposition—as the Senator from Arkansas has said—of never tying the hands of the President in regard to such a matter?

If the Senator will clarify this point, I think that will help us. I have heard many non sequitur arguments and cliches which are not helping this case at all.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly I have not attempted to argue that the Export-Import Bank should be given this right in order to have comparable credit terms available. The Bank already has that right. This bill seeks to take it away from the Bank; but I say that should not be done.

Furthermore, our foreign policy—and the question of whether we shall have dealings with other countries does involve our foreign policy—is for the President of the United States to decide.

President Kennedy decided in the affirmative and on October 10 he wrote a letter to the then Vice President of the United States, who is now the President of the United States, and that same day held a news conference in which he said he was advocating the sale of the wheat. I do not believe either in taking the powers away from the Export-Import Bank or trying to take powers away from the President of the United States. I say that, and I say it deliberately.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, may I ask a further question? I am not sure I correctly understand the position of the Senator from Alabama. The Senator has said that he is not in favor of taking powers away from the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER. Is the reason he is not in favor of doing that his concern that we would not be able to have our private commercial firms extend comparable credit to that of firms of our allies who are selling to the Soviet Union?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is the reason I am not in favor of crippling the Export-Import Bank. I could probably give the Senator several reasons. The principal reason is that Congress established the Export-Import Bank before most of us came to Congress—in 1934. It has been doing business for 29 years.

It has grossed a profit of approximately $2 billion. It has paid $1 billion or more into the Treasury of the United States. I have just been informed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] that the amount is $1.2 billion. I do not believe Dr. Linder gave that figure. He testified on it. It is in the neighborhood of $1 billion. In addition, they have a reserve of $840 million.

I have heard statements about the use of the taxpayers' money. The proposal would not require the use of taxpayers' money. There is an insurance premium, if one wishes to call it "insurance." It is a guarantee. A premium of five-eighths of 1 percent is charged on all of the credit extended in order to build up the reserve which they have maintained against any loss.

If every dime of the loan were lost, the most that could possibly be lost would not be one-third of the $840 million reserve.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. First, I should like to include in the RECORD the figures found on page 162 of the hearings. The paragraph is very short:

> Interest and guarantee fees earned amounted to some $1.717 billion. Out of this income the Bank has paid the U.S. Treasury $466 million in interest on borrowed funds (including earned but unpaid interest as of September 30); it has paid the U.S. Treasury $356 million in dividends on the Bank's capital stock and it has built up a reserve against contingencies of $840.4 million.

During the 29 years it has been in existence, the Export-Import Bank has authorized $13,800 million in loans, and has disbursed against them approximately $9.2 billion.

Repayments have amounted to $5,600 million which is about 60 percent of what the Bank has disbursed. I said a while ago that the reason I did not believe in crippling the Export-Import Bank is that it was set up in 1934, and that during its 29 years it has had a remarkable record of efficiency and effectiveness, with practically no loss. It has made money for the United States. Through the years, the members of its Board of Directors have shown good business judgment. They have made money. They have saved it. They have not departed from normal procedures in respect to the proposed transactions.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am sure the Senator will recall that the original act creating the Export-Import Bank contemplated as one of the reasons for its existence financing trade with Russia.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. It was set up for the primary purpose of extending credit to Russia.

Mr. TOWER. What year was that?

Mr. SPARKMAN. 1934.

Mr. TOWER. Why is it, then, that the Bank has never loaned them any money?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Because it did not find the situation right. The Bank did not think the credit was good.

Mr. TOWER. Is it not because it found they were a bad credit risk?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Today, after England and France and West Germany and our friends in Western Europe have had years of doing billions of dollars' worth of trade or business with them, without loss, without delay, they have decided that, just as the Senator from Virginia, the chairman of the committee, decided and stated on the floor today, their credit worthiness is not an issue.

Mr. MILLER. When the Senator from Alabama gets down to the heart of his argument, is he ready to say that the reason he did not wish to take away the power of the Export-Import Bank was that to do so would not enable commercial traders to do business on the same credit terms as commercial traders in the countries of our allies?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I said there were several reasons. If the Senator wishes to state it in those words, that is all right as one of the reasons. But I prefer to put it on the basis that the Bank has shown during the 29 years of its operation that it is composed of good business people. They have extended good credit; they have guaranteed loans upon which they have collected premiums virtually with no loss, if there was any loss at all during the years. They have earned around $2 billion gross profit during that time. They have done a remarkable business job, and I am willing to trust them in the job they propose to do.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama this question: When he says that if all the credit under the wheat sales proposed should become in default it would not cost the taxpayers any money, it appears to me that there would be less in dividends to be paid.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly. I do not care to argue the point. I do not argue that there is no risk to be taken. What I do say is that they have determined that a guarantee premium of five-eighths of 1 percent is sufficient to cover that risk. I am willing to take their judgment because they have shown through their efficient, effective, successful, and profitable operations during the past 29 years that their judgment has been good. I am willing to risk it again. If I were a stockholder in a bank that had a board of directors that had a record like that, I would gladly take any decision that they made. I believe we should be glad to do it in the case of the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Alabama for responding.

Mr. President, I hope the discussion has been helpful in narrowing the arguments, because there have been too many arguments that I do not believe have been responsive to the problem facing us.

Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the Senator from Iowa allow a little time to revert to me so that I may yield to the Senator from Missouri for one question?

Mr. MILLER. May I first yield to the Senator from Texas? The Senator from Texas can then yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is satisfactory.

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from Missouri in the fervent hope that he will be succinct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Texas.

I shall vote against the bill because I wish to get the administration started off on the best possible basis, and they are opposed.

However, there is one problem that worries me a great deal, and I believe it is to the credit of the Senator from South Dakota that he brought it up.

The theory of capitalism is risk capital. There is no risk of any kind in this deal when the Government guarantees against loss. The idea we are making a private enterprise deal out of it by letting private people profit from it just does not add up to me.

It is true that the Export-Import Bank has a large surplus, and any loss would come out of that surplus.

I have done business abroad. Everybody who does business abroad wants a guarantee, so as not to lose money but usually normally there is no guarantee. It is normal not to have a guarantee.

We wish to sell the grain. I believe that more than 50 percent of our total agricultural surplus is in wheat, though I have not examined the figures lately. We wish to get rid of much of it.

I hope we can get rid of our surplus by offering inducements to obtain gold in return, instead of being forced to make arrangements which will result in a profit to people who are taking no risks for the profit they will get out of it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I agree with much of what the Senator from Missouri has said.

The Senator mentioned they were not to take any risks. They are not to take a risk because they will pay an insurance premium.

Perhaps I do not take any risk when I drive my automobile, but I would not drive it around the block without having it insured. I pay an insurance premium to get an insurance company to take the risk off my hands.

There will be the payment of five-eighths of a percent on every dollar involved, in order to obtain the insurance.

We are now operating under an insurance program.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Five-eighths of a dollar, or five-eighths of 1 percent?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Five-eighths of 1 percent.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is not a very tall risk.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is a pretty good premium.

What is paid for insuring bank deposits? I believe that is now one-twelfth of 1 percent.

What is paid for insuring FHA loans? There are billions of dollars tied up in FHA insured loans. I believe that premium is one-fourth of 1 percent, and many people argue that it should be reduced to one-eighth of 1 percent.

Five-eighths of 1 percent is a little higher premium than ordinarily is charged, and is considered to be a proper insurance premium on this loan.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the Senator know what the profits of the private contractors in question will be?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No. I do not believe anybody knows, because the negotiations have not been fully worked out. We must also remember that the private grain dealers have certain knotty problems of transportation yet to solve.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have been investigating an agricultural transaction that has me somewhat disturbed. The foreign country in question selects the private contractor in America, but there is no way of finding out what is the profit of the contractor in question.

Will there be any limitation on the profit to be made by the contractors? Will there be any renegotiation, or redetermination?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not know. I am not sure that anybody would have any control over that. This is to be a private enterprise transaction.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not see how the Senator can say it will be a private enterprise transaction, when any loss to the private enterprise entrepreneur is guaranteed by the Government.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is not the mortgage guarantee business in this country private enterprise? They run to the FHA.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is the Senator comparing the mortgage guarantee business and the FHA operations in this country to giving credit to the Communists?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No. I am comparing it to the operations of the private grain dealers who are negotiating this transaction. The Government did not negotiate it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. A businessman is subject to renegotiation for business he does in America. Why should he not be subject to renegotiation when he does business with Russia? Especially when it is Government business on which he profits, but without risk.

Mr. SPARKMAN. He may be. I do not know.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would like to yield the floor and leave the Chamber for a while, because I have been on my feet for quite a long time.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator for his gracious courtesy in answering my questions.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from South Dakota really has a right to the floor.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the proponents of the bill really have had practically nothing to say on the bill, except that the chairman has presented the legislation. I believe we are entitled to make some of our case at this time, and then divide the use of the time. Otherwise, we shall be out of context from the standpoint of available time to discuss issues as they are brought up.

Mr. President, I now yield 15 new minutes to the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. I understand the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] took 14½ minutes of the first 15 minutes yielded, so I now yield the Senator 15 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Texas?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have no objection. I believe the Senator would like to have the time necesary for the call of the roll not charged to his time.

Mr. TOWER. Yes, Mr. President. I also ask unanimous consent that the time consumed during the call of the roll not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I have been consistently opposed to the idea——

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, may we have order so we can hear the Senator from Texas?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania, and I am flattered to know that he wants to hear.

Mr. President, I have consistently opposed the idea of selling foodstuffs to the Soviet Union. I regard foodstuffs as strategic goods. Napoleon said that an army marches on its stomach, and that certainly includes the Red armies. I think the most notable failure in the Communist bloc has been the failure in the field of agricultural production. The Soviet Union has many more acres under cultivation than we have. I think it has 50 percent again as much as we have under cultivation in this country. Yet the per man productivity is much lower than ours. It has had singular failures in its agricultural production.

I think selling wheat to the Soviet Union would be helping Khrushchev out of a difficult domestic problem, one which would tend to promote domestic discontent.

Furthermore, we have no assurance that this wheat will not find its way to Castro's Cuba or Mao Tse-tung's China. We do not know what Russia intends to do with it.

Perhaps she intends to stockpile it and release her domestic production for use in world trade. I think any agricultural expert will tell us that our wheat stores better than Russian wheat does.

So I think the whole idea of selling wheat to the Soviet Union is unwise.

I think it is a specious argument that simply because our friends are selling wheat and other foodstuffs to the Soviet Union, we should get in on it and make a little money, ourselves.

That is like saying to the owner of a hardware store whose competitor is selling switchblade knives to juvenile delinquents, "Since they are going to buy switchblade knives, you may as well sell them, yourself, and get in on the profits and compete with the man across the street."

I do not think that is a wise argument. I think it runs contrary to American policy. Our policy has been not to do business in strategic goods with Communist-bloc countries. We have used pressure, moral persuasion, and a little of everything else, to convince our allies they should not do business with the Soviet Union. Now we are going to recapitulate and do that very thing ourselves. I think it shows a singular weakness in the morality of the Nation that we abandon a position aimed at furthering the cause of the free world, in order to get a little gold exchange and get rid of a little surplus wheat.

Actually, that is not really the argument here today. The argument is whether or not we are going to extend credit for this purchase of wheat. If the Mundt bill is enacted, it will not preclude or prevent the United States from selling wheat to the Soviet Union. This could still be done.

I personally believe selling wheat to the Soviet Union is contrary at least to the spirit of the Latta amendment, if not the letter of it.

If the Mundt bill passes, it will not alter in any way the ability of the administration to proceed with the wheat negotiations. It will not prevent the administration from selling wheat at all.

The issue has been harped on by the Senator from Alabama to the effect that credit worthiness is not an issue. He kept quoting the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] to the effect that it is not an issue. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and I may not agree as to the result, but we do agree on what is the important issue. I think credit worthiness is an issue. I think it is obvious that the Soviet Union is a poor credit risk.

It has been said over and over that with 29 years of experience the Export-Import Bank has shown it is a moneymaking operation—which it is, and which nobody denies—that it is always sound in its loans and in its practices—which is also true. It has been a moneymaker. As a matter of fact, it is the only moneymaking agency I know of besides the FBI. It makes money. I think the Export-Import Bank is a fine agency. I sat shoulder to shoulder with my colleagues in the conference committee holding out for an extension of the Export-Import Bank. I think it is a fine agency and should be preserved.

That is one of the very reasons why I favor the Mundt proposal.

In this instance I think we are extending credit to a bad risk. The fact that the past performance of the Bank has been good does not mean the Russians are good credit risks. I cannot see the relevance of that argument at all.

Let us have a look at the Soviet record. We are well aware that the Soviets have not lived up to their word, to their treaty commitments, and agreements on many subjects; but they are also very poor at paying off their bills. We have been lending Communist Russia money since March 1941. We advanced them $222,494,574. Of that amount, $205,709,633 is in default and has not been paid.

What kind of credit risk is the Soviet Union? The interest rate on those loans was 2⅜ percent, by the way. I cannot get a loan at 2⅜ percent at my bank.

In addition to those loans, there was $11 billion in lend-lease. We have allowed Russia to negotiate us down to $800 million from that $11 billion amount, and Russia will not even pay the $800 million.

In addition, as a condition of recognition, going back to the Litvinov agreement, Russia agreed to recognize the outstanding obligations of the czarist governments. Immediately after this country recognized Soviet Russia she refused to pay the claims we made against the czarist government.

This is the treatment we have been receiving, and I cannot see how anybody can say that the Soviet Union is a good credit risk.

It has been stated by the Senator from Alabama that the taxpayers will not be losing anything if the Soviet Union defaults. This simply is not true Who owns the stock in the Export-Import Bank? It is the taxpayers. Mr. Linder has said "they own our reserve just as they own our stock." Mr. Linder acknowledges the ownership of the American people, through whose funds the Export-Import Bank was established. So it will be a loss to the taxpayers. This has been a profitmaking operation. If it ceases to be a profitmaking operation, it is going to cost the American taxpayer.

It has been contended that the wheat deal will not go through if we fail to allow the Export-Import Bank to extend credit, if we pass the Mundt amendment. But if it is a good credit risk, why are not the commercial banks willing to assume the risk, and why would the passage of the Mundt bill in any way inhibit the wheat deal? If it is such a good risk and such a good deal, I think adequate financing can be found in the commercial banks.

I fear we are placing ourselves in the position of financing both sides of the cold war by agreeing to underwrite this wheat deal. I take issue with the Senator from Alabama in his contention that the blue ribbon advisory board—and it is a blue ribbon advisory board, because some very able men served on that board—considered this question. Mr. Linder, in his testimony, said he did not know about the Latta amendment, and did not know it existed until the morning he appeared before our committee to testify. He said that it had not been discussed by the advisory board, that they had no knowledge of it, and they did not take it into consideration. I submit that the Latta amendment is plainly congressional policy. Failure to pass the bill of the Senator from South Dakota would mean reversing congressional policy. It was the intent of Congress at the time the amendment was adopted that we should not subsidize foodstuffs to the Soviet Union. The advisory board did not take that into consideration. It should be pointed out that this is not an ordinary commercial transaction; this is a foreign policy matter, and a foreign policy decision. When it becomes Government policy that credit should be extended by the Export-Import Bank, the bank will yield to the pressures and approve something that might not be done under ordinary practices.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Did I rightly understand my friend from Texas to say that the advisory board or committee had not passed on the propriety of the proposed sale?

Mr. TOWER. They did. Secretary Dillon said they had not, but Mr. Linder, when he testified, corrected that point and said that they had. When it was presented to them, I believe it was a fait accompli, and the committee was asked to give approval retroactively. Apparently they had not taken into consideration some of the angles. They apparently did not take into consideration congressional policy previously established.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I have not reached a conclusion on the pending proposal. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Texas, the Senator from Pennsylvania, the Senator from Alabama, or some other Senator. If no risk is involved, why should the interest rate be 5 percent? It seems to me that a government guarantee makes the loan as good as a government bond.

Mr. TOWER. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. There may be some reason for it. I raise the question because I do not know the answer. Perhaps the Senator from Pennsylvania can tell me.

Mr. TOWER. I believe 5½ percent is the Canadian rate, and 5 percent is our rate.

Mr. CLARK. Yes. From our rate the banks must deduct a five-eighths of 1 percent premium for insurance. The net return is about 4⅜ percent. Of course, the American deal was negotiated with the Russians in the light of the deal with the Canadians, which the Canadians had already negotiated. To some extent that was a precedent. However, in Canada the interest rates are normally higher. The Russians were able to get from us a slightly lower interest rate.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to supplement what the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has said by pointing out that while those were the asking terms, the results were not quite so satisfactory from the standpoint of America, because the Canadians got 80 percent in cash and 20 percent in credit. Here it is proposed that America get 25 percent in cash and 75 percent in credit.

Mr. CLARK. I do not believe that is exactly accurate. The actual agreement with Canada, as I understand it, permitted the Russians to have 75 or 80 percent in credit, extending for as long as 18 months, and only 20 or 25 percent in cash. After the deal was signed, sealed, and delivered, the Russians decided, in order to save on the interest rate, to pay more cash.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Texas has expired.

Mr. CLARK. I yield 2 minutes on our side, to complete this discussion.

When our deal was signed, sealed, and delivered, we had no way of knowing whether the Russians would pay 25 percent in cash or 50 percent in cash, or owe any cash. In the case of Canada they paid a larger amount in cash than required under the contract.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. TOWER. The Senator from New Hampshire, I believe, wishes to ask me a question.

Mr. COTTON. One point bothers me; and I should like to have the Senator from Texas, who has contributed so ably to the discussion, touch upon it. I am not sure from what source these statements come, but I do know that I listened to panel discussions on television, in the early days of the discussion of the proposed wheat deal with Russia, and I also heard statements in the Senate, to the effect that one of the benefits to be derived from the wheat sale would be the effect on the imbalance of gold. It was asserted that it would bring gold back into this country, in our endeavor to relieve the imbalance-of-payments situation.

That was one point that the distinguished Senator from Texas did not comment on. I wonder if he would say something on that point.

Mr. TOWER. The Senator has raised a vital and important question. The proposed deal will reach proportions of around $250 million. If we spread it over a long period of time, it will be only a dribble from the standpoint of improving our balance of payments.

At the present time our gold reserves are about $16 billion, which is a drop from $23 billion in 1952. The claims held against the reserves amount to about $25 billion. Therefore, we have had an annual attrition rate of about $700 million. If we are to extend credits, instead of demanding payment in cash, and spread out the deal, it will be a drop in the bucket so far as the attrition on our gold reserves is concerned.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to say to my friend from New Hampshire that the arrangement is 25 percent cash on the barrelhead required, 25 percent cash on the barrelhead required in 6 months, 25 percent more cash required on the barrelhead in 12 months, and finally cash required on the barrelhead in 18 months. The Senator may consider this as trifling, but I believe it is a very great advantage from the standpoint of the balance-of-payments situation, extended as it is, I agree, over a period of 18 months, with half of it paid within 6 months.

Mr. COTTON. If we get it.

Mr. CLARK. Yes; if we get it.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from New Hampshire said he did not know exactly where he got the idea that it was accepted around the country that these deals were to be for cash on the barrelhead. He is not the only one who had that impression. The same impression was held over in the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Sylvia Porter is an economic analyst and a syndicated columnist, with a large circulation in many newspapers. She is paid for writing and for reporting actions of the government which have relation to the financial people who read the newspapers and who are her clients.

To illustrate: In her column entitled "Wheat Sales To Aid Balance of Payments," published in the Minneapolis Tribune of November 14, 1963, and in many other newspapers, she said:

> The wheat being sold to Russia and the Soviet bloc is to be paid for in gold and hard cash.

Her entire column appears in the hearings. She points out how this transaction would have a helpful reaction upon our balance-of-payments problems. But she, without equivocation of any kind, without reservation of any kind, and writing for pay, to advise the people who read her columns about the nature of the wheat deal, said categorically:

> The wheat being sold to Russia and the Soviet bloc is to be paid for in gold and hard cash.

So the understanding of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and many of the rest of us is that that was the way in which the deal was proposed.

Mr. TOWER. Does not the Senator from South Dakota feel that if the Russians really need the wheat, we should get the most favorable terms possible from Russia and get cash on the barrelhead?

Mr. MUNDT. Precisely; and Russia has the cash.

If the Russians desperately need the wheat, we should get not only cash, but also some concession with respect to Vietnam, some concession with respect to the autobahn to Berlin; some concession with respect to Cuba, our next-door neighbor. If Russia really needs wheat, we are in a bargaining position which we would destroy once we sold her the wheat on credit.

Mr. TOWER. If Russia really needed the wheat, I would be willing to give it to her, but only after we had obtained some favorable concession in return, not through some financial uncertainty.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In line with what the Senator from New Hampshire said, it is proposed that we sell $250 million worth of wheat for 25 percent cash down and the other 75 percent payable when and if Russia decides she wants to pay, and Russia is a nation which not only has not paid her debts in the past but absolutely refuses to acknowledge that she owes us anything.

Mr. TOWER. That is correct. I said a moment ago that there is a sorry record of experience with respect to Russian repayments of debt.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Is it not proposed in the sales agreement that not only should we trust Russia for 75 percent of the wheat payments but that we should sell it to her at 60 cents a bushel lower than the price at which American consumers can buy it?

Mr. TOWER. We would be subsidizing the wheat sold to Russia.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We would be subsidizing it at the rate of about 60 cents a bushel. Under the plan the wheat would be sold to Russia for 60 cents a bushel less than the price at which Americans can buy it.

Mr. TOWER. The Americans would be subsidizing both sides of the cold war.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. There would be nothing to prohibit Russia, when she gets the wheat, from diverting the Russian ships to Cuba or Communist China, and we could not stop her.

Mr. TOWER. That is correct. Even if we wanted some commitment from Russia that she would not give or sell wheat to Red China or Cuba, Russia could release some of her domestically grown wheat to be shipped to those countries.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is true; but would there be any control over the wheat once we shipped it from the United States?

Mr. TOWER. Certainly not.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There would be no way in which we could say that Russia could not or would not ship the wheat to Cuba or to Communist China.

Mr. MUNDT. What the Senator from Delaware has brought up by his interrogatories is, of course, correct. But the situation is even worse than that, because if we were able to control the situation and make the Russians eat and consume American wheat, there would be no way under high heaven in which we could prevent Russia from shipping her own wheat to Cuba or Red China.

So at best what we would get out of the credit deal would be that the Russians might have to eat American wheat. That would enable them to provide their own wheat, so that the Cubans and Red Chinese would eat Russian wheat which would become available, because the Russians would have filled up their shortages which they had available for export.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I repeat there is nothing that would prevent the identical wheat from going to Red China or Cuba. Once our Government had shipped it, it would have no control over it. That is evidenced by the situation that I called to the attention of the Senate as recently as July 16, 1963. I pointed out then that under Public Law 480, which definitely is a subsidy program, we had sold 40 million bushels of grain to Austria at a subsidized price wherein we took in exchange strategic materials or currencies.

While these 40 million bushels of grain were en route to Austria more than 24 million bushels were lost; they never reached their destination. At that time the Department of Agriculture officials emphatically denied that any of it went behind the Iron Curtain. I asked how they could be so positive when at the same time they said they did not have the slightest idea where the grain went. Anyway, they quickly responded by saying they were positive that none of it went behind the Iron Curtain.

I have in my possession a letter dated last week which they wrote to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture confirming that while they still had not located approximately 300,000 tons of grain they have definitely established that two shipments, or more than 10,000 tons, did go to East Germany. That grain was subsidized by the American taxpayers, and the Department admits that some of it has gone behind the Iron Curtain. Apparently the Department never knew the grain was missing until the question was exposed on the floor of the Senate. Later the Department admitted that it knew it was missing, but I assume that they were going to keep it from the public. After this shortage was exposed on July 16, 1963, they first denied, then later admitted that they knew that it had gone behind the Iron Curtain. Now, under this proposed wheat sale to Russia, some of the wheat will be loaded in Russian ships in our ports.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. First, while there has been much talk both in the hearings and in the Chamber about our selling wheat to Russia at a subsidized price, that is a lovely word in terms of semantics and usage. Actually, the wheat would be sold at the world price, the same price at which the Canadians sell it.

It is true that we subsidize our own wheat farmers in order to keep them in business. But to my way of thinking, this is a question of semantics. The wheat that we would sell would be sold at the world price. I do not consider that to be a subsidy to the Russians. The wheat would be sold at the world price.

With respect to what the Senator from Delaware said, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], in the course of cross-examining Under Secretary of Commerce Roosevelt, raised the same question, as to whether we could control the destiny of the wheat and whether we could require its shipment to Russia.

The question by Senator DOMINICK and the reply by Mr. Roosevelt appear on page 214 of the hearings, as follows:

> Senator DOMINICK. You can keep track of it, but you couldn't stop it.
>
> Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is correct. Mr. Hockersmith, who is in charge of our export control program, points out that our regulations require that any shipment, including those

> in a foreign ship, must be unloaded at the port specified in the license, and it cannot be unloaded anywhere else.
>
> Senator DOMINICK. Why not? Who is going to stop them?
>
> Mr. ROOSEVELT. Well, I doubt that we will send out the Navy to stop it, but certainly that ship would go on our blacklist, if it went to Cuba.

I interpolate: If it went anywhere except where the shipping documents required it to go—and let us remember that half of the shipments would be made in American bottoms—I make the allegation in my argument that, first, there is no real subsidized price; and, second, that the chance of the wheat going anywhere except where the shipping documents say it shall go is extremely slim.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Pennsylvania, if this is not a subsidy, what does one call it? One can look in Webster's dictionary and find many definitions. Whether it be called a subsidy or a gift does not alter the fact that if the sale goes through the Russians will be buying the wheat for 60 cents less than the American consumers. The American taxpayers will be paying this 60 cents.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In my book that is a subsidy. Do I understand that Secretary Roosevelt stated that he will be able to positively identify where every shipment of this grain goes? If so why could they not identify where the other 24 million bushels of grain went that were supposed to have gone to Austria? They admitted that they do not have the slightest idea where that 24 million bushels went, except that the Department has now located 10,000 tons that went to East Germany.

Last July, only 72 hours after I first disclosed this missing grain, they emphatically denied that any of it had gone to Communist countries. Now the Department of Commerce and the Secretary of Agriculture admit that part of this 24 million bushels went to East Germany.

I repeat that there is no possible way by which they can identify this grain once it is sold to Russia, particularly in the case of transportation by Russian ships. Even when the grain was transported in American ships they did not know where it went.

So I am not persuaded by the argument of the Senator from Pennsylvania that suddenly they will now be able to determine where the wheat goes—unless they argue that they can trust Russian ship captains better than American ship captains.

Mr. TOWER. Furthermore, there is nothing to prevent the wheat from being transshipped to other bottoms, and then be taken somewhere else.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Certainly. However, in the case of the other transaction now, 3 years later, they admit that they have discovered that some went to East Germany. Still they have no idea where the rest of it went. It may have gone to Russia direct so far as any officials in the executive agencies downtown know or seem to care. This is a proposal to have the American taxpayers finance the Communist bloc in a subsidized purchase of American wheat.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from Delaware.

Furthermore, not one witness before the committee or no spokesman in favor of this bill has said, thus far, in public, that there is no possibility that if the wheat were sold by the U.S. Government, it would be transshipped and taken to Red China.

So I repeat that all we can possibly do, if we accept every guarantee the Russians are willing to give, is to decide that the Soviets need this American wheat, not for food for the people of the Soviet Union, but so that the wheat produced in Russia can be sent to Red China and can be eaten by the Red Chinese, and so that some of the wheat can be sent to Cuba and can be eaten by the people of Castro's Cuba.

Mr. President, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished ranking Republican member of the committee, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, this afternoon we have heard a great deal of argument about the proposed sale of wheat to Russia.

At this point I should like to refer to the bill itself—S. 2310—to prohibit any guarantee by the Export-Import Bank or any other agency of the Government of payment of obligations of Communist countries. I now read the bill:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That neither the Export-Import Bank nor any other agency of the Government shall guarantee the payment of any obligation heretofore or hereafter incurred by any Communist country (as defined in section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961) or any agency or national thereof, or in any other way participate in the extension of credit to any such country, agency, or national, in connection with the purchase of any product by such country, agency, or national.

Mr. President, we focus our attention on the proposed sale of wheat; and I can understand that Senators who come from States in which large quantities of wheat are produced are greatly concerned about the potential loss of sales of wheat of this volume. But we are concerned with a policy which is far more important than the proposed sale.

In 1953 the law was changed, to permit the Export-Import Bank to have authority, in addition to its authority to lend money, to engage in guarantees of insurance. When that law was written, the words "any friendly country" were included.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. The words were, as I recall, "any friendly foreign country."

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct; and I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his assistance, and make that correction.

At that time Representative WIDNALL, of New Jersey, asked why those words were omitted. The answer was that probably it was an inadvertence, but that in any case it was of no significance, because we did not intend to sell our products to any foreign country that was not friendly.

When Mr. WIDNALL asked that question in connection with the proposed sale of wheat, the answer given was:

> If we sell the wheat to Russia, probably it will be sold for cash or gold, anyway; so there will be no problem.

When the bill reached the Senate, we were under much pressure, and there was little or no time for debate in the committee.

Since 1961, and because of that very interesting change in the law, the Export-Import Bank has been able to guarantee the sale of our products to countries that were not friendly foreign countries. However, that has not been done; now we are facing the first test of the new law, and are making the fundamental decision.

This afternoon, much has been said to the effect that we are taking away from the President the power to determine the foreign policy, and so forth. But, in a sense, the President did not have this power until 1961 and he has never used it.

So now, thanks to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], we are having an opportunity—for the first time—to consider whether we would have approved the granting of this power in 1961. The words "any friendly foreign country" have been eliminated; and, therefore, presumably any country in the world—including any Communist country, and including Red China—would be available to receive such guarantees from the Export-Import Bank.

The Export-Import Bank takes the position that it will guarantee sales only when the Department of Commerce will grant an export license. So to that extent there is protection against a decision to guarantee such sales to Red China.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Utah has expired.

Mr. BENNETT. May I have 5 minutes more?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized for 5 more minutes.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, a few weeks ago the Senate spent a great deal of time debating the nuclear test ban treaty. At that time there was evidence that that was a great first step which could lead to many other changes in our relationships with Russia, including liberalization of our trade policy.

If the bill is not passed, we shall be setting a precedent for any future proposal to sell commodities to Russia with a guarantee from the Export-Import Bank. Those who favor the proposed sale of wheat to Russia—and I can understand their position—are saying, "The other countries are doing it, and so should we." The argument seems to be that because Russia purchases wheat from other nations, we should hurry to sell Russia our wheat before some other country sells Russia her wheat.

In my opinion this proposal represents so basic a change in our relationships with Russia that we should give it much more attention than we have had time thus far to give it. Probably it should be passed on by the Foreign Relations Committee, from a different point of view.

So I shall vote for the Mundt bill, because I am not quite ready to vote to make this basic change in our relationship with Russia—a proposal which I believe is motivated very much by the desire to sell the wheat.

When the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] introduced the bill, it referred only to wheat. But Senators will recall that in the heat of the debate that afternoon, some Senators said, "If you have the bill cover everything, I will support it." Those Senators included one Senator who had voted against the bill. So the change was made, and thus we would set the pattern by which the resources of the Export-Import Bank would be available to finance any trade transaction for any product for which the Department of Commerce will issue an export license to any country in the world.

I believe that this is so serious the bill should be passed and we should take a longer look at the problem.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] such time as he may desire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for such time as he may desire.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, Senators, we have spent a large part of this afternoon debating a matter completely irrelevant to this situation—namely, the fine business record of the Export-Import Bank. Of course it has made a fine record. Every one of us is proud of it. But, this bill has nothing to do with that. The question is whether we are going to determine a policy which will launch the Bank into a new field, a field which heretofore it has avoided either as a matter of law from 1953 to 1961, or as a matter of policy from 1961 until the present time.

I should like the record to clearly show that what we are discussing is the question of policy. Should the executive or the legislative branch, or the executive branch with the approval of the legislative, have the power to throw the credit of the U.S. Government behind much of the purchase price for the sale of grain or other products which Russia wants from this country?

The record shows that approximately $200 million worth of business was done last year with Russia and other countries behind the Iron Curtain without any such extension of credit from the Export-Import Bank. The record also clearly shows there has been none of the miserable business of underwriting with our public credit through the insuring policy the selling at a reduced price under a subsidy of important products to the Communist countries, which are certainly not our friends.

Mr. President, that is the real question—whether we, as a matter of policy, empower the Export-Import Bank by our vote on this bill today, to go ahead with a policy of extending credit to Communist countries on the same basis that we do to our most friendly allied countries, public credit supplied from a public institution, which belongs to every American citizen to make possible the sale of hundreds of millions of dollars worth of American grain to Communist countries.

I do not wish to see that policy changed. I do not wish to see a new policy initiated. I believe the Export-Import Bank, with its fine record, is entitled to better protection from the Congress and from the Executive than to be launched into that particular kind of trade.

It is for that reason that I strongly support the bill of the Senator from South Dakota.

There is no question that in the public mind, at least, there has been a change of direction in regard to the proposed loans.

I read from an editorial in the Washington Post of yesterday, Monday, November 25. Everyone knows the Washington Post is supporting the proposed wheat sales. The words I read, however, show its first real understanding of this proposal in several weeks:

> Supporters of the Mundt proposal have jumped on the administration's previous assurance that only private traders and bankers would assume the risk in the wheat bill. This statement embarrasses the administration, and rightly so. In retrospect, the administration was lax in failing to anticipate the shipping and credit hurdles which have now risen.

The embarrassment the administration is suffering is small compared with that which is being sustained by me. We have thrown at us every day the fact that in our national policy we are not permitting the sale or shipment of anything to Cuba and that we are not permitting the ships of our friendly allies to take any kind of product there without losing the right to come to our own ports. What is the difference between the small Communist nation which is just offshore and the large Communist nations far away in Europe?

It is a very difficult question to answer.

To go further, relying upon what we had learned—we thought from official sources—the Senators from Florida answered many letters from people in our State stating that one of the major reasons assigned by the administration for the sale was that it was for cash and would help us in our balance of payments. In addition, both Senators from Florida have been on television distributing this information to the hundreds and thousands and perhaps millions of people who have seen us upon those television occasions, including television panels, where we were directly questioned by able correspondents about the particular question. In every case we tried to give the reasons which had been assigned by the administration, which I related in the Chamber the other day, for the sales, one of which was the fact that were to be for cash and that they would benefit our balance-of-payments problem.

We are left in a hopelessly contradictory and inconsistent situation with reference to policies which are in effect for Cuba—and which have been in effect for a long time. The people of Florida are the worst affected by those policies but have gone along with them gladly, though it has meant the destruction of some of our fine industries which are 75 or 100 years old.

Now we are expected to stand by and witness a change of policy with reference to Russia and its satellites, while there is a continuance of the policy toward Cuba. It is extremely difficult to explain to any sane person why there should be such a difference and distinction.

There are some who say, "We should make these sales because of the immense amounts of grain piling up." I wonder if they have ever heard of a man named Joseph. I wonder if they recall that the granaries of the world are being emptied before ours. Canada has made sales to Red China and to other countries behind the Iron Curtain, and other countries are also doing so. Our wheat is becoming more valuable instead of less so, yet there are those who believe we ought to run away from the storage problem by selling as much as we can at reduced prices to people who are not our friends, and thereby establish a policy which has not prevailed at least since 1953 in this country.

Without laboring the question, I wish to quote from some excellent witnesses who testified in favor of the bill. The first is Dr. G. Warren Nutter, the chairman of the James Wilson Department of Economics, University of Virginia. The quotation I shall read is from page 70 of the hearings. I hope Senators will follow it.

> Granting special concessions to the Communist countries would indeed be sadly ironic. We have given foreign aid to various countries in order to inhibit the spread of communism. This foreign aid has helped to bring about a deficit in our current international balance of payments. We would then propose to correct that deficit by giving aid to Communist countries.

I should like to read other portions of the testimony by Dr. Nutter, but I shall content myself with placing in the RECORD his statements appearing in the first two paragraphs at the top of page 71, in which he makes it clear that the real question is whether we are going to change this important policy, not merely with reference to grain, but also with reference to other things, and whether we are going into a program of partly financing from public funds and public credit large sales to Communist countries of any product not a strategic product. He is quite correct in what he says; that would be an important change in policy and ought not to be made without most careful consideration, which he says has not been given.

I quote the following from his testimony:

> This brings me to the question before the committee this morning. The primary effect of governmental underwriting, through the Export-Import Bank, of credit risks incurred by private lenders to Communist countries is to reduce the cost of credit to those countries. There is no reason for us to reduce the cost of credit to Communist countries unless we wish, as a general and long run policy, to encourage expansion of our trade with them. If we are to embark on this course, we should do so only after careful consideration of its full consequences. As far as I can see, nobody in authority has argued that the present negotiations of wheat sales is the first step in a general program of trade expansion with Communist countries.
>
> The question of underwriting aside, we should also recognize that any financing of wheat sales by extension of credit in dollars, no matter who extends the credit, has no effect in easing our deficit in the current international balance of payments for as long as the credit is extended. This is another reason for doing nothing to encourage credit financing of sales to Communist countries.

Without laboring the question, I quote briefly another fine witness, Mr. Gerald L. Steibel, head of the Research Institute of America, New York. The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], though he is on the other side, in introducing him said to the chairman, "That is a very distinguished organization in New York."

I read from page 72 of the hearings:

> When we grant credits—and the fact that the Export-Import Bank merely insures someone else's credit is not significant—we are announcing our faith in the debtor. In ordinary commercial transactions, this faith generally extends only to the prospect for repayment; in this transaction it inevitably goes much further: We are saying that we are expressing faith in their system, because we are doing more than selling them commodities; we are aiding them to ride out some very fundamental internal troubles.
>
> I realize that this is not necessarily the purpose of the administration. Nevertheless, that is its effect. It will be so read by other nations, and it is so being read by them now.
>
> A business deal with the Communists for cash is, in my opinion, bad enough. Nevertheless, it does maintain at least some reserve on the part of this country. It informs the Communists that we are dealing with them, to be sure, but that we are doing so gingerly, that we do not trust them. A cash deal also is a warning that we are not committing ourselves to a "next time." It gives them at least some incentive to behave better in all the ways in which we would like them to behave better. And it gives us the option of stopping the flow of goods quickly when that becomes necessary.
>
> But when we underwrite credit we are going far beyond that. For one thing, we are opening ourselves to the possibility that we may be asked to take Communist goods as repayment for the credits. It would be entirely within the Communist character to say to us after the 18 months are up, "Sorry, we don't have the cash, but we'll be glad to give you oil, or chrome or something else that will cut the heart out of your own allies' markets." And, what would that do to the balance-of-payments argument for the wheat deal? We would deserve that fate if it turned out to be ours.
>
> Furthermore, what guarantee do we have that they won't repudiate this debt, just as they have repudiated so many others?

It seems to me quite clear that the question is whether we are willing to change a longstanding policy, willing to open the door, willing to say to our allies all over the world that we will extend the same sort of credit to those we know to be our enemies that we are extending to our friends and allies. It is a question whether we are willing to do this merely because Canada, our nextdoor neighbor and friend, has done it. That is really what is behind it all. We should remember that Canada sold to Red China, and we are not even thinking of doing that.

We do not seem to be trying to establish a common policy applicable to all Communist nations, because it is proposed that we continue our policy toward Cuba, a policy which I believe should be continued with respect to all such countries.

Mr. President, it seems to me that for us to involve our national credit in the way in which it is asked to be involved—and that is exactly what we would do by insuring, through a publicly owned agency, every dime of which belongs to the citizens of the United States, three-fourths of the transaction at a lower rate of interest than that which has been extended by Canada—is the wrong thing to do. I am glad the Senator from South Dakota has brought up this point.

We have had abundant evidence in the past few days of what may happen when there is involved one who has been indoctrinated in the Communist doctrine, and what he may be expected to do. We should have ample evidence and knowledge of the fact that communism is not living at peace with us; to the contrary. For us to extend a most-favored-nation treatment—and that is what it would be—through the underwriting by Federal credit of three-fourths of the deal, is not only different from what we all understood the proposal to be, ahead of time, but also would establish a precedent and policy which would come home to haunt us. I believe it will haunt every Senator who votes against the Mundt bill. Mr. President, I feel very keenly about this.

Referring again to the Cuban problem, I wish to ask a question. I have not heard anybody answer it, though I addressed the question to the distinguished Senator from Alabama when he was speaking.

How can we justify the contrast and difference with respect to policy that we are continuing with reference to Cuba—not permitting in our ports vessels of our allies which have carried foodstuffs to Cuba—with the entering into of a policy of sales such as is requested with the Communist nations behind the Iron Curtain?

This is not an expression of lack of confidence either in the late President or the present President. We have an opportunity to measure up to our responsibility; and establishing the policy in these matters is our responsibility.

I am glad we have an opportunity to go on record as being in favor of not giving the most-favored-nation treatment to nations behind the Iron Curtain merely to enable us to keep pace with other nations.

When the sugar problem arose, and when the sugar market was about to fall to pieces, after Cuba ceased to make available her sugar, some people got rid of sugar in a hurry. I know some people who dealt in sugar futures at that time. The sugar was soon used up, and we were calling for more sugar to be produced by our own people. People who had kept it in warehouses were able to sell it at higher prices than they could before.

I remind the Senator there is only so much wheat in the world, and that wheat from other parts of the world is already moving toward countries that have made a failure of production, in contrast with our country.

Are we going to give up the ace in the hole which we have by allowing our granaries to be drained at this time, without knowing where the grain is going—and we cannot control that—because we want to keep up with our sister nation of Canada?

We like the Canadians. We are very fond of them. But I do not think their policy is necessarily sound. So far as they are concerned, they do not have far to go, because they have been selling in great abundance to Red China. So far as we are concerned, it is proposed to change our policy overnight, by which we have been able to build up our great supply and have shown to the world our great productive capacity. It is our ace in the hole, as I said. Shall we dissipate it now because it is proposed to pass a measure by which we can sell the wheat for the support price plus the holding cost for it, when we know that the other granaries are becoming empty, and our holdings every day will become more useful and valuable?

It is proposed that our country enter into this disposal program, to nations behind the Iron Curtain, as if to friendly nations that are clamoring for it, but to which we owe nothing except suspicion; and to give them this most-favored-nation treatment, and underwrite three-fourths of the cost with our own public credit.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I gladly yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say friendly nations were clamoring for the wheat?

Mr. HOLLAND. Friendly nations are not clamoring for the wheat. I said we are trying to enter into relations to sell to Iron Curtain Communist countries as if they were friendly nations clamoring for it. Friendly nations are not clamoring for it.

With the limited amount of wheat in the whole world and with the granaries becoming empty in many parts of the world, our wheat store becomes more and more valuable to us and our friends in our bargaining position in the world. To say we ought to dispose of it to Iron Curtain countries at subsidy prices does not make sense to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator referred earlier to conceivable sales to Red China and Cuba. I think, more directly, he referred to the fact that our neighbor, Canada, was making such sales, and proceeded to say that such was not contemplated by the United States.

Mr. HOLLAND. No; it is not contemplated. Yet how can the world understand the difference in our policy when it knows very well that most of the trouble in Cuba is caused by Russia? In October a year ago we found Russia was behind Cuba, and since that time Russia has remained behind Cuba. How can we justify our more generous treatment of Russia and the other Communist countries than of Cuba, and how can we make it appear that we have a policy? Is there any international policy when we deal in such contrasting ways with a Communist nation which is near us and Communist nations which are farther away?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Under the present law, if the executive branch of the Government so determines, and the Export-Import Bank should be willing to comply with such a move, would it not be just as legal, just as possible, to insure credit for sales to Cuba, or Red China, or to whomsoever?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not know enough about the other laws that are involved, but so far as the Export-Import Bank is concerned, the answer, in my opinion, is "Yes." There may be other laws that apply in this field. That is why it is difficult to understand the completely contrasting policies here. Have we any foreign policy on this question?

Mr. GORE. What possible law would draw a distinction between Russia and China so far as a guarantee is concerned?

Mr. HOLLAND. As I understand, we are still at war with China. There possibly is a difference in that connection. So far as Cuba is concerned, there is no such condition; Cuba is nothing but the stooge of Russia, assisted by Russia, supported by shipments from Russia, supported by arms from Russia. As we all know, Russian mechanics were installing missiles which could reach to any part of the United States—missiles which could be used with nuclear warheads. Russia is the one that really threatens us. Yet it is proposed to render Russia most-favored-nation treatment, and, under the law, guarantee three-fourths of the sales to her. I cannot understand it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator speaks eloquently and persuasively. Nevertheless, something that troubles me even more is that we are dealing piecemeal with what is or should be essentially a very fundamental question of foreign policy.

Mr. HOLLAND. We are, indeed.

Mr. GORE. It may well be that Congress erred in 1961 in the amendment of the act. I confess that I did not know that change was being made at the time it was being made.

Mr. HOLLAND. Neither did the Senator from Florida. I invite attention to the fact that, notwithstanding that change, the Export-Import Bank has continued not to underwrite or insure any loan for the $200 million worth of business we have been doing with central Europe.

Mr. GORE. It seems unfortunate to me that, because of the tragic events of the past few days, this question, which is essentially one of fundamental foreign policy, as the Senator has agreed that it is, is nevertheless brought to the floor of the Senate in this piecemeal way, and under circumstances which are described as constituting a vote of confidence or a vote of lack of confidence in the new President.

Mr. HOLLAND. I suggest to the Senator that this question first arose, not in the present administration, but in the previous administration. I suggest also that the question arose by reason of an amendment to the foreign aid authorization bill. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], who had raised the question, was gracious enough, at the request of both leaders, to withdraw his amendment after he had had a victory on a certain vote with reference to it—the vote to lay the amendment on the table—so that the matter could be handled through a legislative committee.

That disposition was made, of course, before there occurred the tragedy that has recently struck our country.

Therefore, it is a matter of handling that which was already before the Senate and already subject to a mandate from the Senate to have the committee return it by a fixed time. It is now before us for a decision of the question by the Senate. There is no way in which we can evade it. There is regret on the part of all of us that it comes at this particular time, but it was not a prearranged situation; it was the pending business. We can no more satisfy ourselves or our people back home by taking no action on this matter than we could by adjourning without passing appropriation bills or by adjourning without doing any of the many things which this Congress must do in spite of the pall of sorrow that hangs over all of us. It is one of the things that happens to be in our lap as a matter of duty.

I did not regard it as a slap at the previous administration, but, rather, as an effort of Congress to reassert a responsibility which it had laid down in 1961, and which I was distressed to find it had laid down.

I have just heard the Senator from Tennessee indicate something to that same effect, that he did not know, either, that this particular provision had been taken out of the law so as to make trading with the enemy possible. That is all it amounts to—making it possible to trade with the enemy. I do not believe the Senate would have voted that way if there had been an opportunity to debate the subject at that time.

Therefore, we have the question of what we shall do with it. The question is whether Congress has any responsibility in the matter. I for one say we have the responsibility, because we helped to emasculate the law which had operated from 1953 to 1961. That law was changed in the terminal days of the previous Congress. I believe that damage should be repaired. I would not know how to answer my people, who would raise the question of the contrast with our effort toward Cuba and central Europe, without making some effort to correct this manifest mistake which we, the Congress, not the Executive, made in the step taken in 1961.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator may recall that the Senator from Tennessee rose when this question was last before the Senate and complimented the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader upon the achievement of an agreement to refer this vexatious issue to committee for careful consideration.

Mr. HOLLAND. And speedy return to the floor of the Senate by a fixed date, namely, yesterday.

Mr. GORE. At that time there was no way of foreseeing the horrible history which ensued. I almost feel that the whole issue should yet be considered by the Foreign Relations Committee, following receipt of specific recommendation by the new President.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the Senator is within his right to have that feeling. I do not share that feeling, because I believe the Senate is trying to correct, through positive action on the pending measure, a bitter mistake which it made 2 years ago.

I am sorry to say that I have received notice from the Senator from South Dakota that my time has long ago elapsed and that he wants me to bring this colloquy to an end. I have enjoyed the colloquy and the gracious questions and comments of the Senator from Tennessee, whom I thank warmly.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Florida. I find this issue to be a very perplexing one. I appreciate the generous responses of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, there is only so much time available. The Senator from Florida and the Senator from Tennessee have made some excellent points. The Senator from Florida has made a pertinent and persuasive argument. He was especially constructive in pointing to the fallacy of some of the arguments that have been raised. First, it is argued that Canada has sold wheat to Russia; therefore, there is no reason why we should not also do so.

Mr. President, Canada has also sold wheat on credit to Red China. Would those who thus argue ask us to do that, also?

The next ugly step would be this: Canada has already sold some wheat to Cuba. Do the opponents expect us to follow in that path also? I do not believe that this is a valid argument.

The time situation being what it is, I advise Senators who would like to make plans in advance that I have promised to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. After that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] will yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. Following that, I have promised to yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. That is the schedule for now.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 1 minute to me, so that I may ask a question?

Mr. MUNDT. For a quick question; yes.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator's bill has been amended, as I understand. Is it correct to say that the passage of the bill, as amended, would not prohibit the sale of wheat to Russia or to any other country for gold or cash, or for private credit?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the chairman of the committee, presented an amendment which spells out in amendment form—and the amendment has been adopted—the ruling of the Attorney General, to the effect that private banks have a perfectly legal right to extend credit for sales to Russia and Communist bloc countries.

This has no relationship whatever to the wheat deal, unless it is intended to sell wheat through credit underwritten by the American taxpayers. Sales for private credit also may continue as planned.

Mr. CURTIS. I invite attention to a telegram sent to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency by the president of the National Association of Wheat Growers, dated November 19, 1963. It appears at pages 246 and 247 of the hearings.

The telegram expresses deep concern over the effect of the Mundt amendment on the sale of wheat for dollars to all Communist countries, especially Russia.

Mr. MUNDT. I received the same telegram. That question is not involved here. My bill would not stop sales of wheat for dollars.

Mr. CURTIS. The telegram continues:

> The President called for sale of wheat through normal commercial channels.

And so forth.

The telegram continues:

> It is furthermore generally agreed the sale of wheat to Russia will not enhance the cause of world communism but will be feeding hungry people and using their gold for food rather than war material.

As I understand, the wheat can still be sold for gold.

Mr. MUNDT. Precisely. Furthermore, the testimony of the Department of State showed that there are no hungry people in Russia. The Wheat Growers Association did not have the facts before it when it made that statement in the telegram.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I am in sympathy with that objective, but this question goes much further than wheat. In order not to read sentences out of context, I ask unanimous consent that the entire telegram may appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> WASHINGTON, D.C., *November 19, 1963.*
>
> WILLIS ROBERTSON,
> *Chairman, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:*
>
> The National Association of Wheat Growers, which is an association of 11 major wheat-producing States representing 65 percent of commercial wheat production of the United States is deeply concerned by the effect of the Mundt amendment on the sale of wheat for dollars to all Communist countries, especially Russia. We are now holding our State wheat association conventions. Of those held to date all have approved the sale of wheat to Russia and satellite countries as outlined by the President.
>
> The President called for sale of wheat through normal commercial channels. It is our understanding that the Mundt amendment would disrupt normal trading procedures which have successfully operated in sale of nonstrategic goods to Communist nations. For a long period of time it is the feeling of most wheat producers with whom we have had contact that if we allow this cash market for wheat to slip through our hands and be served by our Western competitors we will be benefiting the wheat producers of these other nations at the expense of our own producers. It is furthermore generally agreed the sale of wheat to Russia will not enhance the cause of world communism but will be feeding hungry people and using their gold for food rather than war material. We therefore are in strong opposition to the Mundt amendment and request that you place this statement in the record of the committee hearings on this amendment.
>
> GLEN L. BAYNE,
> *President, National Association of Wheat Growers.*

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I shall vote for the bill introduced by the Senator from South Dakota. My position on the issue involved is not new. What we are really considering is whether the Congress shall endorse a basic change in our trade policy with Russia. I have maintained it should not be accomplished by a sale of wheat—which implications have not been fully considered. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry I participated in the meetings in late September when members of the administration consulted with members of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on the proposed sale of wheat to the Soviet Union. At that time we were told that the proposed sale of wheat was an isolated transaction in exchange for gold or dollars; that it was not intended for consumption by the Soviet Union, but was intended to enable the Soviet Union to meet its trade commitments. We were told that the proposed sale did not represent a change in our trade policy.

Because of my interest and concern in the proposal, like other Members of the Senate, I made a study of the enactments which deal with trade with the Soviet Union and other Communist countries. I referred to them, quoting relevant sections in my speech in the Senate on October 2, 1963, opposing the wheat deal.

I do not believe it can be controverted that, so far as Congress is concerned, it has been its declared policy that the United States would not export to the Soviet Union any subsidized agricultural commodities. Of course, there is also a prohibition against the export of strategic materials, and the executive branch, while not wholly bound in the case of agricultural commodities, has in practice followed the same policy.

But since the discussions in late September, a sequence of events has followed, which, in my judgment, indicates that a change in our policy is contemplated. It has been suggested that additional wheat may be sold to the Soviet Union and the fact that it is now proposed that the Export-Import Bank shall guarantee the credit of the Soviet Union in this transaction means, in effect, that the Government has now advanced its credit to assure the sale.

I said when I spoke in the Senate on this question on October 2 that if the sale of wheat did not represent a change in our trade policy, it was not worthy of a great country liks ours to chase after Soviet gold. And today I do not believe it worthy of the dignity of our country to be running after the promise of payment of the price, either in gold or in dollars, through the guarantee of our own institution, the Export-Import Bank.

Perhaps it can be argued there should be a change in our trade policy. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] admits that this is a proposal, in effect, to change our trade policy. I honor him for his honesty and grasp of foreign policy in making a very effective statement in testimony before the Committee on Banking and Currency. But I do not believe the Congress should endorse a change in our trade policy with the Soviet Union, as is proposed now.

What might happen if we go on this course of Export-Import Bank guarantees of Soviet credit? It would, I think, cause our allies, weak as they have been in their trade policy with the Soviet Union, to take it as an expression of intent on the part of the United States to embark on a program of large exports of agricultural commodities; and this might lead them to believe that there would follow a change in our position with respect to the exports of strategic and industrial materials. And then they would cave in, in their trade policy, and who can determine the effect it would have on trade between the Soviet Union and Latin America?

The point I made on October 2, and the point I make tonight, is that if this is to be a change in our trade policy, then the subject ought to be discussed fully with the Committee on Foreign Relations and with the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and with all the appropriate committees of Congress, and with our allies, so that Congress and the country will know in what direction we are going.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. In a way, this proposes a change in policy similar to that which was expressed when the Senate approved the test ban treaty. We approved that treaty with doubts. But we voted for it because we had the belief that the treaty was a first step, that might lead to just settlements in time with the Soviet Union.

We do not know what the effect of a change in trade policy with respect to agricultural commodities and perhaps industrial commodities might lead to; but we can certainly say that the subject deserves full and complete consideration, equal to that of consideration of the nuclear test ban treaty. We have not had such a full and complete consideration. We do not have all the facts. I can see no reason if this is an isolated transaction, that it will influence the Soviet Union's relations with the United States—and certainly not when we seem so anxious to make it.

The security of the United States is always the primary factor if there is to be a change in United States-Soviet trade policy. The subject deserves fuller consideration than has been given, in my opinion, by our Government and, indeed, by Congress. I shall support the bill offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, notwithstanding many of the considerations which have been so very directly explained by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], with whom I often find myself in complete agreement, I favor the approach of the majority in the Committee on Banking and Currency. I shall vote against the bill. Indeed, I think I was the only member of my party who took that position in the committee. My reasons are as follows:

We are a great Nation; and great nations neither bluff nor trifle. As a great Nation, we have said that we will make a wheat deal with the Soviet Union. If now we wriggle out of it on the ground that we will not let the Export-Import Bank guarantee the credit of banks of the United States, when there is no question about credit worthiness—there is only a question about political risk—the Russians and the whole world will have a right to say to us that we are trifling. What the Senate would do would be to forbid what the President said would be the policy of the United States in this deal. That is the fundamental question which I believe is involved.

To say that the intent of this sale is to reverse the trade policy of our country is not to state the fact, because today the United States is already selling nonstrategic goods to the Soviet Union and other countries. We are not selling much, but we are selling.

Also, we have consulted with our allies time and time again. Our allies are pursuing a policy completely out of harmony with our policy. They are now selling billions of dollars' worth of goods to the Soviet Union and the Soviet bloc while we are selling them very little.

I think this proposal has exactly the same quality in another field that the test ban treaty had in the disarmament field. Our policy has developed to the point where we are making a tentative approach of a different character to the Soviet Union and the Soviet bloc than we have made heretofore. The tentative approach to the test ban treaty was to determine whether a small first step could be made with respect to the control of atomic arms. The transaction which we are now discussing would be to determine, as a first small step, whether it would be possible for both sides to gain anything from our increased economic relations with the Soviet bloc. I hasten to point out at once that the situations of Communist China and of Cuba are totally different from this situation, because aside from our maintaining relations and having cultural and other exchange agreements with the Soviet Union and the Soviet bloc, central Europe is at stake. We feel that we can do something there to foster the spirit of independence.

Second, we would not be giving anything to the Soviet Union or the Soviet bloc in this transaction. The question is—and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] has made this plain—Will the transaction be of advantage to us? This will not be an eleemosynary, woolly-headed, maudlin act. Will it, in the hard pull, be advantageous to us? I think it will.

It will be advantageous to us as a small first step to see if economic relations of a modest character can help to improve relations with the Soviet bloc.

It will be advantageous to us in terms of getting rid of a surplus which we have, for hard money which we can use. Furthermore, our surplus is a storage problem to us, which will be relieved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). The time yielded to the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield 2 more minutes to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 more minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I think the proposed sale of wheat to Russia is advantageous to us in terms of the adoption of a different policy with respect to a commodity on which we are now incurring a loss.

I think it will also be advantageous to us in terms of the competition between our producers and those of our allies who sell billions of dollars' worth of goods to the Soviet bloc, whereas we sell them practically none.

I think it will also be advantageous to us in terms of getting the Soviet bloc to be more dependent upon us for necessary food supplies and other materials, as I pointed out earlier in regard to the present dependence of the Soviets upon West Germany for spare parts.

Furthermore, I do not think this proposal involves at all making or breaking the Soviet Union. As regards the food supply necessary for the Soviet Union, all of us understand that the people of Russia can, if necessary, tighten their belts.

Also, the proposed sale of wheat to Russia will not necessarily result in broad-scale trade with the Soviet Union; we have full control over every step.

Finally, it is clear that the proposed sale of wheat to the Soviet Union will give us an economic advantage which we need.

I do not favor a policy of general trade with the Soviet Union unless we can, in that connection, take adequate care of debts, patents, and the right of Americans to travel in Russia for the purpose of servicing and selling. There are many things which we would need to do in terms of a general trade arrangement, just as would be necessary in connection with a full-scale test ban treaty.

But, Mr. President, to put the matter very bluntly and frankly, I think the proposed sale of wheat to Russia is an excellent first step which will give us appreciable economic advantages. In addition, our Government is committed to it.

However, if the pending bill were to be enacted into law, we would be pulling the rug from under our President.

Therefore, I shall vote against the pending bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], who has favored this proposed legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from South Dakota for yielding to me.

The Senator from New York argued that this proposed arrangement will not either make or break the economy of the Soviet Union. Of course that is true; but in the judgment of Khrushchev and the other leading Communists the sale of the wheat to Russia will be sufficiently valuable to the Soviet economic and military machine to make them willing to give up much of their limited supply of gold and dollar reserves.

This wheat is not needed in order to prevent starvation in the Soviet Union. That point was made abundantly clear during the hearings. There is no rationing of wheat or any food in Russia. This wheat is for the purpose of enabling the Soviets to meet their commitments to the satellite countries, including Cuba, and to replenish the U.S.S.R. military reserve. Trade statistics prove that although Russia has not had a good crop year since 1958, its exports of wheat have increased a whopping 50 percent since then. Why? Because the U.S.S.R. knows how valuable this wheat is in holding the Communist alliance together.

Secretary of the Treasury Dillon argued that Cuba has already been taken care of as a result of the wheat deal with Canada. In that connection, only approximately $35 million worth of the wheat, out of the total of $500 million of Canadian wheat, was for Cuba. Furthermore, the Canadian wheat deal was consummated before the occurrence of the hurricane which devastated Cuba, and thus changed the situation there and created a requirement for much more wheat for Cuba—as was conceded at the hearings.

Our Government is engaged in a policy of attempting to bring Khrushchev to his knees; of getting the Russians out of Cuba. The proposed sale of wheat to the Soviet Union would make it possible for Russia to keep supplying wheat to Cuba for a longer period of time to continue to be the principal supplier of food to Cuba. Would anyone argue this continued power over Cuba by the U.S.S.R. is in our interest? Of course not. But our wheat deal will aid the U.S.S.R. to continue its domination.

It is also true that Russian wheat exports to East Germany and Czechoslovakia keep the machine tool and chemical industries in those satellites productive and able to supply the U.S.S.R. with the economic war potential she needs.

Mr. President, I oppose the proposed sale of wheat to the Soviet Union; and I approve of the Mundt bill because I believe it would frustrate the proposed sale of wheat to the Soviet Union, and also because I believe that before we agree to make such a sale to the Soviet Union, we should insist on obtaining from the Soviets a real concession to peace—not gold, or dollars but peace. After all, at present we have the only surplus wheat in the world; we have a monopoly of it, and therefore we are in a very strong bargaining position. At the committee hearing the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who made a strong argument against the Mundt bill, conceded that until next spring, if Russia is to obtain wheat, she must obtain it from the United States. Canada will not be able to deliver any more wheat to Russia; Russia has gotten all she can from Australia. So if Russia does not get the wheat from the United States, she will not be able to get more wheat.

Furthermore, the Senator from South Dakota has argued that we should attempt to obtain among our allies an agreement, particularly with respect to wheat, which will help persuade the Russians to make real concessions. What's wrong with that? Impractical? Not a bit. The hard fact is that some of our allies seem to be willing to agree to concerted action.

Before Canada finally sold the wheat to the Soviet Union, the Trade Minister of Canada said he had cleared the sale of wheat with our Government and our State Department had not protested.

The former Chancellor of Germany, Mr. Adenauer, who was the Chancellor of Germany until a few weeks ago, has protested against our proposed sale of wheat to Russia, unless we win a concession from the U.S.S.R. for access to West Berlin. These straws in the wind may indicate that if we insist on obtaining a concession from Russia before we agree to sell her the wheat she wants very much, we may obtain such a concession. And why should we not try?

The Senator from Arkansas, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee made an argument against the Mundt bill which has considerable appeal to me; namely, that we should not expect to defeat the Soviet Union in either a military or a para military contest, but that if peace in the world is to be achieved, there must be some sort of evolution in Russia—an evolution in terms of more cooperation with the rest of the world, and that trade with Russia of the kind proposed will perhaps lead to the reaching of such an agreement.

This may well be the best possible way to achieve peace in the world. But, Mr. President, from every experience we have had with the Soviet Union, it is clear that the Soviets become peaceful only when we use our bargaining position to obtain concessions. After all, within 48 hours after the President of the United States indicated that we would sell wheat to Russia, the Soviets closed access to West Berlin and kept the American troops from moving into West Berlin. Does this suggest the wheat sale will soften Russian Communist militancy? It is also true that when we took a firm stand in regard to Cuba, at the time when the President of the United States made his magnificent speech of October 22—a speech of which all Americans were so very proud—and showed great firmness in regard to Cuba, the President obtained results for peace, and the Soviet Union and Premier Khrushchev backed down.

And only a few days ago, when Professor Barghoorn was falsely arrested as a spy, again the President of the United States was firm. The result: Barghoorn was released, because the President took steps to make sure that if Barghoorn was not released, the United States would have drastically reduced its cultural dealings with the Soviet Union; Barghoorn was released. In that way we obtained results; the Soviets backed down.

Therefore, Mr. President, we should not permit this lesson of history to be lost. We now have a chance to use this bargaining power. We should use the wheat in order to obtain some concessions, for example, in regard to freedom of access to West Berlin or in regard to the removal of the Russian troops from Cuba.

The distinguished Senator from New York has said we should have the same kind of approach on the wheat deal we had on the test ban treaty. I agree that we should. But we do not. The test ban treaty provides a quid pro quo. The test ban treaty provides that if they do not live up to an agreement to help achieve peace, then we retaliate. We act. Then resume testing ourselves. We secure a concession, positive, definite, specific for peace. But in this case we do not. But we do provide the wheat which they need to keep the Soviet Union's satellites together.

There are two technical points I should like to make before I conclude.

It has been said that the proposal will help our balance of payments, that we will get the gold we need for our balance of payments and they will get the wheat which we do not need. We are confusing the means and the ends here. Why do we have this adverse balance of payments? The reason we have it is because we face the threat of the Soviet Union in the world. That is why we have our troops stationed in Europe. That is why we have made gigantic commitments in foreign military assistance, as well as having troops stationed all over the world. This is the prime cause of our adverse balance of payments. The actions of the Soviet Union through its puppet East Germany in closing access to Berlin costs our balance of payments far more than any wheat deal can benefit it, because that kind of Soviet militancy is the kind of thing that persuades wise people to continue our commitments in Europe that are so costly to our balance of payments. If we are to strengthen our balance-of-payments position, the permanent way to strengthen it is to use our strength to get concessions for peace in the Soviet Union and then in that peaceful situation, we can reduce cautiously and gradually our worldwide commitments.

One element that I believe perhaps has been missing from the debate, as far as the Export-Import Bank is concerned, which should be recognized, is the interest implication of the Export-Import guarantee, to which the Mundt bill is specifically directed.

The Export-Import guarantee assures Russia more favorable terms from this country than she can get from Canada. We did not simply meet Canadian terms. We beat Canadian terms. We not only make wheat available at the subsidized world price, at a lower price than the American taxpayer has to pay for wheat, but also we, our Government, guarantees the shipment. The result: With the risk eliminated the interest rate is lower than the Soviet Union otherwise would have to pay. This was brought out in the hearings. The Canadian deal required a 5½ percent interest rate. The American deal, because of our guarantee by the Export-Import Bank, required only a 5 percent interest rate. The Soviet Union will be buying therefore at a lower price because they have more favorable credit terms. As was brought out in the hearings, and as has been discussed in the newspapers, in the Canadian deal the Soviet Union decided to pay cash and not take advantage of credit terms for the wheat. There seems to be every possibility they will continue to pay cash and not use any of the credit extended by Canada to the Soviet Union.

But the guarantee of our Export-Import Bank has been more beneficial to the U.S.S.R. It has cut the risk out and in doing so gives Russia a favorable 5 percent interest rate on its credit deal. It is favorable because unless we pass the Mundt bill we will be placing the full faith and credit of the U.S. taxpayer behind Russia's credit.

There is one other related point I should like to make and that is that the extent to which shipments of grain and other products should be carried in American vessels.

The law on this question seems abundantly clear. I have recently written a letter to the Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Luther Hodges, questioning whether the shipments of grain to Communist countries should not be entirely or largely in American vessels. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this letter may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. LUTHER HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I understand that in the recent sale of U.S. corn to Hungary, credit is being extended to Hungary over an 18-month period. I further understand that this credit is being financed by a New York bank and the Export-Import Bank is providing a 100-percent guarantee on the loans. My impression is that such a loan arrangement necessitates at least 50 percent of the corn being shipped to Hungary in American-flag vessels. Yet apparently the Maritime Administration has ruled that none of the grain needs to be carried in American vessels. If true, this decision is contrary to our national interests, to both law and custom. It hurts our balance-of-payments position. It deprives Americans of jobs they need.

All the legal precedents on this question indicate that at least 50 percent of any foreign shipments of American grain should be carried in American-flag vessels.

The Congress has repeatedly made this policy explicit and the pronouncements from the Maritime Administration have always been consistent with this policy. The present action by the Maritime Administration would seem to be completely in violation of all legal precedents.

The Maritime Administration has apparently taken action, quietly and without public notice, to permit foreign vessels to carry all corn being shipped to Hungary under the recent agreement. Such a policy will undoubtedly constitute a precedent for similar decisions with other grain shipments to the Soviet Union.

I have been consistently opposed to these grain shipments on the grounds that they serve to strengthen the Soviet bloc economically relative to our own economy. I think the decision by the Maritime Administration accentuates and intensifies the relative benefits given to the Soviet bloc by these deals and correspondingly hurts us in the cold war struggle.

The decision by the Maritime Administration also deprives American shippers of a fair share of this trade with a Communist country. Such trade was originally justified by the administration on the grounds that it would benefit the American economy. Yet foreign-flag vessels will receive all of the benefits from the shipments of products.

Our balance of payments is presently in serious deficit. The shipments of grain to the Soviet Union and its satellites has been justified on the ground that this will aid our balance of payments. Yet one of the principal positive factors in our balance of payments is shipping income. That shipping income is to be denied to Americans under the Maritime Administration actions.

Public Resolution 17 approved by the 73d Congress on March 26, 1934, states in part: "That it is the sense of Congress that in any loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any other instrumentality of the Government to foster the exporting of agricultural or other products, provision shall be made that such products shall be carried exclusively in vessels of the United States, unless, as to any or all of such products the Shipping Board Bureau, after investigation, shall certify to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any other instrumentality of the Government that vessels of the United States are not available in sufficient numbers, or in sufficient tonnage capacity, or on necessary sailing schedule or at reasonable rates."

The Maritime Administration action is a clear violation of this congressional expression of policy.

On June 5, 1934, the Attorney General expressed the opinion that Public Resolution 17 was not to be regarded as mandatory in all cases. However, it is my understanding that, in fact, very few, if any, cases occurred until after World War II in which Public Resolution 17 was not followed.

On September 12, 1945, the then President of the Export-Import Bank wrote the Administrator of the Maritime Administration encouraging the Administration to waive the Public Resolution 17 rule in some cases. The reason for the requested waiver was that we were attempting to promote post-war reconstruction by extending grants and loans to various foreign countries and would be, under Public Resolution 17, taking away with one hand the dollars which were being made available with the other. This policy consideration, of course, is not germane at the present time, especially in view of our balance-of-payments difficulties.

In replying to the President of the Export-Import Bank, the Maritime Administrator stated in part: "The Merchant Act of 1936 emphasizes the congressional policy that a substantial portion of foreign trade be carried in American bottoms. This has been generally construed to mean that at least 50 percent of our foreign commerce in each trade route should be carried in American bottoms.

"It is our thought that the operations of our respective agencies could be most effectively coordinated in this respect if you would insert in your loan agreements a standard clause, providing that all shipments be on flags of American vessels, as indicated by Public Resolution 17, except to the extent that exemptions from the resolution may be permitted by the Maritime Commission.

"The Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration would be prepared to police the above quoted contractual provision and report to you periodically as to the arrangement made in connection therewith. The Commission would insist in all cases upon 100 percent shipments in American bottoms unless the foreign government involved gave satisfactory assurances with respect to reasonable participation by American vessels in the transportation of imports to and exports from that country. As a rough guide in this connection a minimum of 50 percent participation would be used."

On April 21, 1952, the then Maritime Administrator wrote the Secretary of State further on the waiver policy. In that letter it was stated in part: "The Attorney General has held that Public Resolution 17, while not mandatory, is in itself the expression of the basic policy of the United States and serves as a protection against, and amelioration of, the damaging effects which result when exports purchased from the United States with proceeds of loans made by this Government are removed from the scope of normal commerce and their shipment controlled by the recipient of such loans.

"One consideration to the granting of such general waivers is that the recipient nation accords fair and nondiscriminatory treatment to U.S. registered vessels on a parity with its own vessels in the international trade. This includes attention to such features as charges on vessels, taxes, berthing facilities, consular fees paid by shippers, and conversion of freight money, as well as the practice of the foreign nation toward efforts of U.S.-flag lines to complete and participate in cargo movements controlled within that country."

These quotations from earlier correspondence seem to me to establish appropriate guidelines for U.S. policy with respect to loans and foreign freight shipments. My understanding is that the policy of the Maritime Administration has never been to waive more than 50 percent of the U.S.-flag requirement under P.R. 17. Moreover, the waivers of up to 50 percent have only occurred in two types of situations, namely: (1) When the Maritime Administration certifies that U.S.-flag vessels are not available in sufficient numbers, or tonnage capacity, as to sailing schedules or at reasonable rates, or (2) when so-called general participation waivers are authorized permitting the recipient nation vessels to share in the traffic. In fact, a 50-percent U.S.-flag minimum clause was indicated in specific foreign aid acts in 1948, 1949, and other years up to 1954, the so-called Cargo Preference Act.

Indeed the Maritime Administration has consistently followed the policy of requiring at least 50 percent of cargo financed by an instrumentality of the Federal Government to be carried in American ships.

This policy has been enforced in shipments to countries that have had the warmest and friendliest relations with the United States. The Maritime Administration has insisted on this policy even when it is clear that the shipment of goods is to an ally who will stand with us against communism.

But now, in shipment to Communist countries—and Hungary has as black and brutal a Communist record of suppression of human liberty as any nation—the Maritime Administration seems to be abrogating the law and violating established custom to provide discriminating, preferred treatment to the Communist government of Hungary.

In view of this history, I would like to inquire as to the type of waiver which was provided in the case of the corn sales to Hungary. I recognize that this decision is made by the Maritime Administration which is under your general direction.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This question is relevant, Mr. President, because one of the principal arguments for these grain sales is that they will assist us in meeting the current balance-of-payments problem. Yet the assistance to our balance of payments will be minimized if the grain is entirely shipped in foreign vessels.

There is an escape route in the law and regulations with respect to the shipment of commodities of our export-import loans in U.S. vessels. This escape route states that the requirements of 100 percent or 50 percent in U.S. vessels is not relevant if the U.S. ships are "not available."

I raised this question with the Under Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., when he testified before the Banking and Currency Committee on November 22. I would like to quote at this point a part of his answer:

> In order to clarify that point, the Maritime Administration in the Department of Commerce reviewed the projected requirements for American ships during the coming 6 or 7 months, including the requirements for Public Law 480 shipments.
>
> We did this, incidentally, in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture. As a result of that survey, it became immediately evident that on the assumption of approximately 2½ million tons of wheat to Russia, and approximately a million and a half tons required for the satellite nations, or a total of 4 million tons, we would not have sufficient domestic bottoms to carry more than

> 50 percent of approximately 50 percent of this traffic. Therefore, all we did was to interpret, or to specify the terms of reference which the President placed upon the sale of this wheat and wheat flour to the Soviet Union and the eastern European Communist countries.
>
> Now to the second point, as to why we require it for wheat and wheat flour and not for other agricultural commodities, the same basic projection of our requirements for shipping prevailed, and it became obvious if we could only carry 50 percent of the projected wheat sales, then we could not carry any of the additional shipments.

Mr. Roosevelt had to give this answer, because the Commerce Department is required to determine whether vessels are available before deciding that shipments can be made in foreign bottoms.

Mr. President, I challenge the conclusion of Mr. Roosevelt that U.S. ships are not available to carry this grain. In the first place, Mr. Roosevelt has apparently only considered tramp vessels, not U.S. steamship lines. In fact, Mr. President, virtually every steamship line in the country does have tonnage available by which to carry these grain shipments and would like very much to have the business.

After my colloquy with Under Secretary Roosevelt and following the tragic events of the last few days, my telephone has been ringing steadily with calls from representatives of virtually every large steamship line in the country. Representatives of these companies, without exception, have indicated that they have boats available which could carry any amount of grain or other commodities which the United States sells to the Soviet Union or other Communist countries. Moreover, these lines are very anxious to obtain this business.

I am willing to document this statement by letters from all of the major steamship lines. Representatives of these lines have indicated to me that they will provide me with such letters. These companies included Lykes Bros., United States Lines, Moore-McCormack, States Marine Line, Bloomfield Steamship Co., and many others. Time has not permitted me to obtain these letters as yet but I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD one letter which I have already obtained from United States Lines.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> UNITED STATES LINES,
> *Washington, D.C., November 26, 1963.*
>
> Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
> *U.S. Senate,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: We understand, one of the issues that has been raised in connection with contemplated sales of agricultural commodities to Russia and the satellites is that of availability of U.S.-flag ships or space thereon for the delivery of other than wheat and wheat flour to the Soviet Union and its satellites.
>
> We believe the waiver of the priorities for U.S.-flag ships in delivering commodities other than wheat and wheat flour to this area cannot be defended on the basis of the inability of American-flag vessels to make timely delivery of such commodities.
>
> Under present circumstances, vessels of our steamship company not only have available space but we anticipate will continue to have available space reliably and economically to consummate these movements in American-flag ships. Thus we believe that freeing the movement of other than wheat and wheat flour from priorities for American-flag vessels will adversely affect cargo justifiably available to us and thus have negative implications for our balance of payments.
>
> Sincerely yours,
> W. J. D'OLIER,
> *Vice President.*

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, to the maximum possible extent any shipments of grains or other commodities to Communist countries should be in American vessels. This includes both American steamship line vessels and tramp vessels.

To sum up, what this deal provides is wheat at a subsidized world price involving a gift of tens of millions of dollars, in effect, from the American taxpayer to the Soviet Union.

Second, this country's credit and the good faith of the American taxpayer are behind this deal which provides for a lower interest rate than would otherwise be provided; and indeed, for a lower interest rate than is available with Canada.

The sale will help the U.S.S.R. hold Cuba and its other satellites together under Russian domination. Because we fail to use our wheat monopoly to secure a solid, definite concession to peace, this deal will do nothing to advance peace. Indeed it is more likely to reinforce U.S.S.R. truculence and militancy as the Soviet Union has always done when we fail to exploit our bargaining position fully.

I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio from the time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I contemplate voting for the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. I should like to enumerate my reasons for casting my vote for the amendment.

First, in my judgment, we are practically at war with Red Russia. It may be labeled as the cold war but the fact is that Red Russia's policy toward the United States has not been altered in a single degree. Red Russia is waging actual war upon us.

It is intent upon destroying our political, economic, and social system. It has no affection for us. It is waiting for the opportunity to toll the bell when our system of government will be laid to rest.

I should like to read briefly what George Kennan had to say about Red Russia and the United States. These are his words. He tried to paraphrase the thinking of the Communist in Red Russia about our country. He said:

> We despise you. We consider that you should be swept from the earth as governments, and physically destroyed as individuals. We reserve the right in our private, if not in our official, capacities to do what we can to bring this about; to revile you publicly, to do everything within our power to detach your own people from their loyalty to you and their confidence in you, to subvert your Armed Forces and to work for your downfall in favor of the Communist dictatorship. But since we are not strong enough to destroy you today * * * since an interval must unfortunately elapse before we can give you the coup de grace * * * we want you during this interval to trade with us. An outrageous demand? Perhaps. But you will accept it, nevertheless. You will accept it because you are not free agents; because you are slaves to your own capitalist appetites, because when profit is involved, you have no pride, no principles, no honor. In the blindness that characterizes declining and perishing classes, you will compete with one another for our favor.

Those words portray the thinking of Communist Russia today. Not long ago Khrushchev made the statement, "When the gold of Russia and of the Communist nations is dangled before the eyes of the capitalist United States, they will abandon all principle."

That is the situation which prevails today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 5 more minutes?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Khrushchev is waiting at home, convinced that the capitalistic greed and appetite will not be able to resist the gold, but would rather succumb to the threats which are implicit in what is being proposed. I do not propose to become a victim of what Khrushchev wants to offer.

The United States cannot afford to have its friends throughout the world believe that our treatment of our enemies is practically identical with our treatment of our friends. If we subsidize the sale of wheat and extend the guarantee of credit, I ask, "What difference would there be between the treatment we accord to Red Russia and the treatment we accord to our friends throughout the world?" In my judgment, there would be no difference whatsoever.

There is uncertainty in the minds of government officials throughout the world as to what we are thinking. They do not know what our policy is.

It is asked, "Why are you helping Red Russia? Why are you helping the Polish Government and the Yugoslav Government?" "What good does it do for my nation," asks a little nation, "for us to stand by your side when your treatment of us is no different from your treatment of the Communist countries? '

The United States cannot permit such wrongdoing or anything which will indicate a faith and belief in the Communist political and economic system. If we permit the people around the world to believe in communism we shall be helping to drive the nails which will eventually seal our doom.

The United States must not follow a course which causes government officials to be confused about our policies. If we sell to Russia but not to Cuba, not to China, and not to Czechoslovakia, what is our policy? I put that question. What will be our policy?

I have had some experience on the bench. I have had some experience as a Governor. I know that one thing must constantly dominate; that is, whatever the Government does must be done in a uniformity of policy.

Now there is advocated an ad hoc treatment—that we approach the problem on the basis of immediate expediency and not on the basis of a long-range treatment of the entire question.

What a strange approach it is to subsidize sales both as to price and as to credit.

Initially, when the proposal was made, our Nation was told the sale would be made for gold, or for dollars on the barrelhead. Now we are asked to guarantee the credit, and, of course, also to subsidize the price.

What have our friends said about this? Mr. Adenauer complained. Canada did not want to sell its wheat until it first had the approval of our State Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 3 more minutes? I shall be through in 3 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from South Dakota is becoming pressed for time. I do not wish to curtail the Senator from Ohio. If the Senator wishes, I will yield him 3 minutes from the time in opposition to the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania. I appreciate his courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 3 minutes from the time in opposition to the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania very much.

If we are to have a change in policy—and that is what is contemplated—in this important issue, it should not be determined in this fugitive and flighty way. What is sought to be done deals with a change of policy that the United States has followed since World War II.

Now I conclude: Next year there is to be held, under the auspices of the United Nations, a trade conference in Geneva. In my judgment, that trade conference will propose freedom of trade between the Communist nations and the nations of the West.

How is American industry, which relates price to cost, to compete with the economy of the Communists, which fixes price without any relationship whatsoever to cost? That is the problem that will confront us.

This is the beginning of that journey down the road which will supposedly mean that there will be an embrace with Red Russia; that we can compete with Communist governments in the sale of their products. It cannot be done because in Red Russia people mean nothing; in the United States, everything.

I would like to get the $250 million in gold or dollars. It is argued that this is to our advantage. It is to our advantage for the night, but as the nights roll on, the Communist threat will not change. It will grow stronger. What today is a balm tomorrow will be a bane.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] will join me in a request for a quorum call not to be charged to either side, to run only for a moment or two, so that the attachés in the cloakroom may advise Senators that the end of the debate and allocation of time are approaching. If there are Senators who wish to speak, they should notify us. I think they are entitled to that notice.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I would not object to having a quorum call before the Senator from South Dakota made his speech. Can we not continue for a little while, unless the Senator from South Dakota wishes to make his speech now?

Mr. MUNDT. I am down to four or five speakers. I know of no more, but I may not know of other Senators who desire to speak on this side.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand that there are no more speakers on this side. Is the Senator through on his side?

Mr. MUNDT. No; we are not through on this side.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Why not proceed? The Senator is the proponent of the bill, and he ought to make his views known. Up to this moment, except in colloquy, they have not been made known.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. I wanted to protect, not myself, but Senators who may not have made known their wish to speak.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, how much time remains on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proponents have 77 minutes remaining. The opponents have 115 minutes remaining.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The proponents have 115 minutes remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the proponents have 77 minutes remaining.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How much time does the Senator from South Dakota think he may require?

Mr. MUNDT. Not more than 30 minutes, and probably less. I was trying to have a quorum call so that the attachés in the cloakrooms could tell the Senators who called there—as they always do—that if they expect to be heard they had better make it known.

Mr. MANSFIELD. They have had ample notice. The Senate has been in session since 12 o'clock. This is not a club of strollers. We are supposed to be statesmen and stay somewhere near the vicinity of the floor. Senators should have made up their minds whether they wished to speak on the bill.

If it meets with the approval of the Senator from South Dakota and the Senate, I suggest that we have an understanding that the Senate vote at 8 o'clock on the measure, with 20 minutes to be allocated to this side.

Mr. MUNDT. That would be impossible. There are five speakers on this side that I know of. We shall probably require the 77 minutes to finish the argument. I have not yet participated in the debate. I am not a member of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; but the Senator introduced the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Certainly. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] has a speech of about 20 minutes. So he and I will take 50 minutes out of our time.

The PRESIDING OFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I support the Mundt bill. This bill would prohibit the Export-Import Bank or any agency of this Government from guaranteeing the payment of any obligation incurred by a Communist country or from extending credit to any such country in connection with the purchase of any American product.

The Export-Import Bank is an instrument of the United States. Its money is the money of the American taxpayers.

The Export-Import Bank has two principal methods of operation. First, it makes loans to foreign purchasers to finance the purchase of U.S. goods.

Second, it makes it possible for U.S. exporters to finance commercial sales by guaranteeing the short term credits normally involved in such transactions. In practice, short term loans are made by commercial banks, and the function of the Export-Import Bank is to insure all or part of the risk taken by the banks in return for an appropriate premium.

It is the latter method which would be used if the Russians were able to make an agreement with our wheat exporters. This would mean that the American taxpayers would be guaranteeing the payment to our exporters and commercial bankers.

There is no risk for the shippers or the bankers. Full risk, full guarantee that the grain will be paid for, is assumed by the taxpaying citizens of the United States through the wholly American owned Export-Import Bank.

For more than 15 years we have been extending great economic and military aid to nations throughout the world in an effort to safeguard those countries from Communist aggression.

We have made some progress in slowing down the Communist aggression. We now see the first possibility of a weakening and overextended Russian Government. We have held off Russia's advances for many years until, now, her own system is threatening to bring great damage to her reputation.

What do we do when we learn of her difficult condition? I tell the Senate what we do. We immediately make overtures to her negotiators to see if we can make a profit by selling our excess wheat.

Russia does not need our wheat to feed her people; she needs it to meet her commitments to her Communist countries. All of the government witnesses before our committee testified that Russia could get by without our wheat. So, selling wheat to Russia is not a Christian act which would alleviate suffering of a hungry people.

The selling of wheat and other products to Russia permits that Communist country to meet its commitment and to maintain itself as a power in world commerce.

I invite attention to the record of the hearings, at page 151, the testimony elicited by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] from Mr. Ball, Assistant Secretary of State. That colloquy reads as follows:

> Senator DOMINICK. Would you agree in many areas of the world Russia is doing its best to overthrow free world governments and to put them under Communist government?
>
> Mr. BALL. There is no doubt of it.
>
> Senator DOMINICK. At the moment, our policy is not to trade with either Red China or Cuba in any form; this is correct, is it not?
>
> Mr. BALL. That is right.
>
> Senator DOMINICK. If this particular transaction goes through, would you anticipate that we would change our policy with respect to trade with those Communist countries?
>
> Mr. BALL. No; certainly not.
>
> Senator DOMINICK. On what basis do you distinguish that?
>
> Mr. BALL. There is a fundamental difference in the nature of the relationships. Communist China still has Americans in prison.

I pause at that point to say that Communist Russia has had Americans in prison. She has had American servicemen in prison at the autobahn. She held Professor Barghoorn in prison. She has held many prisoners, and will continue to hold others in the future.

I continue to read:

> It still is engaged in a violent action against us around the world in various places. The main problem that we have with it, of course, is its aggressive intention with regard to Formosa, the fact that we have friendly relations with the Republic of China.

While Red China is the aggressor in Formosa, Russia is the aggressor in Western Europe and in Cuba. It should be clear that Cuba, Russia, and China are one and the same type of nation—dedicated to the overthrow of the great United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the Chair). The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. SIMPSON. If ever our economic system had an opportunity to show its superiority, now is the time. We must not weaken our position by bailing out our enemy in a time of crisis. We are not in the cold war for sports. We are in it for the survival of freedom.

For many years we have refused, and properly so, to aid Communist countries. I believe now is the time to reevaluate our position. Do we believe that communism is out to destroy us, or do we believe that the Communists are our friends? I believe they are dedicated to the destruction of our Nation and freedom. I am not prepared to ask the taxpayers of America to guarantee the debts of our cold war enemies.

I do not agree with the administration and its policy to sell wheat to the Communist bloc countries; nor do I agree with the Attorney General in his interpretation of the Johnson Act. However, those decisions have been made, and I do not quarrel with them. We are now confronted with the problem of asking the American people to assume the risk of non-payment by the Communist bloc countries.

We, as a country, have asked our allies not to deal with the Communist countries. We have criticized those countries which did trade with Red China, Cuba, or any of the other Communist countries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SIMPSON. Our Government forgets its role as the leader of the free world and attempts to reinterpret the law so that we can sell our cold war enemy wheat and acquire a profit.

So it is my sincere hope that Congress will place principle above profit and deny the Export-Import Bank the authority to guarantee this credit.

Mr. MUNDT. May I inquire from the other side of the aisle if any Senator wishes to speak for a short period of time? The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] is on his way to the Chamber.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I cannot endorse S. 2310, a bill to take away the facilities of the Export-Import Bank to American businessmen in any commercial transactions they may have with Communist countries. Such export encouragements are provided by every other major trading nation and help to move world trade into channels whose course is at first uncertain.

The issue posed by this bill is much broader than approval or disapproval of the much-discussed sale of surplus wheat to the Communist bloc. So far as that transaction is concerned, as I said at the time negotiations were announced, it seems possible that this Nation might have turned a serious Soviet wheat shortage to better advantage, not in terms of price, but in order to achieve national security objectives. While our traders might have won more, I cannot support a bill that would conclusively bar any public benefits which might flow from such trade, now or in the future. Its passage would place American business at a disadvantage and protect the other trade relations of the Soviet bloc from American competition.

Our trade with the controlled economies of the Soviet bloc should not be free of regulation and restraints. Under existing law, the Government may deny an export license for any such transaction. But the record of hearings on S. 2310 discloses little to support the view that this is the time to impose blanket restrictions on East-West trade. We must avail ourselves of every opportunity to influence the conduct of the bloc countries and should not deny ourselves the instruments of trade in our contest with their governments.

Let the subject economies feel the productive vigor of American enterprise. Our free enterprise system, not threatened by competition with State economies, should welcome such a challenge.

There is a political risk in such trade, which the Export-Import Bank was created to bear. Many of the advantages of such trade, including improvement in our chronic balance-of-payments difficulties, accrue to the Nation as a whole. The purely economic risks, such as price fluctuations, are borne by the traders and their private banks. Once it is decided to have a Government financial institution to underwrite the political risk of exports, I believe it should be permitted to guarantee such export transactions as the Government itself permits. Consequently, I urged the Committee on Banking and Currency to report the bill unfavorably to the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the one basic question which faces the Senate may be stated simply. It is whether it is in the national interest to encourage peaceful trade with all nations, including Communist nations. Our late, great President believed it was. So do I.

We are one in this Chamber in our opposition to communism, in our distaste for Communist governments. However, hating them will not make them go away. Refusing to trade with them does not prevent their trading with other nations in the non-Communist world.

What does it gain us to sell surplus wheat to West Germany, only to have it refined there into flour and sold profitably to the Iron Curtain countries? Our food eventually reaches those countries through middlemen, who reap the gain. To persist in this course is only to harden and harshen the schism between the United States and Communist governments, without weakening them in any meaningful way.

Sooner or later we must realize that we all live on one shrunken planet. We must either live together in peace or die together in a nuclear war.

Sale of food promotes the cause of peace. Two hundred and fifty million dollars paid to us by Russia for surplus food we do not need not only will help us earn added gold, which we do need, but will also represent $250 million which Russia cannot spend on guns or missiles or other mischief in her effort to weaken or subvert free governments elsewhere in the world.

Therefore, I believe that the sale of this wheat is in the intelligent self-interest of the United States. The credit terms to facilitate this sale are of a normal commercial character. To withhold them is to block the sale, for no sufficient cause.

I commend the Committee on Banking and Currency for reporting the proposal adversely, and I hope the Senate will uphold the decision of the committee.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise in support of the bill, S. 2310, introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] to prohibit plans for the U.S.-financed Export-Import Bank to guarantee repayment of commercial loans made to the Soviet Union and Hungary so these two Communist countries will purchase wheat from our country.

There are any number of reasons, Mr. President, why we should not sell wheat to Communist countries, and especially not on credit. For one thing, Public Law 87-128 approved by the Congress in 1961 spells out the intention of the Congress that the United States should:

> In no manner either subsidize the export, sell, or make available any subsidized agricultural commodity to any nations other than * * * friendly nations.

Secondly, selling food to the Communists is giving direct assistance to our enemy, the forces of world communism. It is quite well understood, Mr. President, that any armed force of a nation must have three basic necessities in order to attain any degree of success in battle. An armed force must have food, clothing, and weapons. Therefore, Mr. President, food is a weapon of war—indeed, a very vital weapon of war.

We have heard many cries in support of the wheat deal with the Communists because there is a so-called humanitarian principle involved in keeping the Russian people from starving. Even if we provided this wheat to the Soviets for the purpose of feeding the Russian people, the Russian people would only get the leftover crumbs after the Communist elite, the rank and file Communist Party members, and the armed forces are fed—in that order, Mr. President. It is well known that the Communist leaders, who plan and control everything behind the Iron Curtain, always give the people what is left over after the Communists themselves and the armed forces are first provided for.

Actually, Mr. President, the Soviets have a large quantity of wheat stored for use in war, and the needs of the Russian people can be met from current harvests. What concerns the Communist leaders is how they can meet their wheat commitments to the satellite countries in order to keep them in their grip, and to neutrals under their foreign aid program, and still maintain their wartime stockpiles. The Communists have shown to the world that collectivization of farms does not work so well. They must use several times as many farmworkers to produce the same amount of a particular crop as our efficient, capitalist farming methods require in this country. In order to produce more to meet their commitments to their satellites and in their foreign aid wooing program, the Communists would be forced to pull back to the farms more workers now being used in industry to manufacture armaments or in their armed forces because food, above all else, must be provided to the people behind the Iron Curtain if they are to be kept in slavery.

It should be mentioned that if there is any validity to the theory of fragmentation, which has been the guiding policy consideration in our foreign relations particularly with Yugoslavia, the proposed wheat deal would mitigate against the success of the fragmentation of the Soviet bloc. As has been pointed out, either our wheat will be transshipped to bloc countries, or the Soviets will use our wheat for their domestic requirements, and ship their own wheat to the bloc countries. This will increase the dependence of the bloc countries on Russia, greatly diminish the chances of the fragmentation of the bloc, and lessen the chances of a greater reliance by some of the satellites on the Western nations.

Why should we bail the Communist leaders out—and on credit, too?

Another reason why we should not sell this wheat to the Communists—and we might as well use the term "give" in place of "sell" if we are going to extend the Communists credit to buy the wheat—is that we will be letting down the many captives behind the Iron Curtain who have been willing to sabotage their own food supplies in order to wage the fight for freedom in one of the few ways they are able to battle their Communist masters. The grain harvest in the Soviet Union is sabotaged not only in the fields but likewise, and to a considerable degree, in transportation.

The following excerpts are from an article in the "Gudok"—the Whistle, a Soviet transportation news publication, dated September 17, 1963. It describes the grain-hauling trains at the Atkarsk and Balashov railroad stations. This is a typical article.

> The losses of grain in transportation are not small at all. We visited trains that had arrived to Atkarsk. Grain was pouring out profusely from many cars. It was practically impossible to count them all. In train No. 2617, cars Nos. 139757, 1521454, 72959, and 526139, and in train No. 2631, cars Nos. 1463918, 521553, and 774616 were leaking. And we could list them like that on and on. A lot of grain was being lost.
>
> We followed a grain path that led us to the grain elevator. There was the car No. 742559 with the large holes in its body and with broken doors. Several other cars had broken doors, too.
>
> We asked the transportation supervisor of the flour mill, Sidorov, if the losses are really significant.
>
> "Oh yes," he said; we missed more than 70 tons of grain in 195 cars that arrived recently."
>
> We witnessed the arrival of a train from Pugachevsk and registered a shortage of 2,250 kilograms in car No. 1578724 and 4,400 kg in car No. 779067, and so on.
>
> In 30 cars that arrived from Pugachevsk on 28 August, more than 62 tons of grain were missing. In car No. 140662, that came from Yershov, the loss exceeded 18 tons. The same type of cars arrived from Urbakh, Aleksandrov-Gay, Mokrous, Pitevka, and other stations.

I have outlined several basic reasons why our Government should not permit the sale or giving of wheat to Communist countries, for gold or otherwise.

On the question of extending credit to the Communist Governments of the Soviet Union and Hungary, I should like to outline several points which support the policy position set forth in the Mundt bill. I might point out here that the Mundt bill would not preclude the wheat sale but merely the guarantee by the Export-Import Bank of commercial loans to the countries which are in default to us on previous loans.

First, there is the question of whether the extension of credit to these countries is even lawful. The Johnson Act of 1934 specifically bars extension of credit to nations in default on their debts to our country. Yet, our Government is giving its assent for grain dealers and traders to sell wheat to these two Communist countries at a Government subsidy of approximately 60 cents per bushel. The grain dealers and traders do not want to accept Communist credit in exchange for the wheat, and neither do the commercial banks which have been asked to make the loans to the Communists. They simply do not have enough faith in the Communists to put their dollars on the line in exchange for a Communist promise to pay—and they have good reason to be wary of the Communists and the keeping of their word. So they have turned to the American taxpayer, who supplies the funds for the operation of the Export-Import Bank, and have asked him to guarantee the loans for them. If the present arrangements are permitted to go through, no one stands to lose his shirt except the American taxpayer.

Mr. President, I just do not understand why we cannot demand gold on the barrelhead, as it was generally understood initially that we would get, in exchange for the proposed wheat sale. After all, testimony presented in the Banking and Currency Committee states the Canadians have been getting a downpayment of 80 percent in gold on their wheat sales to the Communists. In fact, Mr. President, it has also been reported and recorded in the committee hearings that the Soviets have approximately $9 billion in gold reserves.

In a recent column, the Allen-Scott report has stated that even the Canadians, who are getting such a large downpayment compared to us, are having difficulty collecting on the credit they have extended to the Chinese Communists.

As to the question of Communist reliability, in September 1962, the Defense Department issued a pamphlet stressing Communist statements and actions which prove that they cannot be trusted. Then, there are the Soviet debt obligations to the United States which have never been met. They owe us $621 million in principal and interest from World War I, $11 billion in lend lease aid during World War II, and $205 million for assistance at the end of World War II.

In making a decision here today I hope that each Senator will ask himself two questions:

First, would I extend such a loan to a credit risk like Nikita Khrushchev who has vowed to "bury us"? and, second, even if I would, would my people back home agree to have the money taken from their own pockets for this purpose?

I think the answer would be a resounding "No" to each of these questions and presents the best reasons anyone could give for refusing to compound an already tragic mistake of providing our enemies with a vital weapon of war in these perilous times.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from South Carolina, and wish to have him answer a question.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. THURMOND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from South Carolina said that under the Canadian sale of wheat, Canada received 80 percent down, as compared with our 25 percent down, as proposed. I am sure the Senator from South Carolina understands that the terms agreed upon with the Canadians were the same as those in connection with our own proposed sale—namely, 25 percent down—but that when the settlement date came, Russia—of her own volition—paid 80 percent.

Mr. THURMOND. But that was in lieu of gold, and we are not to get that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We shall not know what we shall be getting until the settlement date comes. The Soviet Union is required to pay 25 percent down. She may pay more if she wishes to do so. I should like to have the RECORD show that.

Mr. THURMOND. But unless the pending bill were passed, would not the U.S. taxpayers be guaranteeing a loan to the Soviet Union, through private banks, because our Export-Import Bank, which is owned by the U.S. Government, would back up the loan?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Export-Import Bank would be guaranteeing the loan, but would be receiving a premium for doing so—for doing a regular insurance job.

Mr. THURMOND. Therefore, the U.S. taxpayers would be guaranteeing the loan, through their Government, would they not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No. Five-eighths of 1 percent is paid by the private banks to the Export-Import Bank, and the interest charge is to be used to guarantee the loan.

Mr. THURMOND. But if the Export-Import Bank guarantees the loan——

Mr. SPARKMAN. But the private banks would be paying the premium—just as in the case of any insurance business.

At any rate, the time I have yielded to the Senator from South Carolina has expired; and I have promised to yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE]. I now yield that time to him.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Maine is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank the Senator from Alabama for yielding to me.

Mr. President, the issue before us today is whether we shall permit private individuals to sell wheat or other commodities to Soviet bloc countries on normal commercial credit terms. S. 2310, with or without the Mundt amendment, would withdraw from commercial banks, active in world trade, the opportunity to use the Export-Import Bank guarantee program in commercial transactions with the Soviet Union and other Soviet bloc countries. It would, from all indications, kill the proposed sale of surplus wheat or other commodities to the Soviet bloc.

The first question we must ask ourselves is whether we consider the proposed sale of U.S. wheat and flour to the Soviet Union and East European countries as being in the best interests of the United States.

The following seem to me to be pertinent considerations:

First. We have wheat "running out of our ears"—wheat which we do not need. We have 1.2 billion bushels of surplus wheat in storage, for which we are paying millions of dollars a year in storage costs. This year's crop will be in excess of 1 billion bushels. This is nearly double our annual requirements.

Second. We have a balance-of-payments problem which imposes a severe drain upon our gold supply. A sale of wheat for dollars would help us ease this problem.

Third. Other countries in the West, including Canada and West Germany, among others, have sold wheat or wheat flour to the Soviet Union.

Fourth. In selling wheat to the Soviet bloc we would be exchanging wheat which we do not need for dollars which we do need.

On balance, therefore, it seems to me that it is in the national interest to have private traders sell wheat and wheat flour to the Soviet bloc for dollars—including either cash or short-term or medium-term commercial credit terms.

Yankee traders have always recognized that a trade is a two-way proposition. We do not make one unless there is an advantage in it for us. In this case, as I see it, the advantage to us more than offsets the fact that wheat sales will ease the current wheat shortage of the Soviet Union. I believe that the sale will point up, for all the world to see, the success of American agriculture, compared with the bankrupt Soviet agricultural system.

Moreover, as the First National City Bank of New York put it in its recent newsletter:

> Trade among the nations, to mutual advantage, is a good way to keep rivalry on a peaceful basis.

The question raised by S. 2310 is the degree of risk involved in the negotiation of commercial credit arrangements with the Soviet Union and its allies.

It is clear that no one seriously questions the role of credit in international trade—except as it may involve the Soviet bloc. Credit is playing a larger role in international trade each year, as it is in our domestic economy. Our exporters are finding that without credit arrangements, they cannot compete with foreign operators. As a result, there has been a growth in the number of U.S. banks active in world trade.

In their trade financing transactions, our banks rely on the recently established Foreign Credit Insurance Association, made up of over 70 private marine, casualty, and property insurance companies and the U.S. Government's Export-Import Bank, for insurance and guarantees. These devices serve to protect financial houses and exporters from the commercial and political risks inherent in foreign trade. They are comparable to Government owned or supported export guaranty institutions in other countries.

THE ROLE OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

The Export-Import Bank as served for more than 29 years as the Government's only agency dedicated solely to the financing of the foreign trade of the United States. Its present scope and form of organization date from 1945, when the law under which it now operates was enacted.

In performing its function of aiding and facilitating the foreign trade of the United States, the Bank finances or guarantees the payment of medium-term commercial export credits extended by exporters or commercial banks, and, in partnership with private insurance companies, offers short-term and medium-term export credit insurance.

It makes long-term loans to finance the purchase of U.S. equipment, goods, and related services for projects undertaken by private enterprises or governments abroad.

Emergency credits are also provided to assist other countries in maintaining the level of exports from the United States when they experience temporary balance-of-payments difficulties.

Mindful of the expressed desire of the Congress and in full accord with the American emphasis on private enterprise, the Bank avoids competing with private capital, and seeks private participation in its loans. It lends and guarantees only where it finds reasonable assurance of repayment.

The matter of export credit guarantees is of critical concern to American exporters and, in effect, to our free enterprise system. These must be available, or our exporters are simply precluded from competing with foreign trade interests. Without these guarantees in normal foreign trade channels, we leave the field to foreign merchants, and our system of free enterprise suffers.

I quote from the "final report of the Committee on Commerce of the U.S. Senate, prepared by its special staff on the study of U.S. foreign commerce, pursuant to Senate Resolution 243, 86th Congress" and printed on June 26, 1961—page 218:

> None of the competitive factors confronting the American exporters in foreign markets is more crucial than his ability to offer his product on attractive credit terms. Very often this makes the difference between closing a transaction and losing the business to a competitor in another country.
>
> In its interim report in April 1960, the committee's foreign commerce study staff analyzed this problem in terms which bear repeating here:
>
> Considerable confusion appears to have arisen from the failure to distinguish clearly between export credit, or financing, and export credit guarantees, which are essentially a form of insurance. The distinction is graphically illustrated by the fact that the

> two functions are separately performed domestically by banking institutions on the one hand and insurance institutions on the other. Traditionally, the commercial banking function is concerned with the extension of loans at prescribed interest rates to individual borrowers in specific cases; the insurance function is to protect the insured against loss from any one of a variety of causes in return for a premium. This basic difference in purpose suggests an equally basic difference between banks and insurance companies both in psychology and in administration; and the difference should be taken into account in considering the establishment of improved export credit guarantee facilities.
>
> Once the distinction has been clearly drawn, however, the dilemma of the American exporter is evident. Stated briefly, and at some risk of oversimplification, it is this: In order to compete with producers in Western Europe and Japan, the U.S. producer must offer his oversea customer payment terms as favorable as those offered by his competitors. In order to do so, he must be able to finance his export transactions. But because of certain hazards peculiar to the export trade, primarily of a political nature, commercial banks are often disinclined to accommodate him. For the same reason, most domestic insurance companies will not assume the risk on such transactions.
>
> In most countries of Western Europe and Japan these export risks are met through a relatively simple system of guarantees under which the exporter is, in effect, insured by a government or government-backed institution against loss on his export sales. Armed with this insurance, he can obtain financing in normal commercial channels with a minimum of delay.
>
> In the United States, the Export-Import Bank is the only institution corresponding to the government or quasi-government export guarantee institutions of other countries.

It should be noted that European nations have found in commercial transactions with the Soviet bloc there has been no problem on repayments. A check with English, French, and West German credit institutions reveals not one default on a trade credit transaction with the Soviet bloc.

This is not a case of relying on good faith; it is a situation in which the Soviets realize they must meet their obligations or else be cut off from western trade.

It is a fact that the Soviet Union always has tried to evade normal trade negotiations and contracts. It is also a fact that in the proposed wheat transactions, the Soviet Union has been backed into a corner by the United States and other free world nations. We have insisted that they meet conditions established by us, and enter into contractual arrangements that are the essence of free enterprise.

Shipments of grain to the Soviet Union, and to other East European countries, will be handled by the private grain trade on a normal commercial sales basis.

The Soviet Union is not being given any special consideration; there is no exception to the rule on these contractual arrangements.

In fact, the conditions announced by President Kennedy for the granting of export licenses to ship the grain are far more rigid and more rigorous than arrangements made with other nations for agricultural commodities. The President announced that 25 percent of the total cost would be in cash—the same as for the arrangement entered into by Canada. Recent terms on cotton exports to Austria, to Hong Kong, and to Japan—with 18 months terms to Austria, 12 months to Japan, and 12 months to Hong Kong—required no cash at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Maine has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 2 more minutes.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, the wheat deal, like all trade, is a two-way street. The advantages flow both ways. From our point of view there is an advantage worth getting.

The credit terms we are talking about, including the guarantees, are normal in international commercial transaction. The experience of other Western countries indicates that the extension of such terms to the Soviets is justified by their credit record.

More important than any of these considerations, valid as they may be, is the part this transaction may play in the policy toward the Soviet Union which was so eloquently stated by President Kennedy in his address at the University of Maine, on October 19, 1963, from which I quote:

> The United States and the Soviet Union still have wholly different concepts of the world, its freedom and its future. We still have wholly different views on so-called wars of liberation and the use of subversion. And so long as these basic differences continue, they cannot and should not be concealed; they set limits to the possibilities of agreement; and they will give rise to further crises, large and small, in the months and years ahead, both in areas of direct confrontation—such as Germany and the Caribbean—and in areas where events beyond our control could involve us both—areas such as Africa, Asia, and the Middle East.
>
> In times such as these, therefore, there is nothing inconsistent about signing an atmospheric nuclear test ban, on the one hand, and testing underground on the other; about being willing to sell to the Soviets our surplus wheat while refusing to sell strategic items; about probing their interest in a joint lunar landing while making a major effort to master this new environment; or about exploring the possibilities of disarmament while maintaining our stockpile of armaments. For all of these moves, and all other elements of American and allied policy toward the Soviet Union, are directed at a single, comprehensive goal—namely, convincing the Soviet leaders that it is dangerous for them to engage in direct or indirect aggression, futile for them to attempt to impose their will and their system on other unwilling peoples, and beneficial to them, as well as all the world, to join in the achievement of a genuine and enforcible peace.
>
> While the road to that peace is long and hard, and full of traps and pitfalls, that is no reason not to take each step we can safely take. It is in our national self-interest to ban nuclear testing in the atmosphere so that all our citizens can breathe easier.
>
> It is in our national self-interest to sell surplus wheat in storage to feed Russians and Eastern Europeans who are willing to divert large portions of their limited foreign exchange reserves away from the implements of war. It is in our national self-interest to keep weapons of mass destruction out of outer space—to maintain an emergency communications link with Moscow—and to substitute joint and peaceful exploration for cold war exploitation in the Antarctic and in outer space.
>
> No one of these small advances, nor all of them taken together, can be interpreted as meaning that the Soviets are abandoning their basic aims and ambitions. Nor should any future, less friendly Soviet action—whether it is a stoppage on the autobahn, or a veto in the U.N., or a spy in our midst, or new trouble elsewhere—cause us to regret the steps we have taken. Even if those steps themselves should be undone—by the violation or renunciation of the test ban treaty, for example, or by a decision to decline American wheat—there would still be no reason to regret the fact that this Nation had made every reasonable effort to improve relations.
>
> For without our making such an effort, we could not maintain the leadership and respect of the free world. Without our making such an effort, we could not convince our adversaries that war was not in their interest. And without our making such an effort, we could never, in case of war, satisfy our own hearts and minds that we had done all that could be done to avoid that holocaust of endless death and destruction.

Mr. President, I submit that to carry out the spirit of that policy, S. 2310 should be defeated.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, I intend to support the pending bill, S. 2310. This bill merely provides that neither the Export-Import Bank nor any other agency of the Federal Government shall guarantee the payment of any obligation heretofore or hereafter incurred by any Communist country or any agency or national thereof, or in any other way participate in the extension of credit to any such country, agency, or national, in connection with the purchase of any product by such country, agency, or national. "Communist country" includes the Soviet Union, Red China, the various so-called bloc nations, including Yugoslavia, Poland, Hungary, and Cuba.

The reason for the bill is that without its enactment the administration proposes to permit the Export-Import Bank to make such guarantees in connection with the sale of wheat and other surplus agricultural commodities to the Soviet Union and other bloc nations. The bank now has authority to do this, although it is not required to do so. It proposes to do so unless Congress changes the law.

The entire point is whether the taxpayers of the United States, who would pay the taxes needed to cover any losses on guarantees made by the Bank, should have to bear the burden of taxation to cover losses which might result from default on the part of Communist countries, agencies, or nationals.

It is understood that the Bank charges fees to commercial banks and others wishing to discount their commercial paper with the Bank and that in the normal course of business, these fees have enabled the Bank to operate on a self-supporting basis, and also have enabled the Bank to show a profit. No one has any quarrel with this. But if there were to be any large defaulting on loans guaranteed by the Export-Import Bank, the reserves accumulated by the Bank would be diminished, the funds returned by the Bank to the Treasury would be that much smaller, and the U.S. taxpayers would have to make up the difference. So the policy question before the Senate is whether the law should be changed in order to make sure that this does not happen when such a default arises from a Communist country.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. MILLER. I shall be happy to yield if, when I have concluded my remarks, there is left to me time in which to yield.

Mr. President, I think the law should be so changed. There is no valid reason for permitting Communist nations exactly the same credit terms as non-Communist nations, so far as our Federal Government and our taxpayers are concerned. If it is suggested that failure by our taxpayers to underwrite the Export-Import Bank, so that it will guarantee the credit of Communist countries, agencies, or nationals, will mean that the United States will lose out to its competing allies who are willing to guarantee credit for the benefit of its commercial trade, there are three answers: First, the Soviet Union, which promises to be the principal purchaser of surplus wheat, does not need credit. She has plenty of gold to pay for it without any credit at all; second, such being the case, if she needs our surplus commodities, she will be willing to pay spot cash for them—particularly if normal discount for cash rather than credit terms are extended; third, our Government should be willing to protect its commercial trade by putting adequate pressure on our competing allies to eliminate this feature of competition—if indeed it must be eliminated in order to protect our commercial trade.

Let us not fool ourselves into thinking that the problem before us is merely a simple one of insurance. If one wishes to use the term "insurance", let us put it in the precise context: insurance, with stockholders—our taxpayers—bearing the risk of liability for defalcation by Communists—by risks who think that lying, cheating, and stealing are perfectly proper weapons to use; by risks from a Government which shows its contempt for our efforts to ease tensions by repeated incidents on the autobahn, by the arrest of Professor Barghoorn, by a closed-skies policy. This kind of insurance situation does not sound "as American as apple pie" to me, although one of our colleagues so described it.

Nor does it satisfy the situation that any particular Communist country has not defaulted in its previous credit transactions with American businessmen. This might be grounds for private business trade to extend credit, but it still is not sufficient to warrant the American taxpayer underwriting a transaction—because there can always be a first time, when and if it suits the purpose of the Communists, for defaulting deliberately and in line with Communist expediency.

Nor does it satisfy the argument by pointing out that the Export-Import Bank has several hundred millions of dollars in undivided profits that have been placed in reserve to take care of defaults. The answer to that is to have these profits used to reduce the fees charged by the Export-Import Bank, or to return some of that money to the Treasury to help reduce our deficit situation, and not to run the risk of its diminution by underwriting sales made on credit to Communist nations.

To logically extend the arguments of some who have opposed the Mundt bill would find us engaging in trade—on credit—with Red China. Perhaps this might be good business—if the dollar, gold, and profits are all that should be considered. I doubt that it is sound politically or morally, and the fact that the British see fit to trade with Red China does not make it any less despicable. It may be expedient to separate commercial policies from political policies, but that does not make it right. There are other considerations that enter in, and it is not easy to strike a balance between the plusses and the minuses. However, as far as I am concerned, I believe the minuses outweigh any pluses in trading with Red China.

I happen to have been one of the Members of the Senate who expressed the view that the plusses outweighed the minuses in selling surplus wheat to Russia and other bloc nations. But I made very clear that my opinion was premised on the understanding that the sales would be at the world price, for hard dollars. The American people were so led to believe. There was nothing ever said about credit being extended to Russia which would be guaranteed by the Export-Import Bank.

We are told we do not know whether sales are on or off. But we are told Russia needs wheat. If so, then she ought to be willing to pay cash or gold.

Indeed, if she needs flour, one wonders why we do not approve sales of flour so that our milling businesses will obtain the benefits instead of letting millers in the Soviet Union have it.

When and if the Communist leaders cease and desist from the cold war, we can then consider guaranteeing credit for their purchases—but not before.

Mr. President, I hope that the bill will be passed.

I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator from Iowa has stressed the hazards to the American taxpayer involved in credit sales to the Soviet Union. I have some comment to make on the hazards involved. There is another side to this question on which I should like to hear the comment of the Senator from Iowa. There is a letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Charles Murphy, which is printed on page 5 of the hearings, in which he makes the statement:

> If sales of 4 million tons of wheat to Soviet bloc countries are consummated, U.S. budget expenditures will be reduced by approximately a quarter of a billion dollars in fiscal years 1964 and 1965 by reason of receipts from sale of Government-held wheat and savings in storage and other carrying charges.

It seems to me that far from damaging the American taxpayer, if we can take a quarter of a billion of dollars from the backs of the taxpayers and improve our budget position by that amount, the proposal would be a good break for the taxpayer.

In addition, I believe that a good many taxpayers are concerned about the flight of American gold. We are going to get 25 percent of the deal in gold at the start. That we know we have. The question is, What about the balance? Is the proposal a good credit risk? The entire history of Soviet Union dealings with the West would lead one to believe that it is a good credit risk. The British say they have never lost a shilling in their trade with the Soviet bloc. Countries in Western Europe have had the same experience.

I believe that on both counts the Senator is making a rather thin case in the interest of the American taxpayers when he forecloses this possibility.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 3 minutes to respond to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I regret to say that the figures of savings to taxpayers are overstated. If the Senator will be good enough to refer to my statement in the Record of November 15, 1963, starting on page 21944, he will find figures that represent savings to taxpayers.

Second, I have stated that I joined many other Senators, including the Senator from South Dakota, in saying that the pluses outweigh the minuses in connection with the proposed wheat sale, for the very reason the Senator sets forth, although I say that the taxpayers' savings would not be so great as those to which the Senator from South Dakota referred, but there is no argument on it.

I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota the following question:

If the Senator says that the Soviet Union has a fine record as far as the British are concerned, let me suggest to him that Red China has a good record so far as the British are concerned, too. Therefore, would the Senator conclude that we should engage in trade with Red China?

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator knows that transactions with Red China are not at issue in the bill.

Mr. MILLER. No, but the argument follows.

Mr. McGOVERN. The argument may follow. Perhaps someday we shall have to face that issue; but that is not what we are discussing at the present moment.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from South Dakota has argued before that the British have a good record of credit transactions with the Soviet bloc, and that therefore we should do the same thing. If that is the only basis for the argument, we might as well engage in trade with Red China.

Mr. McGOVERN. That is not the issue we are faced with.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator and I have engaged in an analysis of our views, but I do not like to use specious arguments to support them.

Mr. McGOVERN. I do not believe it is a specious argument when we point out that there will be substantial savings to the American taxpayer, who is now carrying the load of these surplus stocks.

Mr. MILLER. It is not a specious argument. I use that myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

The Chair inquires of the Senators in charge of the bill as to who yields time?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] and announce to the Senate that this will probably be the next to the last speech. I believe Senators would like to know that so that they can plan accordingly.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Walters in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator from Nebraska be recognized for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I rise in support of the bill introduced by the Senator from South Dakota. It is my intention to vote for it.

The issue which the Senate is deciding in voting for or against the bill is not whether there will be a sale of wheat to Russia. The issue is whether to convert a private sale into a government-to-government sale. That conversion is attempted by way of having the Export-Import Bank, a Government agency, guarantee the transaction whereby private merchants will be selling grain to the Government of Russia.

The support for this transaction and the opposition to the bill are based upon a number of misconceptions.

I refer to the telegram which was placed in the Record by my colleague from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis], from the president of the National Association of Wheatgrowers. It states in part:

> We are now holding our State wheat association conventions. Of those held to date all have approved the sale of wheat to Russia and satellite countries as outlined by the President.

In a later part of the telegram, it is stated:

> It is furthermore generally agreed the sale of wheat to Russia will not enhance the cause of world communism but will be feeding hungry people and using their gold for food rather than war materiel.

Other arguments were raised. An argument was made a short while ago that it is not fitting for this body to be niggling; that we should not try to wriggle out of a commitment which has been made; that we should not assert a veto over what our President has said and done.

I believe a brief review of what we are discussing will serve some purpose. I believe the Record will show that there has been a curious evolution of this transaction.

I ask Senators to consider that it had, in its original form, three restrictions or three component elements—first, that it would be a cash transaction; second, that there would be shipment of the wheat in American vessels; and, third, that there would be no transshipment of the wheat, but that it would be limited for delivery and use to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

Every one of these three component elements has been completely abandoned or reversed in its direction.

I speak advisedly when I speak in favor of the bill. I come from a State which produces a great deal of wheat. It is quality wheat. No other Senator is more possessed by the idea that we should devise some means of disposing of our surplus stocks so that wheat will not continue to pile up and result in ever increasing expense to the Government and the taxpayers.

On the other hand, it is necessary to analyze the long-range results of this proposed sale. We should not be taken in by the argument that we shall have a temporary tangible advantage, one that we can see, with a definite promise of a reduction in our budget next year of $200 million; and, therefore, that the bill should be rejected.

What about the restrictions imposed on the transaction? What about the requirement that it be a cash transaction, and the other component elements?

The question of the use of American vessels would not be affected by passage of this bill. Neither would the possibility of transshipment of the wheat to a different destination from the destination specified in the original shipping orders. The one component element of the original transaction which is at issue at this time is whether or not this is to be a cash sale, for dollars or gold.

In the original official statement which was made on October 9, it was announced that sales by private dealers for American dollars or gold, either cash on delivery or on normal commercial terms, would not be prohibited. The official announcement then stated that—

> The Commodity Credit Corporation in the Department of Agriculture will sell to our private grain traders the amount necessary to replace the grain used to fulfill these requirements; and the Department of Commerce will grant export licenses for their sale, with the commitment that these commodities are for delivery to and use in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe only.

We know that that conception has been completely thrown out the window. Earlier in October Russia consummated a purchase of wheat from Canada, and the very first shipload of that purchase left the shores of Canada on October 6 destined for Cuba, where the cargo was discharged.

What does that mean? Because that cargo was sent elsewhere and not to Russia, and only because of that fact, any wheat we sell from the United States of America will be retained in Russia. Retained in Russia for what? To feed hungry, starving people? Not at all. There is no such humanitarian purpose of that kind anywhere in this transaction, because the wheat will not be used to feed any of the Russians. It will be used, as the record now plainly and incontrovertibly shows, to replace the wheat sent elsewhere. In other words, it will be used for the purpose of enabling Russia to fulfill her export requirements. That is what she will be doing.

On October 9, when the first official announcement was made of this transaction, a question arose as to whether this was a government-to-government transaction or a private transaction. I wish to read now from a transcript of the press conference which was held. A question was asked as to whether there had been an official ruling that giving commercial credits to Russia would not violate the Johnson Act. The answer was:

> Yes, that is correct, because it is not a government-to-government transaction.

The next question was:

> It is not a government-to-government?

The answer was:

> It is not a government-to-government. These are private traders that will be involved and the credit will be granted by banks.

Another question was:

> Will the grain dealers take the risk, then?

The answer was:

> The grain dealers will take the risk with the private banks.

When we receive telegrams saying, "Please vote in favor of a measure that will permit the President's plan to sell wheat to Russia," which plan is referred to? Is it the plan which was originally described and originally conceived and which, except for the alertness and articulateness of the Senator from South Dakota, would have remained the public image of this transaction? We know now that that is not the fact. It is now proposed to make of it a government-to-government transaction, because the sales by the individual traders are to be financed by private banks, and those private sales are then to be guaranteed by the Export-Import Bank, which is owned in part by everyone in this Chamber and by 190 million other people in America, because it is Government-owned.

This is a government-to-government operation as of now, and there is no question about it.

When the decision was made to grant export licenses to the dealers who will sell this grain to Russia, we witnessed a new trade policy between Russia and America. For the past 20 years, we have pursued a policy of very restricted and limited trade between America and Russia. The most lucid presentation of this policy was made on October 2, on the floor of the Senate, when the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] undertook to describe the several laws which led him to that conclusion. I read in part from his remarks:

> For I do not think it can be contradicted that it has been for many years, and is now, the declared policy of the Congress—a policy which the executive branch of the Government has observed and in which it must be assumed the executive branch concurred—that trade between the United States and the Soviet Union and Communist-dominated countries should not be carried on except under very limited circumstances.

That is the fact. He then proceeded to enumerate the Johnson Act of 1934, the Battle Act of 1951, the Export Control Act of 1949, the Latta amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1961, and a host of other Acts.

If there is to be a revision and reversal of the policy, it should be done with due and deliberate consideration, through the proper channels.

It should not be done by operations that nibble; not by procedures that erode, paragraph by paragraph. It should be done by the same source that fashioned the national policy; namely, the Congress of the United States. Members of the Congress represent the people. They are the closest to the people, and they are the ones who should refashion that policy, if anyone is to do it.

Mr. David Lawrence is generally considered as one of the most able commentators on the political scene. I believe it is generally felt that he has a "feel" for the people and the reaction and the necessity or opportunity for decision by the people. I should like to read from one of his editorials, which appears on page 221 of the committee hearings:

> If the American people were asked to vote in a referendum as to whether they would like to see the U.S. Government lend money to the Soviet Union to buy wheat—which, in turn, could make possible the shipment of Russian grain to Red China or Cuba—it can hardly be doubted that the verdict of the electorate would be overwhelmingly in the negative.

He continues:

> The Congress of the United States today is considering whether or not to pass a law prohibiting the Export-Import Bank—a U.S. Government agency—from guaranteeing the recently proposed transactions for the purchase of wheat by the Soviet Union. So the people's representatives will soon have an opportunity to approve or disapprove the measure.

This is the way of background, because that is not the issue before the Senate today. The issue is whether or not the Senate, by its vote today, will convert what has been represented as a private transaction into a government-to-government transaction. That is precisely what we shall be doing.

From time to time the question has been raised, "Is there anything good in this for the United States? Is there anything by way of a quarter of a billion dollars that will be reflected in reduced expenditures next year for the Agriculture Department budget if the proposed deal with the Russians is consummated?"

There are a number of considerations when we try to ascertain whether there is such a thing as a benefit to the United States. One benefit would be money. Another would be political reasons. Another would be the long-range viewpoint.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. **MUNDT.** I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. **HRUSKA.** The transaction we are concerned with is vital to the Soviet Union for two reasons. One is the stability of their agricultural system itself, for over many years that system has failed to deliver goods so far as the Soviet consumer is concerned. Yet to the political leadership, the collective system is essential.

The second reason is that the importation of wheat is necessary to the Soviet Union in order to meet its grain export commitments. These commitments are important to the political leadership of the Soviet Union for political reasons.

The advantage to the United States from rejecting the deal is simply this—the deprivation to the Soviet Union of things that are of value to it.

Is it advantageous to the United States that we go through with this deal? I listen and I read about the possible gain of $250 million with some amazement, with some disbelief that the thinking processes of people would stop immediately when a pretended, short-range profit might be realized.

Consider, in the first place, that it would be a transaction by which the Soviet Union would reap a profit; that it would not only get the $250 million back, together with the interest the Soviet Union will pay us, if she pays the debt, but she will make a profit on the wheat. We shall be enabling an arch enemy to make a profit in gold on that wheat.

Is that advantageous to us?

Let us remember that that arch enemy is the same country that has promised to bury us. It is the same country that has forced us to spend more than $1 billion a week for every week in the year to maintain a military posture and a defense posture so that the Soviet Union will not be able to conduct those burial services.

Only 2 weeks ago we approved in the Senate an authorization bill for further foreign aid of $3½ billion, rounding out in excess of $100 billion for that purpose.

Here we look at a paltry—relatively speaking—$250 million, rubbing our hands with great glee and saying, "Oh my, what a fine thing this is, that we will recover a quarter of a billion dollars from this sale of wheat."

Events should be put in their perspective. What else will it lead to? We get into the field not only of wheat, but of wheat flour, soybeans, and soybean oil. Now we are getting into the export of alcohol. What else will we do?

It has been our constant effort to dissuade our allies from trading with Cuba and Red China. What warrant will we have then to say that? If we engage in trade with Red Russia, what warrant will we have for saying to Japan, "Do not trade with Red China. It is all right for us to trade with Red Russia, but do not trade with Red China, because they are a bunch of cutthroats. They have prisoners of ours."

Russia is waiting for the time when she can do the same and make it stick. She is probing sore spots every time she can, in order to find out if she can get away with it. Thank goodness that October 22 of last year she was not permitted to get away with something in Cuba.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. **HRUSKA.** May I have 3 more minutes?

Mr. **MUNDT.** I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. **HRUSKA.** President, to get back to the question of whether or not we are trying to wiggle out of something on this proposal. I ask, which proposal? Is it the proposal which was originally made, or the proposal as it was in its second, third, or fourth form, or the proposal in the final form?

Some people say they would not find it surprising if this kind of proposal leads ultimately to foreign aid to the Communist countries. That may be said facetiously. Nevertheless, it has been broached.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the close of my remarks, an editorial from the Stockman's Journal of November 20, 1963, entitled "Second Thoughts on Wheat Deals."

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. **HRUSKA.** Mr. President, people throughout the country, as well as Senators, are very much concerned about the huge surpluses, and about means of getting rid of them. I do not believe in cutting off the advantages of maintaining our powder dry, and in succumbing to the temptation of a quick buck, however attractive it might be.

The amount of wheat involved is less than 10 percent of the regular yearly production of Russian wheat. Therefore I do not believe there is much chance of their reaching the point where we would be depriving them of what is necessary for their people.

Is wheat a strategic material? If it is not, why is it that the Government of Russia maintains such a huge reserve of wheat for war purposes? The answer is obvious. It is obvious, that if it were not strategic, they would dip into their military war reserves to meet their requirements, in order to feed their people if they were hungry. The reason that they are not doing it is plain. It is that the wheat is a strategic commodity in the military sense.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Stockman's Journal, Nov. 20, 1962]

SECOND THOUGHTS ON WHEAT DEALS

Even though the President has expressed nominal willingness by the United States to sell wheat to the Soviets, many Americans continue to wrestle with their consciences over the question of whether we should trade with the Communists, whose sworn aim is to destroy us. Cleavage on the question is sharp.

Some who favor dealing with the Soviets look upon it as a humanitarian matter—we are blessed with abundance and Russia has been shorted by unfortunate circumstances and bad weather, thus we are called upon to share our surplus on moralistic grounds. Others take refuge in the coldblooded economic approach, reasoning that Russia needs our wheat, we need their gold, so it's good business all around.

Although these arguments have sold many of us in the first heat of discussion, there are some deeper second thoughts coming to the surface.

For example, it is now considered doubtful that the humanitarian angle is at all valid. The Russian people are not starving and, in fact, are not even seriously short of flour, although the Kremlin has ordered them to cut waste and start conserving. Thus it hardly seems consistent that we should be called upon to sell them wheat on humanitarian grounds when we did not even consider selling wheat to the Communist Chinese when people in that country were starving by the millions.

The truth is that if the Russian people are not well fed, it is because their Government made the choices which led to that condition. Russian agriculture is in trouble basically, not because of bad weather, but because of the Communist system and the fact that the Red rulers placed a higher priority on industrialization and the production of weapons of war designed to destroy their enemies than on the production of food and comforts for the people. They chose deliberately to chance food shortages and hardship, and now that they have lost the gamble, they are trying to buy their way out of trouble. It is acknowledged that even if all of the have nations were to refuse to sell wheat to Russia, there would be no starvation there, although some foods might become extremely scarce and the people would become extremely unhappy with the Soviet Government.

As to the economic angle, there seems reason to doubt that we would benefit to any appreciable degree from dealing with the Soviets, all things considered. The small economic gain involved could shrivel quickly to nothing in the face of political gains to be achieved by the Soviets in dealing with us. Zbigniew Brezezinski, director of the Research Institute on Communist Affairs and professor of public law and government at Columbia University, reminded us recently in an article in the Washington Post that there can be "no separation of economic and political deals with the Soviets."

"To the Soviets," he wrote, "the wheat deal is political because two very vital Soviet political interests are involved. The first is the stability of the collective agricultural system itself. Over many years, that system has failed to deliver the goods, at least insofar as the Soviet consumer is concerned. Yet to the political leadership, the collective system is essential."

A recent reevaluation of the Stalinist drive for collectivization states that the collectivist system is necessary in order to build socialism in the Soviet Union and for defense of the country, Brezezinski noted. Mounting consumer dissatisfaction with the inability of the present agricultural system to produce adequately might, over the long haul, force the Soviet leaders to revise the agricultural system. However, if the Soviet leadership finds other means of meeting domestic needs, i.e., imports paid for with gold, it can perpetuate the collective system.

Mr. Brezezinski suggests that this, in itself, may not be reason enough for us to forgo whatever economic gain there is in trading with the Reds. His point—a good one, we feel—is that if we do go through with the Soviet wheat deal, we should do so with our eyes wide open and with no illusions as to Soviet motivations in the situation. Categorically, it might be said in this connection that the Reds have more to gain through such deals than we do, hence it does not make sense for us to be offering compromises or concessions to them in the wheat trade, or any other trade.

For years we have been hearing that food is a weapon in the cold war. The fact that the Soviets are out buying food in the world markets strengthens this assertion immeasurably. We ought to paste the slogan in our hats and keep it uppermost in mind when we undertake any dealings these days with the man who has vowed to bury us.

AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING THE ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am sure that every senatorial office has been fairly inundated with telegrams and letters suggesting an investigation into all the circumstances surrounding the assassination of the late, beloved President of the United States.

Moreover, there were a half dozen letters on my desk from Members of the House of Representatives who are undertaking something in that field. I have been conferring with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and other members of the committee. We are of the opinion that under section 134(a) and section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act, and also under Rule XXV of the Senate, the proper place for that investigation to be undertaken is in the Judiciary Committee of the Senate. It would make a full investigation of the entire subject surrounding the circumstances of the assassination of the President and the murder of Lee Harvey Oswald, and of the motivations and the amount of advance planning that might have gone into these matters; and whether they are tied up with any organizations which are controlled or dominated from without or from within.

I need to make no further statement, because the authority under the rule is quite clear.

It is our belief that such an investigation should begin at once. I do not believe a special resolution is required in order to clothe the Judiciary Committee with that power.

I wished to make this brief statement to establish in the minds of the people of the country that the matter is not being forgotten; nor is the investigation being delayed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me a few minutes?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alabama. I have been concerned with the fact that there is no Federal statute making it a crime to commit an assault against the President of the United States. There being no such statute in the Federal Code, and no direct, primary control of an investigation of this matter, I wish to address myself briefly to that point, as well as to an investigation of all the circumstances.

There should be a full, complete, objective, and unbiased examination of all the facts by an appropriate committee of Congress, regarding all the tragic events of the past weekend, which involved the life of the President of the United States. Such an inquiry should commence with thorough and exhaustive staff work, which should be followed by extensive hearings for the purpose of developing all the pertinent facts and revealing the entire unhappy story.

I believe that the Judiciary Committee of the Senate is the proper body to undertake this investigation.

Further, the committee should go into all the details of the President's assassination and its aftermath, and should also explore all the tragic background and actions and motivation of Lee Harvey Oswald, the alleged assassin of the President, and his inexcusable slaying in the Dallas jail itself.

I commend the chairman and members of the Committee on the Judiciary, who acted so promptly and diligently in introducing a bill proposing to make it a Federal offense to assault the Chief Executive of the United States. The necessity for such legislation was made clear last Friday. If such a law had then been on the books, Federal authorities could and would have taken over the investigation. They would then have been in a position to develop the facts and the sum of the evidence in an orderly, logical, and scientific manner and to make the entire story available to the American people at the proper time.

The bill which has been introduced on this subject will have my wholehearted support, and I hope that it will be promptly enacted into law.

The supreme national interests of the people require a thorough inquiry into the disgraceful events of the last few days by Congress itself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert an editorial from the New York Times at this point entitled "The Whole Truth."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 26, 1963]

THE WHOLE TRUTH

The full story of the assassination and its stunning sequel must be placed before the American people and the world in a responsible way by a responsible source of the U.S. Government.

This is a national matter, not one merely for the police of Dallas. We must be told, after a thorough investigation, all the evidence about Lee Harvey Oswald, the accused assassin. We must be told about his motives, about his past activities and travels, about his organizational affiliations, about what branches of government his life touched, about whatever knowledge the local police and the FBI had of Oswald—before and after the shooting by and of the accused.

We must be told all the facts about Jack Ruby's killing of Oswald. President Johnson has rightly directed the FBI to look into "every aspect" of this disgraceful shooting right in the Dallas jail. And we must be told how and why rifles and revolvers can be bought and concealed so easily in this country.

The killing of the accused assassin does not close the books on the case. In fact, it raises questions which must be answered if we are ever to fathom the depths of the President's terrible death and its aftermath. An objective Federal commission, if necessary, with Members of Congress included, must be appraised of all and tell us all. Much as we would like to obliterate from memory the most disgraceful weekend in our history, a clear explanation must be forthcoming. Not in a spirit of vengeance, not to cover up, but for the sake of information and justice and to restore respect for law.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I am glad that the Senator has made this statement. As the distinguished minority leader stated, he has conferred, as has the chairman of the committee, with a number of members of the Judiciary Committee. I believe that the public is asking for a responsible investigation of this subject by an appropriate congressional committee. There are many unanswered questions for which we must all seek replies, not only to satisfy ourselves as to the facts of this tragedy but also to prevent—if we can—the recurrence of such an act. All these matters should be gone into by one of our committees. In my judgment, the Judiciary Committee is the appropriate body to take up such a matter. I hope we can proceed promptly and with proper recognition of our deep responsibility to the Nation.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I heartily agree with what the Senator has said. It should be an investigation away from the glamor and glare which ordinarily accompany such an investigation. It should be done primarily by the staff. Then the essential witnesses should testify under oath. All of it should be handled without any show, pretense, headlines, TV lights, and so forth.

Mr. KEATING. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to take merely 1 minute to endorse particularly the last statement of the Senator from Mississippi. I do not know whether it is true, but I have heard it said that the reason for not moving Oswald in the daytime was that the authorities at Dallas were trying to accommodate the TV cameras, so that they might be able to present the show to the world.

I believe this investigation should be made. I agree with the minority leader. It should be made without glare and glamor.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield one minute to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. Earlier today, I cosponsored the measure introduced by the Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. EASTLAND] to make a Federal crime of the assassination of the President or of anyone in the line of Presidential succession. I believe that considering the speculation, uncertainty, and misunderstanding which have arisen regarding this appalling and tragic act, it would be well for the Judiciary Committee to conduct a thorough investigation. By following this course we will assure our fellow countrymen and concerned people everywhere that the actual facts, and not false notions, will be set down in a permanent record for posterity and ourselves to judge.

The national interest would not be furthered, Mr. President, by the feeling that the Senate was so stunned by the grievous blow struck our President that it accepted the second barbarous act as an answer to the first.

Therefore, I support wholeheartedly the suggestion of the minority leader that the investigation proceed promptly under the auspices of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield 1 minute on this subject?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished minority leader. I join him and the other Senators who have spoken in reference to the proposal of a sensible, prudent, judicious investigation into the unbelievable, incredible developments of the past weekend, which resulted in the loss of the life of our beloved President, and into a situation relating to law enforcement and the protection of the person of the President that really threatens the entire Nation. I commend those who have made the proposal.

GOVERNMENT GUARANTEES OF CREDIT TO COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2310) to prohibit any guarantee by the Export-Import Bank or any other agency of the Government of payment of obligations of Communist countries.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I have just received from the Washington Wheat Growers Association the text of a resolution they passed at their annual convention on November 11 and 12, endorsing the principles of the voluntary wheat certificate plan contained in S. 1946.

Mr. John V. Fisher, president, has transmitted to me the following text:

Whereas the Washington Association of Wheat Growers feel that a national program is necessary to keep the production of wheat within present markets and stabilize farm income; and

Whereas they further believe that the principles of a voluntary certificate, two price plan best fulfills the requirements of such a program: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Washington Association of Wheat Growers go on record as supporting new wheat legislation embodying the voluntary certificate, two-price principle with the substitution clause effective.

At least four other State associations of wheatgrowers have adopted similar resolutions, I am advised, although their exact language has not yet been transmitted to me.

I call these resolutions to the attention of the Senate, Mr. President, so the Members will know that wheat farmers want a new wheat program adopted, and that they are, almost without exception, requesting enactment of a voluntary certificate plan at the first State conventions held since the wheat referendum last May.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the bill before the Senate, in my opinion, is not in the best interest of the United States. It should be very clear from the beginning that we are not considering or discussing the wisdom of selling wheat or other nonstrategic products to the Soviet Union or other Communist countries. While the bill would have an adverse effect on such sales, it does not prohibit them. Also, there is no guarantee if the bill is rejected that such sales would be consummated.

What we are discussing is the placement of certain ironclad credit restrictions on our grain dealers and other businessmen with respect to sales to the Soviet Union and other Communist countries while the businessmen of other nations of the free world are free of such restrictions.

If American grain dealers are to consummate the sales with the Soviet Union, it will probably be necessary for them to have available regular commercial credit avenues. Our commercial banks are not in the position to offer the amount of credit contemplated without the normal guarantees offered by the Export-Import Bank even though the terms are exceedingly good—25 percent cash and 18 months to pay the balance with annual 5 percent interest. Thus, the grain dealers will probably look to the Export-Import Bank for their assistance in the normal conduct of business. Of the 5 percent interest, five-eighths of 1 percent would go to the Export-Import Bank as a fee. For the Export-Import Bank to provide such a guarantee would not aid the Soviet Union. Rather, it would aid the American farmer and the American grain dealer. Similar guarantees may become very important to other American businessmen in the future.

Canada and Great Britain through their counterparts of the Export-Import Bank have been guaranteeing credit to the Soviet Union and other Communist countries on similar terms for some time.

Mr. President, while the enactment of this bill would not prohibit the contemplated wheat sales nor its rejection insure the sales, I do not believe we should impose the restrictions of this bill on the normal conduct of these sales. If consummated, the sales would directly benefit our Government by improving our balance of payments. They would strengthen our gold situation and reduce our enormous expenditures for storage of grain.

If our farmers and grain dealers are not able to sell grain on the competitive terms which would result from Export-Import Bank guarantees, I would guess the Soviet Union would find such terms elsewhere and purchase the wheat they desire. Such wheat could well have its origin in the United States.

It also must be remembered that every dollar used by the Soviet Union to buy grain is $1 less it has for development of its industrial capacity or other activities of far more danger to the free world. Therefore, Mr. President, I urge the rejection of this bill.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S WHEAT SALE SHOULD NOT BE SABOTAGED

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we have before us a bill which, if enacted, would scuttle the proposed wheat agreement between American grain exporters and the Soviet Union. It would kill a wheat agreement which makes good sense from a business point and good sense from a foreign policy point of view. Increased trade will help reduce our surplus of wheat, reduce our unfavorable balance of payments, and reduce East-West tensions. Today all the world is waiting to know if the United States will continue the policy of promoting greater international harmony—the policy of our late President John F. Kennedy. Enactment of this bill would represent a step backward. It would represent a retrogression into the intense suspicion and hostility of an earlier era. It would represent a step away from the goal of peace with justice, a goal espoused by our late beloved President and by our new President Lyndon B. Johnson.

In the past few weeks we have begun to move toward a reexamination of our policy on East-West trade. This review of policy is long overdue.

The atmosphere created by the test ban treaty is particularly favorable for exploring possible further steps toward reducing tensions.

We now have some reason to assume that the Soviet leadership is interested in backing away from the dangerous game of brinkmanship in international relations. In part, we can believe that Moscow has been influenced in the direction of greater rationality in world affairs by its sense of shock over the brutal cynicism displayed by China in the matter of pushing the world headlong toward a nuclear holocaust. This may be as good a time as any, therefore, to test the ground around us, in order to find out just how favorable it is for future steps in international cooperation in the interest of world peace.

The area of foreign trade is a good place to begin. If we act decisively by making a serious move in the direction of a more responsible and permissive trade policy toward Eastern Europe, this could be most helpful in testing Soviet intentions in the field of international cooperation. It should help to give us the answer, within a short span of time, whether Russia is prepared to abandon its past sterile policies of studied hostility and expansionism, in favor of political cooperation and, as a consequence, a climate of unhampered commercial exchanges between the West and the East.

Our trade policy in the past has been essentially punitive, designed to retaliate against and to discourage Soviet international adventurism.

Ever since the early postwar years, when Stalin set out on a deliberate course of expanding the perimeter of world communism, we have attempted, as far as possible, to retaliate against Russia's disruptive international behavior by the use of our commercial power. We were then firmly convinced, on the basis of past international experience, that the Soviet leadership was hopelessly bent on a course of forcible annexation of territory as the only way of demonstrating the inevitability of communism.

We saw that they were willing to sacrifice the elementary economic needs of their own people in its compulsive quest for territorial and political aggrandizement. In a situation of this sort, there was no incentive for us to cultivate Russia either as a friendly neighbor or as a steadfast commercial partner.

Today, we are confronted by a situation that may be quite different. First of all, Russia's leaders seem to have learned the hard lesson that in order to endure, and to gain acceptance, a government cannot continue indefinitely to deprive the mass of population of its basic needs behind a smokescreen of vaguely worded promises. They seem to be standing at a critical juncture in their relations with their own people. The promises that were made over the decades have to be cashed in, last, or else they must run the risk of a severe decline in public morale.

Second, the Soviet Union is confronted with the massive failure of its agricultural system to produce the food needed to feed its people. In spite of their conscious pursuit of economic self-suffering for decades, the Soviet Union has failed completely to achieve self-sufficiency in the agricultural field.

Our trade policy up to now, which we would be powerless to change if the Mundt bill were passed, is not effective in either the agricultural or the industrial field.

It is an open secret that the nations of Western Europe have not, since the end of the war in Korea, shared our highly restrictive standards for the control of exports to Eastern Europe. We and Western Europe did, of course, for a time pursue an effective common policy in withholding strategic goods from the Soviet bloc during the period of maximum peril to the free world. This was during the years between 1949 and 1954. All exports from the free world to Russia in 1950, for example, amounted to $300 million, as compared with $1.8 billion in 1962.

Since then, however, there has been a conscious parting of the way. Western Europe has chosen to withhold from the East only a limited list of strategic goods, while our exercise of export control has extended over a wide range of industrial equipment and materials.

This has resulted in an admittedly anomalous situation. Many of the very same types of goods for which we have been denying export licenses to the U.S.S.R. and its satellites have been legally sold and shipped to them by manufacturers in Western Europe.

The marked disparity in export policy between the United States and Western Europe has had the practical effect, in most cases, of nullifying our attempt to withhold goods from Russia on what was, in effect, an unilateral basis. In practice, it turned out that most of the types of industrial equipment they needed, with some notable exceptions, were available in Western Europe.

A few statistical figures will illustrate the gap that has developed between the level of our exports to the Soviet bloc in Europe and that of Western Europe as a result of our disparate export policies.

In 1962, we exported to Eastern Europe a volume of goods valued at $125 million. Western Europe on the other hand, exported to the same market in the same year a volume of merchandise worth $2.1 billion. This is a rate of 16 to 1.

In the key category of machinery and transport equipment, our 1962 exports to that region amounted to $7.6 million. Exports from Western Europe in the same category came to a total of $756.3 million. A ratio of 100 to 1.

In the case of manufactured goods, the record shows a still sharper disparity: $21 million from the United States; $675.5 million from Western Europe 300 to 1.

In the agricultural field, we know that our Western European allies have been selling wheat and other grain to the Soviet bloc countries. We know that last month the Germans sold 450,000 tons of flour to the Soviet Union. We know that Germany and Italy have previously shipped grain or flour to Russia which was purchased in the United States. It makes no sense for us to refuse to sell wheat to the Soviet bloc countries in this situation—and the passage of the Mundt amendment would prevent us from doing just that.

The figures I have quoted indicating a substantial rise in free world exports to the Soviet bloc, a rise in which the United States did not participate, indicate that the Soviet bloc obtains what it requires from our allies and from the other countries of the free world.

CREDIT

The trade of the free world with the bloc, particularly that of the industrialized countries of Western Europe and Japan, depends upon the extension of credits to bloc countries. The terms of the credit usually depend upon commercial practices related to the kind of the commodity that is exported. If the United States is to participate in the expanding trade of the free world with the European bloc it will be necessary for U.S. business, in order to be competitive with West European and Japanese firms to provide some credit financing.

Financial arrangements in commercial transactions are, by their nature, subject to much secrecy. This is perhaps especially true in the areas of economic activity in which competition plays a very strong role. Consequently, it is not possible to give detailed and documented statistical information on the practices of commercial firms in foreign countries.

It is known, however, that credits have been extended by free world firms to bloc countries for periods ranging from 1 to 10 years. Specific terms such as the amount of cash downpayment, the installment periods of payment, and the rate of interest, are likewise subject to considerable variation depending upon the type of commodities, commercial practice, and other market conditions. In general, credits for industrial and transportation equipment, including ships, are granted for medium- to long-term periods, whereas credits for agricultural commodities are usually for short to medium periods, that is, 1½ to 3 years' credit.

It is conservatively estimated that in the last 5 years the industrial countries of the free world have extended an average of about $350 million credit to the European bloc annually. At least three-quarters of the credit granted by private firms was guaranteed, that is, insured by governmental or quasi-governmental organizations in the exporting country. In the principal free world countries trading with the bloc, such agencies as the Export Guaranty Department of the Board of Trade in the United Kingdom, the Export Credit Insurance Corporation of Canada, the Export-Import Bank of Japan, Hermes of the Federal Republic of Germany, the Companie Francaise d'Assurance pour le Commerce Exterieur of France, and the Instituto Centrale per il Credito Medio termine of Italy provide the credit guarantees.

IMPACT OF U.S. TRADE

The guaranteeing of export credits to the bloc will not necessarily result in a huge trade increase with that area. As has been already indicated, the present level of U.S. trade with the bloc is insignificant, representing less than seven-tenths of 1 percent of our total exports. The bloc, however, constitutes a sizable market for the free world, that is, over $4 billion in 1962. At present, United States business is effectively precluded from competing for a share of this $4 billion. It is quite probable that between 80 and 90 percent of the commodities making up the $4 billion could be licensed for export from the United States. Without a possibility to extend credit guarantees or insurance to potential bloc purchasers, the U.S. businessman would be placed in an untenable economic position, vis-a-vis his foreign competitors. He simply cannot compete.

Another facet of this situation spotlights the inadequacy of our credit policies. The Department of Commerce issues many licenses for nonstrategic technical data to U.S. firms for Soviet bloc destinations. The plant and equipment utilizing these technical data, however, are provided by West European and Japanese firms and to a lesser extent by European subsidiaries of U.S. firms. Thus, the United States derives a minimum economic benefit, although it makes possible the export of plant and equipment from Western to Eastern Europe. Obviously this setup does not benefit the U.S. economy to the extent possible, nor does it contribute to the solution of our balance-of-payments problem significantly. It is also likely that a U.S. subsidiary operating in the United Kingdom or Federal Republic of Germany may be able to grant credit and obtain credit insurance from these countries.

The Soviet bloc countries have indicated an interest in a variety of U.S. commodities and technical data. Some of these items could not be exported because an export license would not be granted. In many of these items, however, for which an export license is obtainable, U.S. firms could be competitive with West European firms. Because of their inability to compete in the credit market U.S. firms and grain dealers are unable to sell to bloc countries even when pricewise U.S. goods are competitive in this market. In fact, it appears that without credit only a minimum of cash purchases will be made by the bloc countries in the United States.

In view of the importance of solving our balance-of-payments problem, every effort should be made to permit U.S. business, and U.S. farmers to be competitive with foreign firms in the free world. The fact that West European countries and Japan have extended credits to the bloc and that this trade has grown from $2.6 to $4.1 billion in the last 5 years, suggests that the bloc countries are good commercial risks. It is entirely likely that U.S. trade with this area in peaceful goods could amount to several hundred million dollars annually and, under proper conditions steadily increase. Foreclosing the opportunity of U.S. businessmen to participate in the bloc market merely transfers this business to other foreign countries.

The question has been raised whether the issuance of export credit insurance by the Export-Import Bank to wheat dealers proposing to sell wheat to the Soviet Union constitutes aid to the Soviet Union. This is not the case. The Export-Import Bank insurance is paid for by the people who do the exporting. This is no gift.

The Export-Import Bank insurance is paid for like an insurance premium to the Prudential Life Insurance Co. or the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. They will make money out of it. They are not losing money. The Export-Import Bank has a record of making money for the Treasury on direct loans.

We must live in this world. It is the only one that we have. It is a world that has many troublesome problems. Some people feel that the best way to deal with Communists is to continue to hate them, to continue to despise them, and hope that they will fade away.

Let us make it crystal clear. The Soviet Union will not collapse because it does not get wheat from the United States. I am not at all sure that the wheat deal will go through anyway.

Furthermore, all the late beloved President of the United States did was to say that our Government is willing to issue export licenses to American commercial firms if such commercial firms could make business arrangements with so-called Eastern Communist bloc countries, including the Soviet Union, provided that those firms fulfill certain criteria and conditions. We have not had any deal with Russia, and I am a little tired of having the record appear as though the late beloved President of the United States sat down and made a deal with Russia. The only people that have been talking to the Russians are some private American businessmen. They are capable of taking care of themselves in the negotiations with the Russians. All the late President Kennedy said was that it is the policy of our Government, insofar as the executive branch is concerned, that licenses be issued to commercial firms in the United States to do business with Eastern-Socialist-Communist-bloc countries in the field of wheat and certain other cereals and feed grains.

What are we talking about now in connection with the Mundt amendment? We are talking about an insurance program on credits. Every Senator knows that every sale that is made involves credits. It is either 30 days, 60 days, 6 months, or 18 months. The Canadian deal with Communist Chinese involved credits that extended as long as 3 years. Those commitments by the Communist Chinese—Communist China aid—have been paid and are being paid.

In the recent Canadian wheat deal with the Soviet Union in which Canada sold substantial quantities of wheat to Russia, the deal was 25 percent down in cash and the balance in 18 months, with payments of one-third each 6 months.

What did the Soviet Union do? Instead of taking advantage of the 18 months' credit, they paid 80 percent down in cash because they did not want to pay the interest charges.

I point out, first, that there is no deal with the Russians now. The only application that we have before us is the one to sell a certain amount of feed grains to Hungary.

The Soviet Union has not consummated a single contract. Whether they will or not depends upon what their needs are, what their shipping rates may be, the price, and other conditions.

The question may be raised whether credit guarantee by a U.S. Government agency in any way affects the U.S. export control system now in operation. The answer is, of course, an unequivocal "No." Each export license application is subject to specific tests that have been developed during the past 15 years by the Department of Commerce; these tests are in no way related to questions of credits or credit guarantees. Furthermore, it should be emphasized that the Export-Import Bank is not required to provide credit guarantees to bloc countries or to anyone else. Each application for credit insurance is passed on by the Export-Import Bank, which under the terms of its laws and regulations decides on the merits of each case. The Export-Import Bank has been in operation almost 30 years and has operated as an independent agency with flexibility, discretion, and in consonance with the foreign policy objectives of the U.S. Government.

Credit plays a tremendous role in modern economic transactions, both domestically and internationally. To cite only one example at home: three-quarters of new-car purchases in the United States are made on a credit basis. The use of credit in the field of foreign trade generally is likewise quite frequent. This point is important when considering any legislation which would remove the U.S. businessman as a competitor for a share in the bloc market to which export controls already limit the movement of U.S. goods and technology.

The proposed legislation is an unnecessary interference in the execution of foreign policy because it would reduce the amount of flexibility the administration has with regard to both the bloc countries and our allies. The present administration and its predecessors felt it necessary to maintain and expand various peaceful contacts with the bloc countries in Europe. In carrying out this objective, the U.S. Government has: concluded credit and sales agreements with Poland, annually since 1957, which now aggregate to over a half billion dollars; participated in trade fairs in Poland, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and the National Exhibition in Moscow; arrived at claims agreement for U.S. nationalized property with Rumania and Bulgaria; established, since 1959, a system of cultural exchanges with the Soviet Union; and has permitted an increasing number of U.S. tourists to visit the countries of the European Soviet bloc in recent years. This administration feels very strongly as did its predecessor, that trade in peaceful goods is one of the most important contacts that this country can have with the European Soviet bloc and that all measures, consistent with our export control policies, should be undertaken to provide for the expansion of this trade.

The proposed wheat agreement is a wise business deal. To consummate it, credit must be available. This bill would kill the possibility of credit being extended. It would kill the wheat agreement. It should be defeated.

Mr. President, I want to conclude by discussing the effect the Mundt proposal has had on farm income.

Between the time when the Senator from South Dakota first outlined this proposal—which was in the form of an amendment to the foreign aid bill, but later the amendment was withdrawn—and last Friday, the price of 1963 crop wheat—both for the cash market and for the futures market—had dropped about 10 cents a bushel. At the time when the Senator from South Dakota first made his suggestions, farmers owned about 400 million bushels of 1963 crop wheat. Thus, Mr. President, there would have been a reduction in farm income of 40 million dollars, covering only the 1963 crop of wheat. This reduction in farm income can be traced directly to the uncertainties in the market which have arisen due to the bill introduced by the senior Senator from South Dakota.

As an indication of this, today—the day following an unfavorable report on the bill by the Committee on Banking and Currency—the market rose 4 cents a bushel for wheat this year and 5½ cents for wheat next year. We must not reverse this upward trend by passage of this bill.

If we take into consideration the 1964 crop of wheat, for which there also had been a 10 cent per bushel drop in the futures market, we add to this $40 million loss of farm income another $120 million. This is due to the fact that farmers are expected to sell about 1.2 billion bushels of wheat next year. Of course, farmers who sold in a recent period did take substantial losses.

In the Senator's own State of South Dakota, farmers have about 25 million bushels of 1963 crop wheat on hand, and next year will sell about 40 million bushels of wheat. Thus, the loss in farm income in South Dakota alone would have amounted to $6½ million, due to the Senator's proposal.

And remember, Mr. President, I am talking now only about wheat. If we get into a discussion of corn, we are talking about another $70 million reduction in farm income.

Mr. President, it is clear that we are considering many serious matters, not just general language relating to the authority of the Export-Import Bank.

So I urge that the Senator's bill be defeated. The farmers of America already have suffered as a result of it, and they should not be subjected to even further reductions in their income.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain questions and answers in regard to the pending bill and tables showing free world exports to the Soviet bloc and U.S. exports to the Soviet bloc.

There being no objection, the questions and answers and the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUESTIONS RELATING TO S. 2310

1. Is an Export-Import Bank guarantee of short-term credits to the Soviet Union a change from "normal commercial terms"?

The President of the Export-Import Bank, Mr. Harold Linder, testified on this point before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. He pointed out that the Export-Import Bank "has not departed from established procedures in offering the Bank's guarantee on these (agricultural products) sales." He cited other transactions as well in which commercial banks took the full Export-Import guarantee. He said "we have in no wise altered our normal conduct."

2. Do sales to the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries by Canada and our Western European Allies involve a public guarantee such as by our Export-Import Bank?

The Canadian wheat transaction with the Soviet Union and some of the Eastern European countries call for terms which provide for cash payment of 25 percent before shipment, with the balance payable in equal semiannual installments over 18 months. The Canadian wheat sales are overwhelmingly the largest of any that are likely to take place. The terms surrounding them have now become the customary terms for sales of wheat to the bloc countries. In the Canadian case, the Export Credit Insurance Corporation of Canada, a government-owned corporation, stands ready to guarantee the credits extended by the Canadian banks to finance Soviet wheat purchases.

Exports from Western Europe to the European Communist bloc in 1962 amounted to $2.8 billion. The credit guarantee institutions in the Western European countries help to make possible the financing of these exports, which consist in large part of industrial goods. Credit terms on Western European sales to the Communist countries run as long as 5 years. Credit guarantees in other words are a normal and accustomed means of helping to finance trade with the Soviet bloc.

3. Is the Soviet Union a "bad credit risk"?

Trade between Western European and the Soviet Union and other Eastern European Communist countries is carried on under credit arrangements no different than in the case of trade with free world countries. As indicated, the volume of Western European exports to Eastern Europe in 1962 was $2.8 billion. Against the background of the very large volume of exports by Western Europe to the Soviet Union, there is no known instance of Soviet default on commercial credits in connection with that trade.

The Soviet Union has a very strong interest in maintaining its commercial credit rating. The U.S.S.R. has only limited reserves of foreign exchange and gold with which to finance current purchases. The credit facilities it can obtain in the free world are needed to conserve the scarce Soviet reserves, since the Soviet Union does not have access to intergovernment credit. If the Soviet Union were to default on commercial credits, its ability to finance normal trade transactions with the West would be fatally damaged. This, the Soviet Union would not wish to risk.

The Export-Import Bank, of course, must take account of credit risk considerations. The Bank's President, Mr. Linder, testified before the Banking and Currency Committee "that the Board of the Export-Import Bank examined the proposed guarantees on the wheat sales and did find reasonable assurance of repayment" as required by the Export-Import Bank account.

4. What would be the practical effect of the enactment of S. 2310?

While S. 2310 does not explicitly prevent the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union, we do know that the U.S. commercial banks will not finance the wheat sales without an Export-Import guarantee.

S. 2310 would tie the hands of our traders and exporters in dealings with the Eastern European Communist countries, no matter what nonstrategic commodities may be involved. Our competitors in Western Europe all have available credit guarantee facilities on export trade with the Communist countries. Many opportunities for the sale by the United States of exports of peaceful goods and agricultural commodities like tobacco and cotton would be foreclosed by S. 2310.

The inability of American exporters to sell in Eastern Europe would not, of course, prevent the Eastern European countries from obtaining peaceful commodities. It would merely assure that virtually all the business would go to other free world suppliers, no matter how harmless the commodities or how interested our producers and exporters might be in the transactions or how helpful it would be to our balance-of-payment problems or relieve cold war tensions when the specific opportunity is in our national interest.

5. What is the significance of S. 2310 in relation to Eastern Europe?

S. 2310 would tie the hands of the American Government at a time when Eastern Europe is in a state of great ferment. The small Eastern European Communist states are increasingly restive with the economic functioning of the Communist system. They show more and more interest in asserting an increasing degree of national independence. They look for alternatives to total dependence on the Soviet Union. Peaceful trade with the Eastern European countries at this time offers one means of influencing developments constructively and in the interest of the free world. S. 2310, by preventing even modest trade expansion, would take the United States effectively out of the picture. Yet our action would not deprive these countries of the agricultural commodities and other nonstrategic goods they may seek; for other nations, including many of our allies, in Western Europe receiving no U.S. economic assistance, have made unmistakably clear they intend to continue and, if possible, expand their trade in peaceful goods with Eastern Europe. Cutting off the flow of U.S. goods, and presence, and influence into that part of the world will thus not restrain or inhibit Communist countries in Eastern Europe in any way. We will be cutting off only our own nose and injuring only our own interests.

6. Would the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union contribute to Soviet aggressive capabilities and intentions?

The Soviet Union has evidently had a serious shortfall in grain production. As a consequence, import needs may range upward of 12 million tons in 1963–64.

The U.S.S.R. already has firm arrangements for roughly 9 million tons of wheat, primarily from Canada and Australia.

The bulk of its import requirements are already being met. Additional imports increasingly are at the margin of essential requirements. In short, if the shortfall in grain output in the U.S.S.R. was ever a major problem for the Soviet Union, it was no longer so after the Canadian and Australian sales had been arranged.

Furthermore, we have no reason to believe that the U.S.S.R. could not have met its absolute domestic needs for grains out of its own production. Total Soviet output of wheat and other grains is in the order of 100 million tons. By strict rationing, the Soviet leadership undoubtedly could have met the basic needs of the Soviet people.

The decision was taken, however, to use some of the U.S.S.R.'s scarce foreign exchange to import wheat, a consumer good. This choice meant that the U.S.S.R. will have a reduced ability to buy manufactured goods which contribute directly to the industrial power of the Soviet Union. It meant that the Soviet leadership had chosen between the current needs of the Russian people and the longer run industrial capacity of the U.S.S.R. It was the kind of decision that could have been taken as a matter of course in any Western state. The fact that the decision in the Soviet Union was in favor of popular needs is a small but useful indication that a desirable process of change may be getting underway within the U.S.S.R. We most certainly should not discourage this development.

7. Will the sale of U.S. wheat, if made, allow the Soviet Union to release wheat to Communist China and Cuba?

In the Soviet purchases from Canada it was understood that the Soviet Union would set aside some of the tonnage to meet Cuban needs, so that Cuban requirements have already been taken into account. We have no evidence that the U.S.S.R. is shipping wheat to Communist China or considering shipping wheat to Communist China. These Chinese Communists have been buying wheat in Australia and Canada for several years. There is no reason to believe that Communist China needs or is seeking additional supplies of wheat. If it did need more wheat, it would undoubtedly turn first to Canadian and Australian sources which have been willing to sell to Communist China in the past.

8. What would the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union do for the U.S. economy?

Secretary Dillon testified that sales of wheat, if they amounted to 150 million bushels, as may be possible, would improve our balance of payments by perhaps as much as $300 million. This amount would be a very substantial help to our balance-of-payments deficit which was running after seasonal adjustments at an annual level of $1.6 billion in the third quarter of 1963.

Furthermore, it is anticipated that Soviet payments would consist, in part, in gold. These flows of gold to the free world would improve the U.S. gold position, either directly or indirectly.

From a budgetary point of view, sales of wheat from CCC inventories, plus the savings on storage and carrying charges could amount in fiscal 1964 and fiscal 1965, to approximately $250 million, with a corresponding effect on our anticipated budgetary deficit.

These benefits could be obtained from a transaction which has the additional feature of advertising to the world that the American farm economy is a flourishing and productive one while the Soviet agricultural system has come upon serious difficulties. If consummated, it would contribute in the first instance and primarily to the well-being of the people, not to the power of the Soviet state. In fact, if the U.S.S.R. had been unable to import wheat to compensate for crop failures, the Soviet leadership undoubtedly would have instituted a system of rationing and strengthened police controls which would have necessarily aggrandized the power of the state and worsened the rigors of the system of domestic controls in the Soviet Union and the controls of the Soviet Union over other Eastern European Communist countries.

TABLE 1.—*Free world exports to the Soviet bloc in Europe, 1958–62*

[In millions of dollars]

Year	Free world exports to—		
	European-Soviet bloc	U.S.S.R.	Other European bloc
1958	2,646.9	1,012.9	1,634.0
1959	3,001.9	1,149.0	1,852.9
1960	3,740.4	1,565.0	2,175.4
1961	3,841.8	1,519.7	2,322.1
1962	4,092.6	1,770.5	2,322.1

Source: International Trade Analysis Division, BIC U.S. Department of Commerce.

TABLE III.—*U.S. exports to the Soviet bloc in Europe, 1958–62*

[In thousands of dollars]

Year	European-Soviet bloc	U.S.S.R.	Poland	Other European bloc
1958	113,125	3,415	105,180	3,530
1959	89,269	7,398	74,728	7,143
1960	193,853	38,440	143,090	12,317
1961	133,324	42,662	74,791	15,871
1962	125,136	15,253	94,454	15,429

Source: "Export Control," 64th quarterly report, p. 39.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the bill (S. 2310) is an amendment to the Export-Import Bank Act, to prohibit any guarantee by the Export-Import Bank or any other agency of the Government of the payment of obligations by Communist countries. In simple language, the bill would prohibit the utilization of the Export-Import Bank insurance program for export or credit guarantees by the Export-Import Bank to any American exporter—and I underscore "any American exporter"—relating to the sale of any product by any individual, partnership, corporation, or association within the United States to any foreign government or political subdivision thereof.

The amendment to the bill is far reaching, since it relates not only to agricultural commodities but also to any product, manufactured or processed, raw material, mineral, food, fiber, fabric, plastic, chemical, or whatever else it may be. My argument in reference to the amendment which was offered at the time the foreign aid bill was under consideration remains, I believe, the argument that is pertinent and relevant to this debate. We Senators are not discussing merely an amendment relating to the Export-Import Bank or to a particular facility or agency of the Government. We are discussing a major foreign trade and foreign policy position or declaration. The whole subject of East-West trade needs the most careful examination. I believe all Senators will want to study this crucial, complex, intricate, difficult problem with meticulous care. I say this because at present the United States and its allies are having discussions concerning East-West trade. Our Under Secretary of State, Mr. George Ball, was recently in Paris, attending meetings of the NATO Council. There he raised the question of the lack of uniformity and of a coordinated policy on the subject of trade relations with the Soviet bloc countries. On the one hand, our good and stanch allies, countries that we now defend, and to which we have given commitments of manpower and materials of defense, in terms of hundreds of thousands of men and the value of billions of dollars, are doing regular commercial business, on regular commercial terms, with regular export credit guarantees and insurance, with Soviet bloc countries.

This subject can be argued in any way one wishes to argue it. One can say that that is entirely the business of those countries, and that we should expect that countries that are industralized would want to find markets. Or one could say that as our allies, those countries ought to stay with our policy, the policy we have maintained for many years; namely, of limiting trade with the Soviet bloc countries.

But whatever the policy may ultimately be, it should not be entered into rashly; it should not be entered into on the basis of a limited investigation or study. The decision will require the most careful study on the part of both Houses of Congress and of members of the executive branch.

If adopted, the proposed amendment, which is S. 2310, would represent an order to the executive branch to stop even any consideration of export trade with Soviet bloc countries or eastern European countries such as Rumania, Yugoslavia, Poland, and others, including the Soviet Union. I know the answer will be: "No, there can still be trading for cash." The answer will be that export licenses can be obtained, if one wishes to have them. This is true with respect to about 90 percent of agricultural commodities. But that is like a man saying, "You can buy a car, but if you cannot buy it on time payments, the automobile company will close up." If the automobile industry of the United States had to depend upon cash sales, I am afraid that only a few custom-made cars would be built, and most people would be joining the Attorney General in taking 50-mile hikes, or riding bicycles or ponies.

The truth is that today the automobile industry requires not cash sales, but normal credit terms, for the creation of what is normal credit for consumer loans.

The same is true of housing. The same is true of a vast number of transactions in the international field. We would be deceiving ourselves and the public, we would be deceiving our colleagues, if we said that an export trade, even with friendly countries, could be carried on without a certain amount of export guarantees.

I summarize the point by stating that the export guarantees do not go to Rumanians or Hungarians or Russians. They go to the American banks that make available the financing of American exporters for the purpose of sales of goods abroad, for a fee which is paid by the exporter to the bank, and not paid by the taxpayer or the Government of the United States.

This is nothing unusual. I shall repeat what I said at the time of the foreign aid debate: Every industrialized commercial country on the face of the earth has this type of program. There is a similar program of export credit guarantees in France and in Italy. Germany has its Hermes Kreditversicherungs. Great Britain has its Export Credit Guarantee Fund. Canada has an Export Credit Guarantee Fund. All these agencies are establishments of their governments. They are public or quasi-public agencies and have as their one purpose the promotion of exports. These export guarantee agencies, which are either public or quasi-public, give guarantees up to 10 years. In this instance, we are talking about a period of 18 months.

I conclude with the thought that so far as the Soviet Union is concerned, the record ought to be clear that the Soviet Union has not asked for any credits. So the Senate will not be voting on whether to give credits to the Soviet Union.

Senators will be voting on the question of whether we are to deny the Export-Import Bank the privilege of having export credit guarantees for U.S. institutions, exporters, and firms, for exports of American products that will be shipped by American transportation, with American workers handling them, and American farms—in the instance of agricultural commodities—producing them, or American firms—in the instance of American manufactured products—making them.

So the question before the Senate is not merely wheat for Russia that will be paid for in convertible currencies or gold or cash or under normal commercial credit terms—because the Soviet Union has not asked, as yet, for any such credit. In connection with the Canadian deal, the Soviet Union asked for 18 months credit; and, as has been stated here, the Canadians extended it under export guarantees, and later the Russians decided to pay 80 percent in cash.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Alabama will yield me 3 additional minutes, I shall yield most of it to the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. KEATING. Very well, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 3 more minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I do not believe that at this time, with a new President and a major policy decision before the country, we should take the severe step which would be required by the pending bill, which—thank goodness—has been reported adversely by the committee. The President may well want to come before us with other recommendations. I am not at liberty to say what his views will be, but I am at liberty to say that a study of this matter is being made in the executive branch. So it seems to me that instead of closing the door, and thus preventing the making of new recommendations by the President, we should leave that door open.

Now I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I agree with the last statement the Senator from Minnesota has made. I believe that any action we take today on the pending bill cannot be isolated from the tragic events of the past few days. I say frankly that I have had serious reservations about the terms of the proposed wheat deal with the Soviet Union; and perhaps under ordinary circumstances would support the pending bill. The bill is controversial, as is indicated by the very close vote in the committee; and I am sure that we could spend endless hours in debate on its pros and cons. A good case can be made both for and against the bill.

In my judgment, however, any reasonable doubt as to the wisdom of this measure must be resolved in favor of our new President. Never was it more essential for us to demonstrate our support for the President in his efforts to carry out the policies initiated by President Kennedy. This is the first matter to come before us from the new administration. If we pass this bill, the headlines will read "Senate Repudiates Johnson on Foreign Policy" just as the defeat of the bill will bring forth the headline "Senate Supports Johnson." I believe it is imperatively in the national interest at this time to demonstrate to the world in a significant way that we are a united country and that all of us stand four square behind the new President. We must reduce to a minimum any uncertainty in our Nation's resolve and determination to maintain its leadership and initiative in the free world.

Whether credit should be extended to the Soviet Union, whether this credit should be insured by the U.S. Government, whether sales to the Soviet Union should be extended and if so, how, and under what ground rules—these and many other questions should be weighed both in the Congress and in the executive branch of the Government. They should be studied with care, and I hope that study will begin early in the new year. But in the context of recent events, this bill is merely shadowboxing. This is not the time or the manner in which to bind the hands of the Chief Executive piecemeal before he has had an opportunity to weigh the situation himself, before he has had an opportunity to chart the course for which he must bear responsibility.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). The time yielded to the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 more minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in my view, this measure now before the Senate offers the first tangible test of bipartisan support and cooperation in a time of national stress. We should, I believe, not vote on this bill entirely on its own merits, but, rather, we should vote on it as a measure of our confidence in the President and of our own determination to meet the real issues that we must not ignore.

There may be some who will disagree with these views, and I would not challenge their sincerity or convictions. But as for me, I have decided that no consideration in favor of this measure outweighs the important national purpose to be served at this hour by its rejection. Therefore, I shall vote against the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as I understand from the Senator from Alabama, the other side has no other speakers except the majority leader, who expects to close the debate for that side.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is our schedule.

Mr. MUNDT. That being true, I shall use what time I have to summarize the arguments made by the proponents of the bill. Therefore, Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. First of all, Mr. President, I believe there has been a highly salutary debate during the last 8 hours of today's session of the Senate. This debate, together with that of a week ago Thursday night, together with the hearings held under the chairmanship of the able and distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, has placed before the public a clear understanding of what is involved in these issues, about which there was previously considerable doubt and misinformation. However, I think that by this time any diligent Senator, newspaper reporter, or radio commentator must clearly understand the facts and factors involved. In fact, all those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should know precisely the nature of the issues at stake.

As the author of the bill—and I have listened all afternoon to the arguments made, both pro and con—I believe the proponents of the bill have built a pertinent, persuasive, and compelling case.

I shall not take as much time as I had expected to take to reiterate the arguments in support of the bill, because they have already been stated by many Senators speaking in support of S. 2310.

Beginning on page 22494 of the Congressional Record for Wednesday, November 20, I placed in the Record the entire résumé of the hearings in which I participated, insofar as my principal, main statement was concerned.

I placed in the Record my affirmative statement, which I believe citizens generally would like to read, since it deals with the complicated and comprehensive issue now before the Senate.

Even Senators who say they will oppose the bill have indicated they believe this significant decision should require much more consideration and discussion. The ramifications are far reaching.

Until the supply is exhausted, I believe that citizens generally would like to get copies of the hearings on S. 2310 held by the Committee on Banking and Currency. For those who care to write for them or to get them from the U.S. Government Printing Office, those hearings are known officially as "Hearings Before the Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate, 88th Congress, 1st Session, on the Bill S. 2310." These hearings were specifically held on November 20, 21, and 22 of 1963. They are available, without charge, from the offices of Senators, or from the committee as long as the supply lasts. They will be provided upon written request, first come first served.

We are dealing with a monumental and a significant issue. It is not at all a question of whether we will extend credit on wheat sales to Russia, Hungary and other interested Communist countries. It has been correctly said in this debate that we are trying to determine whether to adopt an entirely new trade policy toward Communist countries, which differs—as night differs from day—from the prevailing trade policy toward Communist countries which we have supported here in Congress for 15 years without a break.

The Senator from Nebraska has pointed out that Congress has reiterated its position in vote after vote after vote. I do not know how individual Senators voted but it can be ascertained since it is in the Congressional Record. It is a public document. I am sure, however, a majority of Senators voted for the Battle Act, for the Johnson Act, for the Latta amendment, and for the reservations in Public Law 480, because those laws could not have been enacted unless a majority of Senators voted in favor.

We are now called upon to change this entire policy which has prevailed and served freedom well for over 15 years.

Concerning the wheat question, I have been handed a ticker tape, a UPI release, from the Senate cloakroom which states:

> Defeat of the Mundt bill would not guarantee conclusion of any wheat sales to the Soviet Union, a private grain trader said today.
>
> The trade executive said the major stumbling block in negotiations between U.S. grain firms and Russian spokesmen has been shipping costs, not credit. The shipping cost issue grows out of the fact that the United States has insisted that half of any wheat sold to the Communist bloc must go on American ships at rates above those currently charged by foreign ships.
>
> Two weeks ago, shipping rates under the 50–50 "package" plan averaged $3 a ton higher than foreign rates, the trade expert said. Since then, foreign vessel rates have dropped and the gap is probably about $4–$5 a ton today, he estimated.
>
> The trader said actual wheat sales to the Soviets would depend "on how badly they need the wheat."

So we are not talking about the wheat problem. They might not make a wheat deal even if the Mundt bill, so-called, is defeated, because the shipping cost problem is also very directly involved. Neither are we talking about a single request from a single Communist country. It has properly been said that this is a question of foreign policy involving over-all trade policy. For example, in a letter dated November 18, Dr. Walter Sauer pointed out that in addition to the requests from Hungary, and from Russia, we have requests for a $1 million extension in credit to Bulgaria—a Communist captive, a Communist satellite; $1 million for Communist Czechoslovakia; and about $700,000 for East Germany, all prior to November 15, which was the cutoff date which by the unanimous-consent agreement the Export-Import Bank decided they could use in order to hold the line.

They have performed an excellent service in keeping faith with Congress. So for 2 weeks we have had a hiatus—an armistice—in this extension of credit while the Senate has been given the opportunity to discuss the issues.

Seldom in a Senate debate have the issues been so clear. Every Senator can certainly vote in clear comport with his own conscience and his own judgment what he considers to be the judgment and attitudes of his constituents.

Not many arguments remain about the facts. It is recognized that this legislation, S. 2310, does one thing and one thing only: It forbids the Export-Import Bank from extending public credit—the credit of the American taxpayer, the credit of the Government Treasury—to Communist countries for any purpose whatsoever, including the purchase of goods in America. They cannot borrow American taxpayers' money to pay their United Nations debt. They cannot borrow money for some other function that they might have. They cannot obtain a credit guarantee. They cannot get a credit extension from our Government for purchases in the United States. We all agree on that.

We all agree it is not related to the wheat deal or to the corn deal in any way, shape or form, except insofar as extension of credit is concerned. If the transaction should be made for private credit, for cash dollars, or for gold, as Senators were led to believe, and as Sylvia Porter reported in her syndicated column, and as carried in editorials all over the country, the wheat deal would go through.

Nothing in S. 2310 would interfere with any aspect of commercial trade at all except putting public credit, through taxpayers' money, behind the good faith, good credit, and good intentions of Communist dictators who might be buying supplies of all kinds in the United States.

In the third place, it is agreed, that a significant change in basic policy is involved in the vote Senators will cast in another 30 minutes tonight, and by that vote we will decide which policy we support—unlimited extensions of Government credit or credit insurance to Communist countries to make purchases here and for other purposes, or a continuation of our restriction of trade policies on Communist countries, which has been the basis of American trade and foreign policy for more than 15 years.

I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey] when he says that he believes this matter deserves a great deal of study. There are many factors that need to be analyzed. As a result of the last 8 hours of debate, every Senator knows much more about this subject than he knew before. Senators know more about it as a result of the action on my amendment proposed to the foreign aid bill, when a week ago Thursday, by a vote of 46 to 40—Senators will remember how they voted—the Senate, on a yea-and-nay vote, voted not to kill the majority leader's proposal to stop this extension of trade credits with the Soviet Union and other Communist countries. You will find that rollcall vote on page 21894 of the Congressional Record of Thursday, November 14.

We are still getting the facts, but we do not have them all. That is why I advocated the day the proposed wheat sale was announced that we hold a Free World Trade and Aid Conference. The President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, or some one else speaking for the Government would call together representatives of the free world exporting countries and say to them, "Let us have a constructive program; let us cooperate. Let us develop programs and policies which are consistent. Let us decide to sell to the Communist countries in one great big carnival of rivalry, to see who can sell the Communists the most goods, closest to the strategic items, at the cheapest prices, with the longest credit," if that is to be the new free world policy.

I would hope that our spokesman at such a free world trade-aid conference would resist that policy and that they would try to persuade the free world to continue following the restrictive trade policies we have followed in our country, but which we now propose be violated for the first time. We shall indicate what we would do to break it or support it by our vote on the bill S. 2310 here on the Senate floor tonight. Our individual and collective decisions are momentous. We should make them carefully.

I should like to add, too, that I would hope that if that free world trade-aid conference is called, during the interim, the new administration in the White House would come to Congress with some constructive and consistent programs which would relate to our trade and foreign aid programs.

Finally, we are agreed on what we are trying to decide by the vote tonight. We shall decide whether it is proposed to deal with the Communists on a private basis or on a government-to-government have put the wholly American-owned Export-Import Bank into the guaranteeing of credits to the extent of this $250 million proposal. We shall have done that plus a great deal more. This quarter of a billion dollars would be backed up by a growing list of licenses and requests from producers, manufacturers, and fabricators of all kinds trying to get in on the act and to get an extension of Government credit insurance, so they can profit with safety and surety from a growing list of supplies privately sold to the Communists. On each such credit sale to Communist dictators, however, the American taxpayer and he alone would take all the risk.

Since we had this debate a week ago, we have learned that the Soviets are now in this country trying to find some way to get alcohol into Russia so that they can maintain their supply of vodka that they make from it.

I wonder how many church people who originally wrote in to say it was a good idea to have sales of wheat to Russia now like to find themselves cosigners of a promissory note with Nikita Khrushchev so that the extension of Communist credit is guaranteed by God-fearing, church-going Americans in order to buy booze for the people of Russia on American public credit.

That potential transaction is involved. That is how far one can slip and slide, and drift into a policy which nobody has planned in advance.

I do not believe a program of this kind should be decided by drift, by easy expedience, by backing away from a position because the program will not quite work.

The exporters, the international grain dealers, will not give credit, so it is said, "Let the international bankers do it." But it will not quite work. The international bankers are too cautious about the welfare of their own stockholders in the banks.

All I ask is that Senators be as careful about the interests of their constituents and of the taxpayers as the bankers of New York City are conscientious and careful about the interests of their stockholders. They would not grant the credit, so from easy expedient to easy expedient we drift into a constantly changing position, and now we find ourselves trapped by inadvertence, without planning, in a sharp breakaway from the foreign trade program which has served America so well, in fact, that if we refuse to retreat from victory in the cold war at this point we find great cracks showing up in the economies of the Communist-bloc countries. So they come to us to purchase the supplies they most desperately need and they seek to buy them on credit which is guaranteed by the Treasury of the United States.

I am positive in my own mind that the Communists will buy the wheat for cash if we do not extend credit to them, because they need it to supply wheat to fill their promises to Castro, to Red China, and to the other Communist satellite countries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time which the Senator from South Dakota yielded to himself has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, this issue involves a trade policy which, in relation to our foreign aid and assistance policy, it seems to me presents an argument and a trial of evidence as clear as the path to the country schoolhouse.

Does anybody really believe that this great, rich Nation of ours can finance both sides of the cold war at the same time?

Now having appropriated more than $100 billion to help the free side of the world to grow strong against communism, can we turn to the Communist bloc and say, "We are going to aid you, too. We are going to extend you credit on cheap terms, at lower interest than you would pay anywhere else. We are going to put the faith and honesty of the American taxpayer behind you and your good faith, to make sure that you will pay for the credit, so as to assist you and to make you strong enough to intimidate the free world which we have been helping, so that we can be required to help that free world some more."

If we should become involved in that kind of suicidal cycle, there will be no end to it. All I ask is that the Export-Import Bank be required not to write foreign policies as a board of directors but to give us time to develop a consistent policy here in Congress where such great national policies should be debated and decided by the elected representatives of the people of this country.

As the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] so eloquently put it, this is not a decision which we can duck, for it is before us now. If we approve S. 2310, we shall hold the line and prevent our trade policy from being decided by inadvertence, by slippage, and by drift.

We shall give the House an opportunity to hold hearings. The administration viewpoint, representing that of the new President, can be heard before the committee. There would be an opportunity to hold a free world trade-aid conference with the free nations of the world looking to the development of a consistent and cooperative free world trade policy vis-a-vis the Communist world.

I have been handed, on the floor of the Senate this evening, a note from Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, of New Jersey, who introduced the companion bill to S. 2310 in the House. He passes along the word from Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, that they are ready to start holding hearings and ready to start action next week on the House version of this bill, the companion bill.

That will give the new leader in the White House an opportunity, as properly should be done, to express himself in connection with this program and the proposed new policy, which would violate entirely the concepts established by Congress, which have been followed for more than 15 years. Clearly, extension of credit guarantees to Russia would sabotage our entire foreign aid program and the cold war program which is beginning to work sufficiently well so that the Russians are swallowing their pride and coming to us to say, "We desperately need alcohol for vodka. We desperately need wheat and corn and other products to supply our Communist allies and friends and associates with the assistance we have promised them."

They seek oil pipe. They seek trucks and tractors. They have a backlog of a group of license requests, which they wish to buy if our Government will extend the credit. In my opinion, the Communists are more interested in establishing a line of credit in this country than they are in purchasing any single one of the individual supplies, in which they have expressed an interest.

I ask Senators to reflect carefully upon whether or not we should guarantee Red credit, upon whether or not we should provide faith in them as debtors.

If I had had more time, Mr. President, I expected to allude in some detail to the testimony of a great American, Dr. Gerald Steibel, of the Research Institute of America, New York, who serves there along with other illustrious Americans. He is recognized by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] who introduced him, even though he opposed his point of view, as a great contributor in this field. The Research Institute he serves is headed by Leo Cherme and Carl Hubbard.

Let me tell Senators what Dr. Gerald Steibel said, as shown on page 72 of the printed hearings of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, which I hope the public generally will read.

He said:

> When we grant credits—and the fact that the Export-Import Bank merely insures someone else's credit is not significant—we are announcing our faith in the debtor. In ordinary commercial transactions, this faith generally extends only to the prospect for repayment; in this transaction it inevitably goes much further: We are saying that we are expressing faith in their system—

I ask Senators to listen. We are told by this high international authority that if we permit Russia and her satellites to get this credit we shall be expressing faith in the Communist system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded by the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I inquire as to how much time I shall have remaining after the 5 minutes is gone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. After the 5 minutes have expired, the Senator will have an additional 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, I reiterate that because it is important. This is not some ordinary individual expressing an ordinary point of view. This is Dr. Gerald Steibel, who serves with the great Research Institute of America, who has pointed out to us what we are being called upon to do when we are asked to vote against S. 2310. It is to express faith in the Communist system—the godless, atheistic, pagan, aggressive system which has done so much to bring heartache to so many, and which, on our own soil, so badly served the cause of decency just recently in the tragedy that befell our Nation Friday.

This is an important issue.

> We are saying—

According to Dr. Steibel—

> that we are expressing faith in their system, because we are doing more than selling them commodities; we are aiding them to ride out some very fundamental internal troubles.

It seems to me that what we should do in this kind of situation is to take a little time, so that all of us can fully understand the ramifications, and so that the people at home can clearly understand that they are being called upon to underwrite and guarantee the credit of the Communists.

If the Senate approves S. 2310, it will not undercut anybody. I could not disagree more with my good friend the Senator from New York. We are not in any sense voting a lack of confidence in anybody, either President Kennedy or President Johnson.

This problem developed under one President. Tragically enough, it is now being considered under another President. It does not represent a repudiation of either of them. There is no place along the line where either of them is on record, that I know of, as advocating the extension of public credit to Communist dictators in this fashion—growing into a multi-hundred-million-dollar and then multi-billion-dollar program. We have slipped into this situation. I am sure the proponents spoke in good faith when they talked about a cash transaction to begin with, but since then we have drifted without plan or design into something entirely different.

The proposed legislation was first considered last Thursday. We are all aware of the heart-breaking circumstances which have intervened. Now more than ever, I submit, it is important for America to have time in which to examine and explore the farflung consequences and ramifications of a new trade policy toward communism, which involves the extension of public credit and the placing of every American taxpayer on a promissory note with Communist dictators, to underwrite their good faith, their good credit, and the value of their system.

By passing S. 2310, we shall provide for a period of reexploration and of reexamination. We would do nothing regarding the sale of wheat and corn except to forbid the Export-Import Bank from guaranteeing the credit with taxpayers' money. Sales for cash and for private credit would continue without interruption.

I would hope that, during the period of careful consideration of all the new policy involves, we could have a free world trade-aid conference, such as I have recommended consistently throughout, since the very first day the wheat proposal was suggested.

I would hope that such a conference would bring about results that would be helpful to the free world, because, after all, communism is a threat to every other member of the free world, as it is to us. If it failed, we could still reexamine the situation, because we recognize that we alone cannot blockade the Soviet Union; we alone cannot succeed in applying economic sanctions.

We have been able, at the end of 15 years of exhaustive and expensive effort, to produce cracks in the Communist world, and we see them calling on us for assistance. Should we encourage them by giving them credit, so they can be strengthened again, to attack us again? That is possible, but it must not be done with the credit of the good taxpayers of America. In my opinion, it should not be done at all.

Let it be clearly understood that a rejection of S. 2310 and a congressional decision placing us on record as favoring the insurance of credits advanced to Communist countries would be an irreversible decision. If this measure were approved, it would not be an irreversible decision. The President could send to Congress next week, or next month, a specific request for an amendment to the Export-Import Bank; and I suspect that Congress would respect such a request. Approval of S. 2310 is not an irreversible decision. But a decision now to reject S. 2310, relating to guarantee of credits from the Export-Import Bank, would be irreversible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. It is irreversible because once we have extended credits of three-quarters of a billion dollars on the guarantees of the Export-Import Bank, we have started down a trail from which we cannot turn back.

We cannot extend credit for a series of payments, and then suddenly call a halt. If this country did that, it would certainly have lost $250 million, because if we told the Soviet Union that "We do not like you any more; we are not going to extend any more credit," we could not expect her to pay the three-quarters of a billion dollars on which we would already have guaranteed her credit.

We would look strange and inconsistent before the world in first voting one policy and then rejecting it.

Before we make that irreversible decision, before we give the green light to the Export-Import Bank to put the credit of the United States behind the decision of the Russians to buy supplies and merchandise from us, is the time to make the decision that the policy should be further considered before we make such a sharp break with a policy we have successfully followed more than 15 years.

If we could obtain counsel from the new President, if we could have deliberations by the Foreign Relations Committee, and perhaps the Agriculture Committee and the Banking and Currency Committee, and if it were then decided to be good and sound policy to extend credit to the Russians, that would be the way to make the decision. That is why I say we should carefully consider retaining this trade policy which has served us so well for many years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time the Senator has yielded himself has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Once started down the sorry road of placing the good credit of the Government and of the American taxpayers behind a loan, on the signature of an atheistic Communist dictatorship, we cannot turn back. But now we can think a while. We can have another opportunity—which we should have—to consider more carefully whether we should get rid of a policy which has proved to be sound for so long.

Watch the rapidly ballooning requests of Communist countries for other products, including manufactured goods, and such other products as I have mentioned, if we go down this road. Once we have started, where can we possibly call a halt?

Let us not make an irreversible decision on the basis of drift or expediency, or on the basis that we are going to do it because it would meet certain temporary problems. Let us make a decision of this significance on the basis of Senators responsibly grappling with the issue, as they did on the issue of the test ban.

What is our program to be? Is it to be one of aid to communism? Are we to treat the Communist world the same as the free world, and give aid, succor, and assistance to both? Or are we going to continue to use some economic pressure on Russia to get out of Cuba, or to bring some stability back to Vietnam, or to Berlin or to establish a workable arrangement under which we do not yield and yield and concede and concede and make available to them, at our credit, the things they both need and want?

We can make that wise and prudent decision by supporting S. 2310, and holding the line, thus giving the new Executive in the White House an opportunity to make recommendations. If Congress can have committee hearings to take another look at this question, we shall not have lost anything. But if we take the wrong step irrevocably because we are emotionally upset, or pressed for time, or for other reasons, we may scuttle a program which has cost us $100 billion, and which has brought us to the verge of success in this long and extensive cold war against the Communists. Let us not retreat from success.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print at this point in the Record six items of interest which are pertinent to this debate.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Plain Dealer, Nov. 22, 1963]

Wheat Deal Based on Credit

Senator Karl E. Mundt, Republican, of South Dakota, has done a public service by bringing out into view the terms under which Russia would buy wheat from American grain merchants.

This isn't a commodity-for-gold or hard money transaction as the public might believe. In effect, the United States would be dealing in credit and footing much of the bill.

Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon, who wants the wheat deal to go through, has admitted before a Senate committee that the Soviet Union would pay only 25 percent down of the purchase price and has demanded 75 percent credit to be underwritten by the Export-Import Bank.

Senator Mundt claims this would be an unprecedented use of public funds to guarantee payment of private commercial accounts owed by Communist-bloc countries. Russia owes $805 million in war loans from two wars, including lend-lease, although its record for paying commercial debts is good.

The Export-Import Bank, an independent agency of the U.S. Government, has a legal right to make the $250 million deal. The point raised by Senator Mundt is whether it is wise for the Bank's Directors to extend what is called "normal commercial credit" under these conditions which, until he raised the issue, were comparatively unknown to the American public.

In the light of these new revelations, the wheat deal should be reappraised.

News Release

New York.—Keith Funston, New York Stock Exchange president, last night called for more trade of consumer goods with Russia but "only if they pay cash on the barrelhead."

Funston made the comment on his return from the Soviet Union which he visited with 20 other top American businessmen.

In urging trade on a cash basis only, Funston said that "if we get their (Soviet) gold in return, they will not be able to use it to stir up trouble in the rest of the world."

He said he felt trade on the basis of long-term credit with Russia would be a mistake. He said short-term credit could be possible in lieu of gold payments.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Nov. 19, 1963]

Backing Deadbeatniks

Should the United States guarantee the credit of its worst enemies, many of whom are also the world's leading deadbeats?

Senator Karl Mundt says no. His amendment to the foreign-aid bill would prohibit the Export-Import Bank, a Government agency, from guaranteeing that the Reds will pay for private grain sales to the Soviet bloc. The liberal leadership of the Senate termed this guarantee just a normal business practice.

Is it? The Export-Import Bank was set up to promote U.S. export trade. In most deals with foreign countries, even those who are our allies and who have good credit, the Bank guarantees only half of the credit extended by private U.S. banks to the foreigners. This means that the banks assume half of the risk that the borrower will not pay off.

The Wall Street Journal reported recently that large U.S. banks had balked at taking half the risk of lending money to the Communists for the grain deals. Therefore, the Government Bank is expected to back 100 percent of the Reds' credit.

The private banks' reluctance is understandable. The Reds aren't too worried about what they owe.

According to Texas Congressman John Dowdy, who queried the General Accounting Office: As of June 30, 1963, the Soviet Union owed us $621 million on debts running back to 1917, an additional $10.8 billion for lend-lease prior to the Japanese surrender, another $205 million for lend-lease goods not delivered until after the Japanese surrender.

In view of that record, should the Export-Import Bank guarantee the full amount of the money loaned to the Communists? Asked about this special treatment for the Soviet bloc, a bank official said: "I guess we just want to sell surplus farm commodities that much."

Thus, we would be backing to the limit the credit of those who have already run up billions in bad debts.

If the Reds should default on payments, as they have in the past, a U.S. Government agency would be left holding the bag.

Some legitimate argument has been made in the past about our Government's guaranteeing some return to U.S. private industry when it invests abroad, makes loans or enters into private deals.

But use American tax funds to guarantee anything with respect to Russia? Such a guarantee would be an open invitation to Soviet thievery. It also would amount to public financing of our own destruction.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 20, 1963]

How To Win the Cold War

It is a bit embarrassing for the Russians to be running out of their national drink. Especially when, as Mr. Williams reported in this newspaper, they are turning to the United States to explore the possibilities of buying enough alcohol to make enough vodka.

Conversely, what a cold war opportunity for the United States. Instead of wasting hundreds of millions on dubious enterprises like Indonesia, we should give, not sell, the Russians so much alcohol they could swim in it. This would further impair the economy and keep the Government permanently befuddled and off base. With such an imaginative initiative, our foreign aid program might finally get somewhere.

On second thought, maybe it would not help much. Even without any extra vodka, Kremlin policies often seem woozy enough.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star]

United States Wheat for Russia on Credit

(By David Lawrence)

If the American people were asked to vote in a referendum as to whether they would like to see the U.S. Government lend money to the Soviet Union to buy wheat—which, in turn, could make possible the shipment of Russian grain to Red China or Cuba—it can hardly be doubted that the verdict of the electorate would be overwhelmingly in the negative.

The Congress of the United States today is considering whether or not to pass a law prohibiting the Export-Import Bank—a U.S. Government agency—from guaranteeing the recently proposed transactions for the purchase of wheat by the Soviet Union. So the people's representatives will soon have an opportunity to approve or disapprove the measure.

When the proposal to sell wheat to Russia was first announced, President Kennedy said it was to be a private transaction and "does not represent a new Soviet-American trade policy." But a few days later, it became apparent that a misleading impression had been conveyed. Senator Karl Mundt of South Dakota, Republican, told the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency yesterday:

"The financing arrangement for these sales to the Communist countries does represent a new departure—the U.S. Government and the taxpaying citizens of this country are assuming full credit risk for these sales. Any loss sustained by the seller of the grain or the banks financing the sales by extending credit to Russia, Hungary, or other Communist-bloc countries is insured by the Federal Government through its Export-Import Bank.

"Now I presume the reason that the Export-Import Bank was brought into this transaction to guarantee payment of the obligations assumed by Communist countries for payment for this grain is that no commercial banker or exporter is willing to assume the credit risk of repayment involved in sales to Communist countries. The private exporters and bankers are reluctant to extend their own credit in order to get the profit and income they will receive from these transactions. That is, they must regard the transaction as a bad risk and the Communists as unsafe debtors."

The South Dakota Senator said that, while President Kennedy had declared that American grain would not go to Cuba, the wheat "will simply become a substitute in Russia for the Russian grain which has been promised to Cuba and the other Communist countries," Senator Mundt added:

The Cubans will eat Russian grain and the Russians will eat American grain bought from American traders on credits.

"The way, therefore, seems to be opened for us to make possible the feeding of our enemies in Cuba, in Red China, and elsewhere even if we were all to agree to the shibboleth that Russia is not an enemy since Russia could use at home the specific bushels of wheat we sell her on U.S. Government credit while shipping to our other Communist adversaries the Russian wheat which our American wheat replaces.

"The American people and their Congress were led to believe that this grain sale would be a commercial cash transaction with private traders and bankers assuming any credit risk in return for a profitable sale and an interest-bearing loan."

Pointing out that the President, in his October 9 news conference, had declared that "The grain dealers will take the risks with the private banks," Senator Mundt said it now turns out that the Government itself will assume the risk.

Senator Mundt is the author of the pending bill which would cover credit extensions on the sale of any products to all Communist-bloc countries. He insists that the passage of the bill would not interfere with the planned sales of wheat and grain to Russia and her satellites, "provided the sales are for cash, for gold or for American dollars, provided the granting of credit to the Communists is privately extended."

The problem of furnishing economic aid to countries that are potential enemies has plagued the Western allies for many years.

Senator Mundt, in his speech this week, said: "Unfortunately, desire for profit—sometimes in the form of thinly disguised human greed—has made it difficult for the United States to enforce this policy of restricting trade with the Communist bloc or even to win the support of the foreign countries which we aid with our foreign assistance programs."

It is true that some of the allies of the United States—including those who have been receiving foreign aid—have been steadily increasing their trade with Russia and the Communist-bloc countries. This has produced resentment in Congress. The question of trading with the Communist countries is likely to be a major issue in the next several months.

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Nov. 25, 1963]

THE COLD WAR IS A WAR

(By David Lawrence)

Every now and then a wave of "euphoria" sweeps this country. This is the word often used nowadays in official parlance to describe the feeling that ensues after Moscow makes one of its periodic gestures of "peace." Promptly, each such move is hailed as the beginning of another era of "friendship." But just as America settles down to occupy itself with matters of internal concern, the Soviets suddenly provoke friction and we discover that it isn't "peace" after all.

Does the fault lie with us? We are so eager to interpret any seemingly friendly move as a genuine act of good will that we lean over backwards to join in the "euphoria" or buoyancy of spirit which is engendered by such tactics.

Realism demands that we take a good look at what is happening around the world and that we do not allow the impression to be built up that we are so eager for a crumb from the Soviet-concocted recipe of "coexistence" that we are for "peace at any price."

The Government which speaks for us presents to the world the image of a nation that sincerely wants peace. But the sad lessons of history tell us that supineness or appeasement is the very thing that causes an enemy to miscalculate. A lack of resoluteness at decisive moments eventually brings on wars.

The President of the United States by his speeches may choose to reassure his own people that they are making progress toward peace, but at the same time this overanxiety to produce an impression of achievement convinces our enemy that the necessary steps to vindicate our position may not be taken.

We shall, of course, use military force if attacked. But, because the whole American policy is based on the idea that we shall await attack, the man in the Kremlin has the advantage. He can bluff and bluff, extort concession after concession, and make his own people, as well as the people of the Communist-bloc countries, believe that the United States is steadily bending to his will.

The politicians who have been getting ready to extol Mr. Kennedy in the 1964 presidential campaign as the preserver of world peace do not like to advise him to take any steps that would "escalate" the situation. "Escalate" is another word in the official vocabulary in Washington. It refers to the sequence which may develop when one country takes a firm stand anywhere and the other side promptly reacts with some form of retaliation. The theory is that such successive steps now could lead to a nuclear crisis.

This permits Nikita Khrushchev to call the shots in the game he plays. For if he can terrify the United States by taking the initiative around the globe, he is accomplishing his major purpose—to anesthetize American policymakers while he pursues his acts of aggression.

It is easy to characterize every proposal for firmness as a desire "to bring on war." Military preparedness, however, is meaningless if the enemy believes force will never be used unless a nuclear attack is made.

What should the President do? First—and most important of all—it is essential that the whole truth be told the American people. Many of the notes exchanged with Moscow after the Cuban missile crisis have never been made public. Mr. Kennedy told a press conference recently that all the Soviet troops are being withdrawn from Cuba and that the evacuation soon will be completed. The Soviet official newspaper, "Izvestia," however, says no such promise was ever given.

The basis for a sincere friendship has not yet been established. Until it is, we shall be involved—as the Soviets are—in "brinkmanship." This can lead to mistakes and miscalculation.

The time has come for the United States to abandon the realm of secret diplomacy and tell the whole world—including the Soviet people—what is going on. The negotiation of the nuclear test ban treaty was given wide publicity, but the factors which are every day depreciating the value of such an agreement and creating distrust are being handled in the routine of formalized diplomacy.

Meanwhile, the Soviets are vigorously fighting the "cold war" on every front—in southeast Asia, in the Middle East, in Eastern Europe, in Latin America, in Africa, and in the Far East. We, on the other hand, are striving merely to bolster up certain "underdeveloped" nations with "foreign aid," even as some of these same countries play one side against the other.

If we intend unwittingly to forfeit the chance of winning the "cold war," then our lassitude and loose policy are understandable. If we mean to fight the "cold war"—for it is in every sense a war, inasmuch as many American lives have been sacrificed on certain battlefronts in the last few years—then it is time to bring the fight out in the open and let the world know of the schemes and duplicity of the Soviet Government.

If the enemy is permitted to push us around, there can be no peace. For the "cold war" is not peace. It is a state of war.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have 3 minutes remaining. I should like to yield to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK]. The Senator from Colorado is a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, and wishes to speak. After that, we shall have exhausted our time. I call this to the attention of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. I had in mind yielding to the Senator from Colorado so he could place certain material in the RECORD.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senator from Colorado needs more time, perhaps the Senator from Alabama will be charitable and yield him a little time.

I yield the remaining time to the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. I did not intend to speak immediately following the superb speech he made. I should like to bring out only one or two matters that he may have overlooked or may not have emphasized. I attended every one of the hearings in the Banking and Currency Committee and participated in the process of examining the witnesses. Representatives of every single commercial bank involved told us they would not put this type of bill up before their stockholders or their investors or depositors because the political risks and/or the commercial risks were too great. As a result, they said that without the Government guarantees they would not be involved in this transaction. It is to be presumed that if they were to participate in it at all, the deal would be for cash.

The bankers themselves, and we in the Senate, unless we pass the bill, come to the obvious conclusion that, although those who are most experienced in this field are unwilling to take the risk on behalf of their investors, the taxpayers should take the risk instead.

That is the main issue. That is the question before the Senate.

Secretary Dillon testified explicitly in the hearings that the commercial banks would not go through with this loan because of the political risks involved; the trouble on the autobahn and trouble with the Berlin wall were so great that no commercial bank should be asked to take the risk. But we are asking the taxpayers to take it if we do not pass the bill.

The next thing I should like to point out is that we have not asked, in the process of these negotiations, for a single concession in return for supplying the wheat. We are selling it on credit terms which the Canadians were unwilling to give the Soviets. We provided lower interest rates. As a result of the Canadians' standing firm on their interest rates, the Soviets paid 80 percent cash.

We have not had a single concession, either commercial or political, and we are selling the wheat at a lower price, in terms of credit, than would have been necessary if we had stood firm or tried to have a palatable consideration.

Mr. DOMINICK subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement following my previous remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOMINICK

As one of the members of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee who followed the hearings on this bill from beginning to end, I think there are several significant factors brought out in these hearings which should be emphasized in support of this bill.

First. The proposed sale of American wheat to Soviet Russia and other nations of the Communist bloc is not a subject which has suddenly come before us in the past several months. In fact, in June of 1961, the Department of Commerce announced that it was going to issue export licenses to ship subsidized agricultural commodities to the Soviet Union and Communist bloc. This announcement of policy was immediately met with adverse responses in the Congress. At that time, the House was considering a bill which later became the Agricultural Act of 1961, as amended. When the bill reached the floor of the House, Representative LATTA, of Ohio, introduced an amendment to section 2 of that act declaring it to be the policy of Congress to "section (c) expand foreign trade in agricultural commodities with friendly nations, as defined in section 107 of Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1707), and in no manner either subsidize the export, sell, or make available any subsidized agricultural commodity to any nations other than such friendly nations and thus make full use of our agricultural abundance."

Apparently, this move discouraged the Department of Commerce from issuing export licenses for this purpose until recent months when the Soviets began exploring the purchase of surplus American wheat, and other countries in the Soviet bloc began similar explorations for the purchase of wheat and other subsidized agricultural commodities.

The Attorney General, in his opinion quoted on pages 27–32 of our committee hearings, passed this off as merely a declaration of policy of Congress which may or may not be binding upon the executive branch. Admittedly, the policy declaration in the Agricultural Act of 1961 does not pose as a strictly legal impediment in the sale of wheat to Soviet Russia. Nor does it pose any legal impediment to the Export–Import Bank to insure a loan granted pursuant to such a sale. However, it is clear that Congress was already on record as opposing sales of such commodities regardless of the terms of the sales. The amendment to the Agriculture Act of 1961 was accepted by the Senate in conference and it became a part of the law.

During the course of the hearings held recently before our committee, I questioned Mr. Linder, President and Chairman of the Board of the Export-Import Bank, about this matter:

"Senator Dominick. Now, Mr. Linder, you are aware, are you not, of the provisions in the Agricultural Act of 1961, in which Congress sets out its position against the sale of subsidized agricultural commodities to the Communist bloc?

"Mr. Linder. I have heard a little about it this morning, sir. I can't say that I was familiar with it before then, but beyond that, I have no comment.

"Senator Diminick. This also came up in 1961, during the time while the act was being amended and while you were being examined concerning this friendly foreign nation problem.

"It would appear that the Commerce Department made the statement that export licenses for sales of agricultural products were being considered.

"The Congressman from Ohio, Mr. Latta, immediately introduced his amendment as part of the preamble of the Agricultural Act of 1961, and it was adopted by Congress to show it was the policy of Congress not to sell subsidized agricultural commodities to the Communist bloc.

"Now, you say you were not aware of this until this morning?

"Mr. Linder. I was not aware of it until this morning.

"Senator Dominick. Was this fact brought to the attention of your Board members?

"Mr. Linder. No, it was not part of any discussion I had.

"Senator Dominick. Was it brought to the attention of any members of the Advisory Board?

"Mr. Linder. No, it was not. But if you will permit me, Senator Dominick, I would like Mr. Sauer to comment on this, because of his greater background with the legal aspects of the situation.

"Mr. Sauer. Without being an authority on the particular provision that you mention, Senator Dominick, it is my impression that it deals with the price at which the wheat is sold. The Export-Import Bank did not participate in the discussions or negotiations on the sale of the wheat. We take up when the Department of Commerce has issued an export license. That is when we enter the transaction. We have nothing to do with anything that goes on before that time.

"Senator Dominick. I accept what you say at full value. My only comment is that it is amazing that the left hand doesn't know what the right hand is doing."

In all fairness, I believe, as stated by Mr. Linder, that his Board must be guided by the foreign policy as promulgated by the State Department. However, it is amazing to me that the Eximbank and its Board of Directors did not even consider a policy of Congress adopted in 1961 on the subject of wheat sales to Russia and the Communist bloc. As we know, the Eximbank has agreed not to act further on any proposals to insure loans to Soviet Russia or Communist bloc nations for the sale of subsidized agricultural commodities pending determination of this issue by the Senate.

Second. Throughout the hearings we heard every opponent to the Mundt bill refer to the reliability and the dependability of Soviet Russia as a good or excellent credit risk, The distinction was made that we should not consider Soviet Russia's default of World War I loans of $621 million or its default on World War II obligations of $205 million or the almost complete ignoring of about $11 billion of lend-lease shipped to Russia during World War II. Even accepting this distinction, which I do not think is valid, we must remember that the Eximbank was set up by Executive order in 1934 in order to stimulate our trade with Soviet Russia. However, as we all know, it never began the function because the Bank and Board of Trustees took the position that credits should not be extended until the Soviets made satisfactory settlement of their debts to the United States. As I have already pointed out, the Soviets have never seen fit to do so. Isn't it ironical then that in 1963 we have to try to enact legislation which would prevent the Eximbank from insuring credits to the very nation and its dominated satellites that the original Eximbank refused to do business with.

During the hearings, I posed the following question in various forms to each of the witnesses: "If the Soviet Union is such a good credit risk, why does a wholly owned bank of the United States, using taxpayers' funds, have to insure short term credits to it." The inevitable reply was that the commercial and political risks in dealing with the Soviet Union are too great and thus the Export-Import Bank ought to do it with taxpayers' funds. After all, Mr. President, all of the commercial bankers who came before the Committee to urge the use of the Eximbank in this transaction and in similar transactions are smart business men. They know and they admitted that as bankers their primary responsibilities are to their shareholders and depositors. They further admitted that the risks were too great to justify the use of their money to underwrite a loan to the Soviet Union or a Communist nation. However, they are perfectly willing to have the taxpayers of the United States underwrite it.

I think we, as elected representatives of the people of our States or districts, have an equal or higher responsibility to them and to ourselves as taxpayers to protect taxpayers' funds in the same way a bank protects its depositors and shareholders.

Third. There is no question that the proposed wheat sale to Communist nations insured by the Export-Import Bank is a new and radical departure from our present trade policies. The opponents of this legislation say that this is a one-shot deal, but all freely admitted that once this deal goes through, the precedent would be established to expand into other areas of trade with Soviet Russia and the Communist bloc countries, underwritten and guaranteed by the Export-Import Bank with taxpayers' funds. Recent information indicates that the Soviets and the Red Chinese have completed comprehensive cross-traffic railroad agreements providing for increased Soviet exports to Red China. In view of the fact that there is no method of policing where this wheat will go, it seems highly likely that we will be placing the American taxpayer in the position of guaranteeing Soviet credit so that the Soviets can supply the Red Chinese and the Cubans, with whom we have cut off trade completely. What irony that will be.

The passage of S. 2310 would not block the proposed wheat sale to Russia or other Communist nations. However, it would deprive these Communist nations of the benefit of credit insured and guaranteed by the American taxpayers through the Export-Import Bank. Indeed, the passage of this bill might encourage our negotiators to press for a cash deal which was the kind of a deal we thought it was going to be in the first place. The hearings did not reveal that the negotiators for this deal set any political or commercial concessions from the Communists in order to get us to sell the wheat. In fact, the rate of interest on the loan now being proposed is lower than the rate of interest paid by the Russians on the Canadian wheat sale.

These and many other points inevitably lead me to support the bill strongly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 15 minutes to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield me such time as I may need, with the proviso that at the conclusion of my remarks I will yield back the unused time?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I modify my statement accordingly. I yield such time to the Senator from Montana as he may require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. GORE. This has been a vexatious question for me. I have been on the floor of the Senate practically the entire day, listening to the debate. I consider this really and in essence a basic foreign policy issue, with which it is proposed to deal piecemeal. It is the proposed action that would deal with the problem piecemeal. I believe it deserves full consideration, and not the precipitate action which is proposed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last year, at the request of President Kennedy, the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs], the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], our distinguished former colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. Smith, and I made a trip overseas. On our return we issued five reports, I believe, which we collectively agreed to.

In one of those reports, entitled "Berlin in a Changing Europe," dated January 28, 1963, we stated the following, under the subhead "U.S. Policies and a Changing Europe":

> Our present position respecting Europe is one which tends to constrict our ability to deal promptly with change. We have, for example, stringently limited contact with Eastern Europe while Western European contact with that region has expanded. In the role of leaders of the Western camp we have made a great investment of resources, bureaucracy, military manpower, and prestige in Western Europe, and in the underdeveloped regions. We are heavily committed to certain evolving patterns of Western cooperation and it is not easy to face the possibility of a need for reevaluation and adjustment.

The distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt] made the statement—and I believe I am quoting him almost verbatim—that we should face this subject as serious-minded Senators.

I believe we are facing it as serious-minded Senators. As one who has indicated his support of the President of the United States and has praised him for his courage and his wisdom, I feel that at this time I should give once again some of the reasons which I gave in support of the proposal on October 10 of this year.

I said:

First. In the field of fiscal responsibility, it will bring into the United States in gold or dollars about $250 million. It will thereby reduce the gold drain.

Second. It will reduce our surplus in wheat now being held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and in so doing reduce costs to the Government and be a saving to the taxpayers. Incidentally, in the agriculture appropriation bill which passed the Senate over a week ago, approximately $2.7 billion was voted for supports of various kinds—

This was said on October 10—

Third. In my opinion, it will firm up the price of wheat which under present estimates will bring $1.15 to $1.25 a bushel next year, instead of this year's approximately $2.

Fourth. This wheat will not be diverted to Cuba or Communist China under the terms of the export licenses to be issued.

Fifth. This wheat will not be used for manipulation in the world markets.

Sixth. The wheat sale will be known to the Soviet people through the Voice of America broadcasts. I note on this morning's news ticker that the Soviet Union itself has informed the Russian people of this proposal.

Seventh. It will bring added employment to American shipping, longshoremen and railroad workers, as well as grain traders, millers, and farmers.

Eighth. It will be conducted through the normal competitive channels of the private American grain trade.

Ninth. Up to now the Soviet Union and Eastern European nations have been obtaining American wheat indirectly by purchasing from West Germany, France, and others, flour made out of American wheat sold to those countries in ever-increasing quantities.

At that time a meeting was held in my office, with 13 or 14 Senators in attendance. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss an amendment to the foreign aid bill which had been proposed by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt]. The Senator from South Dakota also was in attendance.

I consulted the President of the United States; and I should like to read a letter from him dated November 15, 1963. The letter is not signed, but it was dictated and dispatched to my office by the late President of the United States. The letter reads as follows:

The White House,
Washington, D.C., November 15, 1963.

Hon. Mike Mansfield,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Mansfield: I write to urge in the strongest terms that the Senate should not approve any amendment to the foreign aid bill which would prohibit the use of credit guarantees for trade with any Communist country. It would work against the interest of the United States in crippling the American exporter in fair competition with other free countries for nonstrategic trade with the Communist world. The principle of such an amendment would jeodardize not only the projected sale of wheat to the Soviet Union, but possible sales of important quantities of other products like tobacco, corn, and cotton.

If this amendment is adopted—

Incidentally, the pending bill is merely an extension of that amendment—

If this amendment is adopted, it is not primarily Communists who will be damaged, but the American producer and exporter. The Export-Import Bank exists to promote the trade of the United States. Its professional judgment is that the state credit of the Soviet Union and of other Communist countries is sufficiently reliable to justify a guarantee in support of U.S. exports. The judgment of the Bank on such matters of credit over a 29-year period has been outstanding—less than 1 percent is now in default on total credits of $11 billion—and in this process the earnings of the Bank after all expenses have been over $800 million.

It is anticipated that the proposed sale of wheat will be made for payment in gold or dollars, either in cash or on short-term credit not exceeding 18 months. The reinforcement of our balance-of-payments position which such a sale will provide is obvious. The Export-Import Bank will, as usual, charge an appropriate fee for any guarantee.

The proposed sale of wheat still depends upon negotiations between the Soviet Government and private traders. The availability of credit on normal commercial terms may be a central element in this negotiation. The interests of the United States will be advanced by a successful completion of this sale. The American farmer, the American exporter, the American shipping and railroad industry, and the American citizen concerned with the strength of our balance-of-payments position should all support this proposed sale. The guarantee of the Export-Import Bank is a normal element in a transaction of this sort, and to prevent such a guarantee by a legislative rider at this delicate stage of negotiations would be an act against the national interest.

Sincerely,

John F. Kennedy.

Mr. President, earlier today I informed the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, through the distinguished minority leader, that it would be my purpose to make a motion to table his bill.

I therefore yield back the remainder of my time, and move to table the pending bill.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. **PASTORE.** Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. Bayh in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana to lay the bill on the table. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. **HUMPHREY.** I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. Engle]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay" and the Senator from California would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas would vote "nay," and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 36, as follows:

[No. 256 Leg.]

YEAS—57

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Ellender
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Humphrey
Inouye
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—36

Allott
Beall
Bennett
Byrd, Va.
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Edmondson
Ervin
Fong
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jackson
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
Mechem
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Robertson
Russell
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Stennis
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—7

Douglas
Eastland
Engle
Hill
McClellan
Morse
Smathers

So Mr. Mansfield's motion to lay the bill (S. 2310) on the table was agreed to.

Mr. **SPARKMAN.** Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. **HUMPHREY.** I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. **DIRKSEN.** Mr. President, before Senators leave, I should like to ask the majority leader, first, at what hour he proposes that the Senate convene tomorrow; and what will be the first order of business; and what will follow that?

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** If it would be possible for the Committee on Finance to meet until noon, as it usually does by unanimous-consent agreement—I do not see the chairman of the committee in the Chamber, although the ranking Republican member, the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], is present—on that basis we should like to have the Senate convene at 11 o'clock.

Would the Senator from Delaware have any objection to such an arrangement, just for the morning?

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Not if it is agreeable to the chairman; in that event, I have no objection.

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Is a meeting of the committee scheduled for tomorrow?

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Not as yet; but, no doubt, consent can be obtained.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator is on notice that all meetings scheduled this week will—because of the recent tragic event—be objected to.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the session tonight, the Senate take a recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is anticipated that tomorrow morning the Senate will take up the Nitze nomination; and I presume that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee will have a continuing resolution in connection with the appropriation measures; and the Senate will take up the conference report on the legislative appropriation bill. In fact, it can be taken up previous to the Nitze nomination.

If a reasonable agreement could be had regarding a time limitation for the consideration of the public works bill, I should like to have it taken up. Has the Senator from Delaware any idea in regard to what would be a reasonable arrangement?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No; for I am not in charge of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; but the Senator from Delaware has an interest in it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; but I do not know about the time schedule.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If some arrangement of that sort can be made for tomorrow, that bill will be brought up.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of November 25, 1963,

Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported adversely, without amendment, on November 25, 1963, the bill (S. 2310) to prohibit any guaranty by the Export-Import Bank or any other agency of the Government of payment of obligations of Communist countries, and submitted a report (No. 659) thereon, which was printed.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORTS ON OFFICERS ON DUTY WITH HEADQUARTERS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY AND ARMY GENERAL STAFF

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the number of officers on duty with Headquarters, Department of the Army and the Army General Staff, on September 30, 1963 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES IN FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of September 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORTS ON REAL PROPERTY EXEMPT FROM TAXATION IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Two letters from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia, for the calendar year 1962, and property specifically exempt prior to the passage of the act of December 24, 1942 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, for the period April 1960—March 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

INDEX OF AUDIT REPORTS ISSUED TO THE CONGRESS, ITS COMMITTEES AND MEMBERS ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an index of audit reports issued to the Congress, its committees and members on Department of Defense activities, fiscal years 1956 through 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON STATUS OF DAM AT CAMP PENDLETON, SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIF.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics), reporting, pursuant to law, on the status of a dam immediately below the confluence of DeLuz Creek with the Santa Margarita River on Camp Pendleton, San Diego County, Calif. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a statement in the nature of a petition, of Ramon A. Martinez, representing the National Association for the Statehood of Puerto Rico, Inc., of New York City, N.Y., relating to the enactment of House bill 5945, for the appointment of a study commission on the political status of Puerto Rico, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs without amendment:

H.R. 976. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire and add certain lands to the Salem Maritime National Historic Site in Massachusetts, and for other purposes (Rept. 660).

By Mr. GRUENING, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1878. A bill to amend the act providing for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union in order to extend the time for the filing of applications for the selection of certain lands by such State (Rept. No. 661).

By Mr. GRUENING, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 167. A bill to provide for the conveyance under certain conditions of the phosphate rights in certain lands in the State of Florida (Rept. No. 662).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 5949. An act to consent to the amendment by the States of Colorado and New Mexico of the Costilla Creek Compact (Rept. No. 666).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1111. A bill to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a water resources council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning (Rept. No. 668).

By Mr. MOSS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

H.R. 4062. An act to amend the act authorizing the transmission and disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of electric energy generated at Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to also market power generated at Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande (Rept. No. 667).

By Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

S. 1698. A bill to amend section 511(h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to extend the time for commitment of construction reserve funds (Rept. No. 663).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

H.R. 2906. An act to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide an exemption from the provisions of such part for the emergency transportation of any accidentally wrecked or disabled motor vehicle in interstate or foreign commerce by towing (Rept. No. 664).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

H.R. 134. An act to provide that seat belts sold or shipped in interstate commerce for use in motor vehicles shall meet certain safety standards (Rept. No. 665).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself, Mr. Johnston, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Hart, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Keating, Mr. Fong, and Mr. Scott):

S. 2330. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for the assassination of the President or the Vice President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JOHNSTON subsequently said: Mr. President, this bill is introduced to make it a Federal crime and to provide penalties including death upon conviction of murder in the first degree for the willful, deliberate, malicious, and premeditated assassination of the President or Vice President of the United States.

Mr. President, this bill also provides for severe penalties upon conviction for those persons who attempt to assassinate or whoever willfully conspires with any other person to assassinate any person who is serving as President or Vice President of the United States.

Mr. KEATING subsequently said: Mr. President, I have added my name to the list of Judiciary Committee members who have offered the bill to make a Federal crime of an assassination attempt or conspiracy to kill the President or any person in the line of succession to the Presidency. Its passage will not rekindle the life which was destroyed last Friday nor return to our midst the noble man we have lost. We cannot even know if it will, in the future, deter the hand of another assassin and spare another President, another grieving family, another generation of mourning Americans.

We can stand together, however, at this time of monumental national tragedy, to show the world that we are not a lawless land, that we will not tolerate such sacrilege and that we designate such acts as crimes of the highest order, not against one man alone, but against the Nation that we love.

United in our grief and firm in the determination that the rule of law prevail, I ask the support of my colleagues for this measure, praying God that it need never be invoked.

By Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself), Mr. Simpson, Mr. Williams of Delaware, Mr. Curtis, and Mr. Morse):

S. 2331. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for the assassination of the President, the Vice President, or the Chief Justice of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Proxmire when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 2332. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, members of the Cabinet, and Members of the Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Miller when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 2333. A bill to redesignate the Peace Corps as the Kennedy Corps; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Inouye when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 2334. A bill for the relief of Leo M. Mondry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 2335. A bill to recodify, with certain amendments thereto, chapter 19 of title 5 of the United States Code, entitled "Administrative Procedure"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2336. A bill for the relief of John Richard Dolby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 2337. A bill for the relief of Dr. Vedbrat S. Vaid; and

S. 2338. A bill for the relief of Kalliope Kostides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 2339. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Sarpy County, Nebr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

S. 2340. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for the assassination of the President, the Vice President, or any officer in line of succession to the Presidency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Simpson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Clark, and Mr. Humphrey):

S. 2341. A bill to authorize the appropriation of $5 million to carry out the purposes of the National Cultural Center Act and to designate the National Cultural Center, authorized to be constructed by such act, as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Cultural Center; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Fulbright when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

FUNERAL EXPENSES IN CONNECTION WITH FUNERAL OF THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. MORSE submitted a resolution (S. Res. 229) to pay the expenses of the Senate committee incurred in connection with the funeral of the late President John F. Kennedy, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Morse, which appears under a separate heading.)

PROPOSAL TO MAKE ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT, VICE PRESIDENT, OR CHIEF JUSTICE A FEDERAL CRIME

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to make assassination of a President, Vice President, or Chief Justice a Federal crime.

For the last 5 days this country has lived a nightmare. We have lost our President. We have lost something else as well.

The great majesty of America is that we are a country of law, that all men—all men—have equal rights and liberties under law; all men—the crudest, poorest, most brutal psychopath—yes, even the man accused of murdering the President of the United States; all men have rights equal to those of our first citizen: The President of the United States, before the law.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I shall be happy to yield in a moment.

Mr. President, if there is any single quality of this country that is more precious than any other it is this.

But since last Friday the man accused of murdering the President was tried by television. Police officials told the world, including virtually every potential juror, that the case against Lee Oswald was airtight, a cinch. He was held 48 hours—until his death—without counsel. And then he was himself murdered in full view of tens of millions of Americans by a striptease operator with a police record in Chicago as well as in Dallas, a man known well to the police, who were supposed to be protecting him.

What a terrible and sickening counterpoint to the dignity and gallantry of the Kennedy family and to the dream of democracy so dear to President Kennedy as he put it in his inaugural address in calling for a "new world of law, where the strong are just and the weak secure."

The trial of the man accused of murdering President Kennedy should have been a showcase of democracy in action with meticulous attention for the rights of even the man accused of this monstrous crime.

Mr. President, no law in a democracy can prevent the possibility of Presidential assassination in the future. But I am proposing a bill today that may help to make this terrible event less likely, and would certainly help immensely to assure this Nation that if another President is murdered, competent Federal officials, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Department of Justice, will have the legal jurisdiction to move in at once with full and complete authority.

Mr. President, we are generally proud of local police departments in America and of local district attorneys. Many of them are highly competent. Some of them are less so. But almost none of them is equipped to cope with the catastrophic eruption of the assassination of a President. National television with all its glamour, excitement, and confusion moves in. Competent local police officials with no experience in dealing with an aggressive and probing press are obviously likely to be overwhelmed.

If this bill is passed making the murder of the President, the Vice President, or the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court a Federal crime, it will be possible to respond to this national crime with the kind of national competence and national dignity that is required and now so obviously and sadly lacking.

Finally, it was not until after the Lindbergh kidnaping and legislation making kidnaping a Federal crime had become law that kidnaping, which had been a terrible national sickness, came under control. Why is it not likely that Federal jurisdiction over the murder of a President, bringing assurance of prompt and comprehensive FBI jurisdiction, will help, at least some, to reduce the danger of the assassination of the President.

Just as a technical footnote, the murder of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court is now covered by Federal law, but only provided he is murdered in the performance of his duties. This bill would provide Federal jurisdiction any time and all the time for the Chief Justice.

While some case can be made for extending the coverage of the bill to others, I believe that only these three national officers face extraordinary risk; and that we should keep Federal jurisdiction over law enforcement at the minimum level.

Mr. President, I introduce my bill and ask unanimous consent that it may remain at the desk for a week for any Senator who may wish to join as cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ribicoff in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk for 1 week, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The bill (S. 2331) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for the assassination of the President, the Vice President, or the Chief Justice of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Proxmire (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire], and to say that I, too, have prepared a similar measure which I shall now withhold. I should like to add my name as a cosponsor of the bill introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his support.

PROTECTION OF CERTAIN ELECTED OFFICIALS OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I introduce a bill which would make it a Federal crime to kill, or attempt to kill, or to conspire in so doing, the President or the Vice President or the President-elect or the Vice President-elect. My bill would also extend similar coverage with respect to Members of Congress and the Cabinet.

In the present state of the law, a State and not the Federal Government, has jurisdiction over crimes such as the one committed against President Kennedy. The laws of the various States differ considerably. So do the law enforcement procedures and security capabilities. I believe all of us would rather have prisoners such as the alleged murderer of a President held in Federal custody, tried by a Federal court, and punished under Federal law. Moreover, I believe such a policy should extend to others in the Presidential line of succession and Members of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk until a week from Friday for such cosponsors as may wish to join.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection, the bill will lie at the desk until a week from Friday as requested by the Senator from Iowa.

The bill (S. 2332) to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, Members of the Cabinet, and Members of the Congress, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Miller, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF THE PEACE CORPS AS THE KENNEDY CORPS

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the city of Berlin has honored our late and beloved President by renaming its public square after President John F. Kennedy.

The city of London plans to erect a heroic monument to President John F. Kennedy.

The Jewish National Fund of America will plant a forest in Israel in the heart of the American Freedom Forest in honor of President John F. Kennedy.

In South America, a village named after the Alliance for Progress will now be called the John F. Kennedy Village.

Many peoples in many different lands have been moved spontaneously and collectively to honor the work and the memory of one who has been martyred in the summer of his life.

I am certain that all the people of the United States are humble and grateful for this worldwide recognition of President Kennedy, a man who served the world as a servant of America.

There is one way in which we, too, may join the multitude of this world in paying tribute to the President, known throughout as a man of peace.

From his compassionate heart and brilliant mind there first came the idea of the Peace Corps which was to inspire all who would rather emphasize the soldiers of peace than the soldiers of war.

This was his creation, this was his Corps, this was his lasting contribution to the peace of the world.

I, therefore, respectfully urge the Peace Corps be christened the Kennedy Corps. Let his name be remembered throughout the world, let his message for peace be spread to all peoples in the barrios of the Philippines, in the slums of South America, in the villages of Asia, and in the bush and jungle of every newborn country and age-old hamlet in Africa.

I introduce the bill, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that it remain on the desk until December 4 so that other Senators who wish to do so may join in cosponsorship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested.

The bill (S. 2333) to redesignate the Peace Corps as the Kennedy Corps, introduced by Mr. Inouye, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE TO PROVIDE PENALTIES FOR ASSASSINATION OF CERTAIN ELECTED OFFICIALS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, one of the corollaries to the shocking tragedy which occurred in Dallas, Tex., Friday is the surfacing of alarming inadequacies in our criminal statutes dealing with crimes against the Nation's top elected officials.

In the hope that it might either prevent or lessen the likelihood of a reoccurrence of what has already happened, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would make a Federal crime of the murder, or the attempt to murder, the President of the United States or his successors as defined by law. As we have become suddenly aware from events of the past weekend, there is no Federal statute covering attacks upon or the murder of our President. Consequently, the disposition of persons accused of such a crime and the investigation of the crime itself is left to local authorities. It is fair to conclude that the local authorities have not adequately met their responsibilities in this regard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2340) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for the assassination of the President, the Vice President, or any officer in line of succession to the Presidency, introduced by Mr. Simpson, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER, AND ITS DESIGNATION AS THE JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY MEMORIAL CENTER

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], and the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark]. I ask unanimous consent that it be received and that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

This bill authorizes the naming of the National Cultural Center in memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. It further authorizes the appropriation of the last $5 million necessary to construct the Center, the remainder of the funds to be raised from private sources.

Having introduced in the Senate the original bill in 1958, authorizing the creation of the National Cultural Center, I thought it appropriate to introduce this amendment as a tribute to our late President, who took a deep interest in and played an active role in the procreation of this great Center.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] and I are members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian, under which the Center would be placed, and, together with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], are trustees of the National Cultural Center.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial from the Washington Star at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection, the editorial will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2341) to authorize the appropriation of $5 million to carry out the purposes of the National Cultural Center Act and to designate the National Cultural Center, authorized to be constructed by such act, as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, introduced by Mr. Fulbright (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The editorial presented by Mr. Fulbright is as follows:

A Kennedy Memorial

His own best memorial will live in his own memorable words, for he spoke in trumpets, summoning us to seek our finest nature and to fit it to the difficulties and dangers of our time.

Our own best act of remembrance must continue to be the faith we keep with his imperatives.

But the heart desires and the slain leader deserves a more tangible, more specific memorial, a physical place in the Nation's Capital corresponding to his place in prayer in the Nation's heart.

There can be no more fitting memorial than the dedication now, to him, of the National Cultural Center.

The President and Mrs. Kennedy brought to the center of things the service performed by the arts for men and women. In thought and speech John F. Kennedy moved with familiar friendship among the poets and the prophets. It was the same in his and Mrs. Kennedy's home. The White House became a place of welcome for musicians and painters, dancers and writers.

The idea of the Cultural Center preceded the Kennedy administration. But President Kennedy gave the idea force and form, and a singularly personal leadership, without which it could hardly have achieved its present development.

Mrs. Kennedy, from whom we have learned to bear loss with dignity, was even more deeply involved. To salute her loss as well as ours, a Kennedy Memorial Cultural Center would speak intimately of part of her gift to us.

Other memorial proposals have been made, chiefly of renaming athletic stadia already in existence. The Cultural Center as a memorial to Mr. Kennedy is not only uniquely expressive of a purpose shared by the President and his wife. Since it is now in early process, since funds are still being raised, it also would give all Americans the chance to remember the President by bringing to completion an intent and wish of his.

The change of name and the dedication should be made at once. The building should be brought to reality as soon as possible.

John F. Kennedy will live in the hearts of men. Let him live also in the arts he loved.

Mr. FULBRIGHT subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill I have just introduced remain at the desk for possible additional cosponsors until Friday, next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to join as a cosponsor of that bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL AND CORPORATE INCOME TAXES—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 330)

Mr. HARTKE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 8363) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce individual and coroporate income taxes, to make certain structural changes with respect to the income tax, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 331)

Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. Keating) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 132) for the relief of certain aliens, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, November 26, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 777) to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Speech by Dr. Wernher von Braun delivered at the annual chamber of commerce dinner, Charleston, W. Va., November 5, 1963; Senator Randolph's introduction of Dr. von Braun; and the editorial "Dr. von Braun Welcomes Choice," in the November 5 issue of the Charleston Gazette.

TELEVISION AND THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, ever since television came on the American scene almost 15 years ago a gradual process of acceptance has continued until this magic medium has become an irrevocable part of the American way of life.

The significance of this service was most meaningfully demonstrated during the past 4 days following the tragic death of our President, John F. Kennedy. Through the medium of television, millions of American homes were brought together as one to see and hear in respectful and restrained detail the events following this tragedy. Electronic journalism has proved once again through its skillful, respectful, detailed and tastful coverage of the past 4 days the significant role it plays in reporting news events.

I cannot estimate the cost incurred by the networks since the first bulletin announcing the tragedy was made at approximately 1:30 on November 22, but it would be fair to estimate that the costs run into the millions. Since that moment the American Broadcasting Co., the Columbia Broadcasting Co., and the National Broadcasting Co., mustered all their resources and broadcast steadily for 4 days bringing to the people throughout this country the intimate details of the events as they were taking place. All commercial and entertainment programing was canceled.

This was television's superb performance—electronic journalism at its best and public service programing in the true meaning of the phrase of the Communications Act "public interest, convenience, and necessity." It is with great satisfaction, therefore, that I publicly recognize the networks and their affiliates for an excellent performance. Theirs was a difficult task respectfully and skillfully executed despite the moments of disbelief and confusion on November 22. The staff and the executives of the networks and their affiliates worked tirelessly to bring to broadcasting this outstanding achievement. I salute the broadcasters—radio and television—and offer them the highest commendation for this public service.

STATEMENT RELATING TO WELL-BEING OF THE LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the economic well-being of the livestock producer and of agriculture is vital to the entire economy in Kansas. The cash receipts from livestock sales and livestock production equaled 53 percent of all cash farm receipts in Kansas during 1962. Kansas ranks fourth in the Nation in cattle population.

The recent decline in livestock prices, particularly beef cattle, is causing serious financial losses to cattle feeders and producers. It is having a serious effect on the economy of the livestock producing areas.

Recently the Kansas Livestock Association, through its secretary, A. G. Pickett, submitted a brief to the trade Information Committee for consideration in the forthcoming hearings on world trade matters. This brief discusses frankly and fully the situation confronting the livestock industry in our State.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the Kansas Livestock Association be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE KANSAS LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION

The livestock industry is the most important industry in the State of Kansas. It also represents the largest segment of agriculture in Kansas. In 1962, cash receipts from livestock and livestock products totaled $683,102,000. This is equal to 53 percent of all cash farm receipts in Kansas during 1962. Total cash receipts for the State in 1962 were 4 percent below the 1961 total. While a total cash income in 1962 was down 2 percent from the 1961 figure, net farm income was down to $410 million, which represents a 14-percent decrease from 1961. The enormous increase in farm production costs and lower prices were the principal causes of this lower net income.

The economic well-being of the livestock producer and all agriculture is vital to the entire economy in Kansas. Agriculture is the largest user of steel, fuel oil and other petroleum products. Without the market furnished by agriculture for supplies and services, business in Kansas could not prosper. This all means a profitable livestock industry is essential if Kansas is to prosper.

PRODUCTION REACHES NEW HEIGHTS

Kansas ranks fourth in the Nation in cattle population. The January 1, 1963, inventory totaled 5,222,000 head of cattle. This is the first time in history that the Kansas cattle inventory exceeded 5 million head. The year 1962 was the sixth consecutive year in which cattle inventories increased.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture has continued to remind us that with rapid increase in population, a substantial increase in beef production was needed. Both Kansas and the Nation are adequately meeting, and are prepared to continue to meet, this increased consumer demand for red meat.

While producers are meeting the requirements for more meat, the flood of foreign imports has already caused thousands of producers and feeders to suffer substantial financial losses. Unless something is done to correct the situation soon, producers will suffer further severe financial setbacks.

TARIFFS

Thirty years ago, the tariff on beef was 6 cents a pound. In 1947, this import tariff was reduced to 3 cents. The tariff on live cattle and other meat products was also reduced comparably. During this same 30 years, livestock prices and production costs soared to well over double the figures at that time. As a result of this tremendous increase in the price level, present tariffs are not effective and offer little or no protection to the cattle industry from foreign imports. Rather than further reduction in tariffs at this time, we should have substantial increases as well as quotas. We should point out that it would take an increase of several hundred percent applied to the present tariff rates to catch up with the present economic levels and requirements.

In spite of the fact that the U.S. tariffs offer little or no protection to the livestock and meat industry, records show that other countries have not only maintained but have increased their import duties, as well as using other import controls.

The American livestock producer is willing to compete on a fair and equitable basis but with the U.S. cost of production much higher than costs in our importing nations, and with these nations maintaining relatively high import controls, he realizes that he is at a disadvantage. Producers in this country feel that our tariffs and trade policies are permitting this country to become a dumping ground for world supplies of meat, and particularly beef.

IMPORTS

We are familiar with the recent rapid increase in the importation of beef. The 1964 Outlook Issue of the Livestock and Meat Situation, published by the Economic Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, states that the production of steer and heifer beef under Federal inspection for the first 9 months of this year, 1963, was up 10 percent from the same period during 1962. At the same time, imports have increased rapidly and have doubled since 1960. Imports have reached a point well above 10 percent of our total domestic consumption and, according to Government figures, are continuing to increase in 1963. This substantial increase in imports, added to the increased domestic production, has caused a severe break in fat cattle prices. This break is as much as 25 to 30 percent of what prices were a year ago.

Dr. Willard W. Cochrane, one of the chief economic advisers to Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, in his book "Farm Prices, Myth and Reality" published in 1958, stated that the demand for food is highly inelastic. Dr. Cochrane continues, "A 2-percent increase in the amount of food offered will drive prices down by 25 percent. The farmer is truly at the crack end of the whip."

The increase in per capita consumption of beef and increased population has taken care of the increase in domestic production. If we use Dr. Cochrane's formula we can readily see that when the equivalent of 10 to 12 percent of our consumption in foreign beef is dumped on the U.S. market, a terrific pressure will be put on cattle prices. Excessive imports during recent months are directly responsible for the severe break in livestock prices and financial losses by producers. Unless this situation is corrected, our entire economy will suffer.

CONTINUATION OF DISEASE CONTROL MEASURES IMPERATIVE

The United States is the best fed country in the world. Its supply of meat and meat animal products is not only nutritious but our healthy supply of livestock means a healthy, nutritious food supply. It is therefore imperative that during future negotiations our present quarantine measures and other requirements which protect our domestic animals from foreign diseases be rigidly maintained.

In the forthcoming negotiations, it is imperative that rather than removal or reduction of present tariffs, action must be taken which will protect our livestock producers from this recent flood of imports.

The Kansas Livestock Association urges that a system of quotas be established based on average imports over a long period of time. This system of quotas should be accompanied by substantial increases in our import duties. We feel it is only fair to the livestock industry that our import duties at least equal those of our competitive importing nations. This plan would give importing countries access to our markets on a competitive basis.

STATEMENT OF PRESIDENT ERNEST L. WILKINSON, BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY, UPON THE SO-CALLED HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BILL

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, at the Brigham Young University commencement exercises on August 22, 1963, President Ernest L. Wilkinson made a statement concerning the so-called Higher Education Facilities Act, which ought to be made available to all Members of the Senate before the Senate votes upon the conference report on this bill, which is designated as H.R. 6143.

President Wilkinson asserts in his statement a view entertained by millions of Americans; namely, that the establishment of religion clause of the first amendment prohibits the using of tax raised funds for the benefit of colleges and universities owned, operated, or controlled by religious denominations. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Wilkinson's statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT IN OPPOSITION TO THE PROPOSED HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963, BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, AUGUST 22, 1963, PRESIDENT ERNEST L. WILKINSON

On August 15, 1963, the board of trustees of Brigham Young University, composed of the first presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, the quorum of the 12, and some other general authorities of the church, held a special meeting at which an important decision was made which President David O. McKay has felt it would be appropriate to announce to the students, faculty, and friends of this institution at this commencement—together with some of the impelling reasons therefor.

With his greetings and blessings I shall now inform you of this decision. Before that meeting the board had been informally advised that if the "Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963" passed by the Federal House of Representatives last week should become law, the first year's allotment to Utah under a 5-year grant program would be almost $2 million, of which the BYU allotment would be approximately three-quarters of a million dollars. Assuming a similar allotment for each year BYU by spending $7½ million, would receive Federal grants in the total amount of $3¾ million. The board was informally asked whether it would accept this Federal money. The board was advised that if it would not accept this money, such money would be distributed to other educational institutions within the State of Utah.

Upon careful and deliberate consideration the board, although recognizing that BYU could very profitably use such funds, unanimously decided that in keeping with past policy it would not accept Federal grants and loans for buildings under the proposed program. It will, of course, continue to participate in programs wherein the university provides services for Federal funds received on a quid pro quo basis. The board, furthermore, expressed its outright opposition to the enactment of the proposed Higher Education Facilities Act.

One reason for opposing Federal subsidies for college building is that such subsidies will discourage and make unnecessary the more efficient utilization of existing education plants of the country. A study financed by the fund for the advancement of education reported in 1961–62 as follows: "Particularly in the use of space—classrooms, laboratories, and libraries—most colleges and universities persist in traditional and inefficient practices that waste their resources and result in unneeded construction."[1]

This report quoted figures showing that classrooms and laboratories had been used an average of only 44 percent of the possible periods in a 44-hour week. The senior author of the utilization manual showing these figures and the country's leading authority in such studies, Dr. John Dale Russel of New

---

[1] The Fund for the Advancement of Education, A Report for 1961–62, p. 29.

York University, told the Committee on Higher Education in New York State in 1960 that full classroom utilization by institutions of higher learning in the United States would enable existing facilities to "handle four times the present number of students."[2]

Recognizing this inefficiency, a report under the auspices of the American Council on Education stated: "This may be a luxury we can no longer afford and one which we can hardly justify."[3] Nevertheless, that same council, as well as other educational organizations, is constantly proclaiming to Congress and the American people that we are in dire need of Federal funds for the construction of more university buildings. In general, the facts do not support this assertion of need, if present facilities are adequately utilized.

It is, therefore, obvious that the appropriation of new Federal funds would do away with incentive for better management of our educational resources. State legislatures and private donors would not exert the same pressures on universities to obtain more afternoon, evening, and early morning, as well as summer, use of their plants.

In contrast to this profligate national waste of educational space, I am happy to report to you graduates and friends of Brigham Young University that the board of trustees of BYU has made every effort to obtain the most efficient possible use of tithing expenditures. As a result, the utilizations of all BYU classrooms and laboratories for the first term of the 1962-63 schol year was 88 percent, based on a 44-hour week. This was exactly twice as high as the 44-percent national average previously cited.

Similar utilization of facilities on other campuses throughout the Nation and a decent respect for the rights of the taxpayers would make unnecessary large Federal appropriations for educational facilities.

A second reason for opposing Federal educational subsidies is closely related to the first. Under the bill adopted by the House, a total of $2 billion is to be made available for higher education,[4] notwithstanding the fact that the Federal Government has operated in the red for 27 of the past 33 years.[5]

The average deficit for the last year and the next 2 years will be almost $9 billion per year.[6]

During the period of the greatest prosperity in the history of our Nation, we have been sinking further and further in debt. The Federal current debt now amounts to well over $300 billion—or $1,700 indebtedness for every person in the United States. Further, Senator HARRY BYRD, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, reported in June of 1962 that current debt and accrued liabilities of the Federal Government would total well over $1 trillion.[7] This was confirmed by Maurice Stans, Director of the Bureau of the Budget from 1958 to 1961, who phrased it in terms we can all understand when he said that "this is a national debt of more than $22,000 for every family of four in the country."[8]

With this alarming indebtedness constantly going upward, the board did not want to be a party to further enlarging our Federal obligations and thereby impairing the financial integrity and solvency of our country.

Apparently our national legislators have forgotten the advice of Thomas Jefferson, who said: "I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt—we must make our choice between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people, under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy."

The shocking aspect of the present situation is that no one in high public office, nor any top educational leader proposing programs of Federal aid, has even as much as proposed a plan for the payment of Federal aid, except by having our Government go further and further in debt, which means economic slavery for our children and our children's children.

A third reason for opposition to the present proposed legislation is that the problem can be solved by the traditional method of State and community support without new Federal subsidies. The cry of despair that we must have Federal subsidies or higher education will be unable to meet the challenge of the sixties is demonstrably false. The money must come from the citizenry whether channeled through a Federal conduit or State and private conduits. As A. Sydney Hulong, Jr., explained: "Federal aid is just like a man getting a blood transfusion by taking the blood out of his right arm, putting it in his left arm, and spilling part of it on the way over."

During the past decade numerous dire predictions similar to those now currently heard in behalf of higher education were made for elementary and secondary education. The Committee for the White House Conference on Education in 1955 recommended Federal aid for construction of public schools on the ground that the threatened enrollment increases would require a doubling of school funds in a decade, which would be impossible without Federal aid. Yet now we can look back and see what happened without Federal aid. The 10-year increase in school revenues from 1951-52 to 1961-62, according to an NEA report, was 159 percent,[9] far in excess of the 100-percent decennial rate which had been thought impossible to achieve.

We should remember also that the U.S. Office of Education placed the building shortage at 370,000 classrooms in 1954 and estimated it would climb to 476,000 by 1960. Others, including the chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, predicted it would reach 600,000.[10] Yet quite the opposite occurred. Without new Federal aid programs, the States and local committees cut the shortage to 127,000 classrooms (fall 1961). In other words, the available classrooms increased by 33 percent between 1955-56 and 1961-62, whereas enrollments increased only 22 percent. Thus, new construction under our traditional method of State and community support has been at a rate 50 percent higher than new students.[11]

It should be noted that a number of comprehensive studies indicate that the rate of increase in general college enrollments will actually decline substantially during the coming 8 years.

Also, the rate of increase in elementary and secondary enrollments will tend to level off, thus permitting States to shift school building expenditures to higher levels.[12]

Admittedly the future growth of the colleges, even though it may not be at the same rate as during the past decade, will require great effort and sacrifice to finance adequately. But, fortunately, State and local governments are already responding to that need. According to the Bureau of Census, State expenditures for higher education increased 27 percent between 1960 and 1962.[13]

If this rate should continue, State support will almost triple during the 1960's. But whether it does or not, every indication is that without Federal aid, State, local, and private sources will provide the expenditures necessary for institutions of higher learning.[14]

The fourth reason for opposition to Federal aid is that it will lead to Federal control over education.

The Commission on Financing Higher Education, comprised, among others, of the presidents of Johns Hopkins University, the California Institute of Technology, Stanford University, Brown University, and the provost of Harvard University, concluded unanimously in 1952: "We as a Nation should call a halt at this time to the introduction of new programs of direct Federal aid to colleges and universities. We also believe it undesirable for the Government to expand the scope of its scholarship aid to individual students."[15]

The Commission feared that the freedom, diversity and independence of educational institutions "will be threatened if higher education is subjected to further influence from the Federal Government."[16]

---

[2] Sidney Tickton, "The Year-Round Campus Catches On," the Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1963, p. 6.

[3] Ronald B. Thompson, "Educational Alternatives," in Vital Issues in Education, American Council on Education, p. 117.

[4] Funds totaling nearly $1.2 billion are to be given or loaned on a 50-year basis within the next 3 years under the proposed program. An additional $880 million is then proposed for the following 2 years, as a minimum. The minimal proposal then amounts to around $2 billion.

[5] U.S. News & World Report, July 22, 1963, pp. 34-39.

[6] This fiscal year ended with a deficit of $6.8 billion (BRUCE, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug 14, 1963, p. 14968); next year's deficit is predicted to be $9 to $11 billion (BRUCE, ibid., see also LAIRD, ibid., p. 14994); and fiscal 1965, acording to Secretary Dillon, will see a deficit of some $9.8 billion (ibid.).

[7] "The Financial Condition of the U.S. Government," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 7, p. 9672.

[8] Los Angeles Times-Mirror Syndicate, February 28, 1962. See also U.S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States (GPO No. C3.143). See index, "Debt—Public—Federal Government," Budget of the U.S. Government (T51.5).

[9] National Education Statistics, "Estimates of School Statistics, 1961-62."

[10] Emergency Federal Aid for School Construction, hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, 84th Cong., 1st sess., 1955, p. 1 (Jan. 27, 1955).

[11] Considered another way, total educational enrollment has jumped from 28 to 50 million since the end of World War II, an increase of 76 percent. This was accompanied by a growth of funds from $4 to $29 billion. This was a tripling of the share of the national income going to education—from 2.3 to 6.8 percent (School Life (Office of Education), January 1963, p. 23). In Utah, the share of personal income devoted to public education increased from 3.23 to 8.73 percent between 1946 and 1962.

[12] The enrollment increase for colleges from 1954 to 1962 was 74 percent compared with 51 percent, the average of four projections from 1962 to 1970. Total enrollment increase at all levels of education will drop from 35 percent between 1954 and 1962 to 17 percent between 1962 and 1970 (Bureau of Census, Current Population Reports, series P. 20 Nos. 89 and 120; series P. 25, No. 232.) During the 1950's, educational enrollments grew faster than gross national product but during the remainder of this decade gross national product is expected to grow twice as fast as total enrollments. (Statement of Roger A. Freeman, senior staff member, the Hoover Institution in War, Revolution, and Peace, Stanford University, before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, May 27 1963.)

[13] Bureau of the Census, Compendium of State Government Finance in 1962, 1963.

[14] Financing Higher Education, 1960-70, Dexter McKeezer, ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959), pp. 73-75.

[15] Nature and Needs of Higher Education; the report of the Commission on Financing Higher Education (New York: Columbia University Press, 1952) pp. 157-158.

Former U.S. Commissioner of Education, Samuel Brownell, said that "if Federal aid is to bring about better schools, it seems apparent that there must be some control."[17] The kind of control to follow Federal aid is suggested by James Bryant Conant, president of Harvard University for 20 years, who wrote in 1959 that further appropriations for education by the Federal Government would lead to Senate and House committees examining into the "details of curriculums and school organization, much as committees of the State legislatures now do."[18]

An editorial in the Nation's Schools said: "There is something quite naive in the way we school people talk about Federal control of education. Some of us think that Federal influence on education can be prevented simply by stating that it shall not exist. * * * Federal direction is inherent in any Federal law or any Federal court decision pertaining to education."[19]

For some unexplained reason many people, including many educators, look upon Federal aid as coming from the legendary Santa Claus without any controls. They forget that the real Santa Claus, who pays the bills, always exercises complete control, even though in some cases, as with the Government, he may be extravagant, irresponsible and even capricious.

Even though a Federal aid bill may originally be enacted providing for no Federal control, it is inevitable that succeeding Congresses will impose that control. That has been true of all Federal programs. Indeed, if the Goverment puts up the money, it is entitled to control, and will. He who pays the fiddler calls the tune.

Indeed, certain leaders in the school field, while they are discreetly silent as to Federal control while they are seeking Federal aid, will, once they get Federal aid, also seek Federal control.

Thus an editorial in Overview, a monthly magazine for school administrators, openly declares that "the long-held view * * * that educational policy should be made by local units of government" will have to be replaced by "a national system of education."[20]

The danger of such a national system—in addition to an almost automatic stifling of creativity resulting from eliminating the traditional diversity of educational programs across the country—is its inevitable control. This is illustrated by the parallel drawn by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, the late president of Columbia University: "It is universally acknowledged that the unhappy decline in Germany of university freedom and effectiveness and the equally unhappy subjection of the educated classes to the political and military ruling group were the direct result of the highly centralized and efficient control from Berlin of the Nation's schools and universities."

A fifth reason for opposition to the pending legislation is that there is serious doubt about the constitutionality of Government aid to church-controlled schools. The Supreme Court held, in the *Everson* case in 1947, that neither the State nor the Federal Government "can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another."[21] The Court further emphasized the point by saying:

"No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion."[22]

Clearly, funds given directly to church-controlled educational institutions even though restricted to nonreligious buildings do release church funds to be spent for other purposes and thus aid an establishment of religion. President John F. Kennedy recognized this by stating on March 1, 1961:

"The Constitution clearly prohibits aid to * * * the parochial school. * * * There isn't any room for debate on that subject. It is prohibited by the Constitution, and the Supreme Court made that very clear."[23]

"One of the fundamental reasons why Congress, over the last several years, has failed to provide a massive program of Federal aid for elementary and secondary schools is that it was considered unconstitutional to make this money available to church-controlled schools who probably needed it worse than State institutions."[24]

It is difficult to see any difference between a church-controlled high school and college. The constitutional position should be the same.

Even the American Association of University Professors overruled its governing council by resolving in 1962 to oppose grants to private institutions. The Honorable John B. Anderson, of Illinois, found it ironic that, only 1 year after the Supreme Court had banned a voluntarily used 22-word school prayer, the House should pass the Higher Education Facilities Act—completely avoiding the constitutional issue of separation of church and state.[25]

Numerous Protestants join in this concern, as the prominent Protestant magazine Christian Century declared: "American Protestants will never pay taxes to support Catholic schools. We will oppose enactment of laws which require such payment. If Congress is pressured into enacting such laws, we will contest them in the courts. If the courts reverse themselves and declare such laws constitutional, we will still refuse to pay these taxes, paying whatever price is necessary to preserve religious liberty in a pluralistic society."[26]

Summarily stated, the action of the board of trustees of Brigham Young University in opposition to the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 can be supported on at least five premises: (1) Easy Federal money will encouraged the inefficient management and shocking lack of utilization of our existing educational facilities and buildings; (2) the trillion dollars' worth of obligations of the Federal Government and its continuous operation in the "red" do not justify a big new subsidy program (even though the money will be spent anyway, the board does not, by participating in such a program, want to become a party to impairing the financial integrity of the country we love); (3) State and private sources are responding to and can adequately meet the educational needs of the 1960's as they have in the past; (4) Federal controls of higher education, which would accompany and follow Federal grants, would be unwise and dangerous; (5) Federal grants to religious educational institutions appear to be a direct violation of the first amendment to the Constitution, which erects a complete wall of financial separation between church and state, and even though it would be in our financial interest to participate therein, we have too much respect for the Constitution to do so.

ADDRESS OF ROBERT MOSES AT FALL DINNER OF THE SOCIETY OF SILURIANS, GRAND STREET BOYS' CLUB, NEW YORK CITY, NOVEMBER 18, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, one of my favorite Americans is Robert Moses, president of the World's Fair of New York, 1964–65. Recently he gave a speech to the Society of the Silurians, Grand Street Boys' Club, New York City.

It is so full of references to some of our country's historic personages whom Mr. Moses knew during his very productive life that I would like to make the speech a matter of historic record. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASUAL REMARKS OF ROBERT MOSES, PRESIDENT OF THE WORLD'S FAIR OF NEW YORK, 1964–65, AT THE ANNUAL FALL DINNER OF THE SOCIETY OF THE SILURIANS, GRAND STREET BOYS' CLUB, NEW YORK CITY, MONDAY EVENING, NOVEMBER 18, 1963

Murray Davis told me you can take as well as dish it, that you are not sensitive, and that I should just ramble on until you got restive. I am following instructions literally.

A Silurian, I suppose, is a troglodyte who has not learned to accept obsolescence gracefully. The Silurians were the first scorpions who drew their oxygen from the air. Armor-plated, many-toothed, you fight in the open. You don't go sneaking around on padded paws, like many of the smaller, subtler, foxier, and more adaptable creatures with protective coloring.

Snobbery and heraldry aside, there is more to be deduced from fossils and bones neatly fitted together than from recorded history. We know more about Silurians than we do about our own immediate ancestors. That's why you have such a familiar look. You will recall the yarn about the two Irishmen who saw a kangaroo for the first time. They examined the placard which said "Habitat Australia." Pat said, "Glory be to God. My sister married one of them." Mike said, "Well, it looks human." Pat replied, "No more human than you and me."

I like Silurians because they are also dedicated men who can read, write, and speak English and have at least a passing acquaintance with good literature. All the present generation of Yale knows of the classics is the brekekex that rolls over the stadium in the chill of early winter as the shadows lengthen on the football field. Einstein with his $E=mc^2$ has a better chance of immortality than Aristophones.

I have enjoyed the unique experience of greeting twice within a month a pride, bevy, flock, pack, school, tribe, or whatever you call it, of dinosaurs. I must say that you are more prepossessing, if less imposing, than the Sinclair representatives, but I assume fully as good-natured. Out of the bowels of the earth Silurians too draw the fire that sparks the engines of a motorized civilization.

---

[16] Ibid., p. 158.

[17] "Shall It Be 'Yes' or 'No' on Federal Aid?" School and Society, XLIX (May 27, 1939), 669.

[18] "The Child, the Parent, and the State" (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959), p. 56.

[19] Arthur H. Rice, "Looking Forward: It Is Federal Control," Nation's Schools, September 1960, p. 65.

[20] Walter D. Cocking, "A National System of Education," Overview, November 1960, p. 97.

[21] *Everson* v. *The Board of Education of the Township of Ewing, et al*, 330 U.S. 1, 15.

[22] Ibid., 16.

[23] Presidential Press Conference, as quoted by WAGGONNER, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 14, 1963, p. 14962.

[24] Roger A. Freeman, statement before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, May 27, 1963, p. 5.

[25] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 14, 1963, p. 14945.

[26] Feb. 1, 1961, p. 132.

You boys are said to know all about manufacturing public sentiment. You project images like those in the Rubaiyat which come and go round the lantern held at midnight by the master of the show. You can give the politicians cards and spades when it comes to anticipating events that never occur, figuring out angles and editorializing in the sacred, and always wholly factual news columns. I am less and less impressed by the mail which the papers stimulate. I recall up in Albany Governor Smith asking Jimmie Mahoney, a very canny secretary, about the volume of mail on a fomented, blown-up, current issue. Jimmie replied, "Governor, I weighed the pros and cons on the package scale, and the cons won."

You ask me now and then, "Do you get angry when you are criticized?" Very rarely, if there is any artistry in it. I admit a reluctant admiration of clean hatchet work, performed conscientiously and with solemnity—almost a religious rite—and at the end a nice job of drying without wiping, which leaves the edge undulled for the next occasion.

I never kid myself into believing that there is anything unique or indispensable in my experience, or that wisdom will die with me. As Fitzgerald, not Honey Fitz, but the Reverend Edward, remarked "The eternal saki from that selfsame bowl has poured millions of bubbles like us, and will pour." Critics should be greeted in the truly comic spirit of Scaramouche, who was born with the gift of laughter and the sense that the world is mad.

A critic usually makes a bum author. I refer you to a famous essay of a couple of centuries ago called "English Bards and Scotch Reviewers." A belligerent Scotch critic and playwright called, I believe, John Home tried his hand at constructive writing and produced a patriotic turkey called "Douglas." On opening night another Scotchman, overcome with enthusiasm, leaped to his feet in the gallery and shouted, "Whar is your Willie Shaksper noo?"

The critics are often found high up and safe in the fastness of ivory towers, shouting raucous, bold and uncompromising directions to those battling in the forum below. You Silurians will recall the story about Chapin, the famous city editor, who went nuts and ended in charge of landscaping at Sing Sing. Chapin sent a cub reporter to a hush-hush radical gathering. The reporter, tossed out on his can, staggered to a telephone booth and told Chapin about the bum's rush. Chapin roared, "Go right back and tell those blankety-blanks they can't intimidate me."

The pressman creates his own environment and atmosphere. A lad who is happy in smoke and monoxide is unhappy in the thin air of Alpine heights. Englishmen are happiest in the anonymity and seclusion of a pea soup fog. My job as head of the World's Fair is to radiate optimism, not gloom, in spite of provocations. I don't begrudge the wurra wurra boys their happy anticipation of impending tragedy. Let them weep into their beers. It is a luxury I can't afford. Adlai Stevenson said to me one day, "When you drop that alligator hide, leave it to me." I could not bequeath it to a better man.

I am always in fear and trembling that the representatives of some of the new African and other republics, when they come to discuss their pavilions and exhibits at the World's Fair, will ask me embarrassing questions, not so much about free enterprise as about our own vaunted system of government as a model for new aspiring nations. The truth is that our American political history is not in all respects a splendid example of utopia for growing foreign boys and visiting athletes in the coming Olympics of Progress at Flushing Meadow.

We have broken our necks at the fair to help the participating new republics display their skills, wares and ambitions. I have a sneaking notion that they are not as green, primitive and eager for instruction with kindergarten blocks as some of us think. They are old in earthy experience and we are still the innocents of the new world. We think we invented and perfected the democratic process and must pass it on, like the missionaries with their Bibles and mottoes, to the heathen, to those Mr. Kipling in one of his less inspired messages called the "lesser breeds without the law."

To be honest you must say to these ambitious rising people that they must develop genuine, dedicated leaders and depend upon them, rather than upon constitutions, charters, declarations, organization charts and economic guesswork and, on the other hand, reflect on how much of the world's critical, momentous business has been in the shaky hands of sick men—for example, Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt in their last months.

Think, my troglodyte friends, of William Jennings Bryan, the fearless, leather-lunged orator of the Platte. Our democracy has buried stranger Caesars than ever graced the Roman forum. Bryan owed his nomination to a speech advocating someone else, an oration so incredibly corny that you could not believe even an exhausted, delirious, sweating American convention could take it. By invoking the cross of gold and crown of thorns, Bryan bedevilled his party for a quarter of a century, ran three times for President, was a grotesque Secretary of State and foisted the accursed 18th amendment on his countrymen.

Almost half of our electorate actually believed that this Nation, and indeed the whole world, could be saved by banning ardent spirits. Bryan was a pioneer in a number of good causes and anticipated quite a few reforms, but think of the dubious blessings he sought to wish on foreign nations. Remember that this arid statesman boycotted a diplomatic function because he heard that liquor would be served. Bryan truly believed that the wages of gin is breath.

In an odd way Bryan makes me think of Pedro Chicote, the Madrid restauranteur and world's champion collector of liquor bottles. He has 20,000 in his cellar and at our invitation brought 500 of them to the World's Fair. They are nicely exhibited over the Terrace Club bar next to Rube Goldberg's inimitable cartoons. One Chicote is worth a hundred Bryans. Another fair exhibitor, a brewer, told me in all seriousness that what unifies the world is not platitudes about the brotherhood of man, but beer.

But back to Bryan. After a farcical, clownish, fundamentalist monkey trial, this pious man, who hated wine, gorged himself on ice cream and watermelon and died of apoplexy. Bryan's big trouble was that he could control only one major appetite at a time. Henry L. Mencken, a Baltimore Silurian and perhaps the greatest reporter of his time, back in his favorite rathskeller in Baltimore, heard the news, leaped to his feet, raised his stein on high and shouted, "Well, we killed the old S.O.B."

But what I most deplore in our Bryans is not their piety, unorthodox economics, and dogmatic ignorance, so much as their command of empty, sonorous, popular phrases. The presidential assizes are upon us. We face a year of fearsome rhetoric. Surely you Silurians have heard the story of that Ultimus Romanorum, Dr. Samuel Johnson, who was never caught with his dictionary down. It seems that someone—I guess it was the ubiquitous Boswell—came upon the doctor in the arms of Morpheus and Miss Annie Green. "I am surprised," said Boswell. "No," said the doctor, "you are astonished, I'm surprised."

In presenting the new nations the image of our United States, we must also draw the curtain lightly over another fearless statesman, Warren Gamaliel Harding of Ohio, whose poker and bourbon friends gave him the works while Charles Evans Hughes, dean of the Cabinet and Secretary of State, nervously stroked his whiskers and prayed that providence might remove his boss quietly.

Shall we try to sell the new republics the Horatio Alger heroes? We Americans are a funny people—I mean funny peculiar—a prey to mixed motives, Trojan and Tyrian, romantic and realist, puritan and philistine. It shows in our daily lives, our politics, and in the press, which holds a somewhat cracked mirror up to nature. In the streets of Gath and Askelon the scoffers can get a big horselaugh out of our inconsistencies and vagaries, but we blunder through to the nearest thing to freedom and prosperity as yet apparent in this vale of tears. It's nothing to brag about and force on others, but surely nothing to hide.

We live in a world of rapid change. The political clichés of yesterday are fast disappearing. In the expensive race for high office, millionaires seem to be able to overcome the handicap of names synonymous with wealth. I remember a neighbor's small boy taunting one of my daughters at a rehearsal in his father's garage with the remark, "You can't ever be President. In the first place, you're a woman and in the second place, you have to be born in a barn."

Let us as a people be a little more modest, less boastful, less sure of our mission and inspiration. Let us cultivate a bit of humility. Leave us, as the "Guys and Dolls" would say, not be too noble. Fine objectives are not to be despised or derided. The fact that many find it difficult to live up to the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount does not make these revelations any less valid, but pharisaical breastbeating is another matter. As applied to politics excessive piety is human, but it should fool nobody and certainly not the fourth estate which sits in the galleries and observes with detachment the antics on the floor. How can we expect that a candidate frantic about tomorrow's election will think about posterity which works no levers in the polling booths, and ponder the verdict of history which is not handed down until he is gone?

My fine friends, I am a reformed reformer. As a neophyte, loosely attached to the old New York Bureau of Municipal Research in the John Purroy Mitchel administration, I got about our sprawling municipal bureaucracy, made lifelong friends among elephant oilers at zoos, body sewers in morgues, engineers, accountants, bookkeepers, budding and tired lawyers, ditto judges, rising and aspiring politicians, efficiency experts, members of pretzel varnishers' unions and of course demon reporters. I became for a time a firm believer in constitutional amendments, charters, organization charts, forms of government and the lingo, mystique, abracadabra, high signs, incunabula and exegesis of reform. Later as chief of the staff reorganizing the State government, I met Governor Smith and then my practical education began. At the feet of this Gamaliel I learned the facts of public life.

In those early days there was an able researcher in the Mitchel administration called Ben Welton, who had been associated with the mayor when he was commissioner of accounts. Ben's name came before the board of estimate for a nice increase. A Tammany man had sneaked into the board when one of the dedicated reformers, seeing the Tekel Tekel on the wall, disappeared into the New York Times. This hardboiled Tammany product remarked, "I'm against the increase. An efficiency engineer is like a welsh rabbit, not Welsh, not rabbit, just a piece of cheese."

The way of the reformer is hard. Nice players do not win ball games. Our spasms of reform are usually exhilirating, brief, and exhausting. John Purroy Mitchel, with all his fine qualities, received less votes than the Socialist candidate when he ran for reelection in 1917. Mitchel was a handsome, gallant, arrogant, knifelike aristocrat, a grandson of Mitchel the great Irish patriot, with more than a touch of Spanish which came through his mother. He suffered from moodiness and violent headaches. In his battles he even foolishly and unnecessarily took on the church, of which he was a more or less nominal member. He went down with reform.

Paul Wilson was another Mitchel administration reformer. He married Frances Perkins, later State industrial commissioner and U.S. Secretary of Labor. He and Frances accompanied the mayor on an inspection of the city water supply in the Catskill Mountains. Frances registered as Miss Perkins and asked for a double room with Paul. The innkeeper raised hell and, alert journalism being what it is, the story traveled everywhere. On another occasion the same old grizzled landlord asked for a couple's marriage license. The man in a rage tossed him a fishing license. A little later there was a great pounding on the door, and the landlord shouted, "If you ain't done it, don't do it. This ain't fer it."

In 1914, Tammany, already recovered from the Mitchel fusion triumph of the previous year, put in the mansion at Albany a tall, rangy, imitation cowboy Congressman called William Sulzer who could out-Bryan Bryan. Herbert Bayard Swope, a great Silurian, reported that in a second-floor synagogue, following a terrific harangue about Russian massacres, Bill Sulzer, who always referred to himself in the third person as though he were speaking of a remote, revered statesman, was asked by Swope how he could say that Jews got on their knees since they do not pray on their knees. Sulzer spat a wad of tobacco juice at the Franklin stove and replied, "Ordinarily, Herb, you are right, but when they think of Bill Sulzer, they get on their knees." A little later Sulzer was impeached and removed from the governorship.

Red Mike Hylan, who came marching into city hall as reform collapsed, was a broth of a boy. Among his many classical remarks was one addressed to Governor Smith, who had come from Albany to explain the New York port plan and to attempt to persuade the mayor to be for it. The Governor took me along for company—so I can vouch for what happened. His honor listened with rapt attention to an eloquent exposition of the geographical unity and indivisibility of New York Harbor, then put his arm around Alfred Emanuel and said, "Al, to hell with New Jersey. Let's have a port authority of our own."

Jimmie Walker, who succeeded Hylan, was, believe it or not, an exceptionally firm, dignified, businesslike, and yet humorous presiding officer at hearings and meetings of the governing body of the city. Perhaps it was because he was restless, did not suffer bores gladly and was impatient with longwinded demonstrations, perhaps because he had a talent for the dispatch of public business fortified by long experience in the legislature at Albany. He knew how easy it is for a few hundred people to preempt all the seats in a small chamber and pretend that a noisy, jeering, cleverly led faction represents 9 million people in a city or 17 in a State. At any rate, he disposed of calendars with dispatch and fairness and avoided prolonged, exhausting sessions which make a joke of the so-called democratic process.

It is my belief—perhaps I should say hope—that something like the established and respected procedure in an appellate court will become routine practice at the regular public hearings and meetings of administrative governing bodies with time fairly allotted, boisterous interruptions and demonstrations curbed and slander and personalities ruled out.

One reason why the Communists took over large parts of Europe after World War II was that they infiltrated legislatures by means of proportional representation and similar devices, were indifferent to the decencies of debate, established sounding boards for propaganda, and skillfully used parliamentary trickery, not for the free expression of opinion, but to make respected, orderly government impossible. The next move is to bring radio and television right into the councils. The demagogs may then ignore the presiding officials entirely and address the world. Silurians who have read Henry Adams' "The Degradation of the Democratic Dogma" will recognize the familiar signs of decay in government of, by, and for the people.

Speaking of Henry Adams reminds me of what he said about his grandfather, John Quincy Adams. John Quincy Adams, distinguished scholar, holder of about every office of honor in government, in his declining years invited death by travel in wretched trains, stagecoaches and boats to deliver a lecture on astronomy to eager listeners at Cincinnati. Adams literally committed suicide to bring science into government, after Gen. Andrew Jackson, who despised learning, had introduced the common man to the elegance of the White House. The country somehow survived them both, but what a contrast. Unlike the dynamic artist who in his youth paints the sea and movement, and ends up in his old age as a placid student of still life, J. Q. Adams branched out from weights and measures into space and energy, anticipating Willard Gibbs, our greatest and most obscure scientist, another gift of New England to the ages.

Jimmie Walker went with the wind and flung roses riotously with the throng, but was always faithful to New York in his fashion. Jimmie and a lady friend shared a love nest in Queens on what is now the Grand Central Parkway. We took it in acquiring rights of way. Jimmie, who had approved the plans without looking at them, was in a state. I suggested that a small truck farm across the way be substituted. The mayor and his chums promptly bought it, moved the nest over and in a month, as one of the engineers remarked, "the ivory (sic) was growing over it." That's how parkways are built.

As a senator, Jimmie was the Rupert of debate. He demolished a cogent reasoned speech of a learned opponent with a gay wisecrack. Courtlandt Nicoll, a silk stocking senator, once held forth for an hour on the iniquities of the 5-cent fare. Jimmie rose, referred to the need of saving time and replied, "The senator from the 15th has gone pretty far for a nickel himself." Nobody remembered anything but Jimmie's witticism.

The quaint humor of Jimmie's entourage is brightly illustrated by the title "Abroad With Mayor Walker" which Hector Fuller gave his book describing a happy tour of Europe. Jimmie, if I may paraphrase Shakespeare, had that one touch of vulgarity that makes the whole world grin. And when, at an inner circle dinner, shortly after Jimmie died, the first violin rose, drew his bow across the intestines of the agile cat and exhorted his instrument to its utmost tenderness with Jimmie's theme song, "Will You Love Me in December as You Do in May?" there was a lump in every throat and not a dry eye in the house. It was the perfect tribute of Broadway and the press to a great little guy and an incorrigible New Yorker.

LaGuardia, who succeeded Walker, was an extraordinary chief executive, liked to think of himself as a tribune of the people, and as an undeviating practitioner of democratic principles, but he put up with little independence on the part of subordinates. It was said that only Paul Windels, Bill Carey, the sanitation commissioner, and I were in this category. This was flattering indeed. At least I lasted the full three terms in various capacities.

Bill Carey was a big contractor. He didn't need a city job and regarded the sainted Fiorello as just about the most amusing companion he had ever encountered. Bill made and lost several fortunes. Just before the crash, he hired a mansion on the north shore of Long Island and threw a party which put in the shade those of the Great Gatsby. Half his guests were strangers attracted by lights and music. Some were put to bed in hastily summoned cots in the huge tents put up by the caterers. Bill thought it would be a hell of a joke to remove the tents, and so corpselike hangovers woke on a bare hillside, lonesome, cold, uncovered and blinking in the first rays of the rising sun. Within a week Bill had lost every dime he had, but he came back strong with the support of loyal muchachos. La Guardia never said to a stenographer in Bill's presence, as he did frequently in the case of most of his cabinet, "If you were any dumber, I would make you a commissioner."

In my fondest reminiscences the name of Governor Smith is always cropping up. The late Charles Hayden provided the big astronomical dumbbell for the Hayden Planetarium. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation loaned the money to build. I was the chairman of the commission appointed by Governor Lehman to present projects to the RFC. I asked Governor Smith to speak for us. Jesse Jones, head of the RFC, liked the Governor. He got the Planetarium loan, which was a dubious one. Jesse Jones told Al Smith confidentially that one member of the RFC voted for the Planetarium thinking it was a cafeteria. Such are the mysterious processes of bureaucracy.

Well, I have rambled far afield. That's what happens when you sink into your anecdotage. Thanks, Silurians, for letting me join you. You Paleozoic characters have climbed out of the primordial slime to look at the stars. More power to you.

A KENNEDY MEMORIAL

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and myself I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in this afternoon's Washington Evening Star, which makes a suggestion that the National Cultural Center be renamed the Kennedy Memorial Cultural Center. President Kennedy took a great interest in the cultural center and Mrs. Kennedy and Mrs. Eisenhower are its honorary chairmen. The interest of President Kennedy and Mrs. Kennedy in this center has long been well known.

Mr. President, this suggestion has great appeal to us and we are sure it will have to others. However, we suggest that, before this idea is carried further, Mrs. Kennedy be given an opportunity to express her wishes. Certainly at this time no one would wish to press for a decision on the matter, but if she feels that this would be a nice idea we are sure that we would all believe it was most appropriate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A KENNEDY MEMORIAL

His own best memorial will live in his own memorable words, for he spoke in trumpets, summoning us to seek our finest nature and to fit it to the difficulties and dangers of our time.

Our own best act of remembrance must continue to be the faith we keep with his imperatives.

But the heart desires and the slain leader deserves a more tangible, more specific memorial, a physical place in the Nation's Capital corresponding to his place in prayer in the Nation's heart.

There can be no more fitting memorial than the dedication, now to him, of the National Cultural Center.

The President and Mrs. Kennedy brought to the center of things the service performed by the arts for men and women. In thought and speech John F. Kennedy moved with familiar friendship among the poets and the prophets. It was the same in his and Mrs. Kennedy's home. The White House became a place of welcome for musicians and painters, dancers, and writers.

The idea of the Cultural Center preceded the Kennedy administration. But President Kennedy gave the idea force and form, and a singularly personal leadership, without which it could hardly have achieved its present development.

Mrs. Kennedy, from whom we have learned to bear loss with dignity, was even more deeply involved. To salute her loss as well as ours, a Kennedy Memorial Cultural Center would speak intimately of part of her gift to us.

Other memorial proposals have been made, chiefly of renaming athletic stadiums already in existence. The Cultural Center as a memorial to Mr. Kennedy is not only uniquely expressive of a purpose shared by the President and his wife. Since it is now in early process, since funds are still being raised, it also would give all Americans the chance to remember the President by bringing to completion an intent and wish of his.

The change of name and the dedication should be made at once. The building should be brought to reality as soon as possible.

John F. Kennedy will live in the hearts of men. Let him live also in the arts he loved.

WISCONSIN'S GOVERNOR REYNOLDS A MAN OF CONVICTION AND COURAGE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Wisconsin citizens are blessed to have a highly gifted and honest commentator on State government whose column appears in many papers throughout our State. His name is John Wyngaard a man equally respected by Republicans and Democrats in Wisconsin. John Wyngaard has earned a reputation for painstaking objectivity and scrupulous fairness. Those who speculate on his personal convictions are inclined to assume that he tends to conservative views.

Our present Governor of Wisconsin is a man of frank, outspoken, liberal views on virtually every issue. Recently Mr. Wyngaard, who at times has differed sharply with Governor Reynolds on issues, evaluated our Governor as a man.

That remarkable evaluation of our Governor by this thoroughly competent and objective commentator deserves national attention. I ask unanimous consent that this column from the Janesville Gazette be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Governor Reynolds Has Courage to Back Convictions, Even if it Costs Him Ballots

Madison.—In the wake of the overwhelming defeat of the latest series of bills in the Wisconsin Legislature to outlaw racial discrimination in the sale or rental of housing, the question inevitably arises:

What of the insistent pressure from Governor Reynolds on behalf of such bills in spite of the sullen resistance of many members of his own party in Milwaukee County, where the Negro housing problem, however it is defined, clearly centers?

Was the Governor's earnest campaign for such legislation merely a political play, devised out of an awareness of the increasing size of Negro community and its usefulness in what may be another close election scrape next year for him?

Is this a revolt by the rank and file Democratic politicians playing the pragmatic game, against the wishes and the advice of their titular statehouse leader who is more idealistic than practical in such matters?

No one can assert with any certainty what are the motives and private calculations of politicians. There is a tendency among critics to assume the worst—that the politician who likes to hold his office is devoted minute by minute to the invention of means to retain or attract votes.

But on the contemporary Wisconsin record some reasonable deductions can be made, and they point to the probability that the revolting Democrats from Milwaukee (and a few from out of State) are putting their own political safety ahead of their allegiance to their party platform and leaders in dealing with race relations in a legislative way.

Similarly, a legitimate deduction can be made that the Governor is not helping himself in gaining votes, and may very well be damaging his reelection campaign, by adhering so obdurately to his position that discrimination in housing must be outlawed.

This reporter has observed that Mr. Reynolds is probably the most underestimated top figure in State politics. No one who knows him well can doubt the utter sincerity of his belief in civil rights. No one who knows the sense of realism with which he confronts politics can doubt that he knows the risks he is taking.

He knows now exactly what he is doing. But there is not the slightest chance that he will deviate from what he regards as a principle to which he has been committed all of his life. Many of his political friends have pleaded with him. To them he has mildly replied that he is as likely to win some votes by refusing to compromise his most basic beliefs as he is by capitulating to the demands of those who believe he is stubbornly wrong.

Mr. Reynolds is often misunderstood. He tends to walk with a slight slouch. He does not have the false pride so often felt by men in high office. He is not eloquent. His tastes are sometimes plebian. His lack of a sense of punctuality is notorious. Altogether he impresses many persons as a very ordinary fellow. But what he believes he believes deeply and it may possibly be that this may also be good politics.

TV: A CHAPTER OF HONOR

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, television and radio did a magnificent job in the past 5 days in covering our national tragedy. Not only was the coverage dignified and in immaculate taste, it was remarkably competent and frequently it soared with imaginative, if tragic, beauty. The intelligence and sensitivity of the commentary and the continuously expressed dedication to this country's strength and solidity in its hour of terrible grief was superb.

Mr. President, this marvel of the 20th century—television—displayed in the past 5 days what an amazing contribution it can make to instilling in Americans a sense of this great country and what it stands for.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a column by Jack Gould, the TV critic of the New York Times, and a column by Lawrence Laurent, of the Washington Post, evaluating the great job television has done for America.

There being no objection, the columns were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times]

TV: A Chapter of Honor—Millions Join in Rites Through Sensitive and Tasteful Camera Coverage

(By Jack Gould)

In every way but physical presence, untold millions of persons joined in yesterday's final rites for President Kennedy.

With dignity, restraint, and resourcefulness, television made families from coast to coast part of the sorrow, ritual, and renewal in Washington.

When the day's history is written the record of television as a medium will constitute a chapter of honor.

From the early morning scenes of chilled mourners filing through the great rotunda of the Capitol to the late afternoon shadows across Arlington Cemetery, the scenes on the screen demonstrated that the cameras were in sensitive hands.

If one consequence of the assassination of the President is a rekindling of an awareness of civilized values television will have helped to bring it about.

After the agonizing events in Dallas, a better American demeanor and tradition appeared clearly on the screen yesterday.

The three television networks—the American Broadcasting Co., the Columbia Broadcasting System, and the National Broadcasting Co.—achieved a tour de force of electronics.

Whatever a viewer wanted to see next, a camera was ready to show it—at the Capitol, on the route to the White House, in the procession to St. Matthew's Cathedral, in the cathedral itself and on the journey to the grave.

The pooling of such vast facilities on such short notice bespoke vast preparations; not many in the TV news and engineering departments have had much sleep recently.

Aerial views of striking composition conveyed the sense of a city enveloped in a somber spectacle; closeups showed the involvement of the people of the world who, by chance of a camera perspective, at one point were merged into a single multitude.

That scene came as foreign heads of state, American dignitaries, Congressmen, White House staff members, wives and children walked from the White House toward the cathedral behind Mrs. John F. Kennedy and the Attorney General.

The great and the unknown blended together in a procession that seemed almost random but at the same time had its own eloquence as an example of the behavior of democratic people.

Of the visual vignettes, none was more moving than the sight of Mrs. Kennedy entering the rotunda before the removal of the coffin.

The good taste of television then asserted itself as the cameras veered away to assure privacy for Mrs. Kennedy.

The later sight of Mrs. Kennedy awaiting the start of the cortege was for some viewers the hardest moment of the day.

Inside St. Matthew's there came the touch of pure television that may be remembered the longest. As the most famous sentence in President Kennedy's inaugural address—"Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country"—

came from the loudspeaker, the screen showed the lonely flag-draped coffin.

President de Gaulle and Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia, perhaps the tallest and shortest of the world figures in attendance, made an unusual pair, one that only a stroke of history might arrange.

There was the scene, after the service, of Richard Cardinal Cushing comforting Mrs. Kennedy and her daughter, Caroline, with a kiss.

Outside the cathedral the viewer saw her son, John, Jr., looking at his mother with the familiar puzzlement of a little boy for whom it is past nap time.

But the day was not composed of pictures alone; the sounds from Washington could be heard. These included the tattoo of muffled drums, the hoof beats of the horses, the measured cadence of the honor guards, a tolling of a distant bell and the sound of bands as they played marches and hymns.

And often there was silence.

As the cameras last night covered the reception for foreign leaders, normal conversational tones returned to the commentators and the first smiles and touches of informality were seen since last Friday. It was well that they did; the viewer's reservoir of grief was empty.

[From the Washington Post]

Coverage Stays at Peak Level

(By Lawrence Laurent)

The television industry continued its finest performance yesterday, the third day of no commercials or regular entertainment features. The same policy continues today with all stations prepared to resume normal schedules at sign-on time, Tuesday.

Network reporters worked with little sleep, but the weariness rarely showed on camera. The coverage of memorial services for the late President Kennedy was marked by restraint, thoroughness, and the ability to mobilize swiftly for an unexpected news development.

The fatal shooting of Lee Harvey Oswald in Dallas was shown on video tape many times to the Nation's 50 million television homes. Cameras had already been set up in the basement of the Dallas City Jail where the shooting took place.

NBC interrupted its Washington coverage to switch to Dallas within 5 minutes of the event. Reporter Tom Pettit, working in the frenzied atmosphere, remained calm and did a solid job of etching in the missing details. In addition to the video tape recording, CBS came up with a superb set of photographs that were in sequence and had the appearance of motion pictures.

The fine coverage is being coordinated by CBS–TV's Art Kane, who came to Washington on Friday from his CBS News post in New York.

In preparing for Sunday and Monday memorial services and the funeral, a CBS construction crew worked in the Saturday rain and completed work at 4 a.m. Sunday. They built eight platforms for pool cameras. Four are near St. Matthew's Cathedral, two at the Capitol, one at Constitution Avenue and 17th Street NW., and one on Henry Bacon Drive, near the Lincoln Memorial..

Additional camera platforms were being built yesterday for the funeral services at Arlington National Cemetery.

One Washington television station manager, who asked that his name not be published, estimated that the 4 days of television would cost the station "about $50,000." The cost takes in operating expenses and the loss of normal revenue.

Other station operators declined to make estimates.

Along with the detailed live coverage, producers had their research teams searching for film and video tape on the President's career. These were used throughout the day and evening.

Television stations also produced panels of experts, called in to discuss implications of the shift from Mr. Kennedy to President Johnson.

Excellence has become routine in the coverage. Particularly outstanding was the work of Roger Mudd of CBS at the Rotunda of the Capitol. ABC, in late afternoon, put together commentators Howard K. Smith and Edward P. Morgan for a discussion of the "hate" organizations in the United States. They had a thoughtful, sobering discussion.

Noteworthy, also, has been the sure grasp of news developments by David Brinkley of NBC and Walter Cronkite of CBS.

The scope of the television coverage and its flawless handling of this tragedy should enable every member of broadcasting to stand taller.

A TRAGIC, NEEDLESS DEATH

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, each of us has his own thoughts and feelings of loss this day. But I believe a brief editorial in a newspaper in my State of New Hampshire has set down in words the thoughts and feelings of a great number of Americans.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point an editorial from the Portsmouth, N.H., Herald, of November 23, 1963, entitled "A Tragic, Needless Death."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Tragic, Needless Death

There are no words that give adequate expression to the feeling of shock and sorrow brought by President Kennedy's death. The suddenness of the event, in all its infamy, seems too much to grasp. The sense of loss is too great.

But it isn't only a reaction of remorse and bewilderment that occurs. There is also one of anger and indignation. For the American people have been confronted with the terrible truth that a President of the United States can't do his duty as he sees it and remain safe in his own land.

Complaint is not made here, either, of any lack of precautions to protect the President. He was as well guarded as practical circumstances would allow. But at a time when so many fanatical-minded citizens put reason aside to embrace the extremes of discord, depravity becomes a greater menace than the best security can overcome.

It is in such a rabid atmosphere that lunatics take license to practice violence. They are encouraged by the sound and fury of organized malcontents who somehow are credited with respectability, yet who have no real purpose but destruction.

It makes no difference whether the extremism runs to left or right. When the Nation's laws and institutions are scorned, when the elected leadership is treated to open and vicious abuse, when the rights of fellow citizens are ruthlessly trampled upon, the particular direction of political leaning is a matter of small consequence.

What counts is the fact that such extremism exists at all, and that the fact of its existence leads to a crime so foul as to take the life of a President.

While it cannot be said that President Kennedy's death was a direct result of conspiratorial evil, neither can the idea be disallowed that the present state of political emotions was at least partially responsible. That is, to the extent of further perverting an already demented mind.

It is too late now, however, to think of what might have been. President Kennedy is dead, a victim of the hate he devoted his life to counteracting. What matters in the aftermath is that his death was not in vain—and to this end there is fervent hope that the fomenters of malevolence and disunity will have cause for earnest soul-searching.

Meanwhile, the prayers and sympathies of all good Americans will abide with the Kennedy family. They have so much to mourn, but in the years ahead comfort will come from the knowledge they shared the life of one of the Nation's greatest men.

For the new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, there can only be the solemn hope that he will enjoy the good health to bear the heavy burden that fate has handed him. It's a blessing to the country that one so skilled in the demands of leadership occupies the place of succession.

The task ahead will not be an easy one, but President Johnson—thanks to Kennedy's wisdom—is properly prepared for it.

NAMING OF HIGH-RISE PROJECT FOR THE ELDERLY IN MEMORY OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I think it most fitting that it has been decided to name a new high-rise project for the elderly in Concord, N.H., in memory of the late President John F. Kennedy. This is among the first Government buildings in the Nation which will bear the late President's name.

The new edifice, to be constructed next spring, will include a number of facilities for the elderly, including a health center, and will also house a mental health clinic. The late President held close to his heart the problems surrounding the elderly and mentally ill of this Nation, and he articulated them as had no man before him. Among the many great monuments which will stand as permanent reminders of John F. Kennedy will be his humane programs to bring the mentally ill out of the darkness and back into society and to insure adequate medical care to the senior citizens of America.

I wish to congratulate the commissioners of the Concord Housing Authority for this thoughtful and appropriate memorial of John F. Kennedy.

EULOGIES TO THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Sunday, the Members of this body joined in the memorial services held for our late President in the rotunda of this building. We were moved deeply by the words spoken there and they deserve the contemplative consideration of every American.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the eulogies given by our distinguished majority leader, Senator Mansfield, by the Chief Justice, Mr. Warren, and by Speaker of the House John McCormack to be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the eulogies were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Senator Mansfield

There was a sound of laughter; in a moment, it was no more. And so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

There was a wit in a man neither young nor old, but a wit full of an old man's wisdom and of a child's wisdom, and then, in a moment it was no more. And so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

There was a man marked with the scars of his love of country, a body active with the surge of a life far, far from spent and, in a moment, it was no more. And so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

There was a father with a little boy, a little girl and a joy of each in the other. In a moment it was no more, and so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

There was a husband who asked much and gave much, and out of the giving and the asking wove with a woman what could not be broken in life, and in a moment it was no more. And so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands, and kissed him and closed the lid of a coffin.

A piece of each of us died at that moment. Yet, in death he gave of himself to us. He gave us of a good heart from which the laughter came. He gave us of a profound wit, from which a great leadership emerged. He gave us of a kindness and a strength fused into a human courage to seek peace without fear.

He gave us of his love that we, too, in turn, might give. He gave that we might give of ourselves, that we might give to one another until there would be no room, no room at all, for the bigotry, the hatred, prejudice and the arrogance which converged in that moment of horror to strike him down.

In leaving us—these gifts, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States, leaves with us. Will we take them, Mr. President? Will we have, now, the sense and the responsibility and the courage to take them?

I pray to God that we shall and under God that we will.

By Chief Justice Warren

There are few events in our national life that unite Americans and so touch the heart of all of us as the passing of a President of the United States.

There is nothing that adds shock to our sadness as the assassination of our leader, chosen as he is to embody the ideals of our people, the faith in our institutions and our belief in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

Such misfortunes have befallen the Nation on other occasions, but never more shockingly than 2 days ago.

We are saddened; we are stunned; we are perplexed.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, a great and good President, the friend of all men of good will, a believer in the dignity and equality of all human beings, a fighter for justice, an apostle of peace, has been snatched from our midst by the bullet of an assassin.

What moved some misguided wretch to do this horrible deed may never be known to us, but we do know that such acts are commonly stimulated by forces of hatred and malevolence, such as today are eating their way into the bloodstream of American life.

What a price we pay for this fanaticism.

It has been said that the only thing we learn from history is that we do not learn. But surely we can learn if we have the will to do so. Surely there is a lesson to be learned from this tragic event.

If we really love this country, if we truly love justice and mercy, if we fervently want to make this Nation better for those who are to follow us, we can at least abjure the hatred that consumes people, the false accusations that divide us, and the bitterness that begets violence.

Is it too much to hope that the martyrdom of our beloved President might even soften the hearts of those who would themselves recoil from assassination, but who do not shrink from spreading the venom which kindles thoughts of it in others?

Our Nation is bereaved. The whole world is poorer because of his loss. But we can all be better Americans because John Fitzgerald Kennedy has passed our way, because he has been our chosen leader at a time in history when his character, his vision, and his quiet courage have enabled him to chart for us a safe course through the shoals of treacherous seas that encompass the world.

And now that he is relieved of the almost superhuman burdens we imposed on him, may he rest in peace.

By Speaker McCormack

As we gather here today bowed in grief, the heartfelt sympathy of Members of the Congress and of our people are extended to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy and to Ambassador and Mrs. Joseph P. Kennedy and their loved ones. Their deep grief is also self-shared by countless millions of persons throughout the world, considered a personal tragedy, as if one had lost a loved member of his own immediate family.

Any citizen of our beloved country who looks back over its history cannot fail to see that we have been blessed with God's favor beyond most other peoples. At each great crisis in our history we have found a leader able to grasp the helm of state and guide the country through the troubles which beset it. In our earliest days, when our strength and wealth were so limited and our problems so great, Washington and Jefferson appeared to lead our people. Two generations later, when our country was torn in two by a fratricidal war, Abraham Lincoln appeared from the mass of the people as a leader able to reunite the Nation.

In more recent times, in the critical days of the depression and the great war forced upon us by Fascist aggression, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, later Harry S. Truman appeared on the scene to reorganize the country and lead its revived citizens to victory. Finally, only recently, when the cold war was building up the supreme crisis of a threatened nuclear war capable of destroying everything—and everybody—that our predecessors had so carefully built, and which a liberty-loving world wanted, once again a strong and courageous man appeared ready to lead us.

No country need despair so long as God, in His infinite goodness, continues to provide the Nation with leaders able to guide it through the successive crises which seem to be the inevitable fate of any great nation.

Surely no country ever faced more gigantic problems than ours in the last few years, and surely no country could have obtained a more able leader in a time of such crisis. President John Fitzgerald Kennedy possessed all the qualities of greatness. He had deep faith, complete confidence, human sympathy, and broad vision which recognized the true values of freedom, equality, and the brotherhood which have always been the marks of the American political dreams.

He had the bravery and a sense of personal duty which made him willing to face up to the great task of being President in these trying times. He had the warmth and the sense of humanity which made the burden of the task bearable for himself and for his associates, and which made all kinds of diverse peoples and races eager to be associated with him in his task. He had the tenacity and determination to carry each stage of his great work through to its successful conclusion.

Now that our great leader has been taken from us in a cruel death, we are bound to feel shattered and helpless in the face of our loss. This is but natural, but as the first bitter pangs of our incredulous grief begins to pass we must thank God that we were privileged, however briefly, to have had this great man for our President. For he has now taken his place among the great figures of world history.

While this is an occasion of deep sorrow it should be also one of dedication. We must have the determination to unite and carry on the spirit of John Fitzgerald Kennedy for a strengthened America and a future world of peace.

AMERICA MOVES FORWARD

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the sadness in our hearts at the tragic events of this past weekend remains. All the Nation weeps for a man, for his family, for what has been destroyed in our national life.

But the strength of our democracy is that it can overcome such a tragedy without the reins of Government falling slack. We move forward without confusion as our new President sets the course of Government.

The Members of this body know the exceptional talents and abilities of President Johnson very well. He served here with great distinction. Now, we may expect him to use his prodigious talents to make his Presidency a period of progressive and productive legislation and leadership.

William S. White and Max Freedman, two excellent analysts of Washington programs and people, have written thoughtful articles about President Johnson. I think it would be well, as we pledge ourselves to help him in these difficult days, to read their essays.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Johnson Despises Littleness

(By William S. White)

When there is death in the family there is shock and horror and grief and then there is, terribly and inevitably, the harsh awareness that life must go on for those who are left.

When there is death in the national family, death removing the very central arch of the power and purposes of the Western World, as brutal death has removed John Fitzgerald Kennedy, horror and grief are inexpressibly multiplied. But one thought, one emotion, must master all others.

This is that the Republic of the United States of America must go on, under the command now of a new President, Lyndon Baines Johnson. It is he upon whom the great burden has now fallen and it does not seem wrong to thank Providence that the successor is worthy of both the man who has gone and of the country they have both always loved and served, wryly, toughly, unsentimentally, and gallantly well.

If ever in all our history there was an hour when men must put aside all that is small, all that is angry and ugly and pettily partisan in our national life, this is, supremely, that hour. For unless all the people, the parties, the factions, the regions, the races, the clashing private interests, can summon up among themselves the sense and honor to unite behind the new President, the United States of America will face perils of disunity it has not known before.

Who is this man, Lyndon Johnson, who must now have the support, the help, and the understanding of all who are in the United States, and of all they have said and are? What I am now about to say I should never in ordinary circumstances have said, for in ordinary circumstances it would be name-dropping in its most tasteless form. But because of the special circumstances, I say it all the same, so that readers may have some standard to measure the worth of my evidence.

MAN OF TOLERANCE

For 30 years—since he was a slim and eager young secretary to a Texas legislator—I have intimately known Lyndon Johnson as I have never known any other public or private man. I have known no other man of more true tolerance, if a tolerance sometimes hidden behind the brusque mannerisms of a master of his profession—politics—sometimes impatient of slower minds and always impatient with those of smaller motives than his own.

I have known no other man of truer compassion—to the poor and dispossessed, yes; but also to those of more favored status who, too, sometimes weep silently in the night from the fears, the anxieties, the pitiless pressures and private despairs which never wholly exempt any part of humankind.

I have known no man of more true devotion to this country—all of it, North and South, East and West, black and white, and brown and yellow. And I have known no public man, anywhere in the world, with a greater talent—indeed a greater genius—who has given greater service, sometimes at high cost to himself, to that old ideal of one nation indivisible under God and of justice for all so far as justice can be found in a world none of us ever made.

But precisely because he is a political genius, precisely because he has all his public life been too busy doing things—and too proud—to explain things about himself, this man has had his tireless detractors to a degree rarely seen in American politics. I have said this is no time for bitterness; accordingly, this is no time to go forward with this theme. It is a time, however, a desperately necessary time, to appeal to them right here in print to drop the little animosities of the past.

DEVOID OF LITTLENESS

For I say, weighing my words and in full awareness of their implications, that I have never known a truly first-rate man in either party who, truly knowing Mr. Johnson, has ever hated or despised or undervalued his incredible capacities, simple dislike and simple disagreement on principle being set wholly aside.

He has his faults, but this can be said of him: There is not anywhere in him an ounce of littleness; he is larger than life in every sense, including his complete inability to comprehend really little purposes in others.

I have said that I have been and have remained his friend through the greater part of the lifespan of us both; but I have also, on many occasions, been a critical friend on public issues, and may no doubt be on many occasions again. For among the largenesses of Lyndon Johnson is that one form of criticism and one alone can move him to swear like the combat naval officer he once was—he who can also weep for others like a child. This is the criticism of malice based on motives that are small and ugly.

This is a great political figure, a great and natural leader. But this is also, first and foremost and always a man, M-A-N.

Johnson Well Trained for Role—Kennedy Found He Had Special Talent for Sizing Up Foreign Matters

(By Max Freedman)

Tucson, Ariz.—President Lyndon B. Johnson would be the first to admit that there are many things about the Presidency which he must learn for himself by stern experience in the next year. But his close association with President Kennedy has made him more qualified for the duties of the White House than Mr. Truman was immediately after Mr. Roosevelt's death, or than Mr. Nixon was after Mr. Eisenhower's heart attack. This training for the problems of the Presidency may well be Mr. Kennedy's last gift to the Nation which he served even unto death.

In measuring Mr. Johnson's patient preparation for the Presidency, it is not enough to think of the specific executive duties that Mr. Kennedy gave him. Mr. Johnson worked very hard on the space program and on the removal of discrimination in all contracts awarded by the Federal Government. But these activities touched the mere fringes of his relationship with President Kennedy. That relationship amounted to a partnership on public policy during the very period when thoughtless or ill-informed people were making silly littles jokes about Vice President Johnson.

When President Kennedy discovered that Mr. Johnson had an unexpected talent for stating a case calmy and persuasively, he began to use the Vice President all across the Nation as a principal spokesman for the administration on issues ranging from unemployment to Berlin, from civil rights to Vietnam. After the speeches, it was Mr. Johnson's habit to report at once to President Kennedy on the temper of public opinion. From these discussions, which were frank and wide-ranging, President Kennedy gained new insights which enabled him to make necessary adjustments in his policies. They also gave Mr. Johnson the chance, which he greatly appreciated, to have a hand in the shaping or modification of these programs.

The same cooperation was even more visible after Mr. Johnson's trips abroad. The public saw little more in these ceremonial visits to other countries than the attempt to win some fleeting good will for the United States. What the public never knew, because neither the President nor Mr. Johnson saw any point in talking about it, was that each of these major trips produced an incisive and helpful report for the guidance of American policy.

President Kennedy and Secretary of State Rusk learned to rely on these reports, whether written or oral, and that is why they were always glad when Mr. Johnson could go on a foreign mission for a few days. As a result of this experience, President Johnson personally knows more about the world figures with whom he will be discussing the major questions of foreign policy in the next few months.

It has never been a secret to Mr. Johnson's friends that he would have done some things differently, or would have changed President Kennedy's emphasis in doing them. But there never was a murmur of discontent, never a suggestion of grievance, never an impulse to criticize. His loyalty to President Kennedy's program, both domestic and foreign, was unlimited and uncalculated.

It should be remembered that President Johnson's experience with the White House goes back to the era of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, when he was that President's favorite young Member of Congress. Then came the crowded years of association with President Truman and President Eisenhower when he was in and out of the White House many times a week. All these experiences will help to mold his judgment and influence his decisions now.

The last 3 years have taught him a great deal—in his numerous talks with President Kennedy on the most sensitive and controversial question of national policy; by his work on the National Security Council; by his careful study of confidential Government reports and documents; and by his endless discussions with public officials. President Johnson will unquestionably bring some of his own people into positions of great responsibility into the White House. But he will make these changes very slowly, and he will aim always at preserving the greatest possible continuity in policy and personnel.

The large number of people who think that President Johnson was converted by President Kennedy to a new intense faith in racial equality and human dignity are strangely unfamiliar with his longstanding convictions, and with his personal dedication to this cause. The tone may be different in the new administration as it conducts its own campaign on civil rights but the target will remain the same.

We must think today not only of President Johnson but of his wife. She is, quite simply, and in the full meaning of the words, the most important influence in his life. Her quiet wisdom and constant dignity have helped him over many hard places in the past. They will be invaluable again to him in the White House.

President Johnson has always shown that he has what amounts to a political genius in creating the largest possible consensus for legislation. He is at his best when he is working in a spirit of national unity and is speaking for the national interest. There can be no better leader in this period of tension and tragedy than President Johnson as he seeks to hold the Nation together in sedate unity and to move it forward to new achievements. He deserves not only our compassion but our cooperation and support.

MENTAL HEALTH AND WORLD PEACE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Thursday, November 21, I was honored to address a meeting in Washington, D.C., of the National Association for Mental Health.

This was a significant meeting, helping to mark the important achievements of the association and its related organizations on behalf of effective mental health programs. I commend the distinguished citizens from all parts of the country who have provided the leadership for these programs.

The Washington meeting gave me an opportunity to discuss the health of today's world—and some of the political and social illnesses which stand in the way of progress of our own society and international society. I emphasized that it is particularly important today for the United States to understand some of the significant changes which are reshaping our Nation—and indeed all nations—in recent years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my address to the National Association for Mental Health be inserted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mental Health and World Peace

(By Senator Hubert H. Humphrey)

In this season traditionally given over to the counting of our national blessings, we should be particularly grateful that there is a National Association of Mental Health.

Thanks, in large part, to the work of this great voluntary health agency, hundreds of thousands of Americans have been freed from despair and degradation, from the age-old tradition of inhuman confinement and brutal treatment of the mentally ill.

In this the centennial year of the Emancipation Proclamation, the process of emancipation from mental illness is on the way.

There is a new freedom for those who have been the prisoners of antiquated and obsolete treatment of mental illness.

Yet, there continues to be a shocking toll taken by psychiatric disorders in America.

We have only begun the great work of reducing the staggering backlog of unmet psychiatric needs in our communities—of care of the sick young and the sick old, of the institutionalized and the "walking wounded," of the juvenile delinquent and the mixed-up criminal adult, of the potential suicide and the alcoholic.

President Kennedy in his message to Congress in February of this year called for action on both the mental illness and mental retardation front. He asked for cooperative, united action in the Government and on the part of voluntary groups.

We can be grateful as a Nation this year for the enactment of one of the boldest programs in the field of mental health in the history of the world—the President's mental health and mental retardation law—Public Law 88-164.

If the 1st session of the 88th Congress had done nothing more than the passage of the President's mental health program, it could justifiably claim to have achieved a memorable record. In this accomplishment, we are deeply indebted to a great Senater whose name is identified with the health of this Nation and the welfare of our people—the senior Senator from Alabama, LISTER HILL. I have considered it a privilege to have supported his efforts, to serve with him in the Congress, and to be a cosponsor of the mental health and mental retardation legislation.

With the authorized $150 million over the next 3 years, community health centers can be constructed which can substantially reduce the population of our large, centralized, public mental institutions.

Providing preventive services, early diagnosis, comprehensive treatment on both an in-patient and an outpatient basis, these centers will also provide the all-important aftercare for discharged hospital patients.

But, as you know, the final version of the act did not provide the necessary funds to staff these new facilities. We must go on to authorize such funds. You and I know that it takes more than four walls to bring a community health center to life. It takes trained people. It takes money to instruct them, and to keep them on the job.

Here again, short-sighted, self-styled "economy advocates" have proudly wasted a dollar to save a penny. Rather than saving money, such false economy will have "succeeded" in continuing one of the most shocking and indefensible wastes in the world: the waste of human lives.

Wholly aside from the suffering and anguish caused by failing to move ahead swiftly in the field of mental health, the actual dollar costs to our national economy are incalculable. I simply cannot understand the point of view that would deny a modest investment now in order to save literally hundreds of millions of dollars in annual tax moneys which will otherwise have to be expended for direct welfare purposes, for crime prevention and imprisonment, for paying—in short—the incredible direct costs of mental illness in our society.

We must have more psychiatrists, more psychiatric social workers and related personnel. We need them now. And, we are going to need them even more urgently each year, as we come to grips with old and emerging problems.

Each of us has an obligation to dedicate our intelligence, and our energy to the goal of providing this Nation with the intellectual and professional skills to solve the tragedy of widespread and preventable, curable mental illness.

There is a desperate need for greater cooperation between all levels of government—Federal, State, and local—in launching a major offensive upon mental illness and the care and rehabilitation of the mentally retarded. In this great work the role of the private and voluntary groups is invaluable. The care and the treatment—yes, and the rehabilitation of the mentally ill and mentally retarded will require not only the scientific knowledge of the doctor and phychiatrist, but also the understanding professional competence of the social worker, the employment office, private industry, and government agencies. These are being supplemented in a significant manner by the efforts of our schools and the churches. We are particularly indebted to the National Institutes of Health and to Dr. Felix and his staff for their leadership and pioneering efforts.

These are matters of deep concern to the National Association for Mental Health. You need no exhortations to give of yourselves in this—yes, heroic—cause.

Now, I should like to spend a few minutes discussing the role of sanity, of logic, of reason, of emotional stability—all those goals of mental health—in terms of the life and death of our civilization.

For it is not individuals alone who can be afflicted with emotional instability, frustrations, and irrational behavior. Whole groups, entire nations can be swept into patterns of behavior which can have terrible consequences to themselves and to the future of civilization.

The continued life of our world—imperfect as it is—depends fundamentally on the mental health and the emotional stability of the world's leaders. For the power available to such men is so incredible that the world of 1963 literally hangs in the balance upon their decisions.

We live in the kind of a world with no margin for error.

We live in a world in which the penalty for rash judgment is monstrously out of proportion, in which the misjudgment or miscalculation of a powerful leader can bring down civilization in death and destruction; or where the act of an emotionally unstable person or irresponsible citizen can strike down a great leader.

No—the decisions of great nation-states are not child's play. Matters of peace and war, of life or annihilation, cannot be left to men who are dominated by wild emotionalism, or to fanatics, or to those who see the world as a child sees it.

The possibilities for thermonuclear war do not permit childish answers to the vital man-sized problems between nations.

No rational, mature society will accept quickie solutions for complex problems.

I believe, despite the shrill clamor from the extremists in our midst, that the vast majority of Americans demand in their leaders the qualities which we associate with the mature and rational individual—calm and courage in crisis; a determination to weigh the consequences of action, and, finally, firmness in making decisions and sticking to them.

Yes, to face danger calmly, to weigh the consequences, to be firm without being obstinate; to be resolute without being arrogant; to make the hard decisions; these are the hallmarks of the great leaders and Presidents. Everything else—brilliance of intellect, charm of manner, a magnificent voice—all these qualities are of relatively small consequence.

The keeping of an honorable peace is the overriding preoccupation of Americans. This is our commitment to a worried and anxious humanity.

We have learned in the 20th century to deal with mental illness compassionately and intelligently. We no longer recoil before its sign, or panic in its presence. We deal with it. We handle it. As a society, we take steps, as we are doing, to reduce it, to reverse it, to minimize it, to cure it.

So, too, we should deal with that emotional instability that afflicts a significant but small minority in our midst that some call the extreme right, some the Birchers, some the wild men of reaction.

We had another small but significant minority that "flew off the handle" in the 1930's; that swallowed extravagant promises; that thought in terms of slogans and dogma; that represented the fanaticism of the extreme left.

Today some of the very leaders of that fanatic movement of the left of three decades ago turn up as leaders of another fanatic movement, this time on the right. They still see the world in total black or white. They are still looking for immediate and final answers. They are still substituting dogma for creative thought. They are still angry, fearful, deeply and fundamentally disturbed by the world around them.

But we must not react emotionally to such emotionalism.

We must not permit ourselves either to be frightened by the fanatics in our midst or to be goaded into impulsive acts of repression against them.

Nor can we afford to let their strident voices become the dominant theme of the American orchestration.

Rather we must proceed with the work of the Nation, undaunted and undisturbed; to keep the peace, and to continue building our own imperfect society into something better for our children.

It is no coincidence that peoples of the Soviet Union also want a better life for themselves and for those who will follow after them.

I am intrigued and challenged by what appears to be happening in the Soviet Union—that center of hostile power which we have become accustomed to thinking of as implacable, monolithic and impenetrable. That citadel of terror and oppression under Josef Stalin, that fountainhead of violence and subversion, is showing signs of growing maturity. The world is being let in through the cracks in the once-solid Iron Curtain.

I am not optimistic as to believe that because we have an agreement at last on a nuclear test ban, the long cold war that began 16 years ago, is over or even deferred or greatly diminished.

But there are important things happening inside the Soviet Union, and inside the satellite nations of Eastern Europe. Every perceptive visitor who has had the opportunity of comparing his impressions this year with those of earlier years comes back convinced that the lid is coming off—the curtain is lifting, in Communist Europe, however slowly and cautiously.

There are important signs that the Soviet leadership is not paranoid as it once was, that it is beginning to accept the opportunity to communicate. The Voice of America is being allowed to get through freely to the Soviet people for the first time in many years. Despite the curious and disturbing incident of the arbitrary arrest of Professor Barghoorn, travel and inquiry inside the Soviet Union is freer now than 10 years ago. Soviet citizens are being increasingly permitted to travel outside the country. Western books and newspapers and periodicals are increasingly being permitted to circulate—in however restricted a fashion.

Internally, change is in the air. The Communists have failed to make their bloc a maximum security prison. Fresh winds are blowing through the iron bars. Orthodoxy is being challenged; dogmas questioned.

How far it will lead no one knows. But we do know these facts:

The secret police are less omnipresent. An intellectual ferment is beginning.

Communist society is changing. Communist theory has been in a headon collision with 20th century fact—the breakdown of Soviet agriculture, the restiveness of intellectuals, the rising demands of consumers, the emergence of a post revolution managerial elite.

We need to keep in closest touch with all elements of Soviet society.

I have strongly supported the cultural exchange program. I have gone behind the Iron Curtain three times in the past several years, and I have done my best to communicate and to learn—from the Kremlin down to the peasant in the field.

I have watched the fast-growing trade developing between our friends and allies in Western Europe and the Communist bloc—a trade that amounts in exports alone to several billions of dollars annually. So long as such trade is not in strategic materials, I believe that there have been important dividends to the West—beyond the currency earned. For with trade comes contact and communication. If you are to buy and sell, you have to talk to each other.

We need many more projects of peace in which East and West can work together and can ease tension and suspicion.

"Work therapy" will do the Soviet "patients" good.

They could use a "Halfway House" back to the world of reality, a way station between Joseph Stalin's despotic world of "1984" and, we hope, a better, freer life in the years to come.

No one ever cured a suspicious and withdrawn patient by relegating him to an isolated cell.

And the sick attitude of the Soviet leadership that has "seen enemies on every hand," that has seen "persecutors and tormentors" everywhere has fed on itself. Its own propaganda has tended to convince the Soviet leadership.

But that blind, unthinking, dogmatic and emotional conviction that all the non-Communist world is in league to destroy them, and that the highest purpose of life is to conquer or destroy the non-Communist world, is clearly giving way to a new and vitally important attitude. Today the old communism and the new are locked in a struggle. There are still those in the Communist world who continue to be imprisoned by their own hatreds and frustrations. We call them Stalinists, or, more often, Peiping-line Communists. They decry the theory of "coexistence." They call for war to the death, and if such a war should destroy much of their own civilization, so be it. This is a madness. It is a sickness.

What we can hope for is that saner voices will prevail within the Communist world. If there may not be friendship in the coming decades, at least there may yet be a rational leadership in the Soviet Union which can agree with us on common undertaking of mutual benefit.

Such mutual efforts can include:

The scientific conquest of cancer and heart disease, as well as teamwork in basic research.

Joint weather research, looking to the day when weather can be controlled for mankind's service.

Common programs for improved international communication, as through television.

Expanded cultural exchange.

Such a development of common work and common purposes, such an increase in communication between rational men and women inside and outside the Communist world, offers, it seems to me, the only ultimate way out of the time of nuclear terror.

For it is in men's minds that wars are born, that sound or fatal decisions are made.

There are decisions that must meanwhile be made, actions that must be undertaken in our own society to build a still finer America.

We ought to consider that society for a moment—that imperfect, and for many millions of our people, frustrating and soul-searing society of poverty, deprivation, discrimination and humiliation.

Psychiatry tells us: Give a child or a man or a woman room—room to grow, to develop, to fulfill himself.

We are not giving the tenth of America represented by our Negro citizens the "room" to make their fullest contributions to our democracy.

We cannot expect almost 20 million Americans to be contented with living for the most part in the filth of slums, or with being denied the jobs their brains and skills qualify them for, denied the respect and equal treatment they deserve from their fellow citizens.

There are no easy solutions to this foremost of America dilemmas. But there is a constructive work which must be done on every front to make the U.S. Constitution and the American dream a living reality for the Negro. This will demand tremendous effort, understanding and self-restraint on the part of both Negroes and whites, and patient perseverance.

There are other Americans, whose lot is not so desperate as that of our Negro citizens, but which is sufficiently frustrating and deadening. I am thinking of our 50 million over-65 Americans—too many of them condemned to a life of poverty, boredom and stagnation. Some societies make the later years the golden years of respect, of close family affection, of usefulness. Regrettably, we seem to have fallen into a pattern of indifference to our elderly that results for very many of them in loneliness and despair. It is no mere coincidence that the ranks of the extreme right are swelled from this age group, whose experiences have tended to make them bitter, and cynical and who want to strike out in their frustration and anguish.

There are the swelling ranks of the unemployed—displaced by automation, left high and dry in the mining and timber areas of our Nation by radical changes in industry planning—men and women who want to work, to hold up their heads, to pay their way—but who are abandoned by society to the dole, to the welfare rolls, to private charity. What does this treatment do to proud people—who have never asked for more than the chance to work at a decent wage?

What does it do to a good farmer who finds because he and his fellow farmers are efficient that he has overproduced himself right out of a decent living? There is despair and heartbreak through the hills and across the plains of America, as farmer after farmer grows old and sees his sons and daughters leave the life of rural America for an uncertain and too often unprepared life in the city. We are permitting vast and heedless economic forces to transform the vital living patterns of whole classes of Americans without taking steps to make change something more than a painful and cruel uprooting of families.

Meanwhile, in our cities, we introduce more efficient machines into our factories without considering what will happen to the factory producers thus displayed—especially those over 40.

We tear down slums for urban renewal without helping to renew the lives of the lower income groups who occupy some of the new buildings or who are displaced to still more crowded areas.

And what of the women of America—still discriminated against in job opportunities, tens of millions of them discouraged and effectively barred from the benefits of higher education and the opportunity for personal fulfillment once their families have grown up?

The boredom, frustration, and purposelessness of so many groups of Americans is dramatically illustrated by the facts of tranquilizer consumption—an estimated 3½ million people taking tranquilizers daily—by the illegal traffic in amphetamine and barbiturate pills that amounts to 5 billion pills each year.

Too many of the youth of our country—far too many—are rootless and unchallenged, cynical and bored. Too often they are unemployed, too often they are trapped into premature sexual experimentation and ugly forced marriages or humiliating motherhood out of wedlock.

Is our society so barren of ideas that we cannot come up with the excitement of purposeful work, of useful, challenging employment?

We could put young men to work to improve the badly neglected outdoor recreational areas of our Nation, in a Youth Conservation Corps.

We could put our young men and women—and our older citizens, as well—to work in a domestic Peace Corps to attack the terrible social and economic problems of our slum areas. The oversea Peace Corps, now in its third year, has demonstrated that there is an underlying hunger for service in our people, a yearning to do something of significance and honor, to create something, to bring relief from hunger, ignorance, and oppression.

I deeply believe that William James was right when he called for a "moral equivalent of war"—for the development of programs of national policy which could strike fire in the hearts of young Americans, which could call forth the same noble outpouring of generous giving of themselves that patriotism has brought forth in time of war.

Mental health, as you know, is not a negative concept. It is not simply the absence of mental illness, but the achievement of a positive, constructive attitude toward life.

Surely; the good life in the United States does not have to be confined to consumption—to possessing, to watching, to being a bystander of a world passing by.

There is no easy, instant answer to the good life or to peace or to any other great goal.

The real answer comes much harder. It requires plans—investment—hard work to build the America to which our people are entitled.

Science has learned that not just the young must grow, but people of all ages—if their lives are to be full and productive.

If this Nation is to grow at the rate it should, we must continue to be a bold, "can do, will do" people. We must not allow old, tired voices which say "mustn't do"—"can't do"—to restrain our rate of achievement.

We must, in Emerson's words, proceed to "put our creed into our deed."

Our creed is health—not as an end in itself, but as the means for building a better life for ourselves, and for all mankind.

Let us write this creed proudly into the events of today's and tomorrow's world.

THE CHARACTER AND ABILITIES OF PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, a great deal of comment and concern for the future of this Nation has begun both in this country and abroad over the direction that America will now take in the wake of the incredible tragedy that occurred last Friday.

I wish to address my statement today to comments that have been expressed over whether President Lyndon B. Johnson can truly lead this Nation.

I have not a single doubt in my mind about the ability of President Johnson to perform inspirationally in every respect. I have been privileged to know him since 1956 and have had a very close working relationship with him in my official duties and as a friend.

These past associations give me insight into his character and abilities and an understanding of his principles. He is widely known in Nevada, where the citizens of my State have had occasions through his frequent trips to Nevada to know him well.

Based on this intimate prior knowledge of his abilities, I am convinced that he fits the historic mold of the great leaders of our history who have come forth in times of extreme crisis to lead America.

I do not believe there is a single man in this Nation more qualified by experience, temperament, patriotism, and training to lead this Nation.

Lyndon B. Johnson has a compassion and understanding for the average citizen which few men can claim. In the next few days, weeks, and months I believe that these qualities which he possesses in great abundance will be made evident to all of the citizens of this Nation and to freemen around the world.

As for ourselves, as Americans, we can give him no less than our total support and confidence, as well as our good wishes and prayers.

TRIBUTE TO THE RICHMAN BROS.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in Cleveland, Ohio, in the neighborhood where I was born and reared, for many years there has been a clothing factory operated by the Richman Bros. Its workers consist of many persons with ancestral backgrounds of the United States and of foreign nations—especially of the captive and satellite countries. The relationship between employers and the workers has been of a most friendly character. Their joint purpose has been to promote the welfare and success both of the enterprise and the men and women working in it.

On Thanksgiving Day, officials of the company and the workers, numbering about a thousand, will meet to rejoice and express gratitude for the bounties which this country has provided for them. In their mediation they will undoubtedly ponder about what they have and do not have.

Traditionally, Thanksgiving is the time of year when we reflect upon the many things we have for which we give thanks. What about the things we do not have?

For example, our country does not have: An ugly brick wall separating friends and loved ones; a government which forces its people to support a single political party; large numbers of people who are undernourished or uneducated; newspapers which print only what a dictator decides is right for the people to read; an economic system which strictly controls what a person can earn on his job.

We owe the absence of these things to the dedication of the people who founded our Government and their common belief in a way of life which cannot and will not tolerate such things.

For the many things we have in this great Nation as well as these things we do not have, we should be equally thankful.

WHO WAS TO BLAME?

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, something desperately needs to be said in defense of America at this terrible time when a sense of sorrow too often becomes a sense of guilt.

It was not a flaw in the American system or the American character that struck down John Kennedy. It was not the sin of a city or of its citizens. It was not a tragedy that struck from some dark stain of violence on the American system or in the American soul. And we do not serve the best interests of our Nation, of truth, or of the memory of a murdered President by letting wrongly placed recriminations overcome the good sense of this great Nation and its people.

John Kennedy was struck down by a man whose mind had been warped by an alien violence, not by a native condition. Dallas, in good heart and a deeply troubled conscience, of course regrets that it had been recently the scene of a thoroughly reprehensible reproach to another political leader. But that was bad manners. It was not of the same order, by any stretch of even a troubled imagination, as the violent felony that one who was only an occasional resident of that city and a stranger to the American heritage committed last week.

America's greatness is what we are seeing now, as an entire Nation mourns its last President, rallies behind its new President and gets on with the business of freedom and freedom's cause. Let us mourn the terrible event but let us not mourn for the American soul—for that soul is stout and lighted by truth and faith. Let the blame be on him who actually committed the crime. America must believe in itself now and behave as though it does. What happened was not America's fault. Only the sober realization of that can make our mourning meaningful and not torture it with a guilt that is undeserved and unworthy of the cause in which our Presidents live and for which sometimes they tragically die.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORTON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GORE. I congratulate the Senator upon his statement. I have heard many commentators and read statements to the effect that we are all guilty, that we are all to be blamed for this horrible crime.

I accept no blame for what this demented man did. I feel no sense of personal guilt. He is the one who had become a fanatic. Why should all America be blamed for the actions of one fanatic?

I reject the mass guilt which so many are trying to attribute to the entire country. Who attributed the attempt to assassinate President Truman by the Puerto Ricans to collective guilt? True, our society has many problems and imperfections, much stress and distress, hate, fear, and disappointment; but it is an injustice to our millions of people of good will, even the teeming thousands of hospitable, cheering people in Dallas, to charge them with murderous guilt. I reject it for myself and for my people. This was an act of a madman. Again, I congratulate the Senator.

Mr. MORTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MUNDT. I join in those congratulations.

SENATOR CLARK'S TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania paid a fine and fitting tribute to our late President at a memorial service held, last Sunday, at Independence Hall in Philadelphia. He expressed the mission President Kennedy held closest to his heart, which is the great unfinished business of the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Senator CLARK's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY—1917–1963

The world has suddenly lost America's leader.

A man of youth, vitality, and strength. A man of a happy mixture of idealism and practicality, of charm, of wit, of intelligence.

A friendly man committed to the causes of peace, of freedom, of equal opportunity for all.

In his inaugural address nearly 3 years ago, he said: "Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world."

No madman's bullet can be permitted to stop this memorable march of America as a part of the human race toward peace and freedom, compassion and justice under law.

The brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God call upon us to reach out loving hands across barriers of race, religion, color, bigotry and belligerence to all who feel as he did.

Let us keep our hands outstretched.

NEED FOR CRIMINAL STATUTES TO MAKE CERTAIN OUTRAGEOUS ACTS FEDERAL CRIMES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the tragic loss sustained by his family and friends, the Nation and world, in the death of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy makes it imperative that our criminal statutes be amended to make such outrageous acts a Federal crime. A pointed editorial to that effect appeared this morning in the Washington Post and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 26, 1963]

MAKE IT A FEDERAL CRIME

Certainly the law should be amended to make the assassination of the President a Federal crime. It is ironic indeed that the criminal who murdered President Kennedy violated only the law of Texas. Actually his foul deed was a crime against the Nation—one of the most serious crimes against the Nation in this century.

As the law now stands, severe penalties are prescribed for felons who murder or attack Federal judges, U.S. attorneys, FBI agents, postal inspectors, Secret Service officers, customs agents and various employees of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture. But this law for the protection of officers and employees of the United States does not, strangely enough, cover the President or members of his Cabinet.

Presumably the need for Federal law in this field has not previously been emphasized. When Lincoln was assassinated, the country was still under martial law. The assassin of President Garfield was prosecuted in the District of Columbia and the assassin of President McKinley in New York. There is a strong presumption that Texas would have convicted Lee Harvey Oswald of the slaying of President Kennedy if Oswald himself had not been killed as he was being transferred to the county jail. But the serious bungling of this vital case by the Dallas police constitutes a strong argument for the direction of such delicate operations by the FBI from the very beginning.

The events in Dallas have shown all too clearly that Federal officials should have been in charge of the police work from the beginning. High crimes against the Nation cannot be safely left to investigation and prosecution by local officials of the community in which such crimes happen to take place. As soon as Congress resumes its operations, Representative Richard S. Schweiker, of Pennsylvania, will introduce a bill to extend the protection of section 1114, United States Code, to the President and Vice President. We hope that it will be given prompt attention by the Judiciary Committees and that they will also include within the terms of the bill other officials in the line of succession to the President. Perhaps agency heads, their deputies and Members of Congress should also be included.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I understand that such legislation is presently being prepared for introduction in both Houses, and I can only urge my colleagues to act with dispatch so that laws designed to protect all the officers and employees of the United States are available for effective use by all our Federal as well as State law enforcement agencies.

SPECIAL STUDY OF SECURITIES MARKETS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in recent weeks statements have been made about the special study of the securities markets conducted by a special staff at the Securities and Exchange Commission as the result of legislation which was initiated by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

One outgrowth of the special study was S. 1642, the SEC's proposals for modifications of the securities laws. This bill would regulate more closely the entry of persons into the securities business and would call for greater disclosure to the public and stockholders by the major companies in the over-the-counter market.

It is interesting that on November 12 Mr. Richard H. Paul, formerly chief counsel of the special study, made a speech to the Federation of Women Shareholders in American Business, Inc., and on the following day Mr. Milton H. Cohen, formerly director of the special study, made a speech before the annual meeting of the bankers and brokers division of the American Jewish Committee.

I believe that it would be of great public interest to make these two statements available to the public generally. I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Special Study of Securities Markets—Its Results and Prospects

(Address Before Federation of Women Shareholders in American Business, Inc., November 12, 1963, by Richard H. Paul, Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, Formerly Chief Counsel, Special Study of Securities Markets, Securities and Exchange Commission)

I am particularly pleased to have an opportunity to address this group today. For some 19 months, ending last August, I acted as chief counsel to the Securities and Exchange Commission's Special Study of the Securities Markets. Our group was charged by the U.S. Congress with making a special study and investigation of the operations of the stock markets—both the stock exchanges and the over-the-counter markets—and the manner in which they are regulated. The purpose of our study was to determine how adequate—or how inadequate—are the existing laws and regulations "for the protection of investors." The keynote of our whole study, therefore, was the protection of investors. I might add that whenever the study considered whether something was good or bad for investors, our touchstone was the investor like yourselves—not the Wall Street "pro", but the public investor, so often a woman, with savings or an inheritance to invest and with little or no experience in the intricacies and complexities of Wall Street. I am happy, therefore, to be able to talk briefly to a group of people whose interests we were charged with protecting. I would like to tell you a little about what our study found, what we recommend as additional protections for investors, and what my crystal ball tells me are the prospects for our recommendations being carried out.

But first, at the risk of boring some of you with a repetition of what you may already know, I think I should very briefly outline for you the ways in which the securities markets are—and are not—regulated by the Federal Government. Only if you understand the structure of regulation in the stock markets can you, as investors, understand where to look for your protection, and the extent of protection you can expect.

All of you I am sure have heard of the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal policeman of the securities markets. The Commission, of which the special study was a part, is a bipartisan independent administrative body established by Congress to oversee the enforcement of the Federal securities laws. The Commission has many important functions to perform, but so far as you members of the investing public are concerned, its principal duties are two. First, it is charged with the detection and elimination of fraudulent transactions and manipulations, and with excluding from the securities business persons who are known to have violated the securities laws. Second, it is obliged to make sure that as to some securities, the company issuing them makes adequate public disclosure of all material information which relates to them.

It is with respect to this second function that many public investors become confused, and I will digress for a moment to comment on it. It is important to remember that the Securities and Exchange Commission does not pass on the merits of any stock or company. It does not say: "This stock represents a good investment" or "This is a sound company." It simply requires that companies disclose all the relevant facts, good and bad, and leaves it to the investor to make up his or her own mind—on the basis of the facts disclosed, or ignoring them if he or she chooses.

To return to the structure of regulation of the securities markets, you should all be aware that the duty of protection of investors does not fall on the shoulders of the Securities and Exchange Commission alone. The administration of the Federal securities laws depends in large measure upon the principle known as self-regulation. This is perhaps a fancy term for a fairly simple concept. Neither the Government, the securities industry, nor the investing public can afford the burden of a policeman on every corner. To help the Federal Government enforce its laws and regulations and to help the industry itself raise its own standards of ethics and performance, the Commission looks to certain organizations composed of members of the industry itself. Principally these organizations consist of the various stock exchanges, of which the New York Stock Exchange is the most prominent, and the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., commonly referred to as the NASD—an organization of which almost all securities dealers and brokers are members, and about which the investing public, in my opinion, knows far too little.

I think it is important that you as investors know that the exchanges and the NASD are charged by law with your protection, too. The NASD, for example, is required by the Federal Securities laws to have rules "designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices * * * and in general to protect investors and the public interest," as well as rules providing for disciplining those members. One of the most important rules of the NASD from the point of view of investors is its so-called suitability rule, which provides in effect, that every security salesman employed by a member, when he recommends a security to a customer, must have reasonable grounds for believing that the recommendation is suitable for such customer on the basis of the facts, if any, disclosed by the customer as to his other security holdings and as to his financial situation and needs. This rule on suitability, I should quickly make clear, is in no sense a guarantee against losses. It is intended, however, to avoid recommendations of speculative penny mining stocks to elderly widows who depend on their dividend income, or to eliminate the practice known as churning, where salesmen recommend heavy trading simply to build up commissions for themselves. The NASD also has rules governing the persons who may be employed by its members as salesmen—or registered representatives, as they prefer to be known—which are intended to exclude from the business the most undesirable and disreputable characters.

All registered stock exchanges, such as the New York Stock Exchange, are similarly required by Federal law to have rules providing for the expulsion, suspension, or disciplining of a member for conduct or proceeding inconsistent with just and equitable principles of trade. The NYSE similarly has a rule called know your customer rule which apparently will be interpreted to impose an obligation on its members to prevent their salesmen from recommending unsuitable securities to their customers. The exchange also has rules governing the qualifications of its members, their partners, and their employees.

Although the NASD and the exchanges are thus also charged with the protection of investors, you should also be aware that it is not the function of these bodies to assist investors in recovering losses incurred in the stock markets. A complaint to the exchange or the NASD of a violation of one of their rules which, upon investigation, they find to be justified, will lead to punishment of the member firms, but such punishment is usually cold comfort to the investor who has already been injured. For such recovery, the injured investor must still look to his remedies at civil law, which are beyond the scope of my discussion here today.

There, in the briefest compass, is the structure of Federal securities regulation as it exists in this country today. The Special Study of Securities Markets, of which I was chief counsel, spent nearly 2 years and almost $1 million of the taxpayers' money in a close scrutiny of this structure in operation, to determine its adequacy for the protection of investors. You are, then, entitled to ask, What did we find? How is it working?

I am proud of our study, and believe that we found out a great deal. I may perhaps be forgiven for quoting an enthusiastic review of the report which appeared in the London Economist on August 17. "Designations such as 'exhaustive investigation' and 'landmark study' so often used—and so often without real basis—are justified this time," said the Economist.

It will give you some idea of the scope of our study when I tell you that our report which the Commission transmitted to Congress comprised 13 separate chapters running to approximately 5,400 typewritten pages and weighing about 30 pounds. As now printed by the Government Printing Office, it runs into four separate volumes totaling just under 3,000 pages. Each chapter or section is followed by a summary, much of which I might note was printed in the New York Times, and each summary is followed by the study's own separately stated and numbered conclusions and recommendations. There are 174 separately numbered paragraphs of conclusions and recommendations. Some of these urge changes in the Federal securities laws which can be enacted only by the Congress. Some recommend changes in the rules of the Commission, of the exchanges, or of the NASD, which can be effected without legislation. Some are little more than exhortations to piety on the part of the industry.

Having given you a suggestion of the range and scope of the special study's report, I am sure that you will appreciate the difficulty I would have in capsulizing its entire contents. I can, however, point to some of our findings which I think are important to you as investors.

In the first place, I would like to enter my personal demurrer to the statement in Chairman Cary's transmittal letter to Congress in which he said the the report was not "a picture of pervasive fraudulent activity," and to note again the comment of the London Economist to the effect that the characterization was "more politic than accurate." One may quibble, perhaps, over the meaning of the words "pervasive" and "fraudulent," but one cannot blink the fact that with a relatively modest staff and appropriation the study turned up instance after instance of highly questionable conduct in the securities markets, carried on not alone by the marginal element of boilerroom operators and the like, but within branch offices of our largest, most respected and most influential securities firms. I might give just one "for instance." In a disastrously effective selling effort involving shares of what can most charitably be described as a highly speculative company in a brief period early in 1961, some 80 different retail brokerage firms sold 600,000 shares of the stock to more than 2,000 public investors, many of whom suffered substantial losses. Among the brokerage firms involved were more than 10 New York Stock Exchange member firms who would be numbered among the blue chip firms of the exchange.

In my view the Commission's transmittal letter was largely responsible for the frequent description of our report as "mild"—a characterization which I think unfortunate not only because I regard it as unfair to the report but also because I feel it will have an unwarranted and adverse effect on the prospects that the study's recommendations will be carried out. I will return to this subject later. In passing I should note that I am not criticizing the press in this respect. For reasons beyond its control it was given almost no advance opportunity to digest the massive documents on which it was called upon to report. Under the circumstances, I think it did an extraordinary job.

Our report, while concluding that the basic design of the securities laws enacted a generation ago had stood the test of time, focused on a number of matters which should be of grave concern to the investing public. Let me describe some of them to you.

In recent years there have been attracted to the securities industry large numbers of new investors and large numbers of new brokerage firms and securities salesmen. The ranks of the former include the naive, the unsophisticated, and those with slender resources. The ranks of the latter include many who are inept, ignorant or rapacious. To protect investors, the present regulations governing the qualifications of those in the industry are inadequate. Too many boilerroom salesmen still drift from shop to shop, too many untrained people pose to the public as professionals, too many inexperienced people hold positions of responsibility and give investment advice. In detailed recommendations the study suggested methods for raising the standards of entry into the business—standards of competence, character and financial capacity and responsibility.

The predominant concern of the securities industry is, of course, the sale of securities, and the selling practices of the industry were a matter of major concern to the special study. As the report notes, some segments of the industry appear to be promoting high standards of selling, while others seem only to be earnestly promoting sales. Illustrative of the problem is the manner in which the words profession and professionalism are frequently associated with the securities industry. The words have many meanings and many uses. They may be a stimulus to the development of high ethical standards or more often a mere tool of merchandising. It was not necessary, however, precisely to define or measure professionalism in the securities industry in order to conclude that an image of professionalism has been actively promoted which, as to much of the industry, is not warranted.

This is perhaps the most important message I can bring to you as investors today. Remember, when you are dealing with the brokerage community you are dealing with salesmen. There is nothing in the world wrong with salesmen as such, and there are very good salesmen as well as very bad salesmen, but their business is selling. It is very important to realize that they are universally compensated on a commission basis. They are not dispassionate professional investment counselors, though sometimes they assume the pose. I would be doing you a vast disservice if I permitted you to believe that professionalism exists in the securities business today.

The special study made a number of specific recommendations to raise standards in the area of selling practices, but your best protection against overenthusiastic salesmanship is your own alertness.

Another problem which concerned the special study was the torrent of printed material which pours out upon the public under the guise of investment advice. It is important for you to bear in mind that printed investment advisory material is circulated by the brokerage community as a selling tool, and that while some of it is the product of diligent and responsible research, much of it is not. The report concluded that the irresponsible dissemination of printed investment advice has resulted in injury to investors and to the investment community itself. It recommended that reckless dissemination of written investment advice be expressly prohibited by statute and be made subject to civil liability.

The problem of unreliable investment advice is compounded by a flaw in the existing statutory structure of disclosure requirements. You should be aware that these requirements do not apply equally to all publicly traded securities. Once the original distribution of new issues has taken place, the safeguards which apply to securities traded on stock exchanges do not generally apply to securities traded over the counter. Companies traded on exchanges—known as listed stocks—must make regular reports to the Commission and their shareholders of all significant financial information, and are subject to controls over the manner in which they solicit proxies and over the trading in their shares by insiders. Few companies traded over the counter, however, are subject to the financial reporting requirement, and none are subject to proxy regulation or the insider trading rules. The information which stockholders of almost all of these companies receive is at best inadequate.

From a survey conducted by the special study of a large number of companies whose shares are actively traded over the counter, it appeared that more than 25 percent gave no financial information at all to their shareholders. For those who did communicate with their shareholders, most of the communications were seriously defective. For example, in nearly three-quarters of the cases where stockholders were asked for proxies to elect directors, they were not even given the names of those persons they were being asked to vote for. The special study recommended legislation which would extend the reporting, proxy, and insider trading rules to over-the-counter companies.

I shall not burden you with discussior of more of our 174 conclusions and recommendations. I would like to end, however, with a short forecast of my personal views of what the impact of the study has been and will be.

In the first place, it is gratifying to me, as the study's former chief counsel, to see the influence that our report is having—and that the study has had—on the industry's own practices. Just in the last few weeks, for example, the New York Stock Exchange has taken several steps which directly reflect recommendations of our report. On September 25, the New York Times announced that the exchange had adopted stiffer new rules governing its member brokerage firms' market letters, sales literature, and research reports. Shortly thereafter it appointed three consulting firms to study phases of its business that had been discussed in our report, including the odd-lot differential charge, where at our urging the exchange apparently for the first time recognizes its regulatory obligation. And about 2 weeks ago it announced new requirements for branch managers of its member firms. Many brokerage firms themselves, I am aware, have made changes in their practices following the recommendations of the report.

Many of our recommendations, as I have suggested, can be accomplished by the Commission under its present rulemaking powers. Here again it is gratifying to report that the Commission appears to be moving ahead to accomplish a number of our recommended changes. A recent example appeared in the New York Times of October 4, which reported a realinement of jobs and personnel in order to provide a closer watch on the securities markets—another outgrowth of the special study. But here I would like to sound a note of caution. In connection with the special study, the Commission has evidenced a considerable tendency to rush to groups of industry leaders for consultation.

Certainly the Commission should not act in ignorance of the views and problems of the industry, and cooperative endeavor is essential to self regulation and a commendable thing. However, the Commission is no more immune than any other administrative agency to the danger of becoming a captive of the industry which it is charged with regulating. I think the Commission must be continuously vigilant to avoid the danger that cooperation can become appeasement. The proof of the pudding will be in the regulations which it will adopt, but which have yet to appear.

The biggest question mark about the impact of the study may be the Congress. You may be aware that the Commission, at the end of last April, after consultation with industry leaders, proposed to the Congress a bill which reflected several of the most significant recommendations contained in that portion of our report which appeared on April 3, although, to my regret, it omitted some of our recommended legislative changes concerning investment advice and public relations activities. After hearings before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, which developed no significant controversy, the bill was approved by the Senate. It went to the House in July.

The House has now scheduled hearings on the bill, but its very delay in scheduling such hearings gives me cause for concern. It may be that the House feels that the bill lacks sufficient political sex appeal to warrant its attention. Whatever the cause, it seems to me that there is a good deal of indifference to the fate of a bill which I, at least, regard as urgently needed. Perhaps only if organizations such as yours and individuals such as yourselves can manage to communicate some of this sense of urgency to the Congress can we hope that it will overcome its inertia and act on this important piece of legislation for the protection of investors.

Remarks of Milton H. Cohen at the Annual Meeting of the American Jewish Committee, Bankers and Brokers Division, November 13, 1963

A couple of weeks ago when I began to give some thought to what I might say to you today there was an unpredecented October heat wave in Chicago, which the golfers welcomed but some other people found unseasonably uncomfortable. My wife was in the latter group and I suggested she could take comfort in the thought that when I paid my first visit to Wall Street my reception would probably be chilly enough to temper the climate even as far away as Chicago.

Actually, you were most gracious in inviting me and have been most gracious in receiving me today. Perhaps we are not as far apart as I jokingly indicated to my wife. On at least one subject I know that is true. I have been a member of AJC for some years, perhaps not as active a member as I might have been but a very enthusiastic one about the purposes and attainments of AJC. Whether or not each of you sees eye to eye with me on each of the recommendations of the special study of securities markets, I am sure that we are unanimous today in seeing the urgency of moving ahead in the area of human relations. Even if any of you might be instinctively inclined to take an opposite stand from me on whatever I might say today about the securities markets, please do not let that apply when I say—let us all support the AJC campaign to the best of our ability.

Then again, when I survey the entire territory covered in the report of the special study, it seems to me that we cannot be so very far apart in most of that area either, even if our paths diverge at some points. Today I would like to catalog some of the areas where I believe there is essential agreement and then comment a little on the status and outlook of the entire set of recommendations.

At the outset I should remind you that what I say today does not purport to express the views of the Securities and Exchange Commission or its staff. Even when I was director of the special study I did not necessarily speak for the Commission itself. Today I speak merely as the ex-director—as a private citizen who happens to be the individual primarily responsible for the special study and its report. I do not even have beside me any longer the fine group of lieutenants who participated with me in shaping the report, so that I am strictly on my own in these remarks.

As another preliminary, I am pleased to tell you that a summary volume of the entire report was published last week. As you may know, the original typewritten version of the whole report has been available for some time in printed form—a total of 2,994 printed pages in 4 volumes. Part 5, just released, is a 211-page book containing the letters of transmittal and the texts of all summaries, conclusions, and recommendations exactly as they appear in the full report. This book is available at the Government Printing Office at 55 cents. Even if some of you manage to resist the temptation to read the full 2,994 pages, I hope you will get a copy of the summary volume, part 5 of the House Document 95. I express this hope even though, alas, I get no royalties.

In cataloging our areas of agreement, let me remind you, first of all, of some positions we did not take on certain points of crucial importance well within the scope of the study. Perhaps the prime example is on the question of industry self-regulation, which might be considered the central theme of the entire study as authorized by Congress. In some respects we were quite critical of self-regulatory performance, but we certainly did not conclude—as it was expected or feared in various quarters that we might—that the essential reliance on self-regulation should be abandoned or severely curtailed. We said just the opposite, that self-regulation has essentially proved itself in action and should not be abandoned or curtailed but strengthened. We said this as a matter of theory and policy in our chapter XII, and we said it over and over again in our specific recommendations on substantive matters discussed in other chapters. Indeed we put so much emphasis on self-regulation that we have been expressly or inferentially criticized for expecting too much of self-regulation and thus giving it too large a role. I believe this is another way of raising the question of just what matters are in need of what degree of any regulation, which of course is a separate question. My point is that, given any defined area for regulation, our whole thrust has been in the direction of enlarging the authority and responsibility of self-regulatory bodies, not reducing them.

As a second example, I would cite the question of segregation of functions of broker and dealer. This concept—fetish to some and bogeyman to others—seems to hover over all general discussions of market mechanisms and thus was inherently an issue in a broad market study such as ours. The question clearly called for a reexamination in the case of stock exchange specialists, since the elements and quantities involved in the combination of functions had changed markedly in the past quarter century, as was apparent not only statistically but also, for example, in the contrast between New York Stock Exchange President Whitney's 1933 definition of a specialist as "one who executes orders for other brokers on the exchange in a particular stock," and President Funston's 1961 definition that "the essence of being a specialist is dealing for his own account." It was predicted in some quarters that our recommendations would include segregation of the functions, but we disappointed the prophets. Chapter VI of our report contains a detailed and, I believe, through examination of the basic combination of specialist functions, points to a number of specific ways in which the inherent conflicts may need to be tempered, but essentially and affirmatively upholds continuance of the combined functions.

The question of segregation of functions is not, of course, confined to specialists. Combinations of functions are characteristic of the securities business—not just in the primary sense of broker and dealer functions, but also frequently including the functions of underwriter, wholesaler, retailer, investment counselor, custodian, financial consultant, corporate director, and other capacities—and the special study has recognized, as many people connected with the securities business have also recognized, that problems of one kind of another may arise when some of these functions are combined. We have discussed some of the problems, have made some recommendations about them, and have suggested that further attention be given them by the self-regulatory agencies and the Commission. We have not, any more than the industry itself, seized upon the notion of segregation as a simple, pat answer for all such questions.

I will mention just one more instance where the absence of a potential recommendation amounts to essential agreement between us. We looked at the question of customers' free credit balances, where periodically the possibility of complete segregation of customers' funds from firm capital has been advanced. We rejected this notion as being unnecessary and unwarranted in light of experience. Again, while avoiding drastic change, we have given our conception of needed specific improvements and safeguards.

I hope you do not find irony—certainly I intend no irony—in my suggestion that there are large and important areas of basic agreement where we have rejected drastic, sweeping solutions in favor of limited, specific measures. What this signifies, I believe, is that we at least are all in the same ball park, all talking the same language. In broad terms the special study has concluded, not that any of the basic market or regulatory institutions should be drastically reconstituted, but that improvements should be sought where inadequacies or weaknesses or abuses have appeared. I cannot imagine that any of you would disagree with these broad propositions, even though there be considerable difference of opinion as to what constitutes a weakness or abuse and what should be done about it, or in other words, as to some of our specific conclusions and affirmative recommendations.

But even here, in relation to the specific conclusions and recommendations of our report, I know that there are also very important areas of agreement. Two obvious and extremely important examples relate to qualifications to enter the securities business, as discussed in our chapter II, and obligations of issuers of securities traded in over-the-counter markets, as discussed in our chapter IX. In these instances, as you know, the essential accord in our thinking has been reflected in what amounted to joint Commission-industry drafting and sponsoring of legislation that has already passed the Senate and is pending in the House. There are some significant differences in detail between our recommendations and the terms of the pending bill, and no doubt there is room for specific disagreement on the part of individuals as to specific provisions of the pending bill. But as to the two essential themes—the need to limit entry into the securities business to those showing reasonable qualification in terms of knowledge, integrity and capital commitment, and the importance of equalizing investor protections for listed and actively traded unlisted securities in terms of corporate reporting, proxy solicitation, and insider trading requirements—there has been a most impressive display of Government-industry cooperation in meeting worthy objectives with which both sides are in full accord.

Another example of basic accord on affirmative recommendations of the report appears in the recent action of the New York Stock Exchange in revising and strengtening its rules and standards for member firms' communications with the public. Without going into details here, it is apparent that the stock exchange has taken an important step in industry self-regulation along lines that follow recommendations of our report.

When we go on to other positive recommendations of the report—there are in all some 170 numbered black-letter recommendations in the 13 chapters of the report—I realize that there may be more and louder voices of dissent on some specific points. I know of no recommendation we have made that is not likely to find many partisans within the securities business itself, but I also realize that quite a few of our recommendations are not likely to find unanimous accord and that some will meet considerable opposition. It could hardly be otherwise, since the total set of recommendations covers, as I well realize, many very difficult, very complex, and very sensitive issues.

Among the most sensitive, I suppose, are those that go beyond mere mechanisms of the markets and potentially affect income and expense of the securities business. Precisely here, in respect of these vital dollars-and-cents questions, some of you may think we have gone farthest astray. But I think there are some misconceptions as to just what we have said in the report, and before I go to the guillotine I would like to take a few minutes to clarify, in broad terms, what we have and have not said.

First, as to the odd-lot differential, which presumably affects fewest of you directly but which has received particularly prominent attention in the press: We have not said that the odd-lot differential ought to be reduced, and I personally would not venture an opinion as to whether it will prove to be too high or too low in light of all relevant considerations. What we have said is that it it an area that has been left almost entirely within the control of the two firms dominating the business, without significant regulatory attention on the part of either the Stock Exchange or the Commission. Our recommendations on the differential are all in the direction of assuring the kind and degree of regulatory attention that the situation demands but that has been lacking in the past.

Second, as to commission rates: Again, we very definitely have not expressed the conclusion that the level of commission rates is too high or too low; in fact, we have expressly disclaimed addressing ourselves to this question. What we have said, in essence, is that there are some vitally important questions of commission rate structure—not level, but structure—that do not seem to have been looked at in the past with a sufficiently broad perspective but that, in any event, call for thorough examination by the exchange community and the Commission in the context of today; and as to rate levels, that the Commission has not adequately equipped itself to exercise the regulatory role that the statutory provisions, especially in light of the Supreme Court's Silver decision, appear to require of it. Here, as in many other places, the special study does not purport to have produced specific or final answers—certainly not as to the appropriate level of rates, which is a far too complex question for us to have attempted to cover substantively. In this and other instances where we did not feel that we could provide full and specific answers, we have confined ourselves to analyzing the facts and issues involved, spelling out our conception of appropriate remedies as specifically as our data warranted, and suggesting methods or approaches by which more specific solutions should be sought.

Incidentally, our discussions of the odd-lot differential and commission rates are two of many places where the searchlight of the special study has been turned on the Commission itself. The congressional authorization did not expressly call for this; it directed the Commission to study and investigate the adequacy of the rules of the self-regulatory groups and did not on its face call into question the Commission's own performance. Nevertheless, it was recognized from the outset that the two are so intimately related it would be impossible to go deeply into the one while ignoring the other. This was one of several reasons why we concluded that the report's final conclusions and recommendations should be those of the special study, not of the Commission as such. It is hardly necessary to add that the Commission imposed no censorship on what we might say about its own performance; if anything, the Commission encouraged us not to point out shortcomings of others without pointing out its own, where we found them to exist. Particularly in chapter XII, which deals with the regulatory pattern as such, but also in the various substantive chapters, we have not hesitated to speak our minds about what the Commission has or has not done, even though we were not called upon to study its performance in the same sense that we were directed to study the self-regulatory agencies.

A third area where our recommendations may be thought to involve dollars and cents issues is that of pricing in the over-the-counter markets. Here again, although we have had much to say on the subject, we have expressly disclaimed finding that any particular level of markup or commission for any particular security or type of transaction is too high or too low. I believe I am fully cognizant of the complexity and subtlety of the economic and competitive factors involved, and I assure you that I am as much in favor of fair compensation for services and risks in the securities business as I would want you to be in favor of fair compensation in the practice of law, and that is saying a lot. What we have concluded in the report is not that any particular level of markups or commissions is right or wrong but that in some respects the standards of pricing need better articulation and that, in any event, there should be greater reliance on disclosures as distinguished from regulatory controls. Our recommendations on disclosures would require changes in certain present practices and mechanisms, including retail price quotations, and I realize that such changes are likely to be vigorously opposed by many people in the business, although I believe that many voices will be in basic accord. But in any event, I want to make clear that our recommendations in this area go essentially to appropriate disclosures about the prevailing market, not to the level of markups or commissions.

In some quarters, over-the-counter markets and securities have unfortunately been regarded as second-class citizens, and to some extent the present regulatory pattern so treats them. Our report questions whether so sharp a dichotomy is any longer justifiable, if it ever was. As I need not tell this group, the term "over the counter" covers a lot of territory, and there is at least a significant part of that territory that is entitled to be treated as an important and vital segment of the total market pattern rather than as of an inferior breed. Thus, I think it is very regrettable that over-the-counter markets and securities seem to be considered entirely out of bounds by many foreign investors, and indeed many domestic investors, evidently because of a lack of familiarity or of confidence going to the whole over-the-counter category. In the interest of the national economy, the investing public, and the securities business itself, I think it is high time to confer first-class citizenship on at least the upper ranks—the more active segment—of the total over-the-counter category. The essential aim of some of our recommendations in chapters VIII and IX, including especially those in the direction of better disclosures about active over-the-counter securities and about the markets themselves, is exactly this. Some of you may disagree with our specific prescriptions, but I doubt that any of you would seriously quarrel with the aim.

I have been emphasizing today what I consider basic areas of agreement, and I believe they are many and they are important. At the same time, I have recognized that there are many areas where disagreement with our specific recommendations may well arise, or where our recommendations are merely in general terms, needing elaboration and specification by others. I naturally am very confident of the essential rightness of our recommendations, but I do not claim infallibility. What I do assert is that, at the very least we have called attention to a considerable number of existing or incipient problems that need attention, from a business point of view or a public point of view, if we wish to maintain the quality of our securities markets at the level that their importance demands. I say, in other words, that the special study has created a large agenda, for specific action in many instances and for further or continuing study in others, and that this is an agenda for you in the securities business and not just for the Commission or Congress.

I believe it will be of fundamental importance to you as well as the public just how this agenda will be faced by the securities business itself. I cannot ask you to agree with everything we have said but I do not think that you can ignore the questions we have raised. I think, in short, that the industry itself must participate actively and constructively in taking the steps that must be taken from this point on. Where we have made a specific recommendation with which you are basically in accord, I think it is up to you to cooperate in working out the practical details. Where you agree that a problem exists but disagree with our prescription for solving it, or where we have made only a broad suggestion as to the approach towards solving it, I think you have both the opportunity and the obligation to assist in finding the best solution. And even where you disagree that a particular problem exists or feel that any attempt at curing it may be worse than the disease, I think you now have the burden, as of course you have the privilege, to show wherein the special study is wrong.

Whatever else you may think of the special study and its report, I would hope you have no impression other than that we sought to make a serious and objective study and to avoid sensationalism or witch-hunting on the one hand or sweeping generalization on the other hand. Our aim was to recognize and uphold the institutions and practices that have proved successful and beneficial and, where we found shortcomings, to suggest constructive remedies.

From the record to date there is every reason to believe that the industry's reactions to the report will be in similar vein. As an important example, I cite the New York Stock Exchange's announcement of the employment of several outside consultants and the appointment of five committees of members to consider various conclusions and recommendations of the report. There have also been some expressions of specific and sometimes sharp disagreements with our recommendations, and I assume there will be more of these, but there have been no hasty and heated responses and no sweeping condemnations. It would appear that the industry and its recognized institutions are addressing themselves seriously and constructively to the criticisms and suggestions that we—believe me, painstakingly, and I think constructively—have advanced, and this seems to me a strong augury that the end results of the special study will be constructive and beneficial for the American public and for the securities business itself.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS ON NOVEMBER 27, AT 12:30 P.M.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a concurrent resolution received from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair) laid before the Senate the concurrent resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 238—which, by unanimous consent, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, the 27th day of November, 1963, at 12:30 o'clock postmeridian, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

INTERNATIONAL AIR TRANSPORTATION RATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 449, S. 1540. To the best of my knowledge, there will be no further yea-and-nay votes tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1540) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the regulation of rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That subsection (a) of section 404 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1374 (a)) is amended by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(a)" and adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) It shall be the duty of every air carrier and foreign air carrier to establish, observe, and enforce just and reasonable individual and joint rates, fares, and charges, and just and reasonable classifications, rules, regulations, and practices relating to foreign air transportation; and, in case of such joint rates, fares, and charges, to establish just, reasonable, and equitable divisions thereof as between air carriers or foreign air carriers participating therein which shall not unduly prefer or prejudice any of such participating air carriers or foreign air carriers."

SEC. 2. Section 801 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1461) is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately after "801" and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Any order of the Board pursuant to section 1002(f) requiring that an air carrier or foreign air carrier discontinue demanding, charging, collecting, or receiving a rate, fare, or charge for foreign air transportation, or enforcing any classification, rule, regulation, or practice affecting such rate, fare, or charge, and any action of the Board pursuant to section 1002(g) suspending the operation of a tariff filed with the Board by an air carrier or foreign air carrier stating a new individual or joint rate, fare, or charge for foreign air transportation, shall be reported to the President by the Board before publication: *Provided*, That any order of the Board directing an air carrier or foreign air carrier to alter any rate, fare, charge, or any classification, rule, regulation, or practice affecting such rate, fare or charge, to the extent necessary to correct any discrimination, preference, or prejudice, and any order that the air carrier or foreign air carrier shall discontinue demanding, charging, collecting, or receiving any such discriminatory, preferential, or prejudicial rate, fare, or charge or enforcing any such discriminatory preferential, or prejudicial classification, rule, regulation, or practice, need not be so reported."

SEC. 3. Subsection (d) of section 1002 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1482(d)) is amended by changing the colon following the word "effective" to a period and striking out the following: "*Provided*, That as to rates, fares, and charges for overseas air transportation, the Board shall determine and prescribe only a just and reasonable maximum or minimum, or maximum and minimum rate, fare, or charge."

SEC. 4. Subsection (e) of section 1002 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1482(e)) is amended by inserting the words "and foreign air carriers" after the words "air carriers" where they appear in paragraphs (2) and (3) of the subsection, and by inserting the words "and foreign air carrier" after the words "air carrier" where they appear in paragraph (5).

SEC. 5. Subsection (f) of section 1002 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1482(f)) is amended to read as follows:

"RATES AND PRACTICES IN FOREIGN AIR TRANSPORTATION

"(f) Whenever, after notice and hearing, upon complaint or upon its own initiative, the Board shall be of the opinion that any individual or joint rate, fare, or charge demanded, charged, collected, or received by any air carrier or foreign air carrier for foreign air transportation, or any classification, rule, regulation, or practice affecting such rate, fare, or charge or the value of the service thereunder, is or will be unjust or unreasonable or unjustly discriminatory, or unduly preferential, or unduly prejudicial, the Board may alter the same to the extent necessary to correct such unjustness, unreasonableness, discrimination, preference, or prejudice and make an order that the air carrier or foreign air carrier shall discontinue demanding, charging, collecting, or receiving any such unjust, unreasonable, discriminatory, preferential, or prejudicial rate, fare, or charge, or enforcing any such unjust, unreasonable, discriminatory, preferential or prejudicial, classification, rule, regulation, or practice. The Board may in the aforesaid order set forth and prescribe the lawful rate, fare, or charge (or the maximum or minimum or the maximum and minimum thereof) thereafter to be demanded, charged, collected, or received, or the lawful classification, rule, regulation, or practice thereafter to be made effective."

SEC. 6. Subsection (g) of section 1002 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1482(g)) is amended—

(1) by striking out the words "interstate or overseas";

(2) by amending the parenthetical phrase following the word "joint" to read as follows: "(betweeen air carriers, between foreign air carriers, or between an air carrier or carriers and a foreign air carrier or carriers)"; and

(3) by inserting the words "or foreign air carrier" after the words "air carrier" wherever they appear therein.

SEC. 7. Subsection (i) of section 1002 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1482(i)) is amended by changing the colon following the word "operated" to a period and striking out the following: "*Provided*, That as to joint rates, fares, and charges for overseas transportation the Board shall determine and prescribe only just and reasonable maximum or minimum or maximum and minimum joint rates, fares, or charges."

SEC. 8. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective thirty days after the date of enactment of the Act.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, last spring the Nation and the Congress witnessed the spectacle of this government and United States international flag airlines succumbing to the threats and dictates of certain foreign governments in a dispute over the level of air fares to be charged by international air carriers flying acros the Atlantic. The dispute arose, as you will recall, because the Civil Aeronautics Board refused to approve an increase in transatlantic air fares.

The result of that dispute is well known. United States citizens are now required to dig deeper into their pockets and pay more hard dollars if they wish to fly to Europe, 60 percent of which goes to foreign carriers. The prime reason for this costly situation was the lack of statutory authority in the Civil Aeronautics Board to effectively back up our United States carriers in their attempts to prevent the increase in fares. No effective statutory tools were available to the CAB to aid it in its negotiations with foreign governments.

The bill reported by the Commerce Committee, S. 1540, would give to the CAB the power to prevent future recurrences of such disputes. It would give the Board discretionary authority to suspend and fix international air fares. This authority would be comparable to the power the Board now has to suspend and fix domestic air fares. The bill would impose a duty on air carriers engaged in foreign air transportation to establish just and reasonable rates. It would further the objective of the air transportation policy of this government to provide reasonable rates taking into account the interests of both the carriers and the passengers. It would maintain the present mechanism of establishing international rates through the International Air Transport Association, but would give the Board the power to protect travelers from unjust and unreasonable rates. Most important, it would give to the Board the same powers which its counterparts in foreign governments now have.

Under existing law the Board has no authority over the rates charged in foreign air transportation, although most foreign governments have such power.

Rates, fares, and practices in foreign air transportation are currently established by the International Air Transport Association (IATA), an organization of international air carriers. The rates are recommended by the members of IATA and are approved or disapproved by IATA at rate conferences which are held periodically. The approval must be unanimous; any single member carrier can veto the proposed rate structure. The rates established through these conferences must be approved by the governments of the foreign countries represented by the carriers. The Board, under section 412 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, must approve or disapprove the rates established by IATA. But because of the lack of any direct authority over international rates, the Board's indirect power under this section has been ineffective. The result has been the rubberstamping by the Board of previous IATA rate agreements.

In the past, efforts by the United States to improve its position in meeting foreign air transportation competition have been hampered and restricted by the limited authority of the Board over rates and practices in foreign air transportation. In short, foreign countries have recognized this lack of authority and the bargaining power of the United States has been weakened. The Board has been unable to protect U.S. carriers in rate negotiations from the almost complete domination and control of the foreign countries into which they fly. Nor has the Board been able to protect the U.S. traveling public from the unjust and unreasonably high rates which are prevalent in foreign air transportation. When a foreign carrier casts its vote at an IATA rate conference, it is in effect casting its government's vote and can depend upon the full assistance and authority of its government in assuring that its vote for high rates will prevail.

The most persuasive illustration of the need for this bill is the controversy over international air fares which is still going on. We lost the battle last spring because the Board did not have the powers provided in this bill. But the controversy remains. The fundamental difference in the rate philosophies of foreign carriers and our carriers remains.

Intergovernmental negotiations have been conducted to try to arrive at a new and lower level of fares acceptable to this country. Two formal meetings of the members of IATA have been held at Salzburg, Austria, in an attempt to agree on transatlantic fares. No agreement has been reached and from all indications it is unlikely that one will be.

The current agreement as to transatlantic rates will expire next spring. If a new agreement is not reached by that time, we will be faced with the same situation that occurred last spring—an open dispute between carriers and between governments.

It would be ludicrous if this Nation, which is predominant in the field of aviation and international air travel would have to capitulate again to the threats and dictates of foreign governments. Under this bill, the Board would be able to utilize and wield the vast economic power of this country in negotiations with these governments.

Statistics show that the majority of international air travelers are U.S. citizens. The dominance of our flag carriers is undisputed. They currently carry 40 percent of the North Atlantic traffic and approximately 50 percent of the traffic in the other major markets. On the North Atlantic route alone, over 60 percent of the revenue derived by all carriers comes from U.S. citizens. It is clear that the coffers of foreign airlines are enriched largely by the dollars paid by U.S. citizens. It is equally clear that the drain on our dollar supply is substantial.

In the past, foreign carriers have consistently pressed for and obtained rate increases. The U.S. carriers have always sought to lower rates. There is no reason to believe this trend will change.

U.S. carriers have traditionally been the low-cost and most efficient carriers. They operate without subsidy and compete effectively with foreign lines.

Many foreign carriers are either owned or subsidized to a large degree by their governments. With few exceptions, they are not noted for efficient, profitable operations. Many fly uneconomic routes for reasons of national interest and prestige. They offset their losses on uneconomic routes from the profits made in transporting Americans.

Both U.S. and foreign carriers are presently faced with an over-capacity of seats. The solution of U.S. carriers to this problem is to lower fares and increase the market to fill the available seats. The solution of foreign carriers is to increase fares in order to make up for the losses caused by overcapacity.

If the actions of foreign governments and foreign carriers affected only their citizens, we would not be so concerned. But the full impact of their actions and their high rate philosophy must ultimately be borne by the citizens of this country. Affirmative action must be taken now to protect our travelers by empowering the Board to press for lower rates.

The effect of the bill must be viewed in light of our bilateral air agreements with foreign governments. Most of these agreements are patterned after the Bermuda Air Agreement which was entered into between the United States and the United Kingdom in 1946. Contained in these bilaterals is an agreement by the executive branch of our Government to seek legislation which would give to the Board the same power over international rates as it has over domestic rates.

These agreements have alternative provisions with respect to the settlement of rate disputes. Which provision governs depends upon whether or not the Board has the power to fix and suspend international rates. Under one provision, which is presently in effect because the Board does not have this power, either party to the bilateral can take whatever steps it considers necessary to prevent a disputed rate from becoming effective. This provision has been of little benefit to the Board in protecting our citizens from high rates, because the Congress has never given the Board formal legal power to control rates or authorized it to impose severe sanctions against foreign carriers to prevent high rates. The committee agrees with the Board that the apparent authority conferred by this provision is ineffective.

Under the alternative rate provision which would govern if S. 1540 is passed, any disputed rate may go into effect pending settlement by arbitration. The significance of this provision is that neither country party to the agreement can prevent the rate proposed by a foreign carrier from taking effect. While the Board under this provision could not directly control the rates of foreign carriers, it could definitely suspend and fix the rate of U.S. carriers. This is extremely important, because control over rates of U.S. carriers indirectly gives to the Board control over rates of foreign carriers.

If a fare cannot be arrived at by the carriers through IATA which is acceptable to our carriers and the Board, either our carriers or the Board could initiate a lower fare and the foreign countries into which our carriers fly could not prevent the fare from taking effect under the bill we are now considering. The forces of competition would force the foreign carriers to lower their rates also. For example, if our carriers chose to charge only $400 for a round trip economy ticket to London, it is highly unlikely that BOAC or Air France would continue to charge $500. They could not, because of the competitive disadvantage. They would find themselves flying empty planes back and forth across the Atlantic.

Once lower rates are placed into effect by U.S. carriers, the whole rate structure of all international carriers will be lowered and the U.S. traveling public will no longer be subjected to the high rate practices of foreign carriers. This bill will enable our carriers to initiate the lower rates they have for so long advocated.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute differs in only one respect from the bill originally reported on August 28. Under the original bill the President would have had the power to approve or disapprove actions of the Board in suspending and fixing international rates. Under the amendment the Board is required to report to the President its decisions on international rate matters before publication but does not provide any statutory authority for modification of Board decisions by the President.

What is a just and reasonable rate is primarily an economic determination. It is based on many complex factors, such as route patterns, efficiency of management, effect on the movement of traffic, character and quality of service, the need for low-cost transportation, and the need of air carriers for a fair return on investment. These are matters in which the Board is expert. It has acted with wisdom and restraint in exercising its domestic rate-fixing powers and I am confident it will do the same with respect to the power granted by this bill.

I want to make crystal clear that the committee amendment is in no way intended to, nor can it, affect the power of the President in foreign affairs. The committee concluded only that the technical fixing of rates, which will principally be the rates of U.S. carriers, is a function of regulating foreign commerce and that this regulation should be by the Board.

In closing I want to emphasize that the bill does not represent a drastic departure from the present method of arriving at international rates. The only satisfactory way to arrive at these rates is through negotiations. Continued reliance must be placed on IATA as the mechanism for establishing international rates.

All this bill does is to give to the Board the same power over international rates that it now has over domestic rates. It merely grants to the Board the same power which its counterparts in foreign governments have. While the Board has always had the power to fix domestic rates, it has rarely had to exercise the power. I believe that the same will be true with respect to international rates.

This bill will arm the Board and our carriers with the power to negotiate satisfactorily at the bargaining table. They will no longer have to negotiate empty-handed. The equality in bargaining power will give the impetus needed to agree on mutually acceptable fares. This is the primary purpose of the bill and I hope that the Board will never have to exercise the power given to it. But the Board must have the power to protect our carriers and our citizens should the need arise. We can no longer allow the negotiators across the bargaining table to regard us as an impotent giant.

I strongly urge the adoption of this bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I commend the statement made by the Chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee. The RECORD will indicate that last autumn I advocated a measure which is similar to the one now being presented to the Senate for its approval. Mr. President, during my remarks in this forum on September 19, 1962, I declared:

> The problems facing the United States and its international airlines have, in fact, become of increasing concern to the Congress. Under the leadership of the knowledgeable Senators who are the chairman and ranking minority members of the Aviation Subcommittee—the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] and the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]—the subcommittee has begun to come to grips with the issues which cannot be postponed 10 years or 5 years, but issues which must be faced by our Government immediately. The ranking majority member of the subcommittee, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], likewise has for years been alert in bringing these issues to the attention of the Congress. Under a resolution by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], hearings were held last year by the Aviation Subcommittee to define and focus attention on the broad problems involved in the international air picture. Disclosures emphasized the destructive foreign-flag airline capacity and rate practices.
>
> Troubles of this type cause the industry to suggest that additional tools be given the Civil Aeronautics Board to deal with these practices. Two bills introduced by the capable chairman of the Commerce Committee, Senator MAGNUSON, would clarify and strengthen the Board's authority in the capacity and foreign rate fields. Both of these steps are urgently needed as desirable.
>
> These measures are necessary as initial steps if our Government is to have the virile air transport system it requires for its national defense and to build its economic strength.
>
> The legislation introduced by Chairman MAGNUSON, to which I have referred, would give our Government the necessary tools to deal with these rate and capacity problems. It would not erect any artificial barriers to trade and commerce for the sake only of protecting our carriers. It provides our Government with added bargaining power comparable to that provided under the pending trade bill, which will shortly be passed by the Senate.
>
> There is need for our country to have improved negotiating power, because, beside the problems of rate and capacity, we have the fact that U.S. carriers must compete against foreign government-owned or subsidized airlines, both individually and in pools.
>
> To be successfully implemented, both the trade policy and the international air transport policy required the strong and active support of the U.S. Government, the Government acting through an awakened understanding on the part of all our citizens of the situation in which we find ourselves. Both policies require reciprocal international concessions. Both require the lifting of foreign restrictions imposed on American goods and services. Both require equal market opportunity between nations. Both require strict compliance with agreements between nations. Both require effective bargaining. Both require safeguards to protect the national interest of the United States. Both require dedicated and resourceful negotiators. Both require the strongest possible negotiating position. Both require energetic and imaginative American salesmanship, which today is being stifled because of practices which, as I have indicated, are unfair in marked degree.

Mr. President, I believe that this legislation is in the interest of the American-flag carriers and the American economy. It sets forth to the international air carriers from other countries the fact that although we believe in trade—and certainly this is a form of trade—international air travel, passengers and cargo—we are determined and we are realistic in our effort to maintain a competitive position for the American-flag carriers in those markets to which, frankly, they have a justifiable right.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for his consideration and evaluation of the bill. I recall vividly the able and effective advocacy of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. The remarks he made last autumn were prophetic.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, this is a highly complex piece of legislation—more involved than most legislation because its provisions can only be fully understood in the light of the bilateral air services agreements which govern the exchange of international airline services.

The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has explained the effects of the bill, and an explanation can also be found in the reports of the committee, so I shall not go into the details of the legislation. However, there are a couple of major points about it which I believe must be made perfectly clear to all.

First, this might be called standby legislation. The powers which this bill would confer will not have to be used regularly by the Civil Aeronautics Board. In fact, I hope they will not have to be used at all.

Under ordinary circumstances, it is obvious that one government cannot, alone and unilaterally, fix the rates to be charged for an international airline flight. It takes the agreement of at least two governments, and probably more, before the airliner can take off in one country and land in another. For this fundamental reason, agreements on international airline fares have been worked out by the industry itself, not by governments. This has been done through the International Air Transport Association—IATA.

This bill would not replace or supersede IATA. It is not intended to substitute Government regulation for the agreement procedures of IATA.

Instead it would give our Government, through the CAB, standby powers to act should the IATA procedures fail to work.

It may also have the effect of equalizing the bargaining powers among the various air carriers within IATA, because it will give the U.S. Government authority which is comparable to the authority already possessed by most of the world's major airline nations. In this respect, I hope it will encourage all governments to keep a hands-off attitude with respect to these purely commercial aspects of international air service. The intervention of many governments, all with generally equal powers to regulate rates, would only create chaos, a disruption of service, and a head-butting contest between sovereign nations. At the present time, there is some tendency on the part of certain foreign nations to inject themselves into these rate matters because they believe the U.S. Government does not have the same legal powers they possess. The enactment of this bill would dispel any such idea, and, I hope, bring those governments to the realization that massive government regulation on both ends of the air flight is pointless and self-defeating.

Second, Mr. President, it must be pointed out that the bill has a serious and glaring loophole. The plain facts of the matter are that, with respect to the 40 countries with which we have Bermuda-type agreements, passage of this bill will not give us any effective authority over the rates of foreign air carriers. Under the terms of those agreements, passage of this bill to regulate the rates of foreign air carriers actually would give the U.S. Government authority only over the rates of U.S. carriers. In these circumstances, the CAB may find itself powerless, at least under the bill, to do anything about a foreign air carrier should its rates become uneconomically and destructively low, contrary to the public interest. Such destructive rates, particularly on the part of heavily subsidized and Government-owned airlines, could conceivably become a real factor in the world. It is a possibility which must be watched carefully. The administration, as the principal advocate of the pending bill, has a serious responsibility in this area which must not be neglected.

Frankly, Mr. President, I cannot bring myself to regard this bill with any enthusiasm. Its proponents and advocates claim its enactment is the best and surest way to secure lower international airfares. I hope they are right, but the current evidence indicates that transatlantic airfares during the peak season next spring and summer will be considerably lower than they were this year as a result of the activities of U.S. air carriers, and not as a result of any new regulatory legislation.

The committee has amended the bill, as a result of proposals which I offered, in conjunction with others, in such a way as to insure that the economics of air travel will be the principal factors in whatever regulation may take place, so that the international airlines of the United States will not be used as mere pawns on a diplomatic chessboard.

I shall, therefore, not object to passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1540) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MONRONEY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, starting with Calendar No. 629, the calendar be called in sequence. Calendar No. 629 and all bills following have the full approval of the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the various measures in order.

UNIFORM COMMERCIAL CODE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 5338) to enact the Uniform Commercial Code for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments; on page 2, in the article listings between lines 2 and 3, delete the comma after "Bills of Lading", and the comma after "Contract Rights".

Page 10, line 4, strike out "(15)" and insert in lieu thereof "(14a)", and renumber succeeding paragraphs numbered 16 through 47 as paragraphs 15 through 46, respectively.

Page 24, insert a period at the end of line 23.

Page 49, line 2, strike out "28: -719" and insert in lieu thereof "28: 2-719".

Page 115, insert a period at the end of line 14 and at the end of line 20.

Page 118, line 22, strike out "indorsed.'" and insert in lieu thereof "indorsed'.".

Page 122, line 24, strike out "pay.'" and insert in lieu thereof "pay'.".

Page 126, line 20, strike out "Anv" and insert in lieu thereof "Any".

Page 132, line 23, strike out "unles" and insert in lieu thereof "unless".

Page 153, line 1, strike out "a draft" and insert in lieu thereof "A draft".

Page 204, strike out lines 6 through 11, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(1) This article applies".

Page 220, line 17, strike out "this state" and insert in lieu thereof "the District".

Page 281, line 1, strike out "persons".

Page 299, in the section listings following line 15, strike out "28:9—106. Definitions: 'account'; 'contract right'; 'general intangible'." and insert in lieu thereof the following: "28:9—106. Definitions: 'account'; 'contract right'; 'general intangibles'.".

Page 309, line 12, strike out "right.'" and insert in lieu thereof "right'.".

Page 309, line 14, strike out "products."

Page 362, lines 22 and 24, strike out "Article" and insert in lieu thereof "article".

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

REGULATING LOANING OF MONEY ON SECURITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (H.R. 3191) to exempt life insurance companies from the act of February 4, 1913, regulating loaning of money on securities in the District of Columbia was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 650), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 3191) to exempt life insurance companies from the act of February 4, 1913, regulating loaning of money on securities in the District of Columbia, after full consideration, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommended that the bill do pass.

The purpose of this bill is to exempt life insurance companies from the provisions of an act regulating moneylending.

Section 10 of the act of February 4, 1913, as amended by section 7 of the act approved June 11, 1960 (74 Stat. 196), presently exempts from the act, the legitimate business of national banks, licensed bankers, trust companies, savings banks, building and loan associations, small business investment companies licensed and operating under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, or real estate brokers as defined in the act of Congress of July 1, 1902. H.R. 3191 exempts life insurance companies as defined in the bill from that act. In order for a life insurance company to be exempted, it must be authorized to do business in the District of Columbia or in any of the States of the United States.

The bill also amends section 10 of the act to require any person or legal entity making a loan secured on real or personal property in the District of Columbia, who or which does not maintain an office or residence in the District, to appoint and maintain a registered resident agent for the service of process in order to be exempted from the requirements of the other sections of the act. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are designated as the agent for service of process in any case where there is no registered agent, or such agent cannot be found at his registered address.

The legislative history of the act of February 4, 1913, indicates that it was aimed at driving out the unlicensed makers of small loans charging an exorbitant rate of interest to the borrowers. As late as 1930, it was considered that the act applied only to small loans of $200 or less and did not apply to normal real estate mortgage transactions. (See *Von Rosen* v. *Dean*, 41 F. (2d) 982). More recent decisions of the local court of appeals, however, appear to hedge on the Von Rosen case with the result that substantial doubt has been raised as to whether an institutional lender not included in the exemption is restricted by the provisions of the Loan Shark Act in its regular mortgage loan operations.

The problem and the questions relative to life insurance companies arise because the District of Columbia Code establishes a 6-percent interest limit on loans for more than $200 if made by a lender other than those exempted in section 10 of the act of February 4, 1913.

On the other hand, the usury statute of the District of Columbia Code allows for a maximum interest rate up to 8 percent provided the loan contract is in writing. There is no question that banks and building and loan associations, exempted by the 1913 act, are governed in their maximum interest rate only by the usury statute. As indicated, however, there is a question in the case of insurance companies as a consequence of which the conservative position has been taken by many such companies that they will not entertain requests for loans in the District of Columbia which in normal circumstances will justify at a given time an interest rate in excess of 6 percent. Such loans in general are those for larger amounts desired by sophisticated investors in the development of commercial and apartment projects. While it seems clear that the 1913 act was not intended to cover a lender such as an insurance company, the fact is that for all practical purposes many insurance companies will not make available in the District of Columbia funds which otherwise might be loaned for enterprises and under conditions justifying an interest rate in excess of 6 percent. Naturally, the companies prefer to take that portion of their investment funds to a jurisdiction in which there is no question about the authorized interest rate.

The Board of Commissioners have no objection to the enactment of this legislation, and passage of H.R. 3191 will not involve any additional cost to the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT TO LIFE INSURANCE ACT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (H.R. 7497) to amend the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia relating to annual statements, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 651), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The purpose of this bill is to amend section 8 of the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia (48 Stat. 1132), to modify certain overly strict and inflexible statutory provisions relating to the publication and contents of annual statements and reports required of life insurance companies doing business in the District of Columbia.

ANNUAL STATEMENTS

Current law (sec. 35–103, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.) requires that each life insurance company doing business in the District shall publish annually in March in a daily newspaper a summary of its annual statement, "and any such company or association failing to comply with the provisions aforesaid shall have its license to do business in the District revoked." Almost every year, the harshness of this inflexible penalty has created problems for one or more companies which through inadvertence or mistake have failed to make timely publication.

Relief from this provision would be provided by section 1 of this bill which authorizes the Superintendent to exercise his discretion in connection with the publication requirement. The relief here sought for life insurance companies is already applicable to other kinds of insurance companies. In fact, the precise language of this new provision is carried over from the law now applicable to fire, casualty, and marine insurance companies (sec. 35–1311, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.).

Also, present law (sec. 35–407, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.) provides that all life insurance companies doing business in the District must file a financial statement annually before March 1 with the District of Columbia Superintendent of Insurance, and the same mandatory revocation of license is imposed in the event of failure to do so. This bill would change this requirement so as to make it discretionary with the Superintendent of Insurance whether a company should have its certificate of authority revoked for failure to file its annual statement on time, rather than mandatory as under existing law. We are informed that precedent for this change also exists in the Fire Insurance Act. Furthermore, there is an ambiguity in present law regarding life insurance companies in this respect, because of a provision in the Revenue Act of 1937 (sec. 47–1805, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.) which states as follows:

"If any such (insurance) company shall fail to file the annual statement herein required, the Superintendent of Insurance may thereupon revoke its license or certificate of authority to transact business in the District of Columbia."

This apparent conflict in present law would be relieved, of course, by this provision of H.R. 7497.

ANNUAL REPORTS, ALIEN COMPANIES

Current law (sec. 35–410, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.) prohibits alien companies from referring in their District advertisements to assets other than those held in the United States. This provision precludes a Canadian company, for example, from sending to its policyholders in the District a copy of its annual report which is sent to its policyholders elsewhere, since the annual report will reflect the company's total assets.

The provisions of section 2 of this bill would grant relief from this provision to the extent of allowing such a company to mail its annual report to its policyholders in the District.

The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia have no objection to the bill, and a copy of its report to the committee on S. 1775, an identical bill, is set out hereafter and made a part of this report.

RELOCATION COSTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1024) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay relocation costs made necessary by actions of the District of Columbia government which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments, on page 2, line 17, after "$3,000", to insert "(or, if greater, the total certified actual moving expense)", and on page 4, after line 10, to strike out:

SEC. 7. The Commissioners are hereby authorized to make regulations to carry out the purposes of this Act.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 7. The Commissioners are hereby authorized to make regulations to carry out the purpose of this Act, including, without limitation, the establishing, from time to time, of a limitation on the actual amount of moving expenses over $3,000 which will be paid by the District of Columbia to a business concern or nonprofit organization in accordance with the provision of section 2 of this Act: *Provided*, That no regulation affecting individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations displaced by activities of the Redevelopment Land Agency of the District of Columbia, shall be promulgated which will conflict with regulations of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to provide such relocation services as they shall determine to be reasonable and necessary to individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations which may be or have been displaced from real property by actions of the government of the District of Columbia, such actions to include, but not be limited to, acquisition of property for public works projects, condemnation of unsafe and insanitary buildings and enforcement of the laws and regulations relating to housing. The Commissioners are authorized to make housing surveys in connection with furnishing of such relocation services.

SEC. 2. The Commissioners are hereby authorized to make relocation payments to individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations for their reasonable and necessary moving expenses caused by their displacement from real property acquired by the Commissioners after the effective date of this Act for public works projects of the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That no such payment shall be made in any case where a payment for a similar purpose is authorized by a law other than this Act. Such relocation payments shall be made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioners and shall not for any one relocation exceed $200 in the case of an individual or family or $3,000 (or, if greater, the total certified actual moving expense) in the case of a business concern or nonprofit organization.

SEC. 3. The costs of the relocation services, housing surveys and relocation payments authorized by sections 1 and 2 of this Act shall be charged to the District of Columbia general fund, the highway fund, the water and sanitary sewage works fund, or the motor vehicle parking account as the Commissioners shall determine appropriate, based on the activities of the particular District of Columbia governmental agency which resulted in any particular displacement.

SEC. 4. Prior to the acquisition of real property for any public works project of the District of Columbia the Commissioners shall satisfy themselves that there is a feasible method for the temporary relocation of families displaced from such property, and that there are or within a reasonable period will be provided in areas not generally less desirable in regard to public utilities and public and commercial facilities, and at rents or prices within the financial means of the families displaced from such property, decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings equal in number to the number of, and available to, such displaced families, and reasonably accessible to their places of employment. The determinations made by the Commissioners in accordance with the requirements of this section shall be indicated in the records relating to the acquisition of such real property, and upon being so recorded shall be conclusive.

SEC. 5. The Commissioners and the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency established by section 4 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 (60 Stat. 793), as amended (sec. 5–703, D.C. Code, 1961 edition), are hereby authorized to enter into one or more agreements providing for the furnishing of relocation services and the making of relocation payments to individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations referred to the Commissioners by the Agency or to the Agency by the Commissioners. Any such agreement shall provide for payment, either in advance or on a prompt reimbursement basis, for all relocation services furnished or to be furnished and relocation payments made or to be made.

SEC. 6. Except as provided in section 5 of this Act, nothing in this Act shall be construed as modifying any provision of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended.

SEC. 7. The Commissioners are hereby authorized to make regulations to carry out the purpose of this Act, including, without limitation, the establishing, from time to time, of a limitation on the actual amount of moving expenses over $3,000 which will be paid by the District of Columbia to a business concern or nonprofit organization in accordance with the provision of section 2 of this

Act: *Provided*, That no regulation affecting individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations displaced by activities of the Redevelopment Land Agency of the District of Columbia, shall be promulgated which will conflict with regulations of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Sec. 8. Appropriations to carry out the purposes of this Act are hereby authorized, and there are hereby authorized to be expended from the appropriations payable from the funds and account specified in section 3 of this Act, for carrying out the purposes of this Act, such currently appropriated sums as may not otherwise be obligated.

Sec. 9. This Act shall take effect sixty days after the date of its approval.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 652), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The purposes of the bill are: (1) To authorize appropriation of District of Columbia funds for furnishing relocation services to individuals, families, businesses, and nonprofit organizations displaced by District governmental activities; (2) to authorize payment of relocation costs to those whose property is acquired by the District of Columbia for construction of highways, buildings, or other public works projects in amounts not to exceed $200 per individual or family, and $3,000 per business or nonprofit organization, unless in the latter case a greater amount of actual moving expense is certified; and (3) to authorize the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency and the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into agreements with respect to furnishing relocation services.

Each year many individuals, families and businesses, and some nonprofit organizations are displaced by actions of the District of Columbia government. These actions include condemnation of unsafe and insanitary buildings, enforcement of housing regulations, highway construction, and acquisition of property for District of Columbia buildings and facilities. No payment of relocation costs is presently authorized for those displaced by any of these governmental activities. The Department of Public Welfare provides limited relocation services for people displaced by governmental and private action. These services include referral to available accommodations which are listed as being in compliance with housing regulations.

The bill provides for payment of relocation costs to displacees only in the case of acquisition of property for construction of highways, buildings, and other public works. However, the bill will also provide expanded and more effective relocation services for displacees resulting from condemnation of unsafe and insanitary buildings, enforcement of housing regulations, and acquisition of property for highway and building construction and other public works.

On October 23, 1962, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962 (Public Law 87–866) was approved. Section 5 of this act amends chapter 1 of title 23 of the United States Code to provide that the Secretary of Commerce may approve for reimbursement, as part of the cost of construction of a project on any of the Federal-aid highway systems, relocation payments made by any State (including the District of Columbia). Reimbursement to the States is limited to $200 per individual or family and $3,000 per business or nonprofit organization. Presently, therefore, it is necessary for the District of Columbia to be authorized by Congress to make relocation payments in order for the District government to receive reimbursement from the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to the Highway Act. This bill will provide that authorization.

In addition to providing the District of Columbia with the necessary authority to bring it under the provisions of the Federal Highway Act, the bill, as amended, also extends the $200 relocation payment to all individuals and families displaced by a District of Columbia public works project. In those instances where a business is displaced by public works projects, the bill authorizes the District Commissioners to pay relocation expenses up to $3,000 unless there is a certification that the actual moving expenses are in excess of that amount. In that event, the bill provides the District Commissioners authority to make regulations that will establish, from time to time, the limitation on actual moving expenses over $3,000 which will be paid by the District to business concerns. However, there is no provision in the bill for a maximum dollar limitation.

The relocation payment authority that would be granted the District government under this bill, as amended, is similar to the relocation payment authority contained in the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1546) as amended. Under the provisions of the Housing Act, the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency and other urban renewal agencies of our major cities have been authorized to make relocation payments to families and businesses displaced from urban renewal project areas. Section 106(f)(2) of the Housing Act provides for relocation payments not to exceed $200 per family and $3,000 per business, unless, in the case of a business, a greater amount of actual moving expense is certified. The Housing and Home Finance Agency, through regulation, has established $25,000 as the maximum actual moving expense which will be paid by the Federal Government to a business concern.

Sections 1 and 2 of the bill provide for the furnishing of relocation services, and making of housing surveys, and the making of relocation payments to those displaced by actions of the District government. Moving expenses are provided for in cases of acquisition for public works projects but not in cases of housing code enforcement or condemnation actions involving unsafe or insanitary buildings.

Section 3 provides that the cost of the relocation services, housing surveys, and moving expenses will be charged to the District general and special funds as appropriate.

Recent studies indicate that the relocation services furnished by the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency cost approximately $88 per individual, family, or business, with moving expenses averaging $62 per individual or family and business moving expenses averaging $2,400. It is estimated that 1,799 families and 47 businesses will be displaced by District governmental action in fiscal year 1964, 455 of the families by housing code enforcement and condemnation of unsafe or insanitary buildings. If comparable displacement services were furnished to this number of families and businesses, the cost to the District would be approximately $162,488 for individual, family, and business relocation services, $83,328 for family moving expenses, and $112,800 for business moving expenses, for a total of $358,576.

Section 4 of the bill provides that the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia must satisfy themselves that housing is available for those to be displaced by any District public works program prior to acquiring the real property required for such program.

Section 5 authorizes the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Redevelopment Land Agency to enter into agreements for the furnishing of relocation services on a reimbursable basis. The purpose of this section is to permit the centralization of relocation services in either the District government or the Redevelopment Land Agency, with a resulting increase in efficiency.

Section 6 provides that nothing in the legislation, except section 5, shall be construed as modifying any provision of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945.

Section 7, as amended, authorizes the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to carry out the purposes of the legislation, including regulations to establish the maximum certified actual moving expense in excess of $3,000 which will be paid to a displaced business or nonprofit organization. This section also insures that the Board of Commissioners will not promulgate regulations affecting urban renewal displacees which may conflict with regulations of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Section 8 authorizes appropriations to carry out the purposes of the bill, and, in addition, grants authority for the use of currently appropriated funds.

Section 9 provides that the effective date of the legislation shall be 60 days after its approval.

The Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs held a public hearing on this bill on September 12, 1963, at which time representatives of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, and other organizations, appeared and testified in favor of the bill. The committee also received a letter from the Housing and Home Finance Agency favoring enactment of this legislation.

The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia strongly recommends the enactment of this bill and estimates that the additional expense to the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1964, occasioned by its passage, will be $358,576.

UNCLAIMED MONEYS HELD IN TRUST BY DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT

The bill (S. 2054) to eliminate the maintenance by the District of Columbia of perpetual accounts for unclaimed moneys held in trust by the government of the District of Columbia was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in any case in which any money has been held in trust for, or for the account of, any person by the government of the District of Columbia pursuant to statute or otherwise, and no communication, in writing or otherwise as indicated by a written memorandum, has been received by the government of the District of Columbia concerning such money from the person entitled thereto, for a period of not less than ten years, the Commissioners shall send notice by registered or certified mail to the last known address of the person for whom such money is being held. Such mailed notice shall contain a statement that money is being held for such person and if no written claim for the return thereof is submitted to the Commissioners within sixty days of the date such notice is mailed, any future claim therefor will, subject to the provisions of section 2 of this Act, be forever barred.

SEC. 2. (a) Not less than sixty days after the mailing of any notice pursuant to the first section of this Act the Commissioners shall publish notice once each week for two successive weeks in a newspaper of general circulation in the District of Columbia. Such published notice shall be entitled "Notice of Names of Persons Appearing to be Owners of Unclaimed Money Held by the District of Columbia" and shall contain:

(1) The names and the last known addresses, if any, of the persons for whom moneys are being held (listed in alphabetical order of their surnames).

(2) A statement setting forth the substance of subsection (b) of this section.

(b) If no written claim for the return of any such money is submitted to the Commissioners by the date specified in the published notices, which date shall be not less than ninety days from the date of publication of the second notice, such money shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia and all claims for such money shall be forever barred.

SEC. 3. In any case where any money held in trust by the government of the District of Columbia for the period of time and under the same circumstances as specified in the first section of this Act is in an amount less than the cost, as estimated by the Commissioners, of giving notice as required by the first two sections of this Act, such money may be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia without the necessity of complying with the notice requirements of sections 1 and 2 hereof, and after such deposit all claims for such money shall be forever barred.

SEC. 4. Upon the return of any money deposited with the government of the District of Columbia to the person making such deposit after notice has been given such person pursuant to this Act, the Commissioners are authorized to deduct from such returned money the costs of mailing and publishing notices required by this Act, and shall deposit the amount so deducted in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 5. As used in this Act, the word "Commissioners" means the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 653), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2054) to eliminate the maintenance by the District of Columbia of perpetual accounts for unclaimed moneys held in trust by the government of the District of Columbia, after full consideration, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of this bill is to provide procedures whereby the District of Columbia government can be relieved after a period of years of the administrative burden of maintaining unclaimed accounts of money that have been deposited in trust with an agency or department of the District government.

Examples of such unclaimed accounts are moneys received from inmates of the Department of Corrections, juvenile court, patients coming under the jurisdiction of the Department of Public Health and the Department of Public Welfare, and money on deposit in the motor vehicle owners' and operators' financial responsibility fund. The bulk of these acounts are for small amounts averaging less than $20 per account.

Under the terms of the bill, it is provided that after 10 years from the date of deposit of the money with the District government, or after 10 years from the date of the last communication received about such deposit, the money will be transferred to the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia, and all claims shall be forever barred where the persons entitled to the return of such money have failed to submit a written claim for such return after having been afforded notice by registered or certified mail, and newspaper publication of their right of reclaim.

The bill also provides that the costs incident to notification by mail and publication would be deducted from any amount claimed by a depositor. In instances of where the costs of notification exceed the amount on deposit, then notification would not be required and the amount could be immediately transferred to the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia.

The committee has been advised that more than 1,000 accounts could be closed out by enactment of this legislation. The actual saving to the District in terms of man-hours and space is difficult to estimate, but according to District officials it would be substantial.

Public hearings were held on the bill by the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee on September 13, 1963, at which time representatives of the Commissioners for the District of Columbia appeared and testified in support of the bill. No one appeared in opposition to the legislation.

INCREASED FEE FOR LEARNER'S PERMITS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 1964) to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, to increase the fee charged for learner's permits was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a)(2) of section 7 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925 (43 Stat. 1119), as amended (62 Stat. 173; 68 Stat. 732; 76 Stat. 710; sec. 40-301 (a)(2), D.C. Code, 1961 edition), be amended by striking "$2" and inserting in lieu thereof "$5".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 654), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of this bill is to amend existing law so as to provide authority to increase from $2 to $5, the fee charged for a District of Columbia learner's driver permit.

The additional money derived from such fee increase will enable the District government to expand its driver education program, and thereby afford many more youthful motorists an opportunity to participate in the program.

A driver-education program has been conducted in the District schools on a limited basis for more than 10 years and has been demonstrated to be of dramatic effect with respect to driver safety. Evidence of driver education effectiveness is reflected in the response of the Nation's insurance companies which offer reduced premium rates on automobile insurance for those families where the male teenager has satisfactorily completed a qualified driver education course in comparison to the rates charged such families where the teenager has not completed such a course. The committee was informed that studies disclose drivers between the ages of 15 and 19 years are among those having the worst driving records in the Nation as a whole. However, those in this same age group who have had the benefit of driver education courses, have been found to be involved in approximately 50 percent fewer accidents resulting in deaths or injuries.

At present, the District's program provides specialized driver education for about 1,700 young motorists annually on a budget of $98,000 (which funds are taken from the regular school budget). If the proposed fee increase is approved, an additional $136,600 is expected to be made available to enable expansion of the program so as to provide driver education for an approximate total of 5,040 students annually. The additional funds would allow an increase in the driver education teaching staff so that the program can be carried on throughout most of the week, including Saturdays, after school hours, and throughout the summer vacation months.

The District's driver education program conducted by the schools includes not only onstreet driver training, but classroom instruction as well. Instruction is given only by qualified teachers who must meet the same standards required of other high school teachers in the District. The expanded program is expected to offer driver education to students attending nonpublic as well as public high schools. Approximately 5,500 senior grade students are enrolled in the city's public and nonpublic high schools. All driver education classes are to continue to be conducted in District public schools by public school teachers. The program is expected to reach nearly 100 percent of the high school seniors enrolled in the District.

Driver education programs are receiving increasing acceptance throughout the Nation. At least 21 States now provide some form of financial aid for driver education programs. However, the method of providing financial assistance varies. In some States, assistance is through money appropriated from the general fund, while other States use money obtained from learners' license fees as well as from annual operators' license fees. The committee was informed that at the present time, there are 16 States that charge $2 or more for a learner's permit fee. Just recently the State of Maryland increased its learner's permit fee to $5 in order to finance its driver educational program.

In the last Congress, the District of Columbia learner's permit fee was increased from $1 to the current $2 charge in order to provide a source for funds to expand the city's public education program for traffic safety. The traffic safety education program, which is directed at the general public, now operates on a budget of about $63,400 annually.

Driver education, in the view of the District Commissioners, is a most important aspect of the District's overall attempt to reduce the number of automobile accidents which each day grow more costly in terms of lives and property. The benefits to be gained by expanding the current program are quite clear. The method of providing the additional revenue, the Commissioners believe, is a most equitable one. It may be noted that the Department of Motor Vehicles reports that approximately 70 percent of the 40,000 persons who each year apply for learners' permits are school-age youths. The District of Columbia Commissioners are of the view that such a program, directed at those youngsters who are just beginning their careers as motorists, will have a far-reaching beneficial effect for on-road safety of the people of the District of Columbia and the Washington metropolitan area.

On September 13, 1963, public hearings were held on the bill by the Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs. Representatives of the Board of Commissioners for the District of Columbia, the American Automobile Association, and the District of Columbia Trucking Association appeared at the hearing and testified in support of the bill. Also the Director of the District of Columbia Department of Motor Vehicles appeared and testified in support of the measure. The committee was also advised that the Superintendent of the District of Columbia Schools strongly endorses enactment of the bill.

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO D.C. TRANSIT SYSTEM, INC.

The bill (S. 1533) to amend the Act of July 24, 1956, granting a franchise to D.C. Transit System, Inc., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That part 1, title I of the Act entitled "An Act to grant a franchise to D.C. Transit System, Inc., and for other purposes", approved July 24, 1956, is amended by striking therefrom "Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia", and inserting in lieu thereof "Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 655), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of this bill is to amend existing law (act of July 24, 1956) so as to permit the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission, in lieu of the District of Columbia Public Utilities Commission, to make an annual determination of D.C. Transit System's net operating income and to certify the same to the District of Columbia Commissioners for the purpose of computing exemptions from the motor vehicle fuel and real estate tax. Under the terms of D.C. Transit's franchise, the transit company is exempt from payment of these taxes to the District of Columbia, to the extent its net earnings are less than 6½ percent of gross operating revenues.

The Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission was created by an interstate compact between Maryland, Virginia, and the District, and approved by Congress September 15, 1960 (Public Law 86–794), to regulate mass transportation within the Washington metropolitan area. With the exception of the fuel and real estate tax exemption certification, the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission has assumed all the regulatory functions that were originally performed by the District of Columbia Public Utilities Commission, whose authority to carry on this audit function was granted to the Public Utilities Commission in 1956 at the time D.C. Transit System, Inc., was granted a franchise to operate a public transportation system in the District of Columbia.

Subsequently, the Congress, in enacting legislation relating to school fare subsidization to transit companies transporting school children within the District of Columbia (Public Law 87–507), imposed upon the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission the audit function of certifying to the District of Columbia Commissioners annually the earnings of transit companies for purposes of computing school fare subsidies. Basically, this audit process is comparable to that used in arriving at a certification to the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners required by fuel and real estate tax computations. Thus, under existing law both the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission and the District of Columbia Public Utilities Commission are required to make separate, yet duplicating audits. Enactment of this bill would eliminate such duplication and provide the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission with authority to make certification of the net operating income of D.C. Transit System, Inc., on the basis of data acquired through its overall regulatory operations and functions.

Under terms of the interstate compact creating the Transit Commission, the District of Columbia, the State of Virginia, and the State of Maryland each have one member. The committee was informed that this compact provides that the District of Columbia member retains a veto authority over all matters relating solely to the District of Columbia. It is the committee's view that this net operating income certification would affect solely the District of Columbia, therefor requiring concurrence of the District of Columbia representative on the Transit Commission. The committee believes that enactment of this bill will in no way impair the continuing best interests of the District of Columbia, and for this reason the District will continue to be adequately considered and protected.

On September 12, 1963, public hearings were held on the bill by the Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs, at which time the Board of Commissioners for the District of Columbia recommended enactment of the bill. Also, the Executive Director of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission appeared and supported enactment of the measure. The District of Columbia Public Utilities Commission opposed passage of this legislation.

The passage of this legislation will involve no additional expense to the District of Columbia government.

JUNIOR COLLEGE DIVISION WITHIN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS COLLEGE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1406) to authorize the establishment of a Junior College Division within the District of Columbia Teachers College which had been reported from the Committee on District of Columbia, with amendments, on page 2, after line 2, to strike out:

SEC. 2. (a) The Board of Education of the District of Columbia, with the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, is authorized to establish and determine, from time to time, tuition rates for students at the District of Columbia Teachers College, including the Junior College Division thereof: *Provided,* That all moneys received for tuition payments shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the general revenues of the District of Columbia.

At the beginning of line 12, to insert "Sec."; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "(b)" and insert "2"; on page 3, after line 5, to insert:

SEC. 4. (a) Section 2(c) of the District of Columbia Nonresident Tuition Act (Public Law 86–725) is amended by striking "section" and inserting in lieu thereof "Act".

(b) Section 7 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of this Act, the Board of Education is authorized in its discretion to require the payment of tuition for attendance at the District of Columbia Teachers College or the Junior College Division thereof by any student for whom tuitions is not, by such section 2, required to be paid. The said Board, with the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, shall from time to time establish and determine the rates of tuition to be charged pursuant to this section."

After line 18, to insert:

SEC. 5. This Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Junior College Act".

And, at the beginning of line 21, to strike out "Sec. 4" and insert "Sec. 6"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Board of Education of the District of Columbia is hereby authorized to establish a Junior College Division within the District of Columbia Teachers College which shall offer (1) a two-year program leading to the degree of associate in arts, which degree is hereby authorized to be granted upon certification by the president and faculty of the District of Columbia Teachers College that all requirements for the granting of such degree have been met, and (2) technical and vocational courses at the college level, for which certificates of completion may be granted.

SEC. 2. The Board of Education of the District of Columbia, with the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, is hereby authorized to establish and determine, from time to time, fees to be paid by students at the District of Columbia Teachers College, including the Junior College Division thereof, and receipts from such fees shall be deposited into a revolving fund to be known as "District of Columbia Teachers College student fund" in a private depository in the District of Columbia, which fund shall be available, without fiscal year limitation, for such purposes as the Board of Education of the District of Columbia shall approve, and the Board of Education is authorized, with the approval of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, to make all necessary rules concerning deposits into, and withdrawals from, such fund.

SEC. 3. The Board of Education of the District of Columbia is authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 4. (a) Section 2(c) of the District of Columbia Nonresident Tuition Act (Public Law 86–725) is amended by striking "section" and inserting in lieu thereof "Act".

(b) Section 7 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of this Act, the Board of Education is authorized in its discretion to require the payment of tuition for attendance at the District of Columbia Teachers College or the Junior College Division thereof by any student for whom tuition is not, by such section 2, required to be paid. The said Board, with the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, shall from time to time establish and determine the rates of tuition to be charged pursuant to this section."

SEC. 5. This Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Junior College Act".

SEC. 6. This Act shall take effect the first day of July following its approval.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 656), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of this bill is to authorize the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to establish a junior college division of the District of Columbia Teachers College, with a 2-year program of general preprofessional and terminal education by leading to the degree of associate in arts.

The purpose of the amendments is to make it clear that, in fixing tuition rates for students at the District of Columbia Teachers College, including the junior college division thereof, the District of Columbia is not precluded from fixing rates for residents different from rates for nonresidents, and to preserve the authority now in the District of Columbia Nonresident Tuition Act (Public Law 80–725).

The bill would also authorize the Board of Education of the District of Columba to—

"(1) Set fees for students attending the District of Columbia Teachers College, including the junior college division, with the approval of the Board of Commissioners, which fees shall be deposited in a revolving fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation for expenditure for purposes authorized by the Board of Education;

"(2) Make all necessary rules covering the deposits and withdrawals from the revolving fund; and

"(3) Promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the bill."

The bill would preserve the authority contained in existing law to charge nonresident students tuition when they attend the public schools of the District.

The Commissioner's report on the bill indicates that the proposed junior college would use Teachers College faculty, administrative personnel, and physical facilities, and for the most part, the curriculum would serve the two groups of students jointly. It is estimated that the junior college division would serve approximately 175 to 200 District public school graduates who are capable of college level work but do not have the financial resources to obtain a college education; and serve approximately 200 to 250 high school graduates who are capable of some education at the college level.

The Commissioners also report that an additional appropriation of $40,000 would probably be required for the first year, $20,000 the second year, and $40,000 the third year for additional teachers and other expenses. These costs are due entirely to anticipated increases in enrollment.

Similar bills passed the Senate in the 86th and 87th Congresses, but failed of enactment in the House of Representatives.

Hearings upon the bill were held October 8, 1963, at which time testimony was taken from the representatives of the Board of Commissioners, the Board of Education, the Superintendent of Schools, the acting dean of instruction, District of Columbia Teachers College, District of Columbia Congress of Parents and Teachers, District of Columbia Federation of Civic Associations, Local 6, American Federation of Teachers, and the District of Columbia Education Association, all of whom favored enactment of the measure.

The bill was introduced at the request of the Board of Commissioners.

AMENDMENT TO ACT RELATING TO DEVISES AND BEQUESTS BY WILL

The bill (H.R. 3190) to amend the act of March 3, 1901, relating to devises and bequests by will was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 657), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of this bill is to amend existing law (act of March 3, 1901), relating to devises and bequests by will, so as to authorize a testator, by the terms of his will, to "pour over" or add properties passing under his will to existing inter vivos trusts or testamentary trusts.

The effect of the legislation will be to implement into statutory form the present common law of the District of Columbia, which it is believed already permits such transfers to be made.

The committee was informed, despite the lack of specific statutory authority, these so-called pour over-trusts are being established in the District of Columbia at the present time by testamentary devises and bequests. It appears that some attorneys in the probate field believe the common law in the District does permit such testamentary devises and bequests. Although this view is shared by some, there are others who are hesitant to use the "pour over" testamentary devise without a specific statute making provision for its use. The enactment of this bill will remove all doubt in the matter and permit the testator and persons acting in his behalf to act with certainty in establishing such trusts.

The "pour over" trust is a desirable procedure for the distribution of property as it provides for increased flexibility in making a devise or bequest. The proposed legislation, as in the case of much of the other testamentary law for the District, follows closely the Maryland statute of the subject. The similar Maryland provisions are to be found in article 93, section 350A and 350B of the Maryland Code adopted by L. 1959, chapter 612.

The Judiciary Subcommittee of the committee held public hearings on the bill on April 9, 1963, at which time representatives of the Board of Commissioners and the Bar Association of the District of Columbia appeared and expressed their support for enactment of the legislation. The Register of Wills for the District of Columbia has also indicated to the committee his approval of the bill. No objection to the bill was expressed at the hearings and no adverse comments have been received by the committee in connection therewith.

Similar legislation validating "pour over" trusts has already been adopted by 36 States, as follows:

Alabama
Arizona
Colorado
Connecticut
Delaware
Florida
Idaho
Illinois
Indiana
Maine
Maryland
Michigan
Minnesota
Mississippi
Montana
Nebraska
New Hampshire
New Jersey
North Carolina
North Dakota
Ohio
Oklahoma
Oregon
Pennsylvania
Rhode Island
South Carolina
South Dakota
Tennessee
Texas
Utah
Vermont
Virginia
Washington
West Virginia
Wisconsin
Wyoming

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

The first section of the bill adds a new section to the act of March 3, 1901, as amended, which new section will become section 1628a.

Paragraph (a) provides that a devise or bequest may be made by a testator to an inter vivos trust which is in existence at the time the testator executes his will. It further provides that the testator need not be the person who established the trust, the trust may be an unfunded life insurance trust (the corpus of which consists solely of the trustee being designated the beneficiary of certain life insurance policies on the life of the grantor of the trust), the trust may be subject to modification or termination at any time, and the trust need not be executed in the manner required by law for the execution of wills.

Subsection (1) of paragraph (a) provides further that, in the absence of contrary provisions in the will, the devise or bequest shall not be invalid even if the trust is amended after the will is executed, except that amendments occurring after the testator's death shall be ineffective as to the devise or bequest.

Subsection (2) of paragraph (a) provides that the property passing under the devise or bequest shall become part of the assets of the trust and shall not be held as a separate trust.

Subsection (3) of paragraph (a) provides that if the trust is revoked before the testator's death, the devise or bequest shall be invalid.

Subsection (4) of paragraph (a) provides that if the trust should terminate for some reason other than its revocation, the devise or bequest shall not be invalid. The effect of this provision is to permit the distribution of the property covered by the devise or bequest to the persons who were entitled to distribution of the trust corpus at its termination, in the event that the testator neglected to change his will after termination of the trust.

Paragraph (b) of section (1) provides that a devise or bequest may be made by a testator to a trust under the will of another person, if the other person dies before the testator's death and if the other person's will, which establishes a trust, is admitted to probate.

Subsection (1) of said paragraph (b) provides that, in the absence of contrary provisions in the testator's will, the property passing under the devise or bequest shall become part of the assets of the testamentary trust and shall not be held as a separate trust.

The concluding paragraph of section 1 provides that it shall apply to any devise or bequest made by testator living on the effective date of the act, or born thereafter, without regard to the date to the execution of his will or of an inter vivos trust, and provides further that the provisions of the proposed legislation shall not cast doubt upon the validity of the use of the "pour over" device by testators who died before the effective date of the proposed legislation or any devise or bequest which does not come within the legislative provisions.

Section 2 of the bill repeals inconsistent law.

Section 3 of the bill provides that the act shall become effective upon the date of its enactment.

HORIZONTAL PROPERTY REGIMES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 638, H.R. 4276, and that the bill be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 4276) to provide for the creation of horizontal property regimes in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act, including the following table of contents, may be cited as the "Horizontal Property Act of the District of Columbia".

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Definitions.
Sec. 3. Horizontal property regimes.
Sec. 4. Status of condominium units within a horizontal property regime.
Sec. 5. Joint tenancies, tenancies in common, tenancies by the entirety.
Sec. 6. Ownership of condominium units, of common elements; declaration; voting; individual unit deeds.
Sec. 7. Indivisibility of common elements; limitation upon partition.
Sec. 8. Use of elements held in common, right to repair common elements.
Sec. 9. Condominium subdivision.
Sec. 10. Reference to plat.
Sec. 11. Termination and waiver of regime.
Sec. 12. Merger no bar to reconstitution.
Sec. 13. Bylaws, availability for examination.
Sec. 14. Necessary contents of bylaws; modification of system.
Sec. 15. Books of receipts and expenditures; availability for examination.
Sec. 16. Common profits, contributions for payment of common expenses of administration and maintenance.
Sec. 17. Priority of liens.
Sec. 18. Joint and several liability of purchaser and seller for amounts owing under section 16; purchaser's recovery, purchaser's or lender's right to a statement setting forth amount due.
Sec. 19. Supplementary method of enforcement of lien.
Sec. 20. Insuring building against risks; individual rights of co-owners.
Sec. 21. Application of insurance proceeds to reconstruction; prorata distribution in certain cases; rules governing.
Sec. 22. Sharing of reconstruction cost where building is not insured or insurance indemnity is insufficient.
Sec. 23. Separate taxation.
Sec. 24. Actions; right to separate release of judgment.
Sec. 25. Mechanics' and materialmen's liens, enforcement thereof; removal from lien; effect of part payment.
Sec. 26. Nonapplication of rule against perpetuities and of rule against unreasonable restraints on alienation to horizontal property regimes.
Sec. 27. Supplement of existing code provisions.
Sec. 28. Regulations of the Board of Commissioners and the zoning commission.
Sec. 29. Interpretation.
Sec. 30. Supplemental provisions relating to sewer and water services.
Sec. 31. Authority of Board of Commissioners under Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952.
Sec. 32. Severability.
Sec. 33. Effective date.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.—Unless it is plainly evident from the context that a different meaning is intended, as used herein—

(a) "Unit" or "condominium unit" means an enclosed space, consisting of one or more rooms, occupying all or part of a floor in buildings of one or more floors or stories regardless of whether it be designed for residence, for office, for the operation of any industry or business, or for any other type of independent use, and shall include such accessory units as may be appended thereto, such as garage space, storage space, balcony, terrace or patio: *Provided*, That said unit has a direct exit to a thoroughfare or to a given common space leading to a thoroughfare.

(b) "Condominium" means the ownership of single units in a multiunit structure with common elements.

(c) "Condominium project" means a real estate condominium project; a plan or project whereby five or more apartments, rooms, office spaces, or other units in existing or proposed buildings or structures are offered or proposed to be offered for sale.

(d) "Co-owner" means a person, persons, corporation, trust, or other legal entity, or any combination thereof, that owns a condominium unit within the building.

(e) "Council of co-owners" means the co-owners as defined in subsection (d) of this section, acting as a group in accordance with the provisions of this Act and the bylaws and declaration established thereunder; and a majority, as defined in subsection (k) of this section, shall, except as otherwise provided in this Act, constitute a quorum for the adoption of decisions.

(f) "General common elements" except as otherwise provided in the plat of condominium subdivision, means and includes—

(1) the land on which the building stands in fee simple or leased provided that the leasehold interest of each unit is separable from the leasehold interests of the other units;

(2) the foundations, main walls, roofs, halls, columns, girders, beams, supports, corridors, fire escapes, lobbies, stairways, and entrance and exist or communication ways;

(3) the basements, flat roofs, yards and gardens except as otherwise provided or stipulated;

(4) the premises for lodging of janitors or persons in charge of the building, except as otherwise provided or stipulated;

(5) the compartments or installations of central services such as power, light, gas, cold and hot water, heating, central air conditioning or central refrigeration, swimming pools, reservoirs, water tanks and pumps, and the like;

(6) the elevators, garbage and trash incinerators and, in general, all devices or installations existing for common use; and

(7) all other elements of the building rationally of common use or necessary to its existence, upkeep, and safety.

(g) "Limited common elements" means and includes those common elements which are agreed upon by all the co-owners to be reserved for the use of a certain number of condominium units, such as special corridors, stairways, and elevators, sanitary services common to the apartments of a particular floor, and the like.

(h) "Majority of co-owners", "two-thirds of the co-owners", and "three-fourths of the co-owners" mean, respectively, 51, 66⅔, and 75 per centum or more of the votes of the co-owners computed in accordance with their percentage interests as established under section 6 of this Act.

(i) "Plat of condominium subdivision" means the plat of the surveyor of the District of Columbia establishing the condominium units, accessory units, general common elements, and limited common elements.

(j) "Person" means a natural individual, corporation, trustee, or other legal entity or any combination thereof.

(k) "Developer" means a person that undertakes to develop a real estate condominium project.

(l) "Property" means and includes the lands whether leasehold, if separable as defined in (f)(1) of this section, or in fee simple, the building, all improvements and structures thereon, and all easements, rights, and appurtenances thereunto belonging.

(m) "To record" means to record in accordance with the provisions of section 499 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1189, 1268).

(n) "Common expenses" means and includes—

(1) all sums lawfully assessed against the unit owners by the council of co-owners;

(2) expenses of administration, maintenance, repair, or replacement of the common areas and facilities, including repair and replacement funds as may be established;

(3) expenses agreed upon as common expenses by the council of co-owners;

(4) expenses declared common expenses by the provisions of this Act or by the bylaws.

(o) "Common profits" means the balance of all income, rents, profits, and revenues from the common areas and facilities remaining after deduction of the common expenses.

(p) All words used herein include the masculine, feminine, and neuter genders and include the singular or plural numbers, as the case may be.

SEC. 3. HORIZONTAL PROPERTY REGIMES.—Whenever the owners or the co-owners of any square or lot shall subdivide the same into a condominium project in conformity with section 9 of this Act with a plat of condominium subdivision there shall be established a horizontal property regime.

SEC. 4. STATUS OF CONDOMINIUM UNITS WITHIN A HORIZONTAL PROPERTY REGIME.—Once the property is subdivided into the horizontal property regime, a condominium unit in the building may be individually conveyed, leased, and encumbered and may be inherited or devised by will, as if it were sole and entirely independent of the other condominium units in the building of which it forms a part; the said separate units shall have the same incidents as real property and the corresponding individual titles and interests therein shall be recordable.

SEC. 5. JOINT TENANCIES, TENANCIES IN COMMON, TENANCIES BY THE ENTIRETY.—Any condominium unit may be held and owned by more than one person as joint tenants, as tenants in common, as tenants by the entirety (in the case of husband and wife), or in any other real property tenancy relationship recognized under the laws of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 6. OWNERSHIP OF CONDOMINIUM UNITS, OF COMMON ELEMENTS; DECLARATION; VOTING; INDIVIDUAL UNIT DEEDS.—(a) A condominium unit owner shall have the exclusive fee simple ownership of his unit and shall have a common right to a share, with the other co-owners, of an undivided fee simple interest in the common elements of the property, equivalent to the percentage representing the value of the unit to the value of the whole property.

(b) Said percentage interest shall not be separated from the unit to which it appertains.

(c) The individual percentages shall be established at the time the horizontal property regime is constituted by the recording among the land records of the District of Columbia, of a declaration setting forth said percentages, shall have a permanent character, and shall not be changed without the acquiescence of the co-owners representing all the condominium units in the building, which said change shall be evidenced by an appropriate amendatory declaration to such effect recorded among the land records of the District of Columbia. Said share interest shall be set forth of record, in the initial individual condominium unit deeds. Said share interests in the common elements shall, nevertheless, be subject to mutual rights of ingress, egress, and regress of use and enjoyment of the other co-owners and a right of entry to officers, agents, and employees of the Government of the United States and the government of the District of Columbia acting in the performance of their official duties.

(d) The said basic value of said undivided common interest shall be fixed for the purposes of this Act and shall not fix the market value of the individual condominium units and undivided share interests and shall not prevent each co-owner from fixing a different circumstantial value to his condominium unit and undivided share interest in the common elements, in all types of acts and contracts.

(e) In addition to the foregoing provisions, the declaration may contain other provisions and attachments relating to the condominium and to the units which are not inconsistent with this Act.

(f) Voting at all meetings of the co-owners shall be on a percentage basis, and the percentage of the vote to which each co-owner is entitled shall be the individual percentage assigned to his unit in the declaration.

(g) Individual condominium unit deeds may make reference to this Act, the condominium subdivision and land subdivision plats referred to in section 10 hereof, the declaration provided for in this section, the bylaws of the council of co-owners, and the deeds may include any further details which the grantor and grantee may deem desirable to set forth consistent with the declaration and this Act.

SEC. 7. INDIVISIBILITY OF COMMON ELEMENTS; LIMITATION UPON PARTITION.—(a) The common elements, both general and limited, shall remain undivided. No unit owner, or any other person, shall bring any action for partition or division of the co-ownership permitted under section 93 and related provisions of the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1203), as amended by the Act of June 30, 1902 (32 Stat. 523, ch. 1329), against any other owner or owners of any interest or interests in the same horizontal property regime so as to terminate the regime.

(b) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed as a limitation on partition by the owners of one or more units in a regime as to the individual ownership of such unit or units without terminating the regime or as to the ownership of property outside the regime: *Provided,* That upon partition of any such individual unit the same shall be sold as an entity and shall not be partitioned in kind.

SEC. 8. USE OF ELEMENTS HELD IN COMMON, RIGHT TO REPAIR COMMON ELEMENTS.—(a) Each co-owner may use the elements held in common in accordance with the purposes for which they are intended, without hindering or encroaching upon the lawful rights of the other co-owners.

(b) The manager, board of directors or of administration, as the case may be, shall have an irrevocable right and an easement to enter units to make repairs to common elements or when repairs reasonably appear to be necessary for public safety or to prevent damage to property other than the unit.

SEC. 9. CONDOMINIUM SUBDIVISION.—(a) Whenever the owner or the co-owners of any square or lot duly subdivided in comformity with section 1581 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1425), or other applicable laws of the District of Columbia, shall deem it necessary to subdivide the same into a condominium project of convenient condominium units for sale and occupancy and means of access for their accommodation, he may cause a plat or plats to be made by the surveyor of the District of Columbia, on which said plats, together, shall be expressed—

(1) the ground dimensions as set forth under such section 1581 and the exterior lengths of all lines of the building;

(2) for each floor of the condominium subdivision, the number or letter, dimensions, and lengths of finished interior surfaces of unit dividing walls of the individual condominium units; the elevations (or average elevation, in case of slight variance) from a fixed known point, of finished floors and of finished ceilings of such condominium units situate upon the same floor, and further expressing the area, the relationship of each unit to the other upon the same floor and their relationship to the common elements upon said floor;

(3) the dimensions and lengths of the interior finished surface of walls, elevations, from said same fixed known point, of the finished floors and of the finished ceilings of the general common elements of the building, and, in proper case, of the limited common elements restricted to a given number of condominium units, expressing which are those units;

(4) any other data necessary for the identification of the individual condominium units and the general and limited common elements.

(b) And said owners or co-owners may certify such condominium subdivisions under their hands and seals in the presence of two credible witnesses, unpon the same plat or on a paper or a parchment attached thereto. And the same shall thereupon be put up, labeled, indexed, and preserved for record and deposit with the office of the surveyor for the District of Columbia in like manner as land subdivisions have been heretofore recorded or in such other books as the said surveyor may prescribe.

SEC. 10. REFERENCE TO PLAT.—When a plat of a condominium project and subdivision shall be so certified, examined, and received, the purchaser of any condominium unit thereof or any person interested therein, may refer to the plat and record for description in the same manner as to squares and lots divided between the Commissioners and the original proprietors and in the same manner as has been heretofore the practice for land subdivisions: *Provided,* That said purchaser or other person interested therein shall also make reference to the plat of land subdivision appearing prior to the establishment of the condominium subdivision thereupon. Any such conveyance of an individual condominium unit shall be deemed to also convey the undivided interest of the owner in the common elements, both general and limited, and of any accessory units, if any, appertaining to said condominium unit without specifically or particularly referring to the same.

SEC. 11. TERMINATION AND WAIVER OF REGIME.—(a) All the co-owners or the sole owner of a building constituted into a horizontal property regime may terminate and waive this regime and regroup or merge the individual and several condominium units with the principal property; such termination and waiver shall be by certification to such effect upon the plat of condominium subdivision establishing the particular horizontal property regime under the hands and seals of the said sole owner or co-owners, in the presence of two credible witnesses, upon the same plat or upon a paper or parchment attached thereto: *Provided,* That the said individual condominium units are unencumbered, or if encumbered, that the creditors in whose behalf the encumbrances are recorded agree to accept as security the undivided interest in the property of the debtor co-owner and said creditors or trustees under duly recorded deeds of trust, shall signify their assent to such termination and waiver upon the aforesaid plat, paper, or parchment: *Provided further,* That should the buildings or other improvements in a condominium project be more than two-thirds destroyed by fire or other disaster, the co-owners of three-fourths of the condominium project may waive and terminate the horizontal property regime and may certify to such termination and waiver: *Provided further,* That if within ninety days of the date of such damage or destruction:

(1) the council of co-owners does not determine to repair, reconstruct or rebuild as provided in sections 21 and 22 of this Act, or,

(2) the insurance indemnity is delivered pro rata to the co-owners in conformity with the provisions of section 21 of this Act and if the co-owners do not terminate and waive the regime in conformity with this section of this Act, then any unit owner or any other person aggrieved thereby may file a petition in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, setting forth under oath such facts as may be necessary to entitle the petitioner to the relief prayed and praying judicial termination of the horizontal property regime. Said petition may be served as provided in section 14(g) of this Act. The court may thereupon lay a rule upon the council of co-owners, unless they shall voluntarily appear and admit the allegations of the petition, to show cause, under oath, on or before the tenth day, exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays, after service of such rule, why the prayers of said petition should not be granted. If no cause be shown against the prayer of the petition by the council of co-owners, or by any one of the co-owners, the court may determine in a summary way whether the facts warrant termination and thereupon the court may decree the particular horizontal property regime terminated.

(b) In the event a horizontal property regime is terminated or waived, the property shall be deemed to be owned in common by the co-owners, and the undivided interest in the property owned in common which shall appertain to each co-owner shall be the percentage of undivided interest previously owned by such co-owner in the common elements in the property as set forth in the declaration under section 6 hereof.

(c) Upon such termination and waiver the provisions of section 10 of this Act shall no longer be applicable and reference to the principal property thereupon, shall be to the plat and record of the prior land subdivision and thereupon the restraint against partition or division of the co-ownership imposed by section 7 of this Act shall no longer apply. In the event of such partition suit the net proceeds shall be divided among all the unit owners, in proportion to their respective undivided ownership of the common elements, after first paying off, out of the respective shares of the unit owners, all liens on the unit of each unit owner. To be valid such termination shall be recorded among the land records of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 12. MERGER NO BAR TO RECONSTITUTION.—The merger provided for in the preceding section shall in no way bar the subsequent constitution of the property into another horizontal property regime whenever so desired and upon observance of the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 13. BYLAWS, AVAILABILITY FOR EXAMINATION.—(a) The administration of every building constituted into a horizontal property regime shall be governed by the bylaws as the council of co-owners may from time to time adopt, which said bylaws together with the declaration, including recorded attachments thereto, referred to in section 6 of this Act shall be available for examination by all the co-owners, their duly authorized attorneys or agents, at convenient hours on working days that shall be set and announced for general knowledge.

(b) A true copy of said bylaws shall be annexed to the declaration referred to in section 6 of this Act and made a part thereof. No modification of or amendment to the bylaws shall be valid unless set forth in an amendment to the declaration and such amendment is duly recorded.

(c) Each unit owner shall comply strictly with the bylaws and with the administrative rules and regulations adopted pursuant thereto, as either of the same may be lawfully amended from time to time. Failure to comply with any of the same shall be ground for an action to recover sums due, for damages or injunctive relief, or both, maintainable by the manager, the administrator, board of directors or of administration, or as specified in the bylaws or in proper case, by an aggrieved unit owner.

Sec. 14. Necessary Contents of Bylaws; Modification of System.—(a) The bylaws must necessarily provide for at least the following:

(1) Form of administration, indicating whether this shall be in charge of an administrator, manager, or of a board of directors, or of administration, or otherwise, and specifying the powers, manner of removal, and, where proper, the compensation thereof.

(2) Method of calling or summoning the co-owners to assemble; that a majority of co-owners is required to adopt decisions, except as otherwise provided in this Act; who is to preside over the meeting and who will keep the minute book wherein the resolutions shall be recorded.

(3) Care, upkeep, and surveillance of the building and its general or limited common elements and services.

(4) Manner of collecting from the co-owners for the payment of common expenses.

(5) Designation, hiring, and dismissal of the personnel necessary for the good working order of the building and for the proper care of the general or limited common elements and to provide services for the building.

(6) Such restrictions on or requirements respecting the use and maintenance of the units and the use of the common elements as are designed to prevent unreasonable interference with the use of the respective units and of the common elements by the several unit owners.

(7) Designation of person authorized to accept service of process in any action relating to two or more units or to the common elements as authorized under section 24 of this Act. Such person must be a resident of and maintain an office in the District of Columbia.

(8) Notice as to the existence or nonexistence of a declaration in trust for the enforcement of the lien for common expenses permitted under section 19 of this Act.

(b) The sole owner of the building, or if there be more than one, the co-owners representing two-thirds of the votes provided for in section 6 of this Act may at any time modify the system of administration, but each one of the particulars set forth in this section shall always be embodied in the bylaws.

Sec. 15. Books of Receipts and Expenditures; Availability for Examination.—The manager, administrator, or the board of directors, or of administration, or other form of administration specified in the bylaws, shall keep books with detailed accounts in chronological order, of the receipts and of the expenditures affecting the building and its administration and specifying the maintenance and repair expenses of the common elements and any other expenses incurred. Both said books and the vouchers accrediting the entries made thereupon shall be available for examination by the co-owners, their duly authorized agents or attorneys, at convenient hours on working days that shall be set and announced for general knowledge. All books and records shall be kept in accordance with good accounting practice and shall be audited at least once a year by an auditor outside the organization.

Sec. 16. Common Profits, Contributions for Payment of Common Expenses of Administration and Maintenance.—(a) The common profits of the property shall be distributed among and the common expenses shall be charged to the unit owners according to the percentages established by section 6 of this Act: *Provided*, That for purposes of the application of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 331), as amended, the council of co-owners shall, in accordance with the provisions of said Act, be regarded as constituting an unincorporated business and shall file returns and pay taxes upon the taxable income derived from the common areas without regard to the "common profits" as defined in this Act.

(b) All co-owners are bound to contribute in accordance with the said percentages toward the expenses of administration and of maintenance and repairs of the general common elements, and, in proper case, of the limited common elements of the building and toward any other expenses lawfully agreed upon by the council of co-owners.

(c) No owner shall be exempt from contributing toward such common expenses by waiver of the use or enjoyment of the common elements both general and limited, or by the abandonment of the condominium unit belong to him.

(d) Said contribution may be determined, levied, and assessed as a lien on the first day of each calendar or fiscal year, and may become and be due and payable in such installments as the bylaws may provide, and said bylaws may further provide that upon default in the payment of any one or more of such installments, the balance of said lien may be accelerated at the option of the manager, board of directors, or of management and be declared due and payable in full.

Sec. 17. Priority of Liens.—The lien determined, levied and assessed in accordance with section 16 of this Act shall have preference over any other assessments, liens, judgments, or charges of whatever nature, except the following:

(a) Real estate taxes, other taxes arising out of or resulting from the ownership, use, or operation of the common areas, special assessments, including, but not limited to, special assessments for sewer mains, water mains, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, alleys, paving of streets, roads and avenues, removal or abatement of nuisances, and special assessments levied in connection with condemnation proceedings instituted by the District of Columbia, and water charges and sanitary sewer service charges levied on the condominium unit, and judgments, liens, preferences, and priorities for any tax assessed against a co-owner by the United States or the District of Columbia or due from or payable by a co-owner to the United States or the District of Columbia, and judgments, liens, preferences, and priorities in favor of the District of Columbia for assessments or charges referred to in this subparagraph.

(b) The liens of any deal of trust, mortgage instruments, or encumbrances duly recorded on the condominium unit prior to the assessment of the lien thereon or duly recorded on said unit after receipt of a written statement from the manager, board of directors, or of management reflecting that payments on said lien were current as of the date of recordation of said deed of trust, mortgage instrument, or encumbrance.

Upon a voluntary sale or conveyance of a condominium unit all unpaid assessments against a grantor co-owner for his pro rata share of the expenses to which section 16 of this Act refers shall first be paid out of the sales price or by the grantee in the order of preference set forth above. Upon an involuntary sale through foreclosure of a deed of trust, mortgage, or encumbrance having preference as set forth in subparagraph (b) of this section a purchaser thereunder shall not be liable for any installments of such lien as became due prior to his acquisition of title. Such arrears shall be deemed common expenses, collectible from all co-owners, including such purchaser.

Sec. 18. Joint and Several Liability of Purchaser and Seller for Amounts Owing Under Section 16; Purchaser's Recovery, Purchaser's or Lender's Right to a Statement Setting Forth Amount Due.—The purchaser of a condominium unit in a voluntary sale shall be jointly and severally liable with the seller for the amounts owing by the latter under section 16 of this Act upon his interest in the condominium unit up to the time of conveyance; without prejudice to the purchaser's right to recover from the other party the amounts paid by him as such joint debtor: *Provided*, That any such purchaser, or a lender under a deed of trust, mortgage, or encumbrance, or parties designated by them, shall be entitled to a statement from the manager, board of directors, or of administration, as the case may be, setting forth the amount of unpaid assessments against the seller or borrower, and the units conveyed or encumbered shall not be subject to a lien for any unpaid assessment in excess of the amount set forth.

Sec. 19. Supplementary Method of Enforcement of Lien.—(a) In addition to proceedings available at law or equity for the enforcement of the lien established by section 16 of this Act, all the owners of property constituted into a horizontal property regime may execute bonds conditioned upon the faithful performance and payment of the installments of the lien permitted by section 16 of this Act and may secure the payment of such obligations by a declaration in trust recorded among the land records of the District of Columbia, granting unto a trustee or trustees appropriate powers to the end that upon default in the performance of such bond, said declaration in trust may be foreclosed by said trustee or trustees, acting at the direction of the manager, board of directors, or of management, as is proper practice in the District of Columbia in foreclosing a deed of trust.

(b) And the bylaws may require in the event such bonds have been executed and such declaration in trust is recorded that any subsequent purchaser of a condominium unit in said horizontal property regime shall take title subject thereto and shall assume such obligations: *Provided*, That the said lien, bond, and declaration in trust shall be subordinate to and a junior lien to liens for real estate taxes and other taxes arising out of or resulting from the ownership, use, or operation of the common areas, liens for special assessments, including, but not limited to, special assessments for sewer mains, water mains, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, alleys, paving of streets, roads and avenues, removal or abatement of nuisances, and special assessments levied in connection with condemnation proceedings instituted by the District of Columbia, and liens for water charges and sanitary sewer service charges levied on the condominium unit, and to judgments, liens, preferences, and priorities for any tax assessed against a co-owner by the United States or the District of Columbia or due from or payable by a co-owner to the United States or the District of Columbia, and to judgments, liens, preferences, and priorities in favor of the District of Columbia for assessments or charges referred to in this section then or thereafter accruing against the unit and to the lien of any duly recorded deeds of trust, mortgages, or encumbrances previously placed upon the unit and said lien, bond, and declaration in trust shall be and become subordinate to any subsequently recorded deeds of trust, mortgages, or encumbrances: *Provided*, That the lender thereunder shall first obtain from the manager, board of directors, or of administration a written statement as provided in section 18 of this Act reflecting that payments due under this lien are current as of the date of recordation of such subsequent deed of trust, mortgage, or encumbrance.

Sec. 20. Insuring Building Against Risks; Individual Rights of Co-owners.—The manager or the board of directors, if required by the bylaws or by a majority of the co-owners, or at the request of a mortgagee having a first mortgage of record covering a unit, shall have the authority to, and shall, obtain insurance for the property against loss or damage by fire and such other hazards under such terms and for such amounts as shall be required or requested. Such insurance coverage shall be written on the property in the name of such manager or of the board of directors of the council of co-owners, as trustee for each of the unit owners in the percentages established in the declaration. Premiums shall be common expenses. Provision for such insurance shall be without prejudice to the right of each unit owner to insure his own unit for his benefit.

Sec. 21. Application of Insurance Proceeds to Reconstruction; Pro Rata Distribution in Certain Cases; Rules Governing.—(a) In case of fire or other disaster the insurance indemnity shall, except as provided in the next succeeding paragraph of this section, be applied to reconstruct the building.

(b) Reconstruction shall not be compulsory where destruction comprises the whole or more than two-thirds of the buildings and other improvements in a condominium project. In such cases, and unless otherwise unanimously agreed upon by the co-owners, the indemnity shall be delivered pro rata to the co-owners entitled to it in accordance with provisions made by the bylaws or in accordance with a decision of three-fourths of the co-owners, if there be no bylaw provision, after first paying off, out of the respective shares of the unit owners, to the extent sufficient for the purpose, all liens on the unit of each co-owner. Should it be proper to proceed with the reconstruction, the provision for such eventuality made in the bylaws shall be observed, or in lieu thereof, the decision of the council of co-owners shall prevail, subject to all provisions of law and regulations of the District of Columbia then in effect.

Sec. 22. Sharing of Reconstruction Cost Where Building Is Not Insured or Insurance Indemnity Is Insufficient.—Where the building is not insured or where the insurance indemnity is insufficient to cover the cost of reconstruction the new building costs shall be paid by all the co-owners in the same proportion as their proportionate ownership of the common elements of the condominium project, and if any one or more of those composing the minority shall refuse to make such payments, the majority may proceed with the reconstruction at the expense of all the co-owners and the share of the resulting common expense may be assessed against all the co-owners and such assessment for this expense shall have the same priority as provided under section 17 of this Act.

Sec. 23. Separate Taxation.—(a) For the purposes of assessment and taxation of property constituted into a horizontal property regime and to conform to the system of numbering squares, lots, blocks, and parcels for taxation purposes in effect in the District of Columbia, each condominium unit duly situate upon a subdivided lot and square shall bear a number or letter that will distinguish it from every other condominium unit situate in said lot and square.

(b) Each of said condominium units shall be carried on the records of the District of Columbia as a separate and distinct entity and all real estate taxes, other taxes arising out of or resulting from the ownership, use, or operation of the common areas, special assessments, including, but not limited to, special assessments for sewer mains, water mains, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, alleys, paving of streets, roads, and avenues, removal or abatement of nuisances, and special assessments levied in connection with condemnation proceedings instituted by the District of Columbia, shall be assessed, levied, and collected against each of said several separate and distinct units in conformity with the percentages of co-ownership established by section 6 of this Act, and in accordance with the provisions of law in effect in the District of Columbia relating to assessment, levying, and collection of real property taxes.

(c) The council of co-owners shall be liable for the filing of returns and payment of the tax on personal property located in the common areas and held for use or used in a trade or business or held for sale or rent.

(d) The title to an individual condominium unit shall not be divested or in anywise affected by the forfeiture or sale of any or all of the other condominium units for delinquent real estate taxes, other taxes arising out of or resulting from the ownership, use, or operation of the common areas, special assessments, including, but not limited to, special assessments for sewer mains, water mains, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, alleys, paving of streets, roads and avenues, removal or abatement of nuisances, special assessments levied in connection with condemnation proceedings instituted by the District of Columbia, or water charges and sanitary sewer service charges: *Provided,* That the real estate taxes, the duly levied share of such other taxes and of such special assessments, and the water and sanitary sewer service charges on or against said individual condominium unit are currently paid.

Sec. 24. Actions; Right to Separate Release of Judgment.—(a) Without limiting the right of any co-owner, actions may be brought on behalf of two or more of the unit owners, as their respective interests may appear, by the manager, or board of directors, or of administration with respect to any cause of action relating to the common elements or more than one unit.

(b) Service of process on two or more unit owners in any action relating to the common elements may be made on the person designated in the bylaws in conformity with section 14(g) of this Act.

(c) In the event of entry of a final judgment as a lien against two or more unit owners, the unit owners of the separate units may remove their unit and their percentage interest in the common elements from the lien thereof by payment of the fractional proportional amounts attributable to each of the units affected. Said individual payment shall be computed by reference to the percentage established pursuant to section 6 of this Act. After such partial payment, partial discharge, or release or other satisfaction, the unit and its percentage interest in the common elements shall thereafter be free and clear of the lien of such judgment.

(d) Such partial payment, satisfaction, or discharge shall not prevent such a judgment creditor from proceeding to enforce his rights against any unit and its percentage interest in the common elements not so paid, satisfied, or discharged.

Sec. 25. Mechanics' and Materialmen's Liens, Enforcement Thereof; Removal From Lien; Effect of Part Payment. (a) Subsequent to establishment of a horizontal property regime as provided in this Act, and while the property remains subject to this Act, no lien shall thereafter arise or be effective against the property. During such period liens or encumbrances shall arise or be created and enforced only against each unit and the percentage of undivided interest in the common areas and facilities appurtenant to such unit in the same manner and under the same conditions in every respect as liens or encumbrances may arise or be created upon or against any other separate parcel or real property subject to individual ownership: *Provided,* That no labor performed or materials furnished with the consent or at the request of a unit owner or his agent or his contractor or subcontractor, shall be the basis for the filing of a lien pursuant to the provisions of section 1237 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1384), against the unit or any other property of any other unit owner not expressly consenting to or requesting the same, except that such express consent shall be deemed to be given by the owner of any unit in the case of emergency repairs thereto. Labor performed or materials furnished for the common areas and facilities, if duly authorized by the council of co-owners, the manager, or board of directors in accordance with this Act, the declaration or bylaws, shall be deemed to be performed or furnished with the express consent of each unit owner and shall be the basis for the filing of a lien pursuant to the provisions of section 1237 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1384), against each of the units and shall be subject to the provisions of subparagraph (b) hereunder. Notice of said lien may be served on the person designated in conformity with section 14(g) of this Act.

(b) In the event of filing of a lien against two or more units and their respective percentage interest in the common elements, the unit owners of the separate units may remove their unit and their percentage interest in the common elements appurtenant thereto from the said lien by payment, or may file a written undertaking with surety approved by the court as provided in section 1254 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1387), of the fractional or proportional amounts attributable to each of the units affected. Said individual payment, or amount of bond, shall be computed by reference to the percentage established pursuant to section 6 of this Act. After such partial payment, filing of bond, partial discharge, or release, or other satisfaction, the unit and its percentage interest in the common elements shall thereafter be free and clear of such lien. Such partial payment, indemnity, satisfaction, or discharge shall not prevent the lienor from proceeding to enforce his rights against any unit and its percentage interest in the common elements not so paid, indemnified, satisfied, or discharged.

Sec. 26. Nonapplication of Rule Against Perpetuities and of Rule Against Unreasonable Restraints on Alienation to Horizontal Property Regimes.—The rule of property known as the rule against perpetuities, and the rule of property known as the rule restricting unreasonable restraints on alienation, sections 1023 and 1025 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a code of laws for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1351, ch. 854), shall not be applied to defeat any of the provisions of this Act, or of any declaration, bylaws, or other document executed in accordance with this Act as to the condominium project. This exemption shall not apply to estates in the individual condominium units.

Sec. 27. Supplement of Existing Code Provisions.—The provisions of this Act shall be in addition to and supplemental to all other provisions of law of the District of Columbia and wheresoever there appears in the provisions the words "square", "lot", "land", "ground", "parcel", "property", "block", or other designation denoting a unit of land, where appropriate to implement this Act, after such descriptive terms, there shall be deemed inserted reference to a condominium unit, condominium subdivision, or horizontal property regime, whichever shall be appropriate to effect the ends and purposes of this Act: *Provided,* That wherever the application of the provisions of this Act conflict with the application of such other provisions, the provisions of law generally applicable to buildings in like use in the District of Columbia shall prevail.

SEC. 28. REGULATIONS OF THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS AND THE ZONING COMMISSION.—In order to bring horizontal property regimes into compliance with the laws and regulations in effect in the District of Columbia, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia are each hereby authorized to adopt and enforce such regulations as either deems proper, within its respective general authority.

SEC. 29. INTERPRETATION.—(a) This Act shall be interpreted in such a manner as to require each condominium unit and each horizontal property regime to be in compliance with all District of Columbia laws and regulations relating to property of like type, whether it be designed for residence, for office, for the operation of any industry or business, or for any other use. The owner of each condominium unit shall be responsible for the compliance of his unit with such laws and regulations, and the council of co-owners and any person designated by them to manage the regime shall be jointly and severally liable for compliance with all such laws and regulations in all matters relating to the common elements of the regime.

(b) Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, the owner of each condominium unit shall have the same responsibility for the payment of all taxes, assessments, and other charges due to the District of Columbia as does any other person or property owner similarly situated.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, the method of enforcement available to the District of Columbia to collect any tax or assessment or any charge from any individual property owner or any building owner shall be available to collect taxes, assessments, and charges from individual condominium unit owners and from the council of co-owners.

(d) Nothing contained in this Act shall in any way be construed as affecting the right to institute and maintain eminent domain proceedings.

SEC. 30. SUPPLEMENTAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO SEWER AND WATER SERVICES.—(a) Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, the developer or co-owners of any horizontal property regime shall have the right to have installed for each and every individual unit a separately metered water service. Such installations shall be subject to all laws and regulations then or thereafter in effect in the District of Columbia. Upon the establishment of such separate water services each unit owner and his successor in title and persons occupying such units shall be responsible for the payment to the District of Columbia of all water and sewer charges rendered and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to enforce any and all of the remedies for collection of such charges as are authorized by law.

(b) A common water service is hereby expressly authorized for any horizontal property regime and in the event that a horizontal property regime is provided with a common water service the charges for sewer and water service shall be billed to the person designated by the co-owners, pursuant to the bylaws, to manage the regime. In the event that the entire sewer and water charges are not paid within the time specified by law for the payment of sewer and water charges, the Commissioners shall be authorized to enforce payment in any manner authorized by law, including, but not limited to, the assessment of an additional charge for late payment, the shutting off of water to the regime and the enforcement of the liens for nonpayment of such charges against the individual units in conformity with the percentage of co-ownership established by section 6 of this Act.

SEC. 31. AUTHORITY OF BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS UNDER REORGANIZATION PLAN NUMBERED 5 OF 1952.—Nothing in this Act or in any amendments made by this Act shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Board of Commissioners or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Board of Commissioners may be delegated by said Board of Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

SEC. 32. SEVERABILITY.—If any provision of this Act, or any section, sentence, clause, phrase, or word or the application thereof, in any circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this Act, and of the application of any such provision, section, sentence, clause, phrase, or word in any other circumstances shall not be affected thereby and to this end, the provisions of this Act are declared severable.

SEC. 33. EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act shall take effect one hundred and twenty days after its enactment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 658), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of this bill is to establish within the District of Columbia a new estate in property, known as condominium, which is defined in the bill as "the ownership of single units in a multiunit structure with common elements."

The purpose of the committee amendment, which is in the nature of substitute language, is to encompass essentially the language of H.R. 4276 as passed by the House, but with the addition of certain technical amendments as well as other revisions. It was felt that these changes were necessary to clarify the obligations of condominium owners with respect to enforcement of laws and regulations of the District of Columbia relating to property, and to adequately safeguard the District government in its enforcement of judgments against the individual unit owners. The revised bill, incorporating the recommended amendments, was agreed to by the District government and representatives of the Washington Board of Realtors, and the District of Columbia Bar Association.

The bill provides for fee simple ownership of a unit in a multiunit structure which may be designed for residence, office, the operation of any industry or business, or other type of use, with its accessory units, all of which is known as the horizontal property regime or condominium projects. In addition to possessing a fee simple ownership of a unit in a multiunit structure, the owner would also have an undivided interest in the public portions of the building, which includes the corridors, stairways, basements, roofs, heating and air-conditioning plants, and all other elements of common use.

Under the bill, persons would be enabled not only to purchase and convey, but to lease and encumber units in a building in the same manner as other real property, and purchasers would be entitled to deeds conveying said units to them along with an undivided share in the common elements of the structure.

The bill provides for the creation of condominium projects which consist of five or more apartments, rooms, office spaces, or other units in existing or proposed buildings, so that they may be offered for sale. Units thereof may consist of one or more floors, regardless of whether the building is designed for residency, office, industry, or business, or any other type of use.

The maintenance of the common elements of the building in a horizontal property regime would be vested in a council of the co-owners, a majority of which would be empowered to make assessments on each unit owner for this purpose.

The bill provides that a plot of the subdivision setting out the units of the regime shall be deposited in the office of the surveyor of the District of Columbia in order to create the condominium project.

The authority of this bill is essential to provide for separate real estate taxation of the individual units and to permit the creation of horizontal subdivision plats. While these primary purposes are being accomplished, the bill also contains detailed authority for the creation of a quasi-corporation to manage the building; to restrain partition; to provide means to levy, collect, and enforce the lien for common expenses; to provide for separate release of the individual units from the liens of judgments or mechanics' liens, all to the end that the ownership of an individual unit will be as similar as possible to the incidents of ownership of an individual home, or business property.

Public hearings were held on the bill on September 25, 1963, by the Subcommittee on the Judiciary. At these hearings the Board of Commissioners, the District of Columbia Bar Association, the Washington Board of Realtors, and the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade endorsed enactment of the bill. In addition, letters and other supporting documents favoring passage of the bill were received from the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Lawyer's Title Insurance Corp., and the Federation of Citizens Associations.

Testimony at the hearing established that condominium has a flexibility which permits individual financing, and an individual purchaser can either pay cash for his unit, obtain a conventional loan, or an FHA-insured loan, and he will have freedom in repaying the loan or in making whatever financial arrangements he desires.

Condominium ownership has advantages over cooperative projects which impose restrictions on resale, whereas there is no such restriction on the resale of a condominium unit. Cooperative projects usually require a downpayment of at least one-third of the cost, whereas under FHA and other financing the downpayment is much less. Cooperatives involve a stock or membership transaction, whereas condominium involves a real estate transaction, and the member of the condominium, when transferring ownership, has freedom in setting the selling price, etc.

The concept of ownership of real estate by condominium was recognized as early as the Code Napoleon of 1812. Legislation similar to the reported bill has been approved in the following jurisdictions: Alaska, Arkansas, Arizona, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Such legislation is also pending in 22 other States.

The committee is of the view that this legislation will enable the District of Columbia to keep abreast of the surrounding jurisdictions in this recent development in property ownership.

Enactment of this bill will involve no additional expense to the District of Columbia government.

TRIBUTE TO RADIO, TELEVISION, AND THE PRESS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, since the advent of broadcasting, particularly television, history and world events have been brought directly to the home of the American public. Never was it done with such dedication, devotion and detail as during the trying four days following the tragedy of the untimely death of President John F. Kennedy.

I would be remiss in my responsibility if I did not take this opportunity—particularly since I speak for all members of the Senate Commerce Committee in this respect—to commend the broadcasters and specifically the major networks for their magnificent, outstanding service in this particular event to the American public. Their programing during this period was truly a service in the public interest. From the moment of the initial bulletin reporting the shooting of the President shortly after noon on Friday, November 22, the American Broadcasting Co., the Columbia Broadcasting Co., and the National Broadcasting Co. mobilized their complete resources for the coverage and reports that continued uninterrupted for a period of 4 days. The remarkable coverage during this period of shock, bewilderment and confusion attests to the skill and maturity of electronic journalism. The coverage was respectful and restrained but yet in full detail.

No announcements have been made by the networks or their affiliates as to the costs from the curtailment of commercials and entertainment shows—I am sure they do not even care to discuss that matter so dedicated were they to this terrible American tragedy—but I would estimate it runs into the millions of dollars.

When one realizes that in the days following the assassination of President Lincoln it took many weeks before the information surrounding the tragedy was fully disseminated, then one can fully appreciate the tremendous accomplishment of the broadcasters in bringing the events to the public in such intimate detail that took place in the past 4 days. Much has been spoken and written about the public service responsibility of the broadcasters and networks but I must state for the record that the excellent performance of recent days brings to them the highest commendations that I can make. There was a truly great contribution to public understanding of the events surrounding this unfortunate tragedy in American history.

I say, "Well done, networks and broadcasters." This was public service programing at its finest.

Mr. President, I could say the same thing about the American press. Our committee has much more to do in the field of communications with broadcasting and electronics communications than directly with the press, but I believe the American press, along with the networks, the broadcasters, and all others involved, did a more extraordinary job for the American people in sustaining them in an hour of great tragedy and bewilderment than in any other time in the history of communications. They should all be commended for their thoroughly outstanding job.

I believe the television angle during these 4 days has been well covered in articles written by an outstanding writer in the field of television and radio, Mr. Lawrence Laurent, and published in the Washington Post; and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two of his articles, one entitled "Kennedy was a Master of the Television Age," dated November 26, 1963—a superb performance regarding the networks and the broadcasters and the press; and one dated November 25, entitled "Coverage Stays at Peak Level."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Washington (D.C.) Post-Times Herald, Nov. 26, 1963]

KENNEDY WAS A MASTER OF THE TELEVISION AGE

(By Lawrence Laurent)

The superb performance by the television networks these recent, sorrow-filled days underscores the importance of the late President Kennedy as the first television President.

He had particular gifts for the newest of the mass media. He enjoyed appearances on television news panels while a Member of the House and Senate. Even before his campaign for the Democratic nomination, Mr. Kennedy had appeared more times on "Meet the Press" than any other person.

Mr. Kennedy had also been a guest on every major television news program.

In Theodore White's book, "The Making of the President," is the story of Mr. Kennedy's long-range plans for a series of televised debates with Mr. Nixon.

After his 1960 election, Mr. Kennedy told Rowland Evans of the New York-Herald Tribune that he could not have been elected without television.

President Eisenhower had permitted film cameras into his news conferences. Mr. Kennedy threw the conferences open, for the first time, to regular, live TV coverage.

Mr. Kennedy made himself available for intimate television interviews with three reporters, one from each of the networks. He permitted, also, documentary film makers to come into his office in the tense days of the desegregation crisis at the University of Alabama.

In September, when CBS shifted from a nightly 15-minute newscast to a 30-minute program, Mr. Kennedy helped with the premiere. There was a special interview with Walter Cronkite.

A week later, NBC began its nightly 30-minute series and, again, the opening show was an interview with the President.

Certainly, no candidate in recent times was better equipped to handle the terrors of the unrehearsed television interview than Mr. Kennedy.

Peggy Whedon of ABC–TV has recalled his visit to the old "College News Conference" for questioning by students.

"Usually," Mrs. Whedon recalled, "a Senator or Cabinet official would walk in with several assistants and a brief case full of documents." The then Senator Kennedy arrived alone, empty handed. With a deep tan, he needed no TV make up.

"The only work our people had to do," Mrs. Whedon added, "was to lend him a comb."

His lean good looks were suited to the harsh demands of the television cameras. His mind—filled with facts and statistics that could be quickly summoned—was the kind that responded quickly and easily to difficult questions.

Always, there was the flashing humor, the gentle quip and the willingness to smile at himself.

He was attuned to this age of insant, electronic communication as the Founding Fathers had mastered the techniques of print and persuasive pamphlets.

He was very much a part of his own time. He met the challenges of electronic communication as he faced the fatal terrors of the 1960's. He belonged to television as he now belongs to the ages.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 25, 1963]

COVERAGE STAYS AT PEAK LEVEL

(By Lawrence Laurent)

The television industry continued its finest performance yesterday, the third day of no commercials or regular entertainment features. The same policy continues today with all stations prepared to resume normal schedules at sign-on time, Tuesday.

Network reporters worked with little sleep, but the weariness rarely showed on camera. The coverage of memorial services for the late President Kennedy was marked by restraint, thoroughness, and the ability to mobilize swiftly for an unexpected news development.

The fatal shooting of Lee Harvey Oswald in Dallas was shown on video tape many times to the Nation's 50 million television homes. Cameras had already been set up in the basement of the Dallas city jail where the shooting took place.

NBC interrupted its Washington coverage to switch to Dallas within 5 minutes of the event. Reporter Tom Pettit, working in the frenzied atmosphere, remained calm and did a solid job of etching in the missing details. In addition to the video tape recording, CBS came up with a superb set of photographs that were in sequence and had the appearance of motion pictures.

The fine coverage is being coordinated by CBS–TV's Art Kane, who came to Washington on Friday from his CSB news post in New York.

In preparing for Sunday and Monday memorial services and the funeral, a CBS construction crew worked in the Saturday rain and completed work at 4 a.m. Sunday. They built eight platforms for pool cameras. Four are near St. Matthew's Cathedral, two at the Capitol, one at Constitution Avenue and 17th Street NW., and one on Henry Bacon Drive, near the Lincoln Memorial.

Additional camera platforms were being built yesterday for the funeral services at Arlington National Cemetery.

One Washington television station manager, who asked that his name not be published, estimated that the 4 days of television would cost the station "about $50,000." The cost takes in operating expenses and the loss of normal revenue.

Other station operators declined to make estimates.

Along with the detailed live coverage, producers had their research teams searching for film and viedo tape cn the President's career. These were used throughout the day and evening.

Television stations also produced panels of experts, called in to discuss implications of the shift from Mr. Kennedy to President Johnson.

Excellence has become routine in the coverage. Particularly outstanding was the work of Roger Mudd of CBS at the rotunda of the Capitol. ABC, in late afternoon, put together commentators Howard K. Smith and Edward P. Morgan for a discussion of the "hate" organizations in the United States. They had a thoughtful, sobering discussion.

Noteworthy, also, has been the sure grasp of news developments by David Brinkley of NBC and Walter Cronkite of CBS.

The scope of the television coverage and its flawless handling of this tragedy should enable every member of broadcasting to stand taller.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, it was a great effort of dedication and tremendous detail and a respectful job that both TV and the press did in covering this American tragedy.

RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now move, under the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 19 minutes, p.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the previous order, until tomorrow, November 27, 1963, at 10 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 85:8: *I will hear what God the Lord will say, for He will speak peace unto His people.*

Almighty God, as we again assemble for prayer in these strange and sad days, we earnestly beseech Thee that we may hear and heed Thy voice speaking peace unto us through Thy holy word, for we penitently acknowledge that we are troubled in spirit, greatly disturbed and apprehensive, and often discouraged as we face the unknown future.

Grant that we may not forget that Thou wert our help in all the far-off yesterdays, drawing us to Thy self by Thy grace and love, giving Thy healing balm to hearts that were bruised and broken, bestowing Thy pardoning grace for our sins and shortcomings, renewing our strength and courage for our heavy duties and responsibilities.

As we go forth into the hours of each new day, may our minds and hearts be blessed with Thy divine spirit, which alone can deliver them from all thoughts and feelings of hatred and violence and remove those antagonisms and antipathies which divide soul from soul. May the President, our Speaker, the Members of Congress, and all our people be drawn together in one high and holy aspiration to know Thy truth and to do Thy will faithfully.

"O Lord, support us all the day long of our troublous life, until the shadows lengthen and the evening comes and the busy world is hushed and the fever of life is over and our work is done. Then in Thy mercy grant us a safe lodging and a holy rest and peace at the last."

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

S. RES. 228

Resolved, That the Senate has learned with profound sorrow and deep regret of the tragic death of the Honorable John Fitzgerald Kennedy, late the President of the United States, and a former Representative and former Senator from the State of Massachusetts.

Resolved, That in recognition of his illustrious statesmanship, his leadership in national and world affairs, and his distinguished public service to his State and the Nation, the Presiding Officer of the Senate appoint a committee, to consist of all the Members of the Senate, to attend the funeral of the late President at noon today.

Resolved, That the Senate hereby tenders its deep sympathy to the members of the family of the late President in their sad bereavement.

Resolved, That the Secretary comunicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the late President.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late President, the Senate do now adjourn.

WORK PLANS UNDER THE WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication; which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., October 31, 1963.

HON JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Agriculture on October 30, 1963, considered the following work plans transmitted to you by executive communication and referred to this committee and unanimously approved each of such plans. The work plans involved are:

STATE, WATERSHED, AND EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

Texas: Big Creek, No. 2571, 87th Congress.

Minnesota: Crooked Creek, No. 1234, 88th Congress.

Colorado: Indian Wash, No. 1899, 87th Congress.

Minnesota: Joe River, No. 1234, 88th Congress.

Arkansas: Mud Creek, No. 1234, 88th Congress.

Tennessee: Thompson Creek, (supplemental), No. 895, 88th Congress.

Tennessee: Weatherford-Bear Creek, No. 1234, 88th Congress.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

A DAY TO BE SET ASIDE LATER TO EULOGIZE OUR LATE PRESIDENT, JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time only to advise the Members that we plan to set aside a full day at a later date on which Members may eulogize our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

STATUS OF THE APPROPRIATION BILLS 88TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a tabulated statement of the appropriation bills for the session, together with a comparison with the budget estimates.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I include down-to-date tabulation of the appropriation bills of the session and corresponding budget requests.

The only remaining regular appropriation business to be reported to the House is the foreign aid bill—still awaiting the necessary authorization legislation—involving budget requests of $4,840,030,000.

$184,869,965 has been cut from the $2,160,472,456 of supplemental budgets in this session for the fiscal year 1963.

As to the main budget, for fiscal 1964, the table discloses four bills signed by the President, disposing of $61,918,577,000 of his budget requests for appropriations. They are Interior, Treasury-Post Office, Labor-HEW, and Defense, and they were cut by $2,229,557,000. And, in the aggregate, they are below comparable appropriations for fiscal 1963 by $339,000,000.

The conference agreement on the legislative bill is pending in the Senate, having been adopted by the House at a figure $13,925,000 below the budget requests but, owing to some nonrecurring construction items, about $18,000,000 above last year.

The agriculture bill is in conference.

The District of Columbia and independent offices bills are awaiting conference.

Three other bills—State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary, the military construction bill, and the public works bill are being processed in the Senate committee.

The House has cut $5,420,333,026 from the $91,817,407,145 of budget requests considered in the 11 regular bills for fiscal 1964 and will substantially increase that aggregate on the foreign aid bill. It now seems a certainty that Congress will conclude the appropriations business with a very substantial cut below the requests and also below last year's appropriations. And we are determined, in collaboration with the other body, to continue to do everything we can to conclude the work as expeditiously as circumstances permit.

No review of the aggregate probability of total appropriations for the session can omit the approximately $12,000,000,000—using a round amount because it does not stand still—of appropriations recurring automatically for fiscal 1964 under permanent law. That is not in the table to follow because it requires no annual action by the Congress. The principal expense is the interest on the national debt, tentively estimated at $10,020,000,000 in the January budget, but more recently figured to approximate $10,500,000,000.

The substantiating details are in the following table:

The appropriation bills, 88th Cong., 1st sess., as of Nov. 26, 1963

[Does not include back-door appropriations or permanent appropriations [1] under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriations bills

Bill No.	Title	House							
		Budget estimates to House	Date and report number	Amount as reported	Amount reported compared with budget estimates	Date passed	Amount as passed	House action compared with—	
								Budget estimates	Amount reported
	1963 SUPPLEMENTALS								
H.J. Res. 284	Supplemental, Agriculture	[2] $508,172,000	Feb. 26 (No. 35)	$508,172,000	------	Feb. 27	$508,172,000	------	------
H.R. 5517	Supplemental	1,641,507,106	Apr. 5 (No. 198)	988,756,506	−$652,750,600	Apr. 10	1,438,691,506	−$202,815,600	+$449,935,000
	Public works acceleration	(500,000,000)	------	(------)	(−500,000,000)	------	(450,000,000)	(−50,000,000)	(+450,000,000)
	All other	(1,141,507,106)	------	(988,756,506)	(−152,750,600)	------	(988,691,506)	(−152,815,600)	(−65,000)
	Total, 1963 supplementals	2,149,679,106	------	1,496,928,506	−652,750,600	------	1,946,863,506	−202,815,600	+449,935,000
	1964 APPROPRIATIONS								
H.R. 5279	Interior	998,009,000	Mar. 28 (No. 177)	929,690,200	−68,318,800	Apr. 2	922,625,200	−75,383,800	−7,065,000
	Loan authorization	(13,000,000)	------	(6,000,000)	(−7,000,000)	------	(6,000,000)	(−7,000,000)	------
	Contract authority	(17,500,000)	------	------	(−17,500,000)	------	------	(−17,500,000)	------
H.R. 5366	Treasury—Post Office	6,146,842,000	Apr. 1 (No. 179)	5,997,026,000	−149,816,000	Apr. 4	5,997,026,000	−149,816,000	------
H.R. 5888	Labor—HEW	5,759,489,000	Apr. 25 (No. 246)	5,449,988,000	−309,501,000	Apr. 30	5,449,981,000	−309,508,000	−7,000
H.R. 6754	Agriculture	6,368,755,000	June 3 (No. 355)	5,979,457,000	−389,298,000	June 6	5,979,457,000	−389,298,000	------
	Loan authorizations	[3] (855,000,000)	------	[3] (855,000,000)	------	------	[3] (855,000,000)	------	------
H.R. 6868	Legislative	[4] 148,580,245	June 6 (No. 369)	[4] 140,038,919	−8,541,326	June 11	[4] 140,038,919	−8,541,326	------
H.R. 7063	State, Justice, Commerce, judiciary	2,159,891,900	June 14 (No. 388)	1,851,269,900	−308,622,000	June 18	1,851,269,900	−308,622,000	------
H.R. 7179	Defense	49,014,237,000	June 21 (No. 439)	47,092,209,000	−1,922,028,000	June 26	47,082,009,000	−1,932,228,000	−10,200,000
H.R. 7431	District of Columbia	(289,581,800)	July 8 (No. 499)	(284,286,800)	(−5,295,000)	July 11	(284,286,800)	(−5,295,000)	------
	Federal payment	34,868,000	------	32,868,000	−2,000,000	------	32,868,000	−2,000,000	------
	Loan authorizations	(8,000,000)	------	(8,000,000)	------	------	(8,000,000)	------	------
H.R. 8747	Independent offices	14,658,588,000	Oct. 7 (No. 824)	13,102,818,700	−1,555,769,300	Oct. 10	13,102,718,700	−1,555,869,300	−100,000
H.R. 9139	Military construction	1,966,400,000	Nov. 14 (No. 901)	1,562,964,000	−403,436,000	Nov. 18	1,562,964,000	−403,436,000	------
H.R. 9140	Public Works	4,561,747,000	Nov. 15 (No. 902)	4,276,116,400	−285,630,600	Nov. 19	4,276,116,400	−285,630,600	------
	Total, 1964 appropriations	91,817,407,145	------	86,414,446,119	−5,402,961,026	------	86,397,074,119	−5,420,333,026	−17,372,000
	Total, all appropriations	93,967,086,251	------	87,911,374,625	−6,055,711,626	------	88,343,937,625	−5,623,148 826	+432,563,000
	Total, loan authorizations	(876,000,000)	------	(869,000,000)	(−7,000,000)	------	(869,000,000)	(−7,000,000)	------
	Total, contract authority	(17,500,000)	------	------	(−17,500,000)	------	------	(−17,500,000)	------

---

[1] Tentatively estimated in January budget at about $11,500,000,000 for fiscal year 1964 (subject to change—probably upward).

[2] Shifted from budget for 1964, which was reduced accordingly.

[3] Includes $360,000,000 for Farmers Home Administration loans currently made from loan repayments in lieu of former practice of public debt borrowings from Treasury.

[4] Excludes Senate items.

The appropriation bills, 88th Cong., 1st sess., as of Nov. 26, 1963—Continued

[Does not include back-door appropriations or permanent appropriations [1] under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriations bills]

Bill No.	Title	Senate							Conference			Public Law	
		Budget estimates to Senate	Date and report number	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed	Senate action compared with— Budget estimates	Senate action compared with— House action	Date filed and report number	Amount as approved	Increase or decrease compared to budget estimates to date	Number	Date approved
	1963 SUPPLEMENTALS												
H.J. Res. 284	Supplemental, Agriculture	$508,172,000	Feb. 28 (No. 9)	$508,172,000	Mar. 4	$508,172,000				$508,172,000		88-1	Mar. 6
H.R. 5517	Supplemental	1,652,300,456	Apr. 24 (No. 155)	1,486,096,841	May 1	1,488,683,841	−$163,616,615	+$49,992,335	May 6 (No. 275) May 31 (No. 290)	1,467,430,491	−$184,869,965	88-25	May 17
	Public works acceleration	(500,000,000)		(450,000,000)		(450,000,000)	(−50,000,000)			(450,000,000)	(−50,000,000)		
	All other	(1,152,300,456)		(1,036,096,841)		(1,038,683,841)	(−113,616,615)	(+49,992,335)		(1,017,430,491)	(−134,869,965)		
	Total, 1963 supplementals	2,160,472,456		1,994,268,841		1,996,855,841	−163,616,615	+49,992,335		1,975,602,491	−184,869,965		
	1964 APPROPRIATIONS												
H.R. 5279	Interior	998,009,000	May 22 (No. 181)	979,093,400	May 28	979,693,400	−18,315,600	+57,068,200	July 11 (No. 551)	952,456,500	−45,552,500	88-79	July 26
	Loan authorization	(13,000,000)		(6,000,000)		(6.000,000)	(−7,000,000)			(6,000,000)	(−7,000,000)		
	Contract authority	(17,500,000)					(−17,500,000)				(−17,500,000)		
H.R. 5366	Treasury—Post Office	6,146,842,000	May 3 (No. 168)	6,074,216,250	May 8	6,069,466,250	−77,375,750	+72,440,250	May 28 (No. 353)	6,045,466,000	−101,376,000	88-39	June 13
H.R. 5888	Labor—HEW	5,759,489,000	Aug. 1 (No. 383)	5,494,627,250	Aug. 7	5,495,827,250	−263,661,750	+45,846,250	(Sept. 25 No. 774)	5,471,087,500	−288,401,500	88-136	Oct. 11
H.R. 6754	Agriculture	6,368,755,000	Sept. 12 (No. 497)	6,046,738,340	Sept. 30	6,047,988,340	−320,766,660	+68,531,340					
	Loan authorizations	[3] (855,000,000)		[3] (880,000,000)		[3] (880,000,000)	(+25,000,000)	(+25,000,000)					
H.R. 6868	Legislative	182,218,450	June 25 (No. 313)	168,273,069	June 26	168,273,069	−13,945,381	+28,234,150	Nov. 12 (No. 896)	[4] 168,293,069	−13,925,381		
H.R. 7063	State, Justice, Commerce, judiciary												
H.R. 7179	Defense	49,014,237,000	Sept. 17 (No. 502)	47,371,407,000	Sept. 24	47,339,707,000	−1,674,530,000	+257,698,000	Oct. 7 (No. 812)	47,220,010,000	−1,794,227,000	88-149	Oct. 17
H.R. 7431	District of Columbia	(328,724,000)	Nov. 6 (No. 632)	(319,582,825)	Nov. 18	(319,587,785)	(−9,136,215)	(+35,300,985)					
	Federal payment	52,868,000		47,868,000		47,868,000	−5,000,000	+15,000,000					
	Loan authorizations	(20,800,000)		(20,800,000)		(20,800,000)		(+12,800,000)					
H.R. 8747	Independent offices	14,658,588,000	Nov. 13 (No. 641)	13,390,214,650	Nov. 20	13,300,214,650	−1,358,373,350	+197,495,950					
H.R. 9139	Military construction												
H.R. 9140	Public Works												
	Total, 1964 appropriations	83,181,006,450		79,572,437,959		79,449,037,959	−3,731,968,491	+742,314,140		59,857,313,069	−2,243,482,381		
	Total, all appropriations	85,341,478,906		81,566,706,800		81,445,893,800	−3,895,585,106	+792,306,475		61,832,915,560	−2,428,352,346		
	Total, loan authorizations	(888,800,000)		(906,800,000)		(906,800,000)	(+18,000,000)	(+37,800,000)		(6,000,000)	(−7,000,000)		
	Total, contract authority	(17,500,000)					(−17,500,000)				(−17,500,000)		

---

[4] Conference report not yet acted upon by Senate.

Prepared by Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

NOTE.—Totals reflect amounts approved and comparisons at latest stage of congressional action on each bill.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1964

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under previous leave of the House, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 809) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

> *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the joint resolution of October 30, 1963 (Public Law 88–162), is hereby amended by striking out "November 30, 1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "January 31, 1964."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman say whether this will be the last continuing resolution or will we go into the year of 1964 with another such resolution?

Mr. CANNON. It will be the last resolution. It provides for the period ending January 31, 1964.

Mr. GROSS. From the gentleman's long service in the House of Representatives, has this sort of situation ever before obtained when Congress closed out 7 months of a fiscal year under such circumstances? Can the gentleman recall any previous experience such as this?

Mr. CANNON. This is the longest time for which continuing resolutions have provided within immediate recollection.

Mr. GROSS. Can we be sure these present appropriation bills that are pending and in conference will be cleared by January 31? Can the gentleman, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, give us any assurance about that?

Mr. CANNON. No one can predict with certainty what the House and the Senate will do.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure the gentleman is correct in that statement.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this resolution. It is a sad commentary on the legislative process when 6 to 7 months of a fiscal year are permitted to elapse without appropriations having been made for certain agencies and departments. These continuing resolutions continue spending at rates established in a fiscal year which ended June 30, 1963. This is wrong and I am opposed to it.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION, FISCAL YEAR 1964

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2267) to amend Public Law 88–72 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, a bill identical to H.R. 8971, which has been reported by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Is this bill to be passed by unanimous consent, or is this unanimous consent to consider the bill?

The **SPEAKER.** This is unanimous consent to consider the bill.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the Chair.

The **SPEAKER.** If the request is granted the bill will be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 101 of Public Law 88–72 is hereby amended by striking the figure "$172,562,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$190,507,000".
>
> SEC. 2. Section 101(d) of Public Law 88–72 is amended by adding at the end thereof:
>
> "Project 64–d–10, occupational health laboratory, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico, $1,650,000.
>
> "Project 64–d–11, high temperature chemistry facility, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico, $1,435,000.
>
> "Project 64–d–12, plutonium research support building, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico, $655,000.
>
> "Project 64–d–13, radiochemistry building, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, California, $5,900,000.
>
> "Project 64–d–14, hazards control addition, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, California, $1,000,000.
>
> "Project 64–d–15, plant engineering and services building, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, California, $1,400,000.
>
> "Project 64–d–16, west cafeteria addition, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, California, $255,000.
>
> "Project 64–d–17, craft shop addition, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, California, $200,000.
>
> "Project 64–d–18, development laboratory, Sandia Base, New Mexico, $3,780,000.
>
> "Project 64–d–19, explosive facilities, Sandia Base, New Mexico, $540,000.
>
> "Project 64–d–20, classified technical reports building addition, Sandia Base, New Mexico, $500,000.
>
> "Project 64–d–21, control point additions, Nevada Test Site, $630,000."

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us now, S. 2267, provides an authorization of $17,945,000 to the Atomic Energy Commission for 12 new construction projects necessary for the implementation of the safeguards enumerated by the President in connection with the limited nuclear test ban treaty.

This bill, and its identical companion, H.R. 8971, was considered by the joint committee in hearings held on October 31, 1963. The committee is of the opinion that this bill represents an important first step in the implementation of the safeguards proposed in connection with the limited nuclear test ban treaty.

For the most part, these projects are necessary for the maintenance of strong weapons laboratories. The committee is convinced that the maintenance of modern weapons laboratory facilities is necessary in order to attract and retain those competent scientists who can help to assure U.S. leadership in the nuclear weapons field.

At least one of the projects will also assist in maintaining our readiness for the resumption of atmospheric testing. In justification for project 64–d–13, a radiochemistry building at the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory in Livermore, Calif., the AEC stated:

> This project is needed to provide immediate improvements to the physical plant of the laboratory with a view to insuring a high level of nuclear weapons research and development progress, coupled with the readiness to resume full scale weapons testing in the atmosphere on short notice.

Finally, this bill provides facilities which will help to assure a comprehensive and aggressive underground nuclear testing program, which was another important safeguard outlined in connection with the treaty. Project 64–d–21, which provides for additions to the control plant facilities at the Nevada test site, will help to increase the rate and efficiency of our underground weapons testing and improve the collection of test data.

Admittedly, Mr. Speaker, this bill is only a first step. Much more remains to be done. In view of the extreme importance of the safeguards program to the national security, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy intends to maintain a close and continuing surveillance over the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense in this area.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was reported by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy without dissent. It was passed in the other body last Thursday. I urge its prompt approval by the House in order to assure timely consideration of the funds involved by the Appropriations Committees of both Houses and the Congress.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that the consideration of this bill by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was in detail. The recommendation of the joint committee was unanimous. The other body has passed the bill.

The reason for it being brought up at the present moment is that this authorization must be made so the funds may be included in the public works appropriation bill now under consideration by the other body.

Ordinarily, a continuing resolution would be effective in many matters. However, the subject matter of this supplemental authorization has to do with those safeguards which the Joint Chiefs of Staff and which everybody felt required under the circumstances and conditions of the nuclear test ban treaty.

I think it is well that we recall what those safeguards are because the responsibility for implementing them is not alone with the Department of Defense and is not alone with the Atomic Energy Commission nor does it rest alone with the Bureau of the Budget or the President. The responsibility rests also with the Congress of the United States.

It was unanimously agreed that in light of the admitted risks and hazards of the test ban treaty four safeguards would be required.

The first safeguard for the national security of the United States was the continuing conduct of comprehensive underground nuclear test programs.

The second safeguard was the maintenance of the vitality of our nuclear laboratories and insuring they are manned by top flight scientific personnel in order that nuclear technology in the United States should not fall behind.

The third safeguard was the maintenance of an adequate detection system to monitor any possible violations of the treaty as well as to monitor insofar as possible whatever nuclear progress might take place on the other side of the Iron Curtain.

The fourth safeguard, Mr. Speaker, was that this Nation should maintain a readiness to resume testing in the atmosphere should the event occur that the national security of the United States became endangered.

Obviously, this authorization does not include all that is needed to implement the safeguards. It deals with four installations at the Los Alamos scientific laboratory, four at the Livermore radiation laboratory, three at the Sandia base, and one at the Nevada test site. The total amount is in the sum of $17,945,000. It is not known yet what total expenditure is involved in the maintenance of these safeguards to national security. What is necessary is yet to be spelled out in detail. Obviously, the sum of $17,945,000 is not that sum which ultimately will be required to protect the United States. In my own calculations, I believe that the sum for capital investments will involve something close to $1 billion. This authorization is only a little more than a fraction of 1 percent of that amount.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I will yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. But this authorization for an appropriation of nearly $18 million is a direct byproduct of the limited nuclear Test Ban Treaty. Is that correct?

Mr. HOSMER. That is correct. But it is only a small part of what we will have to spend. I would have hoped that by this time we would have spelled out in detail what is needed by way of a vigorous underground testing program, what is needed to keep our nuclear laboratories vigorous and topnotch scientists at work on them, what improvements need be made in our detection system, and what is required for an adequate readiness to resume atmospheric testing under emergency conditions. Unfortunately, those things have not been defined. Therefore we cannot authorize for the appropriations needed to purchase them. It is our responsibility both to see that they are defined and that the money be provided without undue delay.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate bill, S. 2267, and H.R. 8971, to authorize supplemental appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal year 1964. This legislation would authorize $17,945,000 for the construction of 12 new facilities, necessary for the nuclear weapons development program.

It is important also to note at this point, that through the reprograming of operating funds the Atomic Energy Commission intends to add an additional $109,800,000 to its operating budget in fiscal 1964 for the weapons development program.

This request for supplemental appropriations comes as a direct aftermath of the Senate ratification of the partial nuclear test ban treaty. The President of the United States, on September 10, 1963, in a letter to the majority and minority leaders of the Senate outlined a four-part program of safeguards which would be adopted and implemented by the executive branch if the treaty were adopted. This authorization is necessary to carry out that program of safeguards.

This program includes the following:

First. A carrying forward of a vigorous intensified underground nuclear testing program, designed to maintain our superiority in this type of test program;

Second. The maintenance of a posture of readiness to resume testing in these environments which are now prohibited by the treaty;

Third. The expansion of facilities which now exist for the purpose of detecting possible violations of the treaty; and

Fourth. The maintenance of strong weapons laboratories which will maintain the overall lead of the United States in nuclear weapons technology.

It is true that the primary responsibility for seeing that the safeguards are in fact implemented and carried out will be shared by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense. However, I think it is equally obvious unless the Congress of the United States provides the necessary authorization and appropriations that these agencies will not be able to provide the kind of safeguards that the President had in mind. When the Under Secretary of Defense, Mr. Gilpatric, wrote the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the other body on August 23, 1963, he stated that:

> With respect to safeguard (b)—the maintenance of modern nuclear laboratory facilities and a program in theoretical and exploratory nuclear technology which will attract, retain, and insure the continued application of our human scientific resources to these programs on which continued progress in nuclear technology depends.

Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied from the testimony I have heard as a member of the Subcommittee on Legislation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that the construction projects which will be financed by virtue of the funds which are to be made available under this authorization and appropriation are needed to modernize, update, and expand the kind of laboratory facilities which will enable us to carry out the intent and purpose mentioned in safeguard (b). I am convinced that the "continued application of our human scientific resources" depends on the availability of adequate physical plant and facilities as contemplated in these projects. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge the approval of this legislation.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 8971) was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7431) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. NATCHER, GIAIMO, CANNON, WILSON OF INDIANA, and WYMAN.

JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. CON. RES. 238

> *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, the 27th day of November, 1963, at 12:30 o'clock postmeridian, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DECLARATION OF RECESS ON WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 27

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday,

November 27, 1963, it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ADMISSION TO HOUSE CHAMBER ON WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1963

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make an announcement. After consultation with the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent and approval, the Chair announces that on Wednesday, November 27, 1963, the day set for a joint session to hear an address by the President of the United States, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those on his left and right will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

COPIES OF REPORT TO ACCOMPANY CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 572

***Resolved,* That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, two thousand additional copies of Report No. 914 to accompany H.R. 7152, proposed Civil Rights Act of 1963, 88th Congress, first session.**

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF NOVEMBER 25, 1963

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I feel I should advise the membership of the House that it has been decided by the Joint Committee on Printing that by reason of the unusual format of yesterday's Record an additional printing will be ordered from the Government Printing Office. Tomorrow morning, each Member will have delivered to his office 50 additional copies of yesterday's Record. If there are requests for more copies, office calls should be made to the Congressional Record Clerk in the Capitol. He has been instructed to comply with reasonable requests as long as the extra supply is available.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO CAPITOL POLICE FOR THEIR DEVOTION TO DUTY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during these days of tragedy and grief the American people have responded in fullest patriotic measure to the challenge to rededicated service to our country in the spirit and in the pattern of the angel of peace and human understanding who moved among us and we touched his garment, and now is enwrapped in the immortality of history, forever, an inspiration to mankind in the climb to loftier peaks of contentment, dignity, and brotherhood.

I think it not amiss to make some mention here of the part of our Capitol Police, especially in the long hours of the night when men, women, and children came from many sections of the country to pass, with tears and prayers, by the casket of President Kennedy lying in the rotunda of the Capitol. The Capitol Police worked around the clock, and their many courteous and helpful attentions to our constituents did not go unnoticed. They did their part in full when the heart of all our people was broken and in a common grief, we were being drawn closer together than ever we had been.

CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR TO JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, 2 years, 10 months, and 6 days ago, John Fitzgerald Kennedy was inaugurated as the 35th President of the United States. In an inaugural address which has already become one of the classic expressions of dedication to our Nation's ideals, he said, "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

Now, John Kennedy is gone—struck down in the service of the country he loved so well.

The tragedy of this untimely loss has caused an unprecedented outpouring of grief, not only from his countrymen, but indeed from all the peoples of the world.

So much has been said—so little can be done. The assassin's bullet cannot be recalled. But the Congress can act for the Nation in fitting recognition of the supreme sacrifice made by our Commander in Chief in our Nation's service.

To this end, I have today introduced a bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously the Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the late President of the United States. The bill reads as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the President of the United States is authorized to award posthumously, in the name of Congress, a Medal of Honor to the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy, in recognition of his peerless leadership as Commander in Chief, his heroic courage as a pioneer of new frontiers of freedom, his gallant and unselfish devotion to the service of his country, and his everlasting contribution to the cause of world peace.

The language of the resolution is not original with me, but is identical to a bill introduced on April 19, 1945, by the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable John W. McCormack, now Speaker of the House of Representatives, and passed by the House on May 21, 1945. The report of the Committee on the Judiciary, dated April 26, 1945, reads as follows in its entirety:

> The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 2966) authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, after consideration, report the same favorably to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The language of this bill, although written 18 years ago upon the occasion of another President's untimely passing, is—by remarkable coincidence—a perfect expression of the reasons why this award should be made. Its allusion to "new frontiers of freedom" was almost prophetic. I hope that my colleagues will see fit to express in this manner the highest sentiment of our esteem for our fallen President.

SCHOLARSHIP FUND IN NAME OF THE LATE PRESIDENT

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in the last few days all American citizens have felt a hopefulness in this period of great national tragedy. So many have asked "What can I do?" "How can I help?" Just yesterday Nina Blixseth, the president of the Kennedy Club in Oregon, phoned and through her tears asked for advice on what they might do to help carry on the program President Kennedy had started. They had a few hundred dollars in their treasury and they were so anxious that somehow, somewhere those funds would be invested in something meaningful—in something living and vital. We talked of his visits in Oregon, of things which he had said and recommendations that he had made. And to Mrs. Blixseth I suggested that through the joint efforts of private groups and Congress, scholarships might be established that would be known as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Award for Academic Excellence. And that a contribution to this kind of a program would be a fitting testimonial in honor of the memory of our late President.

His words still ring so clearly "an investment in education is at the same time the most profitable investment that society can make and the greatest reward that it can confer—the future of any country which is dependent on the will and wisdom of its citizens is damaged, and irreparably damaged, whenever any of its children is not educated to the fullest extent of his capacity."

As we turn now to the future, we should be mindful that "the future is what men make of it." I am introducing legislation to establish a program of scholarships for academic excellence in memory of our late President. The John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Award for Academic Excellence will consist of a $1,000 scholarship and certificate to be awarded to the young men and women of this Nation who each year rank highest in a national competitive examination. This will help them and encourage others to appreciate and obtain the "life treasures of our open society" which were so eloquently described by our late President.

And let us never forget that "Education is the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress."

PURPOSE OF THE BANKING SURVEY BEING MADE BY THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a speech.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance of the House Committee on Banking and Currency is making a rather extensive survey of the banking system, utilizing questionnaires which have been developed over a period of months with the help of experts in the Federal bank supervisory agencies and with the help of many private bankers.

With these surveys we hope to fill in some rather fundamental gaps in our knowledge about the banking system. Many legislative proposals are being made to revise the banking laws in ways that would bring about important changes in the organization and structure of the banking industry, and these proposals rest, I think, on assumptions, suppositions, and theories as to what the present facts are.

Naturally, however, when we get down to considering legislative proposals which are so important in their implications for the banking system—and for the success or failure of many individual banks—we feel the need to have facts rather than just suppositions.

These banking questionnaires have, of course, aroused a great deal of interest in the banking community and in the financial community generally. For this reason I thought it might be appropriate to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recent speech of mine discussing the purposes of these questionnaires. This speech was made to a convention of the Iowa Bankers Association, at Des Moines, on October 21, 1963, and is as follows:

PURPOSES OF OUR BANKING SURVEY

(An address to the Iowa Bankers Association by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. House of Representatives, Des Moines, Iowa, October 21, 1963)

It is a wonderful experience to be in Iowa at this bountiful season of the year. And it is both an honor and a deep pleasure to meet with the Iowa Bankers Association.

A few months ago I made a speech in which I said I thought there should be more bank failures.

This was at the dedication of the new building which houses the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, in Washington, where a lot of FDIC examiners were present.

Right after the speech, some of the examiners sent me a message that if I really wanted more bank failures, they could help me out on that.

I got their message, and I think the bank examiners also got my message. But from the letters and editorials my remarks inspired, I judge that my message went over the heads of a great many bankers. The point I was making was that I feel the bank examiners should interfere a little less in the loan and investment decisions by the banks, and give a little more freedom to the good judgment of the bankers in their decisions.

I would regret deeply the failure of any bank. But I think we would all regret it more if the banks lost all opportunity to fail. Where there is no opportunity to fail, there is also no opportunity to really succeed.

Let me add that I intend no reflection upon the FDIC examiners or the other bank examiners. They are highly competent men and deeply dedicated to their work. But I do not think that they can manage the affairs of the banks as well as the private managers can; and even if they could, it would be wrong for them to do it.

I have no doubt that my life insurance company knows more about the personal habits that lead to long life than I do. If they sent an agent around to tell me what time to go to bed and what to eat, they could no doubt save me some money on the insurance premiums. But none of us wants that kind of insurance.

I wish it were realistic to think that all Government intrusions into the banking business could be removed, but because of banking's vital role in the whole economy, as provider of the Nation's money supply, this is not the case.

So let me say at the outset that the banking survey which our committee is making is an entirely friendly survey, though it is also one of serious import. We have been told that a few bankers have been apprehensive about our questionnaires. A few, not many, but a few have expressed a fear that the purpose of our survey is to evolve a plan to push out the small independent banks and replace them with large national or regional chains. Nothing could be further from the truth.

I think I can speak for every member of our committee when I say that we are far from persuaded that the American economy would benefit from the disappearance of the small hometown banks. We recognize fully that the hometown banks of America have served long and well the people and business of our country's small towns and cities. We recognize that these banks—your banks, gentlemen—have a right to a completely fair chance to survive and prosper and to continue to serve your local communities.

What we are all interested in is doing a good job of our very heavy responsibility for providing proper, up-to-date banking laws. What we want, gentlemen—all of us—is to maintain the solvency and liquidity of the banking community, and maintain banking laws which will permit your banks to better serve the needs of your communities for the benefit of both your communities and your banks—not to bring about bank failures.

Experience has taught us that unrestricted entry into banking is not compatible with a healthy banking community. No serious student of banking would suggest, I think, that anybody and everybody should be allowed to open a bank, at any time and at any place, as he may open a retail grocery. It has now been a hundred years since Congress established the office of the Comptroller of the Currency and vested him with powers to charter national banks. And it has been even longer that many of the States have been chartering State banks.

With Government controlling entry into banking, it is always possible, of course, that competition might be stifled. Thus the historic mission of Government bank chartering has been to avoid two pitfalls: loose entry into banking which would lead to wholesale failures and troubles for the whole economy; and too little entry, leading to restricted services or a tendency toward a monopoly in banking.

A necessary counterpart of Government regulation of entry is, of course, Government supervision of mergers. Bank mergers also have repercussions in the overall solvency and liquidity of the banking system and its ability to serve the community in general.

In addition, there have been several other Government intrusions into the banking system which carry with them other necessary Government regulation. One of these, the Federal Reserve System, is necessary for an elastic supply of money and credit which does not also lead to runaway inflation in periods of economic boom, or to a general collapse of the money supply in times of business recession.

Another is the FDIC, which has done what the Federal Reserve is not able to do; namely, to prevent unwarranted losses of confidence on the part of depositors, leading to bank runs and unnecessary failures which formerly had chain reactions throughout the banking system.

Yes, I am afraid that we must reconcile ourselves to the fact of Government regulation of banking; but we cannot afford to reconcile ourselves to bad regulation, or to out-of-date and inappropriate banking laws. This brings me to the topic I was asked to discuss this afternoon, which is the purpose of the banking surveys being conducted by the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

The Wall Street Journal, in a feature story on October 4, said this:

"The commercial banking industry, traditionally one of the most conservative elements of the business community, is in a state of ferment that seems sure to bring some significant changes in long-honored policies and practices."

The idea of bankers being in a state of "ferment" is perhaps a little too intoxicating. But there can be no doubt that change and pressures for change are very much at hand. During the past 3 years commercial banks have increased their time and savings deposits by 50 percent; by 100 percent in the past 7 years. Naturally, the bankers are seeking investment outlets for these funds, and seeking changes in laws which have restricted their investment opportunities.

But more fundamental pressures are at work. The banks are in the throes of adopting new technologies. And they are undergoing the rigors of adapting to the changing requirements of business and consumers for banking services, as well as to the competitive pressures of newer types of financial institutions. Tremendous pressures are at work for changing the structure, or organization, of the banking system. We have to face up to the question whether the trend of the future will be to the growth of independent unit banks or toward large-scale branch banking, chain banking, and holding-company banking.

Some very profound changes in the structure of banking have already occurred since the Second World War, even under present banking laws. A great many banks have merged; and many new branches and holding-company banks have come onto the scene.

I recently had a tabulation made of the mergers and new branches of national banks approved by the present Comptroller of the Currency, during his first 17 months in office. On the basis of the record we must conclude that national banks wishing to merge or consolidate have better than a 20-to-1 chance of winning the Comptroller's approval. During his first 17 months in office, he received 147 applications for permission to merge, approved 140 and turned down only 7.

Some impression has been created that although a great many national banks are disappearing through merger, the Comptroller of the Currency is, in effect, replacing these losses by chartering new national banks. I doubt if the impression is correct. The new national banks chartered by Comptroller Saxon and opened for business by March of this year had combined deposits of only $33 million, whereas those banks that disappeared through mergers had combined deposits of $2.2 billion. In other words, if we take deposits as a measure of competitive strength, those banks that disappeared through merger were 66 times as important as the new banks chartered.

Nor can I find much to praise in Comptroller Saxon's approval of new branches. Our tabulation showed that he has approved 893 applications for new branches, and over half of these are for banks having deposits of over $100 million. These are the big banks. Only 2 percent of the banks in the country have deposits of $100 million.

The state of "ferment," as the Wall Street Journal has called it, has led to a number of studies and reports urging all kinds of changes in both the Federal and State banking laws. There is the $2 million study of the Commission on Money and Credit; there is the "Financial Institutions" report by the so-called Heller committee, headed by Dr. Walter Heller, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers; and there is a report by the Saxon advisory committee, and several others. Many of the proposals being urged upon Congress for changes in the Federal banking laws would bring about quite profound changes in the banking structure. The Bank Holding Company Act is under stress; and since the Philadelphia Girard decision, the merger provisions of the Clayton Antitrust Act are also under stress. All kinds of changes in law are being urged. The Comptroller of the Currency is even asking for legislation to permit him to override State law and authorize banks to branch statewide, in all States. It is quite possible that this proposal will be enacted—over my dead body.

But a great many of the legislative proposals that are being made are not so obviously wrong and perhaps not wrong at all. They are raising, however, some very serious questions in the minds of Members of Congress, particularly the members of the banking committees, since these are the ones who must take primary responsibility for drafting and recommending banking legislation.

As you doubtless know, the members of a congressional committee are presumed to be experts on matters under that committee's jurisdiction, and, indeed, they should be experts and usually are; but in this case I must admit we are not experts, because we do not have the facts on which to make informed judgments about what changes of Federal law will be good or bad for the banking industry and for the country. I do not mean to downgrade the studies and reports I have referred to. They are thoughtful documents, written by well-meaning people; but they contain recommendations and conclusions based mostly on opinions, because the writers did not have the needed facts and did not have the means to collect the facts.

These proposals for changes in the banking laws put conscientious legislators on a very difficult spot. Certainly we are being asked to tinker with most serious matters. Much of this legislation will affect the opportunities of many banks to survive. But more than that, it will affect the economy of the Nation, because no industry, no service, and no line of business plays such a vital role in the economy as banking.

Surely we cannot act without having sufficient information to know what we are doing. Nor can we long refuse to act. A shoe that doesn't fit can ruin your foot. Banking laws which no longer fit modern-day requirements can stifle banking and injure the economy.

It hardly needs to be said that while I am talking about Federal banking laws, changes in the Federal laws almost inevitably result in changes in the State laws.

In a nutshell, then, our committee needs information; and we very much need your help in supplying us with information, not only in completing the questionnaires but by writing to us, calling us, or coming to see us. No body of men sitting in Washington can possibly know all that should be known about local conditions in order to formulate wise policies. This is why we welcome all the help and guidance we can get from you.

We are not against change. In a dynamic economy, change is inevitable. But in a democracy, legislative changes must come from the people themselves and not from officials who occupy seats of power in some bureaucracy.

Let me digress for just a moment to thank all of you who found the time, from what I know to be a full schedule, to answer our questionnaire. I also want to thank those representatives of the banking industry who gave us so much help in developing our questionnaires. In particular, I want to thank Mr. M. Monroe Kimbrel, president of the American Bankers Association; Mr. Norris E. Hartwell, president of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks; and Mr. S. E. Babington, president of the Independent Bankers Association, as well as the highly competent staffs of these associations.

Now let me talk more specifically about the purposes of the questionnaires.

These questionnaires require some work. So, in order to minimize the workload on the banking industry, we had the experts select scientific samples of the banks, representative of all parts of the country, all sizes of banks, and all banking structures. A total of approximately 3,000 banks are in the sample.

While making the survey on a sample basis reduces the amount of work on the banking industry, it also makes it more imperative that each bank in the sample cooperate in filling out the questionnaires promptly and carefully. If just a few banks give careless answers or neglect to answer, the whole sample will be invalidated and the work of all the other banks who cooperate will be wasted.

One questionnaire has been mailed to the banks, and most of the returns from this are now in. The response has been very good indeed—almost 100 percent perfect. The second questionnaire will be mailed to the banks this week.

The first questionnaire deals with management and management-succession problems. The second deals with banking services and, more particularly, correspondent banking arrangements and practices.

The first questionnaire asks a great many seemingly intimate questions about the ages of the officers and directors of the bank, the amounts of their compensation, whether or not there are retirement plans and, if so, what kind, the background and training of the management personnel including those in the low echelon. It asks questions about the training and recruitment practices of the bank.

I think that the reasons for these questions will be obvious to you when you think about them. Conflicting views have been widely aired over the reasons for bank mergers, large-scale bank or holding company banking versus independent banking, and so forth.

One of the reasons most frequently given for bank mergers is that the small bank cannot attract competent management, or afford management with the diversity of skills that a bank needs. Another alleged weakness of small- and medium-sized independent banks is that they are unable to provide for a succession of good management as the older managers retire or pass away.

And still another popular notion is that small banks are unable to attract adequate capital to meet the loan requirements of their local communities. The section of the questionnaire dealing with the banks' public reports is related to this question of adequate capital.

We know that in many instances the public reports made by the banks are extremely skimpy. Prudent bankers would not make loans to businessmen who disclose to them so little of their affairs. So I wonder how we can expect local people to invest in bank stock without more adequate information about the operations of the bank.

Failure to make proper disclosures in public reports raises the investment risk of owning bank stock. Where disclosure is poor, investors in bank stock are taking a pig-in-a-poke—and, for the same reason, they are investing in a less liquid asset. This means that when a bank finds it necessary to issue stock to the public, it usually must do so at less than fair value, and thus dilute the equity of the previous owner. I am not suggesting that you should be compelled to make reports of a particular type. But we would like to know, and I am sure you would like to know, what the experiences of the different kinds of banks are, on this matter of raising capital.

The second questionnaire dealing with corresponding banking services is also intimately related to the differing views which have been expressed as to the need for large-scale branch banking, similar perhaps to the nationwide branches of grocery stores.

You have all heard it said that branch banking is needed in order to achieve the mobility of credit that modern industry and commerce require. Greater mobility is needed, we are told, in order that loanable funds may flow from one region of the country to another, with the changes in the season and changes in the pattern of credit demands. Under this arrangement, we hear, the local branches would channel their funds to Chicago, say, where the headquarters office could handle the credit needs of some national merchandising chain whose headquarters are also in Chicago.

We are also told that the independent local bank is frequently too small to meet the loan demands of the large customers located in its own community.

We are told that a small, independent bank cannot have the specialized investment analysts that are needed to determine whether or not a local loan application is sound. This is said with particular reference to those areas of the country where the bankers have been specialists in agricultural matters but know little about the new industries and service establishments moving in.

Then, it is frequently alleged that the small banks do not and cannot offer their customers the quality and variety of services that the branch banks offer.

Well, when all of the virtues claimed for wide-scale branch banking are enumerated, some of us oldtimers recognize these as the selfsame virtues that we used to think correspondent banking supplied.

Let me point out that correspondent banking—if the claims made for it are true—is a very peculiar arrangement which makes banking unique among all the lines of American business. It is an arrangement by which the banking industry can consist of many thousands of locally owned establishments, and still enjoy all of the efficiencies that are generally believed to be associated with large-scale operation and concentrated control of an industry.

The old theory of correspondent banking gave high mobility to loanable funds, not just within a State, as the Comptroller of the Currency would have it, but across State lines as well.

Country banks put those funds they may find idle at a particular time on deposit with the city correspondent banks, and the city banks put their surplus funds on deposit with the banks in the money market centers. Conversely, the funds then flow back to the regions and communities where they are most in demand at the moment.

The correspondent bank is supposed to come to the rescue of the local bank having a loan opportunity larger than it can meet from its own resources.

Conversely, the correspondent bank in Chicago—to continue my example—is supposed to share with local banks the large loan to the merchandise chain headquarters in Chicago.

Finally, it is claimed that large correspondent banks, who can and do have the specialized investment analysts, provide perfectly sound and adequate investment advice to the smaller banks.

This is a theory. And, of course, we all know that to some extent—to some unknown degree—actual practices accord with the theory. But we do not have a really factual picture of how correspondent banking is operating. Is it accomplishing the things I have suggested to the degree that it is a substitute for branch banking? Or is it superior to branch banking?

These are some of the questions that we hope to answer and we hope that the answer will be useful not only to the Congress and the legislatures of the States but to the banking community as well. It has always seemed to me that the most important improvements made in any industry are not those forced by law but those voluntarily adopted by an industry when it has information on which to base a judgment that some new way of doing things is better than the old way.

Let me add that the mechanics that we have set up to handle the questionnaires will fully safeguard the confidentiality of your answer. I have never been persuaded that information from individual banks or independent bankers should be withheld from the public when it seems clearly in the public interest to disclose information. But in our present surveys there is no reason to disclose information on any individual bank or person. Since the surveys have been designed on only a sample of banks, it would be inappropriate to disclose individual information. The fact is that neither I nor any other Member of Congress will ever see the individual questionnaires you return nor individual data from those questionnaires. The FDIC is collecting the questionnaires, editing them, and removing the identification. They then send them to the Federal Reserve Board where they are coded and tabulated.

What the results of these questionnaires will show I do not know. Nor do I have a strong premonition of what they will show. We are going to let the facts fall where they may and report them in just as objectives a manner as possible.

This does not mean that I am trying to pretend personally that I have no preferences, no prejudices concerning the kind of banking system I think is best for the country. Of course, I do and some of you already know what my prejudices are. I think that the present trend toward big business, toward absentee ownership, and concentrated management of all business—including banking—is bad.

There is a need and a place for big business and big banks in our Nation. But I strongly believe that we are overdoing bigness, creating bigger and bigger corporations simply for the sake of bigness and not for the sake of efficiency. To have a viable economy, I think we should have just as many locally owned and locally managed businesses as possible, including banks. It will be a sad day indeed if all of the Main Streets of America become absentee owned and absentee managed.

As more and more decisions affecting our everyday lives on Main Street are made in board rooms of Wall Street or Chicago, we are in for more and more trouble—more big government and big labor—and less local self-reliance. How can we manage our local problems locally, if we become a nation of clerks and hired hands?

With specific reference to banking, it seems to me that the local banks should all be locally owned and locally managed.

Now, with your indulgence, I would like to close on a note which may seem unrelated to the subject I was invited to talk about.

We are hearing an awful lot these days about what is wrong with America. We don't hear much about what is good in America. This is most disturbing.

Certainly, no society at any time anywhere has ever enjoyed so much of the material things and comforts of life. And we have reason to doubt that any society has ever had more of its people engaged in unselfish and patriotic pursuits, or more dedicated to enhancing the intellectual and spiritual values of society. Surely it would be hard to find any other current-day society where so many people give their hearts and their labors to the betterment of their communities, their nation, and even their world neighbors.

Let us not forget that we still have the greatest country in the world. And we are all working—all of us—to make it still greater.

LEGISLATION TO INCREASE INVESTMENT FREEDOMS OF THE FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a speech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Banking and Currency now has pending several bills which would lift restrictions imposed by Federal law on the investment opportunities of national banks, Federal savings and loan associations, and other institutions subject to Federal law.

I had the pleasure of discussing some of the provisions of the bills which would increase investment freedoms for Federal loan associations before a meeting of the National League of Insured Savings Associations at Honolulu on October 23.

Since this matter may be of interest to executives of many of the savings and loan associations who were not present at the meeting, as well as to Members of Congress, I would like to insert this speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as follows:

Aloha: It is always a pleasure to see my good friends in the savings and loan business, anywhere at any time. But in the beautiful State of Hawaii it is a double pleasure.

While flying out here, I was reminded of the story about the two ladies taking their first jet flight. Upon boarding the plane, they sought out the pilot and told him, "Please don't go faster than sound because we want to talk to each other."

As the ladies found out, neither speed nor distance makes things that different. And so it is with the issues facing the savings and loan industry in 1963. They are the same here as in Washington, but I must say that here we can consider them in much more pleasant surroundings—and perhaps we will even see them in a different perspective. In any case, it is a wonderful experience to be here and to be with you at your 20th annual convention.

When I first came to the Congress in 1928, the assets of the savings and loan business amounted to less than $10 billion. Today I understand your assets have passed the $100 billion mark. This is certainly a remarkable rate of development, and it necessarily reflects a remarkable achievement in building public confidence, which is your most priceless asset.

Today the savings and loan business is serving more than 35 million savers and homeowners, through some 6,300 savings and loan associations. Credit for the success in building public confidence in the savings and loan industry rightfully belongs to you and the other operators of savings and loan associations.

But the Federal Home Loan Bank Board has also played an important role in the development of the savings and loan system. As I have heard many of you say, the savings and loan business would not have grown to its present heights without the Bank Board, the Federal savings and loan system, and the nationwide system of the Federal home loan banks.

Over the years we have had some exceptionally fine men on the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, but I believe we have never had as fine a board as we have today.

No Government regulatory agency has ever worked harder to carry out its mandate from the Congress. Furthermore, Joe McMurray, during the past year and a half, has worked diligently to secure for the savings and loan business the legislation needed to better serve the savers and homeowners of the Nation. John Horne, who has only recently become a member of the Board, did a wonderful job as head of the Small Business Administration; and I know he will give to the savings and loan industry the same loyalty and tireless effort he gave to small business.

John de Laittre, the third member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, brings to his job a wealth of experience and knowledge as the former president of a large middle western mutual savings bank. He too is an able and dedicated public servant.

The Bank Board, however—as you know—is a supervisory agency. It is responsible for looking over your shoulder to make sure that your operations are conducted in such a way that thrift and home financing are balanced with safety and soundness. Let's keep it that way, while at the same time allowing private management of savings and loan associations the maximum freedom to exercise their energy and ingenuity.

There is no question in my mind but that you will continue to prosper and continue to grow. But the growth you have already attained carries with it new responsibilities. I do not urge you to adopt any new conservatism, or to settle down into a rut of only tried and true practices. Trial and error experiments with new ideas and new services are the essence of a growing business.

But I do suggest that some of the more flamboyant advertising I have seen recently—giveaway prizes, come-on dividend rates, and so on—is not well conceived to inspire public confidence in a financial institution or in the savings and loan industry generally.

As you know, the administration has recommended—and is recommending—that the Home Loan Bank Board be given "standby" controls over dividend rates paid by the Federal savings and loan associations. This is a proposal Congress has been reluctant to accept; one of the reasons being that experience has taught us that when an agency has "standby" controls there seems to be an irresistible compulsion to put these controls into active operation. I would hate to see support given to this proposal, by reason of the unsound practices of a few associations.

You want to encourage savings, of course. But there is a question whether a dividend rate war actually encourages savings.

A few years ago the Ford Foundation made a survey to find out why people save. They sent questionnaires to a great many people, asking them to list the reasons why they save. The Foundation then tabulated all of the reasons given and issued a report.

A great many people said that they saved for a rainy day, or for their old age. Others said they saved to put their children through school. Others said that they saved in order to make a large purchase, such as a house and so on, for all the reasons familiar to you.

But apparently no one thought to say he saves because of the dividend rate or interest rate he can get on his money.

This suggests to me that the kind of people who put their money in savings and loan associations are concerned first and foremost with the safety of their savings, not with the dividend rate. Such people are going to wonder, as I wonder, whether a savings and loan that pays a 5-percent rate at the present time is investing that money in sound enterprises.

Let me turn now to the legislation before the Congress. The banks and savings and loan associations each want new or broadened lending authorities to permit them to take advantage of the investment opportunities available in our growing, changing economy. And quite naturally this reflects itself in a number of proposals for change in existing laws. I might add that these proposals have generated some spirited rivalry and difference of opinion among various segments of the financial community.

There is a story about a little boy who had kicked his brother in the stomach. "Tommy, why did you kick your brother in the stomach?" his mother asked. "Well, it was his fault," Tommy replied. "He turned around."

Like Tommy, some segments of the financial community are quick to see the others' faults—a condition which makes life a little more difficult for a congressional committee.

Proposals to change the laws governing financial institutions should be measured by two standards: One is better service to the public; and the other is a better balance between savings and investment in our economy.

As you know, our committee has just completed extensive hearings on a bill which would increase the lending authority and flexibility of the Federal savings and loan associations. Without giving a final judgment on the merits of all the proposals in this bill, I would say that at least four proposals seem to have great merit, on the basis and standards I have just mentioned. First of all, we know, a basic problem of the savings and loans today, and of the other financial institutions too, is that they have a surplus of funds and a deficit of good investment outlets. It would be good for the whole economy if these idle funds were put to work. A higher rate of investment would increase employment and step up the rate of economic growth.

One of the proposals which the committee has under consideration would permit the Federal savings and loans to make loans on household furniture, appliances, and other consumer durables which are directly associated with the home. Increased sources of financing for consumer durables of this type should prove advantageous both to the American family and to the savings and loan associations.

A second proposal is to permit the Federal savings and loans to invest in the obligations of State and local governments. It should be advantageous to the savings and loans to help finance municipal improvements, such as roads, streets, and water and sewage systems, etc., because such improvements are frequently necessary to develop suitable building sites for more homes.

Third, the bill would also permit college education loans. Since the savings and loans specialize in the business of managing the family's savings, it would seem appropriate that they be permitted to help finance the children's college education. Because education pays off very handsomely in increased earnings over the working life of the individual, anything that we can do to increase additional opportunities will benefit the Nation as well as the individuals involved.

Another provision of the bill would permit investment in mobile homes. I must confess my surprise at learning how tremendously the use of mobile homes is growing, and how many families are now living in such homes.

During the committee's hearings, the distinguished chairman of your legislative committee, Mr. Arthur Courshon, of Miami, Fla., made a brilliant and most persuasive statement in favor of these provisions of the bill, as well as the other provisions which are a little more complicated. I should think that if the savings and loan associations are deeply interested in this legislation it can be enacted.

While mentioning the most impressive abilities of Arthur Courshon, I would like to add a word about your very wonderful representatives in Washington, Ken Heisler, Bill Kerwin, and your new counsel, Bill McKenna. These fellows are most able, most pleasant, and always obliging on inquiries from Members of Congress.

Let me come now to another most interesting legislative proposal which has been put forward by your membership. This is the proposal to create an international home loan bank, or some similar instrumentality, which would allow you to help bring about savings and loan associations in the underdeveloped countries, especially in Latin America. This would seem to me a most public-spirited idea. As one of the advanced capitalistic countries, we have had the good fortune of learning that economic advancement comes through savings. Also we know that in the long run there is no real hope for economic development in the less developed nations, except as these people generate savings. I can think of no greater service that the United States could perform for these people than to make available the wealth of talent we have in this country, developed in the management of more than 6,000 savings and loan associations, to show the people of Latin America how to organize and encourage local savings.

Stimulating local savings will bring about a middle class in countries where there is no middle class; and it will create public support for stable currencies, against the runaway inflation which is the tendency in so many countries. Helping in this way will also help stem the flight of local capital from these countries.

Ultimately, too, this is the only solution to our own foreign aid burden.

While it is not entirely clear from the testimony given to our committee that Government sponsorship or Federal contributions to this proposed program are necessary, or even most desirable, it has been made clear in everybody's mind, I think, that the general thrust of this proposal is most desirable and necessary.

It is an inspiring idea—even an exciting idea—to consider extending the savings and loan movements to our neighbors in the underdeveloped countries who are groping for just this kind of means of improving themselves. You are to be congratulated for advancing such a far-sighted and warmhearted idea.

It is such imagination and spirit as this that has always won you friends in Congress and among the general public.

It is the kind of imagination and spirit that always makes us wish for your continued success. Aloha.

WHY PHYSICIANS SUPPORT HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE AGED THROUGH SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD recently contained an attack upon the Physicians Committee on Health Care for the Aged Through Social Security and a leaflet, entitled "Why Physicians Support Hospital Insurance for the Aged Through Social Security," which was mailed to Members of Congress.

This attack is surprising. The physicians whose names are attached to the leaflet include some of the most distinguished and best known doctors in our Nation.

Among them are two Nobel Prize winners, Dr. Arthur Kornberg and Dr. Dickinson W. Richards; a recipient of the American Medical Association's Distinguished Service Award, Dr. Michael E. Debakey; a recipient of the American Hospital Association's Distinguished Service Award, Dr. E. Michael Bluestone; two former presidents of the American College of Physicians, Dr. David P. Barr and Dr. J. Howard Means; and a holder of the Theobald Smith Award in Medical Sciences of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Dr. Irving M. London—to mention just a few of the distinctions accorded some of these doctors in the course of their professional careers.

Another of these distinguished physicians is Dr. Benjamin Spock, author of "Baby and Child Care," a book which has received much acclaim and which has been used by millions of parents throughout the Nation.

The vast majority of these doctors are members of the American Medical Association, though they differ with its position on this issue. One of the physicians, Dr. Warren F. Draper, was a member of the AMA's house of delegates for 22 years. Another, Dr. William A. Sawyer, was chairman of the AMA's Committee on Medical Care for Industrial Workers.

The attack on the leaflet is equally surprising. The leaflet apparently is of such great interest that the American Medical Association itself has purchased 4,000 copies from the physicians committee.

The remarks printed in the Congressional Record October 31 stated quite rightly that only 40 physicians have their names attached to the leaflet. I believe that is quite fortunate. I suspect that if the many thousands of doctors who support hospital insurance for the aged through social security had had their names printed at the end of the leaflet, the AMA would have had to pay much more for its 4,000 copies.

I sincerely hope that the number of names printed at the end of a leaflet concerning legislation is not taken as an indication of how many persons support that legislation. On the issue of hospital insurance for the aged under social security, we have definite evidence of the support of tens of thousands of doctors throughout the Nation. This evidence comes from the press, including the medical press.

For example, an opinion poll conducted among some 30,448 physicians by Modern Medicine and published in the June 11, 1962, issue, brought answers from 27,773 doctors. Of these, 2,731 or about 10 percent, favored the King-Anderson bill. Since there are some 276,000 physicians in the United States, this sample would indicate that some 27,600 doctors support the King-Anderson bill. Of the 194,000 AMA members, we might assume from this poll that some 19,000 support the legislation which the AMA officially opposes.

There is still more evidence of large physician support of hospital insurance for the aged through social security. The National Medical Association, composed of some 5,300 physicians, has repeatedly and overwhelmingly supported this legislation.

The Boston Globe of June 8, 1962, published a story headlined "313 Boston Doctors Crack AMA Front on Medicare." The story reported that a petition was "signed by 313 Boston physicians, many of them holding major professorships at Harvard, Tufts, and Boston University Medical Schools, and with both national and international reputations in the world of medicine."

A few weeks previously, a paid advertisement appeared in the New York Times of May 21, 1962, entitled "An Opinion Favoring Legislation for Health Care for the Aged (King-Anderson bill)." The paid advertisement was signed by 548 New Yorkers, 144 of whom were M.D.'s.

I congratulate the members of the physicians committee for speaking out on this issue. Their action is good for America and good for medicine. It would be unfortunate both for our Nation and the medical profession if there were no dissent among doctors on a matter so vital to the health of America.

Since a majority of their colleagues disagree with them, it takes courage to make their views known publicly. Their courage is exactly what one would expect of leading men and women in any field, as the members of the committee are in medicine.

I also want to congratulate them on the high merit of their leaflet. It is not an appeal to emotionalism, as so much of the material against hospital insurance for the aged under social security is. It does not predict the downfall of the Republic, the end of our free enterprise system, and the coming of fire and brimstone. It is a soberly written statement of how some physicians feel about this important legislation.

Yet this statement has come under attack in the Congressional Record as containing "inaccurate and misleading statements." I disagree. I find that the information in the leaflet is correct and supported by official Government statistics. In addition, the information presented in the leaflet is corroborated by the report just issued by the Senate Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly entitled, "Medical Assistance for the Aged: The Kerr-Mills Program, 1960–63."

I would like to discuss some of the leaflet's points which came under attack in the Congressional Record.

First. The leaflet is attacked because it concluded that the insurance today available to the elderly is "either woefully inadequate or costs more than the older person can afford to pay." In the attack on the physicians committee leaflet, it is argued that some 10 million aged have purchased private health insurance policies. But the Wall Street Journal of October 22, 1963, hardly a supporter of the social-security-based hospital insurance legislation, reported that less than 1 million of the 17 million aged have insurance which provides adequate protection against high-cost illness. This conclusion is supported by all the evidence which I have seen.

Second. The physicians committee leaflet is attacked because it concludes that the Kerr-Mills program, although helpful in many ways, is inadequate to do the whole job of providing the aged with health care. In refutation of this very balanced and accurate conclusion, it is argued in the Congressional Record that the Kerr-Mills program helps far more than the neediest of aged because only 30 percent were transferred from other programs. What is not said is that other people who met the requirements for old age assistance went directly on to the medical assistance for the aged program so that the States got the full advantage of the most favorable possible Federal grants. Over half of the recipients meet all the State tests of total indigency, and these tests are not generous.

A recent report of the Senate Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly states:

> Even the most conservative of critics would have to concede that, through September 1962, probably well over one-half of all applications approved for MAA were submitted in behalf of older persons previously receiving or eligible for medical aid under a public program other than Kerr-Mills.

The leaflet is also attacked because it states that Kerr-Mills help is available only after resources are used up and incomes are permanently reduced. Actually, the leaflet's contention is correct. Let me cite an example chosen, not from a low-income State, but from the State of New York which pays one-third of all the MAA benefits in the Nation. In New York, an aged couple with no income and no assets except a life insurance policy with cash value of $2,500 would be ineligible for MAA—I repeat ineligible. The couple would first have to cash in their policy and use the proceeds to pay medical expenses before they could be eligible for MAA. If this action is not using up one's assets before help is obtained, I do not know what is. If this does not discourage those who have carefully saved and provided for the future as best they can, I do not know what does.

Third. The Congressional Record statement asserts that 2 million persons received medical care under the old-age assistance program. Therefore, it concludes they should have no fear of health costs.

Yes, 2 million indigent elderly persons do get medical care through OAA. But let us look for a moment at what this means. In the State of Alabama, for example, people getting old age assistance can get physicians' services only in the 30 days after discharge from a hospital and at no other time. Furthermore, they can only be hospitalized for acute illness or major injury. Even then, they cannot be hospitalized for more than 30 days in 1 year.

If an OAA recipient is sick twice in one calendar year, there is nothing the program can do for him. Unfortunately, sickness is no respecter of calendar years.

Fourth. The Congressional Record attack on the physicians committee leaflet states that the AMA, county medical societies, and Members of Congress have made efforts in recent years to find evidence that individuals have been denied medical care because they could not pay for it. And that these efforts have been futile. This is a self-serving argument. I would like to suggest several places to look: for example, among the people who are turned away by public assistance because their illnesses are not yet emergencies, or among the persons with cataracts, diabetes, nephritis, or cardiovascular diseases who are turned away by public assistance until their cases are extreme.

Fifth. The leaflet is attacked because it points to the use of unsafe facilities for the care of recipients of Kerr-Mills benefits. The attack calls on the States to defend themselves against this charge. But the use of unsafe facilities is well known to the States themselves. It is their own Hill-Burton surveys which provide the evidence for the leaflet's statement. In their surveys, the States have found that 40 percent of the beds in the skilled nursing homes have health or safety hazards. The reason for this is well known and succinctly stated in the leaflet—"limited State tax resources and high cost of good care."

Sixth. The physicians committee leaflet favors the social security approach to hospital insurance for the elderly, because it provides them the opportunity of paying their hospital insurance during their working years. They will then have hospital insurance benefits in old age as an earned right. The concept of earned right as used in the leaflet is attacked in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because the money which is paid into social security is not the exact same money that is paid out in benefits.

I have difficulty in understanding this attack. To my knowledge, a private insurance company does not pay a person's benefits from his own contributions. A few receive much more than they pay in, many receive less. Social security is an insurance system and, I might point out, that the vast majority of those who pay the taxes to support the Kerr-Mills program will never receive a penny of benefits from it.

It is argued in the attack that social security taxes are considered by the Internal Revenue Service as gifts from one group of taxpayers to another. This is exactly what happens in a private insurance policy. Private insurance is no less secure for that reason.

It is said in the attack that earned right implies a contract between the recipients and the Government. This is exactly what social security does. That is why it is security. Congress will always be free to change the program, to improve it, or even restrict it. It will, of course, always act in a responsible way to those who have an earned right in the program.

Seventh. The physicians committee leaflet is further denigrated because it maintains that the patient's freedom of choice is preserved by the King-Anderson bill. Under this bill, the patient will choose his own doctor. With his physician, the patient will select the appropriate participating hospital, nursing home, or other service. That is clearly freedom of choice.

Finally, the leaflet is criticized because the doctor can only send his patient to a participating facility. The attack seems to imply that the choice among facilities will be limited, because few hospitals will participate in the program if enacted. This is hard to believe. Hospitals today participate in many Government programs. They also work with Blue Cross, and the King-Anderson bill would enable them to continue to do so. No hospital official has asserted that if the King-Anderson bill is passed, they will not participate. This attack does great injustice to the sense of responsibility of our Nation's hospitals and nursing homes.

There are many other points on which the physicians committee leaflet was attacked. But a careful analysis of each reveals the same story. The physicians committee has been attacked on the floor of the House. Instead it should be congratulated for the apparent care and attention to fact with which the leaflet was prepared.

PHYSICIANS COMMITTEE FOR THE AGED THROUGH SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a group of physicians, under the name of Physicians Committee for Health Care for the Aged Through Social Security, has sent Members of Congress a pamphlet in support of H.R. 3920 and S. 880. This pamphlet, which seeks to influence Members of Congress and the public on this legislation, contains many misleading and inaccurate statements as well as assumptions unsupported by evidence.

The very title of the pamphlet is deceptive: "Why Physicians Support Hospital Insurance for the Aged Through Social Security." Members of Congress are sufficiently well informed to realize that only a few physicians support this legislation. But the title of the pamphlet could well deceive many people not so well informed into believing that the medical profession favors the proposal. It seems reasonable to assume that these words were carefully chosen in an attempt to conceal the fact that out of more than 271,000 physicians in the country only 40 have expressed a willingness to be identified with this committee or to become signatories to a pamphlet of this kind.

The opening statement that "physicians have long been concerned because the elderly of our Nation live in fear of the catastrophic costs of hospitalization" is a blatant appeal to emotionalism and is totally out of context.

Physicians, more than anyone else except the aged themselves, know, or should know, that the prospect of being hospitalized is of less concern to the majority of older Americans than many other aspects of living during retirement years. This is not to say that they have no concern about the possible economic consequences of illness. Indeed they do, as evidenced by the fact that some 60 percent of the population over 65 now has health insurance protection. Nearly 10 million aged have health insurance, a half million have incomes of $10,000 a year or more, more than 2 million receive medical care under the old-age assistance program, and more than 120,000 a month avail themselves of the benefits of the Kerr-Mills law. These facts alone reveal the absurdity of the portrait of the aged as a monolithic 17½ million-member group of citizens perpetually haunted by the fear of the cost of hospitalization—not hospitalization itself, but its cost.

The American Medical Association and State and county medical societies as well as myself and others in public life for several years have sought evidence of individuals in this country being denied medical care because they cannot pay for it. The AMA has twice asked Members of Congress for any information of cases of this kind so that the needed medical care can be provided and Members of Congress, including myself, have in turn asked our constituencies for such information. Hundreds of county societies have advertised in newspapers soliciting such information and pledging help to anyone who needs it. Only a few cases have been brought to the attention of the profession or the Congress and in most instances these cases turned out not to be examples which King-Anderson type legislation would help.

A subsequent statement in this pamphlet builds upon the first overstatement; namely, that physicians know that because of this fear—of hospital costs—many older people who need hospital care do not get it at all or get it too late.

If these 40 physicians, most of whom are associated with hospitals, clinics, or health care plans, can say unequivocally that they know that many older people are not receiving needed hospital care solely because of financial fears, they must have concrete evidence of it, including circumstances and names. And if they have it, it is incredible that they do not provide these people with the hospitalization they need or call the cases to the attention of others who will.

Members of this committee, in a number of instances such as these, have made unqualified statements without benefit of supporting evidence, or have utilized the device of selective statistics to reinforce their arguments.

Health insurance and prepayment plans are indicated in the pamphlet as inadequate or too costly for the elderly. The physicians who attached their names to this pamphlet, however, offer no standard for measuring adequacy and, if they have one, do not apply it against policies the aged are buying. The fact that some 10 million of the aged have purchased health insurance would seem to demolish the argument that it is too costly.

The Kerr-Mills Act is dismissed as having clearly failed to meet the needs of any but a very few of the very neediest aged. Other erroneous or misleading statements made about Kerr-Mills include:

"1. Less than 7 out of every 1,000 aged people in the Nation (in the spring of 1963) were receiving any assistance under MAA.

"2. Kerr-Mills funds are used in large part to subsidize existing State relief programs.

"3. Benefits are generally meager, spotty, and often uncertain. In many instances, limited State tax resources and high cost of good care have resulted in the use of facilities that endanger health and safety.

"4. Administrative costs have run as high as 124 percent of the benefits in one State (Kentucky).

"5. The relief that is available is given only after resources are used up and incomes are permanently reduced.

"6. Relatives with modest incomes may even be taken to court and forced to give aid."

Whoever wrote this pamphlet evidently avoided an examination of the Kerr-Mills record. This record, which is available from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, is not one of largely subsidizing State relief programs or helping only very few of the very neediest aged.

Only about 30 percent of MAA recipients have been transfers from other programs, mainly old-age assistance. Nevertheless, OAA medical care payments have steadily increased since the Kerr-Mills Act became effective and, in addition to MAA benefits as of May 1963, were running at the rate of nearly $350 million a year. The statistic that only 7 out of 1,000 aged were receiving MAA assistance is deceiving. The fact is that by the spring of 1963, about 7 in 1,000 were being helped every month.

It would seem obvious that most of the very neediest aged were still receiving medical care through OAA now as in the past and that the bulk of MAA expenditures—nearly $29 million in May 1963—are being paid for assistance to aged who are not on OAA rolls.

Furthermore, since a majority of the aged live in States which have implemented Kerr-Mills, a figure of 7 of 1,000 may well be a measure of the need for such an assistance program for the aged rather than an indication of failure as this pamphlet suggests.

States with Kerr-Mills programs may be interested in the charge that they are administering them in some instances in a manner actually endangering the health and safety of the aged. This charge, like other charges in the pamphlet, is not documented.

So far as Kentucky is concerned, elementary principles of fair play should dictate that this State's experience with Kerr-Mills administrative costs should be examined on the basis of current facts. Administrative costs in Kentucky now are reported to be running under 5 percent.

The statement is simply not true that Kerr-Mills assistance is available "only after resources are used up and incomes are permanently reduced." All the State laws are designed to conserve the recipient's minimum resources and no State requires permanent reduction of income. Resource and income limits are measures of eligibility, intended to assure that tax funds will not be dissipated on those able to finance their own health care. The aged who are eligible suffer no loss of income from the operation of the Kerr-Mills program. On the contrary, their incomes are preserved, not reduced. A number of States, as they have gained experience with Kerr-Mills programs, have increased the resource and income limits and thus brought benefits to greater numbers of the aged.

The charge that relatives with "modest incomes" may be taken to court is patently a scare technique. Fewer than half the States with Kerr-Mills programs functioning in January this year had relative responsibility laws. None of these laws is designed to force those with "modest incomes" to contribute to support of relatives. Their own incomes and financial obligations are taken into consideration in determining their ability to assist. It is interesting that the pamphlets say relatives "may" be taken into court, not that they are. Consequently, it must be concluded that the sentence is intended to frighten the uninformed.

The pamphlet describes the hospitalization program proposed in H.R. 3920 and S. 880 as insurance, with benefits to be paid as "a matter of earned right." Everyone familiar with the Social Security law knows that current taxes pay current benefits and that an individual's payroll taxes are not set aside for his future benefits. The Internal Revenue Service considers social security benefits as gifts from one group of taxpayers to another and are therefore not taxable. The "earned right" contention implies a contract between recipient and the Government. There are, of course, obvious flaws in such reasoning. More than 17 million aged who would be entitled to benefits of this legislation immediately, for example, could not claim an earned right, since they would have paid nothing under the program. Furthermore, these 17 million would comprise the majority of eligibles for many years to come. More important to this argument, however, is the implication that Congress would be foreclosed from amending the law, once enacted, to reduce benefits. This, of course, is nonsense. Moreover, the solvency of the social security system rests, not on actuarial insurance principles, but on the power of Congress to levy taxes and the further power of Congress to reduce benefits as an alternative to increasing taxes if the program runs into serious financial trouble.

The writer of the pamphlet has in other respects been careless with facts, stating that the proposed legislation would "permit voluntary organizations, such as Blue Cross, to perform certain administrative functions," would "utilize State agencies in planning, in determination of eligibility of providers of services and in consultation to the providers" and would guarantee free choice of physician and hospital.

Private organizations could not on their own initiative step in and perform administrative functions. They could enter the picture only if invited by providers of services and then only by agreement with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on his terms. State agencies could become involved in all the functions mentioned only on the Secretary's request.

Free choice could not be guaranteed to all the aged eligible for benefits, despite the language of the legislation. Services would be available only in those institutions participating in the program under agreement with HEW. Free choice, as used in this pamphlet and in the legislation, could be guaranteed to the recipient only if every hospital and every nursing home and every home nursing agency was forced to participate.

One final observation should be made. The physicians committee for health care for the aged through social security has by submitting this pamphlet to Members of Congress become directly engaged as an organization in lobbying. Has it complied with the law and registered as a lobbyist? I find no record of this.

I shall have more to say about this physicians committee when I complete my investigation of its memberships' extensive participation in Federal research grant programs and in other programs utilizing Federal funds.

TRIBUTE TO THE TELEVISION INDUSTRY

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I wish, as my first act following this sad weekend, to pay tribute to the broadcasting industry of America for their comprehensive and sensitive coverage of this most tragic event of our century. Criticism of this industry is all too frequent and commendations are rare but commendations are certainly in order for bringing the story of the tragic death and burial of our beloved President to the people of America and to the world. Their presentation of this story proved to the world that they have matured. Almost without exception, every aspect of their coverage was in the best of taste.

I particularly wish to pay a special tribute to the men and women of the three great networks for their sympathetic handling of this event without becoming overemotional but, at the same time, always presenting the tragic aspect of the occasion.

We all recall charges against this industry and statements with reference to the "vast wastelands," many of which I have agreed with in the past, but I am proud to say as one individual, and as a Member of Congress, that the events of the past 4 days have proven that this great industry has finally grown to adulthood and has contributed an outstanding service to America and to the world. I believe it can truly be said that this was television's finest, though saddest, hour.

PROFILE IN COURAGE

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the events of the last few days have saddened and shocked all of us; it is almost incomprehensible that President Kennedy is dead. The one among us here in Washington that has suffered a loss greater than ours, however, is the gracious lady who was the wife of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Yesterday's New York Herald Tribune expressed the admiration that all of us have for her in a brief editorial which follows:

> PROFILE IN COURAGE
>
> This Nation will not soon forget the remarkable conduct of Mrs. John F. Kennedy. Her calm, her bearing, her endurance throughout the painful pageant of removing her husband's body from the White House to the Capitol spoke eloquently of her inner strength.
>
> The decision to bring little Caroline and John along certainly added to the ordeal, but despite the anguish of personal involvement for the children it was a wise and wonderful thing to let them participate in this day of mournful history.
>
> Once again Mrs. Kennedy showed the poise and grace that marked her days as First Lady. She has written her own "Profile in Courage" in a way to make her country infinitely proud.

THE BITTER FRUIT OF HATE

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the fiendish and brutal assassination of President John F. Kennedy is the ugly and bitter fruit of passion, frustration, bigotry, and hate which has grown in our country in recent years at a dangerous and alarming rate. It is difficult to understand how even a madman could commit such a hideous crime that took the life of a great and good man, the President of our country who had the love and affection of countless millions of people at home and throughout the world.

Perhaps the best answer was given by historian Harry Steele Commager. In discussing this tragic event over nationwide television, Professor Commager said that a pervasive climate of fear, violence, and suspicion has been created in this country since the end of World War II.

As a result of the frustrations of an endless cold war, more and more Americans have been ready to preach hatred. But, the professor pointed out:

> It is impossible to preach hate and distrust ceaselessly and then to say, when violence occurs, we didn't really mean it. The atmosphere had been created in which someone on the fringe could act.

I have seen evidence of growing bitterness and hate in mail I have received. I have seen it in vicious pamphlets and books, and on pages of the Congressional Record. It was evident on the pages of a big Dallas newspaper on the day the President died.

The tragic events of the horrible weekend of November 22 should awaken the American people to the dangers of propaganda which is being broadcast by the hate network in hundreds of cities to create confusion, distrust, fear, and hatred of public officials and representative government.

Much of the money that feeds the hate network comes from Dallas, the scene of recent violence and other events of which the city cannot be proud.

The President's death leaves an emptiness in the hearts of all Americans that cannot be filled. Knowing him as I did, I felt that no other President in all of our history possessed so many good and high qualities for leadership.

He was extremely brilliant and well informed on every important issue. He was dedicated, sincere, kind, and courageous. His greatness will grow with passing time as the goals he envisioned are reached and with the advance of those high ideals he held for justice and opportunity for all. It was my privilege to know him as a giant among men and as a friend.

I will always cherish the memories of my associations with him, and of being a part of his team and his administration in seeking the enactment of legislation the people and the Nation need to meet the challenge of these changing and dangerous times.

With consent of the House, Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks the following excellent editorials in honor of our martyred President:

[From the Milton (Pa.) Standard]

The haters of the world have won a battle but not a war.

In his derangement, the assassin who felled the President of the United States may inadvertently have made as great a contribution to world peace as any man in the past 19 centuries: he has filled all mankind with revulsion to the end result of hatred.

He has stilled the lips of the most contemptible of redneck "nigger haters"; he has struck anguish to the heart of the most bigoted political partisan; he has united in hundredfold strength all men of good will, wherever they may tread the earth; he has martyred a brilliant and courageous man who had shown us moments of memorable greatness and stood at the threshhold of historic greatness.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy did not die futilely. He brought America further forward than any man of his century in the reaffirmation of the principle that all men are created equal. His resolute posture in the grave confrontations of freedom's foes brought him administration and acclaim from even his severest critics. His grasp of the Nation's complex economic structure led him to present with forthright conviction the fiscal policies in which he believed.

In all these areas he blazed a trail to mark the way for the Nation's leaders who succeed him. Where he made mistakes, he made great mistakes—simply because he was in a job in which there are no small mistakes.

America has seen men of indomitable courage. It has seen men of dynamic vigor, men of high moral principle; others with the magic touch of warm human kindliness, still others with razor-keen insight and profound wisdom.

But seldom has this Nation—or any nation—seen so many of these qualities combined within the frame and spirit of one man. John Kennedy was born predestined to be a President.

America at this tragic hour of crisis may be likened to a military regiment, locked in mortal combat, that sees its commanding general cut down. Our mourning must be brief; we must close ranks and press on, that our cause—his cause—is not lost for the loss of one man.

Now we will pray, as all civilized humanity will pray to their several Gods, that solace and comfort be visited upon John Kennedy's family; that our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, shall be given the strength and wisdom to assume the staggering responsibilities that are thrust upon him; and that we shall be unfaltering in our continuing struggle against "the common enemies of man—tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself."

Ask not, John Kennedy, what you can do for your country. No man can do more.

[From Sunbury Daily Item]

A courageous crusader for the causes in which he believed died a martyr's death when an assassin's bullet cut down John F. Kennedy, 35th President of the United States.

A glowing light that penetrated areas of darkness on the American scene and throughout a troubled world was suddenly extinguished, leaving only the hope that the problems so clearly reflected will be attacked with new determination. Ending racial bias and the prudent easing of East-West tensions are chief among these. And they pose no small task for his successor. Also they challenge the best efforts of a Congress that has been shamefully addicted to evasion of responsibility and deferment of decisions.

It is one of the incongruities of American democracy that the man chosen by vote of the majority to head the Government and thereby assume responsibilities unequaled by any other living person is subjected to the slings and arrows of disappointment from those whom he has summoned to share his burdens, and also to the criticism of nominal supporters as well as partisan opponents. And this is not to say that differences based on honest convictions are indicative of disrespect or pointless partisanship.

The tragic death of John F. Kennedy has bowed the Nation in grief. Millions in foreign lands who regarded him as a friend are stunned and apprehensively await the impact of his loss.

The greatest tribute that could be paid his memory would be to close ranks in these United States for the advancement of his ideals of equality, justice, and peace based on strength.

[From the Shenandoah (Pa.) Evening Standard]

THE PRESIDENT IS DEAD

Cut down from ambush in the prime of his life, at the height of a brilliant career by a cowardly, treacherous assassin in a meaningless, savage attack, the President gave the last full measure of devotion to the country he so dearly loved.

The loss of John F. Kennedy to the Nation is not only historic, but personal as well. Few Presidents commanded such personal affection of the people as did this warm, enthusiastic human being.

He combined intelligence and activity. He was a man of vitality as a person and as a President. He was a man of courage with a capacity for greatness.

The President's death yesterday leaves unfulfilled his hopes for the solution of many problems, both foreign and domestic. His vitality and energy pushed his programs in many directions, including reduction of taxes, civil rights, prosperity at home and peace throughout the world.

But no madman's bullet can stop the march of events initiated by our late President. And as the Vice President sorrowfully assumes the mantle of the presidency, we are confident that Mr. Johnson will continue his work.

We join this region, the Nation and the world in expressing deepest human sympathy to his wife, who was by his side when he was struck down, to his little children, his parents and his brothers and sisters.

To his wife and family, we offer the words of Abraham Lincoln who wrote to a mother of five sons who died on the field of battle: "I pray that our Heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement, and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom."

But as we mourn a lost leader, we must go on. It is imperative and necessary that we close ranks behind our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson. The burden of responsibility that he now assumes is great and with God's help and the united and dedicated support of the American people, he will succeed in leading this country in his new assignment which is undoubtedly the most difficult of any on earth.

Mr. Johnson is a good man, experienced in the ways of Congress, informed of his country's policies and knowledgeable in foreign affairs.

He will undoubtedly make a good President.

Our task, as a Nation, is to demonstrate to the world that we are a united people, dedicated to our ideals. This is our job—let us do it as well as our late President did his.

A KENNEDY MEMORIAL

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I insert the following touching editorial from the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star of November 26, 1963, on the untimely and tragic death of our late President, John F. Kennedy:

A Kennedy Memorial

His own best memorial will live in his own memorable words, for he spoke in trumpets, summoning us to seek our finest nature and to fit it to the difficulties and dangers of our time.

Our own best act of remembrance must continue to be the faith we keep with his imperatives.

But the heart desires and the slain leader deserves a more tangible, more specific memorial, a physical place in the Nation's Capital corresponding to his place in prayer in the Nation's heart.

There can be no more fitting memorial than the dedication now, to him, of the National Cultural Center.

The President and Mrs. Kennedy brought to the center of things the service performed by the arts for men and women. In thought and speech John F. Kennedy moved with familiar friendship among the poets and the prophets. It was the same in his and Mrs. Kennedy's home. The White House became a place of welcome for musicians and painters, dancers and writers.

The idea of a cultural center preceded the Kennedy administration. But President Kennedy gave the idea force and form, and a singularly personal leadership, without which it could hardly have achieved its present development.

Mrs. Kennedy, from whom we have learned to bear loss with dignity, was even more deeply involved. To salute her loss as well as ours, a Kennedy Memorial Cultural Center would speak intimately of part of her gift to us.

Other memorial proposals have been made, chiefly of renaming athletic stadia already in existence. The cultural center as a memorial to Mr. Kennedy is not only uniquely expressive of a purpose shared by the President and his wife. Since it is now in early process, since funds are still being raised, it also would give all Americans the chance to remember the President by bringing to completion an intent and wish of his.

The change of name and the dedication should be made at once. The building should be brought to reality as soon as possible.

John F. Kennedy will live in the hearts of men. Let him live also in the arts he loved.

A MEMORIAL FOR PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I share in the national and worldwide grief at the death of President Kennedy, but I also feel a very personal sense of loss at his passing. Having served in the two Congresses during his Presidency, having campaigned with him, having seen his popularity, his vigor, and his selfless interest in the welfare of the people, I have felt a close identification with him. It has been a sad experience for me to have shared in the mournful ceremonies here in Washington.

In a larger sense, however, President Kennedy's tragic death is a loss to our whole country. With constant cheerfulness, unfailing courage and faith in America, he pressed for measures which would benefit the average citizen of this country and bring peace to the world.

We shall retain our pride in his achievements and our conviction that he has laid firm foundations upon which future generations may build.

In his great inaugural address, which we heard with pride less than 3 years ago, President Kennedy said that all work on national problems would not be finished in the first 100 days of his administration—nor in the life of that administration—but he urged the Nation to begin that work upon the complex problems which he described.

It will be to his eternal credit that in the brief space of time allotted to him he made a noble beginning.

In the words of Whittier:

And now he rests; his greatness and his sweetness
No more shall seem at strife
And death has molded into calm completeness
The statue of his life.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a resolution calling for the creation of a John F. Kennedy Memorial Commission, whose functions would be the planning and construction of a suitable memorial in honor of the martyred President of the United States.

The people of the United States will insist upon a permanent memorial in honor of their 35th President and I believe that it should be located in or near the Nation's Capital where he labored most effectively in their behalf.

I have no preconceived or definite thoughts as to the type of memorial that should be created. President Kennedy was a man of varied interests and talents. It will take time and study by experts in many fields to arrive at a decision as to a memorial that would best preserve for future generations the image of President Kennedy. Perhaps a cultural center might be appropriate. In any event, we should lose no time in authorizing a start on this study.

A TRIBUTE TO AMERICA'S NEWS MEDIA ON REPORTING THE MOST TRAGIC WEEK IN OUR HISTORY

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in deference to the request by the majority leader [Mr. ALBERT], I shall withhold my eulogy to President Kennedy at this time until the day officially proclaimed here in the House for paying tribute to our beloved President.

Perhaps it is just as well that the majority leader has suggested postponing the official tribute to President Kennedy until a later day. Surely our hearts today are still too overcome with grief to be able to put in its full perspective the glory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Nor can one fully assemble today a description which would do justice to the magnificent demeanor of Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy during this grief-stricken weekend of heartbreak and sorrow.

Only the poets and the laureates will be able to fully describe the majesty with which she inspired the whole world throughout her tragic ordeal.

A proper tribute to the former First Lady must await a time in which men can compose more adequately their sorrow.

I should like, however, today, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to America's press, radio, and television. Never in the entire scope of history have so many millions of people been able to witness personally one of the great tragedies of recorded civilization.

Television and radio, in particular, are deserving of outstanding commendation. Even though it has cost these two media many millions of dollars in lost revenue through the cancellation of advertising commitments, both radio and television gave the American people such a graphic description and portrayal of those incredible 75 hours, that we Americans today can take pride in possessing a new dimension in understanding history.

Those who have been quick to criticize and denounce this country's radio and television industry would do well to study the magnificent manner in which this industry discharged its responsibilities over the most grim weekend in the annals of our Nation.

It would be impossible to try to single out any one individual, but it would be equally unfair not to emphasize that every single person who worked on the reporting of this week's tragic events brought a new concept of dignity and ability to the entire profession.

The anchormen on the networks, Mr. Speaker, maintained that degree of composure and decorum which, in effect, set the standard for our entire Nation in grieving the monumental loss of President Kennedy.

There is no question in my mind that television helped immensely to create an atmosphere of dignity throughout America in this period of enormous tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, I think only today can we reflect upon what an appalling and explosive atmosphere existed throughout the country over these past few days. President Kennedy, it is now perfectly obvious, was a fantastically popular and beloved President.

The first flash of the assault upon his life and the subsequent tragic announcement of his death touched off a wave of emotion across the land which could have led to all sorts of bizarre consequences.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it was to a great extent the medium of television, through its dignified, albeit compassionate, reporting of the fast-breaking events that managed to help America retain its composure and its sense of balance.

There was no fanning of the fire; no coaching of those already on the precipice in their rage against this abhorrent act; no hysterical inciting of a population already deeply embittered by the wanton and senseless assassination of its beloved President.

Here, Mr. Speaker, every single individual in this country who had anything to do with the reporting of this tragic week should hold his head high with pride that he or she discharged his or her duties in a manner of responsibility and dignity which has brought the entire communications industry a new image of profound respect.

History will show that America's television and radio wrote its greatest hours of glory last weekend.

Before we again attack television and radio as a "wasteland," let us ponder its impressive contribution to help democracy endure its most tragic experience during the past weekend.

The newspapers of this country can be equally proud. Even though the printed press has had more experience and perhaps has more time to avoid reportorial mishaps, I think that America's free press has given full meaning to that part of the Constitution which guarantees liberty and freedom of action to all journalists.

As we scan through the newspapers and magazines of our country, we find example after example of the kind of inspirational writing which makes us all proud to be Americans.

The still photographers of America's newspapers are deserving of particular commendation. Who will again ever be able to equal the photograph of the late President's 3-year-old son, John-John, offering his own salute to his fallen father on the steps of St. Matthew's Cathedral?

Mr. Speaker, this is but one single example of a whole ocean of emotion dramatically captured by the press photographers and reporters.

Each of those men and women has given democracy a new dimension through their inspiring conduct, both in the press, on radio, and on television. They have insured that our Nation, into infinity, will always present the most compelling argument for a free press.

Mr. Speaker, it would be impossible to even begin to single out individuals for honors, but I should like today to mention one whom I believe we can all agree stands as the first lady of American journalism.

It is no surprise that the First Lady of America, Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, the widow of our beloved President, would invite Miss Mary McGrory to the White House Monday for a personal thank you.

Miss McGrory's stirring portrayal of Mrs. Kennedy during her great ordeal shall go down as one of the great classics of American journalism. I have never met Miss McGrory, but I am sure that her colleagues of the press will readily join me in acknowledging her as one of the great writers of our time.

The depth of warm understanding which Miss McGrory demonstrated makes us all proud of American journalism. I should like, Mr. Speaker, at this point to include Miss McGrory's classic portrayal of Mrs. Kennedy's ordeal. This is the kind of writing Pulitzer awards are made of.

To the men and women of America's journalism profession, both to those who work with the written word and those who work with the new magic of electronic journalism, I extend my heartiest commendation for a job exceptionally well done.

All Americans have been able to understand more fully last weekend's tragic events because of the tremendously capable men and women who report the news. Mr. Speaker, Miss McGrory's article, which is an outstanding example of the high caliber of American journalism, follows:

THE GRANDEUR OF DEATH: A YOUNG WIDOW BRINGS MEANING TO TRAGIC CHAOS

(By Mary McGrory)

Only one person has managed to pierce the black pall of horror and unreality that has gripped the Nation since last Friday.

It is Jacqueline Kennedy, the President's widow.

Mrs. Kennedy has borne herself with the valor of a queen in a Greek tragedy.

Shock alone might have explained her dry-eyed composure. But Mrs. Kenndy has moved with more than the mechanical compliance that sometimes overtakes people in appalling circumstances.

Everything she has done seems to be a conscious effort to give to his death the grandeur that the savagery in Dallas was calculated to rob it of.

It has been as though she were trying to show the world that courtesy and courage did not die in Dallas last Friday, nor the tradition that was personified by her husband, struck down in brutal irrelevance.

She agreed to his burial in Arlington National Cemetery rather than in Boston, so that he would belong to the Nation and would not in the end have the stamp of a local tragedy.

She has overwhelmed White House aids with her meticulous attention to the melancholy arrangements that have had to be made. She designed herself the memorial cards for his requiem mass. She suggested that she should receive the foreign dignitaries who had come from so far away to pay him last honor.

From the moment she arrived back in Washington, erect and composed, wearing the blood-stained clothes of the infamous day in Dallas, she has imparted meaning and order to the chaos around her.

She has not wanted anything to be lost on the world.

She brought her two children to the Capital yesterday.

If she wanted them to see, however imperfectly, what their father meant, she also dramatized to the world and the evil people in it that a young father had been slain as well as a President.

It was, with the irony that has marked this entire episode, approximately the moment when her husband's suspected killer was being murdered in a Dallas police station.

She took 6-year-old Caroline by the hand and led her to the flag-covered bier, knelt and kissed it and returned to her place.

She came again to the rotunda with her brother-in-law, the Attorney General, at 9 o'clock in the evening. She looked intently into every face she saw in that throng. She walked down Capitol Hill and stopped to talk to a group of nuns.

The crowd was, as a matter of fact, rewarding her heroism with a heroism of its own. They waited hour after hour in the cold evening. They complained only when interlopers crossed the many intersections between them and the rotunda.

The line stretched for many blocks and remained long after the rudest calculation proved there was no hope of entry. They waited with good humor and camaraderie. Seven blocks from the Capitol dome stood a young man with a guitar. One of the seven children of a man in his neighborhood carried the guitar case.

Once, reminded that the President's favorite song had been "Bill Bailey, Won't You Please Come Home," they sang it through. Then they did "Swing Low, Sweet Chariot."

A young mother coping with 5-year-old twin boys, said she would wait all night to go in.

A bespectacled Negro said simply, "It's the last, least thing I could do for him."

A woman who had just had a foot operation, stood clutching a tree on the sidewalk. "I hope I can make it," she gasped, "I wouldn't do this for anyone but President Kennedy."

There were students from Syracuse, a couple from New York, a boy from Toronto, and everywhere the crowd was punctuated with the black and white habits of sisters, out long after their bedtime, poignantly recalling a recent Kennedy quip that while bishops and monsignors were always Republicans, sisters were inevitably Democratic.

Inside, four young sailors performed a last act that was perfectly in the Kennedy style. One by one, they halted before the exact center of the casket, squared their white caps and executed their best salutes for their fallen Commander in Chief.

It is just what this young woman, hitherto celebrated for her beauty and elegance, has been doing in her own way in these black days.

DEBT OF GRATITUDE TO THE COMMUNICATIONS MEDIA

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States—nay, the people of the world—owe a great debt of gratitude to the communications media for their complete and sensitive handling of the events following the assassination of President Kennedy.

It required the greatest sensitivity to give such complete coverage of a family in grief.

It required the deepest understanding of our form of government to display not only for Americans but for all the people of the world, the wondrous majesty and stability with which the transfer of power takes place under our 175-year-old Constitution.

On both counts the communications media scored superbly well.

OUR NATION HAS LOST A GREAT LEADER

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, we have lost a great leader. John F. Kennedy loved his country; and his countrymen loved him. He was a man of compassion and of determination. He brought to us his conviction that our Nation could fulfill its destiny as the leader of free men.

He was of a new generation, which has seen the tragedy of two world wars and the futility of efforts to prevent those wars. His understanding of history led him to search boldly for new paths to peace with honor. He knew that the people of this Nation want peace, and he worked with imagination and determination to secure it.

He understood the dynamics of our Nation's economy and he acted to keep it serving the welfare of the people. The jobless, the sick, the elderly—all those for whom our Nation has not yet fulfilled its promise—these are the people whom he sought to aid.

He spoke with conviction about the need to banish hate and bigotry and acted to translate the American ideal of equality into a living reality.

Above all else, he brought a new spirit to our Nation. He enlarged our horizons, and taught us that we can, when we will, find within this Nation a greater fulfillment of our own lives.

Let us then rededicate ourselves to the goals for which he worked—peace with honor, the elimination of hate and bigotry, and an abundant life for all. His sacrifice shall not have been in vain.

EULOGY TO THE LATE JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the President is dead—the victim of an assassin's bullet. This was the unbelievable news from Dallas which shocked and stunned the Nation and the world 4 days ago. As we attempt to resume our daily responsibilities, the question which weighs most heavily upon our minds is, "Why? Why? Why? What manner of being was this who could be so filled with hatred so as to take the life of a man whose whole heart and mind were dedicated to world peace and good will toward all mankind? Was this a product of our vaunted society? Where had we failed? And why? Why? Indeed, the greatest tragedy in our Nation's modern history has given us cause for some real soul searching.

President Kennedy will go down in history as one of our greatest Presidents of all times. Just as Abraham Lincoln, almost a century ago, laid down his life to make men free, so did John Fitzgerald Kennedy give up his life to free his fellow men from the chains and shackles of prejudice.

We have lost a great President; indeed, the entire world has lost one of the greatest leaders it has ever known. He gave voice to the conscience of America and to the dream of mankind; he gave action to the conscience of America and to the dream of mankind. His unwavering courage and enlightened leadership will forever inspire men of good will everywhere to greater heights.

To Mrs. Kennedy and her children and to the entire Kennedy family, I wish to convey the deepest sympathy and condolences of the people of the State of Hawaii and mine.

In Jacqueline Kennedy, American womanhood, long epitomized by the pioneer's wife, has blossomed into full bloom for the entire world to behold in admiration. Burdened by the grief known only to a bereaved wife, she drowned the woes of life her own in tears to others never shown. As the First Lady of our land, she walked in composed dignity as if guided by that same hand which inspired the rare courage and genius of her late husband.

PROPOSED SOLE-SOURCE PURCHASE OF A CONTROL ANTENNA FOR A DRONE AIRPLANE

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on February 27, 1963, I criticized in a speech to the membership of the House the proposed sole source purchase of a control antenna for a drone airplane. My criticisms were based on the fact that the Navy had or should have manufacturing drawings for the AT 948/U antenna and that competitive procurement would cut the cost of this equipment by at least 50 percent.

Today, my study of that case is concluded, and, as was the case of the AS 1018/URC (XMI) which I reported here yesterday, my position has been borne out by the Comptroller General.

More important, Mr. Speaker, is that the Navy now has a chance to save not 50 but 69 percent of the tax money to be spent on this antenna as a result of competitive bidding forced by me. This compares with the up to $192,000 already wasted on this same equipment.

After I related to the Members the facts surrounding the AT 948/U antenna in my February 27 speech, I asked the Comptroller General to investigate the entire matter. I also demanded that the proposed sole source procurement be stopped until all the facts were known.

Mr. Speaker, the Comptroller General has completed his review and has forwarded his findings to me.

It was my contention on February 27, 1963, that the Navy had, or should have, manufacturing drawings. Mr. Campbell's review did not establish that the Navy had any such data. However, in his report to me, he says the Navy paid for this material and should have been using it.

It might have had it except for the fact that everyone in charge relied on the other guy to get a job done. As a result, nothing was done. One middle-grade employee certified as true what another thought or hoped to be true. The result was that until GAO came into the picture and uncovered the real facts, nothing was done about drawings.

On May 23, 1960, the Navy called the AT 948/U antenna an "off-the-shelf item which is proprietary" to Chu Associates, the developer.

On March 19, 1962, the Navy said:

> The AT 948/U antenna was designed and developed by Chu Associates at its own expense.

On October 8, 1962, the Navy said:

> There does not, however, appear to be any requirement that the contractor prepare and furnish a complete set of so-called manufacturing drawings.

Even Chu Associates says it never supplied drawings of the antenna because it considered the equipment to be a proprietary item.

There you have it. The rubberstamp brigade. Both the Navy and Chu Associates said, time after time, that the antenna was a patented item, developed at Chu's cost and, therefore, the Government had no right to manufacturing data. That evaluation was approved, reapproved, and recertified time after time.

Now, what was the truth? In his report to me, the Comptroller General said, in part:

> Our review (showed) that research and development contracts were awarded by the Navy to Dr. Lan Jen Chu and to Chu Associates, Inc., during the 1950's that called for research in scientific areas, including antennas. Further, our review disclosed that Chu Associates, Inc., had received some purchase orders or subcontracts from Government prime contractors during the 1950's for antennas.

Still quoting the Comptroller General, "In view of these facts, it is possible that Dr. Lan Jen Chu or Chu Associates, Inc., developed the antenna product—or antenna family" covered by its patent "as a result of its business with the Government and its prime contractors, and therefore, the Government should have obtained a royalty-free license to use the patented item, including a right to manufacturing drawings, in the production of the equipments by any company selected by the Government."

Mr. Campbell said the GAO plans "to cover this aspect of the development of the antennas" in a "broader review of electronics procurement currently in process."

There, Mr. Speaker, is point No. 1 of my case. Navy proclaims for all to hear time and again that it has no right to what it calls Chu's patented item developed at Chu's expense. But the GAO has dug under the redtape and found that Chu was paid for development of the antenna—by the Navy—and criticizes the Navy for its failure to obtain what it paid for.

Now, as to point No. 2, the waste in past procurements, and the savings in a competitive procurement.

After my speech of February 27, 1963, the sole source procurement of 47 of the AT 948/U antennas was suspended. Here is what the GAO report says:

> The award of the contract for this proposed procurement had not been made when you addressed the House on February 27, 1963. As the result of your statement, the Navy Department ordered that the award be suspended pending a complete review of the procurement.

Later that sole source procurement was canceled.

GAO's report to me showed that in the past a total of 224 of these antennas have been purchased at an average sole source price of $1,254 each.

Last February I predicted the price would fall by at least 50 percent when competitive bidding was introduced. As a direct result of my statement to the House and work done by GAO, a competitive procurement of these items was issued, and the bids were opened on November 12, 1963. There were three bidders. Bidder A, the low bidder, asked $397.50 per unit—$857 less than the average sole source price. Thus, the competitive price here was less than one-third the sole source price, or 31 percent. Expressed another way, the sole source price was over 300 percent that of the competitive price of the low bidder.

Bidder B, the second low bidder, asked $713 per unit—$541 less than the average sole source price. Bidder B, then, undercut the sole source price by 42 percent.

Mr. Speaker, bidder A, the low bidder, is Randesign, Inc., Copiague, Long Island, N.Y., and bidder B is Chu Associates, Littleton, Mass., which got an average price of $1,254 for the same antenna sole source.

Competitive bidding works, Mr. Speaker, and even the second low bidder in this procurement proves it. Especially so since it is also the sole source producer who jacked the price up when it operated without fear of competition from other industry.

Using Randesign's bid figure, it is obvious that in the two previous procurements, over $192,000 was wasted.

Even using Chu's figures, they show that Chu, the competitive bidder, could have saved the Government $121,240 that was paid to the same Chu as sole source supplier.

Mr. Speaker, this is another damning indictment of our procurement people who every day in the week commit one atrocity after another on our tax dollars. In this case, as in the case I spoke of here yesterday, the General Accounting Office has ferreted out the real facts at my request, and the conclusion is inevitable.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, is this more of the procurement practice in which Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations and Logistics Thomas D. Morris sees nothing that is a departure from good procurement practice? This is another of the cases that he had seen before he made that statement of June 30, 1963.

Answering my questions about this case, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Installations and Logistics Kenneth E. BeLieu couched his replies always in a way to solidify and protect Navy's position that a sole source procurement was mandatory. It was the GAO which got to the bottom of things and exposed the Navy's sham.

This proves that servants such as BeLieu give little more than lipservice to their jobs. The resulting inefficiency raises the cost of defense and hikes every workingman's tax bill. This case involves waste of up to $192,000 and is indicative of the way in which tax money is needlessly thrown to the winds.

Since these procurement people inevitably hide behind superiors such as BeLieu, and since the superiors inevitably defend them regardless of their blame or innocence, I am constrained to state that the top procurement officer behind these purchases was and is Kenneth E. BeLieu. This is another case which proves BeLieu is an inefficient luxury the taxpayers cannot afford. BeLieu must go.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, in this case the Navy has wasted from $121,000 to $192,000 on sole-source buys, while the first competitive procurement there was a 69-percent saving.

INEFFICIENCY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, last March 19 I spoke to the membership—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 4570—about the inefficiency and downright stupidity of the Navy Department in conducting procurements for a radar antenna identified by the nomenclature AS–1018/URC(XMI). That same day I referred the matter to the Comptroller General requesting a complete investigation and report.

Mr. Speaker, I have now received that report and completely reviewed it. Before making the General Accounting Office's findings public, I want to again thank Mr. Joseph Campbell and his staff for their excellent work. Certainly, they are providing a wonderful, needed service to the Congress and to the Nation.

If only the Navy had examined its own actions as did Mr. Campbell. His report to me shows that the Navy lied to prospective bidders for the manufacture of this antenna when it issued a bid document March 7, 1963. It also shows the Navy wasted at least $50,000 in one single past procurement of this antenna. Finally, the GAO report to me knocks down the contention of Navy and the former sole-source supplier that drawings cannot be furnished. As a matter of fact, they were paid for by the Navy, and the developer was paid to develop this and other antennas in the 1950's.

Mr. Speaker, this is a perfect example of what passes for the good procurement practices constantly referred to by the Defense Department. This is exactly the type of shenanigans Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations and Logistics Thomas D. Morris defends as not being a departure from good practice.

The bid document for purchase of the AS–1018 antenna was issued on March 7, 1963, to close April 9, 1963. In a special notice that was a part of the document the Navy stated it did not know if any patents were involved.

When I made my presentation to the House on March 19, 1963, I pointed out that such a vague certification is enough to frighten away many bidders. Not knowing what patent rights might be involved, how strong might be the claim to the rights, industry might well save the approximate $5,000 it costs to prepare a bid for a defense contract. My feeling was that Navy knew if there were patent rights involved all along, but simply put in that bogeyman to scare away competition.

In his report, the Comptroller General says that 10 days after my speech here on the floor, the Navy amended the bid document to state that only one patent might be involved. It listed the patent number and gave full information. The information proved that no industry need be frightened by any claim of proprietary rights.

Armed with full information, industry went to work. Seven bidders competed for the contract, and the price per unit dropped to $487, compared to $970 paid to the sole-source producer, Chu Associates, Inc., Littleton, Mass.—a 50-percent drop in price. Even Chu bid $635 per unit in competition when it got $970 each, sole source, for the antenna.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, comparing the low bidder's price to the last sole-source price, there is a saving on this one small contract of over 100 percent because only $109,000 will be spent, instead of the $218,000 last spent under a sole-source contract. Even giving the sole-source producer the best break possible still reflects a saving of $33,000 on this one award, when Chu's competitive bid is compared to that of the low bidder.

Now, what about that phony Navy certification that was amended 10 days after my speech here on the floor? Here is what the GAO report says:

> Our review indicates that the Navy's special notice originally published March 7, 1963, which stated the Navy did not know if any patents were involved in this procurement, was somewhat less than fully revealing. The Navy did know before March 7, 1963, that Chu Associates, Inc., was asserting a claim to patent rights on this item. Therefore, we can find no support for the Navy's original special notice and we believe the amended statement issued on March 29, 1963, could just as well have been issued originally on March 7, 1963.

There you have point No. 1, Mr. Speaker. The Navy lied, period. Someone in the Navy, through laziness, just said the Navy did not know if patent rights were involved without checking. It was easier that way. Or, someone in the Navy purposely fabricated a lie to scare away competition. Ten days after being caught redhanded, he tried to cover his tracks. Either alternative would have resulted in more waste but for the fact that I stuck a pin in them and pushed out needed information.

Point No. 2 concerns the Navy's past waste on this procurement. I charged on March 19, 1963, that the Navy awarded a competitive contract to Turbo-Machine Products, Lansdale, Pa., for $541 per unit, of this antenna. At almost the same identical time it processed a sole-source contract to Chu Associates for $970 each, thus wasting $429 a unit and $50,000 on the sole-source contract.

What does the GAO say of that? It says the contract under competitive bidding was awarded June 1, 1962, to Turbo-Machine for 107 of these antennas, at a unit price of $541 each. On June 29, 1962, a sole-source contract was awarded to Chu Associates for 121 units of the antenna, at a price of $970 each.

The report goes on to say:

> Regardless of the dates of the procurement requests, both of the purchases were being processed during approximately the same period of time. Our review indicates they were being processed independently and that when each was concluded by a contract there was no coordination as to the prices paid for the unit. Thus, although the contract with Turbo-Machine was issued at a price of $541 per unit, we found no evidence that this fact was known or considered in arriving at the price of $970 per unit stipulated in the contract issued to Chu.
>
> In summary, the Navy could have contracted for the item at a lower price if an appropriate deliverly schedule could have been arranged.

That is point No. 2, Mr. Speaker. It proves that there was no coordination in Navy procurement; that inefficiency again penalized the American taxpayer. Navy's left hand does not even know what its left hand is doing, much less its right.

I suppose this, too, is not considered by the Defense Department as being a departure from good practice.

Now, to point three—the final point. I contended March 19, 1963, that the Navy should have manufacturing drawings. The Navy had said it did not have them, since the antenna is a patented item.

Navy contract NObsr 85111, dated January 1961, required the contractor to submit manufacturing drawings. Almost 2 years later, the contractor submitted inadequate drawings. Four months later, the Navy got around to telling the contractor they were not sufficient; but then, in June of this year, the Navy said Chu Associates could delete proprietary items from the drawings.

I had GAO check out development of this and other antennas, and the GAO report to me says on this topic:

> Our review did show that research and development contracts were awarded by the Navy to Dr. Lan Jen Chu and to Chu Associates, Inc., during the 1950's that called for research in scientific areas, including antennas. Further, our review disclosed that Chu Associates, Inc., had received purchase orders or subcontracts from Government prime contractors during the 1950's for antennas. In view of these facts, it is possible that Dr. Lan Jen Chu or Chu Associates, Inc., developed the antenna product (or antenna family) as a result of its business with the Government and its prime contractors, and, therefore, the Government should have obtained a royalty-free license to use the patented item, including a right to manufacturing drawings in production of the equipments by any company selected by the Government.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, point No. 3 proves the Navy should have had drawings and could have gotten responsible competition much earlier than was the case. But, here again, inefficiency and incompetency replaced hard work. Taking the line of least resistance and accepting what was stated, without checking into it, replaced intelligent inquiry which would have saved valuable tax dollars.

It will be interesting to see how Navy weasels out of this case, Mr. Speaker. This case was one of the cases into which Assistant Secretary Morris must have looked prior to being quoted in the Washington Post of June 30, 1963, that "we haven't found anything we consider a departure from good practice."

Is it any wonder a Member of Congress is disgusted and disturbed when such outright deceit and duplicity is labeled "good" by the No. 1 procurement officer in the Pentagon?

This is exactly the way in which so much of our Defense hardware is being bought. These middle-grade people take the line of least resistance; the other paper pushers sign anything that crosses their desks; and the men at the top rubberstamp their mistakes. That is the reason why our defense dollar is buying less than 50 cents' worth. This is the reason the working man's tax bill is higher each year.

National defense has been a sacred cow for years, and these people have committed one atrocity after another, protected by this shelter.

In this particular case, the blame must be shouldered by Assistant Secretary of the Navy Kenneth E. BeLieu, under whose supervision the antenna case rests. His is the most inefficient command of the lot. It is by his tacit, unspoken consent that such shady deals and manipulations are perpetrated. I shall have more to say about BeLieu in the future, and the evidence will all point to one conclusion—BeLieu must go.

Today's address is the first of 10 cases I will spell out to the House within the next 3 weeks. Tomorrow, I will deal with another procurement by the Navy.

Conclusion: $50,000 wasted under one sole-source procurement. Up to $108,000 saved by latest competitive bidding.

A BILL TO PROVIDE THE PROTECTION OF FEDERAL JURISDICTION TO THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, during the tragic events of this past weekend, I was astounded to learn that it is not a Federal crime to assault or assassinate the President of the United States.

Presently the trial proceedings and the penalty for the assault or assassination of a President are solely determined by the laws of the State in which the crime occurs.

Ironically, it is a Federal crime to kill lesser Federal officials such as a U.S. judge, U.S. attorney, Federal marshal, and FBI, Internal Revenue, and Secret Service agents, as well as certain employees of the Departments of Interior and Agriculture.

It is inconceivable to me that the protection of Federal jurisdiction offered to these lesser Federal officials has not been available to our President and Vice President. I have introduced a bill today to amend Title 18, United States Code, section 1114, so that the Presidency and Vice Presidency are specifically covered.

On the heels of this horrible tragedy which has befallen our Nation, I would welcome the support of my colleagues in this effort.

LEGISLATION TO AWARD OUR LATE AND GREAT JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY WITH A CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer legislation which would award our late and great John Fitzgerald Kennedy with a Congressional Medal of Honor.

This would be a most appropriate action by this body which once had the services of this distinguished champion of freedom and fighter for world peace.

Few men have had the opportunity to serve more notably for our Nation than the late President, in both bodies of Congress and then for an all too brief period as Chief Executive of the land.

As Commander in Chief of our armed services, no one is more worthy of this honor, Mr. Speaker, and no one will ever have such good cause, even though it must be awarded posthumously.

John Kennedy demonstrated throughout his life, during the Second World War and later until his tragic death last Friday in Dallas, that he had the qualities of courage that make genuine heroes. His life became, in fact, more than a profile in courage, but a case study in courage itself.

It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, a genuine responsibility of this House to enact this legislation which would authorize the new President, in the name of Congress, to award the honor.

It is a small but significant gesture which the House could enact, Mr. Speaker, and, in doing so, demonstrate the honor, respect, and love we have in our hearts for this distinguished American hero.

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, all America and much of the world mourns the late President Kennedy. All of us here in the House extend our deepest condolences to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy and the family.

As a young President, John F. Kennedy truly articulated the dreams of America and inspired young men and women to new dimensions of service in the cause of peace. His hopeful and courageous approach to the future will long live in the hearts of the people.

Who can forget his call to a new generation of Americans—"ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

Who can forget his injunction "to invoke the wonders of science instead of its terrors" in exploring the stars, conquering the deserts, eradicating disease, tapping the ocean depths and encouraging the arts and commerce.

Who can forget his recognition of the great truth that our "revolutionary beliefs"—including the rights of man "come not from the generosity of the state but from the hand of God."

Now that he has passed—but with us still—let us remember his imperatives:

First. That "our strength as well as our convictions have imposed upon this Nation the role of leader in freedom's cause."

Second. That "continued Federal legislative inaction—on civil rights—will continue, if not increase, racial strife—causing the leadership of both sides to pass from the hands of reasonable and responsible men to the purveyors of hate and violence."

Third. That in building the peace—"together we shall save our planet or together we shall perish in its flames" and that "it is our intention to challenge the Soviet Union, not to an arms race, but to a peace race; to advance step by step, stage by stage, until general and complete disarmament has actually been achieved."

Finally, do not his words before the Massachusetts Legislature bear relevance to each of us here in the Congress:

> Of those to whom much is given, much is required. And when at some future date the high court of history sits in judgment on each one of us—recording whether in our brief span of service we fulfilled our responsibilities to the State—our success or failure, in whatever office we may hold, will be measured by the answers to four questions: were we truly men of courage—were we truly men of judgment—were we truly men of integrity—were we truly men of dedication.

And now, Mr. Speaker, in this hour of stark tragedy for our country, may we stand as one man back of our President and our Government. May Almighty God guide and sustain President Lyndon Johnson.

CHURCH SERVICES DEVOTED TO A MEMORIAL TO OUR LATE PRESIDENT, JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday, I feel confident, the majority of Members of Congress, together with millions of other Americans, and people all around the world, attended their churches to worship. In most instances, I believe, at least a portion of each service was devoted to a memorial to our late President, John F. Kennedy.

At the service in the church of which I am a member, the pastor's remarks were most appropriate, and his approach to this terrible tragedy was helpful to me. Therefore, I would like to share these remarks with my colleagues and with those who read the Congressional Record.

"On the Passing of John F. Kennedy," by the Reverend Finley M. Keech, minister of the First Baptist Church, Tully, N.Y., follows:

On the Passing of John F. Kennedy

In the 2 days just past we have been cast low by the passing of President John F. Kennedy. But in order to have profound appreciation it is not necessary that his opinions be altogether ours, nor his politics and policies. It is necessary only to know that his country is our country and that his citizenship is ours as well; and because of this we can mourn his passing from mortal life in our midst.

We all have heard many details of the circumstances by radio and television which we need not duplicate here. But in order to describe adequately the enormity of the crime that has been committed we must say something like: "One person, it would seem, has taken unto himself the prerogative which is God's alone—to grant life to a human being or to take it"—and herein is the essence of the tragedy.

Beyond merely describing what has come to pass, however, we crave an understanding of what is happening in our midst.

First, we can observe that there is among us a national personality. For I believe that groups as well as persons express a personality. We belong to clubs or small groups which, by virtue of the persons comprising them, possess a corporate personality. The same, it seems, is true of larger groups, the church congregations we belong to, and even political parties. And a national personality now shows itself in grief and sorrow for the passing from this life of our President.

But just as surely a national personality will also be observed in the days before us as the Nation continues to direct its people's purposes.

Second, in seeking to understand what now happens among us and within us, we must bring to the surface of consciousness what is at least subconscious, to say that we are now struck with how mortal we are. That is to say, upon seeing that another is indeed mortal we have it dramatically impressed upon us that we, too, are mortal and that we can die as well as he.

But there is another side to this matter, namely, that somehow, in our humanity and human society, we are a part of the whole of life that creates human hatreds and promotes, albeit unwittingly, even psychopathic animosities among some of the population. It would be fitting in this circumstance, therefore, that persons of the church use the occasion more assuredly to dedicate themselves to the Kingdom of God in our midst and resolve therein to use the Christian gospel as a counterforce to the passions of hatred.

And last, in the happenings around us we are finding the true purpose of intercession, that is, of intercessory prayer in which we render prayer in another's behalf. Be assured that we are not offering prayer for a dead and inert body. We pray, rather, in the behalf of a living soul received of our Heavenly Father. We pray for a family now broken, for a young widow and her almost infant children, and for a family that has suffered much tragedy and is now cast into the consummate tragedy of human experience. It should be our high hope that, in praying in the face of tragedy, we shall be able to learn also of life in its goodness and blessings.

Involving ourselves, as we have done, in intercession for others, we may hope also that therein shall be found the strength and direction for our lives whereby we shall be able to live in behalf of others and all.

It is a Christian thing to do, to pray for others. It is a Christian thing also to be able to weep with those who weep and to mourn with those who mourn. So I ask that we join with others of our fellow citizens in prayer, silently each in his own way, and corporately too.

MESSAGES OF SYMPATHY FROM MEMBERS OF THE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION IN EUROPE AND SOUTH AMERICA

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include messages from members of the Inter-Parliamentary Union in Europe and South America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following cables have been received by me to transmit to the U.S. national group of the Inter-Parliamentary Union and to the Congress. They are the expressions of sympathy of the Inter-Parliamentary Union from its Secretary General, Mr. de Blonay, and from the same group on behalf of the Council, and the president of the Union, President Mazzilli; from the Spanish group through its president, Mr. De Ananequi; from the Brazilian group through its president, Mr. Rui Palmeira; from the Parliament of Monaco through its president, Mr. Louis Aureglia; from the Italian group through its president, Mr. Vodacci Pisanelli, and from the French group through its president, Senator Moutet.

I ask unanimous consent to include the seven cables, with three translations, in the body of the Record.

I know that I interpret the sentiments of the Inter-Parliamentary Union in requesting you to transmit to the U.S. group our feelings of profound emotion and deep sympathy in the tragic passing of President Kennedy, a great champion of democracy and peace.

Blonay,
Secretary General.

Paris, *November 23, 1963.*

Mrs. St. George,
Inter-Parliamentary Group,
The Capitol, Washington, D.C.:

Suis certain interpreter sentiments union toute entiere en vous priant accepter et transmettre groupe Americain sentiments profonde emotion et sympathie emue a l occasion tragique disparition President Kennedy grand serviteur de la democratie et de la paix.

Blonay,
Secretaire General.

Deputados Brasiliadf,
November 23, 1963.

Katherine St. George,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Please accept my own name and behalf IPU Council expression deepest sympathy tragic event President Kennedy's death. Not only the United States but the whole world mourns one of its greatest leaders.

Ranieri Mazzilli.

Vitoria, *November 24, 1963.*

George B. Galloway,
Library of Congress,
Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of Spanish group Interparliamentary Union please express American group our most sincere condolence.

Manuel de Ananegui.

Brasilia, *November 26, 1963.*

Katherine St. George,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Deeply distressed tragical death President Kennedy I present name Brazilian group and my own expression our deepest sympathy.

Rui Palmeira.

The Inter-Parliamentary group of the principality of Monaco is deeply shocked at the tragic event that has put the United States and the world in mourning. We express through you our profound condolences and the deep emotion of the members of the National Council and the whole population of Monaco.

Louis Aureglia,
President.

Monacoville, *November 23, 1963.*

Mrs. Katherine St. George,
U.S. Interparliamentary Group, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Groupe Interparlementaire Principaute de Monaco consterne par tragique evenement qui endeuille les etatsunis et le monde vous exprime condooleances profoundement emues des membres conseil natinal et de la population Monegasque.

Louis Aureglia,
President.

Roma, *November 25, 1963.*

Mrs. St. George,
Chairman, United States of America Group IPU, the Capitol, Washington, D.C.:

Touched for the tragic lost President Kennedy on behalf of Italian group please accept deepest condolences while jointing to the nations's.

Vodacci Pisanelli.

Deeply shocked by your national mourning. The French national group wishes to express its very sincere and deep compassion.

Moutet.

Paris, *November 25, 1963.*

Lt. Presidente St. George,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Profondement bouleverse par votre deuil national groupe Francais vous exprime sa tres sincere et bien vieve compassion.

Moutet.

THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on November 22, 1963, John F. Kennedy died in action. A young man in the height of his powers, he gave his life for his country. May God comfort his loved ones and give guidance to President Johnson in his constitutional tasks. In this most critical time, for our country and for our troubled world, President Johnson has my support.

As Mrs. Lindsay and I paid tribute to the late President in the East Room of the White House the day after his young life was cut short, and later in the great Rotunda of the Capital, and finally at Arlington Cemetery, our thoughts were with Mrs. Kennedy, the children and the family, with our countrymen, and with the people of the 17th Congressional District in whose name and for whom we stood in silent prayer.

Out of the wreckage perhaps there will emerge a greater sense of the Nation's needs and fresh determination to get on with the job. The Congress has been divided and deadlocked on civil rights and other great issues of our time. Perhaps the late President's tragic death will bring into focus and perspective the futility of putting private prejudices ahead of public needs and human rights.

Always out of the deepest dark of the night there comes the first rays of the new sun and the new day. This week we celebrate Thanksgiving Day and though we mourn our President and weep for his widow and children, we have much to be thankful for.

We are thankful that the world is in relative peace.

We are thankful that each American family will have a Thanksgiving meal.

We are thankful that providence gave us John F. Kennedy even for a short while.

We are thankful that out of the ashes there can come a new sense of unity and commitment to values and purposes other than self.

We are thankful that in the new day the tensions and bitterness arising from unsolved problems of human rights may at last be solved by a people and a Congress awakened to the need for action. We are thankful that this we can do in memory of the late President.

We are thankful that the unity and partnership of the Western World has been reaffirmed and rededicated by the act of respect and faith by the monarchs, presidents, and prime ministers of the West, whose country's have had their share of tragedy, in bowing their heads under an American flag in an American cemetery.

Finally, we are thankful for and have a new awareness of the moral fiber, courage, and strength of the American family, because we have been shown by Jacqueline Kennedy that the American family has that character, courage, and strength.

For all of these things we are grateful, Mr. Speaker, and for these reasons this Thanksgiving will carry extra meaning for every American home.

PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL VIEWS TO ACCOMPANY HOUSE REPORT NO. 914 ON H.R. 7152

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I and the following members of the Committee on the Judiciary may have until Monday, December 2, 1963, to file additional views to accompany House Report No. 914 or H.R. 7152: Mr. Cahill, Mr. Mathias, Mr. MacGregor, and Mr. Bromwell.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE LATE PRESIDENT, JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, the death of President Kennedy, like a clanging of bells, tells us that we have been remiss.

Assassination, because of its effect on the operation of this Government and because of its infinite consequences, is a different crime from murder.

Nothing is more completely or appropriately within the Federal purview than the security of the functions of Government by protection of the physical safety of its officers. I shall offer a bill to extend existing law to protect the lives of all Presidents so long as they live and the lives of all other elected officials of the Federal Government, members of the Cabinet, and the Justices of the Supreme Court during their terms of office.

I shall also prepare a measure which will make punishable armed assault on any such officials during the same periods.

I commend consideration of these measures.

LINCOLN'S SPRINGFIELD MOURNS ANEW

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of President Kennedy had unusual meaning for Springfield, Ill. Ninety-eight years ago that prairie community knew the sorrow of bringing home for final rest the remains of another martyred President, Abraham Lincoln, killed—like Mr. Kennedy—in the prime of his life and in the prime of his service to his country by an assassin's bullet.

Springfield had sent young Lincoln to Congress and had seen him rise to national fame in the Lincoln-Douglas series of debates over slavery. On February 11, 1861, the citizens of Springfield received Lincoln's affectionate farewell, as the President-elect entered the train that was to take him to the White House. Four years later he returned to Springfield in a coffin.

Jack Heintz, the present publisher of Springfield's Illinois State Journal, a paper that reported Lincoln's assassination a century ago, cried out last Saturday with these words:

> What kind of man is this? At 1 p.m. I look out my window at a street Christmas decoration which is now black. A man has died at the hands of a madman. The skies are darkened by a drizzling rain which echoes my despair. What manner of man is this who would differ so violently with a father, a husband, a country's leader who would do but what he felt in his heart was best for his fellow American, fellow man? May God have some mercy on his soul to the end of his violent, misshapen, and maniacal days.

The Journal's companion newspaper, the Illinois State Register, the same day carried this front-page black-bordered editorial:

Nation in State of Shock at President's Tragic Death

> Our beloved President is dead, victim of a bullet fired by a cowardly assassin. John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, who had survived the ordeals of war as a gallant hero, went to his death as he led this Nation in a quest for peace.
>
> The people of the United States, numb with shock at the tragic manner in which our President died, mourn as one. Our hearts go out in sadness and deep sympathy for the President's family in their bereavement. The death of President Kennedy is

a loss to all humanity, a loss made even more tragic by the manner in which he died.

This dastardly crime shook to the core even the most calloused, and the entire Nation poured out its grief unashamedly at the news of the President's death, and mingled with the tears were emotion-filled outpourings of anger at the psychopathic killer who had pulled the trigger to fire the bullet that snuffed out the life of the President.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the fourth President of the United States to die at the hands of an assassin, had experienced in his 46 years the role of successful lawyer, author and recipient of a Pulitzer Prize, of Senator of the United States and of President of the United States. He had experienced personal suffering and hardship in the military service of his country; he provided leadership with the quality of greatness during this cold war period of international political strife with the Communists; and, he was a husband and father, a role dear to his heart. He was a man of integrity, a man of honesty, a man of deep conviction and sincerity.

In a moment of tragedy, his life ended. But the principles in which he believed, and for which he fought, will live on in the hearts of all who live on to fight the battle President Kennedy considered his greatest goal, the quest for peace.

In this hour of breavement, we join with all Americans in their sorrow and in their prayers for our fallen leader, President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

A MEMORIAL TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of President John F. Kennedy has taken from us a great and enlightened leader, a noble soul and a gifted citizen of the Republic.

This tragic end to the young and spirited life of our President has brought to our country a period of deep sadness and mourning as the full magnitude of our Nation's loss becomes more apparent with each passing hour.

In this period of deep sorrow, while our hearts and prayers go out to Mrs. Kennedy and her little ones, and to the entire Kennedy family, our minds turn to the need for a lasting and suitable memorial to our late President. I can think of no greater memorial to his life and times than a development of the full truth behind his assassination.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S UNDELIVERED SPEECH

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemar. from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, at this time of tragedy there is much that all of us could say, yet in a sense there is nothing to say. In this hour of national and international grief let us dedicate ourselves to the principles and purpose of President John F. Kennedy; let us unite in common determination to cleanse our national life of bigotry and vituperation; in doing so, let us consider the words of our beloved President which he had prepared to deliver to the Dallas Citizens Council and the Dallas Assembly. In that speech, an eloquent statement of American policy, it is significant that President Kennedy intended with words of reason to caution against "voices preaching doctrines wholly unrelated to reality, wholly unsuited to the sixties, doctrines which apparently assume that words will suffice without weapons, that vituperation is as good as victory and that peace is a sign of weakness."

The text of the undelivered speech follows:

TEXT PREPARED FOR DALLAS

I am honored to have this invitation to address the annual meeting of the Dallas Citizens Council, joined by the members of the Dallas Assembly—and pleased to have this opportunity to salute the Graduate Research Center of the Southwest.

It is fitting that these two symbols of Dallas progress are united in the sponsorship of this meeting. For they represent the best qualities, I am told, of leadership and learning in this city—and leadership and learning are indispensable to each other.

The advancement of learning depends on community leadership for financial and political support—and the products of that learning, in turn, are essential to the leadership's hopes for continued progress and prosperity. It is not a coincidence that those communities possessing the best in research and graduate facilities—from M.I.T. to Cal Tech—tend to attract the new and growing industries. I congratulate those of you here in Dallas who have recognized these basic facts through the creation of the unique and forward-looking graduate research center.

LINK IN WORLD AFFAIRS

This link between leadership and learning is not only essential at the community level. It is even more indispensable in world affairs. Ignorance and misinformation can handicap the progress of a city or a company—but they can, if allowed to prevail in foreign policy, handicap this country's security. In a world of complex and continuing problems, in a world full of frustrations and irritations, America's leadership must be guided by the lights of learning and reason—or else those who confuse rhetoric with reality and the plausible with the possible will gain the popular ascendancy with their seemingly swift and simple solutions to every world problem.

There will always be dissident voices heard in the land, expressing opposition without alternatives, finding fault but never favor, perceiving gloom on every side and seeking influence without responsibility. Those voices are inevitable.

But today other voices are heard in the land—voices preaching doctrines wholly unrelated to reality, wholly unsuited to the sixties, doctrines which apparently assume that words will suffice without weapons, that vituperation is as good as victory and that peace is a sign of weakness.

At a time when the national debt is steadily being reduced in terms of its burden on our economy, they see that debt as the greatest single threat to our security. At a time when we are steadily reducing the number of Federal employees serving every thousand citizens, they fear those supposed hordes of civil servants far more than the actual hordes of opposing armies.

STEVENSON QUOTED

We cannot expect that everyone, to use the phrase of a decade ago, will "talk sense to the American people." But we can hope that fewer people will listen to nonsense. And the notion that this Nation is headed for defeat through deficit, or that strength is but a matter of slogans, is nothing but just plain nonsense.

I want to discuss with you today the status of our strength and our security because this question clearly calls for the most responsible qualities of leadership and the most enlightened products of scholarship. For this Nation's strength and security are not easily or cheaply obtained—nor are they quickly and simply explained.

There are many kinds of strength and no one kind will suffice. Overwhelming nuclear strength cannot stop a guerrilla war. Formal pacts of alliance cannot stop internal subversion. Displays of material wealth cannot stop the disillusionment of diplomats subjected to discrimination.

Above all, words alone are not enough. The United States is a peaceful nation. And where our strength and determination are clear, our words need merely to convey conviction, but belligerence. If we are strong, our strength will speak for itself. If we are weak, words will be no help.

STRENGTH OF AID PLAN

I realize that this Nation often tends to identify turning points in world affairs with the major addresses which preceded them. But it was not the Monroe Doctrine that kept all Europe away from this hemisphere—it was the strength of the British Fleet and the width of the Atlantic Ocean. It was not General Marshall's speech at Harvard which kept communism out of Western Europe—it was the strength and stability made possible by our military and economic assistance.

In this administration also it has been necessary at times to issue specific warnings that we could not stand by and watch the Communists conquer Laos by force, or intervene in the Congo, or swallow West Berlin, or maintain offensive missiles on Cuba.

But while our goals were at least temporarily obtained in those and other instances, our successful defense of freedom was due—not to the words we used—but to the strength we stood ready to use on behalf of the principles we stand ready to defend.

REVIEWS AREAS OF STRENGTH

This strength is composed of many different elements, ranging from the most massive deterrents to the most subtle influences. And all types of strength are needed—no one kind could do the job alone. Let us take a moment, therefore, to review this Nation's progress in each major area of strength.

First, as Secretary McNamara made clear in his address last Monday, the strategic nuclear power of the United States has been so greatly modernized and expanded in the last 1,000 days, by the rapid production and deployment of the most modern missile systems that any and all potential aggressors are clearly confronted now with the impossibility of strategic victory—and the certainty of total destruction—if by reckless attack they should ever force upon us the necessity of a strategic reply.

In less than 3 years, we have increased by 50 percent the number of Polaris submarines scheduled to be in force by the next fiscal year—increased by more than 70 percent our total Polaris purchase program—increased by 50 percent the portion of our strategic bombers on 15-minute alert—and increased by 100 percent the total number of nuclear weapons available in our strategic alert forces.

Our security is further enhanced by the steps we have taken regarding these weapons to improve the speed and certainty of their response, their readiness at all times to respond, their ability to survive an attack and their ability to be carefully controlled and directed through secure command operations.

But the lessons of the last decade have taught us that freedom cannot be defended by strategic nuclear power alone. We have, therefore, in the last 3 years accelerated the development and deployment of tactical nuclear weapons—and increased by 60 percent the tactical nuclear forces deployed in Western Europe.

Nor can Europe or any other continent rely on nuclear forces alone, whether they are strategic or tactical. We have radically improved the readiness of our conventional forces—increased by 45 percent the number of combat ready army divisions—increased by 100 percent the procurement of modern army weapons and equipment—increased by 100 percent our ship construction, conversion and modernization program—increased by 100 percent our procurement of tactical aircraft—increased by 30 percent the number of tactical air squadrons—and increased the strength of the Marines.

As last month's Operation Big Lift—which originated here in Texas—showed so clearly, this Nation is prepared as never before to move substantial numbers of men in surprisingly little time to advanced positions anywhere in the world. We have increased by 175 percent the procurement of airlift aircraft—and we have already achieved a 75 percent increase in our existing strategic airlift capability. Finally, moving beyond the traditional roles of our military forces, we have achieved an increase of nearly 600 percent in our special forces—those forces that are prepared to work with our allies and friends against the guerrillas, saboteurs, insurgents and assassins who threaten freedom in a less direct but equally dangerous manner.

But American military might should not and need not stand alone against the ambitions of international communism. Our security and strength, in the last analysis, directly depend on the security and strength of others—and that is why our military and economic assistance plays such a key role in enabling those who live on the periphery of the Communist world to maintain their independence of choice.

Our assistance for these nations can be painful, risky, and costly, as is true in southeast Asia today. But we dare not weary of the task. For our assistance makes possible the stationing of 3.5 million allied troops along the Communist frontier at one-tenth the cost of maintaining a comparable number of American soldiers. A successful Communist breakthrough in these areas, necessitating direct U.S. intervention, would cost us several times as much as our entire foreign-aid program, and might cost us heavily in American lives as well.

MOST FOR NINE COUNTRIES

About 70 percent of our military assistance goes to nine key countries located on or near the borders of the Communist bloc; nine countries confronted directly or indirectly with the threat of Communist aggression—Vietnam, Free China, Korea, India, Pakistan, Thailand, Greece, Turkey, and Iran. No one of these countries possesses on its own the resources to maintain the forces which our own chiefs of staff think needed in the common interest.

Reducing our efforts to train, equip, and assist their armies can only encourage Communist penetration and require in time the increased oversea deployment of American combat forces. And reducing the economic help needed to bolster these nations that undertake to help defend freedom can have the same disastrous result. In short, the $50 billion we spend each year on our own defense could well be ineffective without the $4 billion required for military and economic assistance.

Our foreign-aid program is not growing in size; it is, on the contrary, smaller now than in previous years. It has had its weaknesses, but we have undertaken to correct them, and the proper way of treating weaknesses is to replace them with strength, not to increase those weaknesses by emasculating essential programs.

Dollar for dollar, in or out of Government, there is no better form of investment in our national security than our much abused foreign-aid program. We cannot afford to lose it. We can afford to maintain it. We can surely afford, for example, to do as much for our 19 needy neighbors of Latin America as the Communist bloc is sending to the island of Cuba alone.

LOSS THROUGH BALLOTS

I have spoken of strength largely in terms of the deterrence and resistance of aggression and attack. But, in today's world, freedom can be lost without a shot being fired, by ballots as well as bullets. The success of our leadership is dependent upon respect for our mission in the world as well as our missiles—on a clearer recognition of the virtues of freedom as well as the evils of tyranny.

That is why our information agency has doubled the shortwave broadcasting power of the Voice of America and increased the number of broadcasting hours by 30 percent—increased Spanish-language broadcasting to Cuba and Latin-American readers—and taken a host of other steps to carry our message of truth and freedom to all the far corners of the earth.

And that is also why we have regained the initiative in the exploration of outer space—making an annual effort greater than the combined total of all space activities undertaken during the fifties—launching more than 130 vehicles into earth orbit—putting into actual operation valuable weather and communications satellites—and making it clear to all that the United States of America has no intention of finishing second in space.

This effort is expensive but it pays its own way, for freedom and for America. For there is no longer any fear in the free world that a Communist lead in space will become a permanent assertion of supremacy and the basis of military superiority. There is no longer any doubt about the strength and skill of American science, American industry, American education, and the American free enterprise system. In short, our national space effort represents a great gain in, and a great resource of, our national strength—and both Texas and Texans are contributing greatly to this strength.

Finally, it should be clear by now that a nation can be no stronger abroad than she is at home. Only America which practices what it preaches about equal rights and social justice will be respected by those whose choice affects our future. Only an America which has fully educated its citizens is fully capable of tackling the complex problems and perceiving the hidden dangers of the world in which we live. And only an America which is growing and prospering economically can sustain the worldwide defense of freedom, while demonstrating to all concerned the opportunities of our system and society.

It is clear, therefore, that we are strengthening our security as well as our economy by our recent record increases in national income and output—by surging ahead of most of Western Europe in the rate of business expansion.

And the margin of corporate profits—by maintaining a more stable level of prices than almost any of our oversea competitors—and by cutting personal and corporate income taxes by some $11 billion, as I have proposed, to assure this Nation of the longest and strongest expansion in our peacetime economic history.

This Nation's total output—which 3 years ago was at the $500 billion mark—will soon pass $600 billion for, a record rise of over $100 billion in 3 years. For the first time in history we have 70 million men and women at work. For the first time in history average factory earnings have exceeded $100 a week. For the first time in history corporation profits after taxes—which have risen 43 percent in less than 3 years—have reached an annual level of $27.4 billion.

My friends and fellow citizens, I cite these facts and figures to make it clear that America today is stronger than ever before. Our adversaries have not abandoned their ambitions—our dangers have not diminished—our vigilance cannot be relaxed. But now we have the military, the scientific and the economic strength to do whatever must be done for the preservation and promotion of freedom.

That strength will never be used in pursuit of aggressive ambitions—it will always be used in pursuit of peace. It will never be used to promote provocations—it will always be used to promote the peaceful settlement of disputes.

We in this country, in this generation, are—by destiny rather than choice—the watchmen on the walls of world freedom. We ask, therefore that we may be worthy of our power and responsibility—that we may exercise our strength with wisdom and restraint—and that we may achieve in our time and for all time the ancient vision of peace on earth, good will toward men. That must always be our goal—and the righteousness of our cause must always underlie our strength. For as was written long ago, "Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain."

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, in a sunlit street last Friday, a moment in time was made timeless in tragedy. And now we mourn our lost President.

The sense of revulsion that humanity has produced the twisted sniper may be tempered by the sure knowledge that it as also produced the nobility that was John F. Kennedy.

He has left us a legacy of high purpose and idealism. Our willingness to accept this inheritance and our active commitment to it would be our finest memorial to him.

May God grant him sweet repose.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS NATIONAL HOME

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time today to make the Members of Congress aware of a very wonderful and unique institution located at Eaton Rapids, Mich.

This institution is operated by a great veterans' organization, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and is called the Veterans of Foreign Wars National Home.

Many of you know, I believe, of my activities in the VFW, for I feel sure you remember that I met some of you in your native States when I toured our Nation as Commander in Chief in 1957 and 1958. The VFW actually is the second largest veterans' organization in the world, and is the largest organization consisting exclusively of men who have served our Nation overseas and were thus awarded a campaign medal for such service. I might add further that the VFW requires an honorable discharge from wartime service in the armed services and campaign medal service for eligibility.

Our organization is chartered by Congress and is now made up of nearly 10,000 individual units called posts. The membership rolls number nearly 1,300,000.

Inasmuch as the United States has participated in many campaigns and expeditions, we find our membership made up of veterans of the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, and the many campaigns and expeditions recognized by the U.S. Government.

The VFW is also very proud of its ladies auxiliary of some 400,000, giving a combined membership of men and women of nearly 1¾ million Americans. The VFW this year is headed by an outstanding veteran from Brooklyn, N.Y., Joseph J. Lombardo, and our ladies auxiliary is under the direction of the National President, Lillian Campbell, of Neenah, Wis.

I have indicated that this is a unique organization, and our national home is an unique institution. I think that its very founding is unusual, and will be of interest to the Members of this Congress.

In September 1924, first consideration was given at the national encampment of the VFW, held that year at Atlantic City, N.J., to the establishment of a national home for the orphan children of our members. The National Council of Administration, the ruling body of the VFW between encampments, had a session in Kansas City, Mo., in October of 1924 and appointed a committee with full power to act as it deemed fit to acquire farmland near Eaton Rapids, Mich., and thereby provide the establishment of a national home. The committee reported favorably to another council meeting in December 1924, and action was taken to convey to the VFW National Home the then Grand River Stock Farm at Eaton Rapids, owned by Mr. and Mrs. Corey J. Spencer, of Jackson, Mich.

The home was incorporated, following its acceptance of the farmland by the VFW, as a nonprofit membership corporation under the laws of the State of Michigan, and charter was filed with the secretary of state of the State of Michigan in January 1925. This act was approved by the national encampment in August 1925, at Tulsa, Okla. By this action, I feel that my comrades of the VFW gave real emphasis to the longstanding VFW motto—"To honor the dead by helping the living."

To continue just briefly with the history of our national home, the first occupancy was in March 1925, when the widow of one of our members, and her six children, became the first family to move into the home. At that time, they were housed in the original farmhouse which had served as the residence on the Grand River Stock Farm.

The original land conveyed to the VFW amounted to 472 acres. However, later purchases increased the size of these holdings to the 640 acres the home presently occupies.

The first cottage—and here I might qualify that term by saying that the cottages at our national home are rather elaborate, permanent dwellings constructed of either brick or stone and equivalent to private homes in the very best neighborhoods of American cities—was built in 1926 by the State of Michigan, and is referred to now as Michigan Cottage No. 1. This cottage is still in existence and is in use by the home.

The first cottage constructed by a department—or State—organization of the VFW was New York No. 1, completed in 1927. Since that time, many other departments have built cottages at our national home, and each unit represents a great deal of hard work by my comrades and sisters of the VFW residing in the department which provides the funds for the construction.

Only in one instance was a cottage constructed by one individual post. That was Parker D. Cramer Post 2145 in Clarion, Pa. The last cottage completed was by the Department of North Dakota in 1962, and we now have 32 of these beautiful homes housing children and giving ample room for a total of 230 boys and girls.

So many comrades and sisters of our organization have contributed to the growth of the home that it is impossible to list them all. Very important assistance to the national home came from the ladies auxiliary, for example, in building the original hospital and then, as a separate project, adding a wing to that hospital. The ladies auxiliary also built the community center, the nursery, the guest lodge and the chapel, and installed a complete street-lighting system.

The Military Order of the Cootie likewise has furnished important and needed additions to the home by constructing an athletic field and fieldhouse, as well as the beautiful swimming pool, the fire barn and its modern and efficient firetruck, which is manned by the older boys living at the national home.

It is most difficult to single out those who have contributed time and money for our national home, but this great institution is mighty close to the hearts of all the men and women of the VFW. Individual posts, county councils, districts, and departments have built streets, provided transportation and heating systems, and provided general upkeep and improvement of the cottages. The Michigan ladies' auxiliary built the relief housemothers cottage, and the department of Pennsylvania expanded and improved the Woodside Center, named in honor of a distinguished past commander in chief, Robert G. Woodside. And just recently the department of Montana built a modern dairy farmstead to house the Holstein cow herd originally started by South Dakota and provide modern and sanitary dairy equipment.

It seems that when one who loves our home attempts to discuss or describe this great institution, it is difficult to restrict the amount of time and space.

On June 30, 1962, our annual audit, certified by a CPA, showed the fixed assets of the home, including the buildings, land, livestock, et cetera, to be valued at $1,805,084. I think you would be interested in knowing how the money is obtained for the care and education of the children at our national home.

Primarily, the source of income is threefold:

First, funds are obtained from the sale of Christmas seals to the members of the VFW and the ladies' auxiliary; and very importantly, the annual sale of the VFW buddy poppy provides vital help and income; naturally, a third source would be contributions from posts and auxiliaries, as well as donations and bequests from individuals who love this home so very dearly.

I would say that the national home of the VFW is in the very forefront of children's homes regardless of location in providing a homelike, noninstitutional atmosphere. Family-sized living units each have a house mother and provide a typical American home in suburbanlike surroundings, with complete integration into school, civic, and religious life of the nearby community of Eaton Rapids. The house mother prepares the food for her family unit, and I can assure you that I have sampled this food and would say that it is of excellent quality and that each meal is prepared and eaten in the same manner as it would be in an average American home. The blessing is offered, and the trials and tribulations of juvenile life are discussed by the children with their house mother.

The VFW has never felt it would be wise to set up private schools on the homesite, and has provided that school and religious life be in the public schools and in churches of the children's own choice in Eaton Rapids.

During its nearly 40 years of service, the VFW national home has provided care for a great number of children, many of whom lived there during their entire childhood. Hundreds have graduated from Eaton Rapids High School and a great number have gone on to schools of higher learning, including universities and trade schools. The higher learning is usually on scholarships provided by various individuals, VFW organizations, or by the home itself. More than 150 of our children served in World War II and Korea, and 3 of our fine young men paid the supreme sacrifice. Many received medals and citations and were wounded in service. They, like their fathers, have joined that great group of comrades who have served this Nation so very well.

The alumni of our home make up an impressive list of engineers, lawyers, doctors, businessmen, farmers, nurses, secretaries, and homemakers who provide care for their own children. They have fitted themselves well into the social and industrial life of our Nation. Most of our graduates now have their own families, and those living near our national home often return for visits, along with which gave them their chance in life.

If the VFW had no other function, its existence would certainly be justified by the opportunity furnished our children.

May I conclude by saying what inspired these remarks before the Congress. The VFW national home is operated by a board of trustees, made up of 10 home districts representing the States of the United States. This board serves a period of 5 years on staggered terms, so that two trustees are subject to election each year. This year I was honored by election to the board of trustees, representing district 4, which is Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Illinois, and Indiana.

The other new trustee to join the board was Dr. Guy C. Richardson, of Bristol, Va.

At its first meeting, the board elected Mrs. Hedwig Olson, of Denison, Iowa, as president, and Benjamin F. Winn, of Rohnert Park, Calif., as vice president. The board also reelected Charles A. Wagner, of Dearborn, Mich., as attorney, and Mr. A. E. Littlefield, of Eaton Rapids, as secretary-treasurer. Both of these men have served the home for many years.

Other trustees are Thomas Bennett, of Bridgeport, Conn.; Mrs. Gertrude Rhind, of Wilmington, Del.; Mr. William R. Baker, of Winnsboro, La.; Mr. Fred E. Barrett, of Chester, Mont.; Mr. Walter J. Gates, of Galveston, Tex.; and Mr. Wellington Rupp, of Seattle, Wash.

MONTANA FARM IN MICHIGAN AT THE VFW'S NATIONAL HOME

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, in carrying on the discussion of the Veterans of Foreign Wars National Home, it is with great pride that I point out the participation of my State of Montana in making this national home a reality.

Mr. Speaker, this national home provides for what every mother and father in every section of our beloved country prays for. A place in the world where children may grow up, pursuing their quest for peace and contentment in a climate of peace and universal good will.

To explain fully the work the Montana VFW and auxiliary have done in making the Montana Farmstead a reality and a paying entity at the home, I include the article appearing in the March 3 issue of the Great Falls Tribune at this point in the Record:

Montana Farm in Michigan

(By Rita Lindblom)

One of the most unusual of Montana farmsteads is deep in the dairyland of another State.

It's the Montana Farmstead at the Veterans of Foreign Wars National Home in south-central Michigan 23 miles from the State capital of Lansing.

The VFW National Home is a unique village of children—unique in that it is available only to widows, sons, and daughters of VFW members. It also is one of the most beautifully developed children's villages in the world.

Playing a large part in the financial and educational operations of the home is the Montana Farmstead, the pride of Montana VFW and auxiliary members who have more than $56,000 invested in this modern dairy farm.

A Montanan, Fred Barrett, of Chester, has an important role in the operation of the home. He was elected president of the home board last October and will serve until October 1963.

When it was founded in 1925, the VFW National Home was a single farm cottage and a group of farm buildings on 472 acres. From the first family, the widow and 6 children of Sgt. Edward Pollett, it has grown to a present capacity of 250 children. There now are 195 children and 40 housemothers at the home.

The home today has 50 units, including 32 cottages, a modern hospital, day nursery, guest lodge, chapel, clothing and grocery store on a 50-acre campus, and the Montana Farmstead, with 590 acres of fertile dairy and orchard land.

The home was developed entirely within the VFW organization. State departments have provided many improvements, including family-sized cottages, a service center, picnic ground, private lake area, swimming pool, athletic field, water-softening system, firefighting equipment, and paved streets.

Not all State organizations have had unit projects at the home, but children from all States are welcome if they meet eligibility requirements. There is no distinction as to creed.

When the Montana Veterans of Foreign Wars Department began its dairy farmstead project at the home in the fall of 1957, there were only an old barn and a farmhouse at the location.

Now there are a 10,000-bale hay barn with concrete yard, a 52 by 150- foot cattle barn or loafing parlor for the dairy cows, a modern milking parlor, new fencing, and new silos with an automatic silage mover connected to the feed bunk.

With the new farm setup, the milking herd was increased from about 40 head to more than 90, with more increases planned. During the past 5 years, the farm has developed to the point where a net profit of more than $7,000 was realized last year to aid in the home's operation. Previously the farm was a nonpaying proposition, and in some years a liability.

All finances for the home are direct donations from VFW and auxiliary members with the exception of the public buddy poppy sale; which is VFW-sponsored—1 penny for every poppy sold goes to the home. The sale of VFW National Home Christmas Seals to VFW and auxiliary members accounts for the largest single income item, about $200,000 net annually. The current operating budget is over a half million dollars.

The home has pioneered in certain aspects of residential child care methods and is recognized as one of the finest in the United States. Child care experts from all over the world visit the home, many of them at the suggestion of the United Nations, to observe and learn its methods.

No children are adopted from the home. Families are kept intact. The average child at the home has been there for more than 3 years, some for their entire childhood.

Children attend public school in Eaton Rapids, 4 miles distant. Those old enough to attend church are required to affiliate themselves with the church of their family choice and participate in youth groups of Eaton Rapids churches.

Many home graduates have gone on to college, helped by VFW and other scholarships. More than 150 have served in the Armed Forces. Graduates who now have their own families often return to show their children the home that gave them a good start in life.

The home is one of the ways in which the VFW keeps its pledge of "honoring the dead by helping the living."

NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Bray] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the ramifications of the nuclear test ban treaty are of concern to all of us and we will continue to study them as time goes on.

One of the most worthwhile discussions I have seen on the subject is in the following article by Dr. Lev Dobriansky which appeared in the Ukrainian Quarterly:

The Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and the Cold War

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

With the so-called first step toward guaranteeing the peace, it would do well for most Americans to learn an old Turkestanian proverb: "When you travel with a Russian, make sure you carry an ax." The Kennedy administration has decided to travel with the Russians on the limited nuclear test ban treaty. What ax, if any, is it carrying?

The partial nuclear test ban treaty may well give rise to the biggest hoax of the cold war. The hoax is the beginning of the end of the cold war itself. Many Americans already are talking in this uncritical vein. If such talk should assume serious proportions, the unswerving enemy will have scored a momentous victory in the cold war. The effects of this spreading illusion would be catastrophic for our cold war efforts and operations, inferior though they have been.

In the Senate hearings on the treaty many delicate questions and points will undoubtedly be raised. Indeed, the treaty itself is an awful gamble with our national security. Testing of all kinds is necessary for the advancement of our military technological knowledge and thus, in all its ramifications, of our national interests. Testing is by nature experimentation, and through the latter we learn more in ways of development and control. Even the dangers of fallout have by this normal process been reduced to a thin minimum. Are we to deprive ourselves of such critical knowledge because of emotional and irrational pleas for peace, much of it stimulated by Moscow's propaganda machine for the past 8 years? The greatest guarantee against the outbreak of a hot global war is our overall military and technological superiority. The treaty does not conduce to this guarantee.

Also, what of the indispensable development of the antimissile missile, which only by atmospheric testing can be efficiently undertaken? Would a ratified treaty lead to the demobilization of our nuclear capital as represented by our assembled scientists, engineers, facilities, and so forth? Who in his right mind would trust the Russians not to cheat on undetectable nuclear explosions in the atmosphere under 1 kiloton and the use of their results for adapted massive missile development? Furthermore, since it is held with some validity that the heavy expenditures involved in nuclear testing have compelled the Russian totalitarians to seize upon this treaty, aren't we relieving them of this extra burden to patch up their imperial economy for even more intensive cold war operations—the Chicoms?

The burden of these and many more questions rests with the proponents of this treaty, not its opponents. Even from a strictly legal point of view the treaty is subject to serious question. Much can and will be made of article IV in the treaty which states that "each party shall in exercising its national sovereignty have the right to withdraw from the treaty." What national sovereignty is exercised by an empire-state such as the Soviet Union, and a democratic but multinational entity like United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland? Two of the three "original parties," the depository governments, are mischaracterized and fallaciously defined right from the start. If parties to a contract are misrepresented in light of fact and logic, the entire contract is overshadawed by this basic invalidity. In a court of law such an ill-based contract could hardly survive the court's objective strictures. Why should it in this all-important case? Or are we to multiply error and fiction?

Highly important, too, for a studied consideration of the treaty are the points of an armaments race and a succeeding nonaggression pact. The treaty is supposed to herald the intention of curbing the armaments race. In developing more powerful and efficient weapons the United States has been in no race. Regardless of what Moscow does or does not do, our goal should unqualifiedly be an adequacy of the best weapons along the full spectrum of weaponry. As to a succeeding nonaggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Pact nations, a ratification of the partial test ban treaty should in no way be interpreted as a predication for such a pact. Khrushchev's one great dream has been to obtain our acceptance of his empire. In point of logic, for a nonaggressor to agree with a historical aggressor on nonaggression is a rather one sided and even absurd agreement. As an imperio colonialist power, Moscow, in fact, is in a state of constant aggression, and any such simple agreement on nonaggression would sanctify this state. It is all important to keep the test ban treaty and this proposed pact strictly apart.

Perhaps the most important of questions bears on the cold war implications of the test ban treaty? Is it, as the President has said, a shaft of light in the cold war? To believe this is only a psychological preparation for the hoax mentioned earlier. Such naive belief runs counter to the facts of typical Russian cold war play; it blindly ignores the utterances of the Soviet Russian totalitarians. More, it reduces our own effectiveness. The test ban treaty itself is in part the result of Russian cold war calculation.

From Moscow's point of view, the treaty can serve numerous ends. It is a slap at Red China; it will decelerate American progress in military technology and weaponry; it can accommodate Russian cheating; it will permit the retention of Russian superiority in high megatonnage weaponry; it will allow a diversion of resources in the economy that might enhance output for more effective cold war operations; and it is a lever for the exaction of a possible nonaggression pact and all that this would entail to the cold war detriment of the United States and the free world.

Neither can Moscow's sudden accession to the test ban treaty be divorced from its evaluation of the political factors surrounding Washington and London. Administrations in both centers will be up for election next year, and in both the United States and Great Britain the pressure to show something as an offset to Cuba and the scandalous Profumo case, respectively, is intense.

The treaty and its assumed observance will in no way lead to the cessation of the cold war. The treaty cannot rationally be regarded as even the first step to any such eventuality. Indeed, to think in the most ultimate terms that the cold war could end without the necessary collapse of the imperial structure maintained by Moscow suggests both an unfamiliarity with East European history and a failure to understand the nature of the cold war itself. But, for that matter, both deficiencies have for too long punctuated U.S. foreign policy.

Moreover, despite its imperialist rift with Peiping, Moscow has been thoroughly consistent in its resolve to wage the cold war on the basis of its meaning of "peaceful coexistence." Taking just the most recent period, we should review a few examples of Moscow's meaning. In January 1957, Khrushchev minced no words when he declared: "For all of us * * * Stalin's name is inseparable from Marxism-Leninism. Therefore, each one of us, members of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, strives to be as faithful to Marxism-Leninism * * * as Stalin was faithful to this cause." The cause of Stalin was the cause of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism.

On January 6, 1961, Khrushchev reaffirmed traditional Russian cold war policy when he stated, "We will beat the United States with small wars of liberation. We will nibble them to exhaustion all over the globe, in South America, Africa, southeast Asia." New? Not at all. For centuries Russian imperio-colonialists have been "liberating" non-Russian peoples for one reason or another. Significantly, even during the Sino-Soviet talks in Moscow, July 1963, Russian organs emphasized that the Red Chinese have nothing over the Soviet Russians in the pursuit of these wars of liberation. And this immediately prior to the signing of the nuclear test ban treaty.

THE INTENSIFIED COLD WAR

Confronted now by the massive competition issuing from Peiping for leadership among the Communist parties throughout the world, Moscow will have to intensify its cold war efforts in order that its demonstrative deeds will exceed the stern competitor's. Unavoidably, we shall feel the brunt of all this. Whether we like it or not, the demands for cold war education on our part will be greater than ever before.

In meeting these demands we shall truly have to reexamine our views, habits, and notions regarding the Soviet Union. Karl Marx wrote, "The Russian bear is certainly capable of anything, so long as he knows the other animals he has to deal with to be capable of nothing." In the contemporary context this, of course, is an extreme historical observation, since the eagle, the lion, and others are capable of more than nothing. Yet this Marxian insight into the nature of the beast, regardless of his ideologic pigmentation, carries immense weight and validity in the one sphere on clear-cut Soviet Russian superiority—the all-embracing sphere of political psychology, artful propaganda, systematic imagemaking. It is in this sphere, incorporating and interrelating into a manifest whole of projected imagery factors of ideologic, political, economic, military-space, and general cultural character, that imperial Moscow wages its Communist assault on American freedom.

In 1960, and on many occasions since, we Americans have been seriously concerned about the image of the United States in the world at large. We have been concerned about our prestige, about how other peoples and nations regard us as to our intentions, our goals, economic performance, scientific feats, military capability, and national will. However, curiously enough, we have paid relatively little attention to the totalistic processes and attainments of Soviet Russian imagemaking. Category by category, ranging from the ideologic to the athletic, on the average we far surpass the Russians, but yet somehow, in the aggregate and in the minds of millions throughout the world, we are held to be in fierce competition by an adversary who claims the future will rest with him.

The whole of the Soviet Russian image far exceeds the sum of its parts. The remarkable ability of Moscow's totalitarians to project such a dynamic and imposing image is the consummate result of a number of institutional reasons. This unique capacity in global Potemkinism is founded in the totalizing political realm on a rich heritage of practical and speculative experience that includes, over the centuries, the cumulative achievements of empire building, the deep perceptions into the recesses of human behavior by the Dostoyevskys, the Tolstoys, and the Pavlovs, the long traditions of revolutionary and conspiratorial activity, the secret society, and the Iron Curtain, and—in the basic institutional lineage of the khans, czars, and commissars—efficient practices in totalitarian control. A study and understanding of this type of assault—the assault of creative imagery to influence, deceive, and confuse in preparation for practical conquest—should guard us against emotional swings of underestimation as well as overestimation, against needless concessions as well as narrow rigidity, in coping with the centuries-shaped adversary. Above all, knowing that the Soviet Union is the crucial power center and all else, including Red China, is basically adventitious, they should motivate us in concentrating on a complete unmasking of both the assault and the assaulter.

SOVIET RUSSIAN IDEOLOGY IN THE COLD WAR

When Khrushchev visited the United States in 1959, every American had the opportunity to witness at first hand the display and manipulation of the philosophico-ideologic component in the image Moscow has sought to convey to the world. The march of communism, burying decadent capitalism, is supposedly in the historical works. This was the philosophico-ideologic pitch made by Khrushchev; this has been the fraudulent pitch made by the successors of the Russian czars since the establishment of Soviet Russia in 1917 and the forced inception of the Soviet Union in 1923. And, strangely enough, countless of our citizens continue to believe that the real struggle is between capitalism and communism. This specious belief is an ideological-propagandist achievement by Moscow.

Those who have had systematic training in Marxism and its organic structure of thought, have over the years attempted to impress upon the inquiring mind the fact that Marxism is a mythical foundation of Leninism and all the ismatic variations that have followed. The arbitrary attachment of Marxism to the Soviet Russian ideologic scheme may lend philosophical dignity and status to the superficial operationalism of Lenin's works and those that followed, but in fact Marxism bears so much relationship to Russian totalitarian thought and, objectively, to the Soviet Union, as does French physiocracy to our society. On fundamental doctrinal points of economic determinism, the concept of society versus state, the forced institution of socialism in underdeveloped areas, the Leninist totalitarian vanguard, Marxian philosophical humanism, and the labor theory of value, Marxism in the Russian ideological scheme stands as a crass perversion.

Fortunately, in our country more and more is being written about this ideologic perversion. More and more of our people are beginning to realize that communism is an instrument of ideologic deception manipulated by the real enemy, Soviet Russia imperio-colonialism; that Marxism is a false credential in the Soviet Russian image, a facade behind which the real forces of imperialist conquest and colonial exploitation operate; that the real struggle is not between capitalism and communism but, instead, between freedom and Soviet Russian totalitarianism; and that Moscow's cold war manipulation of a perverted ideology is not a new practice. The czars, like the commissars, also hid behind ideologic masks—those of religious orthodoxy and racist pan-Slavism.

Accumulated evidence clearly shows that when we strike out against ideologic communism, scarcely a ripple is produced in Moscow. On the other hand, when we penetrate the ideologic veneer and merely scratch the real enemy of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, the bear squeals. Much remains to be done in exposing the philosophico-ideologic fraud of the Soviet Russian image, and negatively a study of Marxism can do it. Positively, a study of Marxism and its historical interpretations and insights into the Russian Empire, traditional Russian cold war activity, and the perennial goals of Russian statism helps immensely in the formation of accurate historical perspectives on this East European and Asiatic problem. However, it is also indispensable to penetrate the political component of the total Soviet Russian image for our understanding of the Communist assault on American freedom.

THE SOVIET RUSSIAN POTEMKIN VILLAGE

Marx called the Czarist Russian Empire a "prison house of nations." Today, this conception is no less applicable to the Commissars' Soviet Union, the political component in the Soviet Russian image. When, as in the case of Marxism and Communist ideology, we fail to analyze critically the terms in use and carelessly identify Russia and the Soviet Union, Moscow has no problem in projecting the image of an expanding nation-state with numerous so-called minorities and ethnic groups, similar to the United States. In fact, this fallacious concept is contained in the test ban treaty. When, on the other hand, the U.S.S.R. is shown to be an imperio-colonial system where many different nations are held in captivity, Moscow is compelled to shift its cold war gears and attempts to cast the image of multinational fraternity and brotherhood.

The facts are that the Soviet Union is a "prison house of nations," a basic empire which forms the foundation of the expanded Soviet Russian Empire, and that colonial exploitation in this substrate empire is rife. The more we concentrate on the true nature of the U.S.S.R., the more Moscow is compelled to defend its false image of multinational coexistence, and the more we see the opportunities before us in the cold war. How all this came to be what it is, is the clue to an understanding of the last remaining major empire in the world.

Evidence on this vital score is abundant. When Khrushchev in July 1959, exploded over the Captive Nations Week resolution, he did so because, for the first time, an official act of our Government pierced the false image of the U.S.S.R. In 1960 he appeared in the U.N., purposely to deflect growing attention in this country on the imperio-colonialism that prevails in the U.S.S.R. by stimulating debate on so-called Western imperialism and colonialism. Down to this day, when pressure is exerted and the false image of the U.S.S.R.—the global-appealing Potemkin Village—is placed under critical scrutiny, Moscow takes to the defensive in an attempt to preserve its image. Witness these examples, for instance: (1) the series titled "The 15 Soviet Republics, Today and Tomorrow" (Soviet Booklets, London, 1959–60) that was ordered by Moscow for mass printing in England soon after the Captive Nations Week episode in 1959; (2) the scandalous UNESCO study, "Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R." (by I. P. Tsameyian and S. Ronin, UNESCO, 1962), which we helped to subsidize but which few Americans have been able to obtain—including, it is said, Ambassador Stevenson—is a neat, disreputable work of half-truths designed to preserve at all costs the political component of the Soviet Russian image.

Here, too, much study and work remain to be done. Yet, when our own Secretary of State believes the Soviet Union is a historical state, of which Georgia, Armenia, and Ukraine are "traditional parts"—only to be completely contradicted by our U.N. ambassador shortly thereafter; when we spend $20,000 for an arms control and disarmament study (Walter Milis: "The Political Control of an International Police Force") to be told that "whether we admit it to ourselves or not, we benefit enormously from the capability of the Soviet police system to keep law and order over the 200-million-odd Russians and the many additional millions in the satellite states"; when, repeating an old and stale argument, Rostow tells us that it is "an American interest to see the end of nationhood as it has been historically defined," one cannot but begin to wonder who is helping whom in preserving the Soviet Russian image. Regrettably, even the President affects the cause of truth when in his American University address in June 1963 he stated the quarter-truth that "no nation in the history of battle ever suffered more than the Russians suffered in the course of the Second World War." We need hardly wonder how the Lithuanian, Ukrainian, Byelorussian and other non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., who actually suffered the chief brunt of the Nazi German invasion, must react to this misleading statement of an American President.

OTHER COLD WAR MUSTS FOR US

The economic, military and cultural components of the grand Soviet Russian image are subject to the same critical analysis for practical disintegration. From every viewpoint, the colonial economy in the U.S.S.R. is essentially an underdeveloped economy with overdeveloped ambitions. One cannot but express amazement at times at some of the comparisons drawn between our national economy and the Soviet imperial economy, as though the two in essence were comparable. From an economy that for exactly 40 years has found it difficult to solve the elementary problem of adequately feeding its population, we have little to fear in terms of civilized economic progress.

Militarily, the U.S.S.R. is, of course, an imposing power. But, its quantitative equipment, furnished by its industrial technocracy and cold war economy, is no guarantee of its ultimate qualitative power. The military history of Russia's imperial forces in this century alone fails to attest to such ultimate power in the final showdown.

The grand image induces timidity and fear in intended victims. We are the prime target of this projected Soviet Russian image. It is an image that can be understood, deflated, and tactfully destroyed. America's victory in the cold war, with peace but toward justice and freedom, necessitates that these things be done. We cannot repeat too often Marx's own observation on the Russian Empire, now in the guise of the Soviet Union, "The only way to deal with a power like Russia is the fearless way." The partial nuclear test ban treaty is not an expression of such fearlessness. The intensified cold war should induce it.

THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following editorial comments which indicate, as well as any words can, the depth of feeling, the profound shock, and the grief and sorrow which is felt by the people of Illinois.

A dedicated, valiant, and sacrificing leader has been taken from the Nation by an incomprehensible act of violence. With heavy hearts, we join with millions across the globe in mourning his loss, in extending our prayers for his family, and in pledging our support to our new President at this time of national crisis.

The editorial comments follow:

[From the Chicago Sunday American, Nov. 24, 1963]

The President We've Lost

America's change of Presidents from John F. Kennedy to Lyndon Johnson has been brought about by bullets—methods dreadfully familiar in some countries, but strange and deeply shocking in the United States. It is especially tragic that the victim of this assassination should have been the laughing and confident Kennedy.

While he lived, he was leader of the world—the free part of the world—and he led not only because he commanded the vast resources of the United States but also because he awakened faith in his purposes among those with whom he came in contact.

In his own country he led with imagination and courage. In this time of great and rapid change, he was well suited to his task because he was a believer in change; he looked for good to come out of it, so he was not timid about letting old values go. He felt the country would benefit by the change.

Although some of his suggestions were not acceptable to many conservative minds, the American people are indebted to him because, in general, he taught them to examine novel ideas for themselves instead of responding to them entirely as the teachings of tradition dictated.

The manner of his death is shocking as well as sorrowful because it shows the presence in this country of a mind that could not differ without hate, and did not hesitate to deal death to anyone who disagreed.

If this spirit of partisan hate is widespread in this country, let us have determined campaigns to trample it out. A free country cannot govern itself except by the exercise of friendly disagreement. America must be a land of open debate, not poisonous resentments living and growing in secret.

The American people mourn John F. Kennedy. Their sympathy goes to his wife and children, his mother and father. And so his death is as deeply felt by people who disagreed with his political philosophy as by those who agreed with it. That is the spirit in which free people can govern themselves.

[From the Sun Times, Nov. 23, 1963]

America Weeps

President Kennedy lies dead, a martyr in the cause of democratic government.

His countrymen weep in sorrow and in anger.

The immensity of the crime can hardly be grasped in these hours of confusion that inevitably have followed the assassination of the chief of the most powerful Nation in the world.

The Nation is left temporarily without a leader. Vice President Johnson will assume the heavy burden of the Presidency and the policies of the Nation will undergo no imminent change. But inevitably the assassination will change the course of history, not only in the Nation but in the world.

And it should change the temper of our times. At the moment the motive that lurked in the twisted mind of the killer is not, of course, known:

But the deed in Dallas was different only in degree of importance from such acts of violence as the bombing of houses of worship, racial murders and only last month, in the same city, the degrading assault on U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson.

All of these acts of violence are the work of persons who, fundamentally, do not believe in a democratic government operating under a rule of law.

The preachers and whisperers of hate and disunity, who undermine confidence in our Government and our public officials by irresponsible attacks on their sanity and loyalty, plant the motives in the heads of those who pull the triggers and toss the bombs.

Those who impugn the motives of our national leaders, who defy the courts and distort the operations of the United Nations would not themselves do violence. But they engender the kind of hate that must have been in the eyes that lined up Mr. Kennedy's head in the crosshairs of a rifle sight yesterday.

The awful loss that hate visited upon the Nation and the world should inspire all Americans to join together in this hour of shock and mourning in a reexamination of the national conscience.

The right of dissent, the exercise of free speech, the criticism of the President and other public officials high and low, must not corrode into sullen rebellion that breeds violence. All Americans, those who agree with their government's policies and those who disagree, must stand together on this fundamental and demonstrate this unity by action as well as words. The purveyors of hate must acknowledge the danger they create.

When we speak of the purveyors of hate we obviously are not speaking of the President's regular political opposition, those persons in his own party and in the Republican Party who had disagreed with many of his views and policies and who also grieve for Mr. Kennedy. We are speaking of the extremists from both parties who go beyond the pale in their opposition and criticism.

The Nation owes a great debt to Mr. Kennedy who gave his life in the service of his country as surely as a soldier on the frontline. And to Mrs. Kennedy and the President's family the American people offer their hearts. The personal tragedy of an assassination seldom has been as heartbreakingly evident as in the scene that followed the shooting; Mrs. Kennedy holding the President's head in her lap and weeping "Oh, no."

No, it should never have happened in America. That it did must weigh heavily on America's conscience. And if it brings a reawakening and a real change in the temper of our times Mr. Kennedy will not have died in vain. This is a prayer in which all Americans can join.

COUNTERPART FUNDS

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the wide publicity that has been given to the attack levied on certain trade associations by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINNEGAN], I felt that the information contained in an article which appeared in the Rockford Morning Star on Wednesday, November 20, 1963, should be of interest to the Members of this House. Not only should the information furnished by Mr. Shepard Blumenthal, of Rockford, Ill., the president of the National Hide Association, be of interest, but I further believe that his remarks are entitled to receive the same attention as that accorded the charges that have been made. Among the most important maxims of our Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence are those that relate to a presumption of innocence and of the necessity of being proven guilty. In view of Mr. Blumenthal's prominent position in the industry that he represents, I think that it would be highly unfair to decide this issue before all of the evidence is in.

I am personally greatly impressed by the statistics furnished by Mr. Blumenthal with respect to the hide industry. It seems to me that a very strong case indeed can be made for the proper and judicious employment of counterpart funds which might otherwise remain frozen in a sterile and unproductive account to promote an important domestic industry.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under the leave which I have obtained to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter, I wish to include with these remarks the statements of Mr. Blumenthal as contained in the article which I have referred to above.

The article follows:

CLAIMS AMERICAN COUNTERPART FUNDS SAVE INDUSTRIES

Best possible use of U.S. counterpart funds frozen in foreign countries is in promoting a greater flow of American-made goods into those countries, Shepard Blumenthal, Rockford, president of the National Hide Association, said Tuesday.

The association was one of the trade associations listed by Representative EDWARD FINNEGAN, Democrat, of Illinois, in an attack on what he termed "misuse and waste" of U.S. counterpart funds.

Morning Star Political Editor Joe Fisher, reporting from Washington Monday, disclosed that staff investigators of the House Government Operations Committee have been assigned to determine whether a congressional hearing on the use of counterpart funds is warranted.

Defending his own and other trade groups, Blumenthal credited this aid with saving one industry, the U.S. rendering industry. Europe now is a big market for U.S. tallow and other products of that industry, primarily because of the Government-supported promotional program, especially in Italy, he said. The National Renderers' Association was one of the groups cited by FINNEGAN.

As to the plight of the hide industry, Blumenthal said:

"There are such tremendous surpluses of hides in the United States, action must be taken in the foreign fields."

Hide prices are "off 40 percent" over the past year alone, he noted. Blumenthal pointed out one factor is that Americans are eating more and more beef and the slaughter is "going up and up."

In addition, since World War II, synthetic substitutes have taken 75 percent of the market for sole leather and now new materials are threatening the market for uppers for shoes, he said.

A third major factor, Blumenthal said, is foreign imports. Some 87 million pairs of shoes were imported into the United States the past year, an increase of about 9,000 percent within a decade, he stated.

He said he personally favors the present U.S. policy under which there are "almost no restrictions" on such imports. However, Blumenthal declared, foreign countries should reciprocate by eliminating some of their "restrictive quotas and destructive tariffs" on U.S.-made leather products.

That's why the National Hide Association and other segments of the U.S. leather industry participated in the "Week of Leather," the world's largest show, in Paris during September, Blumenthal explained.

Blumenthal said he would welcome the investigation of counterpart fund spending FINNEGAN said is underway.

"Our hands are clean," Blumenthal said. Blumenthal said he has been questioned by investigators concerning what he understood to be waste in government. He added he felt FINNEGAN's attack was an example of "striking back" over recent criticism of wasteful spending during congressional junkets oversea.

MRS. JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues from Maryland, Congressman EDWARD A. GARMATZ and Congressman SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, join me in asking unanimous consent that the editorial on Mrs. Kennedy, appearing in the Baltimore Sun, under date of November 24, 1963, be printed in the RECORD. Her magnificent courage is, we feel, an eloquent tribute to her husband.

MRS. KENNEDY

At a time when women far from the scene were fainting, and men were overcome with grief, Mrs. John F. Kennedy in Dallas mustered the inner strength to stand by her husband to the end; brave, composed and in every fiber and gesture a President's wife. Bearing the horrible stains of her shattering experience, she stood with Lyndon Johnson as he took the oath as her husband's successor and then faced reentry of Washington, so suddenly no longer her city, and a reunion with the children for whom the Nation's loss always would remain so inconsolably personal.

The Nation and world may take pride in Mrs. Kennedy, even as they extend to her their halting expressions of sympathy. No matter how seemingly secure our existence may be, there can come those moments that demand the raw courage and self-discipline of pioneers. Gentle, retiring and finely drawn, Mrs. Kennedy has demonstrated once again that reservoir of strength that from time immemorial has nurtured our faith, our convictions, our determination to face the future fearlessly.

With her husband dead so soon after the death of a child, with her other children bereaved, her home bestowed upon a new President and her future uncertain, not for a moment did Mrs. Kennedy falter in fulfilling the stern demands made upon her. Her strength is the Nation's and humanity's strength. We may share not only her ordeal, but also her will to carry on as her husband would have expected from her and from all of us.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KING of New York (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for the balance of this week, on account of illness in family.

Mr. JENSEN, for 1 week, due to death in family.

Mr. NELSEN (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for today and tomorrow, on account of illness in family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. ROUDEBUSH, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PELLY in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MATHIAS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PIRNIE.

Mr. GOODLING.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 298. An act to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1309. An act to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2837. An act to amend further section 11 of the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. 311); and

H.R. 8969. An act to provide, for the period ending June 30, 1964, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 777. An act to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriation and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 27, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 130. A bill to provide for the payment of compensation, including severance damages, for rights-of-way acquired by the United States in connection with reclamation projects the construction of which commenced after January 1, 1961; with amendment (Rept. No. 922). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 6777. A bill to amend section 712 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of premiums for certain veterans holding national service life insurance policies who become or have become totally disabled before their 65th birthday; with amendment (Rept. No. 923). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 7751. A bill to extend certain construction authority to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in order to provide adequate veterans' hospital facilities in Los Angeles, Calif.; with amendment (Rept. No. 924). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HÉBERT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 9124. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to vitalize the Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 925). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 9004. A bill to transfer control of Pershing Hall to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in order that such building may be preserved as a memorial to General of the Armies of the United States John J. Pershing while being utilized in the best interests of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 926). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 9223. A bill to designate the authorized Cross-Florida Barge Canal as the "John F. Kennedy Canal"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 9224. A bill to designate the authorized Cross-Florida Barge Canal as the "John F. Kennedy Canal"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 9225. A bill to designate the authorized Cross-Florida Barge Canal as the "John F. Kennedy Canal"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 9226. A bill to designate the authorized Cross-Florida Barge Canal as the "John F. Kennedy Canal"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 9227. A bill to designate the authorized Cross-Florida Barge Canal as the "John F. Kennedy Canal"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 9228. A bill to designate the authorized Cross-Florida Barge Canal as the "John F. Kennedy Canal"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 9229. A bill to designate the authorized Cross-Florida Barge Canal as the "John F. Kennedy Canal"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 9230. A bill to designate the authorized Cross-Florida Barge Canal as the "John F. Kennedy Canal"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 9231. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 9232. A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 9233. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make certain acts against the person of the President and Vice President of the United States and certain other Federal officers a Federal crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 9234. A bill to incorporate the Little League Baseball, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 9235. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 9236. A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 9237. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide that the penalties for homicide prescribed in such title shall apply to any person who kills the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, or the head of any executive department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 9238. A bill to provide that the refusal of nonprofit blood banks and of physicians to obtain blood and blood plasma from other blood banks, and other activities, shall not be deemed to be acts in restraint of trade under the laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 9239. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 9240. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make Federal crimes certain offenses against the person of the President or Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 9241. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 by repealing the exemption for certain lumbering employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 9242. A bill to prohibit interference with the free exercise of religion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 9243. A bill to repeal the cabaret tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 9244. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 9245. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 9246. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it a Federal crime to kill the President or Vice President of the United States, the head of any executive department, or any Member of Congress of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H.R. 9247. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide that every applicant for correction of his military record shall be afforded an opportunity for a hearing, and to require the appearance of certain members of the Armed Forces before the boards for the correction of such records, and to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide for judicial review of the decisions of such boards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.J. Res. 809. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.J. Res. 810. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON:

H. Res. 573. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Un-American Activities to conduct an investigation and study of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 9248. A bill for the relief of Donald Loo, also known as Loo Hong Mun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 9249. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Milazzo, Felicia Milazzo and Emanuela Milazzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H.R. 9250. A bill for the relief of Que Ark Chin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 9251. A bill for the relief of Lee Gen Quon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

No Adjournment of Congress Until Public Laws 815 and 874 Are Extended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable talk among Members of Congress and others about possible adjournment of Congress now and coming back in January and finishing our job.

Contrariwise, it seems to me advisable that Congress remain in session—if for nothing else than to unsnarl some of our important legislation.

I have in mind that closing down Congress is not going to cure such situations as the stalemate between the House and Senate over a vocational education bill which is holding up enactment of other major education legislation.

For example, Mr. Speaker, I see no justification for Members of Congress to go home until Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 have been extended. Impacted area assistance has been going on since 1950 and continuation of these programs is vital to our educational system. More than 4,000 local school districts are unable to complete their budgets and are in the dark about the number of teachers they can hire and the amount of salaries and other essential planning. By delaying the legislation Congress is putting our school administrators in an almost impossible situation.

As the House knows, impacted area legislation provides for Federal reimbursement of costs to schools in localities where Federal defense establishments have placed a burden on local communities and where such military establishments, unlike private industry, do not pay taxes for the support of these schools.

Obviously, while Congress has delayed passage of legislation to continue these laws, the school administrators have counted on our acting to continue these programs and it certainly does not seem right for us to close up shop and let the schools go on waiting. Extension of these two laws means better than $10 million to my State of Washington and to certain school districts these funds are absolutely vital.

He Thought He Had Failed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the entire civilized world paid a final tribute to a fallen leader.

It is ironic that 3 days prior to the day of this tragic event several nations joined in a tribute to a leader who suffered a similar fate.

Sunday, November 17, 1963, in the Student Union Building of Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pa., marked the beginning of 3 days' activities commemorating the 100th anniversary of the delivery of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.

It appears fitting that the addresses given on the occasion of this anniversary be recorded for posterity.

They follow in the order of delivery:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY LT. GOV. RAYMOND P. SHAFER

I deem it a great honor to have been chosen to open these ceremonies commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Gettysburg Address.

On behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, I welcome the representatives of France, Great Britain, and Italy. Their presence is a singularly heart-warming tribute to the cherished memory of a beloved American.

I am privileged, too, to welcome so many of my own countrymen: the distinguished Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk, and you ladies and gentlemen who are here gathered.

This is the only place in the world, to my knowledge, where a monument has been erected to mark the delivery of an address.

What remarkable power did these few words, spoken here a century ago, possess that they should become immortal?

Almost as we ask the question, we are aware that they have drawn us here today.

Certainly they cannot be separated from this setting.

They cannot be separated from the event which gave rise to them.

They cannot be separated from the man who uttered them.

A boy visiting Gettysburg sees—as did boys a century ago—the excitement and the glory of war.

His father—like Lincoln—sees the tragedy.

The boy thinks how much stronger the Union is because the battle was fought.

The father thinks how much greater the Nation might have been if the issues of the Civil War could have been resolved by councils rather than cannons.

President Lincoln came to Gettysburg to pay tribue to the fallen soldiers of the North. He spoke, not of the victory, but the sacrifice. He stressed, not the valor, but the devotion. He urged, not reprisal, but reunion.

Legend has it that he wrote his remarks on the back of an envelope while en route by train from Washington—as if, in an inspired burst, they flowed from the stub of his pencil.

Whenever and however they were written, they were born out of the sorrow and anguish which had traced their toll in the furrows of his face.

They emerged from the long loneliness that was his—the long loneliness of command—the long loneliness of the test to which a dream, a hope, and an ideal had been put.

Yet they had to be spoken, so that a broken nation might look to a brighter day.

He felt that his address was a failure.

Using the language of the plowman, he told a friend it didn't scour.

In his honest humility, he had thought himself a failure. He had tried to preserve the Union by statesmanship, but in the end the task was turned over to the soldier.

Lincoln was not destined to know the heights to which his Gettysburg Address would subsequently soar.

He was not destined to know that, in time, he would personify the cause to which he gave the last full measure of his own devotion.

He was not destined to know that he would, as those whom he had come to honor, go into the shadow of the valley of death before there would be a rebirth of freedom.

But he saw with uncommon clarity that, when the carnage was over, the reconstruction of the Republic would have to be the work of both North and South.

He saw with uncommon clarity that if the Union were dissolved, those in distant lands who looked to America as a model, might lose faith in the ability of free men to govern themselves.

And if Lincoln was not spared to see his dream fulfilled, the testament of faith and hope which he gave here would live on as the noblest expression of a noble President.

The seed of his thought did scour.

It weathered the storm of bitterness which lesser men precipitated after he was no longer here to stay the hand of retribution.

Like a perennial flower, his phrases blossom anew in the place which Lincoln would have loved most—the lips, minds and hearts of the children.

This is the power that gave his words immortality.

For a great man had spoken so simply that generations of schoolchildren could commit his sentences to memory. Pigtailed girls and freckled-faced boys would repeat them in shrill voice, in the haste of shyness—with or without expression. But somehow, if they were not fully understood, they reflected the goodness and the gentleness of Lincoln, and his spirit became a part of them.

My generation has come of age.

We read those words with the weight of maturity.

We see them through the eyes of experience—eyes that have been clouded by the tragic mists of war—eyes that are alight with the aspiration of the dream of universal peace.

And the words of Gettysburg assume new depth, new meaning—not only for Americans, but for all who, under God, love freedom.

Address at Ceremonies Commemorating the 100th Anniversary of President Lincoln's Gettysburg Address

(By Mr. J. E. Chadwick, Minister, British Embassy)

Lieutenant Governor, Secretary Rusk, Your Excellencies, Dr. Hanson, ladies and gentlemen, Her Majesty's Ambassador has asked me to express his profound regrets that a longstanding engagement in New York has prevented him from being here today.

It is fitting, however, that I should be his representative, just as Mr. McDougall represented the British Minister, Lord Lyons, in that historic scene 100 years ago.

I have been asked to speak about what the Gettysburg Address has meant to my country since then.

In Britain, as for that matter in the United States, it was some time before the deep significance of President Lincoln's words was fully understood.

They did not at once evoke the emotion and admiration with which our people responded to Lincoln's second inaugural, an address which the London Times of the day described as "the most sublime state paper of the century."

This was praise, indeed.

For neither the Times nor the administration of Lord Palmerston, nor the Victorian Establishment generally had been particularly friendly to President Lincoln.

There were complex political and economic reasons for this, most of them unrelated to the issue of slavery.

But such leaders of the parliamentary opposition as John Bright and Richard Cobden championed Lincoln and the Union cause up and down our islands.

The masses of the people, who were only beginning to be politically articulate, responded to Lincoln as to no other statesman of the day.

A contemporary American journalist noted that unlike the Government, the British people "believe that ours is the cause of freedom against slavery, of democracy against privilege, of labor against hereditary capital and property."

When the news of Lincoln's death reached London, the wave of sympathy which swept the country astonished American observers.

Memorial meetings and services were held all over the country.

Both Houses of Parliament within 24 hours formally expressed in an address to the crown their sympathies with the Government and the people of the United States; and Queen Victoria penned her famous letter to Mrs. Lincoln, "from a widow to a widow."

From that time on, the Gettysburg address worked like leaven in British political thought, and Lincoln became for all in Britain, in every stratum of society, and of every political color, a model of courageous leadership in the march toward a compassionate and humanitarian democracy.

The address which we commemorate today came to be adopted and established as one of the noblest expressions of British ideals.

What is more, because it has been adopted into British thought, the British way of life, it has greatly contributed to bringing to pass Lincoln's own wish, expressed in his well-known message to the spinners and weavers of Manchester. I quote his words: "Whatever else may happen, whatever misfortune may befall your country or my own, the peace and friendship which now exist between the two nations will be, as it shall be my desire to make them, perpetual."

In this 20th century we have endured two world wars in which Western civilization as a whole has been called upon to face an inescapable moral challenge of the same order as confronted Lincoln.

National leaders in both Britain and the United States have been deeply conscious of this.

You have only to reread their speeches to note how often they went back to Lincoln, and particularly to the Gettysburg Address, to find the most profound and eloquent definition of what we were fighting for.

The gates of Janus' temple are still not closed.

We are engaged in a struggle for the hearts and minds of men in which, now as then, the freedom and dignity of the human individual are the central issue.

This struggle is not to be thought of as merely a contest between rival nations of titanic power or between rival theories of social and economic organization.

It comprehends these rivalries; but beyond them, it is fundamentally a struggle between two standards of values.

For us in Britain, as for you in the United States, and for our great allies, the standard which we uphold, the standard which we must proclaim to all the world, is the moral and spiritual standard defined by Lincoln in the Gettysburg Address.

Gettysburg Address Centennial

(By His Excellency Sergio Fenoaltea, Ambassador of Italy)

Mr. Chairman, Secretary Rusk, distinguished colleagues, and guests, ladies and gentlemen, when a century ago my predecessor, the Italian Minister, accepted an invitation to make the 6-hour trip to come here from Washington, it was to convey, with his presence at the consecration of Gettysburg's cemetery, the feeling and hopes of a European nation which at that very time was struggling to achieve its own unity—the same goal which inspired "the brave men * * * who struggled here."

After 100 years, after so many events and turning points in history, we are here today to express the same feelings and hopes, which have remained actual and alive, as are the words of Lincoln's immortal address, and to confirm our faith in a human society "conceived in liberty."

President Lincoln's message made a profound impact in Italy at that time. May I quote two of his contemporaries: Mazzini and Garibaldi, the prophet and the fighter of Italian unity.

Commenting on the victory of the Union, Mazzini wrote in 1865: "You have done more for us in 4 years, than 50 years of teaching, preaching, and writing from all your European brothers have been able to do."

From a message addressed by a group of Italian patriots to President Lincoln, of which Garibaldi was the first signatory, I quote: "If in the midst of your titanic battles, our voice can yet reach you, let us, O Lincoln, free sons of Columbus, send you a word of good wishes and admiration for the great work you have begun. * * * You will pass to posterity with the name of the Emancipator; more enviable than any crown or any human treasure."

It was this message that prompted Mazzini to remark: "The principle in the name of which Garibaldi sends a salute to Lincoln—the principle that God has set as goal of the American battles * * * is the holiest possible * * * it is the principle of humanity."

Finally may I cite from a letter Garibaldi wrote to an American friend: "I do not doubt of the triumph of the cause of the Union * * * but if the war should unfortunately continue * * * I shall overcome all obstacles which detain me, to hasten to the defense of a people who are so dear to me."

No wonder that the Italians were present on this battlefield with a number of volunteers. Some of them are now resting in Gettysburg's cemetery.

Lincoln's address holds its rightful place among the immortal messages which the idealism of the New World has conveyed to the Old. One century after the American Nation has achieved its unity. We men and women of the 20th century must be grateful to divine providence for having vested a Nation, inspired by so high an idealism, with so great a strength. Because it is on the unique combination of American strength and American idealism that, in this century, rests the primary and certainly the strongest safeguard for all men and women who are and intend to remain free.

The historians tell us that Lincoln's words were heard in silence; they evoked no cheers. This can happen when great men speak in terms which go beyond the horizons of their generation.

But, while the veil of oblivion has shrouded many a speech which at the moment stirred the enthusiasm of the crowd, we continue to honor Lincoln't message. His words will be remembered and repeated every time that, confronted with a threat, men will fear that freedom might "perish from the earth."

Address Delivered by H. E. M. Herve Alphand, French Ambassador to the United States

One hundred years ago, on the very same battlefield where we are gathered today, my predecessor, the French Envoy, M. Mercier, was at Lincoln's side when he uttered his unforgettable address. More fortunate than I, M. Mercier found himself in the comfortable position of listening without having to speak.

As all great masterpieces, as the best of Pericles and Demosthenes, Lincoln's words belong not only to one country but to mankind as a whole. To us they remain as a lesson which will forever endure.

First a lesson in humility: in all modesty Lincoln believed that "the world would little note, nor long remember, what he said here." How mistaken he was.

Then a lesson in brevity: in 268 words, loaded with thoughts, he left in the minds of men imprints that will never wear out. Let those totalitarian politicians who deem it necessary to speak for 8 hours whenever they stand on a podium, learn by this example.

In fact, I know of but one exhortation which was shorter than Lincoln's, but whose aim was identical: I am referring to the three words which our Revolution bequeathed as its national motto to the French Republic, three words which have also made their way around the world and, today as yesterday, remain the inspired lifeline of our two peoples: liberty, justice, fraternity.

Liberty, main theme of Lincoln's canticle; liberty for the sake of which our nations fought three times since your Republic was born, to defend your independence at time, ours at other times and again the independence of some others. Liberty which brings us today side by side on the autobahn to Berlin, since we have to fight once more against a new kind of tyranny which would like to dominate the world.

Equality, because in this country where "all men are created equal" your Government is still struggling against the dark forces of discrimination which Lincoln opposed; and because we also want this equality among nations, we, who within a few years, have recognized the existence of nearly 20 of them, in Asia as well as in Africa, and cannot accept that the rights of self-determination should not be recognized also to old peoples in Central and Eastern Europe.

Last of all fraternity, because you and us wish that "these dead shall not have died in vain," that each one of us may live without danger, and according to his own choice, that despite the differences in ideologies, a brotherly cooperation be established among men for the fulfillment of the great tasks awaiting us and first of all assistance to those two billion human beings who have been living for centuries like their ancestors, deprived of the bare necessities.

The hatred spread all over the world and to which so many recent events bear testimony, shows us that this time has not come yet. But it is up to us, the living, to act in such a way, without respite or desperation, following at times different paths, that peace in liberty and justice reign at last among us.

At no time in their history did France and the United States cease to struggle in unison, so that "this unfinished work be nobly advanced."

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE DEAN RUSK, SECRETARY OF STATE

One hundred years ago there came to this community a most remarkable man whose memory is revered by all of us who are the heirs of those who fought here—both in blue and in gray. He spoke here about ancient verities—not as a sophisticated philosopher—but as a man who felt deeply about the hopes which lie in the heart of man. It was a speech of only 10 sentences, 271 words. It disappointed many who heard it, and the man who gave it thought it was a failure. But it has become the most widely read speech ever made by an American and perhaps by anyone in the English language. It has been translated into every written language and is cherished around the world.

In accepting the Latin version for deposit in the Vatican Library in 1959, the Apostolic Delegate to the United States, His Excellency Egidio Vagnozzi, called the Gettysburg Address not only "a great American document" but also a great Christian document—"one of the greatest documents ever issued by man."

What is there about those words which makes them memorable? In the original tongue they have beauty and cadence—"the vibrations of deathless music." They express tender sentiments. But these qualities are inadequate to account for their indelible imprint. What makes it great and enduring is the simple eloquence with which it restates the ideas to which this Nation is dedicated: "liberty * * * the proposition that all men are created equal * * * government of the people, by the people, for the people."

Lincoln believed, with the authors of the Declaration of Independence, that the large principles it set forth were universal truths. As he saw the meaning of the American revolution: "It was not the mere matter of separation of the colonies from the motherland—but something in that Declaration giving liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but hope to the world for all future time."

Lincoln believed, with the authors of our Constitution, that they were founding a "new order of the ages," as our great seal puts it.

He believed, with Washington, that "the preservation of the sacred fire of liberty and the defense of the republican model of government are justly considered as deeply, perhaps as finally, staked on the experiment entrusted to the hands of the American people."

He believed that this experiment was the "last best hope of earth."

He believed that the central issue in the struggle in which this Nation was engaged a century ago was whether this or any nation "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal" could "long endure." And let us not forget that his reaffirmation of the American commitment to that "proposition that all men are created equal" had been preceded by the Emancipation Proclamation.

The advocates of democracy in many other lands saw the central issue as Lincoln saw it. From England, John Bright wrote: "There is no other political constitution now in existence, in the preservation of which the human race is so deeply interested." From France, liberal republicans spoke out—Edouard Laboulaye said "the cause of America is the cause of liberty" and "should liberty become eclipsed in the New World, it would become night in Europe." From Italy, Garibaldi and his friends hailed Lincoln as the "pilot of liberty." Carl Schurz and other German democrats, many of whom had come to this country after the failure of their own revolution of 1848, saw the struggle in the same light.

After Lincoln's death, a noted French liberal, Lucien Anatole Prevost-Paradol, wrote: "He has not lived for his country alone, since he leaves to everyone in the world to whom liberty and justice are dear, a great remembrance and a pure example."

As our own Brooker T. Washington put it: "By the same token that Lincoln made America free, he pushed back the boundaries of freedom everywhere, gave the spirit of liberty a wider influence throughout the world, and reestablished the dignity of man as man."

Over the years, admiration for Lincoln has spread into other parts of the earth. Sun Yat-sen, the father of the Chinese liberal revolution, drew his three principles of government from the Gettysburg Address. The Lincoln Memorial is a mecca for millions of visitors to Washington every year, including tens upon tens of thousands from abroad. Prime Minister Nehru has kept on a study table a brass mold of Lincoln's right hand. A few years ago high school students in Tokyo ranked him as one of the most respected of all world figures. And Tolstoi said that "of all the great national statesmen of history, Lincoln is the only giant" and predicted that his name would live thousands of years.

Thus Lincoln is a worldwide symbol of freedom and democracy. And the Gettysburg Address is the utterance through which his dedication—and ours as a people—to freedom and democracy is most widely known. Indeed, the central commitments of the American experiment are probably known to more people in other lands through the words of the Gettysburg Address than through those of the Declaration of Independence.

People all around the world not only know of these central commitments but share them. Liberty, equality, the dignity of the individual, "the government of the people, by the people, and for the people"—these are aspirations rising out of the nature of man.

Since the Second World War nearly 50 new nations have emerged. Nearly all are republics or democracies, at least in name. Unhappily, some are in reality dictatorships. In some, the early national governments have tolerated no opposition. In others, democratic governments collapsed or were overthrown. But the yearnings for genuine political freedom have not been eradicated. They are manifest in every nation, including those behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

Our commitments to freedom are the source of our foreign policy. They explain our attitude toward colonial questions, our concern about the future of Eastern Europe, and why we are more comfortable in dealing with democracies than with dictatorships. They explain also our concern about our failures here at home to live up fully to our own great commitments.

The independence we won for ourselves we have favored for others. We have welcomed the rise of the former colonial peoples to "the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them." We want to see these new nations make solid progress—economically, socially, and politically.

Within the free world, old empires have been largely replaced by new partnerships between the less developed and the advanced countries—partnerships based on political equality.

But new empires have appeared, clothing their lust for domination with ideology which plunders the noble concepts of freedom to subvert freedom itself. There are large and dangerous questions which call for final solution—and there is no more enduring basis for settlement than the simple notion of self-determination: let the people themselves decide.

For almost two centuries we have been opposed to dictatorship. We remain so today—and will be opposed tomorrow. We recognize that there are many possible forms of democratic institutions. But we believe deeply in political democracy, individual dignity, and the rule of law. We do not like it when democratic institutions are suppressed. We believe that the setbacks which democracy has suffered in many of the new nations, and a few old ones, will be temporary. For we know that ordinary men and women throughout the world respond to Lincoln's phrase "government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

Likewise, we will not be at ease until every one of our own citizens enjoys in full the rights pledged by the Declaration of Independence and our Constitution. The National Government is heavily committed to insuring these rights for all.

The rest of the world is watching closely the struggle for full equality in this country. Our failures distress our friends and hearten our enemies. But this is not the main reason why we must complete this task. We must complete it as a duty to ourselves. It is past time to complete the task which Lincoln began with the Emancipation Proclamation.

We are a powerful Nation—with almost incomprehensible power. Our farms and factories are ever more bountiful. We enjoy levels of well-being almost beyond the dreams of men a generation or two ago. But our greatest strength lies in the ideas about freedom and human dignity which gave birth to our Nation and to which Lincoln renewed our dedication in the Gettysburg Address. These ideas, these aspirations, are shared today by a great majority of mankind. They bind us with others throughout the world. They are the mightiest force in the world today. They are the enduring memorial to the apostles of liberty for all men, of whom none has been greater than Abraham Lincoln.

Complete Elimination of the Cabaret Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, after years of effort the so-called cabaret tax in May 1960 was reduced from 20 percent to 10 percent. The results of that tax cut and the experience as far as the income of the Federal Treasury was concerned is most significant.

To begin with, the objective of removing the longstanding inequity of this war-time excise tax was more jobs for musicians. But the interesting part of this tax reduction is that not only did it increase work opportunities and musicians' earnings but now it can be shown that the Government lost no revenue because of the reduction in the rate of taxation.

This analysis of the results of the 50 percent reduction is set forth in a report by the International Statistical Bureau for the American Federation of Musicians. This report based on an independent study found that the increase in income for musicians alone ranged between $25 and $35 million. The many millions of additional taxable income of proprietors and other employees was not included but the facts seem quite clear on the basis of this impartial survey that elimination of the remaining 10 percent of this depressive tax is desirable and would not cost the Government a penny.

Mr. Speaker, evidence is available that the first cut increased jobs and earnings by more than a third for musicians and an estimated five times that for other employees such as culinary workers in establishments subject to the tax.

Now with the Congress considering a tax reduction bill to stimulate employment and prosperity I do not know any more effective area for a tax cut than outright repeal of this unfair job destroying tax.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced legislation to accomplish this purpose. Actually, rather than consideration of a separate bill I would hope the Senate would amend the House-passed tax bill so as to expedite repeal of this tax. The purpose of my introducing a new bill—which is H.R. 9243—is to invite the U.S. Treasury's comments as to the merit of such legislation.

Originally Treasury officials were skeptical of opinions such as mine that elimination of the cabaret tax would stimulate business. It was not believed possible that a tax cut would increase business to the extent that it would not cost the Government any revenue.

Now, however, the record as to what has happened since the 50-percent reduction became effective should assure a more optimistic attitude by the Government. Indeed it is hard to believe the Treasury could be opposed to this legislation.

Summing up, Mr. Speaker, I hope Congress will give consideration to complete elimination of the tax. If so, I am sure there will be another 34-percent increase in man-hours of employment for musicians, and even greater employment and taxable incomes in other kinds of work. This type of reduction would accomplish just what is intended by the administration tax recommendations. Here is the way, with no loss in Government revenue, to create more jobs. This has been proved. The facts are available. Let us completely eliminate the cabaret tax.

Our Fallen President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, many will endeavor to express their great sorrow at the tragic passing of our beloved President, but few will find words adequate to do so. The impact of such an event is so deep and so special as almost to defy expression.

An assassin's bullet has robbed our Nation and the free world of a young and vigorous leader. Without warning, and while the cheers of thousands were ringing in his ears, his brilliant career came to an end. A cowardly, criminal act has done that which enemy action so nearly accomplished in the dark waters of the South Pacific.

In the intervening years, John F. Kennedy lived an exciting, useful and memorable life. The youngest man ever to be elected President, he demonstrated a poise and resourcefulness which belied his years. He worked hard at his task. He was articulate and forceful. He made friends at home and abroad. He was dedicated to his public service, and to it, he made the supreme gift of self. This, a grateful, yet sorrowing Nation, will remember.

In our grief we should particularly remember the sorrow within the family circle. Our hearts go out to his wife and children who have been robbed of a young husband and father. Little Caroline and John-John have crept into the hearts of millions. They and their brave mother will be remembered in our prayers.

We trust this sad hour will cause us to be even more dedicated to the welfare of our country and the preservation of all that is best in our national life.

Dr. Wernher von Braun, Noted Space Scientist, Addresses Annual Dinner of Charleston (W. Va.) Chamber of Commerce—Receives Centennial Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Chamber of Commerce of Charleston, W. Va., is comprised of energetic and public-spirited citizens who are dedicated to the continued progress of the Mountain State and the capital city area. Each year, they gather for an annual dinner at which they are addressed by a leader of national and international renown. The 1963 event occurred on Tuesday, November 5, in the civic center.

Principal speaker on this significant occasion was Dr. Wernher von Braun, Director of the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala., and a leader in U.S. space programs. It was my privilege to introduce Dr. von Braun to an attentive and responsive audience numbering more than 650 persons. Charles E. Hodges, managing director of the business and professional group, had carefully arranged the program with his characteristic attention to details.

Presiding was Chamber President Charles W. Cammack, Jr., and the invocation was offered by Rev. William M. Kirkland of the St. Johns Episcopal Church. Also present were Representative KEN HECHLER of Huntington, a member of the Aeronautics and Space Committee in the U.S. House of Representatives, and Representative JOHN M. SLACK, Jr., who serves on the House Appropriations Committee. Mayor John A. Shanklin, members of the Kanawha County court, and the presidents of institutions of higher learning in the State, were honored guests.

A highlight of the evening was the presentation of the Order of the 35th Star to Dr. von Braun by Mrs. William Wallace Barron, wife of the Governor. Her husband was unable to be present. The award was established as a part of West Virginia's 1963 Centennial celebration and has been given to a number of dignitaries who have made contributions to growth and achievement.

Dr. von Braun cautioned that U.S. space probes must not be taken lightly, and that our success in rocketry will have direct bearing on national security. He explained:

"Our national security demands that we insure no hostile force will be permitted to use space as an unchallenged avenue of aggression against us."

The famed scientist illustrated his speech with color slides showing an artist's conception of the Apollo spacecraft, and its round trip journey to the moon. Dr. von Braun said:

"We are on the eve of the greatest scientific and economic revolution in history, brought on by the expanding knowledge from research in every field of endeavor. And the urge to explore the unknown is its stimulus."

Mr. President, I request that portions of the text of Dr. Wernher von Braun's speech be printed in the RECORD, together with my remarks in introducing him. I also ask the inclusion of the editorial "Dr. von Braun Welcome Choice" in the November 5, 1963, issue of the Charleston Gazette.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, IN INTRODUCTION OF DR. WERNHER VON BRAUN, DIRECTOR, GEORGE C. MARSHALL SPACE FLIGHT CENTER, HUNTSVILLE, ALA., AT THE ANNUAL DINNER, CHARLESTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, CHARLESTON, W. VA., NOVEMBER 5, 1963

Mine is a twofold privilege, since I am afforded the opportunity to greet men and women who are vitally interested in the development of West Virginia, and also to introduce our brilliant and renowned speaker.

We have enjoyed modern science for little more than 300 years, and have learned to utilize it in revolutionizing the power of technology only in the last 150 years.

Three centuries ago the cardinals who condemned Galileo stated that it was false to assert that the earth was not the center of the universe, and to believe that the earth moved through space.

Today, a moment later from the standpoint of historic time, we are sending aloft manmade earth satellites—intricate devices which gather thousands of seemingly unimportant bits of information and relay them to tracking stations back on our globe.

The space age has truly arrived, and with it a pace of living, a scope of change which brings benefit and complex new problems.

Today we confront change on an ever-broadening scale and at a rapidly increasing rate. Automation and mechanization which are so much a part of the age of space have brought far-reaching implications to each of us. It is particularly appropriate that we have as our guest a man who has been deeply involved in the planning, construction, and execution of all phases of the surge toward outer reaches of the universe. He is conversant with technological advance and has been associated with the new science of rocketry since its infancy.

Dr. Wernher von Braun is recognized and respected as a leading figure in rocket propulsion and space powerplants. His service to this country has included such meaningful endeavors as the participation in development of the Jupiter IRBM and Pershing rockets; and the perfection of special versions of the Redstone, Jupiter C, and Juno II missiles used in launching the free world's first satellites of the Earth and Sun—satellites Explorer I and Pioneer IV. He also exercised leadership in the first successful space flight and the recovery of animal life.

In 1959 Dr. von Braun was awarded the Distinguished Federal Civilian Service Award by the President of the United States, for significant work in the space program. Today he is Director of the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center, in Huntsville, Ala., and is recognized throughout the world as a foremost authority in the space sciences.

International tensions and the expanding technology have become the significant challenges of the sixties. The role of American space effort has genuine meaning in each of these problem areas, and Dr. von Braun has been among the leaders in the application of technological advance and in maintaining a position of progress in astronautics. I know he shares with all West Virginians a concern for useful space achievement, and for sensible solutions to the economic problems which confront citizens in various sectors of our economy.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are delighted to have Dr. Wernher von Braun at this notable gathering of citizens of Charleston and of West Virginia—Dr. von Braun.

THE NEED TO EXPLORE SPACE

(Remarks by Dr. von Braun, Director, George C. Marshall Space Flight Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Huntsville, Ala., at Charleston, W. Va., November 5, 1963)

This is a happy occasion to discuss pioneers and exploration. There is an imperative need today to cultivate, rather than squash, the urge to explore that has helped make America the most powerful Nation in the world, at the same time offering us the most freedom and independence. The urge to explore, self-sufficiency, and love of freedom come naturally to West Virginians. I understand that the immortal Daniel Boone, reknown the world over for his love of "elbow room," once represented Charleston in the Virginia Assembly. If this famous explorer were alive today, I am sure he would be an astronaut, eager to go to the moon. NASA has one West Virginian who is a modern-day pioneer in this field. He is Col. Charles E. Yeager, the first man to fly faster than the speed of sound.

I have learned recently of another pioneer of your State. You see—your centennial publicity is widespread. We read a lot about it in Alabama. James Rumsey of West Virginia had a steamboat operating on the Potomac 20 years before Robert Fulton's. If Rumsey could have had Governor Barron and the centennial's publicity chairman on his staff, the popular conception of history would more accurately reflect his pioneering accomplishment.

Rumsey's paddle wheel steamboat must have been a picturesque sight steaming up the Potomac. Its boiler capacity was limited, however. Every time the whistle blew, the paddle wheel would slow down. I ought to be back in Huntsville right now, getting up steam to go to the moon, but here I am blowing my whistle.

Your State is rich in natural resources—timber, minerals, oil, and natural gas. You are more blessed than California, in fact. But your most valuable asset is your human resources. I am delighted to hear of your efforts to improve your educational system, and to provide the specialized vocational training that a worker needs in the complex technology of the space age. Brainpower will make a desert bloom. How much easier then, will it be for West Virginia to go forward with its fortunate combination of human and natural resources. Progress needs the proper climate, however—a climate of the mind.

The people themselves must want to move forward before a state—or a nation—can advance. A favorable state of mind must be cultivated, a pioneering spirit imbued, and willingness to sacrifice for a noble cause encouraged.

Fortunately for the advancement of civilizations, man was born with an itch to explore the unknown. He has always wanted to see what was under the big rock, over the next hill, across the ocean, inside the atom—and out in space. It is the role of leadership to point the way, to stimulate, inspire, and to lend encouragement to others. This is true on the battlefield, in religious, social, and community affairs, and in programs of national importance.

One of the biggest national programs today is the exploration of space. The space age began on October 4, 1957, when Russia's Sputnik I blazed a trail across the horizon, dazzling the world, and striking a blow to America's pride and prestige. This spectacular achievement in space reflected an advanced scientific and engineering technology in Russia. That was supposed to be our strong point. Project Vanguard was underway to orbit a grapfruit-sized satellite as part of our scientific participation in the International Geophysical Year, but it was having technical difficulties. A completely new launch vehicle was being designed in Project Vanguard, and it takes time to iron all the bugs out of any new system. While the world watched, and the American public called frantically for action, a Vanguard missile suffered an unfortunate explosion at launch.

Washington was reluctant to use a military missile in a satellite launching attempt, but eventually consented, to salvage what it could of our damaged prestige. Our research and development team at Huntsville was able to place Explorer I, the free world's first satellite, into orbit 83 days later. We used a modified U.S. Army Redstone missile with solid propellent upper stages to loft a payload weighing about 31 pounds. The first-stage thrust of the launch vehicle was 78,000 pounds. This was the largest operational rocket we had on hand at the time.

Meanwhile, back at the Soviet rocket range, more large payloads were being placed into orbit. Although information was meager about their missile and space programs—and still is—it was evident that powerful rockets were used to orbit the heavy payloads. The Russians were using rockets for space exploration that were developed in their military program. They were obviously larger than any missile then under development in our intercontinental ballistic missile program.

In the beginning, rockets were built to deliver atomic bombs. Rocket designers were given the job of building a rocket big enough to carry a certain size atomic bomb so many miles to its target. But the rocket was to be no larger than necessary for its mission, since this would make it more costly, and take longer to develop. At this time the United States enjoyed a substantial lead over Russia in nuclear technology consequently, we knew how to build more compact and lighter weight atomic bombs, with sufficient destructive power. So we built smaller and less powerful rockets which could, nevertheless, deliver the same explosive power the same distance as the larger and less efficient systems.

Now, when it was realized that rockets developed for military purposes were of immense importance for space exploration, Russia appeared in a very advantageous position—because of her ineptitude in another field.

The spectacular achievements of Russia and the United States in space were having significant impact on people around the world. The United States, historically and fundamentally a peace-loving Nation, wanted to separate its space program from its defense effort. To accomplish this, President Eisenhower proposed the establishment of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

I was honored with an invitation to testify about the proposed creation of this separate Government agency in the opening testimony before the House select committee considering the bill. I was employed by the Army at the time, but my opinion on the need for a sustained effort in space has not changed. I said at the time:

"Even more important than the budget figures for the first year is the question of how we can stabilize this program and keep it going at a sustained, accelerated rate over a number of years, how we can eliminate this lethal and wasteful hot-and-cold blowing that has plagued all our missile projects in the past. I think this lack of steady determination and unwavering support over the years has hurt us more than anything."

Others spoke out just as strongly. Speaking in Los Angeles in April 1958, Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, now Deputy Administrator of NASA, said:

"I know that some knowledgeable people fear that although we might be willing to spend a couple of billions for space technology in 1958, because we still remember the humiliation caused by the appearance of the first sputnik last October, next year we will be so preoccupied by color television, or new style cars, or the beginning of another national election campaign that we'll be unwilling to pay another year's installment on our space conquest bill. For that to happen—well, I'd just as soon we didn't start.

"Fortunately, for the sake of our children's future, if not for the protection of our own skins, I don't think we're that grasshopper minded. * * * As a Nation, we have the scientific and technical competence. We have the resources to pay the bill. We can and we must succeed in finding our destiny in space."

NASA was established in October 1958, and began to organize for a broad assault on the mysteries of our atmosphere and space. Weather, communications, and navigation satellites were launched successfully, and factfinding probes were made into the space near earth and the lunar region.

Then on April 12, 1961, Yuri Gagarin struck another blow to America's pride and international prestige when he became the first human being to orbit the earth. This dazzled the world more than anything that has taken place since Sputnik I in 1957. All America was astir. If you will recall, the Russians didn't tell us beforehand that they were beginning a program of manned space flight. Just as they didn't tell us in 1957 that they were planning to orbit a scientific satellite.

One month after Gagarin's flight, on May 25, 1961, President Kennedy proposed an accelerated space program for the Nation. "This is the new ocean," he said in his inaugural address, "and I believe the United States must sail on it, and be in a position second to none."

To exemplify our developing space technology, he held up for all the world to see, the goal of landing an American on the moon and returning him safely to earth.

"No single space project in this period will be more exciting, or more impressive to mankind, or more important for the long-range exploration of space," he said, "and none will be so difficult or expensive to accomplish."

Later he added:

"Let it be clear * * * that I am asking Congress and the country to accept a firm commitment for a new course of action—a course which will last for many years and carry very heavy costs * * *. If we are to go only halfway, or reduce our sights in the face of difficulty, in my judgment it would be better not to go at all."

Three NASA centers are primarily engaged in carrying out Project Apollo. They are supported, of course, by all other NASA centers, universities, and a large segment of private industry.

The Marshall Center is providing the Saturn V launch vehicle. The Manned Spacecraft Center at Houston is providing the spacecraft and the mission control center, and will select and train the astronauts. The Launch Operations Center at Cape Canaveral has under construction at Merritt Island the necessary launch facilities.

Lunar orbital rendezvous has been chosen as the best method for accomplishing the mission. All major contracts for hardware have been let, and design and development are underway. Complete new facilities for the Manned Spacecraft Center are under construction at Houston.

Extensive expansion of laboratory and test facilities is in progress at Huntsville. We have acquired the huge Michoud manufacturing facility in New Orleans for the fabrication of Saturn stages, and are modifying and enlarging it. Construction is underway for a static test site in Mississippi. The first stage of the Saturn V moon rocket is well along at Huntsville, and the first production F-1 engine arrived last week for acceptance testing. In other words, we are building up considerable momentum for accomplishing the mission that has been assigned us. Our course is charted and the pace is set. Now we must stick to it.

When the heat is on, we are too prone to holler for a crash program. When the pressure eases off, we grab for the emergency brake. You can't even drive a car by switching suddenly from accelerator all the way in to both feet on the brakes—and back again. And the space program is far more complex than an automobile. It takes time to get up momentum, and sustained effort to maintain it. You don't work miracles overnight. Plans must be made, designs drawn, people hired and trained, buildings constructed, hardware built and tested. And all this work must be integrated to come out on schedule with a rocket and spacecraft on the launch pad and trained pilots aboard, with thousands of qualified technicians standing by to help with the mission. Visualize the immensity of this task, if you will, by a comparison with Project Mercury, completed this summer. The total cost of Project Mercury was less than half a billion dollars, and two million people had some part in it. Project Apollo will cost $20 billion, and will require contributions from countless workers.

NASA's program is carefully planned, well conceived, and well paced to achieve a national capability in space on a broad front. The lunar landing goal per se is not the overriding consideration in our space program. It has been chosen as a goal easily understood by everyone, toward which all parts of the space program can be focused, matched, and integrated. Another goal, such as a manned orbiting laboratory, could possibly have been picked instead. But the moon offered the best choice as a goal since it embraces all vital elements of a true national space flight capability.

Governor Barron has called the West Virginia Centennial a challenging opportunity for the State.

"Our centennial, in itself," he said, "is not a magic carpet to a better life for West Virginia. But it does give us a rallying point. Through our centennial we can show a united front to the rest of the country by demonstrating our pride and confidence in West Virginia."

If the Governor will permit me to paraphrase his statement, I would like to say: Project Apollo, America's manned lunar landing program, is not a magic carpet to a national capability in space. But it does give us a rallying point. Through Project Apollo we can show a united front to the rest of the world by demonstrating our pride and confidence in the scientific and engineering technology that makes a trip to the moon possible.

The United States today is in a position somewhat similar to that of a family that a few months ago bought a new car. The excitement of the purchase is over, and now the installments are coming due with relentless regularity. Some second thoughts creep in as the householders juggle their budget. Susie needs a winter coat, and Johnny's shoes are wearing out. What should they do? You've had the problem, I'm sure, and you know the answer. A car is a necessity these days. So they buckle down and do both—pay for the car, and still have all the other necessities of life. If they have to trim back, they cut out a few luxuries, like a weekend outing or other expensive recreation.

Just as our space program is getting its second wind, some people are having second thoughts about it. The annual budget is under consideration, and the pro's and con's are being aired. Public debate is the very essence of democracy, and none of us would change it. Men have fought and died for the principle of government by, for, and of the people. And we cannot make the right decisions unless we hear all the facts.

As a citizens, I want to add my two cents worth to the debate with the thesis that space exploration is a necessity for a dynamic America, vital to our role of world leadership, and essential for the preservation of peace.

Nikita Khrushchev has said that the Russians are not planning to put cosmonauts on the moon in this decade. One of his cosmonauts says they are going next year. Perhaps Nikita hasn't given him the word, or vice versa. Some Americans are willing to believe Khrushchev. But let me remind you, Mr. Khrushchev did not say that the Russians were not developing a national space capability. Nor did he outline his immediate goal in space, although we know they have a rapidly accelerating space program. Personally, I would not be surprised if the Russians orbited a 40- to 50-ton satellite before the end of this year. The heaviest object placed into orbit so far weighed less than eight tons.

What Mr. Khrushchev says or doesn't say is not the point. The size and pace of our space program should be decided by America's needs, and not on the basis of Mr. Khrushchev's comments. Man has pushed his explorations into the nearer fringes of space. The need to push onward is great, and now is the time to do it. Man has long dreamed of a trip to the moon. But it has been possible only in his imagination. Now, for the first time, our science, technology, and economy can transform the imagination of the past into reality.

When Mr. Khrushchev said he would bury us, he implied that it would be done through the weight of the socialistic system in developing Russia's economy, and crushing our free enterprise system. Now he is buying wheat from us. Going to the moon or not going may be a purely economic choice for the Russians. Perhaps they cannot afford it. But we can—without detriment to the comfort of our standard of living. All of NASA's programs cost each person in the country less than 10 cents a day.

The Space Age is more than 6 years old, but some people will still have nothing to do with it. It's difficult to understand. I am reminded of the two caterpillars who were crawling along in the grass. Looking up, they saw a butterfly fluttering about overhead. One caterpillar turned to the other and said, "They'll never get me up in one of those things." The Space Age is here, and it's here to stay. And we must accept it, for it affects every one of us. We are on the eve of the greatest scientific and economic revolution in history, brought about by the expanding knowledge from research in every field of endeavor. And the urge to explore the unknown is its stimulus.

A comedian has suggested a possible means of securing all-out public support for Project Apollo. He would put all the women on the Moon and leave the men on Earth. Then, he says, think how busy everybody would be building Moon rockets. And it would solve the unemployment problem.

Project Apollo is a serious, scientific undertaking. It is not an adventurous race to the Moon for dramatic propaganda purposes, although it will be crammed with adventure and drama such as we have never before witnessed. And there will be undeniable beneficial prestige effects when we demonstrate our ability to accomplish lunar exploration. It will reflect the heights which science and technology can reach in a society of free men.

But remember—Project Apollo is only a stepping stone in the effort to expand human knowledge of phenomena in Earth's atmosphere and in space. Beyond the Moon the planets beckon. Will we find life on Venus or Mars? What kind of life will it be? If we should meet with other creatures on another planet, let us hope that they will find us socially acceptable, understanding, tolerant —anything but delicious.

There are many unknowns in space, and many hazards. We are not even certain at this time about the surface of the Moon. Some scientists say it may consist of a coral reef-like structure, similar to cobwebs piled one on another to give it a porous, fairy castle appearance. Others fear that the dust may be so deep that it will swallow anything that lands there. Others say that the dust may be electrostatically charged, and will sweep out to meet the spacecraft, covering it like a cocoon. High-speed meteoroids may puncture the spacecraft, and heavy atomic particles from a solar flare could give the astronauts an excessive dose of radiation unless they are protected by appropriate shielding.

Whether these things are true or not remains to be seen. In spite of the hazards, I believe we can make it.

Whenever I need a bolstering of faith, I try to imagine the conditions at the time Wilbur Wright climbed into his tiny plane with bicycle wheels at Kitty Hawk, N.C. A horse was considered suitable transportation at that time. What would he have thought if I had walked up to him and said: "You are opening a new era for man today. Fifty years from now a jet pilot will take off from New York in a giant mechanical bug and cross the Atlantic at 600 miles an hour over a raging storm with 100 helpless men, women, and children aboard. Yet they will ride in air-conditioned comfort, with steak, television, and beautiful stewardesses to ease the rigors of the trip." He would not have believed me.

The predictions we are making today of things to come may sound impossible—but they are just as realistic.

Why should we explore space?

First and foremost, man has always explored space. Even before he could read and write he was exploring the world about him, migrating across continents. Later he penetrated the depths of the jungles, climbed the great mountains, and fought his way through Antarctic blizzards to the South Pole. He built devices to explore the subminiature world, then theorized on what was too small to examine even with the most powerful of microscopes. He built larger and larger telescopes to penetrate the universe, and again theorized on that which was beyond his reach. In short, man was born with an insatiable curiosity to learn more about himself and the universe about him. He has always been an explorer, and he always will be.

Second, Sputnik I demonstrated that international preeminence in science and technology is synchronous in the eyes of the world with preeminence in space flight. This identification, whether well founded or not, is a fact that we dare not ignore. The prestige value alone of demonstrating America's technological and financial capability for manned lunar exploration is by no means something to be taken lightly.

Third, our national security demands that we insure that no hostile force will be permitted to use space as an unchallenged avenue of aggression against us. It is impossible to predict now what the military significance of peace will be. That space has a military significance is amply demonstrated by the intercontinental ballistic missile, which must travel through space to reach its target. What we need now is the general NASA program to accumulate a body of knowledge, and to make the United States a spacefaring nation.

Fourth, the scientific knowledge gained from our space program will offer vast returns right here on earth for years to come. Scientific discoveries advance technology, and improved technology spurs the economy. New products are born, and jobs are created. As one observer put it. "We don't spend the money on the moon, you know; we spend it right here in the United States."

There are other indirect and intangible benefits of space exploration. Not the least of these is its stimulus to education. Space is fascinating to young minds. The space effort's use of practically all the scientific disciplines encourages their study and demands improved curricula and better teachers.

I hope that you share my conviction that we must sail on and on over this new ocean, and that you are eager to explore the mysteries about us. I hope that there is not a caterpillar among you.

DR. VON BRAUN WELCOME CHOICE

The Charleston Chamber of Commerce has scored a small triumph in obtaining the service of Wernher von Braun tonight as speaker at its annual banquet.

In an age that is being profoundly altered by science and technology, Dr. von Braun is a towering figure. Through a combination of accomplishments and personal experience, his name is familiar to those who are otherwise oblivious to the impact the technological revolution is having on their world and their lives.

By choosing him as a speaker, the chamber has stressed the importance it places not only on his work but on the work of the countless scientists-technicians he has come to symbolize. In doing so, it is to be congratulated.

In accepting the chamber's invitation, Dr. von Braun is recognizing the responsibility of the scientists to share his knowledge and ideas. And, for a man who goes around with his mind in the clouds, he has an abundance of each.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, DD., offered the following prayer:

Judges 18: 5: *Ask counsel of God, that we may know whether our way, which we go, shall be prosperous.*

Eternal and ever-blessed God, today we are praying especially for Thy grace and favor upon Lyndon B. Johnson, who now occupies the exalted office of the Presidency of these United States.

Burdened with tremendous tasks and responsibilities, may he be blessed with those capacities and abilities which will enable him to help solve our many national and international problems.

Believing that all greatness and power begin with faith and humility, may he daily cultivate a great faith and walk humbly with the Lord and keep in step with Thine eternal will and purpose.

Grant that his wisdom and sound judgment may inspire our beloved country to reach the proportions of lofty moral and spiritual idealism and leadership among the nations.

Although we are bending all our energies to shelter our Republic from the assaults of external enemies, may we realize more fully how absolutely necessary it is to guard our country against the temptation to allow the violent hands of irreligion and paganism, materialism and immorality, to lay hold upon us and undermine our character and corrupt our very soul, as a God-fearing people.

May we all have a glorious part in helping the President, our Speaker, and the Congress to steer the ship of state into deeper and wider and grander channels.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3190. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, relating to devises and bequests by will;

H.R. 3191. An act to exempt life insurance companies from the act of February 4, 1913, regulating loaning of money on securities in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 7497. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia relating to annual statements and for other purposes; and

H. Con. Res. 238. Concurrent resolution establishing that the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on November 27, 1963, at 12:30 o'clock postmeridian.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5338. An act to enact the Uniform Commercial Code for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1024. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay relocation costs made necessary by actions of the District of Columbia government, and for other purposes;

S. 1406. An act to authorize the establishment of a Junior College Division within the District of Columbia Teachers College, and for other purposes;

S. 1533. An act to amend the act of July 24, 1956, granting a franchise to D.C. Transit System, Inc.;

S. 1540. An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the regulation of rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, and for other purposes; and

S. 1964. An act to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, to increase the fee charges for learners' permits.

THE HONORABLE ALBERT W. JOHNSON

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

HARRISBURG, PA., *November 26, 1963.*

The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

The returns received in my office clearly show that Hon. ALBERT W. JOHNSON has been duly elected to be Representative in Congress from the 23d Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

The sad events of the past few days have delayed preparation of all official certifications. Our certification under signature and seal will follow within a day or two.

GEORGE I. BLOOM,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. HALLECK. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. ALBERT W. JOHNSON, be permitted to take the oath of office today. His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE, HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 238, TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER of the House presided.

The Doorkeeper announced the President pro tempore and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On the part of the Senate, the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

The Doorkeeper announced the ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m. the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the high privilege and personal honor of presenting to you a former colleague, the President of the United States. [Applause, the Members rising.]

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 178)

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, Members of the House, Members of the Senate, my fellow Americans, all I have I would have given gladly not to be standing here today.

The greatest leader of our time has been struck down by the foulest deed of our time. Today John Fitzgerald Kennedy lives on in the immortal words and works that he left behind. He lives on in the mind and memories of mankind. He lives on in the hearts of his countrymen.

No words are sad enough to express our sense of loss. No words are strong enough to express our determination to continue the forward thrust of America that he began. [Applause.]

The dream of conquering the vastness of space—the dream of partnership across the Atlantic, and across the Pacific as well—the dream of a Peace Corps in less developed nations—the dream of education for all of our children—the dream of jobs for all who seek them and need them—the dream of care for our elderly—the dream of an all-out attack on mental illness—and above all, the dream of equal rights for all Americans, whatever their race or color [applause]—these and other American dreams have been vitalized by his drive and by his dedication.

Now the ideas and the ideals which he so nobly represented must and will be translated into effective action. [Applause.]

Under John Kennedy's leadership, this Nation has demonstrated that it has the courage to seek peace, and it has the fortitude to risk war. We have proved that we are a good and reliable friend to those who seek peace and freedom. We have shown that we can also be a formidable foe to those who reject the path of peace and those who seek to impose upon us or our allies the yoke of tyranny.

This Nation will keep its commitments from South Vietnam to West Berlin. [Applause.] We will be unceasing in the search for peace; resourceful in our pursuit of areas of agreement, even with those with whom we differ—and generous and loyal to those who join with us in common cause.

In this age when there can be no losers in peace and no victors in war, we must recognize the obligation to match national strength with national restraint. [Applause.] We must be prepared at one and the same time for both the confrontation of power and the limitation of power. We must be ready to defend the national interest and to negotiate the common interest. This is the path that we shall continue to pursue. Those who test our courage will find it strong and those who seek our friendship will find it honorable. We will demonstrate anew that the strong can be just in the use of strength—and the just can be strong in the defense of justice. And let all know we will extend no special privilege and impose no persecution.

We will carry on the fight against poverty and misery, ignorance and disease—in other lands and in our own.

We will serve all of the Nation, not one section or one sector, or one group, but all Americans. [Applause.] These are the United States—a united people with a united purpose.

Our American unity does not depend upon unanimity. We have differences; but now, as in the past, we can derive from those differences strength, not weakness, wisdom, not despair. Both as a people and as a Government we can unite upon a program, a program which is wise, just, enlightened, and constructive.

For 32 years, Capitol Hill has been my home. I have shared many moments of pride with you—pride in the ability of the Congress of the United States to act; to meet any crisis; to distill from our differences strong programs of national action.

An assassin's bullet has thrust upon me the awesome burden of the Presidency. I am here today to say I need your help, I cannot bear this burden alone. I need the help of all Americans in all America. [Applause.] This Nation has experienced a profound shock and in this critical moment it is our duty—yours and mine—as the Government of the United States—to do away with uncertainty and doubt and delay and to show that we are capable of decisive action [applause]—that from the brutal loss of our leader we will derive not weakness but strength—that we can and will act and act now.

From this Chamber of representative government let all the world know, and none misunderstand, that I rededicate this Government to the unswerving support of the United Nations [applause]—to the honorable and determined execution of our commitments to our allies [applause]—to the maintenance of military strength second to none—to the defense of the strength and stability of the dollar [applause]—to the expansion of our foreign trade [applause]—to the reinforcement of our programs of mutual assistance and cooperation in Asia and Africa [applause]—and to our Alliance for Progress in this hemisphere. [Applause.]

On the 20th day of January, in 1961, John F. Kennedy told his countrymen that our national work would not be finished "in the first thousand days, nor in the life of this administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But"—he said—"let us begin."

Today in this moment of new resolve, I would say to my fellow Americans, let us continue. [Applause.]

This is our challenge—not to hesitate, not to pause, not to turn about and linger over this evil moment but to continue on our course so that we may fulfill the destiny that history has set for us. Our most immediate tasks are here on this Hill.

First, no memorial oration or eulogy could more eloquently honor President Kennedy's memory than the earliest possible passage of the civil rights bill for which he fought so long. [Applause.] We have talked long enough in this country about equal rights. We have talked for 100 years or more. It is time now to write the next chapter—and to write it in the books of law. [Applause.]

I urge you again, as I did in 1957, and again in 1960, to enact a civil rights law so that we can move forward to eliminate from this Nation every trace of discrimination and oppression that is based upon race or color. [Applause.] There could be no greater source of strength to this Nation both at home and abroad.

And second, no act of ours could more fittingly continue the work of President Kennedy than the early passage of the tax bill for which he fought all this long year. [Applause.] This is a bill designed to increase our national income and Federal revenues, and to provide insurance against recession. That bill, if passed without delay means more security for those now working, more jobs for those now without them, and more incentive for our economy.

In short, this is no time for delay. It is time for action [applause]—strong, forward-looking action on the pending education bills to help bring the light of learning to every home and hamlet in America, strong, forward-looking action on youth employment opportunities, strong, forward-looking action on the pending foreign aid bill, making clear that we are not forfeiting our responsibilities to this hemisphere or to the world, nor erasing executive flexibility in the conduct of our foreign affairs [applause]—and strong, prompt, and forward-looking action on the remaining appropriation bills. [Applause.]

In this new spirit of action the Congress can expect the full cooperation and support of the executive branch. And in particular I pledge that the expenditures of your Government will be administered with the utmost thrift and frugality. [Applause.] I ask your help. I will insist that the Government get a dollar's value for a dollar spent. The Government will set an example of prudence and economy. [Applause.] This does not mean that we will not meet our unfilled needs or that we will not honor our commitments. We will do both.

As one who has long served in both Houses of the Congress, I firmly believe in the independence and the integrity of the legislative branch. [Applause.] I promise you that I shall always respect this. It is deep in the marrow of my bones.

With equal firmness, I believe in the capacity and I believe in the ability of the Congress, despite the divisions of opinion which characterize our Nation, to act—to act wisely, to act vigorously, to act speedily when the need arises.

The need is here. The need is now.

We meet in grief; but let us also meet in renewed dedication and renewed vigor. Let us meet in action, in tolerance and in mutual understanding.

John Kennedy's death commands what his life conveyed—that America must move forward. [Applause.] The time has come for Americans of all races and creeds and political beliefs to understand and to respect one another. [Applause.] So let us put an end to the teaching and preaching of hate and evil and violence. [Applause.] Let us turn away from the fanatics of the far left and the far right, from the apostles of bitterness and bigotry, from those defiant of law, and those who pour venom into our Nation's bloodstream. [Applause.]

I profoundly hope that the tragedy and the torment of these terrible days will bind us together in new fellowship, making us one people in our hour of sorrow. So let us here highly resolve that John Fitzgerald Kennedy did not live—or die—in vain. [Applause.] And on this Thanksgiving eve, as we gather together to ask the Lord's blessing, and give Him our thanks, let us unite in those familiar and cherished words:

> America, America,
>   God shed His grace on thee,
> And crown thy good
>   With brotherhood
> From sea to shining sea.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m., the President, accompanied by the committee of escorts, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m. the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

REFERENCE OF PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 29

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Friday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE AND SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House, until Monday, December 2, 1963, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate, and the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

A DETROIT MEMORIAL FOR JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ryan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill in Congress proposing that the Federal building heretofore authorized by Congress to be constructed at Detroit, Mich., be named the "John F. Kennedy Federal Building."

To have one of our most beautiful buildings in Detroit dedicated to the memory of our beloved President would be a special honor for the people of Detroit. It would be a fitting and appropriate memorial named after a most courageous, a most effective, and a most energetic American leader.

The House and Senate Public Works Committees authorized the construction of a new Federal office building on April 4, 1963.

The bill states:

> Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which such building is referred to shall be held to refer to such building as the "John F. Kennedy Federal Building."

SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Waggonner] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I have had a number of occasions to express my concern over the direction taken by our program in space.

Because of the staggering cost of all our space efforts, I have always maintained the position that our primary motivation must be military in scope. Heretofore, the emphasis has been unclear in definition. Perhaps, the haze which has surrounded our motives for a lunar landing, for instance, has been because of our uncertainty of Russian intent. That same uncertainty exists today and we must be ever mindful of it, but our purpose in space is solidifying in the posture all of us can support and promote: military superiority for this Nation over the Soviet Union.

A recent editorial in the Shreveport Times sums up the position I have taken since becoming a member of this committee and I ask unanimous consent to insert it here in the Record for the attention of all.

[From the Shreveport Times, Nov. 8, 1963]

Changing Emphasis on Space

As Khrushchev continues to take himself out and put himself back into the moon race, the American price tag for the trip has shrunk suddenly from $20 billion to a tenth of that figure. Khrushchev must be given the credit for bringing the whole U.S. space effort into focus and making it clear that a lunar landing can be made only a culminating item in our plans. The Government is prepared to go military in space.

To say that it will cost only $2 billion to put a man on the moon is just another way of saying that Project Apollo is the end aim of a broadly based intermediary space effort whose counterpart the Russians have no intention of giving up, whether they go to the moon or not. The U.S. effort can be viewed either as intermediary or as an end in itself. The moon landing gives it coherence and drive but a lunar landing isn't vital, and the program has important features that can be made to serve a military instead of a civilian end. It is already partly military.

The moon project is now worth the money; for the Government is now giving the space effort a military focus it has always lacked. It needs doing for the reason that the Russians are doing the same thing, and evidently have the edge on us.

The United States has planned a two-step program, ending in 1970 with an actual lunar landing. First comes Gemini, a two-astronaut near-earth project with controlled orbiting, space rendezvous, inspection of other space vehicles, and the ability of the spacemen to leave and return to their ship as the aims. The Russians made a long stride toward achieving these things when they launched a maneuverable spacecraft last Friday. The emphasis was military as it has always been with the Russians. Now ours can and should be, too, Federal officials say.

Thus, Gemini, a planned forerunner of the Apollo mooncraft will, along with the huge upcoming Saturn rockets, and new launching and testing facilities, cost plenty, but it's not a "moondoggle." If we don't continue with it, the Russians will have a decided military advantage in near-earth space, an advantage they already have a start on because of more powerful rockets.

Officials of the National Aeronautics and Space Agency have in the past few months been trying to make clear that Gemini and Apollo are both needed, but when Khrushchev began talking equivocally, NASA went heavily over to the military tack where before it had talked only peaceful pursuits. It is well that the Agency is able to make the switch, however reluctant it may be, and however much the urgency of getting to the moon is diminished thereby. For the House, partly because of the purely civilian aspects of the space program, has already cut $600 million off the 1965 NASA budget of $5.6 billion. If the expected compromise comes, it will not be long before the intermediary stages of the U.S. moon plan will, after being converted to military focus, have priority over the lunar landing itself, which may well dim well past the 1970 target date.

One telling point NASA officials have made is that the United States should by no means slack off the urgency of the moon program to where it would affect delivery date of the huge Saturn rocket-booster, now scheduled for 1966. When Saturn reaches the pad it will be the most powerful booster in the world, and whatever advantage the Reds have enjoyed since 1957 will diminish; for we will be able to loft payloads far in excess of theirs—whether we're heading for the moon right away or not.

The U.S. space program from the start has been geared to catching up with Russia in rocket power. By 1966, we will have done that, perhaps permanently, for our intelligence reports do not show that the Russians are building the equivalent of the huge Saturn.

So, 2 years from now should be time enough in which to assess the American position in space and to take our own initiatives so far as actual space travel goes. It will be the first time we will not have had to react to a Russian threat to do something or get somewhere first in space.

Meanwhile, we should let no word or deed of the Russians deter us from launching a military program in space to match theirs, regardless of U.N. compacts not to test or use space for warlike purposes.

THANKSGIVING TO A PRESIDENT, JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Carey] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I believe there is no need to recount for the people of my State and my community, any part of the tribute, the funeral and requiem or the burial at Arlington. In the East Room of the White House, in the great hall of the people at the Capitol Rotunda, and finally at Arlington Cemetery, I was there humbly in person and all the world was there more vitally in spirit.

This message is simply to pledge the continuum of that spirit.

Thank you, thank you very much, Mr. President.

This is the day we press on. Twenty-four hours after the mortal part of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy was placed before the altar of God for his requiem, we resumed the business of the Congress in which he served so long and well.

Because he led us for a thousand days our aims are high, our goals clear. We have no time for the indulgence of self pity that he was with us so short a time or so swiftly departed. Rather let us reflect on our fortune that he was here in our dark and dangerous hours. In his name, let us be impatient with futility of the present and move to the high promise of the future. If his sacrifice is to have full meaning, our pace must be urgent, our steps determined.

We mourn and our memories of the moments we spent with him are precious to us no matter how brief. Because they are precious, I will share mine on another day and set them forth so they will not be lost to our children and my countrymen. But at this time as we approach the day set for Thanksgiving let us have one recollection.

As he walked among the people he loved with outstretched hand and his smile of friendship, he was not silent. While he had a special word of wit, of intimacy for some, these words he had to all:

"Thank you, thank you very much." "Thank you" was his constant expression to the children, the men and women, the crowds, the country, because his heart was full of gratitude for their high honor, for their support, but most of all for the opportunity to serve mankind which he had firmly sought and fully won.

Now as we press on in that same service, if we pause, let it be only for gratitude, for thanksgiving. Let us now respond.

Thank you, Mr. President.

For the faith in God and fellow man your life personified, we are grateful.

For the unity and strength you left us as a country, we are grateful.

For teaching us that there must be an end to venom as a means of vengeance and hurt for the sake of hate, we are thankful.

For the lesson that we measure mortality in the mystery of eternity not in days but in deeds, we are thankful.

For your interest in our children, your concern for their education, your determination that the handicapped among them who "had felt the hand of fate would never be victims of neglect," we are grateful.

For the path to peace you found amid the thicket of tension and threat of war, we are most grateful.

For your words and works, your "Profile in Courage," which you brought to life in your own sacrifice, we are most grateful.

For your judgment, that favorite word of yours which guided us toward well-being for all men, toward order and understanding in the whole world, we are most grateful.

For your heroism in war and peace which won you your rightful resting place among our brave departed you will be well remembered.

But above all, Mr. President, we give you thanks for the self you left to lead us in the person of your wife and family.

For Mrs. John F. Kennedy who raised us from despair and summoned up in all of us the spirit we needed and did not have, for her example, her calm, her love, and, hopefully, her forgiveness.

On Thanksgiving Day to you, Mr. President, Mrs. John F. Kennedy, and all your family, thank you, thank you very much. Thank you.

NAMING OF CULTURAL CENTER FOR JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on Wednesday, November 27, 1963. I wholeheartedly endorse and subscribe naming the Cultural Center for John F. Kennedy. I think that this is a wonderful suggestion, and I will introduce a resolution in the House to have the new memorial named for John F. Kennedy.

The article follows:

A LIVING MEMORIAL TO JOHN F. KENNEDY

It was just 1 year ago this week—on November 29, 1962—that President and Mrs. John F. Kennedy inaugurated a nationwide fundraising campaign to erect a National Cultural Center in Washington.

The late President and First Lady were guiding spirits in the development of this project to fulfill a longtime need in the Nation's Capital for facilities to accommodate the performing arts.

We propose that the Center be named in honor of John F. Kennedy and that it be dedicated as a national living memorial to him.

This would be fitting and appropriate. President Kennedy and Mrs. Kennedy, in addition to their devoted interest in the National Cultural Center itself, were intensely active in the encouragement of all things culturally and artistically worthwhile. No President and First Lady in the country's history have done more than they to promote the arts and to infuse the American people with a greater sense of appreciation for esthetic endeavor.

A John F. Kennedy Memorial Cultural Center overlooking the Potomac River—not far from the White House and the final resting place of President Kennedy at Arlington—would serve as a useful and enduring monument to honor John F. Kennedy and to perpetuate the priceless treasure of principles and ideals that are his legacy to the American people and all mankind.

GREAT NATIONAL FORUM FOR THE ARTS

The National Cultural Center in Washington has been planned as a national forum for the performing arts in the United States.

Designed by the noted American architect, Edward Durell Stone, the monumental building will be built on the east bank of the Potomac not far from the Lincoln Memorial.

The Center will house 3 auditoriums: a 2,750-seat symphony hall; a 2,500-seat theater for opera, ballet and musical productions, and a 1,200-seat auditorium for theatrical performances.

On the roof will be an area for band concerts, art exhibits and festivals.

Sheathed in white marble, the building will be 600 feet long and 100 feet wide. Its roof will be 100 feet from the ground, 18 inches shorter than the Lincoln Memorial.

Plans call for the Center to play host to visiting artists and groups from throughout the United States and from foreign countries. Washington's own cultural institutions, like the National Symphony and the opera society, will be given preference in scheduling but will not be considered permanent tenants. The planners want to keep the Center a national enterprise.

The land on which the Center will be erected has been set aside for that purpose by Congress, which originally authorized the project in 1958. Congress provided that the funds be raised privately and set a deadline of September 1963.

The project languished for 3 years until President John F. Kennedy took an interest in it and appointed Roger L. Stevens, New York financier and theatrical producer, as chairman.

Fundraising got underway in earnest last November 29 in a cultural spectacular on closed-circuit television seen in five cities, including Philadelphia.

President and Mrs. Kennedy headed the cast of 100 notables which included former President and Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower; Pianist Van Cliburn, Singer Marian Anderson, Poet Robert Frost, and Cellist Pablo Casals. Leonard Bernstein, conductor and composer, was master of ceremonies.

Mrs. Kennedy and Mrs. Eisenhower have served as honorary cochairman of the Center.

President Kennedy put his support in these words: "A great cultural Center which expresses the interest of the people of this country in this most basic desire of mankind is a most important responsibility."

Since that kickoff event, some $13 million has been raised toward construction of the Center. This includes a $5 million gift the Ford Foundation has earmarked on a 3 to 1 matching basis.

Last August, Congress extended the deadline for fundraising by 3 years, to September 2, 1966. Chairman Stevens said he was confident the money could be raised in that time.

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday last Mrs. Rooney and I attended holy mass at the hospital chapel at Walter Reed Army Hospital here in Washington. The celebrant of the mass was Rev. Eugene L. A. Fisher, C.S. Sp., chaplain—lieutenant colonel—AUS, retired. For his sermon during the sacrifice of this memorial mass, which was for the happy repose of the soul of the late President John F. Kennedy, Father Fisher read to the congregation the following beautiful prayer poem which he had written out in longhand the evening before:

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

(By Eugene L. A. Fisher, C.S. Sp., chaplain (lieutenant colonel), AUS retired)

We know not track time or lone hour
When God will say, "Come see."
The great, the grand, with all their power
Can hardly set us free.

Within a triumphal parade
Mid shouts of joyous praise
The call may come in sudden raid
Or as explosive blaze.

Our President was jubilant
The crowds acclaimed with pride
Not knowing that the time was scant
Sad tragedy the ride.

Assassin's bullets turned the joy
To grim reality
It could have been his wife or boy
It hurt both you and me.

A great man, lover of world peace
Who kept our country strong
Given the time, would still increase
Our strength to right the wrong.

Cut down in virile prime of life
With aspirations high
To conquer in world's bitter strife
Keep flag safe in the sky.

A gifted man with talents rare
To help his fellow man,
He labored with that special care
As only masters can.

Our States have lost their greatest friend
The world a man most kind
Whose labors and great toil could lend
A key to freedom find.

He now rests in a hero's grave
Life's trials for him are o'er
A martyr's palm archangels wave
God blessed his latest chore.

His passing is our country's loss
God called him when ready,
Like you, we shall not shirk the cross—
John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

TURN TO HIM WITH CONFIDENCE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by the distinguished columnist Walter Lippmann, which appeared in the November 26, 1963, edition of the New York Herald Tribune. In spite of our tragic loss we, as Mr. Lippmann says, "have much hope in the healing art of Lyndon Johnson. We can turn to him with confidence."

The article follows:

Murder Most Foul

(By Walter Lippmann)

The first need of the country is to take to heart the nature of this unspeakable crime. There is no public crisis at home or abroad which demands such instant attention that it cannot wait until we have collected ourselves and can proceed deliberately. But there is a searing internal crisis within the American spirit which we have first to realize and then to resolve.

The American future depends on it, and our capacity to govern ourselves. What we have to realize is that, though speech and gossip and rumor are free, the safety of the Republic is at stake when extremists go unrestrained. Extremists may profess any ideology. But what they all have in common is that they treat opponents as enemies, outside the laws and the community of their fellow men.

What happened in Dallas could, to be sure, have happened in another city. But it must be said that the murder of the President was not the first act of political violence in that city but one in a series. The man who is now the President of the United States was manhandled by his fellow Texans. The man who represents the United States at the United Nations was spat upon.

In this atmosphere of political violence lived the President's murderer, himself addicted to the fascination of violence in his futile and lonely and brooding existence. The salient fact about him was his alienation from humanity, from country, family, and friends. Nothing within him, it would seem, bound him to the President or to the Governor as human beings. No human feeling stayed his hand.

In his alienation Oswald turned to the left. But that was incidental. Those who spat on Mr. Johnson and on Mr. Stevenson had turned to the right. The common characteristic of all of them was their alienation, the loss of their ties, the rupture of the community.

An extremist is an outsider. For him the Government in Washington is a hated foreign power and the President in Washington is an invading conqueror. There is no limit, therefore, to his hatred, which feeds upon the venom of malice, slander, and hallucination. In Dallas today there is much search of conscience, and well there should be. For Dallas has long been conspicuous for its tolerance of extremists, and for the inability of its decent citizens, undoubtedly the great majority, to restrain the extremists and restore a condition of honest and temperate and reasonable discussion.

It was comforting, therefore, to read on Sunday that the mayor of Dallas, Earle Cabell, had said that "each of us, in prayerful reflection, must search his heart and determine if through intemperate word or deed we might have contributed in some fashion to the movement of this mind across the brink of insanity."

We must all follow the mayor of Dallas in that prayerful reflection. For it is only too easy to forget that in a free country there must be not only liberty and equality but also fraternity.

The only solace for the Nation's shame and grief can come from a purge, or at least the reduction of, the hatred and venom which lie so close to the surface of our national life. We have allowed the community of the American people to be rent with enmity. Only if and as we can find our way back into the American community will we find our way back to confidence in the American destiny.

We must stop the flow of the poison that when men differ, say about taxes or civil rights or Russia, they cannot be reconciled by persuasion and debate, and that those who take the other view are implacable enemies. In the light of this monstrous crime, we can see that in a free country, which we are and intend to be, unrestrained speech and thought are inherently subversive. Democracy can be made to work only when the bonds of the community are inviolate, and stronger than all the parties and factions and interests and sects.

I wish I felt certain that the self-realization into which grief has shocked us will endure when we go back about our business. The divisive forces of hatred and ungovernability are strong among us, and the habit of intemperate speech and thought has become deeply ingrained. It is deepened by the strains of war and the frustrations of this revolutionary age, by the exploitation of violence and cruelty in the mass media, by the profusion of weapons and by the presence of so many who know how to use them.

But I do have much hope in the healing art of Lyndon Johnson. We can turn to him with confidence. For his great gift is in finding the consensus without which the American system of government with its States and regions, its checks and balances, is unworkable.

To find the consensus among our divided and angry people is his historic opportunity. To restore the internal peace of the United States is his unique mission.

That done, all else will be manageable.

DEDICATION OF NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER AS MEMORIAL TO JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon.

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is seldom that an idea so catches the imagination of the American people as has the proposal to dedicate the National Cultural Center as a memorial to John F. Kennedy. All over the country the idea has spontaneously appeared. No better evidence could be asked to demonstrate the appropriateness of such a dedication; the identification of President Kennedy and his great First Lady with culture and the performing arts makes the naming of the Cultural Center in his honor a most fitting tribute.

I, therefore, have joined the gentleman from New Jersey, Representative Frank Thompson, in introducing a bill changing the name of the National Cultural Center to John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, and authorizing funds not to exceed $25 million to be expended on a matching basis with privately donated funds, and ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee. I also strongly urge its early adoption.

Press Release by Mr. Ullman

Al Ullman, Democrat, of Oregon, and George F. Senner, Democrat, of Arizona, today announced their intention of introducing a resolution dedicating the National Cultural Center as a memorial to John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and said they hoped it would receive early consideration by the Congress.

The two Congressmen also wrote Roger L. Stevens, Chairman of the National Cultural Center, asking his support of the resolution. In their letter to Mr. Stevens, the Members said:

"In the heart of every American today, there is a desire to honor the memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy and a resolve to magnify the causes he so magnificently represented.

"As you know, no American President has done more to foster the development and the appreciation of the performing arts. Through the leadership of both the President and his wife, culture in our national life has taken on new meaning. We, therefore, intend to introduce a resolution dedicating the National Cultural Center as a memorial to John Fitzgerald Kennedy and will ask for its early adoption.

"We wish to urge you and the members of the Commission to support this effort as a fitting tribute to the man we all loved so well."

The two Representatives in a joint statement said: "President Kennedy brought to this Nation, and to this Capital, an intellectual and cultural reawakening that has made a profound impact on our national life. The Cultural Center is one of the most dramatic expressions of that reawakening. The Nation needs his continuing guiding spirit to insure that we do not lose the stimulus to a higher realization of our cultural heritage."

The sponsors of the resolution urged other Members of Congress and all people associated with the Cultural Center to unite behind their effort. They pointed out that the love of every American for President Kennedy would be of great value in bringing early fulfillment of the plan for the Center.

ASSASSINATION OF JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, last Friday on a sunlit thoroughfare in the city of Dallas, an assassin's bullets snuffed out the life of our President. Those malicious shots cannot be undone, but we have a solemn obligation to the memory of President Kennedy, to President Johnson, and to those who will follow in their places to do our best to prevent repetition of such cruel and senseless acts.

I am today introducing a House resolution to create a joint committee of seven Senators and seven Representatives to explore all facets of the problem and report back to the Congress.

Throughout the feverish and painful hours of investigation of the President's assassination, while Americans watched in suspenseful horror, it is shocking to know that our best Federal police authorities were participating only as invitees of the State of Texas and the city of Dallas. I repeat—as invitees. They might well have been treated as interlopers by local authorities. Fortunately, they were not so treated, but the FBI and the Secret Service were obviously not in charge of the situation. They should have been.

Federal criminal law today presents many unbelievable inconsistencies. The shooting of a game warden is a Federal crime—title 18, U.S.C. 1114. The assassination of a President is not. Assault upon a Federal judge, a U.S. attorney, or their assistants, is a Federal crime—18 U.S.C. 1114. The murder of a President is not. The murder of the lowest paid and newest employee of the Department of Agriculture is a Federal crime—18 U.S.C. 1114. The murder of John F. Kennedy was not. An assault on a Federal process server is a Federal crime—title 18, U.S.C., section 1501. Assault on the leader of our Republic is not. Indeed, under title 18 U.S.C., section 1951, it is a crime against the United States to interfere with interstate commerce by violence; section 1361–1364 of the same title makes it a Federal crime to injure or destroy Federal property. Yet, it is not a Federal crime to injure or destroy the President's life. Threats against the President or Vice President are offenses against the United States under section 871 of title 18. Even the utterance of contemptuous words about the President by commissioned officers of the armed services is punishable by court martial—title 10, U.S.C., section 888. But the devastating acts following upon mere threats or contemptuous words violate no Federal law.

Interestingly enough, U.S. Senators, U.S. Representatives, and Cabinet officials are completely unprotected by Federal law. Actions against the person or property of such high Federal officials do not violate any Federal criminal law.

President Johnson has rightly ordered a full investigation into the facts surrounding the assassination. It is shameful that such an investigation can only be justified under Federal law by stretching and straining Federal jurisdiction that does not directly apply to this kind of situation. The general powers of the FBI contained in title 5, U.S.C., section 556 do not deal specifically or by inference with this type of situation. Some sections of the Subversive Activities Control Act, involving investigation of plots to overthrow the Government of the United States by force, might be invoked to justify FBI involvement. Other less pertinent grants of authority may be cited, but the fact remains that the FBI and other Federal investigating agencies do not have the kind of direct and unambiguous jurisdiction that they should have in matters of this nature.

Mr. Speaker, the murder of a high Federal official has ramifications far beyond the personalities involved. The officials of Dallas found this out the hard way. It is not fair to any local officials to place such a responsibility on their shoulders. How humiliated and ashamed we all would have been if the Supreme Court had been compelled to reverse the conviction of President Kennedy's assassin because the defendant's basic rights had been violated. This could well have happened. Denial of counsel for 48 hours places conviction in jeopardy. If they failed to explain to the defendant his right not to make any statement, and the fact that any statement he made could be used against him, a conviction could be reversed. Dallas officials were under fantastic pressure from the public to issue statements with reference to the guilt of the defendant. Trial and conviction by television could have forced a higher court to reverse a jury's verdict. Dallas officials were placed under unique and almost irresistible pressures from the public because the victim was not just an ordinary citizen. He was our national leader.

And then the final touch of shame to our country: a self-appointed executioner deprives the assassin of his basic rights. The guarantee of such rights, even to those we hate, is one of the proudest adornments of our civilization. Suddenly, the law of the jungle took charge and America looked no different to the world than the harshest tyranny of communism or fascism. And not the least of our concerns here is that the assassin carried with him to the grave information that could well be important to the security of our country.

Mr. Speaker, there is another area that a joint committee should explore. Congress wishes to cloak the President and other high officials with all the protection that can be provided by law. Are we doing that? Are there other ways that the incredible burdens of the Secret Service in protecting the President can be eased? These matters are so urgent and so vital to our Nation's interest that they alone justify the formation of a joint committee of the Congress.

Sunday afternoon, before the President's funeral on Monday, I shared the deep apprehensions of other Americans as I heard that President Johnson was going to march in the open streets of Washington from the White House to the church, a distance of seven blocks. I salute President Johnson for his courage. He obviously felt that the world's leaders must know that the President of the United States can still walk safely among a free people in our Nation's Capital. I am not sure the President's decision was wise and in the best long-run interests of our country. Thank God he came through safely.

But what of future decisions of this nature? The law gives the head of the Secret Service the right to overrule the President in such instances. Is this really workable? Can we expect a single individual to overrule the President? Is there another arrangement that either the President or the Congress could devise to meet this kind of circumstance?

The life of President Johnson carries with it an incalculable value to our country today. What would a second assassination do to our country? Any actions that can be taken by the Congress to prevent another disaster should be taken. Let us not neglect our solemn responsibility in this serious situation.

Today there are many proposals for investigating the circumstances surrounding the assassination of President Kennedy. We must not compound confusion with a variety of uncoordinated investigations. This matter deserves the best that Congress can offer. I urge that we move immediately to create a joint committee of the Senate and House.

A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE GREATER PROTECTION OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, MEMBERS OF THE PRESIDENT'S CABINET, AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today making it a Federal offense to assault or assassinate the President, the Vice President, members of the President's Cabinet, or Members of Congress. The enactment of this measure would add the Nation's highest elective and appointive officers to a long list of Government positions already covered by criminal statutes.

The recent tragedy suffered by our country has revealed the unfortunate absence of Federal law to cover these situations. I found it difficult to believe that there is no statute permitting Federal jurisdiction over cases of assault or assassination of the President, Vice President, members of the President's Cabinet, or Members of Congress.

Since the law of Presidential succession provides that the Vice President is followed by the Speaker of the House, the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the members of the President's Cabinet, I think it is essential that they be included in the protection of these Federal criminal provisions.

Presently, we have laws providing Federal investigation, prosecution, trial, and imprisonment or execution of those responsible for the assault or death of a great number of Federal officials. These include U.S. judges, attorneys, and marshals; FBI, Secret Service, Internal Revenue Service, Post Office, and customs agents; and many other Government employees.

My bill would allow the legal processes of the Federal Government to begin immediately in the case of any future attack on our President, Vice President, members of the President's Cabinet, or Members of Congress.

Currently, Mr. Speaker, without Federal statutes, attacks on those holding the offices specified in my measure are dealt with solely under the local or State jurisdiction in which they occur.

The text of this bill is brief. I am including it with my remarks in the hope that all Members will read it and pledge their support to its enactment:

H.R. 9255

A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and Vice President of the United States, members of the President's Cabinet, and Members of Congress

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after "Whoever kills" the following: "The President, the Vice President, members of the President's Cabinet, Members of Congress,".

PRESIDENT JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, John Fitzgerald Kennedy is now a part of history. The God that made him has taken him, and God's will be done.

No words can portray the shocking events of the last few days nor set forth the grief of our Nation. Each family in America feels a loss of a loved one, for the President belonged to us all. Let us measure our sorrow, however, by the agony of his brave wife and family who have lost a beloved husband, father, brother, and child. Our prayers should be for them.

President Kennedy was a man of intelligence and charm, a brave man and a dedicated one. His wit, his confidence, and his ability will be missed. We mourn him.

The Presidency, however, never dies. Our strength lies in the fact that we are a nation of laws, not men. The new President has assumed his full responsibilities. Our country is scarred but intact. Our hopes are high. Our faith is secure.

As we pray and mourn together, it is time for us to assume our full responsibility. Let our Nation draw closer together, more united, more dedicated.

The measure of a man is the effect he has on the lives of others. In life and death President Kennedy served us all. He told us we can do better, and I believe that history will show this Nation rose from its sorrow to stand taller than it ever did before.

INVESTIGATION OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT DEMANDED

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, without a doubt, almost everyone in this House recognizes that an investigation of the Department of State is long overdue. The tragic events of the past weekend indicate that the Department of State was the vehicle through which the assassin, Lee Harvey Oswald, returned to the United States. Just think of this, Mr. Speaker. Here was a man who traveled to the Soviet Union not just to visit, but to live there, and who gave our Government an affidavit renouncing that most precious possession, his U.S. citizenship. After 3 years in this Communist country, he was not only allowed to return to the United States but received a loan of over $400 to pay his way back here. What happened to him in the Soviet Union? Was he trained by the Soviet espionage butchers? We do know that immediately after his return to America he became a spokesman for a pro-Communist front and he then assassinated the President in Dallas, Tex.

This is but one of scores of examples of the Department of State's policies which show mismanagement, bad judgment, and even subversion. Now is the time to clean up this Department once and for all, and I am introducing the following resolution:

Whereas the State Department which had discretion, paid the way back to the United States of Lee Harvey Oswald who had given an affidavit renouncing U.S. citizenship, surrendered his passport to our Moscow Embassy and then spent 3 years being trained in Communist Russia and after repatriation returned to the United States and killed the President of the United States;

Whereas the dismissal of Otto Otepka signaled the end of effective security in the Department of State;

Whereas personnel of the Department of State have played a major role in engineering a series of miniature Munichs including nuclear agreements, grain deals, over 25 percent unilateral disarmament and a prospective nonaggression pact in evolving a policy of peace through appeasement;

Whereas people sympathetic to the Soviet Union have been put in office, supported or tolerated in nearby and other countries and anti-Communist governments have been destroyed, with the murder of their leaders tolerated;

And whereas the American people have lost confidence in the Department of State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the Department of State, its personnel and its security and other policies be investigated from top to bottom with the purpose of eliminating subversives and questionable personnel; and

That a special joint committee be named for an overall, extensive, and intensive investigation of the Department of State with orders to report back to the Congress not later than March 1, 1964.

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY NATIONAL SEASHORE

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to redesignate the Cape Cod National Seashore in Massachusetts as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy National Seashore.

It is heartwarming to note the number of proposals to perpetuate the name of our late beloved President. John Fitzgerald Kennedy needs no particular memorial to enshrine him in the hearts of our people or to assure him a lofty place in the history of our land. His magnificent leadership and deeds, the quality of his character and personality, have already done this. But, monuments and memorials serve an excellent purpose in constantly reminding us of the present and those of future generations of the activities with which John Fitzgerald Kennedy was so closely identified.

So, Mr. Speaker, I offer this proposal as one of the warmest ways to remember him. He loved Cape Cod and all of its overpowering beauty and enchantment. The cliffs, dunes, meadowlands, heath, marsh, lakes, and ocean were a constant source of enjoyment to him as he sailed, swam, and rambled its unspoiled beaches. At Cape Cod, John F. Kennedy found surcease from the awesome and arduous tasks of the presidency to spend some of his finest hours with his wonderful wife and children.

Mr. Speaker, the Cape Cod National Seashore is a reality today because of President Kennedy. When he was in the Senate, he filed, together with Senator SALTONSTALL, the bill that finally became law. He recognized that time was running out down Cape Cod way and it was essential to set aside, preserve, and protect the last of the "old" cape so that the inspiration of its surpassing beauty be kept intact and handed down to future generations of Americans. When he assumed the Presidency, he continued to press for this legislation. On August 7, 1961, he signed into law the bill that finally established Federal jurisdiction over this splendid seashore area. I was present, together with other Members of the Congress, at that ceremony and am one of the proud possessors of one of the pens with which he affixed his signature. I know that I can truthfully say that no other bill signing ceremony gave him any greater satisfaction than that which brought into being the Cape Cod National Seashore.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I proudly present this bill to this Congress renaming this area as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy National Seashore.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and place in the RECORD an editorial from the News Tribune in Beaver Falls, Pa., in my congressional district by Mr. James March, editor.

Mr. Speaker, our hearts will be heavy for a long, long time in the loss of our beloved President and friend. This editorial by Mr. March expresses the thoughts and feelings of all of us.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

We are all, like swimmers in the sea,
Poised on the top of a huge wave of fate,
Which hangs uncertain to which side to
fall;
And whether it will heave us up to land,
Or whether it will roll us out to sea.

—MATTHEW ARNOLD.

The high and the low, Americans all, with any sense of responsibility at all are saddened by the heinous murder of the President of the United States.

No matter what one's political faith may be, the death of a President is a loss to the Nation and to the world and a personal tragedy to many.

John F. Kennedy along with his ability as an outstanding leader was endowed with great personal charm. On two occasions he visited Beaver County briefly. Everyone who heard him speak here will never forget his personal magnetism.

His New England "Ameriker" and "Cuber" and his stabbing finger to emphasize a point were another kind of charm.

Part of the personal popularity of the President and Mrs. Kennedy was that they brought gayety and life to the White House. They were young, they were rearing children, they liked the theater, the arts, sports, were devoted to their parents—qualities with which millions of Americans could identify.

The Kennedy clan with all its wealth, prestige, and power knows only too well the anguish of grief in the loss of loved ones as do most families.

It is particularly hard to reconcile the death of a family man in the prime of life and the only salvation for those personally affected is to learn to accept and not to question.

Those who believe the words of Jesus who said that not one sparrow falls to the ground without the Father's notice, do not question the wisdom of God, no matter what the burden, or anguish they may have to bear.

The length of one's life is not the greattest factor. The use made of the time allotted man on earth is of utmost importance. The President did not squander his time or talents and will serve as an inspiration for generations to come.

We join the closely knit Kennedy family in their sorrow.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON ORDERS COMPLETE INVESTIGATION BY DEPARTMENTS OF JUSTICE AND TREASURY

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Congress has responsibilities to fulfill for itself and on behalf of the people of this country in expressing its interest in the circumstances surrounding the assassination of the late President Kennedy and the killing of the suspected assassin. There are too many unanswered questions, and every effort must be expended to answer those questions for the American people. This issue does not involve only the decisions of local law enforcement officials in Dallas, Tex., but complications are grave for the national security.

The President has properly ordered a complete investigation by the Departments of Justice and Treasury. As chairman of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations which has investigative jurisdiction of the Departments of Justice and Treasury, I concur wholeheartedly in the investigation which has been ordered. The Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs does not, at this time, intend to conduct an investigation duplicating that which has been ordered by the President. I am taking this action to aid in the investigation which has been ordered, since overlapping duplications by the executive branch and by the congressional committees having jurisdiction in the House and the other body, would probably make more difficult the job which has to be done.

However, we not only intend to fully cooperate with the investigation, but to be as fully informed as possible. The results of this investigation should be made available to this committee and others of appropriate jurisdiction for the purpose of review and evaluation to determine whether there is any need for congressional action. Congress shares in the responsibility of doing all that can be done in the future to lessen or eliminate the chain of events which reached such tragic proportions. Some committees will be concerned with the need for new legislation. Some committees will be concerned with the need for additional funds to provide for additional security measures. Some committees will be concerned with the internal operations and efficiencies of each of the departments, and the coordination and cooperation between the Secret Service and the FBI dealing with the security of the President and other high officials of our Government. Some committees will be concerned with the actual and factual determination of every event which took place, the motivation which inspired each act, and all the people who might be involved. While all of these interests are proper and reflect the responsibility which the Congress has, in my judgment, it would serve no useful purpose for each of the committees to conduct an independent investigation of its own. Consequently, speaking for the subcommittee of which I am chairman which does have jurisdiction and responsibility for part of the problem involved, I have made this statement. I have advised the leadership that I expect to contact both the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department, expressing the desire of the subcommittee to be fully informed and to receive all of the results of the investigation so that we, the Congress, and the American people, can benefit therefrom.

BEAUTIFUL TRIBUTE TO A MAJESTIC LADY

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, the terrible event of recent days has wantonly deprived this Nation and, indeed, the world, of one of its greatest citizens of all time. The senseless, cold-blooded murder of our young, dedicated, and talented President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, will forever sting in our hearts and minds.

As we dwell upon the loss of his unfulfilled promise, our thoughts turn constantly to his deeply bereaved but magnificently courageous widow.

The majesty, the saintliness, with which she has faced and endured her unspeakable ordeal have set standards to which all should aspire if we would have a better world.

Mr. Speaker, like everyone else here, this monstrous tragedy has affected me deeply, and I have read and listened to the outpoured words of disbelief, sorrow, and condolence that have been so much with us since that day of infamy, Friday, November 22, 1963.

Standing high among the writings inspired by Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy's hours of anguish is an editorial in the Washington, N.C., Daily News of November 25, 1963. I ask leave to insert the editorial entitled "True First Lady," in the RECORD at this point.

TRUE FIRST LADY

In the hour of great tragedy which has befallen America, we tend to place all the emphasis on the man who has fallen and on the man who has risen to take his place. Somehow we look upon the others involved with a sense of sorrow, but we seem not to pause and recognize the true greatness, courage, and devotion all of which have played such a vital part in the doings of the tragedy.

When Jacqueline Kennedy became America's First Lady, it was generally agreed that she was a woman of beauty, charm, grace, and youth. But somehow the feeling seems to have persisted that in her youth, she did not typify the true American First Lady.

In this tear stained hour of great tragedy, Mrs. Kennedy has lost a husband and the father of her children. Her loss is terrific and in truth she has lost more than any other American. But in her loss, she has gained the admiration of people all over the world. She has shown more courage than any woman of this era that we know about.

Holding the head of her mortally wounded husband and crying "no, no," standing in the emergency room and gently placing the wedding band on the finger of her still husband, walking to the ambulance that carried him to the plane, riding in the back of the ambulance beside the coffin, standing beside President Johnson on the plane as he took the oath of office, riding in the back of the plane that bore the remains back to Washington, D.C., walking off the ramp and opening the door of the ambulance that took the remains to Bethesda Naval Hospital, riding in that ambulance, still wearing the bloodstained clothing she was wearing when the fatal shot was fired, taking little Caroline in her arms to tell her that "Daddy has gone to live with God," and in her every move and action, Jacqueline Kennedy has shown the stuff which truly stamps her as a true First Lady.

It would have been so easy and so understandable had she become hysterical anywhere along the line. She did not. Somehow had her beloved husband have written the script for her to follow, he would have written it as she lived it through each tragic second. If today there was ever any doubt about her role as America's First Lady, that doubt has been dispelled completely.

In an hour far more trying than most people ever know, she showed a courage and a bearing that shall forever stamp her as having earned the right to be known always as America's typical First Lady.

Our heart goes out to her in deep sympathy and in tremendous admiration for the beautiful demeanor with which she faced the ordeal.

She's a wonderful lady. She's lost something so very precious, but she has won the hearts of all the world.

What a woman.

THE ARMY ELECTRONICS COMMAND

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the Army Electronics Command has at long last drastically revised its policies in regard to obtaining procurement data that will allow competitive bidding on future contracts.

I am happy to report today that another battle has been won in the fight to give American industry a chance to work competitive bidding on our staggering defense budget.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I am constrained to report that the Army has not gone far enough. Those who in the past took advantage of shoddy regulations that have now been corrected, have been allowed to escape without so much as a reprimand. However, the Army has now admitted, and for all to see, that prior to my speech of May 28, 1963, on the floor of the House in regard to the purchase of the AN/ASM 61 test set for a gyro compass, and prior to an investigation that I demanded, faulty procedures were being used daily in securing competitive bidding information.

The Army has also reported to me that corrective action has been taken. I am told by industry that, to a degree, this is true. Performance to date has been far more satisfactory, however.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, the Army has reported to me that steps are being taken to get more competitive bidding. I even understand that a new command is being established within the Signal Corps to push the Army's procurement sections into more competitive purchases.

Mr. Speaker, on May 28, 1963, I protested the proposed sole-source purchase of the AN/ASM 61 test set. The Army said it could get no competition because it had no drawings. When I saw this certification on a bid set, I shortly picked up my phone and called Brig. Gen. Allen T. Stanwix-Hay, then commander of the U.S. Army Electronics Materiel Agency at Philadelphia. My information sources had told me in less than an hour that drawings existed for this equipment, and I conveyed this information to General Stanwix-Hay before coming to the floor to inform Members of the impending atrocity on the tax dollar.

Late that same afternoon, I received a telegram from General Stanwix-Hay informing me he had canceled the procurement until he could study the background of the case. He also said:

> Your interest in this matter is appreciated by the Army, and I personally thank you.

He also told me he was requesting a "full and unbiased investigation of the matter by the Army's Inspector General."

Mr. Speaker, although the "urgently needed" test has never been resolicited competitively or bought in any fashion, and while we cannot as yet count the savings that will surely come about, that investigation is complete and the report has been submitted.

In a letter to me dated October 25, 1963, Maj. Gen. Frank Moorman, commander of the U.S. Army Electronics Command, outlined what was found in the investigation. I shall quote only pertinent parts of his report.

To begin with, General Moorman said that he had uncovered an old directive under which drawings received from manufacturers were primarily used for maintenance information, purchase of spare parts and planning purposes.

> Neither the Electronics Materiel Agency nor the Electronics Materiel Support Agency adhered to the practice or policy of using drawings received from a manufacturer for reprocurement purposes.

Mr. Speaker, that is word for word what General Moorman said. Imagine. Manufacturing drawings which could have allowed competition and saved billions each year were not used to get competitive bidding by the Army.

General Moorman also said, in effect, that in the ASM 61 procurement and scores of other cases, sloppy staff work was the order of the day. No attempt was made to determine whether drawings that existed were complete or contained proprietary data.

A complete review of the whole problem of getting adequate data grew out of my charges on the ASM 61. After completing this investigation, General Moorman informed me that at his specific direction:

> 1. All interested agencies are taking all possible steps to eliminate the problem of getting data insufficient to allow future competitive bidding.

Mr. Speaker, if this directive is prosecuted in procurement agencies around the country, the result will be revolutionary. There will be more procurements that are competitive than ever before, and the rising cost of defense will be cut back.

> 2. Directives have been issued to everyone concerned with the acceptance of such data to insure receipt of a complete and accurate set of data, together with a contractor's statement that what he submits as drawings are fully accurate.

Mr. Speaker, here is another far-reaching directive. In the past, drawings submitted have sometimes been full of errors, accidental and otherwise. They have gone unnoticed and unchecked while someone blandly stated, "No drawings available," and sole-source producers continued to mop up. Now, someone is going to check the accuracy of this material. Again, here is another victory for competitive bidding.

> 3. Invitations to bid (IFB's) and requests for proposals (RFQ's)—the documents which inform industry of proposed purchases—"have been expanded to fully inform prospective bidders as to the extent of all manufacturing data."

Mr. Speaker, here is another victory for full disclosure of information if what General Moorman outlines is implemented at the midde-grade action level. It will also be a victory for industry which in the past has been denied the information necessary to bid intelligently.

> 4. Formal acceptance of drawings and payment for them is now contingent upon clearance by engineers of the Army Electronics Materiel Support Agency.

In the past, Mr. Speaker, this clearance has been slipshod to say the least. Now, a manufacturer will be paid for the drawings when he delivers a good product, and that is as it should be. This, too, will stimulate healthy competition if properly implemented.

General Moorman's report was one of two reports on this case, Mr. Speaker. Brig. Gen. F. W. Boye, Jr., also reported to me in October. His study dealt with my specific charges on the AN/ASM 61 and the full-scale probe that resulted. He summarized his findings as follows:

> In summary, the investigation indicates that faulty procedures were employed. These old procedures have been brought to light and corrective action has been taken. The Army intends to procure the AN/ASM 61's competitively in the future.

Mr. Speaker, there has been no competitive procurement for the AN/ASM 61 test set as yet. When there is, it is my prediction the price will fall as much as 50 percent or more, and the savings will be passed on to the taxpayers.

The old Army policy that just about consigned manufacturing drawings to the scrap heap has now been exposed for what it was and has been scrapped.

It should be a source of satisfaction to every taxpayer that the Army has finally gotten around to modernizing its procedures. This modernization will mean a little lower defense cost if properly implemented. The much abused taxpayer should be elated that he has won another victory in the struggle to keep as much of his paycheck as possible. However, he has not won the war—just another battle—the third I have talked of here this week.

We in Congress, who are the soldiers on the tax front for John Q. Taxpayer, owe it to him to keep a close watch on how these new policies are implemented. If they are just tacked on the wall and forgotten, they will do little good. If they are properly used, they will, like a good razor, become sharper and do a better job for all of us.

That, Mr. Speaker, concludes my third presentation this week on procurement. Report No. 1 detailed GAO's criticism of Navy waste of up to $50,000 and a savings of $108,000 through competition. There was no indication that Navy tried to correct the faults that were pointed out. Report No. 2 detailed waste of up to $192,000 and savings of 69 percent under competitive bidding. Here, again, the Navy resisted and has failed to correct a messy situation. Report No. 3 concerns the Army and its attempt to get to the bottom of a mess. I ask you, Which service displayed cooperation and which displayed blind obstinacy? Which service showed a regard, to a degree, for good practices and which service shouted, in so many actions, "Dam the Taxpayers, Full Speed Ahead"? The answers are obvious.

The conclusion is just as obvious. There has to be a shakeup in Navy procurement, and it must start at the top. Kenneth E. BeLieu is the Assistant Secretary of Navy who simply gives lipservice to efficiency and competency. He is the one man at whose doorstep must be laid most of the blame for Navy procurement shortcomings, since he really is not doing a thing about correcting them.

Mr. Speaker, BeLieu must go. Any other action will be a direct slap at the taxpaying American and an endorsement of wasteful, sloppy, inefficient management of the Government's business.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, John F. Kennedy was born when the world was in a time of heavy crisis. Later in life, in another crisis, he answered the call of his Nation to defend the principles and ideals upon which our Nation is founded. He served with honor.

His country again called upon him to serve when he was elected to represent the people of Massachusetts to the U.S. House of Representatives and later in the U.S. Senate.

The people of our Nation then deemed it right to honor him with the highest office and greatest responsibility of the land. To this challenge he gave his life.

It has been written:

> No man is competent to judge in matters of a kingdom until first he has been tried; there are many things to be learned in the depths which we may never know in the heights.

During this time of tragedy we must measure these depths that we, in turn, may travel those heights. From this deep trial, perhaps we, too, shall be declared competent to judge a nation.

No greater love hath a man than to lay down his life for his brother. By this death we are challenged to live—to work for right and justice—to guard our heritage, and to provide continued leadership to a dark and searching world.

MUCH EXCESS CAPACITY IS OBSOLETE—SKILL SHORTAGES EXPECTED

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, two recent articles make an important contribution to the debate on the administration's tax cut proposal and the contention that inflation will not result from the expansionary fiscal program because of a large amount of idle plant and manpower in the economy.

A survey by the Wall Street Journal shows that the nearly unanimous consensus of top economists who follow capital investment trends is that a considerable increase in plant and equipment outlays will take place next year even if taxes are not cut at all during 1964. Capital spending is expected to be about 8 percent higher than in 1963 without the tax cut and, with a tax cut, the increase could go as high as 10 or 11 percent.

One of the most important reasons for the anticipated increase in capital spending is the fact that manufacturers are employing more and more of their productive facilities. According to the Federal Reserve Board Index, manufacturing in the third quarter was operating at a rate equal to the first quarter of 1955, just before the 1955–56 capital goods boom began. Government specialists are cited as saying that during the current quarter the operating rate will hit 88–89 percent, which would be larger than the level of any quarter in 7 years.

Aside from the fact that manufacturing has less excess capacity than in many years, it is also relevant that much of the excess capacity which exists is largely obsolete. The average age of the Nation's production equipment is now 9.6 years, up from 8.5 years in 1955. McGraw-Hill estimates that 64 percent of U.S. machine tools are at least 10 years old. At the start of the post-World War II period, the figure was only 38 percent. The current percentage, according to the Journal, is higher than for any other major industrial country.

These facts have led many economists to believe that industry really has far less excess capacity than the record indicates. Almarin Phillips, professor of economics at the University of Pennsylvania, is quoted as saying that a great deal of this productive capacity is obsolete and that for this reason, "an operating rate of 87 percent today is a lot closer to true capacity than was an 87-percent rate 6 or 7 years ago."

The steel industry illustrates the situation. Last year steel producers eliminated nearly 3 million tons of obsolete steelmaking capacity. The elimination rate will accelerate in the years just ahead. The high retirement rate helps to explain why, despite its low operating level of 63 percent of capacity, the steel industry will spend $1.8 billion for new facilities next year.

An article from Steel magazine gives the results of an annual survey of 7,500 managers in the metalworking industries. Of the managers surveyed, 29.1 percent expect skilled personnel shortages in 1964. Only 23.3 percent expressed similar concern last year. These figures bear out the contention of many economists that as the economy expands under the stimulus of tax cuts and higher levels of Government spending, skill shortages and bottlenecks will occur that will lead to inflationary pressures in the economy. At the same time, many believe that a general economic expansion will have little effect in reducing hard-core unemployment.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the articles from the Wall Street Journal of November 20 and the Steel magazine of November 18 in the Record at the conclusion of these remarks:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 20, 1963]

SPENDING SPEEDUP: SHARP RISE IN OUTLAYS FOR PLANTS, EQUIPMENT FORECAST BY ECONOMISTS—SOME EXPECT 10 PERCENT RISE IN 1964 OVER 1963—CITE LESS EXCESS CAPACITY, AGING MACHINERY—BULLISH BUILDERS, TOOL FIRMS

(By Alfred L. Malabre, Jr.)

Business spending for new plants and machinery, now climbing at a leisurely pace, will mount sharply in coming months.

That's the nearly unanimous consensus of some 2 dozen economists who closely follow capital investment trends. Their view is buttressed by reports from plant builders and makers of machine tools. Because capital spending is such an important spur to overall economic growth, the forecast augurs well for continuing business expansion in 1964 and perhaps beyond.

"The clearest spot in my crystal ball, and the brightest, is capital spending—it should provide a very big plus for next year's economy," declares Albert T. Sommers, director of economic research at the National Industrial Conference Board, New York.

Plant and equipment spending is already on the rise. Government estimates put full-year 1963 outlays at a record $39.1 billion, nearly 5 percent higher than last year. And a recent survey of businessmen by McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. places capital expenditures next year 4 percent above the estimated 1963 level.

SEES 8-PERCENT RISE

Now, however, many analysts forecast much steeper gains. "We're inclined to look for a rise of at least 8 percent in capital outlays in 1964," says Norris Johnson, senior vice president and economist of First National City Bank, New York.

"Business activity has moved up to the point where it can trip off a real acceleration of plant and equipment expenditures," adds Paul McCracken, an economics professor at the University of Michigan. "I don't think a 10-percent increase next year is out of line at all."

A gain of 10 percent would be sharper than any yearly rise since the 1955–56 capital spending boom, when outlays swelled 22 percent.

So sanguine is the mood of most economists that a considerable increase of outlays is anticipated even if taxes aren't cut at all during 1964. Typically, an analyst at the National Bureau of Economic Research, New York, says, "Without any tax cut, 1964 capital spending should still be at least 8 percent higher than in 1963; with a cut, the rise will probably go as high as 10 or 11 percent."

Talks with companies that build plants and machinery give support to economists' predictions of sharply rising outlays.

BUSY BUILDERS

"Our bookings are running some 15 percent higher than a year ago and leave little doubt that 1964 will be a very big year for us," reports F. B. Warren, executive vice president of Turner Construction Co., New York. The company builds commercial structures ranging from factories to office buildings to stores.

E. P. Bullard, president of Bullard Co., a Bridgeport, Conn., machine toolmaker, is no less ebullient. "We've got our biggest order backlog in over 7 years," he says. "Orders already on our books will occupy our full production facilities through June, and new business is still pouring in." Among Bullard's most eager customers are auto and appliance manufacturers.

Generally, analysts who forecast a sharp capital spending rise base their estimates on several broad economic developments, rather than on any survey method of checking businessmen's spending plans. Many economists contend executives are habitually conservative about their spending plans and, in any case, often haven't decided upon their full programs when most polls about the year ahead are conducted.

Perhaps the key development leading many analysts to forecast a capital spending speedup is the fact that most manufacturers are using an increasing portion of their total production capacity. Heretofore, extensive "excess," or unused, capacity has been viewed as a major deterrent to any large increase of capital outlays.

As one Commerce Department economist puts it: "Who's going to rush out to buy a lot of new machines when half his existing equipment is standing around idle?"

USING MORE CAPACITY

No exact measure of production capacity exists. The prime guide of many economists, however, is an index issued by the Federal Reserve Board. It measures the percentage of production capacity used each quarter by manufacturers. According to this yardstick, manufacturers employed 87 percent of their full production potential in the third quarter, up from 85 percent at the year's start and from only 77 percent as recently as the first quarter of 1961, at the beginning of the current business expansion.

The latest rate, some analysts note, is equal to the rate in the first quarter of 1955, just before the 1955–56 capital goods boom.

A Government specialist who helps put together the quarterly estimates believes the rate in the current quarter will probably hit 88 or 89 percent. At 89 percent, it would exceed the level of any quarter in 7 years. "And unless companies begin to step up their expansion programs, we can expect 90 percent rates and above next year," he adds. Once their operating rates move much above 90 percent, most manufacturers say, production becomes less efficient and more costly.

Studies indicate that as the operating rate for manufacturers climbs so does the portion of capital outlays devoted to expansion, rather than modernization, of facilities. McGraw-Hill finds that 32 percent of this year's outlays are for expansion, up from 30 percent last year.

Expansion may become an even greater spur to capital spending in 1964, company reports suggest. Example: Some 75 percent of Scott Paper Co.'s increased 1964 capital outlays will be spent to expand plant facilities, up from only 25 percent for expansion this year.

Operations also appear to be gaining on capacity in some major industries not directly measured by the Federal Reserve's index. The Nation's railroads, in fact, have much more business than they can handle. One analyst recently estimated that shippers need 10,000 more freight cars daily than the railroads can supply.

AGING PRODUCTION FACILITIES

The increasing average age of U.S. production facilities is another key consideration of the many economists who believe businessmen are bound to accelerate their plant and equipment expenditures in coming months.

The Machinery and Allied Products Institute, a Washington-based trade group, places the average age of the Nation's production equipment now at 9.6 years, up from 9.4 years in 1962 and from 8.5 in 1955. And McGraw-Hill estimates 64 percent of U.S. machine tools are at least 10 years old, up from 60 percent in 1958 and only 38 percent at the start of the post-World War II period. The current percentage is considerably higher than for any other major industrial country; the Russian rate, for instance, is 50 percent. One of every five U.S. machine tools, in fact, is over 20 years old.

The age of U.S. machinery prompts many economists to believe industry really has far less excess capacity than the record indicates. "A great deal of today's production capacity is obsolete," says Almarin Phillips, a professor of economics at the University of Pennsylvania. "For this reason, an operating rate of 87 percent today is a lot closer to true capacity than was an 87 percent rate 6 or 7 years ago."

Steel probably provides the most dramatic illustration of an industry compelled to step up its capital spending because of obsolete equipment. Last year steel producers eliminated nearly 3 million tons of steelmaking capacity, a postwar record. The elimination rate, moreover, will accelerate in the years just ahead, a steel industry analyst predicts, because of the industry's competitive need for new equipment, such as oxygen-type furnaces.

BIG STEEL OUTLAYS

This high retirement rate helps explain why, despite its low operating level of about 63 percent of capacity, the steel industry is sharply increasing its 1964 capital outlays. Steel producers will spend $1.8 billion for new facilities next year, McGraw-Hill forecasts. That's 50 percent more than the industry's estimated 1963 spending. It's a sharper gain than is predicted for any other U.S. industry.

The record accumulation of cash in corporate coffers is another consideration of analysts who forecast steeply higher business expenditures in 1964. Companies' so-called internal funds—earnings retained after dividend and tax payments, plus amounts set aside from pretax profits for depreciation—exceeded $37 billion last year, a record, and some $10 billion higher than a decade before. And, of course, the cash pileup may accelerate if corporate taxes are cut.

"The fact that many companies have a record amount of cash on hand, and therefore aren't faced with costly borrowing problems, certainly weights on the side of increased capital spending," says the University of Michigan's Mr. McCracken.

Most economists also reason that the prospect of rising profit returns will induce many executives to proceed with projects that were previously in question. Profits of U.S. manufacturers amounted to 5 percent of sales in the second quarter, the latest period available. That's up sharply from 3.5 percent as recently as the start of this expansion.

"If profit margins continue to widen, and that seems quite likely, many projects that have been merely pending will be actually launched," says an economist for a large appliance manufacturer.

[From Steel magazine, Nov. 18, 1963]

ARE YOU FACING A SKILLED LABOR SHORTAGE?

"Skilled help is becoming a greater problem every year." While not yet a universal complaint, that comment appears more frequently in Steel's annual survey of metalworking managers this year than in the last 7 years.

Of the 7,500 managers surveyed, 29.1 percent of the respondents expect a skilled personnel shortage in 1964. Only 23.3 percent expressed similar concern last year, the 1962 Steel survey shows.

Machinists and tool and diemakers top metalworking's personnel demand list. More than 7 percent of the respondents say they will need topnotch, experienced machinists next year, while nearly 6 percent are looking for tool and diemakers. In contrast, less than 3 percent cite a shortage of engineering talent. Chief demand for machinists and tool and diemakers will come from the nonelectrical machinery industry, the survey shows.

While large firms (more than 500 employees) expressed greatest concern over lack of skilled labor last year, small companies (less than 100 employees) are crying the loudest this year. More than 31 percent of small firms replying cite skilled labor needs (up from 22.7 percent last year), while 28.5 percent of the large corporations voice similar concern (up from 24.9 percent last year).

Industry breakdown: All seven of the industry groups studied in the survey (S.I.C. 19, 25, and 39 were combined) show greater concern with the problem than last year.

Do you expect a shortage of employees in any trade or skill in 1964?

	Yes	
	1964	1963
	Percent	*Percent*
Primary metals	27.1	17.7
Fabricated metal products	26.4	24.6
Machinery	36.5	29.2
Electrical machinery	21.6	17.9
Transportation equipment	27.3	17.4
Instruments	38.0	26.7
Other metalworking [1]	26.5	22.0

[1] Includes manufacturers of furniture and fixtures, ordnance, and miscellaneous metalworking.

"We find we must train 70 percent of all skilled workers," says a Midwest machinery manufacturer. "Men just don't want to develop or improve their skills," adds a metal fabricator.

A particular area skilled labor shortage is cited by an East Moline, Ill., manufacturer. "There is a shortage of skilled factory workers in this area, and we expect the same condition to exist in 1964," he reports.

Investigation: At least two studies are in the works, geared to identifying areas and industries affected by the skilled manpower shortage.

Beginning in January, the U.S. Employment Service (USES) will issue monthly reports on skilled labor shortages in particular industries.

The information will appear in a new Government publication, Employment Service Review, and will include the missile, computer, motor vehicle, appliance, electronic, and steel industries, USES says.

George Rockwood, executive director, Tool & Die Institute (TDI), Chicago, says opinions on the shortage in the Chicago area differ depending on "which shop you talk to."

For that reason, TDI is planning a comprehensive survey of the skilled manpower status to be conducted within the next couple of months. Mr. Rockwood offers one encouraging sign: "We have a record attendance at our night schools this year—

better than 600, which is 27 percent ahead of a year ago. We graduated 63 in May, expect to graduate 80 next May, and 125 by 1966," he enthuses. "Instructors report a better caliber of young men entering, indicating that employers are doing a better job of screening apprentices," he adds.

APPRENTICE PROGRAM ENROLLMENTS LAG

Despite increasing demands for skilled labor, Labor Department figures show that apprentice programs can't be expected to offer much help. The Department's Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training (BAT) reports the number of registered apprentices in the United States has been steadily declining since 1957.

Currently, about 160,000 apprentices are registered with the Labor Department through State agencies. Another 50,000 are enrolled in unregistered programs, officials estimate. In contrast, registered apprentices at the end of World War II totaled about 260,000.

BAT researchers blame the drop on repeated recessions and rising unemployment. "We are having a tough time selling apprenticeship when people are out of work," says one source.

Approaches: The main force of the Nation's apprenticeship programs is concentrated in what BAT calls area joint programs—those where a union or a number of unions join with a group of employers. Such programs, representing every major trade, now total about 5,500, BAT says. In addition, some firms have their own programs, though "too many of them are limited to only one or two apprentices at a time," a BAT official tells Steel.

Technical institute apprenticeship programs for semiprofessional workers (such as electronic technicans and automatic machinery operators) are also criticized. "You can't duplicate plant facilities in a schoolroom. Of course, you can put a lathe into a school and teach a man how to run it, but the lathe might be 10 years old—surplus from some plant," says the BAT official. He believes industries which need modern skills should look at the possibility of more apprenticeship programs.

Despite an upswing in the number of registered apprentices in Ohio, Oscar Poole, Cleveland BAT representative, admits that there is "still a noticeable skilled labor shortage in the industrial trades." Most of the increased registrations have been in the building trades.

CHRYSLER LOCAL WINS U.S. TRAINING GRANT

Your union may be able to help you provide training designed to upgrade workers.

Local 412, a Chrysler Corp. white-collar unit of the United Auto Workers, was recently granted $16,231 under the Manpower Development and Training Act to train 60 employees.

Plan: Ray Sullivan, president of the local, says that 20 persons will be trained in each of 3 trades—mechanical drafting, graphic illustrating, and clay modeling.

The union petitioned the Labor Department last March after a Detroit Board of Education survey showed increasing demand for these skills.

The UAW, with representatives from the international and the local on the board of administration, will provide the instructors, supervision, and facilities.

Aptitude tests will be given by the Michigan Employment Security Commission. These factors will count heavily in final selection:

1. Is the applicant employed but due to be displaced by automation?
2. Is he employed but in a nonskilled or lower skilled job?
3. Is he unemployed due to a lack of technical skill?

ECONOMISTS AGREE ON NEED TO IMPROVE STATISTICS FOR POLICYMAKING PURPOSES

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on October 15 I inserted in the Record—pages 19584–19588—an article by Dr. Oskar Morgenstern, of Princeton University, relating to the weaknesses in our economic statistics and the need of improving upon them. The subject is of crucial importance for sound economic policy and, in my view, Dr. Morgenstern has made a major contribution to this end.

As I indicated in my remarks accompanying the article, I sent copies of Dr. Morgenstern's article to a large number of outstanding economists, requesting any comments that they might have. I have now received a number of replies, all of which express general agreement with the major points of Dr. Morgenstern's article, particularly on the need to indicate the margin of error in our statistics whenever that is possible.

Because of the generally favorable character of these replies and my own conviction about the importance of the article, I have urged Senator William Proxmire, in a letter of November 18, to hold hearings by the Joint Economic Committee's Economic Statistics Subcommittee next year on some of the major points in the Morgenstern article. Under unanimous consent, I include a copy of my letter to Senator Proxmire, who is chairman of the subcommittee, as well as copies of the letters from economists on the Morgenstern article, in the Record at this point:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., November 18, 1963.

Senator William Proxmire,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, Joint Economic Committee, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Proxmire: On October 15 I inserted in the Congressional Record an article by Dr. Oskar Morgenstern, of Princeton University, relating to the production and use of economic statistics. Attached is a copy of my remarks and the Morgenstern article from the Record.

As I said in my comments, I wrote to a large number of outstanding economists asking their opinion on the Morgenstern article. I have now received a number of replies, copies of which are attached for your information. As you will see, there is almost universal agreement about the major points raised in Dr. Morgenstern's article, particularly on the need to indicate the margin of error in our economic statistics whenever that is possible.

I think that the issues raised by Dr. Morgenstern are so important that it would be useful if the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics of the Joint Economic Committee were to schedule hearings next year to explore some of the major points which he has raised. The general agreement among economists about the validity of Dr. Morgenstern's main contentions reinforces my opinion that hearings should be held. I hope you will give this suggestion your most careful consideration as you plan the subcommittee's program for next year.

With very best wishes.

Sincerely,

Thomas B. Curtis.

Michigan State University,
School of Labor and Industrial Relations,
East Lansing, October 28, 1963.

Hon. Thomas B. Curtis,
U.S. House of Representatives,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Curtis: Thank you for your letter of October 21. I was glad to have the opportunity to read the article by Dr. Morgenstern from Fortune magazine.

I find myself in agreement with some of the points that he makes, especially with regard to our unemployment statistics. I am enclosing herewith a copy of a speech which I gave here last week in elaboration of some of the points which I made in my testimony before Senator Clark's subcommittee last month. You were kind enough to express an interest in my Senate testimony, and it occurred to me that you might also be interested in the further development of some of these points in the enclosed speech.

Sincerely yours,

Charles C. Killingsworth,
University Professor of Labor and Industrial Relations.

The Chase Manhattan Bank,
New York, N.Y., October 28, 1963.

The Honorable Thomas B. Curtis,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Curtis: I found Dr. Morgenstern's article fascinating. The main moral I drew from it was that greater attention needs to be paid to the quality of our statistics. I wonder sometimes if it might not be better to improve existing statistics rather than trying to develop a lot of new sources.

In the very nature of things, however, I doubt if it will ever be possible to achieve the degree of perfection sought by Dr. Morgenstern.

Cordially,

William F. Butler,
Vice President.

Bucknell University,
Lewisburg, Pa., October 28, 1963.

Representative Thomas B. Curtis,
House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Curtis: I want to thank you for your thoughtfulnes in sending me the copy of your insertion in the Congressional Record of Oskar Morgenstern's article on the margins of error present in the currently available statistics of national income and price levels.

I had already read Professor Morgenstern's article in Fortune and was impressed, as were you, with its salutary warning on the misuses of statistics, particularly where they are made the basis for formulating and applying economic, monetary, and fiscal policy.

The balance-of-payments problem of the United States, in particular, seems to be an area in which we have for too long allowed ourselves to be deluded by hopeful prognostications concerning fractional differences in rates of growth and fractional differences in price levels in the United States and in the rest of the world, particularly Europe. A case in point is the recently completed study of the U.S. balance of payments by the Brookings Institution ("The U.S. Balance of Payments in 1968," by Walter Salant, et al.). This is a book which on the basis not only of existing statistics but statistics projected 5 years ahead argues that the deficit in the U.S. balance of payments will be eliminated by 1968. The highly questionable inference drawn by the authors from these statistical projections and manipulations is that the United States need take no significant internal action now to correct the deficit, since the balance of payments will be automatically in equilibrium in a few years anyhow.

The danger that the do-nothing policies recommended by the Brookings report will become guidelines for the present administration is great because of the almost cabalistic zeal with which the statistical numbers game is played by many and this in spite of the authors' own explicit warnings of the possibility of error in their findings. Unflaggingly, the report warns that its basic assumptions may be wrong, that the effects of assumed relative changes in prices and incomes in the United States and Western Europe may lie outside the range projected, and that numerous important variables, not considered, may seriously modify the hypothetical values of the variables which are considered.

Though the authors of the Brookings report give no numerical value to the margins of error they postulate, the legitimate inference which may be drawn from their repeated cautions on this point is that the margins are wide. Errors may enter not only into the projected trends but into the statistics which are the basis of such projections. As Morgenstern points out, errors of 30 percent and more are not uncommon in the computation of national income statistics. But a margin of only 5 percent may result in wide swings of estimated national income and even wider swings of variables dependent on national income. Assuming a gross national product of $550 billion, a 5 percent error amounts to a plus or minus variation of roughly $30 billion, or approximately the value of total U.S. exports (visible and invisible). If, as Morgenstern asserts, a reliable growth rate of two significant digits is "impossible to establish," it would be a foolhardy policymaker who would attach any particular significance to the Brookings report's estimates that U.S. growth will proceed at an annual rate of 4.8 percent a year for the next 6 years, whereas Europe will achieve only a 4.2 percent growth rate. But a major part of the Brookings report's conclusions are based on this fractional difference in growth rates and on its continuance from 1961 through 1968.

Given this indeterminate but probably large band of error in the calculations of the authors of the Brookings report, the so-called basic balance of payments of the United States could be in deficit in 1968 rather than in surplus, and in deficit by a substantially larger amount than the $600 million yielded by the "pessimistic" assumptions of the authors. The concept of the "basic balance" is itself a source of errors and rests upon what seems to be a questionable methodology. The basic balance comprehends only transactions in goods and services and long-term capital transfers, private and official. Excluded from consideration as "transitory factors" whose movements allegedly do not lend themselves to long-term projection are short-term capital movements and errors and omissions. However, errors and omissions comprehend various unrecorded capital transactions which on occasion, as in the gold crisis of fall 1960, may be of significant size. Moreover, short-term capital tends to move sympathetically with the balance-of-payments position: such capital is likely to flow out when the basic balance is in deficit and to flow in when the basic balance is in surplus. The "basic balance" is thus clearly an abstraction. What will be decisive in 1968, however, and indeed in all the years intervening to that point, will be the actual total net balance of payments, namely, the algebraic sum of all of the U.S. international credit and debit transactions except transactions in gold and changes in U.S. liquid liabilities abroad. If this total net balance were to continue negative until 1968, only further outflows of U.S. gold and/or additional increases in dollar holdings abroad would provide the necessary offsetting credits.

The authors of the Brookings report, in their preoccupation with the statistical projection of the basic balance of payments in 1968, ignore the psychological effects of further cumulative deficits in the actual balance of payments. If the gold base continues to shrink as it has been doing and the foreign claims on this dwindling reserve continue to increase as they have been doing, the hoped-for swing in the "basic balance" in 1968 may never occur because considerably before that date foreign dollar holders may have decided to cash in their chips, fearing devaluation. The projected statistical turn in the "basic" balance of payments in 1968 will be of little comfort where a worldwide collapse of confidence in the dollar will have destroyed the existing international monetary system.

In summary, I want to enter my strong endorsement of Professor Morgenstern's views and to express the hope that it will indeed be possible to schedule hearings before the Joint Economic Committee on the dangers that result from the excessively casual use or aggregative statistics in deciding issues of the gravest moment to the Nation's future.

"Economics by statistics" has become the modern abracadabra of policy; like magic in general, its aim is very often not to enlighten but to hoodwink. The possibility of manipulating numbers of questionable accuracy in directions which tend to support preconceived positions presents a constant temptation to economists anxious to avoid confrontation with unpleasant economic truths. Professor Morgenstern has performed an important and timely service in reminding us of these facts.

Very sincerely yours,

Patrick M. Boarman,
Associate Professor of Economics.

Yale University,
Department of Economics,
New Haven, Conn., October 28, 1963.

The Honorable Thomas B. Curtis,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Curtis: Thank you very much for your interesting letter of October 21. I very much appreciate your sending me that part of the Congressional Record which contains Oskar Morgenstern's warnings concerning the inappropriate use of statistical data. The warning is, I think, justified and I am very glad it got into the Congressional Record.

With repeated thanks.

Sincerely yours,

William Fellner,
Sterling Professor of Economics.

Dartmouth College,
Department of Economics,
Hanover, N.H., October 28, 1963.

Hon. Thomas B. Curtis,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Tom: Thank you for sending me pages from the Congressional Record containing Oskar Morgenstern's article of warning on the use of economic statistics. I am in complete agreement with Morgenstern that both economic concepts and economic data should be improved, and I have for many years deplored the spurious accuracy implied in many official statistics. Greater regard concerning the number of figures that are significant should be observed by compilers and publishers of data.

Furthermore, I also agree that the margin of error should be indicated whenever it is determinable, but this cannot be done for many statistical series. Generally, when the margin of error cannot be determined on a basis of mathematical probability it has little scientific meaning. In short, when error is due to vagaries other than observation and measurement, an estimate of the margin of error is itself subject to an unascertainable margin of error. Professor Kuznets, who is second to none in his mastery of national income concepts and data, has had to resort to estimating the margins of error of national income components in an unscientific manner because they could only be measured subjectively. His subjective estimates of the margins of error are, of course, not necessarily cumulative, nor need they be entirely compensating, but they are probably partially compensating. This still leaves us with the likelihood, as Morgenstern notes, of a subjective margin of error that may be as large as 5 or 10 percent.

Nevertheless there is reason to suspect that such margins of error are apt to change relatively little from one year to the next and, therefore, probably do not seriously affect most comparisons over a relatively short span of years. The reason for this stability is that the basic concepts and the method of data collection itself do not change rapidly. Consequently, I believe Morgenstern tends to exaggerate the effect of such errors, perhaps to dramatize the shortcomings of economic data, when he assumes a shift in the margin of error in making short-run comparisons as he does in his discussion of the table reprinted from his article.

Elsewhere in the article Morgenstern suggests the use of qualitative information. I am not entirely certain what he means by this. There is some value in using business annals but they are fragmentary and usually not available in time for policy determination. In any case such qualitative information is prone to an even greater margin of error than the data previously complained of. However, if Morgenstern is suggesting the desirability of disaggregating composite statistics into smaller components, a procedure which has been vigorously proposed by Prof. Arthur Burns, I am convinced such data could be exceedingly helpful in many policy situations; e.g., statistics concerning structural unemployment and its location.

In conclusion, I feel that economists both inside and outside the Government should improve their concepts and the statistical data they use and furthermore that the margin of error should be measured whenever it is meaningful to do so and the results published along with the data to which the margins are applicable. Budget and time constraints as well as intellectual limitations will still leave us with imperfect statistics. In my view the Government therefore will still be compelled to act on imperfect knowledge, which is what businessmen do every day, or not act at all.

We certainly require far more sophistication on the part of the press, the public, the Government, and academic economics in the use of imperfect data much of which will continue to possess an unknowable margin of error. As a first step, it would perhaps be advisable for the Government to publish only the significant figures in their official statistics. Didn't Aristotle say something to the effect that the mark of an educated man was not to expect more certainty than the subject permitted? We should strive for greater certainty and we must not be misled by spurious accuracy, but we cannot afford to be paralyzed for lack of certainty.

With best regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL MARX, Jr.,
Professor of Economics.

THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA,
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Athens, Ga., October 23, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: I greatly appreciate your sending me Dr. Morgenstern's article which I think is eminently sound. It bears out one of my pet theories which is that the public today does not go wrong on esoteric points of economics but on pretty elementary ones.

Morgenstern's points are—or should be—well known within the profession. My "Key to Modern Economics," Macmillan 1954, has long sections on the vagueness of such concepts as unemployment, full employment, price indexes, gross national product, etc. I do not personally think shifts in most economic figures of less than 5 percent can be given any scientifically conclusive weight. In many cases even 5 percent is not enough.

The trouble is that a political lobby comes to have a vested interest in the idea that certain figures are conclusive. Also some Macro-economists often do not like to think of the vagueness of their basic data. Thus the defects and unreliableness of the data are not stressed. The point is a very serious one.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID MCCORD WRIGHT.

NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE
BOARD, INC.,
New York, N.Y., October 24, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: Thank you very much for your letter of October 21, and the enclosed excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Professor Morgenstern's fine article on the use of economic statistics, as well as your own interesting comments, serve an extremely useful function and, in my opinion, deserve wide circulation.

I find myself in general agreement with the warnings and proposals contained in the article and shall therefore limit myself to but a few brief comments.

1. Many of our statistical series are still very imperfect and should be improved over time. As a rule these imperfections are the result of serious conceptual problems, deficiencies and lack of uniformity in the accounts of the private economy and limitations of funds for gathering and digesting statistical information. Improvements are therefore dependent on conceptual refinements, better statistical resources and full cooperation between the agencies and the private economy.

2. An indication of the probable margins of error of statistical series is very desirable whenever such margins can be established with some degree of accuracy. In those instances where this is impossible, a general statement concerning the proper and legitimate uses of the data may be helpful.

3. There is great need for alerting and educating practicing economists as well as government officials, the press, and the general public on the subject of proper use, and the dangers of abuse, of the inexact statistical data that by necessity form the raw material of economic analysis.

On this count Professor Morgenstern's article, as well as your own valuable comments and past work, perform an important and timely service.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL E. LEVY,
Senior Economist,
Division of Economic Research.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., October 23, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: Thank you for your letter of October 21, 1963, in which you enclosed copies of the article by Dr. Morgenstern, from the October issue of Fortune magazine and your own comments inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I do have some comments to make on Dr. Morgenstern's article and I will be happy to forward them to you as soon as they are completed.

Sincerely yours.

RAYMOND T. BOWMAN,
Assistant Director for Statistical Standards.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY IN THE CITY
OF NEW YORK, DEPARTMENT OF
ECONOMICS,
New York, N.Y., October 23, 1963.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: It was indeed good of you to send the copy of Prof. Morgenstern's article. Just this week I had one of my seminar students report on it, but I realized that we should give it more time.

After I have myself studied it more carefully, I shall pass along any suggestions that may occur to me.

As a big consumer of statistics, I appreciate efforts, such as those of the Government's Division of the Census, to indicate confidence intervals.

Please be assured of my best wishes.

Your truly

C. LOWELL HARRISS,
Professor of Economics.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER,
November 4, 1963.

The Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: Thanks for sending me the reprint of Oskar Morgenstern's article.

A thesis on which I have expounded from time to time is that our economic policy of the fifties was seriously misled by poor statistics, and that our economic policy of the sixties will be seriously misled by good enough statistics badly interpreted.

For the fifties I am referring to the Consumer Price Index. As the studies in the Stigler volume (prepared by the National Bureau of Economic Research under contract with the Bureau of the Budget and first published by the Joint Economic Committee) show, the Consumer Price Index almost certainly overstated the amount of inflation in the fifties. As a result, the Federal Reserve Board spent a lot of time combating an inflation that wasn't there, and had an inhibiting effect on "growth." The unemployment figures are probably better, statistically, but they are terribly complicated to interpret, and the superficial interpretations given to them make the unemployment problem appear considerably worse than it is. That is why I say that good statistics poorly interpreted are likely to mislead our economic policy in the sixties.

While I was still working at the White House, Bud Fackler and I calculated that if unemployment stays the same in the sixties as it was in the fifties, the numbers published by the BLS will run about 10 percent higher. When I say to suppose that unemployment in the sixties is the same as in the fifties, I mean to suppose that it is the same for each specific subgroup of the labor force, when the labor force is classified by age, sex, education, occupation, marital status, race, and all the other factors that are related to unemployment rates. The mix of the labor force of the sixties will change in a direction that will raise the overall unemployment rate by about 10 percent, even if the rates stay the same for the individual subgroups. For example, a new entrant to the labor force cannot become employed without first being defined as unemployed by the definition in use by the Bureau of the Census. The very fact, therefore, that there will be a great increase in the number of new entrants during the sixties means that the overall statistical figure on unemployment will rise, even if there is no real deterioration in the employment situation.

Another example relates to comparative economic growth of Russia and the United States. If the basic performances of the two economies stay the same in the sixties as they did in the fifties, we can expect to look a whole lot better statistically compared to the Russians in the sixties. The reason is that we will have tremendous additions to the labor force, and therefore additions to our GNP, whereas the Russian labor force will suffer greatly from failing to acquire all of the babies who should have been born during the period 1941–46. (Incidentally, this may have something to do with the Russians' realization that the moon is not in reach for them in this decade.)

Sincerely,

ALLEN.

NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC
RESEARCH, INC.,
New York, N.Y., November 6, 1963.

The Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: Thanks for your letter and for the copy of Dr. Morgenstern's article.

I certainly agree that official agencies need to give far more attention than they do, first, to estimating or judging the margins of errors surrounding the statistics they compile; second, to informing the public of these margins of error; third, in laying plans before their superiors in the Executive and the Congress for reducing or eliminating statistical errors.

Cordially,

ARTHUR F. BURNS.

NATIONAL PLANNING ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., November 14, 1963.

The Honorable THOMAS CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: I appreciate your sending me a copy of your speech in which you commented on Oskar Morgenstern's article in Fortune magazine. I had already read Morgenstern's article with great interest. I entirely agree with him that the agency providing statistics should pay more attention to the margin of error implied in the statistics.

I was very much interested when Professor Mehalanobis from India, who is the president of the Institute of Statistics in Calcutta, discussed "margins of error" at the United Nations Conference on Application of Science and Technology in Underdeveloped Countries in Geneva last February. If I remember correctly he proposed that we use besides a statistically and mathematically defined concept of margins of error also an operational criterion for determining tolerable limits of error. For some purposes it is most important to know whether a certain curve is going up or down (for instance sales expectations in various industries) even if we have no confidence at all in the quantification. In other instances even small margins of error may make the statistics useless for policy or business purposes.

What I'm suggesting is that if the Joint Committee should deal with this topic both these aspects are considered.

With best regards,

Sincerely yours,

GERHARD COLM.

MEMORIAL TO THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, our late President, John F. Kennedy, and Mrs. Kennedy in their 3 short years in the White House enriched the cultural life of our Nation beyond measure. Our appreciation for their vital interest in the arts should be expressed in a living tribute. Plans presently underway for a national center for the performing arts should be stepped up and the product of the encouragement of Mr. Kennedy and the labors of so many citizens should be rededicated as the John F. Kennedy Memorial Center. This will be the most appropriate memorial to a man who firmly believed that the extent of a nation's esteem for the arts is a reflection of the quality of its civilization. I am introducing legislation to this effect and ask that a fine editorial which appeared in this morning's Washington Post be included at this point in the RECORD:

A FITTING MEMORIAL

Of course, the National Cultural Center should be newly consecrated to the memory of John F. Kennedy. There could be few more fitting memorials to a President who enlivened the White House with music, drama and poetry. Mr. Kennedy, moreover, was the embodiment of life and vicacity; a conventional monument would be false to his own spirit. Far better a place where people gather to hear and see works of beauty than a marble mausoleum which would seem to embalm rather than evoke his memory.

A John F. Kennedy Memorial Center—the name itself is an improvement over the present self-conscious name—would have an additional merit. It would enable the sponsors of the center to reexamine the design and location in the light of a changed purpose. Perhaps the present setting and architecture would in the end be found adaptable to a memorial function. But the objections raised about inaccessibility and structural limitations could be thoughtfully reconsidered.

No living memorial could catch all the qualities of a gifted President who was equally at home in the library and on the football field. But the best single suggestion so far is a memorial center for the performing arts—potentially, a place of splendor and grace that could be a proud addition to the Capital of the United States.

NATION'S GRATITUDE DUE BROADCASTING INDUSTRY

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of the atmosphere of shock, disbelief, and sadness many thoughts felt by each of us could not find expression in words. I would like, however, to attempt to put into words the debt of gratitude which this Nation owes to the broadcasting industry—both radio and television—for the magnificent way in which the members of that industry have permitted the American people to participate in their homes in the tragic events of the last few days.

In judging the performance of an industry on an overall basis it is necessary to balance significant contributions with trivial offerings. If a balance sheet were to be made up today, I certainly feel that the performance of the industry during the last few days in the minds of the American people tends to offset much of the criticism which more recently has been levied against the industry.

The achievement of the industry is all the more remarkable because it demonstrates the capacity for voluntary cooperation on the part of networks and stations in serving the American people at times when such service is most needed.

The decision of networks and individual broadcasters to cancel commercial programs and advertising is a clear demonstration that the industry can, if it so desires, live up to the highest standards of public service.

We have some appreciation of the cost to the industry of this unprecedented coverage, and the vast technical achievements which were accomplished in putting together the pieces of the story of one of our Nation's saddest periods. Never before has there been such a documentation of history in the making for the American public.

Having been a frequent critic of particular aspects of the broadcasting industry, I am particularly gratified that I can say to the industry today:

> Thanks for a job well done. We can say truthfully today that we Americans have felt fused together as one people largely because of the outstanding contribution made by the broadcasting industry during these last few days in covering the tragic events which none of us will forget in our lifetimes.

Not only for myself, Mr. Speaker, but for the Congress and the American people I want express sincere thanks and appreciation for this tremendous public service rendered so magnificently by this great industry. To the management, the performers, newscasters, commentators, engineers, technicians, and everyone associated with the industry, we owe a debt of gratitude.

A TRIBUTE TO THE BROADCASTING MEDIA

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to commend and thank the broadcasting media for the excellent manner in which they undertook to inform the public of the tragic event that was thrust upon us last Friday. Immediately the industry dispensed with all regular programing and voluntarily prohibited commercials in order that the American people and the world could be kept informed of the subsequent events.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, to bring this matter to the attention of the House for I am sure that the manner in which the industry performed a public service from Friday last until after the interment of our beloved late President cost the industry untold millions of dollars. This act is of great significance at this time particularly since the Federal Communications Commission has recently proposed strict limitations on commercial time which I believe to be contrary to the intent of Congress at the time of the enactment of the Communications Act of 1934.

On November 7, 1963, Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Communications and Power under the chairmanship of my very good friend and colleague from Texas, the Honorable WALTER ROGERS, held hearings on H.R. 6697, and a companion bill, H.R. 8980, which I had the pleasure of introducing to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from prescribing standards with respect to the length and frequency of advertisements which may be broadcast by all or any class of stations in the broadcast service.

Mr. Speaker, we have been very vividly shown the value of the broadcasting media during the past sorrowful days. This has been accomplished through the desire of the media to provide a public service and, I say again, at considerable operating expense—not to mention the loss of revenue from prohibiting commercials.

I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will act favorably on H.R. 6697 in order that the House may consider it in the near future, at which time I urge all Members of this body to remember the commendable way in which this great media conducted itself during the events of the past few days.

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, a bright and shining figure in the image of Plato's philosopher-rulers has been struck down. It is the essence of the image that the guardian of the state possess vast disinterestedness, perceptive understanding, swift insight—that "divine madness" which reaches valid conclusions before the premises are fully stated. Power in President Kennedy's hands was only a means to an end—and that end was the enrichment of human life. Born to privilege, inured to prestige, he was trained for service—to the Nation—to all people. He carried with him the sure knowledge that the blood in his veins was derived from the same almighty parent, and was no better than than of the humblest citizen. His intelligence recognized that simple fact, and he built his life to conform with it.

The President led us to an open window through which he pointed to the dawn of a new day, a day from which the clear light of reason and selflessness had burnt away the clouds of misery and injustice and oppression which have lain heavily over the human race through the centuries. That day could be approached only through a "long twilight" of toil and sacrifice and devotion. To reach it, new and untried paths would have to be hewn through seemingly insuperable difficulties. The bright spark of his unique personality had lit up the prospect, and we were almost persuaded that the end was worth the effort. And then he was cut down.

In our hour of anguish, two thoughts bring some little comfort. The first is that only a half-crazed individual could have perpetrated the foul deed. The act was the venom of a mind so egocentric that it could view the normal operation of economic and social laws as expressing a personal vindictiveness toward itself. Such a mind strikes out blindly, irrationally, with a demoniac futility. Its victim is simply the most conspicuous object in sight.

And yet there is a terrifying and half-expressed, half-suppressed, dread that we are all somehow involved in the act. We instinctively turn a searching eye on our own inner souls, and ask the troubling question: Have I, myself, by word or deed, whether intentionally or unintentionally contributed to the confusion and suspicion in this Nation, confusion and suspicion which seems to prefer contention to orderly progress?

Whence arises the second source of comfort in our distress. In the shock which removed this deed from the realm of the unbelievable to the fact of reality, there is opportunity to pause and think. This Republic was established by men who believed in the platonic tradition. The true questions which divide us today concern the public policies and procedures which are appropriate to the needs of the time. Prejudice and bias and selfishness will not discover the answers, nor will they put them into execution. We have a new opportunity to examine them all in the cold light of reason, and with an acute awareness of the practical potentialities which this age of enlightenment and of technical competence offers us to make what changes we will. Unanimity of agreement to rational examination is not a function of a free society. But, once decisions have been arrived at by rational processes, unanimity of action is. The thing that must become unbelievable today is that while we loll in the luxury of plenty and power, we should permit "the bounty of heaven to be spilt" by fratricidal emotionalism.

On last Saturday, the heavens wept unrestrainedly as if in attempt to wash away all traces of bitterness and ugliness in our relations with one another. In the late evening, a cooling wind swept back the clouds, and along with them, we hope, the clouds of passion in men's souls which obstruct their view of a beneficent infinity. Bright stars appeared, and a crescent moon hung in the western firmament. On Sunday morning a new day—a holy day—dawned in glory and brilliance. May it be a symbol.

On a gentle hillside, and in full view of the seats of the mighty on this continent, there flickers a glowing flame. It, too, is a symbol, a symbol of the indomitable spirit of our departed President and leader. May the thoughts and efforts of all of us be dedicated to the determination that the bright spark which our fallen President kindled shall never go out, but that it shall grow stronger and clearer until it leads us through the long twilight to a more perfect day.

It has always been an inspiring thought that out of evil may come good. The Judeo-Christian tradition assures us that sacrific is never in vain, and that the ways of providence, however inscrutable, are righteous altogether. The last speech prepared by John Kennedy on that fatal November day contained the words:

> Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain.

If good comes out of his sacrifice, he would bow in humble submission. We trust in God.

SUMMARY OF NET BUDGET RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES (THE TRADITIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET)—4 MONTHS OF FISCAL 1964 VERSUS 4 MONTHS OF FISCAL 1963, WITH COMPARISONS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a tabulation of the budget receipts and expenditures in the first 4 months, to October 31, 1963, for the fiscal year 1964, with pertinent comparisons.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in conformity with previous practice, I include for the information of Members and others a tabulation of budget receipts and expenditures in the first 4 months—to October 31—of fiscal year 1964 with pertinent comparisons.

BUDGET RECEIPTS

In contrast to budget expenditures which tend to recur more evenly throughout the fiscal year, the normal pattern of budget receipts shows September, December, March, and June as peak months; and receipts in the first half—July–December—of the fiscal year are usually lower than in the January–June second half.

Budget revenues were officially estimated at $86,900,000,000 in last January's budget for the current fiscal year 1964, which, if realized, would exceed actual fiscal 1963 revenues by $543,000,000. That is the last official budget estimate; the Secretary of the Treasury updated the figure to $88,800,000,000 in testimony on the last debt limit bill, which, if realized would mean a $2,443,000,000 increase over actual fiscal 1963 revenues. In any event, in the first 4 months of the fiscal year—a relatively low collection period—actual budget revenues amounted to $24,331,000,000, some $593,000,000 higher than the corresponding 4 months of last year.

BUDGET EXPENDITURES

Budget expenditures were officially projected in the budget last January at $98,802,000,000 for fiscal 1964 which, if held to, would represent an increase of $6,212,000,000 over the fiscal 1963 actual budget expenditure. On a straight monthly basis, it would mean an average of $8,233,000,000 per month, in contrast to which the expenditures in the first 4 months, July–October, averaged $8,190,000,000 which in turn compares with $7,911,000,000 in the corresponding 4 months last year; the national defense monthly average was up $113,000,000 over a year ago and the monthly average for all other items—nondefense—was $166,000,000 higher.

But in his recent testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, the Secretary of the Treasury informally presented a revised estimate of $97,800,000,000 net budget expenditures for fiscal 1964, in contrast to the original estimate of $98,802,000,000; supporting details are not available. This would represent an increase over fiscal 1963 of $5,210,000,000; expenditures in the first 4 months, July–October, were $1,116,000,000 higher than those for the same 4 months last year; both defense and nondefense were up. The revised estimate of $97,800,000,000 translates into a straight monthly average of $8,150,000,000, in contrast to which, as noted, the actual average for the first 4 months was $8,190,000,000.

As in all past budgets, the original January budget expenditure (disbursements) estimate of $98,802,000,000 for fiscal 1964 represented a composite of, first, estimated disbursements in fiscal 1964 from appropriations made in prior years—$42,353,000,000, or approximately 43 percent, and therefore not directly affected by current congressional action on the 1964 appropriation bills; second, $1,202,000,000 estimated first-year expenditure in fiscal 1964 associated with proposals for new legislation; third, roughly $11,781,000,000 estimated to be expended from permanent appropriations recurring automatically under prior law and therefore not required to be voted on in the current session; fourth, thus leaving only about $43,466,000,000 of the total $98,802,000,000 original spending estimate for 1964 subject to direct action in the appropriation bills of the current session.

EXPENDITURES FOR DEFENSE, SPACE, AND INTEREST—AND ALL OTHER PROGRAMS

Messages and statements have emphasized that the expenditure estimates and programs for fiscal 1964 were so constructed that total proposed administrative budget expenditures for all programs other than national defense, space, and interest were slightly below the fiscal 1963 level—as originally forecast—for such programs. The original net budget estimate for fiscal 1964 for such other programs was $29,066,000,000. In the meantime, actual expenditures in fiscal 1963 for comparable purposes did not go as high as forecast in last January's budget, with the result that the $29,066,000,000 stands as an increase of $1,747,000,000 over fiscal 1963 rather than being below that year. In the first 4 months—July–October for fiscal 1964—expenditures for such other programs were $10,578,000,000, about $94,000,000 below the corresponding expenditure in July–October of last year.

SURPLUS OR DEFICIT

Whether the budget deficit is the $11,902,000,000 originally estimated, the $9,000,000,000 informally projected only recently by the Secretary before the Ways and Means Committee, or some other amount, fiscal 1964 represents the 28th year of budget deficits in the last 34 years. And we were told that the next budget, for fiscal 1965, and probably the one following that, will also be in the red. In summary here are the official administrative budget deficit figures of the last 3 years:

	Administrative budget deficits	
	From July 1, 1961, to date	For 3 fiscal years, 1962-64
Fiscal 1962 (from July 1, 1961)	$6,378,000,000	$6,378,000,000
Fiscal 1963	6,233,000,000	6,233,000,000
Fiscal 1964 (4 months to Oct. 31, 1963)	8,428,000,000	------------
Fiscal 1964 (informal estimate to Ways and Means Committee on the last debt bill)	------------	9,000,000,000
Total as above	21,039,000,000	21,611,000,000

And in total, actual budget expenditures in the fiscal year closed on June 30 last, and those now informally projected by the Secretary for the current fiscal year 1964, compare with certain earlier years as follows:

	Administrative budget spending	
	Over fiscal 1961	Over fiscal 1954
Fiscal 1963 actual:		
National defense	+$5,249,000,000	+$5,757,000,000
Other than national defense	+5,826,000,000	+19,296,000,000
Total, 1963 over	+11,075,000,000	+25,053,000,000
Federal 1964 current estimate:		
Total, 1964 current informal estimate over	+16,285,000,000	+30,263,000,000

THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. Speaker, after 4 months of budget operations in the current fiscal year 1964, the total public debt, both direct and guaranteed, stood at $307,147,152,239.03 and compares with certain earlier dates as shown in the following table:

Federal public debt—Direct and guaranteed

	Fiscal 1954	Fiscal 1961	Fiscal 1962	Fiscal 1963	Fiscal 1964 (at Oct. 31, 1963)
1. The debt at end of period (in billions of dollars)	271.3	289.2	298.6	306.5	307.1
2. Amount per capita (in dollars)	1,670.0	1,575.0	1,600.0	1,619.0	1,614.0
3. Average for a family of 4 (in dollars)	6,680.0	6,300.0	6,400.0	6,476.0	6,456.0

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the following table elaborates the receipt and expenditure situation more fully:

Net budget receipts and expenditures (the traditional administrative budget), 4 months of fiscal 1964 versus 4 months of fiscal 1963, and comparisons with full year estimates

[In millions of dollars]

	Actual for 4 months (to Oct. 31)			Budget estimates for all of fiscal 1964 compared to actual results for all of fiscal 1963			1964 estimates over 1963	
	Fiscal 1964	Fiscal 1963	1964 compared to 1963	Budget estimates for 1964 [1]	Informal Treasury revision [2]	Actual, 1963	Original estimates over 1963	Informal Treasury revision over 1963
1. Budget receipts (net)	24,331	23,738	+593	86,900	88,800	86,357	+543	+2,443
2. Budget expenditures (net):								
(a) National defense (per official budget classification)	17,496	17,043	+453	55,433	(3)	52,743	+2,690	(3)
(b) Other than national defense	15,264	14,601	+663	43,369	(3)	39,847	+3,522	(3)
Total expenditures (net)	32,760	31,644	+1,116	98,802	97,800	92,590	+6,212	+5,210
3. Net surplus (+) or deficit (−)	−8,429	−7,906	−523	−11,902	−9,000	−6,233	[4] −5,669	[4] −2,767
4. Average monthly expenditure:								
(a) National defense	4,374	4,261	+113	4,619	(3)	4,395	+224	(3)
(b) Other than national defense	3,816	3,650	+166	3,614	(3)	3,320	+294	(3)
Total monthly average	8,190	7,911	+279	8,233	8,150	7,715	+518	+435
5. Dividing net budget expenditures on the basis emphasized by the budget message of January 1963:								
(a) National defense	17,496	17,043	+453	55,433	(3)	52,743	+2,690	(3)
(b) Space	1,184	650	+534	4,200	(3)	2,552	+1,648	(3)
(c) Interest	3,502	3,279	+223	10,103	(3)	9,976	+127	(3)
(d) All other expenditures	10,578	10,672	−94	29,066	(3)	27,319	+1,747	(3)
Total expenditures (net)	32,760	31,644	+1,116	98,802	97,800	92,590	+6,212	+5,210

[1] As per original budget, Jan. 17, 1963.

[2] Given by Secretary of Treasury to Ways and Means Committee in connection with last public debt limit bill (H. Rept. 885, p. 4).

[3] No breakdowns available.

[4] That is to say, these 2 estimates represent a projected deficit in fiscal 1964 higher, by $5,669,000,000 and $2,967,000,000, respectively, than the deficit actually experienced in fiscal 1963.

Source: Monthly Treasury statement for Oct. 31, 1963; budget for 1964; and monthly Treasury statement for June 30, 1963.

INSPIRING MESSAGE OF PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the splendid address of President Lyndon B. Johnson at the joint session of the Congress this afternoon was a call for national unity in the solution of the unfinished business before this Nation in both domestic and international affairs.

It is my hope that Congress will measure up to its share of the responsibility and stay on the job until the charted work has been done. In the spirit of President Johnson's message, it is my hope that the House of Representatives will act on the civil rights bill and complete action on it before Christmas. It is also my hope that the other body will complete its work on the tax bill within the same schedule.

There is indeed no more fitting tribute that could be paid to the memory of our late beloved President.

FAREWELL, MR. PRESIDENT

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, there is so deep a sense of loss, so great a sense of grief that I cannot yet find the words that will give a full measure of meaning to the tragedy we have suffered.

To what my colleagues are saying here today, and to what the world has already said I can now only add—Farewell, my beloved President, I will miss you.

A BRAVE STATEMENT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, our President has spoken for the great majority of American citizens, in both the Democratic and Republican Parties, in calling for an end to the teaching and preaching of hate and evil and violence.

I am sure that the great body of our citizenry will follow his leadership in rejecting the fanatics of both the left and the right, and seeking a meeting ground of reason on which our Nation's most pressing problems may be solved.

In his decisive call for action on a broad legislative front, President Johnson has outlined a brave program that is faithful in its structure to the principles and policies of our late President.

It remains to be seen whether that brave program will survive the rocks and shoals of congressional action.

Certainly, no one can say our new President has failed to "lay it on the line," both as to his policy and his need for help from his fellow Americans.

PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Staggers] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, "We will keep our commitments." "I have come here to ask your help." "I believe in the integrity of the legislative branch." "In January 1961, President Kennedy stood in this place and said: 'Let us begin.' I stand here today and say: 'Let us continue.' " "There has been enough of talk; now is the time for action." "Let us put away all talking and preaching of prejudice and hate."

These are some of the striking phrases used by President Johnson in his first official address to the Congress, and incidentally to the American people and an anxiously listening world. Their import is that the Ship of State is firmly set on the course laid out by his predecessor. The administration has changed, but not the policy.

The atmosphere in which the new President spoke was obviously tinged with the gloom and restraint imposed by the tragedy of the last few days, and Mr. Johnson made no effort to lighten it. Actually, he heightened it by saying that he would give everything he has if it had not been necessary for him to appear in that place on such an occasion. His phrases were reminiscent of, almost identical with, those phrases made so familiar by the late President. "Let the Nation know." "Let all the world know."

The crowd which thronged onto the floor of the House and the galleries was, of course, not unlike those which appear on all important State occasions. The significant thing was the number of foreign representatives, ambassadors, and all the rest, who crowded into the Chamber. The space reserved for them was inadequate, and they were forced to scatter wherever they could. Their presence indicates the enormous importance attached by the whole world to the first statements of the new President.

Mr. Johnson spelled out in some detail the points in the Kennedy program which he endorsed and which he meant to push. This was expected, of course. Each point met with an expression of approval from the audience, none more so than his commitment to strong national defense and his advocacy of an early civil rights bill.

What are the general impressions of the occasion? There stood an immensely strong man, deeply earnest, and positive in his convictions. No glamour, no boasting, no obsession with words. Only determination and inherent strength of character. This is not a man to cross. Both our friends and our foes must have been convinced of this as he spoke. Furthermore, it is evident that he thinks in terms of action.

So a new administration has been set on its way. We may be hopeful that a program outlined and initiated by a man of genius and consecration will be pressed to implementation and conclusion by a successor equally dedicated to the public good and equally equipped with the moral force to carry it through.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Short) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Short.
Mr. Grover.
Mr. Goodling.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Morris.
Mr. Powell.
Mr. St. Onge.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on November 26, 1963, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2837. An act to amend further section 11 of the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. 311); and

H.R. 8969. An act to provide, for the period ending June 30, 1964, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, November 29, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

"I A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 88th Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U.S.C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948: Albert W. Johnson, 23d District, Pennsylvania.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1393. A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the 30th Annual Report of the Farm Credit Administration on the work of the cooperative farm credit system (including the report of the Federal Farm Credit Board), covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963, in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended; paragraph 3, section 4, of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended; the Executive order of March 27, 1933, creating the Farm Credit Administration; and section 6 of the Farm

Credit Act of 1953 (H. Doc. No. 177); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1394. A letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that the appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for "Grants to States for public assistance" for the fiscal year 1964, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1395. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting the July–September 1963 report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, pursuant to the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1396. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting copies of the Nobel Peace Prize award notice to the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1397. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on possibilities for reducing Federal expenditures under the electric loan program and other matters pertaining to the Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1398. A letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to plans for works of improvement relating to the following watersheds: Dry Creek, Ga.; Fishing Creek, Ga.; Little Cache, Ill.; Bachelor Run, Ind.; Grant-Shanghai Creeks, Kans.; Clam River, Mass.; Crane Creek, Minn.; Briar Creek, Pa.; and Glen Hills, Wis., pursuant to section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), and Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1399. A letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to plans for works of improvement relating to the following watersheds: Big Caney, Kans. and Okla.; Town Creek, Miss.; Rush Creek, Ohio; and North Fork of Powder River, Wyo., pursuant to section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), and Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 189. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, Calif., to the county of Kern, State of California; with amendment (Rept. No. 927). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 393. A bill to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of jurisdiction over certain land in the vicinity of Fort Devens, Mass.; with amendment (Rept. No. 928). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 7248. A bill to change the designated use of certain real property conveyed by the Department of the Air Force to the city of Fort Walton Beach, Fla., under the terms of Public Law 86–194; with amendment (Rept. No. 929). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 7499. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force or his designee to convey 0.25 acre of land to the city of Oroville, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 930). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 9252. A bill to authorize an appropriation to carry out the purposes of the National Cultural Center Act and to designate the National Cultural Center, authorized to be constructed by such act, as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 9253. A bill to amend the National Cultural Center Act to designate the National Cultural Center authorized to be constructed by such act as the "John F. Kennedy Memorial Center," and to authorize the appropriation of $25 million to provide matching of amounts contributed by the general public; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SENNER:

H.R. 9254. A bill to amend the National Cultural Center Act to designate the National Cultural Center authorized to be constructed by such act as the "John F. Kennedy Memorial Center," and to authorize the appropriation of $25 million to provide matching of amounts contributed by the general public; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 9255. A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and Vice President of the United States, members of the President's Cabinet, and Members of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 9256. A bill to redesignate the Cape Cod National Seashore, Mass., as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy National Seashore; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 9257. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army pay a fair share of the cost of certain highway improvements; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 9258. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to assure that adequate sites will be available in Arlington National Cemetery to provide for the interment there of recipients of certain decorations and awards; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 9259. A bill to authorize the appropriation of $5 million to carry out the purposes of the National Cultural Center Act and to designate the National Cultural Center authorized to be constructed by such act as the "John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial National Cultural Center"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROMWELL:

H.R. 9260. A bill to punish the killing, attempted killing, or assaulting of the President of the United States and other high officials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 9261. A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 9262. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to classify as third-class mail certain matter mailed by State motor vehicle authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 9263. A bill to designate the Museum of History and Technology of the Smithsonian Institution as the "John Fitzgerald Kennedy Museum of History and Technology"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 9264. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp as a tribute to the memory of President John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 9265. A bill to establish a program of awards for academic excellence in memory of our late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9266. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.R. 9267. A bill to provide that standard silver dollars shall hereafter bear on one side a likeness of our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 9268. A bill to designate the Peace Corps as the "Kennedy Peace Corps," and to provide for a suitable insignia for volunteers of the Kennedy Peace Corps; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 9269. A bill to authorize the appropriation of $5 million to carry out the purpose of the National Cultural Center Act and to designate the National Cultural Center, authorized to be constructed by such act, as the "John Fitzgerald Kennedy Center of the Performing Arts"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 9270. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose additional duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year in excess of annual quotas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 9271. A bill to authorize the appropriation of $5 million to carry out the purposes of the National Cultural Center Act and to designate the National Cultural Center authorized to be constructed by such act as the "John Fitzgerald Kennedy Cultural Center"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9272. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9273. A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of Michigan:

H.R. 9274. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it a Federal crime to kill the President or Vice President of the United States, the head of any executive department, or any Member of the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9275. A bill to designate the authorized Federal building to be constructed at Detroit, Mich., as the "John F. Kennedy Federal Building"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 9276. A bill to authorize the appropriation of $5 million to carry out the purposes of the National Cultural Center Act and to designate the National Cultural Center authorized to be constructed by such act as the "John Fitzgerald Kennedy Cultural Center"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 9277. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make certain acts against the person of the President and Vice President of the United States and certain other Federal officers a Federal crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H.R. 9278. A bill to impose quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 9279. A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.J. Res. 811. Joint resolution to establish the World War I Commemorative Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.J. Res. 812. Joint resolution directing an investigation of the Department of State; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.J. Res. 813. Joint resolution to redesignate the Cape Cod National Seashore as the "Kennedy Memorial Seashore," and to establish a commission to recommend a simple and fitting memorial to John Fitzgerald Kennedy within such seashore; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.J. Res. 814. Joint resolution establishing a joint committee to conduct an investigation and study of the recent assassination of the President of the United States and of certain other matters pertinent thereto; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.J. Res. 815. Joint resolution providing for the issuance of quarter dollars bearing the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.J. Res. 816. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.J. Res. 817. Joint resolution establishing the John F. Kennedy National Memorial Conference; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. Res. 574. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7152; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 575. Resolution authorizing the printing of an additional 1,000 copies of the document entitled, "Study of Population and Immigration Problems; Population of the United States"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Res. 576. Resolution to provide for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 73; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 9280. A bill for the relief of Donald J. Kent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 9281. A bill for the relief of Oro and Mayer Yahes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 9282. A bill for the relief of CWO Edward R. Kreiss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 9283. A bill for the relief of Pavlos Agos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 9284. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims against the United States with respect to the title to certain real property situated in El Dorado County, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 9285. A bill for the relief of Mrs. J. D. Tippitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 9286. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. John W. Cassell, U.S. Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 9287. A bill for the relief of Livia Sernini (Cucciati); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9288. A bill for the relief of Marianna V. Aguiar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 9289. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Colella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 9290. A bill for the relief of Danny Hiromi Oyama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

462. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Father Edward B. Geyer, Jr., and others, St. Luke's Church, New Haven, Conn., relative to requesting passage of the civil rights and other legislation for which the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy asked for in his program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

463. Also, petition of Maurice R. Franks, Searcy, Ark., to enable and to require the Attorney General to enforce the Communist control legislation of the United States, and to cease the present policy of domestic coexistence with and toleration of the organized forces of evil, which present policy of nonenforcement has enabled the brutal assassination of our President by a known member of the international Communist conspiracy; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

◆

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1963

(Legislative day of Tuesday, November 26, 1963)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou changeless God of the changing years: In these so suddenly saddened days, we are conscious that a new page in the Republic's history is being turned and another form sits in the Presidential chair.

We especially pray the benediction of Thy grace upon Thy servant who, after a notable record of public service in this body, crowned by these past years as its President, faces now as Chief Executive a maddening maze of problems tragic and thorny.

We beseech Thee to strengthen the heart and mind, the hands and lips of our colleague, Lyndon Johnson, as this day to a listening world he sounds the trumpet of his inaugural hope and purpose. As the ship of state plows on through perilous seas, in spite of rock and tempest roar, in spite of false lights on the shore, bring our national barque to the desired haven of peace with victory for truth and justice. Toward this goal, trusting in Thy mercy and might, we press on to meet the vast issues of this day of destiny as in the name of the Lord, our God, we set up our banners.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, November 25, and Tuesday, November 26, 1963, was dispensed with.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, it was ordered that there be a morning hour, with statements limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MONRONEY, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

THE SENATE AND ITS LEADERSHIP

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, minutes before the tragedy last Friday, I asked the Senate for unanimous consent that I might be recognized on the following Monday at the conclusion of the morning hour for the purpose of making a statement on the Senate and its leadership. The remarks which I had already prepared at that time were intended to set forth a few facts on the Congress, in order to set straight some of the generalizations and the illusions about the Senate which had been coming from a variety of informed quarters. It was a statement of what has been achieved, not by any genius of the leadership or by some Senate establishment but by the 100 Members of this body working in cooperation and in mutual respect. The statement is, I repeat, the record of 100 Senators. We all share in the responsibility for its achievements as well as for its shortcomings. There have been both achievements and shortcomings and both are recorded in the statement, I hope, in useful perspective and on the basis of fact. I have recorded on the basis of what is tangible in the legislative record not on the basis of what the Senate looks like at 8 at night or whether the Members are driven or herded or function at their own collective pace and of their own will. After awhile, what the Senate appears to have been in any given period will be noted, if at all, only by the scholars. What the Senate does in a legislative sense in any given period will be felt for a long, long time by all the people of the Nation. We are not here as actors and actresses to be applauded. We are here as Senators to do the business of the Government. It is not we, but it is that alone, in the end, which counts to the Nation.

So, Mr. President, the remarks which I had intended to deliver on Monday last in the nature of an interim report on the Senate and its leadership, now become, because of this overwhelming tragedy, a final report on the Senate and its leadership during the Presidency of John Fitzgerald Kennedy and an indication of what remains to be done under the administration of President Johnson.

In the light of what has happened, I have no heart to read this report to the Senate. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the statement, "The Senate and Its Leadership," unchanged from the form in which is was as prepared for delivery in the Senate on Monday, November 25, 1963, be printed as though read at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, some days ago blunt words were said on the floor of the Senate. They dealt in critical fashion with the state of this institution. They dealt in critical fashion with the quality of the majority leadership and the minority opposition. A far more important matter than criticism or praise of the leadership was involved. It is a matter which goes to the fundamental nature of the Senate.

In this light, we have reason to be grateful because if what was stated was being said in the cloakrooms, then it should have been said on the floor. If, as was indicated, the functioning of the Senate itself is in question, the place to air that matter is on the floor of the Senate. We need no cloakroom commandos, operating behind the swinging doors of the two rooms at the rear, to spread the tidings. We need no whispered word passed from one to another and on to the press.

We are here to do the public's business. On the floor of the Senate, the public's business is conducted in full sight and hearing of the public. And it is here, not in the cloakrooms, that the Senator from Montana, the majority leader, if you wish, will address himself to the question of the present state of the Senate and its leadership. The Senator from Montana has nothing to conceal. He has nothing which is best whispered in the cloakrooms. What he has to say on this score will be said here. It will be said to all Senators and to all the members of the press who sit above us in more ways than one.

How, Mr. President, do you measure the performance of this Congress—any Congress? How do you measure the performance of a Senate of 100 independent men and women—any Senate? The question rarely arises at least until an election approaches. And, then, our concern may well be with our own individual performance and not necessarily with that of the Senate as a whole.

Yet that performance—the performance of the Senate as a whole—has been judged on the floor. Several Senators, at least, judged it and found it seriously wanting. And with the hue and cry thus raised, they found echoes outside the Senate. I do not criticize Senators for making the judgment, for raising the alarm. Even less do I criticize the press for spreading it. Senators were within their rights. And the press was not only within its rights but was performing a segment of its public duty which is to report what transpires here.

I, too, am within my rights, Mr. President, and I believe I am performing a duty of the leadership when I ask again: How do you judge the performance of this Congress—any Congress? Of this Senate—any Senate? Do you mix a concoction and drink it? And if you feel a sense of well-being thereafter decide it is not so bad a Congress after all? But if you feel somewhat ill or depressed then that, indeed, is proof unequivocal that the Congress is a bad Congress and the Senate is a bad Senate. Or do you shake your head back and forth negatively before a favored columnist when discussing the performance of this Senate? And if he, in turn, nods up and down, then that is proof that the performance is bad?

With all due respect, Mr. President, I searched the remarks of the Senators who have raised the questions. I searched them carefully for I do not make light of the criticism of any Member of this body. I searched them carefully for any insight as to how we might judge accurately the performance of this Senate, in order that we might try to improve it.

There is reference, to be sure, to timewasting, to laziness, to absenteeism, to standing still, and so forth. But who are the timewasters in the Senate, Mr. President? Who is lazy? Who is an absentee? Each Member can make his own judgment of his individual performance. I make no apologies for mine. Nor will I sit in judgment on any other Member. On that score, each of us will answer to his own conscience, if not to his constituents.

But, Mr. President, insofar as the performance of the Senate as a whole is concerned, with all due respect, these comments in timewasting have little relevance. Indeed, the Congress can, as it has—as it did in declaring World War II in less than a day—pass legislation which has the profoundest meaning for the entire Nation. And by contrast, the Senate floor can look very busy day in and day out, month in and month out, while the Senate is, indeed, dawdling. At one time in the recollection of many of us, we debated a civil rights measure 24 hours a day for many days on end. We debated it shaven and unshaven. We debated it without ties, with hair awry and even in bedroom slippers. In the end, we wound up with compromise legislation. And it was not the fresh and well-rested opponents of the civil rights measure who were compelled to the compromise. It was, rather, the exhausted, sleep-starved quorum-confounded proponents who were only too happy to take it.

No, Mr. President, if we would estimate the performance of this Congress or any other, this Senate or any other, we will have to find a more reliable yardstick than whether, on the floor, we act as timewasters or moonlighters. As every Member of the Senate and press knows, even if the public generally does not, the Senate is neither more nor less effective because the Senate is in session from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. or to 9 a.m. the next day. In fact, such hours would most certainly make it less effective in present circumstances.

Nor does the length of the session indicate a greater or lesser effectiveness. We live in a 12-month nation. It may well be that the times are pushing us in the direction of a 12-months Congress. In short, we cannot measure a Congress or a Senate by the standards of the stretchout or of the speedup. It will be of no avail to install a timeclock at the entrance to the Chamber for Senators to punch when they enter or leave the floor.

There has been a great deal said on this floor about featherbedding in certain industries. But if we want to see a featherbedding to end all featherbedding, we will have the Senate sit here day in and day out from dawn until dawn, whether or not the calendar calls for it, in order to impress the boss—the American people—with our industriousness. We may not shuffle papers as bureaucrats are assumed to do when engaged in this art. What we are likely to shuffle is words—words to the President on how to execute the foreign policy or administer the domestic affairs of the Nation. And when these words pall, we undoubtedly will turn to the court to give that institution the benefit of our advice on its responsibilities. And if we run out of judicial wisdom we can always turn to advising the Governors of the States or the mayors of the cities or the heads of other nations on how to manage their concerns.

Let me make it clear that Senators individually have every right to comment on whatever they wish and to do so on the floor of the Senate. Highly significant initiatives on all manner of public affairs have had their genesis in the remarks of individual Senators on the floor. But there is one clearcut, day-in-and-day-out responsibility of the Senate as a whole. Beyond all others, it is the constitutional responsibility to be here and to consider and to act in concert with the House on the legislative needs of the Nation. And the effectiveness with which that responsibility is discharged cannot be measured by any reference to the clocks on the walls of the Chamber.

Nor can it be measured, really, by the output of legislation. For those who are computer-minded, however, the record shows that 12,656 bills and resolutions were introduced in the 79th Congress—1945–46. And in the 87th Congress—1961–62—20,316 bills and resolutions were introduced, an increase of 60 percent. And the records show further that in the 79th Congress 2,117 bills and resolutions were passed and in the 87th 2,217 were passed.

But what do these figures tell us, Mr. President? Do they tell us that the Congress has been doing poorly because in the face of an 8,000 increase in the biannual input of bills and resolutions the output of laws 15 years later had increased by only a hundred? They tell us nothing of the kind.

If these figures tell us anything, they tell us that the pressures on Congress have intensified greatly. They suggest, further, that Congress may be resistant to these pressures. But whether Congress resists rightly or wrongly, to the benefit or detriment of the Nation, these figures tell us nothing at all.

There is a refinement in the statistical approach. It may have more meaning than the gross figures in measuring the effectiveness of a Democratic administration. I refer to the approach which is commonly used these days of totaling the Presidential or executive branch requests for significant legislation and weighing against that total the number of congressional responses in the form of law.

On this basis, if the Congress enacts a small percentage of the executive branch requests it is presumed, somewhat glibly and impertinently, to be an ineffective Congress. But if the percentage is high, it follows that it is classifiable as an effective Congress. I am not so sure that I would agree and I am certain that the distinguished minority leader and his party would not agree that that is a valid test. The opposition might measure in precisely the opposite fashion. The opposition might, indeed, find a Democratic Congress which enacted little if any of a Democratic administration's legislation, a paragon among Congresses. And yet I know that the distinguished minority leader does not reason in that fashion for he has acted time and again not to kill administration measures, but to help to pass them when he was persuaded that the interests of the Nation so required.

In any event, the statistics on this score are not calculated to give aid and comfort to those who are in a hurry to mark off this Congress as a failure at the midway. For here, Mr. President, are the facts:

As of November 15, the Executive had submitted 125 legislative recommendations to the 88th Congress, in the form of messages, letters, and communications. In addition, 15 appropriations bills have come down. Thus, the total is 140. But for three of these measures, the executive branch has yet to suggest draft legislation. The working total of Executive requests, therefore, is 137.

Of these measures, 45 have been enacted into law. Two have had conference reports filed and will shortly be enacted. In conference at the present time are six more. And already passed in the Senate and awaiting House action are 26 additional Executive measures. In sum, Mr. President, 79 of the requested 137 Executive measures, or 58 percent of the program, has, in effect, cleared the Senate. As a Democratic Senator who needs to make no apology to any Member on this side of the aisle for his voting record in support of the President, I, nevertheless, find nothing to brag about in these figures. But neither do I find any grounds for apology as majority leader. I ask any Member to search the RECORD and find in the postwar years, a basis for deprecating the work of the 88th Congress on a statistical basis of this kind. The 88th Congress has yet to run its course but about 60 percent at the midway is not in any sense an inadequate statistical response to the President's program. And I would point out that the figure of laws enacted pursuant to the President's program in the 87th Congress was 68 percent. And I ask the Senate to search the RECORD and find a basis for deprecating the work of that Congress on a statistical analysis of this kind.

In short, I see no basis for apology on statistical grounds either for this Congress to date or for the last. But at the same time, I do not take umbrage in statistics. I do not think that statistics, however refined, tell much of the story of whether or not a particular Congress or Senate is effective or ineffective.

But there is still another test which persuades me that the previous Congress under this administration was and—bemore it is done in 1964—this Congress will be more than adequate. This test, admittedly, is a subjective one. Yet it may provide a more accurate insight than statistics into what really matters most in any Congress. I refer to the test of history. I refer to the capacity of a Congress—any Congress—to produce what might be called significant legislation of adjustment, legislation which is in consonance with the forces of change which are at work in the Nation and in the world of its time. I refer to the capacity of a Congress to do its part, to do what it must, to keep the Nation attuned to ever-changing national and international realities. I refer to the ability of a Congress to come to grips with those few specific critical issues which confront it and to act constructively on them.

And before it becomes fashionable to hold up to ridicule this Congress and the last as well, it seems to me appropriate to take a look at the historic record in the light of this criterion. It seems to me sensible to isolate from the appearance of things, from the hundreds of things which any Congress does, those few specific measures which past Congresses have enacted, measures which without too much stretch of the imagination may be regarded as significant legislation of adjustment—the legislation which reveals the vitality of a Congress in meeting the needs of the Nation in its time.

The lists which I am about to set forth are arbitrary, to be sure, but any oversights are inadvertent. I welcome any additions to them from other Members who may feel that I have slighted the achievements of any past Congress.

Let me go back, Mr. President, to the 80th Congress, to the first full Congress after the war. What significant legislation do we find in those years 1947 and 1948? This, Mr. President, is the list:

First. The Congress adopted the Marshall plan and other urgent foreign aid programs.

Second. It legislated the unification of the Armed Forces.

Third. It ratified the peace treaties with Italy, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania.

Fourth. It ratified the Inter-American Treaty.

Fifth. It added the peril point concept to reciprocal trade.

Sixth. It adopted a peacetime selective service act.

Seventh. It passed the Taft-Hartley Act.

Eighth. It balanced the budget and passed an income tax reduction bill, the Revenue Act of 1948.

Ninth. It enacted the Presidential Succession Act as well as the presidential term amendment.

That is the record of that Congress, of the significant legislation of the 80th Congress, of a Republican Congress in a Democratic administration. It is not an unimpressive record, Mr. President, especially for a so-called do-nothing Congress.

What of the 81st, of the years 1949–50, Mr. President, of a Democratic Congress in a Democratic administration? This is the list:

First. It expanded social security.

Second. It authorized Federal aid for the construction of housing for middle income families.

Third. It set up the National Science Foundation.

Fourth. It enacted Federal aid to education for impacted areas.

Fifth. It authorized aid to Yugoslavia.

Sixth. It raised taxes.

Seventh. It passed the Internal Security Act.

Eighth. It removed the peril-point concept from reciprocal trade.

Ninth. It continued substantial foreign aid programs.

Tenth. The Senate made cloture more difficult to invoke.

On the basis of this list can we say with certainty that it was better than the 80th Congress—of the so-called "do-nothing Congress"—but the Congress which, nevertheless, enacted the Marshall plan?

Here is the list of the legislation of adjustment for the 82d Congress; for the years 1951–1952:

First. It appropriated $179.2 billion, more money than any peacetime Congress in history.

Second. It raised taxes to the highest peacetime level.

Third. It passed the first universal military training bill in history.

Fourth. It approved the stationing of troops in Europe.

Fifth. It increased certain social security payments.

Sixth. It passed a GI bill for Korean veterans.

Seventh. It restored the peril point concept to reciprocal trade.

Eighth. It continued substantial foreign aid programs.

And so, Mr. President, we come to the first Eisenhower Congress, the 83d, for the years 1953 and 1954. Here is the list for these 2 years:

First. Its first order of significant business was to confirm the titles of the States—as against the Federal Government—to submerged tidelands, to the repository of a substantial share of the Nation's resources in petroleum.

Second. It acquiesced in reorganization plans for the executive branch which grew out of the Hoover Commission of the previous Democratic administration.

Third. It overhauled tax laws.

Fourth. It enacted flexible price supports in five basic crops and reduced dairy supports.

Fifth. It made certain extensions in social security coverage and increased the benefits.

Sixth. It authorized construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Seventh. It defeated the Bricker amendment.

Eighth. It terminated Federal rent control.

Ninth. It continued substantial foreign aid programs.

Tenth. The Senate censured Senator McCarthy.

Eleventh. It created a Small Business Administration.

Twelfth. It passed the Communist Control Act of 1954 which outlawed the Communist Party.

In the 84th Congress, a 1955–56 Democratic Congress under a Republican administration here is the list:

First. It authorized the President to defend Formosa and the Pescadores.

Second. It ratified the SEATO Treaty.

Third. It raised minimum wages from 75 cents an hour to $1.

Fourth. It passed a housing bill.

Fifth. It set up the soil bank.

Sixth. It established under social security a new program for the disabled and reduced the eligibility age for women from 65 to 62.

Seventh. It authorized grants for medical research facilities.

Eighth. It set in motion a 13-year, $30 billion roadbuilding program.

Ninth. It authorized construction of an atomic merchant ship.

Tenth. It continued substantial foreign aid programs.

For the 85th, 1957–58, here is the list of the legislation of adjustment:

First. It established the Space Agency.

Second. It approved a major military reorganization.

Third. It extended unemployment benefits for 16 weeks.

Fourth. It authorized a national defense education program.

Fifth. It increased social security benefits.

Sixth. It came to the aid of the railroads with a loan-guarantee program.

Seventh. It voted Alaska statehood.

Eighth. It enacted an emergency Housing Act.

Ninth. It legislated a requirement for full disclosure of pension funds.

Tenth. It passed a Mideast resolution.

Eleventh. It approved the first civil rights measure in 82 years.

Twelfth. It approved the atoms-for-peace program under the new International Atomic Energy Agency.

Thirteenth. It continued substantial foreign aid programs.

Then, Mr. President, for the last Eisenhower Congress, the 86th, 1959–60, here is the record:

First. It passed another civil rights bill.

Second. It authorized another housing program with emphasis on low-cost housing.

Third. It authorized funds for the study of mass transit problems.

Fourth. It ratified the Antarctic Treaty.

Fifth. It began a new program of aid for Latin America.

Sixth. It approved Hawaiian statehood.

Seventh. It approved a Labor-Management Disclosure Act.

Eighth. It approved a constitutional amendment giving the vote in presidential elections to the citizens of the District of Columbia.

Ninth. It continued foreign aid programs.

Tenth. The Senate restored the cloture rule to what it had been in 1948—to two-thirds present and voting rather than to a constitutional two-thirds.

That is the record, Mr. President, of the Congress from the end of World War II to the inception of the Kennedy administration. When all else recedes into history, when the newspapers of the times yellow on the library shelves, when all years roll into the good old days, these are the measures, beyond the routine, which will count in terms of the shaping of the Nation and of its place in the world. And it is largely on the basis of this legislation of adjustment that the historical judgments will be made. The number of significant measures is not great in these pre-Kennedy Congresses. The range is from 7 or so in the 2 years of the 80th Congress to a high of 13 or so during the 2 years of the exceptional 85th Congress under the leadership of the distinguished Vice President, Mr. Johnson. For the most part, each 2 years witnessed the enactment of a total of eight or nine items and most of them elaborations or variations on themes already set in preceding years.

We come now, Mr. President, to the record of the 87th Congress, the first Congress of the Kennedy administration. Here, then, is the comparable list.

First. It passed the omnibus farm bill to reduce surpluses and to provide for a new land use adjustment program.

Second. It authorized a program of health aid for migrant farm workers.

Third. It extended unemployment benefits an additional 13 weeks.

Fourth. It provided a program of aid to dependent children of the unemployed.

Fifth. It increased minimum wages from $1 to $1.25 and extended coverage to several million additional workers.

Sixth. It established the area redevelopment program.

Seventh. It increased old-age insurance benefits and provided for retirement of men at 62 and liberalized disability payments.

Eighth. It authorized almost $5 billion in new funds under the Omnibus Housing Act.

Ninth. It extended the efforts to control water pollution.

Tenth. It established the manpower training program.

Eleventh. It accelerated the public works program by an authorization of $900 million.

Twelfth. It made a significant revision in the tax structure.

Thirteenth. It authorized direct loans for housing for the elderly.

Fourteenth. It provided for voluntary pensions plans under the tax laws.

Fifteenth. It enacted the trade expansion program.

Sixteenth. It passed the communications satellite bill.

Seventeenth. It established the Peace Corps.

Eighteenth. It established the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Nineteenth. It created the U.S. Travel Service.

Twentieth. It authorized the purchase of U.N. bonds to save that organization from bankruptcy.

Twenty-first. It initiated a Federal program on juvenile delinquency.

Twenty-second. It provided a program of aid for educational TV in the schools and colleges.

Twenty-third. It ratified the Treaty of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Twenty-fourth. It approved a constitutional amendment abolishing the poll tax.

Twenty-fifth. It passed a substantial aid bill.

Twenty-sixth. The Senate invoked cloture for the first time in several decades.

Mr. President, I will not draw comparisons between the 87th Congress and those which preceded it. Each Congress has its own challenges. Each does the best it can. But I will say to every Member of this body, this is the record that counts most. This is the record which you made.

It is not the record of the majority leader or the minority leader. It is the Senate's record and as the Senator from Montana, I, for one, will not make light of these achievements in the first 2 years of the Kennedy administration. And the achievement is no less because the 87th Congress did not meet at all hours of the night, because it rarely titillated the galleries or because it failed to impress the visiting newsmen and columnists.

And now, Mr. President, we come to the 88th Congress, and particularly to this Senate. We come to this Senate, which some have already consigned to the wasteheaps of history. We come to its leadership, which some find is to be pitied, if, indeed, it is not to be scorned.

Here, Mr. President, I will include in the list—in the list of the significant legislation of adjustment—not only the measures which have cleared the Congress but also items which have at least cleared the Senate and are awaiting final action. Congress is not for 1 year. It is for 2. What this Congress will in the end produce we cannot say until this Congress comes to an end some time in 1964. But to date in this Congress and in this Senate, here is the list:

First. It has initiated a program which begins to recognize the full dimensions of major health problems of the Nation and to come to grips with them—mental illness and mental retardation.

Second. It has expanded Federal aid for maternal and child health services and for crippled children.

Third. It has acted to forestall what would otherwise have been a crippling railroad shutdown.

Fourth. It has acted to provide for a vast expansion in training and research facilities in medicine, dentistry, and related sciences.

Fifth. It has acted to expand academic facilities in higher education through grants and loans for construction.

Sixth. It has acted to expand vocational education and extended for 3 years the National Defense Education Act and the impacted areas program.

Seventh. It has acted on the problem of mass transit.

Eighth. It has acted to establish a Domestic Peace Corps.

Ninth. It has acted to establish a system of Federal public defenders.

Tenth. It has acted to create a Youth Conservation Corps.

Eleventh. It has acted on a water resources research program.

Twelfth. It has acted to preserve wilderness areas.

Thirteenth. It has acted to expand the area redevelopment program.

Fourteenth. It has acted on the problems of air and water pollution.

Fifteenth. It has authorized a substantial foreign aid program.

Sixteenth. It has given consent to the ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty.

That is the record, Mr. President, at the halfway mark in the 88th Congress. And once again I will leave it to others who are so inclined to draw comparisons with past Congresses. But I will say that no Senator need be ashamed of this record. The record is no less a record because it has taken 10 months of work to achieve. It is no less a record because it has been produced by cooperation, because the leadership wields no whip and seeks no whip to wield. And the record is for 1 year not for the 2 to which every Congress is entitled.

However this midway Congress may compare with what has gone before, the leadership would be the first to recognize that there are inadequacies in it. And the most serious, in my judgment, are neither the status of the civil rights bill nor the tax bill. The most serious, in my judgment, have to do with the day-to-day financial housekeeping of the Government. We have got to face the fact that if we are going to have an orderly fiscal administration of this Government we cannot long continue with the practice of raising every few months, as a ritual, the legal debt ceiling. Nor can we expect a rational administration of the vast and farflung activities of the executive branch of the Government if the basic appropriations bills do not become law until months after the fiscal year begins.

I do not know where the answer to these problems lies. I do not blame the House and I most certainly cannot blame the Senate which must await the completion of House action on legislation of this type before considering it. And how the Senate is going to discharge its constitutional responsibilities on appropriations bills by July 1, the beginning of the fiscal year, when some of the bills do not reach the Senate until long after June 30, I do not know. This year, for example, the District of Columbia appropriations arrived in the Senate committee on July 15. The military construction appropriation has just arrived. And the foreign aid appropriation has not even yet started its journey to the Senate.

I want to say again that I do not place the responsibility for this breakdown on the House and even less do I place it on the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Whatever the causes, and they are varied, the problem is still there. It has been growing worse over the years and if it is not faced soon, it will be a standing invitation to national financial chaos. Perhaps, what the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has suggested on occasion, along the lines of dividing the initiative on appropriations measures between the House and Senate may provide at least a partial solution. Perhaps, what the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has proposed in the way of a division of the congressional year between a legislative and an appropriating session may be helpful. Or perhaps the problem is even more fundamental. Perhaps, it is the persistence of the illusion of a 7 months Congress in a 12 months nation which is at the root of the difficulty and with this illusion, the incongruity of a June 30 fiscal closing in a December 31 government and nation.

Whatever the difficulty, we are and have been for some years, I repeat, on a course of increasing disorderliness in the management of the fundamental fiscal affairs of the Government. I, for one, would welcome an initiative from the administration and the relevant committees looking to the establishment of a special commission to explore this problem and to come up with recommendations for its solution. The job needs to be done and it needs to be done quickly.

If the Senate is not wholly at fault with regard to the appropriations situation, neither is it wholly at fault with regard to such measures as health care and the tax bill. I deeply regret the fact that the tax bill to which the President rightly attaches such great importance has yet to be considered and disposed of. But, again, Mr. President, I will not point the finger of a prejudiced scorn at the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. Again, the Constitution and the practice require the House to complete its work on a measure of this kind before the Senate begins consideration. And the House was 8 long months in completing action on the tax bill. I do not criticize the House. That body has its responsibilities. It may be that it was illusory in the first place to anticipate a rapid consideration of a bill of this complexity.

And if I do not criticize the House, I most certainly will not criticize the Finance Committee of the Senate if it, as it will, in a far shorter time, reports this bill to the Senate. May I say, further, that regardless of his personal attitude on this bill, I have every confidence that the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee [Mr. BYRD] will report it as quickly as the work of his committee can be completed.

Here again, Mr. President, as in the case of appropriations, we have got to face the fact that the Congress, under the Constitution and its established procedures, is not basically equipped to respond, to reach a decision one way or another on urgent matters which go to the heart of our national economic structure. And in all honesty, we have got to face the fact that in this instance, a failure to respond with some degree of urgency to an urgent Presidential request consigns to the Congress—to the whole Congress—a great responsibility for whatever consequences flow to the Nation from this failure.

I turn next, Mr. President, to the civil rights measure. Here, too, Mr. President, there has been a prolonged delay in coming to grips with an issue which the President placed before us on the basis of urgency. Insofar as this delay is attributable to the Senate, I assume full responsibility. It has been the announced intention of the leadership to await a bill from the House on this measure rather than to seek to proceed independently on a separate Senate bill. The hope was to simplify and to reduce the procedural gamut which—as every Member knows—must be run by any such bill in the Congress and, particularly, in the Senate. The hope was that by awaiting House action we would have been enabled—as a body—to face this issue, as indeed it must be faced, whole and directly, on its merits and resolve it more quickly.

But the House action has been a long time in coming. It may be that, in the end, the leadership will have to suggest alternative approaches to the Senate. However that may be, the issue will be faced and it will be faced whole by this Senate in this Congress. Regardless of political consequences, we cannot ignore, we cannot turn our back on a matter whose long neglect has not only brought us to the edge of and over the edge of street-violence, but an issue which has seared the conscience of the Nation deeply and opened up fundamental questions which we have not heretofore had the courage or the inclination to ask ourselves.

That is the story of the legislative state of the Congress during the Kennedy administration and, particularly, of the Senate, as the majority leader sees it. It is a barebones story, without embellishment. It is a story written by all the Members and not by the leadership. It is a story of the facts—the significant and enduring facts—as one Senator sees them at the midpoint of the 88th Congress.

Let me turn briefly, now, to another matter, to the matter which is before the Rules Committee, a matter which has cast a shadow of uncertainty over the Senate. I do not presume to look down upon any man from some Olympian height of a superior morality. Most certainly will I not do so when we ourselves are largely to blame for the difficulties which have arisen because it is we who are responsible as a body and we provided little guidance in these matters to staff officials of the Senate. Can we say in good conscience that we made it clear that in the Senate we demanded more of ourselves and, hence, expected more of all those associated with us in the higher interests of this institution and the nation which it serves?

That, Mr. President, is the deeper question which is before the Rules Committee. And the answer which we give to it will affect this institution more deeply and for a long time after the sensationalism of the moment is forgotten.

I turn, finally, to the recent criticism which has been raised as to the quality of the leadership. I do not question the right of anyone to raise this question—certainly not the right of the Senate and the press, to do so. I regard every Member with respect and esteem and every Member in his own way has reciprocated that sentiment, and I am sure that no Member intends to do me ill. As for the press, it has been invariably fair, even kind, in its treatment of me personally. I have never been misquoted on any remarks I have made in the Senate and only on rare occasions have I been misinterpreted and, even then, understandably so.

Of late, Mr. President, the descriptions of the majority leader, of the Senator from Montana, have ranged from a benign Mr. Chips, to glamourless, to tragic mistake. I have not yet seen "wetnurse of the Senate" but that, too, may not be long in coming.

It is true, Mr. President, that I have taught school, although I cannot claim either the tenderness, the understanding, or the perception of Mr. Chips for his charges. I confess freely to a lack of glamour. As for being a tragic mistake, if that means, Mr. President, that I am neither a circus ringmaster, the master of ceremonies of a Senate night club, a tamer of Senate lions, or a wheeler and dealer, then I must accept, too, that title. Indeed, I must accept it, if I am expected as majority leader to be anything other than myself—a Senator from Montana who has had the good fortune to be trusted by his people for over two decades and done the best he knows how to represent them, and to do what he believes to be right for the Nation.

Insofar as I am personally concerned, these or any other labels can be borne. I achieved the height of my political ambitions when I was elected Senator from Montana. When the Senate saw fit to designate me as majority leader, it was the Senate's choice not mine, and what the Senate has bestowed, it is always at liberty to revoke.

But so long as I have this responsibility, it will be discharged to the best of my ability by me as I am. I would not, even if I could, presume to a toughmindedness which, with all due respect to those who use this cliche, I have always had difficulty in distinguishing from softheadedness or simplemindedness. I shall not don any Mandarin's robes or any skin other than that to which I am accustomed in order that I may look like a majority leader or sound like a majority leader—however a majority leader is supposed to look or sound. I am what I am and no title, political facelifter, or imagemaker can alter it.

I believe that I am, as are most Senators, an ordinary American with a normal complement of vices and, I hope, virtues, of weaknesses and, I hope, strengths. As such, I do my best to be courteous, decent, and understanding of others and sometimes fail at it. But it is for the Senate to decide whether these characteristics are incompatible with the leadership.

I have tried to treat others as I would like to be treated and almost invariably have been. And it is for the Senate to decide, too, whether that characteristic is incompatible with the Senate leadership.

I have done my best to serve the people whom I represent and, at the same time, to exercise such independent judgment as I may have as to what is best for the Nation as a whole, on national and international issues. If that is incompatible with the Senate leadership that, too, is for the Senate to decide.

I have always felt that the President of the United States—whoever he may be—is entitled to the dignity of his office and is worthy of the respect of the Senate. I have always felt that he bears a greater burden of responsibility than any individual Senator for the welfare and security of the Nation, for he, alone, can speak for the Nation abroad; and he alone, at home, stands with the Congress as a whole, as constituted representatives of the entire American people. In the exercise of his grave responsibilities, I believe we have a profound responsibility to give him whatever understanding and support we can, in good conscience and in conformity with our independent duties. I believe we owe it to the Nation of which all our States are a part—particularly in matters of foreign relations—to give to him not only responsible opposition but responsible cooperation. If these concepts, too, are incompatible with the majority leadership, then that, too, is for the Senate to decide.

And, finally, within this body I believe that every Member ought to be equal in fact, no less than in theory, that they have a primary responsibility to the people whom they represent to face the legislative issues of the Nation. And to the extent that the Senate may be inadequate in this connection, the remedy lies not, in the seeking of shortcuts, not in the cracking of nonexistent whips, not in wheeling and dealing, but in an honest facing of the situation and a resolution of it by the Senate itself, by accommodation, by respect for one another, by mutual restraint and, as necessary, adjustments in the procedures of this body.

I have been charged with lecturing the Senate. And perhaps these remarks will also be interpreted in this fashion. But all I have tried to do is state the facts of this institution as I see them. The constitutional authority and responsibility does not lie with the leadership. It lies with all of us individually, collectively, and equally. And in the last analysis, deviations from that principle must in the end act to the detriment of the institution. And, in the end, that principle cannot be made to prevail by rules. It can prevail only if there is a high degree of accommodation, mutual restraint and a measure of courage—in spite of our weaknesses—in all of us. It can prevail only, if we recognize that, in the end, it is not the Senators as individuals who are of fundamental importance. In the end, it is the institution of the Senate. It is the Senate itself as one of the foundations of the Constitution. It is the Senate as one of the rocks of the Republic.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, at the end of the statement, a detailed, item-by-item record of the action on President Kennedy's legislative recommendations, as it has been taken either by the Congress as a whole or by the Senate alone. I also ask unanimous consent that the press interview on the state of the Senate and its leadership which I gave on November 13, 1963, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandums were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATE AND ITS LEADERSHIP

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last week I was interviewed in my office by Mr. Jerry O'Leary, of the Washington Star; Mr. Richard Dudman, of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch; Mr. J. F. Ter Horst, of the Detroit News; and Mr. George R. Kentera, of the Newark News. A condensation of this interview, I assume, appeared in their Sunday papers. The condensation, which was necessitated by space limitations in the papers, was made by the interviewers. It is, in my judgment, faithful to the sense and tone of the interview, and it had my approval. But a condensation can never be the full story. And insofar as the Senate is concerned, it ought to have the full story. The reporters who conducted the interview were aware of and approved my intention of placing the full verbatim text in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD subsequent to the publication of the condensation.

I shall do so today. I want the record to be clear and complete as to my attitude on the questions which have been expressed of late on this Senate and its leadership. This interview may not be the last word which I shall have to say on the subject. But because the interview was wholly spontaneous and conducted by highly skilled reporters, it provides an authentic indication of what the Senator from Montana, the majority leader, thinks on subjects which are or ought to be of concern—of very deep concern—to every Member of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the verbatim transcript of the interview to be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"INTERVIEW WITH HON. MIKE MANSFIELD, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF MONTANA, 2 P.M., WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1963, ROOM S-208, THE CAPITOL

"Proceedings

"Question. Senator MANSFIELD, there has been a lot said on the Senate floor and in the newspapers about the quality of leadership in the Senate. Since leadership is frequently measured by what is or is not accomplished, can you tell us how you view the record of the Senate under your leadership?

"Senator MANSFIELD. Well, as far as the analysis of the leadership or a leader is concerned, that is up to each individual to decide as to whether it is good, bad, or indifferent. But I think the final test is what the Senate has done.

"I would say that the Senate, up to this time, has made a very respectable record, and for this the Senate should get credit. As far as the Congress is concerned, we have completed action on 43 pieces of legislation out of 128, including appropriations, asked for by the President this year.

"In addition to that, 24 other measures, which have been recommended by the President, have passed the Senate. One measure has a conference report filed and will be brought up some time after the aid bill is out of the way.

"There are four measures in conference between the two Houses. That brings us to a total of 72 items passed either by the Congress as a whole or by the Senate, or in conference. Out of a total of 128 Presidential recommendations this year, and that is the total of the Presidential recommendations, that would give us an average of 58 percent up to this moment.

"Question. Senator, could you break those down as to whether they are major pieces or minor pieces, and what are some of the measures that have been passed by the Senate?

"Senator MANSFIELD. Well, there have been a number of important measures passed. For example, the Defense Appropriations Act is one. That amounted to about $47 to $48 billion. Equal pay for women, the feed grains bill, housing for the elderly, medical education aid, a mental health bill of tremendous importance; maternal and child health services, military construction, military pay, the nuclear test ban treaty, the public debt ceiling has been attended to twice, the difficult railroad labor dispute has been settled at least on a temporary basis until next March 1.

"We have repealed the Silver Purchase Act; passed six treaties in addition to the nuclear test ban treaty. In conference we have the Pacific Northwest power bill, the vocational education bill, which is quite important. Out of conference and ready to come up we have the higher education bill, which is also of major significance.

"All those bills, of course, are not major, but I would point out that in all the Presidential recommendations, as I see the picture now, there remain only three bills which could be considered of really major significance. They are, of course, the tax bill, the civil rights bill, and the health care for the aged bill.

"Question. Senator, do you think it will be possible in the time that is left before Christmas to get action on either of those two big ones, the tax or civil rights?

"Senator MANSFIELD. The best I can say at this time is that I am hopeful that one or the other will be brought up before Christmas.

"Question. In the Senate?

"Senator MANSFIELD. In the Senate.

"Question. As the priority determines, Senator, the civil rights bill will probably have to be first?

"Senator MANSFIELD. Whichever one is ready first we will take up.

"Question. Senator DIRKSEN estimated yesterday it would be March 15 before the Finance Committee gets the tax bill out on the floor. Does it look that far away to you?

"Senator MANSFIELD. Maybe Senator DIRKSEN is being a little too pessimistic. It is my understanding that the hearings will conclude on the tax bill on December 13.

"I would assume they would take several weeks to mark up that bill, which would indicate that it might be available sometime after the first of the year for action on the Senate floor.

"So I would hope that if we do not get a civil rights bill in between, that we would be ready to take up the tax bill shortly after New Year's.

"Question. Senator, it has been generally said and understood that the Congress will probably adjourn on December 20. Do you anticipate the civil rights bill could come up before then? If so, wouldn't that prolong the session due to lengthy debate?

"Senator MANSFIELD. No. If the civil rights bill does come up before then, we will take it up, but we will go out at the conclusion of business on December 20 and we will not come back until the day after New Year's.

"I see no reason to keep the Senate in during the Christmas and New Year's holidays. After all, this is only the 1st session of the 88th Congress. We have another session. There is no breakoff. There is no final adjournment. We have the time to do the work which will have to be done.

"Question. Senator, do you think from now on Congress, because of the growth of the country and so on, is going to be in session all year, or do you think they might do something that would shorten the sessions in the future?

"Senator MANSFIELD. Well, I would hope that they could shorten sessions or prepare themselves to operate on a year-round basis. But if they are going to shorten the sessions, they are going to have to bring about some reforms in the rules of the Senate pertaining to germaneness. They will have to do something about the fact that the Finance Committee in the Senate cannot take up a measure such as the tax bill, for example, until the House Ways and Means Committee is through with it and it has passed that body.

"I believe the time taken on that bill in the other House was approximately 9 months this year. That applies to other bills out of the House Ways and Means Committee, too.

"Question. The custom applies that to appropriations also, does it not?

"Senator MANSFIELD. That is correct. Some people say that the House has a constitutional right. I think that is a debatable question. But I would think that a formula based on what Senator RUSSELL proposed some months ago, to the effect that consideration be given to half the bills originating in each House, is worthy of consideration, or at least that we could start hearings at the same time the other body does.

"The same reasoning applies to bills out of the Ways and Means Committee because, unfortunately, the Senate is blamed all too often for delays when, as a matter of fact, we are unable to act in our committees until the opposite committees in the House have acted on the legislation under consideration.

"Question. Except for those difficulties you have mentioned, are you generally satisfied with the pace of business in the Senate this year?

"Senator MANSFIELD. Yes; I am satisfied. I think that the Senate as a whole has done a very creditable job. I think you only have to look at the calendar to find out that we are pretty well caught up.

"If you will check with the individual committees, except for the Finance and the Appropriations Committees, and for reasons beyond their control, you will find that they have been on the ball pretty much all year. Contrary to popular reports, a good deal of really responsible legislation has been reported out of the committees, has been considered by the Senate, and has been passed.

"Question. Senator, in view of that, you would think that most of the Members of the Senate would share your pride in what has been accomplished and wouldn't be indulging in some of the criticisms of other Members of the Senate that we had last week?

"To what would you attribute this restlessness or backbiting, or whatever it can be described as?

"Senator MANSFIELD. I think the Members are getting a little restless, a little edgy. It has been a long session. It hasn't been a dramatic or glamorous session. There are other responsibilities which impinge upon the activities of the Members of this body. But I would say that by and large, there are very few Members who would be willing to stand up and state that they are dissatisfied with the progress of the Senate.

"I have heard a lot about these cloakroom rumors. I am afraid that most of these cloakroom rumors come out of the imaginations and the speculations of members of the press. I have yet to see one of these cloakroom commandos that they talk about, and if there are any I wish they would come to me and make their views known, and, as far as I am concerned, would get up on the Senate floor and do the same thing.

"Question. Senator, it is frequently said that you believe in dealing with other Senators as one adult to another and that not all Members of the Senate are prepared for that treatment and really would like to have their arms twisted now and then.

"Senator MANSFIELD. I would disagree completely. I think this is a body of mature men and women. They want to be treated as equals. They are. I expect to be treated by them as I treat them, and I am.

"Question. Senator MANSFIELD, what are your feelings about the resolution introduced the other day by Senator PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin, that the leadership of both Houses should get together and try to expedite the business of the second session of this Congress?

"Senator MANSFIELD. Well, I think that psychologically it may have some effect, but practically it would have none. After all, what power do the leaders have to force these committees, to twist their arms, to wheel and deal, and so forth and so on, to get them to rush things up or to speed their procedure?

"The leaders in the Senate, at least, have no power delegated to them except on the basis of courtesy, accommodation, and a sense of responsibility. I see nothing to be gained by it. I see nothing to be lost by the introduction of that particular resolution.

"Question. Sir, did I understand you to say that it wouldn't help if the committees decided not to go along? You did say there is nothing you can do about the committee pace; is that right?

"Senator MANSFIELD. That is correct. We can ask the committees, and I have had four or five meetings this year with committee chairmen, for reports on their work. I have asked them to speed up their procedures on certain pieces of legislation.

"They have been most cooperative. There has been no dilatoriness that I am aware of, and despite reports to the contrary I have seen no evidence of any delaying action on the part of the southerners; nor have I seen any evidence of delay on the part of Senator BYRD, whose committee is considering the tax bill at the moment. As a matter of fact, on at least three or four occasions over the past 5 or 6 months Senator Byrd has come to me and asked me to see if there wasn't some way the House could speed up the tax bill so that his committee could get started on it.

"He also stated that he thought that they could finish their consideration of the bill in the vicinity of 6 weeks. That has been extended, but I would be the last one in the world to question Harry Byrd's good faith as some have.

"Question. That 6 or 8 weeks would be measured against 8 or 9 months in the House, wouldn't it?

"Senator Mansfield. That is correct. A lot of people do not take that comparison into consideration.

"Question. Senator, do you think the Magnuson plan would help in the future, of having two sessions a year?

"Senator Mansfield. I certainly do. I have advocated it for a long time because what Senator Magnuson's proposal would do would be to have a legislative session and an appropriation session.

"At the present time, what we do is to sandwich the appropriation bills, some of them, way up in the tens of billions of dollars between other legislative proposals. We do not give them the attention they deserve. Consequently, I think we are subject to the charge of hasty and ill-considered legislation, although I must admit in all honesty that we do depend upon committees to a large extent, and we are fairly certain that the committees go into the necessary details and we can take their reports and their recommendations with good heart.

"Question. Senator, what would be necessary to bring this about?

"Senator Mansfield. Just the passage of the Magnuson proposal, which I understand is in the Rules Committee, if it has been introduced this year. I am not certain.

"Question. He told me the other day he was going to ask the Rules Committee to look into it in the coming session.

"Senator Mansfield. Well, I would like to see it reported out. I would like to see it passed, because while tradition is a great thing in the Senate and I believe in it, I think that as times change the Senate has to change, too. This is one way that we could change.

"I think we also ought to reduce the number necessary to invoke cloture from two-thirds of those present and voting to three-fifths. I think we ought to follow Senator Pastore's idea of a rule of germaneness for the first 4 or 5 hours each day, and I think we ought to do something about the authority which each individual Senator has to object to unanimous-consent requests.

"The times call for a change. Changes must be made without undermining the foundations of the Senate as an institution. But with the questions coming before us in this day and age I think that changes are mandatory, though I would not go as far as some of our Members would recommend.

"Question. When you spoke of unanimous consent a while ago, did you mean to a committee meeting or unanimous consent on anything?

"Senator Mansfield. Well, I think we have to be a little selective. To committee meetings, for example. There is no reason why committee meetings cannot meet on many occasions while the Senate is in session. In that way, committee work could be speeded up and legislation could be brought to the floor that much more quickly and possibly as a result in the overall picture the Congress could adjourn that much sooner. But any Senator has the right to object to any kind of a unanimous-consent request, and I think that that gives too much power to any one Senator in a 100-Member body.

"Question. Senator, do you think a majority of the Senators feel this way about it, as you do, and that such a thing could be passed?

"Senator Mansfield. I think at times they feel that way, depending on the circumstances. But I think it would be worth a test on the Senate floor and then we would see what the Senate would feel. No one could tell at the moment.

"Question. In connection with the pace of the Senate and the matter of getting work done, in the last session, in the 87th, there was considerable criticism that the White House had been too heavyhanded on the Hill. This session some of us have heard comments from Members indicating that the President and his advisers have not been there when their help was needed.

"How do you feel about this question of pressure or lack of it or coordination between the Senate and the White House?

"Senator Mansfield. I have had nothing but the utmost in cooperation insofar as Senate-White House relations are concerned. They have been understanding and they have realized that we have our responsibilities.

"As far as I am concerned personally, I have nothing but words of praise for the relationship which exists between the White House and this body.

"Question. One complaint we hear sometimes is that the scheduling of votes is so uncertain that Senators can't tell when it is safe to be out of town and miss a rollcall vote.

"Do you consider that the responsibility of the leadership, to try to group these votes and make the schedule known in advance?

"Senator Mansfield. Insofar as possible. I must say I have been at fault many times in that respect. But when you have people, colleagues, come to you two or three times a week and say, 'Please don't bring up this bill on that day,' 'Please don't vote at this hour,' 'I have an engagement out home and I can't be here,' it places the leadership in a very difficult position, because the leadership cannot tell a Member to stay on the floor. He can ask the Members to stay on the floor, but they can thumb their noses at him and they do it quite often.

"As I said before, the leadership has no real power, none at all. He has to operate on the basis of persuasion, accommodation, understanding, but he has to expect something like that in return. But all too often Members have come to me, and on occasion some have even threatened me, that they didn't want votes at a certain time or on a certain day, that they had engagements back home or they wanted to go some place for some reason, and—very rarely—if I did not accommodate them, well, they would see that there was a lot of talk and no action would be taken on the floor and so forth and so on.

"So the result is we have to try and get along with our colleagues on the best possible basis and do the best we can to keep the wheels of legislation running. Keep in mind the fact that there is always other legislation to be considered and that you need this vote, that vote and all these votes. It isn't easy. You are subject to criticism.

"I have bent perhaps too often to extend favors of this nature to my colleagues. I have been criticized. The criticism is justified. But I do not know how else to operate if the Members themselves do not show a sense of maturity and recognize the fact that their job is here, to represent the people and their States, and that their engagements are of secondary importance.

"Question. Is there too much absenteeism in the Senate?

"Senator Mansfield. There is.

"Question. Sir, it seems inevitable that if and when the civil rights bill comes up in the Senate there is going to be a filibuster of some kind. I think you are aware that in the past there has been some criticism of you on the grounds you haven't held people's feet to the fire, so to speak, and kept them up all night.

"Senator Mansfield. I don't intend to. This is not a circus or a sideshow. We are not operating in a pit with spectators coming into the galleries late at night to see Senators of the Republic come out in bedroom slippers, without neckties, with hair uncombed, and pajama tops sticking out of their necks.

"I believe there is a certain amount of dignity and decorum attached to this institution and to the position that each of us hold. Regardless of the consequences, as far as I am concerned, that dignity will be upheld and the best interests of this institution will be looked after as long as I happen to be the leader.

"Question. You would rather see the rules modernized than go to an endurance contest?

"Senator Mansfield. Of course. Who wins in an endurance contest? Not the older members, not those who may be under medical treatment. But the minority wins, because they are well disciplined; they know what they are doing. They operate on a 4-hour-shift basis. Some of those who are always spouting off and talking about how much they are for civil rights, this, that, or the other thing, where are they when you want them? When you want a quorum call? They are not around.

"So as far as being a whipcracker or a coordinator for a Roman holiday, count me out.

"Question. Senator, it sounds as though you are making a good case for the proposition that being a Senator is a full-time job.

"Senator Mansfield. It is, and it is getting to be more and more of a full-time job. I wish my colleagues would all realize it. Most of them do, fortunately, but not all of them.

"Question. Do you think, sir, that in light of the fact that you think it is a full-time job that the Senate should undertake, or the Congress should undertake, to establish some kind of code of ethics which it expects of the executive branch, so that Members will not have outside financial and business interests which might interfere with their duties here?

"Senator Mansfield. That is a question which I do not feel that I am qualified to answer for the Senate. But I do feel I am qualified to answer personally. As far as I personally am concerned, yes.

"Question. What would be the nature of such a code of ethics?

"Senator Mansfield. As far as I am concerned, speaking personally, not for the Senate, I think it should list outside stockholdings and other business interests, as has been done by Senators Clark, Young of Ohio, Scott of Pennsylvania, and perhaps others.

"I recall several years ago when Senator Clark listed his outside interests. I listed mine. It was very easy. I had none.

"Question. How difficult would it be to get Congress as a whole to require disclosure of that sort?

"Senator Mansfield. That is something that the Congress, itself, should consider, and I personally would not want to talk on it except as it affects me personally.

"Question. Sir, do you think personally that this would increase the confidence of the voters of this country in their elected representatives?

"Senator Mansfield. Not necessarily, because I think that there are those who, if their holdings were common knowledge, would be looked upon with suspicion every time they voted on a certain kind of measure.

"As far as I am concerned, I think that the Senate is a very honest body. I think the individual Members of the Senate are honest representatives of the people. I would not want suspicion to be cast upon them, because after having observed them for several decades now I have nothing but the highest admiration for the membership of this body, not only today but as it existed down through the years that I have been here, and that applies to both Republicans and Democrats.

"Question. But the Congress seems to point this suspicion toward people who are selected for executive jobs in the administration by its actions.

"Senator MANSFIELD. That is correct. I have felt for a long time that the Congress has carried this idea of conflict of interest entirely too far as regards Presidential appointees. A nominee should not be considered dishonest because a particular administration wants him to undertake a particular job.

"The result is we cast guilt on these people who appear before our committees in the process of nomination, unwittingly, of course. We make them strip themselves of their stocks which might come in conflict. I think it is very unfair. I think if a man is brought into Government he should be considered honest until proven otherwise. He should be looked into thoroughly before they are appointed, as I am sure they are, and I do not think they should get rid of their stocks nor do I think they should be subjected to the inquisition which many of them have to suffer on the basis of this conflict-of-interest proposal.

"Question. At any rate, you would say what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander?

"Senator MANSFIELD. As far as I am concerned personally, yes.

"Question. Senator, in light of that, do you think that the Senate's decision to investigate the outside activities of its staff employees should be limited to those employees or should the investigation proceed to wherever the evidence leads it?

"Senator MANSFIELD. It should be limited to those employees who are employees of the Senate as a whole. As far as the employees in a Senator's office are concerned, that is that particular Senator's direct responsibility.

"As far as the Senators themselves are concerned, that is something which they themselves must face up to.

"I would point out that there have been bills in the Rules Committee for well over a decade—I think the longest in time is Senator MORSE's and there have been bills introduced by Senators KEATING, JAVITS, CASE, NEUBERGER, and others—seeking to bring about this disclosure on the part of Senators.

"These bills are lying fallow in the Rules Committee. I would hope that the Rules Committee in good time would take them up and report them out and bring them to the Senate floor for consideration and debate.

"But getting back to your original question, I think the Williams resolution should be adhered to strictly, and that applies only to employees of the Senate. There are bills to take care of the Senators themselves. They should be taken up in due time by the Rules Committee.

"Question. Not as a legal matter, but as a psychological matter, something that might affect the country, isn't there some weight to the argument of a Senate employee who might say, 'Well, what is wrong if I have outside business interests, because my bosses do?'

"Senator MANSFIELD. There is an argument there and a good one. I must say that as far as the outside interests of Senate employees are concerned, the fault primarily lies with the Senate, itself, because we have laid down no rules, regulations, or guidelines. Therefore, the employees of this body are free to do what they want to, within the limits of the law, and it is not up to us to point the finger at them because we haven't said nay nor have we laid out guidelines which they should follow.

"There again I would say that basically the fault is the Senate's for not meeting its obligations and laying out rules and regulations.

"Question. Do you think that the Senate will do that now, that is, issue such guidelines?

"Senator MANSFIELD. I think that they will. As far as Senate employees who are directly or indirectly subject to the Democratic conference, that is being done at the present time.

"Question. Do you think the disclosures about Robert Baker, the former majority secretary, have hurt the reputation of the Senate in the country?

"Senator MANSFIELD. Well, all I can say is this, that as far as Bobby Baker's work in the Senate was concerned, it was excellent and efficient. He did his job well. As for the rest of the question, yes.

"Question. Senator MANSFIELD, do you ever find it frustrating to be leader of a group of 66 other men who range from Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey to Senator LAUSCHE of Ohio?

"Senator MANSFIELD. I find it frustrating, exhilarating, and depressing.

"Question. That is a good note to finish on.

"Question. Sir, I just have one other question, Senator, if I may ask it.

"You come from Montana and the West supposedly is beginning to look like Goldwater territory to a lot of Republicans and perhaps to many Democrats. How do you feel about your own chances for reelection next year and the chances of the Democratic Party doing a better job of picking up Western States they missed in 1960?

"Senator MANSFIELD. First, I wouldn't give the Rocky Mountain West to GOLDWATER. I think it is just as much Kennedy country as it is Goldwater territory.

"Second, as far as my own future is concerned, it is little early for me to say anything. Montana is a two-party State. No one is invincible in this profession. No matter who runs for the Senate next year, he is going to have an extremely difficult job. Campaigns in Montana are tough, but I have been a pretty lucky man. I have been back here for 21 years, which is a long time. I have had the breaks, I have had the benefit of the doubt in the minds of lots of my people.

"When we go into next year's campaign, I will either win or I will lose, and whichever way it comes out I will have no apologies and no regrets.

"Question. You will have no regrets or no inhibitions about campaigning on the Kennedy ticket?

"Senator MANSFIELD. None in the least. I am delighted to campaign on the Kennedy ticket and in behalf of President Kennedy and all the way.

"The PRESS. Thank you very much, Senator."

SENATE ACTION STATUS OF PRESIDENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS (LEGISLATIVE, 122[1]; APPROPRIATIONS, 15), SENATE DEMOCRATIC POLICY COMMITTEE

Recap: Action completed (45); conference reports filed (2); in conference (6); passed Senate (26); Senate Calendar (2); committee action (28); no action (28); no legislation (3).

ACTION COMPLETED (45)

1. AEC authorization. Public Law 88-72.

Appropriations

2. Agriculture supplemental for 1963. Public Law 88-1.
3. Supplemental, 1963. Public Law 88-25.

Fiscal Year 1964

4. Defense. Public Law 88-149.
5. Interior. Public Law 88-79.
6. Labor-HEW. Public Law 88-136.
7. Treasury-Post Office. Public Law 88-39.
8. Civil Rights Commission extension. Public Law 88-152.
9. Corporate-excise tax extension. Public Law 88-52.
10. District of Columbia fiscal affairs. Public Law 88-104.
11. District of Columbia National Cultural Center. Public Law 88-100.
12. Disarmament Agency—increased authorization. Public Law 88-.
13. Equal pay for women. Public Law 88-38.
14. Equal time suspension. Public Law 88-.
15. Export-Import Bank extension. Public 88-101.
16. Feed grains. Public Law 88-26.
17. Foreign Service buildings. Public Law 88-94.
18. Housing for elderly—increased authorization. Public Law 88-158.
19. Medical education aid. Public Law 88-129.
20. Mental health. Public Law 88-129.
21. Mental retardation—Child health. Public Law 88-156.
22. Military construction authorization. Public Law 88-174.
23. Military pay. Public Law 88-132.
24. Military procurement authorization. Public Law 88-28.
25. Outdoor recreation. Public Law 88-29.

26-28. Public debt—increase ceiling: To August 30, 1963, Public Law 88-30; to November 30, 1963, Public Law 88-106; to June 29, 1964, Public Law 88-.

29. Railroad labor dispute. Public Law 88-108.
30. Railroad retirement amendments. Public Law 88-133.
31. Reorganization Plan I—Roosevelt Library. Effective July 26.
32. Silver policy repeal. Public Law 88-36.
33. Space authorization. Public Law 88-113.
34. Tax on air passenger transportation—extend at 5 percent. Public Law 88-52.

Treaties ratified

35. Nuclear test ban.
36. Coffee agreement.
37. Consular convention with Korea.
38. Consular convention with Japan.
39. Extradition Treaty With Brazil—amend.
40. Extradition Treaty With Israel.
41. Extradition Treaty With Sweden.
42. Protocol to International Civil Aviation Convention.
43. UMT extension—4 years. Public Law 88-2.
44. Veterans' family benefits. Public Law 88-21.
45. World Bank—increase capital stock. Public Law 88-178.

CONFERENCE REPORTS FILED (2)

1. Higher education. House adopted November 6.
2. Legislative. House adopted November 13.

IN CONFERENCE (6)

1-3. Appropriations. Agriculture, District of Columbia, independent offices.

4. Foreign aid authorization.
5. Pacific Northwest power.

---

[1] Excluded from totals—awaiting submission of specific proposals.

6. Vocational education—National Defense Education Act—impacted areas.

PASSED SENATE (26)

1. AEC supplemental authorization of $17 million for nuclear weapons program. (November 21.)
2. Air pollution control. (November 19.)
3. Airport construction extension. (August 26.)
4. Area redevelopment. (June 26.)
5. Dairy program. (October 10.)
6. Juvenile Delinquency Act extension. (September 25.)
7. Land-use adjustments. (October 11.)
8–9. Manpower Training Act amendments (two bills).
10. Mass transit. (April 4.)
11–14. Migratory labor: four bills—S. 521, S. 523, S. 524, S. 525.
15. National Defense Education Act—extend loan forgiveness provision. S. 569. (October 24.)
16. National Service Corps. (August 14.)
17. President's Transition Act. Passed Senate amended October 17.
18. Public defenders. (August 6.)
19. SEC amendments. (July 30.)
20–22. Shorelines: Lake Mead; Canyonlands; Ozark National Rivers.
23. Water pollution control. (October 16.)
24. Water resources research program. (April 23.)
25. Wilderness. (April 9.)
26. Youth employment. (April 10.)

SENATE CALENDAR (2)

1. International air rates, S. 1540.
2. Library services construction, S. 2267.

SENATE COMMITTEE ACTION (28)

Appropriations

1–4. State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary, markup week of December 3.

Public works hearings concluded November 20.

Military construction hearings underway.

Foreign aid hearings underway.

5. Civil Rights Act of 1963. Senate Judiciary, intermittent hearings since July 16.
6. Civil service retirement financing, S. 1562. Senate Post Office and Civil Service hearings, concluded August 14.
7. Cotton program. Senate Agriculture hearings, May 20–27.

Education

8–12. (Senate labor hearings, ended June 30). Adult basic education, cooperative research, elementary and secondary school construction, teacher quality, teacher training of exceptional children.
13. Equal employment opportunity, Senate Labor Subcommittee, approved September 16.
14. Foreign Affairs Academy: S. 865. Senate Foreign Relations, markup July 10.
15. Housing for elderly—make single persons eligible for moderate income housing: S. 1170. Senate Banking hearings, October 2–4.
16. Inter-American Bank—increase contribution: H.R. 7406. Senate Foreign Relations hearings, November 15.
17. International Development Association—increase resources S. 2214. Senate Foreign Relations hearings November 15.
18. Land conservation fund, including user fees. Senate Interior hearings concluded March 8. Executive August 26.
19. National Forest Roads and Trails. S. 1147. Senate Public Works Subcommittee, concluded hearings July 31; Executive August 15.
20. Pay bill. Senate Post Office and Civil Service—one hearing September 3.
21. Presidential Commission on Automation. Senate Joint Resolution 105. Senate Labor hearings started November 15.
22. River basin planning. S. 1111. Senate Interior ordered reported November 22.
23. Shorelines: Oregon dunes. S. 1137. Senate Interior ordered reported November 22.
24. Stockpile disposal. S. 2272. Hearings March 7, 1962; January 30, 1963.
25. Tax reform-cut. Senate Finance hearings started October 15.
26–27. Transportation policy (two bills) S. 1061, S. 1062. Senate Commerce hearings concluded October 24.
28. Watershed Act Amendments—multiple use. S. 566. Senate Agriculture hearings June 3.

NO ACTION IN SENATE (28)

1. Air carriers—limit subsidy payments. S. 1884: Senate Commerce.
2. Airports—Dulles and National—management. Senate Commerce.
3. Bank accounts—savings and loans—increase insurance coverage. S. 1799: Senate Banking will wait for House.
4. Bureaus of Community Health and Environmental in NIH—create. Senate Labor.
5. Civil defense—foodstuff stockpile. S. 1711. Senate Armed Services.
6. Coffee Agreement—implement. Senate Finance.
7. District of Columbia home rule—Senate District of Columbia.
8. District of Columbia transit system. Senate District of Columbia.
9. Fallout shelter. Senate Armed Services.
10. Food and drug amendments. Senate Labor.
11. Food stamp plan. Senate Agricultural.
12. FPC—Gas industry. S. 1463: Senate Commerce.
13. Group practice facilities, mortgage insurance. S. 1426: Senate Labor.
14. Hill-Burton Act—extension and expansion. S. 894: Senate Labor.
15. Immigration amendments. S. 1932: Senate Judiciary.
16. Interest equalization tax.
17. Medicare. S. 880: Senate Finance.
18. Mental health—Vocational rehabilitation. S. 968: Senate Labor.
19. Minimum wage coverage expansion. Senate Labor.
20. Patient fee increase. Senate Judiciary.
21. Peace Corps—expansion. Senate Foreign Relations.
22. Political campaign tax incentives. Senate Finance.
23. Public welfare work-training. S. 1803: Senate Finance.
23. Reorganization Act Extension (amended). Senate Government Operations.
25–26. Social Security admendments. S. 1357, 1358. Senate Finance.
27. Unemployment compensation—Permanent program. S. 1542: Senate Finance.
28. U.N. Participation Act. Senate Foreign Relations.

NO LEGISLATION (3[1])

1. Narcotics control. President reviewing Advisory Commission report.
2. User charges—fuels—air freight.
3. Urban Affairs Department.

STATUS OF APPROPRIATION BILLS, FISCAL YEAR 1964 AND SUPPLEMENTS 1963

Enacted into law: (6)

Defense.
Interior.
Labor-HEW.
Treasury-Post Office-Executive Office.
Agriculture supplemental, 1963.
Supplemental, 1963.

Conference report ready: (1)

Legislative—adopted in House November 13.

In conference: (3)

Agriculture.
D.C.
Independent offices.

In Senate committee: (4)

Military construction.
Public works.
State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary. Markup week of December 3.
Foreign aid—hearings started November 18.

No action: (1)

Supplemental, 1964.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MORSE. It was within the right for anyone yesterday, out of loyalty to the President of the United States—if that is their conception of loyalty—to vote to lay the Mundt bill on the table. But I resent the imputation that any Senator who voted in favor of the Mundt bill or against laying it on the table is disloyal to the President. Those that have that conception of loyalty should speak for themselves, but not for those of us in favor of the Mundt bill.

When the White House called my office yesterday morning, through its aid, Mr. Manatos, he notified me that the President would like to have me vote against the Mundt bill. I notified the President, through Mr. Manatos, that I would vote for the Mundt bill because in my judgment it was in the public interest.

The people of Oregon elected me to sit in the Senate and vote in accordance with the facts as I find them, testing those facts against the question of what I believe is in the public interest. I happen to believe it is in the public interest to pass the Mundt bill. When I left my pair to be voted in accordance with the facts as I saw them, I did not cast a vote of disloyalty to the President of the United States. I did not cast my vote on the basis of instructions that came to me from the White House, for in my opinion the President was dead wrong in the position he took on the Mundt bill. I do not sit in the Senate as a Senator of the President of the United States. I sit in the Senate as a Senator of the people of the State of Oregon and it is to them that I owe my trust of following where the facts lead. I owe them and not the President the duty of voting in the Senate in accordance with what I think the best public interest is in connection with any issue and not in accordance with the wish of the President if I consider him to be wrong on any issue. I consider the President to be wrong in his position of opposition to the Mundt bill.

That is a matter of judgment. I am sure it will not be the last time that I will find myself in disagreement with the President of the United States on the merits of some issue.

I yield to no Senator in respect to my personal loyalty to the President of the United States. I have the highest regard for him. My job is to sit in the Senate and vote in accordance with the facts as I find them. I regret very much that, even temporarily, any Member of this body would have cause from the printed mistake in the Congressional Record to believe that I had walked out on my word in connection with the Mundt bill. My word happens to be my bond in this body. From the beginning I have always supported the Mundt bill.

---

[1] Not included in totals for Presidential recommendations.

I make this brief further statement as to the merits because in my judgment we cannot justify, as a matter of public policy, subsidizing the grain dealers of America who wish to sell wheat to Russia—which is their privilege—by assuring them that the taxpayers of the United States will stand by them and guarantee them against any loss.

Our experience with Russian leaders is perfectly clear. We have no assurance that Russian leaders will not find some reason for refusing full payment for the wheat on the basis of many of their rationalizations and their alibis.

I can hear them. They may say that they have found that the wheat is wormy. Or they have found it dirty. Or they have found this and that wrong with the wheat but they have found some excuse for welching on their purchase.

I see no reason why taxpayers' money from the Export-Import Bank should be set up as a subsidy guarantee to the grain dealers of the United States, assuring them that they can go ahead and trade, without loss, because the American taxpayer will guarantee their payments.

That was the reason, and the basic reason, why I was for the Mundt bill. I wish the Record to show that I am still for the Mundt bill.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Plans for Works of Improvement in Various States

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement on Dry Creek, Ga., Fishing Creek, Ga., Little Cache Creek, Ill., Bachelor Run, Ind., Grant-Shanghai Creeks, Kans., Clam River, Mass., Crane Creek, Minn., Briar Creek, Pa., and Glen Hills, Wis. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report on Possibilities for Reducing Federal Expenditures Under the Electric Loan Program

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the possibilities for reducing Federal expenditures under the electric loan program and other matters pertaining to the Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, dated November 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Plans for Works of Improvement in Various States

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement on Big Caney, Kans. and Okla., Town Creek, Miss., Rush Creek, Ohio, and North Fork of Powder River, Wyo. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

H.J. Res. 809. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 1931. A bill to provide that the United States shall hold certain land in trust for the members of the Alamo Band of Puertocito Navajo Indians (Rept. No. 669).

By Mr. BURDICK, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 536. A bill to donate to the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe of the Fort Totten Indian Reservation, N. Dak., approximately 275.74 acres of federally owned land (Rept. No. 670).

By Mr. CHURCH, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2279. A bill to authorize the transfer of the Piegan unit of the Blackfeet Indian irrigation project, Montana, to the landowners within the unit (Rept. No. 671).

By Mr. CHURCH, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1565. A bill to amend the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 857; 25 U.S.C. 406, 407), with respect to the sale of Indian timber (Rept. No. 672).

By Mr. McGOVERN, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 711. A bill to authorize the sale and exchange of isolated tracts of tribal land on the Rosebud Sioux Indian Reservation, S. Dak. (Rept. No. 673).

OREGON DUNES NATIONAL SEASHORE, OREG.—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL AND MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 674)

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 1137) to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore in the State of Oregon and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the minority views of Senators Allott, Mechem, Simpson, and Jordan of Idaho, and the individual views of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Nevada.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 2342. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Toros Torosian; and

S. 2343. A bill for the relief of Josefina B. Sepagan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2344. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Tippitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Yarborough when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 2345. A bill to amend the Federal Fire-Arms Act to further restrict the use of instumentalities of interstate or foreign commerce for the acquisition of firearms for unlawful purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Scott when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. Case, Mr. Clark, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey):

S. 2346. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact of agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. Inouye, and Mr. Javits):

S. 2347. A bill to provide for the establishment of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. Humphrey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2348. A bill to quiet title and possession of certain lands in St. Clair County, Ala.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 2349. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. John C. Alford, U.S. Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. Clark):

S. 2350. A bill to provide for judicial review of the constitutionality of grants or loans under certain acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

MRS. MARIE TIPPITT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Tippitt. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2344) for the relief of Mrs. Marie Tippitt, introduced by Mr. Yarborough, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Marie Tippitt of Dallas, Texas, the sum of $10,000, for services rendered the United States by her late husband, J. D. Tippitt, who gave his life in the line of duty searching for the assassin of the late President of the United States, John F. Kennedy.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FIREARMS ACT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act to further restrict the use of interstate or foreign commerce for the acquisition of firearms for unlawful purposes.

The bill will make it unlawful for any manufacturer or dealer to ship, transport, or cause to be shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce any firearms to any person, other than a person excepted by section 4 from the provisions of this act, unless such person has delivered to such manufacturer or dealer a written certificate by a duly designated law enforcement officer of the State or political subdivision thereof within which such person resides. Each such certificate executed by any law enforcement officer with respect to any person shall contain the following information:

First. The purpose for which such person is seeking to acquire such firearm, as declared by such person.

Second. A description of each indictment or conviction of such person, if any, for any crime punishable by imprisonment for a term of 1 year or more, as disclosed by records available to such law enforcement officer.

Third. Any information available to such law enforcement officer indicating whether such person is a fugitive from justice.

Fourth. Any information available to such law enforcement officer as to the probable mental competence and stability of such person, and his reputation for observance of law.

In the bill it is provided that these certificates shall be kept available for 10 years.

To those who fear that the bill would unduly interfere with hunters or farmers, I point out that the bill simply provides a prohibition which will be effective unless there is filed a certificate of the nature described in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2345) to amend the Federal Firearms Act to further restrict the use of instrumentalities of interstate or foreign commerce for the acquisition of firearms for unlawful purposes, introduced by Mr. Scott, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the 87th Congress, I joined with my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] in the introduction of S. 1482. In conference this year on H.R. 6143, in connection with the Ervin amendment to the Senate version of that bill, I agreed with my distinguished colleague from the Third Congressional District in Oregon, Representative Green, that each of us would introduce in this session of the Congress legislation incorporating a judicial review provision.

The legislation which I am introducing today for myself and for the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] honors that commitment. It offers, in my judgment, an avenue of legislative approach for settling the exceedingly difficult constitutional problems which are of such deep concern to those of us who seek to pass the broadest possible educational legislation within the constitutional confines. The bill which is now being introduced I hope will have early hearings and favorable action on the part of the Senate. It meets the criteria of sound legislation in that it will help to resolve differences, which by their nature, are divisive.

Mr. President, I send this bill to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2350) to provide for judicial review of the constitutionality of grants or loans under certain acts, introduced by Mr. Morse (for himself and Mr. Clark), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL AND CORPORATE INCOME TAXES—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NOS. 332 and 333)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 8363) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce individual and corporate income taxes, to make certain structural changes with respect to the income tax, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR COMPREHENSIVE PLANS FOR CERTAIN RIVER BASINS—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 334)

Mr. SIMPSON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 8667) authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL FIREARMS ACT—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 335)

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by us, to the bill (S. 1975) to amend the Federal Firearms Act.

Mr. President, from the tragedy of Dallas, we have been made aware of the inadequacy in this Nation's control over lethal weapons. The Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency has long been a voice in the wilderness warning of the dangers of the indiscriminate availability of weapons to juveniles, criminals, and narcotic addicts. Throughout two and one-half years of investigation, we have found that the secrecy which shrouds the mail-order gun business has allowed those with the capabilities of committing monstrous crimes against society to clandestinely avail themselves of the means to do so.

On August 2, 1963, I introduced a bill that would help to prevent the tragedy that occurred on November 22, 1963.

My bill would insure that the purchaser of a mail-order weapon could not use the privilege of the mails to disguise his identity and eventually his evil deed.

My bill would insure that, as a minimum, a person provide his correct age, name, address, whether or not he has a criminal record, and that he is complying with the laws of the State in which he resides.

Lee Harvey Oswald purchased his terrible weapon by concealing his true name and address.

On the introduction of this bill, the subcommittee had the complete support of the National Rifle Association, the domestic arms manufacturers, and the major gun clubs of this Nation.

In view of the tragic events we have just been through, I feel that my bill should now be reevaluated and strengthened where feasible.

This I have done.

I have decided to amend S. 1975 to include all firearms regardless of size, shape, or description.

I have amended my bill to require that not only must a person provide an affidavit attesting to his age, name, address, and criminal record, if he has one, and his compliance with State gun laws, but, in addition, the affidavit must be authenticated by the highest local law enforcement authority in his community.

The other provisions of my bill stand as is.

Briefly, they put responsibility on both the mail-order seller and the common carrier to determine that they are not delivering a murderous weapon into the hands of a juvenile or a criminal.

I am certain that the responsible, law-abiding sportsmen and gun owners in the United States will be willing to tolerate what I feel is only a slight inconvenience at worst. Certainly my bill will be a step forward to get some measure of control over the intolerable situation that prevails today with respect to the sale of firearms.

What more do we need than the death of a beloved President to arouse us to place some regulation on this traffic in guns used for crime.

Mr. President, I urge that my bill be given swift consideration by the Commerce Committee, the urgent attention of every Member of the Senate, and the quick passage by the Congress of the United States.

I am sure our new President would want the Senate to take these steps.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the Record, and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

On page 2, strike out lines 11 through 14.

On page 2, line 15, strike out "(5)" and insert "(4)".

On page 2, line 20, strike out "(6)" and insert "(5)".

On page 3, line 4, strike out "(7)" and insert "(6)".

On page 3, line 10, strike out "(8)" and insert "(7)".

On page 3, line 14, strike out "(9)" and insert "(8)".

On page 3, line 16, strike out "(10)" and insert "(9)".

On page 3, line 21, strike out "(11)" and insert "(10)".

On page 5, line 5, beginning with "handgun" strike out all through "1954" in line 7 and insert "firearm".

On page 5, line 8, strike out "handguns or such firearms are" and insert "a firearm is".

On page 5, line 11, beginning with "handgun" strike out all through "1954" in line 13 and insert "firearm".

On page 5, beginning with line 16, strike out all through line 14 on page 6 and insert the following:

"( ) It shall be unlawful for any manufacturer or dealer to ship any firearm in interstate or foreign commerce to any person other than a licensed manufacturer or licensed dealer or person exhibiting a license as prescribed in subsection (c) of this section, unless the person to whom such firearm is to be shipped has submitted to such manufacturer or dealer—

"(1) a sworn statement in such form and manner as the Secretary shall by regulations prescribe, attested to by a notary public, to the effect that (A) such person is eighteen years or more of age, (B) he is not a person prohibited by this Act from receiving a firearm in interstate or foreign commerce, and (C) there are no provisions of law, regulations, or ordinances applicable to the locality to which the firearm will be shipped which would be violated by such person's receipt or possession of the firearm; and

"(2) a certificate by the chief law enforcement officer of the locality in which such person resides, as prescribed by the Secretary by regulations, to the effect that, to the best of his knowledge and belief, the statements made by such person in his sworn statement are true.

It shall be unlawful for any person to cause to be transmitted by United States mail, or to cause to be transported in interstate or foreign commerce, a sworn statement described in paragraph (1) which contains any false statement as to any material fact for the purpose of obtaining a firearm."

On page 8, line 14, strike out "SEC. 904. EXEMPTIONS.—" and insert "SEC. 4."

On page 10, strike out lines 1, 2, and 3 and insert the following:

"SEC. 6. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective on the date of the enactment of this Act; except that the amendments made by section 3 of this Act to section 3(a) of the Federal Firearms Act shall not apply to any manufacturer or dealer licensed under the Federal Firearms Act on the date of the enactment of this Act until the expiration of the license held by such manufacturer or dealer on such date."

RENAMING OF NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER—ADDITIONAL TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON THE DESK FOR COSPONSORS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced S. 2341 to rename the National Cultural Center in honor of our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. I asked and received unanimous consent for the bill to remain at the desk for possible additional cosponsors until Friday, November 29.

In view of the fact that we are entering a period of the Thanksgiving holidays and many Senators will be away from the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk for an additional period until Friday, December 6.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON CERTAIN POSTMASTER NOMINATIONS

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, pursuant to the rules for committee procedure of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the standing Subcommittee on Contested Nominations will hold a hearing in room 6202, New Senate Office Building on Wednesday, December 4, 1963, at 10:30 a.m. on the following postmaster nominations for:

First. Garland, Tex.
Second. Port Arthur, Tex.
Third. Belvidere, N.J.
Fourth. Elmer, N.J.
Fifth. Jackson, N.J.
Sixth. Newton, N.J.
Seventh. White House Station, N.J.
Eighth. Morenci, Ariz.
Ninth. Maysville, Ky.

GOVERNMENT GUARANTEES OF CREDIT TO COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate considered at length and took action on S. 2310, Senator MUNDT's bill to prohibit guarantees by the Export-Import Bank of obligations of Communist countries. This was a major bill; it received the prompt and thorough consideration which it deserved.

Yesterday I expressed my thanks briefly to the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], for his handling of the matter. My remarks were all too brief, and I should like to call the attention of the Senate again to the help it has received from the chairman and the members of that committee.

Less than 2 weeks ago, on Friday, November 15, and late in the day at that, the bill was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee with instructions to hold hearings and report back to the Senate by November 25.

The chairman carried out these instructions to the letter. Hearings were held on Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, November 20, 21 and 22, at which both sides had full opportunity to present their case and both sides took full advantage to do so. Senator MUNDT and Senator FULBRIGHT made full and strong presentations of their sides of the argument; the administration presented its views fully and ably; and many public witnesses also were heard. The transcript of the hearings was available in printed form in a volume of 275 pages by Monday morning, and the frequent references to the printed hearings on the floor demonstrate the value of the hearings and the transcripts of them.

The committee met Monday, November 25, at hy request, under very trying circumstances. I was distressed, and the chairman of the committee was distressed, to hold the meeting under these circumstances, but it seemed necessary and it seemed appropriate.

I think the Senate should take notice of the way in which this difficult and important task has been carried out by the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Senator from Virginia, and also by the ranking Members, the Senators from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and Utah [Mr. BENNETT], and the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on International Finance, the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK]. They have demonstrated that the Senate is able to carry on its functions under the most difficult and distressing of circumstances in keeping with its tradition.

I should like at this point also to thank the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee and the committee's members for their record this year. Among the major bills which this committee has considered and acted on are the SEC legislation, S. 1642, the mass transportation bill, S. 6, the extension of the Area Redevelopment Act, S. 1163, the repeal of the Silver Purchase Acts, H.R. 5389—and I see that the first $1 Federal Reserve notes under that act are being issued today, the authorization for a new mint building in Philadelphia and many other bills.

I ask unanimous consent to print at this point in the RECORD a list of the bills reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, indicating the status of each.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, 88th Cong., 1st sess.

No.	Description	Senate Report No.	Final action (Nov. 27, 1963)
S. 6	Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963	82	Passed Senate Apr. 4, 1963.
S. 874	Additional mint facilities	163	Public Law 88-102.
H.R. 5389	Repealing certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver.	175	Public Law 88-36.
S. 1163	Area Redevelopment Act Amendments, 1963	250	Passed Senate June 26, 1963.
H.R. 3872	Export-Import Bank Act extension	262	Public Law 88-101.
S. 1125	Nevada 100th anniversary medal	290	Public Law 88-147.
S. 743	Padre Junipero Serra 250th anniversary medal	291	Public Law 88-143.
H.J. Res. 467	2-year extension of FHA sec. 221 mortgage insurance authority.	304	Public Law 88-54.
S. 879	Battle of Lake Erie 150th anniversary medal	314	Passed Senate June 27, 1963.
S. 1642	Securities and Exchange Commission legislation, 1963	379	Passed Senate July 30, 1963.
S. 1952	Extension of authority to insure mortgages under secs. 809 and 810 of the National Housing Act.	487	Public Law 88-127.
H.R. 772	Transfer of certain property purchased for low-rent housing project in Detroit, Mich.	508	Public Law 88-141.
H.R. 4842	Amendments to the Federal Credit Union Act	509	Public Law 88-150.
H.J. Res. 724	Housing for the elderly	561	Public Law 88-158.

Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, 88th Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

No.	Description	Senate Report No.	Final action (Nov. 27, 1963)
S. 2228	Annual meetings of national banks	622	Passed Senate Nov. 5, 1963.
S. 1241	Annual reports under the RFC Liquidation Act	628	Do.
H.R. 3488	Indiana statehood commemorative medals	630	Passed Senate Nov. 7, 1963.
H.R. 7193	ILGWU Health Center 50th anniversary medals	631	Do.
S. 2079	New York Historic Shrine medals	633	Passed Senate Nov. 8, 1963.
S. 2032	Study of Federal financial assistance to victims of flood disasters.	634	Do.
S. 298	Small Business Investment Act Amendments of 1963	639	Passed Senate Nov. 21, 1963.
S. 1309	Small Business Act Amendments	640	Do.
S.J. Res. 129	Additional funds for sec. 702 programs—reserve of planned public works.	643	Passed Senate Nov. 19, 1963.
S. 2310	Government guarantees of credit	659	Tabled by Senate Nov. 26, 1963.

AMENDMENT OF LIBRARY SERVICES ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Senate on yesterday a bill providing for the extension and expansion of the provisions of the Library Services Act, passed the Senate. Although the timing is incidental, it is certainly fitting that consideration of this support for such an important American institution should coincide with the granting of the national Book-of-the-Month Club awards to outstanding small-community libraries.

In all, the Book-of-the-Month Club chose 45 libraries in as many States to receive the awards. Thirty-five institutions will receive State awards of $1,000, and the remaining 10 will receive national prizes of $1,500.

I am very pleased to note that one of the national winners was the Lincoln County Free Library of Libby, Mont. This library, small in size, perhaps, but playing a large role in that northwestern Montana community, typifies the efforts being made across the Nation by smaller libraries to alert the public to their accomplishments and needs. It is in recognition of this effort that the national award was made.

Presentation of the cash awards will be made on April 12 of next year, the first Sunday in National Library Week. I would like to take this opportunity to extend my best wishes to the community of Libby, Mont., and to Librarian Mrs. Inez Herrig and the staff of the Lincoln County Free Library, for winning this outstanding honor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a list of the National and State winners of the Book-of-the-Month Club library awards, as well as a news release from the club.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIBRARY AWARDS IN 45 STATES ANNOUNCED BY BOOK-OF-THE MONTH CLUB

NEW YORK, N.Y., November 25, 1963.—Harry Scherman, chairman of the Book-of-the-Month Club, today announced the annual winners of the 1964 Book-of-the-Month Club Library Awards given in memory of Dorothy Canfield Fisher. This national awards program, open to libraries in towns of 25,000 or less, in every State of the Union as well as Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, was first established in 1959 to encourage interest in and support of small-community libraries.

The Public Library Association, a division of the American Library Association, set up the criteria for the awards, and selected the 45 winning libraries from among applications screened by the State library agencies. Thirty-five of these libraries will receive $1,000 awards, nine will receive $1,500 awards, and one will receive the main award of $5,000. The 35 State winners and the 10 national winners are announced today and the main award winner will be announced by the Book-of-the-Month Club in January.

According to Mr. Scherman, the 5-year history of these awards has shown that they mean far more to the libraries than the winning of a cash prize. This is because they represent an opportunity to review their activities, and to achieve public recognition by national leaders in the library field—an honor that focuses the attention of the State and the Nation upon them. The records show that there is widened public support for each library that applies, whether it receives an award or not.

The year 1964 will mark the sixth year of the Book-of-the-Month Club Library Awards. Including 1964, a total of $157,000 will have been distributed among 124 libraries, bringing dividends of public pride and community financial support in the form of new buildings and expanded service.

An official presentation ceremony will take place in each of the 45 award-winning communities on April 12, the first Sunday of National Library Week. This simultaneous across-the-Nation event is designed to dramatize one of the most pressing problems of the American library system, the universal need of small libraries for more private and public financial support. At each of the ceremonies a distinguished American author or an eminent figure will appear as guest speaker.

BOOK-OF-THE-MONTH CLUB LIBRARY AWARD WINNERS, 1964

NATIONAL AWARD,[1] $1,500

Arkansas, Arkansas River Valley Regional Library, Dardanelle, Ark.

Connecticut, Cheshire Public Library, Cheshire, Conn.

Hawaii, Maui County Library, Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii.

Indiana, Plymouth Public Library, Plymouth, Ind.

Kentucky, Cynthiana Public Library, Cynthiana, Ky.

Massachusetts, Avon Public Library, Avon, Mass.

Minnesota, East Central Regional Library, Cambridge, Minn.

Montana, Lincoln County Free Library, Libby, Mont.

Oregon, Deschutes County Library, Bend, Oreg.

Virginia, Martinsville Memorial Public Library, Martinsville, Va.

STATE AWARD, $1,000

Alaska, Seward Community Library, Seward, Alaska.

Arizona, Gilbert Public Library, Gilbert, Ariz.

California, Plumas County Free Library, Quincy, Calif.

Colorado, Montrose Public Library, Montrose, Colo.

Delaware, Seaford District Library, Seaford, Del.

Florida, Indian River County Library, Vero Beach, Fla.

Georgia, Colquitt-Thomas Regional Library, Moultrie, Ga.

Idaho, Nez Perce County Free Library, Lewiston, Idaho.

Illinois, Woodstock Public Library, Woodstock, Ill.

Iowa, Fairfield Public Library, Fairfield, Iowa.

Kansas, Colby Public Library, Colby, Kans.

Maine, Falmouth Memorial Library, Falmouth, Maine.

Maryland, Kent-Caroline Public Libraries Association, Ridgely, Md.

Michigan, Walled Lake City Library, Walled Lake, Mich.

Missouri, Maryville Public Library, Maryville, Mo.

Nebraska, Sidney Public Library, Sidney, Nebr.

Nevada, Elko-Lander-Eureka County Library System, Elko, Nev.

New Hampshire, Franklin Public Library, Franklin, N.H.

New Jersey, Manasquan Public Library, Manasquan, N.J.

New Mexico, the Public Library, Silver City, N. Mex.

New York, Highland Falls Library, Highland Falls, N.Y.

North Carolina, Southport Public Library, Southport, N.C.

North Dakota, Adams County Library, Hettinger, N. Dak.

Ohio, Ross County District Library, Chillicothe, Ohio.

Oklahoma, Ardmore Public Libraries, Ardmore, Okla.

Pennsylvania, the Hoyt Library, Kingston, Pa.

Rhode Island, North Kingstown Free Library, Wickford-North Kingstown, R.I.

South Carolina, Colleton County Memorial Library, Walterboro, S.C.

South Dakota, Alexander Mitchell Library, Aberdeen, S. Dak.

Tennessee, Bolivar-Hardeman County Library, Bolivar, Tenn.

Texas, Bailey H. Dunlap Memorial Library, La Feria, Tex.

Washington, Mid-Columbia Regional Library, Kennewick, Wash.

West Virginia, Charles W. Gibson Public Library, Buckhannon, W.Va.

Wisconsin, Shawano City-County Library, Shawano, Wis.

Wyoming, Washakie County, Worland, Wyo.

EXPRESSIONS OF REGRET ON TRAGIC DEATH OF THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, during the past few days a great number of telegrams and letters have reached me. They are expressions of regret on the tragic death of President Kennedy. Some came to me in my capacity as majority leader. Others in my capacity as a Senator from Montana and still others as a friend to turn to in order to give voice to a profound grief.

The telegrams came from Canada and from many countries in Latin America. They came from France, Denmark, Germany. They came from "just simple Montana people," from Indian tribes and from an association of sergeants at the San Antonio Air Base and from student associations in my State. They have one characteristic in common—an outpouring of a deep grief at the terrible loss. It is a grief which cannot be comforted by words. It can only be made to recede by a rededication to the purposes for which President Kennedy strove—a more decent nation in a more decent world.

---

[1] One of these 10 will be chosen in January to receive the main award of $5,000.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a selection of telegrams and letters be included at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Helena, Mont.,
November 22, 1963.

Senator Mike Mansfield,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Although we are just simple Montana people we wish to extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. John F. Kennedy and family, the greatest President since Franklin Delano Roosevelt. May God be good to us as we will need all of His grace in the months to come.

Mr. Edward J. Wordal.

Billings, Mont.

Senator Mike Mansfield,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I am extremely proud of your actions in this time of tragedy.

Express our support for you and President Johnson in the future.

Bill Speare.

Bozeman, Mont.,
November 22, 1963.

Senator Mike Mansfield,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Mannix Electric, Inc., and each employee requests you to extend every condolence to the Kennedy family. Also, we want you to know we have the utmost confidence that you will see, after proper and full investigation is conducted, that the responsible people will be made sorry they executed this plot.

Con Mannix,
President.
Otto Zeier,
David R. Bruck,
David Anderson,
Frank A. Hays,
Florence A. Williamson,
Carl Nuber,
Employees.

Great Falls, Mont.,
November 22, 1963.

Hon. Mike Mansfield,
U.S. Senator, State of Montana,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mike: The assassination of our President John F. Kennedy has shocked the citizens of our city. We feel a very personal loss since he visited here with you in September. Knowing that you already are carrying a heavy load, we want you to know that we join the mourning Nation and extend sincere sympathy to Mrs. Kennedy and the children.

Marian S. Erdmann,
Mayor, City of Great Falls, Mont.

Great Falls, Mont.,
November 22, 1963.

Mike Mansfield,
Senate Majority Leader,
Washington, D.C.:

The deepest sympathy and the prayers of the sisters of the College of Great Falls are with you and Congress. May the memory of the great man gone to God be a beacon of inspiration in your effort to preserve and extend the blessings of justice and liberty for all.

Sister Rita,
Sacred Heart President,
College of Great Falls.

Montreal, Que.,
November 22, 1963.

Speaker of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

The council, mayor, and all the citizens of the city of Westmount share your loss of a tremendous leader.

C. H. Drury,
Mayor, City of Westmount.

Great Falls, Mont.,
November 22, 1963.

Senator Mike Mansfield,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The student body of the College of Great Falls shares your grief at the passing of our President. Please convey our sincere sympathy to the President's family and friends. May God bless and guide you in the difficult days ahead.

Sincerely,

Arlen D. Stubes,
Body President,
College of Great Falls.

Westfield, N.J.,
November 22, 1963.

Michael Mansfield,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Huguette in France but know she joins Anthony, Peter, myself in wanting to tell you and Maureen how deeply grieved we are at this monstrous act and we pray the President, with God's help, will continue to work with your help like his predecessor for the peace on earth and good will of mankind.

Rupert.

Oakland, Calif.,
November 23, 1963.

Hon. Mike Mansfield,
The Senate, Washington, D.C.:

My prayers for your strength at this time of deep sorrow and new responsibility are with you and Maureen. May God be with you.

Maxine B. Scott,
Hotel Caremont.

November 22, 1963.

Senado Estados Unidos,
Capitolio, Washington, D.C.:

Konrome Transcribir ustedes siguiente resolucion aprobada unanimidad Senado Nacional Bolivia bipuntos articulo primero rendir su homenaje postumo al gran Presidente John F. Kennedy lider de la hermandad en el mundo muerto alevosamente por mano criminal por defender los derechos de igualdad libertad y mejores condiciones de vida del ser humano. Articulo segundo izar el pabellon nacional en el parlamento durante tres dias como dolorosa expresion del sentimiento del pueblo Boliviano. Articulo tercero hacer llegar al senado Norteamer cano el texto de esta resolucion camaral.

Atentamente,

Federico Fortun Sanjines,
Presidente Senado Nacional.

Montevideo, Uruguay,
November 22, 1963.

Etat al Senado de los Estados Unidos de America, Washington, D.C.:

El Senado de la Republica Oriental Del Uruguay presenta a esa alta corporacion sus mas sentidas condolencias por la muerte del ilustre Presidente John F. Kennedy, que priva a esa eignisima nacion y al mundo, de una de las mas altas expresiones de la democracia y del derecho. Y de un celoso cultor de las supremas leealidades del hombre y de los pueblos.

Martin R. Echegoyen,
Presidente Senado.
Jose Pastor Salvanach,
Secretario.

Butte, Mont.,
November 23, 1963.

Hon. Mike Mansfield,
Senate Majority Leader,
Washington, D.C.:

Express our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Kennedy—Kennedy family and members of the administration.

Dr. and Mrs. Harry G. Farrell.

Butte, Mont.,
November 23, 1963.

Senator Mike Mansfield,
Washington, D.C.:

Please convey our sincere sympathy to the Kennedy family on their tragic loss and the Nation's loss.

Sincerely,

Francis X. Dolan,
Dennis F. Dolan.

Coral Cables, Fla.,
November 23, 1963.

Mike Mansfield,
Senator from Montana,
U.S. Senate, Capitol Building,
Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of the Cuban Medical Association in Exile I express to you our deepest condolence for the death of President Kennedy, victim of a treacherous crime.

Dr. Enrique Huertas,
President, Cuban Medical Association in Exile.

San Antonio, Tex.,
November 23, 1963.

Hon. Mike Mansfield,
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Mansfield: We, the airmen of the U.S. Air Force, join with you and the Nation in mourning the loss of our Commander in Chief, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States. That this Nation, under God, should suffer indignity and shame of this nature when we strive so hard with all our sources to create peace and nonaggression in all the world. It is incomprehensible.

May our combined prayers provide solace for the bereaved families of our great leader.

Benny W. McGehee,
President of the Air Force Sergeant's Association.

Great Falls, Mont.,
November 22, 1963.

Hon. Mike Mansfield,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please convey Cascade County's deepest sympathy to the Kennedy family for you and for our new President Johnson go our prayers for strength and wisdom in the days ahead.

Democratic Central
Committee, Cascade County,
John McLaughlin,
Mrs. P. J. Gilfeather.

Koebenhavn,
November 23, 1963.

The Congress of the United States,
Capitol, Washington, D.C.:

The Parliamente of Denmark wishes to express its heartfelt condolences on the tragic death of President John F. Kennedy.

Gustav Pedersen,
President of the Folketing.

November 23, 1963.

Capitol,
Washington, D.C.:

Our whole sympathy belongs to the greatest President of the United States, John F. Kennedy. May God bless him always.

Family Patan,
Family Knoblock,
Western Germany.

Tokyo, *November 23, 1963.*

Senator Mike J. Mansfield,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Wish to present my profound condolence to the President Kennedy's death.

Yang Il-Dong.

Mexico City, Mex.,
November 24, 1963.

Senator Mike Mansfield,
Senado de Los Estados Unidos,
Washington, D.C.:

A la profunda consternacion causada por el innoble crimen cometido en la persona senor Presidente Kennedy seguira luto mundial para quienes admiramos portentosa magnitud del estadista que habiendo sido el mas insigne abanderado de las causas nobles y justas coma sera por siempre para digma del bien y la paz universales punto sirvase aceptar mis.

As sentidas condolencias por la perdida irreparable ha sufrido pueblo y gobierno Northe Americanos.

Punto respetuosamente,
Dputado Lic Romulo Sanchez Mireles,
Presidente Gran Comision.
H. Camara, *Diputados.*

Paris,
November 22, 1953.

Senator Mike Mansfield,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Our deepest sorrow and condolences.

Robert and Suzanne Louppe.

Guanajuato, Mexico,

Senator Mike Mansfield,
Senador de Los Estados Unidos,
Washington, D.C.:

Unome profunda pena pueblo Noteamerica y sentimientt munidal por muerte excelentsimo Senor Presidente esa nacion punto atentamente gobernador constitucional del estado.

Lic Juan Jose Torres Landa.

Guadalajara, Mex.

Senator Mike Mansfield,
Edificio Del Capitaolio,
Washington, D.C.:

Unome duelo General Perdida Gran Ciudadano America Presidente Kennedy abrazolo sentidamente.

Senador Guillermo Ramirez Valadez.

Long Beach, Calif.,
November 24, 1963.

Senator Mike Mansfield,
Former MSU History and Political Science President, Senate Democratic Leader, Washington, D.C.:

What happened in Dallas, Tex., yesterday is not only a national tragedy; it is a national disgrace. We hang our heads not only in mourning but in shame. So another fragment of the American dream is ripped away before our eyes by ignorance, hate, and murder. Is mankind forever to be ignorant, hateful, and capable of such heinous acts? Oh, Lord, are we Americans to destroy our magnificent testimonial of what free and democratic people can do.

Jim Beakey,
MSU Graduate Teacher.

Guanajuato, Mex.

Senator Mike Mansfield,
Senado de Los Estados Unidos,
Washington, D.C.:

Reuegole aceptar mis sentimientos por muerte excelentisimo Senor Presidente Estados Unidos punto atentamente Secretario Privado C. Gobernador Guanajuato.

Marcos Aguayo Duran.

Havre, Mont.,
November 23, 1963.

Senator Mike Mansfield,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Extend our deepest sympathy for the Kennedy family. The loss of our great President is felt by the tribe for his untiring efforts for the Indian people.

Edward Eagleman,
Secretary, Business Committee.

Mexico City, Mex.,
November 23, 1963.

Senador Mike Mansfield,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Con profunda consternacion he recibido la noticia del asesinatodel Señor Presidente Kennedy su gran amigopunto acompanolo en su pena y por su conducto expreso mi stentida condolencia a todos su colegas del senado puto un abrazo fraternal.

Senador Manuel Moreno Sanchez.

November 25, 1963.

Sympathy as we have all lost a great leader and friend. If and when you see Lyndon please also convey to him our sympathy and warm wishes for the great task that lies ahead of him.

Affectionately,
Jane and Charlie.

Mexico, *November 23, 1963.*

Mr. Mike Mansfield,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Juego a usted aceptar mis mas sentidas condolencias por la muerte de su gran Presidente y muy querido amigo mio John F. Kennedy punto lo saludo afectuous amente punto Secretario Agricultura.

Julian Rodriguez Adame.

November 22, 1963.

Dear Mike: Our hearts are heavy with grief and our minds refuse to believe that our President has been killed.

A first reaction is one of desire for vengeance—an agonized cry against persons or factions which could have been responsible.

Mr. Kennedy has been a good President, and one can only hope that our Nation will give sober thought to our future.

We send our message to you, expressing our sorrow, since you knew him as a friend and since you may let the family know how we Montanans feel.

One can hope that through or because of this tragedy, our people will draw closer to the American hearth in unity of action and peace.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

P.S.—Please be careful, Mike. We don't want to lose you.

Leon, Gto.,
22 de Noviembre de 1963.

Senator Mike Mansfield,
U.S. Senate,
Office of the Majority Leader,
Washington, D.C.

Querido y fino amigo: No habiendo podido comunicarme en estos momentos telefónicamente con usted, séame permitido—usar este medio para presentar por su conducto al Senado de su País mi más profunda condolencia por la pérdida irreparable que acaban de sufrir no sólo los Estados Unidos y México, sino el mundo entero, del más preclaro paladin de la libertad y de la democracia, Señor Presidente John F. Kennedy.

Guardo en mi corazón y mi memorialas deferencias y atenciones que para mí tuvo el Señor Presidente tano en Washington como en México, y siempre pediré al Todo Poderoso por su alma.

Reciban sus compañeros de Gámara y usted, repito, mis mas respetuosas y cariñosas condolencias.

——— ———.

Memorial Resolution

We, the Missoula County, Mont., Democratic Central Committee, gathered in special memorial meeting on this day, November 23, 1963, at 10 a.m., do hereby express our shock over the assassination of President Kennedy. We are stunned and bewildered by this harvest of hate and political immaturity.

For comfort we turn to his courage in seeking peace and justice for a troubled world. We ask, in his words, what we can do for our country. Our answer is a call upon men of good will everywhere to put down their hates, to seek a resolution of differences in a fashion consistent with the dignity of man.

For hope we turn to his successor and pray that God will give him wisdom and courage as he assumes his new burden of Government.

We do, hereby, pledge to President Lyndon B. Johnson our full and energetic support in the days ahead.

We offer our deepest sympathies to Mrs. Kennedy, her children, and the Kennedy families. We offer our assurance that in President Kennedy's memory we will continue to find inspiration.

Thomas F. Murray,
Chairman, Missoula County Democratic Central Committee.

Attest:

Adeline Barton,
Secretary.

Missoula County
Democratic Central Committee,
Missoula, Mont., November 23, 1963.

Senator Mike Mansfield,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Mansfield: I am enclosing a copy of the memorial resolution adopted this morning by the Missoula County Democratic Central Committee.

The original has been forwarded to Mrs. Kennedy.

Sincerely,

Thomas F. Murray,
Chairman.

Rabat,
November 23, 1963.

Senator Mansfield,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Presentons condoleances les plus emues suite deces du President Kennedy heros de is paix heros de la liberte et grand ami du peuple Marocain.

Le Comit Provisoire de la Chambre des Conseillers,
Du Maroc.

Rio de Janeiro,
November 25, 1963.

Senator Mansfield,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Still under the impact of Friday's tragic event. We wish to convey, dear friend, our deepest sympathy.

Elizinha and Walther Moreira Salles.

Cutback, Mont.,
November 25, 1963.

Hon. Mike Mansfield,
Senate Majority Leader,
Washington, D.C.:

To see and hear you give the eulogy in the Capitol for our great and beloved friend most touching in my sorrow. We have lost him but have President Johnson and you. In this hour of darkness and challenge God bless both of you.

Walter Wetzel,
Chairman, Blackfoot Tribe.

Missoula, Mont.,
November 25, 1963.

Senator Mike Mansfield,
U.S. Senate,
Office of the Majority Leader,
Washington, D.C.:

The Associated Students of Montana State University do hereby express our regret over one of the gravest tragedies that has befallen our Nation in the lifetime of many students at Montana State University, the death of John F. Kennedy. We only hope that former President John F. Kennedy, who served during his time of Presidency as an inspiration for the youth of America, because he himself was a young man and because of his ability to work unceasingly for the United States of America, will continue to serve in history as a man with ideas that will inspire students toward building lives of promise.

Rick Jones,
President, Associated Students of Montana State University.

Poplar, Mont.,
November 26, 1963.

Senator Mike Mansfield,
Washington, D.C.:

A humble tribute to President Kennedy, the greatest white father of the vanishing race, shall always be remembered for his New Frontier pace, he has joined the great chiefs at their happy hunting ground, leaving us a cultural transition that may never be found, his love and understanding devotion to all mankind shall never be forgotten throughout the ages of time, divine hopes in a redeemer of his integrity, will enlighten the spirit of preservation in perpetuity. The American Indians shall forever cherish his virtue, especially those of the Assinniboine and Sioux.

Austin Buckles.

Wolfpoint, Mont.

Senator Mike Mansfield,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

We have no words to tell of our grief for the passing of our martial President but only to know that in spite of his physical absence from us the ideals and examples he set shall not die and cannot be taken from us. Please convey this message to the Kennedy family. Letter follows.

Chief First To Fly,
Joseph Wefit,
Representing Indian People of the Fort Peck Reservation, Wolfpoint, Mont.

Washington, D.C.,
November 21, 1963.

Dear Mike: I write at once to share our grief on this tragic day. God rest the soul of John Kennedy and comfort his widow and the family. This loss is profoundly distressing to us all; and I pray that we may learn yet again to value properly what he dedicated himself to do and consider how best to carry out the unfinished task. May God bless our country and guide its people and their representatives and comfort us in our sorrow.

Devotedly your friend,

Andrew.

Montreal, Quebec,
November 23, 1963.

Speaker,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

The IUE Canadian General Electric Conference Board, meeting in Montreal, learned with indescribable shock and mortification of the untimely and unwarranted passing of the President of the United States. We share the mourning of his passing with all people the world over who have come to admire his unmatched capabilities and capacity to promote peace and the well being and equality of mankind everywhere. As we pray for the happy repose of his soul, our prayers and deep condolences go out to his widow and the President's entire family in this hour of monumental grief. You may be sure that all Canadians feel the same sense of immense loss for this great man and good neighbor to the south of us.

Harold Davey,
Chairman.
Robert Orr,
Secretary.

Mexico City, Mexico.

Senator Mike Mansfield,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D.C.:

I beg you to accept my most sincere condolence on the death of President Kennedy, great guardian of the world's peace, and defender of the human rights in the United States.

Sincerely,

Manuel J. Sierra.

THE FLAG AS A SYMBOL IN COMMEMORATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the family of Dr. Stanley B. Covert of Kingfield, Maine, has taken action which I believe should be an inspiration for other Americans and which I would hope they would follow. I commend their example to all Americans.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter that I have received from Dr. Covert be placed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Kingfield, Maine,
November 25, 1963.

Senator Margaret Chase Smith,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Smith: The events of the past few days have caused several outstanding reactions, namely;

1. All people everywhere are shocked and grieved.

2. Most Americans are keeping very close contact with news media.

3. There is widespread desire on the part of a great many individuals to show their respect for and to provide a tribute to President Kennedy.

I am also impressed by the fact that the Nation as a whole exhibits a considerable lack of patriotism and knowledge of our national heroes.

To commemorate President Kennedy and the significance of his passing in the eyes of our children, our family went into the woods and selected a straight spruce tree, shaped it into a flagpole and flew the American flag on our lawn for the first time in 11 years today.

Mrs. Covert and I feel that many families everywhere would be grateful if this means of commemoration were suggested, for it is not difficult to get a flag and fly it. This would provide each family, regardless of financial ability, the means to show that it grieves, and wishes to honor a dedicated President. It seems possible that such a program could result in a considerable increase in patriotic spirit and respect for our leaders, for the flag is a symbol of those things dear to a nation, and the presence of many more flags along our streets could recall sentiments that would live on. And if this came to be, it is suggested that, even in death, President Kennedy would be responsible for a significant achievement in strengthening our Nation.

Our family cannot convey this message, but we believe that if you and others think the idea worthy, it could receive adequate guidance and publication.

Very truly yours,

Stanley B. Covert, M.D.

RESOLUTION OF WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF ATTORNEYS GENERAL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a resolution adopted at the 1963 annual meeting of the Western Association of Attorneys General in opposition to so-called quality stabilization legislation.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Proposed Quality Stabilization Act, 87th Congress, 2d Session

Whereas there is presently pending before the Congress of the United States proposed legislation styled S. 774 and H.R. 3669, bearing the title "Quality Stabilization Act." Although so titled, it is in fact another price maintenance bill of the type which has had the so-called fair trade label for many years.

Whereas S. 774 and H.R. 3669 would authorize the owner of a brand name or trademark to establish the resale prices of goods bearing his identifying mark. The Western Association of Attorneys General, at the 1963 annual meeting, opposes enactment of this legislation or similar legislation which, it is submitted, would result in the following undesirable consequences:

1. Establish price fixing by private individuals as a substitute for free and open competition, the keystone of the American economy;

2. Undermine existing antitrust laws and the free competition system which the antitrust laws are designed to protect;

3. Weaken statutes and principles governing public competitive bidding;

4. Raise prices paid by consumers and thereby encourage inflation;

5. Foster a climate favorable to price fixing agreements among competitors;

6. Increase disrespect for the law because the public and business will attempt to evade what is against their economic interests; and

7. Add the heavy cost of enforcing private price fixing agreements to the cost borne by the consumer.

The Western Association of Attorneys General as an organization and each of its members pledge resistance to the enactment of S. 774 and H.R. 3669. This organization requests its chairman to take immediate steps to make known to Congress its opposition to such legislation, despite the fact that the proposed legislation provides exemption for sales to or by Federal, State, or municipal governments or their political subdivisions or agencies. This exemption clause, in the opinion of the Western Association of Attorneys General, based on previous experience with similar legislation, fails to provide the protection sought for public agencies because it does not permit adequate enforcement or penalties for violation thereof.

"Quality Stabilization Acts" proposed to the last Congress and to the current Congress are opposed by the U.S. Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission, the U.S. Department of Commerce, Council of State Governments, the American Bar Association, the National Association of State Purchasing Officials, and many other public and nonpublic bodies and organizations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western Association of Attorneys General opposes enactment of S. 774 and H.R. 3669 and directs the secretariat to send copies of this resolution to members of the Rules Committee, the House of Representatives, the Senate Commerce Committee, the Attorney General of the United States, and to all Governors and State attorneys general.

CONSERVATISM TODAY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, recently it was my privilege to be interviewed by editors of the New York Times. Specifically I was asked to define "conservatism" and to explain my application of conservatism to the issues of today. This article was handled in such a manner that it fairly represents my views on a number of subjects, and so I ask unanimous consent that the article "GOLDWATER Defines 'Conservatism'" from the November 24, 1963, edition of the New York Times magazine be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The New York Times magazine, Nov. 24, 1963]

GOLDWATER DEFINES CONSERVATISM—THE REPUBLICAN FRONT RUNNER FOR THE PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION NEXT YEAR ANSWERS SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT HIS PHILOSOPHY AND THE NATURE OF THE MOVEMENT WHICH SUPPORTS HIM

(Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, currently front runner for the Republican presidential nomination, was recently interviewed by two members of the New York Times staff. In the course of the talk, the Senator set out his concept of conservatism and discussed elements of the present conservative movement which supports him. Salient parts of the conversation follow.)

Question. Senator GOLDWATER, let me ask you first: Are you surprised by all of this?

Answer. Frankly, I am. This draft thing started without my knowledge and I felt, "Well, let it go. It can't last. At best, it'll go through the summer." I expected it to start losing steam about Labor Day. But it has not, and I do not know where it is going to go from here.

Question. Well, why were you surprised?

Answer. For a number of reasons. First, I never sought this position. I do not seek it now. And yet I am suddenly confronted with a decision of whether to go after it or not.

Then we have the matter of coming from the West, and particularly from a small State. Just looking at it in a practical, realistic way, no man in his right mind would ever chase after this thing if he came from a small State, whether East or West, unless it might be from one of the New England tier.

Question. But you are talking about ordinary circumstances. These are extraordinary circumstances. This whole movement, in a way, is extraordinary.

Answer. It has turned out to be. One of the problems with this movement is that you cannot find anything to parallel it in modern times so as to make some judgments about it. We do not know—is it moving too fast? Is it moving too slowly? Is it too big? Is it too small? What do we do here? We do not have anything to measure by.

Question. Someone has said that this is a protest movement rather than a program movement. What do you think are the elements of the protest?

Answer. Well, first, most political decisions in this country are negative decisions. In my own State, I know of no one's being elected because he presented a better program or was a better guy. It has always been the result of some kind of "against" vote.

You read some of Kennedy's speeches from 1960—about the missile gap, or the lack of international prestige. The appeal he made was to negative feelings of the electorate.

Question. Do you think this was true of Eisenhower?

Answer. In a way. But Eisenhower's victory could have been a victory for Taft, or almost any top Republican, because of the negative feeling against the Truman administration.

Eisenhower himself was a political phenomenon you cannot expect to see repeated in our lifetime. This was a national hero. He could have run on either ticket and he could have run on any kind of platform. He would have been elected. I think he could be reelected today.

Question. Now that you find yourself in this position, do you feel a sense of obligation?

Answer. I—well, you have a very definite feeling of responsibility. You feel a responsibility first to your country—what you might be able to do for it. And you feel a responsibility to your party. Then, in my particular case, I feel a responsibility to the young people who seem to be moving toward conservatism. They are probably my greatest concern as of the moment.

Question. You talked about the negative aspects of an election. Is the youth movement you describe a negative movement? What are the other negative forces that in your opinion have contributed to this boom?

Answer. I think you can separate the young ideas from the older ideas. The older ideas, the older negativism, would be, typically, resistance to high taxes, resistance to an economy that is not moving, resistance to continuing unemployment in the domestic fields. There are others. And there is a growing awareness of union power versus management and government and public power.

Then, in the international field, there is the growing doubt—I will not say fear, but the growing doubt—as to whether or not we are pursuing the right course vis-a-vis communism. The strength of this doubt can only be measured at the polls. But it is a definite factor.

Question. You said you felt that young people are moving toward a conservative viewpoint. To what do you attribute that?

Answer. Nature. Young minds resist the established order. They always have.

I happen to have gone to college for 1 year—in 1928, when my age was swinging away from conservatism. I have often said that if I had finished 4 years in college I probably would have been a liberal along with most of my classmates. Because at the University of Arizona we had very conservative professors. Our parents were conservative. The political philosophy of the day was conservative. But the natural inquisitiveness of the young mind said there must be something else.

In the elections of 1932, my classmates were all backing Roosevelt. They did not know why—it was just something new. Then, when Roosevelt succumbed to the left, they declared themselves liberals and most of them have been so ever since.

Now their children have reached the age where they are beginning to say, "Isn't there something besides the liberal concept?" They are beginning to ask questions just as my generation did. And I just happened to come along at the right time to watch this develop.

Question. So it is almost a rebellion against parents and the established order?

Answer. You cannot really say rebellion. It is a resistance to the established order. But it is perfectly natural among kids. And it can happen in a conservative mind; it can happen in a liberal one.

Question. But you are getting other protests, too. In fact, this is almost the first time when different groups all over the country have focused on one man for such totally different reasons. Some seem to act out of frustration, but they are not even all the same frustrations. Doesn't this disturb you?

Answer. Oh, naturally, you get groups that demand you take a position like opposing the income tax, or that say, "Let's invade Cuba tomorrow." But they are really few in number and, frankly, I do not pay any great attention to them. I think that the press, the country—and many people in the Republican Party—have become unduly exercised about the extreme minority. I was reading an unpublished paper of Madison's the other day and it is very interesting to note that he observed these groups. He called them "accidents." We have always had them in our country.

Question. Eliminating these fringe groups, then, what are the others that go to make up your movement?

Answer. Well, we have talked about youth. We have talked about the older people. Otherwise, I think these people are just generally across the country, at all age levels. They do not belong to any one group, but you will find them through the whole spectrum of American life. And they are worried. They have been worried for some time.

Question. What do you think their philosophy is? What do they stand for?

Answer. That is a tough question. If I were certain of what they were for I could very easily write a platform. I do not think anybody can say what they are for.

Take one area: the trend toward centralized government. Nobody can say that you can do away with the Federal Government, and nobody can say that you can diminish its size to a great extent, but you can diminish its power over local government. Now here is where you begin to run into the varying shades of opinion. There are those people who say, "Get the Federal Government completely out of State and local government." And there are others who say, "Let the Federal Government resume—assume—its constitutional limitations." Some place between those two you have the answer.

Question. Then you are not certain what positive view this element has?

Answer. Let us clear up this positive negative attitude. I think it is a positive attitude to want to stay with the Constitution. I think it is a positive attitude to want to stay with the free enterprise system.

If you approach it from that position then you can say that the negative becomes the other side, those who want to circumvent the Constitution, to misinterpret it, and to replace the free-enterprise system. I would say that the Republican Party in 1964 will present a positive program as opposed to the negativism of the New Frontier.

Question. Did you not say, Senator, that you would find it difficult to write a program to satisfy this large group you are now describing?

Answer. If we sit down and try to be specific, yes. But if you want a statement of principles, such as Eisenhower has proposed and Nixon has proposed and I have proposed, then it is not difficult to be positive and be positive in a way that everybody can understand.

Question. You think you could agree with Messrs. Eisenhower and Nixon on such a statement?

Answer. I think so.

Question. If I were suddenly to say to you, "How do you classify yourself philosophically?" what would be your quick answer?

Answer. I would call myself a conservative although I think history will refer to me as a liberal.

Quesion. How do you define conservative?

Answer. A conservative, briefly, has a philosophy based upon the proven values of the past. When we seek answers for the problems of today we look to the past to see if those problems existed. Generally, they have. So we ask, What was the answer? Did it work? If it did, let us try it again.

Question. Speaking of the past, there is another question. You have taken certain positions in the past but today apparently, upon looking at things anew, you feel these positions do not apply any more.

Answer. I do not think any man living can say that he does not change his mind once in a while. In fact, I would not want a man in office who was so inflexible that he could not budge. And when I am wrong I am going to say I am wrong. I am not going to develop some new theory to prove that I was right the first time and that I am still right.

I have changed my mind, for example—and I have said this for over a year—about the Attorney General's having the power to move in in the case of a school district not integrating upon the complaint, the specific complaint, of a resident of that school district. I would not buy the idea—and I never have—that the Attorney General should be given the power to move in of his own will.

If a Federal court gives an edict, then the Federal Government, I think, has the duty to enforce that edict. If the Attorney General feels today that he does not have the right to move in on the complaint of a resident, let us write a tightly drawn law aiming at the righting of that one particular problem and give it to him.

Question. How does the States rights position come into this picture?

Answer. Once a Federal court has acted, or once a citizen has complained to the Attorney General based upon the Supreme Court's decision, I do not think the States have a right. But I would like to see this thing thrashed out through the courts again.

Question. Have you not said that you did not believe the Supreme Court's order on school integration was necessarily the law of the land?

Answer. I do not think any decision of the Supreme Court is necessarily the law of the land. The Constitution says that the laws of the legislature and treaties are the law of the land.

Now this is a great argument: Is a Supreme Court decision a law of the land or is it merely an interpretation of the Constitution? I think some decisions, given in the form of edicts, certainly would be the law of the land. But the one on school desegregation was not in the form of an edict.

Question. Senator, you have had a lot to say about centralized government, about the need to return powers to the States. When you talk about decentralization, what exactly would you decentralize?

Answer. It is not an easy process. I think if any person of a mind like mine became President it would not be a matter of immediately reversing the field. It would be looking at every new program and saying, "Can this be done better at the State level? If so, that's where it shall be done."

Question. Would you spell out three or four elements which you think are most important, and what you would do to change them?

Answer. First, there is the tax power. The taxing power of the Federal Government is the greatest source of centralized power.

You cannot do much about taxes, of course, until you can reduce expenditures. I think that you can reduce expenditures now maybe in the magnitude of $10 billion. I do not think more than that, and it might not be more than $7 billion. I think you can balance the budget. And once that has been done, then I think you can talk about relieving the load of Federal taxation so that the local governments can tax more.

Question. In social security, what would you do?

Answer. I think that social security should be voluntary. This is the only definite position I have on it. If a man wants it, fine. If he does not want it, he can provide his own.

Question. What other elements of centralization are there?

Answer. Agriculture, for one. Thirty percent of our agriculture is not free. It is not only a terribly expensive approach, but the farmer is deprived of freedom of choice: what he is going to plant, how much he is going to plant, and what his price is going to be.

Or take the Department of the Interior. We in the West have to live with it. The uses of land are much more restricted than they've ever been before. Uncalled-for restrictions have been imposed. Decisions that used to be made at the State level now have to be made here in Washington.

Question. How about labor? Would you propose a right-to-work law now?

Answer. No. I do not think that solves the problem. I am in favor of voluntary unionism. "Right to work" is a misnomer. There is no right to work. You do not have the right to work. Neither do I. We have the right—the privilege—to take a job only if we can. I like to call it voluntary unionism.

I think we should start out on the premise that all States have voluntary unionism and then allow each to enact union-shop laws if it wants.

Question. What about foreign affairs? You have said in effect that it is almost impossible to reach any lasting agreement with the Russians. Then how do you propose to deal with them? What would you do specifically?

Answer. Well, again I would go to history. When have we been successful with—I dislike using the word "Russians," but I guess you have to—with the Communists? Whenever we have been firm, they have backed down. So my answer is let us keep it up. I am convinced that Russia will stand almost anything but an invasion of her own soil before she will go to war.

Question. Have we not been doing this? We did it in Cuba, did we not?

Answer. Yes. Wonderfully. Everybody in the country backed Kennedy to the hilt, and then one day he just pulled off. No more demand for on-site inspections and the thing fell through. So we still have a Communist problem down there. I am convinced that had Kennedy pushed, pushed, pushed, it could have been solved right there.

Question. What could he have done? Would you have invaded Cuba?

Answer. No. I do not think we would ever have had to. I think there were many alternatives open to Kennedy at the time. I think his first boner was the Bay of Pigs—although whether you can blame it entirely on him or not I do not know. Had he continued what he started and augmented it by encouragement of forces other than ours—Cubans, mercenaries—I think the thing would have been stopped.

Question. On the matter of our alliances. You have backed up the alliance with the more powerful countries. But what concession, if any, will you make if the inter-American system, for example, will not go along with our policy of blockade of Cuba?

Answer. I think that whatever we do, in an alliance or not, we have to be prepared to do it ourselves if necessary. I have never been convinced that the Latins would not back us. In fact, the only time I have ever seen real strong unanimity all across Latin America was at the time of Cuba, when they said, "Thank God, the United States is finally acting like a power."

Now, with our Allies, we do not have to go to war to prove to them that we are strong. We do not have to go to war to prove Kennedy's word that the defense of European cities is tantamount to the defense of our cities. But we have to show by consistently strong action that we mean what we say. I think this essentially is the weakness of our foreign policy today.

The Eisenhower-Dulles brinkmanship policy to me was the policy that we should maintain. There was nothing new about it. It has been used successfully since the beginning of history to keep peace.

Question. What do you do when you are a party to an alliance and the commanders agree that a certain number of divisions are necessary for the defense of the area from the Elbe to the North Sea, but they do not come forward with their troops to help defend it. Do you keep a quarter of a million Americans there indefinitely?

Answer. No. I think this is one of the great arguments for a decision on the use of nuclear weapons. I think we could probably return a third—maybe half—of our forces if we gave the NATO command the right to use nuclear weapons—tactical weapons—when they were attacked. If we had the immediate capacity of retaliating and the Communists knew it—and this is the important thing: if they knew it—I doubt that they would ever initiate an attack.

Question. Senator, could we conclude this with a high, wide and not so handsome question? What do you see as the job of the President today?

Answer. Well, it is a very tough job.

Question. Does it frighten you—the prospect that you might be in it?

Answer. Certainly. It scares the living daylights out of me—out of any man.

Question. What about Kennedy?

Answer. It scares the daylights out of him. As for your question: I think it is a job of leadership, a job of decisionmaking. I think this is why Truman is becoming more and more in the minds of Americans a better President, not so much for what he did, but because he made decisions. Eisenhower's greatest days were his days of decision. Kennedy is the same way. When Kennedy makes up his mind, everybody buys it.

Question. How do you direct this leadership?

Answer. How do you exert leadership over a business organization? You do not do it by sitting up on a top floor behind a desk. Nor can you be expected to know everybody. But you understand the problems, and when you are confronted with one that requires a decision it is not put off and put off and put off. A decision is reached.

My experience in business has been that and my experience here in the Senate has been that. One of Taft's great attributes was that he made decisions. You never had to say, "Well, what are we going to do tomorrow?" He told you. That, to me, is leadership.

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY MEMORIAL CENTER

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced the bill, S. 2341, to redesignate the National Cultural Center the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center as a tribute to our late President.

Today I received a letter from Col. Waldron E. Leonard, president of the Metropolitan Area Council of Veterans' Organizations. This council numbers among its members in the District of Columbia, nearby Virginia and Maryland the following organizations: the American Legion, the AMVETS, Army and Navy Union, Catholic War Veterans, Disabled War Veterans, Irish War Veterans, Jewish War Veterans, Legion of Valor, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Military Order of the World Wars, United Spanish War Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Veterans of World War I, World War Memorial and May Day Corp.

President Leonard has polled the members of the council and they are unanimous in the endorsement of S. 2341, which would rename the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center. I am appreciative of the support of the council and felt that my colleagues in the Senate would wish to know of the unanimous endorsement given by this organization and its member groups. I ask unanimous consent that the letter, to which I have referred, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

METROPOLITAN AREA COUNCIL OF VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D.C., November 27, 1963.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.
(Attention: Mr. Lee Williams).

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: I have just polled the members of this council and they are unanimous in the endorsement of S. 2341 redesignating the name from the National Cultural Center to that of John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center.

Sincerely,

WALDRON E. LEONARD,
President.

FOUNDATION OF NORTH AMERICAN INDIAN CULTURE, BISMARCK, N. DAK.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, an important development of great significance to Indian peoples in Canada and the United States is now taking place.

I refer to the organization of the Foundation of North American Indian Culture, a private, nonprofit, education corporation, which will hold its first annual meeting in Bismarck, N. Dak., on December 6 and 7. The Indian Culture Foundation is an outgrowth of the 1963 convention of the National Congress of American Indians held last September in Bismarck.

The importance of this foundation, it seems to me, is the broad scope of its organizers, who have recognized that something must be done in this generation to preserve past and present Indian culture on the North American Continent for our future generations. The foundation has a most comprehensive program—one which deserves support of all persons interested in perpetuating knowledge and works of our Indian people.

The Foundation of North American Indian Culture is the first organization of its kind dealing in Indian matters on an international basis. It seems to preserve this marvelous Indian heritage of Indian people in both Canada and the United States. Its board of directors includes some of the most respected Indian leaders of these two countries. An effort is being made to gain added representation on the foundation board from Mexico, so that the rich Indian culture of our friends to the south may be brought into the overall program of preservation of Indian culture in North America. It is indeed a noble effort in international cooperation.

To cite some of the background of the Foundation of North American Indian Culture, I point out that it was organized during NCAI convention in Bismarck on September 12, 1963. A resolution calling for cooperation between NCAI and the foundation was adopted at this convention and the NCAI executive council suggested 11 names from among its leadership for consideration as foundation board members.

The foundation's organizers established headquarters in Bismarck because of the city's central location in the heart of the North American continent and because of the Indian heritage in this region. Preceding the NCAI convention were several months of careful organizational planning by the organizers, a group of public-spirited North Dakota citizens who were working on the annual convention of the National Indian Congress.

Since its establishment, the foundation has begun a membership drive, has completed plans for its annual meeting in early December and has clearly enunciated its goals and objectives.

These goals and objectives are as follows:

A. LONG RANGE GOALS

First. Provide a clearing house of information in one central location for all persons interested in Indian culture on the North American continent and throughout the world.

Second. To preserve all knowledge, history, artifacts, art work and handicrafts of the North American Indians.

Third. Provide a means of communication between persons interested in Indian culture.

Fourth. Tell the story of the North American Indian, through publication, tapes, filmstrips, films, speakers bureau and the news media. This story of the Indian and his culture, honestly told, will be done on an international basis.

Fifth. Help raise the prestige of North American Indians—among themselves and non-Indians—by displaying what the Indian can do and what talents he possesses.

Sixth. Help increase the economic possibilities for North American Indians by dramatizing this talent in the fields of entertainment, art, music, literature, and so forth.

Seventh. Encourage colleges and universities throughout the North American continent to offer courses in Indian history, art, anthropology and other fields.

Eighth. Help bring people from throughout the world to see firsthand existing Indian culture in its own surroundings.

B. SHORT-RANGE OBJECTIVES

First. Establish permanent headquarters in Bismarck, N. Dak., with office facilities, staff, and other arrangements; November 1963.

Second. Hold an annual meeting for persons in the United States and Canada interested in program of the foundation; December 1963.

Third. Carry on national membership drive—following a Bismarck-Mandan and State drive this fall. Winter and spring 1964.

Fourth. Hold an annual Indian culture exposition in Bismarck; summer 1964.

Fifth. Begin a finance drive nationwide for a permanent headquarters building in Bismarck; fall 1964, winter 1965.

Sixth. Assemble best available Indian entertainment talent, art works, and handicrafts, for international tour; spring 1965.

Seventh. Take traveling entertainment-art show on the road to Europe and major United States, Canadian cities, winding up at second annual exposition; summer 1965.

The foundation will be financed through memberships and by a concerted finance drive throughout the United States and Canada. Finances from endowed foundations, private corporations, and individuals will be secured for office facilities of the foundation, which include construction of a headquarters and information center. An international Indian culture museum is planned for the late 1960's.

The cost of maintaining these headquarters facilities will be met through memberships and through proceeds of an annual North American Indian exposition to be held in Bismarck. This international attraction will include such features as an international Indian art show, a Canadian-United States rodeo, a trade fair of Indian handicraft and other manufactured products, an Indian parade, an Indian entertainment show and pageant, pow-wow dances, and stage shows starring show business celebrities. The Royal Canadian Mounted Police will be invited to participate in this colorful week-long attraction and other events will be included in the first annual exposition. Planning is now underway, and dates will be announced by the foundation at its annual meeting in early December.

In the space of a few short months the Foundation of North American Indian Culture has had tremendous growth. It has won the respect of Indian leaders in Canada and the United States. It has captured the imagination of citizens all over my State of North Dakota and gained backing of our public officials, chambers of commerce, city governments, and others.

I am pleased to report some of the comments on the foundation.

North Dakota Gov. William L. Guy had this to say in a letter to the Foundation:

> I would like to commend all of you for your initiative and vision in establishing this foundation to take note of the impact of Indian culture on our way of life. We in North Dakota are proud of the heritage given us by Indian culture, but it takes such leadership as this foundation will provide to explain this heritage to others throughout the Nation. * * * I know this first annual meeting will be a rewarding experience and I think your plan for an annual exposition on Indian culture to be initiated next summer is a particularly noteworthy idea. I am pleased to note the progress you have already made.

The Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune editorialized this summary of Indian Culture Foundation accomplishments:

> The projected Foundation of North American Indian Culture, which will be headquartered in Bismarck, has interesting possibilities. * * * But like anything that is worthwhile, to bring it to maximum attainment of its far-reaching objectives will take a lot of hard work. It will need the stout support not only of Bismarck-Mandan but of all North Dakota. * * * Basically, these objectives are to preserve and display the culture of the American Indian, past and present, and improve the economic opportunities of the Indian in the process. * * * It would be difficult to find a better location than Bismarck, in the heart of the North American Continent and the center of so much Indian-related history itself, for this Indian cultural center. * * * Here, on the banks of the Missouri, one of the most advanced Indian cultures thrived long before the white man came to disturb it. * * * Here, also, the primitive Indian and the white man came into sharpest conflict in the long battle that was the winning of the West. * * * The Missouri was the highway up which the white man advanced his civilization even as the Indian retreated before him. In this Great Plains area, the Indian actually made his last stand. Here he still makes his home, seeking now to preserve his ethnic heritage in a white man's cultural environment. * * * From the standpoint of the Bismarck-Mandan area, and of North Dakota as a whole, the possibilities for gain from this endeavor are great. * * * We have only to look around to see how successful are other activities in which the Indian is the central figure to know what a great attraction to visitors the planned annual Indian culture exposition here would be. The huge crowds attracted to this fall's convention of the National Congress of American Indians was but a hint. * * * The Foundation naturally must seek and gain support here before it can expect to achieve much elsewhere. It is now in the process of a membership drive. Those who can see the possibilities in what it is trying to do, and want to give it their support, can do so by accepting this opportunity to become a part of it. It could be a tremendous thing for the community, area, State, and region.

In conclusion, I would like to report on the very excellent plans made for the foundation's annual meeting, December 6–7.

The annual meeting sessions will take place in the Grand Pacific Hotel, opening at 9 a.m. on December 6 and closing at 4 p.m. on December 7. The December 6 sessions will include an official welcome, reports on organization, membership and finance, formal incorporation eceremonies of the foundation, six simultaneous panel discussions and a review of each before a general assembly and an awareness program by a group of Indian students, a luncheon meeting and a banquet and program of Indian entertainment in the evening. The December 7 sessions will cover the board of directors meeting and planning sessions of the annual exposition committees.

Dr. Sol Tax, noted anthropologist and dean of the University of Chicago Extension Division, will deliver the meeting's main address at a December 6 luncheon. Dr. Tax is an authority on Indian culture.

Two well known Indian entertainers—Anita de Fre'y and Hot'e Casella, both of New York City—will be among featured performers on the December 6 evening program of banquet and Indian entertainment. Dance teams, drummers, and chanters from nearby reservations also will take part in this program. Will Rogers, Jr., Beverly Hills, Calif., has been invited to M.C. the program.

Chairmen have been secured for the six panel discussions on the afternoon of December 6. They are:

Entertainment potential in Indian Culture: Robert Burnette, Washington, D.C., executive director, National Congress of American Indians.

Employment possibilities in Indian culture: George Schmidt, Aberdeen, S. Dak., Area Resources and Industrial Development Officer, Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Tourism outlook in Indian culture: John H. Sticher, Washington, D.C., Tourism Development Specialist, BIA.

Historical aspects of Indian culture: Miss Lyla Hoffine, Minot, N. Dak., English Department, Minot State College.

Technical and financial possibilities: Harold Schunk, Rosebud, S. Dak., Rosebud Agency Superintendent.

Arts and crafts marketing potential: Miss Alice Lighthall, Montreal, Quebec, vice president, Canadian Handicraft Guild.

The six panel discussions will begin at 1:30 and last until 3:30 p.m., followed by a 1½-hour period devoted to 15-mnute reviews of each panel. Transcripts will be made of each recorder's summary and will be made available to the public upon request.

Plans for the December 6–7 annual meeting are being coordinated by seven committees under the general chairmanship of Bismarck businessman Chester Perry. The next meeting of the annual meeting committees is set for 10 a.m., November 22, in the Arikara Room of the Grand Pacific Hotel. Committees appointed for the annual meeting are: Banquet and ticket sales, reception and registration, program planning, hospitality, membership, annual exposition planning, and publicity.

The Indian American Folk Club of the Wahpeton Indian School, under the direction of Mrs. Robert Horne, will perform at the morning session on December 6, with an awareness program.

INTEREST RATE ON REA LOANS TO COOPERATIVES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, about 2 months ago the Senate considered and passed the agricultural appropriations bill for the fiscal year of 1964. During the Senate consideration of this bill, as the Senate may recall, the 2-percent interest rate on REA loans to rural electric cooperatives was the subject of a full afternoon's debate.

The senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] argued that the rate should be raised from the present 2 percent to 3 percent, and he moved to amend the bill to write such a provision into the law.

Much of the debate on that day concerned the interest cost to the Government for the money it borrows and the comparative amount of taxes paid by power companies and by rural electric cooperatives. Senator LAUSCHE maintained that the cooperatives should pay the same rate of interest for their funds that the Government pays for its long-term borrowings and that the cooperatives should be taxed in exactly the same manner as the private power companies.

At the close of the debate, in which I took part along with several other Senators in support of the 2-percent rate, the Senate refused to suspend the rules to consider the Lausche amendment. The vote was 16 yeas to 57 nays.

I have high respect for the distinguished Senator from Ohio, and I frequently vote and work with him to cut or to prevent unwarranted subsidies. He is a conspicuously consistent and honest man. He has, as he has every right to do, spoken further in the Senate in defense of his criticism of the 2-percent interest rate on REA loans. I know he will not misunderstand my position and feelings if I now reply to certain arguments which he has made.

On November 13, the Senator referred to a $125 million electric generating plant which is being built in his State. The project is a joint venture. The partners are a subsidiary of the American electric power system and a group of 30 rural electric cooperatives known as the Buckeye Electric Power Co.

As the Senator pointed out, the financing of this project is most interesting. The 30 rural electrics are not borrowing their share of the capital cost from the Rural Electrification Administration. Instead, the cooperatives are borrowing their share from general lenders in the open money market.

My good friend from Ohio says:

> The ability of rural cooperatives to borrow in the open market rather than from the Federal Government is clearly demonstrated by this Ohio experience. It constitutes substantial proof that the Federal laws on rural electrics need modification.

Mr. President, I feel this alleged "proof" is insufficient and the conclusion much too hasty. I have inquired into this matter, and I find that the joint venture in Ohio is, in fact, a special case made possible only by a happy and enviable set of circumstances, which, so far as I can determine, does not exist in any other State.

Further, I believe that very few of the nearly 1,000 electric cooperatives now operating in 46 of the 50 States can go into the open money market today and borrow at the market rate of interest—and still remain solvent enough to perform the difficult job which has been assigned to them by the Congress.

We must remember that the cooperatives are required by law to provide electric service at the lowest possible cost to all who want such service in even the most remote rural areas, and I want to emphasize the word "all." The cooperatives are also nonprofit corporations. They operate in thinly populated areas. They are owned by the people they serve.

To assist the cooperatives in overcoming built-in impediments, the Congress set the interest rate on REA loans at 2 percent in 1944. Since then, the rural electric cooperatives have made remarkable progress. Many of them are well on the way to the day when they will in fact be able to stand alone and be able to pay the open money market rate.

But I do not believe that this day is already here for all of the rural electric co-ops. A sudden change in the REA interest rate, made too soon and in too sweeping terms, could make many of these cooperatives dependent upon the Government and the Congress for an even longer period of time.

Now let us look at the uniquely favorable circumstances in Ohio. The 30 rural electrics associated in Buckeye Electric Power Co. are among the oldest and best established in the Nation. They were formed in the middle 1930's, right after the Rural Electrification Act was passed. Moreover, the areas served by these Ohio rural electrics have a high density of users of electricity and are a concentrated market contrary to the usual situation.

I think it can be agreed that these cooperatives are serving farmers in prosperous and growing rural areas. They are keeping in step with this prosperity and growth. Their equity in their systems amounts to more than 39 percent, a figure that is nearly double the national average for the rural electrics.

The generating plant that is being jointly built is located among the coalfields from which fuel for the plant will be mined. A tremendous saving in the cost of transporting fuel to the new plant will benefit both the power company and the cooperatives.

But perhaps the most favorable circumstances result from good relations which exist between the power company and the group of cooperatives. These good relations have helped to bring about three agreements vital to the project and to the cooperatives' place in the power industry of Ohio.

First, the company has agreed to stay out of rural areas served by the cooperatives.

Second, the company has agreed to dispose of the cooperatives' surplus power during the early years of the new plant's operation.

Third, the company has agreed to transmit cooperative power from the plant to the 30 rural electric systems at a reasonable rate.

All of these agreements mean savings to the rural electrics. By their terms, the cooperative areas are protected from power company attempts to serve the larger and more lucrative loads. The cooperatives are not forced to build an expensive extra plant to provide standby power. The cooperatives are not forced to build their own transmission system.

In return for these agreements, the 30 rural electrics made a concession of their own. They agreed to borrow their share of the financing for the generating plant in the open money market, at the going rate of interest of about 4½ percent. I am told the power company insisted upon this point.

Thus the unique circumstances of this project permit significant savings, in the transporting of fuel, in construction, generation, and transmissions costs, and in protecting the present areas served by the cooperatives. Because of these savings, the total cost of the power delivered to substations will be about 6.1 mills per kilowatt-hour or 1 mill less per kilowatt-hour than the present cost of wholesale power to these cooperatives. About 135,000 member-consumers in 74 of Ohio's 88 counties will substantially benefit. If REA financing had been used—and it should be noted that present REA policy restricts generation and transmission loans to 10-year future capacity and this project has capacity for from 15 or 20 years—the reduction in the cost of wholesale power would have been about 1⅓ mills per kilowatt-hour. So it is clear that only the unique combination of circumstances in this case justifies and provides compensation for the higher interest rate.

I emphasize, that the only alternatives open to rural electric cooperatives in other States are the 2 percent interest rate on REA loans and the REA Administrator's authority to make loans for the construction of generating plants and transmission lines. For in these other States, the private utilities are insisting on poaching on the more profitable areas which the REA serves and refusing to share with cooperatives the generating and transmission facilities and costs.

Incidentally, I understand that the Ohio rural electric cooperatives plan to continue to finance further additions to their distribution systems by borrowing from REA, because they, too, have found that when they are deprived of the specific advantages which are involved in the current arrangement they cannot yet bear the increased cost of private financing for these facilities which may be needed in the future.

This is true because the electric power business is different from most businesses in several respects. It requires, for example, a high ratio of capital to revenue from the sales of power. In other words, investment in the electric power business turns over slowly.

The rural electric cooperatives, because they operate in thinly populated areas and serve relatively light loads, sell about $1 worth of energy annually for every $5 invested in plant. This means it takes about 5 years for gross revenues to equal the capital value of the cooperatives' plant and other fixed assets. It should never be forgotten that for the Nation as a whole, there are only about three customers for every mile of REA distribution line whereas in the case of the private utilities there are approximately 33 or 11 times as many. May I give an example of what these facts mean to a rural electric cooperative? Suppose the co-op had a turnover rate of plant to revenues of 5 to 1. This would mean that the co-op received every year $200,000 of revenues for every $1 million invested in plant.

At a 2 percent rate of interest, the interest charges would amount to $20,000 or 10 percent of the revenues received by the cooperative. But if the co-op were forced to borrow in the open market at 4 percent, as the Senator from Ohio maintains all rural electrics should borrow, the interest charges would eat up $40,000 or 20 percent of the revenues. At 3 percent the interest costs would consume $30,000 or 15 percent of the revenues. At 6 percent, which might be the interest rate for cooperatives in the private money market, the interest charges would take a full $60,000 or 30 percent of the revenues.

Mr. President, the overwhelming majority of the rural electric cooperatives in this country are not ready for such a tremendous increase in their capital costs. The favorable circumstances which attend the current Ohio project exist today only in Ohio. The 2 percent interest rate on REA loans and the REA Administrator's authority to make generation and transmission loans should be preserved intact by the Congress. It would be a serious mistake to force the cooperatives as a whole into the open market; many of them would become wards of the Congress for many more years to come. In return for area coverage and compelling the cooperatives to provide service in sparsely settled farm districts, the Nation has granted the REA's favorable credit terms. This does involve a small subsidy, but it is one subsidy which to my mind is justified. For it has helped to lift a terrific burden of toil from the shoulders of farm men and women. It has brought electric lights, refrigeration, and warm baths to farm homes. It has helped to banish lanterns from the barn and the scrubbingboard from the washroom. Food is being cooked, cows milked, and water pumped by electricity. By television and radio, the news of the outside world has been brought into the farmers' families just as the subsidized rural free delivery systems has helped to bring to them letters and printed matter. The sister service of cooperative telephone systems has also helped to make communications between the relatively isolated farmers and the outside world more immediate and direct. All this and many other benefits as well have helped the farmers both socially and economically. In fact, the REA's were one of the great constructive achievements of the New Deal of Franklin Roosevelt. We should not permit them to be strangled in the full flower of their usefulness.

RAMPART DAM ON THE YUKON RIVER IN ALASKA CAN BE A MONUMENT TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, recently two important organizations have passed resolutions urging construction of the great Rampart Dam on the Yukon River in Alaska.

At the recent convention of the AFL–CIO, held November 14–20, the great Alaska project was endorsed by this powerful organization in its resolution recommending action on various projects of significance in the conservation and development of American natural resources.

Meanwhile, at an important meeting at Seward, Alaska, the Alaska Municipal League, an organization established to encourage the civic betterment of all communities in Alaska, adopted a resolution calling attention to the importance of constructing the Rampart project. This organization—whose membership includes most Alaska towns and cities, from tiny Anaktuvuk, with an isolated population of 103 to our largest city, Anchorage, with its 50,000 population; the farthest north city of the United States, Barrow; the farthest southeastern Alaska city of Ketchikan; Nome on the far western shores of the Bering Sea; Juneau, the State's capital, in southeastern Alaska and many others—has demonstrated Alaskans are united in an effort to make the dream of Rampart on the Yukon River, 100 miles northwest of Fairbanks, a reality.

The Rampart site is, unquestionably, the greatest hydroelectric power resource in the free world. At Rampart could produce nearly five million kilowatts of electric energy—more than 2½ times the power produced at Grand Coulee and more than at all the installations of the TVA. Rampart is the only site now known on the North American continent where could be produced the same quantities of power now made available in the Soviet Union at two giant dams the Russians have developed, at Bratsk and Krasnyarsk in Siberia—one of which is now producing and the other of which is close to production. Rampart power will cost less than any other in America—2 to 3 mills per kilowatt at tidewater locations.

The meaning of this to America is clear. The great power that Rampart will produce will be needed for the defense of our Nation, as will all the natural resources this Nation possesses.

Not only for bolstering our industrial base for the protection of the Nation, but for its immense potential contribution to the economic welfare of the country, Rampart must be built.

Studies completed for the Corps of Engineers by the Development and Resources Corp. of New York, by highly reputable economists and engineers led by the distinguished David Lilienthal, chairman of the board, and the late Gordon Clapp, who was president of the corporation, have demonstrated that, without doubt, there will be a substantial market for the power that will be produced at Rampart. Indeed their report indicates that all of Rampart's power will be spoken for as soon as generated; that more will be needed and that an entire river basin development, on the mighty Yukon, will be in order.

The great electroprocess industries that use energy as a raw material, and not simply as a means of moving equipment, to produce such commodities as aluminum, magnesium, titanium, zirconium, hafnium, electric steel, electric pig iron, electrolytic copper, zinc and nickel, ferro alloys, chlorine and caustic soda, calcium carbide, elemental phosphorus, artificial abrasives, and many others will shortly find there is a shortage of the essential cheap electricity required for operation. At Rampart there will be exactly the resource needed.

There is no question that the demands of our growing population will increase enormously for the rest of this century. The need for all the goods and commodities necessary to sustain our standard of living will inevitably require increased supplies of low-cost power.

It does not take a sophisticated economic analysis of this to come to the conclusion the demand for more goods, accompanied by the demand for greater supplies of power means, at the same time, employment of ever increasing numbers of our citizens at productive jobs. The existence of an inexcusably high rate of unemployment in the United States leads to the inescapable conclusion people who want to work should have remunerative employment producing the goods others want to buy.

Thus, construction of Rampart will, without question, lead to desirable improvements in our economy everywhere, since our country grows and prospers as a whole.

Of course, the effect of Rampart construction in Alaska will be most dramatic. This one project can do more to develop the economy of the 49th State than any other measure that can be taken. No one project can add more to U.S. power and prestige in the realm of resource development.

Beyond the economic boost it will give the State of Alaska, Rampart will provide an unparalleled opportunity to enhance the environment of the area for residents now living there, for wild creatures now indigenous to the area, and for new species of fish and fowl that could be introduced.

The reservoir at Rampart will be larger than Lake Erie—a manmade lake of more than 10,000 square miles in area. Here will be a new paradise for sportsmen. Here can be a great inland fresh water commercial fishery. The traversable waterway will make available wilderness areas of Alaska now completely inaccessible for lack of transportation. It will permit introduction of new species of fish to Alaska that will be a great attraction to fishermen, both sport and commercial.

Those who are most dedicated to preservation of wilderness beauty of the great forests of southeastern Alaska, the towering mountains and glaciers and the lovely rivers and lakes that make our State incomparably beautiful will, I believe, find only gain and no loss resulting from construction of Rampart Dam. In fact, the location of the damsite in the Yukon Flats is one of its major advantages. The barren and desolate wastes, the vast swamplands that would be flooded by the Rampart reservoir could only be improved by the creation of a manmade lake providing generous opportunity for recreation as well as economic development now impossible in the area. There are, at the Rampart location, at present, no scenic wonders, no recreational resources, no natural beauty that would be affected by construction of the dam.

The people who would be first and most dramatically affected by the construction of Rampart and the creation of the reservoir are the some 2,000 native residents of the villages of Circle, Fort Yukon, Venetie, Beaver, Stevens Village, Rampart, and Chalkyitsik whose villages will, over a period of 18 years, be flooded by the waters of the reservoir. Last August I toured all of these villages with the exception of Chalkyitsik, which is so isolated as to be virtually inaccessible, to talk with the residents about Rampart Dam and discuss their views on this new development in their lives. I found almost no opposition to construction of Rampart. On the contrary, the native citizens of the area are as well aware of the great economic benefits this project can bring to them as any other residents of Alaska. Living as they do now, in grim deprivation of the most elementary comforts of modern life in the rest of America, nothing but good can come to the natives of the Yukon from the construction of Rampart. For the first time in their history there will be an opportunity for useful employment bringing stable incomes, in the beginning, at jobs necessary to preparation of the site and construction of the dam, later in industries using Rampart's 5 million kilowatts of energy. With employment and economic stability will come opportunities for education and a standard of living providing such ordinarily accepted necessities as plumbing, electric lights, and appliances, to say nothing of roads giving access to the world outside the isolated limits of the villages.

For these reasons, I commend to our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, the strong endorsement of his administration of Rampart Dam. As Grand Coulee, Bonneville, and TVA are enduring reminders of the vigorous achievements of the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration, so Rampart can be a monument to the vitality of the Lyndon Johnson administration.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions of the Alaska Municipal League and the AFL–CIO be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF ALASKA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE

Whereas the population of the United States is expected to almost double in the next 50 years; and

Whereas roughly 2 million new jobs must be created each year; and

Whereas gross national product is expected to quadruple in the next 50 years; and

Whereas Alaska, one-fifth as large as the 48 States, can and must supply many of the resources needed for this economic explosion; and

Whereas the use of electric power in the United States in the next 40 years is predicted to increase 10 to 12 times; and

Whereas the development of the last remaining large hydroelectric power site in the United States capable of producing the cheapest electrical power is located on the Yukon: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Alaska Municipal League, recognizing the urgent need of large quantities of low cost power for the proper development and economic well-being of Alaska and the Nation, hereby urges the early submission to Congress and passage of an authorization bill allowing immediate construction of the Rampart Dam.

RESOLUTION 221

CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

The unfinished business that lies before this Nation is the conservation, development, and wise use of its natural resources is one of high urgency.

Population growth, urbanization, expended industrialization and technological change have not only accentuated the draft upon available natural resources, but have brought with them serious problems associated with man's assault on his environment—on the water he uses, the air he breathes, on the lands he needs for his out-of-doors recreation.

Our natural resources dilemma is compounded of these factors, and does not yield readily to stop-gap approaches, half-measures or compartmentalized jurisdictions.

The present administration has from time to time appeared to sense the urgency of our resources situation, and proposed a number of measures to meet some of its more serious aspects. Yet our hope for a firm decisive modern Federal resources policy has not been realized.

Labor regards such a policy as indispensable to the attainment of full employment, economic stability and growth called for in the Employment Act of 1946.

We set forth these principles as guidelines for such a policy and for the programs which must give it life and meaning to the people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

1. The Federal Government is and must continue to be the principal steward of the natural resources of the American people. Resources problems, like river systems, geographical regions, and flow of air, are no respectors of man-made boundaries. They have become national in scope and can be successfully attached, only if the massed resources and the national leadership of the United States is brought to bear upon them.

2. To eliminate the years of duplication, waste, jurisdictional, and policy conflicts among Federal resources agencies, the Federal Government must undertake to reorganize and coordinate its resources policies and structure. Such unified policies will facilitate carrying out comprehensive land, water, and energy resources programs to contribute their fullest measure to achievement of overall national goals of economic growth and stability and strengthening of democratic institutions.

3. Within a reinvigorated policy framework, there would be undertaken comprehensive river basin development programs based on the approach so magnificently demonstrated by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

4. We call for reservation of and strengthening historical Federal safeguards against monopolization of America's resources heritage, including preference in the sale of federally generated power, excess land ownership provisions, and the safeguards and regulatory programs under the Federal Power Natural Gas and Public Utilities Holding Company Act.

5. America is now moving into the age of giant power technology which must be harnessed to benefit all consumers and the general public.

The Nation's future power supply will require joint ownership of the power supply and transmission facilities by private, cooperative and publicly owned utilities, including the Federal Government, with Federal leadership in planning the most economic and feasible regional and interregional power interconnections, and laying down the rules for their operation in the public interest.

Existing utilities, privately, cooperatively, and publicly owned would be allowed to pool their resources into regional power supply agencies and required to meet the requirements of all electric distributing systems without discrimination and at uniform low wholesale rates. Regional systems would be allowed to finance their operations through issuance of revenue bonds under Federal legislation.

A prerequisite for success of such a giant power program would be provision in legislation that all major transmission lines be designated as common carriers, just as are railroads, steamship lines, airlines, and bus lines.

6. We regard the so-called public versus private power controversy, as a contrived irrelevancy which continues to block needed resources development programs. The Federal, State, and local governments, and the electric utility industry all have a proper and necessary place in America's energy future—each within its own area of responsibilities.

We urge legislation adopted by the various States enabling all utility workers, whether employed by publicly, cooperatively or privately owned utilities, to achieve the same collective bargaining rights as are accorded to workers in industry generally.

Within the framework of the broad policies we have proposed, the principle of comprehensive, multiple-purpose development must be the guideline for land, water and energy development programs, including harnessing the great Passamaquoddy tidal resource, and building the Rampart Dam in Alaska.

We call special attention to the Nation's water supply situation, which is not only limited by natural conditions, which require further storage and control as an answer, but is facing serious curtailment at the hands of man through pollution of rivers, lakes, and streams throughout the Nation and by impending regional shortages. Progress is being made through amendments to Federal water pollution control legislation. Further efforts will be required, particularly in strengthened Federal enforcement authority, expanded research, State and local action, Federal desalination programs, and national standards to determine presence of water pollution.

Labor urges equivalent efforts at all levels of Government be made to abate increasingly serious threat to the Nation's health and economy from air pollution. We support legislation calling for similar programs in this field and in the field of pesticides control as have been established by the Congress to abate pollution of water.

We support legislation to establish a national wilderness system. Progress is being made toward a national outdoor recreational policy, together with programs of outdoor land acquisition and development for expansion of Federal, State, and local recreational facilities, taking into particular consideration growing urban requirements.

We urge expansion of scientific research programs in the field of natural resources and environmental health, air and water pollution, pesticides and manmade radiation.

SENATOR CHURCH'S TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an address delivered by myself, in tribute to the late President John F. Kennedy, at memorial services held at the River Road Unitarian Church, in Bethesda, Md., on November 24, 1963.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN MEMORIAM—A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

(By Senator FRANK CHURCH, at memorial services held at the River Road Unitarian Church in Bethesda, Md., November 24, 1963)

It is not my purpose or place to deliver the sermon this morning. That is properly a service for your own pastor to perform. It is, rather, my purpose to say a few words in tribute to our fallen President.

I hope you will understand if I speak of him in somewhat personal terms, for this is the way I shall remember him.

He was my friend. I loved and honored him. I was proud for my country that he was our President.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was one of those rare human beings about whom it could be truly said "* * * the elements so mix'd in him that Nature might stand up and say to all the world 'This was a man.' "

He was as handsome as a storied prince; his wife, Jacqueline, as fair as any princess of song or legend. With his encouragement, she made the White House a place of impeccable beauty, where occasions of state were conducted in the style, and with a graciousness and gaiety that befits a great nation. Whenever I was present on these occasions, I never failed to marvel at the President's composure. His dignity was natural to him, and his friendliness always set his guests at ease. How unprepared they were to discover in him that endearing quality of self-effacement, which he often revealed through some lighthearted witticism, but which invariably disclosed his underlying humility. Once, in a toast to the King of Afghanistan, I recall how he explained why the Constitution limited the President to 8 years in office. The amendment had been adopted, he said, partly out of consideration for the well-being of the President, but mainly, he added with a smile, out of consideration for the well-being of the country.

Many of you will remember the celebrated comment he made to that illustrious company of Noble Prize winners who came to dine with him at the White House. Never, he remarked, has so much talent been gathered at one time under this roof, since Thomas Jefferson used to dine here alone.

Such was the billiance of the social life which John and Jacqueline Kennedy brought to the Presidential Mansion. But more important was the kind of family life they implanted there. Somehow they managed to make that big house a home. Along with other playmates, their daughter, Caroline, and their little son, whom the President liked to call "John-John," used to gather in the play yard, within easy view of their daddy's office. He was seldom too busy to be interrupted by them; he refused to permit the heavy burdens of his office to usurp his family function as a loving father. The personal attention he gave to his children, and to the needs of his griefstricken wife, when their infant son, Patrick, died soon after birth a few months ago; the tender pictures of John-John on the south lawn awaiting his father's arrival by helicopter, or crawling through the trapdoor in his father's desk, while the President was sitting there absorbed with his evening's work; the familiar sight of Caroline clutching her father's hand as he led the family into church on a Sunday morning—all combined to present to the country the finest example of a devout and affectionate family, setting a moral standard of the highest order.

The many attributes that made John F. Kennedy such an exceptional person cannot be compressed into the short tribute I pay him this morning. Well known was his bravery in battle; his literary talents which won for him the Pulitzer Prize; the fortitude with which he bore the pain in his injured back; the ceaseless energy with which he pursued his quest for self-fulfillment through 17 years of honorable service in the House of Representatives, the Senate, and, finally, the White House itself.

History will judge his greatness as a President, but already it is clear that he will be remembered for the strength of his statesmanship which saw us through the dread missile crisis in Cuba a year ago, when the world trembled on the brink of thermonuclear war. And he will be remembered too for the initiative he brought to the search for peace—for the first step along that road he made possible through the nuclear test ban treaty. Not since Lincoln has any President been so deeply committed to the cause of equal treatment for all Americans.

The tragedy of his death is heightened because it came so cruelly at the prime of his extraordinary life. It came as he was grappling with the gigantic problems of our times with the skill and courage of a young David—only to be struck down by an assassin in his own country, in a foul and cowardly murder which crosses us all with shame.

Once, when he faced a crucial primary test, in that long, arduous trek he made toward the Presidency, I ask him whether he believed in prayer. He said he did, and he seemed genuinely moved when I told him I would pray for him. Now, I think, he would want us all to pray for our new President, in faith that a national revulsion against every kind of fanaticism will wash the land clean, so that the hand of Lyndon B. Johnson may be upheld by the councils of reason and decency against the councils of ignorance, bigotry, and hate.

May God preserve this Republic and keep her sensible, strong, and free. Amen.

RECLAMATION PROGRAM

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, for many years I have used the adage "You can outwit the bureaus but you cannot outwait them." The more experience I receive in Government the more I realize the truth of that saying.

Recently the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, Floyd E. Dominy, addressed the National Reclamation Association at Sun Valley, Idaho. The title of his speech was "Wake up, America." He expressed his concern that there were no new starts in sight and that no new projects were being authorized by the Congress. He said:

> We seem to be on dead center, caught in the middle of controversy, disagreement, and unresolved issues. I am deeply concerned about this stagnation in our reclamation program.

Mr. President, I, too, am concerned. I will yield to no one in my support of reclamation. We need not be on dead center nor should we be. If the Bureau of Reclamation will come forward with realistic programs that are feasible Congress will approve them. But, if the Commissioner continues to push for projects which are unwise, uneconomical, and unfeasible, he will be denied again and again.

This year Mr. Dominy and the Bureau were once again denied the Burns Creek project which is unfeasible and impractical. Although this was the seventh time that Congress had said "No" to the Burns Creek project, Mr. Dominy gave a speech on October 25, endorsing and calling for the construction of this project which is unworthy of further consideration.

He said, "Burns Creek is still with us." And I say, how many times does Congress have to say "No" to a bad project?

Burns Creek has been considered by various committees in the House and Senate every year since 1958. Burns Creek was originally proposed for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation as a reclamation project.

Congress considered Burns Creek as a reclamation project five times and in every instance refused to endorse the project. In 1962 the Government employees, who had been denied their project by Congress, brought forward the Burns Creek scheme as a flood control project. Never before had it been suggested that Burns Creek was a flood control project and it is not—its purpose is to produce Federal power.

The House of Representatives defeated it as a flood control project after floor debate in 1962. Again, this year the Federal power people of the Department of Interior tried to classify Burns Creek as a flood control project. Fortunately, the Flood Control Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee has refused to authorize Burns Creek.

This committee has demonstrated its superior wisdom but can it outwait the bureaucrats? It is the hope of the people of Wyoming and all America that Congress will not yield to the persistent but unwise pressures of the Bureau of Reclamation.

What do you have to do to convince the Bureau of Reclamation and other agencies that you mean "No" when you say "No" to one of their pet projects?

I appeal to Mr. Dominy to use his energies and his staff to develop a realistic reclamation program. We need to get off dead center and to wake up America, but we cannot do this by riding a dead horse such as Burns Creek.

TRIBUTE TO MATSON NAVIGATION CO.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the big "M" emblazoned on many a ship smokestack in the Pacific is the proud symbol of the Matson Navigation Co. Matson can look back today over a record of 81 continuous years of service to its country in the Pacific.

Recently, Hawaii's elected lawmakers and those in Washington who have played a role in helping to develop Hawaii's ocean transportation system were honored by the shipping line. Matson's newest combination container-automobile freighter has been named the *Hawaiian Legislator*. Matson felt this was a fitting tribute to legislators in Hawaii and Washington who continue to work to develop a healthy economy for the State and an efficient and modern water transportation system between Hawaii and the Mainland.

The C-4 type vessel, named the *Coast Progress* when Matson acquired her in 1962, was renamed the *Hawaiian Legislator* this year after her conversion for her significant place in Matson's specialized Hawaiian freight fleet.

The use of occupational type names preceded by "Hawaiian" for most of Matson's freighters is relatively new in the line's 81-year history. It began shortly before America's entry into World War II and makes an interesting chapter in the derivation of the names of Matson ships since Captain William Matson entered the Hawaiian trade with his three-master schooner *Emma Claudina* in 1882. Since the "Matson Era" of Hawaiian trade shipping, the vessels of Matson—incorporated as a San Francisco-headquartered firm in 1910—have been interwoven with the heritage and folklore as well as the economy of Hawaii—first the kingdom, then the Republic, followed by the Territory, and now the State.

The SS *Lurline*, a combination passenger-freight carrier built in 1908, was the first ship actually constructed by Matson Navigation Co. after 26 years of ship acquisitions. At the time of Captain Matson's death in 1917 there were 8 ships in the Matson fleet, a fourth of the 32 he acquired during his lifetime. Twenty-two of these were sailing vessels.

Except for the *Lurline* of 1908—the second *Lurline* operated by Matson—and the *Enterprise* and *Hilonian*, all of the remaining 29 ships during Captain Matson's lifetime retained the names given them by their previous owners.

Matson's second *Lurline* was named after the *Lurline* Captain Matson acquired an interest in during 1887, the year the ship was named by the Spreckels family of San Francisco, which had her built.

German-born Claus Spreckels, who came to San Francisco with his family in 1856, put up 58 percent of the $2,500,000 Oceanic Steamship Co., incorporated on December 22, 1881. Oceanic, which served Hawaii, the South Pacific, and Australia, was acquired by Matson in 1926.

Spreckel's *Lurline*, a 135-foot brig, was named during her construction at Matthew Turner's Benicia, Calif., shipyard. Nor was she the first Spreckels-owned *Lurline*. John D. Spreckels, son of Claus and a music lover since boyhood in Germany, gave his 1883-built schooner-yacht the name *Lurline*.

Lurline, incidentally, stems from Lorelei, the title of several European operas composed in the 1800's. A three-act grand romantic opera titled "Lurline" was published by William Hall & Son on New York's Broadway in 1868. The words of the opera, by Edward Fitzball, refer to Lurline as "The nymph of the Rhine, who, by her enchanted harp and song, lures vessels to destruction in the whirlpool of the river."

The derivation of Lurline is of particular interest today because on December 6, 1963, in San Francisco, the fourth oceangoing *Lurline* will be christened to perpetuate this famed and beloved name in Pacific passenger service. The *Lurline*-to-be is presently the 760-passenger luxury liner *Matsonia*, the third ship named after the founder of the Matson Lines.

The first *Matsonia*, constructed in 1913, saw the start of a succession of Matson ships whose names began with the letter M. The *Matsonia*, was followed by the *Manoa, Maui, Manulani, Manukai, Mahukona, Makaweli, Makena, Mauna Ala, Makiki*, and *Malama*, and several others, all of which had Hawaiian meanings.

It is worth noting that, during this period, all the Matson ships carried the letter M on each side of their smokestacks as they do today. The smokestack lettering started with the *Enterprise* in 1902 after Captain Matson converted the ship to burn oil and carry a capacity of 22 passengers.

The breaking point in the succession of Matson Navigation Co. ships whose names started with M came in 1934 when Matson dissolved the 10-ship Los Angeles Steamship Co. it purchased in 1931. Matson retained some but not all of the line's ship names. In 1937, the year Matson took full ownership of 11 ships then owned by Oceanic and Oriental Navigation Co., it chose "non-M" names for some of its Los Angeles Steamship and O and O ships. It did so for good reason.

There are only 13 letters in the Hawaiian language and the company was hard pressed to select suitable Hawaiian "M" names which had such meanings as budding season for Maliko; coral reef-fish for Manini; winding mountain for Maunawili; fragrant mountain for Mauna Ala, and sea bird for Manukai.

By March 1, 1938, Matson owned 43 freighters and the liners *Lurline, Matsonia, Mariposa,* and *Monterey.* The 47 ships were the most ever owned at one time by Matson, although the line operated about 125 ships for the War Shipping Administration during World War II.

Just prior to the war as well as after it, Matson officials decided to rename the freighter fleet. Each ship was to have "Hawaiian" as part of its name. The reason was to avoid any confusion on the part of any mainland shippers between Hawaiian and Japanese names.

On March 19, 1947, the company announced its postwar fleet-naming program. Each of the company's 15 C-3 type freighters were to have an occupational type name preceded by "Hawaiian." This carried forward the plan inaugurated just prior to World War II with the naming of the *Hawaiian Shipper, Hawaiian Merchant, Hawaiian Packer,* and *Hawaiian Planter.* The Government requisitioned these ships during the war.

Matson's postwar fleet of 15 C-3's ultimately became the *Hawaiian Merchant, Hawaiian Builder, Hawaiian Planter, Hawaiian Banker, Hawaiian Craftsman, Hawaiian Educator, Hawaiian Retailer, Hawaiian Citizen, Hawaiian Fisherman, Hawaiian Packer, Hawaiian Rancher, Hawaiian Farmer, Hawaiian Refiner, Hawaiian Pilot,* and *Hawaiian Wholesaler.* These ships were mainly in the California-Hawaii service.

In the Pacific Northwest-Hawaiian trade were the Liberty-type ships *Hawaiian Forester, Hawaiian Lumberman,* and *Hawaiian Logger.* The *Hawaiian Trader* replaced the *Hawaiian Forester* in 1955, leaving the *Hawaiian Lumberman* and the *Hawaiian Logger* in this service. In the Hawaiian-East Coast trade were the *Hawaiian Tourist* and the *Hawaiian Traveler,* both purchased in 1956.

Three liners were in Matson's wholly owned subsidiary, The Oceanic Steamship Co., purchased from the Spreckels interests in 1926. The United States-South Pacific trade ships were the *Sierra, Ventura,* and *Sonoma.* These passenger liners were replaced in 1932 when Oceanic built the luxury liners *Mariposa* and *Monterey.*

In Oceanic's postwar service there were four C-2 freighters, the *Alameda, Ventura, Sierra,* and *Sonoma.* The present passenger liners *Mariposa* and *Monterey* entered the Oceanic service in December 1956 and January 1957, respectively.

In 1961 three of Matson's C-3's replaced Oceanic's four C-2's. The *Hawaiian Banker* became the *Sierra,* the *Hawaiian Pilot* the *Sonoma,* and the *Hawaiian Wholesaler* the *Ventura.*

Meanwhile, in Matson's Hawaiian fleet the *Hawaiian Fisherman* reentered the trade in 1961 as the Pacific's first automobile carrier. She was renamed *Hawaiian Motorist* in 1962.

Two "jumboized" C-4's, the *Californian* and *Hawaiian,* were purchased in 1960 for bulk sugar-container service in the Hawaiian trade. Because of their apt names when purchased the company retained the names for these two similar ships.

I have not mentioned the names of non-ocean-crossing Matson vessels—of which there have been many—but Matson has a 300-foot container barge *Islander,* a vessel designed by Matson's Engineering Development Department and built solely for Hawaiian waters. The *Islander,* which goes into service late this year, inaugurates Matson's container service between Hawaii's four major islands. She will operate out of Honolulu calling at ports on Maui, the Big Island of Hawaii, and Kauai.

The container barge, like Matson Navigation Co's. present oceangoing fleet of 1 passenger liner and 15 freighters and Oceanic's 2 passenger liners and 3 freighters, is unique. These vessels are unique because they carry, in addition to their cargoes, the responsibilities for maintaining an unbroken link of commerce between the only ocean surrounded State in the Union, more than 2,000 miles from the nearest State of California. Matson should be justifiably proud of its 81 years of achievement.

PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, as the Nation emerges from its all-engulfing grief over the tragic loss of our great President—and emerge somehow we must—the question naturally on everybody's lips is "What about Lyndon Johnson?"

I am confident that those of us who know him well, those of us who have served with him anywhere along the line in his 30 years of Government service, would answer with almost one voice:

"He is undoubtedly the most superbly trained man in the country for the Presidency."

When we look back on these dark days from some vantage point in the future, I am convinced we will be able to say, with conviction and gratitude, that a fortunate nation was given the right man in the right hour. By experience, by temperament, by love of country, and by personal conception of the duties of a national leader, it is hard to imagine a man with more suitable qualities for the Presidency at this time than Lyndon Johnson. He is cast in the mold of greatness, and his compassionate heart, his tough and resilient mind, and his ability to ask for—and get—action when it is needed, will move our country on in the work we must do to meet the challenge of the 1960's.

President Johnson is widely known and respected in Utah. He has made several visits to the State, and has been warmly received. His manner is Western, and he speaks our language. Like President Kennedy, he has always been a good friend of reclamation, and we have no fear that he will dim or change the vital place in our national life given to water resource development in the past 3 years.

President Johnson, then majority leader of the Senate, made one of his visits to Utah in the closing days of the 1959 campaign. I shall always feel that his appearance at that time—the force of his personality, and his words of endorsement—helped give me the margin for election to the U.S. Senate.

Upon one of his visits to Utah, after his serious heart attack, Senator Johnson met the late John F. Fitzpatrick, publisher of the Salt Lake Tribune, and during the years before Mr. Fitzpatrick's death, the two exchanged many letters and became warm, personal friends.

I am glad that Joseph Alsop, the noted columnist, recalled for us in his column the assessment of President Kennedy, the candidate, for the man who was opposing him for the nomination. Jack Kennedy stated:

> If I didn't want the job myself, I'd get behind Lyndon. He's the ablest man I know in American politics, and he really cares about this country, as I want the President to care.

I am convinced that President Kennedy's evaluation of the man he chose as his Vice President, and the man who as his successor will now carry forth the Kennedy program, will be borne out in the months ahead. America is blessed to have him at its helm in this heartbreaking moment in history a new President of the caliber of Lyndon Baines Johnson. We can give him no less than our total support.

THE STRATEGY OF DECEPTION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] praised the new book, "The Strategy of Deception," edited by Jeane J. Kirkpatrick and published by Farrar, Straus & Co. I would like to join in their recommendation.

This book is the most concise yet descriptive volume on Communist tactics that I have read in a long time. In none of the 16 perceptive essays will the lay reader become lost in theory and conjecture. These essays present hard proven facts. They show the devious, inconsistent, and conflicting methods that the Communists have used in their efforts to expand Soviet power.

Many of the contributors to this series of assays in "The Strategy of Deception" have had firsthand experience of Communist tactics. One of the writers in fact, Julian Gorkin, was a founder of the Communist Party in Levant, Spain.

This book reveals to the layman what communism really is—a totalitarian dictatorship aimed at carrying out that which is most expedient for its leaders and at any cost, even the cost of multitudes of human lives. The essays show that communism is not the panacea its masters claim for the benefit of the working class, for, as Mr. E. P. W. da Costa, one of the essayists, points out, under communism neither the lot of the working class nor the speed of industrialization is superior to that found in India or Japan; if anything such progress is inferior because of the great waste of material and human resources under Communist methods.

Among the essays is one by Mr. Asoka Mehta showing how the local Communists in India change their policies and propaganda without any concern for consistency so as to be able to toe the partyline dictated by Moscow. The Communist Party in India, as is also true in the countries of South America and Asia, merely adapts itself to whatever conflicts divide the society. Thus Mr. Mehta shows that in one State—Kerala—the Communists sided with the low caste Hindus, while in another State—Hyderabad—they campaigned for the restoration of the Maharajah.

The Communists in India have supported and opposed national independence; have supported and opposed Indian participation in World War II; have supported and opposed regional and linguistic separatism; and have supported and opposed Gandhi and his goals. This complete opportunism in India is not unique; the same opportunism is found wherever the Communists exist. In another essay Prof. Robert S. Alexander amply demonstrates that this is true in Latin America.

Jeane Kirkpatrick's book is a book which will be extremely useful to all people who want to learn what communism is all about without groping through tedious basic political theory. This is a book for the general public. Also, I recommend it to the youth of today who has not had the opportunity to observe Communist tactics at firsthand or is too young to remember the Communist's promises and their betrayal of them.

Mr. President, this is indeed a book written and edited pro bono publico and one that I highly recommend.

THE NEW PRESIDENT—LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the State, the largest daily newspaper in South Carolina, presented to its readers on Sunday a biographical sketch of the new President of the United States. This article reports on the successful career of this distinguished American and points up the great abilities and experience which should be invaluable to him and our Nation as our new President seeks to fulfill the tremendous responsibilities which have been thrust on him by virtue of the act of perfidy which last week claimed the life of our late President John F. Kennedy.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks this article from the State of November 24, 1963, together with my newsletter for next week entitled "An Assassin's Bullet."

There being no objection, the article and newsletter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Nov. 24, 1963]

THE 36TH PRESIDENT—LYNDON JOHNSON: FATE TOUCHED HIM

HIS BIOGRAPHY

Lyndon Baines Johnson.

Born: August 27, 1908, in Stonewall, Tex.

Educated: Texas State Teachers College and Georgetown Law School.

Married: In late 1934 to Claudia (Lady Bird) Taylor. Two children, Lynda Bird Johnson and Lucy Baines Johnson.

Elected to Congress: 1937, at age 29.

Elected to Senate: 1948, at age 40. Served as Senate minority leader 1953–54. Served as Senate majority leader 1955–61. Elected as Vice President of the United States in 1960. Became President of the United States November 22, 1963.

A tall, ashenfaced man stood at the doorway of an office in the White House Friday night.

By a violent twist of fate this man, still stunned by the horror which he witnessed only a few hours before, had become the 36th President of the United States.

Lyndon Baines Johnson had surpassed the prophecy made by his grandfather the day he was born.

On that day, in Stonewall, Tex., August 27, 1908, his grandfather looked at the infant and said, "He'll be a U.S. Senator some day."

Now Johnson had the job he had prepared for all his life.

The 55-year-old Johnson was groomed for the Presidency by both his father Sam and the late House Speaker, Sam Rayburn, a fellow Texan. The Rayburn-Johnson team led a Democratically controlled Congress during most of the administration of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The prediction made by Johnson's grandfather began taking shape in 1937 when young Lyndon was elected to Congress; in 1948 he was elected to the Senate—he was 40.

He won his first seat to the Senate by a tiny margin, a bare 87 votes. This minute margin didn't squelch the now-famous Johnson sense of humor.

A short time after his election the already politically acute Senate Member began a speech with a smile and this statement:

"Well, here I am—Landslide Lyndon."

Four years later the Senate Democrats picked him as minority leader. This was at the birth of President Dwight D. Eisenhower's administration when Republicans were in control of Congress.

The Democrats took over the reins of Congress during the next three sessions and Johnson became Senate majority leader.

Johnson and a fellow Senate Member, John F. Kennedy, battled for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1960. Johnson, who was strongly supported by Southern delegates, nevertheless lost out to the youthful Senator from Massachusetts.

Kennedy chose his vanquished rival for second place on the ticket. He said that "Lyndon Johnson has demonstrated on many occasions his brilliant qualification for the leadership we require today."

Almost 3 years later, Johnson took the oath of office as President on a plane in Dallas, Tex. At the moment life left the body of John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson automatically became the leader of the United States.

Lyndon had a rich heritage on both sides of his family. Both his father and paternal grandfather, a Confederate veteran, served in the Texas House of Representatives. One of his paternal ancestors signed the Texas Declaration of Independence after battling the Mexicans with a squirrel rifle in 1836.

On his maternal side, Johnson was descended from Baptist preachers and educators. His great-grandfather, a Baptist leader in Texas during the Civil War, headed Baylor University for 2 years.

The man who became President November 22, 1963, carried an inheritance of pioneer spirit, love of adventure and a gift for public speaking.

His educational birthright was a little late in asserting itself. When he completed high school at the age of 15 he and a group of youths trekked to California. They made their jaunt by camping along railroad trestles and each night they buried their small amount of money to prevent it being stolen by other wanderers.

"None of us had been off the farm for a trip longer than the road to town," Johnson said of the band of would-be nomads.

When their money supply trickled away, each boy went his own way to find work. Johnson tramped the coast of California and he finally tramped homeward.

"The trip back home was the longest I have ever made," Johnson said. It was accomplished by walking and hitchhiking. He was away from his home State for 7 months.

Books had little appeal to the young man at that time. After his return from the California venture, Johnson went to work as a laborer on highways. He pushed wheelbarrows, drove trucks and shoveled sand and gravel. He had a serious discussion with his father after a short while and as a result he decided to go to college. He borrowed $75 and set out for the Southwest Texas State Teachers College.

His interest in learning was revitalized there and a boyish adventurer became a politically ambitious young man.

In 1931 Johnson went to Washington as secretary to Representative Richard Kleberg, Democrat of Texas, and the career of Johnson the politician began in earnest.

When he went to the Capital, Johnson was a confirmed New Dealer and a protege of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt. He was elected "speaker" of the "Little Congress," an organization of congressional secretaries. By the time a few years had passed Johnson returned as a Congressman and started an uninterrupted political career.

In a special election during the spring of 1937, Johnson was named to the congressional seat of Representative James P. Buchanan who had died a few months before. He won over 10 opponents.

In his first try for a Senate seat a few years later, Johnson lost by a "whisker." In his second attempt, he won by the same margin, a whisker.

During a hearing in the office of the Texas Railroad Commission in Austin in 1934, Johnson met the woman he was to marry. She was Claudia Taylor, but everyone called her Lady Bird, a name given her by a childhood nurse.

She and Johnson were married late in 1934. Their first child was named Lynda Bird and their second, Lucy Baines. This caused Johnson to remark, "We all have the same initials so we can all use the same baggage for traveling."

President Johnson is a big man, a 6-foot-3 southerner who weighs close to 200 pounds. Ever since a "moderately severe" heart attack in the summer of 1955 he has tried to hold his weight down.

But he is charged with a relentless energy. Even when doctors warned him to slow down after his heart attack, Johnson paid little heed. A burning inner drive kept him going from sunup to sundown and in 1960, 5 years after his hospital stay, Johnson said that his health, in the estimation of his physicians, was "too good."

"They say I feel too good and go too much and work too long," he told a Los Angeles news conference.

Asked if his working hours were limited because of his heart attack, he replied "Yes, to 18 or 19 hours a day."

This super capacity for work even gleamed through gloom-filled Friday night when Johnson plunged into a meeting of congressional leaders of both parties where he asked for and got pledges of support in the days ahead.

Lyndon B. Johnson is a man who has carved an image as a tough political genius into a Washington atmosphere filled with the tough, the political, and genius.

As Senate leader he was known as a behind-the-scenes operator who steered a middle course politically.

During the years 1955 to 1961 when he was head of the powerful Senate Democrats—in a Republican administration—Johnson counseled his party members against opposition for opposition's sake.

He urged a course of responsibility as best for his party and the country and preached the doctrine that reasonable men of good will can resolve their differences. He said, "Let us reason together."

And then suddenly, violently, tragically Friday night, Lyndon B. Johnson squared his shoulders and stepped over the threshold into the office of the President. This man, described by his wife, as a man who "acts like there was never going to be a tomorrow," picked up the massive responsibility of the tomorrows of the United States and held them in his hands.

Then he turned to his country and said, "I will do my best. That is all I can do. I ask for your help, and God's."

Assassin's Bullet

The assassination of the 35th President of the United States has shocked and saddened Americans of all political persuasions. This act of perfidy closed a brilliant political career of one of the most personable and popular Presidents ever to serve our Nation. There were many disagreements with President John F. Kennedy's policies and proposals, but his personal popularity, according to opinion polls, continued at an unusually high level.

This tragedy contains many lessons. Some, who have sought to mix blame with their grief, credit the assassination to all who have dissented from the policies of the New Frontier. Actually, the fatal shots were apparently fired by a Communist. This man had renounced his American citizenship to the U.S. Embassy in Moscow upon moving to the Soviet Union a few years ago. When, however, he wanted to return here, our Embassy was tolerant of his anti-American views and his pro-Communist sympathies, and thus loaned him $435 to return to America. On his return, he distributed leaflets and spoke out for Castro, being very active in the pro-Communist Fair Play for Cuba Committee. In June of this year, the State Department issued him a new passport despite his background which also included an undesirable discharge from the U.S. Marine Corps.

To a Communist the life of any individual is not worth much because it is society—the planned society—which counts most. To an American who cherishes freedom and individual rights, a life is indeed dear, even where deep political differences exist. Under the American system we settle our differences at the ballot box. Under the Communist system, ideological differences are settled with a bloodbath, individually and collectively. This is just one of many reasons why we cannot continue to tolerate the Communist ideology, especially in our own midst.

As a consequence of the tragic murder of President Kennedy, we now have a new national leader. President Lyndon Johnson is one of the most capable and experienced public officials I know. My relationships with him in the Senate, where he has served as majority leader and Vice President, have been pleasant, even though we have not agreed on all issues.

In view of his announced plans to push for enactment of the so-called civil rights legislation and the tax legislation as proposed, I am certain we will be in disagreement on more occasions. I was very favorably impressed, however, to hear the President recently give on television an eloquent testimony in support of our form of government with its unique system of divided and separated powers and our thriving "capitalist," free enterprise economy. I was particularly pleased with his praise of our "capitalist" economy because all too many have been shamed by Communist propaganda into looking upon "capitalism" as a bad word connoting exploitation.

In this interview, the President, then Vice President, also expressed a strong measure of devotion to our country and to the importance of preserving our freedoms. Likewise brought out in this interview were his background and interest in our defense and space programs. In the Senate he served as chairman of both the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee and the Space Committee, having in effect fathered our present space exploration program.

It is difficult to assess what course the new President's administration will set for our Nation until he has had the time to chart his course aside from the policies he has inherited. I hope that his main aim will be the preservation of freedom at home and the extension of freedom around the world. If so, he will have the strong support of an overwhelming majority of Americans.

WALTER PINCUS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on December 1, Walter Pincus of the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations will leave the staff of the committee to return to his profession of journalism as a reporter for the Washington Star.

Mr. Pincus was employed by the committee in April 1962, for the specific purpose of assisting the committee in its study of the activities of nondiplomatic representatives of foreign governments and of the Foreign Agents Registration Act. This study has now been virtually completed. The committee has held extensive hearings, as a result of which the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] and I have cosponsored legislation (S. 2136) which we feel will minimize if not correct the abuses which the committee's inquiry uncovered. Hearings have been held on this legislation, and I hope that it may be considered by the Foreign Relations Committee in executive session in the near future and reported to the Senate. We have been assured that Mr. Pincus will be available to the committee as a per diem consultant, should we need his services again in connection with this legislation.

At this time, I simply want to note for the record that Mr. Pincus performed outstanding work for the committee and it would have been difficult to carry out our inquiry to its successful conclusion without him. When he began his work for the committee, it was contemplated, both by him and by the committee, that he would return to journalism when this particular job was done. We regret to lose his services, but we thank him for a job well done, and we wish him well in his future endeavors. He exemplifies to a high degree the best in the professional staffing of the Senate and its committees. I believe Mr. Pincus has rendered a valuable service to the Senate and to the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

HORIZONTAL PROPERTY REGIMES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4276) to provide for the creation of horizontal property regimes in the District of Columbia, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, which is a complete substitute for the text of the bill. For the purpose of amendment, the committee amendment will be considered as original text, and is open to amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1964—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6868) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Walters in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of November 13, 1963, p. 21624, Congressional Record.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished chairman of the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee and the Senate conferees for successfully concluding, under difficult circumstances, the work on this important proposed legislation. As Members of this body know, this appropriation bill passed the Senate on June 26 of this year, and included therein was an amendment adopted on the floor prohibiting the use of the simplified mailing system by Members of the House of Representatives as well as the Senate. In conference, the amendment was modified to eliminate the Members of the House.

My position on the simplified mailing amendment was set out in my letter of November 13 addressed to each Member of the Senate, and I do not think it is necessary that I discuss that issue at this time. I ask unanimous consent that this letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
November 13, 1963.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to you with reference to Senate amendment No. 40 in H.R. 6868, the legislative branch appropriations bill for fiscal year 1964. This amendment prohibits the use of the simplified mailing system by Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate. The bill passed the Senate on June 26, 1963. When the bill was in the Senate Committee on Appropriations, a motion was made to prohibit the use of a simplified mailing system by Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate. The Senate committee rejected the proposal to include the Members of the House of Representatives within such a prohibition and made it applicable only to Members of the Senate.

The Senate Committee on Appropriations stated in its Report No. 313, dated June 25, 1963, that in the interest of comity and understanding, the prohibition should be made applicable solely to the U.S. Senate. The committee stated further that the Constitution provides that each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, and while the mailing privilege does not specifically come under the rules of either body, the committee felt each House should make its own determination in this regard.

During consideration of the bill on the Senate floor on June 26, 1963, a motion to include the House Members within the prohibition of simplified mailings was adopted on a rollcall vote.

The House of Representatives has refused, since the bill passed the Senate on June 26, 1963, to send the bill to conference because of what the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations describes as a violation of the rule of comity between the two bodies.

On November 8, 1963, the bill was taken from the Speaker's table and was sent to conference. The House of Representatives, on that date, agreed to all of the amendments in the bill relating solely to the Senate. This meant that none of these amendments relating solely to the Senate would be subject to conference, since the two bodies had previously agreed to them. The House subcommittee chairman said in the House that this was in accord with tradition and comity.

A conference on the legislative appropriation bill was held on November 12, 1963, and the House conferees were adamant in refusing to include the House of Representatives within the prohibition on simplified mail. The conferees on the part of the Senate have agreed to rewrite the language and make it applicable solely to the Senate. The conference report containing this language has been adopted on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I am writing this letter to each Member of the Senate with my earnest recommendation that the conference report, as adopted by the House, be agreed to in the Senate. I served for many years in the House of Representatives, and I know how much Members of the House resent having the Senate attempt to dictate to them on their housekeeping functions. If the House of Representatives desires to prohibit the use of the simplified mailing system by its Members, it has had ample opportunity to do so in connection with the many House actions on this bill. In addition, a bill has been introduced by a Member of the House to bar the simplified mailing by Members of the House and is pending in the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

I think the Senate should make every effort to restore the comity which has always existed between the two bodies, and I earnestly recommend that the Senate adopt this conference report and discontinue any attempt on our part to regulate the House of Representatives.

Yours very sincerely,
CARL HAYDEN.

Mr. HAYDEN. As is well known, the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations has made certain irresponsible charges against employees of the Senate. I, along with many others, considered these statements to be an insult to the Senate, to its Members, and to its many devoted lady employees.

In view of the serious nature of his charges, I personally made available, to the Member of the other body two documents—one showing the names of all Senate employees and their salaries, and the other all expenditures made by the Senate. These are documents available to the public. Later, I personally discussed with him this material which I had made available.

Last Friday morning, I received a letter from Representative STEED, which I consider to be an apology to the Senate, its Members, and its lady employees.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter and the altered House bill may be printed in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the letter and the bill were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., November 22, 1693.

Senator CARL HAYDEN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This will advise that I have carefully checked the current published list of Senate employees which you provided me and I can assure you as follows:

Although all Senate employees are not known to me personally, a great many of them are. All those on your list that I personally know are men and women of highest integrity and moral character. I found no name on the list known to me to be otherwise.

Any remarks I have made which reflected in any way on the character and integrity of these employees is sincerely regretted and I extend you my apologies by way of some amends.

Also enclosed herewith is a text of the proposed bill I have had prepared and which I discussed with you which I am sure the House will pass if the opportunity and necessity arises.

You are authorized to make whatever use of this letter you may see fit.

Again assuring you of the very high personal esteem I have for you and of my admiration for your unequaled public career, and thanking you for all your courtesies and kindnesses to me, I am,

Sincerely yours,
TOM STEED,
Member of Congress.

A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to limit the authority of Members of the House of Representatives to send bulk mailings under the franking privilege

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 57 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"4169. Limitation on authority of Members of the House of Representatives to send bulk mail under the franking privilege."

The authority of Members and Members-elect of Congress to mail matter with a simplified form of address under the franking privilege shall not be construed to permit the mailing of bulk mail matter with a simplified form of address under the franking privilege by any Member of the House of Representatives unless such matter is addressed to destinations in the congressional district from which such Member was elected. As used in this section—

"(1) 'Member of the House of Representatives' means a Member or Member-elect of the House of Representatives and the Resident Commissioner or Resident Commissioner-elect from Puerto Rico; and

"(2) 'congressional district' means (A) the congressional district from which the Member or Member-elect was elected, (B) in the case of a Representative-at-Large or Representative-at-Large-elect, the State from which such Representative or Representative-elect was elected, and (C) in the case of the Resident Commissioner or Resident Commissioner-elect from Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico."

SEC. 2. The table of contents of chapter 57 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"4169. Limitation on authority of Members of the House of Representatives to send bulk mail under the franking privilege."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I want to make it clear that in my opinion this letter does constitute an apology from Representative STEED. However, this is a matter for the determination of each Member of this body.

I urge that the conference report be agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as a member of the conference committee of the legislative appropriation bill, I approved all questions in dispute with the exception of the item concerning junk mail, and on that item the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and I reserved our right to be against it. I also told the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that I would be in opposition to that item when it came before the Senate. I personally hope that the legislative appropriations bill will be sent back by the Senate for further conference on this subject.

I make that statement regardless of personalities, regardless of what a House

Member said about the Senate, or anything else. I do so because the way the conference dealt with the problem of junk mail, a Senator would find it impossible to conduct a political campaign against a Member of the House who would have the advantage of sending out junk mail, so called, but a Senator would not.

I hope, on that ground alone, regardless of personalities, that the item will be sent back for further conference.

I thank the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his remarks in support of the Senate amendment. I hope the Senate will reject the conference report, but not only on the basis of the irresponsible statement made by a Member of the House who threatened that if the conference report were not accepted, he would expose certain alleged wrongdoings in the Senate.

My only comment on that point is that the Senate has a committee now examining alleged misconduct. We welcome the Representative to come and testify in relation to any information that he may have. If he has no such information we most respectfully suggest that he keep his mouth shut.

The fact that he has apologized for this on the basis that it was a slip of the tongue does not mean much to me, because a man does not make such statements with merely slips of the tongue unless he admits himself to be an irresponsible individual to begin with.

I believe, therefore, that on that basis, if on no other, the conference report should be rejected, but the problem goes beyond that point to the merits of the amendment itself.

A year ago the Senate adopted my amendment, and the House concurred in it, which would prohibit Members of either the House or the Senate from using the junk mail privilege. Under the law as it was prior to the adoption of the amendment a Member of Congress could make an obviously political speech and then incorporate that speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He could then print it by the thousands and distribute it over his State or his congressional district, and if he were bitten by the presidential bug, through the franking privilege, he could circulate the entire United States of America at the expense of the taxpayers.

That was permissible under the law as it was prior to the adoption of the amendment last year.

As the bill comes back from the conference today it would reinstate this privilege for a Member of the House of Representatives. It is wrong for the House of Representatives. It is wrong for the Senate. As the Senator from Massachusetts pointed out, in the form in which it now is it represents a definitely unfair advantage, because a Member of the House running against a Member of the Senate would have a distinct advantage.

On the other hand, if Congress should pass the provision for both Houses an incumbent in either the House or the Senate would have an unfair advantage over his opponent at home, because it would mean that a Member of the House of Representatives or of the Senate could finance with free postage circulation of his political material, whereas his opponent would have to raise the cash to pay the postage. That, too, would be wrong. It could run into a sizable amount of money.

The taxpayers never were supposed to be shouldered with the responsibility of financing the postal charges of political campaigns either in congressional districts or in the senatorial races or for some Member of Congress who might have the presidential "bug."

In fairness to the American taxpayers, by all means the conference report should be rejected and sent back, and the Senate should insist upon support of the Senate amendment as it was originally passed.

I urge the rejection of the conference report.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, apologies, like that referred to by the distinguished chairman, never quite catch up with the charges. They are always buried somewhere along the line, and it is necessary for the Senate to take action to rebut this affront to all the womanhood on the Senate side of the Capitol.

The gentleman in question, of another body—and I must be careful not to violate the rules—in an article which appeared in the Washington Daily News of October 30, 1963, was quoted as saying:

> I personally know of a Senator who keeps two call girls on his office payroll. I know because I've been at parties where they've been. I've already prepared an amendment that will require the Senate to publish all its payrolls, as the House does.

On the 1st of November, there was an Associated Press article in which the same gentleman, of another body, was quoted as saying:

> They started this. If they want to violate the traditional rule of comity between the two branches and tell us how to run our shop, I'm going to aggravate them all I can.

The first paragraph of that Associated Press article also refers to:

> a Senator who had two "call girls" on his payroll.

On November 13, there appeared in the Washington Evening Star an article dealing with this same matter. It is only repetitious.

But on November 14, the New York Times carried the article:

> Senate Conferees Yield on House "Junk Mail."

There was this paragraph:

> Representative * * * recently threatened to disclose the name of a Senator who he said had two call girls on his payroll unless the Senate yielded on the junk-mail issue.

Mr. President, that sounds like blackmail in order to secure junk mail.

Then, on the 19th of November, the Washington Daily News carried the article which said, in part:

> Mr. * * * said "Why, of course, I wouldn't. I may be a dirty rat, but I wouldn't hurt any human being. If somebody did that * * * well, I'm pretty broadminded. I'm no reformer. That sort of thing has been going on since Adam and Eve, the historians say.

And then there was the question:

> I said, "Is there a Senator with 'call girls' on his payroll?"

And then the gentleman in question, from another body, said:

> There was, some time ago, but I'm not going to pin it down. I don't give a damn anyway.

Mr. President, we do care, and we are not going to let this insult to every woman working on the Senate side of the Capitol stand, or permit this sinister cloud, this innuendo, and these cheap and nasty insinuations. The one thing we can do is to send the conference report back to the conference committee and send it back unanimously, to show that the Senate will not tolerate this sort of thing.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator agree with me that the provision of having junk mail available to one House and not to the other would be completely different from the general courtesy between the two Houses regarding their own affairs? This is a matter which concerns both Houses, and cannot be permissible for one and not the other. The Senator agrees with me, does he not, that that is fundamental?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed I do. It involves a service by one of the largest departments of government, and runs into millions of dollars a year. That is something more than comity and understanding between the two Houses of the Legislature.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And that is fundamental in the consideration of this item in the conference report.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It definitely is.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. Does the Senator propose to place those dispatches in the RECORD?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I read portions of the dispatches. I can put them into the RECORD.

Mr. SIMPSON. I make that request.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in their entirety the news articles, from which I read several excerpts into the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Oct. 30, 1963]

REPRESENTATIVE STEED SAYS HE KNOWS THE ANSWER—DOES A CERTAIN SENATOR HAVE CALL GIRLS ON HIS PAYROLL?

(By Richard Starnes)

Which Senator keeps two call girls on his office payroll?

And which ones anoint themselves with all manner of exotic hair oil at the expense of us worried, bald taxpayers?

And how many Senate lawgivers wallow in torrents of iced mineral water, charged to you-know-who?

And which ones have keys to the anonymous doorway behind which the free booze is kept?

The answers to these (and other) diverting questions are being carefully squirreled away by Representative TOM STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma, in anticipation of a rousing "skunk fight" between the House and Senate. Representative STEED fervently hopes he won't have to launch the gamy ammunition he's laying by. But he stoutly insists he'll do it if "they" ("they" being Members of the Senate seeking to work their wicked will on the House) force him to.

He might do it, too. Once, when a group of home State newsmen asked him why he'd voted for a bill raising congressional salaries (his own included) he replied: "Because I'm a greedy s.o.b."

SATISFACTION

He tells the story now with obvious satisfaction, and without recourse to any nicenellie initials.

"I figured I'd have had to quit if we hadn't gotten the raise, because I couldn't stand the financial strain," he says, "so I figured if I got beaten over the pay raise I hadn't lost anything. As a matter of fact I voted for the increase because Members of Congress needed it, and I hoped it might mean we'd get Members who could afford to pass honest legislation."

Representative STEED's war with the Senate has grown out of a deceptively picayunish issue. The question is whether Members of the House should be permitted to frank (mail free) material variously described as patron mail or junk mail, depending on whether you are for it or against it. By any name it is bulk mail addressed to, say, all rural boxholders in a Congressman's district.

ACCOMMODATION

The Senate violated the ancient accommodation between the two Chambers of Congress by amending the legislative appropriation forbidding the House to engage in such taxpayer-subsidized bulk mailing. Representative STEED, a salty-talking former country newspaper editor, concedes there are abuses in franked patron mail. But in the Senate action he sees a dark design whereby the Senate is seeking to dominate the House.

"By the traditional rule of comity," he says, "each House has always been responsible for its own housekeeping. We don't try to tell the Senate what to do, and they shouldn't try to tell us what to do. A Congress of two coequal Houses can't exist under any other arrangement."

As chairman of the joint House-Senate conference committee that will try to reconcile the two versions of the appropriation bill, Representative STEED is in a unique position to carry out his threat to embarrass the Senate if it refuses to lift its ban on bulk mail franking. He is armed with 11 amendments to the bill, and vows he'll use every one, if necessary.

"Nobody on earth can find out names of everyone who is on a Senator's payroll," he insists. "I personally know of a Senator who keeps two call girls on his office payroll. I know because I've been at parties where they've been. I've already prepared an amendment that will require the Senate to publish all its payrolls, as the House does.

"I've also got amendments that'll require them to give newsmen access to all the vouchers for money spent for any purpose. It isn't done now, and every Senator can have his own brand of hair oil—greasy kid stuff or whatever—as well as chilled mineral water and liquor and anything else at taxpayer expense."

Representative STEED won't go into production with his skunk works until the legislative appropriation bill is the last hurdle before adjournment. "Then we'll have our conference on the bill," he promises, "and if the Senate doesn't back down I'll hand in one of my amendments every day, along with the reasons for it, until it does."

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 1, 1963]

STEED SAYS CALL GIRLS ARE ON HILL PAYROLL

Representative TOM STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma, renewing his running fight with the Senate, said yesterday that he knew a Senator who had two call girls on his payroll.

He also said in an interview that "there is plently of free whiskey around senatorial offices."

STEED, chairman of an Appropriations Subcommittee handling the congressional budget, has been feuding with the Senate since it refused to go along with a House provision that would let Representatives send mail free throughout their States without addressing it to individuals.

"They started this," STEED said. "If they want to violate the traditional rule of comity between the two branches and tell us how to run our shop, I'm going to aggravate them all I can."

STEED said he did not know whether the two girls of shady reputation still are employed by the Senator whom he refused to identify.

Their employment, he said, was discovered by him inadvertently at a Washington party.

[From the Washington Star, Nov. 13, 1963]

OCCUPANT MAIL ACCORD MAY SPEED UP BILLS

A long-stalled $106 million appropriation bill for the operation of Congress was expected to start moving again in the House today because of a proposed compromise on so-called occupant mail.

There was some doubt, however, that the Senate would readily accept the compromise worked out late yesterday by a joint House-Senate conference committee. The compromise would limit a proposed Senate ban on the sending of occupant mail to Senators and permit Representatives to go on using this type of mail.

BAN ON BOTH HOUSES

The controversy, similar to one which stalled some legislation last year, flared up last spring when the Senate amended the House version of the legislative appropriation bill by prohibiting Members of Congress from sending mail to dwelling and business addresses without specifically naming the recipients.

This occupant mail, often referred to as junk mail in congressional debates, has been defended by House Members as a proper and necessary method of communicating with large numbers of constituents, particularly in election years.

Many House Members protested that Senate adoption of such a ban on House Members as well as Senators violated the comity which should exist between both branches of Government. They warned that the House would reject any legislative appropriation bill compromise containing such a prohibition.

One irate House Member, Representative STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma, threatened at one point to reveal the name of a Senator who, he said, had two call girls on his payroll. Mr. STEED had refused to meet with Senate colleagues until they assured him the prohibition would be dropped.

CALLED POST OFFICE OPERATION

Some Senators have contended that congressional comity was not involved because the problem of handling occupant mail relates primarily to the operation of the Post Office Department and is not, strictly speaking a housekeeping operation of the House or Senate.

Although House and Senate passed the legislative appropriation in different forms last June, it was only last week that the House consented to sending the measure to conference.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 14, 1963]

SENATE CONFEREES YIELD ON HOUSE JUNK MAIL

WASHINGTON, November 12.—Senate negotiators gave in Tuesday to House insistence that its Members be given free junk mail privileges.

The settlement in a House-Senate conference resulted in approval of a $168,293,069 compromise money bill providing funds to operate Congress, the Library of Congress and the Government Printing Office for the budget year ending next June 30.

Representative TOM STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma, recently threatened to disclose the name of a Senator who he said had two call girls on his payroll unless the Senate yielded on the junk mail issue.

[From the Washington Daily News, Nov. 19, 1963]

BLACKMAIL? OR JUST JUNK?

(By Tom Donnelly)

Have things reached such an ugly pass that Congressmen now practice blackmail right out in the open, and no voice in an amoral Congress is raised in protest?

A wire story the other day said, casuallike, that Senate negotiators gave in to the House's insistence that its Members get free junk mail privileges. "In return, a House threat to expose alleged call girls on a Senator's payroll was never mentioned."

One newspaper reader, me, was shocked. To snatch at just one shockmaking aspect, I thought dirty deals were made in the back end of the Capitol cloakroom, or some place shady like that. Not in public, for all the world to see. Or at least, for such parts of the world as might be paying any attention. I waited for somebody in Congress to take the floor in righteous wrath. I'm still waiting.

It was several weeks ago that Representative TOM STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma, said he knew of a Senator who kept two "call girls" on his payroll, and intimated that the Senate had better let the House have junk mail privileges, or else.

I phoned Representative STEED. After some gingerly preliminaries, I said "You didn't name the Senator with the 'call girls' on his staff, and the Senate negotiators surrendered on the free-mail-privileges-for-the-House issue. Some people might say that looks like blackmail."

Mr. STEED said amiably, "Whatever interpretation people put on that has nothing to do with me."

I said, "Would you have named this Senator, if it came to that?"

Mr. STEED said, "Why, of course I wouldn't. I may be a dirty rat, but I wouldn't hurt any human being. If somebody did that * * * well, I'm pretty broadminded. I'm no reformer. That sort of thing has been going on since Adam and Eve, the historians say."

I said, "Is there a Senator with 'call girls' on his payroll?"

Mr. STEED said, "There was, some time ago. But I'm not going to pin it down. I don't give a damn anyway."

I said, "You mean there isn't a Senator now with call girls on his payroll?"

Mr. STEED said, "I don't know. I haven't seen a recent Senate payroll. It did happen once. But the Senate keeps its records secret. They say they don't, but they do. These things could not happen if the Senate kept its records accessible, the way the House does. What I was doing, I was showing the Senate what would happen if we tried to impose our rules on them, the way they were trying to impose their rules on us. And I think we've got a lot more right to have free mail privileges than they've got to keep their records secret. I'll cure 'em of trying to affront the House."

I said, "Then you were making a genuine threat, and a bargain was made?"

Mr. Steed said, "Why, there wasn't any bargain. No such thing. Why, under the rule of comity I'd be the worst offender of all if I named names. I was dramatizing the need for the traditional rule of comity, which makes each House responsible for its own housekeeping. Now, after 4 months of patient effort on this free mail issue I gave the Senate an example of how distasteful it would be if there wasn't any rule of comity."

I said, "And one could say the threat was effective?"

Mr. Steed said, "That's just your interpretation. I was just trying to be as resourceful as I knew how. Maybe I illustrated the need for comity in a crude and defenseless sort of way. But after 4 months of nothing happening, I made my slip of the tongue and I got my story across."

"Slip of the tongue?" I echoed.

Mr. Steed said, "These are days when all sorts of things get out of focus and out of gear. It's probably very unfortunate that I used that illustration. But if there isn't going to be any rule of comity * * *. I guess it all shows you newspaper people are more interested in sex than constitutional government."

"Is that what it shows?" I said.

I couldn't think of anything else to say.

[From the Washington Daily News, Nov. 13, 1963]

Senate Gives In—Call Girl Threat Is Junked

Senate negotiators gave in yesterday to the House's insistence that its Members be given free junk mail privileges.

In return, a House threat to expose alleged call girls on a Senator's payroll was never mentioned.

FUNDS OK'D

The settlement, in a House-Senate conference, resulted in approval of a $168,293,069 compromise bill providing funds to operate Congress, the Library of Congress, and the Government Printing Office for the budget year ending June 30.

Representative Tom Steed, Democrat, of Oklahoma, had threatened to disclose the name of a Senator who, he said, had two call girls on his payroll, unless the Senate yielded.

The compromise bill permits House Members to send franked congressional mail addressed to "occupant" if they so desire, but prohibiting Senators from enjoying the same privilege.

"COMITY"

The Senate earlier had approved an amendment by Senator John L. Williams, Republican, of Delaware, extending the Senate mail ban to the House.

Representative Steed, head of the House conferees, had complained this was a "violation of comity" between the two Chambers. He had refused since June to meet with Senate negotiators until he got assurances that the Senate would scrap the Williams amendment.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 14, 1963]

Senate Conferees Yield on House's Junk Mail

Washington, November 12.—Senate negotiators gave in Tuesday to House insistence that its Members be given free junk mail privileges.

The settlement in a House-Senate conference resulted in approval of a $168,293,069 compromise money bill providing funds to operate Congress, the Library of Congress, and the Government Printing Office for the budget year ending next June 30.

Representative Tom Steed, Democrat, of Oklahoma, recently threatened to disclose the name of a Senator who he said had two call girls on his payroll unless the Senate yielded on the junk mail issue.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 14, 1963]

Senators Lose Round to House Members on Junk Mail Issue—Full House Approves Conference Version, Senate Test Due—Battle Holds Up Spending Bill

Washington.—The Senate lost a round in this year's battle to deny so-called junk mail privileges to House Members.

The House and Senate have been deadlocked over the issue since June 26, when the Senate voted 58 to 26 to continue a ban on broad-scale congressional mailing to unnamed occupants. Yesterday Senate champions retreated in a conference with House Members and the full House approved the conference version restoring the mailing privileges. The key test, however, will be in the full Senate.

Ordinarily, each Chamber is content to let the other mind its own affairs. But many Senators fear ambitious House Members trying to win Senate seats could use the disputed mail privileges to blanket States with campaign material.

Outraged House Members argue that the Senate, which has never sought such mail privileges, has no right to meddle in House business. The leader of the House forces, Representative Steed, Democrat, of Oklahoma, has even threatened to disclose evidence of alleged Senate extravagances and scandals if the Senators don't yield.

This year the battle has held up congressional action on a bill appropriating $168.3 million to operate Capitol Hill. House Members hope the session's lateness will force Senate surrender. Tarrying tactics have worked before for the House. After losing on the issue in 1960, the House voted itself the privilege the day before adjourning the 1961 session. The Senate had no choice but to accept. Last year, however, the Senators outmaneuvered House Members and the proviso was defeated.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In response to the question of the Senator from Massachusetts about comity between the Houses, is it not a fact that existing law prohibits bulk mailing privileges to either the House or the Senate?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The proposal in the conference report would reinstate the privilege for the House of Representatives alone; which, as the Senator from Massachusetts pointed out, would be wrong in that it would give House Members an unfair advantage over the Senate. It would be equally wrong, or even worse, to extend the privilege to the Senate because then both the House and Senate Members would have an unfair advantage over an opponent at home.

It was not intended that the Congress extend free junk-mailing privileges to political candidates who happen to hold office in the Congress. The Congress recognized that as being wrong, and both the House and the Senate by overwhelming votes had rejected the proposal. We have denied such junk-mailing privileges for the American businessman even though he pays for them.

Yet we are now asked to extend this special privilege to the House of Representatives. It is a privilege which both Houses of Congress deny to the American businessman even though he would pay for it.

We are now asked to say—if we accept the conference report—that a Member of the House of Representatives can use his franking privilege for the mailing of his political propaganda.

I agree further with the Senator from Illinois that the irresponsible statement which was made by a Member of that body is an insult to the integrity and character of every girl working on the Senate side of the Capitol. The Senate should rise up and by unanimous vote send the report back and by so doing accept the challenge of the man who made such an irresponsible statement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, amplifying in part what the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts said, there are 41 Members of this body who at one time served in the House of Representatives. It is fair to assume, without any definite information, that many who serve in this body and who were Members of the House came here as a result of a contest with an incumbent Senator.

That was not true in my case, because I had retired from the House, but I know of instances in which the junk mail privilege was used for the purpose of a political campaign.

We cannot extend this privilege to one House and not the other. We believe, however, that it is wrong. We believe it is unlawful. We do not believe it comes within the provisions of the so-called comity understanding between the two Houses. Therefore, the conference report must go back. The Senate conferees must stand their ground. The Senate amendment, which passed by a record vote, must be insisted upon by the Senate conferees.

The House has an election in the matter. If I remember the rule correctly, after 20 days the House can discharge its conferees. It can appoint new conferees. After our deliberations with the House conferees, we shall know what to do. So this situation does not necessarily have to be a stalemate. The answer lies in the hands of the House of Representatives, because it can do what it will, and can select new conferees.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of having the yeas and nays ordered?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I understand, in connection with the conference report, that there is an item still in disagreement that could be acted on and disposed of, so that it would not have to go back to conference, if the conference report is rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, that has reference to the amendment having to do with withdrawal of authority from the

Capitol Building Commission of unlimited construction authority for the west central front.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. It withdraws the authority of contract from the Capitol Building Commission. Only a small amount could be spent for a nongovernmental survey as to the actual physical condition for the construction of the foundation for the west front.

With the exception of that expenditure, appropriations will first be required.

Therefore, I think it would be wise, considering the great difficulties between the House and the Senate on this unhappy bill, at least to agree to the amendment that the conferees have agreed on, and have the Senate accept it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As the Senator from Illinois has said, why can we not consider all the matters with the exception of the so-called junk mail item? We are all agreed upon them. There is no question as to the other items. In that way action could be completed on the conference report except for the junk mail item.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct. There is general agreement. If the Senate could accept the items on which the conferees have agreed, and take final action, leaving out the Williams amendment, it would still have plenty to do. The conferees will still have great difficulty. They have had this bill under consideration since May or June.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Such action would be wise, because the House conferees receded on the Senate amendments. So action on the bill would be complete except for this one item.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is my understanding that this difficulty can be cured by the Senate concurring in the amendments, or taking any other action the conferees propose, after action on the conference report. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate can act on any amendment of the House after action on the conference report.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was a member of the conference committee. I basically supported our chairman, who rendered admirable service in obtaining, in the main, House concurrence in the Senate language. I shall vote to send the report back, not because of the provisions of the report, because I think they are essentially proper. I shall vote to send it back because of the innuendo in the regrettable, unfortunate, and indefensible remarks which have been made by a Member of the other body regarding conduct in the Senate.

On that basis I feel that the report should be sent back.

I want to make it quite clear that I believe the conference committee did the best that possibly could be done under the circumstances relating to the provisions of the bill itself.

All the talk to the effect that, somehow or other, members of the conference were blackmailed or threatened is mere "hogwash." I was present. There was no such talk. All the loose talk occurred after the conference committee had done its work. At that time stories appeared to the effect that one or more Members of the Senate had so-called call girls on his or their payroll, making a serious reflection upon every Member of this body and on every lady that works for the Senate.

On the basis of what the minority leader has said, I join him. I think his suggestions are entirely proper in this area. The report should be sent back.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I rise briefly to express the hope that the report will be sent back with an overwhelming vote. The attack on the Senate in this case is one of the most inexcusable breaches of congressional courtesy, as well as one of the most massive assaults upon the truth, that I have ever seen during my service in this body.

This attack was originally made before the conference ever met and before the House appointed conferees. That is what makes it absolutely inexcusable. If it had occurred after the conference, it might have been explained.

The Washington Daily News of October 30 carried this headline: "Representative STEED Says He Knows the Answer—Does a Certain Senator Have Call Girls on His Payroll?"

It continues:

> He knows that he had call girls on his office payroll.

Then the news story states further—

> In anticipation of a rousing "skunk fight" between the House and Senate.

The article does not say the conference would be a fight between skunk and man, but that is a fair interpretation. This man was free with charges that he was not willing to substantiate by giving the name of the Senator who, he alleges, had call girls on his payroll.

It has been said here that this is a reflection on all the fine young ladies who work on the Senate side of the Capitol. Indeed, it is. Mr. President, it is more than that. It is a direct insult to every Member of the Senate. It forces every Senator to live under the charge of his enemies, at least, that he has call girls on his payroll.

This man ought either to have the courage to come out and give the name of the Senator who he claims has call girls on his payroll, or who had them in the past, or this man ought to admit that he is an unmitigated liar.

There are other charges in this story. I did not hear all the earlier discussion on the floor, but I assume these news items have been discussed at some length. I will not go into details.

It is said that Senators keep their payrolls secret. That is another charge that is without a semblance of truth. The Senate payrolls were opened some time ago. They are published quarterly. The Senate publishes a report that carries the name of every employee in the office of every Senator, and the compensation that those employees receive.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, it not only carries all the names, but every employee must be sworn in and identified as he goes on the payroll. The list also carries the name of every Senate employee generally employed and performing Senate functions of any kind.

Furthermore, it is required that the financial clerk and the Sergeant at Arms publish annually a complete list of all the vouchers showing all the expenditures of the Senate.

I have a letter before me written by Robert A. Brenkworth, the financial clerk of the Senate, pointing all this out in detail. I should like to ask to have it printed in the RECORD at this point, with the Senator's permission.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to have it inserted at this point in the RECORD. What I have said applies not only to employees in the office of every Senator, but also to every employee of every committee, and of the Senate generally, down to the lowliest laborer on the payroll of the Senate.

Their names are published quarterly, along with the amount of money that each of them has received in the preceding quarterly period.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, October 31, 1963.

Hon. MIKE MONRONEY,
Chairman, Legislative Subcommittee, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MONRONEY: The following information is furnished in response to your recent inquiry as to the availability of information regarding the payrolls and other disbursements of the Senate.

You will recall that on June 25, 1959, the Senate agreed to a resolution (S. Res. 139) requiring the Secretary of the Senate to publish a quarterly report of the names, titles, and amounts paid to all employees of the Senate. The first such report covered the fiscal quarter July-September 1959, and reports have been printed for every fiscal quarter since that time. We are presently preparing, for the Secretary, the report for the July-September 1963 quarter which will go to the printer shortly and be available to the public on or before November 29. Being responsible for the preparation of the reports, I can assure you that the name, title, and amount paid every employee in every office of the Senate authorized to be paid from appropriated funds of the Senate, is carried in said reports. While this document is distributed by the Secretary of the Senate, I am sufficiently aware of the distribution procedures to assure you that anyone requesting this publication, in person or by mail, is accommodated.

The information contained in these reports, as well as itemized and detailed information regarding all receipts and expenditures of the Senate by fiscal years is also available to the public in the annual report of the Secretary of the Senate, which is submitted to the Senate in January of each year and available as a Senate document shortly thereafter. This annual report is prepared for the Secretary by this office and I can assure you that it is a direct and accurate reflection of Senate disbursements without exceptions. As a matter of fact, the galley proofs of this report are prepared from copies of the original vouchers submitted to the

General Accounting Office in support of our disbursing accounts.

In regard the intimations that liquor is being purchased by the Senate, I can assure you that during my tenure as financial clerk of over 9 years, this office has not issued a check paying for or reimbursing anyone for liquor. By order of the Committee on Rules and Administration, this office audits all vouchers to insure, among other things, that only official expenses, in accordance with law or regulations, are paid. With the exceptions of meals furnished laborers required to remain on the job because of late sessions, the specifically authorized reception of foreign dignitaries by the Foreign Relations Committee (S. Res. 247, agreed to February 7, 1962), and the reception for the President and Vice President of the Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies, we do not pay or reimburse for luncheons, dinners, or any other entertainment expenses.

I am unaware of any organization at any government level, public or private, that reveals to the general public more information regarding its financial transactions than does the U.S. Senate and this includes the House of Representatives. I would be very much surprised to learn of any published reports as revealing, or more revealing than the Senate's. I am constantly amazed by the newspaper statements regarding secrecy of Senate transactions in this area and cannot understand how or why these charges are made when the existence of these reports entirely refutes them.

Respectfully,
ROBERT A. BRENKWORTH,
Financial Clerk,
U.S. Senate.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON. As I understand, this information is also printed in booklet form, so that anyone who wishes to do so may obtain a copy of the booklet.

Mr. RUSSELL. Anyone who was interested in the truth would have at least investigated to see whether there was any substance to the charge before it was made. Any Member of either House can easily obtain a copy of each of these printed reports.

I read another paragraph from the News article:

> "Nobody on earth can find out names of everyone who is on a Senator's payroll," he insists.
>
> "I personally know of a Senator who keeps two call girls on his office payroll."

The Senate is entitled to have the Member of the other body give the name of that Senator. If he does not do so, if he refuses to do it, only one conclusion can properly be drawn.

He continues:

> I know because I've been at parties where they've been. I've already prepared an amendment that will require the Senate to publish all its payrolls.

As I have said, that has already been done.

The other business, about Senators using "greasy kid stuff" on their hair would not apply to me or some of my colleagues in the Senate, but I suppose this statement was a poor attempt to lard a little humor onto a monumental falsehood.

I do not see how the Senate could possibly maintain its self-respect if it accepted the conference report. I am as much in favor of comity between the two Houses as anyone else, but I have a vivid recollection of an instance in which this rule did not work. It is a poor rule that does not work both ways. I am sure Senators will recall the last supplemental appropriation bill of 1961, when the Senate received the conference report on that bill after the other body had adjourned and gone home. A number of things had been done in that conference report which caused a great deal of discussion in the Senate, not only in the wee small hours of the morning, but up to the break of day. In that conference report, there was one item which increased the clerk hire of each Senator by $3,000 basic.

If ever there were a housekeeping item, pertaining solely to the office of a Senator or Representative, that was it.

That was vastly different from an item affecting not only Congress, but also the Post Office Department and the delivery of mail throughout the entire United States. The definition of mailing privileges is a matter of policy, not of comity. The House, in that conference report in 1961, rejected the $3,000 addition to the Senate payroll, which was truly a matter of comity.

That did not cost me any personal tears because I have never utilized all of my payroll allowances. I have returned to the Treasury thousands of dollars. However, it did offend me, as a Senator, to have such a breach of the rule of comity that had always obtained between the House and the Senate.

Therefore, the cry of comity can appeal only to those with very short memories, because back in 1961, only 2 years ago, with the sun rising in the east, the House of Representatives having gone home several hours earlier under the joint resolution of sine die adjournment, the Senate found itself without the comity that traditionally has permitted each House to fix the allowances for staff assistance in the offices of the Members of each body.

Mr. President, the Senate cannot afford to leave the matter in this position. I have the utmost sympathy for Senators who must deal with this matter as conferees. I know from my own experience how difficult it is to meet with Members of the other body, men of good will, who want to do what is fair, proper, and appropriate under the traditions and the understandings that have always guided these two bodies, and then to encounter a situation of this kind. I do not know how it is to be dealt with, but we in the Senate cannot afford to leave it in this position.

This person ought to name the name of the Senator who, he said, had these two call girls on his payroll, in order that the Senate might then take the necessary steps to protect its own dignity and its proper position in the view of the people of the United States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I reiterate the point the Senator has made, that this is not a matter of comity, but a question of policy with relation to the whole Congress. I believe that is a very important point that the Senator brought out in connection with the conference, where, we know, comity exists to a great degree between the two Houses, but on the question of policy it becomes a question of discussing and arguing out and reaching a common ground for both branches of the Congress.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Georgia for the service he has rendered to the Senate and the country. Every statement he has made is unanswerably sound, and I associate myself with his statements.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I commend the Senator from Georgia for his fine analysis of the problem. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Merely because an apology might be tendered, I would hope that it would not be the position of the Senator from Georgia or other Senators that that would cure the problem raised by the Williams amendment. Suppose the Senate received a humble apology from the other body.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not undertake to pass on that question. I do not believe the Senate is passing on it at this time. The conferees will deal with that question when they go into conference. Whatever is agreed upon will have to be brought back to the Senate for the approval of the entire Senate.

Mr. MILLER. But I would hope that the Senate at this time would not by the expression of our concern over this unfortunate incident indicate that the situation could automatically be cured by a simple apology.

Mr. RUSSELL. I said I did not undertake to pass on that question, because I am not one of the conferees. I do know that the Senate cannot afford to leave the matter in this situation and still maintain its self-respect in the eyes of the American people.

I yield the floor.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE ARGENTINE REPUBLIC AND PRESIDENT OF THE ARGENTINE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate is distinctly honored this morning by having as a visitor in our Chamber Dr. Carlos Humberto Perette, Vice President of the Argentine Republic and President of the Argentine Senate. We have heard of this distinguished gentleman over the years and are delighted that so high ranking an official of the Argentine Government is among us.

We are extremely happy to have him escorted to the Chamber of the Senate by the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], our President pro tempore.

It is indeed a privilege and an honor to welcome to our midst Dr. Perette and also Dr. Roberto T. Alemann, the Ambassador of the Argentine Republic. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I concur in the sentiment expressed by the distinguished majority leader. It is always a felicitous occasion when our Latin American neighbors come to visit us, and particularly when they visit the legislative branch of the Government.

So we salute the gentlemen and bid them welcome.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 1964—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6868) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Georgia upon his remarks concerning the conference report on the legislative appropriations bill.

For several years, I have been chairman of the subcommitte which handles the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill. In that bill in 1960, the House included a provision for the free distribution of unaddressed mail in cities, mail which the Department had theretofore declined to handle. The subcommittee of which I am the chairman eliminated that provision. The Senate confirmed that action, and the item remained out of the bill.

The next year, the provision for the House to put the taxpayers to the expense of sending franked mail unaddressed to cities was included in a supplemental bill. Is not that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sorry; I do not recall.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It is my recollection that such a provision was included in a supplemental appropriation bill. Just why, I do not know. I was not one of the conferees. But when the provision was considered by the Senate, the Senate yielded to the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am advised by the assistant chief of staff of the Senate Committee on Appropriations that the Senator from Virginia is correct, that such an item was in the bill and was left in disagreement when the House adjourned. The Senate later was compelled to adopt it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. As a matter of policy, the Senate has consistently objected to what it regarded as an improper expense to the taxpayers of the Nation of permitting Members of Congress, primarily for campaign purposes, to send franked mail into the cities, to be distributed without addresses, only to boxholders.

As the Senator from Georgia has said, in a legislative appropriation bill, not a bill dealing with the Post Office Department, again the Senate is confronted with a similar provision in the conference report. What is desired is to have the Senate agree that only the House may send such mail, but not the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not sure as to that. I have not been too much concerned about this particular item. It is my understanding that the original provision that came to the Senate from the other body provides that both bodies could distribute such mail. The Senate struck out the entire item, and it was agreed in conference that the House could have that privilege.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am relying on the statement of one of the conferees that the issue is one that applies to the Senate. If the House gets the privilege, the Senate gets it, too.

I wish to emphasize that, as a matter of public policy, the Senate for a number of years, starting with the bill that I handled in 1960, has stood practically unanimously, so far as I can recall, against this practice.

The Senator from Georgia is eminently correct in saying that the Senate should insist on its amendment, especially in view of the reflection that has been made upon the entire membership of the Senate by the claim that some Senator, unknown, now has, or in the past has had, call girls on his payroll.

I shall with pleasure support the proposal of the distinguished Senator from Georgia to send the conference report back to the other body.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is the motion before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report on the legislative appropriations bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 2, nays 88, as follows:

[No. 257 Leg.]

YEAS—2

Hayden
Monroney

NAYS—88

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—10

Carlson
Eastland
Engle
Lausche
Long, La.
McCarthy
Morton
Neuberger
Pell
Smathers

So the report was rejected.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the Senate has decided by an overwhelming vote of 88 to 2 not to agree to the conference report.

I point out that the distinguished chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee and President pro tempore of the Senate, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and I as chairman of the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee voted in support of the conference report.

I can say for myself—and I feel certain for the Senator from Arizona—that we voted in that manner on the basis that we asked for the conference. We feel that the legislative content of the conference report is good and that the report is one that the Senate could have considered. The amendment in disagreement was the junk mail amendment which the Senate had written into the Senate bill. Our agreement in conference to the language that the Senate would deny the junk mail privilege to Members of the Senate and permit the House to use it if they chose to do so we felt would be an exercise of the proper responsibility of comity between the two Houses.

I believe the vote was not upon the content of this particular amendment or other adjustments, but resentment—and properly so—against the charges made by a Member of the other body that were completely unfounded and reflected on the morality of Senate employees, charges that were irresponsible in the extreme.

Consequently, the Senate has rejected the report by what could be called a unanimous vote, except for the two of us who had to arrange the conference, and perhaps will have to arrange the next one—if there is one.

Mr. President, there is an amendment, discussed earlier, that does not pertain to anything with which the Senate is in disagreement. It is a House amendment to the Senate amendment which would withdraw unlimited authority in the Capitol Reconstruction Commission to contract for expenditures without either House passing upon them. They usually are allowed only to pick up the final cost.

There was no control whatever over that authority, which was given and properly used by the Capitol Reconstruction Commission during the building of the east front. There is considerable feeling that the authority would carry over and be available for a $20 million or more expenditure for remodeling the west front, unless the language were changed, and the unlimited authority for contract authorization withdrawn. The Senate withdrew the authority. The House adopted an amendment which would withdraw the authority completely, as the Senate had done, except in the case of a nongovernmental survey of the actual state of the facility, the construction, the foundations, and the walls of the west front.

That would be a small expenditure that could still be authorized; otherwise, there would be no funds available to go ahead without specific appropriation of Congress. The amendment is the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 32.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 6868, which was read as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 14, 33, and 39 to the bill (H.R. 6868) entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes," and concur therein.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided,* That the proviso to the paragraph entitled 'Extension of the Capitol' in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, as amended, is amended by striking out 'and to obligate the additional sums herein authorized prior to the actual appropriation thereof', and by substituting in lieu thereof 'and, prior to any appropriations being provided for extension, reconstruction, and replacement of the west central portion of the United States Capitol, to obligate such sums as may be necessary for the employment of nongovernmental engineering and other necessary services and for test borings and other necessary incidental items required to make a survey, study, and examination of the structural condition and such west central portion, to make reports of findings, and to make recommendations with respect to such remedial measures as may be deemed necessary, including the feasibility of corrective measures in conjunction with extension of such west central portion.' "

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 32.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. My understanding is that the amendment would permit the special commission to engage the services of nongovernmental engineering firms?

Mr. MONRONEY. Specifically nongovernmental engineering firms. We hope they will be the leading engineering and architectural firms of the country, which will give us a solid, sound report on the exact condition of the west front, and what needs to be done to remedy it.

Mr. COOPER. Acceptance of the report and determination as to what should be done, however, would still be reserved to the Senate and the House.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes, indeed. The proposal would withdraw carte blanche authority in the case of the modernization of the east front. One thing we wish to avoid is carte blanche authorization. We wish to come back for authorization and appropriation of funds for whatever improvements Congress itself desires.

Mr. COOPER. I will not take any more time than is necessary, but I assume the Senate will consider amendment No. 33. Do I understand correctly?

Mr. MONRONEY. We do not intend to take up any amendment except No. 32. We intend to move that the Senate further insist upon its amendment.

Mr. COOPER. May I ask a question regarding amendment No. 33 while I still hold the floor?

Mr. MONRONEY. Of course.

Mr. COOPER. Amendment No. 33 would give authority to the Commission or the Capitol Architect to determine what plans would be followed in the restoration of the old Senate Chamber and the old Supreme Court?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes. This was the exact language as it passed the Senate. The House adopted this language, so it is not in disagreement.

Mr. COOPER. It is accepted?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes. The House accepted it.

Mr. COOPER. We hear talk about restoration of the old Senate Chamber. There have been some examples of restoration in the Capitol which I assume were not authentic restorations. Would the decision as to how the old Senate Chamber and the old Supreme Court chamber would be restored be left in the hands of the Capitol Architect or in some special commission?

Mr. MONRONEY. The report provides only for research, securing old pictures, drawings, and plans for the restoration.

They will be subject then to whatever committee or subcommittee the Senate wishes to have consider the matter.

This has been a favorite work of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. For many years the Senate has put the item in the bill. Each time heretofore it has been eliminated by the House.

I assure the Senator from Kentucky that great care will be taken to see that the restoration is actually to restore as nearly as possible the original Chamber.

Mr. COOPER. And not to modernize.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Am I correct in saying that this is merely to determine how much it will cost and what it is possible to do?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes. It will commit us to nothing except with respect to plans and research.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the House amendment to the Senate amendment No. 32.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate further insist upon its amendments in disagreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

HORIZONTAL PROPERTY REGIMES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4276) to provide for the creation of horizontal property regimes in the District of Columbia.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 4276.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill be passed. I understand there is no objection to it. It was placed before the Senate last night merely for the purpose of having something as the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 4276) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. DOUGLAS subsequently said: Mr. President, I understand that the Senate recently passed House bill 4276, to provide for the creation of horizontal property condominiums in the District of Columbia. In view of certain difficulties which recently have developed in connection with condominiums, I ask unanimous consent that the votes by which the committee amendment was agreed to and engrossed and the bill was read the third time and passed be reconsidered, in order to make possible further study of this measure by the Senate.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. **RUSSELL**. Mr. President, what was the request?

Mr. **DOUGLAS**. I asked for reconsideration of the votes in connection with the bill providing for the creation of horizontal property condominiums in the District of Columbia.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1964

Mr. **HAYDEN**. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations I report House Joint Resolution 809 and ask unanimous consent that the Senate may proceed to its immediate consideration.

The House joint resolution would continue until January 31, 1964, appropriations for those functions of the Government for which funds have not as yet been provided by law.

Mr. President, I regret as much as anyone the necessity for another continuing resolution during this session of the Congress. As Senators know, most of the delay on the appropriations bills has been occasioned by the lack of necessary authorization and, to date, only the foreign aid authorization bill remains to be enacted. For the RECORD, I am submitting a listing showing the status of all appropriations bills for fiscal year 1964:

Enacted into law are the bills for the Interior, Treasury, Post Office, Executive Office, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Defense Departments, and their related agencies.

With respect to the legislative branch appropriations bill, the Senate has just rejected the conference report.

Three bills have passed both Houses of Congress, the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and the Independent Offices appropriations bill, and conferences on these bills are being held or will be in the near future.

Three bills are presently in the Senate Committee on Appropriations. Hearings are underway on the military construction bill, and awaiting subcommittee markup are the bills for public works and the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary.

Still remaining in the House committee, pending finalization of the authorization bill, is the foreign aid appropriations bill.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, I object.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Objection is heard.

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, I should like briefly to explain why I have objected.

There is at the desk an amendment I have submitted to the joint resolution, which would substitute the date "December 31, 1963," for "January 31, 1964." I should like to call up that amendment and discuss it in some detail.

This does not mean I would attempt to delay inordinately the passage of the joint resolution, but I am not in a position to agree to have the joint resolution acted upon before the Senate goes to the House to hear the message of the President at 12:30.

If the Senator from Arizona will renew his request for unanimous consent after the Senate returns, I shall not object at that time, but I will then call up my amendment. I wish to discuss it at reasonable length.

I hope the amendment will receive support from Senators, because in my judgment we should remain in session and finish our job. We should pass the appropriation bills which have not yet been passed before the end of this year, so that those appropriations will not hang over us like a shadow—over the tax bill, over the civil rights bill, over the program of the President—1 minute longer than necessary.

In my judgment—and I may well be wrong—we can pass those appropriation bills before the end of this calendar year.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I have talked with the Senator from Arizona, who has indicated, in view of the objection raised, that he will accede to the request made by the Senator from Pennsylvania. Therefore, I hope now the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Mr. Nitze to be Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. **PASTORE**. Mr. President, this is the day before Thanksgiving. Most of us plan to go home to our families. Could not a unanimous-consent agreement be arrived at to limit debate with reference to this matter, so that all Senators can make plans as to transportation for going home? Senators must rely upon the commercial lines. One cannot make such arrangements as easily as one would like.

Most Senators would like to join their families tomorrow. I believe we have that right. It is now late in November. We are still working at our business. Most Senators will return on Monday or Tuesday, I am sure. Can there not be a unanimous-consent agreement to allot time so that we can know exactly what will be involved?

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. All we can know exactly is that at the conclusion of the joint meeting the Senate will come back into session. I hope that the Senate will then consider the joint resolution reported by the Senator from Arizona. In the meantime, in the view of the fact that Senators must leave the Chamber at 12:12 or 12:13, I suggest that the Senator from Rhode Island discuss this matter with the Senator from Pennsylvania, to see if something can be worked out.

Mr. **PASTORE**. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, with respect to the proposal of the Senator from Pennsylvania to change the date in the resolution from January 31 to December 31, that was discussed by the House leaders. We had a session of our own people on that yesterday morning. The joint resolution comes to us from the House, and fixes the date as of January 31. I believe that is a proper date.

I can only say now that when the amendment by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania is offered it should be rejected.

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, I listened to the colloquy in reference to the resolution for continuing appropriations to January 31, 1964. I wish to make the record clear.

I believe after Members of this body hear the message of President Johnson today they will know we have work to do. They will know we will proceed with that work as best we can, as rapidly as we can, and as decisively as we can.

There is not a thing in that resolution that prevents this Congress from passing bills, particularly appropriation bills, promptly. The leader of the majority has made it clear that we are going to be in session until very close to Christmas—in fact, during the Christmas period itself, until December 20. We are going to have an opportunity to work on the appropriation bills. In the meantime, I do not think we ought to tie the hands of the Government by denying adoption of a continuing resolution which has as its objective the continuation of the operations of the Government. I am going to insist, also, that we act on every bill that it is possible to move to.

Mr. **PASTORE**. Mr. President, I agree implicitly with everything the Senator from Minnesota has said. That is not exactly the problem that confronts us. The Senate can vote the resolution up or down, and I think it should; but I think we should vote one way or the other.

The proposal is to move the date up from January 31 to December 31. I think the Senate ought to work its will, but I think we ought to be reasonable about it. I think 1 hour's debate is enough.

Mr. **SALTONSTALL**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **JACKSON**. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. **SALTONSTALL**. This matter has been discussed by the Republican leadership. It also has been discussed with various members of the Appropriations Committee. As a senior member of that committee, I say December 31 is impracticable and impossible.

While I am just as anxious as the Senator from Pennsylvania is to get through with the appropriation bills, we cannot do it by that time, and therefore the best available date is January 31.

I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania, for whom I have high regard in many respects—I do not include this proposal as one on which I agree with him—will withdraw his proposal, because I think what he is proposing is impossible.

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota a friendly question. Why does he think we cannot get the appropriation bills through this year, so they will not stand in the way of the civil rights bill and the tax bill? If we cannot have them passed by the end of the year, let us have another continuing resolution to the middle of January. Let us not commit ourselves to what I am convinced is a well thought out plan to hold up appropriation bills until next year so as to help defeat the program of the President.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am fully aware of the possibilities that may be involved in having undue delays on appropriation bills, but, frankly, I may say that this subject has been discussed not only with Republicans but with responsible Democratic Members of the Senate.

After the President's message to the Congress today, every person who supports the administration and the program laid down by our late and beloved President Kennedy will want to get these matters considered, particularly the appropriation bills. But if we cannot, we must have the money to continue the operations of the Government. Incidentally, the continuing resolution is a little more generous than what is contemplated in some of the appropriation measures.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, our purpose can be accomplished by a 1-month extension. We do not need a 2-month extension. I think the Senator from Minnesota in his heart agrees with me.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY SIR ALISTAIR McMULLEN, PRESIDENT OF THE AUSTRALIAN SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate is honored this morning by having as its guest Sir Alistair McMullen, President of the Australian Senate. He came here for the purpose of attending the funeral of our late President. He holds a distinguished position in the Australian Government. We are indeed fortunate and proud he has seen fit to honor us by visiting this body.

At this time it gives me great pride to introduce a fellow parliamentarian, the President of the Australian Senate, Sir Alistair McMullen.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a distinguished visitor from "down under" is always welcome in this Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On behalf of the Senate, the Chair extends a cordial welcome to our distinguished guest.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business for the consideration of the nomination on the calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the name of Paul H. Nitze, of Maryland, to be Secretary of the Navy.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, my remarks on this nomination will be very brief. I cannot support confirmation of the appointment of Paul H. Nitze to be Secretary of Navy.

In years past, Mr. Nitze expounded views on Defense policy which, in my opinion, are contrary to the best interests of the Nation. I refer specifically to a speech or lecture made by Mr. Nitze at the Asilomar seminar on April 28, 1960. To be sure of keeping this speech in context, I will not attempt to quote from it, but I ask unanimous consent that the text of this speech be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. Nitze was questioned about this speech during the hearing on his nomination. Mr. Nitze testified that his speech at the Asilomar seminar was, in effect, nothing more than an academic exercise, or the presentation of ideas by him which he did not advocate nor even agree with, but merely articulated in order to stimulate intellectual discipline. He stated to the committee that his views on defense policy now are at variance with those presented by him at the Asilomar seminar.

Mr. President, the present views of Mr. Nitze on defense policy may be in conflict with his Asilomar speech. There are those for whose judgment I have a great respect who attest to the soundness of Mr. Nitze's present and past views on national security policy.

Despite Mr. Nitze's protests to the contrary, however, I cannot believe that the Asilomar speech given by Mr. Nitze was only an academic exercise. Despite the apparent disclaimers in the presentation, the entirety of the speech is a work of advocacy. It is no less the work of a salesman because it was the soft sell.

In many respects, Mr. Nitze's proposal for defense policy has subsequently been followed by national policy, although the policy may not have been attributable to Mr. Nitze. Indeed, the portion of the Asilomar speech on composition of military forces and on unilateral actions to be taken in the interest of stability could well have been a charter for the recent policies and actions of our Government, so closely do they follow.

In the final analysis, however, it is Mr. Nitze's attempts to evade his remarks in 1960 which reflect most on this nomination. The denials of the nominee that he advocated or even agreed with the remarks he himself made at the Asilomar seminar represent a lack of candor and forthrightness which should not be condoned. A nominee who engages in equivocation in his testimony on his own nomination is not likely to be more candid in his appearances before congressional committees after he is confirmed to his position of trust.

It seems to me clear that of late there is an increasing problem in obtaining forthright and unequivocal testimony from some officials in the executive branches. It is a problem which will plague the Congress until it is by some means brought to an end.

When this tendency is apparent even in hearings on nominations, it is time that the Senate draw the line.

I, therefore, cannot support Mr. Nitze's confirmation.

Mr. President, there are other matters which bear on this nomination about which I am not satisfied with the explanation given. One of these is a report of section 2 of the Fifth World Order Study Conference convened at Cleveland in November 1958 by the Department of International Affairs of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America. Mr. Nitze was reported to be chairman of section 2. In his testimony, the nominee stated that he merely presided at this Conference, that he was not a delegate, and had no vote. Although no record of a dissent was made, Mr. Nitze testified that he did not concur in the report. I ask unanimous consent that this report also be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], and the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], who opposed the nomination of Mr. Nitze in the Senate Armed Services Committee request that they be recorded against the confirmation of Mr. Nitze's nomination.

Exhibit 1

Power and Policy Problems in the Defense of the West

(Speech by Paul Nitze before Asilomar Seminar, April 28, 1960)

When Mr. Carter first suggested that I talk to you here this evening, he stressed one point. He said that the daytime presentations and seminars were to be serious exercises in disciplined analysis, while the evening speakers were free to toss ideas around as they saw fit. I shall therefore adopt for this evening's talk the standard suggested by one of the less widely accepted definitions of the economist. According to that definition the skill of the economist is adroitly to pass over the minor inconsistencies, the better to press on to the grand fallacy.

So let me begin by listing some of the assumptions upon which my argument will rest. Each one of these assumptions has ample room in it for inconsistency, difference of opinion, and substantial possibility of error. I take it that the rigorous daytime sessions will have clarified all these points, and I will therefore be free to spin out my chain to its full length without dwelling on the possibilities of error in each step as I go along.

The first assumption is that there is a radical distinction between a policy of deterrence and a military strategy. I take it that in a general war, or a central war, as my Rand friends prefer to call it, the rational aim of wartime military strategy would be substantially to disarm the enemy and thereby leave him no rational choice but to accept our will, while preserving our own essential core as a nation capable of exercising policy. I further take it that the aim of a policy of deterrence is to make it unlikely that we shall ever have to put our military strategy to the test.

The second assumption is that to support a military strategy aimed at disarming the enemy, if deterrence fails, one would need what I shall call a class A state of advance preparation. This would include all the essential elements, so often stressed by Dick Foster and Herman Kahn, including an effective first strike, counterforce capability backed by a secure second strike capability, plus excellent intelligence as to the extent and location of enemy forces and essential supporting installations; also active defense, passive defense, plus a program for rapid recuperation. To support a policy of deterrence something less than this may suffice. How much less is debatable. The key element obviously is a secure second strike capability, able under all foreseeable circumstances, including a surprise first strike by the enemy, to penetrate and do unacceptable damage to the enemy. Let us call this a class B capability. The essential definition of a class B capability is that it denies a class A capability to the other side.

The third assumption is that it is possible, in principle, to distinguish between relative stability and relative unstability in the relationship between the U.S.S.R.'s central war capabilities and those that we possess. If either side, or both sides, have a strong first strike counterforce capability but a weak second strike retaliatory capability, the important thing is who strikes first. Under such circumstances, any serious situation of tension, making it appear possible that one side might strike, will lead the other to try to get in a preemptive strike. If, on the other hand, both sides have inadequate first strike counterforce capabilities but have strong second strike capabilities, there will be little or no advantage in initiating a central war. In the latter case, a situation of relative stability should result.

The fourth assumption is that the situation today and for the next few years can be judged to be relatively unstable. The probable advantage of being first in getting off a counterforce strike is now so great that whoever does so may have some hope of following a rational military strategy, while the one striking second can have no such hope.

The fifth assumption is that in the next 3 or 4 years it should be possible for us to develop a secure second strike capability and that the Russians, because of their superior opportunities for secrecy and concealment, will need less time to provide themselves with such a secure second strike capability, if they do not now already possess one.

The sixth assumption is even more debatable than the other five. It is that the progress of technology is unlikely to make it easier than at present for one side to achieve a true class A capability, as against a major power that devotes itself intelligently and with timely measures to maintaining a secure retaliatory capability.

The basis for this assumption is that limits can already be foreseen beyond which further improvements in speed, range, power of warhead, accuracy, and reliability would appear to be of marginal significance. On the other hand, improvements in simplification, smaller size, lower cost, greater numbers, concealment, dispersal, hardening, mobility, and control are factors that seem to favor a second strike retaliatory capability more than a first strike counterforce capability. Obviously, some presently unforeseen development, such as a belt of ionized gas giving complete invulnerability to one side, would falsify this assumption. But the most radical of today's weapons systems were foreseen as possible in principle many years ago. I just don't know of any systems now thought to be possible in principle that would make a class A capability feasible against a determined opponent taking timely steps to counter it. I repeat, however, that this is a highly debatable assumption and one which would in no way justify any relaxation of research and development work attempting to prove whether the assumption is right or wrong. But for the moment let us assume it to be right.

Now if we start from these assumptions and look at our power and policy problems over the longer term future, what thoughts come to mind?

In the first place, we would naturally ask ourselves, what is the nature of our policy aim which it is the function of our military power to support? We dealt with this subject at considerable length in the first chapter of study No. 8 which the Washington Center for Foreign Policy Research prepared for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This evening I will merely summarize a few of the main points of the argument there presented. These are the following:

The fundamental purpose of the United States is laid down in the preamble of the Constitution. The aim of our foreign policy is to create and maintain in the world an external environment within which a nation with purposes such as ours can survive and prosper.

Today the fundamental world issue is, who is it to be who will succeed in constructing a new system of world order to take the place of the one which was destroyed as a result of the two world wars? We can no longer rely, as we did prior to World War I, upon the balance of power in Europe and Britain's command of the seas for the maintenance of such an environment. No country today other than the United States has the power and influence to challenge the U.S.S.R. in its effort to build a Communist world system, a system that would be incompatible with our purposes as a nation. We are therefore faced with a dual task—that of constructing a world system compatible with our purposes and appropriate to the world of today and tomorrow, and also of defending that system, while it is still being built, from successful attack or subversion by the Soviet Union and its associates. Our policy then is both to construct and to defend; not only to defend ourselves but to defend the entire coalition of non-Communist nations.

I imagine our second question would be, what are the aims of the Soviet leaders? I suggest they are threefold: first, to maintain the power of the Communist Party within Russia; second, to consolidate their hold over the Sino-Soviet bloc; third, to create their kind of a world system, a system in which no center or aggregation of power and influence would exist that could challenge their power and preeminence. The degree to which the original ideological fire of communism has burned itself out in the Soviet Union is debatable. To some extent that fire has transformed itself into a powerful bureaucracy. But powerful bureaucracies can also be dangerous. And ideological fervor seems still to maintain its intensity in Communist China. In any case, the historical development of communism has been such as to put special emphasis upon conflict and conflict management, almost to the complete subordination of other purposes.

The question which is now pertinent to our analysis is that of the means on which the Sino-Soviet leaders may prefer to put primary reliance in their conflict with us. Specifically, will they bend every effort to build a class A nuclear capability, or will they be content with a class B counterdeterrent while they rely primarily upon other than nuclear means for the pursuit of their policy objectives?

My guess is that they will strive for what they consider to be predominant military posture, but that this does not mean that they will strive at all costs for a class A capability, as I have defined it. I believe that they would much prefer to achieve their aims through means other than a nuclear counterforce strike and that if we apply ourselves intelligently to the task, we should be able to so shape our policy and programs that it neither appears possible nor desirable to them to rely upon a class A nuclear capability.

Clausewitz makes a distinction between hostility of feeling and hostility of intent. What I am suggesting is that Soviet hostility to us has become less a hostility of feeling and more a hostility of intent; and that a sustained effort to put oneself in a position to defeat another great power in nuclear war requires passion and not merely reason. In any case, if my first six assumptions are conceded, we ought to know within the next 3 or 4 years. If my assumptions are correct, this would be the period within which the U.S.S.R. would have the best chance of executing a counterforce disarming attack. If we get through that period, we may have greater reason to believe that the U.S.S.R. does not wish to put primary reliance upon achieving its objectives through the initiation of a counterforce attack.

So my seventh assumption is that we get through the next 3 or 4 years without a general nuclear war.

Now what broad alternatives for power and policy in defense of the West do we see as possibilities for the period 1964 and beyond? I propose to discuss three broad ranges of alternatives. One alternative will be for the United States to strive for a class A capability. The second will be for the United States to strive for a continuing unilateral class B capability. The third will be for the United States to strive for a system that utilizes collective defense in an effort to maximize collective security and thus create a system making mutual deterrence surer and more stable.

In years past I have supported the first of these alternatives, largely because it has never seemed clear to me how deterrence could be made certain if it was not backed up by a military force that could pursue a rational military strategy if deterrence failed. On the other hand, if deterrence is uncertain, to be capable of pursuing a rational military strategy is, a fortiori, important. I have been in the past, therefore, I think, among the first to ferret out or support the various possibilities for creating or maintaining a class A capability, including not only a counterforce capability, but a secure second-strike capability, active defense, passive defense, and recuperation.

But today one must ask oneself three questions when considering this first alternative. Is it technically possible? Is it possible in domestic economic-political terms? Is it desirable in international political and policy terms?

If my sixth assumption is conceded, a true class A capability after 1964 becomes hard to foresee on technical grounds alone, unless we accomplish some kind of a scientific breakthrough of a type which I have not yet seen even as a gleam in some scientist's mind.

The attempt to achieve such a capability within the limits of presently foreseeable technology would certainly require an economic effort of far greater magnitude than anything we are now seriously contemplating. And the barriers are not merely economic. Nelson Rockefeller's civil defense effort in New York State foundered not so much because of the expense involved. People just don't want to burrow into the ground on the off chance that they will be enabled to survive long enough to participate in the immense job of re-creating a nation from piles of nuclear rubble.

The third question, of the desirability of creating a class A capability in international political and policy terms, is also not to be ignored. If both we and the Russians succeed in building a class A capability, this means that neither will have a truly secure class B capability. In other words, the value of the initiative, the initial strike, would then be conclusive. Such a situation would be highly unstable. And an attempt to build such a capability that came off second best could be disastrous. It is useful from time to time to look at analogies from games. In a poker game with several players, what is the most dangerous hand? Not the worst hand, but the second best hand. With the second best hand, one is tempted to follow up the betting, but if one does, one gets clobbered.

So we must consider our second alternative, the attempt unilaterally to maintain merely an invulnerable second strike capability as a foundation for a policy of deterrence. Wohlstetter, Herman Kahn, and others have shown why the maintenance of a secure second strike capability is no easy job. The principal problem, however, with this alternative, is that it provides us with no rational military strategy if deterrence fails. From such a posture we cannot possibly hope either to disarm the enemy or to preserve the core of our Nation as a body capable of executing policy. If deterrence fails, the only reaction open to us is retaliation in support of a purpose that no longer exists—the purpose of deterring the enemy from taking the action that they have already taken.

The policy of deterrence is, therefore, a policy resting on psychological rather than on military grounds. Its premise is that Russian action will be controlled by rational considerations and that one of those rational considerations will be their judgment that we are capable of engaging in an irrational response; that is, that we will retaliate when no rational purpose can be served by that retaliation. I think this is sound psychology. If the tables are reversed and one assumes that we have struck the Soviet Union with a surprise counterforce blow and they have enough left with which to retaliate even though not enough with which to pursue a rational military strategy, I think the Russians would similarly be capable of such a basically irrational action.

But the problem becomes more difficult in the gray area where something less than an all-out counterforce attack is involved. Let us suppose that we are relying upon 20 Polaris submarines under the icecap, 100 mobile Minutemans in Alaska, and 50 planes in the sky with Skybolts for the invulnerable component of our deterrent force. Let us say that one day we wake up to find that four Polaris subs don't report. It is unlikely that such a loss was an accident. But does it justify reprisal against the Soviet Union, and if so, of what kind? Then one day 10 Minutemans are sabotaged. Again we are faced with a decision as to what to do. My point is that a policy that rests upon psychology rather than upon a capacity for rational military action can possibly be probed in a gradual manner, so as to avoid the psychological reaction that would rightly be expected from a sudden and all-out challenge.

Furthermore, a policy of deterrence backed solely by a secure second strike capability can give little beyond class I, or passive, deterrence. Its influence in deterring aggressive acts against minor members of the coalition, or even in deterring an attack with conventional weapons against our major allies, cannot be relied upon. The very instability of today's nuclear relationship spreads a precarious deterrence out to class II and even class III deterrence. A stable second strike deterrence posture, unless accompanied by a substantial measure of political detente, would tend to increase the prospect of limited peripheral aggression. We should, therefore, under this second alternative, concurrently have to build forces appropriate to meet the increased limited war threat. These forces would have to be largely independent of, and require only in a secondary sense the backup of, the deterrent power of our central war capabilities.

Since our first two alternatives look pretty unsatisfactory, we are then brought to examine seriously the third class of alternatives—collective or multilateral approaches to increased security.

Last month I was in Geneva for a few days and sat in on the disarmament discussions that were going on there. Neither the extreme Soviet proposal of total and complete disarmament within 4 years, nor the Western position of total and comprehensive disarmament, with a continuing United Nations force stronger than any national force, looked as though they were going to get anywhere. The Russian proposal leads to a situation of inherent instability in which even a small number of secreted weapons or a more rapid mobilization capability could be decisive. The Western proposal involves the unlikely prospect that the Communist countries will agree to a force outside their control which would be in a position to dominate them. It appeared that each side was jockeying to squeeze the maximum propaganda advantage out of its extreme position before going on to discuss more limited agreements.

I would not assert that useful limited agreements are impossible. The difficulties are, however, immense. These difficulties are in part those of negotiation, including the effort of each side to get the maximum advantage for its side, and the fact that each side naturally tends to a conservative approach in estimating the risks and gains to its side of such an agreement. A conservative approach means a cautious estimate of the possible gains and a full appraisal of possible risks. There seems to me to be an even more fundamental difficulty. This goes to the nature of the problem. If one rules out an arbitrating third force, a United Nations force superior to any combination of national forces, the agreement must be inherently self-executing by the two sides. The problems of inspection, verification of violations, and enforcement become interrelated. As Bob Bowie has pointed out, in the absence of an arbiter with power to enforce, each side must do its own enforcement. The basic sanction is abrogation. But abrogation is apt to set off a period of great tension increasing immeasurably the risk of war, or at a minimum a most serious arms race. The suggestion is then made that modification or abrogation should be made very easy, so that partial sanctions can be indicated or initiated without causing a possibly fatal crisis. Major reliance would then be placed upon reciprocal action based on a common interest in mitigating the dangers of a hazardous and unstable nuclear relationship rather than upon the binding power of a treaty or other piece of paper. I think there is much to recommend this point of view. It leads to a search for a series of reciprocal actions resulting in a tacit working agreement.

We have had some experience with this sort of thing. The mutual cessation of nuclear tests of the last couple of years has been of this nature. The reciprocal limitations on the Korean war were of this nature. Neither of these instances is wholly satisfactory. But were they any more unsatisfactory than the Korean armistice agreement which was a clear-written agreement, provided for international inspection, and was nevertheless of little use beyond permitting a termination of hostilities? The only sanction available, other than the resumption of hostilities, was abrogation. The Communists violated the agreement. We did not wish to resume hostilities. We were, therefore, forced into reciprocal violation of the agreement.

I should like to make one further comment before pressing on to the main point. That comment is that I have a hard time seeing how we can look forward to ratification by the Senate of the type of treaty that is apt to result from negotiation of a limited disarmament agreement. To secure ratification of a treaty requires a two-thirds vote of the Senate. I should think at least a third of the Senators would take a most conservative view of the benefits and risks to our side of such an agreement; and that means a low view of the benefits and a possibly exaggerated appraisal—at a minimum a fully realistic appraisal—of the risks involved in such a treaty. At the moment, Senate approval appears doubtful even for a test ban treaty, which involves far smaller risks than would a disarmament treaty.

My eighth assumption then is that the prospects for a disarmament treaty are not sufficiently good to warrant our failing seriously to explore other approaches to meeting the policy and defense problems of the West.

I have now completed the first task I set myself—that of passing rapidly over the minor inconsistencies. I am now ready to press on to the great idea—or, if you will, the grand fallacy.

In brief, my proposal is (1) that we accept the improbability that we can achieve a true class A nuclear capability, (2) that we accept the proposition that a class B nuclear capability only exists for the purpose of denying a class A capability to the enemy, (3) that we take seriously the proposition that the aim of our foreign policy is to construct a world system compatible with the survival and development of nations with purposes such as ours, and (4) that a possible route toward the aim is a series of unilateral actions designed to produce reciprocal action on the part of our allies and also on the part of our enemies.

The actions I propose are the following: (1) that we concentrate on building a variety of secure, purely retaliatory systems, preferably those exploiting mobility and concealment, and locatable away from population centers, in the air, under the sea, or in the deserts or tundra; (2) that when we have such a mix of relatively secure systems, we scrap the fixed-base vulnerable systems that have their principal utility as components of a class A capability; (3) that we multilateralize the command of our retaliatory systems by making SAC a NATO command, and (4) that we inform the United Nations that NATO will turn over ultimate power of decision on the use of these systems to the General Assembly of the United Nations subject to the following conditions:

(a) That we and our allies will assume continuing responsibility for manning, maintaining, and improving these systems.

(b) That U.N. inspectors would be invited to inspect and satisfy themselves that these are the only nuclear systems we are maintaining.

(c) That a U.N. order to use them will be honored only in the event some nation has initiated the use of nuclear weapons other than on or over its own territory in self-defense against military aggression.

In order to guard against the increased danger of local aggression, we and our allies would have to support a substantial increase in forces appropriate for limited war. A considerable stock of small tactical nuclear weapons might be maintained to be made available to any country subject to overt military aggression and desiring to use such weapons in and over its own territory in self-defense. An intensified research and development program would be maintained to guard against the possibility that technological developments do in fact make a class A nuclear capability possible—in other words, that our sixth assumption may be wrong.

As part of the plan, the Soviet Union would be invited to take reciprocal action. In particular, it would be hoped that the U.S.S.R. could give convincing demonstration that it, too, was prepared to restrict its preparation for the contingency of central war to a class B capability.

It would be made clear that we and our NATO allies reserve the unilateral right to modify or terminate the plan. New technological developments or evidence that the

U.S.S.R. was continuing to strive for a class A capability might well cause us to judge some new approach more conducive to the world's and our security.

Such, in outline, is the idea I offer for critical examination—most probably so that you can demonstrate it to be in fact the grand fallacy I suggested in my introduction.

Some of the objections can be anticipated. In the first place, it may be said that this isn't much of a plan. We make no binding commitment. We can modify the plan unilaterally. We get no assurance from the U.S.S.R. that they will do anything at all. We don't refrain from doing anything that it would make much sense, or any sense, for us to do anyway.

This is all quite true. But in a matter of this kind, pieces of paper aren't worth much. The stakes are too high. The important thing is that our action be sensible from the standpoint of our larger interests and remain sensible. We can't expect the Russians to do more than what they continue to consider sensible from the standpoint of their interests. If there is, in fact, a common interest in both our and the U.S.S.R. restricting ourselves to deterrent retaliatory forces and letting our opponents be sure that that is what we are doing, the thing to do is to do it. If there is no such common interest, pieces of paper aren't going to help much.

A related objection may be made that we don't give the U.N. much real control, because we continue to maintain and man the retaliatory systems ourselves. It is quite true that we maintain an effective veto on the use of the weapons and that, in the event of a direct attack, U.N. control might break down. I do not believe it would be to our interest to have it break down and that we can, therefore, make the offer contained in the plan with all sincerity. On the other hand, uncertainty on the part of a potential aggressor who might otherwise hope for nonaction on the part of the U.N. is essential to the plan.

A third objection is that if we do not continuously strive for a class A capability we increase the possibility that the Russians may achieve one. This objection worries me most of all. The fact that we are not now striving for a class A capability is at least a partial answer. When we cancel the Bomarc and Sage elements of our active defense for all except the eastern industrial area, we may be giving the Russian bombers a substantially free ride over much of the United States. We have never done much but talk about passive defense or recuperation. It does not seem to me, therefore, a valid objection to the suggested plan to argue that we would be abandoning an effort to build a class A capability. We just have not been doing it anyway.

But, nevertheless, I am worried by this objection. It is not so much that I really believe that my sixth assumption is wrong. I don't think the danger is some fantastic and one-sided technological development that will give to the Soviet Union, or perhaps to us, such a clear and unambiguous technological superiority that one side can be assured thereby that it can defeat the other side without unacceptable losses to itself. It is rather that I fear that one nation, which devotes itself intelligently and persistently to the problem of how to win a war through a rational military strategy geared to a consistent political aim, may well develop a strategic doctrine, tactics, training, and deployments that will give it a decisive advantage against the side that devotes itself solely to deterrence of war through military means that cannot be adapted to any sensible military strategy if deterrence fails. Strategic doctrine, tactics, training, and deployment may be decisive where technology alone is not. The early German successes in World War II were not based on any radical technological superiority. Their blitzkrieg successes were based more on doctrine, training, tactics, and initiative than on technical superiority of equipment.

In conclusion, therefore, I might say that the key to whether the suggestion I have put forward is worthy of further serious study, or should be quickly relegated to the scrap heap of other grand fallacies, depends upon whether the Soviet leaders show themselves determined at all costs to strive for a predominant nuclear position, a true class A capability, or whether they give some indication that they perceive a common interest in a more stable nuclear relationship.

EXHIBIT 2

THE POWER STRUGGLE AND SECURITY IN A NUCLEAR-SPACE AGE—REPORT OF SECTION II

(Chairman, Paul H. Nitze, Cochairman, Kenneth W. Thompson. Rapporteurs: Harold E. Stassen, Raymond E. Wilson, George W. Rathjens, Jr.)

This report was "received by the conference and referred to the churches for study and appropriate action" by vote of the conference.

I. THREATS TO SECURITY

We remind ourselves, in considering this subject, that we are thinking and speaking, not only as citizens but more particularly as Christians. Ours must be a sustained effort to relate the love of God as revealed in Jesus Christ to the complex problems of our time. Two temptations must be resisted: on the one hand, the temptation to be so impressed with complexities and difficulties that we fail to say clear words on issues that require moral judgment; and on the other hand, the equally strong temptation to overleap concrete problems in the enunciation of general principles.

Christians have a loyalty which transcends the Nation. The security they seek cannot be limited to any nation or group of nations. Their obligation is to God-given life. All of it. But this, again, does not mean that Christians should be indifferent to the survival of the Nation. For the survival of a nation may be important to the defense of human personality as the Christian faith understands it.

In the contemporary world situation, the question for Christians in the United States is not simply whether the Nation is righteous but also whether our national existence is valuable, both to the people of this country and to the life of mankind. Some aspects of life in the United States could, without loss, perish, just as some characteristics of life in nations opposing us are worthy of survival. Nor should Americans claim that this Nation, taken as a whole, is better for human life than other nation. We can, however, say that the present and potential character of our country makes it possible for the United States to beget continued service to human welfare. Not to try to preserve the security of our Nation could be moral dereliction to mankind. Although the Christian's national loyalty is always qualified, it may, nevertheless, be a part of his loyalty to mankind. This does not exclude recognition of the possibility that mankind may be served and enriched by a wide variety of social forms and cultures.

It is implicit in what we have said that security should not be thought of primarily in national terms. The Christian obligation to mankind and the technical developments of our time now combine to make a purely national concept of security wrong from every point of view. Freedom, justice, social welfare and security are indivisible. And the nationalistic approach to these goods is both morally and practically obsolete.

What today threatens our security? The manifold aspects of the revolution of our time constitute both a profound challenge and a threat to the basic security of the United States and others of the older nations. The continuing security problem comes from the age-old problem of nations struggling for strategic advantage and competing in national armaments, in a situation lacking order and often approaching anarchy. The growth of Russian and Chinese military power controlled by and coupled with the Communist movement and ideology constitute the present focus of this struggle.

The Marxist-Leninist view of man and society, coupled with a national and personal urge to worldwide power, make the contemporary struggle profoundly serious. The Communist powers are resolved to win the worldwide struggle. They expect to win. They will acquiesce in a genuine coexistence only when their own continued existence clearly demands it, or when, with the passing of time, some of their basic convictions have been eroded.

That the intransigence and aggressive tactics of the Communist powers are caused, in part, by fear for their own security is not to be denied. The tragic experience of the Russian people in two world wars and the history of Western imperialism must be taken into account if we are to understand contemporary Communist attitudes. American nuclear stockpiles and widely scattered military bases, some of them near the borders of the Soviet Union, arouse apprehension. Accordingly, we, on our part, must try, more earnestly that we have done, so to conduct ourselves that Communist nations will have less cause to fear our intentions. But their fear also arises out of a legitimate Western response to their aggression. The aggressive aims of the Communists are a real and formidable factor in world tensions and a responsible national policy must take this into account.

From some such appraisal of the threat to security, all considerations of the most effective methods of dealing with the threat should start. It should be added that our response to communism should always include the recognition that the whole Western World, and particularly the Christian church in prerevolutionary Russia, carries heavy responsibility for the movement's emergence, because of an inadequate emphasis on social justice and human welfare. Communism is, in part, a judgment upon our sins of omission and commission. Humility and repentance are incumbent upon us. But to underrate the threat is no service to human well-being or to world peace.

II. THE SECURITY ROLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Neither the United States nor any other nation can insure its security in the years ahead through the unilateral development of military or other power. It is our firm conviction that the best hope for the creation of a system of world order lies in an increase in the power of the United Nations to assume wider responsibilities. Very frequently it may appear that actions taken by that body, in the resolution of disputes, will not be, from the short-term point of view, to the best interests of the United States. We hold, however, that there must be an increased recognition that U.S. interests can find their long-term satisfaction only within a far wider structure of interests that includes those of the rest of mankind. The United States should show a greater willingness than has heretofore been demonstrated to resolve disputes through the organs of the United Nations including the World Court.

We are agreed that if military force is to be used it should be sanctioned by, and under the control of, the United Nations.

The United Nations in deterring aggression and in resolving disputes relies upon the authority and moral force of its recommendations backed by the support of those nations committed to the principles of the Charter.

Much more emphasis must be placed upon the development of economic and political stability, efforts to settle disputes as early as possible, and the amelioration of situations before they break down into armed conflict or result in situations that invite aggression.

Our basic goal would be a system of international disarmament and security to supercede continued reliance upon military pacts and alliances such as SEATO and the Baghdad Pact.

III. TOWARD THE CONTROL, REDUCTION AND ABOLITION OF ARMAMENT

Progress toward the goal of universal disarmament is of major importance in the achievement of world order, in reducing the threat of war, and in lessening the tensions of the power struggle. It is urgent that greater emphasis and multiplied efforts be made by the United States and other nations to reach disarmament agreements because of the rapidly increasing destructiveness of nuclear weapons and intercontinental missiles; because of the growing difficulty of bringing these weapons under adequate inspection and control, and because of the large sums now being spent on armaments compared to aid and technical assistance, in a world characterized by widespread hunger, disease and illiteracy.

It is not possible at a conference such as this to spell out the process of arms reduction and control in detail, but the following are suggestions for continued efforts. In its efforts toward world disarmament, the United States should:

1. Assume greater initiative toward bringing national armaments under international inspection and control in a process directed toward their consequent limitation, reduction, and eventual abolition.

Toward this end, we should follow up on the progress of the United Nations negotiations and the successful Geneva scientific talks and keep pressing for an early agreement to stop nuclear weapons tests and to install a United Nations inspection system to verify the fulfillment of the agreement, along the lines recommended by the conference of scientists at Geneva. We believe the U.S. Government should continue its present suspension of tests, unilaterally if necessary, for a sufficient period of time to permit full exploration of the possibilities of arriving at a definitive international agreement.

2. Follow up this significant first step of inspection and limitation by additional steps of international control and reduction.

3. Continue to seek an international agreement setting up a U.N. agency for the peaceful exploration of outer space, and a control system to assure the use of outer space for peaceful purposes.

4. Cooperate in establishing the proposed inspection system of the International Atomic Energy Agency in the hope that this may help furnish the pattern necessary for supervising worldwide cessation of production of nuclear weapons.

5. Continue negotiations with the U.S.S.R. for a mutual aerial and ground inspection system to guard against surprise attack and thus seek to aid in creating a climate where more far-reaching disarmament negotiations may be undertaken.

6. Recognize the close relationship between political settlements and disarmament and be more willing to broaden the framework of disarmament negotiations. These discussions might include the possibility of mutual withdrawal of nuclear forces from points of closest proximity, and disengagement in areas such as the Middle East or central Europe.

7. Work to reopen, as soon as possible, disarmament discussions within the U.N. for the purpose of prohibiting production of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, to transfer nuclear weapons stockpiles to peaceful purposes, and to begin the process of reducing arms and armed forces.

8. Press for the creation of a permanent U.N. police force for border patrol, inspection, and the various functions of a genuine international police system.

Within its governmental system, the United States should:

1. Enlarge the staffs and strengthen the programs of the executive branch for studying the problems of world disarmament and formulating workable plans for its accomplishment. The proposal of a carefully worked out, safeguarded, comprehensive disarmament plan by the United States would serve as a focus for specific negotiations and for rallying world opinion.

2. Expand and make permanent the important work of the Special Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

3. Undertake a coordinated program among Government agencies to work in cooperation with management and labor for making the transition in as orderly a manner as possible, to an economy less dependent on military expenditures, and to remove the fears that disarmament steps will result in a depression.

4. Offer to devote a substantial percentage of the savings from armaments to allocation for development of underdeveloped countries, using the United Nations as far as feasible.

5. Abolish the system of military conscription and allow the authority of the selective service system to draft men to lapse on its expiration next June. The Government should consider ways of encouraging recruitment to meet those of its manpower requirements as would result from following the interim military policy suggested in the next section of this report.

IV. INTERIM MILITARY POLICY

Until substantial progress has been made toward disarmament, we must use all our influence to see that wisdom and imagination are used in limiting and controlling military force.

As citizens we have a natural concern for the security of our Nation. As Christians we have a wider concern for the security of mankind. We cannot, therefore, view with equanimity preparations for nuclear war which might result in the genetic distortion of the human race as well as widespread destruction of civilized life. Since we as Christians could not ourselves press the buttons for such destruction, we must now declare our conviction that we cannot support the concept of nuclear retaliation or preventive war.

During the interim period prior to a strengthened system of world order, law, and disarmament:

1. We urge our Government to consider all methods for contributing to world security other than reliance upon nuclear weapons.

2. If the Government continues to rely in any way upon nuclear defenses, we urge that it be only for the deterrent effect that their possession by us may have on their possible use by anyone else.

3. If any such weapons are to remain in U.S. possession, we urge that the U.S. Government shift the character of the nuclear weapons it is developing away from systems implying very rapid and inadequately considered decision in the event nuclear warfare is believed to have, or has, been initiated by others. Weapons systems more nearly invulnerable to surprise attack would permit time for political consideration, for negotiation, for the exercise of third party judgment, and for the force of the moral opinion of mankind to be brought to bear before a decision would have to be made as to the appropriate reaction in such a crisis. Such a shift in weapon systems would materially reduce the danger of nuclear war arising from misunderstanding or error.

With respect to providing military aid to other nations, the United States should give due regard to the character and objectives of the recipient governments, the effects of the aid on their economic and political systems, and the effects on neighboring states.

V. PEACEFUL COMPETITION AND INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

The nuclear stalemate prompts both U.S.S.R. and ourselves to shift competition to nonmilitary fields. Presumbably, American leaders ought to welcome peaceful competition in ideas, institutions and opposing conceptions of the good life. Yet, up to the present, national initiative has not been equal to the task. Why have American policies been unsuccessful in this sphere?

Five reasons are advanced for these failures. First, American attitudes have been too one sided in seeing the cold war in simple, military terms. The power of communism rests in part in its offering opportunities for rapid economic development to technologically underdeveloped nations. In the next decade, the results of Chinese and Indian experiments will be watched for the object lessons they carry for other new nations.

Second, we have hesitated to accept the fact of living with two major communist nations for an indefinite period and of recognizing that hostile grimaces and provocative acts will be of no avail.

Third, we have not seized every opportunity to react creatively to more hopeful developments within the communist world, particularly within the so-called satellite nations.

Fourth, Americans are disposed to see the present struggle as a conflict between good and evil. A simple black-and-white moralistic approach may impair the effectiveness of our policies toward satellite countries or those whose political goals are not immediately our own.

Fifth, many assume that the world is and must be divided into two ideological blocs. In fact, an important part of the world's peoples are not alined with either side. More understanding and effective policies must be evolved for cooperation with this part of mankind.

The United States should:

1. Seek continuation over a 5-year period of the International Geophysical Year.

2. Extend trade and travel with mainland China, Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

3. Encourage association and fellowship of various professions and groups across the Iron Curtain, for example, exchange of farmers, students, and religious groups.

4. Explore more effective use of its surplus food for distribution in communist countries and in underdeveloped nations.

5. Evolve more seminars and conferences for social scientists and scientists from the Soviet bloc and the West. We commend the Department of State for persisting in negotiating an agreement for expanded exchange of persons with the Soviet Union and urge the lifting of restrictions on the travel of Soviet visitors in the United States.

6. Implement programs for common attacks on basic human problems of disease, such as malaria, and threats to crops such as wheat rust, that may be carried across national boundaries.

7. Invite wider participation by the U.S.S.R. in U.N. technical assistance programs.

8. Encourage private investments in underdeveloped areas with appropriate safeguards both for the private investor and for the host nation.

9. Encourage the religious and philosophic dialogue above the level of present political struggles. In particular, we urge that all opportunities be utilized, through the World Council of Churches and other channels, for meetings of churchmen from the Soviet nations and the West.

VI. POINTS OF POLICY WITH RESPECT TO SPECIFIC AREAS

Several of the areas of the world pose particular challenges to American foreign policy at this time.

With respect to China, U.S. policy has not been responsive to the realities. While we cannot condone many of the things for which communism stands, it is the part of wisdom to admit that we see no reasonable alternative open to us other than to recognize that Communist China is a nation of tremendous and growing importance with whom we must live. To continue to treat this great power as an outcast can serve only to deepen existing tensions and to further developments in China which we must deplore. Moreover, continuation of such a policy by the United States is indefensible. We feel that the stiffness of our attitude has already cost us dearly in world opinion, and has made the resolution of our difficulties with China more difficult than might have been the case had there been official channels of communication from the beginning.

The section would urge a more flexible approach to the Far Eastern problem in the interest of a more adequate representation of American purposes and objectives. In the interest of greater stability in the Far East, Washington should encourage the Chinese Nationalist Government to evacuate exposed positions that may be militarily unsound and politically detrimental, and submit to the U.N. the question of securing peace and security in the area of Formosa. The people on Formosa should be protected in their right freely to determine their own future.

At minimum, the Western World should not be prevented from liberalizing trade relations with any Far Eastern country. The United States should liberalize its policies with respect to travel of Chinese nationals in the United States and of U.S. citizens within Communist China. At the same time, our policy should move in the direction of an acceptable solution of the problems of participation by the People's Republic of China in the counsels of the United Nations and the establishment of diplomatic relations with that Government by the United States.

We feel that, with respect to peaceful competition with communism, one of the most crucial contests is that being waged in India. Inevitably, all of the underdeveloped nations of the world will compare progress in India with that in China; it will be tragic if the comparison is unfavorable. We, therefore, urge that special consideration be given to providing India with sufficient economic and technical assistance to insure the success of her development program. The fact that India has been unwilling to identify itself with us in our military policy should not deter us in this. Rather, we should welcome the fact that free, uncommitted nations can exist in the world today, and that they may facilitate settlement of disputes in which any of the great powers is involved.

At the heart of any settlement of European problems is the question of the two Germanys. Moreover, the continued isolation of West Berlin is clearly a source of great vulnerability to the West. We see no means of materially reducing tensions in this part of the world while remaining faithful to our obligations to the people of West Germany, and of Berlin particularly, other than in unification. We, therefore, urge that our Government continue to support the unification of Germany.

We are deeply concerned that Christians better understand the involved and explosive situation in the Middle East. With humility and penitence we confess that our own lack of understanding and sympathy both in our reluctance to resettle in Christian countries the oppressed Jews of Europe, and in our disregard of Arab rights, has contributed to the tragedy of Palestine. We believe that Christians must join with Moslems, Jews and others in a continuing search for just and durable peace in the area. We urge that every effort be continued to find agreement by negotiation whether under the U.N. or by direct consultation among the governments immediately concerned. Particularly we call for the implementation of the U.N. resolutions providing for the return, where possible, of the Arab refugees to their homes; and, where not possible, for adequate compensation for their loss. We believe the Christian community should stand ready to assist in the repatriation or resettlement of the Arab refugees.

We call on our Government to support the legitimate aspirations of the Arabs for unity, and of Israel to survive in peace.

We firmly record our support of the U.N. recommendation providing for the internationalization of Jerusalem and its environs.

In general, we feel that our attitudes toward the whole Middle East should be conditioned less by our fear of Soviet expansion into the area and become more responsive to the needs of the peoples of the region.

We must recognize the aspirations of the people in the area for independence and economic development. The United States should generously support a widespread program for economic development of the region. We feel that the Baghdad Pact and the Eisenhower doctrine are not responsive to the major problems of the area, and that the former in particular, may have hindered the development of peaceful solutions to Middle East problems.

VII. CALL TO THE CHURCHES

We call upon the members of the Christian churches:

To dedicate themselves to the task of working in a spirit of Christian love for the healing of the nations;

To pray for a spirit of penitence for the selfishness of our affluent society in a world of hunger and need,

To make common cause with the disadvantaged and dispossessed for the realization of their hopes and freedoms;

To transfer the conflict of ideas and ideologies from the battlefield to the realm of peaceful competition and the rule of law;

To translate into reality the old Russian proverb, "Mountains may never come together but men can";

To multiply their efforts toward beating swords into plowshares and achieving a warless world.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE CONFERENCE RELATED TO SECTION II [1]

Resolution on nuclear retaliation, preventive war, and the elimination of war [2]

The conference, in receiving the report of section II and commending it to the churches for study and appropriate action, wishes to record that there were differences of views in the conference on certain statements in that report, specifically, regarding the fourth sentence of part IV [3] of the section report.

Members of the conference agree in categorically rejecting the concept of preventive war.

There are many of us who emphatically do not agree with the inference that deterrence through the capability for nuclear retaliation is to be bracketed with preventive war.

Such peace as there is today, precarious as it may be, rests to some measure upon the capability for nuclear retaliation. The world's hope of achieving international agreements leading toward universal disarmament may similarly rest in part upon that capability.

In expressing these views it was made clear that this is not to be taken as approval by the conference of the moral acceptability of allout nuclear retaliation, or as modification of the view of the conference that the elimination of nuclear warfare and of war itself is a Christian imperative. The problem of whether or not a Christian can support nuclear warfare in any form must be squarely and prayerfully faced by the churches.

The conference directs that this resolution be recorded in the appropriate place with the published version of Section II's report.

RESOLUTION ON THE MIDDLE EAST

We are deeply concerned that Christians understand better the involved and explosive situation in the Middle East. With humility and penitence we confess that our own lack of understanding and sympathy, both in our reluctance to resettle the oppressed Jews of Europe in Christian countries, and in our disregard of Arab rights, has contributed to the tragedy of Palestine. We believe that Christians must join with Muslims, Jews, and others in a continuing search for just and durable peace in the area. We urge that every effort be continued to find agreement by negotiation whether under the United Nations or by direct consultation of the governments immediately concerned. Particularly we call for the implementation of United Nations resolutions providing for the return, where possible, of the Arab refugees to their homes; and where not possible, for adequate compensation for their loss. We believe the Christian community should stand ready to asist in the repatriation or resettlement of the Arab refugees, and in the meantime should urge less grudging and more generous support of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East.

We firmly record our support of the United Nations recommendation providing for the internationalization of Jerusalem and its environs.

The United States should support the legitimate aspirations of the Arabs for unity, of Israel for survival in peace, and of both for political and economic progress. In particular, our country should continue its search for plans satisfactory to both the Arab States and Israel for the development, to their mutual benefit, of water and other resources.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the confirmation of Paul H. Nitze to be Secretary of the Navy. I had the privilege and the honor of serving in the greatest navy in the world, the U.S. Navy, during World War II. I am still proud of that service, and maintain my relationship with it through membership in the Naval Reserve.

Because of my pride in the Navy, and because of my concern for the strength and morale and effectiveness of the Navy, I must oppose confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Nitze. Because I believe the Navy's performance is a vital role in the defense of the free world, a role that must not be diminished. Because of his views on disarmament, his views on our military posture, and his views on the disposition of the military forces, I feel that his nomination should not be confirmed.

---

[1] For official actions of the National Council of Churches related to the topics dealt with in the resolutions see appendix A, sec. II, and appendix B.

[2] There was some dissent to this resolution on the part of those who preferred the statement in the report of sec. II, pt. IV.

[3] This sentence reads: "Since we as Christians could not ourselves press the buttons for such destruction, we must now declare our conviction that we cannot support the concept of nuclear retaliation or preventive war."

I bear no personal animosity toward him. I understand he is a man of considerable ability. Were he being nominated for some other office not connected with the Nation's defense, I undoubtedly would vote for the confirmation of his nomination.

Under the circumstances, it is my fervent hope that the Senate will not vote to confirm his nomination.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Texas with respect to the nomination which is now before the Senate. I cannot bring myself to vote to confirm Mr. Nitze's nomination, especially in view of his statements, uttered, printed in the press, and in his speeches. From all I have observed from him, he is another "one worlder." We have too many of them as it is.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have known Paul H. Nitze since 1945, as an outstanding citizen, both as an acquaintance and later as a friend. In my opinion, he is highly qualified for the position of Secretary of the Navy. It is fantastic to me that objection should be raised on the basis of his military views. My one disagreement with him is that he is entirely too belligerent. I am confident that as Secretary of the Navy he will be as astute and as determined to advance our national military strength as any man in America. In my judgment, he is too belligerent, and I would wish that he could modify his views in the interest of the proposals made by the late President in support of general and complete disarmament. The suggestion that he is not adequately qualified to advance our naval strength to the best of his ability in his position as Secretary of the Navy seems to me fantastic.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I listened to all the testimony with relation to the nomination of Mr. Paul H. Nitze for Secretary of the Navy. I have known him ever since my days in college at Cambridge, Mass., a good many years ago. I have never been close to him, but I have known him as a man of great intellect and great energy and force, and a man of strong opinions.

I hope he will be a good administrator. I should like to call attention to some testimony given before the committee, particularly with relation to the question that I asked him. He was a consultant to the so-called Gaither committee. He recommended a stronger security position for our armed services and for our country. As a consultant, he helped write the report. We, as Members of Congress, never saw that report, but we know it was a very emphatic report, and stimulated a sense of security in all of us.

In the testimony Mr. Nitze said:

> I believe I have taken no position which would make it difficult for me to do so.

In other words, to support the Navy.

> In fact, I believe my position has been and certainly is today in support of an increasing role for the Navy. Certainly in the field of nuclear deterrence, I believe the Polaris system is one—is the strongest element we have. Certainly in the field of support of oversea positions which might be threatened, I think our carrier strike forces are most apt to be there quick and with the necessary power.

Then I asked him:

> Senator SALTONSTALL. And the protection of our shores through ASW and other means of the Navy is of vital importance to our security? You thoroughly believe in that?
>
> Mr. NITZE. I thoroughly believe in that.

Mr. President, I believe that he is a patriotic American citizen of strong convictions and that he will be a good Secretary of the Navy. I hope so, in every respect.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I understand there is no demand for a yea-and-nay vote on the confirmation of the nomination of Paul H. Nitze. The distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] has requested me to ask unanimous consent that the RECORD show that he would vote against the confirmation if a yea-and-nay vote were had.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, anyone who has known the nominee for as long as I have known him cannot sit silent at a time like this.

I first met Mr. Nitze during the war, when I was an officer in the Army and he was concerned with matters of a military nature.

He has always been a strong-minded man and a dedicated public servant, one who is disciplined to accord with policy decisions which are taken and which bind a person to carry them out very well.

This is a very interesting attitude, which I understand as a lawyer; namely, that a man might disagree with a decision and yet have the ability to carry it through, notwithstanding his disagreement. It is a very interesting aspect of Nitze's abilities. He is certainly a man of enormous experience.

It is my judgment, as it is that of the Senator from Massachusetts, that, if he is given this important position of Secretary of the Navy, he will perform it superbly and faithfully in accordance with the commitments that he has undertaken.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I, too, have known Paul H. Nitze since he first came to Washington, and I have followed with a great deal of satisfaction the distinguished career he has made here under various administrations. He is a loyal, dedicated American. He brings to Government a great capacity, both mentally and physically, to see through the very difficult problems that lie ahead in our strategy for defense and our strategy for the production of armaments and equipment which will keep this Nation safe and free and keep for us the supremacy that we need in the cold war in connection with our military armaments.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I support the nomination of Mr. Nitze. I have known him for many years. The news of his appointment was highly gratifying to me. He is a man of the highest character, hardheaded, and is most worthy of the appointment which he has received.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I have not known Mr. Nitze for a long time, but I had some conversation with him during the recent hearings held by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy with reference to nuclear propulsion of an aircraft carrier. I found him to be a sensible, practical, dedicated, patriotic American. I am happy to support the confirmation of his nomination.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, today, we have the opportunity to vote in confirmation of the nomination to the position of Secretary of the Navy of a man who has provided outstanding service to his Government and his country for a period of 20 years.

Paul Nitze was born in Amherst, Mass., while his father was a professor at Amherst College. He was brought up and attended schools in Chicago and Connecticut, graduating from Harvard University. Upon completion of college, he entered business and was associated with Dillon, Read & Co. of New York until 1941 except for a short period during which he had his own investment firm.

Beginning in 1940 he came to Washington on several occasions for particular assignments with Mr. Forrestal, General Marshall, and General Hershey. During this period, he participated in the formulation of the Draft Act of 1940 at a time when it was vitally needed as an element of our national security. He also worked as a consultant to Mr. Burden and Mr. Harding, who were instrumental in effecting the elimination of German and Italian airlines from Latin America during World War II.

In 1941 he left his position as vice president of Dillon & Read and moved permanently to Washington where he became Financial Director of the Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs working for Mr. Nelson Rockefeller. He had participated with Mr. Forrestal in the creation of this Office.

Subsequently, he joined the Economic Warfare Board which was later changed to the Foreign Economic Administration upon merging with the Lend Lease Administration. He continued to serve there as the Director of the Foreign Procurement and Development Branch which was responsible for the procurement abroad of the strategic materials required to sustain our World War II effort. From 1944 to 1946 he served, first as Director for the European phase, and then as Vice Chairman for the Pacific phase, of the U.S. Strategic Bombing Survey. In the latter phase, this survey determined the effects of nuclear weapons exploded over Hiroshima and Nagasaki and ascertained the role of airpower in the results of the Pacific war. A great deal of important data for application in subsequent military planning was produced by this group.

Upon completion of this survey, in 1946, he began a period of service with the State Department becoming, successively, the Deputy Director of the Office of Trade Policy, Deputy to the Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, and then, for 3½ years beginning in 1950, the Director of the Policy Planning Staff. During this service in the State Department he was a key staff officer involved in the development of the Marshall plan, and in forming up its organization from the time of the announcement of the plan until Mr. Paul Hoffman took over its operation. He was also instrumental in the formulation of policies which helped resolve the recurrent British currency crises.

It was during this period that Mr. Nitze played a vital role in the development of a study, NSC 68, which was a basic review of our national security position. As an example of the dramatic nature of the conclusions of that study it proposed that we treble defense expenditures. The conclusions and recommendations of that study were approved by President Truman, but could not be significantly implemented prior to the outbreak of war in Korea. Nevertheless, they formed the basis for an early start toward the necessary defense buildup.

Other sectors in which he provided strong support for policies which have contributed to U.S. security were in the Iranian oil crisis generated by Premier Mossadegh, the creation of SHAPE, the strong U.S. position in the Berlin blockade, and the negotiations which led to the Austrian Peace Treaty. He also played a part in the development of the DEW line.

With the advent of the Eisenhower administration, Mr. Nitze left Government and succeeded Gov. Christian Herter as President of the Foreign Service Educational Foundation, and became a trustee of Johns Hopkins University. During this period, however, he continued active participation in public affairs. He served as a consultant to several groups studying defense issues. These included the Weapons Systems Evaluation Group, the Applied Physics Laboratory of Johns Hopkins University, Project Nobska which had a bearing on the development of the Polaris submarine, and Project Lamplight which led to the concept of the extension of the DEW line. Additionally, he was a consultant to the Gaither Committee and shared fully the Committee's view that the U.S. defense posture was at that time ing a poor state and badly needed bolstering.

Upon the inauguration of President Kennedy, Mr. Paul Nitze became the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs where he has played a key role in the development of a defense posture which, in my opinion, has improved by an order of magnitude the readiness of this country to meet any threat. I have had it reported to me by men who worked extremely closely with him during the Cuban missile crisis that he was a strong supporter of the decision to force the missiles and bombers out of Cuba and in policies designed to achieve these decisions. I have also learned that he is noted for his insistence upon referral of problems to the Joint Chiefs of Staff and for his careful reflection upon and consideration of their military judgment.

As for his views on seapower, I shall merely quote a page from the statement he gave before the Senate Armed Services Committee.

> I am a strong believer in the importance of maintaining superiority over the Communist bloc in every element of our military power.
>
> I believe that the United States must maintain its strategic superiority over the U.S.S.R. I believe that the U.S. Navy plays a vital part in the maintenance of that strategic superiority through its invulnerable Polaris submarine missile system and its attack carrier strike forces. I believe that our strategic forces provide the only sure deterrence, in the present era, against strategic nuclear attack by the Communist bloc.
>
> I believe that the deterrence provided by our strategic forces is not adequate by itself to restrain all forms of conventional military attack by the Communist bloc and that deterrence of such conventional attack can best be achieved by maintaining adequate nonstrategic military forces and oversea bases. This in turn makes it imperative that the U.S. Navy and U.S. Marine Corps have the tools to maintain the control of the seas necessary to bring these nonstrategic forces to bear and to assist our allies against conventional or paramilitary aggression.
>
> I believe that only by maintaining this superiority of strategic and nonstrategic military forces can the United States have the optimum opportunity to use its military power short of war to support its foreign policy or be in a position to win a military victory, at the lowest level of conflict adequate to do the job, if war should, nevertheless, occur.

I urge the Senate to confirm the nomination of a man who has been a successful businessman, a proven patriotic public servant in war and peace, a vigorous and able administrator with the Departments of State and Defense, a man who over the years has served his country with outstanding capability and talent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that pertinent excerpts from the hearings be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> Chairman Russell. I assume, Mr. Secretary, that you recall a speech you made in the Asilomar National Strategy Seminar, on April 28, 1960, dealing with policy problems and the defense of the West. You wrote this speech, I assume.
>
> Mr. Nitze. I did.
>
> Chairman Russell. There are one or two statements in it that caused me some concern.
>
> There is here your proposal that we should multilateralize the command of our retaliatory systems by making SAC a NATO command, and that we should inform the United Nations that NATO will turn over ultimate power of decision on the use of these commands to the General Assembly of the United Nations subject to the following conditions:
>
> "(a) That we and our allies will assume continuing responsibility for maning, maintaining, and improving these systems;
>
> "(b) That U.N. inspectors will be invited to inspect and satisfy themselves that these are the only nuclear systems we are maintaining;
>
> "(c) That a U.N. order to use them will be honored only in the event some nation has initiated the use of nuclear weapons other than on or over its own territory in self-defense against military aggression."
>
> Would you care to make any elaboration as to the circumstances under which this speech was delivered, or just what you had in mind by proposing to turn our retaliatory systems over to NATO, and NATO, in turn, turn it over to the United Nations?
>
> Mr. Nitze. Mr. Chairman, in the very first paragraph of that speech I said that I was going to press on to the grand fallacy. I think four or five times in this speech I indicated that what was contained in this package was to be viewed as probable grand fallacy, or the grand fallacy.
>
> As I say, five times in the speech I made this point clear, that this was either a grand fallacy or probably a grand fallacy.
>
> But let me say a few words about why I dealt with this at all.
>
> I had been a participant in the Gaither Committee. We had been deeply concerned about the security, or the adequacy of our military posture at that time. We felt that we faced the prospect of a missile gap, we faced a situation in which SAC was vulnerable or would become vulnerable at such time as the Russians had missiles if we didn't do a great many things about it.
>
> This report recommended that we accelerate our missile program, it recommended a program to accelerate the construction of BMEWS, the ballistic missile early warning system, it recommended a dispersal——
>
> Chairman Russell. I am sorry, Mr. Nitze, I am not quite clear as to what report this is you are referring to.
>
> Mr. Nitze. I am talking now about the Gaither Committee report, in which I was a participant. And this preceded this Asilomar seminar.
>
> Chairman Russell. It was between this Cleveland conference and the Asilomar seminar?
>
> Mr. Nitze. This is correct.
>
> Chairman Russell. And you were on that board, or that Committee?
>
> Mr. Nitze. I was a consultant to that Committee, participated in the drafting of its report.
>
> It recommended a number of other things which we considered to be necessary for the improvement of our defense posture. It was our feeling that our recommendations were not being adequately prosecuted. We were under instruction not to talk publicly about our recommendations or our disappointment.
>
> This speech in part was meant to shock people into a realization of what the requirements of our security were, and what unpalatable alternatives we might have to face if we did not do things, many of which we subsequently have done, to improve our defense posture.
>
> Chairman Russell. Was that the report that never was released?
>
> Mr. Nitze. I believe it never was released, that is correct.
>
> Chairman Russell. Who was responsible for that Committee?
>
> Was it appointed by the President?
>
> Mr. Nitze. It was appointed by the President. I think Mr. Sprague and Mr. Gaither were the co-Chairmen.
>
> Chairman Russell. I remember there was a great deal of comment on it. I never did see a copy of it.
>
> I read this speech hurriedly. I saw where you said this is either a great idea or a grand fallacy. You didn't undertake to say it was the only plan. It was a discussion of scholars and intellectuals. And you threw this out as something worthy of consideration, as I understand it, that is the way I would interpret it. But you are now here before this committee nominated for the position as the Secretary of the Navy. We have a responsibility. We have a responsibility to have some idea of your views.
>
> Do you think today—as you outline in your speech—that it would be wise for us to see that the SAC was turned over to the General Assembly of the United Nations?
>
> Mr. Nitze. No, I see nothing that would make that wise.
>
> Chairman Russell. Do you have any intention in your position of power as Secretary of the Navy of advocating a policy that would result in SAC being turned over to any command other than that of the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States?
>
> Mr. Nitze. I do not, sir.

Chairman Russell. Mr. Nitze, I think you know that great concern has been expressed in a number of letters and telegrams to members of the committee with respect to the views that were expressed in a report of section II of the Fifth World Order Study Conference that was convened in Cleveland in November 1958 by the Department of International Affairs of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. The text of this report indicates that you were the chairman of section II.

Some of the views expressed in this report have caused many persons to be concerned about your nomination.

In all candor, I must say that I would be hesitant to vote, myself, for the confirmation of a man to serve as Secretary of the Navy who adhered to all of the views expressed in this report.

Your staff has furnished us a compilation of material relating to the circumstances in which this report was prepared. I think it would be well at this juncture to have this compilation printed in the record at this point. It includes all of section II, as well as a summation or compilation that was furnished by your staff.

As I understand this compilation, it indicates that you were only the moderator of section II, that the views expressed in the report of this section are not necessarily yours, and that in fact in some respects your views are quite contrary to those expressed in the report.

I think it important to clear up any doubts that might exist on this subject. And I have a few questions based on those statements.

In asking these questions, I will use some quotes that are, necessarily, out of context. This is always unfortunate, but in any event, the entire report has been inserted in the record.

This report states that, "We are agreed that if military force is to be used it should be sanctioned by, and under the control of the United Nations."

Does that statement represent your views?

Mr. Nitze. It does not, Mr. Chairman, and it did not at the time.

Chairman Russell. You do not think the utilization of military forces in this country should be dependent upon any affirmative action of the United Nations?

Mr. Nitze. I do not. I think there are many potential occasions when we might have to use force ourselves, even though not sanctioned by the United Nations.

Chairman Russell. And can you conceive of conditions where it would be necessary for the United States to utilize its full military force even if this were contrary to the expressed views and resolutions of the United Nations?

Mr. Nitze. I do. I would hope that such an occasion would not arise.

Chairman Russell. I am sure we all would. At least I hope the occasion never arises when we must use them, in any event.

Just what effect do you think we should give to the resolution that the——

Mr. Nitze. I did not quite understand the question.

Chairman Russell. To just what extent do you think we should be guided by the views of the United Nations in the utilization of our military forces? Do you think that we should wait until we were attacked before we would utilize them, if the United Nations had not approved it, or disapproved it, or do you think we would be justified in using them in a peripheral war, pursuant to our obligation under some worldwide agreement, even though this were contrary to the present-day opinion of the United Nations?

Mr. Nitze. I agree with the latter point. I think we should use them if it is necessary, even if it were contrary to a United Nations resolution.

It would seem to me, however, that we did have an advantage in the Korean war when our military response to the Korean war was in conformity with the United Nations resolution.

Chairman Russell. Yes. Of course we were fortunate in one extent at that time. The Russians had withdrawn, as I recall it, from the Security Council.

Mr. Nitze. That is correct.

Chairman Russell. And we were able to get the approval not only of the General Assembly, but of the Security Council, which would not have been the case if the Russians could have vetoed the action in the Security Council.

Do you draw any distinction as to action this country should take, as to whether it has been approved by the General Assembly and the higher group in the United Nations, or do you think it should depend entirely upon the security of the United States and our national interests?

Mr. Nitze. I think it should depend upon the security of the United States and our national interests.

But I think our national interest is to be broadly interpreted. I think it is important that we have the support of our allies and the free world as well.

Chairman Russell. Well, do you think that we should solicit that support before taking any military action?

Mr. Nitze. I do not think that would apply in many conceivable contingencies.

Mr. Chairman, may I say a few words about the substance of this?

Chairman Russell. Yes, I want you to make as full a statement as you wish, because it is an important matter.

Mr. Nitze. With respect to this National Council of Churches meeting—this was a meeting in 1958, the success of which was of very much interest to Mr. Dulles and Mr. Ernest Gross, they were very much interested that that be a successful meeting. They were worried that it would not turn out well.

Mr. Gross asked me whether I would chair one of the six panels. He assured me before I went there that I would merely preside, I was not to be in any way responsible for the views expressed by the delegates of the 27 denominations of the Protestant church who were there.

They hoped that as presiding officer I might put forward some of the realities of our foreign policy and the necessities of our defense posture in connection therewith.

I tried to do so. I was unsuccessful. And the report reflects the fact that I was unsuccessful.

But at that time I felt that almost all the views in that panel II report were contrary to what I thought was right, and I still think so.

Chairman Russell. I am not completely clear. Did the members of this section sign this report or not?

Mr. Nitze. They voted upon the report section by section. Many of the views expressed therein—well, for instance, the question of the recognition of Communist China—this was unacceptable—the view expressed there was unacceptable to Mr. Dulles, who made the principal speech at the conference. It was unacceptable to Mr. Ernest Gross, who was in charge of that division of the National Council of Churches. It was put to a vote of the full plenum. The full plenum voted, as I remember, more than 75 percent in favor of this language, which none of us thought was correct.

I make this statement only as an example of the way in which the conference went.

Chairman Russell. I am not too familiar with the parliamentary procedures, I regret to say, of the National Council of Churches.

Mr. Nitze. I wasn't a delegate, did not have a vote, myself.

Chairman Russell. You did not have a vote?

Mr. Nitze. No, sir.

Chairman Russell. That is rather remarkable, isn't it—for a man to chair a seminar or a meeting of this kind without participating in it, or having any power of participation?

Mr. Nitze. I was asked to do this, even though I was not a member.

Chairman Russell. Was Mr. Dulles a member?

Mr. Nitze. He was a member, and, as I remember, at one time chairman of their governing board.

Chairman Russell. And you think he was a delegate?

Mr. Nitze. He made the principal speech at that occasion.

Chairman Russell. Did he have a vote?

Mr. Nitze. My recollection is he left the meeting before the final votes were taken. I believe that in Mrs. Eleanor Dulles' book she relates his deep unhappiness with this particular session of the National Council of Churches.

Chairman Russell. Having known him personally, I know he was very unhappy with any recommendations for this country to recognize Red China. But the thing that concerned me was if there was one person who was opposed to the report, under the parliamentary procedure did they not have the authority to file a minority report? In other words, was this report of your section ever submitted to the entire conference, or was it just a unilateral action within each subdivision?

Mr. Nitze. My recollection is it was submitted to the entire conference after having been developed by majority vote wtihin section II.

Chairman Russell. Did you make any statement to the conference to indicate you disapproved of any part of this report?

Mr. Nitze. I wasn't present at the final conference but I voiced frequent objections during the preparation of section II. After I had finished doing what I agreed to do, to chair that, preside over that panel, I left, as did the cochairman, Mr. Kenneth Thompson.

Chairman Russell. Were you not apprehensive, Mr. Nitze, that the views of this report would be considered your views, inasmuch as you had presided over this section?

Did you, anywhere, at anytime, disavow these views, or disassociate yourself from these findings?

Mr. Nitze. To the best of my recollection, I did not see the final conference report until Senator Jackson, 2 days after my nomination had been announced, asked me about it, and I didn't know what he was referring to. So I then had our office get the records of the National Council of Churches, and they showed me the report.

To the best of my recollection, this is the first time that I was aware of the fact that the report had appeared with my name in a position which might seemingly attribute these views to me.

The fact that I not only did not consider myself associated with the report but also registered my concern during and after the conference is attested by the letters which the chairman has entered into the record.

Chairman Russell. I would assume it was carried quite widely in the press in the city where the meetings were held, if not over the country as a whole.

But I have no information as to that. I haven't made any detailed inquiry into it.

I assume that you did agree with some parts of the report.

Mr. Nitze. I am sure there must be some parts. But, as I say, I think the report contains almost every view that I disagree with.

Chairman RUSSELL. Well, you have read the report several years after the session that you chaired had made the report. I assume you have read it, since Senator JACKSON called it to your attention.

Mr. NITZE. I did.

Chairman RUSSELL. Are you familiar with the part that recommends that the United States should continue its suspension of nuclear tests unilaterally, if necessary, for a sufficient period of time to permit exploration of the possibilities of a definitive international agreement in this area?

Mr. NITZE. I am trying to recollect what my views were on that particular thing at the time.

Chairman RUSSELL. If you don't recall the exact wording, perhaps you can tell the committee now just what are your views on disarmament generally, particularly with respect to measures of inspection and control in an agreement for international disarmament.

Mr. NITZE. Now that I have thought back on the preceding question, I believe the word "unilateral suspension" is in there.

Chairman RUSSELL. Yes, sir; it is.

Mr. NITZE. And this I disagree with. I think my recollection is I disagreed with it at the time.

Chairman RUSSELL. Well, all of us, I think, are in favor of disarmament. We all have our own particular formula for disarmament And they differ very widely.

Do you mind telling us generally, since you are in a position where your views have influence, what your views are on disarmament agreements, inspection, and whether there should be comprehensive procedures to assure compliance with the agreement?

Mr. NITZE. With respect to the test ban agreement, I did support the test ban agreement as it has been approved, and I support Mr. McNamara's testimony with respect to the test ban agreement.

NITZE AND BUNDY NOMINATIONS

Chairman RUSSELL. You are in good company there with many Members of the Senate, even though I happen to be in the unfortunate minority.

Mr. NITZE. With respect to disarmament agreements reducing and controlling armaments, there it would seem to me they would be quite unwise unless they provided thorough inspection, adequate inspection provisions.

Chairman RUSSELL. Do you think it is possible to have a system of inspection that would protect the interests of this country without it being onsite? Do you believe it can be a treaty by means of devices, black boxes, and things of that kind?

Mr. NITZE. I do not have confidence in black boxes, and I think I so testified before the Stennis subcommittee when it was having hearings on the test ban treaty, when a comprehensive test ban treaty was under discussion. I think the utility of black boxes—there may be some utility of black boxes in a test ban, a comprehensive test ban agreement. But I do not believe that one can rely just on the black boxes.

Chairman RUSSELL. There is another statement in the report, and I quote:

"Until substantial progress has been made toward disarmament we must use all our influence to see that wisdom and imagination are used in limiting and controlling military force."

I am curious to know what that statement means. I am a little confused.

You say you have nothing to do with it—that you just chaired the section. But to what extent would you endorse any injunction of this nature, limiting and controlling military force?

Mr. NITZE. To the extent that it was suggested by my introductory statement. I think at the end of my introductory statement I said I believe that only by maintaining this superiority of strategic and nonstrategic military force can the United States have the optimum opportunity to use its military power short of war to support its foreign policy or be in a position to win a military victory at the lowest level of conflict adequate to do the job if war should nevertheless occur.

Chairman RUSSELL. I assume by the lowest level of conflict adequate to do the job, that you have in mind avoiding, if we can, nuclear war.

Mr. NITZE. If that is possible, and if we can still achieve our objectives without so doing, it seems to me this is an important objective for us to have.

Chairman RUSSELL. If we could avoid it, we would limit it to conventional weapons.

Mr. NITZE. If we could avoid it and still achieve our objectives.

Chairman RUSSELL. A number of the communications I have received with respect to your nomination quote this sentence from the report:

"Since we as Christians could not ourselves press the buttons for such destruction, we must now declare our conviction that we cannot support the concept of nuclear retaliation or preventive war."

Now, as Secretary of the Navy it might be necessary for you to participate in pressing the button that would set in motion one of our most formidable nuclear weapons, the Polaris submarine. Do you have any reservations about nuclear retaliation if we should be attacked by nuclear weapons?

Mr. NITZE. I do not, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RUSSELL. You have no reservation whatsoever?

Mr. NITZE. No, sir. That particular section I remember taking violent exception to at the time of the conference. And the steering committee at the time of the conference also took exception to it, and I believe there was some language put into the report which registered that disagreement.

Chairman RUSSELL. So you personally believe that a person could be a Christian and believe in nuclear retaliation all at the same time?

Mr. NITZE. I do.

Chairman RUSSELL. Mr. Nitze, this report states that—

"Washington should encourage the Chinese Nationalist Government to evacuate exposed positions that may be militarily unsound and politically detrimental."

I don't see how we could avoid the conclusion that that refers to Quemoy and Matsu, at least, if nothing else.

Did you in 1958, or do you today, believe that we should pressure the Chinese Nationalists to evacuate Quemoy and Matsu?

Mr. NITZE. I do not think so today. My recollection is in 1958 I did think so.

Chairman RUSSELL. It might help some of us in our thinking if you tell us what brought about the change in your thinking on that subject.

Mr. NITZE. At that time, as I remember it, the U.S. planning was that in the event of an attack on Quemoy and Matsu, the response would be a nuclear response. It did not seem to me that Quemoy and Matsu, which were right close to the border, to the coast of China, which were not part of our security guarantee, would merit that kind of response.

Subsequently, when the threat really developed against Quemoy and Matsu, the Chinese Nationalists were able to hold them wth logistic support from the United States, and so it turned out that you could hold the position without taking what had been the planned action.

Chairman RUSSELL. You don't think the Chinese Nationalists could hold Quemoy and Matsu if Red China made an all-out assault on them?

Mr. NITZE. With our support, I think they can.

Chairman RUSSELL. I mean without our active participation.

Mr. NITZE. As it turned out at that time they were able to.

Chairman RUSSELL. I understand that. But you don't think firing several thousand shells out there was an all-out attack on Quemoy and Matsu. Do you think that the Nationalist Chinese could hold without the 7th Fleet which would be under your command?

Mr. NITZE. If it were necessary for the 7th Fleet to support them, that is, if the actions which we took back in 1958 and 1959 were not adequate, then we would have to use the 7th Fleet in support of Quemoy and Matsu.

Chairman RUSSELL. I believe at one time you held some position of trust and responsibility in the Eisenhower administration, did you not?

Mr. NITZE. I did, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RUSSELL. Policy planning staff?

Mr. NITZE. It continued over from the Truman days, through the first 6 months of the Eisenhower administration.

Chairman RUSSELL. I thought you were an expert in planning.

Did you disagree with the position of the U.S. Government with respect to Quemoy and Matsu in the Eisenhower administration, when we took a position on that matter, and the Senate passed a resolution on it?

Mr. NITZE. I do not recollect that this issue came up during the period January to June 1953.

Chairman RUSSELL. I did not mean to say it did. As a matter of fact, I know it did not.

But, at that time, were you still of the opinion that we could not participate in Quemoy's and Matsu's defense without the use of nuclear weapons?

That seemed to be the predicate you laid for your belief at that time, that we should not help defend Quemoy and Matsu. I was in some of those conferences. I never heard anybody say we had to use nuclear weapons. The question was whether the President should have the authority to commit our forces to their defense. And we generally talked about the 7th Fleet.

Did you approve or disapprove of that action? You are familiar with it.

Mr. NITZE. I did not believe that I was—I was not in support of that resolution at that time.

Senator BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, does he mean he does not believe he was in support of the resolution, or does he mean that he was in support of the resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Paul H. Nitze, of Maryland, to be Secretary of the Navy?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nomination.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is anticipated that between now and 12:13

p.m. there will be only a few brief remarks and a quorum call. At 12:13 the Senate will leave the Chamber in a body to attend the joint meeting with the House of Representatives.

I hope that Senators who obtain the floor during the interim will give the leadership an opportunity at approximately 12:05, to ask for a quorum call to enable Senators to come to the Chamber.

It is anticipated that after the reconvening of the Senate, following its return to the Chamber after listening to the message of the President, a motion will be made by the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to consider a continuing resolution.

PROPOSAL FOR INVESTIGATION OF ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I hope the majority leader will hear me out, because I desire to speak on a subject to which I wish to direct his attention.

Yesterday there was considerable discussion in the Chamber, in which I participated, not by any advance design, but only because I was moved to do so by the discussion, concerning the national calamity which befell the country in the assassination of our beloved President, John F. Kennedy. The discussion related to how the American people might have at one time and place, and in the most authoritative way, an assessment of what occurred and of what might be done to avoid ever again any such dreadful eventuality.

The sequel to that discussion came in an announcement by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary would undertake a complete inquiry, as is indeed its right. In a matter of this kind, one could have proceeded, for example, by way of a national commission. If a similar situation had faced the British or the Canadian people, it undoubtedly would have resulted in the appointment of a Royal Commission consisting of the most distinguished people in the country, including legislators and judges, to bring to the nation its authoritative assessment, report, and recommendation. In our case, that does not necessarily have to be the way the investigation should be made; however, it is still a possibility.

Speaking as one American and one Senator of conscience, I am entirely satisfied that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary should conduct the investigation. But I urge and hope that the leadership could, by arrangement with the President and the leaders in the other body, see to it that the only investigation to which the American people would look would be the Senate investigation. The members of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary are dedicated, high-minded, capable Americans. The staff would be of the best. The executive department would cooperate fully in such an investigation.

Americans are concerned that there will not be an investigation by the Senate, that there will not be an investigation by the House, since the President has already ordered an investigation to be made by the FBI, with its report to be made public. Other people may have other ideas, which would only result in so much confusion concerning this terrible, serious, national situation.

So I address a plea to the leadership that, within the limits of their authority, they do their utmost to bring about a situation in which, if the die is cast that way—and, as I say, I am sure it can be done, and done superbly well—the Senate Committee on the Judiciary will be the investigating body, and that everybody's ideas and everybody's desires to get to the bottom of the whole situation may be pooled in that committee, and that its report be the authoritative report to the people.

I assure the leaders that the people will not be satisfied with anything but an authoritative report and recommendations on the highest national level, representing the entire Nation. If the people are given bits and pieces, many Americans will be left dissatisfied, and we would be derelict in our responsibility to the country.

I suggest this procedure to the leaders, who I know have the utmost good conscience on this subject, and are most desirous of seeing this dreadful, serious, tragic national duty performed, as I said yesterday, with the dignity that Mrs. Kennedy showed to the Nation we are capable of as a people.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, yesterday, after a conference with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and a majority of that committee, we came to about the same conclusion; that is, that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary is the proper instrumentality to conduct the investigation, to tie all the information together. It was also the belief that the committee should "tool" and organize for such an investigation, so that it would be thorough in every respect. I believe we can consummate that end; we shall certainly try to do so.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the minority leader. I am sure the country will be. I hope that the one central idea that the committee will have, the one report which will speak for the whole Nation, is that which will find the most congenial echo in the hearts of every American.

I thank the minority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, many questions are connected with the assassination of last Friday which have not been answered. Too many questions remain. Those questions must, and I am sure they will, be answered before Federal Government in the person of the Executive and in the person of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate will be through with their investigations.

TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, recently the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Committee on Banking and Currency held out-of-town hearings in three cities on S. 750, the truth-in-lending bill.

This bill simply requires that all lenders and credit extenders fully disclose to the customer the interest rates or finance charges involved in consumer credit transactions. It would not in any way attempt to regulate or control the terms of credit but merely requires full disclosure of credit costs so that the consumer may have full information in order to make intelligent choices about using credit.

Unfortunately some powerful elements in the finance industry are opposed to this bill, and so far the opposition has been able to keep this legislation bottled up in the Production and Stabilization Subcommittee.

Earlier this summer, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the author of the truth-in-lending bill, indicated his wish that additional hearings be held on the bill in various cities throughout the country. I am delighted to say that the committee received a warm invitation to hold hearings in Pittsburgh from many local labor and public-spirited groups. Moreover, the citizens of Pittsburgh have formed a local truth-in-lending committee.

I am also pleased that so many of Pittsburgh's leading citizens and representatives of leading organizations turned out to testify in support of the bill. Among those appearing to endorse this legislation were Mayor Joseph M. Barr, Allegheny County Commissioner John E. McGrady, Ellwood C. Knapp, president of the Friendship Savings & Loan Association, Mr. William Lawry, a director of the Pennsylvania Credit Union League, Mr. Paul Normile, director, District 16 of the United Steelworkers, Mrs. Margaret L. Martin, chairman of the Women's Activities Department, Allegheny Labor Council, Mr. William J. Hart, president of the Allegheny County Labor Council, Miss Kathryn Knapp, of the Catholic Social Services, as well as representatives from the Pittsburgh Catholic Diocese, the St. Vincent DePaul Society, the Society for the Improvement of the Poor, and many others.

Indeed, there were more witnesses than the subcommittee could possibly accommodate during the 1-day hearing in Pittsburgh. I am delighted that there is such strong support for the truth-in-lending bill in the Pittsburgh area and that so many of Pittsburgh's citizens have taken such an interest in the problems caused by consumer credit abuses.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a very excellent article on the Pittsburgh truth-in-lending hearings, which was published in the October 1963 issue of the newspaper Steel Labor, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERSONAL EXPERIENCES AIRED AT TRUTH-IN-LENDING HEARINGS

The right to know is all that Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, is asking for in his truth-in-lending bill which will require only that all lenders and credit sellers fully disclose to the consumer the costs of using credit in an accurate and uniform manner.

Pittsburgh, Pa., was the scene of one of four out-of-town hearings authorized by the Production and Stabilization Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee of which Senator DOUGLAS is chairman. Members of the United Steelworkers of America led the list of witnesses testifying from their personal experiences on loans made from finance companies at interest rates which committee staff members quickly computed as ranging from 26 to 73 percent.

The United Steelworkers of America, guided by Director Paul Normile of district 16, spearheaded a citizens' committee to generate support for the bill by enlisting the aid of individuals and organizations. The response was tremendous from all labor unions in the area and other organizations that wanted to be heard such as credit unions, savings and loan associations, Pittsburgh Catholic diocese, St. Vincent DePaul Society, Improvement of the Poor, and city and county administration officials.

There were so many witnesses willing to testify in support of this bill that the limited time allotted to the hearing prevented them from appearing.

It was clear from the evidence submitted at the day-long hearings in the Federal Building in Pittsburgh which overflowed courtroom 6 why the reactionary and conservative members of the committee opposed Senator DOUGLAS' suggestion that the committee go into communities to get grassroots testimony on consumer credit abuses.

The subcommittee voted to authorize out-of-town hearings on the truth-in-lending bill in May. However, because of a parliamentary objection to the vote taken at that time, the full Banking and Currency Committee met on July 17 to reconsider the question of whether or not out-of-town hearings should be held on the truth-in-lending bill. On July 17, the committee reaffirmed the decision of the Production and Stabilization Subcommittee to hold out-of-town hearings on S. 750 by an 8-to-7 vote.

Two members of the committee who voted against holding out-of-town hearings were Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, Republican, of Utah, and Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, Republican, of Wyoming, both of whom accompanied Senator DOUGLAS to Pittsburgh and indicated strong opposition to the bill.

The battle lines on this Senate bill have been drawn. Those in favor of the truth-in-lending bill include almost everybody who buys on the installment plan. The opponents of the bill include the powerful, well-financed lobbies in Washington such as small loan companies, retail merchants association, automobile dealers, particularly used car merchants, American Bankers Association, American Bar Association, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

The opposition within the committee is represented by Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, a well-known Salt Lake City automobile dealer and a former president of the National Association of Manufacturers. His brother, Harold H. Bennett, also a Salt Lake City businessman, is the president of the National Retail Merchants Association, an organization devoted to the defeat of the bill.

"It seems incredible that there is so much opposition to this bill," stated William J. Hart at the Pittsburgh hearing. Mr. Hart is president of the Allegheny County Labor Council, AFL-CIO, which represents approximately 160,000 union members in Allegheny County. He also serves as director of District 19, United Steelworkers of America. Continuing, he asked: "Why the objection to a law which would merely require businessmen and lenders to state in plain English exactly what they charge for their merchandise and the cost of credit? The public and our Nation need the Douglas truth-in-lending bill and it should be enacted as soon as possible."

Joseph Martonic, a steelworker, said he borrowed $152 which he paid back at the rate of $11 a month for 24 months, a total of $264, which staff workers for both Republican Senators and Senator DOUGLAS figured at 73 percent interest. "I was sucked in real good," Martonic testified.

Speaking as an official representative of the Pittsburgh Catholic Diocese, Miss Kathryn Knapp of the Catholic Social Services indicated the church's strong support of the truth-in-lending bill and urged immediate enactment for the protection of consumers.

Representing the Friendship Federal Savings & Loan Association of Pittsburgh, Mr. C. Ellwood Knapp urged passage of the bill, stating: "It is in the belief that applicants for credit might be more reasonable in assuming debt if they understood the real costs thereof and that credit, like all other commodities, should be sold at a price buyers understand."

A. William Lawry, director of the Pennsylvania Credit Union League and the Credit Union National Association, appeared as a witness and urged the committee to act favorably on the truth-in-lending bill.

The Women's Activities Department (WAD) of the Allegheny County Labor Council, AFL-CIO was represented by Mrs. Margaret L. Martin, who told the committee: "Since women today do most of the family budgeting and purchasing, any way in which we can learn to do this more economically and wisely would be welcomed. And in fact—this information is absolutely necessary because of the complex manner in which goods and services are marketed today.

"The truth-in-lending bill provides that the amount of interest charged on a time-payment contract must be stated in two ways on the face of the contract. In dollars and cents for the total time the contract runs and the simple annual rate on the outstanding balance. We hope that this bill will be brought out of committee, voted on by the Senate and enacted into law as quickly as possible," she said.

The hearings in Pittsburgh certainly demonstrated to Senator DOUGLAS, the author of the bill, that there is a vital need for legislation to require the full disclosure of the costs of consumer credit. Senator DOUGLAS said "my bill would not in any way regulate credit costs, charges, or interest rates. All we ask is that the consumer be told the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth about the cost of credit.

"Today, consumers owe more than $235 billion in their personal debts—approximately $171 billion on their homes and $64 billion in short- and intermediate-term debt. On this personal debt, consumers last year paid out approximately $15 to $17 billion in interest and finance charges."

DOUGLAS concluded, "we must restore consumer sovereignty in the consumer credit marketplace. Every individual has the right to know what he is paying for credit."

President Kennedy has strongly urged enactment of truth-in-lending legislation.

In his consumer protection message last spring he said: "Excessive and untimely use of credit arising out of ignorance of its true cost is harmful both to the stability of the economy and to the welfare of the public.

"Legislation should therefore be enacted requiring lenders and vendors to disclose to borrowers in advance the actual amounts and rates which they will be paying for credit. Such legislation, similar in this sense to the truth-in-securities laws of 1933–34 would not control prices or charges. But it would require full disclosure to installment buyers and other prospective credit users, and thus permit consumers to make informed decisions before signing on the dotted line."

Pittsburgh Mayor Joseph M. Barr, Allegheny County Commissioner John E. McGrady, and State Senator Paul Mahady, Latrobe, Pa., urged enactment of the truth-in-lending legislation.

FEDERAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE ARTS AND A NATIONAL ARTS FOUNDATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Special Subcommittee on the Arts has recently concluded hearings on bills introduced by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], to provide for a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts and a National Arts Foundation. It has been my privilege to cosponsor these bills and to serve on this subcommittee in this Congress and in the 87th Congress as well.

The chairman of this subcommittee in this Congress and the last is Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, of Rhode Island. He has contributed determined leadership and effort to the goal of enacting legislation to provide encouragement and assistance to the arts. He deserves the thanks of all of us in this regard.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "CLAIBORNE PELL, A Profile," written by Daniel Millsaps, and published in Art Voices for October 1963, be printed at this point in the RECORD. I am glad that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] has won this recognition from the arts world he serves so well.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope very much that President Johnson will take the same interest in the future of the country's cultural field that President Kennedy did, and that he will go through with the appointment of the Advisory Committee on the Arts. This action is well underway and is an essential first step in the outstanding work to which the Senator from Pennsylvania has referred, to which he and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] are parties, and to which I have made my contribution during past years.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLAIBORNE PELL, SENATOR FROM RHODE ISLAND, THE KEY FIGURE IN ART LEGISLATION

(By Daniel Millsaps)

Forty-five-year-old CLAIBORNE PELL, who is a key figure in current art and Government legislation in the U.S. Senate, divides his time between Washington and Newport, R.I. Educated at Gibb's Preparatory School in London and at Princeton and Columbia Universities here, he served as an officer in the U.S. Coast Guard during World War II. He then had 7 years of duty with the State Department in Czechoslovakia and Italy before being elected to the Senate in 1960. His forebears include many statesmen; his father, Herbert, was for a time Ambassador to Portugal and Hungary and served in the U.S. House of Representatives from New York. His stepmother is Olive Bigelow Pell, the portrait painter.

PELL is married to former Nuala O'Donnell, a close niece of Huntington Hartford, the art patron. She adds vivacious charm to their Georgetown home in Washington where they entertain other socially prominent guests and are surrounded by many beautiful objects of art, mostly inherited by the young Senator from his family. Their four children and two dogs make a lively household when they can all arrange to be together.

Senator PELL's interest in art began quite early and he minored in art history and appreciation at Princeton. One of his classmates there was Livingston Biddle, the author of the well known novel "Main Line." Recently PELL brought Biddle down from Philadelphia to work on his staff with part of his duties being directed at the details connected with legislation in the arts.

Last year PELL was named head of the subcommittee which heard testimony by many leaders in the art world to get their views on three bills then being considered. He conducted the hearings most efficiently and lent a sympathetic ear to all the testimony both pro and con. His subcommittee approved a combined version of the bills which was passed by the Senate but died at the end of the session without any action having been taken in the House of Representatives. This year PELL is expected to be selected to head the same group and he says he will work toward passing something out of committee which will be acceptable to the full Senate as well as having a chance of passage by the House.

PELL also has another official duty in the Senate which can affect Government and art relationships. He has been named head of the subcommittee which oversees the operation of the Smithsonian Institution. The major art collections belonging to the U.S. Government come under this Institution. The subcommittee has been in existence since 1947 but there has never been a meeting. PELL plans to have meetings soon and hopes to achieve more vitality in the programs of the Institution. He is the man to whom suggestions may be made for expansion of the collections and any other improvements thought desirable.

Senator PELL believes in bringing "art to the people," and he has some pet projects of his own in this field. At his personal expense last year he arranged for a pilot program of exhibits of reproductions of master works to be shown in his State. He worked with John Walker of the National Gallery to send framed prints of both traditional and more modern art to city halls in Rhode Island for a 10-month tour. His idea met with great success for the most part although some local politicos were somewhat bewildered. He hopes the pattern will be followed by others until more formal programs are established by the Government.

Again footing the bills for transportation, Senator PELL exhibits works of Rhode Island artists in the reception room of his suite of offices on Capitol Hill. He has a jury of private persons in that State select the works for him; his assistant in charge of the project is Isabelle Leeds of the Rhode Island office. Currently there are works by these artists on exhibition: Antonio Dottaro, Florence Lief, Waldo Kaufer, Michael Mazur, David Aldrich, and John Bozarth.

CLAIBORNE PELL is the first to show up when it is felt that his prestige is needed to boost a community art affair. In visiting him at home and in his office one feels that he is willing to do whatever is necessary to further the cause of art and artists, even though the pressures of politics and duties in other areas of interest are heavy and time consuming. It is perhaps through men like him that early President John Adams' ambition for his grandchildren may come true. Adams put aside art in his day for more imperative business, but he said: "My sons ought to study mathematics and philosophy, geography, natural history and naval architecture, navigation, commerce and agriculture in order to give their children a right to study painting, poetry, music, architecture, statuary, tapestry and porcelain."

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] for their kind words.

NAMING OF THE NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER IN HONOR OF JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in these hours when we search our minds and hearts for some suitable commemoration for our late President, John F. Kennedy—during these days when in West Berlin a square, through which marched thousands and thousands of free German students in candlelight procession honoring his memory, is being dedicated in his memory—I fully endorse the concept that a fitting memorial for President Kennedy would be to name the National Cultural Center here in Washington the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center.

As we know, construction of the Center has not yet begun; yet our former President's thoughts were directed toward the ideal of its growth as a symbol of our Nation's cultural vitality.

During his administration President Kennedy and his First Lady devoted an important part of their energies and their aspirations to the development of the arts, to the enhancement of our cultural resources. Together they looked upon the arts as having a deeply significant, central meaning to our national life. Together, they gave distinction and high purpose and grace to this definition; together, they, themselves, created a new environment for artistic achievement in the United States.

Mr. President, great art speaks in a universal language. The great poet, or painter, or sculptor or musician—the fine artist, no matter what his medium of expression—goes beyond narrow limits of time and place. He uplifts us. He shows us the harmonies which our world can possess and did possess generations or even centuries ago.

He gives us a sense of continuity, of mankind's always renewing inspiration. He creates a work of abiding value. He illuminates our vision, so that we can better understand each other and better comprehend the goals we seek.

In this sense, I believe President Kennedy was a true artist—not alone in the words he used to motivate us, but in the impulses which motivated him. Therefore, Mr. President, I think it would be appropriate for our National Cultural Center—as it is contemplated, as it is planned, as it emerges to reality—to bear his name.

I am further struck by the proposed location of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center. Fortuitously, its site is close by the Lincoln Memorial, on the edge of the historic flow of the Potomac River across whose waters our late President is buried.

The Center would be more than just a stone monument. In accord with the highest ideals of our Nation, it would be a living tribute to all creative talent.

As our first President George Washington wrote in 1788:

> The arts * * * are essential to the prosperity of the state and to the ornament and happiness of human life. They have a primary claim to the encouragement of every lover of his country and of mankind.

Two months ago, in an address before the United Nations, President Kennedy said:

> Let us complete what we have started.

The words seem particularly applicable to this memorial. It would be a wonderful flowering of the zest and intellectual sparkle that President Kennedy gave our country during the past 3 years.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. PELL. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. PASTORE. I compliment my colleague for his magnificent statement and his very brilliant idea, and I associate myself with everything he has said.

Mr. PELL. I thank my colleague.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield to me?

Mr. PELL. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Rhode Island.

During his lifetime, President Kennedy made the White House a living center for the performing arts; and nothing could be more appropriate to the memory of this great man than to name the National Cultural Center for the Performing Arts for President John F. Kennedy.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PELL. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I gladly associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Rhode Island. I think it is apparent and will be eternally memorable that during his relatively brief administration, President Kennedy and his brave and lovely wife, Jacqueline Kennedy, made the White House a cultural citadel to an extent that it had never been before in all its history. They refurbished and redecorated the interior of the White House, with distinction and taste bringing to it examples of outstanding American painting, sculpture, ceramics, furnishings—treasures of the art and craftsmanship of our American civilization. Jack and Jacqueline used the facilities of the White House to recognize, encourage, and support the arts. They invited poets, musicians, actors, and dancers. A poet, Robert Frost, graced President Kennedy's inaugural. President Kennedy gave important recognition to the Nobel Prize winners; and to Pulitzer Prize winners. At his invitation, outstanding demonstrations by exponents of American culture and creativeness were made at the White House.

I think nothing could be more appropriate than the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island to name the proposed Capital's Cultural Center after President Kennedy, and I trust that it will be adopted. This will not and should not be his only memorial, but surely none could be more fitting and more deserved.

THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact—we are reminded of it again, this morning—that the Genocide Convention, pending before us now for 13 years, has not been approved. I urge the Foreign Relations Committee, which is considering three other United Nations conventions, on forced labor, slavery, and the political rights of women, to consider the one on genocide, as well, at this time. All of these have been approved by the Department of State for immediate ratification.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, the editorial entitled "Genocide," which appeared in the Washington Post, November 27.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> ### GENOCIDE
>
> Genocide—the deliberate destruction of an ethnic group—was declared an international crime by the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1950. The United States, to its great credit, was a leading influence in the drafting and adoption of the Genocide Convention. But to its enduring shame, the United States has been laggard in ratifying this convention. The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate seems to have filed and forgotten it.
>
> Genocide was defined in the General Assembly as a deliberate policy involving acts intended to destroy, in whole or in part, "a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group"; and the acts characterized as entailing genocide were specified as "killing members of the group, causing serious bodily or mental harm to members * * * deliberately inflicting * * * conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part, imposing measures to prevent births * * * forcibly transferring children * * * to another group."
>
> One would suppose that in the United States there could be no hesitation about outlawing such practices as part of a deliberate extermination policy. But among some of the country's southern lawyer-statesmen, there developed an anxiety about the language of the convention. Could southern patterns of segregation be regarded as "causing serious * * * mental harm" to Negroes? Could the United States be haled before the World Court as a perpetrator of genocide in relation to its colored minority?
>
> The anxiety is manifestly fantastic and reveals much more about the southern sense of guilt than about any defects in the Genocide Convention. Odious as the aspects of racial discrimination may be, they cannot be considered a pattern designed to bring about the destruction of an ethnic group. Nevertheless, southern fears have kept the Genocide Convention from coming to the Senate floor.
>
> Instead, the administration this year is pushing, somewhat timorously and tentatively, three more modest U.N. conventions—those on forced labor, slavery, and the political rights of women. Before his death President Kennedy sent these three to the Senate for advice and consent to ratification. They are significant and desirable, of course; and American adherence to them should be speedily approved. Once they have been ratified, we hope the Senate will turn serious attention to the Genocide Convention.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, today 65 nations—Venezuela as recently as 1960—have acceded to the Genocide Convention, including the Soviet Union—which ratified it in 1954—and its satellites; but conspicuous by their absence among the nations are the United Kingdom and the United States.

The United States took the lead in helping to draft this convention and was one of the first of 20 nations to sign it. Why then have we failed to ratify it and thus bring it into force?

We have come a long way from the international fears and domestic considerations which kept the convention from the Senate floor. Genocide as defined in the convention has never occurred in the United States and there is no likelihood that it ever will. Yet, action at this time by our country would have a tremendous influence on the other nations of the world. The Genocide Convention should be reconsidered now—at the session of the 88th Congress—and hearings should be reopened by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Two years of painstaking effort by the United Nations Economic and Social Council went into the drafting of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, and it was unanimously approved by the General Assembly on December 9, 1948. It came into force on January 12, 1951, as between the states that had ratified it.

The convention came before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1950, and hearings were held. A subcommittee reported the convention favorably to the full committee but after discussion in executive session and in spite of the urgings of the Department of State the committee withheld its recommendation. Thus, after more than 11 years the Genocide Convention is still pending in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and without the advice and consent to ratification of the Senate, the convention cannot be made effective as to the United States.

The convention defines genocide to mean certain enumerated acts committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group; and this is made a crime under our own as well as international law. As long as dictatorships exist which seek to destroy their opposition, there will be groups subject to the kind of mass murder outlawed under this convention. Who can deny that as long as the conditions exist which brought about in recent years the suppression of Hungary, the conquest of Tibet, and the tribal conflicts in Africa, there is need to outlaw the shocking crime of genocide? And who has not felt a tremor of fear at the recent reports of the nature of Soviet persecution of Jews for alleged economic offenses?

Long after we are gone, the deep significance of the trial of Eichmann for the crime of joining in organizing the mass slaughter of 6 million Jews will continue to disturb the conscience of man. It has made us look again into the terrifying depths to which human depravity can fall and the delicate balance of a humane civilization in the 20th century. What happened in Nazi Germany could happen again and the world should take concerted action to serve clear notice that it is outlawed and will not be tolerated.

We must not permit the pressures of the cold war to distract us from the memory of the horrifying acts of genocide committed by the Nazis before and throughout World War II; we must not weaken in our resolve to make genocide, in the words of the United Nations resolution of 1946:

> A crime under international law which the world condemns—and for the commission of which principals and accomplices * * * are punishable.

In the 1950 hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee, the Deputy Under Secretary of State concluded his appeal by saying that ratification would "demonstrate to the rest of the world that the United States is determined to maintain its moral leadership in international affairs and to participate in the development of international law on the basis of human justice." I commend these words, which he may remember as his own, to our present Secretary of State Dean Rusk. I add to them my own appeal that he call for prompt and conclusive hearings by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

There is much sound reason for ratifying the convention and time has eliminated some of the known objections. For example, the Soviet Union and its satellite states, in spite of initial objections and reservations, deposited instruments of ratification with the United Nations in 1954. This was one of the reasons presented by the Secretary of State John Foster Dulles in 1953 when he told the Senate Judiciary Committee:

> The solution of the problem which is envisaged by that (genocide) treaty could better be reconsidered at a later date. I would not press at the moment for its ratification.

As long as the specter of genocide continues to haunt mankind, the United States has a basic international obligation to assume the responsibilities of this convention.

Our country has a long history of moral leadership in alleviating the plight of oppressed peoples, and many will recall the successful efforts of our leaders at the turn of the century in awakening public opinion in the United States to the persecution of Jews in Russia and Rumania. At other times we have intervened on behalf of persecuted Armenians, Greeks, Cubans, and other peoples. We have entered into conventions with other nations to prevent and punish criminal action many times in the past without endangering our sovereignty, and there is no reason to fear that by ratification of the Genocide Convention we shall be inviting foreign powers to intervene in domestic questions, as some critics have charged. If international law is to have any sanction for enforcement, it must rely upon treaties, and the convention is a treaty.

We should be taking every opportunity to champion the rule of law in the conduct of nations, and we can give fresh vitality to our peace leadership by acceding to this convention.

Hearings by the Foreign Relations Committee, followed by Senate ratification, are needed now to strike a powerful blow in the struggle for human rights and the advancement of the rule of law.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DESIGNATION OF ESCORT FOR PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on the part of the Senate, the leadership designates the following Democrats to constitute a committee to escort the President of the United States: The majority leader, the assistant majority leader, the secretary of the majority caucus, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who will be the senior Member of this body due to the fact that since there is no Vice President, the President pro tempore will be presiding with the Speaker of the House.

When the Senate returns to its Chamber, it will take up the continuing resolution.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move, pursuant to the announcement made yesterday, that the Senate now proceed in a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the Senate, preceded by its Secretary (Felton M. Johnston), its Sergeant at Arms (Joseph C. Duke), and the President pro tempore, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives, to hear the message of the President of the United States.

(The message of the President of the United States, this day delivered by him to the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress, appears in the proceedings of the House of Representatives in today's RECORD, pp. 22838–22839.)

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Upon the conclusion of the joint meeting of the two Houses, the Senate returned to its Chamber at 1 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE PROSECUTION OF COMPREHENSIVE PLANS FOR CERTAIN RIVER BASINS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 628, the bill (H.R. 8667) authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins, and that it be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8667) authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, in accordance with our word and our pledge, we intend to take up a joint resolution which would continue appropriations. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who will handle the joint resolution, and the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who has some observations he desires to make, are in the Chamber.

CONTINUATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1964

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 809.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the joint resolution of October 30, 1963 (Public Law 88–162), is hereby amended by striking out "November 30, 1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "January 31, 1964."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the joint resolution would continue until December 31, 1963, appropriations for those functions of the Government for which funds have not been enacted into law.

I regret as much as anyone the necessity for another continuing resolution during this session of the Congress. As Senators know, most of the delay on the appropriations bills has been occasioned by the lack of necessary authorization and, to date, only the foreign aid authorization bill remains to be enacted. For the record, I am submitting a listing showing the status of all appropriations bills for fiscal year 1964:

Enacted into law are the bills for the Interior, Treasury, Post Office, Executive Office, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Defense Departments, and their related agencies.

With respect to the legislative branch appropriations bill, the Senate has just rejected the conference report.

Three bills have passed both Houses of Congress, the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and the Independent Offices appropriations bill and conferences on these bills are being held or will be held in the near future.

Three bills are presently in the Senate Committee on Appropriations. Hearings are under way on the military construction bill, and awaiting subcommittee markup are the bills for public works and the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary.

Still remaining in the House Committee, pending finalization of the authorization bill, is the foreign aid appropriations bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In order that it may be clear in the RECORD, am I correct in my understanding that, as a result of the Senate having rejected the conference report on the legislative appropriation bill, neither the House nor the Senate will be able to use junk-mailing privileges under the continuing resolution?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is my understanding. The Post Office Department has been consulted, and the committee has been advised that under the continuing resolutions, first enacted June 29, 1963, and extended to January 31, 1964, if House Joint Resolution 809 is adopted, no Member of the House or of the Senate is authorized to use the simplified mailing system.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call up my amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 5, it is proposed to strike out "January 31, 1964" and to insert in lieu thereof "December 31, 1963".

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. Has the House of Representatives adjourned until after the first of December?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Chair is unable to advise the Senator. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that that is not a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I say to my colleagues who are concerned about their vacation plans that, while I do not intend to agree to a unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate on my amendment, I have no intention of protracting the debate with the result that some Senators might miss their Thanksgiving dinners with their beloved families.

If during the course of my remarks it should develop, as I have been informally advised, that the House recessed or adjourned until after the first of December, I hope the Senator from Montana will cause me to be advised during the course of my speech, because if that is the case, my action will be somewhat different from what it will if it is not the case.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I assure the Senator that if any information comes to my attention the Senator will be promptly notified.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 258 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania takes judicial notice of the fact that a quorum is not present, and asks the clerk to observe that there are only seven Senators present in the Chamber.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The record shows that a quorum responded.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. When it is clear to the Senator who has the floor that a quorum is not present—and I ask the Chair to take judicial notice of that fact—is it within the power of the Senator who has the floor to suggest the absence of a quorum, even though no business has been transacted since the previous quorum call?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that a second quorum call is not in order until business has been transacted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, is it the transaction of business to address a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that it is not.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is it the transaction of business to ask unanimous consent to insert a matter in the Record?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** If request is granted, it will be business.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert sundry matters in the Congressional Record.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield for that purpose?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to my friend from Illinois.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the request is granted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the introduction of a bill, without losing the floor?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Minnesota without losing my right to the floor.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF THE JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY MEMORIAL COMMISSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have noted in the press and in the Record a number of suggestions that various activities and buildings be named after our late President, John F. Kennedy. This is fitting and proper, and I am happy to see at work a number of minds seeking to find the most appropriate memorial to President Kennedy.

I have a personal hope that the National Cultural Center might be designated as the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. President and Mrs. Kennedy were uniquely instrumental in advancing the state of the arts in our country, and I feel sure that there would be widespread agreement upon the designation of the proposed cultural center in the late President's name. However, Mr. President, in deference to President Kennedy's family and to insure that only the most appropriate memorial or memorials be created for President Kennedy, I would strongly urge the immediate creation of a special commission for the John F. Kennedy National Memorial and further, Mr. President, that there be no Federal activity designated as a John F. Kennedy memorial until such time as such a commission would come forth with its official recommendations and guidelines. Such a commission would be expected to consult with the family of the late President before coming to the Congress and the Executive with its recommendation. Therefore, Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill calling upon the President to establish a President John F. Kennedy Memorial Commission and ask that it be appropriately referred. I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk for an additional week so that other Senators can add their names as cosponsors if they desire, and that the full text of the bill be printed in the Record.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The bill (S. 2347) to provide for the establishment of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission, introduced by Mr. Humphrey (for himself, Mr. Inouye, and Mr. Javits), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby established a commission to be known as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

MEMBERSHIP

Sec. 2. (a) The Commission shall be composed of 13 members as follows:

(1) Four Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(2) Four Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate; and

(3) Five members to be appointed by the President of the United States from among private citizens of the United States.

(b) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(c) The President shall designate a Chairman and a Vice Chairman of the Commission.

(d) Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 3. (a) It shall be the duty of the Commission to make a full and complete study and evaluation with respect to any plan or plans which shall have been proposed with a view toward memorializing the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. In the course of such study and evaluation, the Commission shall consult with members of the immediate family of the late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, in order to determine their sentiments concerning all such plans.

(b) The Commission shall submit to the Congress a preliminary report of its findings and recommendations not later than six months after the organization of the Commission for the performance of its duties. The Commission shall submit a final report setting forth the results of its study and evaluation, together with its recommendations, not later than three years after its organization for the performance of its duties. The Commission shall cease to exist sixty days after the submission of its final report.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) The members of the Commission appointed from private life shall each receive $75 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. (a) The Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949.

(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810; 5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, but in no event shall the sums hereby authorized to be appropriated exceed a total of $100,000.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me so that I may address a request to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has the floor. He has yielded to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield briefly to the Senator from New York without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may join with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] as a cosponsor of the bill, if that is agreeable to him.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am delighted to have the Senator from New York do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. I compliment the Senator from Minnesota. I am a member of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Commission, I believe the Senator's approach to this very important national task is exactly right.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am honored to have the Senator join as a cosponsor of the bill.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 809) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, preparatory to a suggestion which I shall make in a moment, I believe it is highly desirable that we have a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania. I therefore declare that it is my intention to suggest something in a moment, which will call for a live quorum. This will be insisted upon until a sufficient number of Senators are present to order the yeas and nays.

Therefore, with the full intention of obtaining a live quorum, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield for that purpose?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, let me say to the dwindling number of Senators on the floor, whose needs for sustenance are fully understood, because I have those same needs for sustenance, that I can allay their fears. This is not a filibuster. I have a point which I, at least, believe is a valid point, with respect to the pending joint resolution. I had hoped that I would be able to debate my point before a reasonable number of my colleagues in the Senate. I may be talking long enough to permit most of my colleagues to finish their lunch, in the hope that some of them, at least, will return to the Chamber.

Let no Senator be unduly concerned. I shall not keep the Senate in session this afternoon long enough to interfere with the plans of any Senator to get away at a reasonable time this afternoon.

Having, as I am sure many of my colleagues do not know, operated a dude ranch in Wyoming for 8 or 9 years during the decade of the twenties, and in that endeavor having become acquainted, at least to some extent, with the habits of the horse, and having learned that it is a wise dude rancher who does not come too close to the heels of a cranky horse, I have observed that Senators—I say this with all deference to my beloved colleagues—have a number of characteristics in common with the horse. As I say this, I would like it well understood that I consider the horse to be a noble animal.

I have great affection and admiration for the horse, just as I have great affection and admiration for my 99 colleagues. I hope that to some extent they reciprocate in their affection, if not in their admiration, for me.

But I found, during the period when I was operating the dude ranch in Wyoming, that there was much truth in the old fable, the old saw, that "You can lead a horse to water, but you can't make him drink." It has been my experience that a U.S. Senator can be led to a live quorum, but he cannot be made to sit and listen to one of his colleagues talk. This is particularly true when the Senator, unlike the horse who will not drink, is not only hungry, but is thirsty, as well. Therefore, I have no sense of affront because a number of my colleagues, having, no doubt, charming luncheon companions, and being also, I have no doubt, hungry—because I am hungry, too—think it more desirable to finish their midday meal rather than to come to the floor of the Senate and hear the senior Senator from Pennsylvania deliver another little comment about the Senate establishment.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. I have asked the Senator to yield for a question. Would the Senator from Pennsylvania be willing to let me leave the floor, notwithstanding what he has said, in order that I may consult the dictionary which is in the reading room, to obtain a definition of "act" and "action now"? I thought I understood the definition until a recent conversation as we came back from the House Chamber, after listening to the President urge us to act now. I would be more comfortable if I could find the dictionary definition.

Mr. CLARK. I thoroughly sympathize with the mission that the Senator from Michigan intends to perform. I not only give my approval; I give my enthusiastic approbation to have him consult the dictionary; and when he finds the definition, I hope he will bring it into the Chamber. After all, the word "act" is a fairly basic word; it has only three letters in it—a-c-t. "Action" has only two syllables—ac-tion. I thought I knew what the word "act" meant, and I thought I knew what the word "action" meant, even before the President called those words so forcefully to our attention only a few minutes ago in the other Chamber.

So I encourage the Senator from Michigan to consult the dictionary.

I observe that one of our assiduous and able pages, always interested in the welfare and comfort of the Members of the Senate, has already carried that heavy volume into the Chamber, where I hope the Senator from Michigan can consult it, and that my words, spoken so close to his right ear, will not detract him from his pursuit of the intellectual enterprise to which he has dedicated himself.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. I suggest that the dictionary will indicate that "to act," "to act now," and "to act speedily" do not take into account recesses for Thanksgiving and Christmas; that they mean getting down to work.

I can think of no more appropriate single move than an expression of willingness by Senators to make themselves available, to express a willingness to forgo holiday recesses if the President and the leadership think it is necessary, and to devote ourselves to the tasks ahead.

The President outlined a formidable list of tasks for our consideration. He said that the time to begin on them is now. I do not understand the reasoning of those who say we must wait until January. We would lose momentum; we would experience a time lag between now and then. Instead of standing still, we ought to be moving forward now.

I can think of no finer response to the new President, I can think of no more rewarding endorsement of the principles of John Kennedy, than to devote ourselves promptly to the tasks ahead.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his interjection. I find myself in complete accord with what he has said. The Senator from Wyoming is a hard taskmaster. I have no doubt he represents, to some extent, the same Puritian ethic in which I was brought up.

I see my dear friend, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], looking at me anxiously. I will keep my commitment to him.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. This is merely a rejoinder to what has already been said by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. I do not think there is a Member of the Senate who is not willing to stay here and do his work. The subject of vacations was discussed some time ago. However, in the meantime, the country has experienced a terrible, tragic incident. In view of what President Lyndon Johnson said today, I believe the whole subject should be reappraised. Most of us would be willing to forgo our holidays and do the work that must be done for the betterment of mankind and for the good of our country. I do not understand why anyone is quarreling about that today. It would be unfortunate to leave the impression that this great body, which is dedicated to the welfare of the country and its people, is more anxious to go home for a holiday than it is to stay here and do its work. I do not believe anyone has said that; I do not believe anyone intends to do that.

All I said this afternoon was that this is an important matter. We all know what it means. I do not think it is necessary to talk about it endlessly.

All I said was that it is not hard to explain to the intelligence of this august body the difference between December 31 and January 31. It is a difference of a month. The only situation that confronts the Senate now is that if the Senate amends the joint resolution, it will have to go back to the House. The joint resolution that is now in effect will expire November 30. Therefore, there would be a hiatus. If that had not been the case, I would go along with the idea that the date should be December 31. If it were then necessary further to extend the time for a week or so, that could easily be done.

I should like to say a word in fairness to the Committee on Appropriations. I do not know how many Senators now in the Chamber are familiar with the work of that committee. It is the only committee of the Senate that is authorized under a continuing unanimous-consent agreement to meet while the Senate is in session. All other committees must have particular, specific consent to do so.

Mr. CLARK. That is not true. Yesterday on the floor of the Senate the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore] objected to allowing the Committee on Finance to meet this morning.

Mr. PASTORE. I merely say that the Committee on Appropriations has a continuing unanimous-consent agreement to meet when the Senate is in session. I am speaking only about the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CLARK. That is true.

Mr. PASTORE. That is true.

What does that mean? It means that we work day in and day out. I do not say this in deprecation of anyone else. Every Member of the Senate works. But the assignment to the Committee on Appropriations is a difficult one. We sit for hours, as I am certain the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] will attest. Sometimes the hearings are monotonous. We try to accommodate witnesses as much as we can.

The committee has done its work this year. The only bill we are now awaiting is the foreign aid appropriations bill. I am sure the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will bear out my statement that the only big appropriation bill we are waiting for is the foreign aid appropriations bill. It has not yet come from the House. The minute it comes to the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations will work on it as assiduously as it has done with respect to the other appropriation bills. We will do our work.

I am for what the Senator from Philadelphia is for.

Mr. CLARK. Pennsylvania.

Mr. DOUGLAS. He is the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PASTORE. Pennsylvania; excuse me. The Senator was formerly mayor of Philadelphia.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand. He is now the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PASTORE. No offense whatsoever was meant.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And none was taken.

Mr. PASTORE. All I am saying is that all of us want quick action on the civil rights bill, and all of us want quick action on the tax cut bill. I hope the committees will process the bills and place them in our hands as soon as possible.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, before I yield to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], I wish to make a brief statement to the Senator from Rhode Island. I believe he quite inadvertently made a mistake in point of fact when he said there would be no opportunity to pass a continuing joint resolution, with my amendment in it, without allowing a hiatus to take place.

I have just been advised that the House of Representatives is in recess until noon on Friday, November 29. Friday, November 29, is 2 days before the hiatus would occur. The House of Representatives customarily—and I hope that when I say this, I am within the limitation of the rule—in effect puts a pistol at the head of the Senate and says to the Senate, "Take this bill as we have passed it or leave it. We are going home."

For once in our lives we should say to the House of Representatives—and should go on record to this effect—that we want these appropriation bills passed by the end of this year, not by January 31 of next year; and that we have so amended the resolution, and that the House could consider it on Friday.

Mr. PASTORE. Those at the other end of the Capitol Building could not care less.

I subscribe to some of the things the Senator from Pennsylvania has said; but he knows very well that the House would not act upon a measure of that sort. In the second place, what would we be holding up? The foreign aid bill? Most of them would hope we would do something that would give them an excuse not to report such a bill.

Mr. CLARK. I say to my friend, in all good humor, that I do not share his low opinion of the other body.

Mr. PASTORE. Oh, my goodness gracious. Only a moment ago the Senator from Pennsylvania said the House customarily puts a gun at the temple of the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Rhode Island said they could not care less about the public welfare.

Mr. PASTORE. Some would care less about passing a foreign aid appropriation bill.

Mr. CLARK. But we put up our hands and say, "Yes, Mr. House, take our money, and we will take your bill. But just spare our life."

I suggest to the Senator from Rhode Island that this is a good time to say to the House that we want to do what the President called for a few minutes ago when he spoke at the other end of the Capitol Building; we want action taken now.

At this time I yield to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], who, I believe, has concluded his research in the dictionary.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. CLARK. I yield first to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. The House scheduled this joint resolution last Monday; and but for the death of the President, the

Senate would have acted on it last Monday. If the resolution were amended, there could not be a conference before next week.

Mr. CLARK. Why not on Friday?

Mr. HAYDEN. Sunday is December 1, and the bill necessarily should become law before the 1st of December, because we must remember that this is the bill which provides also for our payroll. The Senator from Pennsylvania may have vast wealth and may not need his pay, but I need mine. However, if the joint resolution is not passed in the way recommended we shall all be in the same boat.

Mr. CLARK. Why could not there be a conference this Friday?

Mr. HAYDEN. Because I understand many of the House Members will not be in the city.

Mr. CLARK. The House will be in session on Friday. Why do not its Members come back?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not know; I have no control over the Members of the House. All I know is that they will not be here then.

Mr. HART. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the dictionary which the staff kindly brought to me provides many definitions of the several words which were so strongly emphasized a few minutes ago by the President of the United States. I assume that, in fairness, we should request that the full definitions of the words "act," "now," and "action" be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my brief remarks. I so request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I have made excerpts from these definitions. The full definitions will be found in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

I find that the first of a series of definitions of the adverb "now" is:

> At the present time; at this moment; at the time of speaking—

which, by the clock, was less than 1 hour ago, in the case of the speech by the President of the United States.

I read further from the definition—

> as, he is busy now.

There is a second definition, which I take it is by way of illustration:

> In the time immediately to follow; forthwith. * * * At the time immediately before the present.

Then appears what I believe is an extreme definition, and one with which we could not possibly comply:

> a moment ago.

Then there is a reference to a passage from Isaiah, I believe, as a further example:

> Come now, and let us reason together.

One who reads Isaiah would not think the suggestion "Come now" meant that a month or so later we should reason together.

Let me explain that I advance these definitions, not so much in the nature of participation in the debate on the pending motion and amendment, but rather, in order that early this afternoon we have before us definitions which will give meaning and understanding to the basic theme of the message of the President. That message, as I read it, urges us to recognize that the time is now; that this body should remain and should consider and act on specific enumerated legislation. It relates to more than this appropriation joint resolution; and if the mechanics of appropriation action would be too difficult, then let us now reason together with respect to the litany of problems which the President of the United States recited to all of us less than 1 hour ago.

None of the problems he cited is new. None of us is so startled by the suggestion as to be caused to go home and get out the books and study them. President Lyndon Johnson has today told us what President John F. Kennedy urged us to do many months ago, but which we, until this moment, have only talked about and studied. I suggest that as we read these definitions, and then reread, as I know we must, the message of the President, we accept as a fact that when the President of the United States said:

> Our most immediate tasks are here on this Hill—

And then listed the civil rights bill—and there is no obscurity as to the bill he was talking about—and then said:

> The civil rights bill for which he—

The late President Kennedy—

> fought.

I believe it is time that we understand, as he understood, the dictionary meanings of the words "now" and "act" and "action"; and I point out that it is time to act now on the tax bill, and it is time for our action to be taken on the other measures that yet remain, here at the end of November, from the list which President John F. Kennedy sent to us many months ago.

I do hope that the message of the President will be interpreted to mean what the dictionary says its terms mean. It does not mean tossing a coin on three or four appropriation bills, going home, and returning in January. I could not find the eloquence to suggest, as did the President, that the proposal happens to be one way that we can show that while they can kill a man with a bullet, they cannot destroy the things he stood for.

Exhibit 1

Act (ăkt), n. [F. and L.; F. "acte," fr. L. "actus" a doing, and "actum" a thing done, fr. "agere" to drive, do. See Agent.]

1. That which is done or doing; the exercise of power, or the effect whose cause is power exerted; a performance; a deed.

His little, nameless, unremembered "acts"
Of kindness and of love. —Wordsworth.

Jurisprudence is concerned only with outward "acts." An "act" may therefore be defined * * * as "a determination of will, producing an effect in the sensible world." The effect may be negative, in which case the "act" is properly described as a "forbearance." The essential elements of such an "act" are three, viz., an exertion of the will, an accompanying state of consciousness, a manifestation of the will. —T. E. Holland.

2. The result of public deliberation; the decision or determination of a legislative body, council, court of justice, etc.; a decree, edict, law, judgment, resolve, award; as, an "act" of Parliament, or of Congress. Properly a legislative "act" is the complete formally declared will of the legislature, the final step in which is usually the signature of the proper executive officer; and it is properly to be distinguished from a "bill," which is strictly the draft of a proposed act, and is properly so called prior to its final enactment as law. "Act" and "statute" are generally used synonymously, and "bill" and "law" are also often used in the same sense, "law," however, being a term of much wider application, and therefore inexact in this use. Under the common law an act took effect by relation as of the first day of the session at which it was enacted, but by statute it is now provided in England (by 33 Geo. III, c. 13, 1793), and generally in the United States, that except when otherwise provided a statute shall take effect only as of the date of the actual completion of its enactment. Acts are broadly divided into "general," or "public," and "special," or "private." See under Public and Private.

3. A formal writing stating or evidencing that something has been done; as, an "act" of sale. Cf. Instrument, n., 5.

4. Process of doing; action. "In act," in the very doing; on the point of (doing).

"In act" to shoot. —Dryden.

This woman was taken * * * in the very "act." —John viii: 4.

5. [cap.] pl. (a) Short for "Acts of the Apostles;"—used syntactically as a singular, usually with "The." See New Testament. (b) The Apocryphal Acts. See Apocrypha.

6. Originally, a performance of part of a play; now, specif., one of the principal divisions of a play or dramatic work in which a definite part of the action is completed; hence, one of the parts, each complete in itself, of a vaudeville or circus program, or the like.

7. [cap.] Formerly, in Oxford and Cambridge Universities, but now only at the latter, a thesis publicly maintained by candidates for certain degrees.

8. Metaph. A state of reality or real existence as opposed to a possibility or possible existence. See Actus, 2; Entelechy.

The seeds of plants are not at first in "act," but in possibility, what they afterward grow to be. —Hooker.

9. Psychol. (a) Any motor performance leading to a definite result. (b) Any dealing with objects, as by moving, perceiving, or desiring them.

10. [usually cap.] R.C.Ch. A short prayer of profession, as of love for God or sorrow for sins. The best known are the "Acts of Faith, of Hope, of Charity," and "of Contrition."

Syn.—See Action. Ant.—See Negligence.

Act (ăkt), v. [L. "actus," past part. of "agere" to drive, lead, do; but influenced by E. "act," n.] "Transitive:" 1. To perform; execute; do; as, to "act" one's will by force; to "act" the commands of another. "Archaic."

2. To move to action; to actuate; animate. "Obs."

Self-love, the spring of motion, "acts" the soul. —Pope.

3. To perform as an actor; as "acting" the rôle of Ophelia; to represent dramatically, esp. on the stage.

4. Hence: (a) To play the part of, as if in a play; to assume the office or character of; to personate; as, to "act" the hero or the child. (b) To behave as befits (a specified status); as, to "act" one's age.

5. To feign or counterfeit; to simulate.

With "acted" fear the villain thus pursued. —Dryden.

——, Intransitive: 1. To perform on the stage; to represent a character; as, the dramatist "acted" in his own play.

2. Hence, to simulate or dissimulate; to behave as if acting a part.

3. (a) To conduct oneself or behave, as in morals, private life, or public offices; to bear or comport oneself; as, to "act" with becoming modesty; to "act" handsomely (that is, generously);—often used in colloquial comparisons to express disparagement; as, to "act" like one possessed. (b) Specif., with adjective complement, to comport oneself as if possessing certain characteristics or qualities, or being in a certain state or condition; as, to "act" rich, wise, or intoxicated.

4. (a) To perform actions; to put forth energy; to move, as opposed to remaining at rest; to carry into effect a determination of the will; as, ready to "act" at a moment's notice. (b) To perform or fulfill functions; as, the emergency brake failed to "act." Cf. Work, v.

5. To exert power; to produce an effect;—followed by "on" or "upon;" as, the stomach "acts" on food.

6. Of plays, to admit of being performed or acted; as, this play "acts" as well as it reads.

Syn.—Perform, represent, play, impersonate; pretend; function, work.

Ac'tion (ăk'shŭn), n. [OF., fr. L. "actio," fr. "agere" to do. See Act.] 1. The act or process of acting or doing; the doing of something; the exercise of activity by an agent; distinguished from "passion;" as, an emergency requiring "action."

2. The effecting of an alteration by means of force or some natural power or virtue; as, the "action" of water on rocks.

3. Process of change or alteration considered as a natural condition; activity; as, intervals of "action" and repose.

4. The progressive alteration of mental states, or of mental and physical states coordinately; as, volitional "action;" automatic "action;" specif., bodily movement; behavior.

5. An act; thing done; deed; enterprise; also, enterprise or efficiency in a generic sense; as, a man of "action." In pl.: Habitual deeds; hence, conduct; behavior; demeanor.

6. The deportment of an actor or speaker, or his expression by means of attitude, voice, gestures, and countenance.

Suit the "action" to the word, the word to the "action." —Shak.

7. The event or series of events, either real or imaginary, forming the subject of a play, poem, or other composition; hence, the unfolding of the events of a drama.

8. The acting of a play; hence, a play. Obs.

9. Transactions, proceedings, or records, as of a court. Obs.

10. Com. A share of stock, as in a joint-stock company; hence, pl., stocks; as, the "actions" of the East India Company. "A Gallicism." Obs.

11. Eccl. A religious ceremony; specif. [cap.]: Obs. exc. Hist. (a) The Canon (of the Mass). (b) After the Reformation, the Communion service; the Lord's Supper.

12. Law. A legal proceeding by which one demands or enforces one's right in a court of justice; a judicial proceeding for the enforcement or protection of a right, the redress or prevention of a wrong, or the punishment of a public offense;—usually disting. from "special proceeding." Also, the right to bring or maintain such a proceeding. See Suit.

13. Mech. A mechanism; as, the breech "action" of a gun. Specif., the mechanism in an organ, piano, or similar instrument by means of which the impulse of the player's finger is transmitted to the strings, reeds, pipes, etc. See Piano, Organ.

14. Mil. & Nav. Combat in war; also, an engagement between troops in war, whether on land or water; a battle.

15. Paint. & Sculp. Attitude, or position, esp. of the human figure or any of its parts, as suggestive of movement or as expressive of the sentiment or passion depicted.

16. Physics. The integral, $\int (p_1dq_1 + \ldots p_ndq_n)$, of a sum of terms each of which is the generalized momentum corresponding to any position co-ordinate multiplied by the differential of the co-ordinate, the q's being the position co-ordinates and the p's the corresponding generalized momenta. In the motion of a particle this reduces to $\int m\,v\,ds$, in which m is its mass, v its velocity, and ds an element of its path. Action has the dimensions of energy multiplied by time. For a natural dynamical system, the action between two configurations of the system is twice the time integral of the kinetic energy of the system.

Phrases (esp. in sense 13) are: action busher, action filer, action finisher, action forger, action freer, action jointer, action machiner, action regulator, action viewer.

Syn.—Action, act, deed. "Action" refers primarily to the process of acting; "act" and "deed," to the result, the thing done. An "action" is usually regarded as occupying some time, and involving more than one step; an "act" is more frequently thought of as momentary or instantaneous, and as individual; as, the rescue of a shipwrecked crew is a heroic "action;" the launching of the lifeboat a brave "act;" a course of "action," the springs of "action," an "act" of vengeance, caught in the "act." But the distinction cannot always be made. In the plural, "action" has frequently an ethical connotation, and is loosely synonymous with "conduct;" as, "by him [the Lord] 'actions' are weighed" (1 Sam. ii. 3); "Only the 'actions' of the just smell sweet, and blossom in their dust" (Shirley). "Deed" refers to a thing as "done;" it frequently connotes an act as illustrious or as an achievement; as, "The 'deed' is worthy doing" (Shak.); "What, are my 'deeds' forgot?" (Shak.). Deed is frequently opposed to "word," as "act" to "thought;" as, "I'll endeavor 'deeds' to match these 'words'" (Shak.); "Be great in 'act,' as you have been in 'thought'" (Shak.). See Battle; cf. feat.

Give thy thoughts no tongue, Nor any unproportion'd thought his "act." —Shak.

The attempt and not the "deed" confounds us. —Shak.

Then boast no more your mighty "deeds." —Shirley.

Ant.—Inactivity, rest, inaction; speech, statement, talk.

Now (nou), adv. [ME. "nou, nu," fr. AS. "nū;" akin to D., OS., & OHG. "nu," G. "nu, nun," ON. "nū," Dan., Sw., & Goth. "nu," L. "nunc," Gr. "ny, nyn," Lith. "nu," Skr. "nu, nū." See new.]

1. At the present time; at this moment; at the time of speaking; as, he is busy "now;" also, in or under the present circumstances; as, what alternative "now"?

2. Hence: (a) In the time immediately to follow; forthwith; as, I shall write "now." (b) At the time immediately before the present; very lately; a moment ago; as, he was here but "now;"—in modern use chiefly in the phrase "just now." (c) At the time spoken of or referred to;—indicating the historical present, as, peace "now" ensued.

3. With the sense of present time weakened or lost, indicating a point in the thought to which there has been a sequence or simply marking transition of thought.

Come "now," and let us reason together. —Is. i: 18.

Then cried they all again, saying, Not this man, but Barabbas. "Now," Barabbas was a robber. —John xviii: 40.

Combinations are: now-accumulated, now-being (noun), now-big, now-borne, now-dead, now-existing (adjective), now-fallen, now-full, now-known, now-lost, now-neglected, now-waning (adjective).

Now (nou), conj. Since, at, or by, this time; seeing that;—often with "that;" as, "now" that the snow was melting.

Why should he live, "now" nature bankrupt is? —Shak.

Now, n. The present time or moment; the present; also, a present moment or point of time; as, from or ere "now."

Now, adj. Existing at, or pertaining to, the present time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Florida, provided that in doing so I will not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I wish to say two things.

First, the learned Senator from Michigan has quoted part of the President's message. He has left out an important part of it, which reads as follows:

> I firmly believe in the independence and integrity of the legislative branch.

I am glad that the President has that belief. I am sorry that some of our brethren in the Senate do not share that belief.

If Senators will look at the catalog of appropriation bills on the back page of the calendar of business for today, they will see, among many other items, that the bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, which passed this body on September 30, remained on the desk of the Speaker of the House and did not go to conference until November 14—more than 6 weeks afterward.

I wish the Record to show that since that time we have been struggling almost daily in conference. There were 47 differences, many of them major differences, between the two Houses. I happen to be chairman of the conferees on the part of the Senate. Our committee has held five meetings. There will be another one at 2:30 p.m. today. If the distinguished Senators, neither of whom has ever served in the Appropriations Committee, do not know that this long give-and-take in conference between the two bodies is a worrying, soul-searching sort of business, as indicated by the Senator from Rhode Island but a few minutes ago——

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to resume the floor for a moment so that I may reply to that statement? Then I shall be happy to yield again to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to do so.

Mr. CLARK. I wish the Senator from Florida to know that I, too, have been engaged in some pretty wearisome conferences with the House. I do not believe the Appropriations Committee has a monopoly on having trouble with House conferees. The Banking and Currency Committee, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, on which I have served for 7 years have had pretty rough times with the House, too. I do not believe any Member of this body is really very much in order when he says he has had a harder time in conferences with the House than has anyone else.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield again?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad the Senator from Pennsylvania is beginning to recognize that there is some independence in the Senate, that we do have to stand up in conference and fight for what we have enacted, and that the process takes a long time. We are opposed by skillful and dedicated men who have belief in what they have done, as we do.

I come back to the words of the President that he believes in the independence and integrity of the legislative branch. We are not rubberstamps. I believe in the independence and the integrity of the legislative branch. I am trying to carry out my duty in conference, and I know perfectly well that unless the Senator expects the conferees on the part of the Senate to yield on every point to the other body, there is no prospect for having the remaining seven or eight appropriation bills reported overnight. It is a long, wearying, and difficult task. We are trying to perform it. We are being hindered in it by all this child's play in the Senate in which the good faith of the Senate is being attacked.

I shall not permit it to be attacked in my presence any more.

I have listened to the Senator from Pennsylvania hour after hour in this session. Apparently he wishes to tear down the temple in which he lives. I do not share that feeling.

Mr. CLARK. I call the attention of my friend to rule XIX, section 2, and ask him to be careful.

Mr. HOLLAND. I know the meaning of rule XIX very well. I say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I share the feelings of the President, who, having served here, has the deep conviction that this body—and Congress as a whole—must be independent, must have integrity, and must stand for what it believes in.

Unless we do, we are not worthy of being here.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I now yield, first to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], and then to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas].

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I shall reread carefully my comments to discover if there is any passage that I should like to strike out. If there is any suggestion that I seek to tear this temple down, I shall correct it.

It occurs to me that if any tearing down should occur, it will be by reason of our failure to act.

Perhaps, in fairness to all, at this point in the Record there should be inserted in full the President's message. Following the passage relating to the independence of the legislative and executive branches, the President said:

> With equal firmness, I believe in the capacity and the ability of the Congress, despite the divisions of opinion which characterize our Nation, to act—to act wisely, vigorously and speedily when the need arises.
>
> The need is here. The need is now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point the address of President Johnson to the two Houses of Congress today at 12:30 p.m.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT BEFORE A JOINT SESSION OF THE CONGRESS, NOVEMBER 27, 1963

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, Members of the House and Senate, my fellow Americans, all I have I would have given gladly not to be standing here today.

The greatest leader of our time has been struck down by the foulest deed of our time. Today John Fitzgerald Kennedy lives on in the immortal words and works he left behind. He lives on in the mind and memories of mankind. He lives on in the hearts of his countrymen.

No words are sad enough to express our sense of loss. No words are strong enough to express our determination to continue the forward thrust of America that he began.

The dream of conquering the vastness of space—the dream of partnership across the Atlantic and across the Pacific as well; the dream of a Peace Corps in less developed lands; the dream of education for our youth; the dream of jobs for all who seek them; the dream of care for our elderly; the dream of an all-out attack on mental illness—and above all, the dream of equal rights for all Americans, whatever their race or color—these and other American dreams have been vitalized by his drive and dedication.

Now the ideas and ideals which he so nobly represented must and will be translated into effective action.

Under John Kennedy's leadership, this Nation has demonstrated that it has the courage to seek peace, and the fortitude to risk war. We have proved that we are a good and reliable friend to those who seek peace and freedom. We have shown that we can also be a formidable foe to those who reject the path of peace and who seek to impose upon us or our allies the yoke of tyranny.

This Nation will keep its commitments from South Vietnam to West Berlin. We will be unceasing in the search for peace; resourceful in our pursuit of areas of agreement even with those with whom we differ; and generous and loyal to those who join with us in common cause.

In this age where there can be no losers in peace and no victors in war—we must recognize the obligation to match national strength with national restraint—we must be prepared at one and the same time for both the confrontation of power and the limitation of power—we must be ready to defend the national interest and to negotiate the common interest. This is the path that we shall continue to pursue. Those who test our courage will find it strong and those who seek our friendship will find it honorable. We will demonstrate anew that the strong can be just in the use of strength—and the just can be strong in the defense of justice.

We will carry on the fight against poverty and misery, ignorance, and disease—in other lands and in our own.

We will serve all of the Nation, not one section or one sector, or one group, but all Americans. These are the United States—a united people with unity of purpose.

Our American unity does not depend upon unanimity. We have differences; but now, as in the past, we can derive from those differences strength, not weakness; wisdom, not despair. Both as a people and as a government we can unite upon a program which is wise, just, and constructive.

For 32 years, Capitol Hill has been my home. I have shared many moments of pride with you—pride in the ability of the Congress of the United States to act; to meet any crisis; to distill from our differences strong programs of national action.

An assassin's bullet has thrust upon me the awesome burden of the Presidency. I am here today to say that I need your help; I cannot bear this burden alone. I need the help of all Americans. This Nation has experienced a profound shock and in this critical moment it is our duty—yours and mine—as the Government of the United States—to do away with uncertainty and to show that we are capable of decisive action—that from the brutal loss of our leader we will derive not weakness but strength—that we can and will act and act now.

From the Chamber of representative government let all the world know, and none misunderstand, that I rededicate this Government to the unswerving support of the United Nations—to the honorable and determined execution of our commitments to our allies—to the maintenance of military strength second to none—to the defense of the strength and stability of the dollar—to the expansion of our foreign trade—to the reenforcement of our programs of mutual assistance and cooperation in Asia and Africa—and to our Alliance for Progress in this hemisphere.

On the 20th of January, in 1961, John F. Kennedy told his countrymen that our national work would not be finished "in the first 1,000 days, nor in the life of this administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But," he said, "let us begin."

Today in this moment of new resolve, I would say to my fellow Americans, let us continue.

This is our challenge—not to hesitate, not to pause, not to turn about and linger over this evil moment but to continue on our course so that we may fulfill the destiny history has set for us. Our most immediate tasks are here on this Hill.

First, no memorial oration or eulogy could more eloquently honor President Kennedy's memory than the earliest possible passage of the civil rights bill for which he fought. We have talked long enough in this country about equal rights. We have talked for 100 years or more. Yes, it is time now to write the next chapter—and to write it in books of law.

I urge you again, as I did in 1957, and again in 1960, to enact a civil rights law so that we can move forward to eliminate from this Nation every trace of discrimination and oppression based upon race or color. There could be no greater source of strength to this Nation both at home and abroad.

And second, no act of ours could more fittingly continue the work of President Kennedy than the earliest passage of the tax bill for which he fought—a bill designed to increase our national income, our Federal revenues, and our insurance against recession. That bill, if passed without delay, means more security for those now working and more jobs for those now without them.

In short, this is no time for delay. It is a time for action—strong, forward-looking action on the pending education bills to help bring the light of learning to every home and hamlet in America—strong, forward-looking action on youth employment opportunities, strong forward-looking action on the pending foreign aid bill, making clear that we are not forfeiting our responsibilities to this hemisphere or to the world, nor erasing executive flexibility in the conduct of foreign affairs—and strong, forward-looking action on the remaining appropriation bills.

In this new spirit of action the Congress can expect the full cooperation and support of the executive branch. And in particular I pledge that the expenditures of the Government will be administered with the utmost thrift and frugality. I will insist that the Government get a dollar's value for a dollar spent. The Government will set an example of prudence and economy. This does not mean we will not meet our unfilled needs or that we will not honor our commitments. We will do both.

As one who has long served in both Houses of the Congress, I firmly believe in the independence and integrity of the legislative branch. I promise you that I shall always respect this. It is deep in the marrow of my bones. With equal firmness, I believe in the capacity and the ability of the Congress, despite the divisions of opinion which characterize our Nation, to act—to act wisely, vigorously, and speedily when the need arises.

The need is here. The need is now. I ask your help.

I know we meet in grief; but let us also meet in renewed dedication and renewed vigor. Let us meet in action, in tolerance, and mutual understanding.

John Kennedy's death commands what his life conveyed—that America must move forward. The time has come for Americans of all races and creeds and political beliefs to understand and respect one another. Let us put an end to the teaching and preaching of hate and evil and violence. Let us turn away from the fanatics of the far left and the far right, from the apostles of bitterness and bigotry, from those defiant of law, and those who pour venom into our Nation's bloodstream.

I profoundly hope that the tragedy and torment of these terrible days will bind us together in new fellowship, making us one people in our sorrow. Let us here highly resolve that John Fitzgerald Kennedy did not live—or die—in vain. And on this Thanksgiving eve, as we gather together to ask the Lord's blessing, let us unite in those familiar and cherished words:

> America, America,
> God shed His grace on thee,
> And crown thy good
> With brotherhood
> From sea to shining sea.

Mr. HART. In my book, the action President Johnson says is needed now does not relate to our closing down and going home until January. It is to this point that I principally address myself. When we define "integrity"—the integrity of this body which the distinguished Senator from Florida mentioned—in my book that term suggests an obligation on our part not to lock up and go home until January. I feel this would dismay the Nation and harm the Congress.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois, but before doing so I wish to express my strong conviction that it is a little out of order for Members of this body to suggest that those of us who would like to act when a majority is ready for action are tearing down the pillars of this body. I, for one, have no such intention. I do not believe that is what we are doing. I believe that what we are trying to do is to resuscitate this body and make it, once again, the fine adornment of American government which once it was, before we fell into these evil ways.

I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand that the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania provides that, instead of giving added time until the 31st of January to pass specific appropriation bills, for the current fiscal year which is now almost half over the time, be extended only to the 31st of December?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. That is the purport of my amendment which is now before the Senate and on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. The Senator from Florida properly called attention to the last page of the current calendar. I wish to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania to look at that page. Perhaps the rest of us may do similarly.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in order that this colloquy may be well understood when read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that the last page on the calendar of business of the Senate for Wednesday, November 27, which is page 16, and is entitled "Status of Appropriation Bills, 1st session, 88th Congress," may be printed in full in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Status of appropriation bills, 1st sess., 88th Cong.

No. of bill	Short title	Passed House	Received and referred in Senate	Reported in Senate	Passed Senate	Sent to conference	Conference report agreed to in—		Date approved	No. of law
							Senate	House		
		1963	1963	1963	1963	1963	1963	1963	1963	
H.J. Res. 284	Agriculture supplemental, 1963	Feb. 27	Feb. 28	Feb. 28	Mar. 4	X X X	X X X	X X X	Mar. 6	88-1
H.R. 5279	Interior, 1964	Apr. 2	Apr. 3	May 22	May 28	July 10	July 18	July 17	July 26	88-79
H.R. 5366	Treasury, Post Office, 1964	Apr. 4	Apr. 8	May 3	May 8	May 15	June 4	June 4	June 13	88-39
H.R. 5517	Supplemental, 1963	Apr. 10	Apr. 11	Apr. 24	May 1	May 3	May 15	May 14	May 17	88-25
H.R. 5888	Labor, HEW, 1964	Apr. 30	May 1	Aug. 1	Aug. 7	Sept. 23	Sept. 26	Sept. 26	Oct. 11	88-136
H.R. 6754	Agriculture, 1964	June 6	June 10	Sept. 12	Sept. 30	Nov. 14				
H.R. 6868	Legislative, 1964	June 11	June 13	June 25	June 26	Nov. 8		Nov. 13		
H.R. 7063	State, Justice, Commerce, 1964	June 18	June 19							
H.J. Res. 508	Continuing, 1964	June 25	June 25	June 25	June 25	X X X	X X X	X X X	June 29	88-55
H.R. 7179	Defense, 1964	June 26	June 27	Sept. 17	Sept. 24	Sept. 26	Oct. 8	Oct. 8	Oct. 17	88-149
H.R. 7431	District of Columbia, 1964	July 11	July 15	Nov. 6	Nov. 18	Nov. 26				
H.J. Res. 667	Continuing, 1964	Aug. 27	Aug. 27	Aug. 27	Aug. 27	X X X	X X X	X X X	Aug. 28	88-109
H.R. 8747	Independent offices, 1964	Oct. 10	Oct. 11	Nov. 13	Nov. 20					
H.J. Res. 782	Continuing, 1964	Oct. 28	Oct. 28	X X X	Oct. 28	X X X	X X X	X X X	Oct. 30	88-162
H.R. 9139	Military construction, 1964	Nov. 18	Nov. 19							
H.R. 9140	Civil functions, 1964	Nov. 19	Nov. 20							
H.J. Res. 809	Continuing, 1964	Nov. 26	Nov. 26							

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania to follow me as I read. As of today, the 27th of November, only four major appropriation bills have been passed; namely, Interior; Treasury, Post Office; Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare; and Defense—is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. He has omitted a supplemental bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There are two supplemental bills—the Agricultural supplemental, 1963, and the supplemental, 1963. There are four continuing appropriation resolutions, but I am referring to the basic bills.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the agricultural bill was in conference as of November 14?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. My understanding is that the senior from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], is the chairman of the Senate conferees. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFICER (Mr. BAYH in the Chair). Does the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Many fine Senators serve on that conference committee on the part of the Senate, including the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

There has been no neglect of duty of any sort by any member of that conference. We are straining every nerve we can to come to a reasonable agreement with conferees from the other body, and to bring to the Senate a bill in final form.

I repeat that there are 47 substantial differences between the 2 bodies. I add that we are working now on the last four or five of those differences.

Mr. CLARK. It is my understanding that the bill went to conference on the 14th of November. I ask my friend from Florida how many times the conferees have met.

Mr. HOLLAND. The conferees have met five times in conference with the other body; and we have had a long conference among ourselves to try to determine a policy on these last and most substantial matters.

It is no child's play to handle in conference a bill which carries with it some $7 to $8 billion, as to which there are 47 differences.

I see in the Chamber the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who is confronted with a similar duty, except that the bill with which he must deal is about twice as big—as I remember, involving some $13 to $14 billion, affecting the independent offices of the Government.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is not possible, if Senators try to do their duty and if the members of the conference committee from the other body try to do their duty—and I assure Senators they do—to compose all the differences relating to such huge sums of money in a day, or ofttimes within less than weeks. We are doing the very best we can, within our power, to move as rapidly as we can.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend for his comment. I am sure that everything he says is 100-percent correct. I should like to note, however, that in my opinion none of the activity of a Senator of the United States is child's play, and I hope the Senator from Florida did not mean to imply any part of it was.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida was talking about the particular duties he is performing.

I have seen some things happen, on the part of certain Senators, which I thought might be so characterized, but I am not talking about them now. I am talking about the work of the Appropriations Committee.

I heard the Senator from Pennsylvania inveigh against an important chairman of a subcommittee on appropriations the other day in the Senate. I tried to bring to the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania the added duties which have been imposed upon that Senator by reason of the joining of two bills which have heretofore been separate bills. Apparently even yet the Senator from Pennsylvania does not realize the heavy obligations which fall upon those who represent the Senate in conferences upon these important measures.

As late as we have been getting into conference, due to no fault of this body at all, we are confronted with this problem. It will not be settled overnight. I hope it may be settled by December 20. It can be settled, I believe, in the committee of which I spoke a while ago, handling the agriculture bill.

There are several bills which have not yet been reported to the Senate, due to no fault whatsoever on the part of Senators who will handle them. The important public works bill came over from the House on November 20. I am a member of the subcommittee which, under the guidance of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] as chairman, handles that bill. The Senator completed the hearings of our subcommittee, insofar as they could be completed, months ago, waiting for House action.

The Senator from Louisiana is in the Chamber now, and I am sure he can give a closer date than I for consideration of that bill.

Members of the Senate who serve on the Appropriations Committee have been exerting themselves in every way they know how to complete their duty, because it is important duty. The fact that we are doing exactly that should be recognized. There should be no querulous complaints by those who do not know anything about what is going on in the appropriations conferences.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I shall yield to my friend from Illinois in a moment.

I am quite unaffected by the rather extreme comments which my friend the Senator from Florida just made; a part of which, perhaps, when he looks at the RECORD, he may want to delete.

I now yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am sorry. I have yielded to the Senator from Illinois. I shall be happy to yield later to my friend the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am not making any charges against anyone. I merely point out that today is the 27th of November. Nearly 5 months of the fiscal year have passed.

A proposal is now before the Senate to make it possible to postpone action on appropriation bills for 2 months more. If this plan is carried out, appropriation bills may not be passed until 7 months of the fiscal year have passed. I believe it is unprecedented in the history of the U.S. Congress to have such slow action on appropriation bills.

The Senator from Florida is taking this situation altogether too much as a personal charge. I merely point out what has happened.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. I believe it should be noted that the agriculture appropriation bill passed the House on the 6th of June and was received in the Senate June 10. It was reported to the Senate on September 12. It passed the Senate reasonably promptly after it was taken up by the Senate. The question is, What was happening between June 10 and September 12? What was happening between September 30 and November 14, when the bill went to conference?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Since the Senator asked a question, I believe it should be answered.

Between the time the Senator mentioned, June 10, when the agricultural appropriation bill was received in the Senate, and September 12, when it was reported, lengthy hearings were held upon the matters contained in that bill, involving appropriations of between $7 and $8 billion.

The Senator from Florida does not know what happened between September 30 and November 14. Perhaps there were difficulties in the other body in having the bill go to conference.

After the Senate passed the bill on September 30, no conferees were appointed by the other body until November 14. Ours were appointed September 30.

While I cannot explain that delay, I say the earlier delay was because of long hearings and of many considerations by the committee as to what should be included in the bill and in the report, which was a very lengthy one, as the Senator will remember. No time was wasted in that regard.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is aware, is he not, that both Houses of Congress are bound by law—by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946—to pass all appropriation bills and other legislation by the first of July of each year?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida knows that the act so provides.

I know also, though, that if it is appropriate for a committee in the other body to consider the agricultural appropriation bill from January 9 to June 10, facing that same responsibility, it is no abuse of our responsibility to take from June 10 or shortly thereafter, when the bill came to our subcommittee, to September 30 to fulfill the same obligation here. That is about half the time which was taken in the other body.

I know that this particular bill has been aggressively handled and has been handled with all possible speed. I know with reference to some other bills in which I have had a part—for instance, the public works bill, to which I have already referred, and others—long and hard and exhaustive work has been done in hearings, in formulating reports, and in arriving at what should be recommended to the Senate and, since that time, in conference.

The Senator from Florida is not at all prepared to say that there is any bill in the consideration of which he has had any part that has been subjected to abusive delay or dawdling with the public business.

Mr. CLARK. I have no doubt that what the Senator from Florida has said is entirely correct.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as I promised some time ago, I now yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. Then I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and other Senators as soon as I have completed yielding to the Senator from Illinois, as I promised to do.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Again, Mr. President, I am making no charges. I am calling attention to the fact that the State, Justice, Commerce appropriation bill was passed on the 18th of June, and was received and referred in the Senate on the 19th of June; and that it has not yet been acted on 5 months after being referred to the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Pennsylvania is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. What bill is that?

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator will look at page 16 of today's calendar, he will see that H.R. 7063, the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill for 1964, passed the House on June 18, and was received and referred in the Senate on June 19. I find no record that it has been reported to the Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have the floor. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am making no charges; I am merely reading the record.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Arkansas in order that he may engage in a colloquy with the Senator from Illinois, without my losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator very much. I have no desire to participate in this harangue about the way the Senate conducts its affairs. I think it would be well to proceed to the business on the calendar and the business pending, and get on with our work. This debate is not contributing to anything but is causing more delay.

With reference to the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill, I point out that this year the appropriation bill has had added to it the appropriation for the Commerce Department. Long hearings were held on the bill. We could have shut them off, but we must go to conference with this bill. If we increase any of the amounts recommended by the House, we must have time to weigh the items carefully and try to do a thorough job in determining what the departments need. A record must be made, and it is necessary to make a pretty strong record to sustain our position when we meet in conference with the other body.

The committee has worked diligently on this bill. It will be ready to be reported just as soon as it is marked up. After we heard from the Government witnesses, there were a number of citizens who wished to be heard on certain items in the bill. That was done. These measures are not easily handled.

This year the chairman of that subcommittee had an unusually heavy workload as my colleagues all know. I believe I have worked as many hours a day as other Senators have. I have never for a moment delayed action on the bill purposely, but have at all times worked diligently to expedite it. It will be on the floor in a few days. I hope, after the Senate passes it, we shall be able to expedite a conference and get a report back to the Senate.

I for one want to remain in session until the appropriation bills are passed. I think it is imperative that we do so.

However, I remind my colleagues of one fact: We are dealing with a $100 billion a year Government. We are no longer dealing with trifles. If we are to be proper stewards of the resources of our people, in supporting Government, and in making these expenditures, it is very necessary that the appropriation committees undertake to conserve the tax resources of this Nation. It cannot be done with indifference to the testimony and evidence that comes before the committee. Nor can that be done in haste and without proper consideration and deliberation.

I make no apology. I am going to do the best I can.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois is making no charges. He is merely pointing out what the situation on the calendar is, and what is the situation that confronts the Congress and, in a sense, the country.

Continuing with my discussion of the calendar, the Senate passed the defense appropriation bill on September 24 and it is now law.

The District of Columbia appropriation bill passed the House on the 11th of July, and was received and referred in the Senate on the 15th of July. It was not reported to the Senate until the 6th of November, and was passed by the Senate on the 18th of November. I think that is correct.

The independent offices appropriation bill was not passed by the House until the 10th of October. It was reported to the Senate on the 13th of November, and passed by the Senate on November 20. There is no record on the calendar that it has been sent to conference.

The military construction appropriation bill was not passed by the House until the 18th of November.

The civil functions appropriation bill was not passed by the House until the 19th of November. These bills were received and referred in the Senate on November 19 and 20, respectively.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I can do so only with permission of the Senator who has the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Louisiana, without losing my right to the floor, so that he may engage in a colloquy with the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator. The subcommittee which I head held hearings for 2½ months on the civil functions appropriation bill before it was received in the Senate and came to the committee on November 20. On the 21st we concluded hearings by listening to the Corps of Army Engineers. I hope to spend tomorrow and Friday preparing a report that I shall submit to the subcommittee on December 2. It is impossible to go any faster.

The subcommittee which I head could not take any action on the bill until it was received from the House. Why the House kept the bill so long, I do not know.

The bill contains appropriations not only for flood control, rivers and harbors, and navigation, but also for atomic energy, the TVA, and reclamation.

I am glad to state that I hope we shall be able to mark up the bill on the 2d or 3d of December, and 2 days thereafter have the full committee act on it, and try to present the bill to the Senate not later than the 8th, 9th, or 10th of December for debate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator. I can personally testify to what every Member of the Senate knows—that the Senator from Louisiana is an exceedingly hard worker, who devotes himself to his tasks with all his strength and vigor. I was merely pointing out that the civil functions bill did not come to the Senate from the House until the 20th of November.

I am not, and I am sure the Senator from Pennsylvania is not, indicting individual Members or simply indicting the Senate as a whole. It is the congressional system which brings us almost to the very end of calendar 1963 with a large number of the appropriation bills still not passed, and a considerable number not having been even reported to the Senate.

That is what the Senator from Pennsylvania is talking about. I do not understand why anyone should take umbrage at these statements of the facts.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Illinois is correct. I am not referring to any individual specifically. What the Senator from Illinois says is correct—the system is wrong. We must change the rules, or congressional government will break down.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true.

There remains the problem of foreign aid. The appropriation for that program has not come to the Senate from the House. No one knows when it will, authough I understand there is an encouraging statement from the chairman of the committee in the House.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will yield, the difficulty with the foreign aid appropriation bill is that it cannot be started on its way in the House until the authorization bill is passed; and in the Senate we took our own sweet time about passing the foreign aid appropriation bill. I do not complain about the debate on it. I thought it was helpful and meaningful. But I wonder a little why the bill could not have been brought up on the floor perhaps 3 months earlier.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I take it that what the Senator from Pennsylvania is getting at is that the unfinished and vital business of the Senate is clogged with appropriation bills which, in the ordinary course of events, would have been passed months ago.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senator is correct. I should like to make a correction of what I said earlier. My friend the Senator from New Mexico called my attention to it. I said the law required that the appropriation bills and all other matters be concluded by the beginning of the fiscal year. That was incorrect. They must be concluded by the end of July of each year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Even on that basis, we are 4 months overdue, and have a great deal of work to do. Is it not correct to say that if the appropriation bills pile up, it will be very difficult to obtain action on the two burning measures, which both President Kennedy and President Johnson have urged, namely, the civil rights bill and the tax bill.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The more the calendar is clogged with these appropriation measures, the greater will be the delay in dealing with those two bills of civil rights and taxes. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. Inevitably, and without regard to motive.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. Is it not true that President Kennedy sent the civil rights bill to Congress in June of 1963?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But it is not yet on the floor of the House.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Similarly the tax bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senate acted promptly on the civil rights bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have no complaint to make of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We worked night and day for 4 months.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator refers to the public accomodation section of the civil rights bill that is to come out of the Commerce Committee. But I understand it is the policy of the leadership to hold up action on this bill and instead to bring the House bill on the floor and to try to pass it. That is my understanding.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In connection with the tax bill, the Secretary of the Treasury appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee in February with the administration's program. The Ways and Means Committee of the House took until the end of September to act. If my addition is correct, their consideration took 7 months. The bill has been under consideration in the Finance Committee since then. Our esteemed chairman has scheduled hearings which will continue until the 13th of December, unless plans are changed.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Illinois is an able member of the Committee on Finance. How long does he think it will take, after hearings have been completed, and the testimony is printed, for the committee, in executive session, to mark up the bill and report it to the Senate?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should say several weeks. What is likely to happen is that the tax bill will not reach the floor until January, at the earliest, possibly not until February.

As to the civil rights bill, it is not known when that will reach the floor, because it has yet to run the gauntlet of the Rules Committee in the House. The Rules Committee in such matters has been very dilatory in the past.

Mr. CLARK. At that point, we shall be faced with the necessity, unless we are to violate the law again, of passing 12 more appropriation bills for fiscal 1965. Is that not correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct. If the Rules Committee does schedule hearings, I suppose it will grant the right of Members to appear before it to testify on the bill; therefore, no one knows when the bill will pass the House, and no one knows when it will be before the Senate for action.

In the meantime, the appropriation bills will be piling up, and it will be said that we cannot act on the civil rights bill or on the tax bill, because we should consider the vital appropriation bills.

I take it that what the Senator from Pennsylvania is saying is that we should get down to work and work until the end of December, and at least clean up the appropriation bills, instead of putting them over until the end of January. Is that not what the Senator is trying to do?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. I wish to set a deadline. I believe that at least one or two of our colleagues have the same feeling. We should try to meet a deadline. We may not be able to meet it, but at least we should try to do so. So let us set down a self-imposed deadline of not January 31, but December 31.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Far from pulling down the columns of the temple, the Senator from Pennsylvania is trying to strengthen the columns of the temple. If we continue with the present process, we shall make ourselves the laughingstock of the country. I do not blame anyone. I merely say that by some slip, either of machinery or scheduling, or something else, we have plunged ourselves into a legislative jam which will hold up not only the appropriation bills, but also the tax bill and the civil rights bill, with incalculable damage to the future of this country.

I do not say it has been planned to come out that way, but I do say that if it had been planned that way it could not have been done more expertly. We are moving into what looks like a calendar filibuster.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall be very brief. In many respects I agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania. On October 28, when the last continuing resolution was before the Senate, and when we extended the provision for 1 month instead of 2 months, I said this:

> As I said to the distinguished chairman of the committee, for whom I have the utmost respect, I believe that we should not have to pass another joint resolution of the character of the one now before the Senate. It does not help Congress to have appropriation bills that were due to be passed before July 1 of 1963 pending for 5 months after they became due, so that we are asked to act on resolutions that would authorize the various departments of the Government to spend money on the basis of last year's appropriations or on the basis of the recommendations of the President, whichever amounts are lower. I do not believe that action gives us an opportunity to operate our Government as efficiently as possible. So I say that the Senate cannot do otherwise than to pass the joint resolution. The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], for whom we all have the utmost regard, agrees with me that that is not a process which helps the prestige of the Congress.

I still feel that way. However, we are up against a practical, realistic situation. At the present time four appropriation bills are in conference. Three appropriation bills remain to be acted on. For one of these the authorizations have not yet been made. It is not realistic to believe that we can do this before December 20, when we shall recess for Christmas.

On principle I agree with what the Senator from Pennsylvania is trying to do. We should have passed those bills in July. We have not done so. It is realistic to believe that we cannot do so before December 30, if that is what is provided in the continuing resolution. It will mean that we shall have to pass another resolve before December 20, or whatever date is set for the Christmas recess. We shall then have to adopt a resolve to continue our action until January 31.

Some of the bills which are in conference will have become law prior to that time. Three bills will have to be acted upon. The military construction bill will take a little time to debate. The civil functions appropriation bill will take a little more time. The appropriations for State, Justice, and Commerce should not take more than a few hours of debate.

Therefore by December 15 or 20, when we recess for Christmas, there will be only the foreign aid bill outstanding.

There may be one other, but I would hesitate to believe that there would be.

I believe that what the Senator from Pennsylvania is trying to accomplish will be accomplished, but I do not believe it is practical to make the date December 31 in the resolve, because I do not believe it can be done by then.

In principle we should have done it; in practice, we have not. In practice, the Senator's resolution is not realistic, and it is not advisable because it is not realistic.

I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. CLARK. I shall comment in a few moments on what the Senator from

Massachusetts has said. I shall now yield to the Senator from Wyoming. So far as I am concerned, when no other Senators ask me to yield to them, I can conclude my remarks in not more than 10 minutes, and the Senate will then be ready to vote.

I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for yielding and commend him for bringing a number of these questions not only to our attention, but really to a position of priority in our conscience. I believe that some things ought to be made clear as a result of the discussion that has been taking place, and I wish to comment on them.

I do not believe that the really central point is the continuing resolution, for example. I shall support the continuing resolution as a housekeeping necessity under the circumstances which confront us now. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I feel strongly about guaranteeing the continuity of precision in this regard.

Likewise, I hestitate to agree that the basic issue at stake is the rules of the Senate. The champion of the modification of those rules, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], occupies a most noble role.

What is at stake in the discussion is the whole spirit of the Senate itself, the atmosphere that pervades this body. We all have a task to complete, because a great backlog of business is staring us in the face. Extremely tortuous conferences are taking place and will have to be resolved. Many of these problems will still be with us in January. Therefore, as a body we ought to make it clear to the country that instead of going home until January, after the 20th of December or the 14th of December, or whenever it is proposed we should go home, we will continue the sessions of Congress through the holiday recess, so that whatever progress mortal man can make with the combined wisdom of the legislative process will be accomplished by our being continually at work on those questions from now on. It seems to me that this is really at the heart of the apprehension raised today.

I would hope that we would not let our differences concerning methods of procedure involved in the continuing resolution, or even the fundamental resolution in terms of the rules of the Senate, blind us to what I think is really a sense of spirit, of attitude, a matter of conscience as to points of view.

The President called us to action today. He said the time is now. He stressed that. I think we would not only discredit the high office of the Presidency; we would not only inhibit the role of the new Chief Executive; but we would cast a sorry reflection on the guidelines already laid down by his immediate predecessor if we were to shut the door, go home, and observe our traditional seasonal rites under these circumstances.

These are trying times. We have been through trying times in the past 4 days. I dislike to think that the collective leadership of this body and of the other body could not manage to adjust itself and accommodate itself to the needs that the times now call for.

I hope serious thought will be given to grinding away at the business at hand, under whatever procedures are available to us, without the interruptions available to us at a time like this.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his comments, with which I am in complete accord. I believe there are three problems before us. The first is the procedural one, as to why we are so far behind with the appropriation bills, and what we can do to assure that this situation does not happen again. The pending amendment is merely a convenient way of calling that matter up for attention.

My second point is that in the quickest way we should determine how we can prevent this situation from happening again. In my judgment, it will be necessary to change a great many of the rules of the Senate and of the House. Probably the most important changes we should consider would be with respect to the handling of appropriation bills. Why do we have to let the House start them all? Nothing in the Constitution requires that. Why can there not be joint hearings? Why is it not possible to expedite the appropriations process? What can be done to expedite it more quickly?

The third matter, and perhaps the most important, is the one which the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] so eloquently raised. That is the matter of spirit of the Senate. It concerns our obligation as Senators to remain here and do the work that the President who died last week and the President who spoke to us today have asked us to do.

I share the strong conviction of the Senator from Wyoming: Let us stay here and get our work done.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I promised to yield first to the Senator from New York. After that I will yield to the Senator from Washington. I shall be happy to yield at any time to the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and President pro tempore of the Senate.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania. It seems to me to be most unfortunate that November 30 has come so quickly. I can appreciate the necessity of acting this week on the joint resolution. The time provided in the previous continuing resolution will expire on November 30.

I am trying to put myself in the position of someone who sat in the gallery to hear the President address Congress a few minutes ago, and who might happen to be sitting in the Senate gallery now to hear this wrangle.

The President said that our most immediate tasks are here, on this Hill. He said this is not the time for delay or postponement, but the time for action. The need is here; the need is now—now.

Yet when we returned to our Chamber, the first order of business in the Senate was to put off the consideration of all appropriation bills, or at least permit them to be put off, until January 30, 1964.

No word of mine is intended to be critical of any member of the Committee on Appropriations. We are all aware of the amount of work in that committee. No committee is more diligent, or requires more effort. All the members of that committee are members of other committees, as well—and they are important committees. All of us should understand the magnitude of the task which the members of the Committee on Appropriations have.

But it seems to me that the amendment suggested by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, which as I understand provides only that the continuing resolution shall extend not to the end of January, but to the end of December of this year, is an eminently reasonable one. There is no reason on earth why, if appropriation bills are still not enacted, we cannot, toward the end of December, act on another continuing joint resolution which would extend into January.

But to walk straight across the Capitol into this Chamber, immediately after the President has said, "I want action, and I want it now," and agree to a resolution which provides, in effect, that so far as appropriation bills to operate the Government are concerned, we will put them off until January 30 of next year, seems to me not to be in support of the President. It would not be in fulfillment of our duties as Members of the Senate.

To relegate the remaining appropriations bills for fiscal year 1964 for consideration next session is to traffic with a double danger; first, the danger of delaying civil rights and taxes for an intolerable length of time, and second, to actually waste the Government's money. As to the latter, any budgetary expert knows that continuing money resolutions breed nothing but false economy out of half-finished projects and staffing uncertainties. With respect to unfinished projects which could create income and tax revenues, the Government is put in the position of a shipper of goods who is losing the equivalent of interest he would be making on the capital tied up in inventories sitting inside a boxcar on a railroad siding.

If this amendment is adopted, it will still permit remaining money bills and bills still in conference to be disposed of in December before we receive and digest the major January messages of President Johnson setting forth his legislative program in far greater detail than was possible today. As we all know to be the case, however, commitments on civil rights and tax—commitments to the people of the United States and to the memory of the late President they revered so deeply—must be met as early as possible. In my judgment, this resolution, if adopted, would plainly defeat such early consideration, and for that reason I shall support the Senator's amendment.

While I appreciate the fact that the civil rights and tax bills are in such a state that the chances of their enactment do not look good at this time, it seems to me there is a possibility that their consideration might be expedited. It would be much better if we agreed to a continuing resolution until December 15, or some period of a few weeks, and acted on as many appropriations as possible. We might then reconsider the situation, and approve a continuing resolution then, but not on the very day when the President had said, "I want Congress to act, and act now."

I feel a hesitancy in supporting a resolution to extend appropriations until the end of January under these circumstances, and I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from New York. I now yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not wish to talk about the joint resolution, and I do not wish to talk too much about the Committee on Appropriations. I do not believe any member of the Committee on Appropriations needs to stand here and defend himself with respect to the work of that committee and the amount of the work in that committee.

Mr. CLARK. I agree completely with the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The President, today, was talking about two bills.

Mr. CLARK. He was talking about two legislative bills and the appropriation bills.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mainly two bills.

Mr. CLARK. He mentioned appropriation bills, too.

Mr. MAGNUSON. He was really talking about two bills. One of them is stuck in a Senate committee; the other is stuck in the House Rules Committee.

We can finish the appropriation bills; but even if we remained here until New Year's Eve, no Members of the Senate, except the members of the Finance Committee, could do anything about the tax bill, and no Members of the House except the members of the Rules Committee could act on that bill.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct. But if we pass the appropriation bills, and if the other bills mentioned are still stuck in the committees, I would not object to having the Senate then take a recess. All I am saying is that we should pass the appropriation bills.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me point out that the appropriation bills—I do not have the figures before me, but I shall place them in the RECORD—take up less of the time of the Senate sessions than do any other bills.

Mr. CLARK. Probably that is a shame.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That may or may not be; but the appropriation bills take up less of the time of the Senate sessions than do any other bills, even though it is true that the appropriation bills take up more of the time of the members of the Appropriations Committee. So the logjam is not due to the appropriation bills. This year, I waited until October to get one appropriation bill from the House. Last year, I believe, it was November when I got it from the House.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator got the public works appropriation bill on November 20 and the military construction appropriation bill on November 19.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; and we have worked with due dispatch on them.

The Senator from Pennsylvania and I agree upon one thing which I tried 2 years ago; and if the chairman of the committee does not object and if no other Senator on the committee objects, I shall try it again.

Mr. CLARK. The chairman is here now.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am referring to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CLARK. I was referring to the Rules Committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall refer to it in a moment.

I will start the hearings on this appropriation bill in February, if that is agreeable to them. Then we can "put the monkey" on the backs of the Members of the House—where it belongs. We are willing to work; but in this case we have nothing to work on.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Washington is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. So when the Rules Committee gets through with some other business which it regards as important, I hope next year it will report either the bill I have introduced for about 10 sessions or a similar bill, because we are the only legislative body in the world that does not divide its sessions into legislative sessions and fiscal sessions. That arrangement would solve all of these problems, because once we get at the bills, they do not take much of our time. Only the committee hearings, where the witnesses appear, take up much of our time.

Last year, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] had to hear 989 witnesses, who came from all over the country, who wished to be heard.

So if we follow an arrangement of that sort we shall be able to make some sense in the timing of our consideration of these measures. Each individual Senator works hard and is willing to do so.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But when a committee ties up a bill, we can do nothing about it until the committee reports.

I do not think any practical person—and I see present the Senator from Illinois, who is on the committee—will come to the conclusion that in the next 15 days the Finance Committee will report the tax bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Early in October, I made a motion——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; and it was defeated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I moved that we terminate the hearings by November 1. That motion was defeated by a vote of 12 to 4.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The other day the Senator from Indiana moved that we terminate the hearings and proceed immediately to take action. That motion was defeated by a vote of 12 to 2; the Senator from Indiana and I were the only ones who voted for the motion. Some of us have made every possible effort to speed up the action on that bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I realize that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But we have not been able to have action on it speeded up.

Earlier in the session the Senator from New Mexico and I moved that joint hearings be held by the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee or parallel hearings on successive days so that we could save time in the process of committee consideration of the bill. But that motion was also defeated.

I am not blaming anyone; but I say the Senator from Pennsylvania is correct, and that we have encumbered ourselves with all sorts of rules and procedents which make it very difficult to legislate, and that this is particularly the case when civil rights bills are in the offing and when delay will slow them up or derail them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; we are also talking about the civil rights bill. My committee got out one portion of the civil rights bill, and got it out with due dispatch. We heard many witnesses and worked at night. That bill is here now.

It is also important to consider the action taken by the House Rules Committee. It can act quickly; but I have some doubts that it will act within the next 10 days.

The Senate Appropriations Committee has the job of reporting the appropriation bills to the Senate. The committee is holding hearings now. The hearings being held by my subcommittee will end on Wednesday, and those being held on the other bill will be concluded on Tuesday.

I suppose some of the delay is due to the authorization bills. But part of the fault lies in the fact that, as a result of the committee system, two or three committees can hold up the work of the entire Congress. When that happens, it would appear that Congress is doing nothing.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But I point out that I have never been busier at any time in my congressional service than I have been this year. I welcome the responsibility, and I think other Members do, too. But I think everyone should know what we are talking about.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. What brought me to my feet was the statement by the genial Senator from Washington that he and the other members of his committee worked hard and reported part of the civil rights bill; and he said they had done their best. However, I cannot find that bill on the calendar, and it has not been reported on the floor. Therefore, no Senator is in a position to call it up.

Those of us who feel that the leadership is wrong in waiting for the bill to be received from the House should then have had their "day in court," in determining whether the following of our suggestion would result in acceleration of the work of the session.

I thoroughly agree with my colleague from New York.

It is very interesting to note that most of the other Members who agree with him sit in the back rows, where the rank and file of the Members of the Senate are to be found.

Just as the Mundt bill touched off the debate on the wheat bill, so the Senator's suggestion is a start in connection with a very critical debate in the Congress. All of us know who are responsible for the situation. We know that the committee chairmen who have these bills on their hands are just as sincere and just as patriotic as are we who disagree with them. But we have no way to manifest our disagreement, except once in a while we are able to call to the attention of everyone in the country the consequences of the action or lack of action of the committees.

It is suggested that at this very late stage in the session we could not even take final action on the appropriation bills by the end of November, whereas year after year we have ended our session by this time, after having taken final action on all the appropriation bills.

So I could not agree more completely with the Senator from Pennsylvania. Let us get the heat turned on by the people of the country, who are the ones who are in a position to turn it on. That must be done if we are to take the action that is called for by President Lyndon Johnson.

I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his remarks, and I congratulate him on them.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Pennsylvania on his speech. I think this is a good time for us to serve notice on the House that if we have the major appropriation bills by June 1—in view of the fact that under the Reorganization Act we are supposed to end our session by July 31—we shall not only hold hearings on them, but we shall also act on them on the floor of the Senate.

There is no constitutional reason why we should not do so. The only justification for proceeding as we have done has been custom, which has worked out well. The accommodation has been a happy arrangement between the House and the Senate. But once a custom of that kind, which has no strength in law or in the Constitution, becomes a bad custom, I believe everyone in Congress must take action. We cannot go on believing that constitutional government will operate itself. What may, at one time, have been a good practice, a good rule, perhaps a bad rule never invoked, or a bad custom which was never honored, should be revised and restricted in action when the effect of it is not merely to discredit Congress, which is incidental, but to interfere seriously with the processes of government. That is our concern today—interference with the processes of government in the United States. The least we can do is serve notice on the House regarding appropriations, and perhaps also with regard to other legislation.

Even though we could make a case for House action on tax bills, if they do not bring a tax bill to us until the month of October, and we are supposed to act on it before the end of the year—a complicated tax bill on which hearings should be held—we should say to them that we shall hold hearings in advance; or we may not even limit it to the holding of hearings. We will act on the tax bill.

The House has shown no particular hesitancy about going over to the field of foreign policy and foreign affairs, even if it is an area which the Constitution and tradition reserve to the Senate. The Senate has within its sphere the area of foreign policy and decision in that field, but the House has come into that area without apology. When the foreign aid bill was being considered 2 weeks ago, there were Members of the Senate who were urging us to surrender to the House—a rather strange disposition, I believe. In any case, it was the disposition. We have given ground and let them come in.

There is much more reason for us to act in the field of taxes ahead of the House, if need be, and certainly in the area of appropriations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, unless other Senators desire me to yield to them, I should like to finish my remarks and get on to the vote. I am always happy, however, to yield to the genial Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and I do so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was about to ask that the Senator yield to the acting majority leader with respect to the public works bill. We have been trying to arrive at some kind of arrangement with the necessary unanimous consent request, and I believe it can be worked out for the first day when we return after the Thanksgiving recess.

Mr. CLARK. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that I had hoped the Senate could vote on my amendment, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered, within the next 15 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This is only a request, but this afternoon Members will be moving out to take advantage of their transportation.

Mr. CLARK. Let me ask the acting majority leader, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], what he would like me to do.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask the Senator if he would permit me to propound a proposed unanimous-consent agreement relating to the public works bill—the rivers and harbors bill—which is Calendar No. 628, House bill 8667, which is the unfinished business.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Minnesota for the purpose of propounding a unanimous-consent request, provided that in doing so I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE PROSECUTION OF COMPREHENSIVE PLANS FOR CERTAIN RIVER BASINS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H.R. 8667) authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I send to the desk a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, which has been discussed with the interested parties, including the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the minority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and others on the other side of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement will be stated.

The legislative clerk read, as follows:

> *Ordered,* That, effective on Tuesday, December 3, 1963, at 1:00 p.m., during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 8667), authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.
>
> *Ordered further,* That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would hope that the request would be modified—otherwise I shall object—to provide that it take effect after the morning hour.

I should like to state the reason why. These are dangerous days. The Senate will be in a 4-day recess and would return to a limitation of debate under strictly controlled time. The genius of the Senate is that Senators shall express themselves. We do not know what may happen over the weekend. I want the opportunity to say what I may have to say when I return, and I do not wish to depend on Senators yielding time to me.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My hope is that the Senate will recess, and then return and be able to make adjustments to any Senator's request. If it would make the Senator from New York feel better, there can be the customary morning hour, to which I have no particular objection. Let me ask the Senator if he would be agreeable to a unanimous-consent agreement effective at a particular hour, say at 1 o'clock?

Mr. JAVITS. No; it would not. But might 2 hours of additional time be added to the agreement, and will the Senator state that he will yield to Senators 3 or 4 minutes?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let us make it effective at 1 o'clock and have an additional hour on the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I modify the unanimous-consent request to make it effective at 1 p.m. and the time on the bill to be 3 hours.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Senator state that there will be time for Senators to speak?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is clearly understood.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the agreement, as modified, is agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield, that I may ask a question of the acting majority leader?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is the Senator from Michigan present?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I discussed the subject with him and it is perfectly all right.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We will vote on the bill when we come back after Thanksgiving, and the bill will then go to the House.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There must be a conference?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand that most of the provisions are fairly well ironed out. I say this because of the great concern in the so-called river basin areas all over the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If this bill does not pass by the first of the year the authorization level will be reached and the Army Engineers may have to serve notice on contractors to cease their work, which will cost a considerable amount of money.

I shall be asked a great many questions when I return home this weekend. We can probably look forward to the prospect that the bill will be taken care of, so that contractors will not have to stop work the first of the year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The observations of the Senator are as I understand the situation.

Mr. President, I should like to make it clear that the distinguished Senator from Michigan wished to proceed with the bill today, but time is going by. It is not possible for us to arrive at a vote upon the bill today because of the amendments that would be pending and the speeches that certain Senators would like to deliver.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should also like to make it clear that following consideration of that bill, we will immediately proceed to the bracero bill which we had discussed with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], and others. The bracero bill will come up late Tuesday or the first thing on Wednesday.

I should also add that before we leave tonight, Senators who wish to speak on Calendar No. 628, House bill 8667, which would authorize additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins, should deliver them tonight so that we can expedite our work on Tuesday when we return after the Thanksgiving recess.

I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 809) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. PASTORE. In view of the statement made by the Senator from Pennsylvania, who has been very cooperative, that he expected we would vote in 15 minutes on the joint resolution, I wonder if we could not have an agreement to vote on the amendment at a specific time?

Mr. CLARK. Assuming I do not have to yield any more time.

Mr. PASTORE. That is true. I would hope that Senators would grant that indulgence.

Mr. CLARK. It would not take me 10 minutes. If I could have 10 minutes, I would agree to a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator agree to a proposal that the Senate vote at 3:30 p.m.?

Mr. CLARK. Yes, if my argument is so weak that no Senator wishes to reply.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say to the Senator that his argument is compelling and appealing. I will leave it there. If the Senator would be willing to agree to a unanimous-consent agreement at 3:30 that the Senate vote on his amendment, he would be doing us a favor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may continue without interruption until 3:30, at which time I shall yield the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to modify that unanimous-consent request to provide that at that time we shall vote on the Clark amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I take it, then, that no Senator will rise in opposition to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. PASTORE. No, but just vote in opposition.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am willing to agree to almost anything, but I do not believe we ought to preclude ourselves from answering anything which might be said. I am perfectly willing to vote now. There are implications in some of the remarks about which I do not intend to remain silent if they are repeated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe the Senator from Rhode Island gave a very succinct and concise answer.

Mr. CLARK. I say to my friend the Senator from Minnesota that I believe we will get along better if we go along without an agreement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I do not intend to consent to be silent regardless of what may be said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unanimous-consent request is granted.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered to House Joint Resolution 809 would substitute "December 31, 1963" for "January 31, 1964."

The purpose of the amendment is to require that all appropriation bills be passed before the end of this calendar year or that another continuing resolution be passed sometime in December.

I have offered the amendment because I believe it is entirely possible, if we follow the injunction of the President of the United States given to us only a couple of hours ago, that we can get through with the appropriations work, if we put our minds to it.

I wish to point out what remains to be done.

We must pass the agriculture appropriation bill, which is in conference.

We must pass the State, Justice, Commerce appropriation bill, which has not yet come from the Senate committee.

We must pass the military construction appropriation bill, which has not yet come from the Senate committee.

We must pass the public works bill, otherwise known as the civil functions appropriation bill, which has not yet come from the committee.

We must pass the foreign aid appropriation bill, which has not yet been passed by the House.

We must pass also the independent offices appropriation bill, which is presently in conference.

I believe those things can be done, if we put our minds to it.

The senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who unfortunately has left the Chamber, suggested it was not realistic to believe we could pass the foreign aid appropriation bill before the end of this calendar year. The Senator felt we could pass everything else.

I suggest that his judgment is in direct conflict with the statement made earlier, as reported on the news wires, by Representative OTTO E. PASSMAN, Democrat, of Louisiana, a senior member of the House Appropriations Committee, who said:

> It will be simply ridiculous and a disgrace if Congress puts off the passage of the foreign aid money bill until next year.

I continue to quote the Representative:

> We should get these money bills behind us.

He said his group was ready to start to act immediately, as soon as the House and Senate arrive at a compromise on the authorization bill.

I suspect that we would do well to play it safe and continue the appropriations for only 30 days, in order to build a fire under all those concerned with prompt passage of appropriation bills. I believe that can be done.

This has been the precedent. This has been the custom previously.

I hope the amendment will be approved. Let no one think it cannot be approved by the House. The House is to meet on Friday. I believe the House could and should accept the amendment. There is no reason why the House should oppose it. I believe it is a perfectly feasible suggestion.

I close with the comments made to us only a few hours ago by the President of the United States. I quote from his message to the joint meeting of the Congress. He said:

> In short, this is no time for delay. It is a time for action—strong, forward-looking action on the pending education bills to help bring the light of learning to every home and hamlet in America—strong, forward-looking action on a number of other bills, I now interpolate, including the civil rights bill, the tax bill, and these appropriation bills.

President Johnson also said:

> As one who has long served in both Houses of the Congress, I firmly believe in the independence and integrity of the legislative branch. I promise you that I shall always respect this. It is deep in the marrow of my bones. With equal firmness, I believe in the capacity and the ability of the Congress, despite the divisions of opinion which characterize our Nation, to act—to act wisely, vigorously and speedily when the need arises.
>
> The need is here. The need is now. I ask your help.

The Senate can help the President of the United States to achieve these objectives.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered on the Clark amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let us vote, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASE (when his name was called). I have a live pair with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] are detained on official business, and if present and voting would each vote "nay."

The pair of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who is necessarily absent, has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 63, as follows:

[No. 259 Leg.]

YEAS—22

Bartlett
Burdick
Church
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Javits
Keating
McCarthy
McNamara
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Pell
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—63

Allott
Anderson
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Cooper
Dominick
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Mundt
Pastore
Pearson
Prouty
Randolph
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Walters
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—15

Aiken
Beall
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Case
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Eastland
Engle
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Morton
Neuberger
Robertson

So Mr. CLARK's amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 809) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, can the majority tell us whether there will be any more votes this afternoon?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be no more yea-and-nay votes this afternoon. The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] has been waiting very patiently—and he has been very patient, and I appreciate it very much—to make the opening address on the rivers and harbors bill.

There are six or seven items on the calendar that will be taken up.

Then the Senate will go over until Friday.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY AT 9 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it adjourn to meet at 9 o'clock a.m., on Friday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECESS FROM FRIDAY TO TUESDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1963

Mr. MANSFIELD. On Friday there will be a pro forma meeting; the Senate will meet and immediately adjourn.

I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of that brief period on Friday next the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon the following Tuesday, December 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S FIRST ADDRESS TO THE CONGRESS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, President Johnson's first address to the Congress will live as one of the loftiest utterances in the history of American state papers.

It was noble in its concept, elevated in its vision, compelling in its urgency, and masterful in its presentation.

President Johnson has sounded a clear call to duty to which every true American will answer.

He has issued an appeal for help to which every patriotic heart will respond.

He has in one great bold stroke assumed the leadership of the Nation and I am confident that the Congress and the people will follow him.

THE PENDING TAX BILL: HOW NECESSARY, HOW EFFECTIVE, HOW BENEFICIAL; AND TO WHOM?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in his stirring and moving address to the Congress, President Johnson gave us all inspiration and solid substance. One could comment at length and with enthusiasm on virtually every sentence of his vigorous declarations of purpose. I join in applauding them.

For the moment I want to say a word about his reference to one of the agenda, high on President Kennedy's program, which President Johnson wishes to see materialized. I refer to the tax bill.

Of course this is a controversial issue. And indeed it should be when our Nation is plunging deeper and deeper into debt and our debt ceiling has just been raised to the astronomical figure of $315 billion dollars. Indeed there is doubt, and understandably and justifiably among many Americans whether there is need of a tax cut at this time. The country appears to be prosperous—at least on the higher levels. The stock market yesterday reached unprecedented highs. But we still have 5 million unemployed. That is our overshadowing domestic problem. None is more important in our so-called affluent society. It may well be doubted that a tax reduction will put an appreciable proportion of these 5 million Americans to work. Especially will this tax reduction not attain this desirable, and I might say essential, objective unless accompanied by other measures such as a vast public works program—a great increase in the appropriation for the accelerated Public Works Act. That act served a most useful purpose. It put people to work on good projects. It increased employment locally and back in the factory. But the funds provided for it were insufficient. The funds have now run dry, although thousands of desirable and needed projects throughout the 50 States are ready to go, but there is no money to let them be constructed.

Now we know that if a tax reduction is enacted, we will be told that we must cut other domestic expenditures, and the really needed legislation to put men and women back to work; namely, the authorization and appropriation of funds which will mean jobs and family income where there is now no income—will go by the board.

Moreover, there is much question whether the particular draft of the tax bill which came over from the other body and is now the object of hearings in the Senate Finance Committee, is one which will meet the needs of the great majority of the American people. It has been said of this draft that in its present form it is a bill to make the rich richer. I submit, Mr. President, that we should be vigilant to prevent that from being the case. Our rich are rich enough. The middle and lower income Americans are those who will need tax relief if it is needed anywhere. We had better look searchingly into the provisions of the draft of the tax bill when it emerges from the Senate Finance Committee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. GORE. I have listened to the eloquent speech of the distinguished Senator from Alaska. Does he not think, in view of the inequitable situation to which the Senator has referred, that the single most imperative thing in the tax field is to bring about equitable reform?

Mr. GRUENING. I fully agree. Unless there is tax reform, we are making a mockery of the tax bill. What is the point of reducing taxes if large sums that should be taxed go untaxed?

Moreover some of us strongly believe that an effective tax bill should contain some elements of tax reform. It would appear that the glaring loopholes in our existing tax structure are not being plugged in the pending draft of the tax bill.

The distinguished senior Senator from Illinois has pointed out that a number of recipients of incomes above $5 million and of others whose incomes are in the lesser millions of dollars in the year 1959 paid no income tax whatever. Surely that is intolerable when the so-called little people, and indeed the overwhelming majority of the American people, pay their income taxes conscientiously.

Why do we not have tax reform along with a tax cut? The reasons are lucidly set forth in an illuminating article in the current—the December—issue of Harper's magazine, written by Philip M. Stern entitled "The Slow, Quiet, Murder of Tax Reform."

This is a realistic appraisal of the built-in obstacles found in the Federal edifice, as it really is, why tax reform is so difficult to obtain. But surely the effort should be made. We should make it here.

In any event the whole question of how important and how beneficial, and to whom, the tax bill, and in particular the pending tax bill draft, will be, should be fully discussed by this body. If there is to be a tax bill, let it both include some measure of reform and provisions which will be clearly recognizable by the American people as destined to help those levels of our society which need such help.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Stern's article, "The Slow, Quiet Murder of Tax Reform," be printed at this point in my remarks. I hope it will be read by all my colleagues, and by others interested in the procedures of Government.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Slow, Quiet Murder of Tax Reform

(By Philip M. Stern)[1]

(Note.—The case of a beautiful ideal, abandoned by her parents, surrounded by enemies, neglected by her friends—and finally cut to pieces behind the closed doors of a congressional committee room.)

On the morning of last June 6, the House Ways and Means Committee, plodding slowly through the administration tax-reform proposals, came, at last, to the hottest of hot potatoes: the oil-depletion allowance. But even before Treasury Department spokesmen could begin to explain their plan for a mild tightening of the special tax deductions enjoyed by the oil industry, a motion was made to bypass the entire subject without further debate. The motion—made, ironically, by California's Cecil King, usually a loyal administration supporter with a pro-labor voting record—was quickly passed, the New York Times reported, "by near-unanimous voice vote." (Days later, after some unfriendly newspaper editorials, the committee did reconsider, and approved a token part of the original depletion proposal.)

Perhaps other Kennedy loophole-closing proposals were less summarily treated by Ways and Means. But whatever amenities were observed, the outcome was, in most cases, as dismal. By August. even before Ways and Means had finished its work, the tax-reform program was so badly battered that the administration threw in the sponge, electing to abandon the fight for tax reform in the hope of speedier passage of its tax cut pep pill for the economy.

Yet as of early November, with Senate hearings proceeding at a desultory pace, it appeared the reforms may have been sacrificed in vain, for the strong possibility loomed that the tax bill would not be passed until early 1964.

To veteran observers of the taxwriting process, the mauling of the Kennedy reform program was no surprise. True, there were in 1963 some special inhibiting factors, prime among them the President's own declaration last February that nothing—including controversial reforms—"should stand in [the] way" of a tax cut ("JFK Scuttled Own Tax Bill" was one headline). Yet, most past loophole-closing efforts have met the same fate as the 1963 Kennedy round; in fact, the tax laws today contain far more preferences, exceptions, exclusions, and special advantages than existed 5 years ago, or 10 or 20—this despite an occasional tax tightening here or there.

Judging by that evidence, the deck is heavily stacked against tax reform. Turning up a few of the cards in the deck discloses why:

The proreform forces: Diffuse, inarticulate, politically impotent (who ever heard of an antidepletion lobby?).

The antireform forces: Highly focused, intensely vocal, politically powerful.

The taxwriting power in Congress: Tightly held by two carefully chosen committees.

The complexity of the tax law: Supremely technical, it confounds many lawyers, perplexes most Congressmen, totally baffles the public.

The tax experts and lobbyists: Often they alone can find their way through the legal and verbal fog, which can shroud their actions from public understanding and scrutiny.

Each of these cards turns up not once but many times as a tax bill works its way through the legislative maze, and each played its part in the dismal defeat of the 1963 Kennedy reforms.

SIXTY-SEVEN WITNESSES FOR OIL

Hearings on the 1963 tax bill opened formally on February 6, when Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon took his seat before the 25 Ways and Means Committee members arrayed above him on a semicircular dais, and laboriously unfolded the "conprehensive tax reform" program the President had presaged 2 years earlier. It was, in scope at least, ambitious. Challenging many of the most powerful business lobbies in Washington, the administration proposed stiffer taxes on oil, coal, real estate, timber, cattle, insurance, top corporation executives, and the privately owned corporations used as a tax shield by the very wealthy. It also risked the opposition of the labor unions' lobby by seeking to end, for example, the tax-free sick-pay privilege, which benefits working people. And by proposing a curb on tax deductions for such items as home mortgage interest and charitable gifts, the administration flung a disastrously unpopular challenge not only to middle-income taxpayers, but also to such strong and vocal groups as churches, charities, and the homebuilding industry, which would be indirectly affected.

---

[1] Philip M. Stern is a Washington writer who has served in the Interior and State Departments, as well as with Senators Jackson, of Washington, and Douglas, of Illinois, and was founder and publisher of the Northern Virginia Sun. This article is adapted from "The Great Treasury Raid," his book on tax loopholes, which will be published in February.

Douglas Dillon must have known he faced an uphill fight. He was but the first of 195 witnesses the committee was to hear from in 27 tedious days of hearings, recorded in 4,035 pages of testimony, and after he left the stand few other proreform voices were heard. The remainder of the hearings were, as usual, dominated by spokesmen for this industry, that company, this labor union, cautioning against one administration proposal or another. For example, in the 4 days set aside for testimony on the oil-depletion recommendations, the committee heard from no less than 67 officials, individuals, and organizations, including 13 Governors and 10 Congressmen—not one favoring reform.

Washington's downtown office buildings are studded with listening posts for the various industrys, ready to alert industry members to any dangers such as an adverse tax proposal. The ninth floor of the Commonwealth Building, for example, is occupied by the American Petroleum Institute, whose president—tall, striking Frank Ikard—can furnish the most authentic advice on how to pass or stymie tax measures; for 7 years, as a Texas Congressman, he was a member of the Ways and Means Committee. On the fifth floor of the modern Solar Building are the offices of the National Coal Policy Conference, headed by portly, bespectacled, soft-spoken Joe Moody, a 17-year veteran on the Washington scene. (Moody decided early in 1963 that the favorable tax treatment enjoyed by coal-royalty income was in no danger of repeal, as asked by the administration, and so mounted no extraordinary national effort.) The real estate industry has its National Association of Real Estate Boards, and the National Association of Life Underwriters was watchful of proposals for stiffer rules on the taxation of group life insurance.

There is, of course, nothing reprehensible in an industry's maintaining a Washington representative or in 67 proindustry witnesses bombarding the committee. But the general public has no such watchdogs; and tax hearings are so lopsided that, as one close observer put it, Congress has difficulty securing "a balanced view of what is in the general interest, what the public wants, or what the public would want if it were informed of the facts." True, at scattered points in the hearing, the administration's oil proposal did receive glancing support from Columbia Professor Roy Blough, from the American Veterans Committee, the National Farmers Union, and three unaffiliated witnesses; but as usual the Treasury Department's was the principal voice of tax reform.

Treasury, though, possesses little of the political power that Washington responds to. Unlike the Labor and Agriculture Departments, it lacks the political leverage of a constituency of its own, and, because it is chronically opposed to the special tax favors many lawmakers believe should be granted, it comes to be regarded not as representing the collective interests of all taxpayers, but as a stiff-necked, theory-minded bureaucracy insensitive to the real-life problems of flesh-and-blood taxpayers. Still, weak reed or strong, the Treasury is virtually all that the loophole closers have to lean on.

CAPTURING THE SWING VOTES

When the public hearings are finally concluded, the Ways and Means Committee descends from its dais and assembles around a U-shaped table to begin shaping the tax bill it will recommend to the House.

The commodious room in which it labors—by far the largest of the House hearing rooms—attests the fact that Ways and Means is the House's most powerful legislative committee. Looking down from the pale-green walls are the portraits of former Ways and Means chairmen, three of whom (Polk, Fillmore, and McKinley) later ascended to the White House. But as Chief Executives, their power on tax matters could hardly have been greater than they were in Congress. One portrait is that of Robert L. "Muley" Doughton, who once (1949) suffered the indignity of having his committee approve, by a one-vote margin, a bill inimical to his North Carolina tobacco constituency. Shaken but not downed, Mr. Doughton successfully insisted that the President of the United States not only reverse the official administration position on the measure but also telephone a proadministration committee member and request him to change his vote.

Ways and Means maintains a tight rein on all major tax, tariff, or social-security legislation; for its assent is required, by House procedure, for any amendments to such bills to be introduced during floor debate. This tight committee control is crucial, for it permits pressure-group spokesmen to concentrate on a limited target. If they can win the favor of a few "swing" votes on Ways and Means, they can, by and large, ignore the other 400-plus Members of the House. In 1963, when the 10 Republican committee members were generally arrayed solidly against the administration, as few as three Democratic defections could defeat any reform. Since any tax-tightening proposal was bound to touch the political nerve end of one Democrat or other, it required no special lobbying effort to put together a shifting antireform coalition to defeat one after another of the administration's recommendations. After all, how could JOHN WATTS, from Kentucky, permit his colleagues to vote for stiffer taxes on cattle and race horses? And how could such administration loyalists as AL ULLMAN, from timber-laden Oregon, or PAT JENNINGS, from a coal-rich Virginia district, support higher taxes on timber or coal?

One of the factors helping to solder the oil-depletion provisions so securely into the tax laws has been the careful selection of Ways and Means members. One recent candidate for committee membership was "approached" (he declines to say by whom) for a commitment in favor of oil depletion and was told that all the other contestants for the seat had declared themselves prodepletion, just as all prior-year candidates had. "If that's true," he replied, "the oil people certainly don't need my vote." He refused to commit himself one way or the other and was denied the Democratic leadership's blessing.

"Ways and Means is the strangest of all the House committees—and the hardest to understand," comments one reform-minded Democratic Congressman. "Judging by the voting records of its members on the floor of the House, the liberals ought to have darn near a working majority. But their public voting records and their 'operating' records in the committee, behind closed doors, are two different things."

A labor-union lobbyist confirms this. He cites statistics compiled by the AFL-CIO showing that 12 of the 15 Democrats on the Ways and Means vote "with labor" on major issues more than two-thirds of the time, 8 of them more than nine-tenths of the time. Yet, he disclaims angrily, few of them, in closed-door committee sessions, will vote to tighten loopholes against the well-to-do, as organized labor would like them to (and as consistency with their usual voting pattern would lead one to expect).

STRANGLED IN THE CITADEL

While the pressure groups were active and vocal in opposition to the 1963 Kennedy reforms, the general public was utterly silent. If there was any proreform sentiment in the land, it was successfully concealed from Congress. Perhaps one reason was the very technicality of the proposed reforms which, in turn, was due to the complexity of the tax laws themselves. Consider this passage, chosen at random from the Internal Revenue Code:

"If the allowance of a deficiency dividend deduction results in an overpayment of personal holding company tax for any taxable year, credit or refund with respect to such overpayment shall be made as if on the date of the determination 2 years remained before the expiration of the period of limitation on the filing of claim for refund for the taxable year to which the overpayment relates."

Clearly, the tax code amply deserves its characterization, by tax attorney Louis Eisenstein, as "a remarkable essay in sustained obscurity," having "all the earmarks of a conspiracy in restraint of understanding." This complexity arms the experts and the insiders with unusual powers, and robs even the most vigilant Congressman or newsman of his normal powers of scrutiny. What casual observer, for instance, would be able to spot a bill innoculously entitled "A bill to amend part III of subchapter O of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954" as being a bill to provide substantial retroactive tax relief to the Hilton Hotel chain (and, potentially, 19 other unsuccessful defendants in antitrust proceedings)?

So murky are tax measures that Congressman PATMAN, of Texas, has observed that they "are passed with the Members not knowing exactly what they mean"—an argument used by some to defend the no-amendment rule governing House debate on a tax bill. Because of this rule, tax bills are quickly passed by the House and sent to the tender mercies of the Senate Finance Committee.

Senate Finance has been variously called "the citadel of conservatism" and the "happy hunting ground" for tax pressure groups. At times, such as the early 1950's political liberals have had no representation on the committee; at best, they have been an impotent and frustrated minority. This is not entirely accidental; the two current windmill tilters, Senators ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee and PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, both say they had great difficulty gaining their Finance Committee posts. According to Robert Engler, in the Politics of Oil, at one point in 1955 a committee vacancy thought sure to go to DOUGLAS (a leading critic of the depletion allowance) was preempted by Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson, who later in the session handed on the seat to former Vice President Alben Barkley, thus again stymieing DOUGLAS. It was only on Barkley's death that DOUGLAS finally won his Finance Committee seat.

Whereas Ways and Means has, of late, been headed by two stanchly reform-minded chairmen (Jere Cooper, of Tennessee, and Wilbur Mills, of Arkansas), Senate Finance has for decades been dominated by a procession of men in whose hearts loophole-closing kindled no great flame: Reed Smoot (of Smoot-Hawley tariff fame) of Utah; Pat Harrison, of Mississippi; Walter F. George, of Georgia: Eugene Millikin, of Colorado; and Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia.

Like all congressional committee chairmen these men have possessed great power. For example, the fact that soft drinks were one of the few items that wholly escaped any excise tax during World War II, was not, according to knowing observers, wholly unrelated to the fact that the giant of the soft-drink industry, Coca-Cola, has its headquarters in Senator George's home State. It is also said that the 3-percent limitation on medical deductions was waived for those over 65 shortly after the elderly Senator George found that he could not deduct his own medical expenses one year, since they came to less than 3 percent of his income. When this amendment (estimated revenue cost: $15 million) came up in a closed-door Finance Committee session, one new staff member whispered surprise that the Treasury spokesman present did not speak up against it. "He can't oppose this one," was the reply. "This one is old man George's amendment."

Senate Finance sits as a court of appeals from the actions of the House. In theory, of course, the Treasury has an opportunity to appeal from Ways and Means' rejection of its tax-tightening proposals. But, as in the House hearings, the preponderance of pleas come from private-interest spokesmen, protesting such reforms as the House did enact (or seeking added tax concessions), and it is rare that a reform bill emerges from Senate Finance stronger, from Treasury's viewpoint, than when it passed the House.

Once Senate Finance has completed its work and a tax measure is placed before the full Senate for debate, the power of the committee and its chairman are on full display. Understandably, the Senate regards the Finance Committee as its expert in tax matters, and by tradition the committee chairman is the sole arbiter of the acceptability of outsiders' amendments. Consistency is not required in his screening. Senator BYRD, for example, once righteously rebuffed an effort by Vermont's Senator Ralph Flanders to bring tax relief to a particular Vermont citizen, on the ground that "this would establish a very dangerous precedent * * * attempting to pass a general law for one specific purpose"—while, on that same day, Chairman BYRD himself had shepherded through a measure tailor made to bestow up to $4 million of tax relief on the estate of Mrs. Gerard Swope, wife of the former president of General Electric.

Frequently, loophole-closing amendments are either voted by the Senate or accepted by the chairman of the Finance Committee, only to perish shortly in the House-Senate conference committee. When, in 1959, a Senate repeal of the so-called dividend tax credit failed to survive the House-Senate conference, Senator DOUGLAS was prompted to liken the fate of such loophole-closing actions "to the fate of the two young princes of England who * * * went into the Tower of London under very good promises but were strangled by Richard III and never emerged from the Tower."

WE GET TO KNOW WHO COUNTS

Not only do tax bills usually fail to contain the reforms asked by the Treasury; they frequently contain individually tailored provisions which, while mentioning no names, are so deftly drawn that their benefits are confined to a lone taxpayer. In 1951, the Senate Finance Committee tucked into a major tax measure a provision bestowing $2 million of tax relief on movie magnate Louis B. Mayer. And in 1956, the Senate appended to a House bill a provision reversing two court decisions and sparing an Oklahoma City contractor the unpleasantness of paying hundreds of thousands in back taxes and penalties.

Such special provisions are, by and large, the mark left on the tax laws by the Washington tax lobbyist. Typically, he is a lawyer, but he may be less sought after for his legal acumen than for his intimate knowledge of lawmaking and politics and, particularly, for his contacts on the Hill. Thus, he might well be an ex-Senator or Congressman or, perhaps a former congressional staff aid. One former Treasury official tells of witnessing the Ways and Means Committee approve a tailormade relief bill represented by a former Ways and Means staff member, on the ground that "we've got to do something to help out old ———."

The Washington lobbyist is likely to be generously rewarded for his efforts—his fee may run into the hundreds of thousands if his assigned mission is special relief legislation—but this is not astonishing in view of the considerable tax savings involved. The $2 million provision for Louis B. Mayer is by no means unique; one Washington lawyer matter of factly mentioned in a sidewalk conversation that his success in changing a single date in one tax measure meant a saving of $3 million for one client, and the mere insertion of a parenthetical cross-reference in another statute brought comparable savings to another.

Given their special power, the chairmen of Ways and Means and Finance are clearly the most advantageous Hill contacts—both for the lobbyist and his client. No one, perhaps, has equaled the success, in this line, of Ellsworth C. Alvord, Mayer's personal attorney, who was known to be on the most cordial terms with Chairman George of the Finance Committee. Lest anyone doubt the intimacy of this relationship, those attending a Finance hearing frequently saw the impressive figure of Mr. Alvord appear in the private entrance supposedly reserved for Senators, stand poised in the doorway surveying the audience, and then disappear into the private recesses of the Finance Committee chambers.

The tax lobbyist is not likely to be found registered as such under the lobbying law—Alvord, for example, did not register as a representative of Mr. Mayer. (Many attorneys take the view that the vaguely worded lobbying statute does not apply to the particular activities in which they happen to engage.)

There is little talk in Washington of personal venality among the Senators and Congressmen who sponsor special tax amendments, but campaign contributions are another matter. One high-ranking Finance Committee member—asked by a reporter why he uncharacteristically sponsored several pro-insurance-company amendments—explained, in an unguarded moment, "This is the way we finance our campaigns. Hell, I wish there was a tax bill up every year."

The astute lobbyist seeks to minimize the Washington pressure and maximize the "back home" influences. Says one: "Over the years, we get to know who counts with a Congressman in his district." In 1963, for example, hometown insurance agents were effectively mobilized to protest to Ways and Means members the proposed restrictions on tax-free group life insurance. One committee member got an appeal on this subject from one of his most trusted political supporters at home, and also—on behalf of the oil-depletion allowance—from a friend and business associate who was the local representative of a major oil company. The latter acknowledged frankly that he was only calling at the behest of company headquarters in the State capital.

To bolster congressional support for a bill making an exception for Du Pont's court-ordered sale of all its General Motors stock, Du Pont and GM each sent letters to their millions of stockholders urging them to write their Congressmen and Senators. The response was impressive.

Ordinarily, mail from constituents has little effect on a legislator's vote. But when it comes in torrents, it can be decisive—as it was in the case of the mail blitz credited with the 1962 defeat of tax withholding on dividends and interest. This blitz had its origins in private dining room No. 4 of the Palmer House in Chicago, on March 26, 1962, according to James McCartney of the Chicago Daily News. There, the "legislative subcommittee" of the U.S. Savings & Loan League—the trade association—resolved, after a 4-hour debate, to organize a massive letterwriting campaign by the 30 million users of savings and loan institutions.

Four days later, a mailing went out to the league's 4,800-member institutions, with sample "Dear Saver" form letters to send to their customers. Treasury officials recall with bitterness what they feel was an erroneous implication in these mailings, that the proposed withholding plan involved a new tax, and not merely a means of collecting a tax that had been due all along. Reports McCartney: "Soon the deluge began to fall on the Capitol, first in letters by the handful, then by the box, then by the cartload, then by the carload. Before it was over Senator PAUL DOUGLAS had received 75,000 letters, Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER got 60,000. Nobody in the Senate remembers anything quite like it."

At the time of the Palmer House meeting in Chicago, a savings and loan league expert estimated "we didn't have the votes in the Senate" to kill the withholding plan. But after the blitz, the vote in Senate Finance was 11 to 5 and in the Senate as a whole 66 to 20 against withholding.

Mail storms such as this operate in only one direction: they sometimes defeat but they never rescue a tax-tightening proposal; on the contrary, reform-minded Congressmen report they get almost no pro-reform mail to spur them on—another of the cards that help to stack the deck.

MY LOOPHOLE VERSUS YOURS

While the opponents of loophole-closing are single-minded and articulate, the forces of reform are divided and often mute. "You would expect us labor guys to have gone all out to tighten up on expense-account high living," says one top-ranking AFL-CIO official. "But we had Actors Equity and the hotel and restaurant and bartenders' union on our necks telling us that an expense-account crackdown would ruin the theaters and the restaurant and hotel business. So while we went on record for the tighter rules, we couldn't mount an all-out campaign."

The voice of the Treasury can also be muffled. Congress makes no effort to conceal its distaste for outspoken Treasury reformers. During World War II, Randolph Paul, the dean of tax reform and then a top Treasury official, took to the speech circuit to defend the Roosevelt tax program. This incurred the displeasure of the chairman of Ways and Means and the speechmaking came to a prompt halt. And President Kennedy's appointment of Stanley Surrey, Harvard law professor and apostle of tax reform, as top Treasury tax official, "spurred a vigorous effort by oil companies and other groups to block the appointment," the Wall Street Journal reported. Surrey was subjected to a merciless grilling by Senate Finance, and only an assurance by the Secretary of the Treasury, Douglas Dillon, that he, not Surrey, would decide tax policy, clinched Surrey's Senate confirmation.

Faced with a continuous uphill struggle, reform-minded legislators are likely to lose their zeal over the years. Minnesota's Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY, who twice led the effort in the Senate to repeal the tax concession for corporate dividends, noted a severe attrition of his allies on the second go-round. His explanation: "A lot of Senators came to me and said, 'I took a lot of heat for my vote last time—and anyway,' they said, 'it's futile.' "

The quest for tax reform isn't entirely futile. Many efforts to enact new loopholes are rebuffed; and Congress does, from time to time, abolish or constrict tax preferences—as, for example, in the stricter taxation of life insurance companies in 1959 and of American businesses overseas in 1962. No one, moreover, should underestimate the staggering difficulty of the task confronting congressional tax writers, for theirs is the toughest legislative job Congress undertakes.

Nevertheless, over the years, the exceptions and preferences in the tax laws have grown rather than diminished in number—largely, it would appear, because the general public either doesn't understand about tax loopholes, or doesn't care about them, or both.

One member of Ways and Means—the most vocally reform minded of the 25—thinks it's the latter. "The average American," he says, a bit regretfully, "doesn't mind other people having their own loopholes—he only cares about getting his. So you shouldn't blame Congress or the committees about what the American people don't want. If we don't vote tax reform, it's simply because there's no pressure for it."

AUTHORIZATION FOR ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE PROSECUTION OF COMPREHENSIVE PLANS FOR CERTAIN RIVER BASINS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8667) authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the bill (H.R. 8667), as amended and reported by the Senate Committee on Public Works, is a realistic effort to reach accord in a difficult situation.

It provides authorization for appropriations to continue construction work on several comprehensive river basins, and for several new projects.

The committee in the Senate, and the House have spent much time this year in attempting to reach agreement on a level of authorizations.

In June, the House passed H.R. 6016, which provided only for a 2-year authorization for river basin construction for fiscal years 1964 and 1965.

The Senate Public Works Committee reduced the basin authorizations to fiscal year 1964 only, on the assumption that there would be ample time later to give proper review to the future needs of these basins.

The committee also added several new projects to H.R. 6016.

These projects had been adopted by the Senate in the omnibus bill of 1962, but were dropped in conference with the tacit understanding that the House would consider them this year.

However, the House did not do so, and the committee added them to the river basin bill.

The Senate concurred in this action by adopting H.R. 6016 on July 29 and sending it back to the House with a request for a conference.

For reasons best known to Members of that body, the time-honored traditions of the Senate and the House to reach agreement in conference were not followed in this instance.

In the meantime, an emergency situation has developed on a number of river basins awaiting authorizations for further construction.

Rather than meet this situation by settling our differences on H.R. 6016 in conference, the House chose to adopt a new river basin authorization bill, H.R. 8667.

The Senate Public Works Committee has always been ready to reach a realistic and meaningful accord, while still protecting the rights and prerogatives of the committee and the Senate.

As a result, the committee considered H.R. 8667 and has recommended several amendments. These would include the authorization of four new projects—three less than in the Senate version of H.R. 6016.

It is normal for Congress to consider an omnibus rivers and harbors bill in the even years—at 2- to 4-year intervals.

The last ones were enacted in 1960 and 1962. Additional basin authorizations were included in the 1962 act but were deleted in the conference on the bill.

That is the necessity for having legislation on this matter this year.

Since the time the committee considered the basin authorizations in H.R. 6016, almost 6 months of fiscal year 1964 have passed.

The House has passed the public works appropriations bill for fiscal year 1964.

It is the judgment of the committee that H.R. 8667 should be amended by increasing the river basin authorizations to an amount adequate to cover anticipated appropriations for fiscal years 1964 and 1965.

This procedure will allow plenty of time to consider the basin authorizations for fiscal year 1966 and subsequent years.

Unless we grant 2-year authorizations, we will have to introduce another bill right after the first of the year to cover fiscal year 1965.

It is the further judgment of the committee that the bill should be amended by adding certain of those projects adopted by the Senate last year and approved again this year .

The increase in basin authorizations recommended by the committee are shown in the following tabulation:

Basin	Amounts in H.R. 8667, fiscal year 1964	Senate amendments, fiscal years 1964–65
West Branch Susquehanna	0	$2, 000, 000
Central and southern Florida	$4, 000, 000	21, 000, 000
Brazos River	14, 000, 000	30, 000, 000
Arkansas River	31, 000, 000	157, 000, 000
White River, Ark.-Mo	1, 000, 0 0	8, 000, 000
Missouri River	0	80, 000, 000
Ohio River	47, 000, 000	150, 000, 000
Upper Mississippi	0	11, 000, 000
Los Angeles-San Gabriel	12, 000, 000	30, 000, 000
Columbia River	0	195, 000, 000
Missouri River	0	100, 000, 000
Total	145, 000, 000	784, 000, 000

The projects which the Senate added, with their estimated costs, are:

	Estimated cost
Cape Fear River Basin	$25, 143, 000
Flint River, Ga	63, 200, 000
Dardanelle lock and dam, Arkansas	404, 000
Waurika Dam and Reservoir, Okla	25, 100, 000
Missouri River bank stabilization	3, 000, 000
Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Mont	50, 000, 000
Total	166, 847, 000

This is a total of $950 million, but only about $167 million is new construction.

These new projects are:

New Hope Dam and Reservoir, Cape Fear River Basin, N.C., estimated cost, $25,143,000, benefit-cost ratio 2.5. This project will provide needed flood control and will augment low stream flows along the main stem of the Cape Fear River, and provide a valuable water supply for municipal and industrial use.

The Flint River, Ga., plan provides ultimately for five reservoirs for multiple purposes in the basin. Only one, the Spewrell Bluff Reservoir, is authorized in this bill. The estimated cost is $63,200,000, and the benefit-cost ratio 1.2. This reservoir is to be undertaken as the initial step in the development for flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power, recreation, and allied purposes.

For the Dardanelle lock and dam modification, Arkansas, the estimated costs are $404,000, to provide Federal payment for relocation of sewage facilities for the city of Russellville, Ark., necessitated by the construction of this multiple-purpose project on the Arkansas River.

The Waurika Dam and Reservoir, Okla., project, estimated to cost $25,100,000, with a benefit-cost ratio of 1.9, is a multiple-purpose project for flood control, water supply, recreation, and other purposes semiarid area, with incidental irrigation features. Over 50 percent of the cost for the project will be repaid by local interest.

The Missouri River bank stabilization is estimated to cost $3 million. This is a technical amendment to permit correction of severe bank caving below Garrison Reservoir, N. Dak., caused by degradation, caused by power releases from the reservoir, resulting in loss of valuable farmland.

For the Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Flathead River, Mont., the total estimated cost is $247 million, and the benefit-cost ratio is 1.3. This bill authorizes an initial amount of $50 million for partial accomplishment. This is a major unit of the plan for the Columbia River Basin, and is essential for development of the water resources of the basin.

These projects have been studied by the Corps of Engineers, who have found them feasible and have recommended them.

They have been studied by the Senate, which has found them feasible and adopted them twice.

They have been studied by the House Public Works Committee, but no action has been taken.

Mr. President, the committee believes that the course of action we are taking is more than reasonable.

I appreciate the patience and understanding of Senators who have these river basins in their States and who have been under considerable pressure because of threatened shutdowns.

We want to settle this matter quickly, but we want to do it fairly.

It is my hope that we can do so with this bill, and I urge its prompt passage.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The chairman and other members of the Committee on Public Works and the staff have performed magnificently in preparing the bill. They have shown much perseverance and patience in considering the entire river basin bill, especially with respect to the projects that were added this year.

Is it not true that the Senate has never tried to remove from a bill any projects that were included by the House? The Senate has never asked the House to remove any of its projects, has it?

Mr. McNAMARA. To the best of my recollection, the Senator from North Carolina makes a true statement.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. All that we have asked is that the House include projects which the Senate approved last year and again this year.

Mr. McNAMARA. Twice in the past 13 months, to be absolutely correct.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. This time, we have deleted three projects that were very expensive projects, but were also controversial. Senators from the States where those projects were to be located were generous enough to say that they would forgo asking to have those projects included this year. Is that not correct?

Mr. McNAMARA. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The Committee on Public Works, of which I have the honor to be a member, together with the distinguished chairman and other Senators, has been generous. We are not trying to impose on the House committee or tell them what to do or what not to do. We have merely asked that they be as generous toward us by approving what we have asked for as we have been toward them.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator is correct. We are taking this step following an informal conference with House leaders concerning the public works program. They suggested this step. We are going this far to try to accommodate them.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. If I am not mistaken, the Senator from Michigan had an off-the-record conference with the chairman of the House committee that was handling this particular bill, and an accord was reached.

Mr. McNAMARA. That is correct.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I am certain that the bill will work to the good of both Houses.

Mr. McNAMARA. I agree.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. As I have said before, and as I believe the Senator from Michigan has said, we do not want to deny any State any project to which it is entitled, and which both Houses have approved. We would like to have the House accept the projects the Senate approves, and we ask that they show their willingness to do so.

Mr. McNAMARA. That is what they are trying to do at this time.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the chairman of the committee yield to me?

Mr. McNAMARA. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the record of the projects and the hearings, which have been outlined by the chairman of the committee, speaks for itself. At this late hour, I have no desire to engage in a discussion of the merits or demerits of the various projects involved. In my opinion the chairman of the committee has done an outstanding job in handling the hearings on the bill and in bringing it to the floor of the Senate. He has been patient and tolerant with both the members of the Senate committee and with those from the House, who at times have failed to keep the obligations which they solemnly pledged to the previous chairman in the last Congress.

I hope the chairman of the committee will understand that many of the Senators who have in their States projects which are dealt with in this bill or who have suffered because of the closing down of the work on them, as a result of the delay in the making of these authorizations, are grateful to him for his patience and his tolerance in handling this measure.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the Senator from Montana for his generous remarks.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, several days ago I prepared a statement for delivery on the floor of the Senate, on the serious situation confronting us as a result of the inability of the House and Senate to proceed effectively in the traditional manner on legislation passed by one body and amended by the other. I refer specifically to the bill now being considered.

Prior to delivery of that statement, however, the Honorable Pat McNamara, chairman of the Public Works Committee of the Senate, together with the dedicated members of that committee reported H.R. 8667 on November 21. Since that prepared statement of mine covers the situation in some detail, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record immediately following my remarks.

I note that again the Senate Public Works Committee has amended the House version of the bill. With those amendments, I agree. The basin authorizations have been increased to 2 years, 1964 and 1965. The Senate committee version increases the number of basins from 7 to 10, and the authorization totals from $145 million to $684 million. It also adds the Missouri Basin—Department of Interior—for $100 million, and six new or modified project authorizations amounting to $166,847,000, for a grand total of $950,847,000.

Mr. President, these amounts are not appropriations. This measure will simply provide the authority that is needed before any money can be appropriated for the construction of these projects.

I congratulate the distinguished chairman and members of the Public Works Committee and also the members of its efficient staff. I have many fond memories of my own service on that committee. I have observed through the years how this committee performs on a nonpartisan basis. Its members put the development of the resources of this country ahead of politics. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] is rendering great service to the Senate as chairman of this committee, as is the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], the ranking minority member.

Mr. President, I hope the House will, with dispatch, appoint its conferees and that this measure may be promptly transmitted to the President for his signature.

How regrettable it would be if the action of this Congress, or the lack of action, would cause work now underway on important projects to be shut down.

If work is stopped because of the failure of Congress to act, that will not only mean unnecessary delay in completion of the work, but it will also result in economic waste and extravagance. It will also increase the amount of expenditures that will have to be made to carry these projects on to completion.

Therefore, it would be most unwise to further delay action on this authorization bill.

I trust that it will be passed promptly and that it can be expedited to final enactment.

Mr. President, inasmuch as my prepared statement covers the situation in some detail, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record immediately following my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator McClellan

I wish to call to the attention of the Senate a situation which may result in shutting down 58 public works projects in 24 States, thus affecting the territorial responsibility of 48 Members of the U.S. Senate and about 130 House Members.

This situation arises because of the inability of the House and Senate to proceed in the traditional manner on legislation passed by one body and amended by the other. There seems to be a stalemate in getting the two in a free conference to iron out the differences on a bill which was passed by the House, amended by the Senate, and sent back to the House.

Let me recite briefly for the record the situation as I understand it to exist.

By the Flood Control Acts of 1936 and 1938, Congress approved comprehensive plans for the development of many of the river basins throughout the Nation in the interest of flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power development, and other allied water uses. Congressional approval was given to the entire plan in these cases, with authorization of funds limited to a portion of the entire cost to cover anticipated appropriations for a few years. This procedure gave the Congress an opportunity to examine the work that was being accomplished in the basins at periodical intervals, authorize additional projects found feasible, and make any modifications in the plans that might be desirable. When the authorized monetary limitation is approached, enactment of legislation is required to provide for additional increases in the monetary ceilings for these partially authorized basin plans.

At the present time there are 21 basin plans in this category. It is estimated that 7 of these will experience deficits between estimated appropriations and total authorizations for fiscal year 1964, and 10 will have such a deficit through fiscal year 1965.

It has been the policy of Congress to consider authorization bills at intervals of from 2 to 4 years. General authorization acts were approved in 1958, 1960, and 1962. These acts included increased basin authorizations and authorization for individual projects on which favorable reports had been transmitted to the Congress by the Chief of Engineers.

During consideration of H.R. 13273 (Public Law 874) during the 87th Congress, the Senate Public Works Committee included increases in basin authorizations for 11 river basins totaling $805 million, to cover appropriations for fiscal years 1964 and 1965. This amount was reduced in conference to $4.7 million to cover the amount urgently needed for fiscal year 1963. If the amount approved by the Senate had not been eliminated, there would be no necessity for increased authorizations at this time. It would have been necessary, however, to consider during calendar year 1964 additional increases to cover the budget request for fiscal year 1966.

On May 15, 1963, the House Public Works Committee reported H.R. 6016, which included increased basin authorizations for fiscal years 1964 and 1965. This is the identical authorization contained in the Senate version of H.R. 13273 (Public Law 874, 87th Cong.) which was objected to by the House and reduced to the requirements of fiscal year 1963 only in conference.

H.R. 6016 passed the House on June 24, 1963, and was sent to the Senate and referred to the Public Works Committee.

On July 18 the Public Works Committee reported H.R. 6016 with amendments, and on July 30 it passed the Senate and was returned to the House.

The bill as passed by the Senate differed from the House bill in that it reduced the basin authorizations to include that needed for fiscal year 1964 only and added nine projects formerly passed by the Senate and lost in House-Senate conference on H.R. 13273 (Public Law 874, 87th Cong.).

Normal procedure would be a conference. The Senate appointed their conferees, but to this good day the House has not appointed conferees.

May I point out here that every project added by the Senate has been approved by the Corps of Engineers, other Federal agencies, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Public Works Committee, and passed by the Senate on two occasions.

In lieu of a conference, the House Public Works Committee on October 1, 1963, reported out H.R. 8667, a bill which provides "for increased authorizations for the prosecution of river basin plans for flood control and related purposes." It carries monetary authorization for only 1 year (fiscal year 1964) for basins which lack adequate authorization for the full year. The House report carries the following language:

"The committee met in executive session on October 1, 1963, and ordered the bill reported. The action was in the nature of an emergency because of the fact that monetary authorization will be exhausted in the very near future on some basins and successively on others in the present fiscal year. This means that work will have to be suspended by the contractors at great cost. There will be disruption in the local area, loss of employment, and in some cases, actual creation of hazards in connection with flood control projects which are only partially completed. The reason for the emergency action is as follows:

"The situation regarding the basin authorizations has not been unrecognized this session. The committee on May 15, 1963, reported to the House H.R. 6016 (H. Rept. 299), which covered a total of 10 basins which, it was estimated, would have deficits during fiscal years 1964 and 1965. In other words, H.R. 6016 covered a 2-year period of authorization. H.R. 6016 passed the House on June 24, 1963. It passed the Senate on July 30, 1963, with amendments involving the inclusion of a number of specific projects not directly related to the basin authorizations. In passing the bill, the Senate asked for a conference. On August 6, 1963, the amended bill was brought up on the House floor and unanimous consent was requested to disagree with the Senate amendments and to agree to the conference requested by the Senate. This was objected to. The inclusion of the individual projects by the Senate has brought up a number of controversial matters with respect to these projects. On most of these projects there is strong support and strong opposition. It appears that there may be considerable time required to resolve these questions. In the meantime, the situation with regard to the basins, which is noncontroversial, has become increasingly acute. In one case, funds have already been exhausted and the contracts underway are being carried on with an advance of funds from the local sponsoring unit. This device, however, is not practical for application to the other basins because of the fact that they are too large in area and the same situation does not prevail as it does in the basin which is being carried on with advance funds—the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin.

"Because of the extreme importance of providing sufficient authorization to prevent the curtailment or complete cessation of work, beginning in the very near future, the committee feels that it is of the utmost importance that this matter be considered separately and that swift action be taken, and that the resolution of problems regarding individual projecs added by the Senate be left for future consideration.

"The committee recommends that the bill, H.R. 8667, be acted upon immediately to prevent the serious consequences that would otherwise inevitably result."

The House passed H.R. 8667 on October 21, 1963. No action has been taken by the Public Works Committee of the Senate, and I am advised none is expected since the Senate has passed a bill which awaits conference.

The seriousness of the present situation is best illustrated by the fact that the House Appropriations Committee has now reported the Public Works appropriations bill to the House. That measure contains 58 projects for which funds are recommended but for which no expenditure can be made without the necessary authorization. As a consequence, the House committee, to avoid a point of order, included in the appropriations bill (H.R. —) the following proviso:

"*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for projects not authorized by law or which are authorized by law limiting the amount to be appropriated therefor, except as may be within the limits of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be appropriated."

Following is a short statement on each of the basins which will be forced to close down if remedy is not forthcoming:

CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA

This project provides for modification and expansion of the works in the Lake Okeechobee area, to the comprehensive plan for flood control in the upper St. Johns River area, the Kissimmee River Basin and related areas, and the Lake Okeechobee-Everglades-east coast areas, all in central Florida. The project was authorized in the Flood Control Act of June 30, 1948, which authorized the appropriation of $16,300,000 for partial accomplishment of the first phase of the plan. Subsequent legislation has increased the monetary authorization and expanded the project to include additional units.

Total estimated cost of projects in plan	$263,000,000
Available monetary authorization	106,300,000
Appropriations made available through June 30, 1963	95,373,000
Remaining monetary authorization	10,927,000
Less estimated funding in fiscal year 1964, based upon approved budget request	$14,000,000
Deficit monetary authorization	−3,073,000
Additional monetary authorization requested for fiscal year 1964	4,000,000

Projects on which requested authorizations are planned to be used:

Central and southern Florida project, Florida.

BRAZOS RIVER BASIN

The Flood Control Act approved September 3, 1954, adopted the basinwide plan of improvement in the Brazos River Basin and authorized the appropriation of $40 million for partial accomplishment of that plan. The Flood Control Act of 1960 authorized an additional amount of $21 million. The plan includes reservoirs for flood control and allied purposes, and projects for local flood protection.

Total estimated cost of projects in plan	$185,124,000
Available monetary authorization	61,000,000
Appropriations made available through June 30, 1963	51,579,000
Remaining monetary authorization	9,421,000
Less estimated funding in fiscal year 1964, based upon approved budget request	23,045,000
Deficit monetary authorization	−13,624,000
Additional monetary authorization request for fiscal year 1964	14,000,000

Projects on which requested authorizations are planned to be used:

Proctor Reservoir, Tex.
Somerville Reservoir, Tex.
Stillhouse Hollow Reservoir, Tex.
Waco Reservoir, Tex.

ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN

The general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Arkansas River Basin was adopted by the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938, which authorized an appropriation of $21 million for partial accomplishment of the plan. The plan has been further amended and modified and additional monetary authorization provided by subsequent acts.

The River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, authorized construction of a multiple-purpose plan for improvement of the Arkansas River Basin, Arkansas and Oklahoma, for navigation, flood control, and other purposes, and authorized the appropriation of $55 million for partial accomplishment of the plan. This plan has likewise been modified by subsequent acts, and additional monetary authorization provided.

The Flood Control Act of July 14, 1960, incorporated the authorized flood-control plan and the multiple-purpose plan into a single plan of development, and provided that all authorizations made available for the Arkansas River Basin would be applicable to the combined plan of development.

Total estimated cost of projects in plan	$1,334,116,000
Available monetary authorization	529,773,000
Apropriations made available through June 30, 1963	469,627,000
Remaining monetary authorization	60,146,000

Less estimated funding in fiscal year 1964, based upon approved budget request	$91,010,000
Deficit monetary authorization	−30,864,000
Additional monetary authorization requested for fiscal year 1964	31,000,000

Projects on which requested authorizations are planned to be used:

Bank stabilization works, Arkansas and Missouri.
Blue Mountain Reservoir, Ark.
Dardanelle Reservoir, Ark.
Elk City Reservoir, Kans.
Eufaula Reservoir, Olka.
Fort Gibson Reservoir, Okla.
Keystone Reservoir, Okla.
Navigation locks and dams, Arkansas and Oklahoma.
Minrod Reservoir, Ark.
Ozark lock and dam, Arkansas.
Arkansas River, snagging and plant, Arkansas and Oklahoma.
Short Mountain lock and dam, Oklahoma.
Tenkiller Ferry Reservoir, Okla.
Webbers Falls lock and dam, Oklahoma.

WHITE RIVER BASIN, MO. AND ARK.

The general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the White River Basin was authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, which included $25 million authorization for appropriations. Subsequent legislation has authorized additional amounts for continuation of the plan, and included additional projects in the plan. The plan now includes nine reservoirs, of which four are for flood control only and five are multiple-purpose projects.

Total estimated cost of projects in plan	$337,872,000
Available monetary authorization	276,000,000
Appropriations made available through June 30, 1963	262,184,000
Remaining monetary authorization	13,816,000
Less estimated funding in fiscal year 1964, based upon approved budget request	$13,819,000
Deficit monetary authorization	−3,000
Additional monetary authorization requested for fiscal year 1964	1,000,000

Project on which requested authorizations are planned to be used:

Beaver Reservoir, Ark.

OHIO RIVER BASIN

The Flood Control Acts of June 22, 1936, August 28, 1937, and June 28, 1938, approved a general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Ohio River Basin, consisting of reservoirs, levees, floodwalls, and drainage structures for protection of cities and towns. Those acts were amended and supplemented by subsequent acts, which also included monetary authorizations for further prosecution of the comprehensive plan. Additional authorization is needed at this time to carry the program forward.

Total estimated cost of projects in plan	$1,235,600,000
Available monetary authorization	749,138,000
Appropriations made available through June 30, 1963	719,417,000
Remaining monetary authorization	29,721,000
Less estimated funding in fiscal year 1964, based on approved budget request	$76,156,000
Deficit monetary authorization	−46,435,000
Additional monetary authorization requested for fiscal year 1964	47,000,000

Projects on which requested authorizations are planned to be used:

Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa.
Beach Fork Reservoir, W. Va.
Evansville, Ind.
John W. Flannagan Reservoir, Va.
Monroe Reservoir, Ind.
Barren River Reservoir, Ky.
Shenango River Reservoir, Pa.
Summersville Reservoir, W. Va.
Brookville Reservoir, Ind.
Fishtrap Reservoir, Ky.
Lake Chautauqua, N.Y.
Mason J. Niblack levees, Indiana.
Green River Reservoir, Ky.
Rochester and McClearys Bluff, Ill.
Tripond levee, Illinois.
Turtle Creek, Pa.
Deer Creek Reservoir, Ohio.
Berlin Reservoir, Ohio.
Big Darby Creek Reservoir, Ohio.
J. Percy Priest Reservoir, Tenn.
Cave Run Reservoir, Ky.
East Lynn Reservoir, W. Va.
Paint Creek Reservoir, Ohio.

LOS ANGELES-SAN GABRIEL RIVER BASIN

The general comprehensive plan of improvement for the Los Angeles County drainage area provides for improvements consisting of reservoirs, debris basins, flood-control channels, bridges, and related works along the Los Angeles and San Gabriel River, Rio Hondo, and Ballona Creek, and their tributaries. The Flood Control Act of June 22, 1963, authorized reservoirs and flood channels at an estimated cost of $70 million. Subsequent acts authorized additional projects, expanded the scope of the project, and increased the monetary authorization. Additional authorization to cover contracts now in force is urgently needed.

Total estimated cost of projects in plan	$350,265,000
Available monetary authorization	289,741,000
Appropriations made available through June 30, 1963	$286,475,000
Remaining monetary authorization	3,266,000
Less estimated funding in fiscal year 1964, based upon approved budget request	15,000,000
Deficit monetary authorization	−11,734,000
Additional monetary authorization requested for fiscal year 1964	12,000,000

Project on which requested authorizations are planned to be used:

Los Angeles County drainage area, California.

COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

The Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, approved the general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Willamette River Basin and authorized $11,300,000 for the initiation and partial accomplishment of the recommended plan. Individual projects were authorized in the Columbia and Willamette River Basins by the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, and subsequent acts. The Flood Control Act of May 17, 1950, approved a general comprehensive plan for the Columbia River Basin for flood control and other purposes and authorized the appropriation of $75 million for the partial accomplishment of the plan. This monetary authorization has been increased by later acts and additional authorization is needed at this time.

Total estimated cost of projects in plan	$1,849,348,000
Availabile monetary authorization	723,300,000
Appropriations made available through June 30, 1963	673,513,000
Remaining monetary authorization	49,787,000
Less estimated funding in fiscal year 1964, based upon approved budget request	85,739,000
Deficit monetary authorization	−35,952,000
Additional monetary authorization requested for fiscal year 1964	36,000,000

Projects on which requested authorizations are planned to be used:

Blue River Reservoir, Oreg.
Bruces Eddy Dam, Idaho.
Boise Valley, Idaho.
John Day River, Oreg.
Weiser River, Idaho.
Cougar Reservoir, Oreg.
Dorena Reservoir, Oreg.
Fall Creek Reservoir, Oreg.
Fern Ridge Reservoir, Oreg.
Green Peter and Foster Creek Reservoirs, Oreg.
Jackson Hole, Wyo.
John Day Dam, Oreg.
Johnson Creek, Oreg.
Libby Reservoir, Mon.
Willamette River bank protection, Oreg.

MISSOURI BASIN—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

This section provides an increase in the basin authorization for the portion of the comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior. It has been customary to increase the monetary authorization for the Department of the Interior as such increase is needed, in the same manner as increases are provided for the Corps of Engineers for their portions of the Missouri River Basin plan. Information was received from the Secretary of the Interior which fully justified the need for increased authorization so that appropriations for the work already approved by Congress can continue to be made

Section 9(3) of the Flood Control Act of 1944 authorized the appropriation of $200 million for the partial accomplishment of the works to be undertaken by the Secretary of the Interior in connection with the initial stages of the Missouri River Basin project. Subsequent authorizations have increased this limitation.

Annual appropriations by the Congress, including the appropriations for fiscal year 1963, have utilized all but $64,900,000 of the authorized total. The fiscal year 1964 program that is contemplated for the Missouri River Basin project is in excess of the remaining ceiling. It is anticipated that as construction work progresses the fund requirements will average about $80 million for the next several years. The committee believes that an increase in monetary authorization is necessary at this time.

The total estimated cost of the long-range ultimate program of the Bureau of Reclamation in the Missouri River Basin is about $3 billion.

The committee approves the language in H.R. 6016 with respect to new units. Under these provisions, each new unit will be recommended to the Congress for specific authorization or reauthorization, and the funds needed for the construction of such units will be authorized to be appropriated

along with the authorization for construction. This procedure will provide the Congress with proper surveillance and control over further development by the Department of the Interior in the Missouri River Basin.

Amount authorized to be appriated:	
Flood Control Act, Dec. 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887)	**$200,000,000**
Flood Control Act, July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 641)	**150,000,000**
Flood Control Act, May 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 170)	**200,000,000**
Flood Control Act, July 3, 1958 (72 Stat. 297)	**200,000,000**
Flood Control Act, July 14, 1960 (58 Stat. 891)	**60,000,000**
Total authorized to be appropriated to date	**810,000,000**
Less net allotments to projects as of June 30, 1962[1,2]	**−688,589,317**
Balance available as of June 30, 1962	**121,410,683**
Less fiscal year 1963 appropriation	**−56,421,409**
Estimated balance June 30, 1963	**64,989,274**
Less estimated funding in fiscal year 1964	**80,000,000**
Deficit monetary authorization	**−15,010,726**
Additional monetary authorization requested for fiscal year 1964	**16,000,000**

[1] Total Missouri River Basin project C. & R. for regions 6 and 7 and technical records.

[2] Excludes other Department of the Interior agencies.

How critical is this situation? You may judge by the fact that the Chief of Engineers has already given, or will soon give, written notice to contractors that funds for the continuation of works will be or have been exhausted and that they may choose whether to shutdown or proceed at their risk. The schedule for this action is as follows:

Basin	Date of letter to contractors	Date of estimated exhaustion of funds
Los Angeles-San Gabriel	July 10, 1963	Aug. 10, 1963
Ohio	Oct. 24, 1963	Nov. 24, 1963
Central and southern Florida	Oct. 29, 1963	Nov. 29, 1963
Brazos	Nov. 1, 1963	Dec. 1, 1963
Columbia	Dec. 9, 1963	Jan. 9, 1964
Arkansas	Dec. 15, 1963	Jan. 15, 1964
White	Feb. 14, 1964	Mar. 14, 1964

What will shutting down these projects cost? The amount will vary, but it may run to $500 million in stoppage, loss of time, idled equipment and manpower, claims against the Government, loss of benefits, and many other hazards.

The local communities where these projects are located will suffer greatly in loss of payrolls, rentals, and adjustment of business keyed to these construction jobs.

Also at stake is the reputation of the Federal Government as a party to a contract. Future public works will surely suffer when contractors are asked to bid. Will they add a factor for uncertainty of an opportunity to complete a contract as bid?

I urge the House and the Senate Public Works Committees to weigh the seriousness of the consequences of this situation and to act to break this stalemate so that we can appropriate funds to carry to completion these 58 projects—all of which Congress has approved.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for his continued support in connection with this matter. I appreciate very much his kind remarks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be considered original text for the purpose of further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 1, after the enacting clause, to insert:

"That the following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive floodwaters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the provisions of 201 and 202 of Public Law 874, Eighty-seventh Congress (76 Stat. 1180), and to the conditions set forth therein: *Provided*, That the necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project authorized in this Act with funds from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a construction program: *Provided further*, That the projects authorized herein shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements: *Provided further*, That penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam authorized in this Act for construction by the Department of the Army when approved by the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission: *And provided further*, That the monetary authorizations for the river basin plans, under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army, are hereby increased and additional projects authorized as follows:"

On page 2, after line 17, insert:

"WEST BRANCH SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN

"An additional sum of $2,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the West Branch of the Susquehanna River Basin, authorized by the Flood Control Act of September 3, 1954."

After line 22, insert:

"CAPE FEAR RIVER BASIN

"The project for the comprehensive development of the Cape Fear River Basin, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 508, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,143,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct joint investigations and surveys of the upper tributaries of the Cape Fear River in the interest of watershed protection and flood prevention, and the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water, such surveys and investigations and the report thereon to be prepared and submitted in compliance with the provisions of Public Law 639, Eighty-seventh Congress, and said surveys and investigations are hereby authorized."

On page 3, line 15, after the word "of", strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$21,000,000"; after line 19, insert:

"APALACHICOLA RIVER BASIN, GEORGIA

"The general plan for the comprehensive development of the Flint River Basin, Georgia, for flood control and other purposes recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 567, Eighty-seventh Congress, is approved and the construction of the Spewrell Bluff Reservoir on the Flint River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in said report at an estimated cost of $63,200,000."

On page 4, line 6, after the word "of", strike out "$14,000,000" and insert "$30,000,000"; in line 12, after the word "of", strike out "$31,000,000" and insert "$157,000,000"; after line 16, insert:

"That the modification of the existing project for the Dardanelle lock and dam, Arkansas, in order to provide for the construction of a sewage outfall system for the city of Russellville, Arkansas, as authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1185), is hereby modified to provide that the United States shall assume the full cost of constructing said facilities, at an estimated additional Federal cost of $404,000."

On page 5, line 1, after the word "of", strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$8,000,000"; after line 5, insert:

"RED RIVER BASIN

"The Waurika Dam and Reservoir on Beaver Creek, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 33, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,100,000: *Provided*, That nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the acquisition of additional lands for establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the reservoir."

After line 14, insert:

"MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

"An additional sum of $80,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin, authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented.

"The comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin, authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented, is further modified to include such bank protection or rectification works at or below the Garrison Reservoir as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army may be found necessary, at an estimated cost of $3,000,000."

On page 6, line 5, after the word "of", strike out "$47,000,000" and insert "$150,000,000"; after line 9, insert:

"The proviso contained in the authorization for the project for flood control and allied purposes on Laurel River, Kentucky, authorized by Public Law 86-645, approved July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 496), is hereby modified to read as follows: *Provided*, That construction of the project shall not be commenced until the power marketing agency has informed the Corps of Engineers that the power generated by the project can be sold at rates which will insure repayment within fifty years, with interest, of all costs allocated to power."

After line 18, insert:

"UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN

"An additional sum of $11,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Upper Mississippi River Basin, authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented."

On page 7, line 2, after the word "of", strike out "$12,000,000" and insert "$30,000,000"; in line 8, after the word "of", strike out "$36,000,000" and insert "$195,000,000"; and after line 14, insert:

"The Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Flathead River, Montana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House

Document Numbered 403, Eighty-seventh Congress: *Provided*, That such project shall be operated and maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, and the sum of $50,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the partial accomplishment of said project.

"SEC. 2. In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $100,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan adopted by section 9(a) of the Act approved December 22, 1944 (Public Law Numbered 534, Seventy-eighth Congress), as amended and supplemented by subsequent Acts of Congress, for continuing the works in the Missouri River Basin authorized to be undertaken under said plan by the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I wish to conclude by making the following statement:

Before the Senate adjourns for the Thanksgiving recess—I wish to make one or two comments in regard to H.R. 8667—which the Senate will vote on next week.

It is unfortunate, I think, that we were unable to complete action on this bill before the recess.

Projects of serious concern to many Senators are dealt with in this measure.

I refer particularly to the authorizations for continued appropriations for a number of river basin projects—some of which have, or are about to, run out of funds.

I wish to have the Record show very clearly that the Senate Public Works Committee and, so far as I know, the majority have been ready to act on this bill since we reported it to the floor on November 21.

Action now would permit us, it is hoped, to go to conference with the House early next week.

Actually, this is not a new measure before the Senate; and I fail to understand why there is a sudden effort to delay the bill's passage.

These projects have been dealt with twice by the Senate in the past 13 months—the latest occasion being July 29.

Indeed, this version of the measure deals with even fewer projects than those covered by H.R. 6016, which we passed on July 29.

Technically, we do not even need to pass this bill, since H.R. 6016 can still be sent to conference by the House—as asked for by the Senate.

But in an effort to meet the House more than half way and in an effort to help colleagues who are vitally concerned with expiring funds for river basins, the Senate Public Works Committee agreed to act again on a compromise measure.

That is what we have in H.R. 8667; and it is very unfortunate that we are unable now to take final action on this bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Ohio, who is a member of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I desire to associate myself with the remarks made by the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan. I agree with his expressed desire that the projects proceed without further delay. The Senator from Michigan is rendering a needful public service, and I hope that Senators will pay heed to his urgent wishes and that we will consider the question without further delay.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

SENATORS SHOULD DISCLOSE THEIR FINANCIAL HOLDINGS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I desire to address the Senate concerning the problem of conflict of interest about which we have been hearing quite a bit in recent weeks. An investigation is now being conducted into conflict-of-interest allegations involving Senate employees by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan]. The chairman of the committee is proceeding with that investigation with fidelity, zeal, intensity, and impartiality. This investigation has caused comment on the entire question of conflict of interest, which has been raised from time to time in recent months by many newspapers, editors, and citizens in regard to Senators and Members of the House of Representatives themselves.

This is always somewhat of a problem. No lawmaker should allow himself to be placed in a position of weighing his own private interests against the general public welfare on any issue whatever.

In 1958, when I was seeking election to the office I now occupy, I went throughout the State of Ohio, appearing in 86 of the 88 counties in Ohio. I put a great deal of energy into the effort at a time when I was entirely lacking in financial backing. I made two promises to the citizens of Ohio and to all who were good enough to come out and listen to me. At that time, in 1958, I stated that if elected Senator, I would make public all the financial holdings that I had acquired over the years. In addition, I would discontinue the private practice of law. By doing both of those things, I would assure the citizens of my State that, if I were chosen as their Senator, they would know that no question of conflict of interest could involve me.

Both promises have been kept. I recall distinctly on or about December 15, 1958, when my name was removed from the law office door in Cleveland, Ohio, where I had practiced for approximately 40 years, and during which time I had served as president of two bar associations. I recall that the editor of one of the Cleveland newspapers asked if I would pose in front of that door and appear to be removing my name from my law office door.

To that question I stated, "No, indeed. I will not perpetrate any Calvin Coolidge stunt and have an Indian bonnet on my head. I have already directed the office of the National City Bank Building to remove my name."

My name was removed from the door.

The facts are that I felt like weeping, because I had been practicing for so many years in Cleveland.

Regarding my financial holdings, I point out that all of my holdings were disclosed in a letter addressed to the Secretary of the Senate in March of 1959. I took the oath of office as Senator in January. Perhaps there was hesitancy on my part to disclose my entire financial assets. But I did so. In my lengthy letter to the Secretary of the Senate, I told him that he could make that information public.

In addition, since I have been appointed to serve as a member of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I sold stock that I owned in Pan American World Airways and various sugar companies.

There is no use crying over spilled milk. I believe that my action in selling those stocks and taking a financial loss at that time might have been unnecessary, for if a Senator or a Member of the other body fully discloses his financial holdings to the people of his State, they know what he has and can judge for themselves whether he is voting to further his own private interest or voting in accord with his judgment and conscience in the public interest.

Nevertheless, I did disclose my financial assets in March of 1959, to the embarrassment, I understand, of some members of my family. Since that time I have annually written to the Secretary of the Senate and cataloged the list of securities I hold.

It is amusing to recall some of the reaction to my action. In 1959 the president of a leading bank in Cleveland is quoted as having said, "I did not know that the little so-and-so had so much money." The truth is that, according to some standards, I did not have so much after all, and I have less now. But the facts are that when I wrote that letter to Secretary of the Senate in March of 1959, that was the very first time that such action had been taken by any Senator or Representative in Congress. Since that time the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], and other Senators have followed suit and have publicly disclosed their financial holdings.

Such disclosures may be embarrassing, and are embarrassing, to members of families of legislators, but I feel they are proper. I invite attention to what I did in connection with this matter, neither because I have waged a crusade on the subject nor because I intend to, but because I want the citizens of my State to be able to judge whether I, as their Senator, consider the public welfare paramount to my own selfish interests.

Some Members of Congress actively practice law while they are on the public payroll and, in my opinion, are subject to criticism. I made the promise, to the people of Ohio not to practice law, because my opponent in that campaign was the active head of a law firm, and for many years his salary as a Senator went directly from the Disbursing Office of the Senate to the law firm. He drew from that law firm $2,000 a month, so he said. While I do not believe he said it, the fact is that he drew a dividend from the earnings of the firm, when they were split up at the end of the year, or, as some law firms do, twice a year.

In the course of my campaign I was critical of my opponent because his law firm represented the Pennsylvania Railroad and other railroad corporations. Those corporations and officials of those corporations were opposing the great St. Lawrence Seaway before the committees of the Congress and speaking out against it in public.

As the present Presiding Officer, who comes from Indiana (Mr. Bayh in the chair), knows, the St. Lawrence Seaway was considered a great thing for all States of the Middle West, as it is proving to be. Every Democrat and every Republican Member of the House of Representatives and of the Senate from Ohio supported the great St. Lawrence Seaway, except my opponent. For this reason I claimed that private influences rather than the public welfare, actuated his vote. I made a promise at that time. I fulfilled it.

Some Members of Congress who actively practice law while on the public payroll perhaps never think of the fact that, as a result of going before the electorate of their district or of their State, of their own free choice they have sold their services, their talents, and their experience to the people of the United States and to no one else, when they draw their salaries as Members of Congress.

I make this statement because it is a matter of some pride. I was the first Member in either branch of the Congress to make such a disclosure.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I commend the able Senator from Ohio for his statement, for his forthrightness, and for his fine record of public service in this body, as well as for his record of civic service throughout his entire life. He is a great asset to the Congress, and I have no doubt that he will continue to serve here for many years.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I thank the distinguished deputy majority leader for his kind remarks.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS DURING ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committees of the Senate may be permitted to file reports during the adjournment of the Senate.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

ACQUISITION OF LAND FOR SALEM MARITIME NATIONAL HISTORICAL SITE IN MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 640.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 976) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire and add certain lands to the Salem Maritime National Historical Site in Massachusetts, and for other purposes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I desire recognition before the Senate votes on the measure.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I assure the distinguished acting minority leader that these measures were cleared with the appropriate committee personnel. I regret that I did not speak to the Senator about it earlier.

Mr. KUCHEL. Not at all. I see that they are cleared, Mr. President.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 976), which was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 660), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 976, by Congressman Bates, is to provide for the acquisition of the 17th-century Narbonne House in Salem, Mass., and for its administration as part of the Salem Maritime National Historic Site.

NEED

The Salem Maritime National Historic Site was created pursuant to the acts of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666), and May 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1374). It presently includes the old Custom House, Hawkes House, and Derby Wharf, all of them reminders of the day of sailing ships when the American flag was carried from Salem to all quarters of the globe. The Narbonne House, which is located on the same block as Derby House, will be a valuable addition to this collection. It is one of three houses in Salem known to have been built before 1675, and was, during a long part of its life, intimately associated with Salem's seafaring life. It is also an important example of the architecture of the period during which it was built.

COST

The Narbonne property can be acquired for the $18,000 authorized to be appropriated, according to the Park Service. Additional annual operating costs of the site will be nominal.

ALASKA MINERAL LANDS SELECTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 641.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 1878) to amend the act providing for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union in order to extend the time for filing of applications for the selection of certain lands by such State.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1878), which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of subsection (h) of section 6 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union", approved July 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 339), as amended, is amended by striking out "five years" and inserting in lieu thereof "ten years".

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 661), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF BILL

The purpose of S. 1878 is to give the new State of Alaska an additional 5 years from January 3, 1964, in which to select lands under Federal mineral lease. The right of such selection was granted to the State in section 6(h) of the Alaska Statehood Act (act of July 7, 1958; 72 Stat. 339), which provided a 5-year period in which such selections must be made. Alaska became a State by Proclamation 3296, signed by President Eisenhower on January 3, 1959, and published in the Federal Register on January 5, 1959 (24 F.R. 81; 73 Stat. c16). Thus, unless legislation extending the selection period is enacted, the State's rights under subsection 6(h) with respect to lands under mineral lease will terminate shortly.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The Statehood Act granted Alaska more than 103 million acres out of the 378 million acres of Federal lands in the then territory. These grants, which were in the historic tradition of land grants to newly admitted States, were for the purpose of enabling Alaska to carry out the responsibilities and functions of State Government and to provide for economic and population growths. For the most part, the State was given a 25-year period in which to make its selections of these lands. With respect to lands under Federal mineral lease, however, the selection period was limited to 5 years from the date of admission. The intent of the grant of the right of selection of mineral lands was primarily to avoid the confusions which would result from differing ownership in geologic units. Unity of ownership with its consequent uniformity of leasing or other disposition clearly is in the interest of efficient, economical development of mineral resources.

At the hearings, testimony by both Alaska Senators and by officials of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of Interior, established the fact that the Alaska selection program had been subject to a series of unforeseen delays which were not the result of lack of diligence and initiative on the part of the State. Regulations for putting the program into effect were not promulgated until some 18 months after statehood. Other time-consuming problems arising out of withdrawal policies and cadastral surveys have caused further delays.

As a result, only approximately a million acres of the 103 million acres granted have been patented to the State thus far. Further time is essential if the intent of Congress as expressed in the Statehood Act is to be fulfilled.

Accordingly, your committee urges prompt approval of S. 1878.

PHOSPHATE RIGHTS IN CERTAIN LANDS IN FLORIDA

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 642.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 167) to provide for the conveyance under certain conditions of the phosphate rights in certain lands in the State of Florida.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "patents", to insert "or other instruments of conveyance"; in line 5, after the word "issued", to strike out "to entrymen"; in line 6, after "(38 Stat. 509)", to insert "as amended (30 U.S.C. 121–123)"; on page 2, line 3, after the word "that", to strike out "such" and insert "the land is to be utilized for urban, suburban, or other intensive development and that the"; in line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "the sum of $200" and insert "a sum to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior", and in line 17, after the word "of", to strike out "the sum of $200" and insert "such sum as may be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in cases where patents or other instruments of conveyance for public lands in the State of Florida have been issued under the provisions of the Act of July 17, 1914 (38 Stat. 509), as amended (30 U.S.C. 121–123), reserving to the United States the right to any phosphate deposits therein, the Secretary of the Interior shall, upon (1) application and proof that any such land is either nonphosphate in character or not prospectively valuable for phosphate, (2) proof that the land is to be utilized for urban, suburban, or other intensive development and that the reservation is impeding development of such land, and (3) payment of a sum to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse the United States for administrative costs, convey such phosphate right in such land to the record owner or owners of the surface rights in such land.

SEC. 2. In any case where the right to any phosphate deposits has been reserved to the United States as described in the first section of this Act and such right is determined by the Secretary of the Interior to have a market value, the Secretary is authorized to sell such right to the record owner or owners of the surface rights in such land in return for the payment of such sum as may be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse the United States for administrative costs plus an amount equal to the fair market value of such right, as determined by the Secretary after taking into consideration such appraisals as he deems necessary.

SEC. 3. Amounts paid to the Secretary of the Interior under the provisions of this Act shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 662), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 167, which is sponsored by the senior Senator from Florida, the Honorable SPESSARD HOLLAND, is to authorize the conveyance to the surface owners of phosphate rights reserved to the Federal Government in certain lands in the State of Florida. These phosphate rights were required to be reserved by the United States under the provisions of the act of July 17, 1914 (38 Stat. 509), as amended (30 U.S.C. 121–123). In the half century since the reservation, the surface of many of these Florida lands has become of great value for developmental purposes, but in a large number of instances, the lands have no value for phosphates—or at best only nominal value. Nevertheless, the Federal mineral reservation constitutes a cloud on title, interfering with financing and thus hindering development through private enterprise.

HISTORY OF LEGISLATION

Over a period of many years, private bills have been introduced in successive Congresses to authorize sale and conveyance of the reserved phosphate rights in individual tracts to the named surface owners. Such private legislation is a cumbersome and expensive way of attaining the socially and economically desirable purpose of encouraging private enterprise without loss or cost to the Federal Government. Enactment of S. 167 will make such private bills unnecessary, and will place responsibility for determining th facts in each case on the proper administrative officer who is in a position to obtain and judge such facts.

EXPLANATION OF PROVISIONS

Under the terms of S. 167, as amended, where the lands are shown to be nonphosphate in character or not prospectively valuable for phosphate, and where the reservation is impeding urban, suburban, or other intensive development, the reserved mineral rights are to be conveyed by the Secretary of the Interior to the owners of record of the surface of the land at a sum adequate to reimburse the United States for the costs of such conveyance. Where the Secretary determines that the phosphate rights do have a market value, then the conveyance is to be made for an amount equal to the fair market value of the reserved rights, plus the administrative costs.

Thus, under S. 167 the Federal Government will be fully reimbursed both for the fair market value of any property it is conveying and for the administrative costs of such conveyance. The surface owners will be enabled to remove the cloud on title to their lands and to proceed with development.

THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The committee amended the bill in accordance with the recommendations of the Department of the Interior which are set forth in detail and explained in the report of the Department on S. 167, dated March 19, 1963. They are designed to give Federal interests still greater protection, and to lay down more specific guidelines for administration of the proposed law.

The committee notes that the Department of the Interior has testified with respect to previous legislation authorizing transfer of phosphate rights that in many instances the administrative costs of the conveyancing will be less than the $200 amount proposed in the bill as introduced.

EMERGENCY TRANSPORTATION OF WRECKED MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 644.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2906) to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide an exemption from the provisions of such part for the emergency transportation of any accidentally wrecked or disabled motor vehicle in interstate or foreign commerce by towing.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 2906), which was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 664), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

H.R. 2906 would amend subsection (b) of section 203 of the Interstate Commerce Act by adding a new paragraph (10) which would exempt the emergency transportation of any accidentally wrecked or disabled motor vehicle in interstate or foreign commerce by towing. Section 203(b) contains exemptions for various kinds of motor carriers from economic regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Public hearings were not considered necessary on this proposed legislation.

II. DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Under the present provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act, a person wishing to engage in the interstate or foreign transportation of accidentally wrecked or disabled motor vehicles by towing must secure operating authority fom the Commission and must otherwise comply with its regulations. (See Hanavan Common Carrier Application, 72 M.C.C. 477 (1957).) This appears to the committee to be one of the aspects of transportation which could be removed from the "sphere of regulation," thereby enabling the Commission, to a limited degree, to devote more attention to matters of greater regulatory importance. Except for safety of operation, and qualifications and hours of service of employees, the continued regulation of this traffic does not appear to the committee to be justified because of its limited role in the national transportation system.

In addition, the committee notes that highway emergencies of the type contemplated by this bill frequently occur at irregular hours, inconvenient locations, and may well require immediate towing attention. It is anticipated, therefore, that the reported bill will benefit the public by permitting more rapid, efficient, and flexible service from tow truck operators. This is particularly true when the accident occurs just across a State border and the nearest tow truck operator within that State is some distance from the mishap. At the same time ready service might well be obtained from just across the border. This out-of-State service could not be utilized, under existing law, unless that operator were certificated by the Commission.

The effect of this bill would be to relieve garages, service stations, and similar establishments from the necessity of obtaining authority and rate approval from the ICC in the towing of motor vehicles away from a wreck on the highways. This would not remove the controls on safety or hours of service, nor would it relieve other interstate towing services, such as the movement of motor vehicles or house trailers.

Concern was expressed to the committee that the rates charged by carriers in the absence of regulation might be placed at excessive levels. The committee, and, it is expected, the Interstate Commerce Commission, will watch this situation closely. In the event that excessive rates are charged, it may be necessary to pass appropriate legislation at a later time.

In the 86th Congress, 2d session, this committee reported and the Senate passed S. 2375 (S. Rept. 1343) which, with one technical change, is identical to the bill now before the committee. The House did not act. The present bill, H.R. 2906, embodies several amendments which have been made to the proposal during the last several years, particularly to define the vehicles which may be towed under this legislation. H.R. 2906 as passed by the House would provide an exemption from the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act for the emergency transportation of any motor vehicle in interstate or foreign commerce by towing.

SAFETY STANDARDS FOR MOTOR VEHICLE SEAT BELTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 645.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 134) to provide that seat belts sold or shipped in interstate commerce for use in motor vehicles shall meet certain safety standards.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 134), which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments on page 1, line 5, after the word "motor", to strike out "vehicles" and insert "vehicles other than those of carriers subject to safety regulations under part II of the Interstate Commerce Act", and on page 2, line 13, after the word "whoever", to insert "knowingly and willfully."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 665), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF THE LEGISLATION

H.R. 134 is designed to protect the public by providing for the establishment of minimum Federal safety standards for automobile seat belts sold or shipped in interstate commerce.

This would be accomplished by requiring the Secretary of Commerce to prescribe and publish minimum safety standards for seat belts manufactured for sale or offered for sale in interstate commerce, imported into the United States, or shipped in interstate commerce. Manufacture for sale, the sale or the offering for sale, in commerce, or importation into the United States, or the introduction, delivery for introduction, transportation or causing to be transported in commerce, or for the purposes of sale, or delivery after sale, in commerce, of any seat belt which does not meet the standards prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce would be unlawful, and if done knowingly and willfully, be punishable by a fine of up to $1,000, imprisonment for 1 year, or both. No hearings have been held by your committee.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

The efforts to encourage the general use of seat belts by the motoring public could largely be nullified if a substantial segment of the public were to be furnished equipment which was improperly manufactured, and offered little or no real protection. With the rapidly growing public acceptance and demand for seat belts, there is a present danger that a good part of this demand may be met by the marginal operator offering an inadequate and unsafe product.

Automobile seat belts of inferior quality and design are being placed on the market in response to the growing public demand. There is no way to determine how many substandard seat belts are now being used by unsuspecting motorists, but the number will increase unless there is some means to establish adequate standards, such as this bill provides. The vast majority of seat belt manufacturers are maintaining high standards of quality. Unfortunately, however, a few manufacturers and dealers who are more concerned with profit than with public safety are placing on the market inferior and unsafe seat belts.

The States have traditionally exercised regulatory authority over motor vehicle safety features; however, as the President pointed out in his March 15, 1962, message on consumer protection and interest program, consumers have a right to be protected against the marketing of goods which are hazardous to health or life. The President made clear that the Federal Government has a responsibility to consumers in the exercise of this right.

In the 87th Congress, 2d session, the committee reported favorably H.R. 2446, a bill to provide that hydraulic brake fluid manufactured for use in motor vehicles sold or shipped in commerce must meet standards to be set by the Secretary of Commerce. This legislation became Public Law 87-637.

Safety standards for seat belts like safety standards for hydraulic brake fluid are a matter of Federal concern, and the committee believes would not depart from the traditional State exercise of regulatory authority over automobile safety. The seat belt is a unique item of personal safety equipment, originally derived from aircraft practice, rather than a safety feature which is exclusively automotive. Inasmuch as the bill deals only with the quality of belts and related hardware, rather than with such traditional State matters as installation and use, the committee anticipates that it would furnish a new area for effective Federal-State cooperation.

Federal safety standards have been established with respect to aircraft equipment by the Federal Aviation Agency, and with respect to certain technical truck requirements by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The Secretary of Commerce should have no difficulty in complying with the provisions of this legislation inasmuch as seat belt standards have been established by the Society of Automotive Engineers and by the General Services Administration.

The committee considers that the enactment of H.R. 134 would be in the public interest. The purpose of this legislation is to save lives, and to improve highway safety.

COSTILLA CREEK COMPACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 646.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5949) to consent to the amendment by the States of Colorado and New Mexico of the Costilla Creek Compact.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 5949), which was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 666), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

H.R. 5949 would give the consent of the Congress to certain amendments agreed upon by the States of Colorado and New Mexico to the Costilla Creek compact. The amendments make minor changes in the allocations for diversion of the natural flow of Costilla Creek for beneficial use in the two States and in the schedule of deliveries of direct flow water to Colorado by New Mexico. The States of Colorado and New Mexico have already ratified the amended compact.

COST

The enactment of H.R. 5949 would not involve any cost to the Federal Government.

EXPLANATION AND NEED

Costilla Creek is a tributary of the Rio Grande. It rises on the west slope of the Sangre de Cristo Range in the extreme southeastern corner of Costilla County, Colo. The creek flows in a generally westerly direction, crossing the boundary between the two States three times before it joins the Rio Grande in New Mexico.

A compact providing for the equitable division and apportionment of the use of the waters of Costilla Creek was concluded in 1944, and Congress granted its consent to this compact by the act of June 11, 1946. The compact is administered by the Costilla Creek Compact Commission which is comprised of officials from each State. The U.S. Geological Survey collaborates with the commission in the correlation of water data necessary for the proper administration of the compact.

Among other things, the compact provides for the integrated operation of existing and prospective irrigation facilities on the stream in both States. It also sets out the jurisdiction of each State over irrigation works and facilities diverting and storing water in one State for use in both States.

The Jarosa Mutual Ditch Co. of Colorado is served by the Cerro Canal which diverts water from the Costilla Creek in New Mexico and extends northwesterly to the State boundary. This company recently purchased 5.88 cubic feet per second of the water allocated to Colorado for delivery to the Acequia Madre ditch, one of the main irrigation canals crossing the boundary. The ditch company wishes to change the point of diversion and the point of delivery of this 5.88 cubic feet of water from the Acequia Madre ditch to the Cerro Canal. It was determined that, in order to effect the proposed change in point of diversion and changes in delivery, the Costilla Creek compact should be amended. Amendments have been made to the preamble, articles III 1(a), IV(c), V(b), and article IX.

Section 2 of the act of June 11, 1946, expressly provides that nothing in the original compact would affect the obligation of any of the parties to the Rio Grande compact. This disclaimer remains applicable to the amended compact.

AUTHORIZATION TO SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO MARKET POWER GENERATED AT AMISTAD DAM ON THE RIO GRANDE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 647.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 4062) to amend the act authorizing the transmission and disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of electric energy generated at Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to also market power generated at Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 2, after line 14, to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 2. The Act of June 18, 1954 (68 Stat. 255), is amended by adding a new section 4 to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. The release of United States water from the Falcon and Amistad Dams for the production of hydroelectric energy shall be such as not to interfere with United States vested rights to the use of water for municipal, domestic, irrigation, and industrial purposes or with storage of water for these purposes."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 667), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

This legislation was recommended by the Department of the Interior and introduced by Mr. Rogers of Texas. The purpose of the legislation is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to market electric power and energy from Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande. It further provides authority to construct necessary transmission lines to integrate the power facilities at the Falcon Dam and Amistad Dam projects if the interconnection of these two projects is determined to be financially feasible. All the provisions of the 1954 act relating to the Falcon project are made applicable by H.R. 4062 to the power operations of the Amistad project.

NEED

Construction of Amistad Dam and powerplant was authorized by the act of July 7, 1960 (74 Stat. 360). This authorization, however, made no provision for marketing the energy or for interconnecting the Amistad plant with the Falcon plant which is already in operation. Enactment of H.R. 4062 will overcome these omissions. It is necessary to a finding of feasibility with respect to electric power development at the Amistad Dam and is urgently needed so that the Secretary of the Interior will have authority to market the electric power and energy from Amistad Dam as soon as it becomes available.

COST

It is estimated that approximately $10,000 a year will be required for marketing expenses. The appropriation of funds for the powerplant has been previously authorized. The entire cost of the power facilities, including the costs for operation and maintenance and any other costs required in connection with marketing the energy, will be repaid with interest under the provisions of the act of July 7, 1960, which authorized the construction of the Amistad powerplant on a self-liquidating basis.

BACKGROUND

The Falcon Dam and the Amistad Dam are both constructed under agreements between the United States and Mexico. The Falcon Dam was authorized by the act of October 5, 1949 (63 Stat. 701) and the Secretary of the Interior was designated to market the U.S. portion of the power and energy made available from the Falcon Dam project by the act of June 18, 1954 (68 Stat. 255). The construction of the Amistad project, including a powerplant if found feasible, was authorized by the 1960 act cited above. Construction of the project is by the International Boundary and Water Commission. Funds have been requested for inclusion in the fiscal year 1964 appropriation bill for initiating construction of the U.S. powerplant. The powerplant would have an initial generating capacity of 32,000 kilowatts and is estimated to cost $10.8 million. The annual cost for amortizing the power facilities and for operation and maintenance is estimated to be $567,000. Two electric cooperatives in the area have passed resolutions indicating their willingness to purchase the energy at rates which would repay the costs.

THE COMMITTEE'S CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

The committee concluded that this legislation is necessary in order to provide for marketing the electric energy from the Amistad project. There can be no feasible or self-liquidating power development at the Amistad Dam without this legislation. On the other hand, if marketing authority is provided, testimony given the committee indicates that the development is feasible. During the committee's consideration of this legislation, the representative of the Department stated that the committee would be advised of any determination to construct transmission lines connecting the Falcon project and the Amistad project. The committee reaffirms its desire to have this notification and the study upon which such a decision is made. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs recommends that H.R. 4062, as amended, be enacted.

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS TO THE CONGRESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier today I released a statement concerning the remarkable address by President Lyndon B. Johnson to the joint meeting of the Congress.

This statement conveys my respect and esteem, not only for the message, but also for our new President. As I said, it was a message that exemplifies the qualities and character of the President of the United States.

This message carries on the spirit and the philosophy of President Kennedy, and expresses a new determination to breathe life into the effort to put that philosophy into practice.

Those of us who knew President Johnson as majority leader of the Senate know that he insists on performance and action. His message today demands just those qualities.

President Johnson has asked Congress to build a memorial to President Kennedy through a program of legislative action. President Johnson pledges his administration to the Kennedy objectives and to a continuation of the policies and programs initiated by our late and beloved President.

This is a message calling for action, a message which condones no delay. It is a message which places emphasis on the two great issues facing the Nation—equal opportunity and a guarantee of civil rights for all Americans, and a tax program designed to give our economy greater power, greater prosperity, and more job opportunities.

Those in other lands should be reassured that there will be no faltering in our policies, no hesitancy in our will to fulfill our commitments, and no retreating from the responsibilities of leadership.

I happen to believe that this message was a sort of clarion call to the Congress and the people of this Nation to fulfill the tasks that lie yet uncompleted, to do the job we were elected to do, and to see to it that this Nation grows not only in its economic strength, but also in its unity, its sense of purpose, and its moral strength.

I again want to join my colleagues who have spoken publicly and privately in commending President Johnson for his message. In doing so he has given this Congress a great lift and inspiration. I know he has given the people of the United States a sense of competence and assurance which was so desperately needed in these critical times.

HE HAD THAT SPECIAL GRACE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, those of us who want to perpetuate in our hearts the memory of John F. Kennedy can find special assistance from a rare and beautiful tribute paid to him by one of his closest and most devoted friends.

I ask unanimous consent that an article in Newsweek Magazine, "He Had That Special Grace," by Benjamin Bradlee, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HE HAD THAT SPECIAL GRACE

History will best judge John F. Kennedy in calmer days when time has made the tragic and the grotesque at least bearable. And surely history will judge him well—for his wisdom and his compassion and his grace.

John Kennedy was a wonderfully funny man, always gay and cheerful, never mean—but historians are prone to stifle laughter in formality. You could see a laugh coming in his eyes before you could hear it from his lips. His humor was often most appealing when he directed it against himself. One summer night in a Georgetown garden, candidate Kennedy was preparing for the first of many critically important appearances on "Meet the Press."

"You be Kennedy and I'll be Spivak," he suggested to his guest with relish, and the first question was already spilling forth: "All right, Horatio Alger, just what makes you think you ought to be President?"

Only days ago, his thoughts turned to the farewell party for a White House aid who had been memorialized in print as "coruscatingly" brilliant. "Those guys should never forget," he said with a smile, "50,000 votes the other way and we'd all be coruscatingly stupid."

John Kennedy was a forgiving man, far more forgiving than his friends. He forgave many the excesses of their ignorance—many men who hold high positions today because of this forgiving. He forgave quickly and for good, and soon found new quality in the forgiven.

AN APPETITE FOR LIFE

John Kennedy was a hungry man, ravenous sometimes for the nourishment he found in the life he led and the people he loved. This was both literally and figuratively true. He could eat 10 bowls of specially prepared fish chowder without succumbing either to indigestion or embarrassment, and though he smoked only rarely, he could chain-smoke three cigars when the spirit moved him. His ability to devour the written word was legendary, and he could unwrap presents faster than a 5-year-old.

John Kennedy was a graceful man, physically graceful in his movements—walking, swimming, or swinging a golf club—and had that special grace of the intellect that is taste. He never told a dirty joke. He could not bring himself to be "corny" at a time when "corniness" is a hallmark of American politics. On his next to last trip, to the American wilderness, this complete and urbane man was uncomfortable in the clothes of a conservationist; and he laughed loudest of all at the "Paul Bunyan" or "Johnny Appleseed" nicknames he quickly collected. During the 1960 campaign he used the phrase "Jackie and I" only once, and that was enough to embarrass him. He was a student of graceful expression, and had been since he started collecting rhetoric in a small, black leather book before the war.

A PALMER IN POWER

John Kennedy had a Walter Mitty streak in him, as wide as his smile. On the golf course, when he was winning, he reminded himself most of Arnold Palmer in raw power, or Julius Boros in finesse. When he was losing, he was "the old warrior" at the end of a brilliant career, asking only that his faithful caddy point him in the right direction, and let instinct take over.

John Kennedy was a restless, exuberant man, always looking forward to the next challenge. For a year now, it had been "Wait till '64" more and more often. And for a long time he had wondered—at first in fun but increasingly in seriousness—what he would do after his second term. He wondered if he might become the editor of a newspaper. He had no real doubt that he would be reelected—hopefully with the mandate that he missed so much after the 1960 election, the kind of mandate that would let him do what he thought the country needed done.

He wanted to run against GOLDWATER (though he liked GOLDWATER personally more than he liked Rockefeller), and settle forever the dangers he saw in standing still. John Kennedy was a blunt man, sometimes profane, when it came to assessing rivals. But in his judgment, no man was all bad who had run for political office, and by the same token, every man would be better if he ran for political office. He bore no man lasting grudge or envy, and his readiness to love was instinctive.

For John Kennedy was a loving man, lately come to lasting love. And historians are too far removed from love.

A LAUGH WITH LOVE

John Kennedy reveled in love for the Irish patrimony that he had left so far behind. He laughed with love at the roguery of his grandfather, Honey Fitz, and his trip to Ireland was a pilgrimage to that love.

He loved his brothers and sisters with a tribal love. All Kennedys were born gregarious, but under siege it could be the Kennedys against the world.

John Kennedy loved his children with a light that lit up his world. He discovered his daughter when election brought them finally under the same roof, and he delighted in her pride and in her performance. His heart leapt up when he saw his son, careening through life as if there were no tomorrow, and he lit up the hearts of all who saw them enjoy each other.

And John Kennedy loved his wife, who served him so well. Their life together began as it ended—in a hospital—and through sickness and loneliness there grew the special love that lights up the soul of the lover and the loved alike.

John Kennedy is dead, and for that we are lesser people in a lesser land.

ADJOURNMENT TO 9 A.M. ON FRIDAY NEXT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 9 o'clock a.m. on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and at 4 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m., under the previous order, the Senate adjourned until Friday, November 29, 1963, at 9 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate November 27, 1963:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Paul H. Nitze, of Maryland, to be Secretary of the Navy.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Independence of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on November 28, the Islamic Republic of Mauritania will celebrate the third anniversary of her independence, and on this occasion we wish to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of the Republic, Moktar Ould Daddah; and His Excellency, the Mauritanian Chargé d'Affaire to the United States, Mohamed Nassim Kochman.

On November 28, 1960, the last of France's African colonies attained her independence. Mauritania, which stretches over the sands of the Sahara on the northwest coast of Africa, is somewhat larger than our State of Texas but has a total population which has been estimated at roughly 650,000. Observers questioned whether this small and scattered population could carve a viable 20th-century nation state out of Mauritania's desert sands.

Mauritania has achieved remarkable progress in the 3 years which have now passed since independence. Its success has been due in measure to the dynamism of its youthful President and Premier, Moktar Ould Daddah. Even before independence Premier Ould Daddah was off to Paris and Washington in search of funds to develop Mauritania's one important resource, iron ore, the key to the country's development. He returned with a $66 million World Bank loan and a promise from MIFERMA, a French-controlled mining company including British, Italian, and German interests to mine the ore, transport it to the sea, and market it abroad, splitting profits 50–50 with the Mauritanian Government. The agreement included the development of port facilities. Thus Premier Ould Daddah set out to forge a modern nation from ancient Mauritania.

The territory of Mauritania received its name from the Romans, who subjugated two kingdoms inhabited by the Mauri people, or Moors. For centuries before the Europeans arrived in Mauritania its desert sands were the scenes of much of West Africa's bloodiest history as empires rose and fell. Its population is a combination of Moorish and

Negro. The large majority, in fact, are Moors, nomads of the north who move their flocks of sheep and goats from waterhole to waterhole. About one-fifth of the population is Negro, a sedentary population settled in the south of the country.

Because of this racial mixture and of its geographical location Mauritania's largest hope is to become a bridge between black and white, the connecting link uniting Africa into one continent. If Mauritania can accomplish this it will have achieved an indelible landmark on the pages of African history.

Of more immediate, if less global concern, is the internal development of Mauritania. Mauritania has become a land of striking contrasts as it has begun to move, swiftly, into the mid-20th century. Although much of the country's population still moves from place to place, taking their tents with them as they go, three new cities have sprung up from nothing in little over 3 years' time. In Nouakchott, the capital, neat modern buildings have risen where a small desert village of mud huts stood 4 years ago; all houses in the capital of 10,000 inhabitants have running water and electricity. Telephone lines link some 15 oases and towns. A 400-mile railroad is under construction along the frontier of Spanish-held Rio de Oro. Planes land at 21 airstrips. Most important, exploitation of the country's iron ore deposits holds promise of an increasingly optimistic future.

We congratulate you, President Ould Daddah, and the people of Mauritania for the progress you have achieved during 3 short years of independence in transforming your country into a modern nation state.

The Attack on Halleck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, about 2 weeks ago, a leading legislator from a Southern State made some very unfair and unconstructive comments about our minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and the chairman of our national committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER].

In view of the serious problems facing the people of our country in the civil rights field, it is indeed most unfortunate that this type of personal vendetta is carried on against Congressmen HALLECK and MILLER who have heavy responsibilities for constructive civil rights programs.

Mr. HALLECK deserves, and has justly received, praise and recognition for the statesmanlike and realistic attitude which he has taken to move toward a unified Republican position on the civil rights front.

BILL MILLER's voting record also indicates a strong civil rights position. Certainly as chairman of the Republican National Committee, the gentleman from New York certainly shoulders a great responsibility in seeing that the Republican Party is constantly moving forward.

To Congressman HALLECK and Chairman MILLER go a well-deserved pat on the back for their constructive role in obtaining a settlement in the first step of the long path ahead for the civil rights bill. I certainly hope that we Republicans can progress in this area of civil rights without our leaders being subjected to petty criticism.

Assassination of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Wall Street Journal of November 26, puts into frank perspective the question of where, if anywhere, the guilt should be established—or blame laid—for the tragic assassination of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the 35th man to hold the highest office in the land as President of the United States of America.

I commend this editorial to the attention of Members of the House of Representatives, and the public, and under unanimous consent, I include the editorial with my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

At this same time, I would also like to include a copy of my public statement, made shortly after this tragic event took place:

NO TIME FOR COLLECTIVE GUILT

In the shock of these past few days it is understandable that Americans should find their grief mingled with some shame that these events should happen in their country. We all stand a little less tall than we did last Friday morning.

Yet, for our own part, we find past understanding the remarks of some otherwise thoughtful men who, in their moment of shock, would indict a whole nation with a collective guilt. It seems to us that they themselves have yielded to the hysteria they would charge to others, and in so doing show that their own country is past their understanding.

Anyone who has been reading the newspapers, listening to the radio or watching television has heard these men; they include public commentators, Members of our Congress, and men of God. And the substance of what they charge is that the whole of the American people—and by inclusion, the ways of the American society—are wrapped in a collective guilt for the murder of a President and the murder of a murderer.

A Senator said that the responsibility lay on "the people of Dallas" because this is where the events took place. A spokesman for one group of our people said the Nation was "reaping the whirlwind of hatred." One of our highest judges said the President's murder was stimulated by the "hatred and malevolence" that are "eating their way into the bloodstream of American life." A newspaper of great renown passed judgment that "none of us can escape a share of the fault for the spiral of violence." And these were but a few among many.

Such statements can only come from men who have not been abroad in the land, neither paused to reflect how the events came about nor observed in what manner the whole American people have responded to tragedy.

A President lies dead because he moved freely among the people. He did so because he was beloved by many people, respected by all, and because everywhere people turned out in great numbers to pay him honor. In a society of tyranny the heads of state move in constant fear of murder, cordoned behind an army of policemen. It is the fundamental orderliness of the American society that leads Presidents to move exposed to all the people, making possible the act of a madman.

In the tragedy there is blame, surely, for negligence. In retrospect, perhaps, it was negligent of a President himself not to be aware that there are ever madmen in the world; yet it is a negligence born of courage and confidence. It was negligence of the police authorities, perhaps, not to search and cover every corner, every window, which might shield a madman; yet it was a negligence born of years of proven trust in the crowds of Americans through which Presidents have safely moved.

It was most certainly a terrible negligence on the part of the local police authorities which permitted one man to take vengeance into his own hands. It was an outrageous breach of responsibility for them to have moved a man accused of so heinous a crime in so careless a fashion. It was outrageous precisely because all the American people were themselves so outraged by the crime of assassination that anyone who knew these people ought to have known that one among them might be deranged enough to do exactly what was done.

Yet the opportunity for negligence came because here the accused was being treated as any other accused, his detention in the hands of local police, the procedures those followed for the ordinary of murders. In another land he would have been efficiently buried by a secret police in a Lubyianka prison, never again to be seen or heard of until his execution.

One might say, we suppose, that some of this negligence could be laid to all of us. It is, after all, the eager interest of the people in the persons of their leaders that brings them into open caravans, and it is the desire of the people to follow the normal ways even in murders of State that left the accused to bungling local police.

In sum, there is in all of this—let there be no mistake—much to grieve, to regret, to blame. We can't escape remorse that there are madmen in our midst, that a President is dead, that we have been denied the right to show in open court the virtue of a free society. Now we pay the price of all sorts of negligence.

But this is something different from the charge in the indictment. It is more than nonsense to say that the good people of Dallas, crowding the streets to honor a President, share a murderous guilt; or that the tragic acts of madmen cast a shadow on the whole of America. Such an indictment is vicious.

Of reasons for shame we have enough this day without adding to them a shameful injustice to a mourning people.

STATEMENT RELEASED BY CONGRESSMAN DON L. SHORT, REPUBLICAN, OF NORTH DAKOTA, IMMEDIATELY AFTER LEARNING OF THE ASSASSINATION OF JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY, THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 1963

All sane-minded Americans are shocked at the tragedy of the assassination of the President of the United States.

Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives, people of all races and creeds, deplore this tragic happening on what will be recorded as a dark day in our Nation's history.

This is the work of a demented person, as similar attempts on the lives of former Presidents and high Government officials have been in the past. Americans believe in, and have accepted since our Nation was founded, the principle of rule by law.

Forceful overthrow of government is completely un-American, and this shameful incident in our history is completely contrary to the principles by which this Nation, under God, was founded—to give men a new and permanent opportunity for freedom.

Our President has truly laid down his life in the service of his country.

The President and a Former President Write

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, on November 19, 1963, President Kennedy and former President Eisenhower wrote letters to Mr. Paul Roy, editor of the Gettysburg Times (Gettysburg, Pa.)

Three days later the pen of the President was forever silenced by a bullet, triggered by the finger of a conscienceless madman.

Little did the President realize he was writing prophetic words when he wrote of "the uncertainties of the future." Nor did he realize when he admonished "All rededicate ourselves to the perpetuation of those ideals of which Lincoln spoke so luminously," that this was to be one of his last messages to the American people.

It appears fitting that this letter and that of Mr. Eisenhower, be made a part of the permanent RECORD, at this time.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C.

PAUL L. ROY,
The Gettysburg Times,
Gettysburg, Pa.:

From the past man obtains the insights, wisdom, and hope to face with confidence the uncertainties of the future. Abraham Lincoln was keenly aware of this when, a century ago, he journeyed to Gettysburg to make a few appropriate remarks.

Today, as we honor Lincoln's immortal eulogy to the dead on Cemetery Ridge, let us remember as well those thousands of American patriots whose graves at home, beneath the sea and in distant lands are silent sentries of our heritage.

Lincoln and others did indeed give us a new birth of freedom, but the goals of liberty and freedom, the obligations of keeping ours a government of and by the people are never-ending.

On this solemn occasion let us all rededicate ourselves to the perpetuation of those ideals of which Lincoln spoke so luminously.

As Americans, we can do no less.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

GETTYSBURG, PA.,
November 19, 1963.

Mr. PAUL L. ROY,
Editor, the Gettysburg Times,
Gettysburg, Pa.

DEAR MR. ROY: On the 100th anniversary of his immortal Gettysburg Address, the Nation pays tribute to one of history's towering figures, Abraham Lincoln. Of all our great national leaders, Lincoln was most typically American. His achievements from the humblest beginnings to the final crowning years of his life stand as a lasting inspiration to every citizen to respect and defend the fundamental principles on which our governmental system of personal liberty and individual opportunity was founded.

The Nation calls on us now for the same faith and devotion so deeply felt by Lincoln as he stood here amid the havoc of Gettysburg to memorialize our way of life as a government "of the people, by the people and for the people." More than ever we need the example of Abraham Lincoln to guide, influence and uphold us.

The wise, compassionate, challenging words of his Gettysburg Address should be etched on the minds and hearts of every American. They will ever be one of the brightest jewels in the Nation's rich heritage.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Remarks of Lt. Col. Paul A. Fino at Memorial Services for Lt. Col. Clifford W. Johnson, Lt. Col. Jacque Segal, and Capt. William Gibson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, on November 16 the Civil Air Patrol, an auxiliary of the U.S. Air Force, was saddened by the loss of three of its officers who were killed in a Civil Air Patrol plane which crashed in North Lindenhurst, Long Island, shortly after takeoff.

The three CAP officers attached to the New York wing were Lt. Col. Clifford W. Johnson, Lt. Col. Jacque Segal, and Capt. William Gibson.

On Sunday, November 24, memorial services were held in New York City. My distinguished colleague, Congressman PAUL A. FINO, who is a legal officer and holds the rank of lieutenant colonel was the main speaker at these services. I am privileged to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Congressman FINO's sympathetic and understanding remarks on this sorrowful occasion:

(By Lt. Col. PAUL A. FINO, Member of Congress)

In this solemn moment, we gather to pay honor and tribute to three members of our organization who died because of love of country, dedication to a cause, and enthusiasm for aviation.

No question or controversy can disturb the tranquillity of this occasion.

It is indeed fitting and proper that we pause in the quiet and serenity of our garden of memories and reflect upon the lives of our departed brothers.

We are conscious that we are pausing under the shadow of a great loss. Although the certainty of death and the uncertainty of life are ever with us, these memorial services bring upon us a new sorrow and humbles us in our struggle toward the fulfillment of our ambitions.

These men who died in line of duty, have built temples of honor and virtue and unselfish devotion to the everlasting good of the Civil Air Patrol.

To the members of the bereaved families, we extend our deepest and profound sympathy. We ask them to seek consolation in the fact that their loved ones' lives were filled with service to mankind.

The friendship and brotherhood found in the Civil Air Patrol have few parallels in life. Each member of the CPA, young and old, men and women, from all walks of life, all creeds and all religious denominations, is a dedicated public servant. We are grateful, indeed, for the lives we honor on this occasion.

Our departed brothers had a part in the concrete expressions of the ideals of our organization. Our memorial to them must include the continued projection into the future of our accomplishments.

What better course can we of the Civil Air Patrol take than to dedicate our lives to perpetuating the strength of these memorial services? We must accept this challenge and weave the highest good of the past into the fabric of the future.

Dedication of New Office Building, National Capital Region, National Park Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, about 900 people attended a special program dedicating the new three-story office building of the National Capital region, National Park Service, on the grounds at Ohio and Buckeye Drives, SW.—Hains Point—on Thursday, November 14, 1963.

The program, which was presided over by T. Sutton Jett, Regional Director, National Capital Region, began at 2 o'clock with a concert by the U.S. Navy band. Following the invocation by Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, and presentation of colors, Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service, introduced a number of guests including Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall; Assistant Director of the National Park Service, Clarke Stratton; District of Columbia Commissioners Walter N. Tobriner and John B. Duncan; Senator Harry F. Byrd of Virginia; Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission, Mrs. James H. Rowe; executive director of the Washington Convention and Visitors Bureau, Clarence Arata; Superintendent Milo Christiansen, and Assistant Superintendent Joseph Cole, of the District of Columbia Recreation Board; Architect William Haussman, formerly of the National Capital Region Design and Construction Office, who designed the building; and Victor R. Beauchamp, contractor for the building.

A short address was given by Secretary Udall, and a new composition, "National Capital Region March," by Lt. Anthony A. Mitchell, director of the U.S. Navy Band, was dedicated to the park system and played to an audience for the first time by the band.

The dedication ceremony ended with the retirement of colors, after which an open house was held.

An interesting fact about this new building is that for the first time in a history covering a 175-year period of continuing operation, this organization now has its own headquarters building.

By authority of the Resident Act of July 16, 1790, President George Washington appointed three Federal Commissioners to lay out a district, 10 miles square, for the seat of the Federal Government. Later, Pierre Charles L'Enfant was chosen to plan the new Capital. In his plan, the character of the Capital was formed by its parks. The parks were developed to provide settings for the Government buildings. In the beginning, these three Commissioners were, with broad powers, in control of all public buildings and grounds in the Federal City, but as time passed and the Government grew, certain functions of the original Federal Commissioners were given to other Federal agencies.

In 1849, the parks of Washington were assigned to the Department of Interior for administration. From 1867 to 1925, the Chief Engineer of the U.S. Army was responsible for the National Capital Parks, and in 1933, control of the parks was returned to Interior, as they became an important unit of the farflung national park system.

National park areas of the Capital at first included such areas as the Mall, the Washington Monument grounds, Franklin, and Garfield Parks, and the "President's Park." Eventually, however, 301 park reservations were established on lands acquired from the original landowners in 1791. A most significant addition to the Washington park system was the establishment of Rock Creek Park in 1890, one of the largest and most beautiful natural metropolitan parks in the world. Number of units in the National Capital Region at the present time is 771, covering an area of 39,500 acres. Visitation in 1962, in the parks of the Nation's Capital was over 15 million. This does not include the national memorials which received another 7 million. The following figures are for the year 1962: Lincoln Memorial, 2,672,294; Washington Monument, 1,758,287; Jefferson Memorial, 1,251,251; Custis-Lee Mansion, 446,473; Lincoln Museum, 261,513; House Where Lincoln Died, 163,886.

The new three-story office building for the National Capital region staff has 26,000 square feet of floor space, and was built at a cost of approximately $1 million. The steel frame, fireproof building is of modern contemporary design, faced with Indiana limestone and brick. There are Vermont marble window spandrels.

A U.S. Park Police headquarters building now under construction on the grounds is scheduled to be completed in March of 1964. This building, two stories in height will have 11,000 square feet of floor space, and will serve as the headquarters for the 250-man force.

Landscape features of the 11-acre area, when completed, will include a number of linden trees, flowering shrubs, and a parking area.

For the first time in many years, the principal administrative offices of the park department will be housed in one building, and it is anticipated that this move will increase efficiency of operations of the park department, which traces its legal origin to the Residence Act of July 16, 1790.

A Nuclear Submarine in Honor of John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the late President Kennedy's love for the U.S. Navy is well known. So is his bravery and the record of his gallant service in the Navy during World War II.

Several very worthy proposals have been made in the Halls of Congress and elsewhere to pay tribute to his memory and to immortalize the man and his deeds. In the 3 years that it was destined for him to lead our Nation, he was instrumental in building up our fleet of nuclear-powered submarines for the security of our country and of the free world.

I am, therefore, proposing that we name one of these nuclear-powered submarines, now under construction at Electric Boat, Groton, Conn., in honor of the late great President. I feel that this would be a very worthy tribute to him. Consequently, I am this day writing a letter to Acting Secretary of the Navy Paul B. Fay, Jr., suggesting that the U.S. Navy name one of its submarines the U.S.S. *John Fitzgerald Kennedy*.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of my letter to the Secretary of the Navy. I am also inserting several editorials from newspapers in my district in Connecticut commenting on the tragic and untimely death of our beloved President and its meaning for the Nation. These editorials are from the Norwich Bulletin, the Middletown Press, the New London Day, and the Rockville Leader. They are as follows:

Hon. PAUL B. FAY, Jr.,
Acting Secretary of the Navy,
Department of the Navy,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: All of us are deeply grieved and stunned by the sudden death of our beloved President and many of us in Congress are thinking of ways to perpetuate his name and to honor his memory.

In view of the late President John F. Kennedy's great love for the U.S. Navy and his gallant service in the Navy during World War II, I propose to you that the next nuclear-powered submarine to be completed at Electric Boat, Groton, Conn., be named the U.S.S. *John Fitzgerald Kennedy*. I believe this would be a most fitting and appropriate manner of paying tribute to the memory of our late President and at the same time it would also be a signal honor for the U.S. Navy to have one of its ships bear this illustrious name.

In recent months, I proposed that nuclear-powered submarines be named in honor of the Revolutionary War patriot, Haym Salomon, and the early American inventor, David Bushnell, I believe, however, that the present suggestion should take precedence over my earlier proposals for very obvious reasons.

I further suggest that when this submarine is completed and ready for launching, the courageous widow of our late President, Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, who bore up so graciously under the strain of this great tragedy, be invited to christen the new ship.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE,
Member of Congress.

[From the Norwich Bulletin, Nov. 26, 1963.]

IN HIS HONOR

Amid solemnity that was hushed, yet vibrant, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States, yesterday was laid to rest in a martyr's grave in historic Arlington Cemetery. The words that John F. Kennedy spoke in his inaugural address some 34 months ago, "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country" will be engraved on the pages of history. They were prophetic words—and John F. Kennedy fulfilled them to the last degree. He gave his all to his country.

Even though John Fitzgerald Kennedy is dead, struck down most foully by an assassin's hand, the cause he championed as acknowledged leader of the free world lives on. We who survive him can best honor his memory by doing all in our power to advance that cause which he held so precious, which is the very cause for which this Nation was founded—the liberty and dignity of all mankind.

As we thumb through the pages of history for guidance in a troubled time perhaps the best guidance for the difficult time ahead may be taken from the immortal words spoken by Abraham Lincoln on that solemn occasion at Gettysburg almost exactly 100 years ago. For President Kennedy died in defense of freedom as truly as did those who fell on that historic field of battle. In these days of profound national sorrow it is appropriate to recall and reflect on Mr. Lincoln's exhortation to his fellow Americans "that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain."

To resolve thus and to act thus—that is the task to which we must now turn our minds and our efforts. This is so even though grief and a deep sense of loss will far outlast the period of stunned and outraged shock of the past few days at the murderous acts that have occurred in Dallas. We cannot sink ourselves in a sea of heedless sorrow. The forces that work against the realization of man's highest dreams of liberty and dignity remain strong and malignant. Those are the forces which must now be countered with a new dedication of devotion so that John F. Kennedy's martyrdom in the fullness of life shall indeed not have been in vain.

All that was mortal of John F. Kennedy lies in Arlington Cemetery overlooking the banks of the Potomac for which he had such love, but his spirit of devotion to his country will remain forever with us as an inspiration to carry on the cause which he held so dear. The heaviest burden now falls upon Lyndon Baines Johnson, who became President of the United States at the moment John F. Kennedy's thread of life was cut by an assassin's bullet.

But all citizens of these American States in some measure must share the burden that now rests on the shoulders of President Johnson. In his first public utterance as Chief Executive, President Johnson said this to the people of America and the world: "I will do my best. That is all I can do. I ask your help—and God's." His words were a commitment, and a challenge, worthy of the best that is in all of us.

The Nation must go on. The threads of the fabric that was so rudely torn apart that day in Dallas must be gathered and rewoven into an even stronger fabric of freedom and dignity. We must wear it with renewed consciousness that the entire world is watching us. We must so wear this garment of liberty and dignity so that in years to come the entire world will be wrapped in its folds. That is the lest we can do to honor this man who gave so much that freedom should never perish from the face of the earth. That is our task and the task of future generations. We must not fail.

[From the Middletown Press, Nov. 25, 1963]

The Pride and the Shame

Unto the land he so dearly loved, President Kennedy was committed today. The last drum roll has dirged, the last caisson has rolled, the last 21-gun salute has echoed across Pennsylvania Avenue and the green hills of Arlington. The last chords of "Hail to the Chief" have drifted away, and now the land has hushed.

There were kings and queens, and princes, and prime ministers and presidents today in Washington, the largest assemblage of foreign dignitaries ever at once on our shores. And there were thousands of common people too, coming from near and far of this uncommon land where young men, many young men, have grown up to be President.

The pageantry and dignity of it all brought us closer to the national fabric and made us proud.

Steadfastly, Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy has proved an example to us all. As her husband was a courageous man—which Ernest Hemingway once described as grace under pressure, so she has again proved to be a gallant lady. With her tiny children, she has borne with bravery the awful hours that began for her near noon on Friday. The ring she placed in her husband's dead hand, the kiss she bestowed upon our flag so proudly draped, are moments none of us will soon forget.

Would it be that this was the whole story. But yesterday in Dallas the terrible hours continued. In the police station of the city that formerly saw Vice President Johnson spat upon, Adlai Stevenson attacked by pickets, and our President murdered, the prisoner charged with assassinating the President was murdered in the full view of the Nation.

And Dallas is worried about its image.

Whatever may be said about the wisdom of President Kennedy having gone to Dallas, or the security precautions taken there, what can be said about murder in the police station? What can be said about a nation that harbors so many people so conscious of its image, so oblivious to its laws, so willing to disregard its legal and moral precepts? Somewhere we are all failing, and not just in Dallas.

If the majesty of a young President who gave his life for his country cannot be obscured by such horrible events, the least we as citizens can do is to rededicate ourselves to all that is uniquely great about our country—that man does not take the law into his own hands, that man does follow the law of the land whether he likes it or not, that man should care for his substance and not his image. It is in the support of these ideals that we must persist.

[From the New London Day, Nov. 25, 1963]

No One's Above the Law

"Why is everybody going around shooting each other?" the 8-year-old boy asked. Knowing only of the small world around him in which he is occupied chiefly with school and play, he is innocent of complex adult emotions. Perhaps because of this, his reaction is uniquely objective. After the starkness of the weekend's reality has softened and the Nation is able to consider more fully what has happened, many of the boy's elders must try to find the answer to his question.

The shocking developments in Dallas culminated yesterday in the slaying of the President's alleged assassin, even while he was under heavy police guard. This deed was done by a man who walked unquestioned into the Dallas city jail and to within a foot of his quarry, still undergoing questioning as the prime suspect in the slaying of Mr. Kennedy.

As a result, we might well ask whatever became of the principles of law and order in America, or, with the little boy, "Why is everybody going around shooting each other."

The breakdown seems to have begun long before the assassination. It had been evident not only in Dallas but in hamlets and metropolises in many parts of the United States. It is apparent in contempt for the minor laws as well as in the studied disregard for basic concepts of human dignity and rights embodied in the Constitution.

Lee Harvey Oswald didn't act for humanity in his heinous crime on Friday. Jack Rubinstein, the Dallas nightclub operator who slew Oswald, didn't act for Americans. Both took the law into their own hands.

As a result of Rubinstein's shot there may always be doubt as to the origins, and the possibility of others being involved, in the tragedy of Friday. It did not avenge Mr. Kennedy or the American people. There can be no sympathy for those who place themselves above the law.

The terror of the past weekend can be answered only in one way: The American people must renew their belief in law and order, in small matters and large. Freedom is based on principle and has its limits. The sober aftermath of the events in Dallas is the time to give deep thought about whether the Nation can afford to encourage or even tolerate those who would live above its laws.

[From the Leader, Rockville, Conn., Nov. 25, 1963]

A Day of Mourning

Today is a day of mourning, not only for the Kennedy family, but for all the people of the United States and indeed the whole world.

Word Friday that President Kennedy had been assassinated spread quickly and stunned everyone. Certainly nothing has happened in the United States since Pearl Harbor that has come with such a shock.

To be sure, leaders have been assassinated in other countries of the world, and indeed three previous Presidents of the United States have died at the hands of assassins. However, most Americans have felt that we had reached a degree of civilization where such things could not happen.

President Kennedy was the youngest man ever to be elected to the Presidency. During his less than 3 years in office, he was called upon to face problems of a magnitude that few peacetime Presidents have had to face. He did this with initiative and courage.

Certainly at 46 his potential for many years of productive, useful service was great, and he most certainly would have found ways to continue his public service after his years in the Presidency were over.

In his inaugural address, President Kennedy said: "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country." His own life was a personification of these words for his contributions in war and peace were many, including the greatest contribution of all—his own life.

The whole world is sorrowing with Mrs. Kennedy, the two Kennedy children whose relationship with their father was an ideal one, other members of his family, and his close associates.

SENATE

Friday, November 29, 1963

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. **Lee Metcalf**, a Senator from the State of Montana.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. Senate,
President pro tempore,
Washington, D.C., November 29, 1963.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. Lee Metcalf, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

Carl Hayden,
President pro tempore.

Mr. METCALF thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

AUTHORITY TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DURING RECESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, during the recess the Secretary of the Senate is authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives, and the Presiding Officer is authorized to sign bills and joint resolutions passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

RECESS UNTIL TUESDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1963

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate, under its order of Wednesday last, will now recess until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 1 minute a.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order of Wednesday, November 27, 1963, until Tuesday, December 3, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Philippians 4: 6: *With thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God.*

Our heavenly Father, another Thanksgiving Day has come and gone and we have tried to express our gratitude, for throughout the entire year we have been the beneficiaries of Thy bountiful providence.

With a humble spirit and a contrite heart may we continue to thank Thee not only for our many blessings and joys, which cheer us, but also for the trials and sorrows which teach us to put our trust in Thee.

So very recently we have been struck and stunned by a terribly hard blow, causing our hearts to be severely bruised and our thoughts to flow in sadness, but by turning to Thee we are finding help and healing, and comfort and courage to carry on.

Grant that all the people of our beloved country may now be eager to join our President, our Speaker, and our chosen Representatives in pledging anew our fidelity to Thee and to the great cause of peace on earth and good will among men.

We are not asking to be better than others but to be better than ourselves beseeching Thee that our own hearts may be the first to banish bigotry, hatred, and violence and to always choose and pursue the more excellent way of brotherhood and love toward all mankind.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, November 27, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 976. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire and add certain lands to the Salem Maritime National Historic Site in Massachusetts, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2906. An act to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide an exemption from the provisions of such part for the emergency transportation of any accidentally wrecked or disabled motor vehicle in interstate or foreign commerce by towing; and

H.R. 5949. An act to consent to the amendment by the States of Colorado and New Mexico of the Costilla Creek Compact.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 134. An act to provide that seat belts sold or shipped in interstate commerce for use in motor vehicles shall meet certain safety standards; and

H.R. 4062. An act to amend the act authorizing the transmission and disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of electric energy generated at Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to also market power generated at Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 167. An act to provide for the conveyance under certain conditions of the phosphate rights in certain lands in the State of Florida;

S. 1878. An act to amend the act providing for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union in order to extend the time for the filing of applications for the selection of certain lands by such State;

S. 2054. An act to eliminate the maintenance by the District of Columbia of perpetual accounts for unclaimed moneys held in trust by the Government of the District of Columbia; and

S. 2265. An act to amend the Library Services Act in order to increase the amount of assistance under such act and to extend such assistance to nonrural areas.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6868) entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative branch of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes."

The message further announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate amendment No. 32 to the above-titled bill.

The message further announced that the Senate further insists on its amendments in disagreement.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., November 27, 1963.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on November 27, 1963, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate today the following message:

That the Senate passed House Joint Resolution 809 entitled "Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes."

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK AND NEXT WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to ask the majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], to kindly advise us of the program for the balance of this week and for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the distinguished Republican whip, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], we have no further legislative business for this week.

It will be my purpose, upon the conclusion of this announcement, to ask unanimous consent to go over until Monday next.

Mr. Speaker, the program for next week is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar day. There are nine suspensions, as follows:

H.R. 9291, to provide office space, supplies, and equipment for Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6199, Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission.

H.R. 8462, Grand Prairie, Tex., airport.

H.R. 9124, Reserve Officers' Training Corps program.

H.R. 10, Extension of civil service apportionment requirement to temporary summer employment.

H.R. 7381, Dual Compensation Act.

H.R. 9004, transferring control of Pershing Hall, Paris, France, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6777, waiver of NSLI premiums upon becoming disabled prior to age 65.

H.R. 7751, land exchange, Hazard Park, Calif.

There are five printing authorizations from the Committee on House Administration as follows:

H.R. 8751, to print certain proceedings of the AMVETS as a House document.

House Concurrent Resolution 230 and House Concurrent Resolution 231, authorizing the printing of 5,000 copies each of two committee prints entitled "Tax-Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Their Impact on Our Economy," for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business.

House Concurrent Resolution 237, providing for the printing of additional copies of the Supreme Court opinions involving the offering of prayers and reading from the Bible in public schools.

House Resolution 518, to print as a House document the handbook entitled "The United States Courts."

On Tuesday and Wednesday the Private Calendar will be called; and also H.R. 6196, to revitalize the American cotton industry, which will be considered under an open rule with 4 hours of general debate.

On Thursday there will be tributes to our late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may brought up at any time and any further program may be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday next may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING THE $10 BILL SHALL BEAR THE LIKENESS OF EX-PRESIDENT KENNEDY ON ONE SIDE, AND THE WHITE HOUSE ON THE OTHER, AND THAT 50-CENT PIECES SHALL BEAR THE LIKENESS OF EX-PRESIDENT KENNEDY ON ONE SIDE AND THE WHITE HOUSE ON THE OTHER

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, in memory of and out of respect for our late great President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, I have today introduced two bills. The first provides that $10 bills shall bear the likeness of President Kennedy on one side, and the White House on the other side. The second bill provides that the 50-cent piece shall bear the likeness of President Kennedy on one side and the White House on the other side.

The reason for the selection of these particular units of currency to commemorate President Kennedy, is that the $10 bill is the only commonly used piece of paper currency not bearing the likeness of a President of the United States, and similarly, the 50-cent piece is the only commonly used piece of metal currency not bearing a likeness of a President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, we have honored great Presidents in the past in this manner and I submit that it is fitting and proper that we do so today for our recently martyred President.

THE LEGACY OF JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following editorial from the Saturday Review. Its brilliance and depth need no comment of mine.

THE LEGACY OF JOHN F. KENNEDY

An American President is something special in the world precisely because American history has been something special. A nation founded on a decent respect for the opinions of mankind is bound to attract reciprocal sentiments. And when an American President gives life to the central purpose built into the design of that Nation, the purpose being to advance the human cause on earth, it is natural that profound feelings of human oneness should be released.

The Japanese farmer and his family who walked 18 miles through the night in order to stand silently in front of the American Embassy in Tokyo; the Warsaw busdriver who, upon being informed by a boarding passenger of the terrible news, halted his vehicle and wept openly; the elderly woman in Dublin who cried because her own body could not have intercepted the bullet; the students who carried memorial torches in Berlin; and the people everywhere who could only sit quietly with their sorrow—all this is more than a world expression of sympathy. It is a reminder of what this country is all about. It makes real the connections, seen and unseen, between the United States and the human community—connections that were basic in the thinking of the men who fashioned this Nation.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy didn't superimpose himself upon American history; he fitted into it just as it fitted into him. He didn't have to wander through government archives looking for records of ideas and acts that had gone into the making of the American purpose. This knowledge was part of him and he put it to work.

Related to this knowledge was the awareness that his office was a repository of the hopes of many millions of people everywhere and not of Americans alone. He believed deeply and often said that the national interest and the human interest went together.

At his command was immediate obliterative power, more power by far than had ever been collected in one place at one time. In the American arsenal were thousands of explosives, some of which contained more force than all of the bombs and shells in all the previous wars in history put together. In toto, this destructive force represented the equivalant of 30,000 pounds of TNT for every human being on earth.

He regarded this power not as a source of true security, for, as he said, a nation's security could shrink even as its atomic might would expand. The power—not in our hands alone but in the hands of other nations—had to be brought under world control. It could not be unilaterally discarded—this would not create safety or sanity; it would have to be eliminated as part of a genuine world security system under law.

In this sense, John F. Kennedy as President was confronted with issues involving human destiny. Woodrow Wilson used to say that his constituents included the next generation. The question before John Kennedy was whether there would be a next generation at all—here or elsewhere. This for him was not a melodramatic pact; he was not the melodramatic type. But it was a fact nevertheless and it never left him. He knew that his job was connected to the whole of the human future. No greater burden had to be sustained by any man in the history of the race.

He was caught between two worlds. One was a New World trying to be born, a world in which human political evolution might arrive at a point where the world could at least be made safe for its own diversity. The other world was the old and volatile one in which nations acted and reacted according to their sovereign dictates, a world in which superior violence was often the only arbiter. Before the New World could be brought to full growth, the Old World had to be subdued or transformed. But in that old world were thrusts and churnings, themselves the culmination of a long historical development.

John Kennedy came into office at a time when most of the world's peoples were shopping for a revolution. He knew he had to identify the United States with the desire for freedom of a billion people; he had to make this identification convincing to those who were then or had been under the domination or control of the nations with whom the United States had been closely linked for almost two centuries. He did everything he could to accelerate the historical process of national freedom.

But he knew, too, that the issue went beyond independent statehood; it had to do with a conception of man himself. Did man own himself? Was government instituted to protect and cherish the concept of individual sovereignty, which is to say, a free man? Or was man a unit in a vast organism to which he was subordinate and secondary? In either case, man had to be fed, housed, educated, developed. These needs were insistent. Which ideology had most to say to him?

John Kennedy did not minimize the extent of the ideological challenge. But he knew he could not meet it with obsolete information and concepts. He knew that the Communist world was itself in a condition of upheaval. He knew how important it was for the United States to make a correct assessment of these changes, for the wrong decisions could help create a conjunction of the two Communist forces. In this event, the center of gravity would be in Peiping, with its fanatical hatred of the West in general and the United States in particular, and with a readiness to pursue policies that added greatly to the likelihood of nuclear war.

John Kennedy's policy, therefore, was to close off every possible opening through which the Soviet Union might advance its national or ideological interests to the detriment of other nations, and to keep open every channel through which sensible arrangements by the two countries might be made in their joint interest and in the human interest. One example of this policy was Cuba. Another was the nuclear test ban. Both seemed to point in starkly opposing directions, yet both were part of the same basic purpose; that is, a determination to resist encroachments and a determination to explore every opportunity to build a durable peace.

This policy was never better articulated by the President than in his June 10, 1963, American University commencement talk. It tried to cut through the insanity of mounting nuclear stockpiles and mounting antagonisms. It tried to apply a human perspective to grave international problems. It tried to speak directly to the Russian people, not lecturing or scolding but giving full weight to their ordeals and difficulties and recognizing that common hopes can dissolve even the oldest enmities. The full text of this talk was published in the Soviet press.

The June 10 talk led in a straight line to what was perhaps the President's greatest triumph in the area of foreign policy. This was the successful fight, in his words, to get the nuclear genie back into the bottle. He had to obtain Soviet adherence to a nuclear test ban treaty and then he had to obtain Senate ratification, and he did both. He regarded this treaty not just as an end in itself but as a possible wedge into far more difficult and consequential problems between the two countries.

Questions of human destiny, world political upheaval, and ideological struggle were not the only burdens carried by the young President. Inside the United States, another historic process was approaching its culmination. The American Negro was emancipated from slavery but not from humiliation. He received his liberation but not his rights. He was not so much freed as cast adrift. He was accorded no place of essential opportunity or dignity. And the same groundswell that a hundred years earlier had culminated in what another martyred President had called a fiery ordeal was beginning to make its tremors felt.

People today forget that Lincoln was condemned by many of his contemporaries because he didn't move faster, because he seemed to temporize, because he spent so much energy on persuasion. But Lincoln knew his main job was to hold the country together, appealing to reasoning people on both sides and trying to effect a profound transition without insanity or national tragedy.

The same men who have no hesitation today in acclaiming Lincoln for his leadership on the issue of human rights have no difficulty in denouncing John Kennedy for acting as Lincoln acted. John Kennedy tried to find an answer, not to force a solution. His job, no less than Lincoln's, was to keep even the bitter and basic issues from producing a national convulsion. He knew that fundamental questions of human rights could not and should not be deferred any longer. And he accepted the need to find every opening, develop every resource, command every initiative in that direction. But always in front of him, to paraphrase Madison, were the purifying but enfeebling limitations to the Presidential office in bringing about fundamental change.

John Kennedy did not find an answer to the dilemma, any more than any of his predecessors did. He could state the moral issue; he could use the full powers of the Executive office and even of the National Guard to attempt to carry out the laws; but always he had to contend with the raw fact that the ultimate power was in the hands of the people themselves. The legislative process was only one reflection of this fact. The whole mechanism, often mysterious and always intricate, by which an idea gains acceptance and becomes living history, was another.

If the people looked to the President, the President looked no less to the people. He knew that on most big issues he would be helpless without them. Not that he expected public opinion to define every great question, carry it forward, move it triumphantly through the Congress, and deliver it to him for final signature. He saw his role and the role of public opinion as a process of creative interaction. He accepted the job of stating the case and giving it the proper degree of urgency. But the public also had the job to respond—one way or the other.

James Bryce, in his study of American institutions a half century ago, called attention to the relative ease with which the democratic process could be overloaded with pressure groups—to the point where the process would have difficulty in functioning. By the time John F. Kennedy came to the White House, the Presidency had become less a powerful pivotal station for affecting history than an arena for the most complicated balancing act in modern times. One set of pressures had to be weighed constantly against another. Movement in one direction was immediately met by resistance from another. Even the smallest legislative journey was a vast exercise of multiple force, pulling or pushing.

The original design for the Presidency had called for a proper number of checkpoints on the Executive power, but it never anticipated that ultimately the checks and pressures would multiply to the point where the President would spend most of his life running a gantlet.

To sustain this kind of battering, a man must have love for his job or a superhuman disposition. John Kennedy had both. It is doubtful that any President ever paid more attention to his homework or tried harder to comprehend the full dimensions and all the implications of any decision he had to make. His press conferences were remarkable demonstrations of a man in full command of his office, prepared to answer questions covering literally hundreds of topics. Generally, he would begin by making sure he had understood the question thoroughly. He would state the arguments against his position, frequently better than they had been stated by an opponent. Then he would proceed to meet these arguments one by one, not by characterizing them but by providing relevant fact. He rarely left a sentence or an idea uncompleted. And always there was the effort to state a problem in reasonable terms in a way that might appeal to reasonable men.

The key to John Kennedy was that he was in the American rationalist tradition. Not every problem had an answer but every problem had its origins and component parts, each of which called for weighing and grading, and all of which were related to one another in a way that increased the probability of a workable answer.

The American Founding Fathers believed that a government, like man himself, was highly delicate and had to be carefully nurtured. The result was an ingenious system under which the individual had greater protection against excesses or encroachments by officialdom than existed almost anywhere else on the face of the earth.

But the design was not without its inevitable flaws. The rationalist Founding Fathers did everything they could to protect the individual against government, but they had no way of protecting government against the irrational individual.

One man with a gun could create chaos, could shatter the brain of the man whose decisions were critical to the life of that community, and could lay a burden of grief on the hearts of millions.

Confronted with this fact, some people now wonder whether the rational design ought not somehow be changed. Some may even say that the design is no longer workable. John Kennedy would be the first to remind them that not even the most totalitarian society can protect itself altogether against a man with a gun. Indeed, with his sense of history, he would be certain to point out that totalitarianism almost automatically fosters such violence, for that is often the only way to change it.

Is there then nothing we can do to halt and expunge the obscene and spreading violence? Is there no way to keep the face of the Nation from being pockmarked and blistered by men putting their tempers to triggers? Is the shape of America to be determined by a barroom brawl?

There is something we can do.

We can reexamine the indifference to violence in everyday life.

We can ask ourselves why we tolerate and encourage the glorification of violence in the things that amuse us and entertain us.

We can ponder our fascination with brutality as exhibited hour after hour on television or on the covers of a thousand books and magazines.

We can ask why our favorite gifts to children are toy murder weapons.

We can ask whether we are creating an atmosphere congenial to the spiraling of violence until finally it reaches a point where living history is mauled and even our casualness toward it is pierced.

We can resensitize ourselves to the reality of human pain and the fragility of human life.

There is something else we can do at a time of emptiness and national deprivation.

We can be bigger than we are. We can rise above the saturating trivia, redefine our purposes, and bring to bear on problems that combination of reason, sensitivity, and vision that gives a civilization its forward movement. Our ideals are all right, W. Macneil Dixon once said, but they are unreal until they become articulate.

We can give not just added protection but added dignity to public office and reduce the sense of loneliness of public servants who are regarded as easy game for the predatory attacks of extremists.

The best defense against mushrooming madness is to carry on, to strengthen the belief in a rational society and in the natural sanity and goodness of man, to take all reasonable precautions but not to allow the precautions to distort or disfigure our lives. "The fact that reason too often fails," Alfred North Whitehead said, "does not give fair ground for the hysterical conclusion that it never works."

The sense of tragedy over the assassination of the President will not soon be dispelled, but in due time we may find warrant for some consolation in the fact of orderly succession, a miracle in itself, built into the structure of Government. Even more basic is the fact that there is nothing to stop the American people from giving life to the ideas and purposes of the man whose memory they now cherish. The loss of John F. Kennedy becomes a total one only if our understanding of what he tried to do is emptied from our minds.

One of the unique characteristics of a free society is that it can assign immortality to a concept, an ideal, a set of working principles. If the impact of John Kennedy is confined to the circumstances of his death, then the tragedy is indeed a total one. But if there is accord with his purposes, then this may be a solvent for our grief.

John Kennedy believed in peace. He believed in freedom. He saw no conflict between the two. He believed in the creative potential of the individual man. He believed in the reality of hope. He relished laughter and the vigorous life of the mind. He loved life, and by life he did not mean segregated life; he meant all life. He believed in thought. He believed in reasonable exchange. He recognized obligations to people not yet born—to help provide them with a good earth and a decent world.

The ultimate tragedy of a man is represented not by death but by the things he tried to bring to life that are buried with him. The legacy of John Kennedy can be a large one—if that is the way the American people wish it to be.—NORMAN COUSINS.

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I know that all of our congressional offices have been deluged by mail from our constituents expressing their very deep feelings over the death of our late beloved President. All of these people have been bound together to share the overwhelming grief that our Nation and the world has experienced. Many of these expressions of sorrow have been shown in poetry. Under unanimous consent, I include in the Record two poems that came across my desk this morning.

Rev. Thomas F. Curran, pastor of St. Patrick's Church and chaplain of Elder Council Knights of Columbus in Chicopee Falls, Mass., composed and delivered at the Elder Council memorial service to John Fitzgerald Kennedy on Sunday November 24, 1963, the following poem:

In Memoriam

A new frontier for him is crossed,
Pray God he's gained a goal
He richly earned while we have lost
A leader with a soul
Whose intellect and noble will
Sought only love and peace
The heart of every man to fill
That wars and hate might cease.

A leader he was naught to gain
For self, who needed naught,
Happy and in an instant slain
By one with hatred fraught.
A nation grieves, a nation reels,
A nation kneels to pray
For one whose honest, strong appeals
Were for a better day.

So valued and so highly priced
A life, with much to give,
Is taken much like that of Christ
Who died that men might live.
Freed from the prison with white walls
That claims a man's whole being
Where the whole welfare stands or falls
Of men who are unseeing.

Pray God that as his body's free
From care and long endeavor
So may his noble soul now be
To live with Thee forever.
The flag he loved flies at half-mast
Alight from lamps above,
Pray God with him all hatred dies
And men may learn to love.

Mr. Speaker, the following poem comes from Joseph A. Novak, formerly of Chicopee, Mass., and now of Santurce, P.R.:

In Dallas

A shot rang out in Dallas
That traveled 'round the globe
And struck a billion hearts and more
From Cape Cod to Nairobi.

For a great man fell in Dallas
A man whose life was good,
A noble soul whose words and deeds
On earth spelled brotherhood.

Then a cry went up in Dallas
And in each city and nation
Condemning this wanton and senseless act
And recording earth's indignation.

But prejudice in Dallas,
Hatred and greed in all men,
Were the real cause of a martyrdom
Which may well occur again.

For the guilt of a man in Dallas
Was the guilt of men everywhere,
And so it will be forevermore
Until man can love and share.

Only then may one say in Dallas
Only then can mankind acclaim
That John Fitzgerald Kennedy
Did not die in vain.

MRS. JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, these sorrowful days have seen a performance of poise and courage that has won the admiration of the entire world. In this tragic hour, the gentleness, the grandeur and grace of this remarkable woman have inspired the people, not alone of our grieving Nation, but everywhere. Mrs. John Fitzgerald Kennedy has given the country an example of self-possession and love which death itself could not destroy. What a remarkable, truly majestic figure she has been all through this torrent of tragedy, turmoil and tears.

Mr. Speaker, editorial writers, newspaper columnists, and broadcasters throughout the world have marveled at Jacqueline Kennedy and all have written and spoken many moving tributes. The Holyoke (Mass.) Daily Transcript has given us one of the most eloquent tributes, "An Unforgettable First Lady," and I, under unanimous consent, include it in the Record at this point:

An Unforgettable First Lady

How is a President to be mourned? Jacqueline Kennedy has shown the Nation how. And the people of the United States, watching her pass through shocking ordeal, have had their feelings pass from pity, to wonder, to admiration, to pride, and finally to gratitude. She has given us a priceless remembrance of her husband and of a great lady's courage.

This very young and very gentle person would be an aristocrat in another country and she follows the aristocratic tradition of self-discipline. Though privilege has failed to shelter her from a series of tragic losses, Mrs. Kennedy has not shed a public tear. Humble in her acceptance of an experience which must drain every ounce of her physical strength, she has been shiningly proud in leading a nation's tribute to a fine man, her husband.

The dignity, the warmth, the taste that have attended the events since Dallas have had much of their origin in the instinctive rightness of Mrs. Kennedy's decisions. She has refused to let her anguish keep her from the wifely duties attending death. Her thoughtfulness will be thankfully remembered.

Her charm, her gaiety, her style—all of which have endeared her to people in this country and beyond it—she managed to turn these to her country's service when she was First Lady. It was one of the happiest surprises of her husband's administration that Mrs. Kennedy, whose distaste for political hurly-burly was well known, found a lasting way to put her talents to the country's service as diplomat, hostess, patroness of the arts, and particularly as fairy godmother of a reborn White House.

Indeed before tragedy struck, Jacqueline Kennedy had given us some glimpse of the depths of her ability to rise to the demands made of her. The American people weep that this last dreadful claim has been made upon her, yet they should borrow from her the gallantry that she has shown an admiring world these last few days.

For as she has moved through these bleak days, her dignity has supported all those around her. It seems to have passed even into the little girl at her side, whose bravery would make her father proud.

A grateful nation prays that the future will be kind to Jacqueline Kennedy, who has so much more life to live, and to whom the people of this country owe so much.

SYMPATHY FROM ABROAD

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time today to share with you a letter I received from a very dear friend. It was my great privilege some years ago to study in Great Britain where I worked with the distinguished Prof. S. G. Raybould of the University of Leeds. He writes from Leeds, England:

The University, Leeds,
November 25, 1963.

Dear Jeff: I feel I must write at this time to at least some of my American friends to send our profound sympathy to you in your terrible loss. Throughout this country there is a deep feeling of personal grief and bereavement, and sense of tragedy, such as we felt when Hugh Gaitskill died—perhaps even deeper; and an awareness, of course, of the greater loss to the whole world. But beyond all that, I'm sure there is great sympathy for the people of America, as well as for the President's family and household, such as can rarely, if ever, have been felt by the people of one country for those of another.

I wish there was more I could say. But I suppose it's a measure of the tragedy that there isn't.

Yours most sincerely,

Sid.

OUR IMAGE TARNISHED HERE AND ABROAD: JOINT HOUSE-SENATE COMMITTEE NEEDED

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my concern and I think the concern of a great many of our colleagues that this Congress not start running in all directions with various committees and subcommittees investigating the circumstances surrounding the tragic happenings of last week. I hope that we will have a joint committee established at the highest level which can, with prestige and with dignity, explore all the facts, implications, and significance of those dreadful occurrences and report openly to the country and to the world. I would hope that our leadership will see to it that the Senate and the House do not start elbowing for position or have any competition between one subcommittee and another or one committee and another. This is a matter that deserves attention at the very highest level of our Government.

Mr. Speaker, some 10 years ago, a then obscure American author said in another connection:

> This is a personal day, a terrible day, the day to which his entire sojourn has been tending. It is the day he realizes there are no untroubled countries in the fearfully troubled world. That the tensions of American life as well as the possibilities, are tremendous is certainly not even a question. The time has come God knows for us to examine ourselves, but we can only do this if we are willing to free ourselves of the myth of America and try to find out what is really happening here.

These words might aptly describe any one of the last 7 days. It is my fervent hope that each of us here, and all other Americans, have so reflected in the course of this trying week. For James Baldwin was describing in those words the title of his essay, "The Discovery of What It Means To Be an American." America, her system, and her people stand today with their souls bared before the world and each other as never before.

The New York correspondent for Pravda, Boris Strelnikov, told his readers on Sunday past:

> Definite quarters are now striving to cover up the traces of the bloody crime and use the tragic death of the President for stirring up anti-Soviet and anti-Cuban hysteria.

A Tass dispatch followed up with a list of what it called "fully justified questions to which the Dallas police gave no answers."

In London, the Daily Telegraph said:

> The killing of Oswald closed nothing except the main doorway, until then still open, to the whole truth. It opened the door to every sort of rumor and insinuation that evil men can invent to serve their own ends.

"Was Lee Oswald perhaps the man who knew too much?" queried the Socialist Party's organ, Vooruit from Belgium. In the Beirut Daily, Al Hadaf raised the identical question.

The Washington Post foreign service reports that 33 percent of the French public interviewed believed that President Kennedy had been "murdered by a racist organization" and only 10 percent believed the assassination was related to a pro-Castro organization. More significantly, well over half of the French public believed that "Ruby shot Oswald to stop investigation of the crime." These things require an answer.

It is not strange that the opinion makers elsewhere express grave concern for the integrity of our system. Our own New York Times commented editorially:

> The Dallas authorities, abetted and encouraged by the newspaper, television, and radio press, trampled on every principle of justice in their handling of Lee H. Oswald.

Nor is it necessary to phrase the many questions being asked by our own people about those now infamous 48 hours. We are all aware that they are many, serious and some say even sufficient to shake the very foundations of belief in the validity of our system.

Obviously had there been jurisdiction for the Federal Government to assert itself, much of the doubt and suspicion would not have been aroused and hopefully it might all have been laid to rest by competent investigation and adequate safeguards for the constitutional rights of the accused assassin. Three stories from the local press spell out in detail only a few of the many doubts and unanswered questions. News: "Dallas Is Full of Questions"; Post: "Dallas Prosecutor Discusses State's Case Against Oswald"; News: "FBI Wants To Know."

Editorial comment in the Nation carries almost a single theme. The views expressed by such diverse commentators as Richard Wilson, Max Freedman, William F. Buckley, Jr., Doris Fleeson, Ralph McGill, Walter Lippmann, Richard Starnes, and Henry J. Taylor, dramatically illustrate this point. Some explore the depth of concern, confusion, and question raised in the public mind as the state of the Nation and the possibility that the system under which we live is crumbling, but each appeals for the eradication of hate. Hate is a horrible human emotion. It must be controlled, moderated, understood, and intelligently attacked. But if the survival of our country depended upon the complete eradication of hate and bigotry, we would not have survived into the 19th century. Such is the measure of public confusion. We must realize that the threat to our national existence stems not so much from hate as from the frightening loss of self-discipline long evident at every level of our society. That is the essence of the social process by which hate becomes violence. Democracy, to which discipline from without is repugnant, demands an increasingly high level of discipline from within on the part of each individual citizen. The doubts, the misconceptions, the suspicions, the fears which all of these expressions of opinion reflect must be faced. They must be faced—then answered, corrected, or dispelled by those of us who have been sent here by the American people to see that the American system shall endure.

What then must we do? First we must do what was not, for some inexplicable reason, done a decade ago when President Truman was the intended victim of an assassin. Nor was it done when Members of the House sitting in this Chamber were the victims of bullets from the galleries. We must evolve comprehensive legislation to deal intelligently with this problem, clearly vesting the jurisdiction to investigate such crimes in the Department of Justice. Such offenses must be cognizable as crimes against the United States. It is not enough simply to enact legislation of the character that has already been introduced. Nor is it enough to hold hearings on what has already come to pass. The murder or assault on the person of an elected or high appointive official of this Government has far-reaching implications. We have painfully, if belatedly, learned that lesson, I hope. The more important the office, the more dire the implications, and, as we have witnessed, the more extensive the impact. We must evaluate and clearly spell out the handling of these investigations so that there is no confusion, no possible suspicion of suppression of evidence; no denial of individual rights. There must be orderly process so that national and world confidence will not be unnecessarily shaken.

We must not stop there. Assassination of a public official suggests always the possibility of a broad attack on the machinery of government. We can ill afford the loss of one iota of evidence which might shed light on the scope and significance of the act in terms of the national security. Similarly, the machinery for the protection of the most important officials of our Government deserves more adequate attention than the few lines of statute which charge the Secret Service with the duty of protecting the lives of the President and the Vice President. It is said that the Chief of the Secret Service holds the power to overrule the President on questions affecting his security. I ask, where is that power spelled out in law. As a practical matter, it does not, and perhaps cannot, exist. If this power is to exist it should be clearly defined.

I would remind this House that the Constitution clearly vests in the House of Representatives the primary jurisdiction relating to matters regarding the Presidency. It is here that a bill of impeachment must originate; it is here that the election of a President must be held, should the electors fail to find a majority. Clearly we would be derelict should we fail to participate in the proceedings which must ensue to cleanse the past and provide for the future.

It is for these reasons, among others, that I introduced Wednesday a resolution calling for the establishment of a joint committee of both Houses to investigate the matters of which I speak in their entirety. There can be no question that there should be one comprehensive investigation, yet these matters fall under the jurisdiction of at least three committees in this House alone. There is no point in duplication of effort. In the words of the majority whip, the investigation should be "blue ribbon." Both the Daily News and the Washington Post have called for one comprehensive investigation. In the words of the Post, we must "give the country a comprehensive view of the crime and why it happened. It would be incredibly shortsighted to permit this solemn task to be botched by a series of self-starting investigations." I will only add the words of Crosby S. Noyes writing for the Evening Star from Paris:

> A decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that the case against President Kennedy's assassin, closed so prematurely by the Dallas police, be reopened to the fullest public inspection. Until it is proved that he could not have been framed with the evidence, suspicion and rumors will continue to cause inestimable damage to the image of American justice.

Mr. Speaker, we require a committee at the highest level of the Congress broadly representative of the entire membership, to handle this fateful investigation and report.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 27, 1963]

Press Around World Finds U.S. Image Tarnished

The leftwing Paris newspaper Liberation displayed a cartoon yesterday spelling out the State of Texas in pictures:

T—a gallows.
E—three pistols.
X—cross out the Statue of Liberty.
A—a Klansman's hood.
S—a dollar sign.

In editorials, articles and photographs the same picture was driven home yesterday around the world.

The death of President Kennedy produced shock and a touching sense of loss in the world press; the slaying of Lee Harvey Oswald before the eyes of millions of television viewers and scores of Dallas policemen produced a mounting torrent of indignant and undisguised distaste.

In London, the conservative Daily Telegraph expressed the feelings of moderate minded Britishers. It wrote:

"There was only one way in which the Dallas security forces could add one iota to the immeasurable calamity of President Kennedy's murder. That was by permitting the alleged murderer to be murdered in his turn. The laxity which allowed this to happen was almost unbelievable. So was the monumental absurdity of the Dallas police chief's statement that the case of President Kennedy's murder was 'now closed.' "

"The killing of Oswald closed nothing except the main doorway, until then still open, to the whole truth. It opened the door to every sort of rumor and insinuation that evil men can invent to serve their own ends."

Newspapers in Europe have widely reprinted an editorial from Monday's New York Times in which it said that "the Dallas authorities, abetted and encouraged by the newspaper, television and radio press, trampled on every principle of justice in their handling of Lee H. Oswald."

The Daily Worker, organ of the British Communist Party, front-paged excerpts from the editorial.

The British Broadcasting Corp. in its "Tonight" television program Monday replayed an unflattering program that it recently showed about Texas with special attention to Dallas and the fact that Texas, where you can buy a gun as easily as a pack of cigarettes, had the highest murder rate in the United States.

The London Daily Mail reminded readers in an editorial that in Texas guns are bought and sold like cans of peas.

The Daily Mail said the tragedy revealed an appalling undercurrent of violence in American life, especially in the South and more especially in Texas.

Britons who for decades have told each other Texans are the kind of Americans we like best were stunned at the assassination, and one newspaper datelined its foreign correspondent's story from the broken heart of Texas.

Britain's Manchester Guardian said jokes about Texans will never again seem funny. The trouble with the image of the Texan is the six-shooter at the waist.

"Texans have often made, or implied, a boast of lawlessness," the newspaper added. "It cannot be wondered that, in such an atmosphere, potential assassins are tempted to make their madness come true."

The Hamburg Die Welt said police handling of the Kennedy and the Oswald cases left a forest of question marks. The Lisbon Diario Popular spoke of too many mysterious facets. The London Daily Mail told of whispers that Oswald was a tool who was liquidated.

In The Hague, the Dutch newspaper Algemeen Dagblad said the terrible carelessness of the Dallas police cast another shadow across the whole affair and said by parading America's most hated man before television they opened the door to all sorts of suspicions.

In Germany, the Hamburger Echo said "Dallas police had an understandable interest in producing any suspect as quickly as possible, while the rest of the country doubts that Oswald was the only or even the real assassin." It said Oswald's murder raised suspicions that would make Kennedy's assassination a gang plot.

The Frankfurt Abendpost said Chief Curry's declaration the case was closed was pitiful and asked, "What was closed? Nothing."

Il Giorno of Milan said the Dallas police "showed themselves to the world in a tragic-comic sketch * * * and topped off the job with their chief quietly stating that the case was closed by the assassination of the assassin."

"Is Oswald's shooting political or emotional?" Belgium's Christian Democrat La Cite wrote. "Was it ordered by a political group or a criminal organization? Did someone want to silence Oswald, who could be nothing else than a hired killer?"

"What if Oswald was innocent?" Vienna's independent Die Presse asked. "What if he was only a victim of that spiral of panic evident among police who, after having become guilty of negligence in protecting Kennedy's life, might have been driven to find a murderer at once and at all costs and pronounced Oswald guilty. Considering the position of the Dallas police, Oswald might have been the ideal culprit."

The Soviet Government newspaper Izvestia commented on the Oswald slaying in an article headlined "Texas and Telstar." Izvestia said that one of the wonders of the American space progress, the Telstar satellite, "has revealed to Russian eyes scenes that one would have thought could only have taken place in grim medieval Spain."

The Straits Times of Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, blamed the killing of Oswald partly on American demands for news coverage—"otherwise the stage would not have been set so conveniently for Judge Lynch."

Most of the foreign press applauded reports that both State and Federal investigations had been ordered into the double killings to clear the air of mystery. But few editorialists seemed to feel that even the true facts could add much luster to what has become a sadly tarnished U.S. image.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Nov. 26, 1963]

World Needs All the Facts

(By Crosby S. Noyes, foreign correspondent of the Star)

Paris, November 26.—A decent respect to opinions of mankind requires that the case against President Kennedy's assassin, "closed" so prematurely by the Dallas police, be reopened to the fullest public inspection.

Unless the evidence against Lee Oswald, complete with corroborating testimony is conclusive beyond any reasonable doubt, the most sinister doubts will continue to be expressed throughout the world.

It is natural enough to wish to limit political consequences of a crime, which in any case could only have been committed by a madman. It remains a fact, however, that the assassination of a President is a political act of enormous consequence. And any attempt at suppression of the truth opens the way to the most malicious distortions.

NOT CONFINED TO REDS

Suspicions over the circumstances and motivations behind the crime in Dallas were being strongly voiced in Europe and elsewhere as early as last Saturday. They have been enormously reinforced by the almost incredible negligence of the Dallas police in allowing the second murder to take place before their very eyes and those of the whole world.

These suspicions unfortunately are not confined by any means to Communist circles. The most responsible and conservative sections of the Western European press are chorusing their doubts about the case and the actions of the local authorities.

Thus the conservative Paris Le Monde observes that "the death of the accused man—the only one so far—reinforces the rumors and gives a certain credence to those who see in it not an act of civic conscience but the elimination of a man who knew too much."

OPENED DOOR TO RUMOR

Thus the London Daily Telegraph charges that "the killing of Oswald closed nothing except the main doorway until then still open to the whole truth. It opened the door to every sort of rumor and insinuation that evil men can invent to serve their own ends."

Other Western European papers were equally critical, according to the Associated Press. Here are some excerpts:

Vienna's independent Neues Oesterreich: "Oswald can no longer talk, even if he wanted to, even if he was forced to. Was this the purpose of his death? Who was the brains behind the deed of Jack Ruby, the so-called revenge taker? It is not very probable that this man did what he did for the sole purpose of saving Mrs. Kennedy from appearing in court to testify against the murderer of her husband."

POLITICAL OR EMOTIONAL

Vienna's independent Die Presse: "What if Oswald was innocent? What if he was only a victim of that spiral of panic evident among police, who, after having become guilty of negligence in protecting Kennedy's life, might have been driven to find a murderer at once and at all costs and pronounced Oswald guilty?"

Belgium's Christian Democrat La Cite: "Is Oswald's shooting political or emotional? Was it ordered by a political group or a criminal organization? Did someone want to silence Oswald, who could be nothing else than a hired killer?"

Doubts and criticisms have not been quieted by the evidence that has been produced so far by officials in Dallas. The case against Oswald, on the face of it, may appear overwhelming. But under the circumstances, the evidence itself may be considered suspect until it has been authenticated and corroborated by the testimony of still-unidentified witnesses.

DANGER IN SUSPICIONS

It may be impossible to do this by a formal courtroom procedure in which the accused man, even though dead, is represented by counsel, the evidence is tested and witnesses are subjected to cross-examination. It seems unlikely either that the trial of Jack Ruby will provide answers to all the troubling questions that surround this tragic case.

It is not enough that most reasonable men may accept Oswald's guilt and the integrity of officials in Dallas. Until it is proved that he could not have been framed with the evidence, suspicions and rumors will continue to cause inestimable damage to the image of American justice.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 28, 1963]

A NATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

There is danger that would-be investigators of President Kennedy's assassination may soon be falling over one another. A thorough and impartial inquiry into every facet of the double crime is of great importance; but the inquiry should contribute to the restoration of order, not to the proliferation of chaos.

House Majority Whip HALE BOGGS, Senator JACOB K. JAVITS and others have warned against the dangers of a race to resolve the unanswered questions about the assassination. Such a race would divert many Congressmen from their work; it would lead to confusion and inexcusable publicity seeking; it would lend a farcical touch to a task of the utmost gravity; and it would seriously divert the country from the sense of rededication for which President Johnson has called.

This is not an occasion on which committee chairmen in either the Senate or the House should be allowed to follow their isolated inclinations. The type of investigation to be conducted and the experts who should be assigned to it are both matters of high policy that should be decided by the central leadership of Congress in consultation with President Johnson. And the national interest in one full and fair inquiry should not be blurred by rival investigations designed largely to exploit the national tragedy.

Fortunately, the initial investigation by the FBI is going forward on order from President Johnson under the general direction of the slain President's brother, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. No doubt this probing, which has taken more than 50 FBI agents to the Dallas area, will bring to light most of the pertinent data now available. It will remain for an experienced body of factfinders to sift this evidence, to pursue any avenues that may remain clouded, and to give the country a comprehensive view of the crime and why it happened. It would be incredibly shortsighted to permit this solemn task to be botched by a series of self-starting investigations.

[From the Daily News, Washington (D.C.), Nov. 27, 1963]

JUST ONE

If there is to be a congressional investigation of the assassination of President Kennedy, then there should be just one, as some senatorial leaders have suggested.

This very important search for facts must not be transformed into a race between two or more investigating committees for witnesses—and headlines.

President Johnson has already ordered the FBI to inquire into the facts behind the tragedy. This is fitting. But it is also fitting—and necessary, in our view—for the same tragedy and its background to be investigated by Congress.

Meanwhile, it is not too early for Congress to pass, before it quits, the proposed new law which would make the murder of a President, or Vice President or anyone else in the line of succession to the Presidency, a Federal crime.

It's almost unbelievable that there is no such law now. There should be. Now.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 28, 1963]

TWO SENATE LEADERS URGE ASSASSINATION INQUIRY

(By James E. Clayton)

Senate leaders yesterday promised an immediate investigation with full public hearings into the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

Democratic Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, and Republican Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois, talked of the inquiry on the Senate floor after Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, said the Nation would be dissatisfied with anything less than an authoritative report.

MANSFIELD said, "There are many questions connected with the assassination last Friday which have not been answered * * * too many questions. Those question must be answered."

DIRKSEN told newsmen, "no time will be lost" in the inquiry. He said he expected public hearings to begin before Congress takes a Christmas recess.

The Senate Judiciary Committee, headed by Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, has taken jurisdiction over the investigation and has begun its preliminary work. EASTLAND has assigned responsibility for that work to the staff of the Internal Security Subcommittee and its chief counsel, J. G. Sourwine.

REPORT FOR JOHNSON

Although there were reports yesterday that the Justice Department was funneling information to the subcommittee, top officials of the Department said its full energies were now devoted to preparing a report on the assassination for President Johnson.

In that report, the administration hopes to put to rest most, if not all, of the dozens of rumors and questions floating around about the assassination.

But, as the list of questions and rumors grows longer, so does the length of time it will take officials to prepare the report. Its preparation is under the supervision of Deputy Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach and FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover but many other Government agencies are contributing to it.

Officials now do not expect to be able to send the report to the new President until early next week. Presumably, the President will make public all, or most of its contents.

CONNALLY STATEMENT

In Texas, meanwhile, Gov. John Connally, who was wounded when the President was killed, called for an investigation aimed at finding ways for a President to move about the country "without fear of personal harm."

Connally said this was one of the two matters he hoped all investigations would pursue. The other is whether the assassination "was the act of an individual maniac or a conspiracy."

Texas Attorney General Waggoner Carr said he hoped to convene a court of inquiry shortly, probably in Dallas. "Its purpose will be very simple," he told a news conference. "To establish what is fact and what is rumor in this matter."

As time goes on, before the formal reports are made and the inquiries begun, the difficulty of sorting out fact from fiction becomes increasingly difficult.

The flow of questions and unverified reports carried to the Justice Department and the FBI has become heavy and both agencies have adopted a "no comment" policy.

Officials have consistently denied the existence of evidence to show that more than one man was involved but reports to that effect keep springing up both in the United States and abroad. So do reports linking the assassination to international communism, to organized crime, to rightwing groups, and to almost every dissatisfied group and person.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 28, 1963]

FRENCH THINK RACISTS ASSASSINATED KENNEDY

PARIS, November 27.—France believes that President Kennedy was assassinated by segregationists and that Lee Harvey Oswald was then murdered to prevent the truth from becoming known.

This was the result of a sampling taken here by the French Institute of Public Opinion. The results were published this evening by France-Soir:

Thirty-three percent of those questioned thought Mr. Kennedy had been murdered by a racist organization, 19 percent by one man, probably a maniac, and 10 percent by a pro-Castro organization. The rest had formed no opinion.

Fifty-seven percent thought Jack Ruby shot Oswald to stop the investigation of the crime. Only 18 percent believed it was to avenge Mr. Kennedy and the rest had varying other ideas.

Forty-three percent believed the risk of world conflict had not been increased by Mr. Kennedy's assassination, 35 percent thought it had and only 1 percent thought it had been decreased.

Thirty-four percent described their reaction to the news as having been either indignation or stupor. Sixteen percent said they had received it with horror. Eight percent described their feelings as compassion and 5 percent as anxiety.

Ninety percent approved of President de Gaulle's trip to Washington for the funeral. Three percent disapproved.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 26, 1963]

SOVIET PRESS SHIFTS ON OSWALD, LINKS HIM TO U.S. TROTSKYISTS

(By Victor Zorza)

LONDON, November 25.—In an artful zigzag the Soviet Communist Party press today linked Lee Harvey Oswald to "the American Trotskyists."

The man accused as the assassin of President Kennedy first was described by Pravda as a dupe of "Facist forces." When Oswald in turn was killed the party newspaper suggested that rightwing extremists "shut his mouth."

Thus some confusion is evident in the attempt of the Soviet press to represent Oswald as possibly the innocent victim of a "frameup" and, at the same time, as a Trotskyist sympathizer.

In a dispatch from New York, the party newspaper's correspondent said political literature had been found at Oswald's home.

"Judging by the titles of the books and newspapers, many of them are publications of the American Trotskyists," the dispatch said.

The Soviet press has recently mounted a campaign against foreign Trotskyists as the allies of the Chinese, accusing both of advocating the use of violence in international relations.

A Tass dispatch also hinted at the deviationist nature of Oswald's "communism" when it referred to a transcript of the New Orleans radio discussion in which he took part last August.

In it, Tass said, Oswald had "slandered" the Soviet Union and had claimed he was "a Marxist, not a Communist," seeking to prove that there was a difference between the two. The Soviet press has in fact often ridiculed the claims of Chinese leaders that they are the truest followers of Marxism.

No mention was made, however, of Oswald's remark during the radio discussion which suggested he was anything but a Peiping sympathizer. He said that the United States had made monumental mistakes in its Cuba policy, "Pushing Cuba into the sphere of activity of, let us say, a very dogmatic Communist country, as China is."

As to the other arm of the two-directional propaganda gambit, the Soviet press took over the Reichstag fire analogy, which was used on Sunday by Communist papers outside Russia.

The Pravda article, a series of Tass news service dispatches and an article in the Government newspaper Izvestia drew a comparison between the fire and the assassination.

"Every effort" was being made in the United States to launch "a vast provocation" reminiscent of the Reichstag hall fire, "which the German Fascists needed to strike a blow against the progressive forces of Germany." Those who had placed inflammable material in the Reichstag cellars in 1933 and those who were now circulating the "absurd version" about Communist involvement in the Kennedy assassination "pursued the same ends" said the Soviet press. (It is generally accepted today that the Nazis covertly set the fire which they blamed on their opposition.)

"With every hour since Kennedy's tragic death, it is becoming increasingly clear that the assassination in Dallas was a premeditated action of Fascist-minded forces, the ultrarightwing and racist quarters, which plot against any step aimed at an international detente * * *" said the Soviet press.

(Leon Trotsky, assassinated by a man with a pickax in Mexico City in 1940, was a leader of the Russian Bolshevik Revolution of 1917. Before being forced into exile for political "crimes," Trotsky was a politician and journalist. He was founder of the Red army.)

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 25, 1953]

Other Countries Hear Quickly About Shooting

Radio and television networks on both sides of the Iron Curtain broke into their scheduled programs yesterday to report the slaying of Lee Harvey Oswald in Dallas, Tex.

Television recordings of the actual shooting were relayed abroad via communications satellites and made available to viewers around the world.

Only hours after the slaying, British television networks screened the films showing Jack Ruby break from a rank of Dallas detectives and shoot Oswald at pointblank range before a crowd of stunned police officials and newsmen.

A comment by a French television announcer summed up much of the reaction in Western Europe to the second Dallas killing in 48 hours:

"There will always be a doubt in the world whether he (Oswald) was innocent or guilty."

In Moscow, Moscow television interrupted a special program dedicated to President Kennedy to announce his accused assassin had been killed.

Tass, the official news agency, reported that Oswald's attacker was "a resident of the city of Dallas. His name is Jack Ruby and he works at a second-class night club. Police told reporters that Ruby is well known to the police. The police do not explain how Ruby could find his way to the police station when Oswald was being transferred."

A Tass dispatch from New York later said of Oswald's death: "The murderers of President John Kennedy are trying to cover up their traces."

DOUBTS OSWALD'S GUILT

The Tass report said Dallas police gave no answers to some "fully justified questions."

"For instance, it was announced that a photograph showing Oswald with the rifle with which he allegedly shot the President and with the revolver with which he allegedly killed the policeman was found in his wife's possession.

"But why should a man planning to kill the head of state have his photograph taken with the weapons of his future crime and then give this photograph to his wife?"

It also questioned why Oswald's wife and mother were "reportedly completely isolated" by the FBI.

"Now the only person who was accused of killing President Kennedy, a man who till the very end denied his implication in this assassination, has also been silenced forever," Tass said.

"The whole of America could watch this new crime on the screens of their televisions," Tass said.

In East Germany, the official news agency, ADN, said "political observers" believe Oswald was shot to cover up an anti-Communist plot.

The news agency said these observers also felt that the people guilty of the shooting were to be found "in the same extreme right-wing circles who ordered the murder of President John F. Kennedy."

"These circles had tried with all means to put the blame for the murder of Kennedy on the Communists and brand Oswald as a Communist," ADN said, still quoting the observers. "To impede all further investigations which would reveal the true men behind the assassination of Kennedy, they had decided to eliminate Oswald in the Fascist manner."

NEWS FLASHED

ADN reported Oswald's death less than 10 minutes after Western agencies had flashed the news.

Prague radio also broke into its regular program to announce Oswald's death.

In the United Arab Republic also the state-controlled radio and television network interrupted its programs to broadcast word of Oswald's slaying.

Before Oswald's slaying the Soviet and Communist Eastern European press had lashed out at implications of Communist blame for the President's assassination.

The Soviet Communist Party newspaper Pravda, which appeared to set the tone for much of the Communist press comment, said:

"The murder of Kennedy was not a shock for the John Birch society, the Ku Klux Klan and other ultra right-wingers," but it came like a thunderbolt for most Americans."

This is what Boris Strelnikov, Pravda's correspondent in New York, told his Sunday readers:

"Definite quarters are now striving to cover up the traces of the bloody crime and use the tragic death of the President for stirring up anti-Soviet and anti-Cuban hysteria."

"Reports based on statements of Dallas police officials so far indicate only that police are trying to implicate in the murder of the President, with obviously provocative purposes, the Communist Party of the United States.

"The murder of the U.S. President is a monstrous crime, which has shocked all the world, and the indignation of the Americans is perfectly understandable. But the very method of this terroristic act is not new for the United States. It is reminiscent of other, of course much smaller acts of gangsters, whose connections often led to high-placed extreme rightwing quarters and their patrons."

AMERICANS ANGERED

The Pravda dispatch concluded:

"The shot fired at the President is a shot at the realistic and sensible sprouts that are appearing in American life. This is why the crime in Dallas has aggrieved and angered many Americans."

Here is a sampling of how the Communist Parties in other countries portrayed the political implications of President Kennedy's assassination and Oswald's arrest:

Cuba: Prime Minister Fidel Castro: "There is a confused situation about the acts that led to the assassination. But the act shows that extreme reactionary forces are active in the United States * * * (and they) are taking advantage to create a state of anti-Soviet and anti-Cuban hysteria."

Great Britain: The political committee of the Communist Party, in a statement: "Mr. Kennedy's tentative steps toward negotiations with the Soviet Union as well as his attitude toward civil rights for the American Negroes had aroused the bitter hostility of the extreme right in the United States. Nothing could have suited their book better than his death at this moment. It is almost as if the assassination had been engineered to attempt to increase tension and try to wreck any further moves toward ending the cold war."

North Vietnam: From the official newspaper Nhan Dan: "Kennedy is dead, but the reactionaries now ruling in the United States still follow his aggressive path."

Hungary: The Communist Party organ Nepszabadsag: "All people believing in peace and progress hold that this henious crime unmistakably points to the fanatic radicals of the Southern States, the modern wild west of racists. The people of Hungary go into deep mourning over the President's untimely death."

Bulgaria: The party organ Rabotnichesko Delso said Kennedy realized "the radical changes that in the last decades had come about * * * and was making efforts to coordinate the interests and aims of U.S. policies with these changes."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 27, 1963]

Dallas Police Are Target Abroad

The world's press, in its extensive coverage of accused assassin Lee Harvey Oswald's death, raised hard questions about the quality of Dallas justice and asked often if the shooting by Jack Ruby was a coverup plot.

Moscow television viewers yesterday watched the films of Oswald's death in the Dallas jail basement. And the government newspaper Izvestia printed the photograph of the attack.

As gathered from wire service dispatches, here is the radio and press comment on the death of the man accused of killing President Kennedy.

Waverley Root, of the Washington Post foreign service reported from Paris last night an indictment of the incident by the top-ranking political commentators of the French air waves, Georges Altschuler and Georges Leroy, of the privately owned station, Europe No. 1.

The script of their daily broadcast contains this passage:

Leroy. "The investigation carried out by the Texas police flouts every honest man's conception of justice and the right of the people to know the truth.

Altschuler. "Shifty politicians, thinking of reelection * * * slick-talking policemen, who think they can get away with anything * * * and who are doing everything to prevent the truth from coming out. A man was arrested. Was he guilty? Maybe yes, maybe no. First he was put down as a Communist. There was talk of proofs, which either are not produced, or are offered to the curiosity of the mob, not without having passed, it would seem, through certain shady darkrooms where everything is distorted.

Leroy. "And then—was it because they became frightened, because they feared they could no longer hide the truth, the unvarnished that this presumed assassin was struck down—under the eyes of the police of Dallas?

Altschuler. "And struck down by whom, I ask you? * * * This isn't a tragic comedy, this assassination of a President of the

United States. It is a pure tragedy. It must not end in farce."

This broadcast expressed a general feeling, Root said, that of almost universal disbelief that the murder of President Kennedy is as simple an affair as it has been represented to be from Dallas. Paris-Presse banners its front page "A tragic doubt: Was Oswald really guilty?" The sober Le Mondle headlines its story: "Serious doubts soil the behavior of the Dallas police." Le Monde added that the killing of Oswald reinforced these views and supported those "who see in it not an act of civic loyalty but the elimination of a man who knew too much."

The paper's New York correspondent, Phillipe Ben, wrote that certain characteristics of American life were in question.

He cited "the animosity between the races, the tolerance of violence, the enormous publicity given to the most fantastic accusation devoid of any foundation."

In London, the Daily Express said:

"The disgrace of the Dallas police is complete. They have been criticized in the Kennedy shooting and now they have let the No. 1 suspect be shot down while in their custody."

The Daily Telegraph reported that its Dallas correspondent "walked down the stairs to the basement of the police station unchecked. If anyone had wanted to silence Oswald the police could not have helped them more."

The Daily Mail wondered if Ruby and Oswald were linked in the assassination plot.

Il Popolo of Rome said it could not accept the Dallas police statement that Oswald's death closed the assassination case.

Il Messaggero asked if Ruby might not have killed Oswald "because he belonged to an organization responsible for the attack and was afraid that Oswald would talk and unmask all accomplices. Or was this an attempt to close the investigation of the assassination of the President by silencing a man forever and thus covering up the true killers?"

Helsinki's Uusi Suomi said Oswald's death was partly the result of the American public's demand for news about the accused assassin. "The publicity expected of authorities by the American public has been destructive."

Belgian Catholic and Socialist papers questioned whether the killing had been "ordered by a political group of criminal organization," as the Catholic Le Cite put it.

"Was Lee Oswald perhaps the man who knew too much and had to be liquidated, since he would be forced to speak?" queried the Socialist Vooruit.

In Lebanon, the Beirut daily Al Hadaf raised the same question.

Said Bildzeitung, which has West Germany's largest circulation:

"Until now it is not known whether he (Ruby) belonged with Oswald to a ring of agents that planned the Kennedy murder. Did he kill Oswald because he feared he would reveal all? Or did he want to revenge Kennedy's death?"

Frankfurt's independent Frankfurter Rundschau said "American authorities have been robbed of the possibility of replacing wild and threatening rumors with the truth—truth which the whole world needs if it is not to fall into a deep confusion."

In Yugoslavia, the leading Belgrade newspaper Politika said: "It would be terrible if in America and in the world outside it the suspicion spontaneously caused by horrible scenes from Texas should remain to smoulder and develop.

"Because of the America which is recognized and honored as a country of democratic traditions and strivings, the world must preserve hope that the sickening suspicion will soon be removed and the great responsibility accepted without question."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Nov. 27, 1963]

ASSASSINATION EVOKES ODD VIEWS—MANY SEEN LINKING KENNEDY KILLING TO RACISTS, RIGHTISTS, DESPITE FACTS

(By Richard Wilson)

The mood of self-examination which has overtaken the country following the assassination of President Kennedy has produced both ludicrous speculation and tortured reasoning.

We can see coming now the tracts entitled "The Conspiracy To Murder John F. Kennedy." In one version it will be an inverse antidesegregation conspiracy using a double-agent Communist to carry out the deed. In another version it will be just a plain Communist conspiracy. Additional versions will prove the ingenuity of the human mind when stimulated by 4 days of unremitting TV-radio programing.

These fantasies are not confined to the lunatic fringe. Here in Washington, simple but seriously intentioned people arrived at the strange conclusion that the murder of the President is related in some amorphous way to the slaying of a desegregation leader in Mississippi.

In spite of the simple facts of the assassination, there are many in this city who will not separate the President's tragic death from the segregation and "Far Right" issues. Their tortured reasoning is that the assassin came out of the same pot, that the city of Dallas in the reactionary Southwest had spawned them all and all were equally culpable.

Even the Chief Justice of the United States allowed himself to stray from the path of sound reasoning. The misguided could deduce from his remarks that the extremities of the right in this particular case carried a responsibility for inspiring the extremities of the far left.

It is understandable that reasonable men, shocked and perplexed, should grope for the causes of the savagely incongruous event. But why there should be supposed to be any vague relationship between the assassination of President Kennedy and the assassination of President Lincoln escapes rationality. Lincoln's assassination was indeed the act of a crazed and pitifully inadequate conspiracy that aspired to control of the Nation. That assassination was part of the great Civil War over the issue of slavery and the rights of the States.

All too often, and without sound cause, the events of today are cast in the mold of a century ago, as if the relatively peaceful demonstrations for Negro equality were revolutionary acts. All too often the reaction of the white community of the Nation is related to the cause for which millions of men sprang to arms a century ago.

These exaggerations seem to be part of the uncertain national mood. It could be expected, therefore, that the man-in-the-street last Friday, before the circumstances became known, should conclude that the attack on the President could be traced either to the segregation or the far right issues.

This notion is given up by some only reluctantly and if any twisted version can be made to fit their preconceptions they readily turn to it.

Nothing could have been more repugnant to the vibrant spirit and rational mind of John F. Kennedy.

Now a series of inquiries is beginning. One is by the FBI and the Justice Department into both the assassination and the murder of the accused assassin. Another study will be conducted in Congress in connection with legislation to make a murderous attack on the President and Vice President a Federal crime wherever committed. The State of Texas will conduct a special ex post facto inquiry.

If these inquiries are well conducted they can help to clarify whether or not Oswald, in fact, murdered the President and his probable motives; they can never prove in the legal sense, however, that Oswald was the assassin, and he will remain for all time the accused assassin.

Only a continuing self-examination by those who influence public thinking will find the root causes for the act. It may simply be that the cause lies more in the disorderly, undisciplined and callous phases of American life than in the ideological concepts that divide the country.

But one simple fact should not be ignored. The accused, and likely, murderer was a proudly professed Marxist; he never boasted of being a segregationist or a far righter.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Nov. 27, 1963]

FBI WANTS TO KNOW—WHERE DID OSWALD GET MONEY TO LIVE ON?

(By Jim G. Lucas)

Who, if anyone, bankrolled Lee Harvey Oswald, the presumed assassin of President Kennedy who was himself slain 48 hours later?

Federal investigators, exploring on orders from President Johnson "every facet" of the two slayings, are trying to find out.

Oswald had worked but two weeks for the Texas School Book Depository. His salary was $50 a week, before deductions. His take-home pay was nearer $45.

Before that, he was unemployed.

FOOD, CLOTHING

Yet Oswald was able to feed and clothe his family in Irving, Tex., and rent an $8 a week room for himself in Dallas. He spent weekends with his family. Mrs. Oswald and their two children lived with Mr. and Mrs. Michael Paine, in Irving, a suburb of Dallas. Mrs. Paine charged no rent, in return for which Mrs. Oswald was teaching her Russian. They had become acquainted in Dallas, and later met again in New Orleans, police say.

Oswald also was able to spend the week of September 26 to October 3 in Mexico City, where he applied unsuccessfully at the Czechoslovak and Russian consulates for transit visas to Cuba en route to the Soviet Union, where he had once lived.

Oswald went to Mexico in a private car (ownership unknown), which crossed the Rio Grande at Laredo and returned a week later. His trip aroused no suspicion at the time. However, tourists usually are required to give proof they can support themselves in Mexico.

Oswald also apparently traveled between Dallas and New Orleans regularly.

Authorities noted that Oswald and his family did not seem to lack for food and clothing, despite his long unemployment and subsequent modest salary. They were well, if not fashionably dressed, and not undernourished.

Federal investigators say frankly it is hard to believe Oswald could do all this on $50 a week.

CASH?

So far, they have located no bank accounts under Oswald's name or any of his aliases. If he were receiving outside support, apparently it was in cash, which is hard to trace.

Mexican authorities are cooperating with the FBI to learn what Oswald did in Mexico City. They are trying to find where he stayed. If he stayed with friends, they want to find who they were.

Mexican authorities say Oswald's tourist card was issued by their New Orleans consulate. His wife was in New Orleans with him at the time, and presumably stayed there a few days.

Mexican investigators also are said to be checking their immigration records on travelers who arrived from and returned to Havana during that time, and whether Oswald contacted any of them.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Nov. 27, 1963]

Guilt Is Personal

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

The grief was spontaneous and, in most cases, wholly sincere. Not because Mr. Kennedy's policies were universally beloved, but because he was a man so intensely charming, whose personal vigor and robust enjoyment of life so invigorated almost all who beheld him. The metabolism of the whole Nation rose on account of the fairyland quality of the First Family. After all, no divine typecaster could have done better than to get J.F.K. to play J.F.K., Jackie to play the First Lady, and the children to play themselves.

It is, of course, a little eerie how, in response to tragedy, everyone ends up saying just about the same thing. It is not the easiest thing to do to distinguish even between Khrushchev's encomium and the Pope's. It is absolutely impossible to distinguish between tributes given to him, and the messages of sorrow sent to his family, by officials at opposite ends of the political spectrum.

Those who were unmoved by Mr. Kennedy's career, and opposed his policies, tend to sound exactly like those who loved him and loved his programs as well.

Wanting to show their opposition to treachery, his critics, even at the expense of apparent hypocrisy, are prepared to blur in deference to the awesome occasion their estimate of (a) the man's fate and (b) the policies to which they were in opposition.

My own message, which I was called upon to make a few minutes after the President's death, began as follows (and thereby hangs a tale): "The assassination of President Kennedy was," I said, "the act presumably of a madman, heir to the madmen who killed Lincoln and McKinley and, for that matter, Christ, reminding us that the beasts are always with us, and that they continue to play decisive roles in history, and in human affairs."

I meant in that first sentence to try to warn against an impending storm, whose electricity was hot on the air.

The opinionmakers of the country, and probably large segments of the population, were getting ready to turn the President's tragedy into an excuse for a pogrom against the American right.

Within a matter of minutes, nationally known radio and television commentators had started in, suggesting that the assassination had been the work of a right-wing extremist, and recalling that it was also in Dallas that Adlai Stevenson had recently been hit on the head by an anti-U.N. placard.

However, to the quite obvious dismay of the bloodhounds, it was only a matter of hours before the Dallas police put their finger on the probable culprit. An almost undeniable case apparently has been built against him and lo and behold—the assassin turned out to be a member of a Communist front who only a few years ago tried to give up his citizenship in Russia as a means of expressing his contempt for this country.

Goodness knows what would have happened if Lee Oswald had not been apprehended, or even if he had been apprehended a day or two later.

Even as it was, the disappointment was more than some could bear, and the genocidal fury here and there broke its traces.

The point to remember is that the act in question, although it was done by a far leftwinger, is not an act for which the far left bears the collective guilt. It was made by a fiend. Oswald was, in all probability, psychotic; it is of no importance whatever whether his political delusions were of the left, or of the right. The finger that pulled that trigger was directed by a febrile mind. The political coordinates of that mind are purely coincidental, and nothing of a general nature is to be gathered from his membership in the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, or his sympathy with Marxism.

I do not suggest, obviously, that the far left is incapable of organized acts of political assassination. I say, merely, that this horror did not have the earmarks of one. The presumption, on all such occasions as this, is against a conclusion of collective guilt, whether imputed to the left, or the right, whether to all the whites in Birmingham, all the Vietnamese in Saigon, or all the Jews in Jerusalem.

Let us hope there will not be a next time, though history is against such optimism; yet let us all recall that in crime, as in art, there is great scope for individuality.

So this is a time for courage. Even his most adamant political opponents acknowledged the personal courage Mr. Kennedy showed during his young and dazzling lifetime. Now, no doubt, he would desire that his countrymen also act courageously, enduring their grief; and demonstrating to his bereaved family not only their compassion, but also their fortitude.

SERMON DELIVERED AT THE PAN-AMERICAN MASS, ST. PATRICK'S CHURCH, NOVEMBER, 28, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include a sermon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include an eloquent and touching sermon delivered at the pan-American Mass, St. Patrick's Church, Washington, D.C., November 28, 1963, by the Reverend Robert Paul Mohan, S.J., associate professor of philosophy, the Catholic University of America:

Today, a nation pauses to give thanks to God for the year's blessings, for the fruitfulness of the land, and the abundance of the harvests.

Around the firesides people will gather this day with those they love. They will gather in the same spirit of those colonists of old who made a nation and a way of life of the resisting wilderness that was America.

There were those who thought Thanksgiving inappropriate then, when the Colonies were ravaged by disease, and graves multiplied behind the little churches. Nature yielded her fruits only at the price of blood, bone, sweat, and tears.

The fainthearted could well have asked then as the prophets of doom can ask today: What have we to be thankful for? But most of the men and women of old saw visions and dreamed dreams, and their labor, their faith, and their devotion is our heritage.

Those who tell us that we of the Americas have little to be thankful for on this morning of 1963 can indeed marshall some arguments of weight.

They see a world but narrowly avoiding a war in which tomorrow's victories would be worse than yesterday's defeats. They see widespread destitution, hunger, injustice, and insensitivity on every side.

They see a sluggish and apparently inept humanity still unable to answer the ancient question of Cain: Am I my brother's keeper?

They see goodness harrassed, evil triumphant, and innocence crucified. They see technological sophistication and moral immaturity, a demand for privilege and an abdication of responsibility. They see suspicion and cynicism which militate against all those values in which we are supposed to believe.

And most of all through eyes dimmed with tears, and hearts possibly rebellious at the nightmarish vision of senseless and wanton violence, they see a martyred President who was the symbol of America's promise, the voice of America's aspirations' and the incarnation of America's dream. They see this man cut down in the springtime of his greatness.

They see a young wife kneeling before a catafalque in dignity and beauty, flanked by two children who will no longer hear a beloved voice, nor feel the caress of a paternal hand.

They see a world deprived of wonderful qualities of mind and heart; a knowledge and compassion hammered by experience into wisdom; and wisdom itself given soaring words that will inspire the lowly and the great for years to come.

They see the singer silenced before the song is sung, a story ended before the teller of tales has hardly spoken. They see a nation explaining away the violence of the assassin and the avenger, in terms of insanity, unmindful of the festering hatred that exists in our land.

They see meaninglessness in a wisdom that permits the triumph of apparent evil and irrationality. And understandably they consider Thanksgiving Day, 1963 a mockery.

But calm reason, enduring faith, and sustaining love must temper both our sorrow and our wrath.

We can first of all be thankful that destinies are built on the dreams of the visionary rather than in the cynicism of the so-called realist.

We can be thankful that the imperishable spirit of man, his God given nobility can triumph over his stupidity, his avarice, his insensitivity, and his cruelty to his fellow man; and it is our task to see that in this generation that it does.

We think of the ages of miracles as historically improbable but we forget twelve unlettered apostles who scattered the fire of God's love across the world, that was never the same again.

We forget a few short years ago a man sent from God whose name was John, a simple man from Bergamo who wore the ring of Peter, whose love made the world's sophistication and cynicism foolish, and many of the world's rivalries obsolete. A man who reminded humanity in 5 short years that our fate is not in our stars, nor in our economics, nor in a power that must vindicate itself by an inevitable titanic struggle with similar power.

Love, to those who do not love enough, is softness. Worldly power to those who love power too much is strength.

We who kneel together this morning before the majesty of God can be thankful too for the younger John whose death has left anguish in the heart of the civilized world.

We remember his ringing words a few short years ago:

"To our sister republics south of the border, we offer a special pledge—to convert our good words into deeds—in a new alliance for progress—to assist free men and free government in casting off the chains of poverty."

The day before he died he spoke to the League of United Latin American Citizens in Houston. Mrs. Kennedy addressed the same group in Spanish.

Before we cry out at the senseless waste of life of this good and talented man, let us remember that in the Providence of God it may take the crucifixion of goodness today as in the past to bring home to the unthinking and uncommitted the values for which they should live and die.

Perhaps it takes a martyr to tell us in the 20th century what we have left undone.

Perhaps the idiom of tragedy alone can pierce the insensitivity of our hearts to the injustice, poverty, and tyranny which flaws our world.

We can indeed lament the loss, but we can still be thankful for that life which glowed in the world.

We can weep for the irrationality or malice of the deed, but we can be thankful for the searching of soul that will lead to rededication for the tasks that lie ahead.

We can mourn that John Fitzgerald Kennedy did not see the completion of the "Peaceful Revolution of Hope" that he foresaw for the Americas; but again we can be thankful if the task which he saw as possibly the work of a lifetime can be taken up by a shocked and aroused citizenry with renewed vigor.

A few hundred yards away on this very street on another dreadful Friday almost a hundred years ago, another great President who strove mightily for the rights of man was similarly wounded unto death.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy whose life parallels that of Abraham Lincoln in so many respects also had the light of a brilliant life snuffed out with work apparently undone. A desperate nation then too lamented in frustrate grief the loss of a nation which needed its leader so much.

But in the past century we have walked in the light of Lincoln's simple goodness, and how thankful we can be for everything he has been to our Nation.

In the providence of God, the work of John Fitzgerald Kennedy was not interrupted, but finished. But may we not hope that in the meteoric brilliance of his years and in the nobility of his aspirations our martyred President may be the teacher of men yet unborn.

"Grant to us life, that though the man be gone
The promise of his spirit be fulfilled."

Thanksgiving this day must indeed be offered for all that we are and all that we have; but it must also be a day of unselfish dedication to becoming what we are not.

A reminder of the challenge that confronts us of the Americas this Thanksgiving Day may be found in words that inaugurated and closed the luminous years of John Kennedy as President of this Nation. I would like to pronounce these words in the language of our distinguished guests.

Con-ciudadanos del mundo, no pregunteïs lo que America puede hacer para Ustedes, sino lo que podemos hacer juntos para la libertad del hombre.

Finalmente si son Ustedes ciudadanos de America o ciudadanos del mundo, pedidnos a nosotros el mismo alto nivel de normas de poder y de sacrificio que pedimos a Ustedes.

Con una buena conciencia como recompensa unica con la história como juez final de nuestras obras, adelantémonos a conducir la patria que amamos, pidiendo a Dios su benedición y su ayuda, pero sabiendo que aquí en el mundo, el trabajo de Dios tiene que ser verdaderamente nuestro propio trabajo.

RADIO AND TELEVISION INDUSTRIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from a constituent of mine which expresses completely my own view, as follows:

LEWIS J. MILLER & ASSOCIATES,
November 24, 1963.

Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT,
325 House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: During the tragic hours and days that followed the assassination of President Kennedy there seemed to be a remarkable assumption of social conscience and duty to the American public by the radio and television stations and networks of this country, who, apparently with virtually no exceptions, broadcast and televised the actions, reactions and events as they occurred; and concurrently suspended all commercials and scheduled programs.

It would also seem that the immediate coverage of President Lyndon B. Johnson and the clear evidence of the continued functioning of our Government served to remove a feeling of panic which could have swept over the country.

Additionally, the network stations made their coverage available to the local independent stations. (It was unusual to see network emblems appearing on channels 5, 9, 11, and 13.)

The sense of responsibility displayed by radio and television, particularly the networks, should possibly not go unnoticed by the Congress.

With warm greetings.

Sincerely,

LEWIS J. MILLER.

Mr. Speaker, the radio and television industries as well as all who devoted themselves so completely to providing these services to the American people deserve the highest praise. I join my other colleagues who have spoken on this matter in expressing our sincere appreciation in which I know millions of other Americans would wish to join.

SAN ANTONIO HEALTH FAIR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on October 25, 1963, I had the opportunity of opening in San Antonio an epochmaking event, the first San Antonio Health Fair. Over 40 hospitals and health-related agencies under the coordination of the San Antonio Chamber of Commerce and under the able leadership of Dr. John A. Bradley, chairman of the Alamo Hospital Area, presented vivid displays of their respective organizations in action. Because of the obvious importance of the objective of improvement of health and health facilities for our citizens, I would like to submit to you the text of address given by Brig. Gen. Conn L. Milburn, Jr., Deputy Surgeon General:

REMARKS BY BRIG. GEN. CONN L. MILBURN, JR., DEPUTY SURGEON GENERAL, AT OPENING EXERCISES OF THE HEALTH FAIR, SAN ANTONIO, TEX., OCTOBER 25, 1963

It is a double joy for me to participate in the opening ceremony of this health fair of San Antonio: First, to have the honor and privilege of representing the Army Surgeon General, Lt. Gen. Leonard D. Heaton, and second, to have this opportunity for a homecoming to my place of birth, city of lifelong friends and where some of my family still resides.

The Army Medical Service and Brooke Army Medical Center are indeed pleased to participate in this community activity in such a vitally interested and Armed Forces motivated city.

We are particularly happy to be of assistance in fostering health education and careers, especially as San Antonio is rapidly becoming one of the important medical centers in the United States.

I hasten to congratulate San Antonio for this fine effort in bringing health service needs to the attention of the public.

It is timely to make young people of this city aware of the critical situation that exists today in the health field, of the golden opportunities for rewarding careers in any one of a number of health services, and to stimulate them to choose one for a lifelong career.

Today, there are critical shortages in almost every category of health service—doctors, registered nurses, practical nurses, and other paramedical personnel, such as laboratory and X-ray technicians, and many others.

And the health needs of this country will continue to increase in future years, requiring more and more medical and health personnel.

The population of the United States is increasing rapidly; namely—Do you realize that between 1960 and 1970, the number of people will increase at a rate equivalent to adding each year a city the size of Chicago?

So, simply to serve more people, we need an increased number of health workers. The population will not only increase in number, but there will be more babies, more elderly people, and higher economic status of the people, resulting in greater and greater demands for health services.

At present $29 billion (5.7 percent of the gross national product) are expended annually for health services contrasted to $3.6 billion in 1929; health workers have quadrupled to 2 million from 500,000 since 1910. We are now destined to see even more rapid demands for health services.

San Antonio shares in these critical shortages of health personnel, and increases in demands for health services.

A recent survey by the health and medical committee of your chamber of commerce revealed some 2,600 job opportunities in hospitals in Bexar County, and additional ones in medical and dental offices and in private laboratories. And just recently, after a special study, one of the San Antonio newspapers ascertained a critical shortage of paramedical personnel—specifically, there were some 357 actual vacancies in the principal hospitals at the time.

Today, health services are administered to the population by a team—the health team.

This team, the physician as its captain, and with its integral members, must work together toward one common goal—the preventive measures against disease, the curing of the sick and injured, the saving of life and limb, and the amelioration of pain and suffering.

And what could be more important, more self-rewarding than to become a member of this noble and Godly team.

The many new discoveries of scientific facts and truths, with their accompanying means and methods of treatment, have made the practice of medicine, as we know it today, complex and of tremendous scope.

At the present time, the conquest of infectious diseases, the newer knowledge of nutrition, the broad ramifications of stress physiology, and the rise of psychosomatic medicine, have all served to focus attention on the patient as a whole—comprehensive and rehabilitative medicine, if you will.

So today, working with the doctor in fulfilling his overall obligation to the patient, we have the health team, composed of the doctor and his many assistants.

The nurse, who ministers to the sick, alleviates discomfort, allays apprehension, and gives medications.

The medical laboratory technician, who performs laboratory tests of various kinds in aiding in the making of diagnoses.

The social worker, who collects socioeconomic and environmental factors, important to comprehensive care.

The dietician, medical record librarian, the occupational and physiotherapist all perform innumerable functions which expedite patient management.

There are many other paramedical technicians and personnel on the team, including the X-ray technicians, the operating room technicians, the practical nurse, and nurses' aids and other auxiliary personnel.

Ladies and gentlemen, the purpose of this health fair, which we are inaugurating this morning, is to acquaint the eligible persons of this community with the roles and career opportunities of the various assisting members of the health team which I have mentioned. I am sure the fair will accomplish its purpose.

I would like to brag a little about the Army's accomplishments in the training of large numbers of technicians and other paramedical personnel, to assist our medical officers and nurses on the Army health team.

I am certain I can claim the right to do some bragging, in view of my Texas birthright.

Here at the Brooke Army Medical Center, Fort Sam Houston, about 15,000 young men and women in the Army Medical Service are trained each year to function as practical nurses or as laboratory or X-ray technicians, as operating room technicians, as technicians in physiotherapy or occupational therapy, or as dental, pharmacy or preventive medicine specialists, and as others. In all, we are training individuals in 18 different medical technical or specialty areas.

Many of these young Army medical service trainees, after serving obligated tours of duty in the Army, or after completion of varied length enlistments, return to their home communities to serve them in their technical skills. San Antonio shares this benefit of Army medical training.

Accordingly, our programs of Army medical and technical training have mutual relationship and benefits with the citizens of this city.

And I am quite certain that General Snyder, commander of Brooke Army Medical Center, and General McGibony, commandant of the Medical Field Service School, are well aware of this interdependence between the Army Medical Service and this community in meeting the health needs of both the Army and the civilian community. I am certain that their counsel and advice will always be available to you.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am very proud that the Army and community are partners in the conservation of the health of our soldiers and civilians alike.

Thank you.

NUCLEAR PROPULSION FOR SURFACE SHIPS OF THE NAVY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which I am a member, recently concluded a series of executive hearings on the application of nuclear propulsion to surface vessels of the Navy. In our hearings we covered the question of the use of nuclear power in the next aircraft carrier, CVA67, in considerable depth. During these hearings we heard representatives of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Navy, and the Department of Defense, including the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara. I understand it is the objective of the chairman of the Joint Committee to prepare a report on these hearings. Such a report, I am sure, will clarify a number of very vital issues in this field concerning which there appear to be some misunderstandings.

Some of the cost comparisons given as arguments against the use of nuclear power, speaking as an individual, give me concern. Included in the cost estimate for the nuclear propulsion plant was the cost of the first set of reactor cores which would fuel the propulsion plant for 7 years. On the other hand, no fuel cost was charged against the conventional oil-fired plant.

In addition, the Secretary of Defense in his comparison of the nuclear aircraft carrier propulsion plant with an oil-fired plant claimed that the nuclear ship would be capable of carrying an extra squadron of fighter aircraft as compared to the conventional carrier he intends to build. He then charged the cost of an extra aircraft squadron to the ship with the nuclear plant. This was used as an argument against the nuclear plant.

In addition, included in the costs of the nuclear-propelled aircraft carrier, are costs for a bigger ship which greatly increases aircraft fuel and armament capacity both vital to the intended purposes of the carrier. No compensating factor was considered for the conventional carrier in this respect either.

To put it in a few words, such comparisons do not appear to convey the pertinent factors involved.

I hope that the Joint Committee report on this matter will analyze these comparisons and will be made available soon since such a report, I am sure, will help us all in considering vital defense and security issues in the future.

Mr. John W. Finney prepared an article which was printed in the Sunday, November 17, 1963, issue of the New York Times which discusses a number of factors concerning the use of nuclear power by the Navy. I commend this article to the review of my colleagues. Under unanimous consent, I include the article entitled "Criticism of McNamara Mounts" in the RECORD:

CRITICISM OF MCNAMARA MOUNTS—HE IS RESPECTED FOR HIS ABILITY BUT POLICIES ARE CHALLENGED

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON, November 16.—As he sat in his Pentagon office this week, Robert S. McNamara, far from the thickest skinned man in town, must have wondered what happened to all those congressional friends of yesterday.

A year ago the Congressmen were competing for time to praise Mr. McNamara as the greatest Secretary of Defense in history. So fawning were they in their praise that one began to suspect that Congressmen's memories were beclouded by a desire to ingratiate themselves with the richest man in town, so far as their home districts were concerned.

Now, instead of paeans, Mr. McNamara was finding politically sharp barbs being hurled at him from Capitol Hill. He was accused, probably unjustly, of incorrectly informing the President on the cutback of an air defense communications system. A prominent Democrat, Representative MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois, insinuated that Mr. McNamara was the willing prisoner of "computer jockeys." And perhaps most biting of all for the former Ford Motor Co. executive, members of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy were suggesting that he was intent on building a model T Navy.

BRUISES

Ahead of him lay the still uncompleted Senate investigation of the TFX contract, with all its political bruises on administration ranks and on the military. The investigation, which at times seems motivated as much by a personal animosity toward Mr. McNamara as a desire to establish the facts in the contract selection, will resume next week, with the Defense Secretary finally being subjected to senatorial cross-examination.

Behind him lay a potentially more significant, decisive confrontation this week with the congressional Atomic Energy Committee over his refusal to build a nuclear carrier. What was basically involved, however, was not so much the carrier as a challenge to the McNamara accounting logic that to the Congressmen seems to overlook the irreversible technological tides of a nuclear age.

It is probably going too far to say that a general disenchantment has set in on Capitol Hill with Mr. McNamara. As from the outset, he still commands widespread congressional respect as the "take charge guy" who brought some order and discipline into a building that the Congressmen were convinced was overflowing with interservice rivalry, waste and duplication. If Mr. McNamara is not outwardly perturbed, it is because he still commands the respect of the individuals who count on Capitol Hill, the senior legislators who control the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees.

NO LONGER IMMUNE

But it also is becoming evident that Mr. McNamara is no longer the invincible champion of the Pentagon, immune to congressional criticism or challenge. Gradually developing within congressional ranks is a certain personal hostility to Mr. McNamara and an uneasiness over his centralized control of the Defense Establishment and over the direction of his defense policies.

Just why the McNamara popularity began to ebb is difficult to say. Probably one reason is that in this politically jealous town a man can ride high for just so long before he is cut down to manageable size. But Mr. McNamara undoubtedly contributed to his prestige decline by his own personality and policies.

Like many a brilliant, assertive individual—which he is—Mr. McNamara can give the impression of intellectual arrogance, an impression that is particularly annoying to a back-slapping politician who prides himself as much on his knowledge of national problems as on his geniality. As they have sat behind their committee benches listening to Mr. McNamara, some Congressmen have begun to wonder if they were listening to a college professor lecturing a not-too-bright freshman class.

Mr. McNamara has only compounded his congressional difficulties by his seeming indifference to legislative proprieties and sensibilities. A case in point was the way he handled his decision against a second nuclear carrier. He chose to announce his decision just a few days before the congressional Atomic Energy Committee was scheduled to hold hearings on the nuclear fleet issue—a timing that incensed the committee chairman, JOHN O. PASTORE, normally an administration stalwart. What Mr. McNamara neglected to tell Senator PASTORE, at least in advance, was that he wanted to clear the decks of the nuclear carrier issue before Fred Korth left as Secretary of the Navy.

DEMANDING WAYS

Mr. McNamara's humorless, precise, demanding ways have also contributed to his difficulties within the military ranks. His difficulties may be largely with the older generation of military officers who do not understand the computer approach to defense questions. But the fact remains, as Adm. George W. Anderson recently deplored in his swan song as Chief of Naval Operations, there has been a breakdown of the degree of confidence and trust that should exist between the civilian and military leaders of the Defense Establishment. It is significant and illustrative, for example, that before making his decision on the carrier, Mr. McNamara did not give the Navy an opportunity to present a detailed briefing on the pros and cons of a nuclear carrier or to rebut some of the erroneous cost estimates that the Navy felt Defense Department "operations analysts" were presenting. Whether the Navy officials are correct in their accusation is not so important at this point as the fact that they should feel this way.

POLICY CHANGE

But far more personality is involved in this changing congressional attitude. There is a widespread congressional concern over the direction of McNamara policies toward abandonment of manned bombers and reliance upon ballistic missiles. In fact, if Mr. McNamara had been willing to accept the production of another squadron of B-52 or B-53 bombers, he probably could have pacified much of the congressional animosity.

There also is concern over Mr. McNamara's cherished "cost effectiveness" approach in reaching decisions, an approach that attempts to determine which weapon to build by weighing its effectiveness against its cost. Cost effectiveness is not new, of course. It was basically this approach that a decade ago led to the "big bang" revamping of the defense program by Charles E. Wilson. But under Mr. McNamara cost effectiveness has been brought to such a degree of sophistication and influence that Congressmen and military men alike are beginning to complain that defense policies are being determined by a bunch of "computer jockeys" in back rooms of the Pentagon convenient to Mr. McNamara's office.

The long-range significance of the nuclear carrier issue may well be that it provides the first clear-cut challenge—minus all the political implications of the TFX case—of the cost effectiveness approach. It is primarily on the basis of cost that Mr. McNamara has opposed the nuclear carrier. He questions whether the advantage of nuclear power would be worth the extra cost, which he estimates at $125 to $160 million—nearly double the Navy estimates. And he contends that a decision really cannot be made until the Navy makes a detailed cost effectiveness study of the implications of nuclear power for the entire surface fleet.

Among some of the administration's scientific advisers and particularly among members of the congressional Atomic Energy Committee there is a feeling that Mr. McNamara and his associates have carried the cost effectiveness approach too far on the nuclear carrier issue. The feeling was reflected in a letter written last December by Dr. Emanuel R. Piore, a scientist influential in the ranks of the President's Science Advisory Committee. "Very often detailed analysis confuses the issues in making bold technical decisions," Dr. Piore wrote. "In nuclear-powered ships we may be in this situation."

POSSIBLE MATCH

With the congressional Atomic Energy Committee, Mr. McNamara may meet his legislative match. Few committees on the Hill are so well informed, so well staffed, so aggressive in fighting a cause. And like Mr. McNamara, the committee members do not suffer from much humility about their beliefs.

One of the strongly held convictions of the committee is that the nuclear fleet issue cannot be answered solely by cost studies but also requires an element of judgment that cannot be programed on a computer. Almost intuitively, the committee members believe that technological progress makes inevitable the conversion of the fleet to nuclear power and that it makes no sense, militarily or technologically, to continue building capital ships with obsolescent powerplants.

In their convictions the committee members are strengthened by their past judgments, such as in prompting the development of the hydrogen bomb over the opposition of the scientific community and in pushing the development of the *Nautilus* atomic submarine over the resistance of the Navy and the Defense Department. As they are pointing out, no amount of cost effectiveness studies or programing on a computer could have shown that out of the *Nautilus* would have come, within a few short years, the Polaris weapons system.

NOT CERTAIN

It is evident that the atomic committee, despite all its historical and factual arguments, was unable to sway Mr. McNamara on the nuclear carrier issue. Nor is it certain that the committee and Congress in the future will be able to rush Mr. McNamara any faster than he wants to go in building a nuclear surface fleet.

After all, despite the congressional criticism, Mr. McNamara holds one powerful weapon to keep Congress in a cooperative mood. In his hand he holds $50 billion, and no Congressman wants to bite too openly a hand that may feed contracts or military bases in his home district.

The committee, however, also has an ace in the hole, for it can raise the question of whether Mr. McNamara wants to go down in history as the man who blocked the transition to a nuclear-powered fleet. For a man who is insistent upon being right and finds it difficult to admit being wrong, that could be a subtle but persuasive argument.

COTTON ALLOTMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, the Democratic whip.

Mr. BOGGS. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me, because I want to talk about something that is not relevant to what the gentleman will be talking about.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] made a statement on the floor a minute ago about hasty inquiries; and about statements which have been made relative to conflicting inquiries on the circumstances surrounding the death of our late lamented President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. I can say on the highest authority that this matter is going to be the subject of an inquiry, and that it will be a very high level inquiry and that it will bear no resemblance to partisanship. It will be completely objective. So what I am saying is that the gentleman can be assured that it is such a type of inquiry that will be conducted.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. I think the gentleman from New York was interested in having the various congressional inquiries coordinated. We have had the announcement that there will be an inquiry conducted by the Senate Judiciary Committee, the House Judiciary Committee, and the House Un-American Activities Committee. I believe the suggestion of the gentleman from New York was to try to coordinate the inquiry from the standpoint of the Congress. We understand there will be a congressional committee appointed to make an inquiry. But from the standpoint of the legislative branch, I think his suggestion was that we try to coordinate the activities at this level where we have the responsibility.

Mr. BOGGS. I will say to the gentleman, I am in no position to make a commitment of any kind. But what the gentleman is talking about; namely, the coordination of the efforts here so that there will not be this unseemly scramble for hearings, and so forth, will be done and I think it can be said, also, that this body and the other body will be properly included.

Mr. GOODELL. I appreciate the assurances of the gentleman from Louisiana. I would have preferred that we proceed with a high-level joint committee of the Senate and the House. I introduced such a resolution last Wednesday—but in any event, I appreciate the gentleman's assurance that that effort will be made to coordinate any action that is taken by the Senate and the House so that it is done in a dignified manner at the highest level without a competitive situation involved at all.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman. I think what the American people want both for the sake of the President and the future of our country is a straightforward, objective research into all of the facts so that there will be no question about this either now or hereafter.

Mr. GOODELL. If the gentleman will yield further, I may say that there are facets of this that extend beyond the jurisdiction of any single committee of the Congress. We all recognize that and I think it should be a broad inquiry representing the entire Congress of the United States.

Mr. BOGGS. I think I made that position quite clear and I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for yielding.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I think all of us were somewhat surprised, although few lawyers were aware of the fact, that there was no jurisdiction in the Federal courts of this country, even a concurrent jurisdiction with the State courts, in an area where the homicide of the President occurred. I believe that the appropriate Federal court should have concurrent jurisdiction with the State court for the punishment of an assault upon or the killing of the President or Vice President of the United States. So I have just introduced a bill providing that the appropriate Federal court shall have concurrent jurisdiction with the State court, and the prior right of trial, for the punishment of anyone who attacks, assaults, or kills either the President or Vice President of the United States.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, in the Congressional Record of October 17, 1963, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Weltner], under special order, placed in the Record a list of cotton farmers in the various States of the belt holding allotments in excess of 1,000 acres or more, and indicating the amount of subsidy such farmers received from the Government. I hope he is present or will be during the course of these remarks. In this table he showed the name of the owner of the farm, the county and State where the farm was located, the effective allotment, measured acres, estimated yield per acre, production, and the alleged amount of subsidy for the year 1961.

Here is a table that was sent me by the ASCS Policy and Program Division, Department of Agriculture, which summarizes the sizes of the allotments throughout the Cotton Belt for upland cotton. This table reflects the following information with regard to allotments of 1,000 acres or more. According to the table there are 286 original allotment farms across the country throughout the cotton-growing area of the Nation with 1,000 acres or more of allotments. Of these 286 farms 145 were owner operated, and 141 tenant operated farms. There were 2,691 share tenants and sharecroppers involved in working these cotton farms. The economy of many communities as well as great numbers of farmers and farmworkers are to be considered.

The large farm is nothing more than an aggregation of several small farms. They are small operators who live on the land and earn their livelihood and support their families by producing cotton. When it is alleged that there are 286 who operate alloted acreage of more than 1,000 acres in cotton, no mention was made of the actual facts, contained in the table to which I have referred, that they are talking about 2,691 small farmers who actually lease or are tenants or sharecroppers upon such cotton farms.

The incentive system made our Nation great. John C. Claybrook, a Negro, came to Crittenden County, Ark., the county in which I live, as a young man with a few pennies in his pocket. He started to work clearing land from virgin forests. He saved his money and was able to obtain timber contracts of his own in the area. He acquired a few acres at first and such holdings grew to a sizable operation as he applied his energy and talents.

There was a town named for him—Claybrook, Ark. He was a respected citizen and was highly regarded. He was the owner of a store, a cotton gin, and several hundred acres of fertile delta land. He acquired these properties by his own efforts. When he passed away, the Memphis Commercial Appeal paid a fine tribute to the man himself and his accomplishments. I read that splendid editorial into the Congressional Record, along with comments, as I knew John Claybrook and was aware that here was a success story that had been repeated over and over again in this country. The incentive system means a desire to get ahead. It distinguishes America from the Communist world in that in communism you find a monolithic type of philosophy. Under the American system initiative is the moving force by which we operate. Abraham Lincoln had this to say about our property system:

> No man living is more worthy to be trusted than those who toil up from poverty—none less inclined to take or touch aught which they have not honestly earned.
>
> Nor should this lead to a war upon property or the owners of property. Property is the fruit of labor, property is desirable, is a positive good to the world.
>
> That some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him labor diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built.

These farmers who hold cotton allotments of 1,000 acres or more should not be condemned because of their success. Under the American plan of individual initiative they should be encouraged.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is to associate myself with other Members who have corrected the record with respect to our orderly marketing program for cotton. Too often the mechanics of this marketing program are misunderstood, as they have been in this instance. I have not had the opportunity to contact those farmers in my parishes listed in the statistics placed in the Record of October 17, but I feel perfectly safe in saying that those growers marketed their cotton in the same fashion outlined by other Members who have checked with their farmers.

Thus, as the statistics indicate that some 7,796 bales of cotton were grown in four parishes of my congressional district, giving an exact amount which was paid in "subsidy," and, certainly it would be most difficult to believe that all of this cotton was sold into export. But, that is what the Record of October 17, 1963, would indicate.

It is my expectation that these farmers marketed their cotton into private channels of trade and that the only benefit they received was the fact that our Federal marketing program made it possible for them to hold on to their cotton until the price on the market reached a point that encouraged them to sell.

This is the purpose of the cotton marketing program and without it there would be chaos in the Cotton Belt and a resulting depression throughout the Nation.

I am glad that this effort is being made here today to set the record straight.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I have some letters from Arkansas farmers here that I would like to incorporate and make a part of the Record to show just what was done with this cotton in the year 1961. The last column of the table indicates that the full amount of subsidy of $42.50 per bale was paid these producers, as though all of it, every bale, was sold for export.

The purpose of these remarks is to bring to the attention of those who may be interested the facts with respect to just what happened with regard to these farmers' cotton in 1961. Generally, if all the crop had been disposed of, some two bales out of every three found their way into use by the domestic mills and approximately one-third of the cotton would have been shipped for export and there was a subsidy paid on that export cotton of $42.50. The table placed in the Record should be corrected in this respect.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the Record several letters from my district and attachments with regard to this particular issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. Mahon]. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Letter No. 1 with attachments)

J. F. Twist Plantation,
Twist, Ark., November 11, 1963.

Congressman E. C. Gathings,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear "Took": Enclosed find detailed analysis of our 1961 cotton sales compiled by Sledge & Norfleet, Memphis, Tenn., who marketed our crop on a commission basis.

Several observations of interest can be made from these facts. First, that Mr. Weltner submits these production figures obtained from the Department of Agriculture but omits the information also of record in the Department of Agriculture that the J. F. Twist acreage allotment is shared by eight additional farmers renting from the plantation and operating separately in every regard except for paying rentals. These eight-family operations produced 1,409 bales of the 1,856 bales produced in 1961.

The next clear fact is that 1,825 bales of the total production of 1,856 bales was sold to domestic mills. How Mr. Weltner can compute that $71,187.50 subsidy was paid to the plantation, I do not see.

Only 31 bales of the total production of nine farming operations was placed under Government loan.

Anything else you need, let us know.

Very truly yours,

John F. Twist.

J. F. Twist Plantation cotton sales, year of 1961

Date sold	Number of bales	Farmer	Price	Buyer	Mill
1961					
Oct. 5	49	J. F. Twist	$0.36	R. L. King & Co.	Martel Mills Group.
	20	Caldwell	.36	do	Do.
	24	Gilchrist	.36	do	Do.
	39	Harbison Bros.	.36	do	Do.
	18	Kelly	.36	do	Do.
	8	Kelly & Bounds	.36	do	Do.
	13	Leo Linn	.36	do	Do.
	13	Milam	.36	do	Do.
	15	McCain	.36	do	Do.
	14	J. F. Twist	.35	do	Do.
Oct. 11	35	do	.3575	do	Do.
	17	Linn	.3575	do	Do.
	12	Milam	.3575	do	Do.
Do	47	Caldwell	.3575	R. A. Armistead & Co.	Matthews, Crews & Lucas, Inc.
	11	Harbison	.3575	do	Do.
Oct. 13	21	Gilchrist	.3575	A. M. Sinclair & Co.	Woodside Mills.
	15	Caldwell	.3575	do	Do.
Oct. 17	28	J. F. Twist	.3325	R. L. King & Co.	Martel Mills Group.
	14	Caldwell	.3325	do	Do.
	25	Harbison Bros	.3325	do	Do.
	23	Linn	.3325	do	Do.
	21	J. F. Twist	.3575	do	Do.
	28	Gilchrist	.3550	do	Do.
	13	Harbison Bros	.3550	do	Do.
	2	Kelly	.3550	do	Do.
	4	Kelly & Bounds	.3550	do	Do.
	14	Linn	.3550	do	Do.
	17	Milam	.3550	do	Do.
	1	Caldwell	.3550	do	Do.
Oct. 19	13	Gilchrist	.3575	A. M. Sinclair	Woodsie Mills.
	17	J. F. Twist	.3350	A. C. Brooks & Co.	Deering Milliken Service.
	15	Harbison Bros	.3350	do	Do.
	12	Linn	.3350	do	Do.
Oct. 23	31	J. F. Twist	.3350	do	Do.
	25	Harbison Bros	.3350	do	Do.
	9	Linn	.3350	do	Do.
	7	Caldwell	.3350	do	Do.
Oct. 24	11	Kelly	.3575	F. M. Crump & Co.	J. P. Stevens Mills Group.
	3	Kelly & Bounds	.3575	do	Do.
	24	Milam	.3575	do	Do.
	16	J. F. Twist	.3575	do	Do.
	15	Gilchrist	.3775	do	Do.
	10	Harbison Bros.	.3575	do	Do.
Oct. 26	43	J. F. Twist	.3350	R. L. King & Co.	Martel Mill Group.
	7	Caldwell	.3350	A. C. Brooks	Deering Milliken Service.
	13	Harbison	.3350	do	Do.
	54	Linn	.3350	do	Do.
Nov. 2	54	do	.3350	R. L. King & Co.	Martel Mill Group.
	18	J. F. Twist	.3350	do	Do.
	29	Caldwell	.3350	do	Do.
	2	Harbison	.3350	do	Do.
	22	Milam	.3350	do	Do.
	15	Kelly	.3550	do	Do.
Nov. 6	25	J. F. Twist	.3540	do	Do.
	14	Caldwell	.3540	do	Do.
	20	Gilchrist	.3540	do	Do.
	5	Harbison Bros	.3540	do	Do.
	3	Linn	.3540	do	Do.
	3	Caldwell	.3350	A. C. Brooks	Deering Milliken.
	10	Linn	.3350	do	Do.
	9	Milam	.3350	do	Do.
Nov. 14	3	Linn	.3350	R. A. Armistead	Matthews, Crews, & Lucas.
	24	J. F. Twist	.3350	do	Do.
	16	Caldwell	.3350	do	Do.
	9	Harbison	.3350	do	Do.
	4	Linn	.3350	do	Do.
	9	Milam	.3350	do	Do.
	29	J. F. Twist	.3275	Anderson-Clayton Co.	Unknown.
	15	Linn	.3275	do	Do.
	12	Milam	.3275	do	Do.
Nov. 15	21	Caldwell	.3275	Larkin-Hinkle & Co.	Do.
Nov. 17	3	Kelly & Bounds	.35	Clarence Hessley & Co.	Do.
	10	Kelly	.35	do	Do.
	2	Kelly & Bounds	.32	do	Do.
	5	Kelly	.32	do	Do.
Nov. 22	22	Caldwell	.3350	A. C. Brooks & Co.	Deering Milliken.
	3	Harbison	.3350	do	Do.
	15	Linn	.3350	do	Do.
	21	Milam	.3350	do	Do.
	13	J. F. Twist	.3275	do	Do.
	12	Caldwell	.3275	do	Do.
	14	Linn	.3275	do	Do.
	20	Milam	.3275	do	Do.
Nov. 27	7	Harbison	.3275	do	Do.
	14	Gilchrist	.3350	do	Do.
	10	McCain	.3350	do	Do.
	1	do	.33	do	Do.
Nov. 28	1	J. F. Twist	.3275	do	Deering Milliken Service.
Nov. 30	11	Kelly	.3150	Lawshe Cotton Co.	Do.
Dec. 4	3	J. F. Twist	.3250	A. C. Brooks	Do.
	13	Caldwell	.3250	do	Do.
	8	Gilchrist	.3250	do	Do.
	2	Linn	.3250	do	Do.
	1	Milam	.3275	do	Do.
	12	J. F. Twist	.35	R. A. Armistead	Matthews, Crews, & Lucas.
	15	Caldwell	.35	do	Do.
	7	Gilchrist	.35	do	Do.
	5	Harbison	.35	do	Do.
	10	Milan	.35	do	Do.
Dec. 8	2	McCain	.32	A. C. Brooks & Co.	Deering Milliken Service.
	5	J. F. Twist	.32	do	Do.
	10	Caldwell	.32	do	Do.
	18	Harbison	.32	do	Do.
	34	Linn	.32	do	Do.
Dec. 11	2	Milam	.34	T. J. Flake & Co.	Do.

J. F. Twist Plantation cotton sales, year of 1961—Continued

Date sold	Number of bales	Farmer	Price	Buyer	Mill
1961					Deering Milliken Service.
Dec. 15	1	Gilchrist	$.3050	F. M. Crump & Co.	Do.
	1	Harbison	.3050	do	Do.
	21	J. F. Twist	.3050	do	Do.
	10	Milam	.3050	do	Do.
	4	Caldwell	.3050	do	Do.
	6	Linn	.3050	do	Do.
Dec. 27	5	Caldwell	.3050	A. C. Brooks & Co.	Deering Milliken.
	3	Harbison	.3050	do	Do.
	11	Linn	.3050	do	Do.
	2	McCain	.3050	do	Do.
1962					
Jan. 2	3	Linn	.3375	do	Do.
	1	J. F. Twist	.3250	do	Do.
Jan. 6	15	McCain	.35	R. A. Armistead	Matthews, Crews & Lucas, Inc.
Jan. 24	1	Milam	.3350	Clarence Hessley Co.	Do.
Feb. 1	2	J. F. Twist	.3056	C. L. Andrews & Co.	Do.
	2	Caldwell	.3056	do	Do.
	5	Gilchrist	.3056	do	Do.
	2	Linn	.3056	do	Do.
	5	McCain	.3056	do	Do.
Feb. 13	21	J. F. Twist	.27	W. B. Bridgeforth & Co.	(Cotton still on hand.)
	9	Harbison	.27	do	Do.
	26	Linn	.27	do	Do.
	1	Milam	.27	do	Do.
	1	Kelly	.27	do	Do.
Feb. 16	1	J. F. Twist	.33	George M. Dorms & Co.	Do.
Mar. 15	12	do	.27	W. S. Campbell & Co.	Do.
	10	Milam	.27	do	Do.

Source: Compiled by Sledge & Norfleet, of Memphis, Tenn.

On the 1,675 acres of cotton harvested on the J. F. Twist Plantation in the year 1961 by J. F. Twist and renters, here is the yield and disposition of the bales:

	Number of bales	Sold to mills	Government loan
J. F. Twist Plantation	447	435	12
Leo M. Linn	339	339	0
J. E. Milam	200	197	3
Johnny Twist	17	17	0
John L. Cummins	39	39	0
Paul McCain	65	52	13
T. A. Gilchrist	156	154	2
Bobby Kelly	92	92	0
L. M. Caldwell	287	286	1
Harbison Bros	214	214	0
Total	1,856	1,825	31

Mr. Allen stated that the farmer never gets the subsidy on the cotton sales; that the first buyer of the cotton is the recipient instead.

He further stated that affidavits attesting to the validity of the above sales can be secured from the buyers if needed.

(Letter No. 2 and attachment)

BIRDEYE ANGUS FARMS,
Birdeye, Ark., November 18, 1963.

Hon. E. C. GATHINGS,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR "TOOK": Replying to your letter of several days ago and your conversation with Maurice, Jr., this morning, we are enclosing a list of the various tenants and their acreage participation in the 1961 cotton allotment. Some of these tenants participated one-half and some three-fourths in the acreage listed by their names. Also we are enclosing a letter from Staple Cotton Co-op Association, who sells all our cotton, stating that one-fourth of the 1961 crop was sold for export. [Letter not made an exhibit.]

Trusting the enclosures will be useful and sufficient, I am,

Yours very truly,

J. H. JOHNSTON, Jr.

Distribution of 1961 cotton acreage, ASC contract, section J-105, Cross County, W. M. Smith & Sons, owners, and J. H. Johnston, Jr., operator, as follows:

Name of participant:	*Cotton acreage*
Erwin Worley	40
Levelle Hinton	35
Doise Parker	25
J. C. Parker	25
Travis Vaughan	15
Nolan Stafford	25
Milam Bros	50
Bud Huey	20
Earl Wheelington	26
Hoyte Evans	30
Gene Scott	150
Herbert Burroughs	90
John Barnes	6
Sylvester Cannon	17
Bill Manual	14
Albert Glass	20
Gracie Garrett	18
Captillar McHenry	14
Ezell Moore	20
Tom Payne	15
Kid Widdlington	10
Buddie McDaniel	10
Andrew McNeil	8
Eugene Hinton	25
Mary Williams	16
H. T. McCoy	15
Pete Harris	10
James Slaughter	7
Jim Johns	12
Lucious McCoy	30
Parilee Scott	22
Frank Harris	18
John Fuller	8
Anna McDaniel	7
John Robinson	24
W. M. Robinson	5
Bilbo Robinson	5
Homer Johnson	8
Wilbert Williams	20
Coatney Bailey	27
Fred Tucker	10
Mabel Davis	15
Willie Eashington	18
Caleb Drew	7
Alberta Farmer	8
N. G. Akins	9
Corenza Hopkins	10
Myrtle Hazlett	7
Boat Wynne	11
Fletcher Barton	20
James Farmer	5
Lee Wright	17
Ed Ginn	8
W. W. Hazlett	13
William Jordan	15
M. B. Burroughs	30
Madie Davis	3
Henry Scott	11
Willie Barnes	12
W. M. Smith & Sons	201
Total	1,372

(Letter No. 3)

ARMOREL PLANTING CO.,
Armorel, Ark., November 9, 1963.

Hon. E. C. GATHINGS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR "TOOK": I want to thank you for the copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I enjoyed Mr. WELTNER's remarks; however I do not agree with them all.

After checking our records I find we did not put any cotton in the loan from our 1961 crop. It was all sold on the open market. If it should have been put in the loan it would be very difficult for us to find out if it was sold export or to domestic mills since if we decline to exercise our options to pay off the loan to the Commodity Credit Corporation, we pass out of the picture and to check the number of bales you refer to would have to be done through the compress records and would be a very slow process. The original purchaser from the Commodity Credit Corporation might sell the cotton several times before it reaches its final destination.

Yours very truly,

E. M. REGENOLD.

(Letter No. 4)

HOWE LUMBER CO., INC.,
Wabash, Ark., November 9, 1963.

Hon. E. C. GATHINGS,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR "TOOK": Many thanks for your letter of November 5 and the copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 17.

Our cotton production for the year 1961 is grossly misrepresented in this report as our actual harvest for that crop year was 3,991 bales from the 3,598.8 acres allotted us for the year. Of these 3,991 bales 2,928 of them were sold to domestic mills through regular channels, 40 of the bales were destroyed by fire either on the gin premises or en route to the compress, leaving 1,023 bales which were placed in the Government loan. These bales weighed 537,162 pounds and grossed a loan figure and, of course, the Government subsidy would be for only a fractional amount of the average loan price. The total loan price as shown on the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD certainly would not be considered the amount of subsidy used to market this cotton. The yield per acre for our 1961 crop was 545.9 pounds lint per acre.

We hope we have given you the information needed to make proper correction of the statements regarding our crop and if additional information is desired, please advise. We have complete records with reference to the above submitted figures.

Sincerely,

S. J. Howe.

(Letter No. 5)

Cromer Bros.,
Ginners and Planters,
Osceola, Ark., November 12, 1963.

Congressman E. C. "Took" Gathings,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Gathings: One thousand and thirty-six bales of cotton were sold to the domestic mills from our 1961 cotton crop leaving a balance of 139 bales which went into the Government loan. By multiplying these 139 bales by the $42.50 per bale export subsidy rate we come up with a total of $5,907.50.

It would be appreciated if you would pass this information on to Mr. Weltner, of Georgia, in an effort to refute the figure $49,937.50 which he alleged we received as a subsidy from the U.S. Government in 1961.

It is hoped this is the information desired in your letter of November 5, 1963.

Yours sincerely,

H. A. Segraves.

(Letter No. 6)

Crain Co.,
Wilson, Ark., November 12, 1963.

Hon. E. C. Gathings,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear "Took": Replying to your letter of November 4 in regard to cotton, we wish to give you the following information:

The acreage allotment was 1,376.9 acres, and the measured acres were 1,376.9 acres.

The production for the year 1961 was 1,280 bales or 642,505 pounds lint cotton, which is a yield of 466.6 pounds of lint per acre.

Of this 1,280 bales produced, 273 bales were put in the CCC loan for a total loan value of $47,710.42, and the balance of 1,007 bales were sold to domestic mills.

Trusting the above will give you the information needed, I am,

Sincerely yours,

W. J. Denton.

(Letter No. 7)

A. G. Patteson & Co.,
Jonesboro, *Ark., November 7, 1963.*

Hon. E. C. Gathings,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Gathings: In reply to your letter of November 5, wish to advise that, with the exception of 105 bales, all of the cotton grown on our cotton allotment in 1961 was sold to mills in the United States.

Trusting this is the information desired, I am,

Yours very truly,

A. G. Patteson.

(Letter No. 8)

Lee Wilson & Co.,
Wilson, Ark., November 6, 1963.

Congressman E. C. Gathings,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear "Took": It is unique that our two letters, both written on the same day and both covering the same subject, crossed. I refer to our letters of November 4 regarding Mr. Weltner.

To answer your question more specifically, Lee Wilson & Co. handled in the year 1961, not only the 5,201 bales as shown, but the Keiser Supply Co. cotton of 1,035 bales, and the Lee Wilson Estate cotton of 803 bales. According to Mr. Weltner, the subsidy paid us was $299,157.50. This is not true. Our entire crop was sold to George H. McFadden, Bros., and the 1962 and 1963 crops to Cook & Co. I have no way of knowing how many of these bales went to domestic mills and how many went for export, but in any event, none of it went in the loan and no subsidy was paid to us as farmers as is alleged by Mr. Weltner.

Sincerely yours,

R. E. L. Wilson, 3d.

(Letter No. 9)

Lowrance Bros. & Co.,
Driver, Ark., November 14, 1963.

Hon. E. C. Gathings,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear "Took": In reference to your letter of November 4 requesting information as to how many bales of cotton of the 1961 crop were sold to domestic mills, it is hard to get this exact figure but I can give you the following information:

In 1961 Lowrance Bros. & Co. produced 1,355 bales. Of this amount 741 bales were sold, and 614 bales went in the loan. C. J. Lowrance & Sons produced 1,563 bales. Of this, 1,121 bales were sold, and 442 bales went in the loan. The cotton that was sold from both accounts was sold by Dockery & Donelson Cotton Co., of Memphis, Tenn., of which my brother, Chester Lowrance, is a partner. I have talked with him and he said that at least 80 percent of the cotton that was sold that year was sold to domestic mill buyers. The other 20 percent was sold to buyers like Anderson-Clayton and Cook & Co., and there is no way to trace where that cotton went without a lot of detail work on the buyers' part.

The only correct thing that I can see that Mr. Weltner, of Georgia, has in the Congressional Record is the allotted acreage and the measured acreage for each farm. He is simply assuming that the cotton he shows was produced that year was all sold for export shipment, which is ridiculous on the face of it. I cannot understand how Mr. Weltner could get such information entered in the Congressional Record. If I can be of any further help to you please call on me.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

C. J. Lowrance, Jr.

(Letter No. 10 and attachment)

Marvell, Ark.,
November 9, 1963.

Hon. E. C. Gathings,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear "Took": I want to thank you for your good letter which came yesterday, and I want to assure you that I am more than happy to give you all the assistance possible in clearing up the misinformation assembled by the Representative from Georgia.

For some years all of our cotton from Ration plantation, which Brooks Griffin operates, along with his own farming interests, has been handled either by our cotton brokers in Helena, T. W. Keesee Cotton Co., whom you know well, or it has been put in the Government loan. At no time has even a single bale of this cotton been disposed of through the direct export program, and neither Mr. Griffin nor I have ever received a penny of subsidy from the Government for any of this cotton.

Sincerely yours,

Lily Peter.

T. W. Keesee & Co., Inc.,
Cotton Factors,
Helena, Ark., November 9, 1963.

Miss Lily Peter,
Marvell, Ark.

Dear Miss Peter: With reference to the letter from the Honorable E. C. Gathings in connection with the Brooks Griffin 1961 cotton crop, we have gone through our files and submit the following information to you:

Sold to domestic mills, or direct by us for domestic mills: 767 bales of cotton.

Sold to local cotton shippers: 246 bales of cotton.

Of the 767 bales sold to domestic mills, 329 bales were redeemed from the Government loan and sold. The other 438 bales were sold directly without going into the Government program at all.

We have no way of knowing what disposition was made of the 246 bales sold to shippers, and we can only assume they were used by domestic mills rather than exported.

If there is any further information we can give you regarding this matter please let us know, and we will be delighted to do so.

Yours very truly,

Allen R. Keesee.

(Letter No. 11)

Crump & Rodgers Co.,
Memphis, Tenn., November 20, 1963.

Hon. E. C. Gathings,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

Dear "Took": I am sorry but your letter just reached me in regard to the cotton crop of N. Vick Robbins.

Without digging up the old records which would be quite difficult to find, I can say from memory that Vick Robbins' allotment in 1961 was 500 acres, and on this allotment he only made about 300 bales, as this was the year of the early freeze. Of the 300 bales, I feel sure none went export.

I hope this information will be of help to you.

I certainly appreciate your effort in behalf of the cotton legislation and hope something can be done in December.

Yours very truly,

Dabney Crump.

(Letter No. 12)

R. H. Taylor & Stuckey,
Merchants, Planters, Ginners,
Trumann, Ark., November 15, 1963.

Hon. E. C. Gathings,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear "Took": With reply to your letter of November 5, 1963:

The best I can ascertain from our records it appears that of the 1,283 bales of the 1961 crop, 891 bales were sold outright; 391 bales were placed in the loan. Then prior to the takeover date of this 391 bales of equity in 183 bales was sold. The remaining 208 bales went into the CCC stock.

Hope this information will be of use to you.

With my best personal regards to you and yours, I remain,

Yours truly,

J. C. Stuckey.

(Letter No. 13)

Staple Cotton
Cooperative Association,
Greenwood, Miss., November 15, 1963.

Mr. Glenn U. Miller,
President, Miller Lumber Co.,
Marianna, Ark.

Dear Mr. Miller: We are very glad to report to you on the sales of your 1961 crop.

You will recall that your cotton was handled through our grade and staple pool. Therefore, the exact figures on your individual baleage have to be partially by estimate since your returns reflected the equities above loan value on a per-bale basis within the pool. A close approximation is that 75 or 76 percent of your total baleage was sold and the loan repaid with interest to the Commodity Credit Corporation with no subsidy involved. In the case of cottons from the pool more than 95 percent of them were sold to domestic mills. Applying these percentages to 1,450 bales, as indicated in Mr. Gathings' letter, there would be only 5 percent on which there was an export subsidy paid, or 73 bales. Altogether, the 75 percent redeemed from the loan would amount to 1,088 bales on which the loans were repaid to the Commodity Credit Corporation with interest and the Government did not have a loss in that part of the cotton at all. The remainder of the cotton in the loan was turned over to CCC on July 31, 1962.

If we can be of further assistance to you, please do not hesitate to call upon us. I am enclosing an extra copy of this letter, thinking you might want to forward the copy to Representative Gathings.

Cordially yours,

Charles R. Sayre.

(Letter No. 14)

Ohlendorf Farms,
Osceola, Ark., November 15, 1963.

Hon. E. C. Gathings,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear "Took": Referring to your letter regarding the subsidy received by Ohlendorf Farms on the 1961 cotton crop, it would be almost impossible for us to trace the cotton sold by us to the ultimate consumer. I would, however, seriously question the figures presented.

Our records show for the 1961 crop of 1,827 bales of cotton all were sold on the market except 99 bales. These 99 bales were placed in the Government loan.

We appreciate your interest in this matter very much.

Sincerely,

Harold F. Ohlendorf.

(Letter No. 15)

R. C. Branch,
Joiner, Ark., November 12, 1963.

Hon. E. C. Gathings,
House of Representives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear "Took": In reply to your letter of November 4, 1963, with reference to my cotton acreage allotment and production for the year 1961 as reported on page 19791 in the Congressional Record of October 17, 1963. Wish to give you the following information: My acreage for 1961 was 1,967.9 rather than 2,085 and my actual yield was 1,812 bales. The estimate yield of 700 pounds per acre was wrong since my production was near 500 pounds per acre.

As to the cotton produced on my operations, it would be difficult to say how many bales were exported at $42.50 per bale subsidy and how many were domestically consumed without a complete check of the records of the cotton shippers who purchased the cotton. I would estimate after talking with several cotton factors (sellers) that approximately 20 to 25 percent of this crop was exported and the balance domestically consumed.

This is all the information I could give you on this matter without considerable research of the records.

Hoping this letter will in some respect give you the information you desire, I am,

Yours sincerely,

Rufus Branch.

(Letter No. 16)

Mallory Farms,
Chatfield, Ark., November 15, 1963.

Congressman E. C. Gathings,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear "Took": In answer to your letter of November 4, we find in checking our records that we ginned 1,174 bales of cotton off of our allotted acres in 1961. Our allotted acres for that year were 1,053.4, but only 1,016 were harvested. The weight of these bales did not average 500 pounds each.

These bales were stored at the Memphis Compress & Storage Co., Memphis, Tenn., and through its records we have ascertained the following information:

Shipped to domestic mills, 1,009 bales; high-density compressed for export, 21 bales; shipped to Canadian mills, 28 bales; shipped to other warehouses for consolidation, standard-density compressed, presumably for domestic mills, 56 bales; on hand in storage at present time, belonging to the Government or others, 60 bales; total, 1,174 bales.

These bales were sold or put into the Government loan (40 bales) by local cotton merchants.

I trust this information will give you what you need, and if I can assist you any further in this matter, please do not hesitate to get in touch with me.

Sincerely,

Roger A. Killingsworth,
Manager.

(Letter No. 17)

C. W. Hussey & Co.,
Memphis, Tenn., November 11, 1963.

Mr. R. L. Spurlock,
Weona Farms,
Weona, Ark.

Dear Mr. Spurlock: In reply to your letter requesting information on the disposition of your 1961 cotton crops for Weona Farms our records show that Weona Farms did not receive one cent in subsidy payments.

The cotton crop was sold to merchants and mills with the exception of those bales that were placed in the Government loan. Any subsidy paid on this crop was paid to such merchants as may have shipped the cotton for export. Any of the cotton redeemed by the producer was in turn sold to merchants; cotton not redeemed by the producer from the Government loan was taken over by the Government and then sold by the Government for their own account.

At no time was any subsidy paid to Weona Farms. We are amazed that such a statement would be made by any person the least bit informed.

Very truly yours,

Robert J. Hussey,
President.

(Letter No. 18)

Wesson Farms, Inc.,
Victoria, Ark., November 8, 1963.

Congressman E. C. Gathings,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear "Took": In running down the information you requested in your November 5 letter, I have run into a snag which I think prohibits me from sending you what you really need.

What I can furnish is that we sold our entire 1961 cotton crop of 1,622 gin run bales totaling 838,962 pounds of lint cotton on the tables in Memphis, Tenn. The cotton was sold by Barton Cotton Co., 115 South Front Street. I am enclosing our scratch sheet of penciled figures where we ran down the information. We do not know and have no way of finding out if this cotton all went export or not. Barton Cotton Co. says that the majority of it was sold to domestic mills. I don't know where the 2,016 bales mentioned in your letter came from. Maybe we are due some more cotton from someone.

I hope the above will be of use to you and I am sorry we cannot follow it all the way through for you.

Sincerely yours,

Frank Lee Wesson.

(Letter No. 19)

B. C. Land Co.,
Leachville, Ark., November 8, 1963.

Hon. E. C. Gathings,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear "Took": In 1961 we put 2,673 bales of cotton in the Government loan as indicated in your letter of November 5.

Enclosed find a photostatic copy of 1,849 bales redeemed by the John C. Weaver Cotton Co. on April 23, 1962. (This photostatic copy is not being attached.)

Trusting this is the desired information, I remain,

Blue Hoyt.

(Letter No. 20)

Portis Mercantile Co.,
Lepanto, Ark., November 11, 1963.

Congressman E. C. Gathings,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear "Took": Receipt is herewith acknowledged of your letter of November 5.

In reply thereto, desire to advise that in checking our cotton sales for the year of 1961, it appears that at least 90 percent of our cotton was sold through L. T. Barringer & Co. of Memphis, Tenn., representing the Cannon Mills and through F. M. Crump & Co., also of Memphis, Tenn., representing the J. P. Stevens Mills.

For this reason, you can readily see that we could have had very little cotton which was sold for export.

If you should desire any further information, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Kindest regards.

Yours very truly,

D. F. Portis.

(Letter No. 21)

E. Ritter & Co.,
Marked Tree, Ark., November 15, 1963.

Hon. E. C. Gathings,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear "Took": In answer to your letter of November 5 requesting information about the marketing channels of our cotton, we have checked the sales through to the buyers and are enclosing a copy of this record for your information and use.

Your letter and the Congressional Record show a total of 7,084 bales. This figure tallies with a report that was made prior to the end of the season. Our final ginning was 7,135.

Since we are growing certified and foundation DLP smooth leaf cotton, the domestic mills are our best outlet for this special variety.

We have carried our report to also include our customers which was purchased by domestic mills.

I hope that this report will give you the desired information to help correct the erroneous report made in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

L. V. Ritter, *President.*

(Letter No. 22)

Fairview Farms Co.,
Tyronza, Ark., November 8, 1963.

Hon. E. C. Gathings,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Thank you for your letter of November 5 relative to our 1961 cotton crop. That year our entire crop was sold to cotton merchants, the bulk of it going to F. M. Crump & Co. and L. T. Barringer & Co., both of Memphis, Tenn. These merchants paid us for the cotton, and to which mills they delivered the cotton we have no way of knowing. If there was any subsidy involved it certainly did not come to Fairview Farms Co. As both of the above-mentioned firms do a large business with domestic mills, I assume all of our cotton was used in the United States.

Hope the above information will be of some use to you.

Very truly yours,

H. F. NORCROSS.

(Letter No. 23)

JUDD HILL PLANTATION,
Trumann, Ark.

Hon. E. C. GATHINGS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR "TOOK": I apologize for not having answered your letter of the 5th before, but I have been ill and am just now getting on top of things again.

In my particular case, our records show that we produced 1,938 running bales in 1961 on Judd Hill Plantation land. Not one bale of this was put in the loan but sold to cotton merchants through our Staple Cotton Cooperative Association. Whether any of this cotton was exported, we have no way of knowing. We believe it was all used domestically, but once it was out of our hands we, of course, had no further interest in it. What is a fact is that of the 1,938 bales, 40 farmers on this place got all of the income from 1,063 bales, the balance coming to me as rent or as gross crop income from the portion of the crop farmed by me as a day crop.

I think it should be pointed out that a landowner like me can get along on a lower priced cotton. I do not think I could do it on cotton at the world price of around 24 cents, but I could take some less than the present supported price. But those 40 farmers I mention cannot accept very much less and keep up the standard of living they now have, buy machinery and trucks and send their children through school.

Sincerely,

S. C. CHAPIN.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that several letters addressed to Hon. OREN HARRIS, my colleague from Arkansas, with respect to this matter, be incorporated and made a part of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NOVEMBER 25, 1963.

Hon. OREN HARRIS,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARRIS: In response to your inquiry relative to information Mr. WELTNER, of Georgia, provided to be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD concerning alleged subsidies paid Holthoff Bros., B. A. Bell, and Mrs. A. J. Johnson, of Gould, Ark., I submit the following information:

In the first place the allotment of over 1,000 acres of cotton to this farm was a combination of allotments of several farms with several owners and with approximately 100 families depending on the allotment for a livelihood. This combination was brought into being because the method provided better supervision and made possible some reduction in overhead in growing this cotton. Secondly, I am unable to ascertain how many bales actually went into export trade, but the cotton merchants in Pine Bluff tell me that only a small percentage of southeast Arkansas cotton goes into export markets. These merchants inform me that domestic mills buy out of CCC stock most of the cotton in this area to use here in the United States at a price fixed by CCC and at such times of the year as they have need for stocks of raw cotton. In my considered judgment less than 15 percent of the cotton that Holthoff Bros., B. A. Bell, and Mrs. A. J. Johnson ever was handled by an export merchant and thus was subsidized. Using this figure and a figure of 100 families deriving livelihood from the producing of this cotton, each of these families would, as Mr. WELTNER states, be subsidized $143.65.

It is my understanding that when an export merchant buys CCC stock and exports this cotton which is subsidized he has to in a declared length of time provide either for domestic mills or mills overseas and not paid a subsidy of a like or equal number of bales that he exports with a subsidy. In other words, an export merchant that buys 1,000 bales from CCC and is paid a subsidy must in a certain length of time buy from CCC at CCC prices another 1,000 bales on which no subsidy is paid. You might check into this to see if I am correct.

I trust that the enclosed information is of some assistance to you. No American farmer wants to feel that he is on a dole from the Federal Government. He does feel that the American system should provide him as much protection for his chosen means of making a living as it provides other people who have chosen fields other than farming. An analysis of the percentage of American income spent for food and fiber compared with any other nation should readily attest to the fact that American consumers are fed and clothed better and more abundantly than any other place in God's whole creation.

The Cooley cotton bill is not perfection, but I feel that it is the best we can do at this time and does provide for a measure of protection to the cotton producers.

I thank you for your interest in the matter and hope that you can support the bill.

I was delighted to see you in Dallas and have a visit with you.

Yours very sincerely,

HOWARD HOLTHOFF.

ARKANSAS STATE PENITENTIARY,
Grady, Ark., November 25, 1963.

Mr. OREN HARRIS,
Fourth District of Arkansas,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We are just in receipt of your letter of November 23, 1963, and we are at a loss to know why the records show that we received a subsidy of $70,890 as we did not receive this subsidy.

On August 16, 1961, our entire cotton crop was auctioned off in the field. This cotton brought 105 points over the A loan and the high bidder was James H. Cross & Co., of Pine Bluff, Ark.

We delivered to this firm 2,517 bales of cotton and the last delivery was on January 9, 1962.

We do not understand why the records would show that we received the above subsidy and if you can explain this to us we would appreciate same.

Thanking you for your cooperation.

We are,

Yours very truly,

EUGENE P. NUNN,
Business Manager.

R. A. PICKENS & SON CO.,
Pickens, Ark., November 26, 1963.

Mr. OREN HARRIS,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HARRIS: Your November 23 inquiry about the destination of our 1961 cotton crop is acknowledged and our reply to same follows:

This company produced and sold 3,815 bales of cotton from the 1961 crop. The ultimate destination was: 3,809 bales entered domestic mills (in United States of America); 3 bales went to a mill in Quebec, Canada; 2 bales went to a mill in Hamilton, Canada; and 1 bale was shipped to Italy.

In trying to trace this information, we have contacted the two purchasers of this cotton and the people they sold the cotton to. Then we have had the different cotton warehouses make a check on this and advise where the cotton was shipped to.

We feel these figures are accurate and that we can substantiate them in any way that might be needed.

Your interest is well appreciated here. In cotton legislation, the tail (the Southeast) has been wagging the dog for too long.

Best regards,

R. A. PICKENS.

CORNERSTONE FARM & GIN CO.,
Pine Bluff, Ark., November 27, 1963.

Hon. OREN HARRIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HARRIS: In reply to your letter of November 23, we estimate that our 1961 cotton crop was sold as follows:

To American mills, 95 percent, 1,329 bales; for export, 5 percent, 70 bales; total, 1,399 bales.

We certainly disagree with Mr. WELTNER, of Georgia, and appreciate your assembling this information.

We now understand that passage of the Cooley cotton bill is favorable and are certainly glad that you are supporting it every way possible.

Respectfully,

CORNERSTONE FARM & GIN CO.,
STANDARD INVESTMENT CO.
HARVEY W. MCGEORGE.

DUMAS, ARK.,
November 27, 1963.

Hon. OREN HARRIS,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In reply to yours of November 22 regarding certain cotton allotments and their subsidy, I am happy to report the following disposition of the 1,543 bales of cotton mentioned:

Sale No. and buyer:	*Bales*
152, Walsh	23
156, Columbia Compress	29
155, Walsh	148
163, Walsh	122
180, Barringer	28
197, Walsh	400
213, Walsh	400
272, M. A. Woolen	33
299, M. A. Woolen	96
316, Godecke	11
755, McKee Cotton Co	150
Total	1,440

Mr. Walsh bought the cotton for Johnson & Johnson, the bandage people. Columbia Compress is the buyer for Springs Cotton Mills. Barringer bought the cotton for Cannon Cotton Mills and Woolen is an Atlanta, Ga., shipper who reportedly does no export business, as is the case with McKee of Memphis. That leaves the 11 bales sold to Godecke unaccounted for which we cannot trace on this short notice.

I do not know where Mr. WELTNER got his total of 1,543 unless he included some cotton belonging to our other trust that was included in one or more of the above sales. However, our total of 1,440 bales is the correct one for the allotment involved. It is obvious that all of that cotton was consumed domestically with the possible exception of the 11 bales to Godecke. It is our belief that it did likewise but would take further checking.

We have always tried to raise and process a cotton that is suitable for our mills and have been fairly successful at it, so far. Over the years, Johnson & Johnson have bought a large percentage of our production.

Mr. WELTNER, in his responsible position, should have ascertained the facts before creating this false impression, and going so far as to print it in the Congressional Record. We received no subsidy of $65,577.50. We have been rather proud of the fact that we are raising cotton for the market and not for the Government loan. We also resent this unjust notoriety caused by Weltner without having been given a chance to review it before its publication.

We wish to thank you for bringing this to our attention and will be glad to furnish you any other information that we can, if you so desire.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely,

Stimson Veneer & Lumber Trust.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman for putting in the Record the material which he has just mentioned. To set the record straight somewhat, figures have been misconstrued with reference to the actual subsidies paid. I might say that in my particular district in California there is probably the largest percentage of so-called large cottongrowers in America who are listed in some of these lists showing some rather large subsidies. I have had the opportunity, due to comments made by columnists some months ago, specifically to investigate the amount of subsidy paid one of the largest growers listed in this most recent list placed in the Record. I might say that that particular farmer has not received any Government subsidy of any kind from the Federal Government for the past 5 years; unless you wish to say that the fact that he was permitted to orderly market his crop through the use of a Government loan amounts to a subsidy, even though every bale of cotton placed in the loan for the purpose of orderly marketing was redeemed and he paid interest on the money which was borrowed. So that actually without referring specifically to the names of the individuals in my own district, the farmers did not receive Government subsidies in the amount stated and this particular farmer who it was said received a subsidy in excess of $1 million, as I recall, in this last year, actually not 1 cent of subsidy was paid. He got the loan for orderly marketing and he redeemed every bale of cotton and paid interest on the money borrowed under the loan. But not 1 penny of subsidy was involved in that particular case.

To say that simply because a grower produces *x* number of bales of cotton that he automatically received $42.50 of subsidy per bale is wholly erroneous when we check into the actual facts of the case, as these programs are handled and as they are carried out.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California. The CCC loan is a procedure used for orderly marketing of farm products. In this instance the cotton goes into the loan during the fall of the year when the harvest is underway and it is withdrawn in the spring when the price may be higher. The farmer pays the interest and the carrying charges. On those bales the Government really earns money instead of it being a burden to the taxpayers.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, among those referred to in the issue of the Record were a number of people in the district which I represent. I got in touch with some of them and asked them to give me some statistics concerning their cotton program.

I will not go into detail. I do have here a letter from Judge Charles C. Thompson, farmer and rancher of Colorado City, Mitchell County, Tex., who has an allotment of about 1,000 acres. He advises me that approximately one-fifth of the cotton produced on these acres went into the Government loan. He advises me further of the names of the seven tenants who actually farmed the land and participated in the program.

I do not have the statistics for all the farms referred to in the area which I represent, but I thought the information supplied by Judge Thompson would be of interest.

It places in better focus and makes more understandable the operation of this program.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Record at this point a letter addressed to me on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

(The letter referred to follows:)

Colorado City, Tex.,
November 19, 1963.

Hon. George Mahon,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Mahon: With reference to my cotton allotment for 1962, please be advised:

1. The acreage quoted is substantially correct.
2. Approximately one-fifth of the cotton went into the loan.
3. I presume all the cotton sold to local buyers was used by domestic mills.
4. I did use tenants who lived on the farms and operated them. My tenants were:

(a) Sam Thompson, 320 acres; (b) W. C. Harlow, 120 acres; (c) J. D. Hartsfield, 100 acres; (d) Foy Webb, 125 acres; (e) J. W. Cline, 75 acres; (f) M. J. Sursa, 80 acres; (g) L. F. Forbes, 160 acres; total, 980 acres.

I would be glad for you to use this information in any way you see fit.

Sincerely,

Chas. C. Thompson.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I want to congratulate the gentleman for taking this time and setting the Record straight on the subject which was discussed by our colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, here some few days ago. I do not know that his remarks were deliberately erroneous. I am quite sure they were not. In fact, I am confident they were not. Someone undoubtedly misinformed him, both as to the operation of the program and the benefits thereof.

The gentleman from Georgia inserted in the Record the names of certain farmers, not in my district, incidentally, but from another part of the State, who are alleged to have received this so-called subsidy. As a matter of fact, some of these farmers did not market a single bale of their crop through the loan program. In fact, the marketing by some of these farmers moved their cotton directly from the gin into the trade and not through the loan program. Their cotton was never handled by an agent of the Department of Agriculture. Yet, our colleague inserted a statement in the Record that these farmers received large cash subsidies from the Government. They did not receive a nickel.

I do not know where our colleague from Georgia—of course, Atlanta is not much of a cotton-producing district—got his figures. But, he certainly did not get them from farmers themselves or from a very authentic source.

I think it is very unfortunate that his speech went into the Record accompanied by so many erroneous figures. I hope it will be appropriately corrected.

The speech also clearly indicates that the gentleman was not familiar with the use of the program as a means of orderly marketing. Those who so use the loan program actually pay interest to the Government for their loans.

Also it should be said, Mr. Speaker, that the price support and loan program is very popular among and beneficial to our small cotton farmers. With so many small farmers from Georgia participating therein and benefiting therefrom, it would appear to me that every Georgia Congressman, even though they might come from a metropolitan area like Atlanta, would be making a fight to guard and preserve the program.

Again I wish to congratulate our distinguished colleague from Arkansas for arranging this time and for yielding to me.

Mr. GATHINGS. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so be permitted to extend their remarks with regard to this subject at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION INTO THE AFFAIRS OF ROBERT G. (BOBBY) BAKER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, during the second week in October this year, the Senate Rules Committee unanimously authorized and directed an investigation into the affairs of Robert G. (Bobby) Baker, erstwhile employee of the majority in the other body and whose pay was derived from the legislative payroll.

I am informed that even before that date in October, the U.S. Justice Department had conducted a limited investigation into some aspects of Baker's activities in the Government and in outside business fields. This, I understand, was for the purpose of determining whether he was improperly using his position as secretary to the majority in the other body to pile up a fortune estimated at nearly a million dollars.

While it would seem that the Justice Department proceeded at a slow pace until early October, it now appears that since that time the Attorney General has pressed forward in a vigorous effort to get to the bottom of the whole Bobby Baker story. Many FBI agents, Internal Revenue agents, and law-enforcement personnel in other agencies are reported cooperating on a coast to coast basis in tracing the many facets of Baker's relationships with influential persons in both the legislative and executive branches of Government as well as private business.

This is a most important investigation for it involves a much needed exposure of the misuse of government power for private financial gain. Only through exposure in its entirety can an evil of this nature be eliminated and bad governmental practices ended.

Certainly, every citizen of this country should be gravely concerned by any evidence whatever that fortunes can be amassed through the direct or indirect use of political influence in the executive, legislative, or judicial branches of government.

In recent years, there has been much to criticize in the executive branch of Government from the Truman scandals through the conflicts of interest in the Eisenhower administration and including the conflicts of interest in the cases of Navy Secretary Fred Korth and Deputy Defense Secretary Roswell Gilpatric. And Congress has not been without its share of similar cases in recent years.

Although some steps have been taken to make congressional spending public business, these have been only short steps in the right direction.

The Bobby Baker case has provided the impetus for a full investigation of Congress in these matters, and for reforms that could have real meaning. If Congress really cleans its house it will be in a much better position to speak in a forthright manner with respect to improper activities in the other branches of Government.

The late President Kennedy had become concerned enough to tell his last press conference that "Mr. Baker is now being investigated and I think we will know a good deal more about Mr. Baker before we are through."

The late President indicated that "other people may be investigated as time goes on" in connection with the Baker case.

While I disagreed with the Kennedy administration on many matters, I found some hope in the late President's comments that indicated he was behind a full investigation of the Bobby Baker case. His comments, coupled with the aggressive investigations by the Justice Department, have led me to believe that perhaps we would reach the point of full disclosure and effective action in the Baker case.

I am hopeful that the probe will continue with the same full vigor under President Johnson. I hope President Johnson will soon give the assurance that he finds the Bobby Baker investigation important and couple this with a pledge to see that it is pursued, no matter where it may lead.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MILLER of California, for 30 minutes, on Monday next, December 2.

Mr. GATHINGS, for 45 minutes, today, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HARRIS.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 167. An act to provide for the conveyance under certain conditions of the phosphate rights in certain lands in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1024. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay relocation costs made necessary by actions of the District of Columbia government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1406. An act to authorize the establishment of a junior college division within the District of Columbia Teachers College, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1533. An act to amend the act of July 24, 1956, granting a franchise to D.C. Transit System, Inc., to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1540. An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the regulation of rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1878. An act to amend the act providing for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union in order to extend the time for the filing of applications for the selection of certain lands by such State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1964. An act to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, to increase the fee charges for learners' permits; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2054. An act to eliminate the maintenance by the District of Columbia of perpetual accounts for unclaimed moneys held in trust by the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3190. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, relating to devices and bequests by will;

H.R. 3191. An act to exempt life insurance companies from the act of February 4, 1913, regulating loaning of money on securities in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 7497. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia relating to annual statements and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 809. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2267. An act to amend Public Law 88–72 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, December 2, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1400. A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on title I, Public Law 480 agreements concluded during October 1963, pursuant to Public Law 85–128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1401. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a semiannual report on the fiscal operations of the United Nations concerning the United Nations financial situation as of June 30, 1963; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1402. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, relative to reporting that proceedings have been concluded with respect to the claims of certain Indian tribes, pursuant to section 21 of the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY:

H.R. 9291. A bill to provide office space, supplies, equipment, and franking privileges for Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, to authorize appropriations for the payment of expenses incident to the death and burial of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 9292. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp honoring the late President John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 9293. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 9294. A bill to provide that circulating currency of the United States in the denomination of $10 shall bear the likeness of John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9295. A bill to provide for coinage and issuance of 50-cent pieces bearing the likeness of John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 9296. A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 9297. A bill to authorize an exhibit at the New York World's Fair in honor of the late President of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 9298. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. district courts to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of certain commercial fishermen and fish processors against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 9299. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make certain acts against the person of the President and Vice President of the United States a Federal crime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9300. A bill to authorize the appropriation of $5 million to carry out the purposes of the National Cultural Center Act and to designate the National Cultural Center authorized to be constructed by such act as the "John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial National Cultural Center"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 9301. A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 9302. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make certain acts against the person of the President and Vice President of the United States and certain other Federal officers a Federal crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 9303. A bill to amend the act making Veterans Day a legal holiday and to urge the people of the United States to appropriately commemorate such day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. Con. Res. 239. Concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Con. Res. 240. Concurrent resolution expressing the thanks of Congress to the television and radio industry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. Con. Res. 241. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the services of the radio and television industry during the recent national tragedy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. SICKLES introduced a bill (H.R. 9304) for the relief of Chan Yoon, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

464. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to legislate to cause any attempt on the life of any Federal official receiving more than $20,000 annual salary to be a Federal case above and beyond the powers of any State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

465. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to legislate to require all salesmen or sellers of both telescopic sights for guns, as well as all silencers for guns, to report said sale of the possibly lethal mechanisms to the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

466. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to legislate that no U.S. citizen who renounces his or her U.S. citizenship to live in a foreign country shall ever be readmitted to U.S. soil unless by a special act of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The 4-H Gold Star Banquet at Mount Pleasant, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 29, 1963

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on November 9, 1963, at Mount Pleasant, Tex., I was privileged to attend the district 5 4-H Club Gold Star Awards Banquet. This meeting, attended by several hundred, was sponsored by the six rural electric cooperatives serving the area witnessed awards to the following outstanding young leaders:

Bowie County: Miss Clara Borcherding and Rodney William.

Camp County: Miss Sylvia Warrick and Tommy Bynum.

Cass County: Miss Janette Clark and Wendell Frost.

Delta County: Miss Carol Trapp and Scotty Calvin.

Franklin County: Tommy Tower.

Gregg County: Miss Brenda Cabbiness and Chuck Cowan.

Harrison County: Miss Janet Newman and Pat Wright.

Henderson County: Miss Judith Oliveria and Ed Reeve.

Hopkins County: Miss Judy Potts and Doyle McKinzie.

Lamar County: Miss Catherine Roberts and Mike Sparks.

Marion County: Miss Sandra Grubbs and Jerry Dreesen.

Morris County: Miss Karen Towler and Gary Northam.

Rains County: Nelson Spinks.

Red River County: Miss Marie Pace and Bill Marr.

Smith County: Miss Pat West and Billy Rozell.

Titus County: Miss Barbara Reese and David Adams.

Upshur County: Miss Betty Huggins and Billy Younkin.

Van Zandt County: Miss Joyce Durgin and Ralph Beal.

Wood County: Miss Angela Pipkin and Mickey Barnett.

The banquet was also a tribute to the Texas District No. 5 county extension agents, who spent so much of their time and energy in the training and guidance of these young Americans.

Their names follow:

Bowie County: H. R. Lynch.

Camp County: Robert B. Walsh.

Cass County: W. Truitt Powell and Mrs. Leopal Lambert.

Delta County: James R. Risinger.

Franklin County: C. R. Brown.

Gregg County: O. D. Taylor and Mrs. Jo Etta York.

Harrison County: Joe C. Frobese and Mrs. N. Sue Farris.

Henderson County: Harold O. Spann and Miss Betty J. Pinkerton.

Hopkins County: Paul D. Herschler and Miss Adell Hale.

Lamar County: S. L. Neal and Mrs. Marian B. Moore.

Marion County: Weldon B. Morris.

Morris County: Robert J. Dean and Miss Betty L. Garner.

Rains County: Mr. Herbert W. Brewer.

Red River County: Robert J. Moody.

Smith County: B. M. Browning and Miss Vera E. Adams.

Titus County: E. E. Neal, Jr. and Mrs. Anne S. Buchanan.

Upshur County: John H. Henry and Mrs. Evelyn W. Simpson.

Van Zandt County: Todd W. Berry and Miss Alma F. Flippo.

Wood County: E. A. Spacek and Mrs. Barbara A. Thomas.

District Agents: Mr. J. H. Surovik and Miss Mary L. Cothran.

My address on this occasion is set forth below in further recognition of the fact that with young people like these rest our hopes for the future.

The address follows:

EDUCATION FOR THE FUTURE

It is a great personal pleasure for me to be here at Mount Pleasant with Miss Cochran, Mr. Surovik, and all of you other young members of the 4-H.

Youth has been defined as the first 70 years of your own life and the first 20 years of everyone else's. By that token we are all here together as young people to participate in this happy ceremony.

It is exciting to consider that there are 19 counties involved in this project tonight with 36 award winners. And with the pleasure comes a challenging conviction that we are all partners in the greatest enterprise of all time, the success of our democratic way of life. Upon this depends the hopes of mankind for continued progress.

Tonight we have quite a few champions here in district 5 at this 4-H gold star banquet, and we have come to give our recognition to them. They have earned and won it, and I feel privileged to come here from Washington to join you in paying our respects to these young people for their achievements and for the leadership qualities they have shown. At the same time it is important to remember you are all at the beginning of a serious and fruitful adventure, and the honors awarded tonight are the beginning of what I hope will be a series of milestones in your careers.

Leadership is, of course, an honor and distinction. It is also a responsibility and sometimes a chore. But it is a road that must be taken in every generation by those who have the vision, courage, and stamina to pick up the torch, and one of the satisfactions is that when you do, others will follow.

You know, there is a story about a tenderfoot on a ranch down in Texas, who asked one of the experienced hands why he always slapped his pony on one side when he got into the saddle. "Well," said the old cowpuncher, "I figure that if I get one side going, the other is pretty sure to follow."

There is no necessity to spell out the challenges before you young people. You surely must feel it in your bones. In many parts of the world we have political revolutions as young societies break out of their static way of life and grope for a more fulfilling type of society. Vast economic changes are underway in Europe through the Common Market and other cooperative measures that are having tremendous effect on people. Communist nations continue to threaten our way of life.

At home our whole economy is undergoing vast changes, which have a profound significance for young people. We are in a revolution of automation that will produce results beyond our imagination.

Machines can turn out four automobile engine blocks in 3 minutes, or produce steel bars without any human activity. In the last 10 years, the automobile industry has gotten to the point where they can produce 15 percent more cars with 25 percent fewer workers. One American workman can now produce enough food and goods to sustain himself and six other people, and still leave something over for export to other countries.

The machine has taken over many jobs and is causing extensive unemployment. Coal miners are a case in point. There are just not enough jobs for all the trained coal miners because machines are now doing the work. As a result, their number has dropped from 450,000 to 130,000 in the past 15 years. Or take automobiles. In that same period the man-hours required to produce one car has dropped from 300 to 150.

It concerns you young people particularly because as a result of automation and inadequate purchasing power for goods, our economy hasn't been growing fast enough to absorb in useful work all of our growing labor force. Two years ago approximately 2½ million people reached the age of 18 and soon the annual crop of 18-year-olds will exceed 3½ million. Meanwhile automation is eliminating 1½ million jobs a year.

At the same time, ironically, new machines have created a demand for more skilled employees than we have ever had before. As a result, we have the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty, with almost 6 percent of the labor force out of work and another 2½ million workers restricted to part-time work. At the same time, it is impossible to meet the need for highly skilled employees that the age of automation is demanding.

The problem is a twofold one: First, we must resolve the problems of our economy so that our Nation is as productive as possible and continues to grow fast enough to fully absorb our growing work force. Secondly, we must achieve a higher level of education for Americans. Automation has no time, no place, no patience with the "standpatters"—the people who want to go along with things as they are, or as they used to be. In the real world of today, there are no wagon trains to the past.

This is the biggest problem you will have to face. If you exhibit the leadership that I know you have, this ceremony here today will be a symbolic one. It is the young leaders who are going to have to be sure that their associates will not be permitted to drop out of school or drop back in their efforts. We cannot afford to let our Nation slide into the doldrums.

You must see to it that we have a better educated nation tomorrow than we have today—to direct and operate the entirely new industries that are being developed, and to push the margins of research and development farther into the unknown.

This is not work which calls for people who merely push buttons. Nor does it call for those who swing pickaxes. There will be work, and plenty of it, that requires technical training and skill, as well as managerial competence and leadership, along with reliability and confidence. The world of the future will be a far cry from the dream of the lazy schoolboy that someone would produce a machine to answer all of the questions on his exam whenever the right button was pushed and that someone else would invent a robot to push the button.

The young people who go out into this future world without training and skills will be going into a dead-end street where there is no turning back and only frustration. And if many of our young people try to face the modern world without adequate training, our country will be doomed to mediocrity.

But I do not believe that this is going to happen and one good reason for this optimism is the kind of audience I see before me today.

We in the United States are going to move ahead not as a vast heartless machine, but as the people of faith that we are. And history shall bear us out.

It is important, however, that we all see our tasks and carry them out. Those of us in the legislative halls in the Congress, and in the State and municipal legislatures, must see to it that education and training are adequately financed, that our economy functions fully, and that our research and development move forward in a balanced vigorous style. And you young people who will make up the Nation's human treasure must see the sweep and scope of the problem and act accordingly. We have moved into an age of preparation and education. The frontier of opportunity will be open in precise ratio to the education and preparation that you can bring to your future work.

You may be sure that the world will be in need of everything you have to offer. No one can provide you with the character and education that this requires. You must study for it, strive for it, and earn it. And when you do, like the skilled athlete who enters the arena, you will be given your chance to run with the ball.

Begin your leadership now. Work with and for those among your associates who are less able. Make certain as far as you can that they remain in school and continue their education as you must continue yours.

Don't let automation become an instrument of lessening your job opportunities—instead make it a broad avenue for widening and increasing them.

Our forebears have done a job for us, greater than any in the whole of human history, to make our lives free and enjoyable. The responsibility is now being passed on to you. Your fathers and grandfathers fought through two World Wars and a harrowing depression, and they came out of it whole for themselves and for you. You come of a race that has gallantry and heroism—this has been proved again and again right in your own time. The future, with all its threats and all its perplexities, is brighter for this generation of youth than it has ever been for any generation of youth that has gone before. You here before me today are making an excellent start. I have faith that in the decades to come this Nation, under God, will prove the fulfillment of its destiny as the great hope of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, it was heartwarming and inspirational to see these young people respond with brightened faces to the following presentation with which the banquet concluded:

CITIZENSHIP

Setting: American flag, spotlight, record, "Battle Hymn of the Republic."

Doyle McKinzie. We have all been reading about interplanetary flight. However, we all know the most important space—is that space which we take up as individual citizens in a democracy.

There are many important characteristics in being a good citizen in a democracy. These must be considered, not only at this banquet, but put into practice in our home, club and everywhere we go. We will discuss some of these characteristics.

Judy Potts. I would like to talk about charity. Honor and forgiveness of others. Charity towards others, honor in our activities and forgiveness of other's shortcomings. These three things are necessary in living happily with people. This is a major part of citizenship which is developed each day by each of us. Have you practiced these qualities in your club, in your community, in helping your family, in understanding and appreciating people of different interests from your own? These and the next quality, tell us about things that are necessary to live comfortably with our neighbors.

Barbara Reese. Self-control is essential to every good citizen in our democracy.

Many brilliant and talented people have risen to the top in their chosen fields, only to fail because of the lack of self-control. Every time we permit the petty annoyances of people around us to arouse resentment, anger and impatience we are displaying the lack of self-control. Without this quality we seem undependable and it is easy to say and do things which hurt others deeply. Things which we later resent but cannot call back.

Judy Potts. Love of country is saluting the flag, singing the National Anthem. Love of country is the joining of Armed Forces to fight for freedom. But remember that loyalty is the most important quality of them all.

To love God is to know His will and way as revealed in His Bible. To feel loved by Him is to set our compass for the journey through life on a true course. It insures a safe passage, destination, and the greatest of all companions on the travel. That is why we say to our friends when it is time to part—what I say to you now, "Go with God every step of the way."

Doyle McKinzie. Remember the important characteristics which were stated: Charity, forgiveness, honor, self-control, and love of God. To be a strong democracy we need to rededicate ourselves to these ideals which are important to this great Nation.

One of the most inspiring pledges of rededication ever made comes to us from the past in the beautiful words of Abraham Lincoln.

David Adams: Recitation of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.

Mr. Speaker, if people all over the world could attend such a meeting, and observe our people in this setting, it would demonstrate with convincing force that we are a peace-loving, God-fearing nation and that this new generation is strong to defend our flag and our freedoms, and proffers a wealth of good will to all who will accept.

Your Challenges: Regulation and Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 29, 1963

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, October 21, this year, our able colleague, Hon. WALTER ROGERS, of Texas, made the most interesting, challenging speech to the Texas Association of Broadcasters. His subject was "Your Challenges: Regulation and Responsibility." I have heard many fine comments from members of the association and others who were privileged to hear this address.

Due to the fact that it deals with some of the problems of not only the broadcasting industry but with other regulatory procedures, I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of the Members and commend it for your consideration.

The speech follows:

YOUR CHALLENGES: REGULATION AND RESPONSIBILITY

(Address of the Honorable WALTER ROGERS, Member of Congress from the 18th District of Texas, and chairman of the Subcommittee on Communications and Power of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at the convention of the Texas Association of Broadcasters, Monday, October 21, 1963, in Dallas, Tex.)

Members of the Texas Association of Broadcasters, your distinguished visitors, and guests, I am indeed happy to be here today to visit with you on issues that I feel are important not only to your industry but to our State and our Nation.

I come before you as a duly elected Member of the Congress of the United States of America, fully aware that there are rumors afloat that the actions of that body have not been universally satisfactory. However, I am enjoying a temporary sense of well-being in the knowledge that the group present here today are not strangers to trials and tribulations and have had some experience with criticism.

You executives in the broadcasting industry, whose days are filled with bumbled commercial announcements, complaining sponsors, irate listeners, equipment failures, sharp questions from the station owners, network preemptions, sudden cuts in the opposition's rate card—and another letter from the FCC, probably feel that no other individual could possibly be confronted with so many and so varied problems.

Let me point out that a friendly and understanding soul might be your own U.S. Congressman, whose average day is filled with almost every conceivable turn of events, beginning with the troubles of a misplaced constituent in darkest Africa or a missent baby book, and ending with a letter from an irate constituent beginning Dear Sir—spelled C-U-R.

Please don't misunderstand me, I am not complaining. I am like the rooster who found a football, pushed it home to his own barnyard, and displayed it to the flock of hens telling them he was not complaining but just wanted them to see what was being done in other backyards.

I have always subscribed to the school of thought that if you don't like what you are doing, try something else. Whether we are in politics, the broadcasting industry, or any other phase of the economy of this great country, it would be well to follow the admonition of former President Harry Truman, "If you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen."

The problems of politics, broadcasting, industry, and so forth, cannot be solved by bickering and complaining and calling people names. Life in itself is a challenge, as is everything we undertake in life. Our responsibility is to meet those challenges and to deal with them fairly, honestly, and effectively.

For the purposes of this meeting, and in keeping with the limited time available, I think it would be well for us to address ourselves to a few of the more vital problems facing your industry, the proper solutions of which will serve not only you as individuals but, in my opinion, the Nation as a whole. I think it would be well to preface my remarks by the comment that, in my opinion, the broadcasters of this Nation—both television and radio—have done an outstanding job.

In less than 43 years commercial broadcasting has earned, through technical excellence, imaginative programing, and sound management, the preeminent position as America's entertainment-information medium. For this you are entitled to the highest commendations from this Nation and the world, but I would warn you that it does not relieve you of the continuing need for aggressive action on your part and for constant vigilance to protect yourselves and your industry in the true sense of the private enterprise system of our economy.

The dangers lie in the future, not in the past. Among these many dangers, there are three upon which I feel immediate attention must be focused. I refer to the issue of editorializing, the issue of license fees to be collected by the FCC and, perhaps the most important, the issue of the FCC fixing the length or frequency of commercials.

Taking these up in the order listed, let us turn first to editorializing. All of you are well aware of the extended hearings which have been conducted on this subject to date. I hope to conclude those hearings in the near future and that the committee will make recommendations on the subject matter.

I think one of the most enlightening aspects of these hearings was the reaction of the broadcasters in the first instance when they were announced. So very many in the broadcast industry seemed to view with alarm the movement of a congressional committee into this subject matter. This came as quite a surprise to me, because I had felt that the broadcasters would welcome an opportunity to clarify their position on the subject and to voice the complaints that many had privately expressed to me with regard to alleged arbitrary practices on the part of the FCC. In fact, many broadcasters openly attacked me and took language out of context, thereby misinterpreting my views as well as my purpose in trying to help solve a very touchy problem.

I do not criticize them for what they did because I am satisfied that they were simply equating the Congress of the United States with the Federal Communications Commission and considering the two agencies as being completely interwoven. Let me dispel that myth here and now. It is true that the independent agencies of this Government, including FCC, were considered as arms of the Congress for administrative purposes. The word "independent" was intended to mean that these agencies were independent from the executive branch of the Government.

However, from some of the muscle flexing that has taken place in recent years, it would seem that some of these agencies have decided to construe the word "independent" literally and to consider themselves as the fourth branch of the Government, completely free of any control from the executive, the judicial, or the legislative.

If such is the intention of those now constituting these boards, or the thoughts of the unseen powers behind the throne, now is the time for this whole problem to be dragged out into the open and for a definite policy decision to be made by the people of this country. I think that the problem can be handled if the Congress will face the issue without delay and with definitive action.

If the Congress is not going to recognize and deal with the problem, then the matter should be submitted to the entire electorate, because we are dealing with an attempt to change the constitutional processes, the power to do which should rest only with the people.

The editorializing hearings have brought forth much useful and pertinent information which can serve this country well in the future but, in my opinion, they would have been a great success had they accomplished only the single purpose of awakening the industry and the public to the inherent dangers of permitting administrative agencies to legislate.

The primary question is not whether or not the fairness doctrine was fair, not whether or not the broadcasters should or should not editorialize, not the content of the editorial, and not the programing of these broadcasts. The primary and important question that should be in the minds of broadcasters and the public is as to who, under our Constitution and under a representative form of government, shall have the right to make those decisions in the first instance.

But let us not stray away from the isolated issue of "editorializing," because it is this issue that could provide the open door to the wider subject of the proper base for legislative powers under our Constitution. When this matter was first set for hearing, many of the broadcasters jumped to the conclusion that the Congress was advocating the prohibition of editorializing. Some of them immediately editorialized for editorializing and against the Congress. Some seemed to feel that this was an excellent opportunity to start a fight with the Congress and they certainly did not want to miss such a golden opportunity.

However, I think that most of them have now concluded that the objective was not to enforce or prohibit editorializing but, on the contrary, was to clear the air of confusion about your rights and responsibilities in opinion broadcasting. It has developed that many broadcasters felt that they were taking a calculated risk by editorializing; that in serving their community by stimulating thought on public issues, by taking positions of opinion leadership, by helping their listeners to understand some of the complexities of the issues involved—they were putting their licenses on the line at renewal time.

On the other hand, some, seeking to avoid controversy, refused to editorialize only to have it suggested to them that a policy of not editorializing would seriously jeopardize their licenses.

In my opinion, there is absolutely no need for this kind of confusion, nor is there need for the many other areas of confusion that have stemmed from some of the more recent proposals of the FCC.

Most all of the witnesses felt that the crux of the situation was the fairness displayed by the broadcaster. Of course, there were some who expressed dislike for a fairness doctrine, and one who indicated that he saw no reason to be fair—period.

However, I think the general feeling of the witnesses was exemplified by the testimony of John Tyler of KFDA television in Amarillo when he told the subcommittee with reference to the fairness doctrine, and I quote, "If the doctrine did not exist with the FCC and I was a broadcaster and an editorializer, I would still be fair about it." I think this reflects the position of all conscientious, bona fide journalists. He is committed to being fair not because the Government tells him he should, but because his own ethical standards so dictate.

I think it can be further said that most all of the witnesses subscribe to the proposition that under the law the broadcast spectrum is public property, which broadcasters are licensed to use. Hence, public responsibilities rest upon your shoulders which are not present with your friends who use their own printing presses.

Your principal responsibility in expressing opinions on the air is to be certan you provide ample opportunity for broadcasting opinions dissenting from your own. The newspaper publisher is under no such obligation. Nothing but his own conscience compels him to be fair.

I have always had faith and confidence that the broadcasters would conduct their business in a fair, honest, and conscientious manner. And, I might add that experience would prove that in a vast majority of cases, this confidence has not been misplaced. However, if it is necessary for rules and regulations to be written to avoid abuses and unconscionable practices that could occur, the laying down of basic policy on the subject is the office of the duly elected Members of the Congress of the United States and not the administrative agency created by the Congress, if we are to pursue proper constitutional guidelines.

Some say that this is a matter so complex that it cannot be the subject of legislation. The utter fallacy of this argument is apparent on its face. The Federal Communications Commission is made up of human beings; the same is true of the Congress of the United States.

The only difference lies in the fact that the Members of the House of Representatives are elected by the people and are directly answerable to them every 2 years. The members of the FCC and other agencies are appointed for various terms. The staff people in the offices of the Members of Congress, as well as on the congressional committees, have no job guarantees or fringe benefits usually associated with civil service and Foreign Service personnel. The staff people serving the FCC and the other independent agencies have job rights and all of the other fringe benefits associated with civil service employment. Perhaps it is this built-in protection from the wrath of the electorate that is supposed to make the people in the independent agencies more capable of writing laws than the Members of the Congress who were elected by the people under the Constitution to do this job.

Laws, whether you call them rules, regulations, or otherwise, are the product of man. It occurs to me that if we are to preserve government of the people, by the people, and for the people, then the duly elected representatives should be the ones who lay down the guidelines necessary for the proper conduct of the affairs of this country.

Now let us turn to the second issue before mentioned, to wit: the establishment of fees for the licensing and regulatory activities of the FCC. As most of you know, this has been a highly controversial subject. Many of the parties subject to this order have no objection to paying a reasonable fee. This has been one of the arguments presented to me by people both in government and in industry.

Others, however, are vigorously protesting. However, the size of the fee and the person assessed is not the primary question in issue. The primary question is again the basic question of who has the right to make the determination of whether or not any fee should be charged. I would point out in this respect that the FCC in its original order of May 6 on the subject made this statement: "In summary, the Commission believes it has the authority under title V of the Independent Offices Appropriations Act of 1952, to adopt rules requiring the payment of fees for its licensing and regulatory activities."

If the Commission believed that the Congress had vested it with this power and ordered them to exercise it, why did they wait 10 years? Was it an open defiance of the Congress, or was it the fact that they didn't think they had the power at any time? I prefer to subscribe to the latter. Many of the staff people of the FCC are career employees. And they know the rules of the Congress as well or better than they know the rules of their own agencies.

They know that under the Rules of the House of Representatives the Appropriations Committee is not a legislative committee; that the proper procedure for the adoption of a new law is for the matter to be proposed by the agency advocating the change submitting it to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, who in turn refers it to the proper legislative committee. They also know that under the basic law of this land an agency created by the Congress has only those powers expressly granted it or necessarily implied to carry out the powers granted; they know that the provisions contained in the Appropriations Act of 1952 would have been subject to a point of order and stricken from the bill; they know that there were a great number of Members of Congress who would have made that point of order, including yours truly, had they had the faintest idea that any such strained construction was intended to be put upon that language.

The proper procedure would have been to have made known at the time their intentions. If this was not to be done for 10 years, then good faith and good conscience would require that this Commission or any other independent agency submit to the Congress in the usual manner and in the regular channels proposals to bring about the result sought, so that it could be subjected to public hearings before the proper legislative committee.

Stress should be placed on the word "legislative," because the Appropriations Committee has to do with the appropriation of funds and does not have public hearings on those matters for which they are called upon to appropriate money. Hence it can be said as to the licensing fees proposed that this matter has never been the subject of public hearings in the Congress of the United States of America.

I might add that when it became obvious to me that the FCC intended to put into effect the proposals as to fixing fees, I introduced H.R. 6697 to prohibit the FCC from assessing fees or charges unless specifically permitted by law. I would also add that there are other proposals for the assessment of fees; but, I repeat, this is a matter to be decided by the duly elected Members of the Congress in the regular manner and after full and proper public hearings. I shall do my very best to see that this is done.

Turning now to the third category and, as I said, probably the most important, the issue of the FCC fixing the length or frequency of commercials. Let me say in the beginning that hearings have been scheduled on H.R. 8316, which I introduced to prohibit the FCC from making certain rules relating to the length or frequency of broadcast advertisements. These hearings will commence November 6, 1963.

This is a subject on which thousands and thousands of words have been written and spoken, dating back to 1927 when the Federal Radio Commission was established. It is also the first proposal by either the Federal Radio Commission or the Federal Communications Commission in 36 years for direct regulation as to the amount of advertising that could be broadcast.

My observations with regard to the unwarranted assumption of power by the FCC in the license fee category would be as appropriate, if not more so, with regard to the assumption of power by the FCC with reference to the length or frequency of broadcast advertisements. In this instance, the Commission did not even have the help of a 10-year-old appropriations bill.

I can well appreciate the many divergent opinions of the populace as to the amount of advertising, the content thereof, and the frequency thereof on the radio and television screen. I am sure that these opinions would vary in the numerous geographic areas of our country. Many would say, more power to the FCC. Others would say this is none of the business of the FCC or anyone else, and in between would be thousands of other comments.

Here again we must not lose sight of the basic issue involved. That is, "Who has the right under our form of government to make this determination in the first instance, if it is a question on which determination must be made?"

If the situation is so acute that some action must be had to place limitations on the quantity and the frequency of advertising certainly there must be some very strong supporting facts and justification. If such is the case, then I would ask, "What is wrong with presenting the matter to the duly elected representatives of the people of the United States of America?"

"Have we reached the point that representative government has become so top-heavy and so complex that it remains only in name, and the vital decisions must be by appointed officials?" I grant you that the Congress has delegated too much power in recent years—powers which I think should be reclaimed.

However, it has not delegated nearly as much power as some of the delegates are assuming. And unless affirmative action is taken by the Congress to stop this trend, these assumed powers will become actual. In the case that we are presently treating there are many facets to the problem involving not alone the economic philosophy but the political philosophy upon which this country was founded.

These are basic policy decisions that should be made in the first instance by the Congress of the United States, unless we are ready to admit that the powers to write substantive law have been transferred to independent agencies and the executive branch of our Government and that Congress shall in the future concern itself only with defense, taxes, and appropriations. Let the record show here and now that I am not ready to make such an admission and will vigorously contest anyone who does.

The step proposed in the rulemaking proposal relating to the length and frequency of broadcast advertisements is a step that should not be taken under any circumstances unless it is clearly and conclusively established that only hereby can the best interests of the public in a free enterprise economy and within the confines of our Constitution be best served—a burden of proof that will no doubt be most difficult to meet, but one that must be met if we are to follow the traditions that have made this country great.

In conclusion, let it be said that whether the laws of Congress or the rules of the FCC are to be the dominant governmental influence in your affairs, the fact remains that you will be subject to Government regulation so long as you use the property belonging to the people. Perhaps this regulation will be more than you or I feel necessary, perhaps it will not be as much as many voices say is needed. In either event, it will continue to present challenges to you individually and as an industry—challenges that must be met by responsible action on your part.

You must remember that no regulated industry is more carefully spotlighted, none more in the public attention, than is the broadcasting industry. In most every home in this country reposes someone who is prepared to offer a strong opinion about what he wants from the broadcasters who serve him. This vast audience can make itself heard with the Government; it can outshout you, and it can outvote you. Hence, you must continue to serve it wisely and well or it will cry out for stronger regulation of your affairs.

Before other regulated industry groups I have urged that a unified front be presented wherever possible in the industrywide relations with the Government. In no industry is this more important than in yours. It would be well for you to consider three questions which I leave with you:

"What of your own house?"

"Can you reach agreements as an industry on problems facing you—agreements strong enough so that you can address your Government with a unified voice?"

"Can you recognize that the challenge of regulation is not one to be met merely by loud protests, but that concerted, unified effort is required?"

Of responsibility I would say this: Your sense of service is made clear by the programs you transmit. Most of you do very well. Most of you are responsive to the needs and desires of people you serve. The public is your ultimate judge and as the public judges you, so will be decided your success as broadcasters.

Even within the confines of Government regulation, you are still free to pursue courses of responsibility and irresponsibility. Firmly convinced that most of you most of the time will make the correct choices, I will do my best to see that those decisions are always yours to make.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, DECEMBER 2, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Matthew 6: 35: *Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness.*

Most merciful and gracious God, may this new week be blessed with a deeper experience and a keener awareness of the guidance of Thy divine spirit.

We penitently acknowledge that we so frequently seek to order our character and conduct, on terms of our own selfish desires and wishes, our own personal aspirations and ambitions.

Inspire us with the joyous conviction that we are living and laboring for the kingdom of God and His righteousness, which the Master declared must always be our first concern.

Give us the certainty that there is a spiritual power in the universe which is working for righteousness and justice, however seemingly feeble and frail our own human efforts.

Hear us in His name, who is the King of kings and the Lord of lords. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, November 29, 1963, was read and approved.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, through the Guadalupe Mountains of Texas have passed the Apache of Geronimo, the conquistadores of Spain, the stages of the Butterfield Overland Mail, the packhorses of gold miners, and the fearless feet of cliff-climbing boys. None of them has disturbed the peace. Ten months ago, I introduced a bill in this body to investigate the possibility of a park in the Guadalupes. The Interior Department's subsequent report enumerates 12,000 years of history, a spectacular geological treasure, archeological delights, tales of lost gold mines, and the exultation of one of America's great natural surprises—an 8,751-foot mountain lifting the sky over Texas. Based on the recommendations made by the National Park Service and the National Parks Advisory Board, I am proud to introduce a bill today to authorize establishment of the Guadalupe Mountains National Park.

THE PRESIDENT JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY MEMORIAL COMMISSION

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today filed a bill calling upon President Johnson to establish a President John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission. This legislation is similar to the bill introduced in the Senate by Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota.

The duty of the Commission would be to make a full and complete study and evaluation with respect to any plan or plans which have been proposed with a view toward memorializing the late President Kennedy. During the course of the study and evaluation, it would be the duty of the Commission to consult with members of the immediate family of the late President, in order to determine their sentiments concerning all such plans.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this is the appropriate and sensible approach to the establishment or designation of a memorial to our late beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Many, many proposals have been made to memorialize President Kennedy since his untimely death at the hands of an assassin on November 22. I personally favor the renaming of the Cape Cod National Seashore to memorialize President Kennedy, and so provided in a bill, H.R. 9256, which I introduced last Wednesday, November 27. However, I think it does make sense to have a commission established to make a complete study and evaluation of all such proposals to memorialize the late President, and that is why I introduced this bill today.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during general debate on Tuesday, December 3.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

NO CAUSE FOR COTTON PANIC

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this House will be considering the Cooley cotton bill (H.R. 6196) Tuesday and Wednesday of this week. I believe most of us recognize that there is a need for some changes in the present cotton legislation, but as one who has spent his entire life in the Cotton Belt and therefore more familiar with some of the problems than the average person, I can truthfully say that the Cooley bill is not the answer or the solution to the problem.

As a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, I voted to report H.R. 6196 out of the committee, not with my endorsement, as I stated at the time that I felt this was not a sound bill, and the only reason I was willing to agree that the bill be brought to the floor was for it to act as the vehicle which could be used in securing some of the changes which are needed to strengthen the cotton economy, and to provide changes which in my opinion are necessary if we are to continue the cotton industry in this country.

It is my intention to offer amendments to this bill which I believe will accomplish the changes which are necessary if the cotton industry is to survive; amendments which will greatly reduce the cost of the program; which will tend to make cotton really competitive;

amendments which will provide for removing the inequity without going beyond to the point of providing a windfall to the domestic mills.

I also want to take this opportunity to call attention to an article which appeared in the November issue of the Missouri Delta Farmer, which I am today inserting in the daily RECORD. It will be entitled "No Cause for Cotton Panic."

STATUE OF FREEDOM—THE CAPITOL DOME

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, "Freedom" merits a minute of our time today. One century ago to this very hour she was the cynosure of all eyes including those of President Abraham Lincoln, and she was honored by a 35-gun salute. She is, of course, the bronze figure which surmounts the great cast iron dome of the Capitol.

The statue was modeled in Rome by the American sculptor, Thomas Crawford, and was cast by Clark Mills in his foundry near Bladensburg, Md. While this country was engaged in a Civil War which was extending the rights of freemen to all Americans, this statue was placed atop the lantern of the dome on December 2, 1863, as a symbol of the principle of universal freedom to which our society is dedicated.

Freedom has implications for 20th century America that were unknown during the Civil War or the Revolutionary era. The mechanics of living in freedom alter with the course of history, but the disciplines of freedom remain basically the same in every age. Freedom's habiliment may change, but we must always recognize her face. Unless we know freedom well, and observe her disciplines, as well as appreciate her gifts, we may pass her by and lose her light forever.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I was away from the Chamber for several days on official business as a member of the U.S. delegation to the recent NATO Parliamentarians' Conference. I necessarily missed several rollcall votes. Had I been present I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall No. 191, "aye."
Rollcall No. 192, "aye."
Rollcall No. 194, "nay."
Rollcall No. 195, "aye."
Rollcall No. 196, "nay."

I have also noted that the RECORD has me undeclared on two other rollcalls.

On rollcall No. 48, May 14, had I been present I would have noted "nay."

On rollcall No. 38, May 6, had I been present I would have voted "aye."

"ON THE SILVER STRAND"—BY TIBOR TOLLAS

Mrs. FRANCIS P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues a poem about Africa by a Hungarian poet and refugee from the 1956 revolution, Tibor Tollas. He suffered many years in Communist prisons for no other crime than his belief in freedom. When Soviet tanks finally suppressed the heroic uprising of the Hungarian people, Tibor Tollas decided to dedicate his life to continuing the fight for freedom by pen and word of mouth. As a believer for freedom for all mankind he hoped that, by recounting his experiences of Soviet communism, he might help the African people preserve their newly won independence. His poem, "On the Silver Strand," follows:

ON THE SILVER STRAND

(By Tibor Tollas)

(Translated by Jascha Kessler)

After working hours a line of dusty heaps
Strings out and heads down to the shimmering shore
Away from the dinning, hot and narrow streets,
With their choked shops, of Dar es Salaam,
And escapes the burden of daily cares.

Then they emerge with grace from the steaming cars,
As solemn as princes of the East—
Eight or ten halfnaked brown pages to escort them—
Strangers in black Africa forever.

Moving with that pantherish sway,
The wife goes on ahead, her crown of ebon hair
Shawled with sevencolored lucid silk,
And the man follows, stately slow,
Fullbearded black beneath his high white turban.

In the cool shadow of a palm
They lay their matting, seat themselves and gaze,
Motionlessly, at the moving waves, at the surf
That shouts against the sloping shore.
Somewhere, far beyond many horizons,
In the East, in the endlessness of waves,
Lies their native land, India.

A few wisps of trailing smoke announce
The ship arriving
With greetings from their parents.
It is good to wait for news to come,
To hear of the things they have longed for, longed for.

And it is good to sit on the shore every day
In the tepid breeze beneath the palms
And listen to the familiar sound of these waves.

And it is good to dream, amid suffocating streets,
In the crowded dinning of the shops, among the piled goods,
To dream that sometime
One of those silver-gray ships will take us home.

BROADCASTING INDUSTRY MAKES GREAT CONTRIBUTION TO THE NATION

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in the 9 days following the time of President Kennedy's assassination the people of the United States have been given the opportunity to see and to hear events of great historic importance.

It took the death of our young President to reveal to the Nation his strength of character, his vision, his dedication, and his courage. It focused public attention on the programs he sponsored and for which he worked in order to meet the needs of our people and our country and to promote the cause of world understanding and peace.

The Nation owes a debt of gratitude to the broadcasting industry, both radio and television, for the part members of that industry played in permitting the American people to witness the events of those tragic days and to learn about their Government, their President, and the Presidency as never before.

By its performance during those 9 historic days the radio and television industry has made a tremendous contribution to the Nation and its people.

The decision of the broadcasting companies to cancel commercial programs and advertising is to their everlasting credit and is deserving of the highest commendation of the American people.

There is much to be said for the broadcasting industry for more than any other media it provides the opportunity for the public not only to receive important information but also to hear various points of view on all important questions.

We all owe to the broadcasting industry our deep thanks for the preservation and protection of free speech and the people's right to know. It is an example which the publishing industry would do well to follow.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

PROVIDING FOR ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN SQUARE 758 IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AS AN ADDITION TO THE GROUNDS OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT BUILDING

The Clerk called the bill (S. 254) to provide for the acquisition of certain property in square 758 in the District of Columbia, as an addition to the grounds of the U.S. Supreme Court Building.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SAINT-GAUDENS NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE, N.H.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4018) to authorize establishment of the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site, N.H., and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

LAKE ERIE SESQUICENTENNIAL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1828) to amend the joint resolution establishing the Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission so as to authorize an appropriation to carry out the provisions thereof.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AMEND THE ORGANIC ACT OF THE NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5838) to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to make certain improvements of fiscal and administrative practices for more effective conduct of its research and development activities.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

WATERS IMPOUNDED BY FLAMING GORGE DAM

The Clerk called the Senate joint resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 17—to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Flaming Gorge Dam, Utah, in the States of Wyoming and Utah, as "Lake O'Mahoney."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that this legislation had two dissenting opinions. I do not think it is proper to bring it up on the Consent Calendar as a result, and therefore I withdraw my reservation and ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

FUNDS OF THE KOOTENAI TRIBE, IDAHO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8527) to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Kootenai Tribe or Band of Indians, Idaho.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the unexpended balance of funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Kootenai Tribe or Band of Indians of the State of Idaho that were appropriated by the Act of September 8, 1960 (74 Stat. 830), to pay a judgment by the Indian Claims Commission in docket 154, and the interest thereon, may be advanced or expended for any purpose that is authorized by the tribal governing body and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. Any part of such funds that may be distributed per capita to the members of the tribe shall not be subject to the Federal or State income tax.

With the following committee amendment: Page 1, line 10, strike out the word "approved."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time and passed.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of S. 2139, a similar bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the unexpended balance of funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Kootenai Tribe or Band of Indians of the State of Idaho that were appropriated by the Act of September 8, 1960 (74 Stat. 830), to pay a judgment by the Indian Claims Commission in docket 154, and the interest thereon, may be advanced or expended for any purpose that is authorized by the tribal governing body and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. Any part of such funds that may be distributed per capita to the members of the tribe shall not be subject to the Federal or State income tax.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 2139 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 8527 as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 8527) was laid on the table.

GRAFF HOUSE SITE—INDEPENDENCE NATIONAL PARK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 988) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the Graff House site for inclusion in Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask a few questions concerning this bill. Do I understand that this would authorize $200,000 in Federal funds for the acquisition of a site in Philadelphia of the dimensions of 50 by 124 feet; that it would also cost $190,000 for clearing the site, landscaping, and so on and so forth, and that in perpetuity it would then cost anywhere from $10,000 to $20,000 a year for administration and maintenance? I might add that it appears there would also be an expenditure of Federal funds for furnishing house that is to be built.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. I would suggest to my friend from Iowa that his assumptions are correct. This is a particular spot on which was the building in which Thomas Jefferson wrote out the Articles of the Declaration of Independence. The original house has long since been torn down and there is another building on the property, a business building, with an appraised value of about the amount of money suggested in this bill. If this legislation is approved, most of the money will be spent to purchase this property. The citizens of Philadelphia would do some donating. The moneys necessary for the continued operation and maintenance would be somewhat in line with what the gentleman suggested.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand that we have only verbal assurance that the citizens of Philadelphia or whoever they may be are going to raise the money to put up the structure? I ask the gentleman what assurance other than a verbal assurance we have that they are going to do this? The Federal Government is going to move in now and push this project, but there is no assurance other than a verbal assurance, so far as I can see, that those in Philadelphia are going to carry out their part of the bargain.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, if my colleague will yield to me further——

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. I should like to ask him to yield to my friend from Pennsylvania, who is a Member here from the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and from whom my colleague can get the assurance that he is asking.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. I might say that the gentleman is correct in his assumption that there is only a verbal assurance. But I would like to remind him of what has happened as a result of that verbal assurance as far as Independence National Historical Park is concerned. It is the only park in the United States acquired, cleared, and rebuilt, and the United States has only had to pay one-half of the bill. The people of the city of Philadelphia and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania have assumed and paid half of all the costs, the acquisition of land, the clearing of the land, the cost of the improvements; and I am sure that if the people of Philadelphia and the people of Pennsylvania are the beneficiaries of Congress' action through this bill they will make good on their word and will see to it that they meet the obligations as set forth in the report.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, since this bill involves about half a million dollars, as nearly as I can figure it, and since the great city of Philadelphia, wealthy as it is, could, I am sure, well afford to undertake this rehabilitation or this reconstruction and pay the entire bill, I do not see why the taxpayers of the United States should be saddled with it, at least not until the money has been raised by those who say that they are going to raise part of the money therefor.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I think one of the finest examples of cooperation between a State, a city, and the Federal Government in this particular responsibility of preserving the sites of history is to be found in the Independence National Historical Park operation. This is a part of that program. This is not an original authorization except as it applies only to the Graff House mentioned in this proposed legislation. This is a going operation in Philadelphia at the present time. It is visited by millions every year. I do not believe that it is the sole obligation of the city of Philadelphia or the State of Pennsylvania to continue to preserve this area and to enlarge it in order to meet the demands of the American public.

Mr. GROSS. Nor do I think it is an obligation on the part of all the taxpayers of the country to spend half a million dollars on this kind of project in lieu of any real assurance that the people of Philadelphia are going to carry out their part of the bargain.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I would say that a good man's word is as good as his bond and the same can be said to be applicable to a city or a State.

In this instance, it is my opinion that the State's and the city's words are as good as their bond. They have already complied during the last several years in carrying out their particular part of the agreement in this area.

Mr. GROSS. I am speaking of this specific project.

Mr. ASPINALL. This is a part of the Independence National Historical Park area.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am not interested in what has gone before. I am interested in the expenditure of the taxpayers' money in view of the fact that we have a national debt of somewhere between $310 and $315 billion. In other words, what we are doing is borrowing the money to spend in Philadelphia on this enterprise which could wait until we can see some financial daylight, let me say to the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, my colleague is a very fine friend of mine but when my colleague begins to pinch pennies that are necessary in order to properly teach and to preserve the patriotism of the Nation and to continue this Nation as it should be continued, as far as I am concerned, I do not consider his reference to our national debt to be pertinent or of value to this discussion. Our national debt is a smaller debt per capita and, in comparison with our national income, than it has been throughout most of this century.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to my friend from Colorado that I do not think the patriotism of people of the United States rests upon this precise expenditure or any other single expenditure. I would very much dislike to think that that is the situation.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Certainly.

Mr. FORD. I am curious to know whether or not this particular land acquisition is to be followed by others in the same adjacent area. In other words, are we establishing a precedent in this case that might be used in the future for other acquisitions in the same area?

Mr. ASPINALL. Will my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. I would say that this does not establish a precedent. We have already done this in a few instances since we established the Independence National Historical Park. This is just another step in this same area of historic significance in the tradition of the United States of America.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I would like to say to my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], that at the time the original bill for the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park was introduced, the Graff House site was one part of that bill. At that time the committee felt that the bill should be broken up into a number of pieces, and it was. This is the last part of the original bill.

Mr. GROSS. How many pieces were there originally?

Mr. SAYLOR. Four pieces, because three of them were not adjacent to Independence National Historical Park. Congress has acquired the other two and this is the third.

Mr. GROSS. Does that account for the fact that they did not want the whole bill of expense to hit Congress at the same time and so it was brought in piecemeal? Is that the reason?

Mr. SAYLOR. No, that was not the purpose. This is not the reason. In other words, as I said to the gentleman from Iowa before, the city of Philadelphia and the State of Pennsylvania have met half of the total obligation.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question: What is it going to cost to put up the replica of the Graff House?

Mr. SAYLOR. Those figures I do not know but, roughly, it is around $190,000.

Mr. GROSS. It has been my understanding that the $190,000 is an obligation on the part of all the taxpayers, and is not for the replica. How much money is going to be raised by the people of Philadelphia to put up the replica of the Graff House? That is their obligation. How much?

Mr. SAYLOR. If the gentleman will yield further, all of the costs whatever they are, are for the building and furnishing the replica as well as landscaping the same. The gentleman can rest assured that the city of Philadelphia and the State of Pennsylvania will meet those costs.

Mr. GROSS. I do not believe the gentleman has answered my question.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. According to the information available to me, the citizens of Philadelphia have joined themselves together in an organization and are undertaking a fundraising campaign to secure funds to defray development costs to the extent of $190,000, which is the amount they estimate will be the cost of reproducing the replica of the original home.

Mr. GROSS. Am I correct in assuming this: The committee report says that demolition and development of the site and adjoining property includes landscaping and installation of statuary which are estimated to cost an additional $190,000 to the Federal Government.

Mr. FORD. In my opinion, with the money that will be raised locally, they will be able to build the facility and landscape the grounds after the land has been obtained by Federal funds, to the extent of not to exceed $200,000.

Mr. GROSS. Will someone on the committee tell the House that this $190,000 for demolition and development of the site, landscaping, and so on and so forth will not become an obligation of the Federal Government, that the obligation to the Federal Government is the acquisition of the site, $200,000, plus in perpetuity the maintenance of the property? Will someone on the Interior Committee tell us that the $190,000 for development will be provided and any additional development, landscaping, erection of statuary, and so on and so forth, will be carried out by the people of Philadelphia through their contributions?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I have no hesitancy in assuring the gentleman from Iowa and the rest of my colleagues in the House that the people of the city of Philadelphia and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania will provide whatever funds are necessary—$180,000, $190,000, or $200,000—for the demolition and for the erection of the building, the furnishing thereof, and for the landscaping. The obligation of the Federal Government will be to acquire the site and to maintain it once it is completed.

Mr. ASPINALL. Once again the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has placed a limitation on the monetary authorization in this bill. Unless the moneys are raised by the people of Philadelphia, as presently contemplated, there will be no additional moneys for this project. I can assure my friend that as far as I am concerned I shall not come back to the House and ask for additional moneys.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to include in Independence National Historical Park the site of the Graff House where Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire by purchase, donation, or with donated funds all or any interests in the land and improvements thereon located at the southwest corner of Market and South Seventh Streets, in the city of Philadelphia, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point located at the intersection of the southerly line of Market Street with the westerly line of South Seventh Street, thence southerly along the west side of South Seventh Street 124 feet, thence westerly 50 feet, thence northerly 124 feet, thence easterly 50 feet to the point of beginning.

SEC. 2. When acquired the land shall become a part of Independence National Historical Park and be administered by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the laws and regulations applicable to the park.

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That, in order to include in Independence National Historical Park the site of the Graff House where Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire by purchase, donation, or with donated funds all or any interests in the land and improvements thereon located at the southwest corner of Market and South Seventh Streets, in the city of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, and more particularly described as follows:

"Beginning at a point located at the intersection of the southerly line of Market Street with the westerly line of South Seventh Street, thence southerly along the west side of South Seventh Street 124 feet, thence westerly 50 feet, thence northerly 124 feet, thence easterly 50 feet to the point of beginning.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary is further authorized to erect on the site aforesaid, with donated funds, a replica of the Graff House and to furnish and maintain the same.

"SEC. 3. The lands hereinbefore described and the building to be erected thereon shall become a part of the Independence National Historical Park and shall be administered in accordance with the laws and regulations applicable thereto.

"SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, but not more than $200,000, as may be necessary for acquisition of the land described in the first section of this Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHANGING THE NAME OF THE ANDREW JOHNSON NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5345) to change the name of the Andrew Johnson National Monument, to add certain historic property thereto, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Andrew Johnson National Monument established by Proclamation Numbered 2554 of April 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 1955), pursuant to the Act of August 29, 1935 (49 Stat. 958), is hereby redesignated the Andrew Johnson National Historic Site.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior may procure with donated or appropriated funds, by donation, or by exchange the following described lands, or interests therein, located in Greeneville, Tennessee, and when so acquired such lands shall become a part of the Andrew Johnson National Historic Site:

Beginning at a point which is the intersection of the east right-of-way line of College Street and the north right-of-way line of Depot Street;

thence continuing along the north right-of-way line of Depot Street south 62¼ degrees east 165 feet to its intersection with the west side of Academy Street;

thence leaving the north right-of-way line of Depot Street and continuing along the west right-of-way of Academy Street north 38 degrees east 93.4 feet to a point;

thence leaving the west right-of-way of Academy Street north 64¾ degrees west 184 feet to a point on the east right-of-way line of College Street;

thence with the east right-of-way line of College Street south 25¾ degrees west 83.7 feet to a point of beginning, containing 0.35 acre, more or less.

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 13, strike out "94.3" and insert "93.4"

Page 2, strike out lines 21 and 22 and insert:

"SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, but not more than $66,000 for acquisition, restoration, and development costs, as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1243) which is similar to the bill the House just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Andrew Johnson National Monument established by Proclamation Numbered 2554 of April 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 1955), pursuant to the Act of August 29, 1935 (49 Stat. 958), is hereby redesignated the Andrew Johnson National Historic Site.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior may procure with donated or appropriated funds, by donation, or by exchange the following described lands, or interests therein, located in Greeneville, Tennessee, and when so acquired such lands shall become a part of the Andrew Johnson National Historic Site:

Beginning at a point which is the intersection of the east right-of-way line of College Street and the north right-of-way line of Depot Street;

thence continuing along the north right-of-way line of Depot Street south 62¼ degrees east 165 feet to its intersection with the west side of Academy Street;

thence leaving the north right-of-way line of Depot Street and continuing along the west right-of-way of Academy Street north 38 degrees east 93.4 feet to a point;

thence leaving the west right-of-way of Academy Street north 64¾ degrees west 184 feet to a point on the east right-of-way of College Street;

thence with the east right-of-way line of College Street south 25¾ degrees west 83.7 feet to the point of beginning, containing 0.35 acre, more or less.

SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $50,000 for acquisition of property under this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 1243 and insert the provisions of H.R. 5345 as just passed by the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 1243 and insert the provisions of H.R. 5345 as passed by the House.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 5345) was laid on the table.

REVISING BOUNDARIES OF THE CARLSBAD CAVERNS NATIONAL PARK, STATE OF NEW MEXICO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7458) to revise the boundaries of the Carlsbad Caverns National Park in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have no objection to this legislation, but I am curious about one provision or one action taken by the committee. It is my understanding this proposed legislation repeals a provision of a 1930 law which allows park boundaries to be enlarged by Presidential proclamation. Is this a provision that is applicable to all park boundaries or only to this particular park boundary?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. May I say that as far as national monuments are concerned, except those very few that have been established by statute, and there are only a very few, two or three, the President of the United States can do anything he wishes with reference to a national monument. He can cancel it out, he can destroy it, he can enlarge or decrease its boundaries at will.

Mr. FORD. Was this particular national park established by congressional action?

Mr. ASPINALL. This particular national monument was established first as a national monument by Executive order. Some years later it was reestablished by congressional action. With statutory authorization the President was given the authority, in this instance only, to firm up the boundaries if found necessary.

Mr. FORD. The provision in this proposed bill precludes a President now and in the future to extend the park boundaries. Is that the intent of the committee action ?

Mr. ASPINALL. I am not so sure, now that my friend, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS], has called to my attention that this is a national park. It was my understanding that it was established in the first instance by Executive order. I would have to refer back to the report or to the hearings to find the definite answer to my friend's first question. In any event the boundaries would be subject after this legislation is passed only to action by the Congress.

Mr. FORD. It would also apply only to this particular park or monument, or whatever it is? It is not a provision that is applicable to all parks or monuments?

Mr. ASPINALL. That is my understanding. The gentleman from Michigan is correct in his presumption.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF RETIREMENT INSURANCE PROGRAMS TO CERTAIN LEGISLATIVE EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5128) to extend the benefits of the civil service retirement and group life and health insurance programs to certain legislative employees, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 2(d) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2252(d)), is amended by inserting "(other than temporary employees engaged in the folding of speeches and pamphlets for the House of Representatives)" immediately following "temporary congressional employee".

(b) The provisions under the heading "CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND" in title I of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959 (72 Stat. 1064; Public Law 85–844), shall not apply with respect to benefits resulting from the enactment of subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 2. Section 2(a) of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2091 (a)), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection, temporary employees engaged in the folding of speeches and pamphlets for the House of Representatives shall be entitled to the benefits of this Act.".

SEC. 3. Section 3(a) of the Federal Employees' Health Benefits Act of 1959, as amended (5 U.S.C. 3002(a)), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection, temporary employees engaged in the folding of speeches and pamphlets for the House of Representatives shall be entitled to the benefits of this Act.".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPENSATION IN CONNECTION WITH RECLAMATION PROJECTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 130) to provide for the payment of compensation, including severance damages, for rights-of-way acquired by the United States in connection with reclamation projects the construction of which commenced after January 1, 1961.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding the existence of any reservation of right-of-way for canals under the Act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 371, 391; 43 U.S.C. 945), the Secretary of the Interior shall pay just compensation, including severance damages, to the owners of private land utilized for ditches or canals in connection with any reclamation project, or any unit or any division of a reclamation project, the construction of which commenced after January 1, 1961, and such compensation shall be paid notwithstanding the execution of any agreements or any judgments entered in any condemnation proceeding, prior to the effective date of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, and page 2, line 1, strike out "the construction of which" and insert "provided the construction of said ditches or canals".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 130 provides for payment by the United States for rights-of-way acquired for canals constructed in connection with Federal reclamation projects without regard to any reservation under the act of August 30, 1890. The legislation, as amended, is applicable to canals the construction of which starts hereafter or which began after January 1, 1961.

The legislation does not require the authorization of additional appropriations. If enacted, however, it will result in a nominal increase in the cost of future projects. Department of the Interior officials have estimated this increase at no more than an average of 1 percent. It should be pointed out that this additional cost will be fully repaid under reclamation law.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is needed because of numerous and serious inequities which have been created in recent years by the 1890 act. The 1890 act reserves the right-of-way for canals and ditches constructed under the authority of the United States in all patents thereafter issued for lands west of the 100th meridian. In other words, owners of land west of the 100th meridian whose title derives from a patent issued subsequent to August 30, 1890, are compensated only for improvements or crops that are damaged or destroyed when a reclamation canal crosses their property, while owners of land east of the 100th meridian or of land west of the 100th meridian patented prior to August 30, 1890, must be compensated fully for their land in a similar land taking.

Although the legislative history of the section of the 1890 act affected by H.R. 130 is very sketchy, it is clear that the Congress did not contemplate the construction of canals of the magnitude of those being built today or the long distances over which water is now being conveyed. Sixty years ago, when the reclamation program was getting underway, a right-of-way of 75 or 100 feet in width was normally the maximum that was required. Today, however, on the San Luis project in California, for instance, the main canal right-of-way is about 650 feet in width, and on at least one section of the main canal on the proposed Garrison diversion project in North Dakota about 1,400 feet of right-of-way width will be required. Also, canals today frequently pass through and cause severance damage to lands that are not benefited in any way by the canals or by the project of which they are a part. For instance, the main canal of the Ainsworth project in Nebraska runs 53 miles through lands which will receive no benefit from the Ainsworth project.

The reservation of the 1890 act is a floating type easement, never located precisely until a canal is actually placed upon the land. Hence, a landowner never can be sure that the spot he selects for the location of his improvements is not on the route of a future canal. Also, the first exercise of the Government's reserved right-of-way across a specific property does not terminate the operation of the statute. It is possible, though this happens very infrequently, for two, three, or even more canals to be located across the same piece of land.

The committee was informed that land covered by the 1890 reservation is ordinarily bought and sold at prices that do not take into consideration the existence of a reserved right-of-way. The reservation, however, is a cloud on the title to a tract of land even though there may be no plans for a canal across it, because such plans could develop sometime in the future. Since the act of 1890 does not affect all property through which reclamation canals pass, the act has the effect of producing substantial differences in the amounts paid landowners when rights-of-way are taken and creates serious inequities, not only between landowners on different sides of the 100th meridian but also among landowners west of the 100th meridian. Among the reasons for these inequities are these:

First. The landowners with whom the Bureau of Reclamation deals today are rarely the original patentees and seldom are they aware that their lands are subject to the reservation until they receive a notice advising that the United States intends to exercise its right. In many instances, the present owner may hold lands some of which are subject to the reservation and some of which are not. In these cases the owner often refuses to sell to the United States the necessary right-of-way across the nonreservation land, thereby making condemnation action necessary. This results in additional costs and additional burdens on the courts. In some instances, an owner will attempt to negotiate a purchase contract for the nonreserved right-of-way at a figure sufficiently in excess of the appraised valuation to compensate him for the reserved right-of-way which the United States is taking without compensation. Again, in these instances the acquisition usually results in a court proceeding which is expensive and time consuming.

Second. In the West, many of the roads are built along section lines which are also property lines. Many reclamation project canals, especially the minor or smaller canals, are also built along the roads. In many instances, the canal could be built on either side of the road. The decision will necessarily result in an inequity, for not only is the land of the owner on one side of the road taken while the other's is not, but the first owner is told that he cannot be compensated for his land that is used.

Third. As already pointed out herein, modern techniques of water resource development embrace river-sized canals for which very wide rights-of-way must be taken—up to 1,400 feet in some projects now in the planning stage. In many cases the canals run for miles through lands that receive no direct project benefits. The San Luis project has already been referred to as an example where the main canal requires the acquisition of right-of-way up to 650 feet in width. That canal is approximately 102 miles in length and involves about 110 ownerships, about 80 of which are subject to the reserved right-of-way. The canal crosses land much of which has extremely high productive potential for a wide variety of specialized agricultural crops. Current fair market value runs as high as $2,000 per acre for nonreservation lands. It has been estimated that when the reserved right-of-way is effective and payment is limited to improvements payments may be as low as $100 to $200 per acre. The Ainsworth project has also been given as an example of a canal which runs for miles across lands that receive no project benefits. In this instance, the storage reservoir and the main canal are located to the west of the 100th meridian, while the areas which will receive the irrigation water are on the east side of the 100th meridian. The lands crossed by the main canal will receive no benefit from the project, but there are the owners whose lands are subject to the 1890 act reservation and who are required to furnish free right-of-way for the benefit of the water users on the other side of the meridian.

Fourth. In the normal canal right-of-way acquisition it is the practice of the Bureau of Reclamation to install bridges across the canals for the use of the farmers and in order to reduce the severance damages. However, the Bureau is without authority to build these bridges across canals constructed on reserved rights-of-way, as the construction of the bridges would constitute a form of severance damage compensation. Therefore, in the Ainsworth project case and other similar instances, the landowners find their property cut in two without any means of getting from one part of their property to the other and without compensation for the damage.

Fifth. Even in those cases where the landowners are project beneficiaries, the effect of taking a reserved right-of-way without compensation often results in a burden upon the landowner out of all proportion to the benefits he receives. This results from the fact that irrigation costs, including the cost of acquisition of rights-of-way, for canals and ditches are reimbursable. When a reserved right-of-way is taken, the landowner bears the entire loss and the other irrigation beneficiaries pay less than full value for what they receive.

Mr. Speaker, in acting favorably on this legislation, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee concluded that the right-of-way provision of the 1890 act has become a serious problem in recent years and that the problem will become more serious in the future unless congressional action is taken. While the committee recognized that enactment of the legislation would result in a nominal increase in construction cost of reclamation projects, it concluded that the burden of these additional costs, which must be fully repaid, should be uniformly distributed rather then placed upon a few landowners.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is meritorious legislation and I am pleased that the House has approved it.

WAIVER OF INSURANCE PREMIUMS UPON BECOMING DISABLED PRIOR TO AGE 65

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6777) to amend section 712 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of premiums for certain veterans holding national service life insurance policies who become or have become totally disabled before their 65th birthday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]. On page 11 of the report, do the figures showing the cost to the Veterans' Administration represent money to be obtained by the Veterans' Administration from dividends or increased premiums on insurance? What is the source of the money for the expenditure indicated on page 11?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to extend, effective January 1, 1965, from age 60 to age 65 the delimiting age before which a person insured under a national service life insurance—NSLI—policy must become totally disabled to be eligible for waiver of premiums on such insurance. Under section 712 of title 38, United States Code, as now in effect, payment of premiums on NSLI may be waived during the continuous total disability of the insured, which continues or has continued for 6 or more consecutive months if such total disability began, first, after the date of application for insurance, second, while the insurance was in force under premium paying conditions; and third, before the insured's 60th birthday. The waiver is effective from the beginning of the total disability, if application is made within 1 year therefrom, and the waiver continues for the duration of such disability.

The age 60 limitation was placed in the law in 1940 when the National Service Life Insurance Act was enacted. Today the trend in the insurance industry is toward providing more health protection for our senior citizens. This trend is based upon experience which has established that persons age 60 and over who are alive today can expect to live longer, healthier, and more productive lives than could a similar person in 1940. The Veterans' Administration has, therefore, recently restudied the question of premium waiver for the older veterans. As the result of such restudy the VA advises that it favors the objective of H.R. 6777. The Actuarial Advisory Committee, composed of eminent authorities from the private insurance industry, concurs in this position.

Eighty-eight percent of all NSLI policies in force are participating. Accordingly, as to that group any additional benefit cost which will flow from this extended coverage will be borne solely by the policy-holders themselves in the form of very slightly reduced dividends. This cost will range from zero to a maximum of $12 per year for each policyholder and is expected to average approximately 20 cents per year per policyholder.

The administrative costs are $418,000 the first year.

I insert at this point certain tabular material pertinent to this subject.

Government life insurance programs for veterans and servicemen—Distribution of in-force as of the end of 1962 by ages attained in 1962

Attained age in 1962	World War I, USGLI (K)		World War II, NSLI (V)		Korean, VSLI (R.S. & W.)		Service disabled, SDVI (RH)	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
25 and under			66	$467, 228	6, 769	$58, 222, 358	5, 253	$48, 115, 651
26			40	288, 859	13, 271	119, 125, 818	2, 792	25, 550, 701
27			115	1, 000, 365	33, 528	303, 858, 056	3, 555	32, 281, 687
28			3, 981	35, 163, 601	59, 360	534, 968, 654	4, 317	39, 139, 166
29			28, 322	232, 493, 921	112, 654	1, 004, 756, 924	5, 333	48, 166, 789
30			83, 983	675, 325, 031	115, 383	1, 024, 544, 505	5, 536	49, 153, 958
31			133, 344	1, 035, 587, 841	103, 367	913, 057, 236	5, 098	44, 692, 068
32			166, 297	1, 265, 127, 407	80, 514	710, 638, 779	4, 484	38, 433, 294
33			184, 282	1, 388, 169, 773	54, 790	484, 504, 080	3, 228	27, 857, 782
34			193, 481	1, 387, 148, 311	29, 569	259, 978, 159	2, 180	18, 580, 804
35			237, 077	1, 616, 927, 345	10, 403	88, 615, 035	1, 217	10, 346, 548
36			226, 246	1, 490, 398, 193	6, 258	52, 831, 268	888	7, 537, 987
37	1	$338	235, 826	1, 520, 749, 798	3, 486	28, 808, 481	705	5, 981, 730
38	4	6, 000	252, 881	1, 616, 963, 803	2, 394	19, 738, 482	540	4, 489, 778
39	121	295, 967	252, 500	1, 594, 950, 736	2, 060	17, 072, 104	495	4, 145, 000
40	2, 429	4, 650, 375	255, 676	1, 591, 642, 484	1, 795	14, 457, 500	546	4, 331, 500
41	6, 478	12, 326, 345	282, 872	1, 760, 607, 937	1, 501	12, 141, 000	533	4, 340, 500
42	7, 116	14, 233, 302	281, 081	1, 732, 893, 715	1, 294	10, 610, 500	490	3, 816, 196
43	6, 591	15, 881, 115	250, 949	1, 524, 953, 674	1, 053	8, 509, 000	435	3, 428, 711
44	6, 516	19, 867, 411	244, 935	1, 502, 719, 323	1, 097	8, 818, 027	409	3, 152, 000
45	5, 768	20, 839, 301	215, 308	1, 327, 793, 583	1, 000	7, 832, 500	393	2, 984, 000
46	5, 251	20, 128, 103	194, 210	1, 208, 861, 685	915	6, 880, 000	303	2, 329, 500
47	4, 609	19, 035, 759	172, 947	1, 077, 449, 170	751	5, 617, 500	290	2, 204, 500
48	3, 610	15, 259, 150	150, 505	934, 942, 148	706	5, 473, 000	249	1, 748, 990
49	2, 901	12, 856, 627	131, 631	818, 755, 932	604	4, 572, 000	219	1, 550, 941
50	2, 251	9, 754, 847	120, 101	753, 485, 963	523	3, 976, 383	181	1, 358, 000
51	1, 843	8, 294, 433	106, 990	672, 900, 056	481	3, 539, 000	168	1, 215, 500
52	1, 695	7, 814, 541	97, 264	618, 687, 067	400	2, 786, 500	137	905, 500
53	1, 541	7, 760, 118	87, 805	561, 979, 183	327	2, 156, 500	126	869, 000
54	1, 512	7, 661, 246	81, 933	525, 821, 501	306	2, 115, 000	123	796, 500
55	1, 379	7, 001, 127	72, 933	468, 537, 756	275	1, 869, 000	99	652, 500
56	1, 158	5, 740, 708	58, 461	371, 855, 618	216	1, 421, 000	80	478, 000
57	1, 150	5, 301, 550	39, 752	248, 691, 373	171	1, 076, 000	65	423, 000
58	1, 224	5, 456, 663	24, 876	160, 493, 167	159	1, 067, 500	52	343, 000
59	1, 352	5, 773, 756	21, 117	135, 616, 633	122	783, 000	44	303, 500
60	1, 875	8, 335, 148	18, 116	115, 230, 929	115	699, 500	35	223, 000
61	2, 800	13, 319, 975	14, 941	93, 875, 480	99	620, 500	36	249, 000
62	9, 727	49, 699, 673	12, 993	77, 662, 801	68	461, 500	22	139, 000
63	14, 006	68, 704, 354	10, 266	59, 071, 084	54	385, 000	34	197, 500
64	15, 448	76, 305, 323	8, 811	49, 952, 320	39	240, 000	30	171, 000
65	19, 705	91, 350, 134	6, 487	36, 544, 338	31	177, 500	28	180, 500
66	25, 007	111, 546, 342	3, 779	22, 629, 319	28	185, 000	15	107, 000
67	24, 651	110, 848, 660	2, 987	17, 947, 223	30	225, 000	20	157, 500
68	21, 952	99, 482, 700	2, 375	13, 927, 578	32	196, 500	15	126, 000
69	18, 548	84, 748, 298	1, 954	11, 321, 328	12	84, 000	17	112, 500
70	15, 674	72, 772, 883	1, 479	8, 517, 962	14	71, 000	4	24, 000
71	12, 062	57, 922, 820	1, 005	5, 766, 665	9	43, 500	6	39, 000
72	10, 026	47, 719, 984	749	4, 403, 755	4	37, 000	1	10, 000
73	7, 878	38, 416, 673	631	3, 391, 372	3	13, 000	1	4, 000
74	6, 264	29, 981, 802	480	2, 507, 799	5	15, 000		
75	4, 699	22, 810, 053	333	1, 755, 303			1	7, 000
76	2, 446	12, 976, 972	238	1, 187, 308				
77	1, 147	6, 773, 638	154	746, 312				
78	848	5, 209, 573	124	539, 246				
79	636	3, 855, 089	65	317, 070				
80	483	2, 927, 485	55	226, 500				
81	442	2, 650, 069	32	162, 000				
82	324	1, 942, 441	11	51, 500				
83	266	1, 624, 503	15	57, 500				
84	183	1, 027, 015	4	32, 000				
85 and over	490	2, 849, 533	9	44, 498				
Total	284, 087	1, 251, 740, 212	4, 977, 880	32, 387, 319, 370	648, 045	5, 729, 864, 849	50, 828	443, 451, 281

Personnel in insurance offices

	Insurance personnel on rolls as of—		
	June 30, 1961	June 30, 1962	June 30, 1963
Central office	275	269	[1] 118
Philadelphia Insurance Center	2, 223	1, 853	1, 600
Philadelphia Data Processing Center			[2] 29
Denver	544	506	[3] 6
St. Paul	482	445	[3] 579
Total	3, 524	3, 073	2, 332

[1] Actual personnel on rolls, central office, department of insurance, as of Jan. 31, 1963, prior to reorganization, 257. The estimated insurance employment prior to reorganization as of June 30, 1963, 255.

Subsequent to reorganization (effective Feb. 1, 1963), actual insurance service employment as of June 30, 1963, was 118 (July 1, 1963, 113). The difference of 137 (255−118) resulted from transfers of personnel to other activities within the Department of Veterans' Benefits and transfers to the Department of Data Management.

[2] Data processing center established July 1962; personnel on rolls end of July 1962, 18.

[3] Denver consolidated with St. Paul in June 1963. Staffing prior to consolidation as of—

	Apr. 30, 1963	May 31, 1963
Denver	425	395
St. Paul	460	464

Number of insurance policies in force, June 30, 1963:

	Philadelphia	St. Paul	Total
National service life insurance	3, 624, 159	2, 034, 363	5, 658, 522
U.S. Government life insurance	277, 276		277, 276

Expenditures for insurance operations, fiscal years 1961 through 1964

	Fiscal year 1961	Fiscal year 1962	Fiscal year 1963	Fiscal year 1964	Estimated average employment, fiscal year 1964
Philadelphia	$15, 363, 615	$13, 552, 124	$13, 791, 604	$5, 904, 000	928
Denver	3, 725, 587	3, 436, 386	3, 709, 621		
St. Paul	3, 570, 851	3, 283, 459	3, 581, 845	3, 129, 000	480
Central office	2, 541, 940	2, 523, 755	2, 568, 915	1, 095, 000	113
Field office cost paid by central office [1]	720, 846	649, 284	735, 638		
Manila	16, 300	13, 165	7, 908		
Total	25, 939, 139	23, 458, 173	[2] 24, 395, 532	[3] 10, 128, 000	1, 521

[1] Principally postage cost.

[2] The increase in operating cost for fiscal year 1963 was due to nonrecurring costs of about $2,800,000 for the purchase of automatic data processing equipment.

[3] Represents only personal service and travel costs. The recent reorganization resulted in transfer of all data processing functions from insurance to the Department of Data Management and the administrative, finance, and personnel functions from insurance to other elements of the Department of Veterans' Benefits. Costs other than personal services and travel are budgeted on the basis of total station and total central office requirements rather than by program.

Insurance employment declined from an average of 17,432 in fiscal year 1950 to an average of 3,001 for fiscal year 1963. Thus, in 1950, 1 employee was needed to service about 350 insurance accounts. Today, 1 employee services about 1,988 accounts—more than 5½ times the number serviced only 13 years ago. Major factors contributing to this accomplishment were reorganization combined with consolidation of field stations; many improvements and refinements to operating procedures, systems, and methods, including use of the latest mechanical and electronic equipment; and increased employee productivity attained through training and experience.

As to the question asked by the gentleman from Iowa, may I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], the author of the bill.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 6777, will amend the law providing for waiver of premiums on national service life insurance to permit veterans who become totally disabled prior to their 65th birthday to have premiums on their policies waived. At the present time payment of premiums on national service life insurance may be waived during continuous total disability of the insured which continues for 6 or more consecutive months. Total disability must have begun after the date of application of insurance and prior to the insured's 60th birthday. The waiver is effective from the beginning of total disability and continues for the duration of such condition.

H.R. 6777 will extend from age 60 to age 65 the age limitation for entitlement to waiver of premium. Enactment of this legislation is in keeping with the trend in insurance companies for providing more insurance protection for our older citizens. The age 60 limitation was included at the time the National Service Life Insurance Act was enacted in 1940. Because experience has established that persons aged 60 and over today live longer and are healthier than similar persons in 1940, it is reasonable to extend this coverage to veterans between the ages of 60 and 65 years.

I urge its passage.

In reply to the gentleman from Iowa, the expenses of this bill will be borne by the Veterans' Administration from the funds which come in from the national service life insurance. It will be an increased cost of administration. I will quote from the report on this measure: almost 88 percent of all NSLI policies in force are participating. Accordingly, as to that group any additional benefit cost which will flow from this extended coverage will be borne solely by the policyholders themselves in the form of a very slightly reduced dividend. This cost will range from zero to a maximum of $12 per year for each policyholder and is expected to average approximately 20 cents per year per policyholder.

As to the relatively small group of nonparticipating policies—under 38 U.S.C. 723—there is now a substantial surplus in the revolving fund and future premiums are expected to continue to add to this surplus. The Veterans' Administration believes that the benefit cost of this bill as to such group will be met by earnings from premiums and interest and the proposal to set aside $1,350,000 as additional contingency reserves—out of amounts that would otherwise be transferred from this surplus to the Treasury—is simply for conservative fiscal management. When this type of nonparticipating insurance was originally authorized by the Congress there was no intent that the veterans' excess premiums should enrich the Federal Treasury.

As to administrative costs, all of the over 5.6 million policies now in force have the benefit of the existing statute—38 U.S.C. 782—which has provided since the inception of the program that the United States shall bear such administrative costs. The committee has no intention in this instance of departing from this longstanding policy as to existing contracts and the only cost involved in this proposal is as listed in the VA letter on page 11 of the report.

Mr. GROSS. Paid out of reductions in dividends and increased premiums?

Mr. SAYLOR. Partially.

Mr. GROSS. Both?

Mr. SAYLOR. Partially; out of dividends earned and the administrative expense of $418,000 estimated by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman thinks this is good legislation?

Mr. SAYLOR. It is good legislation. The USGL policy available only to World War I veterans has a waiver provision which is good at any age. This bill is an effort to make the World War II (NSLI) policy more comparable to the World War I policy which is probably the most generous policy ever issued to veterans by the Government.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 712(a)(3) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "sixtieth" and inserting in lieu thereof "sixty-fifth".

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: That effective January 1, 1965, subsection (a) of section 712 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Upon application by the insured and under such regulations as the Administrator may promulgate, payment of premiums on insurance may be waived during the continuous total disability of the insured, which continues or has continued for six or more consecutive months, if such disability began (1) after the date of his application for insurance, (2) while the insurance was in force under premium-paying conditions, and (3) before the insured's sixty-fifth birthday. Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, in any case in which the total disability of the insured commenced on or after his sixtieth birthday before his sixty-fifth birthday, the Administrator shall not grant waiver of any premium becoming due prior to January 1, 1965."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] for introducing this meritorious legislation. I agree with the gentleman and his colleagues on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs as to the desirability of passing H.R. 6777. Heretofore, a veteran carrying national service life insurance and paying the premiums thereon for many years, who became totally disabled between the ages of 60 and 65, had no alternative but to continue the payment of premiums after he became totally disabled. Despite the fact that total disability in many cases precluded the veteran so situated from pursuing gainful employment, he could ill afford to drop the insurance at this critical period in life. H.R. 6777 will correct this situation by extending the age limit within which insurance premiums may be waived for total disability from age 60 to age 65. I support the bill and urge that the House do pass it.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 legislative days to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 130 immediately following the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TRANSFERRING CONTROL OF PERSHING HALL, PARIS, FRANCE, TO THE ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9004) to transfer control of Pershing Hall to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs as a memorial to General of the Armies of the United States John J. Pershing while being utilized in the best interests of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not find very much information in the hearings concerning this transaction. I have one question: How is Pershing Hall in Paris to be financed from now on?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I will say to the gentleman that I do not know how there could be a fuller or more complete report on the bill than the report that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs made pertaining to this bill, and if the gentleman has a copy of the report, he could certainly see that.

I regret that the gentleman does not find the report informative. I invite his attention to the fact that hearings were held on this subject by a special subcommittee appointed for that purpose and held in Paris, France. They were rather voluminous hearings and were not printed. A report of this special subcommittee was filed with the committee, and prior to the subcommittee's report, the General Accounting Office had made a report. All of this information was available to the committee when this question was considered in executive session.

Mr. GROSS. I find that much of the report is dedicated to testimony taken many, many years ago.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I would say to the gentleman that this started many, many years ago.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman give me the answer to the question: How is Pershing Hall to be financed in the future?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The sum of $214,879.28 will be turned over to the Treasury. I am advised that this building is estimated to have a value of at least $1 million.

The building itself is turned over to the Veterans' Administration. There are parts of this building in Paris that are very suitable for a memorial and other parts are suitable for nothing but possibly office space. I assumed that our Government would use this office space or would rent it out, and the income from this source would be used to support this building.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman does not think that this will in time become a burden on the taxpayers of this country?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. No more than it has been in the past.

Mr. GROSS. Has it been in the past?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Yes, the taxpayers of this country are paying a certain amount of money each year running up to as much as $12,000 and down to approximately $4,000 for the upkeep of this building.

Mr. GROSS. As a direct appropriation or revenue derived from certain uses of the building—which?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. No, the money has come from this memorial fund in the Treasury at this time which fund amounts to $214,000.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I do not consider that to be direct congressional financing of the building. They have money invested in bonds and have a return from those bonds. The gentleman is not saying that this is what he considers to be direct Government financing; is he?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Part of this money has come from the taxpayers and part of it has come from many individuals and many different organizations throughout the country. I believe a rather full history is contained in the report on this bill.

This legislation would place Pershing Hall which is located in Paris, France, under the control of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs so that he may transfer control of that real property to any other department or agency of the United States which can use it and so notifies the Administrator before the 60th day after the enactment of the bill, or, failing that, so that the Administrator may use the property to carry out the functions of the Veterans' Administration. This is necessary because, although the United States holds legal title to Pershing Hall, no officer, employee, department, or agency of the United States has exercised responsibility for administering this real property, and the American Legion which heretofore has maintained and operated Pershing Hall has, by a resolution of its national executive committee, indicated its intention of transferring control of Pershing Hall to the United States.

As a part of the transfer to the United States, provision would be made for various items of historical significance now in Pershing Hall, and the building would be designated in perpetuity as a memorial to General of the Armies of the United States, John J. Pershing.

The bill also provides for the transfer to the general fund of the Treasury of the Pershing Hall Memorial Fund—$214,879.28—now in the Treasury, the income from which has been used for the maintenance of Pershing Hall.

The termination of the operating agreement will involve no cost to the United States, in fact, it will result in a saving through permitting the utilization of this real property for governmental functions of the United States and the return and use of the moneys cited above.

It is favored by the Veterans' Administration, the Bureau of the Budget, General Accounting Office, the State and Treasury Departments, and the American Legion.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, in November of 1963, I was selected by the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to serve on a special subcommittee for the purpose of going to Paris and reviewing the operation of Pershing Hall. This is a building located in Paris, France, which has been designated as a memorial to General of the Armies of the United States John J. Pershing.

Although the title of this building is vested in the U.S. Government by the provision of Public Law 171 of the 74th Congress, it has actually been operated and maintained by the American Legion. The responsibility for the day-to-day operation, maintenance, and perpetuation of Pershing Hall has been delegated to the American Legion, Department of France and Paris Post No. 1, based upon an agreement between those organizations and the American Legion national headquarters.

As a result of the review of the operation of Pershing Hall by the special subcommittee of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and on which I had the privilege to serve, it is my opinion that this building may better be preserved as a memorial to General of the Armies of the United States John J. Pershing by the transfer control of Pershing Hall to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9004 will accomplish this purpose and it is for this reason that I rise in support of the bill.

The American Legion is to be commended for their desire to see that a memorial such as Pershing Hall is maintained to honor the memory of one of this country's great soldiers, Gen. John J. Pershing. I was most pleased to note their endorsement of the purpose of this bill by the recent adoption of Resolution 20 by the American Legion national executive committee.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 9004. This bill will transfer the control of Pershing Hall to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to insure that the building be preserved as a memorial to Gen. John J. Pershing.

At the present time, title to the building known as Pershing Hall is vested in the U.S. Government with no U.S. Government agency responsible for its day-to-day maintenance and upkeep. The American Legion heretofore has been responsible for the day-to-day operation, maintenance, and perpetuation of Pershing Hall as a memorial to General Pershing. This responsibility has been delegated by the American Legion national headquarters to its Department of France and Paris Post No. 1 jointly. In a resolution adopted by the national executive committee of the American Legion in Indianapolis, Ind., on October 16, 17, and 18, 1963, the organization has asked to be relieved of its responsibility with respect to the operation of Pershing Hall. The resolution reads in part:

> Whereas the American Legion believes that the high order of patriotic reverence due our great leader of World War I, Gen. John J. Pershing, can best be perpetuated through the acceptance by our National Government of the responsibility for maintaining and perpetuating Pershing Hall; and

The resolution further states:

> *Resolved,* That the national commander be and he is hereby authorized and directed to contact the proper branch and agency of the Government of the United States for the purpose of negotiating and effectuating an appropriate and orderly transfer to, and the assumption by, the Government of the United States the responsibility to maintain and perpetuate Pershing Hall.

H.R. 9004 will carry out the wishes of the American Legion by transferring control of this property to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The Administrator shall then transfer control of the property to any department or agency of the U.S. Government requiring this property to carry out its function. In the event no department or agency expresses a desire to use this property for its function, control shall remain with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the property shall be used by the Veterans' Administration. The bill also provides that the building shall continue to be known as Pershing Hall and shall be maintained, perpetuated, and used as a memorial to General Pershing, whether the building is under the control of the Veterans' Administration or any other Government agency.

In short, Mr. Speaker, it is the committee's feeling that this building is ideally suited for providing sorely needed office space for one or more of our Government agencies in France and will at the same time provide a suitable memorial to the beloved commander in chief of the American Expeditionary Forces in World War I. I urge its passage.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) control over the real property in Paris, France, known as Pershing Hall, title to which was acquired by the United States pursuant to the Acts of June 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 426), and August 12, 1935 (49 Stat. 594), is transferred to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Administrator"). The Administrator shall transfer control over such real property to the head of any department or agency of the United States who before the sixtieth day after the date of enactment of this Act notifies the Administrator that the department or agency of which he is the head could use such real property to carry out its functions. If the head of more than one such department or agency so notifies the Administrator, the Administrator shall transfer control over such real property to the head of the department or agency of the United States designated for such purpose by the President, but the head of such department or agency shall provide for the use of portions of such real property in excess of the needs of the department or agency under his jurisdiction by other departments and agencies of the United States; subject, however, to proviso (b), referred to hereinbelow. If no other head of a department or agency of the United States notifies the Administrator as provided in the preceding sentence before the sixtieth day after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall retain control of such real property for use by the Veterans' Administration; subject, however, to proviso (b), referred to hereinbelow.

(b) Such real property shall continue to be known and referred to as Pershing Hall and shall be maintained, perpetuated, and used as a memorial to the memory of General of the Armies of the United States John J. Pershing and the officers and men of the American Expeditionary Forces in World War I. Any trophies, memorials and/or other memorabilia, legal titles to which are vested in the Government of the United States, remaining in Pershing Hall when control is assumed over it by the Administrator under the first sentence of subsection (a) shall be maintained, preserved, perpetuated, and appropriately displayed by the department or agency of the United States having control of such real property.

Any trophies, memorials, and/or other memorabilia and other personal property, legal title to which is not vested in the Government of the United States, remaining in Pershing Hall when control is assumed over it by the Administrator, under subsection (a) shall be the subject of negotiation between the Administrator and the true and lawful owners thereof.

SEC. 2. The Pershing Hall Memorial Fund created by section 2 of the Act of June 29, 1935, is abolished, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall cover any funds therein into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts and shall liquidate any nonliquid assets in such fund and cover the proceeds therefrom into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 3. The Act of June 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 126), is repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 18, omit "29" and insert "28".
Page 3, line 23, omit "126" and insert "426".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The **SPEAKER**. This concludes the eligible bills on the Consent Calendar.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS AND OUTDOOR RECREATION, COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. **MORRIS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on National Parks and Outdoor Recreation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PRINTING CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS OF AMVETS AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT

Mr. **HAYS**. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up the bill (H.R. 8751) to amend the act of March 2, 1931, to provide that certain proceedings of the AMVETS—American Veterans of World War II—shall be printed as a House document, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act of March 2, 1931, as amended (44 U.S.C. 275b), is amended to read as follows:

"That hereafter the proceedings of the national encampments of the Grand Army of the Republic, the United Spanish War Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, the American Legion, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, Incorporated, the Disabled American Veterans, and the AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), respectively, shall be printed annually, with accompanying illustrations, as separate House documents of the session of the Congress, to which they may be submitted."

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] is recognized.

Mr. **JONES** of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **HAYS**. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. **JONES** of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I opposed this bill in the committee and did so not because of the organization involved, but because I can see no reason why public funds should be used for the printing of the proceedings of any private organization, and I might say this bill will add one more to a long list which enjoys this Federal subsidy.

I have introduced a bill which would do away with this public printing or the public paying for the cost of printing the proceedings of any organization of any private, philanthropic, social, patriotic, or any other type of organization, and I intend to vote against this bill. I can see no reason for the taxpayer being called upon to pay the printing bill of organizations which are apparently financially sound; that maintain elaborate national headquarters buildings, with large and presumably well-paid staffs, and have the funds with which to meet all operating expenses, including the printing of the proceedings of their national conventions.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment. Page 2, line 2, strike out "of the World War".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF "TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS AND CHARITABLE TRUSTS: THEIR IMPACT ON OUR ECONOMY—SECOND INSTALLMENT"

Mr. **HAYS**. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 230 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives five thousand copies of the subcommittee chairman's report to Subcommittee Numbered 1 entitled "Tax-Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Their Impact on Our Economy—Second Installment", dated October 16, 1963.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF "TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS AND CHARITABLE TRUSTS: THEIR IMPACT ON OUR ECONOMY"

Mr. **HAYS**. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 231 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business five thousand copies of the chairman's report to the Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, Eighty-seventh Congress, dated December 31, 1962, entitled "Tax-Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Their Impact on Our Economy".

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR PRINTING OF CERTAIN OPINIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 237 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (a) there shall be printed thirty-two thousand two hundred and fifty additional copies of the opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States (including concurring and dissenting opinions) in the cases of Engel against Vitale (370 U.S. 421) and Abington School District against Schempp (374 U.S. 203). Such opinions shall be printed together in one publication.

(b) Of the thirty-two thousand two hundred and fifty copies of such opinions printed pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, ten thousand three hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate and twenty-one thousand nine hundred and fifty copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PRINT AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT THE HANDBOOK ENTITLED "THE UNITED STATES COURTS"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 518 and ask for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the handbook entitled "The United States Courts," by Joseph F. Spaniol, Junior, of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, as set out in House Document Numbered 233 of the Eighty-sixth Congress, brought up to date by the author, with a foreword by Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, be printed as a House document.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANKING PRIVILEGES FOR MRS. JACQUELINE KENNEDY, ETC.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9291) to provide office space, supplies, equipment, and franking privileges for Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, to authorize appropriations for the payment of expenses incident to the death and burial of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all mail matter sent by post by Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, the widow of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, under her written autograph signature or facsimile thereof, shall be conveyed within the United States, its possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico free of postage during her natural life.

SEC. 2. For a period of six months following the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of General Services shall furnish to Mrs. Kennedy suitable office space appropriately furnished, supplied, and equipped as determined by the Administrator, at such place within the United States as Mrs. Kennedy shall specify. The supplies to be furnished shall include a sufficient quantity of envelopes marked "Postage and Fees Paid" to be used for international mail. For the same period the Administrator of General Services shall, without regard to the civil service and classification laws, provide for an office staff for Mrs. Kennedy. Persons employed under this section shall be selected by Mrs. Kennedy and shall be responsible only to her for the performance of their duties. Mrs. Kennedy shall fix basic rates of compensation for persons employed for her under this section which in the aggregate shall not exceed $50,000 during such six-month period. The rate of compensation payable to any such person shall not exceed the maximum aggregate rate of compensation payable to any individual employed in the office of a Senator. Each individual appointed under this section to a position on the office staff of Mrs. Kennedy shall be held and considered to be an employee of the Government of the United States for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954.

SEC. 3. Subject to the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, the United States Secret Service of the Treasury Department is authorized to protect Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy and her children for the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act. Not less than two agents shall be assigned at all times to provide the protection authorized by this section.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act and to pay the expenses incident to the death and burial of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, including undertakers' charges and the expenses of transportation, to be expended under the direction of the President: *Provided*, That no payment of such expenses shall be made from any appropriation authorized by this Act to any officer or employee of the Government for personal or professional services.

The **SPEAKER**. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, the first section of H.R. 9291 grants the franking privilege to Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, the widow of our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, as is customary for all widows of former Presidents. Similar provisions were made, for example, by the acts of January 25, 1924, June 16, 1934, and May 7, 1945, for the widows of Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Roosevelt.

The second section of the bill makes appropriate and customary provisions for the prompt and orderly management and disposition of the very heavy burden of affairs which relate to the Presidency of the United States and remain unsettled after a President leaves office. The section requires the Administrator of the General Services Administration to furnish Mrs. Kennedy, for a 6-month period, suitable office space, furniture, supplies, and equipment, and an office staff, to be selected by and responsible to her, whose aggregate compensation shall not exceed $50,000. The provisions of this section, except for the time and aggregate staff salary limitations, are substantially identical to those of subsection (b) of Public Law 85-745, which authorizes the furnishing of office space, staff, equipment, and supplies to living former Presidents during their lives.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. In the gentleman's statement he referred to the precedents for the franking privilege. Would he state to the House whether or not there are any precedents for the arrangement for a staff, for quarters and also for protection? By asking the question I am not undertaking to complain about it, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit me to finish my statement, I have the answer to his question therein.

Mr. HALLECK. Very well.

Mr. MORRISON. Section 2 of the bill is essential to assist President Kennedy's widow with the extremely heavy burden of responsibility imposed on her by reason of the tragic and untimely death of her husband while in office. The magnitude of this duty which has devolved on Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy is unprecedented because of the extraordinary scope and extent of worldwide and domestic interest and concern and the deep sense of shock and personal loss, not only of Americans but of world leaders and the people of every civilized nation. To Mrs. Kennedy remains the obligation of responding, in a manner consistent with the high dignity and prestige of the Office of the President and in the tradition of America, to foreign chiefs of state and dignitaries as well as to our own people. Within the first week after President Kennedy's death more than 200,000 letters and 90,000 telegrams were received, and messages still are arriving in heavy volume. This legislation will enable Mrs. Kennedy to care for these and other matters related to her husband's service which require her personal attention.

Section 3 of the bill authorizes the U.S. Secret Service to assign not less than two agents at all times to protect Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy and her children for a 1-year period. It is the unanimous judgment of Federal law enforcement officials, based on experience and evaluation of the circumstances of President Kennedy's death, that there is and for some time will be an unusual degree of danger to the life and health of the President's widow and her children.

Section 4 authorizes appropriations to carry out the provisions of the legislation and to pay expenses incident to the death and burial of President Kennedy. Similar provision for the expenses incident to the death and burial of former President Franklin Delano Roosevelt was made in the Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1945, 59 Stat. 412.

Mr. HALLECK. Now, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes, I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, the gentleman's statement, as I have listened to it, indicates that there are precedents for sections 1 and 4 of the bill but not for sections 2 and 3 of the bill. Is that not correct?

Mr. MORRISON. Well, there is a precedent for the staffing, furniture, and supplies and equipment, as well as secretarial help under the law that this Congress passed for the benefit of past Presidents of the United States who were no longer in office in order to carry on their work after they were out of the Office of the Presidency.

Mr. HALLECK. I understand that.

Mr. MORRISON. This is for Mrs. Kennedy to wind up the affairs of her husband.

Mr. HALLECK. Again, may I point out that by asking this question I am not undertaking to pass judgment on whether or not this should become law, but the Speaker discussed with me section 2 of the bill and other sections. I was out of town and I did not have a chance to discuss with the Speaker section 3 of the bill. But I understand that section was discussed with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]. However, I think it appears from the record that insofar as widows of Presidents are concerned, sections 2 and 3 have no precedent in the law. Of course, the situation now may be different and is probably different than some of the others that existed in the past.

Mr. MORRISON. There has never been this exact situation; therefore, there could be no exact precedent.

Mr. HALLECK. Let me conclude. I just want the RECORD to show that with the enactment of this legislation, if it is enacted and I assume it will be, it does go beyond actions heretofore taken with respect to widows of other Presidents.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Technically, of course, the observation of the distinguished minority leader is correct. But with reference to the matter of taking care of expenses connected with or incidental to the death of a President in office, the Congress has always in recent years taken care of extraordinary expenses. This was true with reference to extraordinary expenses relating to the death of President Harding when the burial and transportation costs amounted to $28,000. This, of course, is not a technical precedent with respect to the matter referred to, but it does show that the Congress has in the past taken care of extraordinary expenses relating to the death of the President of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the Members that this bill, although it states that it was referred to the House Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service, was not referred to that committee nor have there been any hearings whatever on this measure. In the interest of orderly procedure, I regret that the bill did not come to the committee for hearings. The committee has no hearings scheduled for today or tomorrow and could easily have given consideration to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], that insofar as I can ascertain there is no precedent whatever for sections 2 and 3.

I should like to point out to those who may be interested that section 3 will not mean the assignment of only two Secret Service agents. I am sure we can agree that Secret Service agents should be detailed to the widow and her family for a limited time. But let us not think that this will be limited to two Secret Service agents, because the bill provides for the assignment of two "at all times." This means around the clock, and for a year, which automatically means several agents must be detailed for this purpose.

I would also call the attention of those who drafted the legislation to the language to be found on page 2, which reads as follows:

> Each individual appointed under this section to a position on the office staff of Mrs. Kennedy shall be held and considered to be an employee of the Government of the United States for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act—

And so forth. Turning to page 3 of the bill you will find, beginning at line 14, the following proviso:

> No payment shall be made from any appropriation authorized by this Act to any officer or employee of the Government for personal or professional services.

It seems to me that the language to be found on page 3 is in direct conflict with the language to be found on page 2 which I previously cited. I would suggest that an effort be made here today to correct this language. I do not see how the language to be found on page 3 of the bill, covering the entire act, can be with the employee provision in section 2. I do not see how you can deny payment of moneys by this act to any officer or employee of the Government and then provide for Government employees as is done in section 2.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I believe the amendment to the bill takes care of the matter in the proviso, if I understand the gentleman correctly.

Mr. GROSS. I may say to the gentleman I was not aware an amendment had been offered.

Mr. ALBERT. The amendment makes the language on line 14 read that "no payment of such expenses shall be made from any appropriation authorized by this Act to any officer or employee of the Government for personal or professional services."

Mr. GROSS. Was the original language designed to prevent dual compensation, or what was the purpose of the proviso to be found on page 3?

Mr. ALBERT. The proviso, as I understand it, was taken from an appropriation act which did not contain the other sections, and by simply transposing it in this bill. The limitation on these expenses as regards Federal employees was not clear, therefore, in the language of the proviso as originally drawn. For that reason this amendment which makes the matter specifically clear, has been added in the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

There is another observation I should like to make with respect to this bill. I am beginning to get communications as to whether there would be included in the burial expenses paid by the Government the cost of the eternal light that has been installed in Arlington Cemetery. I do not know whether anyone here today is prepared to answer the question. If not, I suggest this and other information be developed in hearings before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I want the record clear that I believe proper provision should be made in all matters dealing with the tragic death of the late President Kennedy. But all that we do should be with restraint and in good taste. In the emotions of the present period let us retain perspective and not indulge in precedents and actions which could tarnish the memory of the man we seek to honor.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON], that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 9291.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

DELAWARE RIVER JOINT TOLL BRIDGE COMMISSION

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6199) granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact of agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the supplemental compact or agreement set forth below, and to each and every term and provision thereof: *Provided*, That nothing therein contained shall be construed to affect, impair, or diminish any right, power, or jurisdiction of the United States or of any court, department, board, bureau, officer, or official of the United States, over or in regard to any navigable waters, or any commerce between the States or with foreign countries, or any bridge, railroad, highway, pier, wharf, or other facility or improvement, or any other person, matter, or thing, forming the subject matter of the aforesaid compact or agreement or otherwise affected by the terms thereof: *Provided further,* That with respect to any port and terminal facilities, as defined in said supplemental compact or agreement, the power to exercise the right of eminent domain granted to the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission shall not be exercised to condemn property devoted to public use by any person or corporation, public or private, having the right of eminent domain or to condemn property of any person or corporation abutting on the Delaware River for the same use as that to which the property is being devoted or to condemn a dock or other facility abutting on the Delaware River when the dock or other facility is used as an integral part of a manufacturing plant or operation.

"SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA AND THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

"*Amending and supplementing the compact or agreement entitled 'Agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission as a body corporate and politic and defining its powers and duties,' as heretofore amended and supplemented, by extending the powers of the commission to include certain port and terminal facilities*

"The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey do hereby solemnly covenant and agree, each with the other, as follows:

"(1) Article I of the compact or agreement entitled 'Agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission as a body corporate and politic and defining its powers and duties,' executed on behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by its Governor on the nineteenth day of December, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-four, pursuant to an act of its General Assembly approved the twenty-fifth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-one (Pamphlet Laws 1352), as last amended by an act of said General Assembly approved the eighteenth day of May, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-three (Pamphlet Laws 827), and executed on behalf of the State of New Jersey by its Governor on the eighteenth day of December, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-four, pursuant to an act of its Senate and General Assembly approved June eleventh, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-four (chapter 215, laws of 1934; R. S. (1937) 32: 8–1), to which compact or agreement the consent of the Congress of the United States was given by section 9 of an Act of the Congress approved August 30, 1935 (Public No. 411, 74th Congress, 49 Stat. 1051, 1058), as heretofore amended and supplemented, be and the same is hereby amended and supplemented to read as follows:

" 'Article I

" 'There is hereby created a body corporate and politic, to be known as the "Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission" (hereinafter in this agreement called the "commission"), which shall consist of the commissioners, on behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, provided for by the act, approved the eighth day of May, one thousand nine hundred and nineteen (Pamphlet Laws, one hundred forty-eight), and its supplements and amendments, for the acquisition of toll bridges over the Delaware River, and of commissioners, on behalf of the State of New Jersey, provided for by the act, approved the first day of April, one thousand nine hundred and twelve (Chapter, two hundred ninety-seven), and its supplements and amendments, for the acquisition of toll bridges over the Delaware River, which said commissions have heretofore been acting as a joint commission by virtue of reciprocal legislation.

" 'No action of the commission shall be binding unless a majority of the members of the commission from Pennsylvania and a majority of the members of the commission from New Jersey shall vote in favor thereof.

" 'In the event that any ex-officio member of the commission from Pennsylvania shall for any reason be absent from a meeting of the commission, a deputy or other person in his department designated by him for such purpose shall be authorized to act at such meeting for and in behalf of such absent member and to vote in his place on all matters which may be presented for consideration at such meeting. Such designation shall be signed by such ex-officio member and filed with the secretary of the commission and shall continue in effect until the expiration of the term of office of such member or until another designation shall be made.

" 'The commission shall constitute the public corporate instrumentality of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey for the following public purposes, and shall be deemed to be exercising an essential governmental function in effectuating such purposes, to wit:

" '(a) The administration, operation, and maintenance of the joint State-owned bridges across the Delaware River between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey, and located north of the present stone arch bridge of the Pennsylvania Railroad across the Delaware River from Morrisville to Trenton;

" '(b) The investigation of the necessity for additional bridge communications over the Delaware River, and the making of such studies, surveys and estimates as may be necessary to determine the feasibility and cost of such additional bridge communications;

" '(c) The preparation of plans and specifications for, and location, acquisition, construction, administration, operation and maintenance of, such additional bridge communications over the Delaware River at any location north of the boundary line between Bucks County and Philadelphia County in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as extended across the Delaware River to the New Jersey shore of said river, as the commission deems necessary to advance the interests of the two States and to facilitate public travel; and the issuance of bonds and obligations to provide moneys sufficient for the acquisition or construction of such bridges; and the collection of tolls, rentals, and charges for the redemption of such bonds and obligations, and the payment of interest thereon;

" '(d) The procurement from the Government of the United States of any consents which may be requisite to enable the commission to exercise any of its powers;

" '(e) The investigation of the necessity for additional port and terminal facilities within the area (hereinafter referred to as the "district") comprising all of the territory within the counties of Bucks, Northampton, Monroe and Pike in Pennsylvania, all of the territory within the counties of Sussex, Warren, Hunterdon and Mercer in New Jersey, and that part of the territory within the county of Burlington in New Jersey north of the northerly bank of Rancocas Creek as said creek and its north branch extend in a general easterly direction from the Delaware River and through Mount Holly, Pemberton and Browns Mills and other communities to the Burlington-Ocean County boundary line in New Jersey;

" '(f) The acquisition, construction, administration, operation and maintenance of such port and terminal facilities within the district as the commission may deem necessary to advance the interests of the two States; the issuance of bonds or other obligations of the commission to provide moneys sufficient for the acquisition or construction of such facilities; and the collection of fees, rentals, tolls and other charges for the payment of such bonds or obligations and the interest thereon, and for the administration, operation and maintenance of such facilities.'

"(2) Article II of said compact or agreement, as heretofore amended and supplemented, be and the same is hereby amended and supplemented to read as follows:

" 'Article II

" 'For the effectuation of its authorized purposes, the commission is hereby granted the following powers:

" '(a) To have perpetual succession.

" '(b) To sue and be sued.

" '(c) To adopt and use an official seal.

" '(d) To elect a chairman, vice-chairman, secretary, and treasurer and appoint an engineer. The secretary, treasurer, and engineer need not be members of the commission.

" '(e) To adopt suitable by-laws for the management of its affairs.

" '(f) To appoint such other officers, agents and employees as it may require for the performance of its duties.

" '(g) To determine the qualifications and duties of its appointees, and to fix their compensation.

" '(h) To enter into contracts.

" '(i) To acquire, own, hire, use, operate, and dispose of personal property.

" '(j) To acquire, own, use, lease, operate, and dispose of real property and interest in real property, and to make improvements thereon.

" '(k) To grant the use of, by franchise, lease, and otherwise, and to make and collect charges for the use of, any property or facility owned or controlled by it.

" '(l) To borrow money upon its bond or other obligations, either with or without security.

" '(m) To exercise the power of eminent domain.

" '(n) To determine the exact location, system, and character of, and all other matters in connection with, any and all improvements or facilities which it may be authorized to own, construct, establish, effectuate, maintain, operate or control.

" '(o) In addition to the foregoing powers, to exercise the powers, duties, authority and jurisdiction heretofore conferred and imposed upon the aforesaid commissions, hereby constituted a joint commission by reciprocal legislation of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey, with respect to the acquisition of toll bridges over the Delaware River, the management, operation and maintenance of such bridges, and the location, acquisition, construction, administration, operation and maintenance of additional bridge communications over the Delaware River at any location north of the boundary line between Bucks County and Philadelphia County in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as extended across the Delaware River to the New Jersey shore of said river. The powers granted in this paragraph shall be in addition to those powers granted by paragraph (a) of article X of this agreement.

" '(p) To exercise all other powers, not inconsistent with the Constitutions of the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey or of the United States, which may be reasonably necessary or incidental to the effectuation of its authorized purposes or to the exercise of any of the powers granted to the commission by this agreement or any amendment thereof or supplement thereto, except the power to levy taxes or assessments for benefits; and generally to exercise, in connection with its property and affairs and in connection with property under its control, any and all powers which might be exercised by a natural person or a private corporation in connection with similar property and affairs.

"'(q) To acquire, construct, rehabilitate, improve, maintain, lease as lessor or as lessee, repair and operate port and terminal facilities as hereinafter defined within the district, including the dredging of ship channels and turning basins and the filling and grading of land therefor.

"'(r) To provide from time to time for the issuance of its bonds or other obligations for any one or more of its corporate purposes; all bonds and other obligations hereafter issued by the commission shall have all the qualities and incidents of negotiable instruments.

"'(s) To fix, charge, and collect fees, rentals, tolls and other charges for the use of any of its port and terminal facilities so as to provide funds at least sufficient, with other funds available for such purposes (1) to pay the cost of maintaining, repairing and operating such port and terminal facilities, including the administrative expenses of the commission chargeable thereto, (2) to pay the bonds or other obligations issued on account of such facilities and the interest thereon as the same become due and payable, and (3) to provide reserves for such purposes, and to pledge such funds, over and above such costs of maintenance, repair and operation, to the payment of such bonds or other obligations and the interest thereon.

"'(t) To petition the Interstate Commerce Commission, any public service or public utilities commission, or any other federal, state or local authority, whether administrative, judicial or legislative, for the adoption and execution of any physical improvement, change in method, rate of transportation, system of handling freight, warehousing, docking, lightering or transfer of freight, which, in the opinion of the commission, may be designed to improve or facilitate the movement or handling of commerce within the district or improve the terminal or transportation facilities therein.'

"As used in this agreement the term 'port and terminal facilities' shall mean and shall include, without intending thereby to limit the definition of such term, any one or more of the following or any combination thereof:

"(1) Every kind of terminal or storage structure or facility now in use or hereafter designed for use in the handling, storage, loading or unloading of freight or passengers at steamship, railroad or motor terminals or airports, and every kind of transportation facility now in use or hereafter designed for use in connection therewith; and

"(2) All real and personal property and all works, buildings, structures, equipment, machinery, appliances and appurtenances necessary or convenient for the proper construction, equipment, maintenance and operation of such facility or facilities or any one or more of them.

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this agreement or any provision of law, state or federal, to the contrary, the commission may combine for financing purposes any port and terminal facility or facilities constructed or acquired by it under the provisions of this agreement with any bridge or bridges heretofore or hereafter constructed or acquired by the commission, subject to any limitations contained in any trust indenture securing bonds of the commission at the time outstanding.

"The powers herein granted to the commission with reference to port and terminal facilities shall supersede the right to exercise any such powers within the district, as defined in paragraph (e) of Article I of this agreement, by any other body which has been heretofore created by compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey.

"Nothing contained in any other of the provisions of this compact or agreement shall be deemed or construed to amend, modify or repeal any of the powers, rights or duties conferred by, or limitations or restrictions expressed in, Article X of this compact or agreement, or any of the provisions of said Article X relating to a bridge to be constructed, operated and maintained by the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission or the New Jersey Turnpike Authority, acting alone or in conjunction with each other.

"In witness whereof, this 16th day of July, 1953, Alfred E. Driscoll has affixed his signature hereto as Governor of the State of New Jersey and caused the great seal of the State to be attached thereto.

"(GREAT SEAL)

"[S] ALFRED E. DRISCOLL,
"Governor, State of New Jersey.

"Attest:

"[S] LLOYD B. MARSH,
"Secretary of State.

"And, on this 13th day of July, 1953, John S. Fine has affixed his signature hereto as Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and caused the great seal of the Commonwealth to be attached thereto.

"(GREAT SEAL) [S] JOHN S. FINE,
"Governor, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

"Attest:

"[S] GENE D. SMITH,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

SEC. 2. The Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission is hereby authorized to combine for financing purposes any bridge or bridges heretofore or hereafter constructed or acquired by the Commission and any port and terminal facilities referred to in the supplemental compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey set forth above. Said Commission is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for the use of such bridge or bridges so combined and to pledge such tolls in accordance with the provisions of said supplemental compact or agreement: *Provided,* That in fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of any bridge heretofore or hereafter constructed or acquired by said Commission or any bridge or bridges so combined, the same shall be so adjusted as to provide funds sufficient, with other funds available for such purposes, to pay the reasonable costs of maintaining, repairing and opertaing such bridge or bridges and their approach facilities and such port and terminal facilities under economical management, and to provide funds sufficient to amortize the costs of such bridge or bridges and their approach facilities and such port and terminal facilities, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible, under reasonable charges, and said Commission may continue such tolls on all bridges heretofore or hereafter constructed or acquired by the Commission until all such costs shall have been amortized: *Provided, further,* That, the collection of tolls for the use of any bridge heretofore or hereafter constructed or acquired by the Commission, in excess of amounts reasonably required for the operation and maintenance thereof under economical management, shall cease at the expiration of fifty years from the date of the opening to traffic by the Commission of the bridge latest constructed or acquired by said Commission after the effective date of this Act, and the rate of such tolls shall be subject only to the provisions of section 503 of the General Bridge Act of 1946, as amended. The powers hereinabove granted shall be regarded as supplemental and additional to powers heretofore granted to said Commission.

SEC. 3. The right is hereby reserved to the Congress or any of its standing committees to require of the Commission the disclosure and furnishing of such information and data as is deemed appropriate by the Congress or any committee thereof having jurisdiction of the subject matter of this Act.

SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? If not, the question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6199.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on August 30, 1935, Congress gave its consent to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey, creating the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission and authorizing the commission to administer State-owned bridges across the Delaware River in the vicinity of Trenton.

In 1947, Congress gave its consent to a supplemental compact authorizing the commission to acquire, construct, and operate bridges at any location north of the boundary line between Mercer County and Burlington County, to issue revenue bonds, to charge and collect tolls for the use of bridges constructed or acquired by the commission.

An act approved on March 31, 1932, gave the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact authorizing the commission to acquire, construct, and operate bridges across the Delaware River north of the boundary line between Bucks County and Philadelphia County and to combine for financing purposes any two or more bridges constructed or acquired by the commission.

At present the commission maintains and operates 5 toll bridges and 11 free bridges.

In 1953 the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey entered into a supplemental agreement which amends the compact of 1934 and is designed to broaden the power of the Delaware Joint Toll Bridge Commission to include the acquisition, construction, administration, and operation and maintenance of port and terminal facilities and the issuance of bonds for the financing thereof. H.R. 6199 gives the consent of Congress to that proposal. H.R. 6199 involves expenditures of no Federal funds.

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, obviously I speak in favor of H.R. 6199, since it is a bill which I introduced. The purpose of this said legislation is to secure the consent of Congress to an amendment to the compact between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission. The original compact of 1934 was approved by Congress on August 30, 1935. Amendments were approved by Congress in 1947 and 1951. H.R. 6199 would give consent to a supplemental agreement approved by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey in 1953.

The original compact of 1934 established the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, which took over responsibility for the acquisition, maintenance, and operation of bridges across the Delaware River above the city of Philadelphia and the opposite point on the New Jersey side. The subsequent amendments of 1947 and 1951 permitted grouping of the bridges into a single project for financing and pledging of tolls and extended the northerly limit of the district to the Pennsylvania-New York line.

The 1953 supplemental agreement, for which consent is sought in H.R. 6199, broadens the power of the commission to include the acquisition, construction, administration, operation, and maintenance of port and terminal facilities and the issuance of bonds for the financing thereof.

The Federal Government has expended approximately $93 million in the deepening of the channel of the Delaware River fom Philadelphia to a point just south of Morrisville, Pa., and Trenton, N.J. H.R. 6199, if enacted into law, will permit the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission to create ports along the said river between these points. The construction and operation of such ports on the New Jersey and Pennsylvania sides of the Delaware River at these points will make, to all intents and purposes, "ports on the sea," because it will permit deep sea cargo and passenger vessels to come up the Delaware River to the said ports. The Delaware Valley can confidently look forward to the growth of its industrial abilities as a result. This, of course, should add substantially to the economy of this area and this, in turn, will give a return to the Federal Government—in the form of additional Federal taxes—of some of the money originally invested in deepening the Delaware River channel. This bill is very necessary.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge passage of H.R. 6199. This bill would expand the existing compact between the States of New Jersey and Pennsylvania to authorize the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission to undertake development of deep water port and terminal facilities at Trenton, N.J., and Morrisville, Pa. The Legislatures of New Jersey and Pennsylvania have passed the requisite legislation to expand the bridge compact. Last December, the bridge commission formally requested the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Curtin] and myself to introduce legislation to effect the necessary congressional approval of the compact changes. Pursuant to this request, I introduced on April 1, H.R. 5347. Subsequently, on the advise of bonding and engineering counsel, the commission indicated it wished the language of H.R. 5347 refined in certain respects. These refinements were made and incorporated in H.R. 6199 as introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Curtin] on May 9. I accepted these changes and endorsed H.R. 6199 at the public hearing held before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on August 7. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend all the public and private agencies and individuals on both sides of our Delaware River who have supported and endorsed this legislation. The entire effort has been carried out in an atmosphere remarkable for its spirit of cooperation and nonpartisanship. In passing this legislation, we will help open the upper Delaware River Basin to the commerce of the world. It is a good bill and I urge its passage.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record immediately prior to the passage of the bill just considered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

GRAND PRAIRIE, TEX., AIRPORT

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 8462) to authorize the conveyance of certain real property of the United States heretofore granted to the city of Grand Prairie, Tex., for public airport purposes, contingent upon approval by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, and to provide for the conveyance to the United States of certain real property now used by such city for public airport purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subject to the provisions of section 2 of this Act, the city of Grand Prairie, Texas, shall be authorized to convey to the highest bidder all right, title, and interest of such city in and to certain real property transferred to such city for public airport purposes by the United States. Such real property consists of a tract of land containing 127.39 acres, more or less, comprising a portion of the 195.82-acre tract situated in the county of Dallas, State of Texas, described in the deed dated May 22, 1962, entered into between the United States as grantor, acting by and through the Secretary of the Army, and the city of Grand Prairie, Texas, as grantee, and more particularly described as follows:

Being a tract or parcel of land lying and situated in Grand Prairie, Dallas County, Texas, and a part of the McKinney and Williams survey, abstract Numbered 1045 and the Elizabeth Gray survey, abstract Numbered 517.

Beginning at a point on the east right-of-way line of Carrier Parkway (formerly Southwest Eighth Street) where it intersects the south boundary line of the McKinney and Williams survey, abstract Numbered 1045, said point being the northwest corner of lot 17, block 9, of the Indian Hills Park Addition to the city of Grand Prairie;

thence south 0 degrees 33 minutes 30 seconds west along the east right-of-way line of Carrier Parkway a distance of 2,683.0 feet to the southeast corner of Grand Prairie Airport;

thence north 89 degrees 34 minutes 30 seconds west a distance of 1,557.3 feet along the south boundary line to a point where property line bears due north;

thence north 0 degrees 02 minutes west a distance of 138.4 feet to a point where property line turns west, said point being the northeast corner of the W. C. May survey, abstract numbered 890;

thence north 0 degrees 24 minutes west a distance of 3,578 feet to the southeast corner of the Texas Army National Guard 42.39-acre tract;

thence north 8 degrees 20 minutes 30 seconds west a distance of 691.70 feet to a point on the south right-of-way line of Jefferson Avenue;

thence north 81 degrees 39 minutes 30 seconds east along the south right-of-way line of Jefferson Avenue a distance of 249.06 feet to the northwest corner of land known as General Services Administration land acquisition;

thence south 8 degrees 20 minutes 30 seconds east a distance of 330 feet to a point for General Services Administration land's southwest corner;

thence south 44 degrees 41 minutes 30 seconds east following General Services Administration land's south boundary line a distance of 2,016.45 feet to the place of beginning and containing 127.39 acres of land, more or less.

(b) Subject to the provisions of subsection (c) of section 2 of this Act, the city of Grand Prairie, Texas, shall convey to the United States, acting by and through the Secretary of the Army, all right, title, and interest of such city in and to certain real property transfered to such city for public airport purposes by the United States. Such real property consists of a tract of land containing 65.99 acres, more or less, comprising a portion of the 195.82-acre tract situated in the county of Dallas, State of Texas, the exact legal description of which property is contained in the deed dated May 22, 1962, entered into between the United States as grantor, acting by and through the Secretary of the Army, and the city of Grand Prairie, Texas, as grantee, and more particularly described as follows:

Being a tract or parcel of land lying and situated in Grand Prairie, Dallas County, Texas, and a part of the McKinney and Williams survey, abstract numbered 1045 and the Elizabeth Gray survey, abstract numbered 517.

Beginning at a point said point being the northeast corner of the W. C. May survey, abstract numbered 890;

thence north 89 degrees 26 minutes west along the north boundary line of said May survey a distance of 1,091.0 feet to the southwest corner of said airport tract;

thence north 0 degrees 32 minutes 30 seconds east a distance approximately 1,162.45 feet to a point in a line with the northwest edge of the most westerly asphalt mat extended;

thence north 29 degrees 32 minutes 30 seconds east along the northwest edge of said mat a distance of 981.15 feet to a point perpendicular to and 400 feet west of the centerline of the north-south runway;

thence north 1 degree 19 minutes 30 seconds west along a line parallel to and 400 feet west of the said centerline a distance of 1,476.75 feet to a point on the south boundary line of most western ramp;

thence north 81 degrees 59 minutes 30 seconds east a distance of 614.10 feet to a point;

thence south 0 degrees 24 minutes east a distance of 3,578 feet to the place of beginning and containing 65.99 acres of land, more or less.

Sec. 2. (a) The sale referred to in subsection (a) of the first section of this Act shall be authorized in writing by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, only after—

1. A site for a new airport has been selected and the Adminstrator, Federal Aviation Agency, has determined that such site is capable of being developed and used as an airport adequate to meet the needs of Grand Prairie;

2. A plan for construction of airport facilities at the new site has been submitted to and approved by the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency;

3. The city of Grand Prairie has, through advertising and sealed bids, provided assurances that construction of airport facilities can be accomplished in accordance with the plan submitted to and approved by the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, and

4. The city of Grand Prairie has, after advertising, received sealed bids on the 127.39 acres to be sold and determines that the bid to be accepted is in an amount equal to or greater than the combined costs of acquiring land for a new airport site and constructing the airport facilities thereon in accordance with plans submitted to and approved by the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency.

(b) Any proceeds of the sale of the 127.39 acres in excess of the amount needed for acquisition and construction at the new site shall be held in a trust account and be available for expenditures only for operation, maintenance, and future development of the new airport.

(c) The real property acquired by the city of Grand Prairie, Texas, with the proceeds of the sale authorized pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be subject to such terms, exceptions, reservations, conditions, and covenants as the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, after consultation with the Secretary of the Army, may deem appropriate to assure that such property will be held and used by such city for public airport purposes.

(d) Subject to the approval of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency with respect to the coordination of the sale authorized by him under the foregoing provisions of this section with the conveyance required by this subsection, the city of Grand Prairie, Texas, shall convey, without monetary consideration therefor, to the United States, acting by and through the Secretary of the Army, that tract of land containing 65.99 acres, more or less, situated in the county of Dallas, State of Texas, the exact legal description of which is set forth in subsection (b) of the first section of this Act.

SEC. 3. The provisions relating to the reversion to the United States of legal title to certain real property in the event it is not used for airport purposes contained in the deed dated May 22, 1962, entered into between the United States as grantor, acting by and through the Secretary of the Army, and the city of Grand Prairie, Texas, as grantee, are hereby declared to be null and void from and after the date of the disposal of said property in compliance with the provisions of this Act, to the extent such provisions apply to the 127.39 acres, more or less, described in subsection (a) of the first section of this Act.

SEC. 4. The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency shall issue and obtain such written instruments as may be necessary to carry out the foregoing provisions of this Act.

The **SPEAKER**. Is a second demanded?

Mr. **SPRINGER**. I demand a second, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. **WILLIAMS**. Mr. Speaker, the airport at the city of Grand Prairie, Tex., was originally constructed by the military for use during World War II. When it became surplus, it was deeded to the city with a reversionary clause, in the event it ceased to be used for airport purposes.

During the 20 years since the war ended the community of Grand Prairie has grown up around this airport to the extent that it is no longer a desirable location for a general airport. The city of Grand Prairie desires to dispose of this airport property and sell it for commercial use, and to use the funds derived from its sale for the purchase and construction of another airport at a more suitable location. The city cannot do this because of the reversionary clause in the deed requiring use of the property for airport purposes.

The Federal Aviation Administration has agreed that it will serve the public interest and that of aviation for this land to be sold by the city and for the proceeds to go into the building of a new airport in a more suitable location. It is understood and it is written into the bill that in the acquisition and construction of the new airport no Federal funds will be used and that it will not be eligible for participation under the Aid to Airports Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT], who is the sponsor of this legislation, and who will explain the bill in more detail.

Mr. **WRIGHT**. Mr. Speaker, this bill will make it possible for the city of Grand Prairie, Tex., to have a larger and safer airport with a longer runway and better approaches, farther removed from traffic congestion, at no cost whatever to the Federal Government.

The Federal Aviation Agency in its long-range study of airport needs has recommended that Grand Prairie needs a new and better airport for general municipal airport purposes.

Grand Prairie lies in the path of very rapid growth. It is between the cities of Dallas and Fort Worth. Its population has grown from approximately 14,000 in 1950 to approximately 42,000 today, and this growth has encroached directly upon the borders of the present airport. It is hemmed in from three sides. With the growth of the city, naturally enough, has come a growth in private air travel. Additionally, according to the Federal Aviation Agency, the approach patterns to this airport are not safe or conducive to continued safe travel by civilian planes in the foreseeable future.

The air is sometimes congested with traffic. Approximately 4 miles north of this present airport, which sits right in the path of this rapidly growing city, is the Greater Southwest International Airport, with long, 9,000 feet runways, used by intercontinental jet flights. Approximately 11 or 12 miles to the northeast lies Love Field, one of the most busily used airports in the entire Nation. Approximately 3 miles east lies the Grand Prairie Naval Air Station, sometimes known as Hensley Field, and used also by the Chance-Vought Aircraft Corp. Approximately 4 or 5 miles to the west of it lies the new Arlington Airport. Directly in one of the approach patterns is a city water tower. Therefore, the present city airport of Grand Prairie has been hemmed in from expansion and the air above it made somewhat hazardous by a proliferation of other airport facilities.

This bill permits the sale of those downtown facilities and the use of the proceeds to buy much more adequate land at a site farther removed from the overlapping air traffic patterns, much more convenient for the purposes of takeoffs and landings and much safer for such use, without 1 penny of cost to the Federal Government.

It seems to me that this is a good bargain for the Government because under the terms of this bill the Federal Government gets back 65.99 acres that it had already given to Grand Prairie for its use. The Federal Government also gets the privilege of attaching to the new airport, which will be built from the proceeds of the sale of the old 127 acres, all rights, reservations, and restrictions that the Administrator of the FAA may desire to apply. Additionally, the Federal Government gets the benefits of a new, modern, safe, usable airport without the outlay of any matching funds as is usually the case. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, and because the legislation in its present form has been approved in principle by the Federal Aviation Agency and by the Department of the Army, and because it has been approved by the city of Grand Prairie and the Grand Prairie Chamber of Commerce and by the Private Pilots Association of that area, and because I know of no present objection to it, I believe this is the kind of bill that is in the interest of the Government of the United States as well as in the interest of Federal aviation and in the interest of the city of Grand Prairie.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. **SPRINGER**. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

Mr. **ALGER**. Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that has been of great interest to the people of Dallas County for many years. For the years that I have been in the Congress, we have been interested in seeing this move taken. I want to commend the gentleman of the subcommittee—the gentleman from Mississippi, and the gentleman from Texas, for their interest in this matter and for expediting it and bringing it to the floor of the House. I know of no controversy involved here insofar as the subcommittee and the citizens for years have tried to resolve the differences and all of the legal claims to this land.

There will be no Federal funds involved or requests for any Federal funds. As to the need for another airport location, I can testify from my own personal knowledge that there are many overlapping traffic patterns existing there, that constitute an extreme hazard to air traffic in addition to the details which the gentleman from Texas has pointed out.

Furthermore, I understand this property can be sold, with the proceeds going to the new airport. The land can be disposed of according to the disposition of the city of Grand Prairie which through its city planning will make the ultimate and highest use of the land.

Is that correct, may I ask my colleague, the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. WRIGHT. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that this is correct.

I should also like to say, if the gentleman will yield further, that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] has been very diligent over the years in attempting to work out the proper and most equitable solution of this problem. The present airport facility lies in his district. I have come in the picture only because of this rapid growth and expansion of the city of Grand Prairie, growing into and encroaching upon the borders of my district. The gentleman's district and mine lie adjacent, one to the other. He and I have worked together on this problem. I want to pay my respects and tribute to my colleague for the cooperative manner in which he has worked with me in the preparation of this legislation.

Mr. ALGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I can also relay the information that to my knowledge the people of Grand Prairie and the mayor of Grand Prairie are pleased with this solution, recognizing the problems involved here.

Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman and the subcommittee for their efforts in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question or two concerning this bill. How did the Federal Government acquire the land in the first place? Did they buy the land or was it donated by the municipality, county, or State?

Mr. WRIGHT. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that the land popularly known as Grand Prairie Airport was acquired during World War II by the Federal Government as a part of the U.S. Navy program of outlying airfields and was used during the war for military purposes by the Government.

Some little time back the Government did deed to the city of Grand Prairie all of this property for the purpose of using it for a municipal airport, which is what it has been used for. Since it no longer is usable as a proper or safe municipal airport and the need exists for a better and more modern one, the property of the present site can be sold.

Mr. GROSS. Did the Federal Government purchase this land originally, or was it donated? I find nothing in the report to indicate how the Federal Government originally acquired it; that is, whether by purchase or donation.

Mr. WRIGHT. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa I do not know the answer to that question. It occurred during World War II. I would presume—and this is only a presumption on my part—that the Federal Government had purchased this land, although in much of that area much property was given to the Federal Government for its use during the war.

Mr. GROSS. What I am trying to do is arrive at the present fair market value of the 127 acres.

Mr. WRIGHT. Of course, we will not know the market value until it is sold, but I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that the value has been enhanced greatly since the time when the Federal Government was using it as a naval field.

Mr. GROSS. Is there a reverter clause in this bill?

Mr. WRIGHT. There is, I would say to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask this question? I am interested in this because the Federal Aviation Agency says the land is not surplus. In other words, according to the report, the Federal Aviation Agency says other agencies of the Government have not been asked whether they want this land.

Mr. WRIGHT. I would reply to the gentleman that one portion of this total property, an area consisting of some 66 acres, is to be given back to the Federal Government for use by the Department of the Army and the Texas National Guard.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. But under present law, I will say to the gentleman from Texas, the General Services Administration, when land is declared to be surplus to the needs of the Government, is supposed to contact other agencies and departments of the Government. That has not been done in this case as I understand it. Therefore, the land is not surplus and has not met this measurement or test of availability to other agencies.

Mr. WRIGHT. I would say to the gentleman that the Government determined that the highest and best public use for the land was for a public airport. Now, what we are doing in this bill is simply transferring the location of that public airport from a site where it is no longer suitable to a larger site where it will be more suitable, and the same governmental rights will then apply to this new site.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 8462.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., November 26, 1963.
Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
House 206, U.S. Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In view of my recent election to the House Committee on Armed Services and the additional duties which I have assumed, I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Government Operations.

It has been a distinct pleasure to serve on this important committee, and I have appreciated the opportunity.

Sincerely,
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 577) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

That ALBERT W. JOHNSON, of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Government Operations.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO VITALIZE THE RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9124) to amend title 10, United States Code, to vitalize the Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Reserve Officers' Training Corps Vitalization Act of 1963".

TITLE I—POLICY AND INTENT OF CONGRESS

SEC. 101. (a) The Congress hereby affirms its conviction that the primary source of commissioned officer personnel for the reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps shall continue to be the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program. Therefore, this Act is designed to continue in effect the four-year Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program with modifications that will make the program responsive to the requirements of our students, our civilian educational institutions, our Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and our national security.

(b) The Congress believes that all commissioned graduates of the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program should be required to perform a period of active duty or active duty for training in the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps and that each year a substantial number of these graduates should be offered commissions in the regular components of those armed forces.

(c) The Congress believes that each of the military departments should be authorized to provide substantial financial assistance to specially selected students in the four-year Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program so as to enable the armed forces under their jurisdiction to satisfy their requirements for highly qualified junior officers who agree to remain on active duty for four or more years.

(d) The Congress believes that the military and citizenship benefits which result from providing a program of military training to students at the secondary school level not only justify a continuation of the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program but require its ultimate expansion and availability to students at all qualified schools as provided in this Act.

TITLE II—JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS PROGRAM

SEC. 201. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Subtitle A is amended by adding the following new chapter after chapter 101:

"CHAPTER 102.—JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

"Sec.

"2031. Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

"§ 2031. Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps

"(a) The Secretary of each military department shall establish and maintain a Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps, organized into units, at public and private secondary educational institutions which apply for a unit and qualify under regulations prescribed by him. However, the total number of institutions in which units may be maintained by all of the military departments may not be more than 2,000.

"(b) No unit may be established or maintained at an institution unless—

"(1) the unit contains at least 100 physically fit male students who are at least 14 years of age and are citizens of the United States; and

"(2) the institution provides a course of military instruction of three academic years' duration as prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned.

"(c) The Secretary of the military department concerned shall, to support the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program—

"(1) detail noncommissioned and commissioned officers of an armed force under his jurisdiction to institutions having units of the Corps as administrators and instructors;

"(2) provide necessary text materials, equipment, and uniforms;

"(3) establish minimum acceptable standards for performance and achievement for qualified units; and

"(4) request from Congress necessary annual appropriations.

"(d) Instead of, or in addition to, detailing noncommissioned and commissioned officers on active duty under subsection (c) (1), the Secretary of the military department concerned may—

"(1) authorize qualified institutions to employ, as administrators and instructors in the program, retired noncommissioned and commissioned officers, and members of the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, whose qualifications are approved by the Secretary and the institution concerned and who request such employment, subject to the following—

"(A) retired members so employed are entitled to receive their retired or retainer pay and an additional amount of not more than the difference between their retired pay and the active duty pay and allowances which they would receive if ordered to active duty, and one-half of that additional amount shall be paid to the institution concerned by the Secretary of the military department concerned from funds appropriated for that purpose; and

"(B) notwithstanding any other provision of law, such a retired member is not, while so employed, considered to be on active duty or inactive duty training for any purpose; or

"(2) recall retired members of an armed force under his jurisdiction to active duty for instructional and administrative duties at qualified institutions, but a member so recalled—

"(A) notwithstanding section 1402(a) of this title, is entitled, upon release from that active duty, to the same retired or retainer pay to which he would be entitled had he not been recalled to active duty;

"(B) is entitled to the benefits of section 1402 (b)-(d) of this title, if applicable to him; and

"(C) is not counted in computing strengths under any law."

(2) The chapter analysis of subtitle A, and the chapter analysis of part III of subtitle A, are each amended by inserting the following new item:

"102. Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps................ 2031".

"SEC. 202. Regulations implementing section 2031(a) of title 10, United States Code, shall be issued by the Secretary of each military department not later than January 1, 1966.

TITLE III—SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS PROGRAM

SEC. 301. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Subtitle A is amended by adding the following new chapter after chapter 102:

"CHAPTER 103.—SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

"Sec.
"2101. Definitions.
"2102. Establishment.
"2103. Eligibility for membership.
"2104. Advanced training; eligibilty for.
"2105. Advanced training; retainer pay.
"2106. Advanced training; failure to complete or to accept commission.
"2107. Advanced training; commission on completion.
"2108. Financial assistance program for specially selected members.
"2109. Advanced standing; interruption of training; delay in starting obligated service; release from program.
"2110. Field training; practice cruises.
"2111. Logistical support.
"2112. Personnel: administrators and instructors.
"2113. Limitations on numbers in the programs.

"§ 2101. Definitions

"In this chapter—

"(1) 'program' means the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps of an armed force;

"(2) 'member of the program' means a student who is enrolled in the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps of an armed force; and

"(3) 'advanced training' means the training and instruction offered in the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps to students in the third and fourth years of a four-year Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps course, or the equivalent period of training in an approved two-year Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps course.

"§ 2102. Establishment

"(a) For the purpose of preparing selected students for commissioned service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, the Secretary of each military department, under regulations prescribed by the President, may establish and maintain a Reserve Officers' Training Corps program, organized into one or more units, at any accredited civilian educational institution authorized to grant baccalaureate degrees, and at any school essentially military that does not confer baccalaureate degrees, upon the request of the authorities at that institution.

"(b) No unit may be established or maintained at an institution unless—

"(1) the senior commissioned officer of the armed force concerned who is assigned to the program at that institution is given the academic rank of professor;

"(2) the institution fulfills the terms of its agreement with the Secretary of the military department concerned; and

"(3) the institution adopts, as a part of its curriculum, a four-year course of military instruction or a two-year course of advanced training in military instruction, or both, which the Secretary of the military department concerned prescribes and conducts.

"(c) At those institutions where a unit of the program is established membership of students in the program shall be elective or compulsory as provided by State law or the authorities of the institution concerned.

"§ 2103. Eligibility for membership

"(a) To be eligible for membership in the program a person must be a student at an institution where a unit of the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps is established. However, a student at an institution that does not have a unit of the corps is eligible, if otherwise qualified, to be a member of a unit at another institution.

"(b) Persons from foreign countries may be enrolled as members of the program when their enrollment is approved by the Secretary of the military department concerned under criteria approved by the Secretary of State.

"(c) A medical, dental, pharmacy, or veterinary student may be admitted to a Medical, Dental, Medical Service, or Veterinary Corps unit of the program for a course of training consisting of ninety hours of instruction a year for four academic years.

"(d) Under such conditions as the Secretary of the military department concerned may prescribe, a medical, dental, pharmacy, or veterinary student who is a commissioned officer of a Reserve component of an armed force may be admitted to and trained in a Medical, Dental, Medical Service, or Veterinary Corps unit of the program.

"§ 2104. Advanced training; eligibility for

"(a) Advanced training shall be provided to eligible members of the program and, if the institution concerned so requests, to eligible applicants for membership in the program, who have two academic years remaining at such educational institution.

"(b) To be eligible for continuation, or initial enrollment, in the program for advanced training, a person must—

"(1) be a citizen of the United States;

"(2) be selected for advanced training under procedures prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned;

"(3) enlist in a Reserve component of an armed force under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the military department concerned for the period prescribed by the Secretary;

"(4) contract, with the consent of his parent or guardian if he is a minor, with the Secretary of the military department concerned, or his designated representative, to serve for the period required by the program;

"(5) agree in writing that he will accept an appointment, if offered, as a commissioned officer in the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, as the case may be, and that he will serve in the armed forces for the period prescribed by the Secretary; and

"(6) complete successfully—

"(A) the first two years of a four-year Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps course; or

"(B) field training or a practice cruise of not less than six weeks' duration which is prescribed by the Secretary concerned as a preliminary requirement for admission to the advanced course.

"(c) A member of the program who is ineligible under subsection (b) for advanced training shall be released from the program.

"(d) This section does not apply to cadets and midshipmen appointed under section 2108, or foreign students enrolled under section 2103(b), of this title.

"§ 2105. Advanced training; retainer pay

"Except when on active duty, a member of the program selected for advanced training under section 2104 of this title is entitled to retainer pay at the rate of $50 a month beginning on the day he starts advanced training and ending upon the completion of his instruction under the program, but not for more than two years. Retainer pay under this section may not be considered financial assistance requiring additional service within the meaning of the third sentence of section 456(d) (1) of title 50, appendix.

"§ 2106. Advanced training; failure to complete or to accept commission

"A member of the program who is selected for advanced training under section 2104 of this title, and who does not complete the course of instruction, or who completes the course but declines to accept a commission when offered, may be ordered to active duty by the Secretary of the military department concerned to serve in his enlisted grade or rating for such period of time as the Secretary prescribes but not for more than two years.

"§ 2107. Advanced training; commission on completion

"(a) Upon satisfactorily completing the academic and military requirements of the program of advanced training, a member of the program who was selected for advanced training under section 2104 of this title may be appointed as a Regular or Reserve officer in the appropriate armed force in the grade of second lieutenant or ensign, even though he is under 21 years of age.

"(b) The date of rank of officers appointed under this section in May or June of any year is the date of graduation of cadets or midshipmen from the Military Academy, the Naval Academy, or the Air Force Academy, as the case may be, in that year. The Secretary of the military department concerned shall establish the date of rank of all other officers appointed under this section.

"(c) In computing length of service for any purpose, an officer appointed under this section may not be credited with enlisted service for the period covered by his advanced training.

"§ 2108. Financial assistance program for specially selected members

"(a) The Secretary of the military department concerned may appoint as a cadet or midshipman, as appropriate, in the Reserve of an armed force under his jurisdiction any eligible member of the program who will be under 25 years of age on June 30 of the calendar year in which he is eligible under this section for appointment as an ensign in the Navy or as a second lieutenant in the Army, Air Force, or Marine Corps, as the case may be. However, a member whose enrollment in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps program contemplates less than four years of participation in the program may not be appointed a cadet or midshipman under this section, or receive any financial assistance authorized by this title.

"(b) To be eligible for appointment as a cadet or midshipman under this section a member must—

"(1) be a citizen of the United States;

"(2) be specially selected for the financial assistance program under procedures prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned;

"(3) enlist in the Reserve component of the armed force in which he is appointed as a cadet or midshipman for the period prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned;

"(4) contract, with the consent of his parent or guardian if he is a minor, with the Secretary of the military department concerned, or his designated representative, to serve for the period required by the program;

"(5) agree in writing that he will accept an appointment, if offered, as a commissioned officer in the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, as the case may be, and that, if he is commissioned as a regular officer and his regular commission is terminated before the sixth anniversary of his date of rank, he will accept an appointment, if offered, in the Reserve component of that armed force and not resign before that anniversary; and

"(6) agree in writing to serve on active duty for four or more years.

"(c) Except when on active duty, a cadet or midshipman appointed under this section is entitled to retainer pay at the rate of $50 a month beginning on the day he starts his first term of college work under this section and ending upon the completion of his instruction under this section, but not for more than four years.

"(d) A cadet or midshipman appointed under this section is entitled to the same allowances as are provided for cadets and midshipmen at the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies for—

"(1) initial travel to the educational institution in which matriculated;

"(2) travel while under orders; and

"(3) travel on discharge.

However, no allowance for travel on discharge may be paid to a discharged cadet or midshipman who continues his scholastic instruction at the same educational institution.

"(e) The Secretary of the military department concerned may provide for the payment of all expenses in his department of administering the financial assistance program under this section, including tuition, fees, books, and laboratory expenses.

"(f) Upon satisfactorily completing the academic and military requirements of the four-year program, a cadet or midshipman may be appointed as a regular or reserve officer in the appropriate armed force in the grade of second lieutenant or ensign, even though he is under 21 years of age.

"(g) The date of rank of officers appointed under this section in May or June of any year is the date of graduation of cadets or midshipmen from the Military Academy, the Naval Academy, or the Air Force Academy, as the case may be, in that year. The Secretary of the military department concerned shall establish the date of rank of all other officers appointed under this section.

"(h) A cadet or midshipman who does not complete the four-year course of instruction, or who completes the course but declines to accept a commission when offered, may be ordered to active duty by the Secretary of the military department concerned to serve in his enlisted grade or rating for such period of time as the Secretary prescribes but not for more than four years.

"(i) In computing length of service for any purpose, an officer appointed under this section may not be credited with service either as a cadet or midshipman or concurrent enlisted service.

"§ 2109. Advanced standing; interruption of training; delay in starting obligated service; release from program

"(a) The Secretary of the military department concerned may give to any enlisted member of an armed force under his jurisdiction, or any person who has served on active duty in any armed force, such advanced standing in the program as may be justified by his education and training.

"(b) In determining a member's eligibility for advanced training, the Secretary of the military department concerned may credit him with any military training that is substantially equivalent in kind to that prescribed for admission to advanced training and was received while he was taking a course of instruction in a program under the jurisdiction of another armed force or while he was on active duty in the armed forces.

"(c) The Secretary of the military department concerned may excuse from a portion of the prescribed course of military instruction, including field training and practice cruises, any person found qualified on the basis of his previous education, military experience, or both. A person accepted for advanced training under section 2104 of this title may be allowed to delay the start of that training and to interrupt it if, under the rules of the institution, there will be time enough, after any delay or interruption and before graduation, for him to complete the advanced training.

"(d) A person may become or remain a member of the program after receiving a baccalaureate degree or completing pre-professional studies if he has not completed the course of military instruction or all field training or practice cruises prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned. If a member of the program has been accepted for resident graduate or professional study, the Secretary of the military department concerned may delay the commencement of that member's obligated period of active duty until the member has completed that study.

"(e) The Secretary of the military department concerned may, when he considers that the interest of the Service so requires, release any person from the program and discharge him from his armed force.

"§ 2110. Field training; practice cruises

"(a) For the further practical instruction of members of the program, the Secretary of the military department concerned may prescribe and conduct field training and practice cruises (other than field training and practice cruises prescribed under section 2104(b)(6)) of this title which members must complete before they are commissioned.

"(b) The Secretary of the military department concerned may—

"(1) transport members of the program to and from the places designated for field training or practice cruises and furnish them subsistence while traveling to and from those places, or, instead of furnishing them transportation and subsistence, pay them a travel allowance at the rate prescribed for cadets and midshipmen at the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies for travel by the shortest usually traveled route from the places from which they are authorized to proceed to the place designated for the training or cruise and return, and pay the allowance for the return trip in advance;

"(2) furnish medical attendance and supplies to members of the program while attending field training and practice cruises, and admit them to military hospitals;

"(3) furnish subsistence, uniform clothing, and equipment to members of the program while attending field training or practice cruises or, instead of furnishing uniform clothing, pay them allowances at such rates as he may prescribe;

"(4) use any member of an armed force, or any employee of the department, under his jurisdiction, and such property of the United States as he considers necessary, for the training and administration of members of the program at the places designated for training or practice cruises.

"(c) A member of the program is entitled, while he is attending field training or practice cruises, to pay at the rate prescribed for cadets and midshipmen at the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies. An applicant for membership who is attending field training or practice cruises to satisfy the requirement in section 2104(b)(6) of this title for admission to advanced training is entitled, while so attending, to pay at the rate prescribed for enlisted members of the armed forces in pay grade E–1 (under 4 months' service).

"§ 2111. Logistical support

"(a) The Secretary of the military department concerned may issue to institutions having units of the program, or to the officers of the armed force concerned who are designated as accountable or responsible for such property—

"(1) supplies, means of transportation including aircraft, arms and ammunition, and military textbooks and educational materials; and

"(2) uniform clothing, except that he may pay monetary allowances for uniform clothing at such rate as he may prescribe.

"(b) The Secretary of the military department concerned may provide, or contract with civilian flying or aviation schools or educational institutions to provide, the personnel, aircraft, supplies, facilities, services, and instruction necessary for flight instruction and orientation for properly designated members of the program. The Secretary of each military department shall report to Congress in January of each year on the progress of the flight instruction program.

"(c) The Secretary of the military department concerned may transport members of, and designated applicants for membership in, the program to and from installations when it is necessary for them to undergo medical or other examinations or for the purpose of making visits of observation. He may also furnish them subsistence, quarters, and necessary medical care, including hospitalization, while they are at, or traveling to or from, such an installation.

"(d) The Secretary of the military department concerned may authorize members of, and designated applicants for membership in, the program to participate in aerial flights in military aircraft and in indoctrination cruises in ships of the Navy.

"(e) The Secretary of the military department concerned may authorize such expenditures as he considers necessary for the efficient maintenance of the program.

"(f) The Secretary of the military department concerned shall require, from each institution to which property is issued under subsection (a), a bond or other indemnity in such amount as he considers adequate, but not less than $5,000, for the care and safekeeping of all property so issued except uniforms, expendable articles, and supplies expended in operation, maintenance, and instruction. The Secretary may accept a bond without surety if the institution to which the property is issued furnishes to him satisfactory evidence of its financial responsibility.

"§ 2112. Personnel; administrators and instructors

"The Secretary of the military department concerned may detail regular or reserve members of an armed force under his jurisdiction (including retired members and members of the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve recalled to active duty with their consent) for instructional and administrative duties at educational institutions where units of the program are maintained. Notwithstanding section 1402(a) of this title, a member recalled to active duty for duty under this section is entitled, upon release from that active duty, to the same retired or retainer pay to which he would be entitled had he not been recalled to active duty. However, such a member is entitled to the benefits of section 1402(b)–(d) of this title, if applicable to him. Retired members recalled to active duty in connection with the program will not be counted in computing strengths under any law.

"§ 2113. Limitations on numbers in the program

"Not more than the following numbers of cadets and midshipmen appointed under section 2108 of this title may be in the financial assistance programs at any one time:

"Army program: 8,000.

"Navy program: 8,000.

"Air Force program: 8,000."

(2) The chapter analysis of subtitle A, and the chapter analysis of part III of subtitle A, are each amended by inserting the following new item:

"103. Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps................ 2101".

TITLE IV—CONFORMING AMENDMENTS AND REPEALS

SEC. 401. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 1475(a)(4) is amended by adding at the end thereof the words "any applicant for membership in the reserve officers' training corps who dies while attending field training or practice cruises under section 2104(b)(6) of this title or while performing authorized travel to and from the place where the training or cruise is conducted; or".

(2) Section 1478(a)(4) is amended—

(A) by striking out "section 4385(c) or 9385(c)" and inserting in place thereof "the first sentence of section 2110(c)"; and

(B) by adding the following sentence at the end thereof; "A person covered by section 1475(a)(4) of this title who dies while attending field training or practice cruises under section 2104(b)(6) of this title or while traveling directly to or from the place where the training or cruise is conducted is considered to have been entitled, on the date of his death, to the pay prescribed by the second sentence of section 2110(c) of this title."

(3) Section 1481(a)(4) is amended by striking out the words "of the Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps, Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps" and inserting the words ", or applicant for membership in, a reserve officers' training corps" in place thereof.

(4) Section 3201 is amended—

(A) by inserting the words "in a reserve officers' training corps or" after the word "members" in clause (5) of subsection (a); and

(B) by inserting the words "in a reserve officers' training corps or" after the word "members" in clause (4) of subsection (b).

(5) Section 3355 is repealed.

(6) The analysis of chapter 337 is amended by striking out the following item:

"3355. Commissioned officers; Army Reserve: appointment; R.O.T.C. graduates."

(7) Section 3540 is repealed.

(8) The analysis of chapter 343 is amended by striking out the following item:

"3540. Educational institutions: detail of members of regular or reserve components as professors and instructors in military science and tactics."

(9) Chapter 405 is repealed.

(10) The chapter analysis of subtitle B, and the chapter analysis of part III of subtitle B, are each amended by striking out the following item:

"405. Reserve Officers' Training Corps. 4381".

(11) Section 5404(b) is amended—

(A) by inserting "and" at the end of clause (3);

(B) by striking out "; and" at the end of clause (4) and inserting a period in place thereof; and

(C) by striking out clause (5).

(12) Section 5504(h) is amended by striking out "5573, 6904, 6906" and inserting "2107, 2108, 5573" in place thereof.

(13) Chapter 541 is amended—

(A) by striking out the following item in the analysis:

"5652b. Regular Navy: lieutenants (junior grade) originally appointed as ensigns under section 5573, 6904, 6906, or 6909 of this title."

and inserting the following item in place thereof:

"5652b. Regular Navy: lieutenants (junior grade) originally appointed as ensigns under section 2107, 2108, 5573, or 6909 of this title."; and"

(B) by striking out from the catchline and the text of section 5652b "5573, 6904, 6906" and inserting "2107, 2108, 5573" in place thereof.

(14) Section 6023(a) is amended by striking out clause (2) and renumbering clause (3) as clause "(2)".

(15) Section 6387(a) is amended by striking out "6904, 6906," and inserting "2107, 2108," in place thereof.

(16) Chapter 601 is amended by repealing sections 6901, 6902, 6903, 6904, 6905, 6906, 6908, and 6910.

(17) The analysis of chapter 601 is amended by striking out the following item:

"6901. Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps: administration.
"6902. Transfer of graduates of Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps to Regular Navy.
"6903. Officer candidate training program: administration; qualifications for enrollment.
"6904. Officer candidate training program: members enrolled from Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps; appointment as midshipmen; pay; allowances; commissioning.
"6905. Officer candidate training program: members enrolled as naval aviation officer candidates; instruction; pay; allowances.
"6906. Officer candidate training program: naval aviation candidates; appointment as midshipmen; flight training; appointment as ensigns.
"6908. Officer candidate training program: naval aviators; retention or transfer to Reserve.

"* * * * * *

"6910. Payment of expenses."

(18) Section 8201 is amended—

(A) by inserting the words "in a reserve officers' training corps or" after the word "members" in clause (6) or subsection (a); and

(B) by inserting the words "in a reserve officers' training corps or" after the word "members" in clause (4) of subsection (b).

(19) Section 8355 is repealed.

(20) The analysis of chapter 837 is amended by striking out the following item:

"8355. Commissioned officers; Air Force Reserve: appointment; A.F. R.O.T.C. graduates."

(21) Section 8540 is repealed.

(22) The analysis of chapter 843 is amended by striking out the following item:

"8540. Educational institutions: detail of members of regular or reserve components as professors and instructors in air science and tactics."

(23) Chapter 905 is repealed.

(24) The chapter analysis of subtitle D, and the chapter analysis of part III of subtitle D, are each amended by striking out the following item:

"905. Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps.................. 9381".

SEC. 402. Title 37, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 209 is repealed.

(2) Section 415 is amended by striking out the words "a reserve officer of armed force or an officer of the Army, or the Air Force, without specification of component," and inserting in place thereof the words "a reserve officer of an armed force, an officer of the Army or the Air Force without specification of component, or a regular officer of an armed force appointed under section 2107 or 2108 of title 10".

(3) Section 422 is amended by repealing subsections (c) and (d).

(4) The analysis of chapter 3 is amended by striking out the following item:

"209. Members of naval officer candidate programs."

SEC. 403. Section 4 of the Act of August 1, 1956, chapter 830 (5 U.S.C. 802), is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Federal Employees' Compensation Act (ch. 458, 39 Stat. 742), as amended (5 U.S.C. 751–793), applies in the case of the disability or death of the following members and applicants for membership in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps of the Army, Navy, and Air Force:

"(1) Any member or applicant for membership who suffers disability or death from an injury incurred in line of duty while engaged in a flight or in flight instruction under chapter 103 of title 10; or

"(2) Any member or applicant for membership who suffers disability or death from an injury incurred in line of duty while performing authorized travel to or from, or while attending, field training or a practice cruise under chapter 103 of title 10.

For the purposes of this section, an injury shall be considered to have been incurred in line of duty only if it is the proximate result of the performance of military training by the member concerned, or of his travel to or from that military training, during the periods of time indicated in clause (2). Any member or applicant for membership who contracts a disease or illness which is the proximate result of the performance of training during the periods of time indicated in clause (2) shall be considered for the purposes of this section to have been injured in line of duty during that period."

(2) The last sentence of subsection (d) is amended to read as follows: "However, reimbursement may not be made for any hospitalization or medical or surgical care provided a person while attending field training or a practice cruise under chapter 103 of title 10."

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. All payments made and supplies issued under sections 9385–9387 of title 10, United States Code, in connection with the training of a person at an Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps unit while he was a student at a civil educational institution where a unit of the corps was not established, are hereby validated.

SEC. 502. If a part of this Act is invalid, all valid parts that are severable from the invalid part remain in effect. If a part of this Act is invalid in one or more of its applications, the part remains in effect in all valid applications that are severable from the invalid applications.

SEC. 503. This Act becomes effective on enactment.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana is not opposed to the bill. I am opposed to the bill and I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Indiana opposed to the bill?

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from New York opposed to the bill?

Mr. STRATTON. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, this legislation comes to the House as a result of an extensive study by a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 210]

Andrews, N.Dak.
Ashbrook
Ashley
Bennett, Mich.
Betts
Bolling
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Brock
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Buckley
Cahill
Casey
Celler
Chelf
Colmer
Corbett
Daddario
Davis, Tenn.
Devine
Dorn
Dowdy
Dulski
Dwyer
Farbstein
Fino
Fogarty
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gary
Gibbons
Glenn
Goodling
Grabowski
Gray
Hall
Hanna
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hoeven
Holland
Ichord
Jennings
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Pa.
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
Kluczynski
Landrum
Lennon
Lesinski
Lindsay
Long, La.
McDowell
McLoskey
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Matthews
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Mills
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
Ostertag
Passman
Powell
Pucinski
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Robison
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Rumsfeld
St. Onge
Schenck
Schwengel
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Sibal
Sikes
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Staebler
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Trimble
Tuten
Van Pelt
Watson
Whitten
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Winstead

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 322 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT].

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is perhaps one of the most important, if not the most important, piece of legislation that this body has been called on to pass judgment upon. This is the ROTC program of our country, the program which provides officers to our three branches of the military services. It supplements and augments the cadre of officers supplied by the three Academies—the Naval Academy, the Military Academy, and the Air Force Academy.

In approaching this problem, the committee started from scratch. By that I mean it just forgot everything that had been introduced, took a piece of paper and started first of all by repealing all the laws on the subject matter and then bringing into consonance and uniformity a unified and uniform ROTC program.

The program touches the home of everybody in the United States and affects in particular the young men in those homes. It provides a plan whereby the young man in high school can participate in a training program which will have him put in the position of being exposed to recognition of authority, recognition of discipline, and, most important of all, the recognition of his own country. It starts the youngster at an early age to appreciate America. It then moves him into the universities and colleges of the country and allows him two or three programs of his own selection and choice whereby the basic foundation is a 4-year officer training program. What the program does is this:

First, it provides for the continuation and expansion of the junior ROTC program;

Second, it provides for the continuation of the 4-year senior ROTC program along with the establishment of an optional 2-year senior program; and

Third, it authorizes each of the military departments to provide financial assistance to selected students in the 4-year senior ROTC program so as to enable the departments to satisfy their requirements for career personnel.

BACKGROUND

As Members of the House will recall, early this spring, the Department of Defense announced that it planned to withdraw its support of the junior ROTC program at the conclusion of fiscal year 1963.

This action would have, if left unchanged, sounded the death knell for the junior ROTC program at 255 schools throughout the country.

Many Members of Congress protested this action, and legislation was introduced to not only require the continuation of the junior ROTC program, but also to require its availability to other schools who desired to incorporate the program in their curriculum.

The bills designed to accomplish this objective were H.R. 4444 and H.R. 4427.

A subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services initiated hearings on these bills early this spring. However, after 2 days of hearings, further deliberations on these bills were postponed when representatives of the Department of Defense requested an opportunity to make a full-scale study of the need for this program. At the same time, representatives of the Department assured the subcommittee that support of the junior ROTC program would be continued through fiscal year 1964.

Subsequently, the Department transmitted to the Congress a legislative recommendation proposing substantial changes to the senior ROTC program.

The legislative recommendations of the Department of Defense relating to the senior program were incorporated with the proposed changes to the junior ROTC program embodied in H.R. 4444 and H.R. 4427, and introduced as H.R. 8130.

Testimony was received from representatives of all military departments, representatives from the field of education, representatives of various veterans' groups and service associations, Members of Congress, and other individuals interested in the ROTC program.

As a consequence of these extensive hearings, the subcommittee rewrote the departmental proposal and introduced it as H.R. 9124.

The bill was unanimously approved by the Committee on Armed Services.

PRINCIPAL FEATURES OF H.R. 9124

The principal features of the bill as reported by the subcommittee are as follows:

1. INTENT OF CONGRESS

Since the bill represents a completely new provision of law providing the basis for a revised and modernized junior and senior ROTC program, the committee considered it appropriate to include in the bill as title I a general statement concerning the policy and intent of Congress in respect to the ROTC program. This statement, among other things, reiterates congressional support of the basic 4-year senior ROTC program. In addition, the statement reflects the intent of Congress that all commissioned graduates of the senior ROTC program be required to serve on active duty or active duty for training in the Armed Forces.

Finally, the statement reflects the desire of the Congress to not only continue the junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program but require its ultimate expansion and availability to students at all qualified schools throughout the country.

2. UNIFORM AUTHORITY FOR ALL DEPARTMENTS

The bill provides for the repeal of all existing authority relating to both the junior and senior ROTC programs for each of the military departments and substitutes a single new provision of law which consolidates this authority, as modified, into one section of the United States Code which will apply uniformly to all the service departments.

3. EXPANSION OF JUNIOR ROTC

The bill would provide new statutory authority for the operation and expansion of the junior ROTC program. In accordance with the request of the Department, the subcommittee proposal would permit the Department to conduct various pilot programs to develop a more economical means of providing support for the junior ROTC program. This support would include the possible use of retired personnel to operate the program. However, in any event, this experimentation must be completed not later than January 1, 1966, at which time the departments would be required to issue regulations which would permit qualified schools to become eligible for the establishment of junior ROTC units. The legislation provides an expansion of the program from the present 254 up to a maximum of possibly as many as 2,000.

Although it would be impossible to estimate with complete accuracy the ultimate cost of this program, the ad hoc committee established by the Department of Defense which reviewed the program as proposed in H.R. 4444 and proposed also in this legislation, estimated the total cost of this program when fully implemented at less than $25 million per year. This figure was based upon an anticipated participation in the program by 1,200 schools throughout the country. The present program includes 254 schools at an estimated cost of approximately $5 million.

4. OPTIONAL 2-YEAR SENIOR ROTC PROGRAM

The bill would reassert the conviction of the Congress that the senior ROTC program should continue to be a 4-year program. However, the program would be modernized by permitting those institutions who prefer a 2-year oncampus program to establish such a program providing that, as a condition precedent for entrance into such a program, students will be required to successfully complete a 6- to 8-week summer period of military training. This training period to be performed in the simulated grade of private—E-1—at $78 per month, will serve as a substitute for the first 2 years of ROTC training—basic course.

Unlike the departmental proposal, use of the 2-year optional ROTC program will not force an institution to abandon the 4-year program. Thus, for example, colleges with a traditional 4-year ROTC program will now be in a position to accept junior college transferees without prior ROTC training and permit their participation in advance ROTC training with an opportunity for a Reserve commission. This cannot be done today.

In short, the availability of the 2-year ROTC program will permit all college students an opportunity to enter ROTC training as late as the completion of their sophomore year of college. The 6-year ROTC course at military schools would also continue to be authorized under H.R. 9124.

5. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STUDENTS IN THE 4-YEAR ROTC PROGRAM

The bill would authorize all the military departments to provide scholarship assistance to students in the 4-year ROTC program in order to satisfy special long-term service requirements for career-type officers. This scholarship program could consist of a maximum of 4 years or a minimum of 1-year scholarship assistance, or any figure in between.

This authority, for practical purposes, would be identical to that presently provided to the Navy alone.

The use of this authority would be permissive but could in no event exceed stated statutory ceiling of 8,000 students for the Army, 8,000 for the Navy, and 8,000 for the Air Force.

This differs from the departmental proposal by providing a uniform scholarship assistance program for all the military departments.

The scholarship assistance contemplated by the bill would consist of two elements:

First, the payment of tuition, books, laboratory fees, and so forth, for each academic year at an estimated cost of between $800 to $850 per student, and

Second, the payment of monthly retainer pay in the amount of $50 per month for 10 months of each academic year at an annual cost of $500 per student.

Students receiving financial assistance of this kind will be required under the terms of the bill, to commit themselves to a minimum period of 4 years of active duty.

6. REQUIRED PARTICIPATION IN SENIOR ROTC, OPTIONAL

The bill would provide by statute that the senior ROTC program can be made compulsory or elective at the option of the institution or State concerned.

7. UNIFORM GRATUITY

The bill would provide that ROTC graduates whether commissioned as Regular officers or Reserve officers, would be authorized to draw the same uniform allowance as is presently provided for ROTC students who are awarded Reserve commissions upon graduation. At the present time, graduates of the ROTC program who are awarded Regular commissions are denied entitlement to a uniform allowance provided their Reserve contemporaries. This uniform allowance amounts to $300 per student. This change by the committee would increase the cost of the bill over the departmental proposal approximately $900,000 per year.

8. INCREASE IN RETAINER PAY

The bill would increase the monthly payment to ROTC students in the advanced course from the present $27 to $50 per month. However, it would also provide a "Reserve liability" for all students entering the advanced course and becoming eligible for this $50 monthly retainer payment. The purpose of this "Reserve liability" is to make the student liable for an involuntary call to active duty for a maximum period of 2 years in the event he fails to accept a commission or elects not to finish the course.

The increase in the monthly retainer pay of students in the advanced course will increase the cost of the departmental proposal by approximately $10 million annually.

It is interesting to note that the departmental proposal included a request for authority to increase this payment to students in the advanced ROTC course. However, testimony received by the committee indicated that the Department had no present intention of increasing this retainer pay until "it could be justified." The committee is convinced that this increase in retainer pay for ROTC students is completely justified and is long overdue. Consequently, the committee bill provides for an automatic increase in this payment to the amount suggested by the Department.

The committee has been advised that enrollment figures in the various ROTC programs of the several military departments have declined drastically over that originally anticipated for the beginning of the current school year. For example, Army enrollment figures for military science I anticipated an enrollment of 91,000 students whereas actual enrollment is approximately 81,000 students. In the Army advanced course—(MS-3)—it was anticipated that 17,700 students would be enrolled whereas only 14,000 actually enrolled. The Navy has suffered a very serious decline in its enrollment in the Navy contract program. Under Navy projections, it was estimated that 3,500 students would enroll in the first-year course of the program when actually fewer than 1,600 students elected to enroll. The Air Force had a similar experience in respect to enrollments in its advanced course.

In the judgment of the committee, there are many factors which contribute to this apparent lessening of interest in the ROTC program, not the least of which is the recent selective service order which provides that married men will be draft exempt. In addition, the committee notes that there has been no increase in the payment to ROTC students in the advanced course since 1950 whereas in the period since 1950 earnings of male workers have increased approximately 87 percent, and there have been corresponding pay increases provided active duty military personnel.

9. INCREASE IN OTHER ALLOWANCES

The committee proposal would in accordance with the departmental request, authorize an increase in travel allowance for ROTC students traveling to and from summer training, from 5 cents to 6 cents per mile and, also in accordance with the departmental request, the payment for students while at summer camp will be increased from the present $78 per month to $111.15 per month. The estimated total cost of these changes will be less than $2 million annually.

10. RETIRED PERSONNEL USED IN ROTC PROGRAM

The bill would authorize the use of retired military personnel to conduct both the senior and junior ROTC program. The committee was of the opinion that the military departments should be permitted to utilize retired personnel in the operation of both the junior and senior ROTC program so as to minimize the drain of these programs on their active duty military personnel and also reduce the budgetary implications of these programs. Retired military personnel receive between 50 to 75 percent of their basic pay while on the retired rolls. The Government receives no particular benefit from this payment. Therefore, the committee believes that many retired officers would be desirous of volunteering for duty in connection with the ROTC program and, thus, permit the military departments to operate these programs with such retired personnel with consequent savings in both dollars and manpower.

11. ADJUST ROTC CURRICULUM

Finally, the bill would permit the respective military departments to realine and adjust their ROTC curriculum so as to best satisfy their military requirements and also eliminate possible conflict with the other academic pursuits of students in ROTC training. This change results from the repeal of the existing statutory requirement that provides that a minimum of at least 3 hours a week of ROTC training be required of each student.

The committee wishes to emphasize that repeal of this requirement in the law is in no way intended to result in a total decrease in the number of hours of military training provided ROTC students. Testimony received by the committee indicates that with the revisions in the curriculum, the total military exposures of ROTC students will, in fact, be increased. Thus, the change provided by the bill would simply remove the inflexible requirement in existing law which precludes the adjustments desired by the military departments.

SUMMARY OF THE NEW SENIOR ROTC PROGRAM

As a consequence of the changes proposed by H.R. 9124, the various senior ROTC programs conducted by the military departments will all have the same uniform statutory basis.

Thus, each department would:

(a) Establish a 4-year senior ROTC program consisting of a basic course of 2 years, and an advanced course of 2 years' duration.

(b) When requested by the institution concerned, authorize students the privilege of substituting an accelerated summer training course between the sophomore and junior years in lieu of the first 2 years of ROTC training—basic course.

(c) Provide scholarship assistance to selected students who are participating for 4 years in the ROTC program.

(d) Pay students in the advanced ROTC course—third and fourth years—$50 in lieu of $27 per month as a retainer payment.

(e) Provide summer training pay of $111.15 per month for all ROTC students other than those students in the special summer camp—substitute for basic ROTC—who will receive $78 per month.

FISCAL ASPECTS OF THE BILL

The changes recommended by the Department of Defense to the senior ROTC program would have resulted in an annual increased appropriation requirement of approximately $4.1 million.

The bill as rewritten by the Committee on Armed Services will result in an annual increased appropriation requirement of approximately $15 million. This represents an increase of approximately $11 million over the Department's estimate.

Practically the entire increase reflected in the committee's proposal results from its decision to increase the amount of retainer pay provided students in the advanced ROTC course.

As I have previously indicated, this change is long overdue, and was heartily endorsed by practically every witness who appeared before the subcommittee, including representatives of each of the military departments.

CONCLUSION

This is good legislation. I am certain that your careful scrutiny of every aspect of this legislation will result in your concurrence in the judgment of the Committee on Armed Services.

I urge your unanimous approval of this bill.

Simply stated, that is what the legislation does. It is important legislation. It came before the committee after a year of study. In this connection I want to say that I should like to compliment my own subcommittee, and particularly the ranking Republican member, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] as well as other members of the committee for the diligence they applied in coming up with this legislation. It was reported out of the full committee by a vote of 31 in favor and 1 present. It comes to the floor now under suspension of the rules in order that we may get along with the business of the House, expedite the business before us, and move this legislation to the other body so that we may get it out and onto the law books so that it may be in force by the next scholastic year.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to underscore what the gentleman has said about the importance of this legislation at this time. I think it is generally recognized in all defense circles and educational circles as well that this overhauling of the ROTC program is long overdue. Will the gentleman indicate whether the land-grant colleges through their authorized spokesmen approve this legislation as written?

Mr. HÉBERT. The land-grant colleges in Chicago in convention several weeks ago unanimously passed a resolution commending the committee for its action and supporting the legislation. It has had the full support of the land-grant colleges of this country.

Mr. FISHER. Will the gentleman indicate further whether all the affected universities, colleges, and school systems all over America have indicated support for this legislation?

Mr. HÉBERT. All have indicated support of the legislation. All are heartily in favor of it. It gives them the flexibility of selecting the course, the 2- or 4-year course which they desire. I may say further that the most heartening thing during this whole hearing has been the support that the committee received from the secondary schools of the country and particularly from the people of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my thanks to the gentleman from Louisiana, the chairman of the subcommittee. When this bill was first brought before the committee we realized that there was a very great need for some legislation on this subject. The committee struck out practically everything but the enacting clause and rewrote the bill. Every member of the committee is for this bill, except as to one section, where they desired the so-called Powell amendment be added to the junior ROTC part of the program. I have usually supported the Powell amendment but frankly I did not see that this was the place where it should be added. It is already in the statute today. Title IV of the civil rights bill will soon be before us and it does cover that in a great deal more detail and receives much better consideration there than it would in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I think that every educator who testified before the committee was for this bill. What they wanted was to have a 2-year program along with the 4-year program. The reason for that was that there is an increasing need for ROTC officers; that is, reserve officers and Regular officers, who graduate from the ROTC program. It was felt that we must have an additional source of officer supply. The reason for that is that the junior ROTC participants—that is the young men who go to a junior college and then who came into the college ROTC program—had no opportunity in which to enter the program. So, now, we do have a 2-year program under this legislation. But in order for a person to take advantage of the 2-year program they must take 6 to 8 weeks of intensive summer training at a military camp so they will not start in cold, so to speak.

Mr. Speaker, there is also a scholarship program connected with this bill. The scholarship program will be limited to the 4-year ROTC participants which I think is entirely proper. Those who take the scholarship route must sign up to take 4 years of commissioned service after they get their commission.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Defense was rather reluctant on the junior ROTC program because there is no direct connection between the junior ROTC program and officers for the regular service. But the feeling was unanimous on the part of the committee that we must continue the junior ROTC program. Every school with which we had any contact was overwhelmingly in favor of continuing the junior ROTC program.

There are now 254 junior ROTC high schools now participating in this program throughout the country. However, many who would like to participate have been unable or at least they have not been able to install any such program since 1947.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation gives to them the right to increase that number of participating schools to 1,000.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated earlier, there was no opposition as I recall—and I think I attended every session of the subcommittee—to this legislation except as I mentioned earlier the tying of the so-called Powell amendment into the junior ROTC program.

Mr. Speaker, there has been some objection that the bill was not brought up under suspension. Frankly, I did not know that it was not going to be brought up under a rule until just before I returned to my district at Thanksgiving.

I, frankly, was against the bill as it was originally brought out by the Department of Defense because I felt it would destroy the 4-year ROTC program which unquestionably is better than the 2-year ROTC program but with the changes made by the committee it is a good bill. The cost of this program cannot be estimated at this point. It depends upon how many scholarships are given. We will cut down the expense between the 2-year ROTC program as compared with the 4-year ROTC program, cut it down materially. But, then there will be the scholarship expense.

Mr. Speaker, we will also increase the per diem amount from $27 to $50 per month.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Hébert] has just indicated that this legislation is, in his own words, the most important piece of legislation that this body has been called upon to pass judgment on this year. He mentioned that it touches the home of every person in the United States. To me it is incredible that a piece of legislation of any such importance should be brought up here under a suspension of the rules, where there is little real opportunity to discuss its merits, and where there is absolutely no opportunity to offer amendments to it.

Last Wednesday the President of the United States in a very eloquent address in this Chamber called upon us all to make certain that we get back a dollar of value for every dollar we spend. I suggest there is serious question, if this bill is enacted without amendment, that we would be getting a dollar value for every dollar spent.

As has already been indicated, one crucial amendment to this bill offered in committee lost by the narrow margin of 17 to 14. Yet in spite of all these considerations we are being asked to vote on this bill under suspension of the rules.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this bill does two specific things. First of all, it takes the so-called junior ROTC program which goes on in high schools in certain parts of the country at the present time, in some 254 high schools, and expands that to cover 2,000 high schools. This expansion involves an increase of some 500 percent in the total cost of the program, from $5 million a year to $25 million a year. More than that, the Assistant Secretary of Defense says on page 28 of the committee report in referring to any junior ROTC program:

> There is no direct military requirement for this program.

That is the first point, and the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Pike] will develop this junior ROTC program in greater detail in a moment.

Now the other thing the bill does is to provide, as the gentleman from Louisiana has already said, an extension of the so-called Holloway plan whereby individuals receive regular commissions in the Navy by going to civilian colleges rather than to the service academies, with their college education paid for them through 4 years by the Government. This bill would extend this Holloway plan which now applies to the Navy alone, to the other two services, and that action could involve, as the committee report indicates, an increase of from $10 to $24 million annually in Defense Department spending.

Now the Holloway plan is a very interesting plan. It is popular with the Navy, and I think there is a good deal to be said for it.

It was designed to provide career officers in the Regular Navy. And it provides the same kind of free education obtained from the three service academies without some of the restrictions and limitations that are involved in attending the Naval Academy itself.

For this reason it has been very much in demand. But I think there is one serious question that has developed with regard to the Holloway plan which would only be aggravated by extending it to the Air Force and the Army, unless we do something to make more certain that the money we put into the program will really be used efficiently in recruiting career officers for our three armed services.

Now let's see how the Holloway plan has actually worked in this regard for the Navy. Actually, the Navy has been concerned about the program because it seems that a very substantial number of individuals, once they take the educational program and serve their time, required time in uniform, have been getting out of the Regular Navy. The Navy has tried hard to increase the percentage of those who stay. Today it stands at 38 percent. In other words, only 38 percent of those whose college education is paid for by the Government under this Navy program have elected to remain in the Navy as Regular officers. And some 62 percent or nearly two-thirds of those for whom the Government has paid their college education do not remain in the Regular Navy after the initial 4-year service requirement is met, do not, in other words, become career officers.

By contrast, in the Naval Academy the retention rate is 80 percent, or in other words, only one-fifth of those who have gotten an education at Government expense in a service academy fail to become career officers.

At the very least we ought to wonder whether this is sound economy, to shift our military officer procurement program from the present OCS arrangement, from the air officer candidate programs, and others, to a program in which we must spend roughly $3 in order to get $1 of return.

At the very least it would seem to me that if we are going to extend this Holloway program then we ought to try to do something to tighten up the bill to make sure that more of these individuals who get the Government scholarships end up as career officers in the regular service.

Some months ago the House passed and sent to the other body H.R. 7356, designed to increase the number of appointees in our three service academies, and in that bill we placed a provision extending from 4 years to 5 years the obligatory time of service in the regular components for those who graduate from our service academies.

Surely this ROTC bill ought at least to have that same 5-year requirement added to it for those whose college education is paid for at Government expense. Yet if we adopt this bill today and pass it under suspension of the rules we have no opportunity to bring this bill into conformity with H.R. 7356, and make at least as severe a service obligation for regular ROTC officers as we require for our service academy graduates.

But we find this important bill before us today under a procedure that prevents any consideration of its fiscal effect, prevents any improvement in the bill to ease the burden on the taxpayers, and prevents any consideration of the very grave doubts expressed by the Department of Defense on the military soundness of the junior ROTC program which this bill would expand rather than terminate.

For all these reasons, I believe the bill should be voted down in its present form.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Pike].

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I have never been able to hear the capable and genial gentleman from Louisiana without conjuring up enjoyable visions of that most delightful of cities, New Orleans. In my mind's eye, regardless of who holds the transitory title of king of the carnival, the perpetual hereditary baron of

Bourbon Street is the chairman of the subcommittee handling this bill.

Today, I must confess, I have a different vision. I see New Orleans, beautiful as ever. I see the Mississippi, rolling irresistibly to the gulf. Perhaps it is a sign of my own misspent youth, or maybe I have just seen too many bad movies, but on the Mississippi I see a majestic white sternwheeler and on the sternwheeler, in the men's cardroom, I see a traveling man who in my fancy looks remarkably like the gentleman from Louisiana.

His laugh is infectious and warming; his wit is delightful; and his eloquence is devastating. He wears a well-cut jacket—and aces drip from its sleeves. In his right coat pocket he carries an absolutely new deck of cards which he can read just as well from the back as from the front. In his left coat pocket he carries an absolutely new pair of dice from which, nevertheless, certain edges and corners have somehow been worn away.

While I love his infectious laugh, admire his delightful wit, and am impressed with his devastating eloquence, I am unhappy because I know I am being bilked, trimmed, jobbed, lumbered, clipped, and swindled. This, of course, is all fancy. This bill today is a fact.

I had an amendment to this bill, and the gentleman from Louisiana knew it. I offered it in the gentleman's subcommittee and it lost 7 to 2. I offered it in the full committee and it lost again, but by a vote of 17 to 14—9 out of 19 Democrats voted for it; 5 out of 12 Republicans voted for it. It was, in essence, a civil rights amendment, and any time you can come as close as 17 to 14 with a civil rights amendment in the Armed Services Committee you have a pretty good chance on the floor.

Today, on the suspension calendar, I cannot offer the amendment, and because I think it is important I ask you to vote against suspending the rules. I do not say this is a terrible bill; in fact, if we were given a fair chance to amend it I would vote for it whether the amendment passed or not, but I do not like a stacked deck or a crooked deal. When 14 out of 31 members of a committee vote for a major amendment to a bill, that bill does not belong on the suspension calendar.

I ask you to look at the additional views on page 31 in the report to see what the issue is. We are, by this bill, increasing the junior ROTC program from its present 255 high schools to a maximum of 2,000 high schools. The Department of Defense estimates that this increase would cost between $25 and $40 million as opposed to the present cost of approximately $5 million. Furthermore, it is the position of the Department of Defense, and I quote:

> There is no direct military requirement for this program.

The committee, however, has determined that this high school level ROTC program is valuable in teaching good citizenship to the youth of America. The gentleman from Louisiana spelled out what this teaching by the military would contribute to America. He referred to the military as teaching our high school students: First, a respect for authority; second, recognition of discipline; and, third, a full appreciation of what this country means. Surely all of these are worthy things for our youth to study. I believe, however, and almost half of the committee believed, that it does not make sense for our military to be teaching good citizenship in schools which deny admission to some students because they are the wrong color. If this constitutes "a full appreciation of what this country means," then perhaps a student who has been denied admission to such a school does not fully appreciate his country. I submit further that it does not make sense for the military to be attempting to teach in segregated schools the benefits of making a career in an integrated military.

On the next to last page of the hearings on this bill the chairman of the full committee said to the chairman of the subcommittee:

> Mr. HÉBERT, will you proceed to obtain a rule of consideration of this bill?

Such a rule was not obtained, and I do not know whether it was sought or not. The bill is here on the suspension calendar, and my civil rights amendment is not in order. The gentleman from Louisiana has said that such an amendment would kill the bill, and how many times we have heard that before. I have said to the gentleman from Louisiana, and I say again, that I will vote for this bill on the floor whether such an amendment passes or not. But I would not vote for it without an opportunity to offer such an amendment. I hope that the Members of this body would not, either. Give us an opportunity to try.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say I concur in the conclusions made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE]. This bill should be voted down today because it is brought before the House under suspension of the rules which precludes necessary debate and the offering of important amendments.

I also want to take this opportunity to congratulate the chairman because I do think that in all other respects we have been able to produce a bill which makes much needed improvements, particularly in relation to the senior college program.

The difficulty here is over the junior ROTC program. As our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE], has indicated, there is every good reason for introducing this type of amendment on this type of program because at best, on the record made before the committee, there is a very marginal demand for the junior ROTC throughout the country. No matter how hard we tried, the testimony persisted in showing that the junior ROTC was expensive and was more related to good citizenship than to a military requirement for our national defense designed to produce a supply of officers for our Armed Forces.

I refer you to page 14 of the committee report where the ad hoc committee's statement on the junior ROTC program is presented.

Quoting from the report:

> This report responds to the request of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower) to study, analyze and submit recommendations on the future operation of the junior ROTC.

Then it goes on to say:

> any future consideration to eliminate the program would bring renewed, vigorous and locally justified protests from students, school authorities, parents, community and national leaders.

This indeed has been true. This has been true in my own State of California where we have an enthusiastic junior ROTC program. I have already declared my interest and support of the program. However, in spite of my support I was startled to learn that in my own State—and you can find this data on page 6863 of the hearings—we have only a 1.1-percent rate of participation in the program. If you look at the hearings, you will find in appendix B the enrollment data of the various States in the program and you will find it is remarkably small.

Again I call your attention to page 14 of the report of the ad hoc committee where they go on to say:

> No military requirements could be established and justified to continue the two programs as essential to national security and thereby become justifiable items in the defense budget.

I must move on in the interest of time, but it goes on to say:

> From the military point of view, the benefits are largely informational and motivational which have undeniable yet unmeasurable impact on impressionable high school youths by creating favorable attitudes, and impressions toward military service and careers in the Armed Forces. From the national interest viewpoint, the development of better citizenship attitudes and attributes in youth at the high school level through the disciplined atmosphere of military organization and training is a felt if not stated national requirement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from California 2 additional minutes.

Let me add that the costs of the program under the bill are estimated to be in the order of $25 million per year and hearing testimony includes a figure of $40 million.

Mr. COHELAN. What this all amounts to is that our committee has done a diligent job and has developed a program which I am willing to support. We Members who are protesting bringing this matter before the House under suspension of the rules are willing to vote for it, but we want the opportunity to amend it. If given this opportunity, I believe the House will work its will and perfect this legislation. In those circumstances I have no doubt in my own mind about the result.

As far as I am personally concerned, and I participated, as did my colleagues, in the work of this committee, I approve of the work that has been done. But in regard to the junior ROTC program, considering its character and the many social facets of this problem, it seems to me exceedingly important that if we adopt it, we do it in a way which will insure that all young Americans throughout the United States who wish to participate in this program can do so wherever an active junior ROTC unit exists.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. Yes. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. Was there any objection voiced in the committee to any facet of this final version of the bill except that it did not include the so-called Powell amendment.

Mr. COHELAN. As far as I know, the gentleman is correct. However, as you know, one of our colleagues who has already spoken, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON], raised some very interesting questions about the Holloway plan.

Mr. BRAY. I recall and I just want to bring attention to the fact that the minority views say:

> This legislation is good legislation which should be made better legislation.

It then went ahead to another matter which was the only other matter brought out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to spending an additional $25 million for a widely expanded high school ROTC. In fact, at the cost, I have grave doubts about any high school ROTC. I favor college ROTC. I find from reading the committee report that the civilian heads of the Pentagon are opposed to this bill. Apparently the bill's support comes from the military. As a matter of simple priorities within the budget we should not consider this expenditure. It is enough that this bill beefs up to some extent the college ROTC program. I would support that. But no amendments are permitted to this bill. In addition, I should like to note, there are many aspects of high school education in this country that needs support; this does not include their military aspects. It is too bad that the Pentagon civilian chiefs, in their letter to the committee, did not say exactly what their opinion is of this bill. It is pretty clear, however, that they think very little of it.

This has been an interesting debate, Mr. Speaker, but all too brief. Let us have this bill under a rule where further debate can be had and amendments offered. I should also like to have a clearer statement from the Pentagon. As it stands, Mr. Speaker, I shall vote against H.R. 9124.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, in closing I do want to take a few moments to pay tribute to my devoted friend from New York, of whom I am very fond. If I had the gift of words that he has and the ability to paint a word picture that he has painted, I would be very happy. However, I presume he is talking about some things I have read about on the Mississippi River in the old days, not only in New Orleans, La., but a little higher up. However, his knowledge of this amazed me. I know it takes one to catch one. There is hardly a day that passes by in the committee when my good friend does not come up to me and say, "Eddie, when are you taking me to New Orleans?" I will promise to take him down there to visit the place at any time the opportunity presents itself, but I am amazed at his statement today. I thought he was interested in our cathedrals, in our battlegrounds, in our historic monuments and, yes, even in the cemeteries which are showplaces in New Orleans. But then he talks about Bourbon Street. I must promise him, if he does come to New Orleans, I will talk to some of my friends who are familiar with Bourbon Street, and I am sure they will give me cards of introduction, although I must say that it is just before an election down there. I am told that we have some of the greatest artistry there that this country has ever shown. I am sure he is going to be interested in the art, but during these seasonal procedures, I am told they drape the statues down there more than at other times. I do not know whether that will delay his visit or not, but I shall call on him.

Mr. Speaker, nobody is dealing a crooked deck around here. I am sure my friend did not mean to say that, having in mind the rules under which we operate here in the House. I am afraid that he has been suffocated through the saturation of frustration. When I was his age in the House I suffered from that same disease and I got a very good lesson by no one less than the distinguished teacher of "Vinson College." I learned from him and if my friend is around here a little while, he too will learn from the history of the committee.

I do not think there is anything dishonest or devious about this procedure. I do not think that every Member who stood up today and moved to suspend the rules and pass a bill was devious. Remember, it takes two-thirds of the Members present and voting to pass this bill. And let me say this to the House, Mr. Speaker. If this bill does not pass here today under suspension of the rules it means that the ROTC program can be thrown out of the window next year. It can be destroyed, as was evidenced already when the Department of Defense did attempt to destroy the high school program. It was only through the introduction of this legislation by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] and myself that we blocked it. An attempt has been made to destroy the 4-year senior program. We want to get along with our business. We want to get this legislation out. This admittedly is a good piece of legislation according to the consensus of the gentlemen who have spoken here today in opposition to this procedure. The procedure which I have attempted to follow in bringing this bill up under suspension of the rules was designed to expedite congressional action on this very important legislation and was not intended to preclude House discussion of the merits of this bill.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. Was there any evidence before the committee that there is any high school in the United States that has a junior ROTC program where the colored members are refused entrance into that program?

Mr. HÉBERT. Not only was it not brought before the committee, but it was not even discussed. If the gentlemen who have spoken against this bill will take the time to read it—and apparently they have either failed to read the bill or deliberately misread it—they will see that with respect to the junior ROTC program, the Secretary of each military department is authorized to establish the program "under regulations prescribed by him."

This language appears on page 3, line 16, of the bill.

So also with respect to the senior ROTC program, included on page 8, line 7, is language which specifically provides that the program will be administered "under regulations prescribed by the President."

Any objective reading of this bill, therefore, indicates that there is no necessity for injecting the question of civil rights into this legislation in the form of an amendment as discussed by the gentleman from New York. I am certain that every Member of this body will agree with me that no one in the executive branch, including the President of the United States, is about to issue regulations governing the administration of the ROTC program which will violate the law of the land.

In short, there is full protection in this legislation for safeguarding every individual's civil rights. But, more importantly, I do not think this issue should be raised in this legislation. I do not understand the purpose of the gentleman from New York's action. He knows as well as every other Member of this body that positive legislation respecting the issue of civil rights in public education is contained in title IV of the bill reported out by the House Judiciary Committee. We should handle that issue when that legislation is being considered by the House and not attempt to drag a red herring into the debate on the merits of this bill.

Mr. BRAY. Was there any objection voiced by any member of the subcommittee or was there any opposition to this bill except just before the vote when the Powell amendment was brought up?

Mr. HÉBERT. I was put on notice that it would be offered. I thought the gentleman from New York was being facetious. I told him at the time it was a move to kill the bill. He said it was not, when he knew it was.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 9124.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STRATTON) there were—ayes 82, noes 44.

Mr. **HÉBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 176, nays 154, not voting 104, as follows:

[Roll No. 211]

YEAS—176

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Albert
Anderson
Andrews, Ala.
Arends
Ashmore
Aspinall
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baring
Bass
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Boggs
Bolton,
Frances P.
Bow
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Brotzman
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burkhalter
Burleson
Burton
Cannon
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clausen,
Don H.
Cleveland
Cooley
Corman
Cramer
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Downing
Edmondson
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Fisher
Flynt
Ford
Foreman
Forrester
Fountain
Friedel
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gonzalez
Grant
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Halleck
Hardy
Harvey, Mich.
Hébert
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Keith
Kilgore
Knox
Kornegay
Landrum
Langen
Lankford
Lipscomb
Lloyd
McCulloch
McFall
McIntire
McMillan
MacGregor
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
May
Miller, N.Y.
Montoya
Moore
Morris
Morrison
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Nelsen
Norblad
O'Konski
Osmers
Ostertag
Patman
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riehlman
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Tex.
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Roudebush
Ryan, Mich.
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schwengel
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Sickles
Slack
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Tuck
Tupper
Vinson
Waggonner
Watts
Weltner
Wharton
White
Whitener
Wickersham
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Wright
Wyman
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—154

Abele
Addabbo
Alger
Auchincloss
Baldwin
Barrett
Barry
Beermann
Berry
Blatnik
Boland
Brademas
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Byrne, Pa.
Cameron
Carey
Clancy
Clark
Clawson, Del
Cohelan
Collier
Conte
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Daniels
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Derwinski
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Duncan
Edwards
Ellsworth
Feighan
Findley
Finnegan
Flood
Fogarty
Fraser
Fulton, Pa.
Gallagher
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gill
Goodell
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Gross
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Harsha
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Hoffman
Holifield
Holland
Hutchinson
Joelson
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Latta
Leggett
Libonati
Lindsay
Long, Md.
McClory
McDade
Macdonald
Madden
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Meader
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Morton
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
Patten
Philbin
Pike
Pillion
Powell
Price
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Rodino
Rooney, N.Y.
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, N.Y.
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Senner
Short
Shriver
Sisk
Skubitz
Staggers
Stratton
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Wallhauser
Weaver
Westland
Whalley
Wydler
Younger

NOT VOTING—104

Andrews,
N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Ashley
Becker
Bennett, Mich.
Betts
Bolling
Bolton,
Oliver P.
Bonner
Brooks
Brown, Ohio
Buckley
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Celler
Chelf
Colmer
Corbett
Daddario
Davis, Tenn.
Devine
Diggs
Dorn
Dowdy
Dulski
Dwyer
Farbstein
Fascell
Fino
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gibbons
Glenn
Goodling
Grabowski
Hall
Harris
Harrison
Harvey, Ind.
Hoeven
Horan
Ichord
Jennings
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Pa.
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
Kluczynski
Lennon
Lesinski
Long, La.
McDowell
McLoskey
Mailliard
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Matthews
Milliken
Mills
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Neill
Passman
Pucinski
Rains
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Robison
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
St Germain
St. Onge
Schenck
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Sibal
Sikes
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Staebler
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Trimble
Tuten
Van Pelt
Watson
Whitten
Widnall
Wilson,
Charles H.
Winstead

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Harris and Mr. Jennings for, with Mr. Grabowski against.

Mr. Passman and Mr. Rains for, with Mr. Rosenthal against.

Mr. Rogers of Texas and Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. Murphy of New York against.

Mr. Thompson of Texas and Mr. Chelf for, with Mr. Kluczynski against.

Mr. Mills and Mr. Brooks for, with Mrs. Kelly against.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska and Mr. Lennon for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Gibbons and Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. McLoskey and Mr. Hall for, with Mrs. Dwyer against.

Mr. Dorn and Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. St. Onge against.

Mr. Winstead and Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Multer against.

Mr. Van Pelt and Mr. Hoeven for, with Mr. Widnall against.

Mr. Whitten and Mr. Davis of Tennessee for, with Mr. Roosevelt against.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee and Mr. Fuqua for, with Mr. O'Neill against.

Mr. Bonner and Mr. Dowdy for, with Mr. Staebler against.

Mr. Matthews and Mr. Murray for, with Mr. Daddario against.

Mr. Roberts of Alabama and Mr. Thornberry for, with Mr. Farbstein against.

Mr. Trimble and Mr. Watson for, with Mr. Shipley against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Ashley with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Brown.

Mr. Dulski with Mr. Robison.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Becker.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Johansen.

Mr. Ichord with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mr. McDowell with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Horan.

Mr. Moss with Mr. Sibal.

Mr. Pucinski with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. St Germain with Mr. Siler.

Mr. Tuten with Mr. Cahill.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Smith of Colorado.

Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Betts.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Glenn.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Messrs. **FLOOD**, **BARRY**, and **BEERMANN** changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. **HÉBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 9124.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF CIVIL SERVICE APPORTIONMENT REQUIREMENT

Mr. **HENDERSON**. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 10) to extend the apportionment requirement in the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, to temporary summer employment, and for other purposes, with a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the sixth paragraph of section 2 of the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, as amended (5 U.S.C. 633), providing for the apportionment of appointments in the competitive civil service, is amended by inserting "(including appointments to temporary employment of more than thirty days in the period from May 1 through September 30 of each year, except appointments to the postal field service and appointments of an emergency nature)" immediately following "appointments to the public service aforesaid".

The **SPEAKER**. Is a second demanded?

Mr. **BROYHILL** of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include data, tables, and other extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I do not know that it is important to take a lot of time on this legislation. It came before the House on October 1, 1962. There was a record vote on it. It passed by more than 300 votes to 19, and it is not materially changed.

H.R. 10, my bill, is rather similar to H.R. 3741 by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SLACK], to H.R. 2863 by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], H.R. 3115 by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS], and H.R. 3501 by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI].

Mr. Speaker, in 1883 there was an apportionment act passed by Congress that pertains to Federal employment. It, however, does not refer to and it is not applicable to summer employment.

Mr. Speaker, summer employment has become quite an important budget item as Members of the House have probably observed. For example, in 1963 the Department of the Army spent about $6 million on summer jobs. The Space Agency spent about $1 million on summer jobs.

It must be borne in mind that this bill applies only to the Nation's Capital. We have never been privileged to make a thorough study of any area other than the Nation's Capital. I would like to have such study made and I have suggested that the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service do so. But we have not had much interest in expanding this study and I regret this so very much.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] made a very timely statement when he appeared before the committee in behalf of H.R. 2863. The gentleman said this:

> It is indeed a great inspiration and a wonderful experience for a young person to be able to come to Washington during the summer and have the opportunity to work in the Federal service. This experience should not be limited in large part, as it is now, to young people living close to Washington. It should be made available to every deserving young person throughout the country.

That is true, particularly if we believe in the merit system. An amendment has been mentioned. The amendment I have offered to the bill that was passed recently, and was not in the legislation last year, requires the Civil Service Commission to conduct a competitive examination which means that boys and girls throughout the Nation can take this competitive examination and have an opportunity to come here to work. I might say even before I introduced the amendment, the chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. John Macy, announced that he expects to hold such an examination. But it must be borne in mind, and I want to emphasize this, until the House of Representatives passed legislation last October no such announcement had been forthcoming. There seemed to be in fact no interest whatsoever in doing so.

I say again, this is a simple bill that extends the apportionment act we have had since 1883 to summer employment. Some people try to pretend the present system has worked well. I have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some tables I was able to work up through figures secured from the Departments. Out of 2,300 summer jobs in 1959 here in Washington, Virginia had 546, Maryland 628, and to use my own State of Texas, we had 14, even though we are considerably larger than either of the States mentioned insofar as our population is concerned.

I do not know whether competition did that or not. If it did, it certainly came out in a one-sided way.

I want to say that I do not blame the Members who live close by for being interested in trying to keep these jobs for the boys and girls of this area. At the same time, I feel as though the rest of us from other sections of the United States who have boys and girls just as capable should have a fighting chance at least to do summer work for the Government in the Washington area.

I want to concur in what the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] had to say. By the way, I wish each of you would get a copy of the report which accompanies this bill today, because it is a fair and representative one in my opinion.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] is the only one who signed the minority report. The vote in the committee was 14 to 3. He said:

> I do not ask preference for these young people—

About the Washington area he is talking—

> I ask only that they be given an equal opportunity with the other citizens and that they be not penalized because they happen to live here. I only wish to see them have the opportunity to compete on the basis of merit for summer employment.

The bill I have offered, H.R. 10, would do only that, plus having in it the apportionment provision and I think we can all concur in that objective.

I quote a paragraph from a column written by Mr. John Cramer which appeared October 24, 1963, in the Washington Daily News:

> No one can defend past handling of summer jobs here. Too many have been handed out as plums for the sons of and daughters of agency big wheels and other favorites.

There are some fairly sizable sums of money spent by some departments for summer employment.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
November 6, 1963.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter which has been referred to my office concerning the amount of funds set aside and spent for summer jobs during the past summer.

The budgeting and funding procedures utilized by the Department of the Army do not permit the separation of funds for summer hire personnel. Also, the accounting system utilized by this service does not permit identification of costs of summer hire personnel. Therefore, the actual amount of funds utilized for summer hire in calendar year 1963 is not available.

A review of actions taken by Headquarters, Department of the Army, in authorizing temporary employment in calendar year 1963 shows that total employment was authorized as follows: 591 for April; 2,271 for May; 5,407 for June; 5,334 for July; 4,577 for August; 2,529 for September; and 178 for October. Assuming strengths in the same numbers, the total man-years would approximate 1,740 which when multiplied by an estimated cost per man-year of $4,000 would aggregate a total cost of $6,960,000.

Sincerely,
H. T. LACROSSE,
Deputy Director of Army Budget, OCA.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., November 20, 1963.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: The following information supplements our previous correspondence to you relative to your question as to the amount of money NASA had set aside to spend for summer jobs during the summer of 1963 and the actual amount NASA spent for this purpose.

NASA did not specifically set aside funds for the summer student program during the summer of 1963. However, during the planning of the program, it was estimated that the cost would be $1,027,500. Analysis of the actual expenditures revealed that the total cost amount for the program came to $976,125.

Sincerely yours,
RICHARD L. CALLAGHAN,
Assistant Administrator for Legislative Affairs.

At least one agency used no summer employees in 1963.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D.C.
The Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This report is in response to your letter of May 4, 1963, concerning summer employment and to which I gave you an interim reply on May 8, 1963.

This agency hired no summer employees in 1963.

If I may be of further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,
LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director.

I quote the pertinent part of an article which appeared in the Washington Post on April 9, 1963. It was written by Mr. Jerry Kluttz.

> Chairman John W. Macy also announced that CSC is developing plans for a nationwide competitive exam that would be used to fill summer jobs in 1964. This would be the first time for such a test and it would discourage both nepotism and partisan political considerations.

I include the two tables I have referred to.

Temporary employees, summer 1962—A tabulation of States of residence of temporary summer employees of the Federal agencies in the Washington, D.C., area, based upon replies to Representative Beckworth's inquiry

	Summary	Air Force	Navy [1]	Office of the Secretary	Area Redevelopment Administration	Business and Defense Services Administration	Bureau of the Census	Coast and Geodetic Survey	Bureau of International Programs	Maritime Administration	Patent Office	Bureau of Public Roads	Bureau of Standards	Weather Bureau	Comptroller General	Bureau of Engraving and Printing	Federal Communications Commission	Federal Power Commission	Federal Trade Commission	Government Printing Office	Post Office Department	State Department
Alabama	2																					2
Alaska																						
Arizona																						
Arkansas	4		1																			3
California	22	1		2	1	4	2						2		2		1		1		1	5
Colorado	8	2		1		2							1								1	2
Connecticut	6			1							1		1						1			2
Delaware	2	1											1									
Florida	8	1				1	1				1		2	2								
Georgia	4	1									1		1									1
Hawaii																						
Idaho	1																		1			
Illinois	12	1	2	2	1		1							1								4
Indiana	7	2																	1		1	3
Iowa	5	1				1	1															2
Kansas	6												3									3
Kentucky	4		2										1						1			
Louisiana	5	1	1			1					1											1
Maine	3		1					1					1									
Maryland	812	75	325	32	10	21	30	16	9	8	19	28	43	20	9	1	36	23	3	24	36	44
Massachusetts	17	1	4	1	1	1	1		1			1					1				1	4
Michigan	13		5				1				2	1							2			2
Minnesota	2										1		1									
Mississippi	1		1																			
Missouri	6	2			1						1											2
Montana																						
Nebraska	4		1		1								2									
Nevada																						
New Hampshire	1																					1
New Jersey	19		1	1	1				1		1		4				1		4		1	4
New Mexico	2												1									1
New York	42	3	4	2		1	4				5	2	8				2		3		1	7
North Carolina	17			3	1		7				3	1										2
North Dakota	3		3																			
Ohio	25	2	2	1		2	2	1					7						2			6
Oklahoma	1											1										
Oregon	2				1							1										
Pennsylvania	34	2	5	1		1	2	1	1		6	1	6	1								7
Rhode Island	3	2																				1
South Carolina	4		2																1			1
South Dakota	2			1			1															
Tennessee	6		3						1				2									
Texas	14	1		3							3								1			6
Utah	5			2							2	1										
Vermont																						
Virginia	655	106	152	27	9	18	3	23	7	8	25	34	27	31	5	5	39	23	3	6	41	63
Washington	1																					1
West Virginia	3	1		1															1			
Wisconsin	6				1			1			1											3
Wyoming																						
District of Columbia	536	36	164	22	9	8	19	6	3	3	32	13	32	16	6		29	26	4	12	25	71
Summary	2,335	242	679	103	37	61	75	49	23	19	105	84	145	71	22	6	109	72	29	42	108	254
Agriculture [2]	611																					
Total	2,946																					

[1] Navy Department specifically notes that permanent home addresses are listed only if local address is not available. Navy list includes 64 employees with no address, local or permanent. They are not in the table.

[2] Department of Agriculture lists 611 employees as summer temporaries. It does not, however, list any local address or State of residence. These employees are not incorporated in the table.

NOTE.—In some instances the replies did not specify whether the employee's address was his temporary summer address or his permanent residence.

Replies were received but no data were supplied by Office, Secretary of Defense; Department of the Army; Atomic Energy Commission; Central Intelligence Agency; Department of Commerce; Department of Interior; and National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Source: Frederick L. Scott, History and Government Division, Legislative Reference Service, Sept. 4, 1962.

Summary of temporary employment in selected Government agencies, summer, 1959

States	Summary	General Accounting Office [1]	The Library of Congress [2]	Department of Agriculture [3]	Department of Commerce [4]	Department of Defense [5]	Department of the Air Force [6]	Department of the Army [7]	Department of the Navy [8]	Department of Health, Education, and Welfare [9]	Department of the Interior [10]	Department of Labor [11]	Department of State [12]	Department of the Treasury [13]	Atomic Energy Commission [14]	Civil Service Commission [15]	Federal Communications Commission [16]	Federal Power Commission [17]	Federal Trade Commission [18]	Interstate Commerce Commission [19]	National Aeronautics and Space Administration [20]	National Science Foundation [21]	Securities and Exchange Commission [22]	Veterans' Administration [23]
Alabama	3				2				1															
Arizona	5				4					1														
Arkansas	6		3	1	1	1																		
California	37	2		2	9					1	1			21										1
Colorado	37				34					2					1									
Connecticut	9		1		5					1	1													1
Delaware	3				3																			
Dist. of Columbia	490		30	48	54	5	3	52	23	164	43	1	19	19		2	11	1		3		5		7
Florida	13	1	1		9				1															1
Georgia	4									2	1	1												
Idaho	13				1										11							1		

See footnotes at end of table.

Summary of temporary employment in selected Government agencies, summer, 1959—Continued

States	Summary	General Accounting Office[1]	The Library of Congress[2]	Department of Agriculture[3]	Department of Commerce[4]	Department of Defense[5]	Department of the Air Force[6]	Department of the Army[7]	Department of the Navy[8]	Department of Health, Education, and Welfare[9]	Department of the Interior[10]	Department of Labor[11]	Department of State[12]	Department of the Treasury[13]	Atomic Energy Commission[14]	Civil Service Commission[15]	Federal Communications Commission[16]	Federal Power Commission[17]	Federal Trade Commission[18]	Interstate Commerce Commission[19]	National Aeronautics and Space Administration[20]	National Science Foundation[21]	Securities and Exchange Commission[22]	Veterans' Administration[23]
Illinois	33			2	13			2	6	2	3			4								1		
Indiana	14				5			2	4			1												2
Iowa	10		1		5	1			2	1														
Kansas	10		1		7				1	1														
Kentucky	9				2				2	3				1		1								
Louisiana	5								1					2							1			
Maine	2				2																			1
Maryland	628	6	16	88	80	1	4	80	33	208	34	2	17	23		5	15	1	2	2	2	4		5
Massachusetts	54		1	1	21	1		2	10	8	1	2		1			1			1			2	2
Michigan	25	1	2		3			2	8	3	1	2	1					1						1
Minnesota	4			1	2					1														
Mississippi	5		1		2			2																
Missouri	13		1		5			2	1	2		1											1	
Montana	2							1						1										
Nebraska	9			2	6						1													
Nevada	1				1																			
New Hampshire	6				2					1		2										1		
New Jersey	24		1		6			2	3	1	1			2	8									
New Mexico																								
New York	110		4	7	28		1	11	9	11	4	1	2	2	23						1	2		24
North Carolina	26		2	1	9			5	4	2				3										
North Dakota	1			1																				
Ohio	16	1	2		6			2			3		1											1
Oklahoma	4			1	3																			
Oregon	6				6																			
Pennsylvania	57	1	2		22	1		9	4	4	1	1		4	4							1		3
Rhode Island	3				3																			
South Carolina	4		1		1				2															
South Dakota	4		1	1	2																			
Tennessee	12		1		8				1	1				1										
Texas	14	2			10	1		1																
Utah	12		1		7										2		1							1
Vermont																								
Virginia	546	2	13	88	77	17	7	137	30	61	57	1	16	15			12	2		4		1	1	5
Washington	9	1	1		4					2					1									
West Virginia	5		2		1					1				1										
Wisconsin	10		1	1	7							1												
Wyoming	2				1																			1
Alaska																								
Hawaii	2				2																			
Puerto Rico	1									1														
Virgin Islands																								
Foreign	3		3																					
Total number of employees	2,321	17	93	245	481	28	15	312	146	485	152	16	56	100	50	8	40	5	2	10	4	14	6	36

---

[1] General Accounting Office, letter of June 1, 1959. The figures given represent applicants who had been chosen or tentatively chosen to fill summer jobs in 1959.

[2] The Library of Congress, letter of Mar. 1, 1961. The figures given represent temporary employees hired for varying lengths of time up to a year, from May 15 to Aug. 15, 1959. The Library has no special program of summer employment.

[3] Department of Agriculture, letter of June 16, 1959. The figures stated represent temporary jobs in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area which were to be filled by students during the summer, 1959.

[4] Department of Commerce, letter of June 18, 1959. The figures given represent student assistants and student trainees hired for the summer, 1959.

[5] Department of Defense, letter of June 10, 1959. The figures given represent students selected for summer employment in 1959 by the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

[6] Department of the Air Force, letter of June 23, 1959. The figures given represent student trainees hired by the Department of the Air Force Headquarters for the summer, 1959.

[7] Department of the Army, letter of June 15, 1959. The figures stated here represent students who had been selected or tentatively selected for temporary appointments for the summer, 1959, with the Department of the Army.

[8] Department of the Navy, letter of May 19, 1959. The figures given represent students majoring in engineering or the physical sciences who were prospective employees of the Navy Department for the summer, 1959.

[9] Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, letter of Aug. 19, 1959. The figures given represent students employed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the summer, 1959.

[10] Department of the Interior, letter of July 21, 1959. The figures stated represent students who were appointed to temporary jobs in the Department of the Interior in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area for the summer, 1959.

[11] Department of Labor, letter of June 1, 1959. The figures stated include temporary student assistants who were selected for positions with the Department of Labor for summer, 1959.

[12] Department of State, letter of June 4, 1959. The figures given represent temporary employees and students whom the Department of State had hired or planned to hire for typing, stenographic, and student assistant positions for summer, 1959.

[13] Department of the Treasury, letter of June 23, 1959. The figures given include all summer appointments of students, regardless of the temporary or nontemporary nature of the jobs, themselves, for 1959.

[14] Atomic Energy Commission, letter of June 15, 1959. The figures given include all temporary summer appointments to the entire Atomic Energy Commission for summer, 1959.

[15] Civil Service Commission, letter of June 9, 1959. The figures given indicate students occupying temporary positions with the Civil Service Commission for summer, 1959.

[16] Federal Communications Commission, letter of June 5, 1959. The figures given represents students temporarily employed by the Federal Communications Commission for summer, 1959.

[17] Federal Power Commission, letter of June 1, 1959. The figures given include individuals who were employed on a temporary basis as student assistants, for summer, 1959.

[18] Federal Trade Commission, letter of May 28, 1959. The figures given indicate students holding temporary summer jobs as of May 28, 1959.

[19] Interstate Commerce Commission, letter of June 1, 1959. The figures listed include tentative selections of individuals made to fill temporary typing and stenographic positions with the Interstate Commerce Commission for summer, 1959.

[20] National Aeronautics and Space Administration, letter of June 10, 1959. The figures given include summer appointments for 1959 with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

[21] National Science Foundation, letter of June 3, 1959. The figures given include temporary stenographic, typing, and student trainee positions that were to be filled primarily by students during the summer, 1959.

[22] Securities and Exchange Commission, letter of June 3, 1959. The figures given include students who were selected for participation in the student assistant program of the Securities and Exchange Commission for summer, 1959.

[23] Veterans' Administration, letter of June 17, 1959. The figures given include temporary summer jobs filled by students in the Central Office Headquarters and the Medical Division of the Veterans' Benefits Office for summer, 1959.

Compiled by Sandra D. Worthen, History and Government Division, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, Mar. 17, 1961.

Senator SALTONSTALL has done considerable work in connection with obtaining information about summer employment. I include a letter he wrote me May 10, 1963.

Senate Document No. 9, 88th Congress, 1st session, has considerable information that was made possible through the efforts of Senator SALTONSTALL.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
May 10, 1963.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Room 1307, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: The material from which the report was printed at my request was collected for me by the Library of Congress by direction of Miss Helen Miller. It is now on file at the Government Printing Office.

The information requested from the various agencies did not include the hometown of the summer employee. Where applicable, it did include the college which he attended. The Senate Document No. 9 indicates jobs by agency rather than by State where located, but the location could be consolidated by going through it on a State-by-State basis.

Senate Document No. 9 is jobs that were actually filled in the summer of 1961 for anywhere from a few weeks to the entire summer.

I hope that this is helpful to you and if you want to send someone to study the basic document at the Government Printing Office, I am sure that they would cooperate.

Sincerely,

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
U.S. Senator.

P.S.—I understand the Government Printing Office has now returned the material to the Library of Congress.

I enclose a table from the Library of Congress:

Number of accredited institutions of higher education, by State (as listed in U.S. Office of Education, Education Directory, pt. 3)

	Accredited	Number of institutions of higher education in State
Alabama	23	26
Alaska	1	3
Arizona	4	7
Arkansas	15	19
California	154	169
Colorado	18	22
Connecticut	25	32
Delaware	4	4
Florida	23	45
Georgia	43	46
Hawaii	4	4
Idaho	7	8
Illinois	83	112
Indiana	32	41
Iowa	36	51
Kansas	29	45
Kentucky	36	36
Louisiana	19	21
Maine	10	22
Maryland	30	44
Massachusetts	72	96
Michigan	48	67
Minnesota	34	43
Mississippi	30	45
Missouri	50	63
Montana	9	11
Nebraska	17	23
Nevada	1	1
New Hampshire	8	12
New Jersey	20	38
New Mexico	8	9
New York	133	183
North Carolina	55	60
North Dakota	8	14
Ohio	63	70
Oklahoma	22	34
Oregon	22	27
Pennsylvania	109	129
Rhode Island	8	12
South Carolina	27	30
South Dakota	13	16
Tennessee	42	46
Texas	81	96
Utah	8	8
Vermont	12	16
Virginia	40	46
Washington	27	29
West Virginia	18	20
Wisconsin	32	62
Wyoming	2	6
Total	1,615	2,069

I enclose some figures that apparently came about by the studies of some employees of the Library of Congress:

Institutions of higher education attended by students hired in summer 1961 by the Federal Government for nonclerical jobs

ALABAMA, 213

Alabama College	3
Alabama Polytechnic Institute	5
University of Alabama	72
Auburn University	100
Birmingham-Southern College	2
Florence State College	10
Howard College	1
Huntingdon College	1
Judson College	1
St. Bernard College	1
Snead Junior College	3
Spring Hill College	2

Institutions of higher education attended by students hired in summer 1961 by the Federal Government for nonclerical jobs—Continued

Talladega College	1
Troy State College	5
Tuskegee Institute	6

ALASKA, 23

University of Alaska	23

ARIZONA, 213

Arizona State College	56
Arizona State University	58
University of Arizona	91
East Arizona Junior College	1
Grand Canyon College	1
Phoenix College	5
Sante Fe College	1

ARKANSAS, 96

Arkansas Agricultural and Mechanical College	35
Arkansas Polytechnic College	2
Arkansas State College	5
Arkansas State Teachers College	1
University of Arkansas	41
Fort Smith Junior College	1
Harding College	2
Hendrix College	2
Little Rock University	2
Southern State College	5

CALIFORNIA, 1,388

Allan Hancock Junior College	1
American River Junior College	4
Antelope Valley Junior College	2
Bakersfield College	3
Cabrillo College	2
California Institute of Technology	27
California State Polytechnic College	77
University of California	376
Chaffey College	10
Chico State College	51
Citrus Junior College	2
Claremont Men's College	4
Compton District Junior College	4
Contra Costa Junior College	7
Diablo Valley College	6
East Los Angeles College	1
East Los Angeles Junior College	3
El Camino College	7
Foothill College	2
Fresno City College	6
Fresno State College	40
Fullerton Junior College	3
Glendale College	3
Hartnell College	3
Harvey Mudd College	7
Heald Engineering College	1
Humboldt State College	101
Immaculate Heart College	1
La Sierra College	1
La Verne College	5
Lassen Junior College	4
Long Beach City College	2
Long Beach State College	10
Los Angeles City College	3
Los Angeles State College of Applied Arts and Sciences	13
Los Angeles Trade-Technical Junior College	1
Los Angeles Valley Junior College	6
Loyola University of Los Angeles	1
College of Marin	5
College of Medical Evangelists	1
Menlo College	1
Modesto Junior College	15
Monterey Peninsula College	2
Mount St. Mary's College	5
Mount San Antonio College	1
Napa College	2
Northrop Institute of Technology	2
Occidental College	2
Oceanside-Carlsbad College	1
Orange Coast College	7
College of the Pacific	4
Palomar College	3
Pasadena City College	13
Pasadena College	5
George Pepperdine College	1

Institutions of higher education attended by students hired in summer 1961 by the Federal Government for nonclerical jobs—Continued

College of Physicians and Surgeons	1
Pomona College	11
Porterville College	2
University of Redlands	5
Reedley College	11
Riverside City College	5
Sacramento City College	8
Sacramento State College	25
St. Mary's College of California	6
Salinas Junior College	1
San Bernardino Valley College	15
San Diego City College	2
San Diego State College	43
San Fernando Valley State College	2
City College of San Francisco	16
San Francisco College for Women	1
San Francisco State College	17
University of San Francisco	8
San Jose City College	2
San Jose State College	66
San Mateo, College of	20
Santa Barbara City College	7
University of Santa Clara	16
Santa Monica City College	1
Santa Rosa Junior College	10
Sequoias, College of the	3
Shasta College	31
Sierra College	22
Simpson Bible College	2
Siskiyous, College of the	11
University of Southern California	31
Stanford University	98
Stockton College	1
Taft College	7
Vallejo Junior College	2
Ventura College	7
Whittier College	2

COLORADO, 351

Adams State College	3
Colorado College	1
Colorado School of Mines	15
Colorado State College	7
Colorado State University	182
University of Colorado	102
University of Denver	11
Fort Lewis Agricultural and Mechanical College	9
Mesa County Junior College	5
Northeastern Junior College	2
Pueblo Junior College	10
Regis College	1
Western State College of Colorado	3

CONNECTICUT, 117

University of Bridgeport	2
University of Connecticut	26
Fairfield University	3
University of Hartford	1
New Haven College	1
Quinnipiac College	1
Trinity College	11
Wesleyan University	13
Yale University	59

DELAWARE, 22

University of Delaware	21
Wesley College	1

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, 318

American University	30
Catholic University of America	60
District of Columbia Teachers College	2
Dunbarton College of Holy Cross	1
Georgetown University	62
George Washington University	90
Howard University	71
Prince George's Community College	1
Washington Missionary College	1

FLORIDA, 168

Broward Junior College	3
Central Florida Junior College	1
Chipola Junior College	1
Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University	1
Florida Christian College	1
Florida Southern College	1

Institutions of higher education attended by students hired in summer 1961 by the Federal Government for nonclerical jobs—Continued

Florida State University	47
University of Florida	80
Jacksonville University	1
University of Miami	12
Orlando Junior College	2
Palm Beach Junior College	1
Pensacola Junior College	6
Rollins College	3
St. John's River Junior College	1
Stetson University	5
University of Tampa	1
Washington Junior College	1

GEORGIA, 178

Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College	10
Agnes Scott College	5
Athens College	3
Berry College	1
Columbus College	1
Emory University	12
Georgia Institute of Technology	43
University of Georgia	79
Medical College of Georgia	20
Middle Georgia College	1
North Georgia College	1
Tift College	1
Wesleyan College	1

HAWAII, 24

University of Hawaii	24

IDAHO, 306

Boise Junior College	20
College of Idaho	5
Idaho State College	37
University of Idaho	225
North Idaho Junior College	9
Southern Idaho College	1
Northwest Nazarene College	1
Ricks College	8

ILLINOIS, 267

Augustana College	4
Blackburn College	2
Bradley University	15
Chicago Medical School	1
University of Chicago	25
Danville Junior College	1
Depaul University	4
Eastern Illinois State College	1
Eastern Illinois University	1
Greenville College	2
Illinois College	1
Illinois Institute of Technology	1
University of Illinois	102
Knox College	4
Macmurray College	3
Millikin University	1
Monticello College	1
Mundelein College	2
Northern Illinois University	6
Northwestern University	31
Principia College	1
Quincey College	1
Rockford College	1
Roosevelt University	2
Rosary College	1
St. Procopius College	1
Shimer College	1
Southern Illinois University	51

INDIANA, 264

Ball State Teachers College	1
Butler University	1
Depauw University	2
Earlham College	5
Hanover College	2
Indiana Central College	1
Indiana State Teachers College	2
Indiana Technical College	1
Indiana University	31
Manhattan College	6
Notre Dame University	45
Oakland City College	6
Purdue University	140
Rose Polytechnic Institute	5
St. Mary-in-the-Woods College	1
Tri-State College	3
Valparaiso Technical Institute	2
Vincennes University	1
Wabash College	2
Valparaiso University	7

IOWA, 219

Clarinda Junior College	1
Cornell College	2
Drake University	6
Dubuque, University of	3
Fort Dodge Junior College	1
Graceland College	3
Grand View College	1
Grinnell College	5
Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts	3
Iowa State University of Science and Technology	122
State University of Iowa	61
Iowa Wesleyan College	1
Loras College	1
Luther College	1
Mary Crest College	1
Morningside College	1
Parsons College	1
St. Ambrose College	2
Simpson College	2
Wartburg Theological Seminary	1

KANSAS, 111

Baker University	1
Kansas State Teachers College	3
Kansas State College of Pittsburg	1
Kansas State University of Agriculture and Applied Science	41
University of Kansas	47
Pratt Junior College	2
Ottawa University	5
St. Benedict's College	2
Sterling College	1
Washburn University of Topeka	3
Wichita, University of	5

KENTUCKY, 83

Bellarmine College	2
Berea College	5
Centre College of Kentucky	1
Eastern Kentucky State College	2
Georgetown College	1
University of Kentucky	36
University of Louisville	22
Morehead State College	2
Murray State College	3
Pikeville College	1
Union College	4
Villa Madonna College	3
Western Kentucky State College	1

LOUISIANA, 107

Louisiana Polytechnic Institute	25
Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechancial College	55
Northeast Louisiana State College	2
University of Southwestern Louisiana	3
Tulane University of Louisiana	22

MAINE, 46

Bates College	2
Bowdoin College	2
Colby College	2
Gorham State Teachers College	1
University of Maine	39

MARYLAND, 587

Baltimore, University of	1
Baltimore Junior College	1
Charles County Junior College	5
Frederick Community College	1
Goucher College	6
Hartford Junior College	5
Hood College	4
Johns Hopkins University	73
Loyola College	2
Maryland State Teachers College	7
University of Maryland	433
Montgomery Junior College	20
Morgan State College	5
Notre Dame of Maryland, Inc., College of	1
St. Mary's Seminary and University	2
Washington College	7
Western Maryland College	13
Hagerstown Junior College	1

MASSACHUSETTS, 387

American International College	2
Amherst College	10
Boston College	18
Boston University	11
Brandeis University	5
Durfee College of Technology	6
Harvard University	106
College of the Holy Cross	3
Lowell Technological Institute	1
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	95
Massachusetts State Teachers College	1
University of Massachusetts	52
Merrimack College	3
Mount Holyoke College	4
New Bedford Institute of Technology	1
New England Conservatory of Music	1
Nichols College of Business Administration	1
Northeastern University	5
Radcliffe College	8
Smith College	3
Stockbridge School of Agriculture	1
Stonehill College	2
Tufts University	21
Western New England College	8
Wellesley College	6
Williams College	7
Worcester Polytechnic Institute	6

MICHIGAN, 283

Alma College	1
Andrews University	1
Calvin College	1
Central Michigan University	5
Detroit Institute of Technology	1
University of Detroit	9
Eastern Michigan College	5
Emmanuel Missionary College	1
Grand Rapids Junior College	1
Henry Ford Community College	1
Hope College	1
Kalamazoo College	1
Lawrence Institute of Technology	1
Mercy College	1
Michigan College of Mining and Technology	31
Michigan State University of Agriculture and Applied Science	95
University of Michigan	96
Northern Michigan College	2
Suomi College	2
Wayne State University	15
Western Michigan University	12

MINNESOTA, 141

Augsburg College	1
Austin Junior College	2
Carleton College	5
Mankato State College	2
University of Minnesota	120
St. Cloud State College	1
St. Scholastica, College of	1
St. Olaf College	8
Gustavus Adolphus College	1

MISSISSIPPI, 160

Delaware State College	2
Delta State College	3
East Central Junior College	1
Hinds Junior College	10
Holmes Junior College	1
Itawamba Junior College	1
Millsaps College	4
Mississippi Delta Junior College	1
Mississippi School of Mines	1
Mississippi Southern College	9
Mississippi State College	10
Mississippi State College for Women	2

Institutions of higher education attended by students hired in summer 1961 by the Federal Government for nonclerical jobs—Continued

Mississippi State University	72
University of Mississippi	40
Perkinston Junior College	1
Sunflower Junior College	1
Southwest Mississippi Junior College	1
MISSOURI, 172	
Central Missouri State College	2
Culver-Stockton College	2
Drury College	5
Joplin Junior College	5
Junior College of Kansas City	2
University of Kansas City	3
Kemper Military Academy	1
Missouri School of Mines and Metallurgy	42
University of Missouri	55
Missouri Valley College	2
Northeast Missouri State Teachers College	7
Northwest Missouri State College	1
Park College	1
St. Louis University	18
Southeast Missouri State College	1
Southwest Missouri State College	2
Washington University	21
William Jewell College	2
MONTANA, 353	
Custer County Junior College	2
Eastern Montana College	2
College of Great Falls	3
Montana School of Mines	9
Montana State College	40
Montana State University	292
Northern Montana College	1
Western Montana College of Education	4
NEBRASKA, 76	
Creighton University	6
Hastings College	5
College of St. Mary	1
Scottsbluff College	1
University of Nebraska	62
Nebraska Wesleyan University	1
NEVADA, 43	
University of Nevada	43
NEW HAMPSHIRE, 44	
Dartmouth College	15
University of New Hampshire	26
Rivier College	1
St. Anselm's College	2
NEW JERSEY, 127	
Douglass College	2
Fairleigh Dickinson University	2
Jersey City State College	1
Monmouth College	11
Newark College of Engineering	17
Princeton University	36
Rider College	1
Rutgers, The State University	33
Seton Hall University	6
Stevens Institute of Technology	17
Trenton State College	1
NEW MEXICO, 144	
Eastern New Mexico University	3
New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts	5
New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology	1
New Mexico Military Institute	1
New Mexico State University of Agriculture, Engineering and Science	68
University of New Mexico	58
New Mexico Western College	5
St. Michael's College	3
NEW YORK, 401	
Adelphi College	2
Alfred University	1
Barnard College	1
College of Education at Brockport	1
Brooklyn College	5
Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute	2
Broome Technical Community College	1
Buffalo University	10
Canisius College	1
Clarkson College of Technology	15
Colgate University	5
Columbia University	35
Cooper Union	11
Cornell University	95
Corning Community College	1
Downstate Medical Center	5
Elmira College	1
Fordham University	7
Geneseo Teachers College	1
Hamilton College	2
Hartwick College	1
Hobart and William Smith Colleges	1
Hofstra College	2
Hunter College	2
Ithaca College	1
Keuka College	1
Long Island Agriculture and Technical Institute	8
Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart	1
New York City Community College of Applied Arts and Sciences	21
New York Medical College	1
New York State College of Education	8
New York State College of Forestry	3
New York State Ranger School	3
State University of New York	22
New York University	22
Paul Smith's College of Arts and Sciences	3
College of Education at Plattsburgh	2
Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn	1
Post College	1
Pratt Institute	5
Queens College	2
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	41
Rochester Institute of Technology	2
University of Rochester	12
St. Lawrence University	1
Stern College for Women	1
Syracuse University	28
Union College and University	6
Utica College	2
Vassar College	1
Wagner Lutheran College	1
Webb Institute of Naval Architecture	1
Yeshiva University	1
NORTH CAROLINA, 206	
Agricultural and Technical College of North Carolina	1
Atlantic Christian College	1
Belmont Abbey College	1
Brevard College	3
Catawba College	3
Chowan College	1
Davidson College	4
Duke University	56
East Carolina College	3
Guilford College	2
Louisburg College	1
Lenoir-Rhyne College	1
Mars Hill College	1
Meredith College	1
North Carolina College at Durham	3
North Carolina State University	66
University of North Carolina	41
Sacred Heart Junior College and Academy	1
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary	1
Wake Forest College	8
Western Carolina College	4
Wilmington College	1
Wingate College	1
NORTH DAKOTA, 75	
North Dakota School of Forestry	4
North Dakota State University	38
University of North Dakota	33
OHIO, 323	
University of Akron	1
Antioch College	32
Ashland College	1
Bowling Green State University	5
Capital University	2
Case Institute of Technology	22
University of Cincinnati	16
Cleveland College	1
University of Dayton	16
Denison University	3
Fenn College	4
Hiram College	1
John Carroll University	7
Kent State University	6
Kenyon College	1
Lake Erie College	1
Marietta College	4
Miami University	11
College of Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio	1
Muskingum College	3
Ohio State University	105
Ohio University	18
Oberlin College	16
Ohio Wesleyan University	10
Otterbein College	5
College of St. Mary-of-the-Springs	1
College of Steubenville	1
University of Toledo	5
Western College for Women	1
Western Reserve University	9
Wittenberg University	7
Wooster, College of	5
Youngstown University	2
OKLAHOMA, 221	
Cameron State Agricultural College	1
East Central State College	1
Eastern Oklahoma Agriculture and Mechanical College	3
Northeastern Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College	5
Northeastern State College	3
Northwestern State College	1
Oklahoma Baptist University	3
Oklahoma State University	134
University of Oklahoma	58
Panhandle Agricultural and Mechanical College	1
Poteau Community College	1
Southwestern State College	5
University of Tulsa	5
OREGON, 547	
Cascade College	1
Central Oregon College	2
Eastern Oregon College	5
Linfield College	5
Lewis and Clark College	5
Multnomah College	3
Oregon College of Education	1
Oregon State University	321
Oregon Technical Institute	36
University of Oregon	58
Pacific University	8
Portland School of Technology	1
Portland State College	58
University of Portland	20
Reed College	10
Southern Oregon College	3
Willamette University	10
PENNSYLVANIA, 641	
Albright College	1
Allegheny College	3
Bucknell University	12
Bryn Mawr College	4
Carnegie Institute of Technology	42
Chatham College	3
Chestnut Hill College	6
Delaware Valley College of Science and Agriculture	5
Dickinson College	9
Drexel Institute of Technology	23

Institutions of higher education attended by students hired in summer 1961 by the Federal Government for nonclerical jobs—Continued

Duquesne University	3
Franklin and Marshall College	5
Geneva College	2
Gettysburg College	8
Grove City College	5
Hahnemann Medical College and Hospital	4
Haverford College	4
Immaculata College	2
Juniata College	2
Jefferson Medical College of Philadelphia	5
Lafayette College	12
LaSalle College	5
Lebanon Valley College	1
Lehigh University	30
Lincoln University	1
Lycoming College	2
Mercyhurst College	1
Moravian College	1
Mount Aloysius Junior College	1
Muhlenberg College	2
Pennsylvania Military College	2
Pennsylvania State Teachers College	2
Pennsylvania State University	178
University of Pennsylvania	76
Philadelphia College of Pharmacy and Science	5
Philadelphia Textile Institute	1
University of Pittsburgh	47
Rosemont College	5
St. Francis College	1
St. Joseph's College	3
St. Vincent College	2
Scranton University	8
(East Stroudsburg) State Teachers College	2
(Slippery Rock) State Teachers College	1
(Shippensburg) State Teachers College	2
Susquehanna University	2
Swarthmore College	22
Temple University	22
Thiel College	2
Ursinus College	1
Villanova University	40
Washington and Jefferson College	1
Waynesburg College	2
Westminster College	8
Wilkes College	1
Wilson College	1
PUERTO RICO, 5	
University of Puerto Rico	5
RHODE ISLAND, 70	
Pembroke College	6
Brown University	26
Providence College	1
Rhode Island School of Design	1
University of Rhode Island	35
Salve Regina College	1
SOUTH CAROLINA, 46	
Anderson College	1
Benedict College	1
Charleston, College of	1
Citadel, The, Military College	6
Clemson Agricultural College	24
Furman University	1
Limestone College	1
Presbyterian College	1
University of South Carolina	8
Winthrop College	1
Wofford College	1
SOUTH DAKOTA, 72	
Black Hills Teachers College	2
Dakota Wesleyan University	2
Huron College	1
Northern State Teachers College	1
South Dakota School of Mines and Technology	16
South Dakota State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts	40
State University of South Dakota	3
University of South Dakota	6
Southern State Teachers College	1
TENNESSEE, 178	
Carson-Newman College	8
Chattanooga, University of	1
Christian Brothers College	1
David Lipscomb College	3
East Tennessee State College	4
King College	3
Meharry Medical College	9
Memphis State University	5
Middle Tennessee State College	2
Milligan College	1
Peabody College for Teachers	1
University of the South	10
Southern Missionary College	2
Southwestern at Memphis	2
Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State University	3
Tennessee Polytechnic Institute	15
University of Tennessee	82
Vanderbilt University	26
TEXAS, 343	
Abilene Christian College	2
Allen Academy	1
Arlington State College	20
Baylor University	11
University of Dallas	2
East Texas State College	5
University of Houston	2
Lamar State College of Technology	3
Mary Hardin-Baylor College	1
McMurray College	1
Midwestern University	1
Misericordia College	1
North Texas State College	4
Pan American University	1
Rice University	22
St. Mary's University of San Antonio	22
Sam Houston State Teachers College	6
Southern Methodist University	15
Southwest Texas State College	1
Southwestern Junior College	1
Southwestern University	3
Stephen F. Austin State College	10
Sul Ross State College	2
Temple Junior College	2
Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College	99
Texas Christian University	6
Texas College of Arts and Industries	5
Texas Technological College	32
University of Texas	67
Texas Western College	5
Texas Woman's University	2
Texarkana College	7
Trinity University	1
UTAH, 411	
Brigham Young University	63
Dixie Junior College	1
Snow College	3
College of Southern Utah	13
Utah State University of Agriculture and Applied Science	235
University of Utah	79
Weber College	17
VERMONT, 19	
Middlebury College	2
Norwich University	4
University of Vermont and State Agricultural College	13
VIRGINIA, 316	
Bridgewater College	4
Ferrum Junior College	1
Hampton Institute	1
Hollins College	1
Lynchburg College	3
Marion College	1
Mary Washington College	10
Medical College of Virginia	10
Radford College	3
Randolph-Macon College	10
Randolph-Macon Women's College	5
Richmond Professional Institute	6
University of Richmond	8
Roanoke College	5
Sweet Briar College	2
Virginia Military Institute	7
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	117
Virginia State College	1
University of Virginia	63
Washington and Lee University	10
Westhampton College	3
William and Mary, College of	45
WASHINGTON, 513	
Central Washington State College	23
Centralia Junior College	10
Clark College	15
Columbia Basin College	3
Eastern Washington State College	3
Everett Junior College	6
Gonzaga University	14
Grays Harbor College	3
Northwest Bible College, Inc	2
Olympic College	15
Pacific Lutheran University	5
University of Puget Sound	4
St. Martin's College	3
Seattle Pacific College	1
Seattle University	11
Skagit Valley Junior College	1
Walla Walla College	10
State College of Washington	2
Washington State University	144
University of Washington	191
Wenatchee Valley College	17
Western Washington State College	10
Whitman College	15
Whitworth College	2
Yakima Valley Junior College	3
WEST VIRGINIA, 114	
Concord College	2
Davis and Elkins College	4
Fairmont State College	1
Marshall University	17
Morris Harvey College	1
Potomac State College of West Virginia University	12
Shepherd State College	3
West Virginia Institute for Technology	7
West Virginia State College	1
West Virginia University	62
West Virginia Wesleyan College	3
Wheeling College	1
WISCONSIN, 115	
Alverno College	1
Beloit College	2
The Cardinal Stritch College	1
Edgewood College of the Sacred Heart	1
Lawrence College	1
Marquette University	9
St. Norbert College	1
(Eau Clair) Wisconsin State College	1
Wisconsin State College and Institute of Technology	5
(Stevens Point) Wisconsin State College	1
Wisconsin State College	3
(River Falls) Wisconsin State College	1
University of Wisconsin	88
WYOMING, 65	
Casper Junior College	2
Sheridan College	5
Wyoming Junior College	1
University of Wyoming	57
Total	11,865

(Some agencies were unable to indicate the student's college training and we were unable to identify institutions of higher education for 128 students.)

Education and Public Welfare Division
May 7, 1962.

I include a study in connection with the preceding figures:

Institutions of higher education whose students were reported employed by the Federal Government in nonclerical jobs, summer 1961 [1]

	Total number of institutions of higher education [2]	Number of institutions represented and number of their students in Federal nonclerical summer jobs [3]		Institutions in the State which combined had at least 50 percent of students employed in Federal nonclerical summer jobs	
		Institutions	Students	Institutions	Students
	(I)	(II)	(III)	(IV)	(V)
Alabama	26	15	213	2	172
Alaska	3	1	23	1	23
Arizona	7	7	213	2	109
Arkansas	19	10	96	2	76
California	169	92	1,388	5	718
Colorado	22	13	351	1	182
Connecticut	32	9	117	1	59
Delaware	4	2	22	1	21
District of Columbia	24	9	318	2	161
Florida	45	18	168	2	127
Georgia	46	13	178	2	122
Hawaii	4	1	24	1	24
Idaho	8	8	306	1	225
Illinois	112	28	267	2	153
Indiana	41	20	264	1	140
Iowa	51	20	219	1	122
Kansas	45	11	111	2	88
Kentucky	36	13	83	2	58
Louisiana	21	5	107	1	55
Maine	22	5	46	1	39
Maryland	44	18	587	1	433
Massachusetts	96	27	387	2	201
Michigan	67	21	283	2	191
Minnesota	43	9	141	1	120
Mississippi	45	17	160	2	112
Missouri	63	18	172	2	97
Montana	11	8	353	1	292
Nebraska	23	6	76	1	62
Nevada	1	1	43	1	43
New Hampshire	12	4	44	1	26
New Jersey	38	11	127	2	69
New Mexico	9	8	144	2	126
New York	183	53	410	6	243
North Carolina	60	23	206	2	122
North Dakota	14	3	75	1	38
Ohio	70	33	323	6	207
Oklahoma	34	13	221	1	134
Oregon	27	17	547	1	321
Pennsylvania	129	56	641	4	343
Rhode Island	12	6	70	1	35
South Carolina	30	11	46	1	24
South Dakota	16	9	72	1	40
Tennessee	46	18	178	2	108
Texas	96	33	343	3	188
Utah	8	7	411	1	235
Vermont	16	3	19	1	13
Virginia	46	22	316	2	180
Washington	29	24	513	2	332
West Virginia	20	12	114	1	62
Wisconsin	62	13	115	1	88
Wyoming	6	4	65	1	57
Puerto Rico	5	1	5	1	5
Total	2,098	809	11,721	90	7,221

[1] Not all agencies were able to report students' college of attendance.

[2] U.S. Office of Education, Education Directory, pt. 3, p. 11.

[3] Reported by Federal agencies to Legislative Reference Service in response to a survey conducted in behalf of the Honorable LEVERETT SALTONSTALL. Results of the survey are contained in 88th Cong., 1st sess., S. Doc. No. 9: "Summer Employment of College Students in the Federal Government."

NOTE.—Selected percentages: 38.6 percent of total number of institutions of higher education had students employed in Federal nonclerical summer jobs (based on totals, cols. I and II); 4.3 percent of total number of institutions of higher education had over 50 percent of the total number of students employed (based on totals, cols. I and IV); 11.1 percent of the total number of institutions of higher education which had students employed had over 50 percent of the total number of students employed (based on totals, cols. II and IV).

Source: Education and Public Welfare Division, Legislative Reference Service.

There have been those who contend they do not know how the apportionment act works. I include two letters.

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., October 15, 1963.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This refers to your letter of October 9, 1963, enclosing a copy of an amendment to be offered by Mr. BROYHILL to H.R. 10.

H.R. 10 would require that summer temporary appointments which are made from civil service registers to positions in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area be apportioned among applicants from the several States on the basis of population. The bill would affect only those appointments made through open competitive examinations. Most summer temporary appointments have not been made from civil service registers which are established as the result of open competitive examinations.

Mr. BROYHILL's amendment to H.R. 10 would eliminate the requirement for apportionment of summer temporary appointments from civil service registers. In lieu thereof, it would require that initial appointments to positions in the competitive service in grades GS–7 and below shall be made as the result of open competitive examinations prescribed by the Civil Service Commission. If the amendment to H.R. 10 is enacted Federal agencies would no longer be permitted to make temporary summer appointments to competitive positions in grades GS–7 and below without regard to civil service registers established as the result of open competitive examinations, either in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area or in the various States. The amendment would not affect current authorities to make temporary appointments to positions which are in the excepted service, i.e., appointments which agencies can make without competitive examinations.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN J. MCCARTHY,
Assistant General Counsel.

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., October 15, 1963.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This refers to your letter of October 9, 1963, asking how the apportionment provision of the Civil Service Act of 1883 works in connection with those jobs to which it applies.

Apportionment applies generally to career-conditional and career (permanent) appointments to competitive positions in the headquarters offices of agencies in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area. The Commission maintains a list of the apportionment standing of the States and territories showing the number of positions occupied by their residents in relation to the number of positions to which each is entitled on the basis of population. Those States and territories with fewer residents occupying apportioned jobs than they are entitled to are "in arrears" of their apportionment quotas. Those having more residents in apportioned jobs than they are entitled to are considered "in excess."

Apportionment does not apply to veterans. When nonveteran applicants seek appointment to apportioned positions, they submit proof of residence. Eligible applicants are certified in the following order:

1. All veterans, and those nonveterans from States and territories in arrears, in order of their examination rating; and

2. Nonveterans from States and territories in excess, in order of (a) the rank of their State or territory on the apportionment list and (b) their examination rating. For example, all eligibles from the State least in excess are certified before those from the State next on the list.

At the present time the apportionment provision applies to about 2.5 percent of all competitive appointments and the Commission can waive its application in the interests of good administration. Even though many appointments are excepted from apportionment, once they are made the person is counted in determining how his State stands with respect to its quota.

Even for those positions to which apportionment applies it has not resulted in comparable representation of all States. In the present labor market the Federal Government cannot attract enough applicants from States in arrears, many of which are at a distance from Washington, to meet their apportionment quotas.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN J. MCCARTHY,
Assistant General Counsel.

OCTOBER 15, 1963.

Memo to Mr. BECKWORTH:

Regarding the application and operation of the apportionment provisions of the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883.

This is in reply to your request of October 14, 1963, requesting a statement covering the manner in which the apportionment laws work and the job areas in which apportionment applies.

From what I am able to determine, the apportionment provisions of the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, do not apply to—

(1) persons subject to the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944;

(2) jobs which, as the law provides, are not "in the departments at Washington"—that is, jobs in the several States and outside the seat of government; and

(3) jobs which are excepted by the Civil Service Commission from the apportionment provisions applicable to Washington, D.C. The Commission is authorized by law to make such exemptions in the interest of good administration. Among these exceptions are scientific and professional jobs, artisan jobs, and other positions such as stenographers, firemen, gardeners, and jobs in the excepted service such as attorneys jobs and jobs in the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Central Intelligence Agency.

In addition, by order of the Commission under the above-mentioned authority of the Commission to make apportionment exemptions in the interest of good administration, the apportionment requirement applies only to those departmental headquarters jobs below the level of grade 13 of the Classification Act of 1949.

The exercise of this authority of the Commission to make exemptions from the apportionment provisions has been accelerated in many instances by reason of the fact that there cannot be obtained enough qualified eligibles to fill a particular State's apportionment, who are willing to come to Washington to work.

In general, some 46 States usually are in arrears with respect to their apportionment quotas.

The above information is based upon information which I have been able to obtain from the Civil Service Commission.

In addition, there are attached several photostatic copies of material prepared by the Commission on the application and operation of the apportionment law.

Respectfully,

David B. Carper,
Assistant Counsel.

I include some information which has been furnished me by the Civil Service Commission and the Housing and Home Finance Agency, plus an article from the Washington Post of September 24, 1963:

U.S. Civil Service Commission,
Washington, D.C., October 16, 1963.

Hon. Lindley Beckworth,
House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. Beckworth: This is in reply to your request of September 24, 1963, for our comments on the enclosed newspaper clippings regarding the filling of vacancies in the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

We do not have information regarding the results of the study reportedly made in the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Under the regulations, agencies may fill vacancies by original appointment from the competitive register or noncompetitively; i.e., by reassignment, transfer, or promotion. It is within the administrative discretion of the agency as to which method will be used. Usually the possibilities of noncompetitive action are explored before a request is made for eligibles from the competitive register.

If the vacancy is to be filled by the transfer of an individual currently employed in the Federal service or by the reinstatement of a former employee, the agency is free to select any qualified person from its files of applicants for noncompetitive appointment. There is no requirement that the vacancy be publicized.

Your enclosures are returned, as requested.

Sincerely yours,

John W. Macy, Jr.,
Chairman.

Housing and Home Finance Agency,
Office of the Administrator,
Washington, D.C., October 10, 1963.

Hon. Lindley Beckworth,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Beckworth: Thank you for your inquiry regarding the article which appeared on September 24 in the Jerry Kluttz column of the Washington Post. I welcome the opportunity to correct some of the impressions which have been drawn from the article.

In the spring of the year, our personnel division conducted an informal survey of new employees to determine just how effective the recruiting activities of the division had been in recent months. The director of personnel sent a brief questionnaire to the last 100 or so employees who had come to work for the Office of the Administrator, Community Facilities Administration, and Urban Renewal Administration. The key questions were simply these: (1) Briefly, how did you happen to come with the agency? (2) who referred you to your supervisor?

The results showed that approximately half of the people who were queried came to the agency as a result of recruiting activities of the personnel division. The other half were referred to the agency by employees or ex-employees. All of our employees involved in the survey were employed in competitive positions and were hired under civil service authority except for two attorneys who were appointed to positions outside the competitive civil service.

Although fewer than 5 percent of the employees who responded first learned of the agency by being referred here on civil service certificates, all of them were qualified through processes of the Civil Service Commission. All but seven passed civil service examinations or gained civil service status in another Government agency. These seven were appointed to temporary positions for which the Civil Service Commission had no appropriate examination.

Included in the survey group were many employees who at the time of their appointment had obtained civil service eligibility—as an example on the Federal administrative and management examination or the Federal service entrance examination—and, who as a result of their eligibility, applied to several agencies including HHFA for employment. Also included were several members of our college trainee group who were interested in the agency as the result of our recruiting activity at colleges across the country. The largest group in the survey, however, was made up of persons who, having full civil service competitive appointments in other agencies, transferred to the HHFA.

Sincerely yours,

Robert C. Weaver,
Administrator.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 24, 1963]

HHFA's Job Query Shows Many Filled Through Friends

(Mike Causey writes the Federal Diary today. Jerry Kluttz is touring the Pacific area to report on the activities of Federal employees in outlying stations. His reports will appear as they are received.)

Housing and Home Finance Agency's Community Facilities Office made what it admits is a highly unscientific study to find out how its recently hired employees found out about job openings.

Less than 5 percent of them were referred to HHFA by Civil Service Commission. About half said they heard about jobs directly through the personnel office or recruiting and the remainder said friends in the Agency and former employees alerted them to vacancies.

HHFA officials concluded that the practice of employees bringing their friends is one reason why some offices have hired so few Negroes and other minority group members in the past.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to considering H.R. 10 under suspension of the rules. Let me state at the outset I realize the difficulty which I am confronted with this afternoon in trying to convince my colleagues to vote against this legislation. I recognize that the odds are overwhelming against me being successful in this endeavor. I do not say that from any attitude of pessimism or any attempt to express humility on my part, even though I realize I am limited in being convincing. It is not because I lack merit insofar as my cause is concerned because, Mr. Speaker, I believe that my cause is just in opposing this legislation. I am speaking in the interest of fair play, good administration, and in the best interests of our Government.

Obviously, the reason the odds are overwhelmingly in favor of the legislation today is because it is loaded with political dynamite. On the surface it appears there are a lot of fat, juicy summertime jobs here in the Washington area that we can latch onto and spread out among our constituents or among the young people, the students, in our particular areas.

If that is the way this legislation appears to my colleagues, I do not blame them for supporting the bill. It would be politically foolish to oppose it.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that my colleagues would not knowingly want to be unfair. I do not think my colleagues would want to inflict injury on the people of this area for what may be a negligible gain to the people of their own particular sections. But regardless of the alleged personal losses or gains that may result from this legislation, I submit it is bad legislation. I think it should be defeated because it is bad legislation.

In the first place, H.R. 10 seeks to amend an outmoded, archaic law which was passed back in 1883. That was the so-called Apportionment Act. Most if not all Federal jobs at that time were located here in Washington. It seemed to be desirable at that time to apportion these Federal jobs in Washington throughout the States and territories on the basis of population. But such is not the situation today, Mr. Speaker. Less than 10 percent of the Federal jobs are located here in Washington. Over 90 percent of them are located in the States and territories. Interestingly enough, there are more Federal jobs in the State of California than there are here in the Washington metropolitan area.

There are, of course, several diminishing factors in this Apportionment Act. It does not apply to veterans, and incidentally 50 percent of the Federal employees are veterans, so they are exempted from the Apportionment Act. Then, the Civil Service Commission can waive the apportionment provisions insofar as certain categories of jobs under the Classification Act are concerned. In fact, apportionment today actually only applies to about 2½ percent of all positions in the competitive Civil Service system. It has also not resulted in equal representation throughout the States and territories. Forty-six of the States and territories are underrepresented so far as their apportionment quotas are concerned. So it is proven that the Federal Government just cannot fill these jobs properly under this 1883 apportionment provision of law.

This legislation now before us is an attempt to apply this old archaic law to temporary summertime jobs, when the Civil Service Commission has been trying for years to get the act itself repealed.

H.R. 10 is unsuited to the type of positions to be filled. There are only 6,000 people involved in summer type jobs in the Washington, D.C., area. Half of those are clerical, clerk-typist jobs. Ten percent of them are under the so-called student trainee program, which are already being filled by examinations given throughout the country. The remainder are various types of jobs, technicians, laborers, and gardeners. There would be no common denominator whereby you could reapportion these jobs or have a nationwide competitive examination for them. It would be impossible to develop a workable system under this apportionment program.

Incidentally, students alone are not involved, or young people. There are many high school or college teachers on summer vacation who are undergoing certain training or studies. Will we deprive the Government of the benefit of their knowledge and experience in their specialized fields?

Then, of course, there are many full time people in the labor market who are waiting for permanent jobs.

It certainly is unfair to penalize these people to impose this type of restriction upon them just for the benefit of a very, very few young people throughout the rest of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, there seem to be two procedures under H.R. 10 which are somewhat contradictory. As pointed out by the gentleman from Texas, it does provide that these jobs be assigned on the basis of a nationwide competitive examination. I wholeheartedly support that portion of the bill.

None of us here in this area are asking for any special preference so far as qualification for jobs here in Washington or anywhere else is concerned. But the bill does contradict itself. It provides for this old outmoded system. How can these jobs be awarded on the basis of merit under a competitive examination and then provide that they have to be awarded on such an accidental basis as where the applicant happens to reside.

I also submit, Mr. Speaker, that this bill, H.R. 10 will not accomplish the objective that it seeks to accomplish.

As I said a moment ago, we are only talking about approximately 6,000 summertime jobs or temporary summer jobs out of a total of over 2½ million Federal jobs. There actually are in excess of 40,000 temporary summer jobs spread out throughout the Nation. Why not cover all of these 40,000 or in excess of 40,000 jobs and not just these 6,000 jobs. Why only talk about the 6,000 jobs and say that only 6,000 jobs would be affected? The Civil Service Commission would continue to waive certain jobs because of shortages and we would probably wind up with only 600 jobs that are under the student trainee program. We will not get anywhere near the bonanza that the sponsors of the bill are claiming and seeking to make the membership believe would be available under this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this is a weak bill. It is incomplete and it is confused. Mr. Speaker, I think there is a better way to approach this problem. I think in opposing legislation, we should not oppose legislation unless we have a worthwhile alternative. I object to this measure coming up under suspension of the rules because I want to offer an amendment which would make a major step forward in our competitive civil service system. My amendment would make merit apply nationwide to these 40,000 jobs and not just to the jobs here in Washington. It would provide for a strict merit system and competitive examinations and not depend on the accident as to where a student or young person might happen to reside at any particular time. Let us put language in the legislation to eliminate all political considerations whatsoever such as favoritism as well as nepotism.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of California. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 212]

Alger
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Ashley
Becker
Bennett, Mich.
Betts
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Brooks
Brown, Ohio
Buckley
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Celler
Chelf
Colmer
Corbett
Daddario
Davis, Tenn.
Devine
Diggs
Dorn
Dowdy
Dulski
Dwyer
Farbstein
Fino
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gibbons
Glenn
Goodling
Grabowski
Hall
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hoeven
Horan
Horton
Ichord
Jennings
Johansen
Johnson, Pa.
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
Kluczynski
Laird
Landrum
Lesinski
Long, La.
McDowell
McLoskey
Mailliard
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Matthews
Milliken
Mills
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Neill
Passman
Pillion
Powell
Pucinski
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Robison
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
St Germain
St. Onge
Schenck
Sheppard
Shipley
Sikes
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Staebler
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Trimble
Tuten
Van Pelt
Vinson
Watson
Whitten
Widnall
Wilson, Charles, H.
Winstead

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 326 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF CIVIL SERVICE APPORTIONMENT REQUIREMENT

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] is recognized.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, before the quorum call I had just stated that H.R. 10, the bill which we have before us under suspension, would not accomplish the objective which it seeks, because there were only 6,000 summertime jobs or temporary jobs here in the Washington area of various types, and by the time various restrictions of the Civil Service Commission were placed upon them there would probably be only 600 to 700 jobs that would be available under the so-called apportionment system.

I was suggesting a better way of approaching this matter, feeling that in opposing any legislation an attempt should be made to suggest a worthwhile alternative, although under this particular procedure we would have to defeat this bill to get at a better approach to the problem.

There are 40,000 summertime temporary jobs throughout the Nation. I am suggesting that we apply the merit approach to all of the jobs, not just the 6,000 jobs here in the Washington area, and then fill these 40,000 jobs on the merit system basis, entirely and strictly on a competitive basis, and not on the basis of the State where the individual may happen to live at the time.

Then I would suggest that we provide for the elimination of all political influence or any favoritism at all, and eliminate any chance of nepotism by providing that having any relative working in a particular department would prohibit the employment of a temporary employee therein.

I was going to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this would be a giant step forward. Incidentally, the Civil Service Commission stated it would cost $300,000 a year if this bill were enacted into law just for these very few jobs which may be made available in the Washington area. If we are going to spend that amount of money, why should we not make all 40,000 jobs throughout the Nation available for persons who are seeking summertime jobs.

As I say, an amendment would accomplish that but under suspension of the rules we are unable to offer an amendment. It is disappointing that the author or the sponsor of the bill asked for this measure to be brought up under suspension of the rules which would prohibit an amendment because he stated rather emphatically during the hearings that he would prefer these jobs to be filled on the basis of merit competitive examinations and not on the basis of where people happen to be living at the time.

Mr. Speaker, assuming that H.R. 10 would accomplish the objectives which it is alleged it would accomplish and assuming that it would be preferable to a truly merit system, I still say it would be unfair legislation. It would cut off the employment opportunities of local people. Government is a principal if not the only industry in this area. Most people work for the Federal Government or they do not work at all. I am not asking for any special concession for the people here in this area, but I am merely asking my colleagues not to penalize them but to give them an opportunity to compete for these jobs and other jobs throughout the Nation along with everyone else.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me point out that this legislation is vigorously opposed by the administration. It was opposed by the Kennedy administration, the Civil Service Commission, and the Bureau of the Budget. I am certain it is opposed by the Johnson administration, in line with what the President said here in his address to the joint session of the Congress on last Wednesday. It seems rather strange here when we have the first opportunity to take up legislation that we have a bill here that the administration strongly opposes with an effort to pass it regardless of the opposition to it. This will be the first opportunity we will have to carry out the policies of the new administration.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia I yield briefly to my colleague.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill—H.R. 10—and in doing so would like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Sickles] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Broyhill], as well as those others who have spoken or will speak against the proposal.

I oppose this bill because it does not make sense. It seeks to extend an antiquated, obsolete, and unworkable provision in extending law pertaining to permanent jobs in the Federal Government to those temporary jobs which are generally taken by college students and others with long vacations during the summer months.

Those who support this legislation think it will make it easier for their summer-free constituents to get jobs in Washington during vacation periods, but the fact of the matter is that those people, if they really want these jobs, have a very good chance of getting them under the existing setup.

The only thing that this bill would actually do if enacted would be to saddle the Civil Service Commission and other Federal agencies with an additional drawn out and involved procedure for hiring temporary summer help. And in doing so, I think it is clear, some of the agencies would have to go without some of the help needed to replace those who are on vacation.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, is designed to keep those people living in the Washington metropolitan area, many of whom live in Maryland, from getting temporary summer jobs with the Federal Government and see that the jobs instead go to people from other areas of the country. But the measure will not do that. It will only make additional redtape and prolong the application procedure. Many of the States will not be able to fill their quotas and then the agencies will be free to hire any qualified person.

Mr. Speaker, I do not argue against attempts to improve the hiring practices of the Federal Government. In fact, I welcome them. If the Members of this House want to improve the hiring procedures for temporary summer jobs, let us do it right. Let us put the whole thing on a merit basis and forget about States quotas. Then, only the most qualified people would be hired by the Federal Government.

Or, if we must retain the quota provision, then let us put the filling of all jobs on a quota basis. Let us take into consideration all the summer jobs that become available in the defense installations and sundry other Federal activities throughout the Nation, not just those in the Washington, D.C., area.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Sickles].

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the suspension of the rules and the passage of the bill H.R. 10. In doing so, I would like to state first that in visiting with the many constituents I have in suburban Maryland I am impressed by the fact that they usually have one thing in common, and that is that they come from somewhere else. It is at the point now where it is a little difficult to find a native out there any more. This problem is going to become more acute and it is going to become more difficult as time goes on if the population projections come true, which estimate that there is going to be a doubling of the population in this metropolitan area in the next 15 or 20 years.

Another thing these folks usually have in common is that they first came here to seek Federal employment. This is a sort of subconscious poll that I have been taking. I am trying to get this information together, but I find that I really am unable to find out how they were first employed. I do not know whether they got the benefit of some sort of apportionment formula or whether they were veterans and the formula was not applied or whether the Civil Service Commission actually waived it in their particular case. But I do know they are here now and they have the right to expect that they will be treated fairly and their families will be treated fairly.

We must remember that the dominant industry in this metropolitan Washington area is the U.S. Federal Government. The effect of the bill H.R. 10 would be to cut short a major source of summer employment for the children of these same Federal employees who are now living in the metropolitan Washington area.

I think first we should recognize the very natural instinct that the children of Federal employees would naturally want to work in the Federal Establishment as their mothers and fathers do. I should think we would want to encourage these children to be employed in the Federal Government. An obvious result of H.R. 10 would be to deny to some of these children employment.

As a matter of fact, it would encourage the bringing of youngsters, without parental control, into this area. I think those of us who are concerned with juvenile delinquency—and I know all of us are—should bear this in mind.

I noted in the report on H.R. 10, the figures show that there is a large number of temporary employees who reside in the metropolitan Washington, D.C., area. I think this is quite normal. I would have been surprised if the figures did not show this, but I am sure that the comparable situation exists if we look in the other centers of Federal employment in other parts of the Nation. But, of course, no one suggested that we apply some sort of an apportionment formula in those areas, and I would be the last to do so.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SICKLES. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I asked the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Broyhill] to yield to me a moment ago. I know he was busy, and I appreciate the gentleman from Maryland yielding. I shall be delighted to work with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Sickles], now addressing the House, and to work with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Broyhill] in helping to bring about an apportionment and a competitive examination with reference to the 40,000 that you have spoken about and pledge to you that if you will introduce a bill tomorrow or the next day and if the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Broyhill] will introduce a bill tomorrow or the next day bringing about an apportionment and a competitive examination with reference to these 40,000, you will have our help. Just draw the bill and let us go over it and agree on one, and we will work on it.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SICKLES. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I will be very happy to do that, and in the light of the gentleman's support, it is needless to waste our time today to vote on this bill.

Mr. BECKWORTH. That is where the gentleman is wrong. He worked to stop this bill a whole year, and he knows it.

Mr. SICKLES. If it is back to me now, I would like to say I appreciate the offer of the gentleman from Texas. As I do not think an apportionment formula should be applicable in the Washington metropolitan area, I do not think it should be applicable anywhere else in the country.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that the only effect of the passage of H.R. 10 would be to deny to the youngsters in this metropolitan area, most of whom are the children of Federal employees, the temporary employment which is offered by the dominant industry in this area. Therefore, I am opposed to the bill.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias].

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, there are several reasons why H.R. 10 should not be enacted. In the first place, civil service apportionment in summer employment has become an anachronism. At a time when almost all the jobs that come within the scope of this legislation were located in Washington, D.C., the idea of apportionment was attractive. With the growth in volume and the geographical dispersal of Federal employment opportunities, the concept is, however, now obsolete. To allow an archaic provision to remain on the books is bad enough, but to advocate its extension is simply unreasonable. An important factor in the consideration of this bill is the type of jobs involved in temporary summer employment. They are of such a nature that apportionment such as described in H.R. 10 would not be beneficial to the Government service. Individuals who have summer jobs with the Federal Government earn the benefits of experience and financial compensation, but the Federal Government receives benefits. We all gain from the fact that young, ambitious students become interested in Federal employment as a career.

The Government also benefits from the highly skilled and highly trained men and women from the professional ranks of educators who are available to the Government during the summertime. These persons make very important contributions to the Federal Government which might not otherwise be realized. An apportionment requirement such as proposed in H.R. 10 will cause many of these persons to find the door of summer employment closed to them and many others will assume the attitude that they would not qualify under the requirement and will seek employment elsewhere. In my opinion this will be a loss to the Federal Government as well as to the persons involved. It would work an effect which is completely contradictory to the merit system of employment it propounds. A highly skilled individual who may wish summertime Federal employment and whose services are desired by an agency of the Government may not be hired simply because his State quota had been filled. As the gentleman from Virginia has noted, to so impose a quota system on top of the competitive examination system would only lead to administrative chaos. Veterans, who make up a large percent of Federal employees, are exempt from the bill. In addition, the Civil Service Commission, "in the interest of good administration" can waive the requirement. There is, therefore, a question raised as to the value of legislation with such wide loopholes. There is an easier and much more effective method of insuring fairness and the highest level of competency in persons selected for summertime employment, and that is to employ summer temporary employees on the basis of nationwide competitive examinations. On this basis only the skilled will qualify and the fair standard of the merit system may at long last begin to become a workable reality.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the author of the bill, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Beckworth].

Is it not a fact that the reason we bring this bill out is so that the young people in his district and mine and in all districts throughout the country will have a chance at one of these very fine well-paying summer jobs here in Washington?

Mr. BECKWORTH. That is exactly the objective, to give them the opportunity to compete. And the last language we adopted in the committee had this kind of wording: "through an assembled examination, written, where possible."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham] has expired.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Beckworth].

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the Apportionment Act being archaic. I will admit there are many people in these agencies and some in the Civil Service Commission who would like to see the Apportionment Act done away with because then they would have the right to hire for various government jobs many more people from the Washington area. People who hire individuals do not care for restrictions. Many would prefer that there be no Apportionment Act. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Broyhill] introduced an amendment in our committee a little over a year ago to do away with the Apportionment Act. Do you know how many votes it got in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service—and I think we try to do the right thing? It got one vote, and that was his vote. I leave it to you to determine who is archaic and what is archaic when it comes to the Apportionment Act.

The same thing has been attempted, I am sure, because the gentleman is correct—the Civil Service Commission has tried to get rid of the Apportionment Act, but it does not seem to get anywhere so far as results are concerned in the House of Representatives and in the other body. So apparently it is not as archaic as some might lead you to think.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that I must respond to the remarks which have been made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Beckworth].

Mr. Speaker, I stated at the outset of my remarks that I recognized the difficulty involved in getting many Members of Congress to vote against an apportionment system, because it would appear that they would get a greater number of jobs for their people than by some other method. But, I should like to quote the sentiments of the gentleman from Texas in this regard which appeared on page 3 of the hearings on this legislation, if I may, and here is what the gentleman from Texas said——

Mr. BECKWORTH. If the gentleman will yield, I did not hear the gentleman. I am sorry.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I am quoting the statement that the gentleman from Texas made during the hearings concerning apportionment versus the merit system or the competitive examination system. Here is what the gentleman stated:

> I would be delighted to see all the patronage factors eliminated totally so far as these jobs are concerned. I am a strong believer in civil service. I have great faith in civil service.
>
> As far as these summer jobs are concerned, I would like to see a written competitive examination given to just as many students as possible and if all of them can qualify from two or three States by that method, it would be all right with me.

Mr. Speaker, that is the type of amendment which I offered in the committee and which failed by a vote of 10 to 7. That is the type of proposal which I have made here on the floor of the House today but which type of amendment is prohibited under the method by which this bill has been brought up. It is the type bill which I would be glad to introduce since the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Beckworth] has pledged me his support.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this procedure which is being attempted here today will be voted down.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Beckworth].

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas has never indicated that he opposes the apportionment aspect of the permanent law, the 1883 law, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Broyhill] knows I have never indicated that I oppose apportionment of summer employment jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I have worked several years to try to bring this legislation about and, certainly, I would not be opposing something on which I have worked as hard as I have on this.

I might say this: The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Broyhill] knows that he has not been introducing bills along the line which the gentleman has been talking today.

I say, again, I shall be glad to work with the gentleman in an effort to bring about an apportionment act, an extension of the 1883 act on a competitive basis for all summer employees throughout the Nation and I here and now so state.

Now on October 15, 1963, John W. McCarthy, Assistant General Counsel of the Civil Service Commission, wrote to me as follows:

> Most summer temporary appointments have not been made from civil service registers which are established as the result of open competitive examinations.

Does the gentleman from Virginia believe that?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Will the gentleman repeat his statement?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I shall be glad to.

> Most summer temporary appointments have not been made from civil service registers which are established as the result of open competitive examinations.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. If the gentleman will yield, I would agree to that because they are not under the competitive civil service system. One portion of this bill places them under it. I am not opposing that.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I want to see them placed on a competitive basis.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

The question was taken and there were—ayes 121, noes 7.

The SPEAKER. Two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules are suspended and the bill is passed.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. I was on my feet, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman insist upon his point of order?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I do. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet and asking for recognition.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state at this point that all time had expired and we were in the process of a vote taking place. Of course, the Chair, under the parliamentary rules, cannot recognize the gentleman at this point.

One hundred and twenty-one Members having voted in the affirmative and 7 in the negative—two-thirds having voted in the affirmative—the rules are suspended and the bill is passed.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman making the point of order that a quorum is not present and is he objecting to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that a quorum is not present and objects to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present.

Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 301, nays 18, not voting 115, as follows:

[Roll No. 213]

YEAS—301

Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson
Andrews, Ala.
Arends
Ashmore
Aspinall
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolton, Frances P.
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brotzman
Broyhill, N.C.
Bruce
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Conte
Cooley
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Derwinski
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Feighan
Findley
Finnegan
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foreman
Fountain
Fulton, Pa.
Gallagher
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gill
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hoffman
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Jarman
Jensen
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Libonati
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McFall
McIntire
McMillan
Macdonald
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
Osmers
Ostertag
Patman
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Powell
Price
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Rains
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Toll
Tollefson
Tupper
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
White
Whitener
Wickersham
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—18

Abbitt
Broyhill, Va.
Curtis
Downing
Duncan
Fallon
Friedel
Garmatz
Hardy
Lankford
Long, Md.
Marsh
Mathias
Morton
Patten
Sickles
Smith, Va.
Tuck

NOT VOTING—115

Alger
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Ashley
Auchincloss
Becker
Bennett, Mich.
Bolling
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Buckley
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Celler
Chelf
Colmer
Corbett
Daddario
Davis, Tenn.
Devine
Diggs
Dorn
Dowdy
Dulski
Dwyer
Evins
Farbstein
Fascell
Fino
Ford
Forrester
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gibbons
Glenn
Goodling
Grabowski
Griffin
Hall
Harris
Harrison
Harvey, Ind.
Hébert
Hoeven
Horan
Ichord
Jennings
Johansen
Johnson, Pa.
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Laird
Lennon
Lesinski
Long, La.
McDowell
McLoskey
Mailliard
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Matthews
Milliken
Mills
Morrison
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Neill
Passman
Pucinski
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Robison
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
St Germain
St. Onge
Schenck
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Sikes
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Staebler
Taft
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Trimble
Tuten
Van Pelt
Watson
Whitten
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Winstead
Wright

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Johansen and Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Corbett against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Robison.

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. McLoskey.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Alger.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Smith of California.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Mosher.

Mr. Daddario with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mr. Multer with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Shipley with Mr. Taft.

Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mr. Fascell with Mr. Cahill.

Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Hoeven.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Van Pelt.

Mr. St Germain with Mr. Widnall.

Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Goodling.

Mr. Moss of California with Mr. Siler.

Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. Staebler with Mr. Becker.

Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Ford.

Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Dulski with Mr. Hall.

Mr. McDowell with Mr. Laird.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

Mr. Mills with Mr. Horan.

Mr. Harris with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Harrison.

Mr. Ashley with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Charles L. Wilson with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Griffin.

Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Glenn.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Schenck.

Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Devine.

Mr. Lennon with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Thornberry.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Whitten.

Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Watson.

Mr. Jennings with Mr. Trimble.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Colmer.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Winstead.

Mr. Bonner with Mrs. Kee.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Thompson of Texas.
Mr. Chelf with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Tuten.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Forrester.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Roberts of Alabama.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Fraser.
Mr. Matthews with Mr. Matsunaga.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Brown of California.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE INVESTIGATION AND STUDIES AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 179

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 547, as amended, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the investigations and studies authorized by H. Res. 179, Eighty-eighth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee appointed by the chairman of the committee, not to exceed $200,000, in addition to the unexpended balance of any sum heretofore made available for conducting such investigations and studies, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of accountants, experts, investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditures in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

With the following committee amendment:

On line 6 strike out "$290,000" and insert "$200,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR THE FURTHER EXPENSES OF THE STUDIES, INVESTIGATIONS, AND INQUIRIES AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 56

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Administration Committee I call up House Resolution 566 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the House resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 56 by the Committee on Public Works, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $495,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, as the chairman deems necessary, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The chairman, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, is authorized and empowered to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any other departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Public Works shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "$495,000" and insert "$450,000".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Over what period of time are these authorizations being made in this resolution as well as in the previous resolution?

Mr. FRIEDEL. This authorization is for next year.

Mr. GROSS. The calendar year?

Mr. FRIEDEL. For the next session, the second session of the 88th Congress.

Mr. GROSS. For the fiscal year ending June 30?

Mr. FRIEDEL. December 31, 1964.

Mr. GROSS. For the next calendar year?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Shriver] may have permission to add their names to the additional views filed today by minority members of the Committee on the Judiciary pursuant to unanimous consent agreed to on Tuesday, November 26, 1963, by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

FILING OF REPORT

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the report referred to directly above may be filed at any time up until midnight tonight.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

CITY OF BIRMINGHAM MOURNS DEATH OF JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the tragic assassination of President John F. Kennedy has brought unparalleled grief and sorrow to our Nation and, indeed, the world. Gone from our midst is an outstanding citizen and a leader who was the personification of the youth, vigor, and vitality of the country which selected him as its President.

My hometown of Birmingham, Ala., joins the Nation and world in an expression of sorrow to the family of the late President Kennedy and a voice of hope and unity for tomorrow to President Lyndon Johnson.

Through a letter dated November 26, 1963, Mayor Albert Boutwell sent to the Members of the Alabama delegation, first, statement of the mayor of the city of Birmingham, November 22, 1963; second, city of Birmingham proclamation dated November 23, 1963; third, statement of the mayor to the council, November 26, 1963; and fourth, resolution adopted by the Birmingham City Council on November 26, 1963.

I respectfully insert the above named documents into this issue of the RECORD on behalf of the city of Birmingham.

STATEMENT OF THE MAYOR OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM, NOVEMBER 22, 1963

I sincerely believe that almost every man, woman, and child in Birmingham, regardless of how deep their personal political feelings may run, are shocked and saddened as I am by this terrible tragedy.

I speak for the city government of Birmingham, for myself, as mayor, and for President M. E. Wiggins and his fellow council members, in expressing to the President's personal and official families the depth of the sorrow and sense of tragedy that we share with them and with the people of the United States. In the name of the city government and the people it represents, I have sent a telegram of condolence to the President's wife and children, to express to them our sympathy in this time of their personal loss and personal grief.

Whatever forces may lie behind this terrible event, whatever persons may have inspired the striking down of a President of the United States, we can have no other feeling than one of sorrow and deep regret.

For the President's wife and children and the members of their families our hearts go out. We pray to Almighty God that He will, in His infinite compassion, comfort and strengthen them. And for the Nation we pray that divine providence will watch over and guide us in the troubled hours that will be the inevitable consequence of this sad day.

CITY OF BIRMINGHAM PROCLAMATION

Whereas the President of the United States of America has made the supreme sacrifice to which the courageous conduct of his office exposed him, as it has other great Americans and other Presidents; and

Whereas his death, in the very prime of life, at the hands of a traitorous assassin, strikes a blow not only to our Nation but to the whole free world; and

Whereas this city, its government and all its people, out of a deep and unalterable respect for the great office of the Presidency of the Nation, and out of sincere and human sympathy for the President's wife and his children and the members of their respective families, bows with them in sorrow; and

Whereas John Fitzgerald Kennedy's death in line of duty, has wiped out, for these hours of mourning and remembrance, all temporal differences or partisan feelings and united the whole free world in regretful sorrow:

Therefore, I, Albert Boutwell, as mayor of Birmingham and by the privilege vested in that office, do proclaim, with the concurrence of the president of the City Council of Birmingham and such members of the council as I have been able to consult, and do declare that the 30 days, beginning November 22, 1963, and ending at sundown December 21, 1963, shall be for the city of Birmingham a period of mourning and respect, during which the flags of the United States flown upon public buildings and other official flagstaffs of the city shall be flown at half-mast; and, that the city hall of Birmingham, and all other of its buildings, not essential to the services of public protection, shall be closed Monday, November 25, 1963, in observance of a day of prayer for the comfort of the President's family, and the blessing and guidance of Almighty God for the newly succeeding President in his administration of the affairs of our Nation;

I hereby request the effects of this proclamation to be observed by all the boards and agencies of the city, not essential to the maintaining of necessary services to the people of this city;

I further order that a copy of this proclamation be engrossed by the city clerk of the city of Birmingham, affixing upon it the great seal of the city of Birmingham and that the same shall be forwarded to Mrs. John F. Kennedy so that the bereaved family may know the sympathy and sorrow of our city in their hour of personal grief;

And, finally, I order that copies, similarly engrossed and sealed, shall be posted, together with appropriate floral wreaths upon the principal doors of the city hall of Birmingham, and there remain until sundown, November 25, 1963.

Given under my hand at Birmingham, Ala., this 23d day of November 1963.

ALBERT BOUTWELL,
Mayor.

Attest:

JUDSON P. HODGES,
City Clerk.

STATEMENT OF THE MAYOR TO THE COUNCIL, NOVEMBER 26, 1963

Mr. President and members of the council, I wish, at this time to offer for your consideration a proposed joint resolution of the mayor and the council of the city of Birmingham.

There is no need to recall to anyone the tragic event of last Friday. Actions taken by your city government to express our deep and lasting sorrow and to condemn the senseless and inexpressably evil act of violence that took the life of President John F. Kennedy have already been conveyed to the last President's wife and widow and to the Nation.

The time of mourning that loss to ourselves and the Nation is not ended. Indeed, it will cast its shadow over a long time to come. But, mourning, as we still are, the undeniable reality of this hour is that a nation, reunited by tragedy, must now proceed upon its destiny under the leadership of the man the Nation chose, along with the martyred President, as its Vice President.

I, therefore, as mayor, offer the following resolution to the council for its concurrence, so that it may be presented to President Lyndon B. Johnson as a unanimous expression of our support and confidence as he proceeds in the tasks which destiny has thrust upon him.

"Whereas on November 22, 1963, the cowardly act of an assassin fatally struck down John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America; and

"Whereas on that same day, by virtue of his earlier election by the people as Vice President of the United States, and by the provisions of the Constitution, Lyndon Baines Johnson, after illustrious service in both Houses of the Congress and in the Vice Presidency, has now assumed the highest office and honor of Chief Executive of the Nation, and leader of the free world; and

"Whereas in the performance of that office, he has earnestly and humbly evoked the support of this Nation, and the blessing and guidance of Almighty God for its successful accomplishment: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the government of the city of Birmingham, on behalf of all its citizens of all races and creeds, That we do hereby declare our unstinting support in all that he may seek to do to accomplish what is good for this Nation, and to lead it in the paths of peace and prosperity; and be it further

"Resolved, That we convey to the President of the United States our confidence in his leadership, and in the high ideals and principles that have characterized his public actions in the past, and predict his future direction; and, finally, be it

"Resolved, That we, as a government and a people, do join our prayers with his and with the Nation and with the prayers of free peoples everywhere, that Divine Providence may counsel him in wisdom, imbue him with unfaltering strength of mind and courage, and bless him with continuous good health against all the trials that lie before him, before us as a Nation. And finally do we pray that the God of peace and good will among men, will bless this Nation, under its new leadership, with lasting peace among the nations of the earth, and the material blessings of plenty to us and all mankind."

STATE OF ALABAMA,
Jefferson County:

I, Judson P. Hodges, city clerk of the city of Birmingham, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution duly adopted by the Council of the City of Birmingham at its meeting held November 26, 1963, and as same appears of record in minute book C-1 of said city.

Given under my hand and corporate seal of the city of Birmingham, this the 26th day of November 1963.

Albert Boutwell, Mayor; John E. Bryan, Councilman; Alan T. Drennen, Jr., Councilman; John Golden, Councilman; Don A. Hawkins, Councilman; Judson P. Hodges, City Clerk; M. E. Wiggins, President of the Council; Nina Miglionieo, Councilman; Dr. Eleazer C. Overton, Councilman; George G. Seibels, Jr., Councilman; Tom W. Woods, Councilman.

RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT OF LYNDON B. JOHNSON BY CITY OF BIRMINGHAM

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the recent tragedy of the untimely death of President Kennedy has left a nation with a new leader who has had the full weight of leading the free world thrust upon his shoulders. In acknowledgment of the difficult position that President Johnson faces, the mayor of Birmingham, Ala., has issued a statement and the city council of that city has passed a resolution of comfort and support to the new President. I am inserting it in the RECORD as a further gesture of confidence in Mr. Johnson's ability to direct the high Office that he now holds.

STATEMENT OF THE MAYOR TO THE COUNCIL, NOVEMBER 26, 1963

Mr. President and members of the council, I wish, at this time, to offer for your consideration a proposed joint resolution of the mayor and the Council of the City of Birmingham.

There is no need to recall to anyone the tragic event of last Friday. Actions taken by your city government to express our deep and lasting sorrow and to condemn the senseless and inexpressably evil act of violence that took the life of President John F. Kennedy have already been conveyed to the late President's wife and widow and to the Nation.

The time of mourning that loss to ourselves and the Nation is not ended. Indeed, it will cast its shadow over a long time to come. But, mourning, as we still are, the undeniable reality of this hour is that a nation, reunited by tragedy, must now proceed upon its destiny under the leadership of the man the Nation chose, along with the martyred President, as its Vice President.

I, therefore, as mayor, offer the following resolution to the council for its concurrence, so that it may be presented to President Lyndon B. Johnson as a unanimous expression of our support and confidence as he proceeds in the tasks which destiny has thrust upon him.

I sincerely believe that almost every man, woman, and child in Birmingham, regardless of how deep their personal political feelings may run, are shocked and saddened as I am by this terrible tragedy.

I speak for the city government of Birmingham, for myself, as mayor, and for President M. E. Wiggins and his fellow council members, in expressing to the President's personal and official families the depth of the sorrow and sense of tragedy that we share with them and with the people of the United

States. In the name of the city government and the people its represents, I have sent a telegram of condolence to the President's wife and children, to express to them our sympathy in this time of their personal loss and personal grief.

Whatever forces may lie behind this terrible event, whatever persons may have inspired the striking down of a President of the United States, we can have no other feeling than one of sorrow and deep regret.

For the President's wife and children and the members of their families our hearts go out. We pray to Almighty God that He will, in His infinite compassion, comfort and strengthen them. And for the Nation we pray that divine providence will watch over and guide us in the troubled hours that will be the inevitable consequence of this sad day.

"Whereas on November 22, 1963, the cowardly act of an assassin fatally struck down John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America; and

"Whereas on that same day, by virtue of his earlier election by the people as Vice President of the United States, and by the provisions of the Constitution, Lyndon Baines Johnson, after illustrious service in both Houses of the Congress and in the Vice Presidency, has now assumed the highest office and honor of Chief Executive of the Nation, and leader of the free world; and

"Whereas in the performance of that office, he has earnestly and humbly evoked the support of this Nation, and the blessing and guidance of Almighty God for its successful accomplishment: Therefore be it

"*Resolved, by the government of the city of Birmingham, on behalf of all its citizens of all races and creeds,* That we do hereby declare our unstinting support in all that he may seek to do to accomplish what is good for this Nation, and to lead it in the paths of peace and prosperity; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That we convey to the President of the United States our confidence in his leadership, and in the high ideals and principles that have characterized his public actions in the past, and predict his future direction; and finally be it

"*Resolved,* That we, as a government and a people, do join our prayers with his and with the Nation and with the prayers of free peoples everywhere, that divine providence may counsel him in wisdom, imbue him with unfaltering strength of mind and courage, and bless him with continuous good health against all the trials that lie before him, before us as a nation. And finally do we pray that the God of peace and good will among men, will bless this Nation, under its new leadership, with lasting peace among the nations of the earth, and the material blessings of plenty to us and all mankind."

STATE OF ALABAMA,
Jefferson County:

I, Judson P. Hodges, city clerk of the city of Birmingham, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution duly adopted by the Council of the City of Birmingham at its meeting held November 26, 1963, and as same appears of record in minute book C-1 of said city.

Given under my hand and corporate seal of the city of Birmingham, this the 26th day of November 1963.

JUDSON P. HODGES,
City Clerk.

THE GIFT OF A MAN

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an address by Bishop James A. Matthews, Methodist Bishop of New England.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address by Bishop James K. Mathews, Methodist Bishop of New England, at the interdenominational service at the Washington Cathedral, Washington, D.C., Sunday, November 24, at 4 p.m., in memory of the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States:

THE GIFT OF A MAN: A PROTESTANT INTERPRETATION OF THE LIFE AND DEATH OF JOHN F. KENNEDY

(By Bishop James K. Mathews)

Today, Americans can have but one thought; for we have been present at a new crucifixion. A people who could endure the villainous murder of Medgar Evers without undue remorse; who could observe the slaughter of the innocents by a bomb in a Birmingham church and not really cry out for justice, have called for a yet more costly sacrifice that of the President of their country. Truly, then, Americans are weeping not only for him but for themselves.

We react, indeed, in anger and sorrow; but do we react sufficiently in repentance? To fail to miss the message of God in this tragic hour would be to allow yet another martyr to have died in vain.

For martyr he was, as surely as those who have died for their vision in earlier ages: a martyr at the hands of extremists of every kind, as well as at the hands of the comfortable captives of the status quo which most of us have become; a martyr to those who enjoy prejudices a century out of date, and those who refuse to live in the day which God has given to us.

To take seriously the death of a martyr is to take the meaning of that death upon ourselves. For in his mortal wound is our own hurt and the hurt of all mankind.

We are a proud, and even arrogant, people who have told ourselves that this sort of thing could not happen here. In more primitive periods of our history, yes. Among more primitive peoples even today. But not here. What could not happen has happened and it has happened to us all.

More than this, all of us have had a part in the slaying of our President. It was good people who crucified our Lord, and not merely those who acted as His executioners. By our silence, by our inaction, by our willingness that heavy burdens be borne by one man alone, by our readiness to allow evil to be called good and good evil; by our continued toleration of ancient injustices, by our failure to address ourselves to this day—by these means we all have had a part in the assassination.

In particular measure, we of the church must bear a heavy share of responsibility. For we are those who speak for God. We are His people and the sheep of His pasture. We are the Body of Christ, which bears His wounds. We are the sentinels of civilization, but we have failed to sound the alarm. We have been conformed to the social order we were supposed to have informed. Alas, the garments of the slayer are at our feet. Therefore, "the time has come for judgment to begin with the household of God."

Our Lord says: "Every one to whom much is given, of him will much be required." This word of God is a summons to accountability, just as the events of these days are a summons to accountability. For all too long now we have not been called to account; either to one another; or to the world; or to God. We have been ready to receive abundantly of God's grace, but it is when the demands of that grace are upon us that we fail to measure up.

We call this Thanksgiving Sunday, when we are supposed to acknowledge the mercy of God. It is not really a question of whether or not it is proper for us to celebrate Thanksgiving at such a tragic hour as this. The fact is that we as a people have allowed Thanksgiving, as a significant day, to be lost long ago. It has been reduced to feasting and football. It has become "a pleasant interlude between leaf raking and snow shoveling." This holiday, far from being a holy day, has become a hollow day. Having eaten our fill, and that in the midst of a hungry world, we are left with an empty feeling.

Fundamentally, we have been seized by a forgetfulness of nationwide proportions. Abraham Lincoln told a war-torn Nation in his Thanksgiving proclamation in November 1863: "We have forgotten the gracious Hand which has preserved us in peace and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us, and have vainly imagined in the deceitfulness of our hearts that all these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own. Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us."

If this was true then, how much more is it true today, exactly 100 years later. So it was that in President Kennedy's Thanksgiving proclamation of November 1963, he said: "As we express our gratitude, we must never forget that the highest appreciation is not to utter words but to live by them. Let us therefore 'proclaim our gratitude to providence for manifold blessings—let us be humbly thankful for inherited ideals—and let us resolve to share those blessings and those ideals with our fellow human beings throughout the world.'"

Yes, we have been seized by forgetfulness. No wonder we debate about our national purpose. No wonder we worry about what other nations shall think of us as a people? Is it not here that we have lost our way? We have forgotten who we are. We have forgotten whose we are. We have forgotten whence we have come. Therefore, we do not know where we are going.

"Much has been given to us," yet we have been a thoughtless and thankless people. I do not mean merely that we have been given abundant harvests and a proud heritage. These, we have come to take for granted. Rather, we have been given a man. And this man has been, in an astonishing way, a symbol of the changing world in which we live, a constant flowing river of change which has not left any part of earth untouched.

For, John Fitzgerald Kennedy represented and embodied a brandnew world. Indeed, he grasped for it by means of the image of the New Frontier, not merely as a political implement, but as a present reality. So radically has the whole climate of mankind changed that one could almost say that a person living at the beginning of this century would have been more at home in Julius Caesar's time than in our own. This cultural revolution in which we find ourselves was that for which our late President stood.

Again, he made valiant efforts to give a new sense of mission to us as a nation. This does not mean that he solved all our problems for us but that he was, by virtue of office and by deliberate intent, in the very middle of the dramatic struggles that characterize our age. This sense of mission, involving the welfare of all civilization, has scarcely ever been as well articulated as it was in his inaugural address. Nor has a more imaginative token of it been created than the Peace Corps. So it was that one Peace Corps volunteer said last Friday, "I myself am a part of the legacy he left to the world." Young Americans, in particular, seemed to catch what this man symbolized.

Moreover, he invited and encouraged a new human dignity—a freedom for man now. If this was to have meaning, through Americans, throughout the world, it had to have substance now within our own borders. Therefore, the Negro citizens, patient for a hundred years, were encouraged by President Kennedy to become a new people. That is to say, they have decided to be the free people our Constitution and the Gospel of Jesus Christ say they are. When men determine to be free, there is an unanswerable quality about their determination.

From the Hebrew-Christian perspective, all of this is the work of God. For God is a God who acts in history; indeed, who makes history and gives meaning to human events. The President saw precisely this when he declared, "Here on earth God's work must truly be our own."

We have assuredly been given much in our day, but some factors in our national life have said "No" to it all. They have said "No" to a brandnew world; "No" to national involvement in the whole process of civilization; "No" to the fulfillment now of human dignity. For all this, the high price of martyrdom has been paid. A martyr is, literally, a witness, and this is the witness we have been given.

Great gifts demand great responsibility. "For every one to whom much is given, of him will much be required." What, in the light of this sacrifice, does the Lord require of us? All humankind will be watching what we do in response, for when a people takes its own history seriously, every man's history is involved.

First of all, we, who have been forgetful are called to recollection and return. We have come to take God for granted, have tried to encase Him in the past and to capture Him in our creeds. Meanwhile, He is at work, as always, in the present orders of society.

Let us recall that we are a people by heritage dedicated to law and order and to equality under law. This was by specific intent. For 343 years ago this very week the Pilgrims landed on Cape Cod. Their navigation had been faulty, and they had missed the territory for which they had been granted authority. Some of the colonists considered that they were, therefore, under no law. Then, by deliberate act, they made themselves equal under law, by creating the Mayflower Compact. In this they promised to "covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil body politic, for our better ordering and preservation and furtherance of the ends aforesaid; and by virtue hereof to enact, constitute, and frame such just and equal laws, ordinances, acts, constitutions, and offices, from time to time, as shall be thought most meet and convenient for the general good of the colony, unto which we promise all due submission and obedience."

They were, therefore, a covenanted community: in acknowledging God, they acknowledged one another. By self-conscious promises, each held himself before God as responsible to his neighbor in a common endeavor. We are summoned by the martyrdom of our President to renew such a covenant of equity, under law, which is basic to any true community.

Secondly, in the light of this sacrifice, we are called to receive the very realities which it symbolizes. Therefore, we must embrace this new world of radical change and possibility. For it is offered to us as the gift of God.

Moreover, if this is to be a meaningful sacrifice, we are called as a people deliberately to involve ourselves in the whole enterprise of humanity. For, in a degree unparalleled in earlier centuries, we owe ourselves to the world. Merely to preserve ourselves as a nation is to lose our identity. But to give our lives in the service of total civilization is to find ourselves. For it is only in our mission together that we are a nation.

Again, in view of this martyrdom, we are called to a deepened fulfillment of the dignity of every person. There can no longer be any second-class people of any kind, anywhere. Only through acknowledging this dignity for all—without any exception—can any one of us possess dignity himself. So it is that integrity may return to us and we can be the nation we have pretended to be.

What I have said is that we have been present at a new crucifixion and that we all have, in fact, contributed to it. Our crucified Lord enables us to understand the cruciform nature of all human existence, and He endows even the most senseless event with cosmic meaning. But the Christian is not allowed to speak of crucifixion without speaking also of resurrection. This can only be realized by our embodying, as living sacrifices, that which was embodied by the one who was slain. That is to say, we are to confront life and the world with a new openness, a new awareness of our true identity and responsibility as a nation, and a new readiness to acknowledge the validity of every human being.

Finally, let us receive the torch that has been passed to a new generation of Americans. For this generation, as John Fitzgerald Kennedy himself so clearly expressed it, "would not exchange places with any other people or any other generation. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world." That never-dying torch has now been lighted by a martyr for his people. For this man not only uttered words but lived by them. "Every one to whom much is given, of him will much be required." Amen.

KENNEDY AND THE WORLD'S FAIR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which will authorize the Secretary of Commerce, under the authority delegated to him by the President's Executive Order No. 11014, to provide an appropriate exhibit of the life and career of our late President at the New York World's Fair, which opens in April 1964.

Participation by the United States in the fair is authorized by the provisions of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961. Last year we appropriated—as part of the public welfare amendments of 1962—$17 million to finance our participation. My bill provides that the Secretary, in carrying out these functions, include an appropriate memorial exhibit in honor of the late President Kennedy.

I hope that the Congress will enact this bill so that the many millions of visitors to the fair from other countries will come to know John F. Kennedy better and come to realize that he was, as President Johnson has characterized him, "a great and good man."

THE COTTON BILL: HOW IT AFFECTS CONSUMERS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on November 13, the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY, of North Carolina, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and author of the Cooley cotton bill, H.R. 6196, extended his remarks in the RECORD, page 21784.

He responded to a statement I had made concerning the bill on November 8.

It was clear that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] contends the bill will benefit American consumers. In fact, his remarks were captioned, "The Cotton Bill: A $500 Million-Plus Gain for American Consumers."

In his remarks he declared:

> Mr. Speaker, the greatest benefactor under this legislation will be the American consumer. Americans will enjoy lower prices for American-made cotton goods, at savings amounting to more than $500 million a year—it was shown to our committee that a rise or fall in the cost of cotton is almost invariably and completely accompanied by a rise or fall of the same degree in cotton cost prices. The Department of Commerce established this as a fact in the hearings of our committee.

Perhaps the gentleman was led to this conclusion by comparisons between the price of raw cotton and "gray cloth," a nonconsumer item which emerges only a short distance from raw cotton in the manufacturing process. Due to this proximity, it is not surprising that gray cloth prices follow raw cotton closely. A chart showing this comparison appears on page 10 of the committee report accompanying H.R. 6196.

A reader who mistakenly thinks of gray cloth as a typical cotton product for consumers might assume that consumer prices go up and down together with remarkable precision.

Perhaps this was the case with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

In any event, the chart does not tell the whole story. Indeed, its incompleteness is misleading.

The price history of retail cotton products is readily available from the Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA, the same office from which the gray cloth-raw cotton comparison came.

At my request, the AMS supplied me with average composite retail cost of 25 products—expressed in terms of 1 pound of cotton—for the period 1935–63. Most of this information appeared in the USDA's Marketing Research Report No. 277, published in 1958. The selection of the 25 typical products, of course, was made by the USDA, not by myself.

The period covered by this information does not reach back quite as far as the chart on page 10 of the committee report, but it goes far enough to refute the generalization repeated by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley]:

> That a rise or fall in the cost of cotton is almost invariably and completely accompanied by a rise or fall of the same degree in cotton cost prices.

I present below this information, listing first the retail cost in dollars of the composite cotton products, and second the average farm value of raw cotton. Farm value is based on average prices of cotton in central markets less one-half cent per pound estimated to be the difference between central-market price and price received by farmers.

It is clear at a glance that retail prices do not rise and fall precisely with raw cotton. You will even observe periods in which raw cotton went down while retail prices rose, and vice versa.

Cotton products: Average composite retail cost of 25 products (expressed in terms of 1 pound of cotton), and average farm value

Year	Retail cost	Average farm value
1935	$0.91	$0.12
1936	.91	.12
1937	.95	.11
1938	.89	.08
1939	.88	.09
1940	.89	.10
1941	.98	.13
1942	1.22	.18
1943	1.29	.19
1944	1.37	.20
1945	1.50	.22
1946	1.84	.29
1947	2.17	.33
1948	2.20	.33
1949	1.98	.30
1950	2.03	.35
1951	2.24	.41
1952	2.14	.38
1953	2.13	.32
1954	2.08	.33
1955	2.07	.34
1956	2.10	.33
1957	2.12	.32
1958	2.11	.32
1959	2.12	.31
1960	2.17	.30
1961	2.19	.31
1962	2.15	.33
1963 [1]	2.17	.33

[1] 1st half of year.

This morning I distributed to each Member a duplicated sheet showing this data graphically. Unfortunately graphs cannot be published in these remarks, so I present the table instead.

In a brief search of legislative history, I find some expert testimony which denies that retail prices necessarily respond to changes in raw material costs.

For example, in the 84th Congress, consideration was given to H.R. 12, a proposal to restore 90 percent of parity price supports on basic farm commodities, including cotton. The committee report, emerging from the committee chaired then, as now, by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley] called attention to the fact that "a $4 dress shirt contains less than 30 cents worth of cotton."

On October 4, 1962, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley] inserted a statement in the Record in which he said:

> From 1950 to 1960 the price of a pound loaf of bread rose by nearly 7 cents—the price the farmer received for the wheat in that loaf of bread actually dropped.

In a speech printed in the Record on September 1, 1960, my chairman made this report:

> As one illustration of how the farmer and the middleman have fared, I refer to an official Department of Agriculture report which shows that from 1948 to 1958 the cost of wheat and other ingredients in a loaf of bread declined 12 percent at the farm, while processing and marketing margins for the loaf increased 55 percent. Thus, in the 10-year period, the cost of the loaf of white bread increased from 13.9 to 19.3 cents, on a national average, while the price received by the farmer for a bushel of wheat declined from $1.98 to $1.72.

On March 24, 1958, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley] inserted a statement in the Record, as follows:

> Now let us look specifically at the relationship of farm price to consumer price in these two commodities.
>
> In 1952 milk prices were supported at 90 percent of parity and the average price of a quart of fresh milk in grocery stores throughout the country was 22.8 cents. In 1957 the support had been reduced to 83 percent of parity (actually 76 percent of parity as computed in 1952), and the retail price of milk had risen to 24.3 cents a quart.
>
> Now look at wheat. Department of Agriculture figures show that in January 1948, the farm price of wheat reached a peak of $2.81 a bushel, and the average price of a one pound loaf of bread at that time was 13.8 cents. In 1955, the farm price of wheat had dropped to $2.14 a bushel, and the average price of a loaf of bread had increased to 17½ cents. Thus while the price of wheat declined 24 percent, the price of bread advanced 27 percent. In 1952, wheat was supported at 90 percent of parity of $2.20 a bushel and the average price of a loaf of bread was 16 cents. In 1957, with wheat at $2 a bushel, the average price of a loaf of bread was 18.8 cents. For the wheat in an 18.8 cents loaf of bread, the farmer gets somewhere between 2.6 and 3.2 cents.
>
> These figures substantiate completely that another cut in the farm prices of milk and wheat will mean simply that $250 million will be taken away from dairymen in 1958, and more than $200 million from wheat producers, and all these millions will be absorbed by middlemen between the farmers and the consumers. Consumers will derive no price benefit whatsoever.

It would be ridiculous to argue, on the basis of what the gentleman from North Carolina has presented, that lower raw material prices mean higher consumer prices. He does not make such a contention, and neither do I.

However, it is equally unrealistic to argue, as the gentleman has been arguing recently on the cotton bill that lower raw material costs will yield an equal drop in consumer prices.

It is fantastic to predict that an increased tax outlay of $250 million for the cotton program will yield a $500 million-plus gain for the consumer. That is picking up more than a $2 gain for each $1 outlay.

Such conclusions certainly fly in the face of the gentleman from North Carolina's statements in 1958, 1960, and 1962 on consumer-raw material prices. They also fly in the face of the official figures reported by the Department of Agriculture.

Another distinguished member of the Committee on Agriculture recently commented on the relationship between raw commodity prices and consumer prices. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage], during the 86th Congress, issued a statement on farm problems in the form of a committee print. In it he declared:

> The tremendous loss which farmers have sustained in the way of low prices for their products in recent years has not been passed on to consumers.

Here is the gentleman from Texas' [Mr. Poage] comment on this subject:

> Let us see just what effect the price of wheat has had on the cost of bread. Just 12 years ago wheat sold as high as $2.81 a bushel. At that time bread sold for a little less than 14 cents a pound. The price of wheat has continued to drop until today the average market price is about $1.80—a drop of approximately one-third in what the farmer received for wheat. During that same period of time, the price of bread has not gone down at all but has gone up to 20 cents a pound—an increase of nearly 50 percent. Certainly, there is no justification for blaming the farmer with the high cost of bread.
>
> The same sort of situation exists in regard to milk. Twelve years ago farmers were receiving 11.3 cents for a quart of milk, which was retailing for 21.1 cents. Today farmers get just 11.1 cents for that quart of milk, but consumers are paying 25.1 cents. Certainly, I don't mean to say that the lower farm prices go, the higher consumers' costs will be, but I do mean to say that the record shows rather clearly that the tremendous loss which farmers have sustained in the way of low prices for their products in recent years has not been passed on to consumers—and if low farm prices don't help consumers, why should Government try to lower them?

No one can accurately predict the effect on consumer prices of a bill like H.R. 6196.

THE STATUE OF FREEDOM ON THE CAPITOL DOME

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Schadeberg] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, today is the 100th anniversary of one of America's most important symbols—the symbol of man's highest aspiration—freedom. Down through the centuries, men have braved the unknown and uncharted seas; have faced the trials of the wilderness; have given up their earthly possessions; have set aside material security; have laid their own lives on the sacrificial block; that this precious right derived as a gift from the eternal Creator would not be corrupted by the self-seeking, power-mad opportunists whose passion it is to wield the scepter of power over the lives of individuals and nations.

Exactly 100 years ago today, December 2, 1863, at precisely the hour this House convened today—12 o'clock noon—the final segment of Freedom Statue which tops the dome of this great Capitol Building and dominates the entire area was lifted off the ground by means of the steam hoisting apparatus which had been successfully used for construction of the entire dome. Twenty minutes later the head and crown was moved to its place and firmly attached to the body of the figure, 300 feet in the air. It was adjusted. The American flag was unfurled over its head and the national salute of 35 guns was fired from a field battery on Capitol Hill. The last gun from this salute was answered by a similar salute from the 12 forts which at that time of Civil War constituted a line of fortifications surrounding the city of Washington.

I invite my colleagues to take special note of this symbol that tops the Capitol dome as they leave the House today and as they come here for sessions of this body. I urge those who visit their Capital City to make a special effort to pause and view this important historic monument as a first on their list of musts to see.

Whether against a clear blue cloudless sky on a crisp autumn day, or a white and pink puffed sky in summer; whether it is seen in the haze of the early morning serving to catch the first ray of a rising sun in early spring, or reflects the light of a setting sun in a fading summer evening; whether the air be hot or chilled, in rain and in sunshine, Freedom Statue stands as a silent sentinel to help all who view it from near or afar to remember that America is richly blessed above all nations with that priceless possession—freedom. For those who may not be in possession of the official information regarding the statue, the following, I am sure, will be of great interest:

Statue of Freedom

The statue surmounting the dome of the U.S. Capitol, and facing to the east, is officially known as the Statue of Freedom. It is 19 feet 6 inches high, weighs 14,985 pounds and cost, exclusive of erecting in place, $23,796.82.

The figure is that of a woman clad in flowing draperies with her right hand resting upon the hilt of a sheathed sword and her left holding a wreath and grasping a shield. At the waist, a broach bearing the letters "U.S." holds the drapery in place. The head is covered by a helmet encircled with stars and surmounted by a crest composed of an eagle's head and a bold arrangement of feathers, suggested by the costume of our Indian tribes.

As a protection from lightning, 10 bronze points, tipped with platinum, are placed as follows: one on the head; six on the feathers in the headdress; one on each shoulder; and one on the shield.

The statue was designed by Thomas Crawford, father of F. Marion Crawford, the novelist, and the plaster model for which he received $3,000 was executed in the Crawford studios in Rome. Mr. Crawford died in 1857 before the model was shipped from his studio. Shipment was subsequently made on April 19, 1858, on the bark *Emily Taylor*. The bark, having sprung a leak, put into Gibraltar for repairs after which the voyage was resumed. Encountering stormy weather, leaks again developed and part of the cargo, such as bales of rags and cases of citron, was thrown overboard, but on the 27th of July, the leak having increased to such an extent, it was determined for safety to put into Bermuda. Upon surveys held, the vessel was condemned and sold. The cargo, which had been landed and stored, was finally forwarded to its destination as indicated in the records, which show that in December 1858 Tappan and Starbuch of New York, acting as general agents for the United States in the receipt and forwarding of the statuary, notified Captain Meigs, in charge of the work at the Capitol, that the bark *G. W. Horton*, from Bermuda, had arrived with some of the statuary on board. It was not possible to bring all of the statuary, and as late as March 30, 1859, the last of the statuary, or portions of the model, were shipped from New York to Washington by the schooner *Statesman*.

The contract for casting the statue in bronze was awarded to Clark Mills, whose foundry was located near Bladensburg which lies just northeast of the District of Columbia. On May 17, 1861, on account of the existing conditions due to the Civil War, Captain Meigs, Superintendent of Construction of the U.S. Capitol, issued orders to stop work on the statue.

The annual report of Thomas U. Walter, Architect of the Capitol Extension, dated November 1, 1862, states that "the Statue of Freedom, which is intended as the crowning feature of the dome, is completed, and removed to the grounds east of the Capitol, where it has been placed on a temporary pedestal, in order that the public may have an opportunity to examine it before it is raised to its destined position."

The hour of 12 m. December 2, 1863, was selected for the completion of the erection of the statue in place on the dome. Four of the sections had been previously raised to their places and firmly secured to the structure, leaving the fifth section, embracing the head and shoulders, to constitute the crowning feature, the hoisting and adjusting of which was the occasion of a Special Order No. 248 of the War Department which provided that at the moment at which a flag was displayed from the statue, a national salute of 35 guns should be fired from a field battery on Capitol Hill, the last gun from this salute to be answered by a similar salute from the 12 forts which at that time constituted a line of fortifications surrounding the city of Washington.

Precisely at 12 m. on the aforesaid 2d day of December 1863, the crowning feature of the statue was started from the ground in front of the Capitol by means of the steam hoisting apparatus which had been successfully used for the construction of the entire dome and in 20 minutes it reached the height of 300 feet, when it was moved to its place and firmly attached to the remaining portion of the figure; as soon as it was adjusted, the American flag was unfurled over its head and the national salute was fired.

The original plaster model from which the bronze statue was cast is now on exhibition in the old building of the National Museum in Washington, D.C.

The freedom statue should remind us and the world of the multitudes who, with their lives—in peace and in war—have made freedom meaningful. These include not only Presidents and other high Government officials but men and women serving in office at every level of government; the schoolboy who writes his thesis on "What America Means to Me"; the young lady who marches with her Girl Scout troop, proudly carrying the flag of her country; the mother who rears her child with a love for freedom with responsibility; the dad who works to support his family, who looks ever beyond each day that he might grasp the opportunity to do greater things; the preacher, priest, and rabbi who serve their countrymen in the name of the Almighty, reminding them it is God who has endowed them with the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; the soldier standing guard on a lonely outpost; the sailor braving the perils of the sea—words cannot begin to name the multitude of citizens who swell the mighty chorus of those who have made freedom ours and who today, unsung yet willing, keep us free.

Let not this day pass without noting that those who had occupied this historic place of responsibility and authority not only were strongly aware of where they had been and from whence they came—but they faced without flinching the responsibilities that confronted them in their day and met them at whatever cost, because they placed their own conscience and sense of duty above life itself. This symbol of freedom which they placed atop the Capitol dome is evidence, too, that in the midst of struggle and pain and suffering they looked forward with hope and faith, confident that God, having a stake in the destiny of this free Nation, would preserve it and keep it.

Our Nation lives because God lives in the hearts and lives of its citizens. While life itself requires sacrifice, I am confident that the people of the United States will not be found wanting in the future as they have not been found wanting in the past when the right demanded their all.

PLEDGE OF SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Foreman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express the heartsickness and sorrow of west Texans and Americans everywhere over the incredible and shocking tragedy that occurred on Friday, November 22. We all mourn this terrible tragedy that brought death to our President and painful injury to our Governor. Our warmest and most sincere sympathies are felt for Mrs. Kennedy, her children, and the family. Our prayers are with the Kennedy family and also, with our Texas Governor, John Connally and his family.

Mr. Speaker, our hopes, prayers, and support are with our new and able President, Lyndon Johnson, in the trying days ahead. We pledge our strength and support in joining with him in picking up the reins of Government and carrying on in the manner in which we know, he and we, are capable. May God's love, grace, and mercy be with President Johnson, the Members of Congress, and all Americans as we face the challenge before us.

JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION TO UNDERGO FIRST TEST ON CUBA IN VENEZUELA DEMAND FOR OAS MEETING TO CONSIDER SANCTIONS AGAINST CUBA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CRAMER**. Mr. Speaker, the first real test of the determination and decisiveness of the administration of President Johnson on the Cuba question comes tomorrow when Venezuela, with proof positive of Cuba's armed intervention in the recent elections there, asks for a meeting of the foreign ministers of the Western Hemisphere nations in the OAS to consider sanctions against Cuba under the Rio Treaty of 1947.

It is my earnest hope that the United States will take a leadership role in calling for the imposition of sanctions against Cuba's Communists who have been caught "Red handed," so to speak, with their weapons on the beach of Paraguana, some 3 tons of it, inciting riots and violence in an effort to create an atmosphere of chaos that could have resulted in the invalidation of the election through the imposition of martial law, had it succeeded.

The arms were traced to a Belgian national arms factory that provided the list of the numbers of weapons provided for the Cuban Army which matched the serial numbers on the weapons found on the beach in Venezuela.

The Rio Treaty provides for sanctions against Cuba in such a case, including the breaking off of diplomatic relations, complete cutoff of all trade—including flow of subversives—all communications and even the use of armed force. Today five Latin countries continue to recognize Cuba: Mexico, Chile, Brazil, Bolivia, and Uruguay.

I have been calling for the demand, by the United States, that these nations withdraw recognition but no effort to accomplish this has been made by our State Department. Little has been done in preventing the flow of subversives to and from Cuba. Too little has been accomplished in cutting off trade—even between our allies and Cuba. Even these steps short of the use of armed force have not been taken.

It is my hope that the Johnson administration will back up this demand for a meeting of the foreign ministers as proposed by Venezuela and that we will at last give the OAS the needed leadership in imposing sanctions to cut off the threat of communism from Cuba.

This is the first major test of the ability of the new administration to meet the challenge of Communist growth in this hemisphere and in dealing with the Cuban challenge. The entire world will be watching to measure the determination of the United States under its new leadership. Now is the time to let the world know of our will to win against the Communist menace in this hemisphere.

Following are two articles on this subject which appeared in the December 2, 1963, issue of the Washington Daily News:

A NEW TEST FOR SOLVING CUBA POSER

(By Virginia Prewett)

Venezuela's request for Organization of American States action under the Rio Treaty against Castro's Cuba for aggression and subversive attack is no more a parochial hemisphere crisis than was Castro's power seizure in Cuba.

This is the beginning of a test of Russian and United States positions. The test will determine whether Russia means to exact as the price of the tenuous existing detente a free hand on the Central and South American land mass. It will determine whether the United States believes Latin America is expendable.

Venezuela now gives the United States an opportunity to solve the Cuban problem at the insistence of a Latin American complainant invoking a treaty that binds all New World governments. This is an open and honorable path, in many ways far less dangerous than the inside plotting against Castro that has gone on in U.S. official circles for months past.

CLEANUP CHANCE

It gives the United States a chance to clean up the Caribbean in support of a Latin American nation that is an example of democratic reform. If there is to be any peace, then our Government must surely stand for the rule of law and of recognized international treaties established to maintain peace. This was the prime purpose of the Rio instrument.

If our helmsmen are timid and boggle this chance, the effects will be tremendously far reaching. For our treaty obligations under the Rio instrument are every bit as solemn and legal and binding as our NATO obligations. They are as binding as the Moscow test ban treaty.

President Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela has voiced a grim truth: So long as Castro's Cuba exists, Latin America will be under unbearable Communist subversive attack. He asks for the threat to be eradicated the only way it can be—with the elimination of Communist Cuba.

THE FINE PRINT

The U.S. State Department appears to support the Venezuelan position. But the fine print shows that our officials, while admitting that Venezuela has caught Cuban subversion red handed, speak of "increasing vigilance" around Cuba. This is quite different from eradicating the evil at its source.

Washington assures Latin America that we keep strict surveillance over Cuba. This rings hollow in face of the Castro-armed terror in Venezuela and in Colombia and elsewhere.

Many U.S. leaders, more familiar with Europe or Asia, regard Latin America as a sideshow. If Washington pushes this fatal weakness too far, we shall find ourselves isolated in a sea of broken alliances, broken treaties, and hostile neighbors controlled from Moscow.

ARMS ISSUE RAISED: OAS PLANS MEETING ON CASTRO

(By Richard H. Boyce)

For the fifth time since Fidel Castro came to power in Cuba, the rest of the hemisphere is considering a high-level conference on what to do about him.

None of the previous meetings has had much effect. Now Venezuela wants the council of the Organization of American States to call a meeting of foreign ministers of the hemisphere nations.

Venezuela, long a prime target of Communist Cuba's terrorism and subversion, wants the meeting because she discovered a cache of 3 tons of arms and ammunition on Paraguana Beach, some 350 miles northwest of Caracas.

The cache included Belgian-made rifles.

PROOF

Venezuela says Cuba put the arms there, and calls this an act of aggression. The United States said modern electronic techniques were used on the arms here to bring out markings, and proved Venezuela's claim.

The Belgian national arms factory clinched it by providing a list of serial numbers of weapons the factory made for the Cuban Army.

Fnding the arms is the first real proof the Castro regime is shipping munitions to Castroites in other Latin American countries, though this has long been regarded as true.

Tomorrow the OAS meets to consider Venezuela's charge and decide whether to order a Foreign Ministers' Conference.

STEP BY STEP

It would take only a majority of the 20 OAS members to call such a conference. But the Ministers' Conference would need a two-thirds vote to take action against Castro.

What action could it take?

Venezuela wants the Conference to be held under the 1947 Rio Treaty.

This spells out steps the hemisphere can adopt—recall of ambassadors from Havana, breakoff of diplomatic and consular relations, complete cutoff of all trade and communications and the use of armed force.

The Foreign Ministers' Conference held in Punta del Este, Uruguay, in January 1962, kicked Castro's regime out of the inter-American family of nations, and suspended trade in arms.

But that action did not make any breakoff mandatory. Five Latin countries still have diplomatic ties with Cuba—Mexico, Chile, Brazil, Bolivia, and Uruguay.

Under the Rio Treaty, breaking ties would be mandatory.

Diplomatic observers here speculate finding of the arms cache is such serious proof of Castro's work that even these five countries might vote for some Rio Treaty sanctions.

But no one expects a ministers' conference to vote the use of armed force. Armed force is not obligatory on member nations under the Rio Treaty.

THE CENTAUR PROGRAM

The **SPEAKER**. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. **MILLER** of California. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday afternoon, November 27, 1963, America's space program achieved another first. A new kind of launch vehicle, called Centaur, was successfully fired from Cape Canaveral, now known as Cape Kennedy. That launching was significant for a number of reasons.

To begin with, Centaur is the first booster in America's stable of launch vehicles that uses liquid hydrogen fuel. Hydrogen has long been recognized as a fuel with great promise for it offers significant performance advantages over conventional propellants for rocket use. Liquid hydrogen, however, is hard to handle, and harnessing it for space missions involves development of a whole new technology.

Virtually all upper stages of large space vehicles under development during the next decade, both chemical and nuclear, will be designed to take advantage of the unique properties of liquid hydrogen. Centaur, therefore, provides the Space Agency with an indispensable research and development tool, with which our scientists are learning liquid hydrogen technology.

In addition, NASA plans to use the Centaur launch vehicle for a variety of space missions, the most urgent of which is the unmanned exploration of the moon with a spacecraft called Surveyor; this is a necessary preliminary to the Apollo manned lunar landing program.

Major elements of NASA's planetary science program also depend upon the Centaur launch vehicle, with its inherent ability to project larger payloads to the planets.

We members of the Committee on Science and Astronautics are particularly pleased at Centaur's first successful flight, following a long history of technical difficulties, delays, and reassignments of responsibility.

In order to throw a little light on some of the problems encountered in the program, I want to give a brief review of Centaur's unusual history.

The Centaur program dates back to the summer of 1958, when a proposal by General Dynamics/Astronautics to develop a liquid hydrogen-liquid oxygen upper stage for the Atlas rocket was accepted by the advanced research projects agency of the Department of Defense.

During its first year or so, Centaur was not a launch vehicle development program in any real sense. The initial contract did not even provide for development of a guidance system. No missions or payload capabilities were specified. The program was conceived as a feasibility study, simply to demonstrate the use of liquid hydrogen as a rocket fuel.

Funding during the early phases of the program was low, and ARPA directed that no interference with the Atlas ICBM program would be permitted. Moreover, off-the-shelf equipment and existing Atlas tooling and technology were required to be used as fully as possible in fabricating Centaur. This is an important point, for it was later discovered that some of the Atlas fabrication techniques were not effective in building tanks for the supercold and highly volatile liquid hydrogen. Taming liquid hydrogen has turned out to be much more difficult than anyone had supposed at the outset.

From this modest beginning, the Centaur program moved gradually toward the status of a full-fledged booster development program. Its first assignment was the synchronous orbit satellite mission and this gave Centaur a payload goal. Later, lunar and planetary exploration missions were assigned to Centaur.

In the meantime, management responsibility for the program went from ARPA to the Air Force. Then, following the passage of the Space Act of 1958, and the creation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Centaur program was officially transferred from the Defense Department to NASA in July 1959.

The Marshall Space Flight Center, already committed to the Saturn program, was given primary responsibility for the Centaur program. Because of Marshall's preoccupation with Saturn, the Air Force technical and contract management teams continued actual supervision of Centaur.

Last year, following the failure of the first flight test, the program was reassigned to NASA's Lewis Research Center in Cleveland.

In summary, Centaur began as a low-priority, financially austere feasibility study, in competition with high priority defense programs. As its importance to the national space effort became more apparent, its terms of reference were changed; and, as time passed, its inherent technical difficulties came to the surface; technical difficulties, I might add, that we have learned to expect in most new programs.

Certainly, the original flight schedule of Centaur was overly optimistic. Hindsight also tells us that the complexity of the program was greatly underestimated.

These facts have combined to make for a history of delay, disappointment, and frustration in the Centaur program.

Shortly after the failure of the first flight test in May 1962, I directed the Subcommittee on Space Sciences, under the able chairmanship of Congressman JOSEPH E. KARTH, to hold hearings on Centaur. The report of the subcommittee was critical of NASA management, as well as the performance of the prime contractor. I am pleased to be able to tell the House today that officials of both organizations have stated to us that the committee's investigation was an important factor in getting the Centaur program on the right track.

The subcommittee recommended, among other things, that consideration be given to assigning the Nation's highest priority to Centaur. Soon thereafter, NASA assigned the DX priority to this essential program.

In addition, many changes have since been made in the management of the program, both by NASA and by the prime contractor. Centaur now has a supporting organization consistent with its importance to the Nation's space effort.

Under the expert supervision of Dr. Abe Silverstein, Director of NASA's Lewis Research Center, the Centaur vehicle has been subjected to the most rigorous and thorough ground testing procedures. Several innovations have been introduced into the program; many new fabrication techniques have been developed, and novel prelaunch procedures have been adopted.

I recently visited the Lewis Center, as several other members of our committee have. Only 2 weeks ago, the facilities of General Dynamics/Astronautics, the prime contractor for Centaur, were inspected by members of our committee. We have all been impressed with the magnitude of the difficulties which have been overcome in this highly complex undertaking. We have been equally impressed with the sound and orderly manner in which the Centaur program is now being pursued. I am sure I speak for all those members when I say we are confident that Centaur is on its way to becoming a great success.

Not too long ago, the press was filled with stories to the effect that $100 million was wasted in the Centaur program. This figure was based on a report to the Science and Astronautics Committee by the Comptroller General which I had specifically requested.

That report was misinterpreted by the press, and a closer look at it will reveal that no such conclusion was drawn by the Comptroller General. The alleged $100 million waste included $76 million reportedly lost in the Advent project, the military communications satellite project.

Interesting enough, the Advent project, like Centaur, came under the scrutiny of our committee during the 2d session of the 87th Congress. We had received reports that Advent was in trouble, and I directed the Karth subcommittee to look into it.

The report on Advent concluded that this program was a poor example of effective interservice cooperation, and that the failure of full cooperation accounted, at least in part, for the fact that over $170 million had been spent on Project Advent, and the Nation had very little to show for it.

Dr. Harold Brown, Director of Defense Research and Engineering, testified that the Advent satellite, designed in 1958, was obsolete in 1962. Our investigation also revealed that the Advent satellite, originally designed to weigh about 1,000 pounds, ended up weighing almost 1,400 pounds—far in excess of Centaur's most optimistic predicted payload capability for the synchronous orbit.

While there can be no doubt that certain programs incurred losses because of the unavailability of Centaur on schedule, it is incorrect and unfair to attribute the entire unrecoverable loss associated with the Advent program to Centaur, as the press apparently did. Suffice it to say that the Advent project had its own severe management and technical difficulties which led to its cancellation in June 1962.

In conclusion, let me say that we have felt free to criticize NASA when criticism seemed to be indicated. More than that, we believe it was our duty. On the other hand, we are glad for an opportunity to praise, when praise has been earned.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the successful flight of Centaur represents a significant advance in the development of a new technology upon which much of America's future space effort depends. The importance of this first step toward the harnessing of hydrogen to do man's work in space can hardly be overestimated. Last week's achievement notably advances the state of the art in chemical rockets.

I believe we should all take this opportunity to extend our congratulations to Mr. James E. Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and his entire organization.

I also want to recognize the competence of the prime contractors, General Dynamics/Astronautics and the Pratt & Whitney Engine Co. These companies, working as a team, have given America a new breakthrough in its exploration of outer space.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. **WEAVER**. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of my committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], for yielding to me.

CENTAUR—FAILURE FOLLOWED BY SUCCESS

I join with my chairman, the distinguished gentleman from California, in the congratulations upon the successful Centaur flight vehicle of November 27, 1963. Centaur is an integral part of our total space program and upon its success depends subsequent stages.

It might be well for us at this time to look back upon the unsuccessful Atlas-Centaur flight vehicle on May 8, 1962. The Comptroller General of the United States in a report—March 1963—upon request of the distinguished Chairman MILLER, of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, made the following summary of its findings:

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A special NASA Board of Inquiry, established to investigate the cause of failure of the first Atlas-Centaur flight vehicle on May 8, 1962, found that, regardless of any other possible causes, the vehicle was doomed to failure because the Centaur weather shield was not designed to withstand the pressure loads which acted upon it. The Board noted that failure of the weather shield could have been predicted on the basis of pressure distribution data furnished in September 1960 to NASA and GD/A personnel responsible for Centaur. Whether NASA or GD/A should have anticipated the failure is a matter of technical opinion.

We were advised that the NASA Centaur project office in California did not have sufficient staff available to permit a detailed review of pressure distribution data. Although the Centaur project office was then under the authority of the Marshall Space Flight Center (MSFC), we found no evidence that the data were submitted to MSFC for review. It appears that, because of MSFC's extensive experience and reputation in rocket design and development, MSFC possessed a sufficient and competent staff to have reviewed the weather shield design and the data in adequate detail.

Although the responsibility for adequately designing the Centaur vehicle lies primarily with the contractor, we believe that the inadequate participation by NASA in the technical aspects of the Centaur structural development greatly enhanced the chances that the improper design in the weather shield region would be overlooked. (See p. 42.)

DAMAGE OF ABOUT $1.2 MILLION AT P & WA TEST STANDS AND RESULTING DELAY PROBABLY WOULD HAVE BEEN PREVENTED IF STANDARD SAFETY DEVICES HAD BEEN INSTALLED

In November 1960 and January 1961, three explosions which cost the Government about $1.2 million occurred at P & WA's Florida Research and Development Center. Although automatic abort equipment designed to prevent explosions had been in general use in rocket engine test facilities at other locations for several years, it was not installed at the P & WA test stands on which Centaur engines were tested until after the third explosion.

The information obtained by us indicates that both the Air Force and MSFC had sufficient previous experience in the practical use of automatic abort systems to have required the installation of such systems at the P & WA test stands. Also, it would seem that P & WA had a responsibility to develop and furnish suitable automatic abort equipment in accordance with prevailing safety standards for rocket test stands. NASA and P & WA have stated that automatic abort systems would probably have prevented explosions such as those which occurred at P & WA. It appears that the risk of monetary losses and program delays involved in not providing automatic abort systems was unreasonably high.

OVERSTATEMENT OF PAYLOAD CAPACITY TO DOD CONTRIBUTED TO COSTLY DELAY IN CANCELING THE ADVENT SPACECRAFT

One of the principal reasons for canceling the Advent[1] in May 1962 was the ever-increasing, unfavorable disparity between the payload capacity of the Atlas-Centaur launch vehicle and the weight of the Advent spacecraft which was being developed by the Department of Defense (DOD). The payload capacity of the Atlas-Centaur decreased and the weight of the Advent increased. In our opinion, NASA, upon becoming increasingly aware that GD/A's payload computations for the Atlas-Centaur were in error, did not take adequate measures to provide the best available payload information to DOD. As a result, we believe that NASA contributed to unnecessarily prolonging development of the Advent for which funds were being expended at a rate of $4 million a month.

NASA officials agree that neither GD/A nor NASA had fully adequate control over payload computations. They stated also that GD/A, since it changed its management in February 1962 to a project-type organization, has forwarded much better information on Atlas-Centaur payload capabilities. NASA informed us further that its employees have now been assigned to review the accuracy of payload quotations on a day-to-day basis.

THERE WAS A DELAY IN ASCERTAINING AND IMPLEMENTING REQUIREMENTS FOR A FLIGHT TERMINATION SYSTEM

Although the Air Force published requirements for an independent flight termination system in April 1960, NASA did not approve GD/A's proposal for a system or did not authorize its incorporation into the Atlas-Centaur until February 1962. The Centaur project office had requested GD/A to submit a proposal for the system in September 1961, following a delayed but unsuccessful attempt by GD/A to obtain a waiver of the requirements.

In February 1962, GD/A estimated that the delays in ascertaining and implementing range safety requirements would result in postponement of the second Atlas-Centaur flight for about 15 weeks. Also, the delay had the effect of NASA's assuming too high a payload capability for the Atlas-Centaur. Although the flight is now delayed for other reasons, we believe that the belated actions by NASA and GD/A are illustrations of deficiencies in the Centaur management practices.

USE OF CONTRACTOR PERSONNEL BY THE NASA PLANT REPRESENTATIVE WAS NOT PROPER

The NASA plant representative at GD/A had been utilizing contractor personnel as secretaries for various periods since August 1960 in contravention of the general rule that purely personal services for the Government are required to be performed by Federal personnel under Government supervision. The GD/A employees were utilized for confidential NASA work while under the supervision and administrative control of GD/A personnel. The NASA plant representative at GD/A stated that after January 1, 1963, he would make no further use of GD/A secretaries. The NASA representative at P. & W.A. informed us that he also uses contractor personnel to augment his secretarial staff.

In our opinion the use of the contractor's secretaries does not provide the safeguards necessary to prevent unauthorized disclosure of confidential NASA information to such contractor.

UNNECESSARY FEE WAS ALLOWED GD/A FOR SUPPORT OF ATLAS PROPULSION SYSTEM

Although the Air Force contracts directly with the Rocketdyne Division of North American Aviation, Inc. (Rocketdyne), to provide field service support to all users of the Atlas booster, NASA contracted with GD/A for estimated costs of $110,000 and a fee of $7,150 to provide such services for Atlas-Centaur vehicles through a subcontract with Rocketdyne. In our opinion the services should be provided under the existing Air Force contract thus eliminating the payment of a fee to GD/A.

The subcontract between GD/A and Rocketdyne expires on June 30, 1963. If an expanded Atlas-Centaur flight program should require additional field service support, the amount of the unneccessary fee to GD/A would probably be increased. While no decision has been made, NASA officials informed us that the GD/A subcontract with Rocketdyne could still be canceled.

AIR FORCE PROVIDED UNREALISTIC LAUNCH DATES UNDER FOLLOW-ON CENTAUR CONTRACT

Initial launch dates for Atlas-Centaur vehicles Nos. 7 through 10 were known to the Air Force and GD/A to be unrealistic when incorporated into the Air Force follow-on contract AF 04(647)-815 with GD/A. The contract provided for the same launch dates for vehicles 7 and 8 that had been established for vehicles 5 and 6 under contract AF 18(600)-1775. Only one launch pad was available for Atlas-Centaur launches and at least 2 months' preparation at the pad was required to launch a single vehicle. We believe that the practice of establishing an unrealistic launch schedule tends to deemphasize to a contractor the importance and urgency of meeting time requirements under contractual agreements.

PROGRAM TO CLEAN UP AND STREAMLINE CONTRACTS DID NOT GENERALLY RESULT IN IMPROVEMENT OF CONTRACTING PROCEDURES

During the hearings before the Subcommittee on Space Sciences of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics in May 1962 on the Centaur program, NASA officials stated that on January 1, 1962, the Centaur project office had been transferred from Los Angeles to Huntsville and that the Air Force contracts had been converted to NASA contracts "in a program to clean up and streamline the administration of the project." We found no evidence that NASA had taken such action with respect to contracts with GD/A. Only one of the two contracts with P. & W.A. for engines had been rewritten to consolidate into one document most of the prior contract changes.

Although it appeared as of January 1963 that NASA had taken steps to strengthen contract procedures, the procedures which existed through calendar year 1962 did not, in our opinion, assure prompt and adequate contractual coverage.

Mr. Speaker, although there has been slippage in the program it now appears that we have the first successful Atlas-Centaur flight vehicle. It is a pioneer in the field where hydrogen propellant will be utilized. This two-stage launch vehicle takes advantage of the high-energy characteristics of hydrogen as a fuel and is therefore ready to perform more complex deep space missions for the United States. Later on hydrogen will be the fuel for the upper stages of Saturn I, I-B, and V which will be five vehicles as well as NERVA—nuclear engine for rocket vehicle applications. Its capability of lifting some 8,000 pounds of scientific equipment into near orbit has been well described by the gentleman from California.

---

[1] The Advent spacecraft under development until May 1962 was canceled as part of a reorientation of the Advent program within the Department of Defense.

Recently, I had the privilege of visiting with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Space Sciences, the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. JOSEPH KARTH, the General Dynamics plant in San Diego, Calif. I was impressed by the dedication of the men on this project and their work in correction of the intermediate bulkhead and weather shield problem. They predicted at that time the successful flight which occurred November 27. The slippage time and the millions of dollars lost in the early pioneering stages for the Centaur cannot be recovered. However, if NASA, DOD and contractors continue to cooperate, communicate, and learn from the mistakes of the past, future losses can be kept to a minimum.

The United States cannot afford the luxury of a wasteful, poorly integrated space program. Careful coordination of the entire space effort must be accomplished.

I join in congratulations to the people of NASA, the DOD, the Centaur project managers, and the people of General Dynamics/Astronautics.

COOPERATION WITH OUR NEW PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, like other Members of the House of Representatives, I listened to the address of President Lyndon B. Johnson to the joint session of the Congress on November 27, 1963.

Having assured the President of my desire to cooperate with him during this difficult period, I was especially anxious to hear his speech and to learn his program for the Nation. Especially, I wanted to listen to what he had to say with regard to keeping America strong economically, because I felt certain he would give assurance of maintaining military strength—which of course he did.

Many of us, Mr. Speaker, have been worried about huge planned Federal deficits and ever-mounting Government expenses to be added to the national debt and charged to future generations. Therefore, I am happy to say it was comforting to have President Johnson pledge that the expenditures of the Government will be administered, as he said, with the utmost thrift and frugality. The Government, he promised, would set an example of prudence and economy. He rededicated our Nation to the defense of the strength and stability of the dollar.

Mr. Speaker, this was good to hear. And equally, or even more so, it was gratifying to have President Johnson state his firm belief in the independence and integrity of the legislative branch of our Government, because I have long been disturbed at the ever-growing power of the executive branch at the expense of Congress.

The 32 years of President Johnson on Capitol Hill, as he said, have given him pride in the ability of the Congress to distill from our differences strong programs of national action and, furthermore, he expressed belief in the capacity of Congress, despite the divisions of opinion which characterize our Nation, to act wisely when the need arises.

Mr. Speaker, it is not for me or anyone other than the President to read between the lines of his speech, but I can comment and point out that the Constitution places responsibility over spending and taxes and the stability of the economy on the legislative branch. My assurance to the President of utmost cooperation is not a pledge to support all New Frontier programs for spending the taxpayers' money when and if the President requests them. He knows that. He knows I have my job to do. But when it comes to helping our President obtain Federal Government thrift and frugality, or setting an example of prudence and economy, I will be cooperating completely.

In this connection, right now, who will say there is an end in sight of deficit spending? Who will say the cost of Government will not continue on an upward spiral? Who will say our Nation is not on a spending spree and that taxes are too high?

Sixty years ago, Government cost 2 percent of the income of the people. Today it takes 23 percent of the national income. Yet we are forced to spend borrowed money. For each family, the Government has spent $5,100 we do not have, and this per capita debt is $129 more in 1963 than it was in 1962.

The biggest domestic problem of President Johnson is that there are not enough job opportunities in America today to take care of our expanding population.

When I pledged my cooperation to him, I meant in helping to solve just such problems as unemployment.

The Kennedy administration had sought to cure unemployment, but its original plan did not succeed—as many of us had predicted. That plan was for accelerated expenditures for public works.

When it was obvious that stepped-up Government spending of money we did not have, for things we did not need, was failing to cure the unemployment problem, a new proposal was suggested, of a tax cut to stimulate business and buying power and thereby create prosperity and more jobs. No one that I know of has successfully argued against this latter proposal. Everyone has agreed that an incentive to industry to expand and make more job opportunities is essential. But there was and still is divergence of opinion as to the issue of accelerating Government spending.

This controversy over the economic benefits of private versus public spending was pointed up by one of our colleagues not long ago, who opposed an administration project for construction in his own congressional district. This was the Department of the Interior's proposed Trotter Shoals Dam on the Savannah River in Georgia. The cost of this project was estimated to be $78 million and it would remove 22,000 acres of land from the tax rolls. Only a few permament jobs would result.

On the other hand, it has been shown that if the Government does not build this dam, a private industry, the Mead Paper Co., will construct a $40 million plant on the site. Some 1,400 workers would be needed to build this plant and permanent jobs for 650 persons would be provided at the mill, and 450,000 cords of pulpwood, worth $9 million, would be used annually. This would employ an additional 2,500 persons.

Meanwhile, if the private paper company is permitted to go ahead, the Duke Power Co. will build a steamplant at this same site at a cost of $210 million. On this project, more than 1,000 persons would be employed during construction and 135 permanent jobs would be created. Moreover this private power company would buy $24 million worth of coal a year to produce 11 billion kilowatt-hours annually. The Federal dam would only produce 471 million kilowatt-hours.

In addition to all this, the Mead paper plant would pay $3.8 million a year in local, State, and Federal taxes. The Duke Power Co. would pay $13 million in annual taxes.

So those, who, like myself, favor private enterprise expansion over public spending wherever possible, have a real example to use in this case. But, in general, my point is that new bridges, post offices, and public projects of this nature, necessary and desirable though they may be, do not create permanent new jobs.

However, getting back to our new President, Lyndon Johnson, who so eloquently asked for our help, Mr. Speaker, I think history and experience clearly indicate wherein the Congress can provide economic cooperation. After all, it is the Congress that votes the new programs and provides the appropriations. The legislative branch, if it intends to cooperate and restore fiscal responsibility, must hold the line and control spending itself. This is the way to help the President. This could generate prosperity and public confidence.

Furthermore, the answer to congressional control over Federal finances, as has been clearly shown, is placing the responsibility for all appropriations in one committee of the House and one committee of the Senate.

Originally, when Congress was organized in 1789, all House appropriations and all taxes were under the jurisdiction of a single committee—the House Committee on Ways and Means. For 76 years, this worked well, because that committee could make the suit, as it were, to fit the cloth. It wrote the spending bills and then wrote a tax program to provide the necessary funds.

By 1865, however, the workload had become too burdensome for a single committee and a new Committee on Appropriations was established, making one committee to handle taxes and one to handle appropriations. This retained the advantage of one overall House committee on spending. But in the years 1880–85, unfortunately, certain House committees, including the Committee on

Agriculture, were given jurisdiction over their own appropriations, and, from then on, Government spending in relation to its revenue got out of hand. From then on until 1920, a net national deficit of almost $22 billion resulted. A billion dollars in those years, relatively speaking, would have been at least 10 times what it is now. It became quite obvious that the Congress was unable to control its own spending, and both major political parties recognized this and the need to return jurisdiction over all appropriations to a single committee which could weigh the urgency and need of programs against the amount of Federal income and the condition of the Treasury. In 1916, both Democratic and Republican platforms called for the return to the former practice of initiating appropriations bills in a single committee, so that waste and duplication in the public service could be avoided as much as possible.

Thus it was that in 1920 an impartial arbiter in the form of a single Committee on Appropriations, was again established, to effect retrenchment when necessary.

Indeed, during the ensuing decade, the Government enjoyed an average surplus of $1 billion a year.

Alas, however, with the creation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in 1932, a new device to obtain funds from the Treasury without an appropriation was initiated. This was done by authorizing Government agencies to borrow and make expenditures without the benefit of the normal annual appropriations procedure. So it has been that in the ensuing 30 years, Congress has used this latter method—now called backdoor spending—to finance many Government programs. More than $150 billion of such borrowing from the Treasury has been authorized. Yet, the Constitution provides that no money shall be drawn from the Treasury except by an appropriation made by law.

Meanwhile, $16 billion of such borrowings have already had to be canceled because the agencies had expended money in a way not subject to repayment. More losses will have to be forgiven in the future. Meanwhile, right now, under various backdoor spending authorizations, $26 billion is available without any appropriation unless Congress rescinds existing authorizations.

Mr. Speaker, through backdoor spending, the control over Federal spending has been abdicated by Congress. The only proven method of acting in a fiscally sound and responsible way is to return all financing of Government programs to the annual appropriations procedure. That is the way to cooperate with our new Chief Executive. Under this method, and with a single committee to help retrench when retrenchment is needed, the President can hope to meet his pledge of utmost thrift and frugality.

President Johnson has assured us he believes in the independence and integrity of the legislative branch, so let us be independent and not delegate our responsibilities to the executive branch, which is done under backdoor spending authorization.

Let me emphasize that the guideline to national solvency and balanced budgets is in elimination of backdoor spending and return to a single Appropriations Committee system.

In this connection, I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that President Lyndon Johnson will follow the advice of former President Eisenhower, who, in his farewell address to Congress, urged that no new borrowing authorizations be enacted.

This past year, we have almost closed the back door of the Treasury. Let us lock it. Mr. Speaker, in this and other ways, let us help our new Chief Executive meet his promises of stability of the dollar and setting an example of prudence and economy.

I applaud President Johnson for his stated respect for the integrity of the legislative branch.

Are we worthy of that respect for our independence and integrity? Are we going to do our part and exercise our judgment as to practicing thrift and frugality with the taxpayers' money? Who would suggest that Lyndon Johnson, a onetime Member of this House, did not mean what he said? Surely both branches of Government can cooperate in this important matter by cutting nonessential expenditures and voting a substantial cut in taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I pledge my support for such a program.

ACTION BY OAS OR FORM A PAN AMERICAN NATO ORGANIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the Organization of American States will meet at the urgent request of the Government of Venezuela because of the attempted subversion of that Government by action of Communist Castro. We have had continuing reports of Communist actions against the Government of Venezuela which have culminated now in the discovery of tons of smuggled weapons and explosives to be used by the terrorists, which the Venezuelan Government says it has proof came from Communist Cuba. Venezuela will produce evidence that these arms came from Communist Cuba. On November 27, these pro-Castro terrorists kidnaped Col. James K. Chenault, deputy chief of the U.S. Army mission in Venezuela. An attempt was made to bomb the home of a naval officer of the mission.

Certainly the Government of the United States should strongly back the efforts of the Government of Venezuela to bring about complete economic isolation of Cuba and to take the necessary steps to prevent the export of Communist arms and munitions from the shores of Cuba. In fact, this Government in announced public statements is already committed to this policy.

It is obvious that the failure of the Organization of American States to take positive and effective action regarding Cuba has been because action by the Organization of American States is dependent upon almost total cooperation within the Organization itself. As a result we have seen action deferred, stymied, and watered down by the refusal of a few countries to be willing to do anything about Communist Cuba and, of course, our own failure to exert necessary leadership must be acknowledged as one of the contributing factors of this inaction.

If the Organization of American States does not formulate and take effective action to live up to its obligations to prevent the spread of communism in this hemisphere as a result of this urgent call by Venezuela, then the U.S. Government should consider a NATO-type agreement with those nations of Central and South America who are willing to do something against the spread of communism in this hemisphere. We should move to form such a military alliance so that we may meet the situation of the spread of communism in this hemisphere with fast action. We should invite those nations who agree to participate in such an undertaking to an immediate conference to set up this NATO-type alliance.

Those who, for their own reasons, do not wish to take part, should not be pressured to join, since they would only be unwilling partners at best, and might in fact destroy the effectiveness of any military moves necessary. We have such an alliance in NATO and it has successfully met the threat of communism in Europe. Our Government tells us that we must be ready to fight communism alongside our NATO partners in Europe, or as we did in Korea, Lebanon, southeast Asia, and elsewhere all over the world. Surely the need to defend our own back door, Latin America, is of equal importance. In Europe and in southeast Asia our defense organizations are based on a willingness of a group of nations to join with us in a military alliance. We should take immediate steps to set up such an organization in Latin America.

To our sister nations in Latin America we should extend a warm invitation for mutual military protection. To those who do not accept, we should say that by your action you indicate you do not want U.S. military or economic aid and any such aid to these countries should be suspended.

While the defense of freedom is a world-wide problem, we must begin to treat our own hemisphere with more attention. The Organization of American States has not responded with the direct action that is needed in emergency situations. Only a mutually agreeable NATO-type organization can respond swiftly and decisively to military action, subversion, and Communist tactics. It has succeeded and proven its worth in Europe. Surely we can apply this experience to Latin America as a means to insure the continued freedom of this hemisphere.

THE ARNOLD ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT CENTER REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, on November 21 a congressional group comprising the gentleman from Michigan, Harold M. Ryan; the gentleman from Illinois, Kenneth Gray; the gentleman from Missouri, Richard Ichord; the gentleman from Florida, Edward J. Gurney; the gentleman from Texas, Bob Casey; the gentleman from New York, Otis G. Pike; the gentleman from Vermont, Robert T. Stafford; the gentleman from Illinois, Roland V. Libonati; and Herbert Lineberger, administrative assistant to the gentleman from North Carolina, Basil Whitener, also included our genial and considerate escort officers Col. Bruce Arnold and Maj. Harry Funk, invitees of the Air Force, were airborne at 9:05 a.m., eastern time, at Andrews Field in two VC140B planes en route to near Smyrna, Tenn., Sewart Field, arriving at 10:45 a.m., eastern time. We were met by commander, Col. William G. Moore, Jr., 839th Air Division, distinguished flier of over 100 missions in World War II and Korea—and also Col. Charles F. Franklin, base commander, holder of the Flying Cross, the Air Medal and cluster in World War II, serving with the 21st Troop Carrier Squadron which he organized. After introduction and pleasantries, we departed by air for Tullahoma, Tenn., arriving at 11:05 a.m., eastern time. We proceeded by auto to the Arnold Engineering Development Center escorted by Maj. Gen. William L. Rogers, USAF, in command of the Center, for a series of briefings and visits to the operational and research laboratories comprising the institute and Center.

General Rogers, in his introductory remarks, covered the history and mission of the Center as follows:

The Arnold Engineering Development Center is named for the late general of the Air Force Henry H. (Hap) Arnold. In November 1944, General Arnold asked Dr. Theodore von Karman, chief scientific adviser to the Air Force, to form a group to investigate air research and development in this country and other countries. The group was to formulate a long-range plan which would establish and maintain the United States in the forefront of air power.

Dr. von Karman's report on that investigation to General Arnold said, in part, that the Air Force should:

> Create new facilities * * * with the objective of developing supersonic and pilotless aircraft.
>
> The Center for supersonic and pilotless aircraft development should be equipped with adequate wind tunnel facilities to attain speeds up to three times the velocity of sound, with large enough test sections to accommodate models of reasonable size, including jet propulsion units, and one ultrasonic wind tunnel for exploration of the upper frontier of the supersonic speed range. Ample characteristics of propulsion systems of very high altitudes should be provided.

Planning for an Air Engineering Development Center was continued from 1946 to 1949 with thorough coordination of Air Force plans with the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the Research and Development Board, Army, Navy, and the Aircraft industry. In October 1949, Congress approved construction of the Air Engineering Development Center and authorized $100 million for an "interim" construction program.

The site selected was an area of approximately 34,000 acres in middle Tennessee, formerly known as Camp Forrest Reservation. This site was donated by the State of Tennessee. Headquarters, Air Engineering Development Center was activated as a limited major air command on January 1, 1950, and construction was underway by the end of 1950. On May 1, 1951, the Center became a part of the Air Research and Development Command, now the Air Force Systems Command.

Since 1953, the facilities have been used to test advanced aircraft, missiles, and space weapons. Data of major importance have been provided for many of the Nation's highest priority aerospace projects. Many changes and additions have gone into the design, construction, and operation of the tunnels and test cells in order to keep them not only abreast of current—1963—requirements, but also prepared for future needs.

MISSION OF THE ARNOLD ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT CENTER

The mission of the Arnold Engineering Development Center is to support the timely acquisition of superior aerospace systems by conducting research, development, test, and evaluation in aerospace environmental facilities for the Air Force, other Government agencies, and industry, and conduct foreign aerospace technology activities within the scope of the assigned mission.

Arnold Engineering Development Center is directly responsible to Headquarters Air Force Systems Command for mission accomplishment and will:

First. Keep headquarters AFSC informed on the progress of the AEDC mission and the Center's effectiveness.

Second. Support AFSC divisions, centers, other Air Force commands, DOD, or Government agencies as directed by headquarters AFSC.

Third. Provide technical assistance to other Government agencies regarding both present and future research and development—R. & D.—programs, basing assistance on Center test experience and analysis of contractor development tests.

Fourth. Prepare and submit to headquarters AFSC or the appropriate AFSC division, time-phased plans within the Center mission areas, based on approved R. & D. objectives. Plans will include projected requirements for technical and supporting facilities and other resources in accordance with approved AFSC procedures.

Fifth. Conduct or support basic research within the scope of Center capabilities and approved research planning objectives.

Sixth. Participate in applied research and technical support programs, as authorized by headquarters AFSC.

Seventh. Support and participate in system studies, development, and tests within the scope of approved AFSC system development directives and system requirements.

Eighth. Perform engineering analysis and evaluation of Air Force tests from data collected, as required.

Ninth. Acquire, evaluate, analyze, and report in a timely manner information on the current and projected status of foreign aerospace technology in technical areas appropriate to Center operations.

Tenth. Establish and maintain close continuing direct coordination and collaboration with the Foreign Technology Division—FTD—to provide an integral and technically enhanced foreign technology capability.

Eleventh. Assure the effective continuing application of pertinent foreign technological data to the planning, development, test, and evaluation activities inherent to the mission of the Center.

Twelfth. Enter into, execute, and administer contracts in support of assigned programs within the limits of procurement authority, as redelegated by headquarters AFSC.

Thirteenth. Conduct basic and applied research for aerospace environmental facility development and operation, and in other technical areas applicable to the unique facilities of AEDC.

Fourteenth. Conduct analysis and research into promising areas that will enhance the design of aerospace vehicles and their propulsion systems, based upon the background of experience gained from tests of weapon and space systems and their propulsion units.

Fifteenth. Conduct active liaison with AFSC divsions and centers, other Government agencies, and industry having management responsibilities for R. & D. in the fields of gas dynamics, propulsion, and aerospace sciences to insure effective use of the AEDC capabilities in these fields.

Sixteenth. Serve as command focal point for simulated high-altitude rocket testing.

General Rogers then proceeded to show slides and films covering the research program and discussed its accomplishments and failures in solving the technical and physical problems referred to the institute by all facilities throughout the Nation—maintained by the services in space operation. The detailed completeness of his dissertation on the highly technical experimentation with parachutes, motors and engines, and so forth, so difficult for laymen to understand is a high compliment to his talents and professional astuteness in this specialized field. His discussion of various phases of the tests in experimental work conducted at the institute were as follows:

INTRODUCTION

> The successful flight of all of today's aerospace vehicles—aircraft, missiles, satellites and spacecraft—requires mastery of a whole new spectrum of extremely hostile flight environments.
>
> Insuring reliable performance of these craft, and their propulsion and control systems, in the very low pressures of space; in the minus 320° temperatures which confront orbiting satellites; through the severe aerothermodynamic forces of reentry is of critical importance in developing aerospace systems of today.
>
> Flight simulation laboratories which can simulate many of these difficult phases of flight are very important factors in the rapid

and economical development of these programs, and they will assume even greater proportions of importance in the future.

There are many different types of flight simulation laboratories ranging from the "as large as a breadbox" high-vacuum chamber owned and operated by a small company in the aerospace industry to the much larger and complex test units operated by the military services, the NASA or large universities.

Today I would like to describe to you the laboratories of the Air Force Systems Command's Arnold Engineering Development Center in southern Tennessee. In general, these facilities are unique in that they represent the largest and most powerful of their specific types currently available for use. A quick look at these various high-altitude rocket test cells, supersonic and hypersonic wind tunnels, and some examples of some of the tests that are performed in them, is the most effective way to convey to you the importance of the work being done in laboratories of this type.

I assumed command of the Arnold Center less than 2 years ago. My prior assignment was as vice commander of the Air Force Missile Test Center at Cape Canaveral, duty which sharpened my appreciation for the work done at Arnold. We are all familiar with some of the spectacular failures or "limited successes" that have occurred at the Cape. My job there gave me an opportunity to learn many of the background problems which caused the loss of these expensive missiles and spacecraft: and, what to me is more important, a realization of how many more failures we might have encountered if it had not been for the valuable development testing performed in flight simulation laboratories like those at the Arnold Center.

The Arnold Engineering Development Center was named in honor of Gen. "Hap" Arnold, a man who had the foresight and wisdom to foresee the need for development testing facilities. These facilities were for the exploration of the upper frontier of the supersonic speed range.

In November 1944 General Arnold instructed Dr. von Karman, chief scientific adviser to the Air Force, to form a group to investigate air research and development facilities in this and other countries. Dr. von Karman accepted this challenge and a thorough study was made.

Within a year the report was completed and presented to General Arnold on behalf of the AAF scientific advisory group. In part, it stated that the Air Force should "create new facilities with the objectives of developing supersonic and pilotless aircraft." It further states that "this Center should be equipped with adequate wind tunnel facilities to attain speeds up to three times the velocity of sound, with large enough test sections to accommodate models of reasonable size, including jet propulsion units, and one ultrasonic wind tunnel for exploration of the upper frontier of the supersonic speed range. Ample characteristics of propulsion systems of very high altitudes should be provided."

In 1946 the "unitary wind tunnel" plan was prepared. This plan provided for the construction of facilities as envisioned by the AAF scientific advisory board. This plan was reviewed by the President's Air Policy Board. It was approved and submitted to Congress in 1948. In October 1949 the plan was approved and signed. At the time when construction was about to begin General Arnold passed away in 1950.

On June 25, 1951, President Harry Truman dedicated the Center in the name of our deceased comrade while General Arnold's widow stood at his side.

Due to the continued foresight of subsequent leaders the mission at Arnold has expanded considerably—from supersonic aircraft to aerospace vehicles; from pilotless aircraft to missiles; from testing of models of reasonable size to full scale vehicles.

The Wright brothers, were two of the early experimenters using a wind tunnel for testing purposes.

For those of you who have not been fortunate enough to see this gigantic complex, the study of an aerial view of our station would show in the background a manmade lake 12 miles long with a shoreline of 75 miles. If the magnitude of numbers means anything, we use in excess of 200,000 gallons of water per minute for cooling purposes.

This is equivalent to the water used by a city the size of Washington, D.C. Our electric bill runs around $4 million per annum in the land of TVA. Electricity used is equivalent to a city the size of New Orleans or approximately 1½ million people.

In the foreground is located the propulsion wind tunnel facility, a far cry from the earlier model used by the Wright brothers.

The rocket test facility is located in the vicinity.

The von Karman gas dynamics facility and the 1,000-foot hypervelocity range which is now being prepared for initial operation.

The aerospace simulation test facility currently under construction is programed to test full and subscale vehicles and their components under simulated orbital conditions.

I call to your attention the J-4 vertical rocket test cell which is now under construction. The cell will test liquid rockets up to a thrust level of 500,000 pounds simulating conditions at altitudes of over 100,000 feet. For future use this cell can be modified to test vehicles of 1.5 million pounds thrust. Cooling water requirements would be 1.5 million gallons per minute.

Thus we have reviewed the past, present, and future. Just how do we do our job? Primarily our end product is a piece of paper giving the results of tests. We are supported in this area with a contractor in the test area and the Corps of Engineers in the construction area.

We have a normal military staff organizational structure—a Headquarters AEDC organization.

In order to show a trend using 1961 as a base line our operation has increased approximately from 23 t 56 percent. This is discounting inflation. During the past year we have supported other Government agencies such as the Mercury and Apollo programs for NASA: Pershing and Nike programs for Army; Polaris program for Navy.

In the last 5 years the real property value has tripled from $88 million in 1957 to approximately $346 million today. This will give you an idea of our dynamic growth.

The questions uppermost in everyone's mind are "Are we paying our own way?" and, "What are we contributing to the overall defense effort?" Since our end product is a test document there is no way to maintain a profit-and-loss statement on our operation. Such laboratories are expensive, but in their proper perspective their cost is minor compared to any single development program involving numerous flight tests of expensive boosters and payloads required to insure an effective and reliable operating system. The findings in our tests conclusively show that testing in a controlled environment is far superior to testing by trial and error from Vandenberg or Canaveral. Controlled conditions can dictate whether the test should be continued or the system abandoned. I would now like to cite some of our major accomplishments.

An Atlas series E launched at Cape Canaveral resulted in failure; the failure occurring in the base of the Atlas. Telemetry data did not indicate the cause of these failures. However, analysis of the film taken and other data showed that the problem originated in the base of the vehicle.

A one-tenth scale model of the Atlas series E was fabricated and placed in one of the altitude test cells of the Arnold Center. It was subjected to the same conditions at which the failures occurred at Canaveral. The extensive amount of instrumentation used in this test showed that the three hot rocket exhaust jets were intersecting at two points. This caused a low pressure zone to occur between the three nozzles which resulted in hot exhaust gases recirculating in the base of the missile.

This shows an Atlas firing in an altitude chamber. When hot exhaust gases were expelled the low pressure areas caused the gases to flow in the base between the three nozzles. This problem was not evident in single nozzle configuration such as Thor and Jupiter.

However, it becomes more evident in nozzle configurations such as the solid propellant motor shown in this film clip and also other multinozzle boosters such as those used on the Titan, Minuteman, and Saturn. All of these systems have received tests at Arnold Center.

Tests on the Agena engine have been conducted for the past 4 years in the Arnold Center facilities. This is the Agena 8096 engine mounted in test cell T-4. This phase of our support deals with the development of an optimum area ratio nozzle. The green portion of the nozzle is an uncooled extension, to cool this much area would result in a weight penalty for the propulsion systems. Therefore, uncooled nozzle extensions of various designs and materials had to be developed.

This shows a proposed nozzle made of graphite being tested at an altitude of 110,000 feet theoretically, and during sea level tests this nozzle performed satisfactorily. However, as shown here after only a few seconds operation the nozzle separated from the engine. This we feel again was due to the fact that there was greater heat input to the nozzle at altitude conditions than the material could withstand. Here, a titanium alloy nozzle was subjected to the same test conditions. It proved sound and is presently being used in the Agena system.

Aerodynamic data must of necessity be obtained before actual flight testing can take place. Many tests are conducted on complete aircraft and missile configurations under highly realistic flight conditions. This is the X-15 installed in our mach 8 tunnel. Design changes necessary to assure safe reentry resulted from these tests. In this program more than 500 different reentry condition were simulated and more than 2 million data points were obtained.

Various control surfaces are subjected to tests in several of our aerodynamic testing units and often assist in overcoming such problems as wing breakups.

Also of critical importance is heat transfer data on reentry. This is, we mount the Mercury capsule in our hot shot 2 tunnel. It is undergoing a reentry condition of mach 15 at 175,000 feet. Data must be obtained on heat transfer rates, pressure distribution, ionization effects, and other reentry phenomena. These are just a few of the critical problems we are able to investigate in the Arnold Center laboratories.

As to the parachute recovery system; the data capsule is mounted in our 16-foot transonic circuit, on a forward sting support system which allows us to release the parachute. A primary chute is bolted to the floor of the tunnel while air flow is being established. Once the condition in the tunnel matches that of actual reentry the explosive bolt releases the primary chute which pulls the main chute out of the data capsule. Therefore you see what could have happened to the first 12 Discoverer parachutes. The parachute was not designed to withstand the opening shock. As a result it was ripped to shreds. Our previous experience in the design and testing of ICBM recovery parachutes enabled us to recommend modifications which resulted in a parachute which performed quite satisfactorily.

The test programs described up to this point are indicative of our past accomplishments. Now, I would like to show some of our most recent tests concerning current and future systems. As an example of our current systems I would like to use the Minuteman ICBM.

As to the Mercury hot-shot firing—of critical importance is heat transfer data on reentry. The Mercury capsule is mounted in our hotshot 2 tunnel undergoing a reentry condition of mach 15 at 175,000 feet. Data must be obtained on heat transfer rates, pressure distribution, ionization effects and other reentry phenomena. These are just a few of the critical problems we are able to investigate in the Arnold Center laboratories.

In a parachute recovery system the data capsule is mounted in our 16-foot transonic circuit. The capsule is mounted on a forward sting support system which allows us to release the parachute for the tests.

Early in the development of the Minuteman we conducted a series of tests on proposed design configurations. These tests were conducted in various AEDC tunnels throughout the transonic, supersonic, hypersonic, and hypervelocity speed regimes. This slide shows the Minuteman model installed in our continuous flow mach 8 tunnel.

Tests of the solid propellant motors for Minuteman have been run continuously in one or more test units for the past 3 years. At first the programs consisted of testing small prototype motors and various components. It then progressed to the full-scale systems, such as this third stage motor mounted in J-2. The programs also became very complex. In this test the plumbing in the foreground is connected to the blowout ports of the third stage. After a specified burning time these blowout ports open in the ducting which is simulating altitude pressures. This is the critical point at which the nosecone separates and continues on a ballistic trajectory. Thus the thrust termination data obtained in this test was of critical importance.

The largest solid propellant motor we have tested to date was this full-scale, second-stage Minuteman mounted in J-2. This program consisted of measuring the total thrust within 0.5 percent accuracy with the nozzles at various gimbal angles. All of these propulsion tests have been conducted under simulated operating altitude conditions. These tests are expected to continue for several months, and even after the missile is operational, product improvement tests will be conducted. Better fuels wil undoubtedly be developed and have to be tested. Improved components and controls will be incorporated even in the operational configurations.

As for systems to operate in the future; we are currently testing several. Among these is the X-20 Dynasoar glide vehicle. The booster for this system will be the Titan III.

Titan III model was tested with solid propellant strap-on rocket motors operating in the 16-foot supersonic wind tunnel. Purpose of the test was to obtain data on base heating of the basic Titan from the exhaust of the strap-on boosters. Test with the 5.5-percent scale model ranges from mach 0.6 to mach 3 at near-trajectory altitude conditions. Technician here makes final adjustments to one of the strap-on boosters prior to test run. Cylinder at bottom simulates container for solid rocket motor thrust vector control fluid. Future tests will be made to study base heating during simultaneous operation of strap-on boosters and main sustainer engines.

TITAN BOOSTER SEPARATION

Titan III separation tests were run on an 11.5-percent scale model of the first and second stages of the launch vehicle in one of the high-altitude simulation cells of RTF. Tests were to determine forces and pressures on the spent first stage boosters, simulated here by dummies on either side of the second stage, as the cases are jettisoned from the launch vehicle. Test results will be used to help determine a safe technique for first-stage booster separation. Technician in this picture is making final adjustment prior to test.

Other tests conducted in the Center's rocket test facility in support of Titan III included the firings of six small rocket motors that contained the propellant planned for use in the solid strap-on boosters to determine the amount of radiant heat produced by the exhaust gases at various trajectory altitudes.

ATLAS STAGING

To introduce another phase of our support—I would like to discuss an Atlas at altitude. We experimented with a 1½-stage vehicle and studied the booster engines being separated at altitude.

TITAN "FIRE IN THE HOLE" STAGING

To jettison the first stage fuel tanks of the Titan sustainer we will use the "fire in the hole" technique as the test setup in T-4 on the rocket test facility.

TITAN FIRING

The second stage rocket fires while the first stage fuel tanks are attached. This was accomplished to determine pressures and temperatures at the interstage compartment during second-stage ignition.

TRANSTAGE IN J-2A

The full-scale transtage engine for the X-20, Titan III. Transtage in this case simply means final stage. It provides the impulse to put the X-20 into final orbit and to make adjustments in the orbital path. These tests were run to learn how the engine would perform at extreme altitudes and to verify the structural durability of the entire system and its individual components.

TITAN-DYNASOAR MODEL IN PWT

Combined aerodynamic and propulsion tests are conducted in our larger facilities. The Titan-Dyna-Soar configuration is installed in our 16-foot transonic tunnel. Air flow disturbances generated by the model and the booster fins are investigated to assure that the exhaust gases will flow correctly. These tests are necessary as we have found in many instances that disturbances caused by external surfaces and pods interfere with the exhaust gas flow.

DYNA-SOAR-TITAN IN A

The suborbital configuration is tested in tunnel A of VKF.

The test was conducted to obtain pressure, temperature, force, and flow visualization data on the X-20 vehicle mated to the Titan booster. This tunnel is capable of simulating velocities from 1.5 to 6 times the speed of sound.

DYNA-SOAR-TITAN SEPARATION TEST

This is the same model being tested to obtain stability and control data during and after staging.

DYNA-SOAR FLUTTER IN 16T

An early configuration of Dyna-Soar is subjected to flutter tests in the transonic speed range. It experienced considerable difficulties.

DYNA-SOAR FLUTTER MODEL IN 16S

The later model was tested in the 16-foot supersonic tunnel. It proved to be structurally sound through the supersonic and transonic range reentry.

SCHLIEREN FILM—DYNA-SOAR HEAT TRANSFER TEST

Unique photographic technique allows us to study the airflow over the model during maneuvering. Also study of shock waves created by airflow over model. These tests were conducted at supersonic reentry conditions.

DYNA-SOAR GLOWING UNDER MACH 10 REENTRY CONDITIONS

This model held longer than a normal period of time shows essentially the results should a pilot be subjected to these mach 10 reentry conditions for more than a few minutes.

IMPACT TARGET

Hypervelocity impact tests are being conducted to determine the effects of impact of projectiles upon various types of target material. Crater volume as much as 32 times the projectile mass has been measured. These studies will aid in properly shielding personnel and instrumentation inside future spacecraft—protection against potential damage that collision between spacecraft and debris presents. Even minute particles of meteorite dust can cause serious damage.

IMPACT OF LUCITE TARGET BY TINY METAL PROJECTILE

Slow motion made up from frames from ultra-high-speed camera which photographs approach and impact upon target at rate of up to 1,400,000 frames a second. We noted shock wave formation and back spalling of target material.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing gives you a look at some of the typical tests and test units at the Arnold Center.

In closing I would like to emphasize one very important point—the basic economics of an operation such as this. The total capital investment in the Arnold Center now is approximately $345 million—a large investment, but one that has paid for itself many times over.

To use just one example: Several years ago three missiles had been launched from Canaveral for the purpose of recovering their nose cones by a parachute to determine the effects of reentry. All three of the attempts were failures, and it was suspected that the parachute system was not working. At Arnold they suspended the full-scale nose cone in the test section of the large 16-foot transonic wind tunnel; brought it to the exact conditions that existed as the parachute was deployed. The recovery package was released and it was observed that the canopy oscillated wildly in a "squidding" motion.

In 3 nights a total of 17 simulated recoveries were run in the tunnel and a fix determined that was proved on the next flight. This test cost less than a hundred thousand dollars, but I hesitate to say how much the first three attempts to recover the nose cone had cost—many millions of dollars each, I am sure, when you consider the expense of down range tracking and recovery and all of the other preparations that are required for actual flight.

Furthermore, in 3 nights time—for relatively little expense—we obtained better information than could have been gained in 17 additional flight attempts. Better, because we had a close look at the parachute at the exact moment it was released.

This same pattern of saving is found in almost every test performed at Arnold. Without these facilities, I am sure, we would not have progressed to the point we have reached today, and the combined military and space programs of this Nation would have cost us many hundreds of millions more than they have. I'm not alone in this conviction; Air Force Secretary Eugene Zuckert, former Chief of Staff Thomas White, and AFSC's commander, Gen. Bernard Schriever, have made similar comments concerning work at Arnold.

In short, facilities of this type substantially reduce the time and money required for systems development. In accelerating aerospace progress they are, truly, springboards to space.

We are proud to present for the Record the biography of Maj. Gen. William L. Rogers, U.S. Air Force:

MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM L. ROGERS, U.S. AIR FORCE

William L. Rogers was born in Larchwood, Iowa, on December 29, 1911. He was graduated from Rock Rapids (Iowa) High School in 1929, and after attending the University of South Dakota for 1 year, entered the U.S. Military Academy. He was graduated in 1934 with a bachelor of science degree.

In 1939 he received a master of science degree from Cornell University in Ithaca, N.Y.

From 1944 to 1945 Lieutenant Colonel Rogers was commanding officer of the 1141st Engineer Combat Group in the European theater of operations, receiving the Legion of Merit and the Silver Star. From 1945 to 1947 he served as commanding officer of the 346th Engineer General Service Regiment in Germany, being awarded the Commendation Ribbon in March 1946 from 7th Army Headquarters.

Colonel Rogers transferred from the U.S. Army to the U.S. Air Force on September 26, 1947. Following 2 years of duty at Offutt AFB, Nebr., and Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind., he attended the Air War College at Maxwell AFB, Ala. He then was assigned to Headquarters, MATS, in Washington, D.C., where he served as Chief of Installations, Directorate of Materiel, from July 1950 to June 1951, and as Deputy Director, Materiel, from June 1951 to April 1952.

From 1952 to 1954 Colonel Rogers was assigned as Deputy Chief of Staff, Materiel, at Headquarters, Air Research and Development Command, in Baltimore, Md. In July 1954 he became assistant for development programing with the Deputy Chief of Staff, Development, at Headquarters, U.S. Air Force, in Washington, D.C. He held this position until March 1958. During this tour of duty he was promoted to the rank of brigadier general in October 1956.

In March 1958 General Rogers became vice commander of the Air Force Missile Test Center, Patrick AFB, Fla. In May 1958 he was awarded an oak leaf cluster to the Legion of Merit for his work at Air Force headquarters, the citation stating that "General Rogers designed streamlined administrative procedures for Air Force ballistic missile programs by revising the controls exercised by Headquarters, U.S. Air Force, over the field agencies to better manage the research and development program; and bringing the management of all research and development resources under the research and development agencies." In March 1961 General Rogers was promoted to the rank of major general.

On June 23, 1961, General Rogers assumed command of the Arnold Engineering Development Center, Arnold Air Force Station, Tenn.

General Rogers is the son of William Boynton and Olivia Beatrice Rogers. He married the former Dolores Stack on March 15, 1947, and has four children. He is a member of Beta Theta Pi fraternity, and a member of the New York Athletic Club.

We were then conducted on a tour of the facilities including space and environmental facilities. At each facility we received a briefing on operational and experimental effects. Major Calkins on dynamics, tunnels, and so forth. Colonel Clements, statistical and compressive operation and control.

Certainly the $45 million per year spent in the operation of the institute is worth millions more in savings, and resulted in the success of the space program. The University of Tennessee has entered the area setting. Its operational building program is being built for the establishment of a branch school of engineering and chemical research center in conjunction with the institute—that theorization, experimentation, and operation may facilitate the training and development of talented and skilled engineer specialists—to insure the future accomplishments and to secure solutions of problems so necessary to protect our domination and study of space in the scientific sense.

The physical plant primarily consists of:

First. Observation point on perimeter of hole during construction.

Second. Test capsule: The rocket engine or missile being tested will be mounted within the capsule. Initial construction will permit testing of engines having up to 500,000 pounds' thrust. Tests will be at a simulated altitude of 100,000 feet. Future expansions of capabilities will permit testing of engines having 1.5 million pounds of thrust. The capsule diameter is 48 feet at the base and reduces to 30 feet prior to reaching the cap. The initial height will be about 45 feet, but can be increased by adding spool pieces of either 48 or 30 feet diameter. The overhead crane has a capacity of 100 tons and a clear hook height of 128 feet above the ground.

Third. Oxidizer tank: The initial tank will be a dewar for lox and has a nominal 20,000-gallon capacity. Propellant combinations which may be used in the immediate future are lox-RP-1, nitrogen tetroxide-hydrazine and lox-LH_2. Other propellant combinations may be required and the propellant system will be modified as required by test requirements.

Fourth. Rocket fuel tank: This is of stainless steel and has a nominal 15,000 gallon capacity. It is pressurized by gaseous nitrogen and will use fuels as described in item 3.

Fifth and sixth. Steam accumulators and plant: Initially there will be three accumulators, each about 12 feet in diameter and 95 feet long. These will be manifolded and fed by the steam generator plant—item 6. The design pressure is 725 pounds per square inch.

Seventh. Fuel oil tank: This is for storage of fuel oil for the steamplant and has a capacity of 30,000 gallons.

Eighth. Calibration steam ejectors: These are used to help evacuate the test cell to the simulated altitude at which the test will be run. These will operate for about 2 hours prior to a test in order to calibrate the instrumentation and will be turned off prior to start of test.

Ninth. Atmospheric exhaust stack: This stack will be used when the exhaust products are routed directly to the atmosphere. Normally, the exhaust products will be routed through ducting to the exhaust machinery presently in existence at the rocket test facility. The duct runs underground from the test cell, passes under the exhaust stack, through a shutoff valve and a water separator, then continues underground to the point marked 13 on the photo where it rises above ground. The centerline of the overhead portion is 49 feet above the roadway and the duct is 13 feet in diameter.

Tenth and eleventh. Watertanks: These provide storage for the water used for cooling the outside of the diffuser and the exhaust products. The water is delivered to the spray chamber—below the test capsule—at a rate of 500,000 gallons per minute. The water duct carrying the water from the tanks to the spray chamber is designed to carry 1.5 million gallons per minute in order to permit future expansion.

Twelfth. Control building: This houses the test controls and the major portion of $2 million worth of instrumentation. Directly above item 12 is the VKF complex. Directly above item 13 is part of the RTF complex.

The tour of the facilities revealed the scientific perfection of all operations to meet the purposes of the installation. Short briefings by Major Calkins treating with the Aerospace Environmental Facility and Dynamics Facility were indicative of the revolutionary advances made in these respective scientific fields. Colonel Clements' subject, "Statistical and Compressive Operation and Control." In conformity with the general described mission heretofore presented, a more detailed description of the capabilities and accomplishments of the U.S. Air Force's Arnold Engineering Development Center at Arnold Air Force Station are herewith presented:

ARNOLD ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT CENTER, ARNOLD AIR FORCE STATION, TENN.

In the four major laboratories of the Center—which is one of six centers in the Air Force Systems Command—flight conditions can be simulated from sea level to altitudes around 350,000 feet and from subsonic velocities to those well over mach 20.[1] Equipment being tested ranges in size from small-scale models to full-scale vehicles with propulsion systems installed and operating. Testing is conducted in all aspects of flight—ballistics, aerodynamics, propulsion and aerospace environment.

Vital problems being investigated in the ballistic missile, satellite and space vehicle fields are connected with launch; stability and heating during transonic, supersonic, hypersonic and hypervelocity flight; propulsion efficiency at low to extreme altitudes, meteorite impact and reentry into the earth's atmosphere.

Problems being investigated in connection with winged vehicles and their engines, which make the most efficient use of the atmosphere's oxygen and density, include stability and propulsion efficiency between all flight extremes of the aircraft and its propulsion system.

The Arnold Center operates as a service to the aerospace industries, to educational institutions and to other military and civilian agencies of the Federal Government involved in aerospace research and development. The direction, scheduling, planning and budgeting of the Center is performed by a U.S. Air Force staff of military and civilian personnel. It is operated and maintained under contract to the Air Force by ARO, Inc., a subsidiary of Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc. Construction is under the supervision of the U.S. Army Engineer District, Mobile, Ala.

The work of the Arnold Center is helping to accelerate development of space, ballistic and atmospheric flight weapons of the future.

---

[1] Mach 1=speed of sound; 763 miles per hour at sea level.

HISTORY

As World War II was drawing to an end, the late Gen. H. H. (Hap) Arnold, wartime commander of the American air forces, became increasingly alarmed over advances the Germans had made in aeronautical research and development. Consequently, he asked the late Dr. Theodore von Kármán, one of the world's leading aeronautical scientists, to form a group to investigate the German facilities as soon as the war was over.

Dr. von Kármán's report on that investigation to General Arnold said, in part, that the Air Force should "create new facilities * * * with the objective of developing supersonic and pilotless aircraft. The center for supersonic and pilotless aircraft development should be equipped with adequate wind tunnel facilities to attain speeds up to three times the velocity of sound, with large enough test sections to accommodate models of reasonable size, including jet propulsion units, and one ultrasonic wind tunnel for exploration of the upper frontier of the supersonic speed range. Ample facilities for the study of combustion and other characteristics of propulsion systems of very high altitudes should be provided."

The job of designing, building, and operating such development test facilities was a large order. Nothing of such magnitude and scope in this field had ever been conceived before. Nevertheless, the task was undertaken and today we have the Arnold Engineering Development Center. Appropriately, the Center carries the name of the man directly responsible for its conception.

Construction on the Center began early in 1950. The first test laboratory went into operation in 1953. Since that time, testing equipment designed to speed the development of rocket engines; turobjet, ramjet, and turboprop engines, and aircraft, missiles and space weapons, has been continually phased through shakedown and calibration into operation. Many of these new testing units have been connected to existing plant equipment, such as compressor and exhauster systems, cooling water lines and control rooms, which eliminated the costly duplication that would have otherwise been required. In addition, new principles, new equipment, new materials and new techniques were incorporated into the Center while it was being designed and built. Moreover, hundreds of changes have since gone into the design, construction and operation of the tunnels and test cells in order to keep them not only abreast of current requirements but prepared for future needs.

ROCKET TEST FACILITY

The rocket test facility is designed for development and evaluation testing of propulsion systems for advanced aircraft, missiles, satellites, and space vehicles. These include rocket engines as well as ramjet, turbojet and turboprop engines.

Although this facility, originally called the engine test facility, continues to test advanced airbreathing engines, the Nation's ballistic missile, satellite, and space programs have brought about a shift in emphasis in this laboratory to more and more rocket testing. This is a significant change in the original role set for the facility, which was designed more than 10 years ago only for testing the airbreathers.

Modifications to the original plant and development of new testing equipment and techniques have made it possible to test both solid- and liquid-propellant rocket units at conditions simulating flight to altitudes above 300,000 feet. Rocket engines which can be tested range from small units of a few hundred pounds thrust to large full-scale engines in the tens of thousands of pounds of thrust class.

A new aerospace rocket test cell provides an altitude simulation capability of up to 350,000 feet with radiation panels for orbital heat flux simulation and full-scale engine propulsion tests.

One vertical test cell now in operation accommodates testing of full-scale rocket engines generating up to 200,000 pounds of thrust at simulated altitudes above 100,000 feet with the engine installed in the cell in its natural upright position.

Another vertical rocket test cell now nearing completion will be capable of testing rocket engines with thrust ratings up to 500,000 pounds. Later, modifications can be made to accommodate engines generating 1,500,000 pounds of thrust. This test cell, most of which is underground, required excavation of a hole 250 feet deep and 100 feet in diameter.

Still another test cell now under construction will be capable of testing solid rocket motors generating up to 200,000 pounds of thrust at simulated altitude conditions of more than 120,000 feet.

The purpose of these rocket engine tests is to obtain such information as the burning characteristics of a propellant, the precise amount of thrust an engine generates, and the durability of a rocket engine nozzle case and associated controls. Thus, information of this nature can be obtained without the costly launch of a complete missile. At the same time, altitude tests in these cells can reduce considerably the time element, as well as the number of launches, required in the development of a weapon system.

By the same token, tests of airbreathing engines can help cut down development time and the number of flight tests required for manned aircraft and certain types of guided missiles. These tests may involve complete flight-type engines or they may involve heavier "boilerplate" versions of an engine in which inlets, compressors, combustors, nozzles or other sections can be installed for experimental investigations.

During test of an airbreathing engine, air that has been conditioned to simulate the desired altitude and temperature is forced onto the test cell at the velocity which permits running the engine at the power setting of the desired mach number.

Testing in this facility is not limited to new and untried propulsion systems. From the start, development tests have been run on a number of airbreathing engines and rocket engines which power operational aircraft and missiles and problems encountered in operation have been solved here.

VON KÁRMÁN GAS

The Von Kármán Gas Dynamics Facility is named in honor of the late Dr. Theodore von Kármán who was one of the world's foremost aerodynamicists and scientists.

Dr. von Kármán was born in Budapest in 1881. He was Chairman of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's (NATO) Advisory Group for Aeronautical Research and Development (AGARD), a position he held from the time the group was formed, on his recommendation, in 1952.

During World War II, he was Chairman of the Scientific Advisory Group of the U.S. Air Force. Later, he became Chairman Emeritus of the Advisory Group's successor, the Scientific Advisory Board. He also served as consultant to a number of industrial concerns and to the Department of Defense, the Army and the Navy, as well as the Air Force.

As Chairman of the Scientific Advisory Group, Dr. von Kármán wrote the recommendation that a center, which developed into the Arnold Center as it is today, be established. He died May 7, 1963.

DYNAMICS FACILITY

The Von Kármán Gas Dynamics Facility is designed for the aerodynamic testing—that is, testing of the effect of airflow on shapes—of aircraft, missiles, satellites, space vehicles and their components at highly-realistic flight conditions ranging from Mach 1.5 to 20 and above. There are eight wind tunnels of various sizes and capabilities in this facility.

Two are intermittent—or blowdown—tunnels. Air for these tunnels is stored in a pressure tank from which it flows through the test section into a vacuum sphere. The pressure tank is 720 feet long. It has an inside diameter of 3 feet. Its walls are 4 inches thick. The vacuum sphere is 80 feet in diameter.

To prepare for a test run, the pressure tank upstream of the tunnels is filled with compressed air. At the same time, air is pumped out of the vacuum sphere downstream of the tunnels. The air pressure in the tank is up to 4,000 pounds per square inch and the sphere can be evacuated to about one three-hundredths of an atmosphere.

When the test run is ready to be made, valves are opened at either end of the tunnel, thereby producing airflow through the 12-inch square test section in which the model is installed. Controls regulate the pressure and density of the air required for the specific test. Duration of the test, which may range from a few seconds to as long as 15 minutes, depends upon the conditions required. One of these tunnels operates in the mach number range from 1.5 to about 5, the other from 5 to 8.

Three of the tunnels in the Von Kármán Facility are continuous-flow tunnels. Air supply is from a nine-stage compressor system that is an eighth of a mile long and is driven by electric motors totaling 100,000 horsepower. These tunnels run for hours at a time. Thus the term "continuous flow."

One continuous-flow tunnel has a test section 40 inches square, the other two, 50 inches in diameter. They can therefore accommodate models much larger than those used in the blowdown tunnels. The mach number range in the first of these tunnels is 1.5 to 6, the other two operate at mach 8 and 10. The first has a flexible nozzle with which the Mach number of the airflow can be changed while the tunnel is operating. The other two have fixed axisymmetric nozzles.

Aerodynamics tests at mach numbers from 15 to 20 are made in the electric-arc-driven, hypervelocity tunnels of the hotshot type, so named by the engineers of ARO, Inc., who developed them originally. Hotshot 2 has a 50-inch-diameter test section whereas tunnel F has a 100-inch-diameter test section.

The components of a hotshot-type tunnel are a generator, an electric energy storage unit, an arc chamber, a nozzle, a test section, and a diffuser (vacuum tank). The operation of a hotshot tunnel is as follows:

First, the model is installed in the test section. Then a thin metal or plastic diaphragm is inserted between the arc chamber and the nozzle. Next, all of the tunnel, except the arc chamber, is evacuated down to near-vacuum conditions. Then the electric storage units are charged with energy. Hotshot 2 has a large induction coil with a capacity of 10 million joules, while the capacity of the tunnel F coil is 100 million joules.

When the desired level of the charge in the storage unit has been reached, an arc is initiated in the arc chamber. The resultant discharge raises the temperature and pressure of the gas (air or nitrogen) in the chamber to as much as 8000° F. and 20,000 pounds per square inch. The diaphragm bursts and the air flows through the nozzle into the test section, over the model and into the vacuum tank.

While the test runs in the hotshot tunnels are relatively short—one-twentieth of a second at most—special instrumentation developed by ARO, Inc., permits recording of the necessary data. In addition, the flow over the model is recorded with high-speed motion picture and still cameras. The film is exposed at thousands of frames per second, as compared to a speed of 24 frames per second used in standard commercial movie cameras.

In another approach to model testing at hypervelocities, experimental work is being conducted in the hyperballistic range field. The model in this case can be equipped with telemetry equipment. It is fired in free flight down a closed range at velocities of thousands of feet per second, instead of having the airflow pass over a stationary model as in conventional wind tunnels. The telemetry equipment in the model transmits to receivers outside the range the temperatures and pressures acting on the model during its flight. Two prototype ranges are currently being used in this work and a 1,000-foot-long, large-scale range is going through shakedown and calibration. Simple models have been launched at satellite velocity (18,000 miles per hour) from VKF two-stage, light gas guns.

Another VKF test unit is a prototype, low-density, hypervelocity, continuous flow wind tunnel. Its purpose is to provide simulation of aerodynamic conditions encountered by spacecraft at altitudes on the order of 200,000 to 300,000 feet and to help decide the most critical features of advanced test facilities. Rarefied atmospheres of certain other planets also may be simulated.

The present tunnel uses a continuous plasma torch which heats any of a variety of gases to the order of 4,000 to 10,000° F. In a typical case, nitrogen gas is being heated to 8,000° F., then expanded through a cooled hypersonic nozzle, to a mach number near 10, where the model is mounted. Equivalent density altitude in the test section is almost 50 miles. Models glow cherry-red with heat despite conduction and radiation cooling.

Still another field of study in this facility is the damage that could be caused by collision of a space vehicle and minute particles of natural or man-made space debris.

Two hypervelocity impact ranges are already in use for this purpose and a third, larger and more versatile range is scheduled to go into operation soon.

Plates of metal such as aluminum or copper, which could be used for the outer skin of space vehicles, are used as targets. Launchers, specifically designed for the purpose, propel BB-sized pellets of various materials down the ranges at velocities of thousands of feet per second.

Special cameras and electronic timing equipment enable technicians to determine the exact speed of the pellet at impact. Another special camera, capable of taking pictures at 1,400,000 frames per second, provides a graphic record of significant crater formation as the tiny projectile slams into the target.

PROPULSION WIND TUNNEL

The propulsion wind tunnel is designed to test large-scale model and, in some cases, full-scale aircraft, missiles, satellites, and space vehicles, and the propulsion systems for them in the mach number range from 0.5 to about 4. In addition, a propulsion system can be mounted for testing in its nacelle, pod, wing section or body of the aircraft, missile, satellite, or space vehicle just as it would be mounted in actual flight.

Altitude conditions ranging from sea level to well above 100,000 feet can be simulated in the propulsion wind tunnel.

The propulsion wind tunnel, as a facility, has two 16-foot wind tunnels—the transonic circuit and the supersonic circuit—and 1-foot model tunnels of each. The transonic circuit operates in the mach number range from 0.5 to about 1.6 and the supersonic circuit operates from mach 1.5 to about 4. In overall design they are basically the same.

The two large wind tunnels have removable, interchangeable test sections, which are an integral part of the tunnel when in place. Each circuit has its own compressor. Both are driven by the same system of motors.

With the interchangeable test sections, preparations for one test may be made at the same time another is being run in the tunnel. Thus, tunnel shutdown time between tests is shortened considerably. The common motor drive system permits operation of both tunnels simultaneously, under certain conditions. For peak operation of either tunnel, however, the entire motor drive system is connected to the compressor in the one tunnel.

Airflow, which reaches velocities between 100 and 200 miles an hour in the ducting both upstream and downstream of the test section, is guided smoothly around the corners of the tunnel by giant turning vanes that resemble oversize, vertical venetian blinds.

The air in the transonic circuit, which has been heated by friction and compression, also passes through a bank of water-cooled baffles before it goes into a stilling chamber and thence through a flexible nozzle, which regulates the velocity to the desired Mach number, into the test section.

The test section itself has perforated walls in the Transonic Circuit. That is, the walls, the floor and the ceiling have thousands of holes in them. And it is surrounded by a plenum chamber. This arrangement prevents shockwaves, inherent to sonic and supersonic flight, from reflecting off the walls back onto the model. Some of the air flows through the holes in the walls into the plenum chamber and is run back into the circuit downstream of the test section.

Since these two tunnels are closed circuits, a scavenging system was devised and installed to remove exhaust gases from the tunnel air when operating propulsion systems are tested. The scoop for this system is located directly behind the nozzle of the propulsion unit being tested. The scoop leads into ducting which, in turn, leads to the exhausters in the rocket test facility. The exhausters suck the exhaust gases out of the propulsion wind tunnel and through a cleaner before they are forced into the atmosphere. At the same time dry, uncontaminated air is fed back into the circuit through a large silica-gel drier in the same quantities removed by the scavenging system.

The flexible nozzles in these tunnels control only the velocity of the airflow through the test section. These tunnels have movable stings or supports on which the test objects are mounted. To simulate diving and climbing the sting is manipulated so that the test object itself is rolled or tilted up and down.

Just as tests are now run on models in these test sections, so were tests run on models of the test sections themselves before construction began on the actual tunnels. Moreover, these two model tunnels—the transonic model tunnel and the supersonic model tunnel—are being used today to run tests on small-scale models of aircraft, missiles, and space weapons. The smaller, prototype tunnels have test sections 1 foot square.

AEROSPACE ENVIRONMENTAL FACILITY

The Aerospace Environmental Facility was established in late 1962 in preparation for testing full-scale satellite and space vehicles under simulated conditions of their operational environment for continuous periods of as long as a year.

While the main test unit of this facility is still under construction, various systems, instrumentation, and techniques to be applied in the operation of this unit are being developed and tested in several smaller aerospace simulation chambers.

Designated the Mark I Aerospace Environmental Chamber, it will have a test area 35 feet in diameter and 65 feet high. It will provide the simulated conditions for ground testing satellite and space vehicles during their trajectory from the launch pad to altitudes of 200 to 300 miles.

The chamber will be capable of simulating real time altitude trajectory conditions from sea level to 15 miles altitude, one of the critical phases of a launching, in 82 seconds.

To create these conditions, the chamber will be equipped with vacuum pumping and cryogenic systems to simulate the low pressures and temperatures of space. Another system will simulate the sun's radiance to which an orbiting vehicle is exposed and an energy source will be installed to simulate the earth radiance and albedo, or earth reflection, as seen by a vehicle orbiting the earth. In addition, the chamber will be equipped with shakers to simulate the vibrations to which the vehicle is subjected while its rocket motors are operating and special handling equipment will simulate the pitch and roll conditions of orbit and space flight.

The types of information that will be obtained in the Mark I chamber include:

Performance and reliability of entire vehicles and their components.

The effects that various space phenomena, such as evaporation of materials, have on vehicles and their components.

Temperature distribution over the entire vehicle and its components.

The function of electrical equipment in a complete vehicle.

The vibrational characteristics imparted to a vehicle in the absence of aerodynamic damping.

And the effects of aerospace environments on lubricants and other materials.

The information that will be obtained in test programs in the Mark I chamber will result in a considerable reduction in the time, expense, and risk required to place a satellite in orbit or a space vehicle on its flight path.

PROJECTS

These are some of the programs for the Army, the Navy, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, as well as the Air Force, which were supported by extensive simulated high altitude, high speed tests at the Arnold Center: Agena, Atlas, Polaris, XB–70, X–15, Surveyor, Bullpup, Syncom, Asset, Mercury, Nike-Zeus, TFX, X–20, Titan I, II, and III, Saturn, Pershing, Apollo, Gemini, Sergeant, Minuteman, Discoverer, Scout, Ranger, Thorad.

Certain aspects of wind tunnel and propulsion system test cell work are common to all four major laboratories at the Arnold Engineering Development Center. Among them are:

CONTROL AND OBSERVATION

Control of the test object and all simulated flight conditions that are not preset in each of the wind tunnels and test cells is from a control room remote from the test sections or cells. In some cases, safety is a factor in this remote control.

When engines are undergoing test, whether in the propulsion wind tunnel or the Rocket Test Facility, power setting is controlled from the control room by an engineer or technician with a throttle similar to an airplane throttle. This is also true in the case of throttleable rocket engines. Angle of attack, airflow velocity, temperature and pressure are also controlled from the control room when not preset. The plenum evacuation and scavenging systems of the propulsion wind tunnel are also controlled from this remote point.

Observation of the object undergoing test can be covered by standard or high-speed motion picture and automatic still cameras mounted in the test sections or cells. In addition, closed circuit television is used to monitor the tests.

INSTRUMENTATION

Hundreds of standard temperature and pressure-sensing devices are attached to the engines or models to obtain the data during simulated flight tests in the wind tunnels and propulsion system test cells.

In the Hotshot tunnels, however, the nature of the tests and their relatively short duration demand special instrumentation. It must be small, yet it must respond instantaneously and it must be accurate. Such instrumentation was conceived and fabricated by ARO, Inc., technicians and has been acclaimed as a major engineering accomplishment.

Additional complications produced by the tremendous acceleration forces which act on hyperballistic range models and the telemetry equipment they carry are being overcome in work in the pilot ranges. Models and transmitters have withstood up to 200,000 G's—a force working against them that is equal to 200,000 times their own weight.

DATA RECORDING AND REDUCTION

Every instrument installed in a test object, whether it is a rocket engine or an aerodynamic shape, is connected or tuned to automatic data recording equipment outside the test unit. The data are then fed from this equipment to automatic data reduction equipment—or "electronic brains"—and the engineers and technicians on the test have precise data available to them only seconds after a test point has been run.

One advantage in this system is that the engineers and technicians running the test in many cases can make changes, if desired, while the test run continues. Another is the tremendous reduction in the lag between the end of the test run and the time finished data are available, which sometimes took weeks or months using the old manual and semiautomatic data reduction methods.

ONLY THE BEGINNING

But even after the data are reduced and the test reports written the job isn't finished. It is, in fact, only the beginning. Not until the information contained in the report is applied—to make the Nation's aerial and space weapons second to none—can the job be considered complete.

"I am keenly aware of the tremendous responsibility the Air Force currently has in using nearly 25 cents of each Federal tax dollar * * * The Air Force must spend this money so that the country receives the maximum amount of defense for it * * * After seeing some of the work at the Arnold Center, I know of no other installation in the Air Force where our money is being spent with greater effect."

EUGENE M. ZUCKERT,
Secretary of the Air Force.

"One of our Nation's most important aerospace research centers * * * with capabilities unmatched anyplace in the free world * * * Its environmental laboratories offers us priceless assistance in developing present and future aerospace systems."

GEN. THOMAS D. WHITE,
Former USAF Chief of Staff.

"Modern facilities such as these are one of the most valuable assets we have to national progress in aerospace technology."

GEN. B. A. SCHRIEVER,
Commander, AFSC.

TENNESSEE SPACE INSTITUTE

The Tennessee Space Institute, which will be operated by the University of Tennessee, is scheduled to open formally in September of 1964.

The institute will be built on a 400-acre site on the shores of Woods Reservoir only a few miles from Arnold Center. It will be fully accredited and will provide graduate study in engineering and science leading to the degrees of master of science and doctor of philosophy.

Establishment of the institute came about as the result of the joint efforts of ARO, Inc., contract operator of the center; the U.S. Air Force and the University of Tennessee. The Air Force donated the land and the State appropriated $1.25 million for construction of the initial buildings.

Students and faculty will have access to many of the laboratories, as well as the engineering and scientific staff, at the $340 million center, which gives the institute promise of becoming one of the world's leading institutions for advanced study and research in aerospace technology.

The curriculum will provide course work in space vehicle design, propulsion, gas dynamics, and space environmental problems. The initial faculty will consist of about a dozen professors.

A recent article by Gen. Bernard A. Shriever, "The Flaw in the Military Space Program," is worthy of the attention of the Congress and the public. He discusses the technical fallacies for tomorrow's space power:

THE FLAW IN THE MILITARY SPACE PROGRAM

(By Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, commander, Air Force Systems Command)

(NOTE.—U.S. Air Force's Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, AFSC's 52-year-old commander, is a graduate of Texas A. & M. and entered on active duty in July 1932. After a brief break in service, he returned to uniform in 1938 and has been on the rise ever since. Considered one of the Air Force's most knowledgeable men, Schriever was named AFSC's first commanding officer when the command was created in 1961, and received his fourth star shortly thereafter.)

A change in attitude is urgently needed because long leadtimes, required for construction, must be clearly recognized when considering.

The United States is engaged in a technological race with the Soviet Union. The obvious intention of the Soviets is to achieve decisive superiority in military technology.

Their leaders have proclaimed this goal repeatedly and they appear to be channeling their national resources effectively toward this objective. A number of their achievements in space flight not only show considerable technical ability but also manifest a definite potential for future military applications.

In the face of this technological challenge, adequate long-range planning for national security must take into account the technical facilities that will be needed to develop tomorrow's spacepower. This is a matter of real urgency, because advanced laboratories, wind tunnels, environmental chambers, ranges, and associated equipment are items with extremely long leadtimes.

Today's weapon systems, it should be remembered, have been developed in facilities that were conceived in the 1940's and built in the 1950's. At that time, they were regarded as very advanced. They involved some technical risk and could not be justified on the basis of systems of that day. However, these same facilities have been indispensable to the development of weapon systems in our inventory today—systems which were neither approved nor funded at the time the facilities were designed.

For example, the engineering test cells at the Air Force Arnold Engineering Development Center (AEDC), Tenn., were designed in 1944–45 to test air-breathing propulsion systems. Today, three of the seven cells are used exclusively to test rocket motors—which were not even part of a U.S. weapon system at the time the cells were conceived.

It took over 4 years of review by a number of agencies before the test cells were finally approved, authorized, and funded. The first cell was partially operational in 1953, but the total complement did not become totally operational until 1957—12 years after initial steps had been taken for their acquisition.

Had it not been for the forward-looking efforts of Dr. Theodore von Kármán, and his scientific associates, as well as the foresight of those who approved construction of these test cells, they would not have been available even then to support the Nation's space efforts.

Since 1958, these Air Force facilities have supported nearly every major missile and space program, including U.S. Air Force's Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman; Army's Pershing and Nike; Navy's Polaris; and NASA's Mercury and Apollo manned space flight programs.

TESTING INDISPENSABLE

They have been indispensable to instrumented tests, designed to investigate the causes of malfunctions, and have repeatedly revealed problems not predicted by theoretical studies or by sea-level testing. They have found design deficiencies which were not revealed by telemetry data.

In many cases, this testing obtained data which could not have been obtained in any other way. In every case, simulated tests proved to be significantly cheaper than flight tests.

Vast quantities of new data, as well as dramatic savings in time and money, have resulted from the use of flight simulation facilities. Testing in a controlled environment has repeatedly proved more effective and less costly than testing by trial and error from the launch pad. Controlled tests have been invaluable in accurately pinpointing the causes of malfunctions in flights.

For example, when an advanced ICBM failed at Cape Canaveral, films of the launch indicated the failure originated in the vehicle's base, but telemetry data failed to show the cause of the failure. A scale model of the missile was constructed and placed in an altitude test cell at AEDC.

When that model was subjected to the same conditions at which failure had occurred, it was determined, through extensive instrumentation, that the launch-pad failure had been caused by hot exhaust gases, recirculating in the base of the missile. This same problem was found to be common to several advanced missile and booster systems, all of which have since received tests in the Arnold facilities.

By enabling research personnel to reproduce the extremely hostile flight environment of the upper atmosphere, the altitude chambers at Arnold have helped solve a number of such puzzling problems.

In one typical instance, the Arnold facilities were used to find out why a rocket motor had failed in orbit, in spite of a perfect test record at sea-level conditions. When the motor was tested under simulated conditions of actual flight, the causes of failure were readily determined and the necessary changes were made.

Similarly, the altitude chambers have been used to test new materials for rocket nozzles and to investigate the causes of failure in recovery parachutes at extremely high altitudes.

One of the factors in the success of the X–15 program is the extensive preliminary testing under conditions simulating those of actual flight. Wind tunnel tests of the X–15 configuration involved the simulation of more than 500 different reentry conditions and resulted in the accumulation of more than 2 million data points. A number of design changes, necessary to assure safe reentry, resulted from these tests.

FACILITIES ARE BROAD

The test cells at Arnold are only a portion of the facilities used by the Air Force for the development, testing, and evaluation of new systems.

The Central Inertial Guidance Test Facility at Holloman Air Force Base, N. Mex., performs invaluable work in the testing of guidance systems. It was here that the Minuteman sled-test program was conducted. In the course of the project, three specific defects were discovered—any one of which could have caused the loss of a missile. Necessary corrections were made and the guidance system worked perfectly when the first Minuteman was fired at the cape.

Development of the Central Inertial Guidance Test Facility points up one of the chief problems in constructing new research facilities—that of providing instrumentation of sufficient accuracy to gage the equipment being tested. This is a continuing problem as weapon systems increase in precision and reliability. The measuring and evaluating devices must always be more precise and more reliable.

It should be evident that modern, up-to-date research facilities are essential to the continuing progress of military technology. These are the items with the longest leadtimes of any element in the system's acquisition cycle.

Acquisition of a comparatively simple facility must start about 4 years before the facility is required. A complicated, state-of-the-art facility, such as an advanced wind tunnel or environmental chamber, may require a leadtime of as long as 8 years. A new item in the military construction program often requires more than 2½ years between its initiation and the receipt of funding which permits negotiating for a construction contract.

The long leadtime for acquiring technical facilities becomes a major pacing factor in the timely acquisition of weapon systems. New technical facilities must be conceived on the basis of projecting the state-of-the-art to anticipate scientific requirements.

Therefore, they must precede the approval and funding of new systems. If facility development is delayed until the emergence of an approved and funded system that specifically requires it, the facility cannot be ready by the time the system requires its services. In order to assist in preventing repeated flight test failures and in developing design parameters, the facility must be ready when the system enters the development phase.

To meet its responsibilities for the rapid advancement of technology and the development of new aerospace systems, the Air Force urgently needs new technical facilities to support research, development, test, and evaluation missions. In order to insure the timely acquisition of these new facilities, more effective procedures must be followed.

U.S. Air Force has taken several specific steps to improve its procedures for facilities acquisition. Recently, the 850-A program area was established to perform resources planning studies and analyses.

Work in this area includes generalized studies to determine facilities requirements and requirements trends; analysis of alternate methods of expanding and modernizing technical facilities; and identification and validation of future facility requirements.

MORE ARE NEEDED

Many of today's research and development technical facilities are, themselves, actually products of research—and more of them will be so in the future.

In recognition of this fact and in order to alleviate the difficulties encountered in establishing design criteria, cost, feasibility, and other specifications as required, the Air Force has established program area 850-E, "Design criteria for R. & D. facilities." Work in this area is a natural follow-on to work in the 850-A program area and includes all research, present and future, that contributes directly to or supports the design criteria of a planned R. & D. technical facility.

Facility acquisition procedures have also been improved by the fact that, beginning with the fiscal year 1964 budget submission, technical facilities are treated separately from other construction items.

Purpose of these improvements is to insure that requests for new research and development facilities will be adequately supported by feasibility and cost data. But, in addition to these changes in procedures which have already been implemented, a change in attitude is urgently needed.

To begin with, the long leadtime required for technical facilities must be clearly recognized and approval procedures should take cognizance of this factor. Efforts must be made to achieve drastic reduction in leadtime—particularly in the long, drawn-out approval phase.

Secondly, the justification of facilities should be based on technical feasibility and design criteria rather than on detailed design drawings and specifications. The design and scope of the new facilities should be flexible enough to permit changes during the acquisition cycle to take advantage of new knowledge and to adapt to changing requirements and applications.

Finally, the importance of economy must be considered in justifying new test facilities. Where adequate environmental test facilities are not in existence, new systems have to be tested in actual flight.

This can be a very costly procedure, since every failure is likely to involve either the destruction of the system or very serious damage to it. Where potential failures can be identified by simulated flight tests, considerable savings are possible.

A recognized element of risk is involved in acquiring new facilities, as there is in any urgent military program. But, the need for technical facilities more than justifies the risk involved, in view of the alternatives. A decisive Soviet lead in space technology and military spacepower would be disastrous for the free world. The United States cannot afford to neglect the requirements of technological progress.

The need for improved research and development facilities has been stated at the highest Department of Defense levels. In his memorandum on in-house laboratories, dated October 14, 1961, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara stated: "The Department of Defense must insure that these laboratories, which constitute one of our greatest assets, are properly supported and utilized."

Several days later, Dr. Harold Brown, Director of Defense Research and Engineering, noted four factors that affect the acquisition and retention of leading scientists and engineers—salary, organization, working environment, and physical environment.

Since the fall of 1961, a major effort has been made to upgrade in-house competence, and a number of improvements have resulted. Public Law 87-793, passed by the Congress on October 11, 1962, reformed the Federal salary structure and incorporated the principle that these salaries should be comparable with those in private enterprise for the same level of work.

Formation of the Research and Technology Division of the Air Force Systems Command, on July 26, 1962, was another of these improvements. This step was designed to improve management procedures for U.S. Air Force laboratories and create a more challenging and stimulating working environment.

But, the problem of improving the physical environment still remains to be solved. As Secretary Brown has pointed out: "The quality of the physical plant is very often viewed as a basic method for expression of the relative value which central management places upon the local laboratory's collective efforts. In many cases, the Defense laboratories are lagging behind Government-supported industrial or university standards."

In spite of this recognition of the problem, the Air Force has not yet been able to secure the modern laboratory facilities it requires to attract and stimulate the efforts of the highest caliber technical people.

It is not enough to give a scientist pay and recognition. He also needs the tools with which to work—and this means research and development facilities, advanced enough to support investigations on the frontiers of knowledge. The upgrading of in-house competence, in the final analysis will be heavily dependent on the provision of adequate working facilities for in-house scientists and engineers.

It is clear that Air Force capabilities, during the next 5 to 10 years, are inextricably tied to decisions made on research, development and test facilities today. These decisions, in large measure, will determine the ability of the Air Force to continue to meet the responsibilities for national security in the space age.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. McLOSKEY (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), on account of death of member of his staff.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. MILLER of California), for today through the balance of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PELLY, for 20 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida for, 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LIBONATI (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 60 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BRAY (at the request of Mr. MORSE), for 15 minutes, on Wednesday, December 4.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PELLY to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter in his special order today.

Mr. ALGER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MORSE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. BRAY.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on November 29, 1963, present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3190. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, relating to devises and bequests by will;

H.R. 3191. An act to exempt life insurance companies from the act of February 4, 1913, regulating loaning of money on securities in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 7497. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia relating to annual statements and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 809. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 3, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1403. A letter from the national adjutant, Disabled American Veterans, transmitting the reports and the proceedings of our national gathering, held in Miami Beach, Fla., August 18 through 24, 1963, for the year ending June 30, 1963, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 282); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1404. A letter from the executive secretary, Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting the 50th Annual Report of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for the calendar year 1962, pursuant to an act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, approved March 4, 1913; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McCULLOCH: Committee on the Judiciary. Part 2, additional views on H.R. 7152. Civil Rights Act of 1963 (Rept. No. 914). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 8751. A bill to amend the act of March 2, 1931, to provide that certain proceedings of the AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), shall be printed as a House document, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 931). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 230. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of 5,000 copies of the study, "Tax-Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Their Impact on Our Economy—Second Installment," for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business; without amendment (Rept. No. 932). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 231. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of 5,000 copies of the study, "Tax-Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Their Impact on Our Economy," for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business; without amendment (Rept. No. 933). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 237. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of certain opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States in cases involving the offering of prayers and reading from the Bible in public schools; without amendment (Rept. No. 934). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 518. Resolution to print as a House document, the handbook entitled "The United States Courts"; without amendment (Rept. 935). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 9000. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; without amendment (Rept. 936). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 7170. A bill to amend the Alaska Public Works Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to collect, compromise, or release certain claims held by him under that act; without amendment (Rept. No. 937). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1713. A bill to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Klamath Indian irrigation project, Oregon, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 938). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 547. Resolution to provide additional funds for the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 179; with amendment (Rept. No. 939). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 566. Resolution to provide funds for the further expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 56; with Amendment (Rept. No. 940). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 9305. A bill providing for the election of an acting Vice President by the House of Representatives in certain instances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 9306. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make loans to Indians for purchase of certain real property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 9307. A bill to establish a commission to be known as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 9308. A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 9309. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide that the penalties for homicide prescribed in such title shall apply to any person who kills the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, or the head of any executive department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9310. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 9311. A bill to continue for 2 years the suspension of duty on certain alumina and to make permanent the suspension of duty on certain bauxite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 9312. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Guadalupe Mountains National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 9313. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 9314. A bill to amend the U.S. Warehouse Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 9315. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act so as to require that certain firearms transported in interstate or foreign commerce must be consigned to the recipients through local law enforcement officers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AYRES:

H.J. Res. 818. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of the Vice President by the Senate in certain instances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.J. Res. 819. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 820. Joint resolution designating the National Cultural Center as the John F. Kennedy Memorial National Cultural Center; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 821. Joint resolution to establish a commission to be known as the John F. Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 822. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.J. Res. 823. Joint resolution providing for the issuance of standard silver dollars bearing the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.J. Res. 824. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve and protect references to reliance upon God in governmental matters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. Res. 578. Resolution to provide for the issuance of identification cards to the spouses of Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 9316. A bill for the relief of Evelyn Adora Flowers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9317. A bill for the relief of Enrico Cortina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 9318. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Francavilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 9319. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Zora Secivanovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

467. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of the mayor and City Council of Omaha, Nebr., expressing deepest sympathy to the wife and family of President John F. Kennedy; resolving that we turn our eyes and hearts toward God in this darkest hour of history while the people of the world are still suffering from the initial shock of the loss of this greatest of leaders by assassination at a time when the strength of his mind and heart are sorely needed throughout the world; and resolving that we strive to bring peace and freedom to all people in all parts of the world, as would be the will of President John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America; to the Committee on House Administration.

468. By the SPEAKER: Petition of John W. Potter, mayor, Toledo, Ohio, relative to memorializing President John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on House Administration.

469. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to legislate to require the President of the United States, when traveling, always to be protected, as far as is humanly possible, by bulletproof glass, or comparable substance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

470. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to amend the second amendment to the Constitution of the United States to the effect that the Federal Government may have the power to cause all keepers and bearers of arms to be duly registered and licensed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

471. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to legislate to require the President when riding in an automobile, to ride in bulletproof cars, and when with the people in large numbers to wear bulletproof clothing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

472. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to initiate an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the term of President to that of one 6-year term, with no eligibility or possibility for reelection, as well as no eligibility for election in his own right to the Vice Presidency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

We Should Proliferate Weapons Among NATO Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Sunday's Star published an editorial, "Nuclear Generosity," commenting on the proposal of the Republican project committee on NATO unity—of which I am a member—that the United States give tactical nuclear weapons to our NATO allies. Here is the text of the editorial:

> NUCLEAR GENEROSITY
>
> A group of House Republicans looking for ways to shore up the Atlantic Alliance is urging that the United States give small nuclear weapons to NATO countries. The idea is that these countries will no longer be irritated by the American monopoly, and the Alliance will tend to draw closer together.
>
> This would be a generous gesture—but a dangerous one. The United States has kept control over its nuclear weapons during the past three administrations for sound reasons. Here are some of them:
>
> Nuclear war is so incredibly dangerous to civilization that even the smallest nuclear weapons should be used only if there is no alternative and only in the most controlled and deliberate way possible. The more countries that can fire these weapons in time of stress, the more likely it is that they will be fired unnecessarily.
>
> Once one is fired, there could be a tendency for both sides to use more and more, bigger and bigger warheads until the world slips unwittingly into what could be nuclear suicide. The more countries that are free to contribute to this slide, the more apt it is to happen.
>
> Nuclear weapons of any size may never be used again, or if they are used, close control may prove to be possible. These uncertainties make it nonetheless important, however, to try to keep the weapons under control. Congress was wise to make transfer of nuclear weapons to other countries illegal. The law should not be changed out of hope for a change in the attitude of our allies.

Mr. Speaker, I disagree with the conclusions reached in the editorial, but believe the newspaper rendered a public service in calling attention to the proposal.

The main purpose of the proposal was to help shore up the NATO alliance. To me, the strengthening of NATO is the most urgent and vital task confronting the United States. The uncertainties which naturally accompany a change in U.S. executive leadership make the task all the more urgent.

At present we are treating our NATO allies like irresponsible children. We deny them weapons we know our common adversary possesses. If West Germany were invaded by the nuclear-armed Communists, for example, it would have no nuclear weapons of its own for defense. Tactical weapons with nuclear warheads exist in West Germany, of course, but they are locked up. The United States holds the keys. Whether they would actually be used to defend West Germany would depend on a U.S. decision at the moment of crisis. The decision might be either yes or no.

As our allies review recent U.S. policy they may be justified in wondering if we would actually defend Europe's cities with our nuclear weapons. Witness our weak followthrough in Cuba, withdrawal of missiles from Italy and Turkey, the test ban treaty, cancellation of Skybolt.

At any moment, Khrushchev may nibble aggressively at NATO frontiers, figuring the United States will not respond with nuclear weapons.

If we give our NATO allies nuclear tactical weapons, we would at the same time be giving each of them—and the NATO alliance—the strongest possible vote of confidence. It would be a U.S. commitment to defend Europe far stronger and more tangible than words. This assurance would not be overlooked in Moscow.

Khrushchev would know that if he attacked any part of NATO he would bring nuclear weapons into action. This knowledge would be a strong deterrent to Communist aggression.

Sharing nuclear weapons with our NATO allies would actually reduce the danger of war. The weakness of our present policy can be illustrated by drawing a parallel between the NATO alliance and the U.S. Federal Union.

Suppose each of our 50 States had its own military defenses, with the 50 tied together with a treaty alliance. Of the 50, only 1—Illinois, let us say—had nuclear weapons. Illinois dispersed nuclear vehicles among the other 49 States and promised to use these weapons to defend each of the other States in case of Communist aggression. Illinois kept the nuclear warheads under lock and key, however, and reserved to itself the final decision on when and if they would be used.

Under these circumstances, would it not be better—for the cause of peace as well as resistance to communism—for Illinois to supply the other 49 States with complete nuclear weapons, which each could use at will?

This would not be the ideal arrangement, of course. Central civilian control of all U.S. nuclear weapons is far better than proliferation among the 50 individual States of the Union. But proliferation certainly would be far better than an Illinois monopoly. Illinois might have the best of intentions, but in a showdown its promise to defend California—or any other State—might not be fulfilled.

Nor is the proliferation our project committee recommends the ideal arrangement for NATO's 15 nations. In my opinion, central civilian control of all NATO nuclear weapons would be far better.

Unhappily, no central civilian authority exists. NATO is not a government and holds no authority. Consequently, there is no central civilian authority to which control of all NATO nuclear weapons could be transferred.

NATO is but a treaty alliance, far weaker than the Articles of Confederation which proved to be grossly inadequate for the Thirteen Original States in early U.S. history.

Curiously, we have advanced to the nuclear age in military science, but we are still in the oxcart age in political science. We have not had the good sense to link the NATO peoples with the same type Federal structure that serves the people of the 50 U.S. States so well.

We should proceed at once to forge this linkage, and thus create a central civilian authority to which all NATO nuclear weapons could be transferred.

Meanwhile, we should strengthen NATO by giving its member nations the tactical nuclear weapons they need and deserve. Proliferation of weapons among those who love liberty is an act of humanity and peace.

Communism Still Poses Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, it is noteworthy that of all the nations in the world the only one which gloated over our President's assassination was Red China. Their official remarks clearly demonstrated the viciousness and hatred which typify the leadership of that country.

It might be well to briefly study the ruthless and insane ambition which is demonstrated in the actions of the present ruler of the 700 million Red Chinese today. I will quote extracts from writings either by Mao Tse-tung or written under his direction. Mao Tse-tung, himself, is a brilliant, well-educated man.

The following verses are taken from a Chinese folksong:

> The sun is rising red in the East.
> China has brought forth a Mao Tse-tung.
> He plans blessings for the people.
> Aiyayo, he is the people's great saviour.
> Mao Tse-tung is a son of the Chinese earth;
> He will lead us to fight the enemy.
> There will come a time when we will be masters.
> Aiyayo, all our enemies shall be beaten.

Mao's supreme egotism is shown in this extract from an official publication of Red China:

> Mao Tse-tung is China's greatest theoretician, thinker, and revolutionary * * * Mao can truly be regarded as a genius such as never before has appeared in Chinese history.

Perhaps the following extract from a poem written by Mao himself best displays his military ambitions to conquer. In this poem he places himself as a greater military genius than Genghis Khan, the great Mongol leader who was perhaps the greatest and most ruthless conquerer of all time.

> These lands, these rivers, their bewitching charm
> Inspired the conqueror of Chin and Han,
> Tang and Sung in splendour striving to expand.
> Alas! All short in stature! And Genghis Khan
> Knew only how to shoot a hawk for play.
> For the towering figure watch the scene today!

Perhaps the principal cause of America's failure to understand what to expect from our potential enemies is that we have forgotten that "he who will not learn the lessons of history is doomed to relive it."

The histories used in American schools have recorded little of the great and ruthless Chinese conquerors who have led a cruel and relentlessly expanding nation in the past. The strength of China has ebbed and flowed several times in the last 20 centuries.

In the centuries of Chinese history, she also has been controlled by dynasties of the Mongols and Manchus, but in each instance these conquering peoples became Chinese themselves.

It is true that for three centuries Russia has been an aggressor against China, but today Mao appears to be bent on revenge toward the rest of the world.

His subjects are hungry. There is nothing Mao would like better than to take over Russian territory in central Asia and Siberia, much of which was once controlled by China. He has created several border incidents, but he knows that he cannot today cope with Russian strength.

He is creating incidents along the border between North and South Korea; he has invaded India in two different places, and India has been one of his friends; he is now taking over American influences in Cambodia and the American mission has been ordered to leave. He is pushing the war in Vietnam, and is gaining control of Laos. The tentacles of Red China are probing deep into the new and underdeveloped countries of Asia.

The fact that China is today vengeful toward Russia should not fill us with hope and confidence toward a better relationship with Russia, for world communism today, whether dominated by Russia, China, or Cuba, is our mortal enemy, and it is naive to believe otherwise.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of November 30, 1963:

AMERICA'S HOUR OF TRIAL

The violent act of a madman has brought sorrow to every American heart. There is no individual who does not grieve at the untimely death of John F. Kennedy. We offer our prayers that his widow and his children receive the God-given strength and wisdom which alone can make the burden bearable. Even in our grief, however, we recognize that life and death are intertwined—that death is not the end, but the continuation for the soul of man. No matter how tragic the death, how deep felt our sorrow, life and the Nation must go on. We pause to pay tribute and honor to our dead President. In that vein I issued the following statements over the last tragic weekend:

STATEMENT ON THE DEATH OF THE PRESIDENT

"No words can express our deep sorrow in this tragic hour. God alone can sustain us in our loss. Our hearts and prayers go out to Mrs. Kennedy, the children, and other members of the Kennedy family. We pray also for the speedy recovery of the Governor. We must call upon our inner strength to keep cool heads and preserve our country and our people."

TELEGRAM TO MRS. KENNEDY

"There are no words to express the deep sorrow felt by all the people of the Nation, but we did want you to know that our thoughts and prayers are with you and the children at this time. May God give us strength to protect and preserve our country to which your husband so valiantly dedicated himself."

TELEGRAM TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON

"The entire Nation is with you as you assume the tremendous responsibility now imposed upon you. May God give you the strength to preserve the Nation and the ideals for which it stands and to that end we pledge our support."

Now the last tributes have been paid and the President sleeps on the hillside in Arlington. It is up to all of us now to move forward in preserving the Nation and its liberties so that John F. Kennedy will not have lived nor died in vain. In preserving this Nation we must preserve the constitutional government with its three branches—we must preserve the freedom of debate, to oppose those things we believe wrong and support those we believe are right. Opposition, loyal opposition, is a tradition of our free society. Opposition to legislation is not based on hate, nor does the mere fact that a legislator opposes certain legislation or certain programs make of him a breeder of hate or an accessory to murder. To believe that to oppose is to destroy would put an end to representative government and there would be no meaning to the President's dedication to his principles or to his death.

In that spirit, then, let's continue to build in America. Let's not condemn the whole Nation, the city of Dallas, or those of opposite political parties. There is good sense in the editorial from the Wall Street Journal of November 26, 1963. I commend it to all the people of Dallas and reprint it here as a part of this newsletter:

"NO TIME FOR COLLECTIVE GUILT

"In the shock of these past few days it is understandable that Americans should find their grief mingled with some shame that these events should happen in their country. We all stand a little less tall than we did last Friday morning.

"Yet, for our own part, we find past understanding the remarks of some otherwise thoughtful men who, in their moment of shock, would indict a whole nation with a collective guilt. It seems to us that they themselves have yielded to the hysteria they would charge to others, and in so doing show that their own country is past their understanding.

"Anyone who has been reading the newspapers, listening to the radio, or watching television has heard these men; they include public commentators, Members of our Congress, and men of God. And the substance of what they charge is that the whole of the American people—and by inclusion, the ways of the American society—are wrapped in a collective guilt for the murder of a President and the murder of a murderer.

"A Senator said that the responsibility lay on 'the people of Dallas' because this is where the events took place. A spokesman for one group of our people said the Nation was 'reaping the whirlwind of hatred.' One of our highest judges said the President's murder was stimulated by the 'hatred and malevolence' that are 'eating their way into the bloodstream of American life.' A newspaper of great renown passed judgment that 'none of us can escape a share of the fault for the spiral of violence.' And these were but a few among many.

"Such statements can only come from men who have not been abroad in the land, neither paused to reflect how the events came about nor observed in what manner the whole American people have responded to tragedy.

"A President lies dead because he moved freely among the people. He did so because he was beloved by many people, respected by all, and because everywhere people turned out in great numbers to pay him honor. In a society of tyranny the heads of state move in constant fear of murder, cordoned behind an army of policemen. It is the fundamental orderliness of the American society that leads Presidents to move exposed to all the people, making possible the act of a madman.

"In the tragedy there is blame, surely, for negligence. In restrospect, perhaps, it was negligent of a President himself not to be aware that there are ever madmen in the world; yet it is a negligence born of courage and confidence. It was negligent of the police authorities, perhaps, not to search and cover every corner, every window, which might shield a madman; yet it was a negligence born of years of proven trust in the crowds of Americans through which Presidents have safely moved.

"It was most certainly a terrible negligence on the part of the local police authorities which permitted one man to take vengeance into his own hands. It was an outrageous breach of responsibility for them to have moved a man accused of so heinous a crime in so careless a fashion. It was outrageous precisely because all the American people were themselves so outraged by the crime of assassination that anyone who knew these people ought to have known that one among them might be deranged enough to do exactly what was done.

"Yet the opportunity for negligence came because here the accused was being treated as any other accused, his detention in the hands of local police, the procedures those followed for the ordinary of murders. In another land he would have been efficiently buried by a secret police in a Lubyianka prison, never again to be seen or heard of until his execution.

"One might say, we suppose, that some of this negligence could be laid to all of us. It is, after all, the eager interest of the people in the persons of their leaders that brings them into open caravans, and it is the desire of the people to follow the normal ways even in murders of state that left the accused to bungling local police.

"In sum, there is in all of this—let there be no mistake—much to grieve, to regret, to blame. We can't escape remorse that there are madmen in our midst, that a President is dead, that we have been denied the right to show in open court the virtue of a free society. Now we pay the price of all sorts of negligence.

"But there is something different from the charge in the indictment. It is more than nonsense to say that the good people of Dallas, crowding the streets to honor a President, share a murderous guilt; or that the tragic acts of madmen cast a shadow on the whole of America. Such an indictment is vicious.

"Of reasons for shame we have enough this day without adding to them a shameful injustice to a mourning people."

TRIBUTE TO ANOTHER HERO

We remember, too, in this moment of sorrow Officer J. D. Tippit of the Dallas Police Department. I attempted to convey some of the feeling of the people of Dallas in the following telegram to his family:

"In this hour we would like you to know that you have our deepest sympathy. May God be with you and give you strength and courage. It may comfort you to know that an entire nation recognizes the bravery and dedication of your husband and that in his death he will become an inspiration to others that we may all meet our challenges with the same courage he did whenever duty calls."

STATEMENT ON PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S MESSAGE TO CONGRESS

President Johnson said what had to be said. He presented his plan, his beliefs as embodied in the legislation to which he has given his support. He will continue the program of the New Frontier. We admire his forthrightness and his decisive action in enunciating his program:

The tragic event of the past few days will not be forgotten by any who lived in this time, but as President Johnson stated so eloquently, the country must move forward. The legislative process must be pursued and those of us charged with the responsibility of representing the people in the Congress of the United States must make an effort to guard the fundamental principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

Some of us will continue to oppose the encroachments on the freedoms of the individual by big government. To abandon our convictions would be a mockery of our system and all that elected representatives of the people should be.

It is a basic part of our constitutional form of government that opposition to stated programs be expressed. Through the give and take of debate, then, we arrive at legislative conclusions in the interest of the whole Nation and all of its people.

Opposition is not hatred. Holding of views contrary to the leadership on given legislation does not make those who hold such views disloyal or accessories to murder.

Should opposition on principle be subdued because of fear of criticism, then the American concept of government will be lost and our late President will then truly have lived and died in vain.

I have faith, however, in the goodness and the stability of the American people, in the honor and judgment of our elected representatives, and I am certain we will move forward, a united nation, each of us dedicated to preserving it and the principles for which we stand in a climate of freedom in which all of us believe.

In this spirit I shall continue to point out the dangers I see in some of the specific legislation now pending. I shall continue to do my best to preserve fiscal responsibility and the soundness of the dollar and will, as I have always done, apply to each piece of legislation the acid test of its constitutionality and whether or not it is within the framework of the amount of money the taxpayers can afford to spend.

I do regret President Johnson's emotional appeal, asking for support of legislation in memory of our late President. We who believe in government of law, not men, endorse or oppose legislation on merit alone, and should not be asked to evaluate legislation on taxation, civil rights, education, and other areas on any other basis.

Also, I share the view expressed by some who sensed the inconsistency of President Johnson's avowal of belief in independence and integrity of the legislative branch just after having appealed as President, in the name of our late President, that we pass all pending administration legislation.

NOW WE LOOK AHEAD

The week has now ended and the events have been recorded in the book of history. Our duty demands that we look to the future. Our national purpose, our national character have been sorely tried, but in the magnificent response of the American people our country withstood the test. We will continue to have our differences of opinion on what means should be used to achieve the common good, but we have proved to the world and, more importantly, to ourselves that we are one people, a united people, able to band together in time of crisis and to openly express our deepest feelings when any neighbor or any fellow human being needs comfort and strength.

Looking toward the future our national purpose is unchanged—to protect and preserve this free Nation and in the words of the Constitution, "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalms 84: 11: *No good thing will the Lord withhold from them that walk uprightly.*

O Thou who art the source of every needed blessing, we beseech Thee to clarify our minds and cleanse our hearts as we face the duties and responsibilities of this day.

Show us how we may strengthen and safeguard the freedom and integrity of our Republic and make her truly great.

May we be assured that Thy continued favor toward us is to be found in obeying Thy will and in following Thy leading.

Fill us with a longing to hasten the dawning of that glorious day when all nations shall be united in the bonds of brotherhood.

Grant that in times of peril and danger we may sustain one another and in times of suffering and sorrow may we minister to one another's needs.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SENDING TO CONFERENCE INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 8747) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, with amendments of the Senate thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. THOMAS, EVINS, CANNON, OSTERTAG, and JONAS.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 214]

Abele
Ashbrook
Ashley
Barry
Becker
Bennett, Mich.
Bolling
Bolton, Oliver P.
Brooks
Byrnes, Wis.
Cameron
Celler
Chelf
Colmer
Curtis
Dawson
Diggs
Dowdy
Dulski
Evins
Fraser
Gibbons
Gill
Glenn
Hall
Harsha
Hoeven
Jennings
Johansen
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
Lindsay
Long, La.
McLoskey
Mailliard
Matsunaga
Milliken
Monagan
Moss
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Brien, Ill.
Passman
Pepper
Powell
Rivers, Alaska
Robison
Roosevelt
Roush
St. Onge
Selden
Senner
Shelley
Sheppard
Siler
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Tupper
Van Pelt
White
Widnall
Winstead

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 368 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 6518, AN ACT TO IMPROVE, STRENGTHEN AND ACCELERATE PROGRAMS FOR THE PREVENTION AND ABATEMENT OF AIR POLLUTION

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 6518) entitled "An act to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution," with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. Harris, Roberts of Alabama, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, O'Brien of New York, Rogers of Florida, Bennett of Michigan, Schenck, Nelsen, and Brotzman.

AGREEING TO SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 134, AN ACT TO PROVIDE THAT SEAT BELTS SOLD OR SHIPPED IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE FOR USE IN MOTOR VEHICLES SHALL MEET CERTAIN SAFETY STANDARDS

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 134), an act to provide that seat belts sold or shipped in interstate commerce for use in motor vehicles shall meet certain safety standards, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "vehicles" and insert "vehicles other than those of carriers subject to safety regulations under part II of the Interstate Commerce".

Page 2, line 11, after "Whoever" insert "knowingly and willfully".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, will the gentleman from Alabama kindly explain if there are any fundamental changes or just what is involved in the Senate amendments?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois that in my opinion these amendments improve the bill. They take from the operation of the bill those carriers who have to qualify with the ICC and they also add the words "knowingly and willfully" which would raise the degree of proof that would be required for the conviction of anyone who seeks to promulgate standards that are not adequate.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Alabama whether all the amendments by the other body are germane to the bill?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Yes, I think they are.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COFFEE PRICE INCREASE

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on November 14, 1963, when the House of Representatives passed the International Coffee Agreement, I opposed it because I felt it would authorize the creation of an international cartel which would restrict world coffee production and raise coffee prices in America.

Well, the price increases are on the way. The Wall Street Journal of yesterday reported that two major coffee processors said they would join another major processor in increasing the wholesale price of ground coffee 2 cents per pound. Today, two more coffee processors joined the chorus. With a previous 2 cents per pound increase in October, wholesale coffee prices have increased 4 cents per pound within the last 6 weeks.

The mere prospects of the adoption of the International Coffee Agreement have been sufficient to increase the cost of green coffee to processors 4 cents a pound. By the time these price increases work their way from processor to roaster, distributor, and consumer, they will be substantially increased and the spiral has just begun. The 15-cent cup of coffee is practically here and the automatic vending machines may soon make it a quarter. Coffee has become a necessary stimulant to millions of Americans, who will soon stimulate Congress about the stimulated price.

As the world's largest consumer of coffee, it was folly for the United States to involve itself in price-fixing agreements which saddle such a tremendous burden upon the people of America.

A BILL TO CONTROL AND REGULATE THE SHIPMENT OF FIREARMS IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to control and regulate the shipment of firearms in interstate commerce. This measure would require the seller of a gun which moved in interstate commerce to deliver it to local police officials rather than directly to the purchaser.

The bill further directs that the FBI should establish standards and regulations to assist local police departments to determine which purchasers are good risks, and to provide for periodical reporting by purchasers on the use and location of their firearms.

We certainly do not want to interfere with the rights of legitimate sportsmen to buy guns, and I believe that such persons would be glad to cooperate.

We do want to discourage the appallingly easy access to guns by juveniles, psycopaths, and hate groups. It is becoming alarmingly familiar to read of leaders of extremist political groups being found with arsenals, even including machineguns. The recent assassination of President John F. Kennedy proves that the need for this type of legislation is clear and urgent.

HERBLOCK'S CARTOONS

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, the point of Herblock's cartoon in today's Washington Post, which shows the hatemongers crawling into their holes, is well taken but it comes very strangely from his drawing board. I recall numerous other cartoons of his which positively dripped venom against his targets and which, by being published, gave a measure of dignity and approbation to emotions of hatred and personal vilification. Even the cartoon of today is guilty of this, in spite of its good intentions. It is sad to observe that the stream of vitriol still rolls on and that the extent of Herblock's charity seems to be "Hate All Hatemongers." I suggest he examine his own participation in the creation of the climate he apparently abhors.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

OUTLET STORES, INC.

The Clerk called the first bill (H.R. 2300) for the relief of the Outlet Stores, Inc.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

DR. AND MRS. ABEL GORFAIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2706) for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Abel Gorfain.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

CHARLES WAVERLY WATSON, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2728) for the relief of Charles Waverly Watson, Jr.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

JOHN F. MacPHAIL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5145) for the relief of John F. MacPhail, lieutenant, U.S. Navy.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

BRYCE A. SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6182) for the relief of Bryce A. Smith.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

REVITALIZE THE AMERICAN COTTON INDUSTRY

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 464 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6196) to encourage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and, pending that, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 464 provides for consideration of H.R. 6196, a bill to encourage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes. The resolution provides an open rule with 4 hours of general debate.

The purpose of H.R. 6196 is to forestall the ruin of the American cotton industry and to revitalize the industry on which millions of our citizens depend for their livelihood.

The bill will end the two-price system for cotton. Domestic mills will be able to buy cotton at the world price. They now must pay approximately 8½ cents a pound more than the world price for the cotton that goes into goods sold in the United States. Cotton again will compete fairly with synthetic fibers.

Americans will enjoy lower prices for American-made cotton goods, at savings amounting to more than $500 million a year, according to competent estimates.

Farm prices will remain stabilized and protected. The legislation will protect the livelihood of millions of workers associated with cotton.

It will encourage a healthy cotton trade and merchandising system. It will assist and promote an efficient, growing, and prosperous cotton textile industry, and the United States will enjoy a fair share of the world cotton market.

Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration here today, H.R. 6196, has had a rather lengthy history in this, the 1st session of the 88th Congress. This specific bill was introduced originally by the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. HAROLD COOLEY, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, back on May 9 of this year. The bill was reported with amendments by the Committee on Agriculture to the House on June 6 of this year.

On July 30 of this year a rule was granted and reported to the House. Of course, here today on the 3d of December we have the bill before the House for discussion.

There have been a great many charges and countercharges made with reference to this particular piece of legislation. What we are seeking to do here today by House Resolution 464 is to adopt the resolution, permit the House to go into the Committee of the Whole where they will have 4 hours to discuss the merits or demerits of this particular piece of legislation.

At the conclusion of the 4 hours, of course, the bill will be open to amendment since it is a completely open rule and the House will be able to work its will to amend or to change this in any way, in the wisdom of the House, that it should be changed.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the Congress representing a district which produces possibly as much or more cotton than almost any district in America, I am very much concerned about the future of the American cotton industry.

This bill has been branded by various opponents with a variety of names, but I think basically that those of us who are close to the cotton industry, whether it be producing cotton or processing it, and those people involved in the textile industry in sales or in the other peripheral industries which affect the cotton industry as a whole, are all concerned over the welfare of this great industry which has throughout the history of the United States been considered to be one of our most basic industries having to do with one of the most basic commodities in the country, and which has been considered to be the money crop for a large portion of American farmers since the very foundation of our Republic.

There is no question in the minds of anyone but what the cotton industry as a whole is in dire straits. I believe it cannot be successfully contested that there is a need for changes in our cotton program if we are to continue to sustain and to maintain a successful cotton industry in this country.

I do not have any of the textile industry in my district. I think we all know pretty well where the textile industry is centered. But, certainly, it is a very vital and integral part of the cotton industry in America. The maintenance of a healthy condition of the textile industry is just as important to the overall industry of the Nation as is the healthy condition of the farmers who produce this fiber and this commodity upon which America has so long depended.

We know when we look at the figures that we have lost a substantial portion of the fiber market in this country. We have lost it to imports of various types and kinds. We have lost it to synthetics.

Today we come here on this occasion to debate the merits of the bill, H.R. 6196, and to discuss the approach which we hope we will be able to carry forward in the immediate future to improve the cotton industry and to improve the lot of the people who have over the years depended upon this industry and to increase the employment possibilities in the industry and to improve the lot of those who produce cotton in this country.

So, Mr. Speaker, for these reasons I urge the adoption of the resolution, House Resolution 464.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. I think the record of the Committee on Agriculture shows that at least 10 million American citizens derive their livelihood from the cotton textile industry in the production, ginning, processing, transporting, manufacturing of the cotton, and in the merchandising of cotton goods. That is a substantial segment of the people in the United States who have a direct interest in a healthy and progressive textile industry.

Mr. SISK. I agree with the gentleman. I appreciate his comments. They are certainly timely.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. SISK. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. In your opening remarks you stated one of the purposes of this bill was to end the two-price system. Does not this bill actually create a three-price system for the producers of cotton?

Mr. SISK. No. I would not agree with my good friend from Missouri that it does. I agree that the bill has certain provisions pertaining to some of the producers in this country, looking in the direction of maintaining a system of family-size farms in this country. There is a very definite desire, I think, on the part of Members of Congress to try to make it possible for many of the small farmers of this country to continue to maintain as nearly as possible a decent income.

So there are some provisions with reference to the 15-bale-or-less producers to enable them to enjoy a little higher price support than would be available to growers growing larger amounts of cotton.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield further, I think you missed my point. I said, would this bill not permit a three-price system for even one producer of cotton? Under this bill would it not be possible for a person who produces more than 15 bales of cotton to be supported at one price for the first 15 bales he produces and to be supported at another price for the remainder of this crop? Then under one section of the bill he would be permitted to plant additional cotton for which he would pay an amount equal to the subsidy. So that in effect one producer could actually be selling cotton at three different prices if this bill is adopted.

Mr. SISK. Let me say this to my good friend from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Can you answer that?

Mr. SISK. Let me say this to the gentleman, because the question he asks, I think, does require some little elaboration. I agree with the gentleman that this bill does provide for the situation which the gentleman recites, but it still eliminates the two-price system so far as the mills are concerned, so far as the processing is concerned, and so far as the consumer of American cotton is going to be concerned. It makes it possible for our own domestic textile mills to buy cotton in competition on an even basis with what the world price is and what the textile industries in other parts of the world buy it at. I am referring to the elimination of what today, as the gentleman knows, is an 8.5-cent differential between what a local textile company has to pay as against what the cotton is sold for in the world markets.

I agree, under the price support system to the farmer, to the grower, that the situation which the gentleman recites can exist.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Will the gentleman take some more time, please, and let me ask one other question?

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield further, you mentioned the fact that it would make a one-price system, but as I read the bill, do you agree with me that the subsidy to the domestic mills or the subsidy that the domestic mill would profit by might not be the same as the 8.5 cents which we are now paying on the export cotton?

Mr. SISK. Of course, let me say to my friend it depends in the final analysis on what kind of a bill we write.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am talking about the bill we have before us.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate what the gentleman is discussing, but I do not necessarily say that that would be the results of the bill which we have under discussion. As the gentleman very well knows, there is an amendment which will be offered on the floor here and which I am supporting and which I understand basically the committee of which he is a member adopted, the McIntire amendment, the amendment of the gentleman from Maine, to bring about a reduction in these price supports which will certainly change that picture, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That was going to be my next question. Was it not understood by the Committee on Rules that the McIntire amendment would be offered to this bill and it would have the support of the House Committee on Agriculture and presumably was going to be accepted in the House? Was that the understanding of the Committee on Rules?

Mr. SISK. Let me say, as one member of the Committee on Rules, that it was my understanding that the McIntire amendment would be offered. As one who happens to believe that it is a good amendment and is supporting it, I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield further, I have one other question. In the title of the bill the committee says: "to maintain the income of cotton producers." If we reduce the support price and the producer is not permitted to expand or to increase his acreage, how is that going to maintain his income? It would, would it not, in fact, reduce the income of the cotton producer?

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Missouri knows as well as I do that unless we do something here to increase the domestic consumption of cotton, there must be a continued decrease in acreage. Even if we are going to maintain a level of 16,200,000 acres, at which it is set today, it is absolutely essential that we do something to increase the consumption of cotton. Otherwise that figure is going to be substantially reduced. Therefore, his income certainly is going to be reduced. We will try to maintain this acreage. I would hope that we would be able to do something to increase consumption, to the extent that acreage might be increased but I think we would be foolish to go out and offer any substantial amount of immediate increase; but certainly to me it is essential that we try to maintain what we have now and increase it as soon as possible. This is imperative to the income of the farmer, just as imperative and just as necessary, I think, as the so-called high-priced support which I think today has become unrealistic, because there is an ever-increasing surplus piling up.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I was only pointing out that the title of the bill contains the language "to maintain the income of cotton producers" and that the income will not be maintained under the provisions of this bill. I thank the gentleman for yielding and hope I will be able to get some time later.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the comments of my good friend from Missouri. He knows that I love him, but I have to disagree with him on this bill.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from California agree with me that this is one of the side effects of the foreign aid program, under which we give and equip plants to various countries, that cost them nothing. Even if the House passed this bill, unless we stop that practice we are going to destroy not only this industry, as we already practically have destroyed it, but many other industries in this country.

Mr. SISK. Let me say to my good friend from Florida that I would have to agree with him that one of the side effects has been as he has noted here; there is no question about that, however, we believe that by improving their economy we will make it possible for them to become better cash customers for our products.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I noted the answer of the gentleman from California to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES], with reference to the three-price system. Is it not true that the incentive of a 10-percent additional price on the first 15 bales of cotton is not in fact a sale, but a certificated purchase on the part of the Government, under which the cotton never changes place or position; the Government, in other words, pays to each and every farmer for 15 bales of cotton a price 10 percent above the support price and immediately takes back from that same farmer a certificate for the cotton at the support price, which is an added bonus to every producer in the United States that produces cotton, of which there are some 800,000? Am I right or wrong?

Mr. SISK. As I followed my good friend in that rather involved question I think possibly he may be right. I would like him to direct that question to some member of the Committee on Agriculture who is far better qualified technically to answer it. It is my understanding that the intent here is to try to help basically the small farmers of the country, try to maintain them until at least such time as we are able to do something better for them. I think we appreciate that.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, to include a telegram from the Governor of California, the Honorable Edmund G. Brown, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,
December 2, 1963.

The Honorable B. F. SISK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I am asking all members of the California congressional delegation to support H.R. 6196, the cotton bill authored by Congressman HAROLD COOLEY and scheduled for debate on the floor on Tuesday, December 3. Both the California Department of Agriculture and the State board of agriculture have carefully studied this measure and join in support of it. The California cotton industry produces nearly $350 million at the producer level and generates approximately a billion dollars of total wealth for our State. This bill is of vital importance, not only to cotton but to our entire agricultural economy. I respectfully request your favorable consideration of this bill.

Sincerely,

EDMUND G. BROWN,
Governor of California.

WHAT COTTON MEANS TO CALIFORNIA

In the State of California, 412,000 people live wholly or in very substantial part upon incomes earned directly from cotton. These include 56,000 people living on cotton farms and 49,000 others whose breadwinners are seasonal domestic workers on cotton farms. The remaining 307,000 consist of people whose income earners work in gins, oil mills, cotton mills, etc., plus cotton's pro rata share of those living on incomes from apparel manufacturing, farm supply stores, merchandising operations, etc.

This by no means tells the whole story because no way was found to compute the number of employees concerned with cotton in banks, insurance agencies, department stores, transportation services and many other fields.

The average annual cash receipts from cotton and cottonseed by California farmers during calendar years 1960 through 1962 was $328.5 million. This makes cotton the leading crop in the leading agricultural State, far surpassing its nearest rivals, grapes ($149.4 million) and tomatoes ($122.8 million). It provides a fifth as much cash income as all other crops combined and a fourth as much as all meat animals, dairy products, poultry and eggs combined.

The total value of petroleum and all other mineral production in 1961, the latest year reported, was $1,421 million. Cotton production alone yielded 23 percent as much as this.

Thus the inevitable conclusion: If the cotton economy is crushed, California will lose one of its big income producers, which will have a depressing effect on the State's whole economic structure. If cotton survives and goes forward, it will provide a stimulant to the industry and commerce of the State as a whole.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this House Resolution 464 so that the committee may proceed to discuss this bill on its merits.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] has so well explained, this resolution makes in order the consideration of H.R. 6196 with 4 hours of general debate and an open rule, subject to amendment in the Committee of the Whole, and final actions, of course, in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is the time to look at facts and to look at the record, as Al Smith used to say, and find out just why we are here and where we are at the present moment and why we have this legislation before us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the brutal truth is that this legislation is designed to pay a subsidy to cotton cloth manufacturers of the United States because we have had a rather peculiar and, in my opinion, a very foolish foreign trade policy in this country whereby we have sold our products, our cotton for instance, to foreign countries cheaper than we have sold such products to American manufacturers. Cotton cloth manufacturers in other parts of the world can buy American cotton produced on American farms and subsidized by the American Government—the U.S. Government—at 8½ cents a pound less than American cotton textile manufacturers can buy it right here at home. Then, with cheap labor overseas they can manufacture cotton cloth and make it into garments in many instances, and under our so-called foreign trade policy, our Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and so forth, ship these goods to the United States and undersell the products of American factories and American labor.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of the foolish and I believe sinister program that we have had in connection with foreign trade, the cotton textile mills of this country face disaster and American workingmen are out of jobs.

Also, Mr. Speaker, we see that cotton is shipped to this country from foreign lands, where under just as foolish a program of so-called aid we have shipped our cottonseed, our know-how, our ability to produce, our technical skills, to other countries such as Brazil, for instance, and to some of the Mediterranean countries, so that they can produce cotton there cheaper than we can produce it in the United States.

That has been done also at the expense of the American taxpayers.

What you see here today is just more chickens coming home to roost. What is the answer? The only answer that these planners have, and if I wanted to be abrupt and rough I might say the social climbers have, is to spend more money, to wring more money out of the American taxpayers, to spend more money to pay for the mistakes of judgment, the failure to use good, commonsense in the past in setting up some of these programs. So the proposal is here now that we pay subsidies to the cotton textile manufacturers of this country and perhaps—I do not know how under this bill, I cannot understand it myself—perhaps maintain cotton prices to the American farmer. Seemingly that will not be accomplished, if I read the measure correctly. Instead of doing the simple and sensible thing, that is, to put an old-fashioned tariff on the importation of cotton goods from abroad to protect American labor and American industry from unfair foreign competition, we have the proposal to pay subsidies to the cotton mill manufacturers.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. During the previous administration, the textile industry of America made a very diligent and a very expensive effort to do just what the gentleman has suggested. That is, they went before the Tariff Commission.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand that.

Mr. COOLEY. And they lost.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And then again after a little trip through a rose garden recently. I know that also.

Mr. COOLEY. And they were rejected again. They went before the Office of Emergency Planning, and they were turned down. This legislation is the only avenue left.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Except the gentleman voted for the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and I did not.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman has the right to vote as he pleases.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But I thought I saw the danger at the time, and the gentleman wakes up at the last minute and sees the danger now. At this time he has another cure for it. The cure should have been a preventative one not to make a mistake.

Mr. COOLEY. It was your President who signed that bill in 1956.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do not agree with my President all the time, and I would have a much higher respect for the gentleman if he did not agree with his President all the time. If you want to talk politics we can talk politics. I will take care of myself.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. It has been suggested by the previous speaker that the Tariff Commission had rejected an appeal for a tariff regulation which would equalize costs. Is it not just as much the prerogative of this Congress to pass a bill today establishing a tariff rate equitable to American producers as it is to pass this bill?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Certainly, because we did the wrong thing in connection with the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, that is no reason why we should go further afield.

Mr. DENT. I object to the gentleman's counting me in on that.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman and I will stay out.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. There will be one difference, and that would be that the Japanese manufacturers would pay the tariff instead of the American taxpayers paying the subsidy. That would be the difference.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. We must not do that because they would not like it. We have got to be sure that we keep a bright and shiny image abroad.

Let me refer to the bill for a minute, if I may. This bill is presumed—and I use the word "presumed" advisedly—to encourage the increased consumption of cotton, hence the income of cotton producers—I do not know about that—to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes. If we find any way of lowering the cost of production, we will export that immediately so that our neighbors to the south and to the east of us will get the benefit. Do not worry about that.

Here are the principal provisions of the bill, as I have tried to diagnose it or analyze it.

First, beginning with its enactment and running to July 31, 1967, the Secretary of Agriculture would make payments in kind to persons other than producers; that is, to the cotton textile mills, in an attempt to eliminate the inequity of the cotton cost differential between domestic and foreign mills. That is the kernel, that is the nut right there, that is the whole question.

Until August 1, 1964, the payment rate would be at a level determined by the Secretary of Agriculture up to 8.5 cents, but presumably 5 cents a pound. From August 1, 1964, to July 31, 1967, the payment rate presumably would be about 6 cents a pound.

Second, the Secretary would be directed to conduct a special cotton research program to reduce production costs as soon as practicable. For this purpose, up to $10 million annually would be authorized subject to the regular appropriations process.

Third, beginning with the 1965 crop of upland cotton, the Secretary would be directed to reduce the level of price support to reflect reductions, if any, in the cost of growing cotton. That would not increase the income of the farmer. It might maintain it, it is true, if it works out.

Fourth, for the 1964, 1965, and 1966 crops, the Secretary would be authorized to provide up to 10 percent additional price support on not over 15 bales of each farmer's production. That is the matter the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jones] mentioned a while ago. But the level of price support could not exceed that for the 1963 crop, presumably about 32.5 cents per pound for 15 bales and minimum of about 29.5 cents per pound for the balance of the crop in the year 1964.

In an effort to keep cotton supported at the higher level in normal channels of trade, the bill provides producer payments through the legal device of "simultaneous purchase and sale." You understand that one, I am sure. The Government sells with one hand and buys with one hand, and so forth. It must not let either hand know what the other is doing, of course.

Fifth, beginning August 1, 1964, the minimum Commodity Credit Corporation resale price would drop to 105 percent of the current loan, plus reasonable carrying charges. Present law restricts such sales at 115 percent of current support price plus reasonable carrying charges.

Sixth, at such time when the national acreage allotment reaches 17 million acres, one-half of the acreage in excess of 17 million acres would be allocated to increases in the regular acreage allotments of farmers. The other one-half would be earmarked for cotton farmers willing to produce additional cotton at world prices. We have to take care of the rest of the people, you know. This extra or overplant acreage would be up to 20 percent in addition to the regular farm allotment. There are your three stages at different prices for cotton. In order to produce this extra acreage for export, farmers would have to pay an extra "export marketing fee" equal to the current export subsidy. These collections would then be earmarked for paying export subsidies.

In spite of the remarks I have made, I have no objection to the adoption of this rule. Unless I change my mind greatly in the next 4 hours, and I am sure the very distinguished linguist from North Carolina may be able to make me change my mind, but I doubt it, I do not expect to vote for the bill. I would be very happy to support a substitute measure that might be called old fashioned and also might be very realistic, and that would be to put a tariff on all foreign manufactured cotton textiles. This would bring in revenue to the Federal Treasury, would protect American industry, and would protect American labor from this unfair foreign competition that has been wrecking the cotton textile business in the United States and has been putting a great many thousands of people out of work. It would correct an inequity for which this Congress is just as responsible as any President, regardless of what his politics or political affiliation might or might not have been in the past.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I ask if my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, knows of anything in the bill that will be of help or benefit to the poultry producers of this country who are getting it in the neck from the Common Market in Europe?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is an entirely different problem, but it is a wonderful example that the Common Market was not set up, as so many people in America believe, for the benefit of Americans, but rather for the benefit of the Europeans who believe in and who belong to the Common Market.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Whitener].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it has been my privilege to have spoken on this subject on numerous occasions under special orders of the House. I think I have said about all that can be said on the subject. But I would like to again point out to the Members of the House that I represent the largest textile producing district in the United States. I also have within my congressional district the second largest cotton-producing county in the State of North Carolina.

I am convinced that this legislation is in the best interest of both of these groups. All of us are aware of the facts that have been brought out in the earlier discussion of the legislation. None of us can do anything about the errors of the past. But it seems to me that we as Representatives of the American people have an opportunity today and tomorrow to look forward to the future and to do something for the economy of our country.

In the State of North Carolina 227,000 people who earn their livelihoods at the machines in the textile plants are looking to Washington today because they are aware of the gravity of the decision which we will make. These people are hoping that the Congress will eliminate the iniquitous two-price cotton system which has been permitted to develop, as has been well stated, by executive and legislative error, and by about every other kind of error that can be conceived by political parties on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that this bill will do what the committee envisions it will do. In all candor I think it is regrettable that we are in a position of having to legislate in this manner. Had the Tariff Commission done what I believe the evidence dictated they should have done under the section 22 petition filed by the Secretary of Agriculture, we would not be concerned today about this textile import problem. But, unfortunately, by a vote of 3 to 2 the people of America lost that decision in the Tariff Commission to the foreigners who sat there in the room during those days of the hearings presenting evidence adverse to the people of this country. Without getting into the details, I say we should approve this legislation for those who earn their livelihoods in the textile industry and for those who work on the farm. We know from the record that in the last few years the cotton textile industry has been going downhill, resulting in the American cotton farmer dropping from 94 percent of the raw material used by our textile plants to 67 percent. And this will continue.

If we today fail to take up the cause of the cotton farmer and to protect his domestic market, we will have failed to serve his interest. The people of the Nation generally have a great stake in what we do, because the textile industry is the second largest employer of people of any industry that we have in America. To permit it further to be injured by these inequitable programs will not be to the best interests of the people of the Nation because of the disastrous effects that further retrocession will have on the economy generally.

So, as we approach this legislation, I hope we can do it without partisan considerations and without selfish local considerations. We must realize that the vote which we cast will be one that may well be the most important economic step we will take in this Congress. I say this because the textile industry is not just something which affects the people I am privileged to represent. It affects all of the people of the United States.

I know that you ladies and gentlemen of the House realize how important it is that we, as we legislate on this subject, bear in mind the opportunities that we have to serve the cause of America.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Avery].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, I do not believe it necessary to address myself further to what is in the bill because I think it has already been fully described and explained to the Members present here today. I feel there is a greater need to talk about what is not in the bill than what is in the bill.

First, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the committee upon which I have the honor of serving, the Committee on Rules, has been maligned in most of the Nation's press the last few days for not passing out rules fast enough to accommodate certain interests; that we are called obstructionists and all of the other descriptive words that are acceptable in the public press. However, I would like to point out that here is a bill upon which we granted a rule on July 30, and for some reason that has not yet been explained—why this bill should only now be debated in the closing days of the 1st session of the 88th Congress here in the month of December.

I wonder why we are taking up a cotton bill today, with the very obvious neglect of a bigger industry, namely, the wheat industry. I have not been able to get an explanation from the gentleman from North Carolina on this procedure.

I think the statistics will reveal, Mr. Speaker, that there are about 850,000 cotton farmers—but there are 1.8 million wheat farmers. Yet suddenly it has been decided—and for what reason we have not yet been told—that there is now an emergency on cotton. Even though the bill has been before the House since July, we are told that there is an emergency now and we must take direct and positive action this afternoon to bail out the cotton industry. But yet nobody seems to be concerned with what is going to be the fate of the almost 2 million wheat farmers throughout the Middle West. If you want to talk politics a little bit, there was some discussion of politics, I believe, when my distinguished senior minority member of the Committee on Rules [Mr. Brown] was addressing the House; there was some reference to politics between him and the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina. As to the politics of this I am just a little undecided. I cannot come to a clear decision. Actually, politically I think it is better for the majority party just to keep on ignoring the wheat industry. I think that would work out very well. I think we, the minority, would do very well in 1964 in the Middle West if they continue to look the other way as apparently they have done for the last year.

But from a position of responsibly representing one of the largest industries in America I feel that those of us from the Middle West have no other choice than to plead with you this afternoon to give us some assurance that at least you will consider our problems and attempt to take some action, probably not this year, but when we come back in the 2d session of the 88th Congress.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, first I want to commend the very distinguished gentleman from Kansas and congratulate him on the great interest he has shown in the wheat producers of the Nation in all the years that I have known him here in the Congress. But he must be mindful of the fact that at least our committee has labored and did bring out a bill and provide a program. It was submitted to a referendum and the wheat farmers rejected it.

Let me say to the gentleman that we have not abandoned the wheat farmers. I have had the wheat subcommittee working constantly, headed by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Purcell]. They have been holding hearings. We are aware of the fact that something must be done to relieve the desperate situation of the wheat farmers. I should like to conclude by saying that the wheat farmers must be willing to help themselves, as the cotton producers and producers of other commodities have indicated their willingness to help themselves in these nationwide programs. And before I close I would like to say to the gentleman that any time he wants to be heard—he has been in our committee room many times—I will provide him a forum to be heard before an interested audience.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that. But let me continue by saying this. The gentleman referred to hearings that were held. Hearings were not held day after day and week after week. I have a copy of the hearings. There were 3 days of hearings held. Nineteen Members on this side of the aisle introduced an identical bill and they could not even get a report on it from the Secretary of Agriculture, whether he was for it or against it or whether he has even had the time to read it.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to send him a message this afternoon and ask him for a report.

Mr. AVERY. I think the gentleman will find that he has already had that request made of him.

Mr. COOLEY. I will be glad to get in touch with him by telephone, if that will help.

Mr. AVERY. Well, I think we are making some progress at this point. This is the first tangible progress we have made, if we can expect a report from the Secretary of Agriculture on a bill that 19 Members have introduced.

The Secretary, in a speech to the Future Farmers of America at Kansas City, Mo., on October 17, made the statement that at least four out of five farmers favor a wheat program. It would seem to me that there is more agreement there than we have on this cotton bill that we have before us this afternoon. I think every Member who has spoken on the cotton bill has offered a different point of view. They are either for it or against it or for it with certain changes. I submit that those of us who attempt to speak for the Middle West have reached at least a larger area of agreement than has the cotton industry with reference to cotton.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his contribution and I thank the Members of the House for their indulgence. May I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying merely that we are relying upon assurances that we have had this afternoon that the Committee on Agriculture with the commitment of the chairman today, will take expeditious action on wheat legislation when we reconvene in January. And that that legislation may also be brought to the floor of the House for debate and final disposition.

Mr. Speaker, we will abide by the judgment of the House, but at least, I submit we have the right to be heard, as well as the 850,000 cotton farmers and the related industries that are being heard this afternoon.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] indicates that he has no further request for time. I have no further requests for time.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6196) to encourage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to raise a point of order against the consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that House Report 366, accompanying H.R. 6196, "a bill to encourage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton growers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes" does not comply with the requirements of clause (3) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives.

Clause (3) of rule XIII, the so-called Ramseyer rule, provides as follows:

> 3. Whenever a committee reports a bill or a joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part thereof it shall include in its report or an accompanying document—
>
> (1) The text of the statute or part thereof which is proposed to be repealed; and
>
> (2) A comparative print of the part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by stricken-through type and italics, parallel columns, or other appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions proposed to be made.

In other words, a committee report must faithfully set forth among other things, changes in laws as provided in the accompanying bill, to comply with the Ramseyer rule.

Mr. Speaker, the committee report accompanying H.R. 6196, shows clearly near the bottom of page 25 the repeal of existing provisions of law dealing with feed grain price supports and acreage allotments. Specifically does it show repeal of section 330 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, and section 105 of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Nowhere in H.R. 6196 is there the slightest reference to section 330 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Nowhere in H.R. 6196 is there the slightest reference to section 105 of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Under paragraph 2, clause 3, of rule XIII it is stated that "under the rule the committee report on a bill amending existing law by the addition of a proviso should quote in full the section immediately preceding the proposed amendment."

In this connection I call the attention of the Chair to the language in the bill, H.R. 6196, page 2, line 22, section 3, which states that "section 104 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows" and it then sets forth a new research authority for upland cotton.

This amendment is to be found in italic in the middle of page 26 of the report and is subsequent to and therefore dependent upon wholly unrelated provisions of law for which there are no provisions for repeal in H.R. 6196.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate my contention that H.R. 6196 does not repeal and does not even seek to repeal section 330 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and section 105 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended; that therefore House Report No. 366, showing repeal of these provisions, is not in compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII.

I respectfully ask that the point of order be sustained.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] desire to be heard?

Mr. COOLEY. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to page 22 of the report, and I read from that, as follows:

> CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW
>
> In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill are shown as follows: existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman.

If the gentleman from Iowa will read the report I think he will find that his objections are not meritorious. He referred to section 330 on one occasion in his speech. On page 25, near the bottom of the page, he will find this language:

> SEC. 104. Not later than December 15, 1958, the Secretary shall conduct a referendum of producers of corn—

And so forth. That whole paragraph deals with section 104.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman be kind enough to point out to the Chair that both sections 330 and 105 to be found on page 25 are bracketed as being repealed.

Mr. COOLEY. I just pointed out 330 is bracketed in black.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman advise the Chair wherein in this bill, H.R. 6196, there is to be found any reference whatever to either of these two sections?

Mr. COOLEY. Section 104 embodies section 330 the gentleman has referred to. He will note that section 330 is in quotations. This is because it was a part of section 104, which is rewritten in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. What the gentleman is saying is that H.R. 6196 does repeal the feed grain and acreage allotment provisions of existing law?

Mr. COOLEY. That was repealed by the referendum provided for in section 104.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, this does comply with the Ramseyer rule just as meticulously as it could apply. I am surprised the gentleman from Iowa has submitted a point of order, because the very sections that the gentleman named are referred to in this Ramseyer rewrite of existing law.

I submit that the point of order should not be sustained, but should be overruled.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard on this because I consider it a very important piece of legislation and a very important point of order.

As the gentleman from Iowa has mentioned, the report on pages 25 and 26 purports to show the repeal of several provisions of law dealing with feed grain price supports and acreage allotments.

This apparently reflects the language on page 2, line 22, in section 3 of H.R. 6196 which states that "section 104 of Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows." and then sets forth a new research authority for upland cotton.

Section 104 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, was added by section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1958—Public Law 85–835, approved August 28, 1958. Section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1958 provided as follows:

> REFERENDUM
>
> SEC. 201. Title I of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end of such title the following:
>
> "SEC. 104. (a) Not later than December 15, 1958, the Secretary shall conduct a referendum of producers of corn in 1958 in the commercial corn-producing area for 1958 to determine whether such producers favor a price support program as provided in subsection (b) of this section for the 1959 and subsequent crops in lieu of acreage allotments as provided in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and price support as provided in section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.
>
> "(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if less than a majority of the producers voting in the referendum conducted pursuant to subsection (a) hereof favor a price support program as provided in this subsection (b), the following provisions of law shall become inoperative:
>
> "DISCONTINUANCE OF ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS ON CORN
>
> "(1) The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding the following new section:
>
> " 'SEC. 330. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, acreage allotments and a commercial corn-producing area shall not be established for the 1959 and subsequent crops of corn.'
>
> "PRICE SUPPORT
>
> "(2) The Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding the following new section:
>
> " 'SEC. 105. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 101 of this Act, beginning with the 1959 crop, price support, shall be made available to producers for each crop of corn at 90 per centum of the average price received, by farmers during the three calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the marketing year for such crop begins, adjusted to offset the effect on such price of any abnormal quantities of low-grade corn marketed during any of such year: *Provided,* That the level of price support for any crop of corn shall not be less than 65 per centum of the parity price therefor.
>
> " '(b) Beginning with the 1959 crop, price support shall be made available to producers for each crop of oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums at such level of the parity price therefor as the Secretary of Agriculture determines is fair and reasonable in relation to the level at which price support is made available for corn, taking into consideration the feeding value of such commodity in relation to corn, and the other factors set forth in section 401(b) hereof.'

"(3) Section 101(d)(4) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is repealed effective with the 1959 crop."

Please note that this section 104(b) stated that if a majority of corn farmers voting in a producer referendum did not favor the price program set out in subparagraphs (1) and (2) then these subparagraphs (1) and (2) would become inoperative.

In the fall of 1958 a corn referendum was conducted by the Department of Agriculture. In that referendum a majority of farmers did favor the program set out in subparagraphs (1) and (2). Therefore, these subparagraphs (1) and (2) did become operative beginning with the 1959 crop.

As you will note, subparagraph (1) contains an amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 adding a new section 330 prohibiting the Secretary from establishing acreage allotments and a commercial corn-producing area for the 1959 and subsequent crops of corn. This provision is still in effect today.

As you will further note, subparagraph (2) set up a new price support formula for corn and other feed grains (related to market average). That section remained in effect for the 1959 and 1960 crops.

As further evidence of the fact that these provisions became operative in the original version of section 104, Congress on four subsequent occasions has amended section 105 of the 1949 act.

Public Law 87–5, approved March 22, 1961, established a special feed grain program for the 1961 crop. This statute added new subsections (c) (1) and (2) to section 105 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 dealing exclusively with price supports on the 1961 crop of feed grains.

Public Law 87–128, approved August 8, 1961, added new subsections (3) and (4) to section 105 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 dealing exclusively with price supports on the 1962 crop of feed grains.

Public Law 87–703, approved September 22, 1962, repealed section 105(a) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 as originally enacted and established a new and permanent price support authority—at 50 to 90 percent of parity—for corn beginning with the 1964 crop and at the same time added new subsections (c) (5) and (6) to section 105 dealing exclusively with price supports on the 1963 crop of feed grains.

Public Law 88–26, approved May 20, 1963, added a proviso to section 105(a) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 applicable to the level of price support for feed grains if an acreage diversion program is in effect for the 1964 and 1965 crops of feed grains. This statute also added a new subsection (d) to section 105 dealing with price supports on the 1964 and 1965 crops of feed grains.

Public Law 88–26 does not contain statutory authority for the Secretary to require compliance by farmers with any acreage limitations as a condition of eligibility for price support beyond the 1965 crop. After the 1965 crop, section 330 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 which specifically prohibits acreage allotments and a commercial corn-producing area will apply.

Mr. Speaker, I contend that the "Ramseyer" in House Report No. 366 is in error because it shows a repeal of both section 330 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and section 105 of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Nowhere in H.R. 6196 is there any reference to section 330 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Nowhere in this bill is there any reference to section 105 of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Nowhere in this bill is there any reference to section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1958.

The only way that the Ramseyer rule can be held to have been met is to sustain as a matter of law that the bill, H.R. 6196, repeals these two provisions which automatically became operative as the result of a farmer referendum in the fall of 1958.

To sustain the validity of the argument that section 3 of H.R. 6196 actually does repeal section 330 of the 1938 act and section 105 of the 1949 act would ignore the fact that Congress on four separate occasions since 1958 has specifically amended and changed section 105 of the 1949 act. In Public Laws 87–5, 87–128, 87–703, and 88–26.

To sustain the validity of this cotton bill report which shows the repeal of these important feed grain laws would be to also sustain as a matter of law that the repeal of an enabling statute enacting substantive law subject to a subsequent contingency which actually occurred repeals not only the enabling statute but also the substantive law which became operative as a result of that contingency. I know of no legal precedent for such a concept.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me state that I hesitate to raise a procedural point against a bill of this magnitude and importance, but I would be derelict in my duty to feed grain farmers if I do not. If it is ruled that the report is in compliance with rule XIII and H.R. 6196 actually repeals the prohibition against establishing acreage allotments on corn, feed grain farmers will be faced with these controls in 1966. If it is held that this bill also repeals section 105 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, price support for the current crop of feed grains, as well as for the 1964 and 1965 crops, will be repealed.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from North Carolina desire to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker.

I want to make just one additional observation. I think the Speaker of the House and the Parliamentarian will find that all changes in existing law have been shown in our report under the Ramseyer rule. The rule does not say that you cannot have something else in the report which might be surplus and which might not be needed. But if you will look at section 104 on page 25 that is a strict compliance with the Ramseyer rule insofar as this legislation is concerned.

The reference to section 330, I think, is irrelevant and immaterial and is not even needed, perhaps, in this report. But we believe this is a meticulous compliance with the Ramseyer rule and we ask that the point of order be overruled.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair has listened to the statements made by the gentleman from Iowa, the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from North Carolina on a very interesting point of order and question.

During the discussion the Chair has had the opportunity to study the report of the committee as well as the bill as comprehensively as was possible for the Chair to do so in light of the fact that the Chair had no advance knowledge that the point of order was going to be raised. The Chair does not make that observation, of course, to convey any impression that the Chair should have been advised in advance.

It is the opinion of the Chair that the report of the committee complies with the Ramseyer rule, the purpose of which is to give Members information in relation to any change in existing law.

If a report includes some other references to other laws which in a sense would be surplusage or unnecessary, it is the Chair's opinion that the committee was attempting to give to the Members of the House as full information as was possible.

The Chair rules that the report does comply with the Ramseyer rule, and the point of order is overruled.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois rise?

Mr. FINDLEY. To propound a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FINDLEY. I am not clear about the substantive effect of the ruling of the Chair at this time. Does it mean that section 105 of the 1949 act and section 330 of the 1938 act are repealed by this bill?

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not pass on that. The Chair simply said that they were included in the report.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kansas rise?

Mr. DOLE. To propound a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DOLE. Based on the decision of the Chair, is it proper now or in order to offer amendments to section 330 and section 105?

The SPEAKER. Not at this time.

Mr. DOLE. But the amendment would be proper at the proper time?

The SPEAKER. At the proper time in the Committee of the Whole, if the gentleman desires to offer an amendment he may do so.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6196) to encourage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes, with Mr. Rooney of New York in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley] will be recognized for 2 hours, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Hoeven] will be recognized for 2 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I have served on the Committee on Agriculture for almost 30 years and have participated in the preparation and passage of many laws which have gone into the making of what we have considered to be a well rounded farm program.

I do not believe that at any time during the long period I have served on the committee has any bill received more consideration over a longer period of time than H.R. 6196, the cotton bill which we are now presenting for your consideration.

We actually started the work on this bill and the problems involved about 12 months ago, and this legislation has been constantly under consideration.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 6196 is a bill to revitalize the American cotton textile industry. It is a bill national in its scope. It is a unique piece of farm legislation, in that perhaps no other farm bill ever considered by the Congress embraced more widely distributed benefits for American consumers, and for so many workers in factories, as well as for farmers and their families.

This bill came from our Committee on Agriculture with the support of our late beloved President, John F. Kennedy. It is recommended unreservedly by the administration of his able successor, President Lyndon B. Johnson.

CONSUMERS, WORKERS, FARMERS

Mr. Chairman, the greatest benefactor under this legislation will be the American consumer. Americans will enjoy lower prices for American-made cotton goods, at savings estimated at more than $500 million a year.

This bill will forestall and prevent the ruin of the cotton industry in which more than 10 million Americans are associated in the production of cotton on the farms, in ginning, marketing, transporting, milling, and in the manufacture and merchandising of cotton goods.

This legislation will protect the livelihood of the millions of people who work with cotton.

COTTON ECONOMY IN JEOPARDY

The economic structure of the American cotton industry now is in jeopardy, due to the price that American mills must pay for cotton—a price that is one-third higher than the world price for cotton. American cotton is assailed, and is losing ground, on two fronts:

First. A flood of low-priced textiles is flowing in from abroad, displacing the goods produced by our own workers and demoralizing the domestic markets for our textile industry. Foreign mills enjoy a great advantage in our markets, in that under our export subsidy program they are able to buy American cotton much cheaper than the same cotton may be obtained by domestic mills. The Tariff Commission has denied a request for relief through an import fee that would equalize the price of raw cotton in foreign and domestically produced goods.

Second. Synthetic fibers—principally rayon—make devastating inroads into markets where cotton never before has been seriously challenged. Rayon imitates cotton and, because it is much cheaper, this synthetic is mixed with cotton or substituted for cotton in goods offered to consumers.

TO END TWO-PRICE SYSTEM

H.R. 6196 will end the two-price system for cotton. It will enable domestic mills to buy American cotton at the world price of cotton. The world price now is 8½ cents per pound below the current American price support level of 32.47 cents per pound.

This will enable American mills to compete more fairly with foreign mills, in the American cotton goods markets.

This will enable cotton to compete more fairly with synthetic fibers.

This will forestall the deterioration of the farmers' markets for cotton which now threatens severe reductions in our cotton acreage. It will enable our farmers to hold on to their markets for cotton, and to expand these markets.

Mr. Chairman, it is true that some additional expenditures in the cotton program are involved here. The Department of Agriculture estimates that the 3-year program embraced in this bill will cost in 1964 around $118,200,000 more than expenditures if the present program continues, $87,900,000 more than the present program in 1965 and $44 million more than the present program in 1966.

But these are modest expenditures, indeed, when we consider that the expected savings to consumers and users of cotton goods will amount to over one-half billion dollars a year, that the livelihoods of many thousands of millworkers will be protected, and that cotton farmers may benefit from the revitalizing of their markets.

SUMMARY OF BILL

Mr. Chairman, I now will give the House a brief summary of this bill which holds so much promise for so many people:

First. Beginning with the date of enactment until July 31, 1967, the Secretary of Agriculture would be directed to make payments in kind to persons other than producers to eliminate the inequity of the cotton cost differential between domestic and foreign mills. Until August 1, 1964, payments would be at a level determined by the Secretary. From August 1, 1964, to July 31, 1967, the rate would be the amount necessary to make cotton available to domestic mills at a price not in excess of that for which it is made available for export. American mills would get American cotton at the world price for cotton.

Second. The Secretary is directed to conduct a special cotton research program to reduce production costs as soon as practicable. For this purpose, an appropriation of up to $10 million annually is authorized.

Third. The bill as reported by the committee directs the Secretary, beginning with the 1965 crop, to make such reductions in the level of price support as will reflect reductions in the cost of producing cotton. An amendment subsequently approved by the committee establishes the general level of price support for 1964 at 30 cents per pound for Middling 1-inch cotton, a reduction of about 2½ cents per pound from the 1963 level. It further provides that the general level of support for 1965 would be 29½ cents per pound, and for 1966, 29 cents.

Fourth. For the 1964, 1965, and 1966 crops, the Secretary is authorized to provide price support at up to 10 percent above the basic loan level established for the remainder of the crop on not more than 15 bales of each farmer's production, but such higher level of support could not exceed 32.47 cents per pound, the same as that for the 1963 crop.

Fifth. Beginning August 1, 1964, CCC may sell upland cotton at not less than 105 percent of the basic loan rate plus reasonable carrying charges, instead of 115 percent of the loan, as presently required.

Sixth. For the 1964, 1965, and 1966 crops, if the acreage allotment exceeds 17 million acres, the amount of the excess would be equally divided: One-half to be distributed among base allotments, and one-half to farmers who want to overplant their allotments by up to 20 percent. The production from the overplanted acreage must be sold at world prices.

WHY THIS BILL IS NEEDED

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 6196, although it bears my name, represents the combined efforts of the administration of John F. Kennedy, the members of our Committee on Agriculture, and the cotton industry generally. I would like to review briefly why this bill is needed and something of its history.

As an aftermath of the Korean conflict, when the price of cotton rose sharply, foreign production of cotton increased. As a result, U.S. exports began falling, and by 1955–56 were down to 2.2 million bales, the lowest level since 1871 except for the period during World War II, when cotton production was disrupted throughout the world. In order to save our export markets, Congress enacted the cotton export program in 1956.

While that program has been generally successful insofar as cotton exports are concerned, it has created a downward pressure on the use of cotton in this country. Under this program, cotton has been made available to foreign mills at world market prices substantially less than those which American users are required to pay. Knowing this would be the result, the American textile industry nevertheless supported this program. But it did so with the understanding that action would be taken to offset its cotton cost disadvantage. Unfortunately, this has not been done. Principally as a result of the cotton cost advantage enjoyed by foreign mills, imports have almost quadrupled since the export program started.

On three occasions, the industry has appealed for action through the Tariff Commission under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended. Each time, relief has been denied. An effort has been made to obtain action under the national security clause of the Trade Agreements Act without success. In short, the industry has exhausted administrative remedies available to it.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I will include at this point a statement setting forth in detail the industry's efforts to meet the problem of imports.

INDUSTRY EFFORTS TO OBTAIN RESTRAINTS ON COTTON TEXTILE IMPORTS

First. In 1955, the then American Cotton Manufacturers Institute petitioned the Secretary of Agriculture for action under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act to impose quotas on imports of cotton textiles at 150 percent of the 1953–54 average of such imports. The petition was turned down by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in February 1956.

Second. In 1956, an amendment, including import quotas on cotton textiles, was offered by Senator Russell to the farm bill (H.R. 12), but was defeated by a vote of 33 to 57. During the same year, the Senate rejected two proposed import quota amendments to the foreign aid bill. An amendment offered by Senator Young to limit imports of surplus agricultural commodities and their products not covered by a section 22 quota was beaten 43 to 45. Another amendment applicable only to cotton textiles offered by Senator Johnston was turned down 36 to 52. Included in the Agricultural Act of 1956 was section 204, authorizing the President to negotiate with foreign countries to limit imports.

Third. Negotiations, aimed at limiting imports from Japan, which at that time accounted for the largest volume of cotton textile exports to the United States, began in 1956. In 1957, they culminated in a 5-year plan for voluntary control of Japanese exports of cotton textiles to the United States.

Fourth. In 1959, the industry asked the Secretary of Agriculture to seek a Tariff Commission hearing under section 22 to obtain relief from imports. The President asked that the case be limited to the effect of imports on the cotton export program. The Tariff Commission turned down the industry's request.

Fifth. In May 1961, the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, together with numerous other interested textile groups, initiated action with the Office of Emergency Planning under the national security clause of the Trade Agreements Act seeking a determination that the cotton textile industry is both essential to national defense and jeopardized by imports. Under the authority of the national security clause, the President may impose import controls to protect an industry if the above criteria are met. The record in the case was closed in October 1961. No decision has thus far been announced.

Sixth. The long- and short-term Geneva agreements were negotiated in 1961 and 1962. Enforcement of the agreements has been rendered virtually impossible because of the cotton cost advantage held by foreign mills.

Seventh. The Department of Agriculture sought Tariff Commission action to limit imports under section 22 again in November 1961. The President widened the scope of the investigation by extending it to cover the effect of imports on all U.S. cotton programs, but the Tariff Commission in September 1962, once more ruled against relief.

Eighth. Development of legislation to remove the inequity of the two-price cotton program began at President Kennedy's direction in late 1962, following the adverse decision of the Tariff Commission. The result is H.R. 6196.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY URGED ACTION

On February 16, 1961, less than a month after taking office, President Kennedy established a Cabinet Committee, headed by the Secretary of Commerce, to make a study of the problems facing the textile industry. On May 2, he announced a program of assistance to the textile industry consisting of 7 points. Point 4 is as follows:

> I have directed the Department of Agriculture to explore and make recommendations to eliminate or offset the cost to U.S. mills of the adverse differential in raw cotton costs between domestic and foreign textile producers.

On November 13, 1961, the Secretary of Agriculture recommended that the President request the Tariff Commission to make an immediate investigation of the cotton textile import situation pursuant to section 22. On November 21, 1961, the President requested the Commission to conduct such an investigation. Although the Commission completed its hearings on February 23, 1962, it was not until September 6, 1962, that its recommendation against action under section 22 was announced.

On the same day the Tariff Commission made its recommendations, President Kennedy issued a statement on cotton in which he said that a solution must be found to the two-price system, which he described as an "inequity" and a "unique burden upon the American textile industry." The President stated that:

> Early in the next session of Congress I shall recommend legislation designed to remove the inequity created by the present two-price cotton system.

In order to cope with the cotton problem, President Kennedy in his message to the Congress of January 31, 1963, stated:

> I urge that the Congress give early consideration to cotton legislation that will make this important fiber more competitive and help it recapture its markets. Ideally it should be signed into law before the end of February and made applicable to the planting of the 1963 crop.

President Kennedy recommended that the new law include payments to reduce the cost of cotton to domestic mills so as to eliminate the inequity of the present two-price system and to strengthen cotton's competitive position. In addition, he asked that authority be granted for producers to exceed their allotments with the excess to be sold at the world price. The President also recognized the importance of research to reduce the cost of producing cotton in the United States as a means of strengthening the cotton industry.

BRIEF HISTORY OF BILL

In anticipation of this message, I introduced H.R. 2000 on January 17, 1963. This bill would have completely eliminated the cotton cost difference to the American mills to better enable cotton to meet its price competition by making it available to them at the same price it is made available for export. In an effort to get legislation as early as possible, hearings began in December 1962 and were concluded the first of February 1963. At the conclusion of the hearings, it was clear that disagreement existed among certain segments of the cotton industry, and with the administration, with respect to some very important parts of the proposed cotton program.

I then brought together a small group representing cotton farmers from across the Cotton Belt in an effort to obtain agreement on a bill. After almost 4 months of negotiation, agreement was reached and I introduced H.R. 6196. That bill had the support of virtually the entire cotton industry and the administration.

Then we began a series of conferences with our friends on the other side of the aisle in an effort to obtain their support. Agreement was reached on a change in the bill which will permit many of them to support it. So today, I am pleased to tell the House that we bring to you a bill which was developed during the administration of John F. Kennedy and which has the blessing of President Johnson, and which enjoys support on both sides of the aisle of the House.

WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO COTTON

That we urgently need to enact H.R. 6196 at the earliest possible moment is clearly shown in the following thumbnail sketch of what has been happening to cotton.

In the 2 years ending July 31, 1963:

First. Cotton has suffered a direct competitive loss to competing fibers of about 1½ million bales.

Second. Exports have dropped from 6.6 to 3.3 million bales.

Third. Imports of cotton in the form of textiles are up from 414,000 to 645,000 bales.

Fourth. The national acreage allotment has been cut from 18.5 million to 16.2 million acres—the statutory minimum.

Fifth. Stocks of cotton on hand in the United States increased from 7.2 to 11.2 million bales—by August 1, 1964, stocks will likely be almost 13 million bales.

Sixth. CCC cotton stocks increased from 1.5 to 8.2 million bales—by August 1, 1964, CCC will likely own 10 million bales.

Seventh. Annual storage and handling charges on Government cotton have increased from about $25 million to about

$75 million—by August 1, 1964, they will be about $83 million.

Eighth. The Treasury spent about $1 billion acquiring surplus cotton—during the year ending July 31, 1964, about $¼ billion additional will be spent by the Treasury acquiring surplus cotton.

Ninth. Government investments in cotton stocks have gone up from about $300 million to about $1¼ billion—by July 31, 1964, investment will likely be $1½ billion.

What will H.R. 6196 do to correct this situation? It will make cotton available to American mills at the same price it is made available for export to foreign mills. It is beyond me to see how any fair-minded person could possibly object to giving the same treatment to an American industry which we accord its foreign counterpart. It is absolutely impossible for an American mill to meet the competition of foreign-made goods when it is forced by its Government to pay one-third more for its raw material on top of a substantially higher wage scale and it is absolutely impossible for U.S. farmers to produce cotton at world market prices. These are the two horns of the dilemma.

Laws, which the Congress of the United States passed, have created what President Kennedy so aptly called this "unique burden." He asked for the elimination of the grossly unfair cost disadvantage which has been legislated on this American industry. H.R. 6196 would do away with the cotton cost difference between United States and foreign textile producers.

SUBSIDY TALK IS NONSENSE

I have heard this described as a subsidy to the textile industry. This is utter nonsense. Such a charge is completely irresponsible. This is a bill that, while entailing great benefits to consumers and producers of cotton, will protect the hundreds of thousands of jobs which are in the textile industry and in those businesses dependent upon the textile industry for their raw material—cotton fabrics.

After fabric is made in a textile mill, it goes through a series of processes which involve dyeing, bleaching, finishing, cutting the cloth, and making the apparel. In addition, many people are involved in the merchandising and sale of those products to the consumers. These are the jobs that are in jeopardy. These people live in highly concentrated areas of our country, where fabrics are merchandised. Misleading statements have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD purporting to show how much money some of the larger firms would receive. The term "windfall" has been used to describe the elimination of this cotton cost difference.

A PRIVATE STUDY

Mr. Chairman, a private research firm conducted a study of the relationship of the price of cotton to the price of cloth. Its findings are on pages 8, 9, and 10 of the committee report. I urge the Members of the House to read it all. Over a period of 38 years—including war and peace—depression and prosperity—cotton cloth prices have gone up and down with raw cotton prices. Let me read to you just two sentences from the report:

> As compared with almost any other industry, the intimate relationship between the price of the principal raw material and the price of the finished product in the cotton textile industry, as demonstrated by the correlation above, is most unusual and remarkable. When consideration is given to the long span covered, the varying political and economic conditions during this time period, the great and minor depressions, the two wars and the two postwar periods, this record verges upon the unbelievable.

Certainly those of us who believe in the private, competitive, free enterprise system will agree that competition among the 5,000 companies which manufacture textiles in the United States will force an immediate and comparable reduction in cotton cloth prices when the price those companies pay for cotton is reduced.

Any person who says the textile industry will be subsidized or receive a "windfall" under H.R. 6196 either does not know the facts or refuses to accept them.

COTTON MORE COMPETITIVE—AT HOME AND ABROAD

When U.S. mills are able to obtain cotton at the price at which it is sold for export to foreign competitors you will see a reversal in the continued upward trend in imports of textiles. It will come in those types of textiles where the cotton cost represents a large part of the cost of the goods.

Another important effect will be to make cotton more competitive. This will expand the consumption of cotton here at home and bring about a reduction in Government cotton stocks. CCC will no longer have to spend money acquiring surplus cotton. Unless this happens, we will be forced to reduce the present minimum cotton acreage allotment. No one wants to see this done. Mr. Chairman, to my friends in the cities, let me say that a further cut in cotton acreage will mean that farmers will not buy as many tractors and other farm machinery, nor as much gas, oil, tires, batteries, et cetera. They will not need as much chemicals for control of insects. In short, lower cotton acreage will mean fewer jobs and unemployment in the cities.

MIDWEST INTEREST

To my friends in the Midwest, let me say that you have a very direct interest in a healthy cotton economy. The acreage now devoted to cotton is much of the most highly productive land in the United States. Whereas your climate will not permit you to grow cotton, the climate in the cotton area is such that we can grow grain, soybeans, grass, and other things which you produce. If we let the cotton situation continue to deteriorate requiring a reduction in cotton acreage, certainly land taken out of cotton will go into other crops, most of which are already in surplus. I do not think I need to elaborate further on this point. But this is what will surely happen if we do not enact H.R. 6196.

RESEARCH

There is another very important provision in this bill. It directs the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a special cotton research program designed to reduce the cost of producing cotton at the earliest practicable date and to lower the price support on cotton as production costs are lowered. As a cotton farmer, I can tell you from personal experience that production costs can be reduced very substantially if we had the know-how. It takes a great deal more research to find the answers to the problems of losses and costs attributed to insects, diseases, and weeds to cite examples of cost-cutting possibilities.

As these costs are reduced, an accompanying reduction in price supports is mandatory. This will further reduce the Government's cost. It is highly probable that in a reasonable time, we can reduce costs to the point where the cotton program will not cost the taxpayers a dime.

Mr. Chairman, as I have said, the problems have been considered for many, many months. This bill is supported by our former beloved President, by his Secretary of Agriculture, his Secretary of Commerce, his Secretary of Labor. It is supported by the National Cotton Council which is the organization of the cotton industry, consisting of cotton producers, cotton ginners, cotton warehousemen, cottonseed crushers, cotton merchants, cotton spinners. I think it is supported as it was reported by the committee by the National Grange. It is supported by the AFL–CIO Textile Workers Union of America and other major labor organizations.

The fact of the business is I do not know of any segment of the cotton industry that is opposed to this bill.

Involved in this legislation perhaps is the future welfare of the New York Cotton Exchange and the New Orleans Cotton Exchange. I am sure this bill is supported by cotton buyers, cotton merchants, and cotton exporters.

My friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] suggested a while ago that we should do it by the tariff. You know and I know that that cannot be done. This administration, the prior administration, and I suppose the next administration all have or will advocate the lowering of trade barriers and removing obstacles to international trade, instead of raising trade barriers and isolating ourselves from other areas. Particularly is that true when we contemplate the Common Market. How can we ask for fair and reasonable treatment in the Common Market countries if we here start raising tariffs? Perhaps you will say, "Why don't we do it some other way?" There is another way and that is by direct compensatory payments. I am willing to take that way out. I would prefer it. But I know that such legislation cannot be passed by this Congress.

The American cotton textile industry reaches from Boston to Houston. All over this country, from the east coast to the west coast, people are interested in cotton.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is our last chance. We either pass the bill at this session of Congress or, perhaps, we will never pass a bill and the entire cotton textile industry will be demoralized.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I took with me some of the members of the House Committee on Agriculture down to the textile areas of the South. We saw the mills in operation. One of the leading textile industry men picked up a ball of yarn and he turned to us and said, "I can import this yarn from Hong Kong or Pakistan or Portugal or some other foreign country, and up to this point I can make money. I will have to fire, or I can fire, and discharge 12,000 textile workers."

I am interested in this bill not only because I am interested in the producers of cotton. In North Carolina we have more textile workers than any State in this Union, as pointed out here a moment ago by my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Whitener], who lives in one of the great textile areas of our State. In the neighborhood of 230,000 North Carolina workers are involved here in this legislation. I want to save their jobs. I want to save the cotton industry.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a moment ago I did not mean to be partisan in talking to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown]. However, the gentleman was talking about the tariff and denounced this whole program. I merely reminded the gentleman of the fact that the bill that made the two-price cotton system possible was signed by President Eisenhower. I was not trying to be partisan about it. The Tariff Commission under President Kennedy did not give us any better treatment than the Tariff Commission gave us under President Eisenhower. But the fact remains, how can you vote to continue a program—and the program will continue unless we enact legislation—that gives to foreign mills a $42.50-per-bale advantage over the domestic mills?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

A few moments ago the gentleman spoke of past administrations. Does this bill have the blessing of the present President of the United States?

Mr. COOLEY. I will say this to the gentleman: I met in the Speaker's office a short while ago and I asked that very question. I said, "Now, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you now, speaking for my committee, I shall not insist upon the consideration of this cotton bill until I know the views of the President."

Within 3 minutes he had the President on the telephone, discussed it with him, and told him about the meeting. We were assured that we would have his 100-percent support for this cotton bill.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I am not surprised, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. What is that?

Mr. GROSS. I am not surprised, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Well, I am not surprised either. I think that his views are exactly right.

But, Mr. Chairman, I appeal to the members of the committee to help us remove this inequity from one of the great industries of America.

This legislation proposes to open up new avenues for American cotton, both at home and abroad. We thought that by bringing down the price that this objective would be accomplished.

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. McIntire] will introduce an amendment which the committee has instructed me to accept. That is the reason a moment ago I attempted to make the motion which I will make at a later time to permit the bill to be open at any place for amendment. Mr. McIntire's amendment will be offered and I have every reason to believe the amendment will be adopted.

The purpose of the amendment is to make cotton more competitive with synthetics and cotton goods imported from other countries. That, it seems to me, should please some of the people who have objected to what they consider to be high price supports.

I have advocated high price supports all through the years, but only on limited production and only when the farmers would cooperate and keep the supply in line with demand. Beginning in 1933, we operated the cotton programs for 20 years on that basis, and at the end of 20 years we did not have a loss. We had not sustained the loss of a single dollar, but we had cotton program profits of $268 million in the Treasury. Now we have lost that profit, and I think the accumulated losses now amount to about $1,800 million.

How long can we continue that program?

We are told under the program embraced in H.R. 6196 there will be a saving of at least one-half billion dollars to the people of the country.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. SHORT. Would the gentleman expand on that point a little bit? If I understand my good friend from North Carolina he is saying that if the price of cotton is reduced to the processor there is going to be a somewhat corresponding reduction in the price of the finished product. Do I understand him correctly?

Mr. COOLEY. That is exactly what I am saying.

Mr. SHORT. What reason do we have to believe this is going to follow? We have seen certainly for many years the price of wheat go up and down. It seems one of the arguments that has been offered many times is that cheap wheat does not necessarily bring about cheaper bread. Do we have any more reason to believe that the price to the consumer on cotton goods is going to go down with the price of the raw cotton?

Mr. COOLEY. I think I can answer that. I remember when I first came to Congress we had a bill to reduce the price support on cotton from 12 to 9 cents a pound. One of my very dear friends, a former Governor of our State, came to my office and told me if we adopted that bill it would bankrupt every one of his friends. I asked him, "What do you mean?" He said, "Because their inventories are building up, and they cannot compete when somebody else starts to making cotton goods on 9-cent cotton."

The same thing happens here. These inventories I referred to have been built up on 32.5-cent cotton, and as they get the lower priced cotton that the foreign mills are receiving they will have to write off losses on these inventories. We were told that the writeoff amounts to about $150 million, or something like that.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I think there is clear proof in the committee report that the price of manufactured, unfinished cotton follows closely the price of raw cotton. A survey was conducted by an independent corporation here in Washington, the Survey Research Corp., of 1010 Vermont Avenue, which traced the relationship of raw cotton costs to wholesale costs of cotton cloth over a period of 37 years. That concern reported that whenever raw cotton goes up 2 cents a pound the wholesale price of cotton cloth goes up 2 cents a pound. When the price of raw cotton goes down 2 or 3 cents a pound, it is immediately followed by a similar reduction in the wholesale price of cotton cloth. Bear in mind also that 55 percent of the cost of manufactured products is represented by raw cotton. So I think the record is clear, if you accept the facts of history, that the price of manufactured cloth will follow the price of raw cotton downward.

Mr. SHORT. If the gentleman will yield further, is it proper to make the observation that this is just a little bit contrary to the experience that we have had in the price of finished products, particularly wheat products, with relation to following the price of the raw products?

Mr. COOLEY. I think wheat is processed so quickly into bread and other food that it would probably be disposed of before the price could be really affected, but this is a different process. The gentleman seems not to agree. But bread down my way, if it is 2 days old they sell it for the pigs, not for human beings.

Mr. SHORT. This is not the basis for the criteria of establishing the price of bread?

Mr. COOLEY. In other words, bread does not come down because wheat comes down.

Mr. SHORT. That is the point we are making.

Mr. COOLEY. Here is a chart showing the price of raw cotton and the gray goods. Every time raw cotton goes down gray goods goes down. That is over a period of 40 years, they tell me.

Mr. SHORT. I am not too familiar with cotton textiles. What do we mean when we talk about gray cloth?

Mr. COOLEY. That is the basic product of the mills, of the spinners. It goes out from there to other industries, for further processing.

Let me hurry on with this. I do not want to take up too much time. I have consumed more time than I intended to.

I am delighted to see my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], let us know how he feels about this. I know I am a good Democrat. I know he is a good Republican, if there is such a thing on earth. He is a very good Republican, and he understands cotton because he comes from up there in the textile country. He knows what this means not only to the farmers but to the workers in his district.

It is the same way with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] and the same way with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] and these people who come from the textile areas. It is important to me in my district as much as it is important to all the people I represent.

I hope the bill will be enacted.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I am not so much interested in politics as I am in the Agriculture Committee continually coming to the House and making fish of one and fowl of the other in the business of allegedly trying to do something for the producers of agricultural raw materials in this Nation. What are you doing for the poultry producers of this country? What are you doing for the livestock producers? Both are in trouble.

Mr. COOLEY. You tell me what you want, and I will see what we can do and what can be done for you. I do not know what you want.

Mr. GROSS. I beg your pardon—you do not know what is happening to the poultry industry?

Mr. COOLEY. I know what is happening. I have one of the biggest poultry-producing counties in the whole United States in my district. Poultry is important to me and to my great State of North Carolina. But I say to you, and as I have said to the producers, they do not know what they want. I have begged them to come forward with a program.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot understand. The gentleman knows what would be beneficial for them.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not know what they want and I do not know what would be beneficial.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. I think this would be an appropriate time to make the point that this bill is not a product of the cotton producers of this country.

Mr. COOLEY. That is correct.

Mr. JONAS. I can announce to this House that I represent a lot of cotton producers who are not happy with this bill at all. They would much rather receive the 32½ cents a pound in price supports than to see those supports go down to 29 cents. This bill is not the bill that is advocated by the cotton producers. I am sure I can speak authoritatively when I say that many of the producers are opposed to it. But this bill is a compromise as all legislation must be when you have a conflict of interest involved; would not the gentleman say that that is a correct statement of the situation?

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman. I am inclined to agree with him exactly. I think the farmers of the Southeast would like to have the 32½ cents a pound, but they are, I think, more or less realistic, generally speaking, and I think they would accept this bill. I have not been deluged with letters in opposition to the bill. This bill is supported by the entire industry from one end of the Nation to the other and from one ocean to the other.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. The gentleman spoke a moment ago about the possibility of the reduction in consumer prices. The margin of profit for the textile mills in the United States has been very small; has it not?

Mr. COOLEY. Very, very small I understand, yes.

Mr. KYL. If that is true, we should expect those mills to take a little larger margin of profit, if an opportunity presents itself; should we not or else we would be giving them no benefit.

Mr. COOLEY. That brings up another question which is still open to controversy and that is—to whom shall the payments be made? We said they should be made to anybody else except to the producers. I want to say that the mill people before our committee said they did not want to be subsidized. The farmers said they did not want to be subsidized. In view of that controversy, we decided to let the Secretary make that decision. The payment will be made somewhere along the line, perhaps, to the cotton merchants of America and then they will pass it on. The mills will have to compete with each other and will have to compete with foreign producers unless in some way we can change this situation.

Mr. KYL. I would just like to make this observation. I know a little something about the retailing of these soft goods. I want to say that this competition between the American mills and the foreign mills is not going to be removed by this venture into which we are engaging today because the disparity of these prices are much too great to be removed by this single action. As a matter of fact, I think there is danger for our domestic mills.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of our committee to explain to me his interpretation of the payments that will be made. As I read the bill, beginning with the enactment of this section, the Secretary may make payments to such persons other than the producers which will eliminate inequities due to differences in the cost of raw cotton between domestic and foreign users.

I think I can understand removing the inequity, and we leave the discretion in the mind of the Secretary of Agriculture. As you know, before our committee there was a lot of discussion about how much it took to remove the inequity. We see further down in the paragraph that beginning August 1, 1964, these payments will be made presumably at a different rate, because it indicates that it will be at a price not in excess of the export subsidy which we are paying.

Am I correct in assuming that the payments which would be made effective with the enactment of this legislation—and those payments would also go to the mills that had raw cotton in inventory that will be at one price—do you anticipate that that price or that payment will be different from the payment which will be made beginning August 1, 1964, when it says here that the payment shall be not in excess of the price at which such cotton is made available for export? Those are some of the things I think which need to be clarified here to see who gets what and why.

Mr. COOLEY. I cannot tell you who will get what, because we leave it in the sound discretion of the Secretary.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. All right.

Mr. COOLEY. But I would prefer that some of the other speakers answer that question. I am sure that it could be cleared up for the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. May I ask the chairman this question: The chairman knows the high regard I have for him. Can I be assured that we will not cut off this 4-hour debate as long as some of us have questions we would like to ask or statements we would like to make?

Mr. COOLEY. I will make you that promise, but I do not want to make it for 435 others.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Now, in summary, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 6196 contains what, in my judgment, is a sound, long-range program for cotton. It is important to the cotton textile industry, to the 542,000 cotton mill workers, to those in the towns and cities who supply the cotton industry, and who process the cloth into garments, to cotton growers, and to the Government.

I understand that several members plan to offer amendments to this bill. For the most part, the adoption of these amendments will mean defeat of the bill on final passage. This bill, like most legislation, is a compromise very carefully worked out among the various segments of the industry, Members of Congress, and the executive branch.

As I stated earlier, the committee approved an amendment after the bill was reported, which was urged by some of our friends on the minority. I refer to the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE]. The committee directed me to accept that amendment; but, as of this time, I can think of no other amendment that would not have a serious effect on this bill, if not preclude its passage.

Moreover, I emphasize to the House that this is not a bill to last forever. It is a 3-year bill. Prior to the expiration of this legislation our committee and the Congress certainly will take another look at the whole cotton situation, in the light of conditions and circumstances then existing, and in the interest of farmers, consumers generally, and of the millions of workers directly associated with cotton.

JOHN F. KENNEDY AND LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Mr. Chairman, I cannot conclude these remarks without paying tribute, on behalf of the farm families of America, to the aspirations and the works of John F. Kennedy, in behalf of these people who feed and clothe us. I cannot conclude without expressing my reverent acknowledgment and thanks that the divine goodness has given us another President who recognizes the great contribution of our farm people to the health, the strength, and the happiness of this Nation, and who is determined that these people who till our soil shall share equitably and fairly in the rewards of the American free enterprise system.

I do now conclude, Mr. Chairman, in humble and thankful awareness that these two great men have approved this bill that is now before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEERMANN].

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege as a Member from Nebraska to serve on the Cotton Subcommittee and I have great interest in it. Maybe us cornpickers will have to help the cottonpickers straighten out this situation.

Cotton hearings were held a year ago this month, on December 13 and 14, and again on January 15, 30, 31, and February 1 and 4 of this year. I attended every hearing because I wanted to learn and I wanted to be helpful to the cotton industry.

The sad situation in the cotton industry today is an ugly monument to failure—the failure of the Government to manage agricultural production and prices for the benefit of either the farmer or the public generally.

Everyone agrees that the American cotton industry is in great difficulty. The relative use of American cotton is lagging, despite the great increase in population and purchasing power. Manmade fibers are replacing cotton in the mills because of the artificially inflated cost of cotton. These artificial prices have accelerated research into other fibers. The discovery and manufacture of synthetic fiber has been a free society's way of compensating for artificial meddling in its free system.

The American cotton manufacturers can no longer compete against foreign mills because American cotton costs too much.

One of the witnesses testified as to this and that testimony is to be found on page 103 of the hearings on January 30, 1963.

The inflated price on cotton—a price which is causing hardship in both the agricultural areas and the textile areas—is not caused by the cottongrowers' inability to raise cotton cheaply and efficiently. It is not the farm operator who has driven cotton costs out of the competitive range of foreign cotton and synthetic cloth.

The culprit is a philosophy. It is a philosophy of supply management, which probably has done more to damage agriculture than all the insects and weeds that ever ravaged a field. I believe supply-management theories will ultimately cause ever further catastrophes to agricultural areas of America.

Cotton now stands as the outstanding, horrible example of what happens when manipulators try to operate farms with laws and regulations that defy natural laws of supply and demand.

Let us review briefly the developments in the American cotton industry under the New Deal program—a program which depended upon high supports and reduced acreage for success:

First. The consumption of American cotton, per capita, has increased very little since 1933. The consumption of foreign cotton and competing synthetic fibers has risen prodigiously.

Second. The program has delayed desirable shifts in cotton production. Areas which in the ordinary course of events would stop growing cotton, still are planting it. Some areas which could produce abundantly and efficiently have been held back because they had no acreage allotment. Even with high supports, the inefficient areas barely make a living out of cotton, but they stay in because of the Government support prices. On the other hand, many producers are given windfalls at the taxpayers expense.

Third. The cotton program threatens to wreck the domestic cotton industry. The high supports raise our price above the world price. In order to keep our markets abroad, a high export subsidy is paid—$42.50 a bale at present. As a consequence, foreign cotton mills can buy American cotton cheaper than our own manufacturers. This gives them a tremendous advantage in the world market as well as in the United States with their new machinery, and since their labor costs are lower than American labor costs, excluding the price of cotton.

In brief, our cotton program is a monstrosity. It is such a monstrosity that it is killing the cotton industry, whose death will have grave repercussions.

Secretary Freeman is not the author of the cotton tragedy, but his fumbling had a hand in it.

The Agricultural Act of 1958 gave the Secretary the authority to set cotton prices and cotton quotas. Clearly, the only sensible decision to aid the cotton industry was to make cotton more competitive. This actually was a life and death choice for the cotton industry. If American cotton did not become competitive, it would slowly strangle to death. But the Secretary chose to protect the vested interests that are built up by a subsidy program. Congress provided the vehicle in the 1958 act to get the cotton industry headed in the right direction. But to the horror of the astute, the Secretary took a course in the opposite direction. He increased the price and reduced the acreage.

This action was foolish and irresponsible. The higher price the Secretary placed on cotton made it possible for farmers to buy more fertilizer, and to invest more in getting the most out of the land. The farmers simply grew more cotton on the same acreage. They reacted with imagination and energy to a new set of conditions, and defeated the purpose of the supply managers. In 1962, cotton production went up 10 percent despite the lowest acreage allotments permitted by law.

For the first time in our history, growers increased the average yield above a bale per acre—to a national average of 516 pounds an acre. The previous high yield was 466 pounds per acre, established in 1958.

Just look at the statistics. The national allotment for upland cotton was 18.1 million acres in 1962. In 1963, acreage was cut to 16.3 million acres. But production increased from 14.7 million bales in 1962 to 15.2 million bales in 1963.

Back in 1953, cotton was not subject to acreage allotments. In that year, there were 24.2 million acres under harvest, and the yield was 16.3 million bales. In brief, we had approximately the same production with only two-thirds of the acreage. We have not solved a thing with the present cotton program.

The major result is greatly increased consumer prices. The price differential between foreign and American cotton is greater, and the cotton industry suffers even more because it cannot compete.

Now H.R. 6196 attempts to tack on another subsidy in order to correct the effects of two other subsidies that have not corrected anything. The Cooley bill just puts one more useless gear into the Rube Goldberg machine that is trying to manage agriculture today.

H.R. 6196 is a steep 180 degrees in the wrong direction.

The cotton industry had begun to recover under the 1958 Agriculture Act. But the unwise action by Secretary Freeman in raising support prices and cutting acreages stopped the recovery, and sent the industry into a tailspin.

The experience of higher yields from reduced acreages is not limited to cotton, of course. The same thing happened in corn. The emergency feed grains program cut corn acreage.

The farmer responded in typical American fashion. He raised production from a national average of 54.5 bushels of corn in 1960, to an average of 66.2 bushels an acre in 1963. We now have the biggest corn crop in history.

The folly of this kind of supply management has not been lost on the American farmer. The evidence seems pretty plain to me that farmers are getting just as sick of Government mismanaged farm programs, as are the city dwellers who look upon the farm program as a gigantic subsidy to their country cousins.

The wheat referendum last spring gave supply managers a tremendous shock. The very wheatgrowers who were supposed to get their pockets lined with extra money were the identical ones who voted down the wheat program. Many farmers have realized for years that Government-controlled agriculture would be detrimental to the industry, in spite of the apparent short-range increase in income through artificially increased prices. They foresaw what has happened in the cotton industry. They predicted their inability to compete because Government management would eventually work to their disadvantage.

The significant thing about the wheat referendum is that a large block of farmers have come to this same conclusion. It is worth noting that most of the States that voted down the wheat program also raise cotton. If those farmers have judged that a managed wheat program is detrimental to their interest, then I suspect they will have a similar attitude toward supply management in cotton.

H.R. 6196 provides for an indirect subsidy that will enable manufacturers to buy American cotton for the same price that it is sold to foreign industry. Here is the ridiculous subsidy situation in a nutshell. We subsidize the cotton grower. We teach foreign operators how to grow cotton. Then we subsidize the foreign buyer so he can afford to buy American cotton. Now, we are proposing in this bill to subsidize our textile industry so it can compete with the foreign mills. At the same time, we have pushed up American tariffs in an attempt to give American industry some protection. But these duties have not been enough.

The Cooley bill simply is an attempt to correct a situation, caused by errors, with another mistake.

Some of our dilemma in the cotton fiasco has been the result of leaving this legislation to experts. Some of us have not tried to understand what is happening to the cotton industry because we have no direct interest in it. Now we find that we do have a direct interest—in fact, another $250 million on top of a present billion dollar cost to the taxpayers. We find that the textile industry, one of the largest employers of Americans, is staggering under an impossible burden.

The cotton situation is firm proof of what can happen to a product and an industry when disinterested people let the interested people make all the decisions. This is no longer a source of worry limited to cotton States. It affects all States and all our constituents. Agriculture and its related industries approach 40 percent of the American economy. The farm bloc may be growing smaller, but the effect of agriculture on the economy is very great. This is no problem to be left to the experts. If this principle of direct payment is approved very likely all crops will be brought under direct payments. This is a problem for every Member.

The Cooley bill is a sign that we have lost our perspective on the cotton problem, just as we have lost our perspective on the entire agriculture program.

I firmly believe we must phase the Federal Government out of production and marketing controls—but on a gradual basis.

We have made a gross error by increasing agriculture programs. Some of us have believed that we were bolstering a sector of our economy that is fading away. This is false. Agriculture controls are hamstringing a vital, vigorous industry that is still the backbone of America's strength. American agriculture does not need the Rube Goldberg type of assistance that is found in this cotton bill.

Rather, the Congress needs to slowly unravel the laws and regulations that prevent agriculture from functioning at its greatest strength in our free society.

You need only think of the wheat deal with Russia to pinpoint the weakness in the Communist world. Their Achilles heel is agriculture, and the Communists have been trying to supply-manage it from the beginning. Agriculture is still our strength in spite of Government mismanagement.

The great American agricultural industry can adjust to the sixties. Livestock, fruits, and vegetables have survived and prospered without libraries full of regulations and buildings full of manager-bureaucrats. The cost-price squeeze is more the product of artificial manipulation than the result of an industry's ability to meet competition.

Mr. Chairman, I urge you to turn down this further doctoring of American agriculture proposed in the Cooley cotton bill. The Government got into the production and marketing of agricultural crops in the thirties under perfectly understandable and necessary circumstances. The intention was to provide a crutch when a crutch would help.

Now, let us permit the patient to recover. He would have been healthier years ago if we would have cut down on the treatment. I do not propose to kick the crutch out from under him this afternoon. But let us not prevent his recuperation by tying another weight on the crutch.

Let us turn this bill, H.R. 6196 back to the Agricultural Committee with the understanding that it will work on a measure to gradually eliminate—not add—controls and subsidies.

I am a farmer. I have repeatedly said—both in Nebraska before I came to Washington, and after I was elected—"Get the Government out of production and marketing agriculture commodities as quickly as possible."

This bill is not the way to do it.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I think it should be made crystal clear that all of the problems about which we are speaking this afternoon were created by the Government, not by the cotton textile industry either through any action that the industry might have taken or because of any inaction.

The mistakes that have been mentioned in the debate so far were made right on this floor and downtown in the executive offices. Our problem today is to try to find a way to eliminate a gross discrimination that resulted from mistakes that have been made in the past. The only possible way of eliminating that discrimination, the inequity and the unfairness, about which so much has been said today, is for the Government to take action because the cotton textile industry itself is powerless to bring about any corrective action on its own responsibility.

The importance of maintaining a healthy, efficient, and growing cotton textile industry becomes manifest when we realize that more than 10 million American citizens rely upon this industry for their livelihood in the production, ginning, processing, manufacturing, and transporting of cotton, and in the merchandising of cotton goods. That is such a substantial number of American citizens that I feel that mere numbers alone should be sufficient to enlist the careful consideration of the Members of Congress in an effort to solve a problem that threatens their very existence.

That this industry is in jeopardy and in trouble is made manifest also by just a few facts which I should like to detail for the record.

First, a quarter of a century ago cotton was the dominant factor in the domestic fiber market, but this position has gradually deteriorated over the years. To be specific, in 1938 cotton supplied 81.6 percent of the U.S. fiber market, but by 1962 this percentage had dropped to below 60 percent. Between 1960 and March of 1963, cotton suffered a competitive loss of 1,500,000 bales. For the past year, cotton's share of the fiber used in the cotton spinning mills of this country has declined every month, and allotted acreage for cotton today is at the lowest since the farm program began about 25 years ago.

Second, cotton once accounted for approximately one-third of all of our exports, manufactured as well as agricultural products combined, but today U.S. exports of cotton amount to only 20 percent of all agricultural exports, and in spite of the current heavy export subsidy of 8.5 cents per pound of $42.50 per bale for cotton, cotton exports continue to decline: In May of this year the U.S. Department of Agriculture reported that only 3,059,333 bales of cotton had been registered for export under the 1962–63 program as compared with 4,350,571 bales on a comparable date a year ago, a drop of 1,291,238 bales in exports in only 1 year.

Third, because of our liberal trade policies, about which some comment has been made previously in the debate, plus the $42.50 per bale export subsidy now in effect, imports of foreign-made textile products have sharply increased in recent years. In 1962 these imports reached a record 650,000 equivalent bales of cotton, compared with only 100,000 in 1954. This sharp upward trend of textile imports has largely occurred since the advent of the two-price system for cotton, which permits foreign competitors of our cotton mills to buy homegrown cotton at $42.50 a bale less than our own manufacturers have to pay for it. Since raw cotton accounts for 55 percent of the cost of manufacturing cotton cloth, the result of these heavy textile imports is devastating to the domestic textile industry: Active cotton spindles have dropped 9 percent since the two-price cotton system has been in effect, active spindles on 100 percent cotton have fallen to an average of 88.7 percent, and 162,000 textile jobs have been lost.

Now I want to take the liberty, after having obtained the permission of the gentleman who wrote this letter, to read into the RECORD parts of a letter written to the President of the United States last year by a textile manufacturer in my State which contains a more eloquent analysis of what is transpiring and in what danger the present situation is placing the textile industry than I can possibly do.

The letter is as follows:

> We have one of the most modern textile spinning mills in the world; it was completed in early 1961. The plant employs 101 people including myself; it has all new machinery, new production methods, and strict quality control. Our manufacturing space is all refrigerated, clean, and is ideal for employee comfort and manufacturing. Our yarn quality is excellent and our customers are pleased with our quality. We all feel that we have done everything humanly possible to build an efficient plant to employ personnel who were left without work when a previous spinning mill closed down on the same location. We invite you personally or any of your representatives to tour our plant at any time.
>
> We have been in a relatively bad market since we made our first pound of yarn. The cotton cost has risen from 32.50 to 37.33 cents per pound and the yarn prices have declined. Our product is all cotton carded knitting yarns from 14/1 to 30/1; we spin Memphis territory cotton.
>
> Last week I was in southern Germany and Switzerland looking at the newest Swiss textile machinery and methods in production. The mills there were spinning cotton from Pakistan. The management informed me that they could buy cotton from Pakistan and other countries other than the United States for 3 cents per pound cheaper than they could buy cotton from the United States—even with our 8½ cents per pound subsidy.
>
> When I came back last Thursday, I called on my knitting customers in New York. I could not procure any new business because they frankly showed me Portuguese yarn that they were buying for 11 cents per pound cheaper delivered than our costs.

Then the other day I saw this gentleman and was discussing with him the approaching debate on this bill, he said:

> I will send you a copy of a letter I wrote to our employees when we had to go out of business because we could not compete.

What he did was to sell his plant to a well diversified integrated big textile operation that could absorb the losses of this spinning mill and make up for these losses in finished goods.

I would like to read a portion of the letter that this manufacturer addressed to his employees explaining why he had to take that action:

> We invested heavily in the new plant in 1960 not only with material means, but also with planning, time, and true enough—a great deal of sweat and tears. The venture has not been the most successful, but each of you has produced far more than was expected.
>
> Unfortunately, we started producing carded cotton yarn for the knitting industry just at the time when our Nation started importing great quantities of foreign yarn. Indeed, more yarn of this specific nature (unbleached, unprocessed cotton carded knitting yarn) has been imported in 1 month—month after month—than we can produce in an entire year. Our customers' competitors were buying this far cheaper yarn; eventually our customers had to start buying it also to remain in business.
>
> Two years ago the basis of our Nation's cotton program was changed. This increased the cost of our raw stock as much as 5 cents per pound which represented a weekly cost increase of $5,000 to us. At the same time, our Nation was/is shipping the same cotton to foreign spinning mills for 8½ cents per pound cheaper than we can buy it ourselves. As a result of this and far lower labor costs of the same mills they are shipping great quantities of yarn into our Nation. One of our largest customers has just purchased 1 million pounds of 18/1 for 48 cents in Egypt—plus a cost of 7 cents to land it in his New England plant for a total cost of 55 cents per pound. The net result of this foreign yarn is that the average sales price of our yarn has dropped from 66 to 61 cents and in some cases to 60 cents. This is a drop of $5,000 to $6,000 per week for our product. This decrease in the market price of our product plus the increase of our cotton has made us labor under a $10,000 to $11,000 per week differential since 1960. This is a total of $500,000 to $550,000 per year.

No wonder he could not stay in business.

The result of all this is that U.S.-grown cotton is not being sold in the domestic or foreign markets but is piling up in Government-rented warehouse space around the country. The following facts make this crystal clear:

First. On August 1, 1961, the U.S. Government owned 1.5 million bales of cotton for which the U.S. taxpayers had paid $300 million.

Second. By August 1, 1963, the amount of Government-owned cotton had increased to 8.2 million bales and the cost to the taxpayers had gone to $1.3 billion.

Third. By August 1, 1964, it is estimated that Government-owned cotton will have increased to 10 million bales and the cost to the taxpayers will go up to $1.6 billion.

Fourth. Storage costs on this cotton will be $75 million in 1963 and are expected to be $83 million in 1964.

So here we have $1½ billion invested in cotton in storage. What are we going to do with it? Unfortunately, cotton is one agricultural commodity which cannot be eaten. A bale of cotton is virtually worthless unless it is processed in a cotton mill. It follows therefore that the textile industry, at home and abroad, is the only customer for this vast quantity of cotton we already own in storage and for additional cotton the Government will be forced to acquire in future years under existing law.

Reduced to its simplest terms, the bill under consideration today will enable the Government to rid itself of an unprofitable investment by unloading some of this cotton on the domestic textile industry at a price which is actually a cent or two a pound above the world price.

If this bill is not passed, the following results will occur:

First. We will sell as much of it as we can to foreign textile manufacturers who will continue to flood our markets and displace goods produced by our own textile industry, thereby throwing additional workers out of jobs and forcing the liquidation of additional textile plants. For every bale we do sell abroad, we will be subsidizing foreign competitors of our own textile industry at the rate of $42.50 a bale. Even so, the record shows that despite this heavy subsidy, our exports are in a declining trend because of increased cotton production abroad at costs even lower than our own subsidized ones. This means that it will be exceedingly difficult, if not actually impossible, to increase our cotton exports even though they enjoy a substantial subsidy. But assuming that we can sell 4 million bales abroad next year, the subsidy alone will amount to $170 million and it all goes to foreign competitors of our own textile mills.

Second. Or we can dispose of some of it abroad under Public Law 480 for unredeemable foreign currencies or give it away under the foreign aid program. For cotton so disposed, the taxpayers will take a 100 percent loss on the acquisition price of the cotton augmented by the substantial storage and carrying costs that have been added.

I submit, in fairness to the millions of American citizens who depend for a living on a healthy domestic cotton-textile industry, that if we intend to continue a policy of selling homegrown cotton to foreign competitors at prices substantially lower than our own mills have to pay, and if we intend to continue to permit this cotton to return to the United States in the form of manufactured products for sale in our own markets at prices substantially lower than domestic manufacturing costs, we ought to make our surplus cotton available to the domestic mills at the same price you make it available to their foreign competitors. To do otherwise will perpetuate a gross injustice to American textile workers and manufacturers.

Moreover, our failure to do so would constitute a disservice to American consumers of textile products. Opponents of the pending legislation argue that the bill will provide a substantial subsidy for domestic cotton mills but an official of the U.S. Department of Commerce testified to the committee that the extra costs of this program, whatever they may be, will find their way into the pockets of the American consumers in a ratio of $2 saved for $1 spent.

This opinion is supported by an independent research study made by Survey & Research Corp., of Washington, D.C. The study included a comparison between the price of raw cotton and the wholesale price of unfinished cotton cloth from August 1925 to February 1963, and from the results of this study it is established that the savings flowing to textile manufacturers from reduced raw cotton prices will be passed on to the consumers of textile products in the United States—and this means all of us. The U.S. Department of Commerce estimates these savings will approximate $500 million a year for consumers if H.R. 6196 is enacted.

Every Member of Congress can in good conscience vote for H.R. 6196 because enactment of this bill will, first, make it possible for domestic cotton mills to purchase homegrown cotton at the same price this cotton is sold to foreign mills and thereby remove an intolerable discrimination against the home folks; second, prevent the creation of new depressed areas all over the Cotton Belt and make it possible for the domestic cotton textile industry to survive the grossly unfair competition which now exists from abroad; third, create some 35,000 new jobs for cotton textile workers; and, fourth, result in an annual saving to the American consumers of cotton textile goods of more than $500 million.

I do not see how we can fail to take appropriate action to prevent the perpetuation of the gross discrimination against the domestic textile industry and the millions of American citizens who depend upon it for a living.

This bill offers your only opportunity to take such action.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from North Carolina on the fine presentation he has made here today. I sympathize with him in regard to the plight of the textile industry. But are we not going about this in the wrong way? Why not do away with the unrealistic price supports on cotton production, plus the export subsidy benefit to foreign textile manufacturers? Are we not compounding a felony here today by doing this, by adding a third subsidy?

Mr. JONAS. No; if the McIntire amendment is adopted, and the chairman of the committee stated that he has authority to accept it, we will be moving in that direction. The price supports are going down over 3½ cents a pound over a period of 3 years. That might not be as far as the gentleman thinks we ought to go at one fell swoop. But that is taking a step in the very direction that the gentleman thinks we ought to go.

Mr. CONTE. Yes, it is a step in the right direction, but I do not think it is a long enough step.

Mr. JONAS. I am sure the gentleman does not want to disrupt the whole industry by taking a giant step. We can make more progress in the long run by taking a small step at a time.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not pretend to be an expert on the intricate factors involved in the cotton problem, and I am sure that a number of my able colleagues are much more knowledgeable on this subject than I am. As both a housewife and a consumer, however, I am very much interested in the statements offered today in support of this legislation and particularly the statements in justification of this bill to the effect that consumers of cotton products, if the bill is enacted, would enjoy a savings of some $500 million. Naturally, this is a most attractive promise, and I am sure that all persons who purchase finished cotton products would like to save such a substantial sum.

Mr. Chairman, I am most intrigued by this theory that a 25-percent cut in the cost of the raw product to the manufacturers, in this case cotton, will result in the accruing to the consumer of manifold benefits, but I am afraid I don't quite understand the logic that is being offered in its support. Quite frankly, a number of questions still remain unanswered and I think we are entitled to have clear-cut answers to these questions.

First. Will a 6-percent cut in the raw product cost of cotton to the mills mean a cut in the price of cotton garments? I recall that Senator ELLENDER remarked during the hearings before his committee that his $6.95 cotton shirt probably contained no more than 30 cents' worth of raw cotton, and I believe that findings of the National Cotton Council and the U.S. Department of Agriculture Economic Research Service support his statement. In other words, the total mill cost of the raw cotton is somewhere in the neighborhood of 5 percent of the retail price of the end product. I suppose that a saving of 25 percent in raw cotton cost potentially might shave maybe 1 percent from the retail price of the shirt, but I am sure that in most instances this saving in raw cotton cost would not be enough to lower the retail price. From every reliable cost survey I have seen, this is the inescapable conclusion. I therefore ask my colleagues whether they can logically expect that when they buy their wives a dress which costs $25 and contains about 2 pounds of cotton, they will expect that the dress will be 12 cents cheaper than it is now?

Second. I notice in the committee report that the table—which has been alluded to—deals with raw cotton prices and gray cloth. As a consumer, I know that gray cloth is not the fabric which is used extensively for such things as shirts, pajamas, bathrobes, dresses, blouses, skirts, slips, and so forth. I am wondering why the proponents of this legislation did not make use of a chart correlating the raw cotton price and the finished cotton material?

Third. Who is the consumer to be benefited by this new, and I might say very expensive, subsidy? I think it is apparent to all of us that the consumer being referred to is the very same working man and woman from whose paycheck a given percentage of income is withheld every week to pay for the costs of running the Federal Government. We know that he or she, as taxpayers, will be paying another $200 million to $250 million a year more for the cotton program. These costs are fact but I feel that the benefit our consumers are to presumably receive is at best a theoretical benefit, and tenuous at that. The money that the consumers might theoretically save is money which was taken from their own pocketbooks.

Fourth. What can we reasonably expect in the way of action on the part of the textile mills themselves if this legislation should pass? Is not the stated purpose of the bill to enable the textile industry to meet foreign competition? It seems to me that all this means is that, for one reason or another, foreign competitors are now offering American consumers cotton products cheaper than the American textile industry can offer. In other words, we can buy Japanese-made corduroy overalls for our children which cost less than corduroy overalls made in America. Presumably, under this bill we will be able to buy American-manufactured overalls at the same price. Can we therefore assume that for other than patriotic reasons the American consumer will be buying nothing but the American-made product, since the prices are just the same?

Fifth. The fifth question that I would like to raise about this theory of consumer benefit is this: If a cut in the raw product cost of cotton in the amount of $250 million, as the committee report indicates, will give consumers a $500 million benefit, why does not this theory work in the opposite way? In other words, according to this theory, an increase in the raw product cost would also substantially increase the cost to consumers. When the Secretary of Agriculture in the spring of 1961 raised the price support of cotton by 2½ cents per pound, he, according to this theory, substantially and disproportionately increased the cost of cotton goods to the consumer, did he not?

Mr. Chairman, I have had the privilege of serving on the Committee on Agriculture for 5 years now and during that time I have often heard my distinguished colleagues, some of whom are advocating this bill today, say that the raw costs of the foreign commodity had very little to do with the cost of the finished product to consumers. A study by the U.S. Department of Agriculture covering the cost of bread from farm to retail counter is especially significant. Bread involves the manufacturing processes of milling and baking and therefore comes somewhat close to the circumstances of manufacturing and distributing cotton end products. Now I think that most of my colleagues know that wheat content cost is about 10 percent of the retail price of a 1-pound loaf of white bread. This compares with the 5-percent ratio of cotton to the retail price of shirts. Food distribution, furthermore, is probably the most highly competitive trade, even more so than apparel. Therefore, the normal expectance theoretically might be that the raw material cost trends would be reflected directly in the retail price of bread. Quite to the contrary, wheat cost has declined 11 percent from 1947 to 1949, while the retail price of bread advanced 55 percent.

I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, that if the House adopts this theory today that the farmer in the future will be in much more serious trouble than he already is. How then will those of us who believe in sustaining farm income to the maximum extent possibly justify an increase in the value of the raw agricultural commodity made available to the processors? Particularly I am concerned about wheat, which under the current program is scheduled to drop in price to $1.25 a bushel in 1964. Will this mean that consumers will save millions and millions of dollars on the price of bread? I think not, but the theory of this cotton bill says it will. Conversely, will it not be exceedingly difficult next year to enact remedial wheat legislation to improve the income of the wheat farmers if the House today accepts the theory that raw products costs are a larger part of the cost to the consumer. If the theory that is being advocated today is sound, then every farm bill which comes before us in the future will be attacked on the basis that by raising the raw product cost, you are doubling the cost to consumers.

Mr. Chairman, the theory of this bill before us today reminds me of a Mutt and Jeff comic strip. Mutt asked Jeff why he was running along the street behind a streetcar. Jeff replied that he always ran home behind a streetcar and therefore was saving 25 cents a day on transportation. Mutt replied that he always ran home behind a taxicab and saved 75 cents a day.

It is an intriguing theory, but I wonder how many of us can sell it to our taxpaying consumer constituent?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield for a question?

Mrs. MAY. Yes, I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Does not the gentlewoman think that she is correct in this, that the price of cotton that goes into a $7 shirt is rather inconsequential?

Mrs. MAY. Yes, I do. I was going to make that point.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentlewoman will yield further, the price of cotton that goes into a cotton blanket or into a cotton sheet or into a cotton towel is a very important factor.

I think the gentlewoman would agree that there should certainly be passed on to the consumer a substantial reduction in the cost of such things as sheets and towels and pillowcases and cotton blankets as well as cotton duck and products that are largely just plain cotton textiles rather than such textiles and products that require extensive workmanship, such as a fine quality, well-tailored shirt.

Mrs. MAY. Of course, I would point out to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], that we are not making a comparison of cost here because to try and back up this claimed savings, we would have to go into every type of end product. I, as a consumer, was thinking of many other types of cotton products which carry different percentages.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. I feel sure that the gentlewoman would be interested in a statement which I inserted in the RECORD, which appears on page 23011, in which I made a very serious effort in trying to determine what relationship, if any, there has been over the years between the price of the raw material, cotton, and the price of the finished cotton product which consumers buy off the shelf.

A chart was inserted in the committee report, which I am sure was placed there in order to convey the idea that retail prices automatically go up and down on the same fixed relationship with the price of raw materials. That did not seem to me to make sense. I contacted the Agricultural Marketing Service of the Department of Agriculture, the same office from which the figures in that chart originated, and asked for any figures, if they had them, on the composite cost—retail cost—of cotton product items.

In this statement, printed in the RECORD today, there can be found a listing of the average farm value of the cotton for each of the years 1935 through this year, and also the retail cost of cotton-product items.

Then, I would also call to the attention of the gentlewoman from Washington that in that same statement I called attention to the statement of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] who is chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and also the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] who is vice chairman of the committee, wherein they comment about the relationship between raw materials and the consumer prices.

I think it is particularly notable that in a statement made by the gentleman from North Carolina back in 1958 when he was commenting on the relationship between the prices farmers get for their milk and the price consumers pay, he concluded that the millions of dollars poured into the program will be absorbed by middlemen and consumers will derive no price benefit whatsoever.

So, it is indeed a very confusing picture. My conclusion is that we cannot be sure of any definite price relationship.

Mrs. MAY. I thank the gentleman. I did see the gentleman's statement in the RECORD. It, again, verified some of the doubts that I have had with respect to the claims for consumer savings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Washington has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. The gentlewoman has made considerable of the fact that she feels the difference between the price of raw cotton and of gray cloth is meaningless, but for 40 years there has been an almost exact relationship in that every time the price of raw cotton has gone down the price of gray goods has gone down almost exactly in the same amount.

The gentlewoman points out that she does not buy gray goods, but gray goods is what the mills produce. The mills sell gray goods. Regardless of what the consumer buys, that is the product the mills sell.

The gentleman from Illinois used another set of figures for the last 30 years for what he calls the cost or retail prices, which must be simply a compilation of certain products because it does not include all cotton products. But even this follows exactly the same curve. When the price of raw cotton went up, gray goods went up and the retail price went up. When the price of raw cotton went down, the price of gray goods went down and the retail price of cotton goods went down.

During World War II the margin between retail prices and gray goods approximately doubled and has remained at approximately that relationship. That does not mean the margin between the price of raw cotton and what the mills sell, because that has remained almost static.

Look at the chart. The gentlewoman has referred to a tabulation the gentleman from Illinois put into the RECORD on page 23012. Does this gentlewoman remember what year the price of cotton was highest?

Mrs. MAY. No, I do not.

Mr. POAGE. I thought probably the gentlewoman would. Actually, it was 1951; 1951 is the same year that the retail cost to which the gentleman from Illinois referred was the highest. The gentleman's charts on this page to which he referred and to which the gentlewoman referred show that the price of raw cotton rose steadily from 1935 to 1951, and that the retail price of cotton goods rose steadily during the same period. Since 1951 the price of raw cotton has declined and the retail price has declined at almost the same rate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Washington has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman 1 additional minute.

Mrs. MAY. I thank the gentleman from Texas, and I will try to make this very brief.

May I say to the gentleman, I believe he misspoke himself as to what I said originally, saying that I did not purchase gray cloth or that I did not see any connection. I believe, if the gentleman had been listening to my speech, I said it was very difficult for us who are not familiar with all the intricacies of this cotton legislation to answer these questions and I asked that the members of your committee give us a more clear-cut answer. I still say some of the misunderstanding comes about because the charts you use have correlated gray cloth and do not give what I would call a more clear-cut picture to the housewife and consumer of the cost of the finished products and how it reflects in the many finished products that we do purchase.

I thank the gentleman for trying to clarify the situation. I think it is very necessary for all of us.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, the cotton industry is languishing gradually but surely and if not revitalized its future is most uncertain. It is the purpose of the Cooley bill to eliminate the two-price system for cotton and permit the American mills to buy cotton at the same price foreign mills are privileged to buy the same cotton. At least 10 million people earn their livelihood in the production, ginning, transportation, marketing, milling, manufacturing, and merchandising of cotton and cotton goods. Quite a large number of additional people are employed by supplying the materials used by the cotton farmer and the various other segments of the industry. Cotton accounts for about 20 percent of our entire agricultural exports. Seven hundred million dollars annually is added to our gold supplies as a result of cash sales for our cotton in world markets. This $700 million helps to maintain our Nation's balance of payments.

The people who produce cotton receive a gross income from that crop of about

$2.5 billion each year. This money turns over about six times, as it flows into the pockets of suppliers and various service industries and all those who are responsible for processing and distributing cotton to the ultimate consumer.

In 1962 the imports of cotton textiles had reached a total of 650,000 bales equivalent, as compared with the year 1954 when the Nation imported cotton textiles with an equivalent of 100,000 bales. These mounting imports of textiles are hurting the farmer, the manufacturer, and more important, the textile workers. Foreign mills enjoy a great advantage over our own mills in that they can buy American raw cotton at 8½ cents per pound less than our mills have to pay for it. With the cheap labor rate paid in many of the importing nations, the finished product can be shipped into this country at a much lesser figure than the American-made product.

The cotton farmer is expected to produce in 1963 15.3 million bales of cotton on 14.3 million harvested acres. The estimated yield of raw cotton per acre is a record 516 pounds. This mammoth crop was produced on 8 percent less acreage than was harvested in 1962. The domestic consumption and exports for the current year are expected to reach 13.8 million bales. The disappearance is larger than a year ago, although a million and a half more bales were produced and consumed. One of the principal problems affecting the cotton industry is finding markets for cotton and cotton goods.

Under the Cooley bill cotton will compete fairly with synthetic fibers. It will greatly improve the position of our domestic mills in regaining markets here at home for various types of cotton textiles. The American consumer will be in a position after about 2 years from the passage of the Cooley bill to buy cotton goods at a much lower price. The savings will amount to about $500 million a year. These savings would be the result as the manufacturer would be able to buy cotton at the world price, which would amount to 8½ cents per pound less than is now being paid by him. The fiber, in this instance raw cotton, makes up about 55 percent of the total manufacturing cost of cotton cloth. The testimony before the Agriculture Committee was that it would reach an even higher figure.

The legislation will save jobs for many millions of our citizens by eliminating the causes for the disruption and deterioration of king cotton.

The Subcommittee on Cotton of the House Committee on Agriculture commended hearings in December 1962. Two days in December were consumed. The second series of hearings were held in the months of January and February. Considerable work on the part of interested individuals and groups has been required in the moving of the Cooley bill to the floor of the House. It is believed that by the reduction in the price to the domestic mills, as anticipated by this legislation, a gradual increased consumption of the fiber would be the result. The United States will enjoy a fair share of the world cotton market, should this bill be enacted into law. It would aid the farmer, as he can then remain in the business of growing cotton. It will make a healthy cotton trade and merchandising system, and it will promote a thriving and growing cotton textile industry and employ great numbers of Americans in useful occupations.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL].

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, I know there is not a man or woman in this Congress who is not aware of the economic situation of his own district. I, for one, have a small compact district of about 11 square miles comprising a lower, middle, and upper-middle economic group. The majority of these people work for a living, as you can tell by the economic group they are in.

I represent about 450,000 people, but a unique district in view of the fact that more people come into my district to earn their livelihood each day than the number of people who actually live in the district itself. I know, for example, there are 30,000 people employed in the field of education.

There are 30,000 people who work for the Federal Government, 10,000 of them working for the naval shipyard.

I know that about 25,000 people are employed in the electronics industry.

I know there are 150,000 white-collar workers.

I know there are 20,000 people employed in the field of candy and confectionery.

I know there are about 30,000 people who earn their livelihood in what we call the apparel section of the city of Boston.

So, consequently, this bill means considerable to me coming from the northeast section of this country representing a district which comprises two-thirds of the city of Boston.

It means a tremendous amount to the economy of my area. It means a tremendous amount to the economy of all the Members from the Northeast who come from metropolitan areas.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is high time that we wipe out the present differential on cotton under which domestic mills have to pay 30 percent more for American cotton than the foreign mills have to pay.

Since the initiation of the two-price cotton system, New England cotton textile and allied employment has declined from 89,000 workers to 47,000 workers, a drop of 47 percent. Over 50 cotton textile mills have been liquidated during this period.

In Massachusetts, the decline in cotton textile employment has been from 40,000 to 22,000 workers during this period. Twenty-eight mills have been liquidated.

Cotton spindles in place in New England have declined from 2,680,000 to 1,041,000 currently, a decline of 61 percent. In Massachusetts, the drop has been from 1,342,000 to 421,000 a drop of 69 percent.

Despite this liquidation, the cotton segment of the Massachusetts textile industry contributes significantly to the whole textile, apparel, and textile machinery complex in this State, which, in turn, is essential for the economic health and welfare of the State.

In Massachusetts, there are over 100,000 textile and apparel workers employed in 1,700 plants in 146 cities and towns, with an annual payroll of $300 million. In addition, there are 16,900 employees engaged in making textile machinery and supplies in over 100 plants.

This great manufacturing complex stretches across the length and breadth of Massachusetts, from Boston to the terminus of the Mohawk Trail; from New Bedford to Amesbury; from Great Barrington to Plymouth. It is also characterized by concentration in several areas. For example, textiles account for 79 percent of manufacturing jobs in Fall River, 46 percent in New Bedford, and 30 percent in Lowell. In the city of Boston itself, 25 percent of the manufacturing jobs are in over 600 textile apparel plants. This is the particular area which I represent.

For these reasons, I support the Cooley bill and the amendment I understand will be offered by my colleague from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE].

The bill will eliminate the inequitable and unfair situation wherein our domestic cotton textile industry has had to pay 25 or 30 percent more for cotton than those foreign mills which turn the cotton into textiles and apparel and ship them back into this country.

Imports have steadily risen since 1956 and, currently, exceed 1 billion—I repeat, 1 billion square yards annually. In terms of cotton content, imports have tripled to 310 million pounds.

Cotton's share of the U.S. market for textile fibers will continue to drop as it has over recent years unless this unfair burden affecting the cotton growing textile and apparel industry in this country is eliminated by this bill.

This bill protects the small grower while permitting a modest reduction in the support price of cotton, and provides for research to reduce the cost of producing cotton in the future.

This is no windfall to our mills or textile workers. Lower cotton prices mean lower fabric prices to the consumer in this highly competitive industry.

The thousands of textile mills throughout the country, of which Massachusetts and New England have a modest share, are the principal customers of American cotton. Without them, the raw cotton industry, as we know it in this country, cannot grow and prosper.

It is essential, therefore, that after 7 years of delay, we now face up to this situation and vote for this bill with Mr. MCINTIRE's amendment.

As I understand it, all of labor and all of management in our area support it, and I cannot for the life of me conceive how any Member from New England, regardless of what city or where he comes from, could vote against legislation of this type. I hope the bill is passed.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-nine Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 215]

Ashbrook
Ashley
Auchincloss
Barrett
Battin
Becker
Bennett, Mich.
Bolling
Brooks
Byrnes, Wis.
Carey
Celler
Chelf
Colmer
Curtis
Dawson
Diggs
Dowdy
Dulski
Edmondson
Ellsworth
Fallon
Fogarty
Fuqua
Gibbons
Gill
Glenn
Gurney
Hall
Harsha
Hawkins
Hébert
Holifield
Jennings
Johansen
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
Kirwan
Lankford
Lindsay
Long, La.
McLoskey
Mailliard
Matsunaga
Milliken
Monagan
Morrison
Morse
Moss
O'Brien, Ill.
Olson, Minn.
Passman
Patman
Pepper
Powell
Rivers, Alaska
Robison
Roosevelt
Roush
St Germain
St. Onge
Shelley
Sheppard
Smith, Va.
Steed
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Van Pelt
Widnall

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROONEY of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H.R. 6196, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 362 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE].

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H.R. 6196, has been designed as an aid to the cotton industry for, as everybody is fully aware, the cotton industry is in grave trouble.

Evidence that the cotton industry is hard pressed is reflected in the fact that during the 5-year period between 1958 and 1963 some 45 cotton mills have been liquidated in the United States, with approximately 30,000 jobs having been wiped out in the process. In this same period, employment in broadwoven fabric mills declined from 246,800 to 216,700 production workers.

There are, of course, many conditions that have contributed to the troubles and problems of the cotton industry. In the case of the textile manufacturer, for instance, there is the complaint that the two-price system on cotton requires the domestic manufacturer to pay 8½ cents more per pound of cotton than does his foreign competitor for the same cotton.

H.R. 6196 would move forward to correct this inequity. It would do this by providing payments-in-kind in order to make American cotton available to domestic mills at world cotton prices. This would eliminate a grossly unfair cost disadvantage under which our American mills have for long labored, and it would enable the American textile manufacturer to meet his foreign counterpart on an improved competitive basis.

It is to be recognized, too, that our national policies in two areas have also contributed substantially to the crisis in which the U.S. cotton industry today finds itself.

In the price-support area, for instance, the support levels on agricultural cotton in 1961 were lifted from 30 to 32.47 cents per pound. Through this unwarranted upward adjustment in the support level of agricultural cotton, the two-price policy was transformed from a program which the domestic industry could barely tolerate into one that was unbearable.

The introduction of this cost disadvantage to our domestic mills was largely responsible for a competitive loss of some 1,700,000 bales of cotton during the last 3 years, a loss which—if something is not done to correct the situation—might very well continue into the future.

The area of trade policy has also failed to offer any protection against the textile imports that have been flooding into our domestic markets.

It is true, of course, that the United States has entered into voluntary trade agreements with other countries toward the end of controlling the volume of cotton textile products coming into America; however, notwithstanding such trade agreements, these imports have reached new and record highs.

For instance, since 1946 cotton textile imports have increased at an average annual rate of 22 percent. For calendar 1962 imports have been up 23 percent, and for the first 8 months of 1963 cotton textile imports are higher than they were for the same period last year.

In absolute terms, cotton goods imports were, in 1955, running just about 300 million yards, in 1960 approximately 1 billion yards, and in 1963 it is estimated that the imports will be just about 1,200 billion yards.

It must be recognized, too, that the price-support program for cotton has boosted the price level for cotton above what it would be under natural conditions in the marketplace. This has had the effect of creating a gap between cotton prices and those of other natural fabrics and synthetics. This gap has been broadening, and as the price of cotton continues to go up, the demand for cotton over and above the other fabrics goes down.

It is quite clear that some administrative action—particularly with regard to trade policies—can be taken to improve the position of our cotton industry. This action would involve restricting cotton textile imports that are sweeping into this country.

Over and above this, however, it is quite obvious that legislation action will have to be taken, too. And H.R. 6196 provides a base of assistance for the severely stricken cotton industry.

In brief, this legislation would help the cotton industry by correcting the severe price disadvantage under which our domestic textile mills today labor.

The legislation also would make cotton more competitive with other natural and synthetic fibers.

I do not, of course, wish to represent this legislation as being, in itself, a cure-all for the many ills that have crowded in upon the domestic cotton textile industry. It does, however, contain the seeds for progress toward a solution.

The program will not be without its costs, but it is interesting to note that as cotton would come out of Government storage under this program, there would be an appreciative saving on storage costs for this commodity.

And toward the end of further reducing the costs of the operation of this program, I will—at the proper time—offer an amendment to H.R. 6196. My amendment would establish a statutory ceiling on the level of price supports on cotton for the production in excess of 15 bales on upland cotton for the 1964, 1965, and 1966 crops.

In short, my amendment would permanently repeal the Secretary of Agriculture's present discretionary authority to set upland cotton price supports from 65 to 90 percent of parity permanently.

The cottongrower will not enthusiastically embrace this proposition, for it would have the effect of adjusting his income a little downward. By the same token, however, it must be recognized that presently the price support level on this cotton is 32.47 cents per pound, an unrealistic figure in consideration of the fact that just about two-thirds of the cotton in this country is produced at cost levels well below this figure.

H.R. 6196 does not, as it is now written, change the Secretary of Agriculture's discretionary authority to set upland cotton price supports from 65 to 90 percent of parity. Under the present parity price, this means that the support price for 1964 could be set anywhere from about 27 to 37 cents per pound. Either of these levels would prompt undesirable results.

Under the present costs of producing cotton, most cotton farmers could not continue to produce cotton if the price were immediately dropped to 27 cents. On the other hand, if the level were set as high as 37 cents, cotton would be priced out of most markets as a textile fiber. Furthermore, it was not possible to estimate the costs of this bill unless a price support level could be definitely nailed down. I, therefore, considered it desirable to include in this legislation a provision specifying precisely what the level of price support should be.

I want to remind my colleagues that at the time the committee reported this bill, it had not been possible to get an agreement on this matter of price support levels. There were some who felt that a proposal offered by the Department of Agriculture was too low, while others thought it was too high. In any event, agreement finally was reached, and the House Committee on Agriculture met and approved the amendment that I will offer.

My amendment provides that the level of support for 1964 shall be such as to reflect a loan of 30 cents per pound for Middling inch, as the basic price support. H.R. 6196, as originally introduced, provided that in 1965 and thereafter, the level of support would be that for the previous year adjusted downward to reflect any reductions in the cost of producing cotton.

In addition, the bill directed the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a special research program aimed at reducing the cost of producing cotton, authorizing an appropriation of $10 million annually for this purpose. It seemed reasonable, then, to establish a maximum of 29½ cents per pound, which my amendment does, for 1965, and for 1966, and thereafter the maximum level would be 29 cents per pound.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I shall be very happy to yield to my chairman.

Mr. COOLEY. Is not that the amendment which was considered by the committee after the bill had been reported and the committee instructed me, as chairman of the committee, to accept the amendment when it was presented on the floor of the House by the gentleman from Maine?

Mr. McINTIRE. This will be the amendment which I shall offer at the appropriate time.

Mr. COOLEY. May I ask one other thing? I am sure my friend will agree that this bill is a 3-year bill, and that before that 3 years expires, it will be the duty of the Congress and the committee to review the situation as it then exists with reference to the prices?

Mr. McINTIRE. This would certainly by my understanding. As I have mentioned, the history of cotton legislation would be that probably within those 3 years other cotton legislation would be proposed in order to follow up with the developments within the cotton industry.

As the cost of producing cotton is reduced, the price support level would be reduced below 29 cents per pound. In each of these instances, the amount applies to Middling inch cotton.

With the cotton industry facing the continuing loss of markets to synthetic fibers, and with increasing imports and reductions in acreage, it was obvious that the price of cotton to U.S. mills must be reduced to world levels.

The present difference in the domestic price and the world price is, of course, 8½ cents per pound. Under H.R. 6196, the price to domestic mills would be reduced by 8½ cents in order to eliminate the obvious inequity. My amendment specifies that farmers would absorb 2½ cents of this reduction the first year. By 1966, the farmers' contribution to the reduction in price to the world level would be 3½ cents per pound or 41 percent. The Government's share would be 5 cents per pound, or 59 percent of the reduction. In addition to a reduction in the potential cost of eliminating the inequity, this would reduce the cost of the present export subsidy by 59 percent or over $85 million.

I sincerely hope that with an expanded research program, it will be possible for costs to be reduced to the extent that the price support level will be below 29 cents by 1966 and continue on down to the world level in a reasonable time.

It is interesting to note that evidence presented to the committee pointed out that there were five areas in which production costs on cotton could be reduced substantially, by as much as 11 cents per pound or about one-third of the current price support level. This presentation was made by representatives of the cotton industry and was concurred in by the top research officials of the Department of Agriculture and many of the State experiment stations in the Cotton Belt.

I firmly feel that the amendment which I will offer is sound, fair, and workable.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, every Member of this House is aware of the fact that the economic stability of the Nation as a whole is threatened as a result of the continual loss of our cotton markets.

Cotton has historically been the largest item in the balancing of our foreign trade accounts. Cotton has historically employed a very large number of our citizens, not only in production but even more in processing and distribution. People far removed from the cotton fields of the South, from Portland, Maine, to Portland, Oreg., have and do depend upon cotton for their livelihood. Cotton is presently in trouble, not from the standpoint of production—producers have learned how to contently increase yields—but in the markets. Our price support structure has placed American produced cotton textiles at a very decided disadvantage as compared either with imported cotton textiles or with domestically produced synthetics.

The Cooley cotton bill is not a sectional measure. It is one of national importance. It is one which deserves the same consideration from New England and the Midwest which it deserves from the Delta and from California. Were this bill fully understood I have no doubt it would receive this widespread support, not because it is a perfect bill—it is not. Very little legislation which comes before this Congress ever reaches or even approaches perfection. The Cooley bill is a bundle of compromises, and each compromise is dependent upon some other compromise. I doubt very much that this bill can survive the breakdown of any of these compromises.

Of course, I must point out in addition to the committee amendments which are printed as a part of the bill, that the so-called McIntire amendment has been approved by the Agriculture Committee and must be considered as an integral part of the bill just as the other committee amendments are. It is one of the compromises. I did not and do not like to support the McIntire amendment because it means that certain cotton producers will, at the end of a 3-year period, be receiving a support of only 29 cents per pound. I had hoped it would not be necessary to drop this support price below 30 cents, but I recognized in the committee, and I recognize now, that there are a great many other Members who believe the support should be brought much lower. This is indeed a compromise. I stand by this compromise and support it just as I expect my colleagues to stand by the other compromises which constitute the bill. Standing together and accepting the compromises heretofore worked out, we can and will pass an effective and workable measure, but to the extent that any of us seek, at this late hour, to write our own personal preferences into this bill, we jeopardize the relief which we know is essential to the maintenance of a great national industry. I am, therefore, voting for this bill for the committee amendments and for the McIntire amendment, and against all other amendments.

Now how does this bill propose to restore the health of the cotton industry? It proposes to do it by making payments in kind, that is, by using some of the 11 million bales surplus we now have to make cotton more competitive when used by our American mills. Years ago the Congress timidly approached the problem of bringing the supply of farm products in balance with the demand therefor. We never have actually done the job. We have used acreage controls in our effort to narrow the gap but our scientific and technical advance has been so rapid we have achieved little real production control, but since the Cooley bill does not deal with crop control in any manner, I will not dwell on this.

We have further implemented our efforts to maintain the price by providing a program of nonrecourse loans for producers who have held their plantings down to their allotted acres. At the present time the loan on cotton is 32.47 cents per pound. This is approximately 8½ cents more than the world market. We have sold cotton on the world market by giving a subsidy "in kind" to exporters. When an American exporter sold cotton on the world market and produced the evidence that he had actually shipped the cotton to a foreign destination, he has been given, from Commodity Credit stocks, additional cotton of the market value of approximately 8½ cents for each pound of his exports.

This has been known as an export subsidy. It has not involved any cash but, of course, it does involve the use of a valuable commodity. The exporter has not been able to retain this 8½-cent value for himself. On the contrary, he has been forced to sell his cotton at world price. The payment "in kind" has enabled him to recoup his losses, that is, the difference between the American price and the world price, but it has left the foreign mill with a decided advantage over American mills insofar as selling on the American market is concerned.

What the Cooley bill does is to apply exactly the same principle and use of the same machinery for the equilization of the price of cotton used by American mills. It gives the same type of subsidy, that is, a payment "in kind" out of Commodity Credit stocks, and in the same amount to the cotton merchant who delivers cotton to an American mill as the law already gives to the merchant who delivers to a foreign mill. To me, this is simple justice.

Many of the critics have contended that we should pay something less than the complete difference of 8½ cents. They base this, first, on the argument that cotton will cost the American mills less because of transportation. I do not believe this argument will stand analysis. Of course, if we assume the use of the so-called conference rates for ocean shipping, the American mills would get their cotton for less than foreign mills would but no foreign mill ever ships cotton and pays the conference rates—they ship by tramp steamer, and as best I can ascertain, it is oftentimes cheaper to ship cotton from Lubbock, Tex., to Osaka, Japan, than it is to ship it from Lubbock to Charlotte, N.C. Freight rates are, at best, a complicated and difficult matter of determination, but I think it is clear that there is very little if any difference between the cost of delivering cotton to American mills and delivering it to foreign mills.

In the second place, those who oppose this measure say we do not actually need to equalize the cost; that if we would give the mills a subsidy of something like half the difference between the domestic and the world prices, this would be very helpful and would be "reasonable." I do not so understand the situation. We know rayon is available to our domestic mills at between 24 and 25 cents. So long as the mills can get rayon for less than the price they would have to pay for comparable cotton fiber it seems to me that the inducement to use it will remain. As I see it, there is a "critical point" just as there is in many chemical processes. For instance, if one wants to make ice he can reduce the temperature of water from 90° to 35° but he would still produce no ice. However, if he will reduce the temperature of the water another 3° he will produce ice. Thus, the money spent on reducing the temperature the first 55° is totally wasted unless we go on for the next 3°. I believe we are faced with a rather similar situation in connection with the use of cotton.

Possibly a more vital and more fundamental question is that raised by those who contend that this bill is a "mill subsidy." This deserves serious consideration. The charge is that if the Government makes it possible for the mills to get cotton at 8½ cents less than they are now getting it, they will simply pocket this 8½ cents as added profits and there would be no saving to the consumer. Of course this conclusion is based on the assumption that all cotton mills in America are parties to some kind of gigantic, mysterious conspiracy in violation of our antitrust laws, because it is clear that no such monopoly exists, for if one mill cut the price the others would have to.

To me, the experience of the last 40 years clearly precludes the possibility of such a conspiracy. I cite you the very figures which have been selected by the opponents of this bill. You have seen the graph on page 23012 of the RECORD for December 2, 1963, showing the fluctuations of the price of raw cotton and of gray cloth, the basic product of our cotton mills. You have seen that for 40 years there has been a direct relationship. Not one time in those 40 years did the price of cotton go down without a corresponding decline in the price of gray cloth. To me this graph is absolutely conclusive. The mills can only maintain a rather basic margin to pay their costs and profits.

True, in one of the letters you received from the opponents this morning, there has been superimposed on this graph another, showing the "retail price of cotton products" for the last 30 years. This second graph shows a wide margin between the price of gray cloth and the retail price of cotton products but it, too, shows that the retail price of cotton products went up every time the price of raw cotton and gray cloth went up, and that this retail price dropped every time the price of raw cotton dropped. I suggest that my colleagues familiarize themselves with this graph and with the tables which the opposition has inserted in yesterday's RECORD.

I sincerely invite your serious study of these tables because I believe they prove better than anything any of us could say that there is indeed a direct relationship between the price of raw cotton and the retail price of cotton products. The only other point which these graphs and tables make is that during the war years and just following the war through 1947, the spread or margin between the price of gray cloth and the retail price of cotton products jumped from something like 60 cents per pound to approximately double that amount. Clearly those who handle cotton goods after they leave the mill have, for the past 15 years, enjoyed a much larger margin of profit than any enjoyed prior to that time. But the important point is the relationship between the price of raw cotton and the price of the retail products fluctuates up and down just as it always has.

Now, based upon this relationship, the Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Luther Hodges, who has himself long had a successful career as a cotton mill operator, told our committee that in his opinion for every dollar's worth of surplus cotton we put into this program, the consumer would save at least $2 on the cost of his retail purchases. Other knowledgeable operators have told me this is a very conservative estimate; in their opinion the saving to consumers would be much greater.

You will understand, of course, that this saving to consumers becomes larger than the actual amount of the reduction in cotton prices because each time the cotton product is sold and passes through additional hands it carries a margin of profit based upon the entire accumulated cost. Thus, if we start with a product which costs the mills 32½ cents we are going to find that the accumulation of profits is substantially greater than if we start with a product costing 24 cents. There is nothing strange or mysterious about these cotton margins of the price of cotton goods.

This bill simply provides an effective way of enabling the mills to get more cotton for their money, therefore enabling them to sell gray goods for less. This keeps the mills using cotton rather than synthetics, and it keeps our stores selling American-produced fabrics rather than foreign fabrics. This means a wider market for American cotton. It means our farmers will be able to grow and sell more cotton. It means that our retail stores will be able to stock more American-made textiles and sell them. It means that American workers will find jobs in American mills, and that in the long run American consumers will get more cotton products for the money they spend, and that more money will be spent at home rather than sent abroad.

I think these are all sound objectives, and that they are all national, not regional, objectives. I would, therefore, Mr. Chairman, urge that my colleagues give serious consideration to the basic implications of this legislation, and that they not be led astray by those who would like to impose upon it their special views or ideas no matter how meritorious any one particular change might be. You simply cannot make changes and retain the structure of the bill. I repeat, this bill in its present form is a series of compromises. This bill does not "solve" the cotton problem but it greatly ameliorates it. We have a chance today to get a part of something, a part of something which is desperately needed. If we defeat this bill, or kill it by amendments, we will then have secured absolutely all of nothing. I am in favor of taking the part of something.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I have given a great deal of thought and study to this proposed legislation, and I have come to the conclusion, in view of the situation which seems to be recognized by everyone, that approval of this bill would be in the best interest of our country.

I represent a rural district. We have heard a great deal about the cotton industry, primarily the textile side of the cotton industry, and I must confess I am not too familiar with the problems of the textile industry because I have not had an opportunity and thus the experience of talking to people and observing the technicalities and all of the operations of that industry, not any more so than our dear, beloved friends and colleagues who come from the cities and who are just as interested in this problem, and appropriately so, as we are in my district. But I am familiar with the cotton producing side of this question.

My State is a substantial cotton producing State. My district produces substantial cotton, both in the delta area and in the uplands. So I do know something about their problems. I do know something about their concern. They are not the kind of people who want to impose upon the textile industry and the consumers of this great country of ours. They are the kind of people who want to continue to be a part of the economy of this country. They want to be in position to produce cotton and get a price for it that will permit them to get along and have equal opportunity in the economic relationships that we enjoy. That is all we want. We should not ask for more, and I do not think we are entitled to any less.

It is admitted apparently by everyone that something needs to be done. I have always had the feeling, Mr. Chairman, that we have had the know-how and the ingenuity and if given an opportunity will resolve any problems regardless of how difficult they may be.

It is our responsibility to try to give them that opportunity with this problem.

There may be other ways that might be more desirable than proposed by this bill. I suppose it is possible that there could be devised some scheme that would be more desirable from the viewpoint of many people. I imagine if I were given the authority or had the responsibility to sit down and try to work something out in my own mind I probably could satisfy myself a little more. But that is not the way to get things done in the Congress. That is not the way we can give that opportunity, as I see it.

So the committee has come up with a plan, and this is the only practical plan, as I see it, with any reasonable opportunity of realizing anything that will alleviate the present situation. Therefore I am supporting this bill.

The purpose of this bill is to encourage increased consumption of cotton. No one can object to that. To maintain the income of cotton producers, and to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production. That is precisely what the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Jonas] talked about earlier. That is precisely what the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McIntire] talked about. That is precisely what the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley], chairman of the committee, who has labored so hard under such difficult conditions to try to come up with some plan that we in this House could support, has talked about.

I think the great Committee on Agriculture under the present situation, recognizing on both sides of the aisle that something should be done, is entitled to our support. I ask my colleagues to join me in giving it this support.

Yes, we are interested in our district in Arkansas, but if we are willing to give a little, why can we not come to a reasonable conclusion here? Let us work it out.

The committee has accepted the McIntire amendment. The committee, you have heard, has accepted other amendments in order to try to strengthen it and accomplish the purposes of the bill.

This payment in kind we are talking about as proposed in the bill, I wish there were sufficient time to talk about it a little bit more, but there are two questions you might ask. First, could we not achieve the same goal by reducing the price support to the point where cotton could be sold on the market at a price competitive with the foreign mills? When we build up the farm economy over the years with cotton at a certain level, to immediately chop it off or drastically reduce it to an unreasonably low price could not do anything except bankrupt the industry and have an adverse result on the consumers of America. So it would not be a proper thing to do, in my judgment. But it is proposed to do something about it in a gradual way.

The next question is, you may ask, Why not eliminate the cotton export subsidy completely? How are we going to do that without getting all the other things involved in our economy and the markets, both domestic and foreign, involved in it? How are you going to do it from a realistic, practical standpoint? You cannot do it without disrupting the whole economy.

Mr. Chairman, I urge approval of this bill. I think it is entitled to our support.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, of all the bills we have reported out of our Committee on Agriculture, I believe this is the worst. Usually, we consider a bill ought to hold down Government expenditures and maintain the farmers' income. In this bill we do neither. This is an increase in Federal expenditures and a decrease in farmers' income. Now I think the farmers might be willing to accept a slight reduction in income in order to correct a very difficult situation which the cotton industry is in. However, I do not think there is any reason why we ought to increase expenditures in the cotton program which is already costing us too much. We have heard so often that the cotton program is one of those successful programs working so well with high supports and mandatory controls. Well, the cotton industry is in trouble and the present program has caused them to be in trouble. But already there is a substantial expenditure of funds. When we add up the cost of this program for 3 years to the present cost of the cotton program, the cost to the taxpayers in 3 years will be exactly the value of the cotton crop for 1 year or about $2,338 million.

I noticed when the chairman talked about the cost of the cotton program he used some smaller figure. As I look at the Department of Agriculture's indications here, I see they give no value whatsoever to 950,000 bales of cotton. Well, that cotton at least could be sold on the foreign market for 24 cents a pound so we ought to give it at least that value and this would make the cotton program cost another $114 million a year. So even with the McIntire amendment, here is a tremendously expensive program.

Now shall we spend that amount of money on cotton? Well, if we did this for every other commodity, mind you, the value of the marketing from all commodities is $35.7 billion a year, that means our Federal program for agriculture, if we gave the same treatment to every commodity would run $35.7 billion in 3 years, if this same deal was given to everybody. Now, I would be willing to spend money for a good program, if it solves something. But I do not believe this bill will solve anything. I do not think the cotton industry will be any better off in 3 years from now than they are right now because there is no insurance that at the termination of this program we would then go to a lower price to prevent a two-price system for cotton. Without the McIntire amendment the prices would go back to any level that the Secretary would want to set as he is doing now. With the McIntire amendment, I understand it would still be kept at 29 cents a pound which is still higher than the world price. Without any more insurance of a better program at the end of 3 years, I could imagine that the mills could use this money to help them to switch over to the synthetics at a more rapid rate than they are able to do right now. They could take this two-hundred-and-some-million dollars a year, according to our figures, we see here it averages $212 million additional each year—they could take that money and use it to switch over to synthetics. We have got to give them a hope that at the end of 3 years something is going to be different for them, that the two-price cotton system would be over with.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. COOLEY. How does the gentleman figure that the mills will receive this money, unless the mills actually use up the cotton because the subsidy that you are talking about is being paid on a per pound basis.

Mr. QUIE. The cotton mills can do anything they want with that cotton. At the world price, it is true, they receive a subsidy in the form of cotton and then they also receive a subsidy in the form of cotton in order to get their subsidy of cotton down to the world price. This would go over and over again until it worked out.

Mr. COOLEY. You mentioned the cost involved. Do you have any idea what the dairy program, in which the gentleman is very vitally interested, has cost the taxpayers of this Nation?

Mr. QUIE. Yes, I recall that the Secretary of Agriculture said we have to get the cost of the dairy program down to $300 million a year—anything above that is unreasonable.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. QUIE. The value of the dairy production each year is twice that of cotton. It is twice that. Dairy production value is $4.8 billion while cotton is marketed at a value of $2.4 billion. So if the Secretary of Agriculture says we must keep the dairy program down below $300 million, why should we have an increase in the cotton program when the crop is worth half as much as dairy products and already taxpayers are paying more for the cotton program than they are for dairy?

Mr. COOLEY. I am not interested in the statement made by the Secretary of Agriculture, but what did this dairy program cost the taxpayers of America?

Mr. QUIE. I could not tell you that for the last 20 years, but it runs $400 million a year presently on a $4 billion crop instead of $750 million a year on a $2 billion crop as this bill proposes.

Mr. COOLEY. Figures I have before me indicate that the Commodity Credit Corporation has lost $3,151 million in dairy price support operations. You seem to quote the Secretary of Agriculture. Are you aware of his calculations on the pending bill that this will result in consumer savings of about $500 million a year?

Mr. QUIE. We have never seen this proven in the life of agriculture. We have seen prices go down. We have seen beef prices go down. But did the consumer receive that kind of reduction in the price of meat? No, we have not seen it happen. Milk prices go down to the farmer. Does the price to the consumer go down? When the price of the raw material, cotton, goes down to the mill, does the consumer receive these savings? We have no assurance of that.

Mr. COOLEY. Do you disagree with the textile manufacturers, the industry statement to the effect that they will have to write off their inventories to the extent of about $150 million, all of which will accrue to the benefit of the consumers?

Mr. QUIE. We have no assurance of that, because like any other industry which utilizes the raw material from the farms, there is no assurance whatsoever that they will cut the prices on their products.

Mr. BELCHER. The chairman asked the gentleman from Minnesota what the dairy program was costing. Could the gentleman tell me what the dairy program would cost if we adopt the same type of program for dairy products that we are going to adopt now for cotton?

Mr. QUIE. If we would do the same thing for dairy products, by making a 15-cent direct payment for butter, and not bring it down to the world market level but just have a 15-cent cut in price, this would cost the taxpayer $360 million just for butter—not for cheese or dry skim milk but just for butter. How would this House react if we came before you and asked for $360 million additional for butter to give them exactly the same kind of program as you are proposing for cotton? They are in the same difficulty as cotton.

Mr. BELCHER. The same argument would prevail on this two-price system for butter that would prevail on the two-price system for cotton, would it not?

Mr. QUIE. That is right. We send dairy products overseas for less than Americans must pay for it. They have an export subsidy, like cotton, and butter is endangered by substitutes, just like cotton.

Mr. BELCHER. Would not the dairy people have the same argument in favor of this type of program that the cotton people have?

Mr. QUIE. That is right. And there is no reason why, if we can adopt this program, we should not go ahead and adopt the same kind of program for every other commodity in the same difficulty, and there are others.

Mr. BELCHER. I suppose the gentleman knows that there are dairy bills which are prepared to be introduced to do that very thing in case this bill passes the House. Do you not?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct. The National Milk Producers Federation last year passed a resolution supporting a dairy program similar to this.

Mr. BELCHER. Is that not going to put us all in kind of a spot, because every Member of this House, unless he represents an entire city district, has at least some farmers that have milk cows. Is that not correct?

Mr. QUIE. That is right. For instance, we also have difficulty with imports of beef now. If we are handing this money out to the cotton farmers and the cotton industry we would want to do the same thing for beef.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, the Chair's ruling against the point of order concerning the committee report raises some very troubling questions about this legislation. To help clarify them I would like to call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], to pages 25 and 26 of the committee report. I call attention to the language on those pages in black brackets. Is it true that the language so bracketed is repealed by this bill? Will the gentleman from North Carolina indicate whether or not the language which is bracketed in black on pages 25 and 26 of the committee report is repealed by this bill?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not care to argue the point of order which has already been overruled. I do not think it is proper for the gentleman to interrogate me about a ruling of the Chair. The point of order was overruled and that stands as it is at the moment.

Mr. FINDLEY. Will not the gentleman agree that the Members of this body are entitled to know the effect of this bill upon existing law?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is explaining to the Members of the House the effect of it. This is in substantial compliance with the Ramseyer rule, and the Chair so ruled. Why does the gentleman take the time to discuss it any further?

Mr. FINDLEY. Precisely because there is doubt as to what language in existing law is stricken by this bill. I think the Members of this body are entitled to know, and I invite anyone on the committee or others in this body who can answer to tell me if the bracketed language on pages 25 and 26 of the committee report are stricken by this bill. And if we cannot get that answer, why should we proceed with the consideration of this bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. This is not a question of discussing the decision of the Speaker on the Ramseyer rule. This is a question of knowing what is in the law today; what you have done with respect to the existing law.

Mr. COOLEY. You have the law in front of you, I am sure, because you examined the law before you made your point of order. You made your point of order and it was overruled.

Mr. GROSS. This is not a question of debating the point of order. The question is this: Are the feed grain and acreage allotment provisions of the law repealed by this bill, H.R. 6196?

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman is in doubt of it, he can offer a clarifying amendment when we get to the amendment stage.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Let the record show that the gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, refuses to respond to the question as to whether these provisions of law have been repealed, according to the report accompanying this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly the gentleman is not serious in saying, "Let the RECORD show." This RECORD is not going to belie my statements. I made my statement and it stands and it has been sustained by the Parliamentarian and by the Speaker.

Mr. FINDLEY. The only point we are trying to clear up is what is actually the effect of this bill; whether or not language now in the law comes out. It is vitally important, especially to anyone who represents a feed grains area, because it is quite clear that the effect of this bill is to strike out the language in brackets on pages 25 and 26. That being the case it is also clear that section 105 of the Agriculture Act of 1949 is stricken out. Therefore, the subsequent amendments to section 105 of the Agriculture Act of 1949 have nothing to hang to, amendments on which authority for the current feed grains program is derived. The striking of section 105 and subsequent amendments thereto reinstates, in my judgment, the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to invoke mandatory acreage controls in the feed grains area. So, it is of vital concern to find out just what this bill actually does to substantive law today.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will my friend from Illinois yield again?

Mr. FINDLEY. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to ask someone on the Committee on Agriculture the meaning of the language which appears on page 2 of the bill, section (3), which reads as follows:

> Section 104 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

I shall not take the time of the committee to read all of the section, but thereafter follows the new language concerning upland cotton.

Now, what does this do? I seek to ascertain from some member of the committee what this does with respect to sections 330 and 105 of the existing law.

Mr. COOLEY. Well, it repeals section 104.

Mr. GROSS. In section 104 are contained sections 330 and 105, would the gentleman agree?

Mr. COOLEY. They are referred to; that is true.

Mr. GROSS. So that it repeals the feed grain and acreage allotment provisions?

Mr. COOLEY. Section 104 of the act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

> The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to conduct a special cotton research program designed to reduce the cost of producing upland cotton in the United States at the earliest practicable date. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $10 million annually, as may be necessary for the Secretary to carry out this special research program. The Secretary shall report an-

> nually to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate with respect to the results of such research.

What is it you want to know?

Mr. GROSS. Section 3, reads as follows, the introducing language:

> Section 104 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

Mr. COOLEY. All right.

Mr. GROSS. If it is amended to read as follows——

Mr. COOLEY. Anything inconsistent with this rewrite would certainly be repealed, as I understand it.

Mr. GROSS. All right, then it is all inconsistent, beginning with section 104, all of the feed grain and crop acreage provisions are inconsistent and therefore repealed?

Mr. COOLEY. No, it does not mention either section by name or number.

Mr. GROSS. It does mention it by number.

Mr. COOLEY. What section?

Mr. GROSS. It does mention that section 104 is amended to read as follows.

Mr. COOLEY. Of course, directly, the 104 section is mentioned. You are complaining that part of section 104 is apparently repealed by the rewriting of the section?

Mr. GROSS. I will say to my friend from North Carolina I am not complaining about anything. I am merely trying to find out what is repealed, if anything, of the feed grains and acreage allotment provisions now in existing law. I am convinced you have repealed those provisions by the language which appears on lines 22 and 23 at page 2 of the bill.

Mr. COOLEY. All right. If we have done that it certainly can be corrected when we start to read the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Why should I correct it? I did not change the law.

Mr. COOLEY. If this bill changes it, you can correct it.

Mr. GROSS. You can do all the correcting you care to. I will say to the gentleman that what I am going to do is vote against the bill.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, it is clear from this colloquy that there is a considerable amount of doubt as to the actual effect of this bill. It would be very hazardous for us to consider the bill and to act on it until these points are clarified. I certainly hope that the chairman of the committee and the staff of the committee will give consideration to amendments which will clarify these points.

Mr. Chairman, I would now like to call the attention of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage], if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Texas, to the chart which was printed on page 23012 of the Record to which the gentleman referred earlier. The gentleman indicated that the price of cotton products always goes up and down with the price of raw cotton. The gentleman mentioned that earlier in the colloquy with the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. May]. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that 11 times in the brief span of years on the chart the two price lines did not move together. They either moved in opposite directions or one stayed the same and the other moved in one or the other direction.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. In the first place, the gentleman's chart does not refer to the price of raw cotton as compared with the price of the gray goods at the mill.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Rooney of New York). The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and ten Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. POAGE. In the first place, the gentleman's table does not relate to the difference between the price of raw cotton and the mill price of gray goods, but to the difference between the average farm value of cotton and the retail cost of goods.

Mr. FINDLEY. That is exactly what I intended.

Mr. POAGE. I understood the gentleman to suggest that it was a comparison between the price of raw cotton and the mill price. This is not the mill price, this is the retail price to which the gentleman referred. The gentleman says there are certain minor variations, and I recognize that is true. You do not find every time there is 1 cent movement that the very next year you will find it reflected because always in a yearly movement you do get times of the year when you do not find exactly the coordination; but the gentleman will agree, I am sure, that at the very beginning of his chart, which is 1935, there is a retail cost price of 91 cents as against a price of cotton of 12 cents.

Mr. FINDLEY. I will say it is true that the price lines have followed a general direction.

Mr. POAGE. A general direction, yes.

Mr. FINDLEY. But there has not been a strict relationship between the two.

Mr. POAGE. It shows both went up at approximately the same percentage until 1951. The gentleman's chart shows, and I think you will agree, a general movement upward from 1935 to 1951 of both the price of raw cotton and the retail price of cotton products.

Mr. FINDLEY. We are adopting a theory, then, that the retail price always goes up or down with the cost of the materials?

Mr. POAGE. The rest of my sentence was to be that the chart he has submitted further shows that beginning in 1951 down to the present time there has been a gradual decline both in the price of raw cotton and in the price of the finished product. That is exactly what I said, and I repeat it.

This very chart the gentleman submits shows a direct relationship between the two sets of prices.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman. I want to say that what really confuses me is a speech which was reprinted in part on the same page of the Record today in which the gentleman from Texas was quoted as saying:

> The record shows rather clearly that the tremendous loss which farmers have sustained in the way of low prices for their products in recent years has not been passed on to the consumers—and if low farm prices don't help consumers, why should Government try to lower them?

Why should we pass this bill to lower the price of raw cotton if it is not going to help the consumers?

Mr. POAGE. We should not pass it if it is not going to help the consumers. The gentleman from Texas was speaking about farm prices in general, of which the gentleman from Illinois is well aware, and that is exactly how farm prices in general have reacted. But the gentleman's own figures show that this is not applicable to the price of cotton products.

Mr. FINDLEY. Is the gentleman excluding cotton from this general picture?

Mr. POAGE. I am pointing out that there is a very special relationship between the price of raw cotton and the products thereof, and that relationship developed as the result of the competitive situation which exists in the cotton market that does not exist in a great many other commodities. There is a great deal more flexibility in the use of cotton products than there is in the use of meat or potatoes or bread. I am not quarreling with the gentleman's figures. I am just asking him to accept the implications which necessarily flow from them.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, on November 8 I made a statement in the Record concerning H.R. 6169, the Cooley cotton bill. I was pleased to see a response in the Record on November 13 by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley]. The gentleman is author of the bill and chairman of the Committee on Agriculture which considered and reported the bill.

He therefore speaks with authority for those supporting this legislation. The arguments he advanced may reasonably be assumed to be the best that can be said for it. If so, the bill deserves a quick demise.

Most—if not all—farm legislation is a conspiracy against public understanding. Its true character is concealed in verbal underbrush so thick that only a few persevering bushwhackers ever fully understand it.

And for very good reason: if the general public ever found out what was actually proposed the taxpayers' wrath would stop the legislation but quick.

The Cooley bill and the gentleman's defense of it constitute a prize example of this conspiracy with public understanding.

First. The gentleman claims this is not really a mill subsidy. The payment is called a trade incentive. Does not the word "incentive" imply a consideration, something of value? Of course, it does, and the consideration is a million dollars worth of cotton—a consideration just like money in the bank to textile mills. Who gets the consideration—the payment in kind—the trade incentive? Is it the producer? No, this is disallowed in the very language of the bill. Is it the first or second handler? No, the Committee on Agriculture specifically rejected an amendment to provide the payment to the first or second handler.

The payment, of course, is to the mill. It is the only practical place for it to go. Not actually a mill payment? How about the mills who buy directly from cotton farmers? In that case, who would get the payment? The producer is disqualified by the language of the bill, so it could go no place other than to the mill—clearly a mill payment.

This bill authorizes a mill subsidy pure and simple. Arguments to the contrary add nothing but confusion.

Not a mill subsidy? Who would get the 8½-cent-a-pound payment authorized for private holders of raw cotton? This payment in total could amount to over $43 million. If the mill holds the raw cotton, would the payment not go to the mill and thus properly be considered as a mill subsidy? Of course it would. It is estimated there are 1,023,000 bales of raw cotton in private hands. At $42.50 a bale, computed at 8½ cents a pound, the direct payment could total $43,477,500.

Another example of subterfuge, and conspiracy with public understanding, is the manner in which cost figures have been presented.

I have in my hand a chart dated October 14, 1963, carrying the reference: ASCS:PPA. It is headed:

> Cotton: Comparison of major items of estimated expenditures under current legislation and H.R. 6196 based on assumptions listed below.

One might assume this would present a fair and clear picture of the cost of this bill. The final dollar figures, showing "net additional expenditures added by H.R. 6196, as amended," are $118.2 million for the first year, $87.9 million for the second, and $44.3 million for the third.

Then a final, innocent line, which may salve the conscience of those who prepared the chart, but hardly completes a fair cost presentation. This line read "Reduction in CCC stocks in addition to cash expenditures," followed by the phrase "950,000 bales" under the column for each of the 3 years.

Completely concealed is the fact that these 950,000 bales enter into the cost of the bill.

These bales are used for payment in kind. They are to be given to the mills. The taxpayers have invested about $162.50 in each of these bales. Nine hundred and fifty thousand bales represent an annual taxpayers' cost of $154,375,000.

Why was this not shown as a part of the program's cost, instead of being skillfully slipped in without a dollar sign, indeed with a subtle phrasing that made it seem like a gain—rather than a loss—for taxpayers?

Another example of conspiracy with public understanding is the claim that this bill is actually a $500 million-plus gain for the American consumer. This is an insult to the intelligence of this body.

Spend an extra $250 million in taxes for a direct subsidy program like this, and the taxpayers get back not just the $250 million—but an extra $500 million as well.

This argument is based on the erroneous theory that consumer prices automatically reflect raw material prices. I refer you, Mr. Chairman, to a statement I placed in the Record, page 23012. It carries a tabulation which shows that cotton product prices at retail do not automatically jump up and down in fixed relationship to raw cotton prices. Indeed, sometimes the price lines go in opposite direction.

In that same statement, I quoted from earlier statements by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage] citing figures to show that consumers do not get the benefit of lower prices for farm commodities. I hope the Members will take the time to read these statements. They effectively destroy the argument that consumers will get a big windfall out of this bill.

If we accept the theory that consumer prices always reflect changes in farm commodity prices, we must remember an economic law works both ways. If this bill will benefit consumers, then Secretary Freeman actually punished consumers to the tune of some $90 million in 1961 when he jacked up price supports on cotton.

Are we now to accept this theory?

Where does all of this lead?

How about the fast-growing synthetics industry in this country? How about the people employed in the manufacture of manmade fibers? If we are going to spend $700 million a year, or so, to subsidize the price of cotton—how can we deny a similar claim from manmade fiber manufacturers? Are they not American citizens too, and entitled to fair and equal treatment?

If this bill passes, the manufacturers of manmade fibers will be forced to help finance this cotton industry subsidy—a subsidy which discriminates unfairly against their own businesses.

Then, how about other commodities, other industries. This bill would establish a dangerous precedent—a new-type subsidy—a big enough gate for any industry to reach through for tax dollars if it gets into trouble.

In our concern for consumers, for cotton textile workers, for cotton farmers, we should remember that these people are also taxpayers.

Cotton is in trouble, literally on the ropes. The blame properly belongs at the door of the Federal Government. The responsibility for providing a remedy belongs at the door of the Federal Government.

But a legislative remedy is not needed. We do not need a new law. Secretary Freeman has the authority—and a legislative mandate—to remedy the cotton problem.

All he has to do is sign his name, and thus order a gradual reduction in his price. He has this authority—and this mandate—under the Agricultural Act of 1958.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and one Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Tuck].

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Chairman, it is my desire to add my voice in favor of the passage of H.R. 6196, because an important segment of our American business community is fighting to survive. I refer to the cotton industry, now facing a situation that is closing mills and eliminating jobs all the way from the silent, boll-studded cotton row to the busy, efficient loom.

The immediate and only answer at hand is the Cooley cotton bill. I urge its prompt passage by both Houses of Congress, thus eliminating an injustice that is rapidly growing into a nationwide social mephitis and a political hystrix.

I wonder how many of our colleagues, not to mention the citizens at large, realize what has been happening to the American cotton farmer and industrialist in the last 8 to 10 years. One phase of our foreign aid program has been the encouragement of greater production abroad. We did this by supplying machinery, financial assistance, and technical knowledge. And then, for the foreign cotton manufacturer, we lowered our export cotton prices so that our American cotton was available to him at 8½ cents per pound less than it is to the manufacturer here at home.

As the years have passed since we started this program, our desire to help our friends overseas has lashed back at us in the nature of the bite at the hand that feeds. The foreign manufacturer can buy our cotton, produce his end product with low-paid labor, and send it back over here to us at a much lower price than we can produce it ourselves.

The cotton interests are bearing the burden. And they do so at a time when they are battling a threat from another quarter. Synthetics are seriously competing with textiles and are demanding a larger and larger share of the market.

In the face of this dilemma which has come upon the cotton industry, I hope we can take immediate action before we lose an element of our business life that has contributed a major part toward America's greatness. The South, during its uphill battle in the regrettable war of the 1860's, learned only too well and too late the importance of cotton.

We should act now to keep the cotton farmer at his plow and the millworker at his loom. The need for such action has been seen for years, both at the executive level and elsewhere. There have been recommendations, but they have gone for naught.

Passage of H.R. 6196 would provide the needed relief. The main thing it does is to make cotton available to our American mills at the same price it is sold to the foreign competitor.

Our mills have been the buyers of more than 70 percent of our domestic cotton. When they are forced to close and the cotton farmer has no buyer for his crop, he must go into some other field of agriculture, thus placing a burden on other branches of our economy. To illustrate the seriousness, I merely cite that cotton has suffered a competitive loss in its domestic markets of 1.7 million bales a year for the last 3 years. More than 3 million persons live on farms growing cotton. Millions of others in allied fields depend upon the raw cotton industry for their livelihood.

The district I have the honor to represent in Congress is largely agricultural, but it also has some important cotton mills. One of these is the Dan River Mills at Danville, Va., the largest in the world confined to a single community. It was formed in the 1880's, coming along at a time when the South was trying to rebuild following the period of reconstruction, and it was a great aid to the people and the economy of the area at that time. It still is an important source of income to working men and women, employing at Danville alone more than 11,000 persons. Its manufacturing establishments are found in three of the Southern States, and its sales agencies are located strategically throughout the United States, while its operations enhance and contribute toward the economy of the entire Nation.

I have always been opposed to subsidies, but I do not look upon the provisions of H.R. 6196 as a subsidy. I realize this bill may not be desirable in all respects and may in some ways be violative of what some of us consider sound legislative and governmental policies; nevertheless, it is the best and only means now available to correct the grave injustice that now exists by reason of these price differentials in favor of foreign manufacturers.

It is a simple principle of law that where there is a wrong there is a remedy, and surely there must be some remedy which will work to the benefit of the cotton industry. I believe this bill, H.R. 6196, has that remedy. If this is not the correct remedy, we can change it later.

In conclusion, in my opinion, a vote against this bill is a vote to give to foreign manufacturers cotton at a price of 8½ cents a pound less than we sell it to our domestic manufacturers who are employing our own people and who are making other significant contributions to our economy. I cannot in good conscience cast a vote that will give a differential in favor of foreign manufacturers against American manufacturers.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, this is a rapidly changing world and we have to change policies and procedures in keeping with the nature of the world in which we live. That applies to agricultural programs and policies.

Much of the discussion today has related to the serious situation confronting the cotton industry. We are confronted with a serious problem. But, as the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] pointed out, this is not the first time we have been confronted with serious problems in agriculture. When we are confronted with these problems, we have always found ways to deal with them.

We should not berate ourselves as Members of the Congress, on the Republican and Democratic sides of the aisle, in regard to what has been done in the past for agriculture. It is true that no perfect answers have been found; some programs have failed, and there have been expenditures which could not always be defended. But the Congress, and I speak of the Democrats and the Republicans, has during the past 30 years done a good job in enabling the farmer to grow and to prosper. The Congress has provided an atmosphere of stability which has enabled the farmer to plant and to produce and to harvest his crops with some assurances. Fortified with these assurances the farmer has done an unbelievably good job. He has achieved the most efficient agriculture in the history of the world. For this neither the farmer nor the Congress need apologize.

I do not personally wish to disassociate myself from a great majority of the farm programs of the past because I believe they have brought this country a long way. I remember as a boy on the farm how the farmer was regarded by many as just an old hayseed, a man who was not capable of doing something more profitable.

Too often the farmer was considered by townspeople a few decades ago as a second-class citizen. You know that—many of you know that. But as a result of farm programs made available by the Government to the farmer, the farmer has for many years been able to achieve a higher status. In the eyes of the townspeople he has become a first-class citizen. We want to continue to cooperate with the farmer in programs designed to enable him to occupy his proper place in the economic life of this Nation.

Yes, we are confronted here with a serious problem in cotton. We can meet this situation. I might add that it is going to take some time and it is going to cost some money, but a healthy agriculture in the future will contribute tremendously to the welfare of labor and industry in the cities. It has contributed in a big way to the welfare of labor and industry in the cities in the past. In the interest of the general welfare, we cannot afford to let this great cotton industry, including all facets, such as production, processing, and manufacture, suffer collapse.

I hope that in the legislative process in the House and Senate a reasonably adequate answer can be found and I shall work with others toward that end.

We have got to find a way to make cotton more competitive. We want an expanding industry, not a declining industry. Our objective is increased consumption of cotton by our mills and additional cotton acreage allotments for farmers.

I hope to have an opportunity tomorrow to speak more specifically as to the statistics on cotton and the pros and cons of the pending bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN], such time as he may desire.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, and my other colleagues. I support H.R. 6196 because it has the almost unanimous support of the cottongrowers of California and those elements of the cotton business which process and merchandise their product. It is also supported by those persons who supply cottongrowers with goods, services, and labor. I am also advised that it has the unanimous support of those sections of organized labor which represent millworkers and those which represent labor engaged in converting cotton into garments and other consumer items. I also support it because I think it is good legislation.

There is one item of stipulated agreement between those persons who favor H.R. 6196 and those persons who oppose it, including the Republican members of the House Agriculture Committee who submitted a minority report on it. It is unanimously agreed that the present cotton program is not working and that something must be done to save the production of a major farm commodity which has an annual value of about $2.4 billion and which earns at least $750 million annually from sales abroad for dollars and which could earn more to assist in the solution of our balance-of-payments problem. In addition the processing, manufacture, and sale of this fiber by U.S. corporations and individuals adds further billions of dollars to the income of both capital and labor.

There is no quarrel then over the fact that a major U.S. industry, which benefits both capital and labor, has a problem which demands a solution. The only dispute is over the means of solving it. I submit that H.R. 6196 is the only solution available to us which will give immediate answers to an immediate problem which, to be sure, will require a different permanent long-range solution.

Let us examine the bill and its background to support this conclusion.

BACKGROUND FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS

First. Only a handful of U.S. cottongrowers—operating under ideal soil and climate conditions and with massive financial investment—can profitably grow cotton at a world market price ranging between 23 and 25 cents a pound, which is established by lower foreign labor and other production costs. Thus if we are not to lose the bulk of our cotton production and irreparably damage a major sector of our farm economy with a probable shift of resources into other crops which are in surplus condition, we must have a fair and reasonable cotton price support program with the protection of the domestic market derived from existing quotas on imports of raw cotton.

Second. These necessities have heretofore worked to the disadvantage of U.S. cotton mills and cotton fiber end users in the United States because they have been paying more for raw fiber and primary cloth than their foreign competitors. The current disadvantage is at least 8½ cents a pound to the mills and a greater amount to cloth users. Do not be fooled by the argument that this disadvantage is insubstantial. Industry figures, verified by Government agencies, reflect that the cost of raw cotton is 55 percent of the manufacturing cost of primary cotton cloth, commonly known as gray goods. This disadvantage combined with higher labor costs at all stages of use after the fiber reaches the mills has resulted in the loss of practically all the U.S. foreign market for finished goods and a rapidly increasing incursion of foreign made finished cotton goods and yarn into the U.S. market. A collateral and equally serious result has been the acceleration of the substitution of cheaper synthetic fibers for cotton by U.S. manufacturers whenever possible to the detriment of both the cotton grower and the consumer. Such substitution also means increased millworker unemployment because a whole section of a cotton mill can be eliminated by such substitution.

How does H.R. 6196 reach these elements of the cotton problems?

First. Through a payment device, using cotton stocks already in Government hands, it assures U.S. mills the right to buy U.S. cotton at the same price that it is sold to their competitors abroad. This reduction of costs to the mills will reach the consumer in the form of lower finished product cost. Consumer savings will be even greater than mill savings because the handlers and finishers, manufacturers and marketers, who operate between the mills and the ultimate consumer buyer, each add percentages on the cost of gray goods material as it goes through them with an estimated minimum 100-percent markup between the mill and the ultimate buyer according to Department of Commerce estimates. For example, if we assume a 30-cent-per-yard gray goods price compared with a 38½-cent price if we fail to pass this legislation, the saving to the mill would be 8½ cents per pound; the saving to the final consumer perhaps 17 cents per equivalent pound of material depending on its finished form. Hickman Price, then Assistant Secretary of Commerce, testified before our committee that this pyramiding of savings between the mill and the housewife meant at least $100 million of saving of cost to the housewife for each penny of reduction of cost of raw cotton to the mill.

There are those who argue that the mill saving would not be passed on. The facts contradict this statement. U.S. Department of Agriculture figures covering a period of from 1925 through part of 1963 demonstrate that a movement up or down in the price of raw cotton is almost identically matched by a movement up or down in the mill price of primary cotton cloth.

Second. It establishes a pattern of price support—with the McIntire amendment which I support—which will result in a reduction of that support on two-thirds of the crop by 3.47 cents a pound. An exception to this reduction is made for the case of the so-called small farmer who produces 15 bales or less but the farmers of this size are rapidly and wisely getting out of the cotton business, and I am satisfied that this bill will result in a permanent reduction of cotton price supports across the board after the 3-year program of the bill terminates. Such permanent reduction of support levels should save at least $243 million annually in the cost of a cotton program.

The opponents of this bill maintain that this new program will cost $221,600,000 more than the present program. They are incorrect. Because of savings as aforementioned from lower support levels and other factors, the Department of Agriculture estimates that the program will only cost an additional $118 million the first year, $87 million the second year, and $44 million the third year of its 3-year lifetime. These costs will be more than matched by consumer savings and the revitalization of a great industry.

Third. It establishes a vehicle for adding to the acreage of those cotton producers who are most efficient and the most damaged by the inadequacies of the present program. Such addition will occur only in the event it will not add to cotton surpluses.

Fourth. It provides for paying the so-called mill payments through delivery of cotton out of surplus Government stocks with the result of reducing a huge Government investment which has already been paid for and which adds costs of storage and other costs daily and which, if not otherwise disposed of through the increased cotton consumption which this bill provides for, are frequently given away abroad at a total loss to the taxpayer.

Fifth. It provides for accelerated research to reduce the costs of cotton growing to the end that price supports and Government costs can be further lowered.

I hope that I have demonstrated that this proposed legislation hits at the major elements of the cotton problem immediately and in a massive, effective way.

The only alternative the opponents of it have offered is a request of the Secretary of Agriculture to reduce cotton price supports across the board. The advice and request overlooks the fact that the present statute does not permit his making a reduction as large as that provided for by this bill for two-thirds of the cotton. The advice overlooks the fact that such action, within the limits permitted by statute to the Secretary, would not solve the mill problem. If the Secretary made the maximum discretionary reduction our domestic mills would still be forced to pay a price for raw cotton substantially higher than that paid by their foreign competitors.

Finally I wish to emphasize that the so-called mill payment is not a payment for the benefit of the mills and under the Cooley bill need not be paid to them. It is merely a method of giving the mills price equity with foreign mills. It is the only method that has even been suggested for achieving that result without requiring such a drastic reduction in the farm price of cotton that 99 percent of our cotton farmers would cease to farm cotton. The payment is designed to benefit farmers.

The Cooley bill was developed after extensive hearings which began in December of 1962. It was reported by our committee in June and given a rule shortly thereafter. Every detail of it was discussed with President Kennedy and President Johnson and it has received the approval of both of these distinguished men. It merits your approval.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] 5 minutes.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-seven Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 216]

Ashbrook
Ashley
Auchincloss
Baker
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Becker
Bennett, Mich.
Blatnik
Bolling
Brooks
Byrnes, Wis.
Celler
Chelf
Colmer
Curtis
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Diggs
Dowdy
Dulski
Ellsworth
Evins
Fallon
Fogarty
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gary
Gibbons
Gill
Glenn
Gurney
Hall
Hansen
Harsha
Hébert
Herlong
Jennings
Johansen
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Latta
Long, La.
McLoskey
Madden
Mailliard
Matsunaga
May
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Minshall
Monagan
Morrison
Morse
Moss
O'Brien, Ill
O'Hara, Mich.
Passman
Pepper
Powell
Rivers, Alaska
Robison
Roosevelt
Roush
St Germain
St. Onge
Shelley
Sheppard
Siler
Slack
Smith, Va.
Steed
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Van Pelt
Vinson
Wharton
Widnall
Williams

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROONEY of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill, H.R. 6196, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 343 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I hope that anything I say here will not further confuse you on this bill. I think it is a difficult bill for the average person, particularly those people who do not come from a cotton area or who do not come from a mill area, to understand.

As I stated yesterday, the only reason that I voted to permit this bill to come out of committee and to come onto the floor of the House was to give an opportunity or to provide a vehicle for making some changes that would improve this bill. It can be improved. It can be made acceptable, I think, to a majority of the people on both sides of the aisle. I regret, of course, that there has apparently been some politics thrown into this fight. I would remind you, however, that this bill has had a rule since July 30. During the months of August, September, October, and the greater part of November it could have been brought to this floor had there been any great effort on the part of the administration or desire to want to pass this bill. The title of the bill as it is written does not indicate what is in the bill. To start with, it says that this bill is "to increase consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes." I take it that the phrase "for other purposes" is the thing that is to cover those parts of the purposes of the bill that are not definitely set out.

The first thing I asked the distinguished chairman of our committee today was to give me an explanation of the differences in section 348 and going over to page 2 of the bill where it says that the Secretary may determine the amount of payments which "will eliminate inequities due to differences in the cost of raw cotton between domestic and foreign users." Then it also says:

> Including such payments as may be necessary to make raw cotton in inventory on the date of enactment of this section available for consumption at prices consistent with the purposes of this section.

I think that most of us realize that this bill originated at the request of our late President to try to eliminate the inequities that existed between the domestic mills and the foreign mills. For several years now we have been paying an export subsidy of 8.5 cents a pound to the foreign mills. In other words, on that cotton that they could buy at a reduction of 8.5 cents a pound.

The domestic mills felt they were being discriminated against and they asked that this inequity be removed. I want to go on record here and now—and I think I represent the views of most of the people in this House—that we do appreciate the fact when an inequity exists that we would like to eliminate it. But I do not want to go beyond eliminating that inequity.

In the hearings before our committee the Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Charles Murphy, was present and made several statements about the views of the Department, as to what was necessary to eliminate the inequity. He did not at any time agree that it required 8½ cents a pound to the domestic mills to eliminate that inequity.

What I am trying to point out here is I am in favor of the Secretary of Agriculture having the authority, with the staff that he has at hand, to determine what this inequity is and to pay that. I have no objection to that at all. But as we go down in the bill, beginning with line 12 on page 2, we find a proviso which says:

> *Provided*, That beginning August 1, 1964, such payments shall be made to persons other than producers in an amount as will make upland cotton produced in the United State available for domestic use at a price which is not in excess of the price at which such cotton is made available for export.

I think it was clear in the committee when that provision was put in there, that the first payment to eliminate the inequity might be 5 cents, it might be 5½ cents, it might be 6 cents, or it might be 4½ cents, but sufficient to eliminate the inequity. After that time this proviso would set up a greater subsidy, and in my opinion would provide a windfall to the mills.

I think it might be appropriate at this time to mention to this body, because I find that many individual Members, when I mentioned this to them during this week, were unaware of the fact that the domestic mills at the present time do receive a subsidy on all of the processed cotton that they export. Last year it amounted to about $17 million, and the year before that about $18 million. They do get that subsidy to allow them to compete in foreign markets already. So I was surprised to learn that many members of our committee, some of them from areas where these mills operate, did not know that that existed. That would be one of the amendments I would propose to offer tomorrow, to provide that we would eliminate the inequity, but not go any further than that.

The next thing I would propose to do to bring this bill into line is to bring the production in line with the demand that we have for cotton. We have gotten into trouble in the cotton industry because we have encouraged overproduction through high supports and through other operations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jones] has expired.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jones] 2 minutes.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. It is going to be difficult. I will have to hurry here in an effort to try to explain these amendments that I will offer tomorrow. I do hope that when we get into the reading of the bill under the 5-minute rule we will have an opportunity to explain these amendments more thoroughly.

Mr. Chairman, under the present provisions of law, the Secretary cannot allot more than 16 million acres of cotton. Last year there was a reduction in cotton allotments of 11 percent. But with that 11-percent reduction, due to a gimmick in the law, all of the States, with the exception of four, produced more cotton than they did the year before. In some of the counties the individual growers, instead of taking an 11-percent reduction in acres, actually received a 40-percent increase in acres, and much of this increase was in high-production areas. Actually, in 1963, with an 11-percent reduction in acres, total production will be up about one-half million bales over 1962.

Mr. Chairman, we have all heard about release and reapportionment of cotton acres which adds to the production. The worst thing about that law is the fact that the people who release their cotton acreage are located in the areas where they have the lowest yield and where it is not profitable to grow cotton. For instance, in one State 32 percent of all the cotton allotments are released from people who have low yield. When the released acres are not requested in that county, that goes into a State pool and is reallocated in areas where they produce two bales, three bales, and in some cases as high as four bales this last year.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to read through all of these States, but in one State 22 percent of its allotted acreage represented released acreage, 27 percent in another State, 14 percent in another State, 26 percent in one, 32 percent in another and 20 percent in yet another. This release and reapportionment has gotten entirely out of hand, yet in this very bill we encourage an increased continuation of this practice.

Mr. Chairman, when the bill (H.R. 6196) is read under the 5-minute rule tomorrow, it is my intention to offer an amendment, which would have the effect of limiting the subsidy, through the issuance of payment-in-kind certificates, to an amount which will be sufficient to eliminate the inequities due to differences in cost of raw cotton between domestic and foreign users of such cotton. This amendment will read:

On page 2, line 12, substitute a period for the colon and add closing quotation marks; then strike the remainder of line 12 and all of lines 13 through 17.

Mr. Chairman, I have prepared other amendments which I am considering offering, although it is not likely that all of them will be offered; in fact if one or more would be adopted it would be inadvisable to offer the others. However, for the purpose of presenting the various considerations that I have been giving to this bill, I am including herewith a statement of the purposes of each amendment, as well as the wording of the various amendments, numbered from 2 through 5.

> Amendment 2 is intended to provide that when the national acreage allotment exceeds 16 million acres, the acreage in excess of 16 million acres shall be allocated so that the first 500,000 acres of such excess shall be "export market acreage" and the balance of such excess shall be allocated one-half as export market acreage and one-half as normal allotment pursuant to section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.
>
> Amendment 2: Amend section 349 in subsection (1) of section 6 of the bill to read as follows:
>
> "Sec. 349. If the national acreage allotment established under section 344(a) of the Act for the years 1964, 1965, or 1966 exceeds sixteen million acres (exclusive of the national acreage reserve established under section 344(b) of the Act), the amount of such acreage allotment in excess of sixteen million acres shall, notwithstanding any other provision of this part, be allotted as follows: The first five hundred thousand acres of such excess shall, subject to the provisions of this section and section 350 of the Act, be allotted by the Secretary as export market acreage directly to farms eligible to receive allotments under the provisions of section 344 of the Act; any remaining acreage in excess of sixteen million, five hundred thousand acres of the national acreage allotment shall be allotted one-half pursuant to the provisions of section 344 of the Act and one-half shall be allotted as export market acreage in the same manner as the first five hundred thousand acres of export market acreage: *Provided*, That no farm may receive an allotment of export market acreage in excess of the per centum prescribed by the Secretary for the crop year of the acreage allotment for the farm established under the provisions of section 344 of the Act. In allocating export market acreage, the Secretary shall estimate the amount which would be planted on farms and establish a percentage, hereinafter referred to as

the maximum export market acreage (not exceeding the per centum prescribed by the Secretary under the proviso in the preceding sentence), of the farm acreage allotment established under section 344 of the Act reasonably expected to result in planting of an acreage equal to the export market acreage available for the crop year. Any acreage allotted to a farm as export market acreage and planted to cotton shall be in addition to the county and State acreage allotments and shall not be taken into account in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments. Notice of the maximum export acreage for each farm shall be included in the notices of farm acreage allotments and marketing quotas issued pursuant to section 362 of the Act. The provisions of this section shall not apply to extra long staple cotton."

Amendment 3 is intended to eliminate the 15-bale provision for a premium price.

Amendment 3: Amend the bill by deleting section 5 thereof and renumbering subsequent sections of the bill accordingly.

Amendment 4 is intended to provide that not more than one-half of the released acreage in each county may be reapportioned to other farms in the same county, or transferred to the State committee for reapportionment to farms in other counties in the State.

Amendment 4: Add a new section 7 to the bill as follows:

"SEC. 7. Section 344(m) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by addition of the following new paragraph:

"'(4) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection (m), for the 1964, 1965, and 1966 crops of cotton the county committee shall not reapportion or surrender to the State committee an acreage in excess of one-half of the acreage released under paragraph (2) of this subsection (m). This paragraph shall not apply to extra long staple cotton.'"

Amendment 5 is intended to authorize the Secretary to purchase and retire the allotment and related State, county and farm acreage history from the owner of any farm having an acreage allotment of 15 acres or less. The price for such purchase could not exceed the smaller of 20 cents per pound of cotton production per acre calculated on the basis of a 3-year average yield or $100 per acre.

Amendment 5: Add a new section 8 to the bill as follows:

"SEC. 8. Add a new subsection (o) at the end of section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended as follows:

"'(o) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary is hereby authorized to purchase all of any farm acreage allotment for upland cotton for the 1964, 1965, or 1966 crops established under this section excluding any allotment reapportioned to the farm pursuant to section 344(m)(2) of the Act which may be offered for sale to the Secretary in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary from a farm having an acreage allotment of 15 acres or less established under this section. Any such purchase shall be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by regulations of the Secretary: *Provided,* That the maximum payment per acre of allotment shall not exceed the smaller of 20 cents per pound of cotton production per acre based on the farm average yield for the three years preceding the crop year as determined by the Secretary or $100 per acre. Allotments for other farms and State and county reserves shall not be revised for the year for which the purchase is made. The related State, county and farm acreage history shall be retired permanently and the allotment and related history so purchased shall not be used in establishing future State, county and farm allotments. The farm shall not be eligible for a new farm allotment for the next succeeding two crops of cotton.'"

There are numerous ways in which the practices which have contributed to the unwarranted and unwanted increase in production, could be handled by amendments to this bill, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps the most simple way would be to add a proviso to this bill stating that as long as the cotton carryover remains in excess of 10 million bales in any marketing year, there will be no reallocation of released acres, thereby requiring that all cotton would be produced on the acres receiving the original allotment.

Another suggestion, and one for which there is a similar precedent in the release and reallocation of tobacco acres, where the release and reallocation is accomplished between two individual growers, and the reallocation is restricted by the production on the farm releasing the acres. Following is an amendment which would carry out, in effect, though not to the exact degree, the release and reallocation within a county; and then from a specific county to the State pool. This sounds complicated, but I have been assured by the Department of Agriculture, that such a procedure would not be difficult to administer.

PROPOSED NEW SECTION 7 TO H.R. 6196

SEC. 7. Paragraph (2) of subsection (m) of section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended (1) by changing the period at the end of the first sentence to a colon and adding the following: "*Provided*, That beginning with the 1964 crop, the acreage so surrendered shall be reduced by the percentage by which the normal yield for the farm surrendering such acreage is below the normal yield for the county for the preceding year, and the total amount of acreage so reapportioned by the county committee or surrendered to the State committee shall not exceed the sum of the surrendered acreage so adjusted and the surrendered acreage not required to be so adjusted."; and (2) by changing the period at the end of the second sentence to a colon and adding the following: "*Provided*, That beginning with the 1964 crop, the acreage so surrendered shall be reduced by the percentage by which the normal yield for the preceding year for the county surrendering the acreage is below the normal yield for the State, computed on the same basis as to years and conditions as the county normal yield for the preceding year, and the total acreage reapportioned by the State committee shall not exceed the sum of the surrendered acreage so adjusted and the surrendered acreage not required to be so adjusted."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 6196 because it contains a means of correcting a situation involving the price of raw cotton which has needed correction for many years.

Notwithstanding my wholehearted support of H.R. 6196, at the appropriate time when the bill is read for amendment, I shall seek recognition for the purpose of offering an amendment in the nature of a substitute. The substitute which I propose to offer is not a surprise to the Committee, because it has been discussed among Members of Congress, especially among members of the respective Committees on Agriculture in both the House and the Senate, among every segment of the cotton trade. It is generally referred to as the Talmadge cotton bill, and has been designated as S. 1190.

Today I have introduced an identical bill in the House of Representatives which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

The objectives of each bill are identical. In my opinion the beneficial effect of each bill would be similar, although I naturally feel that the benetfis to be derived from the amendment which I shall offer are superior to the benefits to be derived from H.R. 6196.

Let me make it eminently clear that I am in wholehearted support of the principles of either bill. If my amendment is adopted, I shall, of course, support the bill on final passage. If my amendment should be rejected, I shall still support the bill on final passage.

The objectives of the bill are the same and include the maintenance of income of cotton producers, the protection of the welfare of consumers and those engaged in the manufacture of cotton textiles, and the elimination of the two-price cotton system.

The principal advantage which I believe is inherent in my amendment is that it would provide a permanent solution to the inequities of the present two-price cotton system, would save approximately $100 million per year, and would provide increased employment in the textile industry and undoubtedly would permit substantial wage increases to textile employees.

The provisions contained in this amendment could provide the means by which the United States can recapture a portion of the world textile market which has been lost because of the vicious two-price cotton system.

One major difference between my amendment and H.R. 6196 is that my amendment would provide for production controls based upon units of production rather than the archaic, outmoded, and unrealistic system of production controls based upon acreage.

During the past 8 months, I have discussed this legislation with hundreds of people, including scores of my colleagues. Almost without exception every person with whom I have discussed this legislation believes that the language contained in the amendment which I shall offer will more nearly solve the problems which exist than would the language of any other legislation yet presented. Almost without exception, each prefers the language which is contained in my amendment.

In the time allowed to me, it will be my purpose to explain the provisions of this proposed amendment.

The text of the amendment which I expect to offer is to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That this Act may be cited as the "Cotton Domestic Allotment Act".

SEC. 2. This Act shall be applicable to upland cotton beginning with the 1964 crop and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, except sections 301(a), 373, 375, and the provisions of subtitle F of title III thereof, shall not be applicable to upland cotton beginning with the 1964 crop.

DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary shall proclaim, not later than December 15 of each calendar year, a national domestic allotment for the crop of cotton to be produced in the next calendar year of a number of bales of cotton which is estimated to result in the production of cotton within such allotment equal to the estimated domestic consumption of cotton for the marketing year beginning in the next calendar year.

(b) (1) For the 1964 and 1965 crops of cotton, the national domestic allotment shall be apportioned to the States for which a 1963 State acreage allotment was established under section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, on the basis of the number of bales of cotton determined for each State by converting such 1963 State acreage allotment (including the State's share of the national reserve) to a number of bales based on the average yield per acre of cotton for the State.

(2) For the 1966 crop of cotton, the national domestic allotment shall be apportioned to the States on the basis of the average number of bales obtained by dividing the sum of the following by three: (i) the number of bales used as the base for apportioning the 1964 national domestic allotment, adjusted for the State average yield, mutiplied by two, and (ii) the State production base for the 1964 crop of cotton. For purposes of this section, the "State production base" shall be the smaller of the State domestic allotment for the crop or the production within such State domestic allotment, adjusted for abnormal conditions adversely affecting plantings and yields of cotton and adjusted for farms regarded as having produced cotton. For purposes of this section, "farms regarded as having produced cotton" shall be farms deemed to have cotton planted or produced under any other provision of law, including subsection (f) of this section, and farms on which 75 per centum or more of the farm allotment was produced or regarded as having been produced under any other provision of law, including subsection (d) (3) and subsection (f) of this section, shall be deemed to have produced the entire farm allotment, and farms on which less than 75 per centum of the farm allotment was produced or regarded as having been produced under any other provision of law, including subsection (f) of this section, shall be deemed to have produced the average of the farm allotment and the production (actual and regarded as produced) on the farm.

(3) For the 1967 crop of cotton, the national domestic allotment shall be apportioned to the States on the basis of the average number of bales obtained by dividing the sum of the following by three: (i) the number of bales used as the base for apportioning the 1964 national domestic allotment, adjusted for the State average yield, and (ii) the sum of the 1964 and 1965 State production bases.

(4) For the 1968 and subsequent crops of cotton, the national domestic allotment shall be apportioned to the States on the basis of the average of the State production bases for the three years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the national domestic allotment is proclaimed.

(c) The State domestic allotment, less any State reserve, shall be apportioned to counties on the same basis as to years and conditions as is applicable to the State under subsection (b) of this section: *Provided*, That the State committee may reserve not to exceed 10 per centum of the State allotment which shall be used to make adjustments in county domestic allotments for trends in cotton production, for new farms, to correct inequities in farm allotments and to prevent hardship.

(d) (1) For the 1964 crop of cotton, the county domestic allotment less any county reserve shall be apportioned to old cotton farms on the basis of the 1963 farm acreage allotment converted into production of cotton by multiplying such acreage allotment by the farm average yield: *Provided*, That if less than 75 per centum of such acreage allotment was actually planted (or regarded as planted under the Soil Bank Act, the Great Plains program, and the release and reapportionment provisions of subsection (m) (2) of section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended) the farm production base for 1963 shall be the production based on the average of the 1963 farm allotment and the acreage so planted or regarded as planted.

(2) For the 1965 and subsequent crops of cotton, the county domestic allotment less any county reserve shall be apportioned to old cotton farms on the basis of the farm domestic allotment established for the preceding crop of cotton: *Provided*, That if less than 75 per centum of such farm domestic allotment was produced or regarded as produced, the farm production base shall be the production based on the average of such farm domestic allotment and the production (including any production regarded as produced) of cotton on the farm.

(3) The farm production base shall not be adjusted under this subsection if the Secretary determines that failure to plant or produce, as the case may be, at least 75 per centum of the farm domestic allotment, or the farm acreage allotment for 1963, was due to conditions beyond the control of producers on the farm. Old cotton farm means a farm on which cotton has been produced (or regarded as planted to cotton) or produced under any other provision of law except subsection (f) of this section and the provisions of subsection (m) (2) of section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, pursuant to a farm allotment in any one of the three years immediately preceding the year for which a farm allotment is established.

(e) The county committee may reserve not to exceed 15 per centum of the county domestic allotment which shall be used to make adjustments for new farms, to correct inequities in farm allotments and to prevent hardship.

(f) The farm operator with the concurrence of the farmowner who is also a producer of cotton may release any part of the farm domestic allotment to the county committee for use in increasing farm allotments on other farms in the county. The county committee shall reapportion any such released allotment in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary. If released allotment is not reapportioned in the county, the county committee shall transfer such allotment to the State committee for further transfer to other counties in the State. Any allotment released from a farm shall be regarded for purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm allotments as having been produced on the farm and in the county where the release was made except that this shall not operate to make the farm from which the allotment was released considered as having cotton production during the three-year period for eligibility as an old cotton farm.

SEC. 4. (a) For the purposes of this Act, the following terms are defined as follows:

(1) "United States" means the several States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

(2) "State" includes the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

(3) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(4) "Person" means an individual, partnership, firm, joint-stock company, corporation, association, trust, estate, or any agency of a State.

(5) "Bale of cotton" means a standard bale of five hundred pounds gross weight.

(6) "Marketing year" means the period beginning August 1 and ending July 31.

(7) "State average yield", "county average yield", and "farm average yield" shall be the average yield per acre of cotton for the State, county, or farm, adjusted for abnormal weather conditions and changes in farming practices, during the three calendar years immediately preceding the year in which such yield is determined.

(8) "Farm" means such land as the Secretary prescribes by regulation to be constituted as a farm.

PRICE SUPPORT

SEC. 5. Section 103 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended effective with the 1964 crop of upland cotton to read as follows:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of section 101 of this Act:

"(a) Price support for each crop of upland cotton shall be made available to producers through loans, purchases, or other operations at such level not less than 50 per centum or more than 60 per centum of the parity price therefor as the Secretary determines appropriate after consideration of the factors specified in section 401(b) of this Act and the price of cotton in world markets.

"(b) Price support in addition to that provided in subsection (a) of this section shall be made available to producers of each crop of upland cotton through loans, purchases, or other operations, including payments in cash or in kind, on a quantity of cotton of such crop produced on each farm equal to the farm's domestic allotment for such crop established under the Cotton Domestic Allotment Act. The levels of price support on such cotton shall be determined by the Secretary within the ranges prescribed in the schedule below after consideration of the factors specified in section 401(b) of this Act.

"Production intervals in terms of bales (standard bales of 500 pounds gross weight)	*Level of support*
"15 bales and less____	Not less than 80 or more than 90 per centum of the parity price.
16 to 30 bales, inclusive	Not less than 75 or more than 85 per centum of the parity price.
More than 30 bales___	Not less than 70 per centum or more than 80 per centum of the parity price.

"If a portion of the price support for any upland cotton is made available through payments to producers, the rate of payment shall be in an amount per pound of cotton which, when added to the average spot market price of middling one-inch cotton for the calendar week preceding the date of the marketing of the cotton with respect to which payment is made, as determined by the Secretary, or the level of support (converted to a middling one-inch basis) for such crop under subsection (a), whichever is higher, will provide a return to the producer equal to the applicable level of support (converted to a middling one-inch basis) under the schedule set out above. The Secretary shall provide adequate safeguards to protect the interests of tenants and sharecroppers, including provision for sharing, on a fair and equitable basis, in payments under this section."

SEC. 6. Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting after the first proviso in the third sentence thereof the following proviso: "*Provided further*, That beginning August 1, 1964, the Commodity Credit Corporation may sell upland cotton for unrestricted use at not less than 105 per centum of the current support price established under section 103(a) of this Act for upland cotton plus reasonable carrying charges".

SEC. 7. In order to maintain and expand domestic consumption of upland cotton produced in the United States and to prevent discrimination against the domestic users of such cotton, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, is authorized and directed for the period beginning with the date of enactment of this section and ending July 31, 1964, to make payments through the issuance of payment-in-kind certificates to persons other than the producers of such cotton, in such amounts and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines will eliminate inequities due to differences in the cost of raw cotton between domestic and foreign users of such cotton, including such payments as may be necessary to make raw cotton in inventory available for consumption at prices consistent with the purposes of this section.

And to amend the title so as to read: "A bill to maintain the income of cotton producers, to permit cotton producers to grow and market cotton on a free enterprise basis, to protect the welfare of consumers and of those engaged in the manufacture of cotton textile, to encourage the exportation of cotton, and for other purposes."

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, it is with some hesitancy that I arise to raise some objection to the bill now before us; namely, H.R. 6196, a bill to revitalize the American cotton industry. My reluctance is generated by the fact that, while I do not have any cotton produced anywhere near my district, I still have a most sincere interest in the welfare of the cotton producers, much the same as I have for all of the many good farm folks throughout the Nation.

Of recent date, and on several occasions, I have found it necessary to call to the attention of the Congress and the public the fact there has been a rather consistent decline in agricultural income with the future predictions indicating that even further reductions are forthcoming in the most immediate future. This is properly the concern of Congress, because in most instances it has been brought about by previous actions or failure to act relative to the many complexities and problems that presently confront American agriculture.

Those of us who live in wheat and feed grain areas are surely very keenly aware of the extent to which net income to farm families has failed to hold its own with the rest of the national economy, and so has created individual hardships as well as a very noticeable effect on the entire contribution of agriculture to our national well-being. It is my most sincere desire that whatever actions may be taken by this Congress may serve the best interests and provide economic stability for the many people throughout the Nation who are engaged in the very vital occupation of producing food and fiber. Their service to the Nation over the years has been such that they are truly worthy of every consideration that might be directed to their problem.

There have been discussed in this debate most of the pros and cons as they pertain to the bill before us. Consequently, I shall confine my remarks to two specific areas.

First, it seems that this bill establishes a new precedent of providing direct subsidies to industry in an attempt to correct a problem that has been created by a questionable program in the first instance.

Having very carefully read the committee report, it is clearly indicative that the problem that this bill proposes to solve is one of reestablishing the American cotton market which has in recent years been substantially curtailed and limited by virtue of imports of cotton textile products, together with the development of competitive synthetic fibers. In this connection, of particular interest on page 5 of the committee report, I note that in 1962 imports of cotton textiles have grown to the extent of 650,000 equivalent bales of cotton, by virtue of average annual increases of about 100,000 bales each of the last 4 years. It is disturbing to note further in the report that this situation has been greatly aggravated by our own program of selling cotton to foreign textile manufacturers at a price that is about two-thirds of the price that the same cotton is available to our own textile manufacturers. We now propose to correct this inequity by making cotton available to our textile industry at the same price that we have for the past several years made it available to foreign competitors. To do so, in my judgment, can but establish three very undesirable complications that will all adversely affect our national economy, and more particularly, American agriculture.

First, it will substantially increase Government expenditures estimated by some to be more than $600 million for the next 3-year period, further aggravating the already huge budget deficits and national debt.

Secondly, and probably even more important, it establishes a precedent of providing subsidies to the processors of agricultural products. Once this practice has been established, it is difficult for me to even vision where it will stop. For, if we can pay this kind of subsidy to this sector of industry, then it naturally follows that there is equal justification for doing so to creameries, cheese factories, slaughterhouses, feed stations, millers, and almost every existing industry that is in the business of processing agricultural products for domestic and foreign markets.

Right at the present time, the dairy and beef, as well as many other processors, have the very same identical problem, in that they find themselves competing with imports from foreign countries for our own national domestic market—all accomplished with additional expense to the American taxpayer as well as consumer.

Finally, it seems to be of gross inequity to me that we at this point should direct our attention to this one segment of the agricultural problem while there is prevalent just as pronounced need in any number of other areas. There has been a need, and a demand raised to this Congress, that something be done in the area of wheat legislation for the past several months, which has been completely ignored. Many of us have introduced bills, presented statements, as well as urged both the respective committees of the Congress and the Department of Agriculture to take some action in this field. To date, these efforts have been completely nonproductive.

May I reiterate at this point a statement that I made to the Wheat Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture, Friday, July 26 of this year:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE ODIN LANGEN, OF MINNESOTA, TO THE WHEAT SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, FRIDAY, JULY 26, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, permit me to express my personal gratitude to the committee for affording me the opportunity to register these few observations in behalf of the wheatgrowers in my district as well as throughout the entire Nation. I should surely compliment the committee on their appropriate recognition of the need that presently exists for consideration of the situation confronting particularly the wheatgrowers who are dependent upon producing wheat for their major cash income.

A great deal of controversy has been generated relative to the wheat production and surplus problems since the recent wheat referendum. As one who has lived in and represents one of the major wheat-producing areas, quite obviously it is of prime concern to me, as well as the major portion of my constituency, whether they are farmers or local merchants. I have noted many recent statements referred to in the various media of the press which would indicate that wheat farmers had a choice in the referendum, and by virtue of their decision should not now be given any further consideration. This, in my judgment, is a substantial miscalculation and improper interpretation of the opinion that was registered by wheat farmers in the referendum.

In order that we might better understand the attitude and thinking of wheat farmers throughout the Nation, I think it is imperative that we look back very briefly to the experience of wheat referendums during all of the time that they have been in existence. Most significant is the fact that farmers have previously been called upon at least 10 times to register their choice as to whether or not they wanted wheat marketing quotas as compared to an allotment acreage program without quotas, much the same as was literally approved by turning down the certificate plan.

The results of this experience, in which they consistently voted to accept marketing quotas, can only emphasize that farmers have actually turned down the program that is now slated to exist in 1964 every time previous to this year's referendum. At the same time they have approved programs similar to the one that is in existence for 1963.

Their reasons for voting as they did this year, I am sure, are well rounded, in that first, they have registered their objection to a further reduction in income, both gross and net, when compared to the programs in existence this year, and for the past several years. Secondly, they have registered their disapproval of a program which offered additional complexities in application to individual farms, as well as the added compliance and participation restrictions. The substitution of the wheat certificate plan for the marketing quota plan left for the wheat farmer a most unfortunate choice, in that he was forced to make a selection between a program he previously has turned down on so many occasions, and a new program which, in his judgment, did not even offer comparable compliance or income possibilities with the program now in existence. It would be well to note that many of them had felt for quite some time that this existing program was inadequate.

Surely, this has left the Congress with the full responsibility of further considering this very unique as well as distressing position in which the farmer now finds himself. For it was by action of the Congress, with the full knowledge that the program that now will be applicable in 1964 had been turned down in each of the previous referendums, that the farmer was provided only with the selection of a program that was less lucrative to him, whether considered on the basis of income or farm operation potential.

In view of the further knowledge that the present agricultural parity income is at the lowest level since 1939, it is no surprise to anyone that the farmer may have rebelled at an even further reduction in his income, with added Government restrictions. These concerns have been conveyed to my office by a great number of farmers and businessmen.

It is further discouraging to the farmer to note that the Department of Agriculture is now using every means at its disposal in attempting to secure compliance with the allotment program for 1964. Recent announcements from the Department indicate that the individual farmer will suffer reduction in his history credit if he overplants his allotment for 1964. All of these have the tendency to place the wheat farmer in much the same position he was in when marketing quotas were in effect, in that his allotment will be reduced by 10 percent, the only exception being that he does not have the price protection that was offered under marketing quotas. This is surely a very gross injustice and a very serious income threat, and carries much of the same dictatorial tactics that were so in evidence during the recent wheat referendum. This and other suggested actions amount to literally forcing compliance with a program that is supposed to be voluntary.

It is for these reasons that many of us have suggested legislation that we feel is worthy of every consideration by the committee during this year's session, in order that it might be made applicable to the 1964 crop year. The provisions of my bill, H.R. 6558, have already been well outlined to the committee by my colleagues and members of the committee who have authored similar legislation. In general, it provides for improved income possibilities on a voluntary basis, somewhat similar to and in conjunction with the voluntary feed grains program that has found both respect and acceptance throughout agricultural circles. The experience with the voluntary program in the feed grains area has been praised by many farm people as well as the Department of Agriculture. The incorporation of wheat into this program offers possibilities that I have long advocated, for I am sure it would serve to simplify compliance and offer a more acceptable production reduction program. Such action obviously is necessary, when we look at the large volume of surpluses and the amount of Government expenditures required to service and administer all of the various aspects of these programs designed to improve the agricultural economy.

The bill provides for the very minimum of income potential, and the committee would do well to give consideration to amendments that would provide even further income security, in view of the continuing rise of operating expenses that confronts every farm operation, regardless of its nature.

There is one section of my bill which I would like to call to the particular attention of the committee. It is section 207, which amends section 22(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 as reenacted by the Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, and merely provides that the President shall cause an investigation to be made by the Tariff Commission in order to determine the extent to which imports may be significant to the price and the market of any agricultural commodity that has been determined to be in surplus by the Secretary. Much has been said, and many statistics have been compiled relative to the extent to which our surpluses have been aggravated and prices and Government restrictions adverse to farmers have been experienced. In many instances, these circumstances came about through no fault of the American farmer, but rather because of increased imports.

These statistics have been set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on many occasions. May I refer the committee to a statement I made on February 27 of this year, to be found on page 3080 of the RECORD, as well as the statement by Mr. BERRY of South Dakota, found on page 7130 of the RECORD for April 26, and a statement by Senator CARLSON, found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 2, this year, on page 7599.

We have particularly noted the significance of imports in oats, rye, barley, beef, lamb, dairy products and others over the past several years. Of more recent date, imports of cream have very seriously affected the entire dairy products market. In all of these instances, not only have farm prices been depressed, but the expense of Government programs has grown to tremendous proportions, and unfortunately the farmer has been unjustly blamed for the resulting problems.

In order that any type of agricultural control program might be effective, whereby we attempt to control either production or the price, it seems essential to me that we must then also give due consideration to the effect that such a program might have in encouraging or promoting imports and thereby losing markets already available to farm producers.

Section 22 of the Agricultural Act, I am sure, was designed to deal directly with this problem. It is my opinion that it has not been used to the extent that it should have been, nor has it been made applicable to all areas of surplus commodities. I hope the committee may give both due and favorable consideration to this particular section.

This statement would be far too extensive and long if I were to attempt to bring to the committee the many different facets that relate to the legislation now being considered. I know, however, that members of the subcommittee, by virtue of the many hours that they have spent in study and deliberation on the problem, are well aware of the complexities and significance of providing adequate income and production opportunities to wheat farmers. In view of these many known facts, to which I have referred only briefly, it is my hope that the committee may see fit to recommend favorable consideration for the voluntary feed grain and wheat program outlined in the many similar bills that have been introduced on the subject. To do so would not only fulfill the responsibility of Congress, but, I am sure, would also find approval among farm, business, and Government circles throughout the entire Nation.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the existing wheat situation to which I have just referred, with additional problems in the dairy, beef, chicken, turkey, and other agricultural areas that have comparable problems and contribute even more to the present decline in agricultural income, it seems that little benefit can result from the enactment of this legislation at this point. It occurs to me that this bill would not contribute anything to the facts that farm income is now at its lowest parity level since 1939, farm mortgages are constantly rising—$2½ billion in less than 3 years—and net income is below that of 1960. This bill will not improve any one of those very alarming facts. It will only add to Government expenditures.

About the only good thing that can be said for this legislation is that it does point out the extent to which American agriculture in general has been seriously hurt by improper import-export policies. I had the occasion and found it necessary to point this out to the U.S. Tariff Commission just yesterday, suggesting that it is time that we began registering the same concern for American agriculture that is being provided for foreign agriculture throughout the world. We have demanded that our producers reduce their production, subject themselves to restrictions and be confined to reduced incomes long enough, in order that we might be able to accommodate the imports of competitive products.

For these reasons, and many more previously brought out in debate and in the committee report, this House would do well to turn down this legislation today, thereby providing the opportunity of directing our attention to the need for action by the Congress on the overall farm income and surplus situation. Farm families throughout the Nation, I am sure, would herald such action.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 6196 with the McIntire amendment which has been accepted by the Committee on Agriculture. I also want to congratulate the committee, its chairman, and all of its members for the long and patient work they have done in developing this bill. All year, a reasonable solution to the problem of two-price cotton has been sought. There have been many roadblocks. For the most part, they have been overcome. Certainly, the legislation is not a perfect solution, yet if we balance all the factors, it is a sincere attempt to meet the problem. The passage of this bill is urgently required if we are to restore some semblance of fair economic opportunity in the cotton industry.

But we are making a serious mistake if we assume that this legislation is for the sole benefit of the cotton textile industry or that its benefits are restricted to only one or two regions of the country. This is not true. We are blinding ourselves to the important national consequences.

The textile industry, the textile worker, the cotton farmer are all being damaged by the present problem. All told, this represents a major multibillion-dollar economic complex that contributes importantly to the Nation's productivity. It is in serious trouble and if it continues, the shock waves will be felt in many ways from one end of the country to the other.

The problem is very simple. Conflicting Federal policies are pulling the noose tighter and tighter. Cotton price supports are eliminating American cotton from the world market. Development of foreign cotton acreage is encouraged as our cotton prices itself out of the market. To hold on to at least some of our markets, we have permitted foreign textile manufacturers to buy cotton here at the world price. The results are obvious enough. Cotton can be bought here at the world price, shipped to textile plants abroad and manufactured into cloth at a great price advantage. Textiles can then be returned to the United States to undersell the products of our own textile plants. In other words, American firms must pay one-third more for the same American cotton.

We are familiar with import competition. It has damaged many industries. But never before has it been encouraged and financed by the U.S. Government. That is what makes this problem unique. The inequities have been manufactured in Washington.

During the last 2 years, cotton exports have dropped from 6.6 million bales to 3.3 million bales. However, imports of cotton in the form of textiles are up from 414,000 bales to 645,000 bales and for the first 7 months of 1963, imports are running at an annual rate of 693,000.

Since the 1930's, the U.S. Government has maintained rigid import quotes on raw cotton which prevents American textile manufacturers from buying cotton produced abroad. As a result, American mills must pay the supported price level.

The vast growth of imports has seriously increased unemployment problems. The textile workers union reports that in the last 5 years, 45 U.S. cotton mills have closed their doors and 30,000 jobs have been liquidated. More jobs, perhaps many thousands of them, depend upon what we do here today.

We are faced with a grossly unfair situation where Government policies are making a calculated sacrifice of the cotton textile industry. This is being done ostensibly to assist the American cotton farmers, but it is self-defeating.

There is a remarkably high and positive correlation between the price of raw cotton and the wholesale price of unfinished cotton cloth. This relationship can be demonstrated historically through varying economic conditions, the two wars, and the two postwar periods. It is just as true today that the price of cotton is directly related to the price of processed cotton cloth.

Raw cotton has little or no value until it is spun into yarn and woven into salable commodities. If cotton prices itself out of the market, no farmer can be blind to the consequences. Neither can the Federal Government be blind to the vast economic troubles it is bringing upon itself. That is the reason this legislation is before us today.

This bill with the pending McIntire amendment offers the prospect of a solution to the two-piece cotton problem. For months, alternatives have been studied. The competing interests of all groups, including those of the American consumer, have been explored. Certainly, I agree that this bill represents the most reasoned and well-balanced approach. It seeks to restore the element of competition that is essential in the entire cotton industry if its problems are to be solved. And, frankly, it represents the first clear and definite effort to untangle some of the smothering Government controls that now beset this industry and the agriculture economy which supplies its raw materials. It is a temporary program of 3 years' duration that begins to phase out the costly and contradictory situation that exists today.

Broadly, the legislation would accomplish three purposes. First, it would permit domestic textile producers to buy raw cotton at the same price it is sold to foreign competitors. Secondly, it would establish a research program to develop means for reducing the cost of cotton production. Thirdly, when the amendment is accepted, it would assure the orderly reduction of price support payments over 3 years to assure a stronger competitive position for American cotton in the world. The bill also provides that as production costs are lowered, price supports will drop.

Actually, this bill is certainly not the windfall to cotton mills that those opposed to it have alleged. It is rather a comprehensive effort to remove the fantastically costly and confusing hand of government from the cotton market. This web has taken 30 years to spin. We must clear it away carefully if we wish to avoid economic chaos.

If we do nothing—if we leave things as they are today, the consequences will be far greater than the additional costs of this bill. We will assure that the cotton textile industry in this country remains stranded in an impossible competitive situation imposed by the Federal Government. The dislocation that will result—the cost of unemployment, bankruptcies, and chaos in the marketplace—is impossible to calculate. The textile industry in this country will turn to synthetic fibers. Those mills which can obtain synthetics and which have the capital to convert will survive. The others will die. It is as simple as that.

The cotton farmer will find himself with a crop that is increasingly hard to sell and Government warehouses will bulge with the costly surpluses. Two years ago cotton stocks owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation stood at 1.5 million bales. As of August 1, 1963, the Department of Agriculture's cotton holdings soared to 8.2 million bales. By August 1964, the figure will reach 10 million bales. The Government investment of $1.3 billion will grow to $1.6 billion with $75 million each year for carrying charges alone. The trend is ominous and shocking.

Export subsidies will continue and so will the increasing import competition.

To do nothing—to allow this problem to fester—is dangerous and, I believe, for any reasonable Member of this House, unacceptable. There are those here who seem to believe that because cotton is not grown or spun in their area, this bill is of little importance. But let me say this: the land in the Cotton Belt contains some of the Nation's most productive soil. It can produce grains in abundance to support large-scale meat-and-dairy production. This phase of American agriculture has its troubles, too. If the cotton farmer turns from his traditional crop to other pursuits, we will find ourselves locked in another dilemma which can be, at least in part, traced directly to the shortsightedness of inaction on the two-price cotton problem.

If this bill is passed with the McIntire amendment, I believe we will be turning down a new and promising road to save a major American industry from Government-sponsored destruction. Its purposes are to assure markets at home and abroad for American cotton as we restore its ability to compete not only with foreign-produced cotton but with new synthetic fibers as well.

I urge the passage of this legislation as a reasonable alternative to the present Federal program.

However well meaning the opposition to this bill has been, no one can question the seriousness of the problem. Let us recognize that the Government has created these problems and that regardless of individual differences in the details of the legislation, we must move positively to correct the situation. I strongly urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Rooney, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6196) to encourage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

THE SPIRIT OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S INSPIRING ADDRESS TO THE CONGRESS

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the spirit of President Johnson's inspiring address to the Congress last week can be seen in the following editorial of November 29 of the St. Louis Post Dispatch. A call for national unity and a pledge to action were the keynotes of this moving speech which eloquently expressed the feelings of the American people over the tragic death of John F. Kennedy.

It is a fitting tribute to have a leader such as Lyndon Baines Johnson ready to accept the challenges of the times with a full realization of the aspirations of President Kennedy. However, President Johnson cannot do it alone. He needs the help of the Congress which must be willing to accept his call for action.

A New President's Strong Hand

In a week of deeply moving events, the new President's address to Congress was an inspiring and strikingly impressive occasion.

Lyndon Baines Johnson stood before the Nation as a man of strong character, warm humility, and high professional competence. In less than half an hour he won the confidence of Congress and of the country. His eloquent words, and the profound sincerity that illumined them, made one feel, with a rush of gratitude, that once again the United States had emerged from crisis with a leadership worthy of its tradition.

Not only the President's appeal for unity and dedication, but the congressional response, gave cause for hope that legislative and executive arms alike will indeed reflect the national resolution to erect a memorial to John F. Kennedy in the form of a cleansed national spirit.

There was no mistaking the meaning of the ovation that greeted the President's call for "an end to the teaching and preaching of hate and evil and violence." Even more remarkable was the prolonged applause that followed his appeal for prompt passage of the civil rights bill.

Nobody can rightly expect, or wish, that President Johnson should make his administration a pale copy of his predecessor's. He must stamp his own character upon the course of policy, draw upon his own sources of judgment and counsel, decide for himself what order of priorities and emphasis to put upon the several goals he chooses for his administration. When he promised continuity with the Kennedy administration, he was not promising identity.

But it was heartening that the broad principles for which he asked continuity included every essential aspiration of President Kennedy. Action on civil rights, action on tax reduction, the exploration of space, the fundamental strengthening of our educational system, an economy of full employment, the fight against poverty abroad as well as at home, powerful leadership of the free world, an unflagging search for peace—these are the goals that deserve continuity, because they are the urgent tasks of a forward-moving society. President Johnson pledged himself to them, and no one could doubt that he meant it.

He also meant it, we are sure, when he emphasized the obligation to match national strength with national restraint. The extraordinary gathering of foreign heads of state and political leaders at President Kennedy's funeral has just given us a sobering reminder of the enormous power this Nation wields in the world. Mr. Johnson gives evidence of grasping the fact that our power is not so much a cause for shallow elation as for the most solemn determination to use it with wisdom and justice. It is gratifying that one of his first acts was to send messages to Premier Khrushchev offering honorable friendship and continued negotiation to reduce tensions; and he reinforced that position in his address to Congress.

Nothing in his address, however, surpassed in impressiveness his appeal for congressional action on the civil rights bill, the tax bill, the education bills, foreign aid, and the long postponed appropriation measures. Until he spoke, the idea had been gaining ground that Congress might well go home now, leaving its work unfinished, under the guise of helping President Johnson settle into the organization of his administration. The President wants help, true enough, but he wants it in the form of legislation, not abdication.

The shock and the strain of the past week might well have justified the President in postponing the start of his struggle for a few weeks, and so it is heartening that he chose instead to fling his full and very considerable talents at once into the battle which Mr. Kennedy was waging when he fell.

Now the Nation's attention falls on Congress. How will Congress respond, when the tears and emotions of recent days are past, when the impact of tragedy has been dulled, when workaday habits supplant the elevation of spirit? Will it go back to business as usual—the business of obstruction, filibuster and delay? Or will Senate and House together rise to the challenge which President Johnson posed, and which we are confident the Nation endorses?

THE ACQUISITION OF LETHAL WEAPONS

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, the assassin's bullet that struck down our beloved President and seriously wounded Governor Connally has at long last made our people aware of how easy it is for a fanatic, a psychopath or an anarchist to obtain a lethal weapon. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee and long interested in law enforcement I have been concerned about the failure of the Federal Government to uphold the hands of our States and localities in their efforts to deal with the indiscriminate sale and distribution of firearms. Even worse our unwillingness to act has almost completely thwarted and frustrated local law and ordinances designed to identify and reassure those responsible citizens who of right are entitled to possess a gun.

We have been slow to come to grips with the existing laxity in the Federal statutes, not because Congress is unconcerned over the growing number of bank robberies, murders, suicides and accidental killings that are due to the easy way a gun can be obtained or because the vast majority of the public are not in favor of some measure of control over firearms but rather, I think, because we have not had an effective, soundly conceived and carefully drafted proposal to consider.

To remedy this situation I am introducing today an amendment to the Federal Firearms Act which I request be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and scheduled for hearings before we adjourn.

My bill has the following important provisions:

First. It would prohibit the shipment in interstate commerce of revolvers, rifles, and certain other lethal weapons except to responsible dealers licensed by the Federal Government and complying with State and local laws with respect to such sales.

Second. It would make illegal the sale by mail order of such rifles as was used to assassinate President Kennedy.

Third. It would strengthen the Federal Firearms Act by driving out of business the fly-by-night dealer who takes out a Federal license only to lend a measure of legitimacy to his guilty dealings with persons who should not be trusted with firearms. At present virtually any person can obtain a Federal license to transport and receive firearms as a dealer, and it will cost him only $1. The Treasury Department issues a dealer's license to almost anyone who applies, and although the Treasury is not authorized to issue such licenses to ex-convicts or fugitives from justice, there are so many applicants that it is not practicable to check up on the truthfulness of statements made in most applications for licenses.

Fourth. It would enable the States to deal more effectively with the problem of regulating the sale of firearms. As it is, State laws are frustrated by the failure of the Federal Government to control interstate shipments or sale of firearms.

In the United States some 21 States require a license to sell guns at retail and a number of States including Missouri require a purchaser to obtain a permit to purchase firearms. But these laws are all but meaningless so far as protecting the public from the purchaser and the dealer who wish to evade local laws by mail-order shipments.

The bill's method of backing up State laws is similar to the Federal controls over the sale of alcoholic beverages, certain dangerous drugs or adulterated foods or types of goods that may be manufactured, sold, or labeled contrary to State laws. A resident of Missouri cannot buy alcoholic beverages outside the State and have them shipped in without complying with State laws and paying State taxes. Why should handguns and other types of firearms, potentially the most dangerous of all manufactured products, be able to cross State lines with what now amounts to absolute immunity?

Fifth. It would require dealers in firearms to keep accurate records of firearms sales and make it possible for State and local law enforcement agencies to obtain such information without difficulty.

My bill, on the other hand, does not contain any provisions that any law-abiding citizen would consider onerous:

First. A citizen could still purchase a firearm or carry one provided he complies with State and local regualtions.

Second. It would be unnecessary to register a firearm unless such registration is required by State or local law.

Third. It would not handicap in any way the legitimate collector of antique guns and curios.

Fourth. It does not attempt to circumscribe the constitutional provision granting the right to keep or bear arms.

The memory of our beloved and martyred President should spur us into taking these belated and halting steps to stop the indiscriminate sale of lethal weapons to fanatics, subversives, and the demented. The dimensions of the problem can be seen in the widespread firearms advertising in comic books, gun magazines, and mail-order houses of all types.

As others have frequently pointed out the unrestricted circulation of firearms that presently prevails in this country is a threat and a growing threat to the safety of every citizen, business, and public official. America is the only civilized country in the world that still permits the unrestricted and unsupervised sale of firearms.

This measure contains proposals that the overwhelming majority of police chiefs and law enforcement officials have long advocated. It is a step that must be taken to put our house in order. Until the Congress acts, the States and local communities who feel the need to control firearms are helpless in controlling the influx of weapons from other States or even from other countries. At bottom the reason no action has been taken on the national level to stay the assassin's bullet is because of the unreasoning and uninformed fears that a basic right to protect oneself, engage in sports or prepare for military service would be infringed. These illusions and prejudices will lose their appeal if my bill is carefully studied and given objective consideration. I urge that the Congress take prompt and effective action.

CONGRESSIONAL SALARY INCREASES

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, an article by one of our colleagues appearing in last Sunday's New York Times magazine is as fine a statement as I have seen on the need for congressional salary increases, and I want to call it to the attention of all Members.

Author of the article is the gentleman from Maryland, the Honorable CLARENCE D. LONG, who happens to be serving his first term in this body. It may be of interest to the Members to know that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG] preceded his congressional service with 25 years of teaching. Most recently he was a professor of economics at the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it is widely known that college professors are not in the highest income brackets afforded by our economy. No one is suggesting these days that college professors are living off the fat of the land. And yet the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG] in this article observes that he is less well off on his congressional salary than he was on the salary of a college professor.

The congressional salary problem is only one of the matters dealt with in this excellent article, and I commend it to the attention of all my colleagues.

OBSERVATIONS OF A FRESHMAN IN CONGRESS

(By CLARENCE D. LONG)

(A first-termer finds that the scene looks better from the top of Capitol Hill than from below: despite handicaps, his colleagues do their jobs pretty well.)

WASHINGTON.

A letter from PRAY (Paul Revere Association, Yeomen, Inc.) predicts that the nuclear test ban will end up with "the Russians and Zionists ruling the world, all Christianity wiped out, and all wives, mothers, and daughters in the brothels of Asia, China, and India." George W. ("Wake Up Humanity") Adams demands that I "banish organized religion damned quick lest organized religion banish the world a hell of a lot quicker." A neighbor wants to know, "What are you clowns doing in Washington?" A 13-year-old boy asks me if I have ever taken a bribe. A tired-looking woman timidly seeks help in getting veteran's benefits, since she just learned that her husband, who years ago abandoned her with 10 children, had recently died after living with another woman in Brazil.

This is a tiny sample of the requests, problems, and comments that have come to me since January when, after a quarter of a century as a professor, I found myself a freshman again, in the U.S. Congress.

I was no stranger to Washington. The center of my Maryland seat—Baltimore, Carroll, and Harford Counties—is only 1 hour from the Capital City. While professor of economics at the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, I had served in advisory capacities in the administrations of three Presidents and testified before numerous congressional committees. I had read and written books on the operation of government.

Now, taking inventory, I am impressed at how much I had to learn and what a gap in attitude and experience separates the Hill from the rest of Washington. Nowhere is this gap greater than between the attitudes I once had, and now have, concerning the effectiveness of Congress.

Is Congress doing its job? What is its job? How are we to judge its performance? These questions are especially pertinent as a new administration takes over.

Surely the job of Congress is not just to pass a lot of laws. Many acts suppressing freedom of speech and religion, or giving fat pensions to all over 55, would not entitle Congress to praise for accomplishing a lot. Nor would a law limiting civilian control of the military, passed without hearing or debate, entitle it to credit for getting things done quickly.

Whether Congress is effective depends really on how well it does its job—how many witnesses it hears, how carefully it questions them and listens to them, how responsibly it debates the issues and how wisely it makes up its mind and votes. On this question of quality there will necessarily be many verdicts. The fact is, there is plenty of everything in the record: brashness, ponderous emptiness, cheapness, stale humor, twisted logic.

But you can also find the classical oratory of GEORGE MAHON, the calm judgment of WILBUR MILLS, the verbal time bombs of WAYNE HAYS, and the good-humored sagacity of the gently powerful CARL VINSON, chairman of my Armed Services Committee. In the late afternoon, when the quorum calls have brought the Members together, and when minds are alerted by parliamentary maneuvering and the approaching vote, the House of Representatives is at its most impressive. Its occasional flashes of wit, of homely erudition, of adroitness, of eloquence to penetrate the mind and move the heart, I have seldom heard surpassed.

But the Congress should be judged neither by its best nor by its worst; it would be a poor service to the truth to maintain that it is as effective as it could be. Few observers, including Members, would dispute that Congress could be doing a better job. Why doesn't it?

Many explanations are offered. Criticism has been directed at the seniority and staffing systems of the committees, at the parliamentary rules and procedures on the floor, at the appropriations process, at conflicts of interest, nepotism, and junketing, at disproportionate representation, campaign financing, and the poll tax. My own feeling now is that procedures are secondary. If Americans value good Congressmen they can get them under any election procedures. If Congressmen are competent and well intentioned, they can be effective with any set of rules.

My short stay in Congress has impressed me with three closely related factors that may hamper Congressmen from doing a better job:

The 2-year term of House Members, which forces them to campaign continually for reelection;

The vast amount of time Congressmen and their staffs must spend on service for their districts;

The modest net salary of Congressmen, which forces many of them to practice law or run businesses on the side, in order to support dual residences and educate their children.

The 2-year term of Representatives is one of the briefest in American politics. The Constitutional Convention made it brief deliberately to keep it responsive to the people, and it has certainly had that effect. But has it not overshot its mark?

It was instituted at a time when the average Congressman represented only a few thousand, instead of hundreds of thousands of constituents; when Congress met a month or two instead of nearly all year; and when the Federal Government confined its activities to national defense, the excise tax, and a few internal improvements, instead of pervading every aspect of personal and business life and spending a quarter to a third of all the income of the economy.

Considering and voting on laws was in those early days a very part-time job. It is now a very full-time job—actually too big for the most brilliant and well-informed legislator—even if he had full time to devote to it. Yet the 2-year term requires that most Congressmen campaign, not just every other year, but literally all the time. The essence of campaigning is personal contact in the home district.

My "rubber-chicken" calendar for a not untypical week included the following: Addressed students of three high schools visiting the House floor, veterans groups in two counties, officers club in Army chemical center, and civil-defense officials of seven States; attended meeting of 13th District Community Council, and various meetings on urban renewal, alcoholism, and relocation of a post office; attended a bar mitzvah, two bull roasts, and dedication of a school; went to a Democratic club dinner, a political cocktail party, and dinner for a visiting Indian industrialist.

This routine—on top of legislative and administrative work—goes on 7 days and 5 nights a week, except in July and August. Holidays are busiest. On July 4, I marched in 4 parades, smiled at 200,000 people, spoke to 5,000 more in the evening, attended a party, drove 100 miles.

I have discovered—or think I have—that a Congressman is judged by the overwhelming mass of his constituents on the personal service he gives the home folks and the contracts he brings to his area.

Four times a young constituent tried to enlist in the Army and had been turned down for high blood pressure; yet the selective service board would not reclassify him, and no employer would hire him while he was subject to draft. I arranged for one more physical exam—by this time his blood pressure was really high—and got his classification changed. He just wrote to tell me that he is employed and happy.

A naval officer fell in love with a girl in South Africa and, having been informed he could bring his fiancée to the United States, paid her way to Niagara Falls, Canada. There she was given the sad news that it was all a mistake, no admittance. At my request, the State Department cut the redtape and let her in. Shortly afterward I received their wedding announcement.

An elderly woman, ill and living on $25 a week, was pressed for $1,000 arrears in income taxes. I convinced the Internal Revenue Service that squeezing blood out of a turnip was a cinch compared to getting $1,000 from a sick old lady existing on a pittance. Now she can live, if not in luxury, at least in peace.

Not all cases are desperate. A constituent complains that post office trucks wake the neighborhood at 4:30 every morning. A lady begs me to investigate why her young son in Vietnam could get "plenty of whisky but no soap." And not long ago a 7-year-old girl asked for some dirt from the White House lawn. I sent an assistant across town, instructing him not to knock on the front door—the President was busy with Alabama—but to reach through the back fence and dig some dirt into an envelope.

Many requests are important to more than one person, for most Congressmen run for office on an implied pledge to get business and jobs. Although my counties are in sound health, certain key firms in space, electronics, and shipbuilding have lost employment. Small firms there, as everywhere, complain of increasing difficulties.

During recent months I have toured plants and offices and talked extensively with management, workers, and union leaders. I visited the Government procurement agencies, including Defense, General Services, Space, and Small Business. These explorations led me in June to set up a business desk, to serve as a center of information on defense business and how to obtain it and to put firms and individuals in touch with Government agencies. Major accomplishments have included getting a contract for radiosondes against the opposition of the entire Pennsylvania delegation and successfully upholding the low bidder on a contract for paper butter dishes.

This service has brought an enthusiastic response from firms, as well as from workers who benefit from the fuller employment. But this service—and time spent listening to pleas for personal help—is what takes up half of my own energies and two-thirds of those of my excellent staff.

The salary of a Congressman is $22,500 a year. This will seem ample to many readers; yet I am less well off than I was as a professor.

To begin with, my election left me with bills I had not even known about. (An Alabama Congressman told me his entire first year's salary went to debts from his campaign.) In addition, my salary, before being available to pay those bills, feed my family, and keep two children in college, must first cover myriad expenses, partly political and partly congressional.

There is a durable myth that a Congressman is reimbursed for trips from Washington to home. In actual fact, he is paid for one round trip a year, at 20 cents a mile, and under a law just passed, two additional round trips, at actual expense, up to 12 cents a mile.

In my case, the total reimbursement amounts to $53 for the year. Since I commute daily my annual expense for car, trains and taxis is a very considerable item. Even Congressmen from distant States commute weekly by train or plane to their districts. A Congressman from Michigan confided that he spent $3,000 for trips last year. Within my district, I drive 3,000 miles a month at my own expense.

A Congressman is allowed $2,400 a year for stationery and supplies. For 2 offices and 10 persons, this covers writing paper, desk supplies, radio tapes, flags donated to schools and patriotic organizations, the telephone in the Congressman's district office, and, most expensive, his newsletter. This year is not over, yet I have spent my entire year's allowance and am in debt to the stationers by $800. As I expand my newsletter circulation—one of the best ways to keep in touch with my large constituency—I shall have to dip further into my own pocket.

Most Congressmen maintain residences in Washington, as well as at home. For this, they get no allowance—only an income tax deduction on what they spend up to $3,000.

A Congressman is under daily pressure to spend on miscellaneous items: luncheons for visitors; chances on baskets of cheer, space in program books of clubs and churches, tickets to dances, dinners and barbecues.

Balanced against all these expenses are a few fringe benefits: haircuts at $1 including tip, free parking, and a free footlocker valued officially at $21.57, but worth perhaps $12 in downtown Washington stores. Total value, under $200.

As a result of this financial strain, most Congressmen—used to a far higher living standard than I, a former professor—keep a hand in their law practices and businesses. The time and energy they spend on these activities can only be at the expense of what they should be spending on the complicated issues that face them in committee or on the floor. These other commitments account for the substantial membership in the Tuesday-Thursday Club—Congressmen who get to Washington on Tuesday morning and leave Thursday night.

Higher salaries would possibly attract better men to Congress—although I know of nobody who has resigned because of salary. They would certainly reduce moonlighting and give the voter a higher degree of full-time representation. They would also enable us more effectively to eliminate conflict of interest.

If these are some of the rules of practical politics which keep legislators too busy to legislate, what are the prospects of changing them?

So far as the 2-year term is concerned, the main obstacle may not be the public—which seems startlingly sympathetic to a longer term—but Congress itself. Between 1789 and 1960 about 120 resolutions introduced in Congress proposed a term longer than 2 years. Only two of these were reported out of committee; only one was debated on the floor of the House where it was defeated during the 59th Congress—over half a century ago. And if the longer term ever survived the House, it would probably lose in the Senate for the very practical reason that Senators would prefer to retain the present system under which a House Member can never run for the Senate without losing his job.

As for cutting down on the service function of Congressmen, a far-reaching proposal to delegate service chores has been made by the alert and fertile-minded Representative **HENRY REUSS**, of Wisconsin, who believes Congress should adapt the Scandinavian institution of the Ombudsman. This special administrator is appointed by the legislature to handle constituent complaints concerning the executive branch. Germany took up the idea in 1957 as a channel for complaints by members of the armed forces, and Great Britain has considered its establishment.

Would this system work in the United States? I somehow doubt it.

First, Congressmen would scarcely abandon the one function which has been demonstrated to be the most effective means of getting reelected.

Second, the main reason a Congressman can get things done is that he has a vote. The Defense Department will listen to me when I ask for justice for an enlisted man or an access road for Aberdeen Proving Ground, because my vote may someday be critical on a $2-billion military construction bill or a $1-billion pay raise. I can't picture an appointed bureaucrat getting that kind of attention.

Third, what might work for a small, closely knit nation will scarcely fit the needs of a continent of 200 million, composed of widely diverse economic, geographic, and ethnic interests. People write their Congressmen because they want special attention to their peculiar needs—help which a huge complex, indifferent bureaucracy never seems to give. A Congressman can do a lot for the ordinary fellow because he is a Congressman. Separate the service from the office and I suspect it won't get done.

What are the prospects for raising salaries high enough to sustain full-time legislating? Congress can set its pay scales at anything it likes, subject to Presidential veto. Yet, currently, the President, the American Bar Association, and many others are urging Congress to raise its pay by at least $10,000 to $32,500; a bill to accomplish this is in the hands of the House Rules Committee, but still Congress drags its feet.

Every Congressman I have talked to wants the raise—some desperately. But many will hesitate to vote for it, and some are committed to vote against it. As one Congressman told the President when the subject came up: "My lips say 'No, No,' but my heart says 'Yes, Yes.'"

Most such Congressmen have rural constituencies, unacquainted with the dis-economies of large-city living in general and of Washington in particular. And every Congressman hears from letterwriters who hold firmly to the philosophy that the only good Congressman is a broke one.

Given congressional reluctance to vote pay raises for itself—it has raised the pay of other Government employees several times since it last raised its own in 1955—it seems safe to predict that any increase it votes will give only temporary relief from the pressures to moonlight. Even $32,500 would be little better in real terms—after income tax and price increase—than the $10,000 pay of 1939—yet Congress in the pre-World War II days was in session less than half as long as it has been in recent years, and the average constituency to be served was one-third smaller.

This Congressman, it is plain, sees no real prospect of lasting mitigation of the working conditions that may reduce the effectiveness of Congress.

But do they really have such a deleterious effect?

The answer to this depends on your views as to what is the function of a Congressman. On this there are two extreme views. One view—mine in my days of innocence—is that it is to pass good laws. The other view—held by the old-line politician—is that it is to survive, by representing constituents, giving them what they want, and staying out of trouble.

Both views are unsound. The first is naive, the second cynical. Neither would require very special skill. If our problem were to pass a logically consistent legislative program without reference to popular consent, it would be easy to assemble half a thousand experts many times as learned as any Congress ever elected. But this would be the Platonian rule of "philosopher-kings," not a democracy which rules with public consent. In an oligarchy of experts, wisdom is ultimately corrupted by power. On the other hand, in a crude democracy, power is dispersed to the endless frustration of the expert.

Here seems to be the ideal role of the Congressman: To represent his constituency, by knowing its needs and aspirations—at the same time inspiring it to something better.

Both functions—to represent and to lead—are indispensable if a democracy of ordinary humans is to survive scientific revolutions every decade. The one requires the Congressman to keep close to his constituency. The other requires him to know what goes on, in economics, in science, and in law. No Congressman is capable of all this, but a surprising number attempt it and a few come amazingly close.

This small band could be enlarged if the public would support better working conditions for Congressmen. Since it is not likely to do this very soon or very materially, Congress will continue to be less than fully effective as a purely legislative body. In adding up the score, however, let us put some of the blame on the public which makes the rules of practical politics, not entirely on the Congressman who has to live with them. And why shouldn't the critics of Congress-as-an-institution add the vital service function of Congress to its legislative one in deciding whether it gets a passing mark?

NEW TARIFF PERILS

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, rising imports of live cattle, beef and veal, have been pressing hard against the domestic cattle growers. These imports have been surmounting our reduced tariff without the least trouble. It is fast becoming a question whether we wish to maintain a cattle industry in this country, or let it go the way of some of our other industries that have been sacrificed to a free trade policy. The United States, for example, now stands No. 5 among the fishing countries of the world; fourth as a textile manufacturing country and we have fallen in point of steel production from over 45 percent of the total world output to less than 25 percent since 1950. Our merchant marine now carries less than 10 percent of our foreign trade.

The cattle industry will suffer the same fate if the present exposure to imports is not corrected soon. I have introduced H.R. 4014, designed to hold our imports of live cattle, beef and veal, to the average level of the 5-year period from 1957–62.

The situation is a menacing one as it is; but under the GAAT negotiations scheduled to begin next year the existing tariff could be cut another 50 percent. This would be disastrous and the cattle industry can only hope that no such folly will be perpetrated.

Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy held a meeting in this city and I had the pleasure of speaking on the occasion. Representatives of some of the leading industries of the country were represented. Great concern was expressed over the forthcoming GATT tariff-cutting Conference. Strong exceptions were taken against the ground rules under which the negotiations will be conducted. These are of such a stringent nature that the hearings to be held before the Tariff Commission and the Trade Information Committee beginning December 2, will be of very little value.

The hope of moderating the tariff-cutting lust of the State Department will be very slim.

The reasons for this slight hope are set forth in the resolutions adopted by the nationwide committee. I think that the statement of its chairman, Mr. O. R. Strackbein, and the resolutions adopted merit the most serious attention. Under leave to extend my remarks the material referred to is inserted at this point in the RECORD:

THE NATIONWIDE COMMITTEE ON IMPORT-EXPORT POLICY

(By O. R. Strackbein, chairman)

THE TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962—ITS FAILURES AND PERILS

It becomes daily more clear that the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 should not have been passed.

An excessive grant of power to the President combined with a destructive surgery on the escape clause remedy, has left American industry, agriculture, and labor defenseless against the market ravages of rampant import competition.

To propose a 50-percent tariff reduction in a 5-year period, after the American tariff has already been slashed to the quick over a period of years, was an appalling act. To accompany this rash exposure of our industries to the sapping competitive forces from abroad, by a withdrawal of the remedy that was long heralded as the very cornerstone of the trade program, represents a betrayal of the good faith of its fathers and all the firm assurances issued over the years, by every President and Secretary of State from 1934 to 1961.

Under the new program of the Trade Expansion Act, despite all the vote-fetching promises, not 1 of the 11 cases that have been brought before the Tariff Commission has resulted in a remedy, either in the form of a tariff increase or adjustment assistance. The tight language of the statute, fathered by the State Department, has strangled all hopes of a remedy. So dark is the present outlook for a successful outcome that the Tariff Commission has not a single new case currently on its escape clause docket.

Even industries that previously were supported with a remedy and enjoying a degree of protection, are now in a status of continuous uncertainty. They may lose their margin of safety at any time.

Beyond the dim horizon lowered on the domestic front by the legislation, the ground rules accepted by Mr. Herter to guide negotiations under the forthcoming GATT negotiations, guarantee a first-class shellacking of the American negotiators.

Oh, there will be preparatory hearings; but the additional items placed on the reserve list as a result of the public hearings scheduled to begin on December 2 will be subject, under the ground rules agreed to by Mr. Herter, to a "mutual confrontation and justification" procedure in the negotiation under GATT; i.e., any items placed on our reserve list after the Tariff Commission hearings would be subject to review by GATT.

This point of the Herter agreement throws a revealing light on the vacuous value of our publicized hearings that are to run some 4 or 5 months and cover some 6,000 items. It simply means that the U.S. reserve list may be pruned by GATT after negotiations open.

Secondly, our State Department, which calls the shots for Mr. Herter, now insists on the broad-category approach to tariff cuts, the faster to run through the 6,000 items. This approach marks a further abandonment of the long-honored assurances of the trade program's originators and their successors. The support of the Congress and the public was repeatedly wooed and won with these assurances. Tariff rates were to be reduced carefully, item by item.

Now this system is to give way to the broad strokes of the wreckers. The tariff on broad groupings of items are to be sliced in half or severed at the one-third, one-quarter mark. Heads will roll with shoulders on or even with thorax attached. Individual differences in competitive standing will be ignored.

Either this wholesale march of American industry and labor to the new guillotine represents a premeditated assault on the health of the American economy, or it is the product of a high-rise philosophy without a basement or a footing in reality.

In all good sense American industry cannot stand the competitive exposure being readied for it. To suggest that it can is to fly against the force of the clear facts verified by industry after industry, including loss of private commercial export markets, a fast-rising tide of imports and an outflow of investments that in a more hospitable domestic climate would flow into new production here and generate the jobs that we so badly need.

Under the title "The Kennedy Round," the Common Market Review of May 1963 says, page 93:

"The Americans have set their sights high this time. They hope that the outcome of the next round will completely eclipse the results of all previous tariff-cutting exercises."

This represents a dedication to economic foolhardiness.

As matters stand, we are indeed on the threshold of an enormous, perilous and uncalled-for act of economic self-mutilation.

RESOLUTION 1: NEED FOR AN EFFECTIVE ESCAPE CLAUSE

1. Whereas the escape clause remedy of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, including the adjustment assistance provision, has been a complete failure as demonstrated by the zero record of accomplishment reflected by the unanimous rejection of all 11 cases processed by the Tariff Commission to date;

2. Whereas the remedy provided for serious injury from import competition is so tightly trussed by the statutory language in that act that no industry, company, or labor group has been able to meet the onerous requirements exacted;

3. Whereas domestic producers, manufacturers, and workers are entitled to an offset, in the form of import regulation, against the combination of lower wage rates and fast-rising productivity prevailing abroad, as a means of competing with imports in the home market and maintaining and expanding employment; and

4. Whereas competitive pressures from low-cost imports foster automation and labor-displacing installations and therefore a shrinkage in employment rather than plant expansion and the hiring of more workers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the nationwide committee exert its utmost efforts to achieve a remedy at law that will assure fairness of import competition and preservation of the domestic market in a state of expansibility, thus promoting domestic employment, freed from disruption by rampant import competition.

RESOLUTION 2: TRADING INDUSTRY OUT FOR FARM EXPORTS

Public statements and pronouncements have established the intent of the U.S. negotiators of the forthcoming GATT tariff reductions to trade off sharp reductions in American duties on industrial products to assure maintenance of the present level of farm product exports to the Common Market countries.

This approach would further expose many of our industries to yet harsher import competition and put a damper on domestic market expansion. More workers are employed in industry, elaborating, processing, and fabricating raw material, than in agriculture. Therefore in terms of employment it is false economics to sacrifice the domestic market for industrial products to the end of disposing of price-supported agricultural surplus products.

We therefore condemn the policy of sacrificing domestic industry and employment to dubious efforts to hold existing export markets for surplus agricultural products, the greater volume of which flows out under the inducement of existing export subsidies.

RESOLUTION 3: F.O.B. VERSUS C.I.F. IMPORT VALUATION

The leading trading nations of the world with the exception of the United States levy import duties and tabulate the value of imports on a cost, insurance, and freight basis, meaning cost, marine insurance, and freight.

The United States levies its ad valorem duties on the f.o.b. basis which excludes ocean freight, marine insurance, etc.

As a result of these differences in practices the United States collects less duty on identical ad valorem rates than most foreign countries. As a result our import statistics show a lower total value of imports than are shown by other countries that import the same physical volume.

While no firm calculation of these differences has been made, one of which makes our tariff look higher than the foreign in terms of duty collected, and the other of which shrinks the comparative value of our imports in relation to that of other countries, it has been estimated that the discrepancy reaches an average magnitude of at least 10 percent. The effect varies, depending on distance of shipment and insurance rates.

In view of the importance of this distortion in statistics that are constantly compared internationally as if they rested on an equal base, we strongly urge that immediate corrective steps be taken by the Federal agencies responsible for the gathering and issuance of trade statistics. These agencies should undertake calculations to determine the magnitude of the discrepancy and thereafter to note an appropriate caution in official publications of trade statistics, calling attention to the discrepancy.

RESOLUTION 4: GATT GROUND RULES

The rules under which the GATT negotiations are to be conducted will rob American industry that is concerned over additional or excessive tariff reductions of virtually any foothold for effective protest.

The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 itself permits the grouping of products into broad categories. The adoption of this approach greatly narrows the effectiveness of representations made in support of individual rates that are above the average of the category into which the items are merged.

The ground rules agreed to by Mr. Herter, the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, tighten the already rigid confines into which interested parties have thus been wedged. This is the result of two conditions laid down by the EEC representatives and subscribed to by Mr. Herter.

One is that the items that may be placed on the reserve list after hearings, over and above those reserved by statute, will be subject to "confrontation and justification" once negotiations actually begin. GATT, in other words, may insist on removal of some of these items, if any, from the reserve list. Mr. Herter may be expected to accede, judging from his record of prior compromise vis a vis the EEC countries.

The other lies in acceptance of the automatic application of rules yet to be adopted with respect to the disparities that the EEC countries attribute to our tariff rates. These refer to those of our tariffs that rise above, say, 30 percent, and are called "skyscrapers." The Europeans insist that these be reduced more sharply than they themselves should be required to cut their more moderate rates.

While the formula for determining how far we should cut our individual rates that stick out above the landscape was not agreed to, it was agreed that it shall become a matter of automatic application when it is adopted.

Once more, American industry that is vulnerable to import competition has been placed in a box.

The nationwide committee wishes to record its dismay over the ground rules and to express its clear sentiment that the Special Representative of Trade Negotiations should adopt a firmer stance henceforward lest irreparable damage be inflicted on American economic interests.

DR. GODDARD MEMORIAL

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, this morning our great Committee on Science and Astronautics ordered reported to the House legislation providing for the erection of a memorial statue honoring the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard, the father of modern rocketry, who came from my district.

I desire again to express my warm appreciation to the gentleman from California, Chairman GEORGE P. MILLER, and the distinguished members of his committee for this latest recognition of the achievements and contributions of Dr. Goddard, whose pioneer accomplishments in rockets and missiles have brought us to the threshold of the stars. I urge that early action be taken by the House on this worthy legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that my statement to the committee in support of this bill be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The material follows:

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, it is a great privilege and pleasure for me to urge today your approval of House Joint Resolution 787, providing for the erection of a memorial statue in honor of the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard in the central Massachusetts area where he conducted his pioneer research in rocketry.

At the outset, let me commend and warmly thank my good friend, our distinguished former Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., for his splendid efforts and outstanding work in sponsoring and advancing this worthy proposal with his House Joint Resolution 787. In addition, Chairman MILLER with his House Joint Resolution 798 and Congressman JAMES C. CLEVELAND with his House Joint Resolution 799 have evidenced their continuing efforts to bring new honors upon this famed pioneer of missiles and space research, who came originally from my district.

For sometime past, I have sought to obtain well merited recognition of the memory and achievements of the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard. Not long ago, I sponsored a special resolution providing for the issuance of a commemorative gold medal in honor of Dr. Goddard and with the effective help of such good friends as Chairman MILLER and other members of this great committee, and our colleagues on the House Committee on Banking and Currency, this measure became law.

I believe that Professor Goddard is to modern rockets what Edison was to the electric light and Marconi was to electronic communication and I am happy indeed to endorse House Joint Resolution 787, which seeks to perpetuate his life's work and achievements.

Contemporaries have seldom been kind to great creative minds and Dr. Goddard was no exception. He was reviled, derided, and insulted, but his persistence and pioneering work laid the basis for Pienemunde, the German rocket center, the V-series rockets, and ultimately the great advances and achievements now being recorded in the space age.

I think that it is most appropriate for the Federal Government to arrange for the erection of suitable memorials, markers, and plaques where Professor Goddard conducted his great experiments and it is particularly fitting that a memorial statue be erected in the area where Professor Goddard launched his first rockets in central Massachusetts, as is contemplated by this bill.

The Nation and the world will surely applaud the favorable action of this great committee on this resolution and I urge that you approve it for the early consideration of the House. We have come to realize at long last the greatness and significance of the contributions of Dr. Goddard, the father of modern rocketry, and in recent years, he has been honored in many ways.

The Congress of the United States has struck off a gold medal in high tribute to Dr. Goddard. Our great space center in nearby Maryland, so meaningful to us in terms of the national security, space exploration, and the advancement of science, bears his name. Many memorials to honor him have been established in this country and throughout the world to bring enduring luster to his achievements.

It would be in our best tradition to erect a memorial statue near the site of his first experiments where, years ago, this great, dedicated man performed his pioneer experiments.

No one could possibly describe, let alone evaluate, the reach, the depth, and the everlasting vital importance of Dr. Goddard's work. Born in struggle and sacrifice, conceived in genius, carried out with a courage and a determination that would not be denied, his contributions now rank by common concensus with the most epochal ever achieved by man.

In this House, no one is more familiar with or more cognizant of Dr. Goddard's great contributions than the distinguished members of this outstanding committee. You are aware of his struggles, setbacks, and the ridicule he suffered while he was alive. I know that you will give most sympathetic consideration to House Joint Resolution 787 because it is most fitting for contemporary history to record, and for the country to know, just how great and epochal a contribution Professor Goddard made. The memorial authorized by this bill will help recall that the ideas he generated and developed have already carried us to the reaches of space. Tomorrow, they will take us to the stars.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ANTI-CATHOLIC ACTIVITIES OF COMMUNIST REGIME IN POLAND

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, enough emphasis has been placed by propagandists for coexistence with communism that the picture portrayed to the public of liberalizing developments behind the Iron Curtain deserves to be discussed.

Contrary to the long-range goals of our State Department, the public at large recognizes the incompatibility of the American way of life and that of Communist ideology.

I ask leave to insert into the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks an article which appeared in the November 16 Polish-American Journal of Scranton, Pa., reporting on anti-Catholic activities of the Warsaw Communist regime.

FORBID SALE OF FOOD, FUEL TO RELIGIOUS IN POLAND

WARSAW.—The guerrilla warfare conducted by the Communist authorities against the church in Poland recently produced the following unusual incidents:

In Nowe Miasto the food stores and bakeries were forbidden to sell bread and other food to religious.

In many localities the fuel offices have been forbidden to allocate coal to monasteries and churches.

WAYSIDE SHRINES

In various localities the peasants received orders to remove the wayside shrines and crosses, although they stand on private lands and there is no law that would require their removal.

A resident of the village of Czernikow, province of Lodz, was fined 1,500 zlotys because he refused to remove a cross from his field. A cross had been there for centuries, was destroyed by the Nazis, and was restored after the war.

A resident of the village of Kurowice Rzadowe, province of Lodz, was fined 1,500 zlotys because he refused to tear down a wayside shrine standing on the land belonging to his wife.

HOSPITAL CHAPLAINS

Officially, according to instruction of the Health Ministry, hospitals in Poland may have regular chaplains and priests are allowed to visit the sick.

However, in many hospitals the calling of priests to the sick has been forbidden, the hospital chaplains were dismissed and chapels closed.

SEIZE BUILDINGS

According to Cardinal Wyszynski, the novitiate and preparatory school of the Capuchins in Nowe Miasto "were liquidated in a most barbaric manner, which reminds one of the most painful methods used so long ago by our enemies."

In Krakow the Felician Sisters were ordered to vacate some 25 rooms, the Seraphic Sisters were forced to vacate their entire convent, and the Daughters of Divine Love were ordered to vacate the building that was used as a hospital and rest home for sick and aged nuns.

ILLEGAL ASSEMBLIES

The Communist authorities often impose fines on priests for holding illegal public assemblies.

Here are a few examples of what the Communist rulers consider illegal assemblies:

Rev. M. Namyslowski of Szubin was fined 1,500 zlotys because he organized conferences for young people about marriage problems.

Many priests were fined for holding talks to children in preparation for first holy communion.

An assistant pastor in Lipno was fined because he invited a group of high school graduates to his home for tea after holy communion.

All such abuses are protested to the attorney general but the protests remain unanswered.

Mr. Speaker, evidence such as this continually trickles through the Iron Curtain, dramatizing to us the basic viciousness of Communist rule. The answer to the cold war remains a victory of freedom over communism not acceptance of its control over enslaved peoples and polite embrace of its economic theories.

NATIONAL SECURITY—THE POLITICAL, MILITARY, AND ECONOMIC STRATEGIES IN THE DECADE AHEAD

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the Center for Strategic Studies which was founded a little over a year ago at Georgetown University has produced a monumental work on national defense entitled "National Security—The Political, Military, and Economic Strategies in the Decade Ahead." The book was edited by David M. Abshire and Richard V. Allen, with an introduction by Adm. Arleigh Burke. Despite the length of the book, it is easy for selective reading, and I wanted to commend it to my colleagues in the House who are in any way involved in international affairs and national security policy.

I also think that this is a most appropriate textbook in international relations and national security courses, and I understand that it has been adopted in at least two colleges.

A review of this book by Joseph P. Bianco, Jr., appeared in the Georgetown University Alumni magazine for November 1963.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the review and the table of contents of the book.

The Center for Strategic Studies was established at Georgetown University in 1962 to study and coordinate research on strategic problems confronting free societies. The first major effort in this continuing study was a conference held at Georgetown University January 23–25, 1963, under the sponsorship of the center.

The January 1963 conference brought to the conference table well-known specialists in international politics, economics, and science. As a result, the debate covered ground beyond the limits of strategy and economics as ordinarily conceived. This book is the direct result of that conference since it includes both the individual study papers prepared by each participant for the conference and the lively discussion which evolved during the progress of the conference.

The book is unique in that it covers many of the major strategic considerations facing the United States today and these strategies are analyzed in depth by a panel of distinguished authorities with a variety of viewpoints.

The organization of this volume deserves special commendation because of its clarity and its range of topics which are arranged with study papers and discussions listed clearly under each heading. In addition each paper has a short summary at the beginning of it which will enable the researcher or the layman to get a capsule view of the author's position before reading further.

Every thoughtful American will find this volume of significant interest because it is designed for the first time to present a thoroughly comprehensive analysis of the political, military, and economic strategies for the United States in a manner which realistically relates one area of strategy to the others and shows clearly how they are inevitably intertwined.

As Admiral Burke so well states in his introduction, "The United States is the most powerful nation on earth. Strategy involves the use of that power in its full array—economic, military, political, cultural, social, moral, spiritual, and psychological—to accomplish national objectives in the world. A strategy that neglects any element of national power or declines to consider any reasonable opinion concerning it is no strategy at all."

This reviewer concurs with the thought of Admiral Burke and it is obvious that this book is a major step forward in the comprehensive analysis of the many aspects of national strategy. I will also look forward to reading the other books and conference proceedings which are now being prepared by the Center for Strategic Studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SINO-SOVIET STRATEGY

Soviet Strategy 1962–70, Robert Strausz-Hupe.

Future Soviet Foreign Policy, Herbert S. Dinerstein.

Soviet Strengths and Weaknesses, Kurt L. London.

The Sino-Soviet Alliance, Richard L. Walker.

Sino-Soviet Trade and Aid, George E. Taylor.

The Role of Economic Growth, Morris Bornstein.

The Effects of Economic Growth on Sino-Soviet Strategy, G. Warren Nutter.

POLITICAL REQUIREMENTS FOR U.S. STRATEGY

Objectives and Priorities, Stephen D. Kertesz.

Political Requirements, Gerhart Niemeyer.

Vehicles of Political Strategy, Arnold Wolfers.

NATO's Nuclear Dilemma, Henry A. Kissinger.

The Middle East and North Africa, Albert J. Meyer.

The Far East, Frank N. Trager.

Alliance in the Western Hemisphere, William S. Stokes.

The Politicalization of Strategy, William R. Kintner.

Address to the Conference on January 23, 1963, Senator HENRY M. JACKSON.

Address to the Conference on January 24, 1963, the Honorable Walt M. Rostow.

U.S. MILITARY STRATEGIES

Escalation and Its Strategic Context, Herman Kahn.

Toward a Strategy of Supremacy, Stefan T. Possony.

An Approach to Military Strategy, James D. Atkinson.

Nuclear Explosives and the Atlantic Community, Edward Teller.

Managing the Arms Race, Thomas C. Shelling.

U.S. ECONOMIC STRATEGIES

An Approach to Economic Strategy, Virgil Salera.

Military Alliance and Mutual Security, Oskar Morgenstern.

Strategic Leverage From Aid and Trade, James R. Schlesinger.

Developed and Underdeveloped Areas, Karl Brandt.

MEETING STRATEGY REQUIREMENTS IN THE FREE ECONOMY

Budget Trends of the 1960's, Otto Eckstein.

Costs of Alternative Military Strategies, Murray L. Weidenbaum.

National Security and Competing Costs, Roger A. Freeman.

Economic Growth: Issues and Prospects, Henry W. Briefs; Joseph L. Tryon.

Economic Growth and U.S. Strategy, Edward S. Mason.

Monetary and Fiscal Policies in U.S. Strategy, Gottfried Haberler.

Tax Policies, Economic Growth, and Strategy, Norman B. Ture.

Industrial and Human Resources in U.S. Strategy, Irving H. Siegel.

Assuring the Primacy of National Security, W. Glenn Campbell.

PROTECTION OF FEDERAL JURISDICTION FOR THE PRESIDENT AND THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday I introduced legislation which would make it a Federal crime to assault or assassinate the President or Vice President of the United States. A number of my colleagues have introduced identical or similar measures.

I feel strongly that the President and Vice President should be accorded the same protection of Federal jurisdiction which is presently provided to many lesser Federal officials.

It is my hope that a majority of my colleagues will support this measure. I am including with my remarks the following editorials in support of this proposal which have appeared recently in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, the Philadelphia Daily News, the Washington Post and the Norristown (Pa.) Times Herald:

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Nov. 27, 1963]

VOIDS THAT NEED FILLING

When Congress resumes its normal deliberations it ought to consider legislation to fill two voids in our governmental procedures and framework which were accentuated by the assassination of President Kennedy.

One is the lack of a firm procedure for decisionmaking concerning the continuity of Government and the transition of leadership in the event a President is seriously incapacitated. What would have happened, for example, if the assassin's bullet had resulted in severe brain damage rather than death?

The problem has been debated before, without conclusion. It has been suggested that some groups such as the Supreme Court, should be duly constituted to make such decisions on the basis, of course, of the best available medical advice. Or that there should be provision for a decision on a temporary transition of the leadership responsibility in the event the incapacity is deemed temporary, as well as on a permanent transition if the incapacity is felt to be permanent. The questions are difficult, but should be faced.

The other void is created by the absence of legislation making it a Federal offense to assault or assassinate the President or the Vice President.

Congressman SCHWEIKER of Montgomery County has already introduced legislation to correct this oversight. As things stand now, a number of lesser Federal officials are given the protection of Federal jurisdiction, but procedures governing the trial and the penalty for the assault or assassination of the President or the Vice President are solely determined by the laws of the State in which the crime occurs.

It was this void in our laws which left Lee Harvey Oswald a State, rather than a Federal, prisoner. Inefficient local police work made possible the murder which has deprived the Nation of the possibility of learning the full story of his crime. If the law had made him a Federal prisoner, the outcome would almost surely have been different.

[From the Philadelphia Daily News, Nov. 27, 1963]

SCHWEIKER'S BILL A MUST

We hope Congress will act quickly in passing a bill to be drawn up by Congressman RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Montgomery County Republican, making it a Federal crime to kill, assault, or conspire to harm the President or Vice President.

The bizarre slaying of assassination suspect Lee Harvey Oswald by a self-appointed executioner points up the need for taking jurisdiction in these cases away from local police.

An attempt, or the actual taking of the life of our Chief Executive or Vice President, is not only of national concern, but also has worldwide repercussions. It is essential that crimes of this nature be covered by Federal law.

We trust that President Johnson's order to the FBI to investigate the slaying of Oswald by nightclub operator Jack Ruby will be thorough and complete. The American conscience calls for it.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 26, 1963]

MAKE IT A FEDERAL CRIME

Certainly the law should be amended to make the assassination of the President a Federal crime. It is ironic indeed that the criminal who murdered President Kennedy violated only the law of Texas. Actually his foul deed was a crime against the Nation—one of the most serious crimes against the Nation in this century.

As the law now stands, severe penalties are prescribed for felons who murder or attack Federal judges, U.S. attorneys, FBI agents, postal inspectors, Secret Service officers, customs agents, and various employees of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture. But this law for the "protection of officers and employees of the United States" does not, strangely enough, cover the President or members of his Cabinet.

Presumably the need for Federal law in this field has not previously been emphasized. When Lincoln was assassinated, the country was still under martial law. The assassin of President Garfield was prosecuted in the District of Columbia and the assassin of President McKinley in New York. There is a strong presumption that Texas would have convicted Lee Harvey Oswald of the slaying of President Kennedy if Oswald himself had not been killed as he was being transferred to the county jail. But the serious bungling of this vital case by the Dallas police constitutes a strong argument for the direction of such delicate operations by the FBI from the very beginning.

The events in Dallas have shown all too clearly that Federal officials should have been in charge of the police work from the beginning. High crimes against the Nation cannot be safely left to investigation and prosecution by local officials of the community in which such crimes happen to take place. As soon as Congress resumes its operations, Representative RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, of Pennsylvania, will introduce a bill to extend the protection of section 1114, United States Code, to the President and Vice President. We hope that it will be given prompt attention by the Judiciary Committees and that they will also include within the terms of the bill other officials in the line of succession to the Presidency. Perhaps agency heads, their deputies and Members of Congress should also be included.

[From the Norristown (Pa.) Times Herald, Nov. 29, 1963]

PROTECTING OUR LEADERS

The legislative proposal of Congressman RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, that attack upon a President or Vice President shall become a Federal crime, is being well taken throughout the Nation.

Mr. SCHWEIKER has submitted his bill to the House of Representatives. There seems to be no reason for any Member to oppose its passage.

Mr. SCHWEIKER admitted last weekend that he was amazed, as were all of us, to learn that attack upon many lesser Federal officers is a Federal offense, but that the law does not apply to a President or Vice President. It would seem amazing that some Congressman, throughout all the years of the democracy, did not think this necessary, particularly since President Kennedy was not the first of his rank assassinated.

Correction is certainly in order and Mr. SCHWEIKER is to be commended for his leadership toward such correction.

A bill to be offered in the Senate is similar, but would also authorize Federal protection status for Presidents-elect and Vice Presidents-elect. This may pose problems since those elected are not Federal officers until they are sworn in and inaugurated. It might develop a loophole.

But the two surely can be fitted together in such a manner that, when properly written, there will be full Federal protection for our top commanders.

When the safety of the men in highest rank of our Nation is involved, certainly they deserve our highest and most powerful force of legal protection.

FOUNDATION OF NORTH AMERICAN INDIAN CULTURE

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include in the RECORD excerpts of an address by my good friend John Peterson, a member of the Steering Committee of the Foundation of North American Indian Culture, given before the Exchange Club of Bismarck, N. Dak., on December 2. Mr. Peterson outlines the basis of support now secured by the Indian Culture Foundation and projects what additional support will be necessary to insure total foundation success. The purpose of the foundation is to preserve and enhance North American Indian culture, and, in so doing, to change the stereotyped image of the North American Indian.

Indian leaders from throughout the United States and Canada, Indian entertainers from New York City, Indian royalty from Canada and the United States, and Indian culture enthusiasts from all over the Midwest will gather in Bismarck, N. Dak., December 6–7, for the first annual membership meeting of the recently organized Foundation of North American Indian Culture.

Mr. Peterson's remarks follow:

EXCERPTS OF AN ADDRESS BY JOHN PETERSON, BISMARCK, MEMBER OF STEERING COMMITTEE OF FNAIC, BEFORE BISMARCK EXCHANGE CLUB, DECEMBER 2, 1963, BISMARCK, N. DAK.

Will the Foundation of North American Indian Culture succeed? This question is on the minds of many in Bismarck and throughout North Dakota as well as on the minds of many persons vitally concerned with Indian matters all over the United States and Canada.

The organizers of the Indian Culture Foundation are well aware that not only has such a venture never before been attempted but also that its program covers an entire continent with a multiplicity of activities and some large-scale budgetary goals.

Although the program of the foundation is big, broad, and imaginative; although there has been nothing like this in the past; although it was only a remote dream of a handful of Bismarck citizens just a scant 4 months ago, this foundation of North American Indian Culture very definitely will succeed for one positive reason.

The Indian Culture Foundation is destined for great success because it has one basic purpose which has earned for it strong support both locally and internationally. That purpose is simply to present, honestly and truthfully, the North American Indian and his heritage as it was and is; and to encourage, by modern methods, the restoration among Indians of lost and latent arts, talents, and abilities that will help raise Indian people to new levels in our society.

In simpler terms the foundation's purpose is to work toward doing away with an old image—a bad stereotype caused by two generations of second-rate Hollywood movies and centuries of mistreatment and abuse by the white man.

Out of these efforts will come not a new image of the North American Indian but only a correct image—a correct image of a race that possesses many talents which are far superior, in some respects, to those of other races in modern society. Out of these efforts will come a public recognition by the more than 200 million persons in Canada and the United States who are non-Indian that the 700,000 North American Indians in these two countries have a very distinct contribution to make—if given the chance to perpetuate what they have done and to show what they can do today in such fields as art, handicrafts, music, entertainment, the dance, and literature.

Because of its basic purpose, the foundation will succeed since this purpose is right and it is just. And since it is right and just, the respected Indian leadership of Canada and the United States will assemble in Bismarck later this week to chart the long-range goals of the Indian Culture Foundation.

This Indian leadership is coming to North Dakota because they, like the foundation organizers, recognizes that something has to be done soon to preserve all that was great and gifted of past Indian culture—or it will be lost for all time within the matter of a few more short years. Furthermore, this Indian leadership, like the foundation organizers, recognizes much more can be done to effectively encourage greater use of the skills and talents of contemporary North American Indians.

We have already seen strong evidence of Indian support for the foundation program—through participation at the approaching annual meeting by the National Congress of American Indians and the National Indian Council of Canada—to indicate outstanding success for the foundation. These Indian groups represent large numbers of tribes in the two nations, and tribal participation is essential to foundation success.

And if the hard work on this December 6–7 meeting by some 100 dedicated persons in the headquarters city of Bismarck and the home State of North Dakota is an indication, there is no question but what the foundation will achieve the necessary local backing. The work of these 100 North Dakota citizens will be multiplied into the hundreds and thousands in the months ahead as the foundation prepares for its first annual North American Indian Exposition next August, for construction of its headquarters facilities by 1966, and for establishment of an International Indian Museum by the late 1960's. The enthusiasm is there.

With local involvement and United States and Canadian Indian participation in the foundation program assured, the Indian Culture Foundation will have little trouble in presenting its cause to the large foundations and corporations for necessary funds to carry on the vital activities of this long-delayed program. We have just begun our job, but our cause is right and we will succeed.

NAVIGATIONAL COMPUTER SYSTEM

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, our Government has paid the developer of a navigational computer system $950,000 of his total cost of $1.3 million and has allowed this developer to claim this equipment as a patented item. My authority for this statement is the General Accounting Office, which has assisted me in investigating this case. This is the kind of inefficiency and slipshod work being done daily in the Department of Defense procurement sections, the kind of inefficiency that must be cleaned up.

Mr. Speaker, this case of an equipment known as the AN/ASN 33 first came to my attention June 18, 1963. In bid documents that I have picked up daily at the Small Business Administration, I found a procurement being conducted by the Chicago Procurement District for this equipment.

It was to be a sole source—no competition—procurement with only one manufacturer given an opportunity to bid. One item called for purchase of manufacturing drawings, the Army contending it did not possess them at the time.

When the military says it does not have drawings for an equipment it has purchased several times, my curiosity is aroused. I called Col. Thomas Davis, of the Chicago Procurement District of the Army, to request information about the equipment.

Colonel Davis told me that the sole source producer of the equipment claims it as a patented, and therefore, proprietary item. In short, Mr. Speaker, the developer had developed the equipment at its own expense and therefore claimed it as its own, which would be only fitting and proper.

Colonel Davis also told me that he was informed the sole source producer did not plan to bid on the manufacturing drawings section of the procurement. Therefore, as it is easy to see, there would still be no manufacturing data to allow competitive procurement.

Mr. Speaker, from that day to this, the Army's attitude has been to back up the developer's claim of proprietary rights. Its entire course has been to rationalize its position. At no time, in my opinion, did it really try to penetrate to the core of the problem.

I inquired in writing on June 25, 1963, as to the proprietary claims. On June 29, 1963, Colonel Davis answered, stating the Army's position that, since developer claimed proprietary rights, no manufacturing data could be made available for competitive bidding.

Later, Col. James E. Foster, of the Army's Electronics Materiel Agency in Philadelphia, backed up Colonel Davis.

To take as short a time here as possible, Mr. Speaker, I shall simply say I was not entirely satisfied with the Army's explanations. I asked the Comptroller General to look into the history and background of this equipment. I stated to him my feeling there might be Government money tied up in it. In my opinion, if Government money goes into a project, Government benefit and competitive procurement data should come out of it.

The General Accounting Office reported to me on November 4, 1963. I shall quote pertinent parts of the report.

The GAO said:

> We estimate that from 1950 to 1960 the Government paid about $950,000 of the $1.3 million of the development costs for the AN/ASN 33 and its predecessor systems, but did not acquire manufacturing drawings, or a royalty-free license to use drawings that would be suitable for obtaining competition in the procurement of any of the products resulting from this development work.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, GAO reported the Government had spent $700,000 out of a total development cost of $800,000 for a commercial product of the developer which parallels the AN/ASN 33.

GAO concluded that:

> On the basis of the relationship between Government sales and commercial sales during the period that development costs for this computer and predecessor systems were incurred, the Government has borne a significant portion of such costs.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, what the Army contends and what an unbiased agency such as GAO has uncovered, are as different as day and night.

This is the kind of inefficiency and mismanagement we have in some of our military purchasing areas.

The Army allowed a developer to lock up a piece of equipment as its own, without really checking. It was easier, less work to take the line of least resistance and pay an inflated price of $11,000 per average unit for the system. To date, about $1 million has been spent on the ASN 33. Competitive purchasing could have cut this cost in half, based on my findings in past cases. Someone in the Army, however, let the developer claim this item as a commercial product without checking; and that is perfectly obvious to me in light of the GAO's findings.

This is another case which shows how superficial is the work being done by purchasing sections of the military. A town or a county would go bankrupt in a week with such buying policies.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time we in Congress force the military to completely revamp its buying policies. Progress is being made. Some of the mistakes are finally being admitted and corrected, as I have shown here in the past few days. But much needs to be done, and every day the job is delayed costs the taxpayers of this country dearly.

It is also my opinion that more changes are needed in armed service procurement regulations to insure that our Government will get data to permit competition where it even indirectly contributes to contractor-sponsored, independent research and development programs.

Mr. Speaker, industriousness must replace inefficiency. Penetrating study must supplant the superficial look given many cases by military purchasing agents. Hard work must replace the lackadaisical attitude held by many who spend our tax money. A "protect the taxpayers' interest" attitude and a willingness to admit and correct errors must replace the "sweep it under the rug" policy that is squandering millions of tax dollars a year.

In short, Mr. Speaker, we must, as President Johnson so eloquently said last Wednesday, get a dollar's worth of value for every dollar we spend. In military purchasing today, I am positive that is not the case.

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY EXPRESSWAY, CHICAGO

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday, November 29, 1963, the City Council of Chicago met at the request of Mayor Richard A. Daley and passed the following ordinance:

> Be it ordained by the City Council of the City of Chicago:
>
> SECTION 1. The name by which the Northwest Expressway shall be known is "John Fitzgerald Kennedy Expressway."
>
> SEC. 2. The commissioner of streets and sanitation is authorized to place the proper signs bearing the name set forth in section 1 along said highway.
>
> SEC. 3. This ordinance shall take effect upon passage.

The John Fitzgerald Kennedy Expressway is one of the most recent improvements for automobile travel in the great city of Chicago. It links our famous Loop with O'Hare Field and northwestern suburbs in Chicago. The late President Kennedy was the first Chief Executive of the United States to officially travel its length. He paid a visit to Chicago last spring arriving at O'Hare Field to motorcade to the Loop.

The welcome extended to late President Kennedy by the people of Chicago was heartwarming. They lined the expressway from O'Hare to the Loop and masses gathered at his destination. Many carried signs of greetings; many waved flags; and many just waved, but all shouted "Hi" in the friendly manner credited to Chicagoans. As a good portion of the highway bisects the Eighth Congressional District, which I represent, I was more conscious of the multitude of people that were present along the roadside. There were people dressed in expensive clothes; there were people in working clothes; there were priests, nuns, and other men of the cloth; and there were children of all ages. Every class was represented and it was a spontaneous expression of admiration and confidence for the leader of our country. Chicagoans felt very close to this great man and wanted him to know it.

Chicago's reaction to his tragic death cannot be described by words. It was a deep personal loss, which will never be fully understood. Therefore the renaming of the Northwest Expressway to the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Expressway is the voice of the people of Chicago for the everlasting memory of a great leader, a great American, but most of all a dear friend.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINNEGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI], who has informed the House of the action of the City Council of the City of Chicago in further honoring our late great President by renaming the great artery connecting the Loop with O'Hare Field and the northwestern suburbs surrounding Chicago.

The name of John F. Kennedy will long be remembered, and this is another instance of the love of his people for a man whose dedicated life was cut off all too shortly.

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT FOR STUDENTS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to the persistent and conscientious effort which has been put forth on behalf of fairer principles of summer student employment in the Federal Government by my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH]. He has bucked the bureaucracy. He has diligently amassed statistics. He has refused to be deterred. He has truly been a sterling champion of those able students who, without friends and "insiders" in the bureaucracy, sincerely wish to serve their country and gain valuable experience by working a summer in Washington, D.C.

As an old teacher of political science, as a longtime member of the executive branch, and also as a personal friend of several chairmen of the Civil Service Commission, I have watched with increasing awe and at times alarm the manner in which many appointments are made to summer positions here in Washington, D.C. I have sponsored programs every summer which have enabled hundreds of students from my own congressional district to spend a week in Washington, working in a congressional office, observing Congress and its committees in operation, and interviewing key officials. These students are chosen on a merit basis by a bipartisan committee consisting of one Republican House Member, one Democratic House Member, and a university professor of political science. I might add that I enforce an apportionment system in the 13 counties of my district, insuring geographic distribution of the winners of the "Week in Washington" contest.

Invariably, fired by an interest in governmental affairs, these students who come to Washington as juniors in high school want to return in later years to gain some experience in the executive branch. They start writing me in September asking me how to get summer jobs. I then ask the Civil Service Commission how to proceed, what civil service exams they should take to qualify, and whom they should contact. The Civil Service Commission gives me an inconclusive answer. They tell me that the Federal service entrance examination is open only to college juniors and seniors. They tell me that there is a civil service exam for the physical sciences but none for the social sciences. The correspondence piles up. The Civil Service Commission tells me that each student ought to get in touch with each Government department, that employment has been decentralized. The departments start a long and usually fruitless correspondence, without clearly defining what will qualify a student for summer employment. I make repeated inquiries on behalf of outstanding students who I know are able to contribute to the agencies in which they are interested. Weeks pass by, and I again make contact. Then suddenly the agencies become interested in my inquiry, but they advise me that they are sorry, but it is too late as all their hiring has been done for the summer.

I daresay many other Members have had similar experience with bright, personable, imaginative, and able students—not political hacks, but young men and women who we know will be able to "cut the mustard."

Now maybe it is just my frustration with the existing system which makes me so enthusiastic about the bill sponsored by my colleague from Texas. I have talked on several occasions with the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, John Macy, an able administrator, who has told me that he opposes this bill. I just hope that the 301-to-18 vote in the House of Representatives today will convince the Civil Service Commission and all the agencies of Government that they are going to have to shake up their procedures for summer employment if they wish congressional support and sympathy for their position. These procedures should make it crystal clear that summer employment of students is to be on the basis of merit, not politics; on the basis of what you know instead of whom you know; on the basis of open and competitive examinations announced far enough in advance and publicized well enough in the hinterlands so anyone can apply; and on the basis of ability instead of what relatives or friends you have or strings you can pull.

I want to rise to the defense of my colleague from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] whom some have said is trying to put politics into summer employment, or to set up some kind of a pork barrel. Nothing could be further from the truth. What he is trying to do by his bill is to take this system and shake the bureaucratic deadwood out of it, and then put it on a merit basis so the average American in all parts of our great land can have an equal chance to compete.

I certainly am happy that the Beckworth bill has passed the House by an overwhelming vote, and I hope that the Civil Service Commission does something radical to improve this impossible situation. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I hope they get so mad down there they will turn over a few tables and turn over a few new leaves and make it clear to students in all 50 States of the Union that they have a chance to work for Uncle Sam next summer if they can qualify on an announced examination.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON—"A MAN OF MANKIND, AS BIG HIMSELF AS THE NATION HE MUST NOW GOVERN"

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on last Sunday, December 1, the Boston Herald published a tribute to President Lyndon B. Johnson which was written by Leslie Carpenter, chief of the Boston Herald-Traveler's Washington Bureau.

He has been a personal friend of President Johnson for many years. In writing about President Johnson, he knows and understands his subject.

I know the Members of the House will read this article by Mr. Carpenter about a great leader whom he describes as "a man of mankind, as big himself as the Nation he must now govern."

A MAN OF COMPLEXITY—FLAME OF HUMAN SPIRIT SURGES THROUGH JOHNSON

(By Leslie Carpenter)

WASHINGTON.—Surging always through President Lyndon B. Johnson is the flame of the human spirit.

And that more than anything else gives fire to the behavior pattern, the goals, the ambition, the hopes, the dreams, and the attitudes of this extremely complex man.

He is an immensely generous man who has deep respect and affection for his fellow man. He races though life at great speed, his mind filled with big and important problems and objectives. But he never fails, somehow, in all the hurry to think of the thoughtful gesture, the kindness.

IMMENSELY KIND

He is a man whose heart is as big as his mind and they work together like the perfect machine.

President Johnson, that big man who must now, in his private sadness, lead the Nation, has spent his 55 years learning more from men than from books. He trusts and respects human beings more than the printed word.

The men and women who have meant the most to him through the years have come from all economic groups and greatly varying backgrounds and education. He has learned something from each of them, and his own life, as well as his political and personal direction, have been shaped by those lessons.

THOUGHTS OF OTHERS

In the 20-odd years I have known President Johnson as a personal friend, I have many times heard him quote thoughts of other friends who were of a different race and who had little education.

"Now," the man who is now the U.S. President would say, "isn't he absolutely right?" No one could disagree that he was.

In thousands of conversations with President Johnson over the more than two decades I have known him, I have never heard him at any time cast a reflection on a man's race or religion, even in humor. There is no question in my mind that he never had such a thought.

POLITICAL DANGERS

Although he represented a State in Congress where it was politically dangerous to have a thinking man's outlook toward the equality and dignity of all human beings, Johnson always felt that way.

Years ago, President Johnson used to have a sign on the wall of his office. It had been given to him by a friend and it said: "You ain't learning anything when you're talking."

Johnson has always been inclined to talk a lot—and to ask an avalanche of questions. But he also has always known how to listen.

Few men in public life seek as much advice as has always been the case with him. He wants three things when he turns for advice, and they are: (1) The best minds he can tap on the subject; (2) both sides of the subject presented with the best possible facts to support each; and (3) every point boiled down to the facts without wasteful adjectives, adverbs or needless elaboration.

GRASPS QUICKLY

The President can grasp anything immediately. There is no point in emphasizing a word. If it is a word, he takes it in for all its meaning.

He has always made his own decision. The closest friend he ever had couldn't influence him if he felt that friend was wrong.

He could hardly have chosen a career other than public life. His unique talents and gifts were long ago recognized by the business world, and he was offered many positions which would have made a more comfortable life for him and his family.

BUSINESS WORLD

One friend who had watched him operate for 8 years as the most powerful and influential Senate majority leader in history once remarked: "You know if he had gone into the business world, he might have become the first man ever to be president of the Chase National Bank, Du Pont, and Ford Motor Co. all at once."

President Johnson has always said that he wants "can-do" people around him. But he is himself the most "can-do" man who ever could and did.

WORLD ON FIRE

For many years before a tragedy as horrible as the Nation will ever experience thrust him into the Presidency, Johnson rushed through life as if the world were on fire and maybe no one except him had access to water.

His wife once put his excessive energy and force this way: "Lyndon behaves as if there were no tomorrow coming and he had to do everything today."

The story is true that his father used to wake him as a boy by shaking one leg and declaring: "Get out of bed: every boy in town is already 15 minutes ahead of you." Time was to him, after that, always too precious to waste.

SENSE OF URGENCY

There was a sense of urgency about his father, Samuel Ealy Johnson. His mother, Rebekah Baines Johnson, was a quiet lady of grace and refinement, unusually beautiful until her death in her seventies.

She shaped her son's greatest gifts, his character and his feeling for people. She had spent most of her life as the wife of a rancher in the lonely hill country of Texas reading, and she read philosophy to her son.

He took it in like a blotter, as he has all the experiences of his life, for they have made him what he is today.

CREATURE COMFORTS

President Johnson is a man who relishes the creature comforts, the fine clothes, the happiness which material things might bring to his wife and daughters, the fine cattle which graze on his ranch, the dog which he loves and loves him, the bath which has been drawn before he gets into it.

All of these things have a meaning to him, because he does not want to travel through life second class, and he wants no fellow man to do it either.

Anyone who knows Johnson well recognizes that there is a collision between two forces which drive him: urgency and kindness.

TASK AT HAND

He gives everything of himself to the task at hand, and when he realizes another isn't, his temper flares. He might shout in rage to a secretary who has not lived up to his expectations for perfection. But when she gets home that night, she will find flowers from him and an apology. Or there will be some other way of showing that he is sorry.

A completely busy man can frequently leave the wrong impression.

Only casual acquaintances, in the great speed of life, have ever failed to understand President Johnson.

Those who know him at all understand he never had a petty thought—or was willing to listen to one.

He is a man of mankind, as big himself as the Nation he must now govern.

ETERNAL LIGHT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURPHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we mourn, in our own way, the passing of President Kennedy, and it is not always easy to transmit our feelings. Some are gifted in expressing that which we may feel, and I offer here a poem written and composed by Mrs. Jessie M. Williams, of Chicago, Ill., on the day President Kennedy passed away:

ETERNAL LIGHT

Somewhere a candle flickers
  Somewhere a voice is hushed
Somewhere all hearts are saddened
  Somewhere a life was crushed

Somewhere the peace he fought for
  On land and on the sea
Somewhere he gave his all
  For his love of humanity

There's a mound upon a hillside
  An eternal light to never cease
A Nation bows in reverence
  For the man who fought for peace.

THE PASSING SCENE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I seldom use the privilege afforded Members of Congress to put printed matter into the RECORD.

Today I am asking consent because of the contents of William S. White's column entitled "The Passing Scene."

Out of the torrent of words, out of the flood of comments and observations on our new President Lyndon B. Johnson I find the attached appraisal one worthy of the attention of all Members of Congress and the whole peoples of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker I present for the RECORD "The Passing Scene" by William S. White:

THE PASSING SCENE: SWIFT DECISIONS AND FIRM LEADERSHIP

(By William S. White)

President Johnson, profoundly relieved and thankful that the country has so rallied in unity and strength from the shock of the assassination of his predecessor, now proposes to keep up the momentum of his administration on every front without pause or letup.

These recent urgent days have shown to the Nation the rapidity of decision and vigor of the new President in a crisis time. What these days have not yet shown is that these attributes are a part of Mr. Johnson's ordinary political life.

In all the circumstances, of course, he simply had to decide and to act firmly and quickly and more or less all at once all along the whole range of the enormous problems of an office thrown upon him without an instant's warning.

RACING AGAINST FEAR

He was racing against nothing less than national fear and potential national hysteria and chaos and an ominous tide of confused bitterness and counterbitterness.

He won the race. But his instantaneous series of unhesitating actions—necessarily taken at times by telephone and with almost dizzying speed as he pressed one button after another to give clipped directives and a sense of sad but rocklike Presidential calm to one momentarily shaken official after another—were unusual only in the tragic atmosphere that surrounded them.

Their speed and firmness were standard operating procedure for a man long known to his old colleagues in the Senate as tireless in action and fretful only when there was nothing much that needed to be done. Of these qualities of decision much more will be seen.

Mr. Johnson, in short, has always believed, in every office he has held, that the enemy of sound and creative public policy is any loss within its leaders of the great elan that comes when the initiative is maintained and fully used.

Doubly and triply he believes this to be true of the office of the Presidency, seeing it as the distilled and ultimate delegated power of the Nation itself—a power which must not be allowed to waste away or to become diffused into nothingness by absence of bold action at the top.

To him a moment lost is not only something to be deplored. It is a grave spoilage. For in his view history in the present world runs with that nation which does not sit down to rest after each task but finishes one only to reach with zest for another task to finish.

He will therefore never carefully divide his duties and programs into something labeled "domestic" and something labeled "foreign," giving a priority to the one or the other. To him a problem is a problem, and the problems and challenges of national leadership—whether across thousands of miles of ocean or simply up Pennsylvania Avenue on Capitol Hill—are all big and urgent.

He will be neither a domestic nor a foreign affairs President. He will only be President—a job he considers to be indivisible.

CAPACITY FOR PERSUASION

Even as he is pressing Congress on his domestic legislative program he will be pressing his purposes on the international scene with what is his greatest operating skill. This is a capacity for persuasion to his point of view—already long since known to Congress—which before many weeks will be about equally known to the world's leaders, some of whom he has already met and will meet yet again and again.

Most of all, he will never willingly lose his and the Nation's present momentum in behalf of a rest here and there.

He will not get from Congress this year all the legislation he wants, and perhaps not even next year. But he will get some of it; and he will always come back and back until at length he gets it all. And allied statesmen—and potential enemy chieftains, too—will find in him what the late President Kennedy also found in him:

A skilled, seemingly casual, negotiator needing no mass of papers and no briefcases. with an absolutely untroubled certainty as to where the real point in every discussion lies.

LAST SPEECH FOR PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the last public remarks by our late and beloved President Kennedy were made in Fort Worth, Tex., on that tragic day of his assassination. He spoke at a breakfast meeting of the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce in the Texas Hotel.

It was my privilege to be in attendance that morning. I had accompanied the President to Texas, and had been with him on his visits to San Antonio and Houston on November 21, the day before his life was snuffed out.

On the morning of November 22, in Fort Worth, President Kennedy was in wonderful spirits. His trip had been a huge success, the large crowds had given him a warm welcome. His usual good humor was very much in evidence.

President Kennedy spoke that morning of confidence, confidence in many things. He spoke of the stature of our defenses, of the wonderful new TFX fighter plane, of Fort Worth Congressman JIM WRIGHT, of the part Texas has played in the development of our Nation. I believe the full text of President Kennedy's remarks, the last he was to make in public, should be read and absorbed by all of us:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT BEFORE THE FORT WORTH CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, TEXAS HOTEL, FORT WORTH, TEX.

I know now why everyone in Texas, Fort Worth, is so thin, having gotten up and down about nine times. This is what you do every morning.

Mr. Buck, Mr. Vice President, Governor Connally, Senator Yarborough, Jim Wright, members of the congressional delegation, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Attorney General, ladies and gentlemen, 2 years ago, I introduced myself in Paris by saying that I was the man who had accompanied Mrs. Kennedy to Paris. I am getting somewhat that same sensation as I travel around Texas. Nobody wonders what Lyndon and I wear.

I am glad to be here in JIM WRIGHT's city. About 35 years ago, a Congressman from California who had just been elected received a letter from an irate constituent which said: "During the campaign you promised to have the Sierra Madre Mountains reforested. You have been in office 1 month and you haven't done so." Well, no one in Fort Worth has been that unreasonable, but in some ways he has had the Sierra Madre Mountains reforested and here in Fort Worth he has contributed to its growth.

He speaks for Forth Worth and he speaks for the country, and I don't know any city that is better represented in the Congress of the United States than Forth Worth.

And if there are any Democrats here this morning, I am sure you wouldn't hold that against him.

Three years ago last September I came here, with the Vice President, and spoke at Burke Burnett Park, and I called in that speech for a national security policy and a national security system which was second to none, a position which said not first but, if, when and how, but first. That city responded to that call as it has through its history. And we have been putting that pledge into practice ever since.

I want to say a word about that pledge here in Fort Worth, which understands national defense, and its importance to the security of the United States. During the days of the Indian War, this city was a fort. During the days of World War I, even before the United States got into the war, Royal Canadian Air Force pilots were training here. During the days of World War II, the great Liberator bombers, and which my brother flew with his copilot from this city, were produced here.

The first nonstop flight around the world took off and returned here, in a plane built in factories here. The first truly intercontinental bomber, the B-36, was produced here. The B-58, which is the finest weapons system in the world today, which has demonstrated most recently in flying from Tokyo to London, with an average speed of nearly 1,000 miles per hour, is a Fort Worth product.

The Iroquois helicopter from Fort Worth is a mainstay in our fight against the guerrillas in South Vietnam. The transportation of crews between our missile sites is done in planes produced here in Fort Worth. So wherever the confrontation may occur, and in the last 3 years it has occurred on at least three occasions, in Laos, Berlin, and Cuba, and it will again—wherever it occurs, the products of Fort Worth and the men of Fort Worth provide us with a sense of security.

And in the not too distant future a new Fort Worth product, and I am glad that there was a table separating Mr. Hicks and myself—a new Fort Worth product, the TFX. Tactical fighter experimental—nobody knows what those words mean, but that is what they mean, tactical fighter experimental—will serve the forces of freedom and will be the No. 1 airplane in the world today.

There has been a good deal of discussion of the long and hard fought competition to win the TFX contract, but very little discussion about what this plane will do. It will be the first operational aircraft ever produced that can literally spread its wings through the air. It will thus give us a single plane capable of carrying out missions of speed as well as distance, able to fly very far in one form or very fast in another. It can take off from rugged, short airstrips, enormously increasing the Air Force's ability to participate in limited wars. The same basic plane will serve the Navy's carriers, saving the taxpayers at least $1 billion in costs if they built separate planes for the Navy and the Air Force.

The Government of Australia, by purchasing $125 million of TFX planes before they are even off the drawing boards, has already testified to the merit of this plane, and at the same time it is confident in the ability of Fort Worth to meet its schedule. In all these ways, the success of our national defense depends upon this city in the Western United States, 10,000 miles from Vietnam, 5,000 or 6,000 miles from Berlin, thousands of miles from trouble spots in Latin America and Africa or the Middle East. And yet Fort Worth and what it does and what it produces participates in all these historic events. Texas, as a whole, and Fort Worth bear particular responsibility for this national defense effort, for military procurement in this State totals nearly $1¼ billion, fifth highest among all the States of the Union. There are more military personnel on active duty in this State than any in the Nation, save one—and it is not Massachusetts—any in the Nation save one, with a combined military-civilian defense payroll of well over a billion dollars. I don't recite these for my partisan purpose. They are the result of American determination to be second to none, and as a result of the effort which this country has made in the last 3 years we are second to none.

In the past 3 years we have increased the defense budget of the United States by over 20 percent; increased the program of acquisition for Polaris submarines from 24 to 41; increased our Minuteman missile purchase program by more than 75 percent; doubled the number of strategic bombers and missiles on alert; doubled the number of nuclear weapons available in the strategic alert forces; increased the tactical nuclear forces deployed in Western Europe by over 60 percent; added 5 combat-ready divisions to the Army of the United States, and 5 tactical fighter wings to the Air Force of the United States; increased our strategic airlift capability by 75 percent; and increased our special counterinsurgency forces which are engaged now in South Vietnam by 600 percent. I hope those who want a stronger America and place it on some signs will also place those figures next to it.

This is not an easy effort. This requires sacrifice by the people of the United States. But this is a very dangerous and uncertain world. As I said earlier, on three occasions in the last 3 years the United States has had a direct confrontation. No one can say when it will come again. No one expects that our life will be easy, certainly not in this decade and perhaps not in this century. But we should realize what a burden and responsibility the people of the United States have borne for so many years. Here a country which lived in isolation, divided and protected by the Atlantic and the Pacific, uninterested in the struggles of the world around it, here in the short space of 18 years after the Second World War, we put ourselves, by our own will and by necessity, into defense of alliances with countries all around the globe. Without the United States, South Vietnam would collapse overnight. Without the United States, the SEATO alliance would collapse overnight. Without the United States the CENTO alliance would collapse overnight. Without the United States there would be no NATO. And gradually Europe would drift into neutralism and indifference. Without the efforts of the United States in the Alliance for Progress, the Communist advance onto the mainland of South America would long ago have taken place.

So this country, which desires only to be free, which desires to be secure, which desired to live at peace for 18 years under three different administrations has borne more than its share of the burden, has stood watch for more than its number of years. I don't think we are fatigued or tired. We would like to live as we once lived. But history will not permit it. The Communist balance of power is still strong. The balance of power is still on the side of freedom. We are still the keystone in the arch of freedom, and I think we will continue to do as we have done in our past, our duty, and the people of Texas will be in the lead.

So I am glad to come to this State which has played such a significant role in so many efforts in this century, and to say that here in Fort Worth you people will be playing a major role in the maintenance of the security of the United States for the next 10 years. I am confident, as I look to the future, that our chances for security, our chances for peace, are better than they have been in the past. And the reason is because we are stronger. And with that strength is a determination to not only maintain the peace, but also the vital interests of the United States. To that great cause, Texas and the United States are committed.

Thank you.

COTTON SUPPORT PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, November 29, 1963, the gentleman from Arkansas obtained a special order to address the House at the conclusion of the business on that day. There was, of course, no legislative business, the preceding day being Thanksgiving Day.

The gentleman took this opportunity to comment upon a speech which I delivered to the House on October 17, 1963, concerning the cotton support program.

Apparently, his purpose was to rebut various tables and figures which I included in the RECORD of October 17 in support of my contention that the American public pays an annual subsidy by virtue of the cotton support program, of $608,008,132.

It was my purpose in making this speech to disclose certain inequities and deficiencies in the cotton program, and point up the fact that the program, while resulting in millions of dollars to large Western growers of cotton, affords but minimum assistance to smaller farmers, notably small Southeastern farmers.

Reviewing briefly my remarks of that date, it was my contention—as it is today—that when the U.S. Government undertakes to purchase cotton from any eligible producer at a price of 32.47 cents per pound through the nonrecourse loan program of the Commodity Credit Corporation, this action creates an artificial price for all cotton, whether placed in loan or sold in private channels. The difference between the support price of 32.47 cents and the price that would obtain in a free market—without cotton supports—is, I contend, a subsidy. The term "subsidy" was defined at page 19795 of the RECORD as follows:

> Subsidy computed by multiplying rate of 8½ cents per pound by number of bales produced in the allotment categories shown.

Everyone knows that the world price for 1 inch Middling cotton is 24 cents per pound. Consequently, the Government's program of supporting prices at 32.47 cents per pound creates a differential of 8½ cents per pound, or $42.50 per bale—for every pound of cotton grown on allotment acreage.

It is, therefore, a simple matter to determine the total amount of this subsidy for the year treated in my speech, 1961. You simply multiply total domestic production by 8½ cents per pound to derive the national subsidy of $608 million.

This was perfectly clear in my remarks of October 17. There followed an analysis of just who among the 928,761 cotton farmers of the United States shared this subsidy. I was startled by the figures—322 growers with 1,000 allotment acres or more shared subsidies totaling $36,590,761, averaging $113,656 per grower. This is compared with 652,387 small farmers, with allotment of 10 acres or less, who received a total of $40,787,449, or the incredibly small amount of $63 each—approximately $5 per month.

On the occasion of my address to the House, I included the names of farmers—insofar as could be obtained from the Department of Agriculture—having allotments of 1,000 acres or more, the effective allotment, measured acreage, and estimated yield for each such farm. Thereafter, I computed the production of each farmer, and based upon production, following the very simple formula, computed the amount of subsidy received by each farmer. In some instances this subsidy was as great as $2,232,737 for the J. G. Boswell interests in Arizona and California. The Kern County Land Co., under this formula, received the benefit of a subsidy of $2,026,992.50.

The subsidy is computed for each of the 322 farms, all appearing in the October 17 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Now Mr. Speaker, on last Friday in his remarks and by insertions consisting of several tables and some 23 letters, the gentleman from Arkansas quarrels with my use of the term "subsidy." Apparently, he would equate subsidy only to the payments made to producers who export cotton, or, possibly, to the amount of nonrecourse loans advanced on bales placed in Government storage.

Other gentlemen, during the course of this discussion on last Friday, took the same position—to wit, that it is inaccurate to term as a subsidy that increase in price of domestic cotton brought about by virtue of the cotton support system.

I am happy to join issue to this point. It seems to me that the entire Nation would do well to consider carefully our agricultural program, and the cotton program is a good point of departure. I believe the gentlemen who took issue with my remarks last week have performed a service by placing this vital issue before the House. The consuming public has been in the dark long enough. It is indeed time that sophistry and legerdemain be swept away, and that the public see this program for what it is.

Mr. Speaker, the price support system does create a subsidy. An inflated price, paid by the consumer, is as much a subsidy as a check drawn on the account of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

In Webster's Dictionary, the term "subsidize" is defined as follows: "To aid or promote, as a private enterprise, with public money."

Does not the public money available to every eligible grower in the form of nonrecourse loans from the Commodity Credit Corporation, which undertakes to pay 32.47 cents per pound for cotton regardless of world conditions and market factors, aid and promote the private production of cotton? Does not the fact that an instrumentality of the Government is bound by law to pay 32.47 cents per pound to any eligible grower, set the price of cotton moving in private channels? Can anyone believe that a producer would sell at 24 cents—the world price—when he can dispose of his cotton to the Government for 32.47 cents? Can anyone believe that a buyer would pay 8½ cents per pound more than the world price if he could find a grower who would sell for less? Under the present cotton support program, the eligible producer has a guaranteed customer—the Government—at a guaranteed price. To the extent that this guaranteed price exceeds the price he could obtain without any such guarantee, every cotton farmer is subsidized. Today the guaranteed price exceeds the world price by 8½ cents per pound. Accordingly, the farmer is subsidized to the extent of 8½ cents per pound for every pound of cotton grown.

And, because the differential is 8½ cents per pound, every cotton farmer receives a subsidy calculated by multiplying 8½ cents by each pound he produces. Hence, the California interests which produced 52,535 bales in 1961 received a subsidy of $2,232,737.

To say that the nonrecourse loan program is nothing more than a mechanism to provide for orderly marketing processes is to avoid reality. To say that the only subsidy involved in the cotton program is payment under the export program is to overlook the facts. To say that 32.47-cent cotton—guaranteed by the Government in the face of a 24-cent world price—enables the farmer only to hold onto cotton until the market reaches an encouraging point, is to deny what any realist should freely admit.

Mr. Speaker, there is a subsidy—paid by the consumer, on every pound of cotton grown in the United States. That subsidy will continue for so long as there exists a differential—at 8½ cents per pound, or $42.50 per bale—between the Government's guaranteed price and the world market's competitive price.

If gentlemen deny that a subsidy exists, let them explain away these facts. If gentlemen quarrel with my disclosures, let them attempt to show to the contrary. On October 17, I stated to this body that the cotton subsidy costs the American public over $608 million in 1961, and that this subsidy aids, in the main, large western growers. Today, on December 3, 1963, I reiterate that statement. I will be happy for any Member to show wherein I am wrong.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELTNER. Yes. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. I appreciate your according us an opportunity to be here this evening and discuss this matter. I am sorry the gentleman was not present at the time the special order was accorded me last Friday. I just want to say to the gentleman that you had brought out in the RECORD previously that there were a number of farmers, the so-called large farmers, who grow more than 1,000 acres of cotton, and that that total, according to the record from the Department of Agriculture, is 286 across the whole country. That is the total. But out of that 286 no mention has been made of the fact that there were 2,691 tenants and sharecroppers who were working on those 286 farms. Here, for example, in your remarks earlier you stated that John F. Twist at the Twist plantation in Crittenden County, Ark., received a subsidy in the amount of $71,187.50. What I did is, I took that $71,187.50 and divided it by the total number of bales of cotton, as your statement revealed, which was produced by the Twist plantation, numbering 1,675, and that gave me the sum of $42.50, as you have just stated; $42.50 subsidy was paid to J. F. Twist plantation on each bale of cotton that was grown on his allotment.

Now, I have a letter from John F. Twist, who is the operator of this Twist interest at Twist plantation, and among other things he says this:

> Several observations of interest can be made from these facts. First, that Mr. WELTNER submits these production figures obtained from the Department of Agriculture but omits the information also of record in the Department of Agriculture that the J. F. Twist acreage allotment is shared by eight additional farmers.

It was not just J. F. Twist, a big farmer, but is divided up into eight small operations. In many instances that does exist throughout those I have had occasion to go into and check. Now I will continue reading.

> Eight additional farmers renting from the plantation and operating separately in every regard except for paying rentals. These 8-family operations produced 1,409 bales of the 1,856 bales produced in 1961.

The next clear fact is that 1,825 bales of the total production of 1,856 bales was sold to domestic mills.

Now, out of the total production on that plantation of 1,856 bales, 1,409 bales were sold to domestic mills at the regular price of 32.47 cents for Middling Inch cotton on which there is no subsidy paid whatever.

The gentleman does bring out the point today that the difference between those two figures of 1,856 and 1,409—some of those did go into the Commodity Credit Corporation loan.

Mr. WELTNER. I did not bring out that point. I maintained that because the Government guarantees prices on every pound of cotton produced by an eligible grower at 32.47 cents, there is a subsidy on every pound of cotton grown to the extent that that price differs from the world market price. And as the gentleman from Arkansas knows, as he stated a moment ago, by dividing the number of bales sold by the Twist plantation into the amount of the subsidy, it came out, I believe, in the words of the gentleman from Arkansas, that "there was a subsidy of $42.50 per bale."

Mr. GATHINGS. I did not say that there was a subsidy of $42.50 a bale. I used the gentleman's figures and said that he had arrived at the figure $42.50, to show that that was the way the gentleman had arrived at the total; that is, that every one of these bales of cotton had gone on board a ship and had been shipped for export. That is the amount that was paid when the cotton was put on board ship for export. And the biggest part of this cotton which we are now referring to was sold to domestic mills on which the full price was paid by the domestic mill. The reason for the legislation that we had before us today is to correct that situation so that we do not charge our domestic mills 32.47 cents a pound for Middling Inch cotton when the mills in Barcelona, Spain, buy that same cotton for 24 cents.

Mr. WELTNER. If the gentleman will yield to me, does the gentleman contend that if the Government did not support—through the nonrecourse loan system—cotton at 32.47 cents a pound it would remain at 32.47 cents a pound in private channels?

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman has alleged that many of my constituents had obtained a subsidy, and he laid out in his presentation the amounts in thousands upon thousands of dollars of subsidy that was paid to these people. The gentleman cannot show that because the information I have put in the RECORD disputes the gentleman's figures.

Mr. WELTNER. I am asking the gentleman, does he maintain that the price of Middling cotton grown in this country would remain at 32.47 cents per pound were there no CCC standing ready, willing, and under legal obligation to pay 32.47 cents per pound for every pound of cotton produced on allotment acres?

Mr. GATHINGS. That does not make them lose any money on the cotton if the bales of cotton are sold to domestic mills for 32.47 cents.

Mr. WELTNER. I submit that the gentleman has not answered my question. May I phrase it another way? What would be the price of cotton per pound——

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman has not answered my question. Why is it that he has alleged that so many of my constituents in the State of Arkansas have drawn subsidies when they have not done so?

Mr. WELTNER. I have merely stated, I submit, what a subsidy is. If the gentleman will refer to page 19795 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the occasion of my address of October 17 he will see underneath the table this note:

> "Subsidy" computed by multiplying rate of 8½ cents per pound by number of bales produced in the allotment categories shown.

That is exactly what I contend a subsidy is. It is a subsidy paid, not by a check written by the Commodity Credit Corporation, not the export subsidy for goods shipped overseas, but paid by the public, because the public has to pay 8½ cents more for that cotton than they would if there were no Commodity Credit Corporation supporting the price at 32.47 cents per pound. That is my sole contention as to subsidy. I am happy that the gentleman has quarreled with me, because it seems to me that this point should be made crystal clear. I contend there is a subsidy for every pound of cotton grown in this country so long as the Government is willing to buy that cotton at a price greater than it would bring were there no support program.

Mr. GATHINGS. If the gentleman will yield further, if 10 million bales of cotton is produced in this country and you sold 10 million bales to the domestic mills for 32.47 cents per pound, would there be any subsidy at all involved?

Mr. WELTNER. There would be so long as——

Mr. GATHINGS. Who would be paying any subsidy if the mills bought that cotton at that price?

Mr. WELTNER. There would be a subsidy so long as the price that every farmer can get for his cotton through the Commodity Credit Corporation exceeds the market price of the cotton, and that difference is 8½ cents a pound or $42.50 per bale.

Mr. GATHINGS. The Commodity Credit Corporation is not involved in that situation at all.

In addition, the gentleman brought out various other farmers from my State and alleged that they had obtained such a subsidy, as the gentleman says, of 8½ cents a pound which is $42.50 a bale, as though it had gone into export channels, while some two out of every three bales produced in this country go to the domestic mills only.

Mr. WELTNER. I am not quarreling with that at all. When I defined subsidy in my speech as 8½ cents per pound, because of the support of the Government of the price at 8½ cents per pound higher than the world price, it is quite simple to figure. Nowhere did I state that all of this cotton went into the warehouse, nor did I state that all of the cotton received the export subsidy. I defined subsidy as the differential of 8½ cents per pound, which, of course, is the differential in the support price and the world price.

I think it is well that the gentleman raises the issue as to whether this is a subsidy.

Mr. GATHINGS. I do raise that issue. The gentleman says that W. M. Smith & Son of Cross County, Ark., received a subsidy of $58,310 on 1,372 acres of cotton.

Mr. WELTNER. That is figured at $42.50 per bale because of the Government's price-support program.

Mr. GATHINGS. You have alleged and you have explained your attitude with respect to it, but you have alleged that they had received that money. Well, the letter that they send in here disputes that fact. They set out here that in addition to the operation that they themselves are engaged in there are many tenants listed here. Arch Whalley has a 40-acre allotment; Levell Hinton, 35; Dorsey Parker, 25; J. C. Parker, 25; Travis Barnes, 15; Noland Stafford, 25; and many, many tenants are involved there in that operation.

They go on and state just exactly how many bales of cotton went into domestic channels.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me on this occasion.

Mr. WELTNER. I thank the gentleman. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELTNER. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I did not want to inject myself into this discussion because I know there are other people who are more qualified than I to discuss these problems about price support which I have, during my years in Congress, supported as a means of giving the farmer a price for his production which would justify him in the cost of the production of that commodity. I do know that there are a great many misunderstandings and it is difficult for anyone to know the intricacies about this whole program.

The gentleman has made his position very clear. Of course, I think the record does not yet disclose that you do not distinguish the difference between the fact that the subsidy is always a condition we have recognized as the payment for something that is not earned.

The domestic market for cotton is such that there is no subsidy involved. In the world market there is, depending on how you look at the whole thing. But that was not the question I wanted to raise. I did want to get that in the record, however.

I do not think the gentleman intended to reflect on any individual or any farmer, certainly not one of our State institutions, but he included a table which stated the State of Arkansas from the production of cotton at the Arkansas State Penitentiary received a subsidy of $70,890. Of course, the State penitentiary is an institution of the State of Arkansas. I am advised by that institution that they had a cotton crop in 1961, to which the gentleman referred. There were 2,517 bales involved, and their cotton crop was auctioned off in the field to the highest bidder. The cotton price was 105 points over the loan. That is, the Commodity Credit guaranteed a support price, as I understand it, but nevertheless it was more than the loan. The highest bidder was James H. Frost & Co., Pine Bluff, Ark., for a private institution. The entire crop of cotton was auctioned off in the usual traditional American way, and they got a price for it which was paid by the highest bidder. I do not believe the implication that the State penitentiary received a subsidy from the Federal Government is quite correct.

Mr. WELTNER. They received 8.5 cents per pound subsidy for their cotton.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman defines that on the world market price which is only 5 million of the total production of the cotton crop where 8 million of it goes into the domestic market.

Mr. WELTNER. Is it the gentleman's opinion, were there no price support in this country, that cotton would maintain that price?

Mr. HARRIS. I do not think it would. I remember when the cotton price at a certain given time of that year was 20 cents, but the farmers because of the economic conditions sold a large part of that cotton the same year, 1920, at less than 5 cents. So the gentleman's theory of economics, if he is proposing any theory, does not bear out the economic relationship of the farmer and what the Government has tried to do to maintain stability in prices like we have in our commerce and industry. That is controlled, as the gentleman knows, by production and demand. If the demand goes up, the production goes up.

Mr. WELTNER. That is the point I am making. In the case of cotton there is a guaranteed demand at 32.47 cents, notwithstanding world conditions, notwithstanding anything else. Every producer can take his cotton and receive 32.47 cents.

If the gentleman agrees with me that that price would not obtain without a price support system, he must agree that there is a subsidy from a price support that differs from the world price.

Mr. HARRIS. Does the gentleman contend that the minimum wage would be $1.25 if the Congress of the United States did not provide a minimum wage of $1.25?

Mr. WELTNER. No, I do not contend that.

Mr. HARRIS. Are you going to say that the minimum wage of wage earners is a subsidy?

Mr. WELTNER. What I am saying is that wages are maintained by the existence of the Fair Labor Standards Act which requires payment at a certain level.

Mr. HARRIS. So are the agricultural products of the country which come under the price support program which is maintained.

Mr. WELTNER. That is correct. I thank both gentlemen for joining in this debate.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELTNER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Under the gentleman's interpretation of subsidy, I would assume that he would say to the extent that the tariff protects the manufacturer of farm implements or other products, for example, to the extent that he is protected and is able to sell his product for a higher price, he would call this protection a subsidy.

Mr. WELTNER. I would call it a subsidy paid by the consumer who is required to pay a higher price because of the tariff law, just as he is required to pay a higher price because of the cotton support program.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman would say that the payment of 8.5 cents a pound on American cotton that is exported is a subsidy paid by the Government, and the support price on cotton that is not exported is paid by the consumer. Is that the gentleman's philosophy?

Mr. WELTNER. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman goes into that field, then subsidy covers the whole earth like a blanket—all segments of our economy, industry, agriculture, labor, and so forth.

Mr. WELTNER. I agree with the statement of the gentleman from Texas. I think it is well while we are considering a revision of our cotton program to examine this. I did not make a speech on October 17 to call for an end to all subsidies. I made a speech to show the direction in which this increased cost paid by the consumer is going. I made this speech to show that the small southeastern farmer has a very small part of this $680 million amount that is paid by the consumer.

Mr. MAHON. Would the gentleman agree with this, that as a result of the farm program initiated under Republican and Democratic administrations agriculture has been given a stability and a base which has enabled the farmer to produce with assurance, and under these circumstances and in this atmosphere the American farmer has been able to provide food and fiber at the most phenomenally low rate, relatively speaking, of any place in the world? As to the so-called subsidy, while paid by the consumer, as the gentleman says, the subsidy of maladjustment and other factors might very well make the consumer pay more than if there were not a so-called subsidy as defined by the gentleman.

Mr. WELTNER. I certainly would not contend we should completely eliminate the price-support system. I did not treat it that way in my speech on October 17, and I do not do so today. It seems to me that there is a very sound proposal before the Congress in the Talmadge bill. This involves price supports. No one will deny that. It involves a higher support price than 32.47 cents for the smallest producers, and it involves a much lower support for larger producers, whose need, if any, is far less than the small grower. At the same time, the Talmadge plan would end two-price cotton, and set cotton on the road back to free enterprise.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BECKER (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), from December 2 through December 7, 1963, on account of illness (an operation).

Mr. PEPPER, for Tuesday, December 3, 1963, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. WELTNER, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. STAEBLER, on Tuesday next, for 1 hour.

Mr. FRASER (at the request of Mr. STAEBLER) for 1 hour, on Wednesday next.

Mr. BOW (at the request of Mr. TUPPER), for 1 hour, on Friday, December 6, and for 1 hour on Monday, December 9, and in each case to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. JONES of Missouri the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include statistics and a table.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MORSE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. AYRES.

Mr. TAFT in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 4, 1963, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1405. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended by Public Law 87–885; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1406. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended by Public Law 87–885; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1407. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the proposed move of the Veterans' Administration regional office from Dallas to Waco, Tex.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1096. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in the designation and administration of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 941). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8190. A bill to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 949). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1838. An act for the relief of

Hannah Robbins; with amendment (Rept. No. 942). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1182. A bill for the relief of Willy Sapuschnin; with amendment (Rept. No. 943). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1355. A bill for the relief of Stanislawa Ouellette; with amendment (Rept. No. 944). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4085. A bill for the relief of Tibor Horcsik; with amendment (Rept. No. 945). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4284. A bill for the relief of Chrysanthos Kyriakou; with amendment (Rept. No. 946). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5982. A bill for the relief of Peter Palermo; with amendment (Rept. No. 947). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6313. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Kuryj; with amendment (Rept. No. 948). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6591. A bill for the relief of Constantine Theothoropoulos; without amendment (Rept. No. 950). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7533. A bill for the relief of Demetrios Dousopoulos; without amendment (Rept. No. 951). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 212. An act for the relief of Yoo Sei Chun; without amendment (Rept. No. 952). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 697. An act for the relief of Misako Moriya; without amendment (Rept. No. 953). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 966. An act for the relief of Yukio Iseri; without amendment (Rept. No. 954). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1096. An act for the relief of Mrs. Susanna Grün (Susanne Roth); with amendment (Rept. No. 955). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1097. An act for the relief of Despina J. Sanios; without amendment (Rept. No. 956). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1272. An act for the relief of Viktor Jaanimets; without amendment (Rept. No. 957). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1479. An act for the relief of Dr. Demetrios Flessas and Dr. Eugenia Flessas; without amendment (Rept. No. 958). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1516. An act for the relief of Ana Murgelj; without amendment (Rept. No. 959). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1570. An act for the relief of Dulcie Ann Steinhardt Sherlock; without amendment (Rept. No. 960). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 57. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 961). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 9320. A bill relating to the dutiable status of certain articles, including articles containing foreign materials, which come into the United States from its insular possessions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 9321. A bill to insure certain minimum prices to dairy farmers for milk sold to Federal installations located in States in which minimum prices for milk are established pursuant to State authority and not pursuant to a Federal milk marketing order; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 9322. A bill to permit coverage under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 and the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority heretofore retired or hereafter retiring under the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H.R. 9323. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.R. 9324. A bill to reorganize the Capitol Police force in order to increase its efficiency in the performance of its duties; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 9325. A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 9326. A bill to license and regulate private employment agencies in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 9327. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act to require that firearms shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce to individuals within the United States must be delivered through local law enforcement officials; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 9328. A bill to repeal and amend certain statutes fixing or prohibiting the collection of fees for certain services under the navigation laws; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 9329. A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 9330. A bill to permit the State of Michigan to obtain social security coverage, under its State agreement entered into pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act, for State and local policemen and firemen (except those in Wayne County); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9331. A bill to permit the State of Michigan to obtain social security coverage, under its State agreement entered into pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act, for policemen and firemen in Kent and Ottawa Counties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 9332. A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 9333. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize loans for waste disposal systems and other facilities providing community services, and for additional financial aid; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 9334. A bill to amend the act of May 21, 1928, relating to standards of containers for fruits and vegetables, to permit the use of additional standard containers; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 9335. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Sarpy County, Nebr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 9336. A bill to maintain the income of cotton producers, to permit cotton producers to grow and market cotton on a free enterprise basis, to protect the welfare of consumers and of those engaged in the manufacture of cotton textiles, to encourage the exportation of cotton, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 9337. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide that the penalties for homicide prescribed in such title shall apply to any person who kills the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, or the head of any executive department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 9338. A bill to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9339. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 9340. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it a Federal crime to kill the President or Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 9341. A bill to provide that the Commission on the Disposition of Alcatraz Island shall have 6 months after its formation in which to make its report to Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.J. Res. 825. Joint resolution to establish a commission to be known as the John F. Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.J. Res. 826. Joint resolution to establish a commission to be known as the John F. Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.J. Res. 827. Joint resolution providing for the erection of a memorial statue to the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard, the father of American rocketry; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.J. Res. 828. Joint resolution to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.J. Res. 829. Joint resolution to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.J. Res. 830. Joint resolution to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.J. Res. 831. Joint resolution to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.J. Res. 832. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.J. Res. 833. Joint resolution to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WATSON:

H. Con. Res. 242. Concurrent resolution fixing the date for the sine die adjournment of the first session of the 88th Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. Con. Res. 243. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document in a form suitable for framing of the inaugural address of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 9342. A bill for the relief of Marie Tippit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 9343. A bill for the relief of Juliana Antonana De Pares; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

473. By Mr. HANNA: Petition of the Wilderness Committee of Orange County; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

474. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Grant B. Youngs, secretary Plumas Unified School District, Quincy, Calif., relative to Federal in-lieu-of-taxes payments to States for apportionment to counties within the Federal Forest Reserve; to the Committee on Agriculture.

475. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to initiate legislation causing the late, great President John Fitzgerald Kennedy to be forthwith awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

476. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., proposing that the U.S. House of Representatives resolve itself into a special "strange interlude" session for Members to confess openly the number of times they heard U.S. citizens stating words to the effect that they would like to see the late President dead, etc.; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1963

(Legislative day of Friday, November 29, 1963)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of all men: Blind and deaf would we be should we bow in this Chamber at our altar of prayer without a sense of solemn gratitude and gladness that while the Nation's losses are grievous, Thou hast given to us so much.

We come in remembrance of lives greatly lived, whose record is our heritage. Be with us in deepened gratitude as we think of those who strove for truth and, when they found it, spoke it; for those who could not see evil without crying out against it; for those who felt in their own hearts the pain of injustice done to others; and for those, no longer here, who condemned oppression, challenged tyranny, and fought for liberty.

In the midst of today's continuing struggle between the true and the false, between love and hate, grant by Thy grace to us whose courses are not yet finished, new fortitude and reinforcement for the times in which we live, until by patience, persistence, and by a daring that turns not back, we become sufficient for the tasks committed to our hands.

We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, November 27, and Friday, November 29, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING RECESS—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Under authority of the order of the Senate of November 29, 1963, the Secretary of the Senate reported that on November 29, 1963, he had received a message from the House of Representatives, which announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 2267. An act to amend Public Law 88-72 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3190. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, relating to devises and bequests by will;

H.R. 3191. An act to exempt life insurance companies from the act of February 4, 1913, regulating loaning of money on securities in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 7497. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia relating to annual statements, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 809. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 9291) to provide office space, supplies, equipment, and franking privileges for Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, to authorize appropriations for the payment of expenses incident to the death and burial of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, it was ordered that there be a morning hour, with statements limited to 3 minutes.

AUTHORIZATION FOR ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROSECUTION OF COMPREHENSIVE RIVER BASIN PLANS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, let me state that it is my understanding that under the agreement entered into in regard to House bill 8667, authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins, the time limitation is to go into effect at 1 o'clock this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS STOCKPILING PROGRAM

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the strategic and critical materials stockpiling program, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON DEFENSE PROCUREMENT FROM SMALL AND OTHER BUSINESS FIRMS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations, and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on defense procurement from small and other business firms, for the quarter ended September 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Executive Secretary, Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the calendar year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a financial report of the United Nations, as of June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

NOBEL PEACE PRIZE AWARD NOTICE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a Nobel peace prize award notice, issued by the Nobel Committee of the Norwegian Parliament, Oslo, Norway (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON FINAL SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS OF CERTAIN INDIANS

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the final settlement of claims relating to 10 such claims (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO CONCESSIONS CONTRACTS IN HOT SPRINGS NATIONAL PARK

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed amendment to the concession contract with the Majestic Hotel Co., to obtain hot waters from Hot Springs National Park (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed amendment to the concession contract with the National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Inc., under which the concessioner is authorized to obtain hot waters from Hot Springs National Park (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate sundry letters and telegrams in the nature of petitions, signed by sundry citizens of the United States, relative to the death of the late President John F. Kennedy, which were ordered to lie on the table.

IMPROPER EMPLOYMENT OF ARMED FORCES—RESOLUTION OF 1963 NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE MILITARY ORDER OF THE WORLD WARS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and referred to the appropriate committee, a resolution approved at the 1963 national convention of the Military Order of the World Wars. The resolution is entitled "Improper Employment of Armed Forces," and expresses the position of the Military Order of the World Wars against the Gesell report and its implementing order.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPROPER EMPLOYMENT OF ARMED FORCES

(Resolution by the Military Order of the World Wars, 1963 National Convention)

Whereas the Gesell Committee, appointed by the President to investigate the equality of treatment and opportunity for Negro personnel of the armed services, and of their dependents within the United States, has made certain recommendations including:

(a) Steps should be taken to insure that a sense of responsibility for problems of off base discrimination replaces the prevalent notion that matters outside the gate are of no concern to the base commander of military installations.

(b) The commander should develop a plan under which military personnel of all races would be permitted to patronize only those facilities which receive his express approval.

(c) Numerous other recommendations that would involve the intrusion of our military commanders in the economic, social, and political mores of the civilian community; and

Whereas the Secretary of Defense has implemented certain recommendations of the Gesell report and held certain recommendations in abeyance.

Whereas the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee has introduced legislation designed to nullify directives already issued by the Secretary of Defense, and to prevent others, which would implement other recommendations of the Gesell report: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the companions of the Military Order of the World Wars, in annual convention at San Antonio, Tex., on October 11, 1963, That we are unalterably opposed to this use of the Armed Forces for a purpose beyond its traditional and natural function of national security; and be it further

Resolved, That this dilution of the effort and work of the military by its use to apply social, economic or political pressure by sanctions or restrictions is a totally unwarranted usurpation of power under our Constitution and savors of the police state, and we urge the Secretary of Defense to rescind his implementing directives of the Gesell report; and be it further

Resolved, That should the Secretary of Defense fail to rescind his directives on a voluntary basis, then this order urges the passage of the legislation proposed by the House of Representatives, designed to restore and maintain the proper function of our military services to prevent further usurpations and to restore the traditional checks and balances in our Government.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2275. A bill to revise the procedures established by the Hawaii Statehood Act, Public Law 86-3, for the conveyance of certain lands to the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 675).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of nominations was submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Walter F. Edmundson, and sundry other candidates for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2351. A bill for the relief of Bethesda Lutheran Hospital, St. Paul, Minn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 2352. A bill relating to sick leave benefits for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police Force of the District of Columbia, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police Force, and the White House Police Force; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 2353. A bill for the relief of Gabriella Quattrochi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

S. 2354. A bill for the relief of David Lee Bogue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:

S. 2355. A bill to provide that standard silver dollars shall hereafter bear on one side a likeness of our late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. CANNON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. DOMINICK):

S. 2356. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from making any charge for certain licenses and permits; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONRONEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. METCALF):

S.J. Res. 135. Joint resolution to require that there appear on standard silver dollars hereafter minted a likeness of the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S.J. Res. 136. Joint resolution to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO PRINT FOR USE OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS CERTAIN INFORMATION ON WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. McNAMARA submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 67); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works not to exceed two thousand additional copies of the hearings on Water Pollution Control, S. 649, and related bills, by the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution during the current session of Congress.

MINTING OF SILVER DOLLARS BEARING THE LIKENESS OF THE LATE PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, during the past week, Senators have felt it appropriate to propose legislation designed to memorialize our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. These proposals are entirely fitting and express a genuine desire to pay appropriate tribute to a great man and to fix for posterity a lasting tribute to an outstanding leader.

I have joined as a cosponsor of some of this legislation including the bill sponsored by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to create a Memorial Commission. My thought in this connection is that some central control should be established to assure that the memorials established be comparable to the dignity which John Kennedy brought to the Office of the President.

Today I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill which provides that standard silver dollars hereafter bear a likeness on one side of our late President. In my judgment, this could effectively serve as a constant reminder to the citizens of this Nation that President Kennedy stood for fiscal responsibility and proposed programs which would have improved the national economy and provided American taxpayers relief from oppressive tax burdens. I hope that the committee will actively consider and favorably report this bill and that the Memorial Commission, if it is eventually established, will also find it to be a suitable method of honoring President Kennedy.

Mr. President, I ask that this bill may lie on the desk throughout the remainder of this week for the addition of those who may wish to cosponsor it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Nevada.

The bill (S. 2355) to provide that standard silver dollars shall hereafter bear on one side a likeness of our late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, introduced by Mr. CANNON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROHIBITION OF IMPOSITION OF CERTAIN FEES AND CHARGES BY THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from imposing fees and charges for obtaining permits or licenses for the construction, installation, or operation of any radio station required by Federal law or regulation of any Government agency, unless such charge or fee is specifically authorized by Federal law other than title V of the Independent Offices Appropriations Act of 1952.

Legislation of this nature is needed because of action recently taken by the FCC in docket No. 14507, which would impose on January 1, 1964, a schedule of fees for the filing of applications for most licenses issued by the Commission.

I do not quarrel with the Commission's general premise that certain recipients of licenses obtain special benefits beyond those which accrue to the general public and should therefore pay a reasonable charge for the special benefits received. However, all recipients of licenses do not fall into that category.

Many persons apply for radio licenses because they are required to do so by Federal law or regulations of another Federal agency. For example, owners and operators of aircraft, both private and commercial, are required by regulations of the Federal Aviation Agency to have two-way radios in their aircraft. The purpose of the FAA regulations is to promote safety.

Certain oceangoing vessels are required by the Communications Act of 1934 to have two-way radios.

Where the use of a radio is required by Federal law or another Federal agency in the interest of safety, I do not believe a fee should be imposed upon the applicant for a license. The achievement of a high degree of safety, such as through the use of a radio on civil aircraft, is of benefit not only to the individual applicant, but also to all other users of the airways and to all people on the ground under the airways and around the airports.

There is absolutely no justification for alleging that these licensees receive special benefits above those received by the general public. An imposition of a fee would be unjust and unsound.

This bill would prohibit the FCC from imposing a fee or charge for obtaining a radio license or permit only in those cases where radios are required by Federal law or regulation of another Federal agency.

To allow the Commission to impose fees in such cases would be unfair to the licensees and would be detrimental to the interests of safety, which other Federal agencies are endeavoring so earnestly to promote.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2356) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from making any charge for certain licenses and permits, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. DOMINICK), was received, read twice, by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title IV of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"PROHIBITION AGAINST CERTAIN CHARGES

"SEC. 417. The Commission shall not make any charge for obtaining a permit or license for the construction, installation, or operation of any radio station which is required by Federal law or by regulation of any Government agency, unless such charge is specifically authorized by Federal law other than title V of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952."

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the bill which the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has just introduced is, in my opinion, an extremely important one. A situation now exists in which, in many cases, the Federal Communications Commission imposes fees for transmission, whereas the same transmitters have been required by other agencies of the Government, largely for purposes of safety.

It is incomprehensible to me that when one agency requires a transmitter to be incorporated in equipment, another agency should require that a fee be paid for what another Federal agency requires to be installed in the first place.

I hope that the bill introduced by the Senator from Oklahoma, of which I am happy to be a cosponsor, may be considered at an early date.

DESIGNATION OF THE NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER AS THE JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY MEMORIAL CENTER

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], a joint resolution to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, and authorizing an appropriation therefor, and I ask that the joint resolution be referred to the appropriate committee.

I ask that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD and I ask unanimous consent that it remain at the desk until Friday, December 6, for the addition of the names of those of my colleagues who may wish to join as cosponsors.

This joint resolution authorizes the redesignation of the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center and authorizes an appropriation of funds by the Congress, which in the aggregate will equal amounts given, bequeathed, or devised to the trustees of the Center from sources other than appropriated Federal funds.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the Record and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 136) to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, and authorizing an appropriation therefor, introduced by Mr. Fulbright (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, as a mark of respect and affection for President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, as a recognition of his abiding desire to promote and encourage the arts in America, and as a commemoration of his great services to the Nation and people of the United States, the National Cultural Center provided for by the Act of September 2, 1958, 72 Stat. 1698, as amended, shall be known hereafter as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center.

Sec. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, for payment to the trustees of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center for use in accordance with section 5 of the Act of September 2, 1958, 72 Stat. 1699, amounts which in the aggregate will equal amounts given, bequeathed, or devised to said trustees pursuant to said section. When so specified in the pertinent appropriation act, amounts appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall remain available without fiscal year limitation.

TAX RELIEF INCENTIVE TO INDUSTRY FOR POLLUTION CONTROL—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 336)

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment to H.R. 8363, the tax bill. The purpose of this amendment is to encourage the construction of industrial waste treatment works to control water and air pollution by permitting the deduction of all expenditures for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of such equipment in any one of 5 years after purchase. The amendment is cosponsored by Senators Bartlett, Bayh, Bible, Boggs, Brewster, Cannon, Dodd, Fong, Gruening, Hart, Humphrey, Inouye, Kuchel, Long of Missouri, Magnuson, McIntyre, Miller, Moss, Muskie, Nelson, Neuberger, Pell, Randolph, and Williams of New Jersey.

Mr. President, the Senate this year has passed two bills greatly strengthening the Nation's air and water pollution control laws. The attack on both these dangers must go forward. But, I learned as a Governor and again as head of the Federal agency administering these programs that solving problems of this sort requires not only a constructive program of governmental assistance but also the active cooperation of those in the local communities upon whose efforts real progress ultimately depends.

If we are to clean up our air and our water, a large part of the job must be done by private industry at the local level. But we cannot simply point the finger at private industry and say, "You are causing some of the pollution—do something about it." We must frankly recognize that the purchase and installation of equipment to control pollution is a big expense. And unlike many capital outlays that ultimately produce new profits, these costs basically serve the health and safety of the public. Therefore, there must be some public sharing with private industry of the economic impact of these expenditures.

Under existing Federal tax laws, expenditures for treatment works to control water and air pollution must be capitalized and the cost deducted as depreciation over the useful life of the machinery or equipment. This requirement fails to recognize that pollution control equipment, unlike most industrial plant and machinery, does not contribute to the revenue producing capacity of the business. And present tax law provides no incentive to industrial polluters to install needed treatment facilities.

The form of tax relief proposed today has been recommended by the 1960 National Conference on Water Pollution, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, the Federal Water Pollution Control Advisory Board. The official policy statement of the National Association of Manufacturers "urges provision for sufficient income tax deductions to offset the cost of such nonrevenue producing facilities within a 5-year period, if desired, rather than over the useful life of the facilities." Just recently my proposal was indorsed by the Manufacturing Chemists Association and earlier in the year by a representative of the National Canners Association.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point the text and an analysis of the amendment and that the amendment remain at the desk for the balance of the week in order that other Senators who wish to cosponsor it may do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment and analysis will be printed in the Record.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

At the proper place in title II of the bill insert the following new section:

"Sec. . Treatment Works To Control Water and Air Pollution.

"(a) Deduction of Expenditures.—Part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 (relating to itemized deductions for individuals and corporations) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'Sec. 183. Expenditures for Treatment Works To Control Water and Air Pollution.

"'(a) Treatment as Expenses.—

"'(1) In general.—A taxpayer may elect to treat expenditures (or any portion thereof) paid or incurred by him during the taxable year in connection with his trade or business for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of—

"'(A) any certified water pollution control treatment works (as defined in subsection (c)), and

"'(B) any certified air pollution control treatment works (as defined in subsection (d)) as expenses which are not chargeable to capital account. The expenditures so treated shall be allowed as a deduction.

"'(2) Deferral of year of deduction.—A taxpayer who during any taxable year has paid or incurred expenditures to which paragraph (1) applies may elect to treat such expenditures (or any portion thereof) as having been paid or incurred in any of the four taxable years following the taxable year in which such expenses are paid or incurred, to the extent such expenditures are not treated as having been paid or incurred in any prior taxable year.

"'(b) Elections.—

"'(1) Time.—The election provided by subsection (a)(1) shall be made not later than the time prescribed by law (including extensions thereof) for filing the return for the taxable year in which the expenditures are paid or incurred. The election provided by subsection (a)(2) shall be made not later than the time prescribed by law (including extensions thereof) for filing the return for the taxable year in which the expenditures (or portion thereof) are treated as having been paid or incurred.

"'(2) Manner; revocation.—The elections provided by subsections (a) (1) and (2)—

"'(A) shall be made in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe by regulations; and

"'(B) may not be revoked except with the consent of the Secretary or his delegate.

"'(3) Certificates required.—No election may be made under subsection (a) with respect to any expenditures unless the certificates required under subsection (c)(1) or (d)(1), as the case may be, have been issued with respect to the certified water pollution control treatment works or the certified air pollution control treatment works for which such expenditures were paid or incurred.

"'(c) Certified Water Pollution Control Treatment Works.—

"'(1) In general.—For purposes of this section, the term "certified water pollution control treatment works" means so much of any facility, land, building, machinery, or equipment, or any part thereof, used to control water pollution by removing, altering, or disposing of wastes from any type of manufacturing or mining process, including the necessary intercepting sewers, outfall sewers, pumping, power, and other equipment, and their appurtenances—

"'(A) the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of which is completed after December 31, 1963;

"'(B) which the State certifying authority has certified to the Federal certifying authority as having been constructed, erected, installed, or acquired in conformity with the State program or requirements for control of water pollution; and

"'(C) which the Federal certifying authority has certified to the Secretary or his delegate as beneficial to the control of water pollution and in furtherance of the general policy of the United States for cooperation with the States in the prevention and abatement of water pollution under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 466 et seq.). No person shall be required in order to obtain certification from the State certifying authority or the Federal certifying authority with respect to any expenditures to divulge trade secrets or secret processes and all information reported shall be confidential.

"'(2) State certifying authority.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term "State certifying authority" means the State water pollution control agency as defined in section 11(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended.

"'(3) Federal certifying authority.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term "Federal certifying authority" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"'(4) State.—For purposes of this subsection, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"'(d) Certified Air Pollution Control Treatment Works.—

"'(1) In general.—For purposes of this section, the term "certified air pollution control treatment works" means so much of any facility, land, building, machinery, or equipment, or any part thereof, used to control atmospheric pollution or contamination by removing, altering, or disposing of atmospheric pollutants and contaminants from any type of manufacturing or mining process—

"'(A) the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of which is completed after December 31, 1963;

"'(B) which the State certifying authority has certified to the Federal certifying authority as having been constructed, erected, installed, or acquired in conformity with the State program or requirements for control of atmospheric pollution or contamination; and

"'(C) which the Federal certifying authority has certified to the Secretary or his delegate beneficial to the control of atmospheric pollution or contamination and in furtherance of the general policy of the United States for cooperation with the States in the prevention and abatement of atmospheric pollution and contamination under the Act of July 14, 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1857 et seq.). No person shall be required in order to obtain certification from the State certifying authority or the Federal certifying authority with respect to any expenditures to divulge trade secrets or secret processes and all information reported shall be confidential.

"'(2) State certifying authority.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term "State certifying authority" means the State air pollution control agency as defined in section 6(a) of the Act of July 14, 1955 (42 U.S.C. 1857e).

"'(3) Federal certifying authority.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term "Federal certifying authority" means the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

"'(4) State.—For purposes of this subsection, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"'(e) Limitations.—

"'(1) Profit-making treatment works.—If it can reasonably be expected that the taxpayer will derive a profit from the operation of any certified water pollution control treatment works or certified air pollution control treatment works, through the recovery and profitable utilization of wastes, or otherwise, the expenditures with respect to such treatment works which would otherwise be taken into account for purposes of subsection (a) shall be reduced by the amount of such expenditures—

"'(A) which are attributable primarily to the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of any facility, land, building, machinery, or equipment, or any part thereof, used in such profit-making operation; and

"'(B) which would not have been paid or incurred but for such profit-making operation.

"'(2) Adjustment for prior depreciation deduction.—If—

"'(A) the taxpayer elects under subsection (a)(2) to treat any expenditures to which subsection (a)(1) applies as having been paid or incurred in any taxable year following the taxable year in which such expenditures are paid or incurred, and

"'(B) any deduction has been allowed under section 167 (relating to depreciation) with respect to the certified water pollution control treatment works or air pollution control treatment works for which such expenditures were paid or incurred,

the amount otherwise allowable as a deduction under subsection (a)(1) for the expenditures so treated shall be properly reduced in such manner and to such extent as the Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe by regulations.'

"(b) Clerical Amendment.—The table of sections for such part VI is amended by adding at the end thereof the following item:

"'Sec. 183. Expenditures for treatment works to control water and air pollution.'

"(c) Technical Amendment.—Section 263 (a)(1) (relating to disallowance of deductions for capital expenditures) is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'or' at the end of subparagraph (D);

"(2) by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (E) and inserting in lieu thereof ', or'; and

"(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"'(F) expenditures for certified water pollution control treatments works and certified air pollution control treatment works deductible under section 183.'

"(d) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1963."

The analysis presented by Mr. Ribicoff is as follows:

Analysis of Amendment To Encourage the Construction of Industrial Waste Treatment Works To Control Water and Air Pollution

This amendment affords income tax relief to individuals, corporations, etc., undertaking to construct industrial waste treatment works by permitting them to deduct the cost of these facilities as ordinary and necessary business expenses in computing their income tax and by allowing them to elect to take such deductions either in the year the expenditures were incurred or to defer them over a 5-year period. This permits the entire cost to be deducted in a single year, instead of being capitalized and depreciated over a period of years.

A new section is added to part VI of subchapter B of chapter I of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to itemized deductions for individuals and corporations. The new section, to be designated "section 183," permits a taxpayer to elect to treat as deductible expenditures (or any portion thereof) paid or incurred by him during the taxable year in connection with his trade or business for the construction, erection, installation or acquisition of any certified water or air pollution control treatment works.

The section further permits a taxpayer who has paid or incurred such expenses to elect to defer such deductions by treating these expenditures (or any portion thereof) as having been paid or incurred in any of the 4 years following the taxable year in which actually paid or incurred.

The section specifies when such election shall be made and in what manner it may be revoked.

Deductibility is conditioned on the construction of such facilities after December 31, 1962, and on the certification of State and Federal authorities that the facilities are in conformity with State and Federal pollution control laws.

The deduction is limited to such portion of the expenditures as is incurred in connection with the construction of treatment facilities from which the taxpayer derives no profit.

Mr. **DIRKSEN** submitted an amendment (No. 337), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 8363, supra, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. **FONG** submitted an amendment (No. 338), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 8363, supra, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

ESTABLISHMENT OF OREGON DUNES NATIONAL SEASHORE, OREGON—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 339)

Mr. **MORSE** submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1137) to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PROTOCOL AMENDING INTERIM CONVENTION ON CONSERVATION OF NORTH PACIFIC FUR SEALS—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, the President of the United States has transmitted to the Senate today Executive O, 88th Congress, 1st session, a certified copy of a protocol amending the interim convention on conservation of North Pacific fur seals, signed at Washington on February 9, 1957, which protocol was signed at Washington on October 8, 1963, on behalf of the Governments of Canada, Japan, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United States. I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the protocol, that the protocol and message from the President be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the Record.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of a protocol amending the interim convention on conservation of North Pacific fur seals, signed at Washington on February 9, 1957, which protocol was signed at Washington on October 8, 1963, on behalf of the Governments of Canada, Japan, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United States of America.

The provisions of the protocol were initially formulated by the North Pacific Fur Seal Conference held at Tokyo from February 18 through March 1, 1963.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the protocol.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

The White House, *November 29, 1963.*

PROTOCOL MODIFYING THE EXTENSION TO THE NETHERLANDS ANTILLES OF THE CONVENTION WITH THE KINGDOM OF THE NETHERLANDS FOR THE AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive P, 88th Congress, 1st session, being a protocol modifying and supplementing the extension to the Netherlands Antilles of the convention between the United States and the Kingdom of the Netherlands for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income and certain other taxes, which was transmitted to the Senate today by the President of the United States. I also ask unanimous consent that the protocol and message from the President be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the protocol, signed at The Hague on October 23, 1963, modifying and supplementing the extension to the Netherlands Antilles of the convention between the United States of America and the Kingdom of the Netherlands for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income and certain other taxes.

I transmit also for the information of the Senate the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the supplementary protocol.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

The White House, *November 29, 1963.*

SUPPLEMENTARY CONVENTION WITH SWEDEN RELATING TO THE AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there was transmitted to the Senate today by the President of the United States Executive Q, 88th Congress, 1st session, a supplementary convention between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Sweden relating to income and other taxes signed at Stockholm on October 22, 1963, modifying and supplementing the convention and accompanying protocol for the avoidance of double taxation and the establishment of rules of reciprocal administrative assistance in the case of income and other taxes, signed at Washington on March 23, 1939. As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the supplementary convention, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the supplementary convention between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Sweden relating to income and other taxes signed at Stockholm on October 22, 1963, modifying and supplementing the convention and accompanying protocol for the avoidance of double taxation and the establishment of rules of reciprocal administrative assistance in the case of income and other taxes, signed at Washington on March 23, 1939.

I transmit also for the information of the Senate the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the supplementary convention.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

The White House, *November 29, 1963.*

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930, TO ELIMINATE PAYMENT OF OVERTIME SERVICES OF CUSTOMS OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh] may be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2173) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and the Act of February 13, 1911, to eliminate those provisions which require payment to the United States for overtime services of customs officers and employees, at its next printing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, TO REDUCE INDIVIDUAL AND CORPORATE INCOME TAXES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AMENDMENT

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre] be included as a cosponsor of amendment No. 329, dealing with income tax credit for higher education costs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF CONSOLIDATED FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1961, RELATING TO LOANS TO CERTAIN FARMERS OR RANCHERS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of November 14, 1963, the names of Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Fong, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Moss, and Mr. Randolph were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2307) to amend the emergency loan authority of the Secretary of Agriculture under subtitle C of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize such loans in areas where credit is not otherwise available because of serious economic conditions for farmers or ranchers, introduced by Mr. Muskie on November 14, 1963.

NOTICE OF CANCELLATION OF CERTAIN HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have been requested by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], to announce that it has been necessary to cancel the foreclosure hearings scheduled by the subcommittee for December 4 and 5.

In March 1962 the subcommittee undertook a study of VA and FHA foreclosure trends and the housing agencies, as well as the General Accounting Office, were asked to submit reports on a large number of questions pertaining to this subject for further study by the subcommittee. It has been the hope of the subcommittee chairman that hearings could be held on the basis of these reports and the subcommittee study to determine whether legislation or further administrative action by the housing agencies was necessary in this area. Now that it has become necessary to cancel the hearings, the subcommittee chairman hopes to conclude the foreclosure study for the time being by publishing a committee print surrounding this entire subject. It is his further hope that the committee print will be available within the near future.

AMENDMENT OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936 TO ENCOURAGE THE SETTLEMENT OF JURISDICTIONAL DISPUTES IN THE MARITIME INDUSTRY — NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 2222

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, tomorrow morning, December 4, at 10 o'clock a subcommittee of the Commerce Committee will begin hearings on S. 2222. The bill contemplates an amendment of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 in order to encourage the settlement of jurisdictional disputes in the maritime industry.

The bill was introduced by me as a consequence of two work stoppages that occurred; the first, with reference to the ship *America* and, the second, with reference to the nuclear-powered ship *Savannah*. Both of these ships ply on the high seas. Both of them have been stopped from sailing because of jurisdictional disputes between two or more labor unions.

The bill which will be the subject of hearings by the subcommittee tomorrow, if approved, would provide as follows: There shall be no strike, lock-out, or interruption of work in connection with any dispute within the maritime industry which involves the interpretation or application of an unexpired collective bargaining agreement or agreements or working rules or conditions thereunder and which involves or affects two or more organizations of employees, or the representatives of such organizations, who have taken opposing positions in such dispute. Any such interunion dispute shall be settled by the procedures indicated in section 1004 or if not so settled then by the procedures specified in section 1005 thereof.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am not acquainted with the proposed legislation. What, specifically, is the purpose of the bill? Is it for the purpose of resolving the difference in jurisdictional strikes?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The sole purpose is to require a settlement by conciliation of disputes between two labor unions but which affect the shipping companies and, primarily, the public. It provides only that when the two unions cannot agree, and there exists a genuine interunion dispute, the ultimate remedy shall be compulsory arbitration.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. In the cases to which the Senator has referred, was there a dispute between the employees and the employer?

Mr. LAUSCHE. In the dispute in which the ship *America* was involved, the operator of the ship was completely innocent. The dispute was between two labor unions. One labor union demanded that the employer dismiss an engineer. The union to which the engineer belonged insisted that there could not be a dismissal under the facts.

It is rather interesting to note that on September 14 this ship was about to leave the port of New York, with 956 passengers on board. They were waiting to sail. The time for departure arrived and went by. Announcement had to be made to the 956 passengers that, because of a dispute between two unions, the ship could not sail. The 956 passengers, although completely embarked in their cabins, had to get off the ship.

My bill declares that when such a situation develops, in which two unions are engaged in an argument and are unable or unwilling to settle their dispute, the operator and the general public shall not be compelled to suffer, but that there must be compulsory arbitration between the two unions.

This is not the arbitration of a dispute between an employer and the union; it is arbitration of a dispute between two unions.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The hearings will begin at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. It is my understanding that the Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce, and the Maritime Commission are not yet prepared to express an opinion on the merits of the bill. It is my sincere hope that the U.S. Government, through the Department of Commerce, the Maritime Administration, and the Department of Labor, will speak up on this subject. My hope is that they will see the injustice of what is happening in work stoppages resulting from jurisdictional disputes between two or more unions and will therefore support the bill which if passed will provide a remedy for the wrong.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that, on November 29, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2267) to amend Public Law 88–72 to increase the authorizations for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 201 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MUNDT:

Statement delivered by him at the House of Representatives Ways and Means Committee hearings on the proposed medical care for the aged through social security.

RADIO AND TELEVISION COVERAGE

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I am very proud to note that our Maryland and District of Columbia radio and television stations—shocked and grieved, like the rest of America, by the assassination of President Kennedy on Friday, November 22—immediately rallied from the shock, though not from the grief, to keep every Marylander and District of Columbia resident constantly informed through the awful hours and days of sorrow. I recognize that all normal broadcasting was canceled, so that countless thousands in their homes and offices could be electronically transported to the scenes of the sad but impressive obsequies, and made aware of the fact that, despite the shock, our Government continues strong and uninterrupted. I recognize, too, that nothing was spared in the energy of men, the use of equipment, and the expenditure of huge sums of money by the Maryland and District of Columbia radio and television segment of our private enterprise system to avoid the vacuum that otherwise would have existed in the information and the intelligence of the people of America and those of the world. This was surely the broadcast industry's finest hour and a most impressive demonstration of the power for the best in public service that resides in the freedom of American enterprise. In this time of grief at our national bereavement, but of pride in our national stability, it is laudable that the industry has pledged itself anew to ever greater efforts to preserve that stability in the free enterprise system and to protect it against bureaucrats who continually harass the industry and often seek to burden and hinder it with the crippling hand of unwarranted and unnecessary control.

RESOLUTION OF THE GOVERNOR AND COUNCIL OF STATE OF THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PRESIDENT, JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY, AND EXPRESSING CONFIDENCE IN THE LEADERSHIP OF OUR NEW PRESIDENT LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on November 26, 1963, the Governor and Council of State of the State of North Carolina adopted a resolution praising the character and achievements of our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and expressing their confidence in the leadership of our new President, Lyndon Baines Johnson. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the resolution be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the Governor and council of state do hereby record their grief and deep sorrow at the tragic, untimely death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, and pay tribute to his wise leadership of our Nation during times of great crisis. As he passes, we salute his gallant and courageous spirit. All Americans are indebted to him for his devotion to the cause of peace, and for his efforts to persuade mankind to turn from the path of dictatorship to the ways of democracy and freedom.

And the Governor and council of state do further record their confidence in the leadership of our new President, Lyndon Baines Johnson, who, wise and experienced in the ways of government, is already summoning the Nation to go forward under his firm guidance. The initiative taken in this crisis by President Johnson is reassuring to our people and to the people of the world, reminding us that the Government of the United States continues to live and to reign.

It is ordered that copies of this resolution be forwarded to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy and the President, Lyndon B. Johnson.

RABBI ABBA HILLEL SILVER

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I rise to offer my tribute to the memory of an outstanding American whose death is mourned by men of good will of all religious persuasions throughout our land and in all countries of the world which value freedom, peace, justice.

Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver was far more than a leader and driving force of his temple in Cleveland for more than 45 years. He truly belonged to the entire Nation.

Rabbi Silver, of the fifth generation of rabbis, with a son who also is a rabbi, was in the tradition of the Old Testament prophets. His voice sounded strong and clear, with the passion of an Amos, when injustice was being done to Jew or Protestant or Catholic or Muslim.

He was unafraid to speak his mind when duty called. Great orator and scholar that he was, he devoted all his talents in behalf of those who were culturally or economically deprived.

Freedom was his passion and his passion for justice and peace was as well known here in the Nation's Capital as it was to those who needed his help in his childhood home of New York City or in any other part of our Nation.

Many here remember well Rabbi Silver's voice, as he said special prayers at the inauguration of President Eisenhower. Many of us here remember the kindness, the thoughtfulness, the humor, and the gentleness of the man who died on Thursday at four score and ten years.

He belonged to all of us, whatever our political or our religious affiliation. He feared not to stand up and be counted and to speak his mind. So had the admiration and respect of all men who believe in peace, justice, and brotherhood.

Rabbi Silver today is mourned, not alone by us, but by all men who know that the preservation of liberty is a never-ending task.

Our hearts go out to his family and I offer my deepest sympathy to them in their bereavement.

To his congregation, to those all over the world to whom his labors meant so much, his death removes a noble champion and a friend.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE FIFTH CONVENTION OF THE AFL–CIO

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the AFL–CIO at its fifth constitutional convention, recently concluded, passed a number of resolutions on foreign policy which deserve the attention and consideration of all Americans. The resolutions deal with the unity and strength of the Western World, the need for peaceful but highly vigilant relations with the Soviet Union, the desirability of firm initiatives on the part of the United States to seek a moratorium and end to the tensions in the Middle East, a strong condemnation of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, and support for the Genocide Convention which is one method of reaffirming to the world our dedication to the principles of human dignity and religious freedom.

Mr. President, in my view, these resolutions, concise and meaningful, cut through to the very heart of some of the most basic issues facing the American people in relationships with foreign nations.

Mr. President, I join with the members of the AFL–CIO in the firm conviction "that a united, strong, and prosperous West will be able to attract more and more the developing nations to our side, to extend the frontiers of freedom, to defeat the ambitious imperialist plans of the Communist camp, and to preserve the peace of the world."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of these resolutions.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 202—FOR UNITY AND STRENGTH OF THE WESTERN WORLD

The West has, through unity and strength, succeeded, in the last 15 years, to insure security and a large measure of prosperity for the democracies, to grant increasing help to the developing countries, and to prevent international communism from attaining its goal of world domination.

This unity and strength were achieved through the close cooperation between Europe and the United States which began with the Marshall plan and was followed, a few years later, by NATO. At the same time European integration proceeded with the creation of the Coal and Steel Community, Euratom, and the Common Market. Thus, the road to a fully unified Europe, in firm partnership with the United States, seemed to be open.

However, this hopeful development has, in recent months, been endangered by discord among our European allies, with the result that closer ties between the United States and Europe have been impaired and Western unity and strength weakened. The disarray in the Western Alliance has been brought about largely by the fact that European integration has been halted through the refusal of the European Economic Community to admit Great Britain as a member, by a trend to transform the Common Market into a closed, inward-looking and protectionist organization, and by the determination of the French Government to follow, in many respects, a policy of going it alone.

Allied disunity has manifested itself in disagreement over NATO strategy, especially in the nuclear field; friction over trade between the United States and other European nations; withdrawal of the French fleet from NATO control; divergent views on the war in Vietnam; contradictory trade practices in regard to Communist countries; differences in the United Nations (expenses for U.N. peacekeeping missions), etc.

This turn of events is all the more disturbing, since firm joint efforts by the West are needed to protect the vital interests of the democratic countries, to meet the growing wants of the new nations, to thwart Communist expansionist designs, and to preserve world peace. In spite of the limited test ban treaty, the world has yet to witness any real relaxation of tension and can ill afford bickering, distrust, and dissension among the members of the Atlantic community.

The fifth convention of the AFL–CIO views with concern the present situation in the Atlantic Alliance. We fervently hope that our Government will spare no effort to resolve the present disputes among the allies and to build an evermore effective and powerful Western community.

To that end, the United States should continue to encourage the European nations to widen the Common Market by admitting Great Britain and other democratic countries which might wish to join it, and to develop into a collective political entity. Such a unified, powerful and prosperous Europe would be a truly equal partner of the United States, sharing full responsibility in all questions affecting Western interests. The closest cooperation between the United States and Europe is particularly necessary at a time of negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union. All impressions of American-Soviet bilateralism must be avoided. Our European allies should be fully informed and their advice and agreements should be sought. In this connection, our Government did well to offer a unified Europe a greater share of nuclear control in the projected multilateral atomic missile fleet.

It is especially urgent for the United States not to make any unilateral decisions on NATO strategy. American labor reiterates its firm conviction that a strong American military presence in Europe is indispensable to the defense of that continent and to the national security of the United States. Any withdrawal of American forces from Germany is bound to raise doubts about U.S. determination to defend Europe. Such a reduction of our forces would only make Moscow still more reluctant to grant any important concessions and would arouse distrust of our intentions by our allies.

In view of the formidable Soviet military power and the continued Soviet refusal to guarantee the freedom of West Berlin, our armed strength in Germany must always be maintained at an adequate level. At the same time and in a spirit of true partnership, our allies should make a more adequate contribution to the cost of the collective (NATO) defense and in regard to providing more of the urgently needed conventional forces. Only when its defense posture is strong enough, can the West deter Soviet aggression.

In this conviction, we regard closer political cooperation between the United States and its allies. Our Government should energetically strive for a common Western policy on all important aspects of international affairs—toward the Soviet bloc, Communist China, and southeast Asia. New machinery should be set up to provide an institutional framework for full, continuous consultation, and joint decisionmaking.

European-American partnership in political and defense matters also presupposes economic partnership. Without freer trade, the United States cannot fulfill its military commitments and responsibilities towards the poorer people of the world. The AFL–CIO sincerely hopes that next year's trade negotiations under GATT will result in an expanded and freer flow of goods within the free world and, thereby, promote the economic wellbeing of the free peoples.

More coordination is also called for in the endeavors by the free countries to help the emerging nations. Western Europe should assume a fairer and larger share of the aid load. Exchange of information and joint planning by the donor countries are imperative in order to obtain maximum results beneficial to recipient nations.

The AFL–CIO is firmly convinced that a united, strong and prosperous West will be able to attract more and more the developing nations to our side, to extend the frontiers of freedom, to defeat the ambitious imperialist plans of the Communist camp, and to preserve the peace of the world.

RESOLUTION 203—FOR PEACEFUL RELATIONS BETWEEN NATIONS

The Soviet dictatorship—under Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev—has at various times waged campaigns for peaceful coexistence with the non-Communist world. The scale and scope of all these campaigns were determined by the requirements of Soviet foreign policy and by the tactics which the Russian Communist Party prescribed, at a particular moment, for promoting the international Communist movement.

Since the close of World War II, a most important development has led Moscow to step up its drive for peaceful coexistence. Through the revolution in technology, an arsenal of new weapons was developed—intermediate and intercontinental missiles with nuclear warheads. The terrifying destructive capacity of these weapons has aroused the deepest fear of another global war and a worldwide desire for peace. Seeking to exploit this great peace mood in order to advance its aforementioned ends, Moscow has intensified and expanded its peaceful coexistence drive, particularly since 1952.

Regardless of differences among them, all Communists maintain that peaceful coexistence is a form of practical class war. While propagandizing political and economic coexistence between nations with different social systems, the Soviet and other Communist governments have made the waging of ideological warfare a matter of principle to be pursued unrelentingly. Khrushchev has repeately insisted that peaceful coexistence in the field of ideology is * * * treachery to the cause of the workers and peasants. It is under the flag of waging ideological warfare, while simultaneously propagandizing peaceful coexistence, that Moscow is striving to dominate the world and remold it on the Soviet pattern—by subversion and similar means, if possible, but by force if necessary. While rejecting the notion that war is inevitable, Khrushchev has explicitly stressed the admissibility, nay necessity, of waging wars for liberation or so-called revolutionary wars. In his emphasis, the Soviet dictator presupposes that the Communist Parties will define and decide what is and what is not a war of liberation. Thus, the Communists can wage any war for the overthrow of any government which does not suit or serve Soviet interests.

In this light, it is most significant that during the very years of the Kremlin's intensified campaign for peaceful coexistence, Moscow instigated the wars for liberation in Korea, Laos, and Vietnam; suppressed the revolt in East Germany and the Hungarian democratic revolution; built the wall of shame in Berlin; threatened to rocket-bomb West European nations; and stealthily placed its missiles in Cuba. On the latter occasion, a global atomic holocaust was avoided and world peace preserved only because the United States demonstrated the necessary determination and promptly mobilized superior strength to force Khrushchev to remove the missiles he denied emplacing.

As long as the Soviet rulers outlaw peaceful coexistence in the matter of one's attitude to life—that is, coexistence with what they call bourgeois ideology—grave tension and dangerous conflicts are bound to plague the world. Surely, the leaders of Soviet communism must realize that nations consist of individuals and that they cannot be separated from ideas and ideals of life. Given the present ideological division of the world and Moscow's unalterable basic aim of world domination, the ideological warfare waged by the Kremlin has put insuperable obstacles in the path of peaceful economic and political competition and a genuine contest of ideas to assure friendly relations and world freedom. Under such circumstances, mankind can, at best, have painful and precarious rather than peaceful relations.

The world does not need new blueprints or schemes to live in peace and harmony. If the Soviet Union and the other Communist countries were to join the free nations in faithfully fulfilling the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the U.N. Charter, the entire world would today be free from suspicion, intrigue, subversion and the threat of war. Full Soviet compliance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights would provide far better guarantees for the preservation of world peace and the promotion of human freedom than any pact or treaty ever could.

The Western democracies must meet the Soviet peaceful coexistence strategy with measures designed to strengthen their national security and the foundations of freedom, to prevent war and preserve world peace.

Then, toward overcoming the destructive consequences of the ideological warfare which the Soviets insist on waging, our country and its allies should demand that the Communist dictatorships remove the barriers they have set up to prevent their peoples from having a free exchange of opinions with the people of the democratic countries. This inevitable struggle between the Communist and the democratic world can never become exclusively a struggle of ideologies and a peaceful emulation (Khrushchev), unless and until identical rules apply to all its contestants.

In this connection, the proponents of the conflicting ideologies must have equal right of access to the people whom they would convince. It is essential that there be actual compliance with article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which provides that "everyone has the right to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers." Also, every member state must abide fully by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 13, section 2, which provides that "everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and return to his country." Furthermore, our Government should support the idea that every U.N. member state obligate itself to permit and encourage the widest circulation among its people of all reports and documents issued by the United Nations, its special committees, and its specialized agencies. In addition, each member state should permit entry to its territory, encourage, and assist the representatives of the U.N. and of its various specialized agencies in connection with the furtherance of their designated assignments and tasks. With this in mind, each government should permit its own citizens to have full opportunity to acquaint themselves with and render help to the U.N. and its undertakings.

Information centers like USIA should be opened, on a reciprocal basis, in the various member states. All rules and regulations hampering or limiting the free use of these centers by the people at large should be eliminated. Books, periodicals, and newspapers published in the various member states should be freely exchanged by universities, professional bodies, and scientific institutes and also be made available to the people as a whole. An exchange of uncensored broadcasts on world developments should be arranged. All jamming of radio services should be discontinued.

Finally, all nations should pledge to settle their differences and disputes by peaceful means and in such a manner that international peace and security are not endangered.

Resolution 204—The Situation in the Middle East

The fifth convention of the AFL–CIO notes with great interest three important developments in the Middle East. The Nasser dictatorship has stepped up its building of an arsenal with a massive array of offensive weapons. Iraq and Syria have undergone Baathist Party revolutions which have great potential significance for the entire Arab world. The Republic of Israel has come forward with a realistic peace offer.

We can only hope that the governments of the various Arab countries will be guided, above all, by the interests of their people and will, therefore, respond favorably to Premier Eshkol's proposal for (a) compensating Arab refugees for the land they abandoned when they fled from Israel; (b) lifting the travel restrictions on Arabs within the State of Israel; and (c) launching a development program in the Galilee highlands with a view of providing the Arabs living in this region with fertile land.

Peaceful and freedom-loving people everywhere can only welcome unity of the Arab peoples for their common well-being, social progress, and peaceful relations with their neighbors. Attempts by the military dictatorship in any one country, under the flag of so-called Pan-Arabism, to subvert the institutions of other Arab countries, impose on them a foreign regime, or overtly or covertly annex them, are the very opposite of genuine Arab unity, hostile to its underlying principle of free and voluntary cooperation and federation. Such moves by any Middle East military dictatorship can be just as grave a threat to peace and freedom as Arab-Israeli tension and conflict.

The Convention fervently hopes that all governments in the Middle East will focus their thoughts and actions on improving the conditions of life and labor for their own people; will recognize the right of national independence, territorial integrity, and inviolable sovereignty of all their neighboring states; and will rely only on peaceful methods for the solution of any issues or differences between them. All the peoples of the Middle East, Arabs and Israeli alike, would serve their vital national interests most effectively and greatly aid world peace as well as establishing relationships among themselves in accord with President Kennedy's declaration which the U.N. General Assembly enthusiastically welcomed on September 20, 1963: "Chronic disputes which divert precious resources from the needs of the people or drain the energies of both sides, serve the interests of no one—and the badge of responsibility in the modern world is a willingness to seek peaceful solutions."

In this realization, the fifth convention of the AFL–CIO urges that:

1. All nations of the Middle East pledge their adherence to a 3-year moratorium on all border strife and transgressions.

2. This 3-year period of freedom from belligerent attitudes and bellicose actions should be actively utilized for exploring the possibilities of settling through negotiation all outstanding issues and differences dividing the various Arab nations and engendering Arab-Israeli hostility and for developing a program of joint action by all the Middle East nations to overcome illiteracy, illness, and poverty in their midst.

3. Our Government should grant economic or any other aid only to those Middle East countries which pledge themselves to honor such a 3-year moratorium.

4. Our Government should desist from rendering further help to any government which violates the principle of freedom of navigation in the Suez Canal against any nation.

5. In line with the position unanimously adopted by all parties in the Bundestag (June 1963), Federal German Chancellor Ludwig Erhard should act to have effective legal brakes placed on the continued activities of German scientists and technicians in the production of missiles and other weapons of mass destruction for the Nasser government which openly seeks to employ them for the conquest and domination of the other Arab peoples and the annihilation of Israel.

Resolution 205—Soviet Anti-Semitism and Genocide

Since the destruction of the Nazi dictatorship in Germany, anti-Semitism, as an official state policy, and anti-Semitic propaganda have become more pronounced in the U.S.S.R.

The present Kremlin rulers are blaming the Jewish population of the U.S.S.R. and making them scapegoats for the evil consequences of the regime's unsound economic policies. The Kremlin has singled out Jews for persecution for so-called economic crimes. Thousands of Russian Jews have suffered the severest penal sentences, including, in many instances, the death penalty, for offenses that nowhere in the civilized world would even be considered crimes. Criminal offenses are being fabricated in order to carry out campaigns for absolving the ruling Communist Party clique of blame for their own mistaken policies.

Trials of accused Jews are set up to mislead the public rather than to assure justice. Toward this end Soviet newspapers and broadcasts issue reports designed to whip up anti-Jewish hysteria. The Jewish names of the accused are emphasized. At times, they are accused of having committed their so-called crimes in the local synagogue. Their family ties in Israel and elsewhere are pointed up. The persecution of Jews is employed to foster the Soviet policy of intensifying hostility against Jews in the Arab world with a view of preventing Arab-Israeli peace.

In addition, the Soviet authorities place Russian Jews under a variety of other disabilities. Far more than other religious communities they are denied the most elementary requirements for practicing their religion. Jewish culture, which was brutally suppressed under Stalin, is being stifled under Khrushchev. The Jewish theater has been suppressed; the teaching of Yiddish and Hebrew to the young stopped; books in Yiddish prohibited, and a systematic program is being carried out to uproot and destroy all aspects of Jewish cultural life. Despite all their talk about liberalization, Khrushchev and his aids are thus persisting in the anti-Semitic practices of the Stalin era and reverting to the notorious anti-Semitic course of their Czarist predecessors: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention of the AFL–CIO, representing free American workingmen and women of all races, creeds, and colors, believing firmly in the application of the principles of the United Nation Charter and the Declaration of Human Rights, in our own Nation and in all others, hereby demands that the Soviet regime cease its persecution and discrimination against the Jewish people in the U.S.S.R.

In this connection, we strongly urge the U.S. Senate to ratify the U.N. Genocide Convention which was unanimously adopted by the United Nations 15 years ago and which has since been ratified by 64 countries.

We further demand an immediate end to the Soviet Communist policy of singling out the Jewish people for special punitive treatment. We demand that the Jewish people be accorded the same conditions and facilities that prevail for other peoples in Soviet Russia with respect to the use of their own language, the practicing of their religion and their national culture.

In line with the traditional humanitarian policy of our country, as demonstrated by President William Howard Taft's cancellation of the U.S. trade treaty with Czarist Russia in protest against its persecution of the Jews, we urge our Government to bring all necessary diplomatic pressure on the Soviet Union and to consider the application of economic sanctions against the U.S.S.R. in order to hasten the end of its anti-Semitic policies and practices.

We call upon our friends and brothers throughout the international labor and democratic movements to join us in raising their voices against Soviet anti-Semitism.

THE REFUGEE ISSUE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, once again the United Nations is considering the issue of the Palestinian refugees. Once again the nations of the world are faced with the need not only to provide for temporary financing, but also to consider the long-range outlook for peace and prosperity in the Middle East.

For 15 years, Mr. President, this issue has been before the United Nations. Yet, with all due respect for those who have worked hard and conscientiously, it is clear that little that is new or really fruitful has been offered in the course of these annual debates, and little that would offer a satisfactory promise of a final solution. In 1948, when the issue was new and when the State of Israel had just come into being, the United Nations called for the repatriation of Arab refugees "wishing to return to their homes and live in peace with their neighbors." Yet, Mr. President, from that time forward, despite the insistent pleas of the Arab nations for the repatriation of refugees, every effort has been made to insure that repatriation would be an impossibility from a practical point of view. The Arab States have left no stone unturned to inculcate among these unfortunate refugees a pan-Arab fervor and a hatred of Israel that make it completely impossible for the State of Israel to assimilate these refugees as citizens. It is, in other words, completely impossible for these refugees, steeped in President Nasser's hate propaganda, to "live in peace as loyal citizens of the State of Israel."

Mr. President, from the point of view of reaching a satisfactory solution that will offer the prospect of genuine peace in the Middle East, and not merely provide lipservice to an unworkable compromise, it is time for the United States and for the other free nations of the world to take a long, hard look at the situation in the Middle East. There is only one satisfactory method for nations to resolve outstanding differences—and that is through negotiation. There can also be no doubt that the best atmosphere for fruitful negotiation is one in which border incidents and aggressions are deliberately discouraged by all parties, in which hate propaganda is brought to an end, and in which both parties consider the constructive points to be gained by a realistic process of negotiation.

Mr. President, I am convinced that as long as the United Nations stands by resolutions adopted in 1948—resolutions which have been deliberately interpreted to the advantage of one party and the disadvantage of others, there is little hope that a satisfactory conclusion will ever be found to the tensions which now impede economic development in many parts of the Middle East.

Mr. President, it is disturbing to me that this year, as last year, the United States has taken the lead in compromising the language of the pending United Nations resolution to appease Arab sentiment, without considering or giving adequate attention to the serious problems created for the State of Israel.

Such action can only undermine the confidence of the State of Israel and lead to increasing pressure on the part of Arab nations.

Mr. President, the special Political Committee of the UN has already approved by a vote of 83 to 1 a resolution along the lines of last year's. The 1 vote in opposition by the State of Israel and the 12 abstentions should certainly make it clear to U.S. officials who are responsible for the supposed compromise language that it leans heavily in favor of the Arab States. It is perhaps too late this year for the United States to call for a new look at the entire Middle Eastern situation. But there is time for the U.S. Government to review again over the coming year the facts of the situation and the physical impossibility for Israel to accept thousands of hostile refugees within its confines. Before another session of the General Assembly comes around, I sincerely hope that our Government will be in a position to take a fresh look at the problem and come up with a more constructive, more objective and more sensible approach than has unfortunately been the case to date.

LOVE FOR OUR FELLOW MAN

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, an editorial entitled "The Missing World," written by David Lawrence, editor of the U.S. News & World Report, appeared in the December 9, 1963, issue of the U.S. News & World Report.

Mr. Lawrence comments on President Johnson's recent plea for "tolerance" and "mutual understanding" among our people, and he adds to that plea the necessity of love for our fellow man. It is through love for our fellow man and our enemies that we will understand others, and it is through understanding that we can have tolerance. Tolerance will help resolve disputes between individuals and economic or social groups and will permit the self-examination and simple honesty needed on both sides so desparately.

It is fitting at this time that this plea be sounded throughout the Nation and the world. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MISSING WORD

(By David Lawrence)

President Johnson, in his address to Congress, spoke eloquently of the need for a "new fellowship." He assured the whole world that America would continue to seek the advancement of human welfare and the maintenance of peace for mankind. As for domestic affairs, the President pleaded for an end of the mood of bitter controversy through which America has been passing. He uttered these words of advice:

"The time has come for Americans of all races and creeds and political beliefs to understand and to respect one another. So let us put an end to the teaching and the preaching of hate and evil and violence. Let us turn away from the fanatics of the far left and the far right, from the apostles of bitterness and bigotry, from those defiant of law, and those who pour venom into our Nation's bloodstream."

But to what mood shall we turn—to an attitude of passivity and indifference as injustices go uncorrected? After we have stopped denouncing as fanatics those persons who disagree with our views, how shall we proceed to bring about "the tolerance" and "mutual understanding" of which the President spoke so feelingly?

Plainly there is one word missing. It is a word often ignored. It is a word that presents not only the alternative to hate but points the way through which bitterness can be removed from human hearts. The word is "love." Its meaning is set forth in the Sermon on the Mount as follows:

"Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shall love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy.

"But I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you."

This passage doesn't mean that your opponent is necessarily right and that you are wrong. It doesn't mean that one must abandon a justifiable viewpoint and adopt that of an adversary. It does suggest that reason must be substituted for anger. How can we begin to come to an understanding with those who are lined up on the other side of a controversy? Certainly not by calling names or by attributing reprehensible motives to people holding opposite views. For this can only widen the cleavage. It does no good to accuse anyone of immaturity or senility just because he does not agree with your philosophy.

How then can disputes be resolved between individuals and between economic or social groups?

Self-examination and simple honesty are needed on both sides. Love includes not only respect and understanding but also a willingness to listen to or read what others may be saying. President Johnson called for "tolerance" and "mutual understanding."

Too often the outbursts of anger that we note in modern life are the result of superficial or inadequate study of the basic issues that divide us. Too often we assume toward one another an arbitrariness which insists that there is only one side and that the other side must be rejected out of hand. But have we examined thoroughly the facts behind the differences that arise among us?

Do we seek to understand the human motivations which tell us that coercion, even by law, cannot by itself win the hearts of those who dissent? Can we produce tranquillity by a process of enforced conformity which has failed to take into account the many causes of individual friction? Do we cure hate merely by imprisoning those who have become embittered?

Jesus gave us the eternal advice which man has again and again disregarded. To love your enemy means to try at least to understand him. To do good to your opponents and to pray for those who despitefully use you and persecute you is to invoke the true spirit of conciliation.

We now are in the midst of a period of mourning for the President of the United States who was slain by a madman. It seems illogical to accuse the whole community of guilt or to point the finger of blame at this or that faction or ideological group among us or at the teachers or preachers of contentious doctrines here and abroad.

Society is, of course, always to blame for any failure to restrain dangerous persons who may resort to acts of violence. But it is an oversimplification to say that a deranged man—who sought vengeance for personal grievances and grudges—was incited to crime just because an atmosphere of bitterness happened coincidentally to surround the public controversies of the day.

Controversy itself can, through healthy discussion, advance rather than retard human progress. For the best solutions to our problems can come when there is full debate by the people, instead of the suppression practiced under totalitarian systems of government.

We have the God-given opportunity to love one another, which means to help one another. We can help one another by trying to understand one another.

We cannot abolish hate by edict. We can overcome its evil expression only by learning the meaning of the missing word: Love.

PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, in these still sorrowful days following the tragic murder of President Kennedy, much of the world is looking back into the past to find out what kind of man Lyndon B. Johnson is and what kind of President he will be. To the readers of the Anderson Independent in Anderson, S.C., this will not be a difficult task because this newspaper has been most competent in its endeavor to keep readers fully informed on the former Vice President and Senator. The transition of readers in Anderson to a full understanding of our new President will be less difficult than for some citizens in other communities.

In this connection, I bring to the attention of the Senate an outstanding editorial on President Lyndon Johnson entitled "President Lyndon Johnson: God Blessed United States With Leadership." I commend this editorial to every member of the Senate and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT LYNDON JOHNSON: GOD BLESSED UNITED STATES WITH LEADERSHIP

On the morning of May 18, 1961, the Independent published an editorial headed "Lyndon Johnson: We Are Fortunate to Have Him as Our Vice President." We concluded with this statement:

"If Providence should strike down President Kennedy, he would be our next head of state. We should thank our stars that we have such an astute, patriotic, aggressive, determined man as Lyndon Johnson in the position of undoubted power and prestige he holds today."

Prophetic? Not necessarily so. Reassuring when such a man was only a heartbeat from the presidency? Certainly.

Men of good will throughout the world pray today for him as he assumes the almost superhuman task as President of the United States.

One of the most important and consoling of facts is that the late President John F. Kennedy—perhaps with prophetic vision of his own—took Lyndon Johnson fully into his confidence on all major issues and dangers confronting this Nation.

Thus President Johnson assumes the office with full knowledge of these issues and dangers, and with the stated determination to carry on unbroken the aims and the hopes of John F. Kennedy.

These aims and hopes are carefully mapped plans for a better nation, a more peaceful world, and determination that the United States of America shall continue to exercise the world leadership it holds.

Background of the two men was drastically different. The one, President Kennedy, was born into a world of luxury. The new President began his career in Texas as a boy shining shoes.

Yet because this is America, because both believed in the American dream, because both were endowed with intellectual and dynamic strength, they became at the same time the only U.S. leaders elected by the vote of the whole Nation.

Some months ago in an interview Lyndon Johnson, speaking as Vice President, had this to say:

"President Kennedy and members of his staff and his Cabinet have given me every opportunity to be aware of all the important decisions that have been made and to participate in them and to make any recommendations I care to make.

"And I have been a party to those decisions—some important ones—the deliberations in connection with the invasion of Cuba and again last October when we had the missile crisis in Cuba.

"We had some 35 National Security Council meetings, meetings of the Executive Council of the Security Committee, of which I was a member. And I participated in all but one of those meetings.

"My recommendations were asked and received, considered. And in both instances, I was a party to both decisions. Although I want to make it abundantly clear that the responsibility is with the President and the President made the decision and accepted responsibility for it."

That crisis and its problems were but one of the many when Lyndon Johnson sat by President Kennedy's side and was consulted and fully informed.

Such procedure was a far cry from the time when the Vice-Presidency was looked upon as a dead end road where his only duties were to preside over the Senate. Americans may thank Almighty God for the wisdom and foresight of the late President Kennedy in taking his Vice President into full confidence.

Thousands of Anderson area residents recall Lyndon Johnson, campaigning here for the Democratic ticket in 1960. He spoke at the Anderson Fairgrounds and we said that those who heard him "will never forget the man and his message." (Anderson County and the Third Congressional District went overwhelmingly for the Kennedy-Johnson ticket.)

We described him as "an intellectual man, a natural leader, a man well schooled in practical politics and statesmanship. He has a down-to-earth touch, and yet he moves among the mightiest with complete ease and assurance. What is more, they listen to him and believe him."

Even then we saw him as a "world leader who is more and more capturing the attention and respect of all nations" which he has proven time and again since.

What is the philosophy of President Johnson? Here it is in his own words:

"I believe every American has something to say and, under our system, a right to an audience.

"I believe there is always a national answer to every national problem. Believing this, I do not think there are necessarily two side to every question. However, sometimes * * * often * * * there is a right side and a wrong side.

"I believe achievement of the full potential of our natural resources, physical and human, is the highest purpose of governmental policies next to the protection of those rights we hold inalienable.

"I believe waste is the continuing enemy of our civilization. I believe that the prevention of waste * * * waste of resources, of human lives, and opportunity * * * is the most dynamic of the responsibilities of our Government."

Yet, as the Independent commented more than 2 years ago, "he is not an ivory tower philosopher, an idle dreamer, a visionary without the power and energy to turn dreams into reality."

A measure of the new President, heartening to the Nation in estimating his stature, is to be found in the first simple statement he made upon taking the oath of office:

"I will do my best. That is all I can do. I ask for your help, and God's."

The Nation knows that with President Johnson doing his best there is nothing to fear, that the country will go forward, and the world leadership will remain firmly in the grasp of the United States of America.

As the new President assumes his burdens, we extend to him the heartfelt and prayerful hope that a nation united by tragedy and realization of his problems will uphold his arms and give him new strength in the crucial months and years ahead. (The Harris nationwide poll will disclose tomorrow that 70 percent of the people of the United States feel that Lyndon Johnson will make an excellent President.)

The Independent is confident that the new President will have the full support of the people of South Carolina.

SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. **DOMINICK**. Mr. President, today we received notice that the first contingent of 1,000 American troops is about to be withdrawn from South Vietnam. The withdrawal will still leave a great number of American technicians and trainees working over there in an effort to fight communism, which is attacking throughout that whole area.

The south Asian situation has been growing increasingly difficult over the past 3 or 4 years. It was hoped, at least by many in the State Department and the CIA, that the coup which recently took place would substantially increase the effort to counteract the Communists in South Vietnam.

Recently, an article entitled "Vietnam Coup Has Its Price," written by Marguerite Higgins and published in the Evening Star commented on what is happening in the war in South Vietnam since the coup has taken place.

I believe Marguerite Higgins is well known to all Senators. Not only is Marguerite Higgins well qualified on the subject but also the article itself casts some doubt on the speed of the success of our efforts in South Vietnam.

The article should be of interest to all Senators, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAM COUP HAS ITS PRICE

(By Marguerite Higgins)

SAIGON.—President Johnson has inherited Vietnam's problems at a time when the situation is likely to get worse—in terms of battles and terroristic attacks—before it gets better.

There already has been a setback in the war against Communist Vietcong since the coup d'etat occurred November 1. But this was predictable.

Those Americans who felt that the coup d'etat was in the interests of the United States were fully warned that a price would have to be paid for getting rid of President Ngo Dinh Diem and his brother, adviser, Ngo Dinh Nhu.

For example, it is impossible to replace nearly 40 province chiefs who are the backbone of the war effort without creating uncertainty and a hiatus in authority that amounts to an invitation to the Communists to increase their pressure.

MORE TERRORISM

The price paid for the coup d'etat included a sharp rise in terroristic bombing attacks in Saigon. President Diem's police and special forces may have been guilty of brutality, but they did manage to reduce terrorism inside Saigon to almost nothing.

In the crucial and rich Mekong River delta area, there have also been important losses of real estate. On a visit to the 21st Division area near Mytho in August of this year, I was able to drive in a single unarmed jeep through a large strategic hamlet complex of which Maj. Olen O'Connor, the sector adviser, was very proud. The area had been virtually immune to Vietcong harassment for the entire year.

But in revisiting the area this month, Maj. O'Connor said the entire hamlet had been completely infiltrated by the Vietcong in operations begun November 3, two days after the coup d'etat.

GAINS TEMPORARY

These gains, hopefully, are temporary and will be reversed when the new military junta has a chance to put its mind back on the war.

Despite the sadness of any setback, the stepped-up tempo of the Vietcong could be of use if it dispelled the myth that dancing in the streets of Saigon and the popularity of the military junta would work some magic on the war. This is misleading nonsense.

If popularity or democracy really were the best weapon against communism, Czechoslovakia's Jan Masaryk would not be dead today and Czechoslovakia would not be Communist. Czechoslovakia's democratic ways could not save it from the Communist coup d'etat of 1948.

In talking of popularity in Vietnam, the question must be asked, "Popularity with whom?"

CRITICAL INTELLECTUALS

The military junta's popularity is with the citified, educated students, particularly those of Saigon and Hue. But these intellectuals form a small percent of the population in the city which in turn represents less than 10 percent of Vietnam's largely peasant population of 14 million.

Further, the intellectuals of Vietnam always have been undisciplined, driven by factionalism and jealousies and convinced that constant criticism is a mark of intelligence.

In six different trips to Vietnam this reporter has found students and intellectuals markedly uninterested in fighting or winning the war against the Communist Vietcong—if it means a contribution from them.

Now, many students are hailing the death of Mr. Diem, in contrast to peasants who take a wait-and-see attitude. And none of the students showed any change in their aversion to help the war effort.

COURTS DANGER

In its earnest efforts to be "liberal" and please the Americans with its democratic image, the military junta has begun to court the same danger of "mobocracy" that brought on a crisis in such Asian countries as Korea.

Just last week in Hue, 10,000 students demonstrated to demand the firing of teachers who had failed to denounce Mr. Diem vigorously enough to suit them. There have been similar demonstrations in Saigon and the provinces.

This Asia version of on-to-the-guillotine has been encouraged by the excesses of the Saigon press.

Even the most anti-Diem Vietnamese of them all, the Buddhist leader, Thich Tri Quang, a militant one-time member of the Communists Vietminh liberation movement, complained about the Saigon press over an interview which quoted him, but which he said he had never given.

The targets of some of the Saigon press smear campaigns include Gen. Paul Harkins, head of the American military mission.

The Saigon press, even at one point, set up a cry for the blood of President Diem's 94-year-old mother.

HANDICAPS GENERALS

Under pressure of this extremism, the military junta has arrested many persons without confronting them with any legal charges and merely on the suspicion of having been "excessively loyal."

These pressures from the mob, and the Vietnam press, are clearly handicapping the generals from getting their minds off the political aftermath of the coup and back on to the war.

Said a British official currently in Vietnam, who was instrumental in winning the anti-Communist guerrilla war in Malaya:

"A certain degree of authoritarianism is necessary to win this type of war. When I see what license and scurrility result from the so-called new freedoms here, I think people—and press—of Vietnam need discipline far more than the people of Malaya."

FINANCIAL HOLDINGS AND HISTORY OF FINANCIAL DEALINGS OF SENATOR PROXMIRE, OF WISCONSIN, SINCE AUGUST 1957

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President, I submit, for the RECORD, my financial holdings and the history of my financial dealings since I was elected to the Senate in August 1957.

When I was first elected to the U.S. Senate, my principal financial interest consisted of ownership of my home in Madison, Wis., one automobile, two small checking accounts and one savings and loan account. In addition, I was the 50-percent stockholder in the Artcraft Press Co. of Waterloo, Wis.

Because I was appointed to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the Senate, I sold my equity interest in the Artcraft Press Co. to Harry Mikalson, of Lake Mills, Wis., who had owned the other 50-percent interest in the firm. I made this sale a few weeks after my 1957 election. Mikalson in turn financed his purchase through a note to be liquidated over a period of years with my father, the late Dr. Thodore S. Proxmire. That note has been steadily reduced. The little that remains of the note is still in the undistributed portion of my father's estate.

When the estate of my father was settled after his death on December 16, 1959, I agreed with my sister—the other principal heir—that she was to receive the holdings in banking stocks of my late father in order to avoid any possible conflict of interest on my part that might develop because of my membership on the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

I did inherit holdings in a variety of stocks and bonds, the annual income from which has varied between $5,000 and $6,000. Late this year I sold all of the common stocks I owned. Accordingly, my present financial holdings consist exclusively of U.S. Government obligations; bills, notes, and bonds; checking accounts in one Washington and two Madison, Wis., banks; a savings account at the Credit Union National Association in Madison; ownership of my home in Madison, from which I now receive $150 monthly in rental income; ownership of my home in Washington, which I acquired in 1959; the furnishings in the homes in Washington and Madison; and ownership of one 1962 automobile.

In addition, I have trust custody over a small savings account for my daughter, Elsie, and my son, Ted, and over 11 shares of stock in the Milwaukee Braves baseball team for my son, Ted.

I owe mortgages to the Credit Union National Association in Madison on my home in Madison and to the Perpetual

Building Association of Washington, D.C., on my home in Washington.

To the best of my knowledge, this is an accurate record of my financial holdings and obligations:

Stockholdings inherited and sold by Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE *by October 1963 or earlier*

Description	*Shares*
General Motors	70
American Cyanamid	50
Monsanto Chemical Corp	54
Union Carbide Corp	23
National Lead Co	20
American Can Co	50
American Home Products Corp	75
Merck and Co	25
Parke, Davis & Co. (purchased by WILLIAM PROXMIRE; later sold)	100
Pfizer, Chas. & Co	98
General Electric Co	25
International Telephone & Telegraph Co	50
Corn Products Co	200
Industrial Ceramics	135
General Foods Corp	50
Continental Casualty Co	63
Aluminum Co. of America	25
Anaconda Co	50
Union Bag-Camp Paper Co	50
Phillips Petroleum Co	50
Royal Dutch Petroleum Co	56
Sinclair Oil Co	50
Standard Oil Co., New Jersey	40
Armco Steel Corp	50
United States Steel Corp	50
American Telephone & Telegraph Co	25
Central & Southwest Corp	100
Consolidated Edison Co. of New York	108
Southern Co	50
Southern California Edison Co	114

THE GENOCIDE TREATY SHOULD BE RATIFIED NOW

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Foreign Relations Committee has had before it for a long time the Genocide Treaty. For some 10 or 12 years it has been pending before that committee. Three administrations have asked for its passage. I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of Senators would approve it.

The treaty is certainly in the interest of humanity. It is a treaty which in good conscience it would seem that we should approve almost automatically. The terrible fact is that brutal governments have exterminated millions of people as the Nazis exterminated the Jews in Germany. The formal dedication of this great Nation to stop this genocide by affirming this treaty would advance the cause of humanity throughout the world.

The Washington Post recently published an editorial commenting on the treaty, expressing the fervent hope that it would be brought up and approved in the near future. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD, as well as other material explaining the treaty and the reasons why its approval by the Senate is so important and desirable.

There being no objection, the editorial and additional material were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENOCIDE

Genocide—the deliberate destruction of an ethnic group—was declared an international crime by the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1950. The United States, to its great credit, was a leading influence in the drafting and adoption of the Genocide Convention. But to its enduring shame, the United States has been laggard in ratifying this convention. The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate seems to have filed and forgotten it.

Genocide was defined in the General Assembly as a deliberate policy involving acts intended to destroy in whole or in part, "a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group"; and the acts characterized as entailing genocide were specified as "killing members of the group, causing serious bodily or mental harm to members * * * deliberately inflicting * * * conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part, imposing measures to prevent births * * * forcibly transferring children * * * to another group."

One would suppose that in the United States there could be no hesitation about outlawing such practices as part of a deliberate extermination policy. But among some of the country's southern lawyer-statemen, there developed an anxiety about the language of the convention. Could southern patterns of segregation be regarded as causing serious * * * mental harm to Negroes? Could the United States be haled before the World Court as a perpetrator of genocide in relation to its colored minority?

The anxiety is manifestly fantastic and reveals much more about the southern sense of guilt than about any defects in the Genocide Convention. Odious as the aspects of racial discrimination may be, they cannot be considered a pattern designed to bring about the destruction of an ethnic group. Nevertheless, southern fears have kept the Genocide Convention from coming to the Senate floor.

Instead, the administration this year is pushing, somewhat timorously and tentatively, three more modest U.N. conventions—those on forced labor, slavery, and the political rights of women. Before his death President Kennedy sent these three to the Senate for advice and consent to ratification. They are significant and desirable, of course; and American adherence to them should be speedily approved. Once they have been ratified, we hope the Senate will turn serious attention to the Genocide Convention.

RESOLUTION 205—SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM AND GENOCIDE

Since the destruction of the Nazi dictatorship in Germany, anti-Semitism, as an official state policy, and anti-Semitic propaganda have become more pronounced in the U.S.S.R.

The present Kremlin rulers are blaming the Jewish population of the U.S.S.R. and making them scapegoats for the evil consequences of the regime's unsound economic policies. The Kremlin has singled out Jews for persecution for so-called economic crimes. Thousands of Russian Jews have suffered the severest penal sentences, including, in many instances, the death penalty, for offenses that nowhere in the civilized world would even be considered crimes. Criminal offenses are being fabricated in order to carry out campaigns for absolving the ruling Communist Party clique of blame for their own mistaken policies.

Trials of accused Jews are set up to mislead the public rather than to assure justice. Toward this end Soviet newspapers and broadcasts issue reports designed to whip up anti-Jewish hysteria. The Jewish names of the accused are emphasized. At times, they are accused of having committed their so-called crimes in the local synagogue. Their family ties in Israel and elsewhere are pointed up. The persecution of Jews is employed to foster the Soviet policy of intensifying hostility against Jews in the Arab world with a view of preventing Arab-Israel peace.

In addition, the Soviet authorities place Russian Jews under a variety of other disabilities. Far more than other religious communities they are denied the most elementary requirements for practicing their religion. Jewish culture, which was brutally suppressed under Stalin, is being stifled under Khrushchev. The Jewish theater has been suppressed; the teaching of Yiddish and Hebrew to the young stopped; books in Yiddish prohibited and a systematic program is being carried out to uproot and destroy all aspects of Jewish cultural life. Despite all their talk about liberalization, Khrushchev and his aids are thus persisting in the anti-Semitic practices of the Stalin era and reverting to the notorious anti-Semitic course of their Czarist predecessors: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention of the AFL–CIO, representing free American working men and women of all races, creeds and colors, believing firmly in the application of the principles of the United Nations Charter and the Declaration of Human Rights, in our own Nation and in all others, hereby demands that the Soviet regime cease its persecution and discrimination against the Jewish people in the U.S.S.R.

In this connection, we strongly urge the U.S. Senate to ratify the U.N. Genocide Convention which was unanimously adopted by the United Nations 15 years ago and which has since been ratified by 64 countries.

We further demand an immediate end to the Soviet Communist policy of singling out the Jewish people for special punitive treatment. We demand that the Jewish people be accorded the same conditions and facilities that prevail for other peoples in Soviet Russia with respect to the use of their own language, the practicing of their religion and their national culture.

In line with the traditional humanitarian policy of our country, as demonstrated by President William Howard Taft's cancellation of the U.S. trade treaty with czarist Russia in protest against its persecution of the Jews, we urge our Government to bring all necessary diplomatic pressure on the Soviet Union and to consider the application of economic sanctions against the U.S.S.R. in order to hasten the end of its anti-Semitic policies and practices.

We call upon our friends and brothers throughout the international labor and democratic movements to join us in raising their voices against Soviet anti-Semitism.

FOR PEACEFUL RELATIONS BETWEEN NATIONS

The Soviet dictatorship—under Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev—has, at various times, waged campaigns for peaceful coexistence with the non-Communist world. The scale and scope of all these campaigns were determined by the requirements of Soviet foreign policy and by the tactics which the Russian Communist Party prescribed, at a particular moment, for promoting the international Communist movement.

Since the close of World War II, a most important development has led Moscow to step up its drive for peaceful coexistence. Through the revolution in technology, an arsenal of new weapons was developed—intermediate and intercontinental missiles with nuclear warheads. The terrifying destructive capacity of these weapons has aroused the deepest fear of another global war and a worldwide desire for peace. Seeking to exploit this great peace mood in order to advance its aforementioned ends, Moscow has intensified and expanded its peaceful coexistence drive—particularly since 1952.

Regardless of differences among them, all Communists maintain that peaceful coexistence is a form of practical class war. While propagandizing political and economic coexistence between nations with different social systems, the Soviet and other Communist governments have made the waging of ideological warfare a matter of principle to be pursued unrelentingly. Khrushchev has repeatedly insisted that peaceful coexistence in the field of ideology is * * * treachery to the cause of the workers and peasants. It is under the flag of waging ideological warfare, while simultaneously propagandizing peaceful coexistence, that Moscow is striving to dominate the world and remold it in the Soviet pattern—but subversion and similar means, if possible, but by force if necessary. While rejecting the notion that war is inevitable, Khrushchev has explicitly stressed the admissibility, nay necessity, of waging wars for liberation or so-called revolutionary wars. In his emphasis, the Soviet dictator presupposes that the Communist Parties will define and decide what is and what is not a war of liberation. Thus, the Communists can wage any war for the overthrow of any government which does not suit or serve Soviet interests.

In this light, it is most significant that during the very years of the Kremlin's intensified campaign for peaceful coexistence, Moscow instigated the wars for liberation in Korea, Laos, and Vietnam; suppressed the revolt in East Germany and the Hungarian democratic revolution; built the wall of shame in Berlin; threatened to rocket-bomb West European nations; and stealthily placed its missiles in Cuba. On the latter occasion, a global atomic holocaust was avoided and world peace preserved only because the United States demonstrated the necessary determination and promptly mobilized superior strength to force Khrushchev to remove the missiles he denied emplacing.

As long as the Soviet rulers outlaw peaceful coexistence in the matter of one's attitude to life—that is, coexistence with what they call bourgeois ideology—grave tension and dangerous conflicts are bound to plague the world. Surely, the leaders of Soviet communism must realize that nations consist of individuals and that they cannot be separated from ideas and ideals of life. Given the present ideological division of the world and Moscow's unalterable basic aim of world domination, the ideological warfare waged by the Kremlin has put insuperable obstacles in the path of peaceful economic and political competition and a genuine contest of ideas to assure friendly relations and world freedom. Under such circumstances, mankind can, at best, have painful and precarious rather than peaceful relations.

The world does not need new blueprints or schemes to live in peace and harmony. If the Soviet Union and the other Communist countries were to join the free nations in faithfully fulfilling the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the U.N. Charter, the entire world would today be free from suspicion, intrigue, subversion and the threat of war. Full Soviet compliance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights would provide far better guarantees for the preservation of world peace and the promotion of human freedom than any pact or treaty ever could.

The Western democracies must meet the Soviet peaceful coexistence strategy with measures designed to strengthen their national security and the foundations of freedom, to prevent war and preserve world peace.

Then, toward overcoming the destructive consequences of the ideological warfare which the Soviets insist on waging, our country and its allies should demand that the Communist dictatorships remove the barriers they have set up to prevent their peoples from having a free exchange of opinions with the people of the democratic countries. This inevitable struggle between the Communist and the democratic world can never "become exclusively a struggle of ideologies and a peaceful emulation" (Khrushchev), unless and until identical rules apply to all its contestants.

In this connection, the proponents of the conflicting ideologies must have equal right of access to the people whom they would convince. It is essential that there be actual compliance with article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which provides that "everyone has the right to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers." Also, every member state must abide fully by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 13, section 2, which provides that "everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and return to his country." Furthermore, our Government should support the idea that every U.N. member state obligates itself to permit and encourage the widest circulation among its people of all reports and documents issued by the United Nations, its special committees, and its specialized agencies. In addition, each member state should permit entry to its territory, encourage, and assist the representatives of the U.N. and of its various specialized agencies in connection with the furtherance of their designated assignments and tasks. With this in mind, each government should permit its own citizens to have full opportunity to acquaint themselves with and render help to the U.N. and its undertakings.

Information centers like USIA should be opened, on a reciprocal basis, in the various member states. All rules and regulations hampering or limiting the free use of these centers by the people at large should be eliminated. Books, periodicals, and newspapers published in the various member states should be freely exchanged by universities, professional bodies, and scientific institutes and also be made available to the people as a whole. An exchange of uncensored broadcasts on world developments should be arranged. All jamming of radio services should be discontinued.

Finally, all nations should pledge to settle their differences and disputes by peaceful means and in such a manner that international peace and security are not endangered.

THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The fifth convention of the AFL–CIO notes with great interest three important developments in the Middle East. The Nasser dictatorship has stepped up its building of an arsenal with a massive array of offensive weapons. Iraq and Syria have undergone Baathist Party revolutions which have great potential significance for the entire Arab world. The Republic of Israel has come forward with a realistic peace offer.

We can only hope that the governments of the various Arab countries will be guided, above all, by the interests of their people and will, therefore, respond favorably to Premier Eshkol's proposal for (a) compensating Arab refugees for the land they abandoned when they fled from Israel; (b) lifting the travel restrictions on Arabs within the State of Israel; and (c) launching a development program in the Galilee highlands with a view of providing the Arabs living in this region with fertile land.

Peaceful and freedom-loving people everywhere can only welcome unity of the Arab peoples for their common well-being, social progress, and peaceful relations with their neighbors. Attempts by the military dictatorship in any one country, under the flag of so-called Pan-Arabism, to subvert the institutions of other Arab countries, impose on them a foriegn regime, or overtly or covertly annex them, are the very opposite of genuine Arab unity, hostile to its underlying principle of free and voluntary cooperation and federation. Such moves by any Middle East military dictatorship can be just as grave a threat to peace and freedom as Arab-Israeli tension and conflict.

The convention fervently hopes that all governments in the Middle East will focus their thoughts and actions on improving the conditions of life and labor for their own people; will recognize the right of national independence, territorial integrity, and inviolable sovereignty of all their neighboring states; and will rely only on peaceful methods for the solution of any issues or differences between them. All the peoples of the Middle East, Arabs and Israeli alike, would serve their vital national interests most effectively and greatly aid world peace as well by establishing relationships among themselves in accord with President Kennedy's declaration which the U.N. General Assembly enthusiastically welcomed on September 20, 1963: "Chronic disputes which divert precious resources from the needs of the people or drain the energies of both sides, serve the interests of no one—and the badge of responsibility in the modern world is a willingness to seek peaceful solutions."

In this realization, the fifth convention of the AFL–CIO urges that:

1. All nations of the Middle East pledge their adherence to a 3-year moratorium on all border strife and transgressions.

2. This 3-year period of freedom from belligerent attitudes and bellicose actions should be actively utilized for exploring the possibilities of settling through negotiation all outstanding issues and differences dividing the various Arab nations and engendering Arab-Israel hostility and for developing a program of joint action by all the Middle East nations to overcome illiteracy, illness and poverty in their midst.

3. Our Government should grant economic or any other aid only to those Middle East countries which pledge themselves to honor such a 3-year moratorium.

4. Our Government should desist from rendering further help to any government which violates the principle of freedom of navigation in the Suez Canal against any nation.

5. In line with the position unanimously adopted by all parties in the Bundestag (June 1963), Federal German Chancellor Ludwig Erhard should act to have effective legal brakes placed on the continued activities of German scientists and technicians in the production of missiles and other weapons of mass destruction for the Nasser government which openly seeks to employ them for the conquest and domination of the other Arab peoples and the annihilation of Israel.

FOR UNITY AND STRENGTH OF THE WESTERN WORLD

The West has, through unity and strength, succeeded, in the last 15 years, to insure security and a large measure of prosperity for the democracies, to grant increasing help to the developing countries, and to prevent international communism from attaining its goal of world domination.

This unity and strength were achieved through the close cooperation between Europe and the United States which began with the Marshall plan and was followed, a few years later, by NATO. At the same time European integration proceeded with the creation of the Coal and Steel Community, Euratom, and the Common Market. Thus, the road to a fully unified Europe, in firm partnership with the United States, seemed to be open.

However, this hopeful development has, in recent months, been endangered by discord among our European allies, with the result that closer ties between the United States and Europe have been impaired and Western unity and strength weakened. The disarray in the Western alliance has been brought about largely by the fact that European integration has been halted through the refusal of the European Economic Community to admit Great Britain as a member, by a trend to transform the Common Market into a closed, inward-looking and protectionist organization, and by the determination of the French Government to follow, in many respects, a policy of going it alone.

Allied disunity has manifested itself in disagreement over NATO strategy, especially in the nuclear field; friction over trade between the United States and other European nations; withdrawal of the French fleet from NATO control; divergent views on the war in Vietnam; contradictory trade practices in regard to Communist countries; differences in the United Nations (expenses for U.N. peacekeeping missions), and so forth.

This turn of events is all the more disturbing, since firm joint efforts by the West are needed to protect the vital interests of the democratic countries, to meet the growing wants of the new nations, to thwart Communist expansionist designs, and to preserve world peace. In spite of the limited test ban treaty, the world has yet to witness any real relaxation of tension and can ill afford bickering, distrust, and dissension among the members of the Atlantic community.

The fifth convention of the AFL–CIO views with concern the present situation in the Atlantic Alliance. We fervently hope that our Government will spare no effort to resolve the present disputes among the Allies and to build an ever more effective and powerful Western community.

To that end, the United States should continue to encourage the European nations to widen the Common Market by admitting Great Britain and other democratic countries which might wish to join it, and to develop Europe into a collective political entity. Such a unified, powerful, and prosperous Europe would be a truly equal partner of the United States, sharing full responsibility in all questions affecting Western interests. The closest cooperation between the United States and Europe is particularly necessary at a time of negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union. All impressions of American-Soviet bilateralism must be avoided. Our European allies should be fully informed and their advice and agreement should be sought. In this connection, our Government did well to offer a unified Europe a greater share of nuclear control in the projected multilateral atomic missile fleet.

It is especially urgent for the United States not to make any unilateral decisions on NATO strategy. American labor reiterates its firm conviction that a strong American military presence in Europe is indispensable to the defense of that continent and to the national security of the United States. Any withdrawal of American forces from Germany is bound to raise doubts about U.S. determination to defend Europe. Such a reduction of our forces would only make Moscow still more reluctant to grant any important concessions and would arouse distrust of our intentions by our allies.

In view of the formidable Soviet military power and the continued Soviet refusal to guarantee the freedom of West Berlin, our armed strength in Germany must always be maintained at an adequate level. At the same time and in a spirit of true partnership, our allies should make a more adequate contribution to the cost of the collective (NATO) defense and in regard to providing more of the urgently needed conventional forces. Only when its defense posture is strong enough, can the West deter Soviet aggression.

In this conviction, we urge closer political cooperation between the United States and its allies. Our Government should energetically strive for a common Western policy on all important aspects of international affairs—toward the Soviet bloc, Communist China, and southeast Asia. New machinery should be set up to provide an institutional framework for full, continuous consultation, and joint decisionmaking.

European-American partnership in political and defense matters also presupposes economic partnership. Without freer trade, the United States cannot fulfill its military commitments and responsibilities toward the poorer people of the world. The AFL–CIO sincerely hopes that next year's trade negotiations under GATT will result in an expanded and freer flow of goods within the free world and, thereby, promote the economic well-being of the free peoples.

More coordination is also called for in the endeavors by the free countries to help the emerging nations. Western Europe should assume a fairer and larger share of the aid load. Exchange of information and joint planning by the donor countries are imperative in order to obtain maximum results beneficial to recipient nations.

The AFL–CIO is firmly convinced that a united, strong, and prosperous West will be able to attract more and more the developing nations to our side, to extend the frontiers of freedom, to defeat the ambitious imperialist plans of the Communist camp, and to preserve the peace of the world.

LYNDON JOHNSON'S DEFENSE OF INDIVIDUALISM AND INDEPENDENCE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the clearest and most persuasive statements that I have ever read in support of individualism and independence was written by our former Senate colleague and leader, and now President, Lyndon Johnson.

President Johnson wrote in the Texas Quarterly in 1958 in protest against the tendency to label public officials as liberal or conservative. Many of the words from that statement have since become famous and will become more so as the Johnson administration progresses.

But, the individualism of our new President's essential spirit of that statement—which is the emphasis on President Johnson's independence of ideology and dogma, his insistence on being free to be himself and not labeled an ideological conservative or a liberal—has not been fully grasped. In my judgment, this lack of dogma or rigid ideology is the real genius of the American political system. Nowhere has it flourished better than in the Senate.

Because of the new significance of this statement I ask unanimous consent that the article by the then Majority Leader, Lyndon Johnson, published in the Texas Quarterly be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHNSON, IN 1958, SAID THAT OPPOSITION TO LABELING OF AMERICANS WAS THE HEART OF HIS BELIEFS

(In 1958, The Texas Quarterly of the University of Texas published this copyrighted article "My Political Philosophy," by Lyndon B. Johnson, now President of the United States. It has been made available to the New York Times through the cooperation of the Houston Chronicle.)

MY POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

I am a free man, an American, a U.S. Senator, and a Democrat, in that order.

I am also a liberal, a conservative, a Texan, a taxpayer, a rancher, a businessman, a consumer, a parent, a voter, and not as young as I used to be nor as old as I expect to be—and I am all these things in no fixed order.

I am unaware of any descriptive word in the second paragraph which qualifies, modifies, amends, or is related by hyphenation to the terms listed in the first paragraph. In consequence, I am not able—nor even the least interested in trying—to define my political philosophy by the choice of a one-word or two-word label. This may be against the tide, but if so, the choice is deliberate.

At the heart of my own beliefs is a rebellion against this very process of classifying, labeling, and filing Americans under headings: regional, economic, occupational, religious, racial, or otherwise. I bridle at the very casualness with which we have come to ask each other, "What is your political philosophy?"

INDIVIDUALITY A CORNERSTONE

I resent the question most often not because I suspect it of guile and cunning, but for its innocence, the innocence that confuses dogma wtih philosophy and presumes that the answer can be given in a word or two. Our political philosophies, I have found, are the sum of our life's experience. God made no man so simple or his life so sterile that such experience can be summarized in an adjective. Yet we seem bent today on reducing every man's philosophy to a mere vital statistic, to the next question asked—of professors, students, public officials, job applicants, business executives, labor leaders, and many more—after age, weight, height, and color of eyes and hair.

Inquiries of men's philosophies do not fit this context.

It is a part of my own philosophy to regard individuality of political philosophy as a cornerstone of American freedom and, more specifically, as a right expressly implied in our Nation's basic law and indispensable to the proper functioning of our system.

NO NATIONAL DOGMA

Our basic law—the Constitution—is distinctive among the basic law of all nations, even the free nations of the West, in that it prescribes no national dogma: economic, social, or religious.

Free enterprise, for example, is not mentioned. Nor are our parties or the party system. Nor is there any provision to require allegiance to any dogma or doctrine.

Yet government is an expression of philosophy, and active governments are inevitably guided by philosophers. As I see it, the mandate of our system—and, perhaps, the ultimate genius of it—is that the American people should be the true philosophers of the American Government within the limits upon governmental powers set by our Constitution.

This is an ennobling concept, yet like many things noble and beautiful, it has certain frailties and we seem quick now to crush it. We crush out the individuality of our political beliefs and, by this process of highspeed sorting and classifying of Americans, automate our choice of courses and sterilize our explorations of the reasons why.

REBELLION NOT PROVINCIAL

Some might suggest that my rebellion against this process is a show of the provincial Texan in me. I would disagree. Texans are independent and individual, but not the monopolists of these virtues that we sometimes suppose ourselves to be. The traits are American in origin and, fortunately for the Republic, are deposited quite widely, not part of certain regional hoards. Thus, I believe it is the American in me—even more than the Texan—that now reacts so strongly against the merging of the individual American into the mass in the name of dogma.

I realize, as I say this, that others might point to the Senate where I serve—and where I am, in fact, a designated leader of the majority party—and suggest that the example there of a two-party, two-philosophy system contradicts or is in conflict with this thesis. The opposite is so. Had I not been privileged to serve in Congress, I might never have come to hold the respect for individuality of philosophy that I do.

The very purpose of Congress, in our governmental form, is to arrive at national decisions by bringing together some 531 individuals, representing 170 million individuals, to achieve a consent on the way the Nation should go. Were we bound by rigid dogmas, whatever their name, there would be no more cause for assembling Congress than for bringing the Soviet Presidium together. We are not so bound, and it is part—a great part—of my own philosophy that the Congress reaches a very dubious decision when its choices are made solely by head counts of the partisan division.

TENETS OF BELIEFS

This leads to a listing of the tenets of my own beliefs, the specific tenets of my own philosophy. I would set them down this way:

First, I believe every American has something to say and, under our system, a right to an audience.

Second, I believe there is always a national answer to each national problem, and, believing this, I do not believe that there are necessarily two sides to every question.

Third, I regard achievement of the full potential of our resources—physical, human, and otherwise—to be the highest purpose of governmental policies next to the protection of those rights we regard as inalienable.

Fourth, I regard waste as the continuing enemy of our society and the prevention of waste—waste of resources, waste of lives, or waste of opportunity—to be the most dynamic of the responsibilities of our Government.

These tenets, I concede, are simple. They are certainly personal. For these are not tenets I have embraced or adopted but rather, beliefs I have—over 50 years—developed and come to follow from my own experience.

MAY SEEM IDEALISTIC

In the instance of the first listed, I realize that—in these times—the notion that each American has something to say and the right to an audience may seem excessively idealistic. I do not believe that is so, either in principle or in practice.

I am reminded always in my work at Washington of my own origins. I was born to the hill country of Texas, a remote region then, still remote today, although less so. My neighbors, friends, and relatives there live independently, self-contained if not self-sufficient.

They are distant from many national issues, yet neither their distance nor their limited information on any given subject makes them any less a party to the national decisions we reach in the Halls of Congress. Knowing the folks at Johnson City and Blanco and Stonewall and Hye as I do, I know that it would be much more difficult for me to secure a unanimous agreement among them than among the Senators in Washington. Yet, in this individuality, my neighbors—or the constituency of all of Texas—are not different from Americans everywhere. There is likely to be merit in the views of the minority, quite as much as there is wisdom in the views of the majority. We have, as I see it, an obligation to seek out that merit, if it is there, and not merely to content ourselves with obliging the majority; for the majority's wisdom—however wise—is never the sum of all wisdom.

What we do, too often now, is oblige our patience with expedients. To grant audiences to 170 million Americans would be exhausting. So we make our divisions, our classifications, and our cross-classifications which permit us to forgo the listening and the searching we ought to do. Trouble compounds when, having made our divisions on one basis, we extend the application to other issues and other decisions. Here we adopt in our American political philosophy the pattern not of philosophy but of cults devoted to dogma, and we construct false equations which produce false answers.

This equation process is much a part of our party systems, and contributes to the myth of the concept that "there are two sides to every question." True, there are two parties. That is not the same as two sides. But, by maintaining the two-side concept, we satisfy our consciences—again as a matter of convenience—that when a partisan majority has prevailed there is no need to examine either the majority's side or the minority's side again. Our reasoning is that, since there are two sides, either side would have been acceptable, and hence the answer decided by political strength does not require closer scrutiny.

I think otherwise. This popular view is, I feel, very much counter to our American philosophy based on the thinking of men like Jefferson and Madison. I do not believe we have arrived at an answer until we have found the national answer, the answer all reasonable men can agree upon, and our work is not done until that answer is found—even if the process requires years of our lives.

ALLOWED FOR GROWTH

Here fits the third tenet of my philosophy—and the fourth. Had America been bound by the Constitutional Convention to the philosophies of the 18th century—and by the limits of the wisdom and vision of those times—we would not have the Nation that is ours today. Our rising greatness through more than 180 years has come from our freedom to apply our accumulating knowledge to the processes of our self-government. Or, to state it another way, this has come because America's course has been left to the living. Thus, the 18th-century philosophy of our Constitution has allowed for growth so that it is still strong, still good for our 20th century.

Our Nation, like all nations, is possessed of certain resources—resources of nature, resources of position, and resources of the human mind. Without conquest or aggrandizement, we cannot add to these basics. Thus whatever we are to be we must build from those things at our disposal, and to content ourselves with less than the ultimate potential is to deny our heritage and our duty.

Obviously, having come from a land like Texas, I feel this strongly. Of all endeavors on which I have worked in public life, I am proudest of the accomplishments in developing the Lower Colorado River during the 1930's and 1940's. It is not the damming of the stream or the harnessing of the floods in which I take pride, but, rather, in the ending of the waste of the region.

OBLIGATION ON GOVERNMENT

The region—so unproductive and insignificant in capacity in my youth—is now a vital part of the national economy and potential. More important, the wastage of human resources in the whole region has been reduced. New horizons have been opened for the fulfillment of young minds, if by nothing more than the advent of electricity into rural homes. Men and women have been released from the waste of drudgery and toil against the unyielding rock of the Texas hills. This is fulfillment of the true responsibility of Government.

Conversely, the elimination of waste of this sort carries with it a continuing obligation for Government—at all levels—not to create waste itself by extracting from the people the fruits of their new opportunities through improvident excesses in spending and taxing. This is an increasingly critical area for American Government, but one to which we sometimes apply false standards.

Government can waste the people's resources by inertia, quite as much as by vigor. Government can, for example, fall into a state of complacency over the relative positions of strength between nations in the world. An international stalemate with communism would, I believe, be the greatest waste of American resources and the resources of freedom, even though stalemate produced no war. A vital government cannot accept stalemate in any area—foreign or domestic. It must seek the national interest solution, vigorously and courageously and confidently.

These tenets are the tenets of my political philosophy.

POSITIONS ON ISSUES

Some who equate personal philosophies with popular dogmas might inquire, endlessly, as to my position on this issue or that issue or some other. Philosophies, as I conceive them at least, are not made of answers to issues, but of approaches more enduring and encompassing than that. By these approaches I have set down, I can seek and, I believe, find answers to the issues of 1958 or 1978, as they arise.

By personal choice, I am a Democrat, for I can in that party best apply and express my beliefs.

As for being anything else, the definitions of what I am will have to be applied by others as they see fit for I make no such distinctions myself.

I am, as I said in the beginning, a free man, an American, a U.S. Senator, and a Democrat, in that order, and there, for me, the classifying stops.

RABBI ABBA HILLEL SILVER

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, a great and revered humanitarian, author, teacher, and internationally respected statesman, passed away on Friday, November 29. Rabbi Silver was for 46 years spiritual leader of Cleveland's The Temple, the largest Reform Jewish congregation in the United States.

The loss of this wise and good man is mourned by people of all faiths, not only in Cleveland where we were privileged to count him among our outstanding citizens, but throughout the country and around the world. Abba Hillel Silver belonged not only to The Temple and to Cleveland, he belonged to the world—and particularly to world Jewry—a world whose tragic dimensions are still incomprehensible two decades after the Nazi genocide. Rabbi Silver was a man of ideals and action, possessing a strong and burning social conscience which lit the hearts and minds of all men.

The descendant of three generations of rabbis, Rabbi Silver was born on January 28, 1893, in Lithuania, and came to New York with his family in 1901. Upon receiving his doctor of divinity degree in 1915—having completed a 9-year course in 4 years—he took up his first ministry in Wheeling, W. Va. He came to the temple in Cleveland 3 days after the close of World War I, at age 24.

During his almost half a century of service in Cleveland, he gave unceasingly of his wisdom, his vision, his conscience and his heart to all people. His interests were legion and his good works

were felt on both the national and international scene.

Rabbi Silver was one of the leaders in founding the State of Israel. As a fervent spokesman for the Zionist cause, he took his case to the leaders of the world. On May 8, 1948, Rabbi Silver pleaded the case for Jewish rights in Palestine before the United Nations General Assembly. One week later the State of Israel was proclaimed. Having seen his dream of a Jewish homeland fulfilled, Rabbi Silver turned quickly to other problems on the international scene. More recently, he devoted much of his efforts toward strengthening the United Nations and firmly chastized those neutralist nations who would seek temporary gain at the expense of the world organization.

The high ideals of this outstanding American also helped produce needed social action in America. Rabbi Silver made the cause of the working men and women his own. Back in 1931 he was appointed chairman of the Ohio Commission on Unemployment Insurance. I was privileged to serve with him on that commission. Under his leadership we wrote the first State unemployment insurance law in the Nation. This served as a model for other States. In addition, Rabbi Silver helped to defeat the open-shop policy in the 1920's and the more recent proposed right-to-work legislation. He was a tower of strength in the drive for social justice.

The recipient of many awards, including the 1958 human relations award of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, Rabbi Silver was honored by his many friends including our late great President John Kennedy only last year.

Abba Hillel Silver will be missed by all of us. I, personally, was honored to count him as a friend. The day before his death, Rabbi Silver worked on a memorial sermon on the death of our late great President John F. Kennedy. The sermon was never delivered. It was printed, however, in the Cleveland Press on Friday, November 29, 1963. In this, his last message to us, the warmth, the wisdom, and the keen insight of Rabbi Silver are everywhere apparent. I commend this sermon, "The Legacy of a President," to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LEGACY OF A PRESIDENT—RABBI SILVER'S SERMON

I have reflected much these last few days on the nature of the universal sorrow which the whole world manifested at the tragic death of President Kennedy.

It was clearly neither formal nor perfunctory. At home and in faraway lands men mourned for him as for a lost brother, as if he were part of their own personal lives, who shared their innermost hopes, and felt their deepest needs.

People of all ages grieved for him, but especially the young. The personality of President Kennedy appealed especially to the youth of the world.

He was a young President and he spoke to the heart of young America and to all who had the hopeful heart of youth everywhere in the world. He was like a young eagle soaring high.

He did not belong to the category of the "tired old statesmen" who were caught and held fast in their weary routines, dreaming of worlds forever gone, the helpless agents of recurrent world disasters.

He was different. There was dawn in his outlook and spring in his call. His was the torch of a new vision.

TOO MANY OF US HAVE LOST OUR WAY

In his acceptance speech as the Democratic nominee for the Presidency, he declared: "Too many Americans have lost their way, their will, and their sense of historic purposes. It is time for a new generation of leadership—new men to cope with new problems and new opportunities."

And in his inaugural address, less than 3 years ago, he sounded a clarion call:

"Let the word go forth from this time and place to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans."

The new generation responded to his summons and challenge. Here, at last, was their true leader, their eloquent spokesman young in years and young in heart, ready to lead them in a new crusade and by the fire of a new faith build a new Jerusalem.

Where did President Kennedy find the torch which he declared would now be passed to a new generation of Americans, "a generation born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage"?

What was this ancient heritage? It was the heritage of the Founding Fathers and the torch was first kindled by them. To use the words of another martyred President, Abraham Lincoln, President Kennedy "returned to the fountain whose waters spring close by the blood of the Revolution."

He invoked the spirit which grows in the Declaration of Independence and in the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the United States. He called upon his generation time and again as did Lincoln, whose loving and faithful disciple he proved to be, "to come back to the great landmarks of the Declaration of Independence."

APPLIED OLD IDEALS TO OUR NEW AGE

He applied the old ideals of our country to the grave problems and the menacing conditions of our new age, and they became even more luminous and more urgently relevant than when they were first promulgated.

An unbroken chain of fervent human aspirations binds the age of Washington, the age of Lincoln, and the age of Kennedy—the unremitting struggles of men for larger freedom, for their basic human rights, for the dignity of man—"the self-evident truths"—"the unalienable rights."

If you lift up your eyes from the fresh grave where President Kennedy now lies at rest, you will see not far away the stately Lincoln Memorial and beyond that the towering Washington Monument. More than mere optical vision embraces these oldest and newest of our national shrines.

A chord of sacred memory, of bounden faith and promise binds them indissolubly together. They represent our Nation's unbroken covenant which time and again is renewed for us by the blood of our martyrs.

I said a moment ago, that President Kennedy was young and that he appealed to the heart of young America, but he was also wise with the wisdom which men, not altogether wisely, associate with age. He had the ardor and enthusiasm of youth but not its inexperience.

HE HAD VISION AND FACED REALITY

He had vision but he was not a visionary. He was an urbane, thoughtful, cultured, well-informed human being, forceful in action but tactful and moderate in speech and manner.

He faced reality. He understood his world—its dangers, its knotted domestic and international problems, some often almost too difficult to unravel. He understood full well the limitations of his high office and his own personal powers to set all things aright.

He realized too that the powers and resources of our country, great as they were, were not unlimited, and that we could neither dictate to the world nor go it alone.

Absolute sovereignty no longer assures us of absolute security. He understood also the limits of military power. The basic problems facing the world today are not susceptible of a final military solution.

But these inevitable limitations and their attendant frustrations did not cause him to seek refuge in inaction. The wisdom of our sages seems to have guided him. "Thine is not the duty to complete the task but neither art thou free to desist from it."

In a dangerously poised world and with an awesome responsibility resting upon his shoulders, he moved cautiously, but he moved, he acted with deliberateness and circumspection but he acted. He failed—but he tried again. He would not permit himself to be angered, or disheartened, or goaded into quick reprisals but neither was he ever deflected from his main purpose.

HE UNDERSTOOD ART OF COMPROMISE

He understood that the art of government was the art of compromise, but never on principles. He stood immovable as a rock when the basic principles of our Constitution or the basic rights of man were involved.

He was not doctrinaire. He knew how to bend as a tree bends before strong winds, but his roots always remained firmly set in the earth. He profited from his mistakes and those of his predecessors, as he did in the case of the Cuban fiasco early in his administration.

He saw clearly the five besetting dangers of our age. He had been summoned to lead our Nation in an hour of maximum danger, but with open eyes and a stout heart he confronted them.

"However close we sometimes seem to that dark and final abyss, let no man of peace and freedom despair. * * * If we can all persevere, if we can in every land * * * look beyond our own shores and ambitions, then surely the age will dawn in which the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved."

He faced the danger of the nuclear age. He, more than any of us, understood, because all sources of information were available to him, what a nuclear war would mean to mankind.

He built up the military strength of our Nation so that it might act as a deterrent to aggression and war. But while so engaged, he explored every avenue to discover some basis of agreement whereby the dangers of a nuclear war might be lessened.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN GREAT ACHIEVEMENT

After many repeated trials and failures, he succeeded in arriving at an agreement with the Soviet Union on a nuclear test ban which banned nuclear tests everywhere except underground. It was an important achievement even though it was not a guarantee against nuclear war.

The next step and the next and the final step still remained; but the first step "back from the shadow of war" had to be taken and he took it.

He was opposed to an arms race with the Soviet Union though in the few brief years in office, he unfortunately could make no headway.

"It is * * * our intention to challenge the Soviet Union, not to an arms race, but to a peace race; to advance step by step, stage by stage, until general and complete disarmament has actually been achieved." He ardently pursued peace. In the speech which he was to deliver in Dallas the day he was assassinated, he declared:

"Our strength will never be used in pursuit of aggressive ambitions—it will always be used in pursuit of peace. It will never be used to promote provocations—it will always be used to promote the peaceful settlement of disputes."

President Kennedy tried to mitigate the bitterness of the cold war. He did not hate. In this he was far ahead of most of our people in whose midst hate now stalks like a dark apparition, like "a pestilence that walketh in darkness, or a destruction that wasteth at noonday."

URGED BOTH SIDES TO SEEK PEACE

He summed up his attitude in his inaugural address:

"To those nations who would make themselves our adversary, we offer not a pledge but a request; that both sides begin anew the quest for peace, before the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction.

"So let us begin anew—remembering on both sides that civility is not a sign of weakness, and sincerity is always subject to proof. Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate."

But he would not be imposed upon. When he saw a clear and present danger to the security of America he acted with a firmness and dispatch which astounded the world—as when he forced the Soviet Union to dismantle the long-range missile bases in Cuba.

When he felt that an unfair advantage was being taken of the American people, he again acted with startling forcefulness, as when he compelled the powerful steel companies of the United States to rescind their price increases after he had persuaded American labor to accept lower wage terms in order to avert national inflation.

He was not afraid to incur the momentary displeasure of his own people. He had courage and he admired courage. In his book, "Profiles in Courage," he showed how the courage of certain men in public life served America, even though at times it wrecked their own political careers.

LOOKED DEEPLY INTO HIS SOUL

"In whatever arena of life one may meet the challenge of courage, whatever may be the sacrifices he faces if he follows his conscience—the loss of his friends, his fortune, his contentment, even the esteem of his fellow men—each man must decide for himself the course he will follow."

"The stories of past courage can define that ingredient—they can teach, they can offer hope, they can provide inspiration. But they cannot supply courage itself. For each man must look into his own soul."

John Fitzgerald Kennedy looked deeply into his own soul.

He saw the danger to the free world in the condition of misery, impoverishment, and backwardness of the underdeveloped countries of the world. Freedom, he knew, cannot thrive in an explosive resentful world which can find its relief from intolerable economic conditions only in revolution.

And so he developed an extensive program of aid to the depressed areas of the earth. He called into being the Alliance for Progress to help the peoples of Central and South America, to mobilize their own resources and energies to raise the standard of living of their people.

He created the Peace Corps, the most noble and beautiful act of his career. He inspired our youth to go to the far corners of the earth to serve without any expectation of monetary reward in order to bring help, guidance, and healing to the desperately needy of the world.

HE SAW DANGER IN BIGOTRY HERE

He saw the danger to our domestic peace and our free institutions in the indurate, century-old discrimination to which the Negro citizens of our country were being subjected and he acted with energy and courage in the face of violent resistance, calumny and personal abuse.

He was compelled to resort to action which was very distasteful to him when bigotry-blinded State Governors in Mississippi and Alabama defied the authority of the Supreme Court of the United States and by their shameless defiance sparked riots and acts of bombing and murder which shamed America in the eyes of the world.

But he was determined that full justice shall be done to the Negro and that the dark ages of segregation, disfranchisement and discrimination in employment shall end for them. He recommended a comprehensive bill on civil rights to the Congress of the United States. He declared:

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL SEEN AS TRIBUTE

"A rising tide of discontent * * * threatens the public safety * * * the events in Birmingham and elsewhere have so increased the cries for equality that no city or State or legislative body can prudently choose to ignore them.

"The result of continued Federal legislative inaction will continue, if not increase, racial strife—causing the leadership of both sides to pass from the hands of reasonable and responsible men to the purveyors of hate and violence."

The sincerest tribute which the Congress of the United States can pay to the martyred President is to pass the civil rights bill now pending. It will be an everlasting memorial to him, even as the Emancipation Proclamation has been to Abraham Lincoln.

He saw the danger of inadequate education and training for the youth of our Nation for the new world into which they are moving. Our Nation needed more schools, colleges, and teachers. "Nearly half of our high school graduates," he declared, "lack either the funds or the facilities to attend college. The Nation cannot afford to maintain its Military Establishment and neglect its brain power."

He recommended bills to improve educational quality, and at the college level, to provide Federal loans for the construction of academic facilities and federally financed scholarships.

One can readily point to many other notable programs and activities of his Presidency. In all of them, he was whole, entire, of one piece, a dedicated servant of justice, fairness, freedom, and peace. He was not always successful. Success is not always the measure of greatness. He was not always in the right. What leader of men ever is?

LIFE WAS FULL OF NOBLE PURPOSE

Most of his work remains uncompleted, even as his life was uncompleted. At the close of every worthy career, much unfinished business remains. He dealt in national and world issues of such wide dimensions that they could not be settled even in a lifetime much longer than was granted him.

But the value of a masterpiece is not the size of the canvas and the glory of a song is not the length of its stanzas. A small pool of clear water may often reflect all the glories of the heavens.

Here was a life replete with the beauty of noble purposes and aspirations, which set in motion great enterprises rich in promise for our Nation and for the world. Here was the American tradition of malice toward none and charity for all embodied in an intrepid young leader who was tragically brought down in the soaring midflight of his resplendent career.

Here is high sorrow for all of us—but also high hope, hope that his life will inspire other lives—that our people will look to his example, his message, and his mission, and, in a chastened spirit, will forgo the hate which turns brother against brother, and people against people, hope that they will resolutely persevere in the ways of progress and peace.

"Jonathan upon thy high places is slain.
"I am distressed for thee, my brother
Jonathan.
"How are the mighty fallen."

TRIBUTE TO JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. **RIBICOFF**. Mr. President, in the last sad days many eulogies have been written and many people have spoken true and deeply deserved words about John Fitzgerald Kennedy. One of the most touching was a letter written by the assistant general manager of radio station WDRC in Hartford, Conn. When it was read over the air, the people of my State responded. Thousands of letters poured into the station, expressing agreement, and requesting a copy. These words are spoken from the heart—the heart of an American, who, as he puts it "will never be President—or even make local office." I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER

DEAR MR. KENNEDY: Please forgive me for not writing sooner. I guess we've both been pretty busy, me running my everyday life, and you being President of the United States. It really was up to me to write first because you've been a lot busier than I have.

What I've wanted to do, though, is to thank you. Thank you for being my idea of what a President of this country should be. Now—don't go getting any ideas that I've always gone along with everything you've said or done. Some things, yes. Some things, no. After all, none of us is perfect. I know I can say this to you because you never got real mad and held a grudge about things like that. I guess that's why people found it pretty hard to get mad at you. Like I tell my kids. It's not always just what you do, but the way you do things, the way you treat people, that counts.

Speaking of kids, Mr. President, they're going to miss you. I know mine are. Oh, they're a little young and they really don't know what some of the important things about being President are. My daughter always thought you were her idea of a pretty handsome guy. And my son? Well, a Navy man, especially a PT boat man, is pretty OK. Oh sure, that space stuff is pretty great. But who pulled 'em out of the water? Darned right. You know how kids are. And the kids knew this, I guess. Heck, you even had my boy interested in history. And any man that could do that has to have something. I know I couldn't.

As for me? Gosh, there's so much to say because of the way I feel today. And I just don't know how to say it. Pictures keep going through my mind. Like the way I always saw you trying to tuck your tie inside your jacket around those breezy airports or coming up to the microphone. Then I see you 1 minute up on the cape in your old clothes, just like I like to be, and the next, looking straight on at Mr. Khrushchev at one of those high meetings. And your voice. I can hear it now. I can't get it out of my mind. Somehow when I was watching you talk on TV, the sound of your voice always sounded like one of those recordings of famous voices out of past history. They had that same ring and the words seemed like words I knew I would be hearing again someday, and so would my children, and theirs. And you know what? The time I was proudest of you was the time we came right up to the brink of a terrible catastrophe, and you talked to us about what might happen. And you stood up and faced it the only way an American should. To me, that was the greatest. Oh I was plenty nervous in those few days. But I sure was glad you were there because after your speech, I knew that whatever happened, I would not be ashamed but proud of you, as President, and of me, as an American.

And now? What can I say. What has happened has happened. I'm so sorry, that I could easily just lie down someplace and cry. I feel all swollen inside, like something wants to bust out. I want to take my feelings out on somebody or something. But at night, after all the radio and TV is shut off and I'm away from these horrible, unfair, unbelievable few days, I get to thinking. I think about you and how you might look down upon this scene. What would you say? And the only line I can hear and your voice is just as plain as day. "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country." And you, Mr. President, I don't think you ever even asked. You just did, and unto death. And I've decided to do the same. Not ask what I can do for my country. But to go about doing it. Oh, I'll never be President. I doubt I'll even make local office. But I'll tell you this. I'll be darned sure I have something to say about who does. I'm going to start doing things to help run this great country of ours, Mr. President. And y' know what? I'm going to be doing it for you.

God bless you.

A FRIEND.

(Written by Charles R. Parker, assistant general manager, WDRC, and recorded by WDRC director of news, Joseph Barbarette, for presentation over WDRC on November 25, 1963.)

THE BEEF IMPORT PROBLEM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the impact of beef imports on our livestock industry is a matter of deep concern to me. The present rate of beef importation is indefensible. Between 1956 and 1962 there was an annual average of 890 million pounds of beef imports, while in 1962 these imports jumped to 1.9 billion pounds. The U.S. Department of Agriculture reports that this year imports are running 18 percent ahead of the 1962 level. The Agriculture Department further forecasts depressed markets for domestic beef through at least the middle of 1964.

I have conferred with the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] on this most serious problem and I wish to commend him for his foresight and direct approach to the question of foreign imports.

On November 20, at the request of the Senator from North Dakota, the Finance Committee unanimously adopted a resolution which directs the Tariff Commission to immediately begin an investigation on the impact of foreign beef imports on the domestic market and to report to the Senate Finance Committee the results of the investigation not later than June 30, 1964.

I wish to associate myself with the position taken by the Senator from North Dakota, and I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the resolution of the Finance Committee be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 20, 1963.

Be it resolved by the Committee on Finance, That the U.S. Tariff Commission is hereby directed, pursuant to section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930, to make an investigation of the conditions of competition in the United States between beef and beef products produced in the United States and in foreign countries, and to report to the Senate Finance Committee the results of the investigation not later than June 30, 1964.

The report of the Commission shall set forth a summary of the facts obtained in the investigation, including a description of the domestic industry, domestic production, foreign production, imports, including sources of foreign supply, consumption channels, and methods of distributions, price, U.S. exports, U.S. Customs treatment since 1930, and other factors affecting the competition between domestic and imported beef and beef products. In the course of its investigation the Commission shall hold hearings, giving adequate opportunity to interested parties to appear and be heard.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I would like to thank my good friend, the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota for calling the pending investigation of the impact of beef imports, to the attention of our colleagues.

The steady increase in imports of beef and beef products has reached an alarming level. It was this steadily rising increase in imports that prompted me to present my resolution to the Finance Committee for consideration.

I should also like at this time to commend the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the Honorable HARRY F. BYRD, and the committee members not only for their favorable action on the resolution, but also for the speed in which they acted. It was just 22 days from the time the resolution was presented until action resulted.

A number of interested cattlemen in North Dakota have already expressed an interest in coming to Washington to present testimony. I trust and hope that representatives of the livestock industry from South Dakota and throughout the Nation will make their views known to the Tariff Commission.

SAVING THE RAILROADS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, our distinguished colleague from Rhode Island, Senator PELL, has authored a worthwhile article on the problem of the American railroads. Senator PELL's article, entitled "Saving the Railroads," appears in the November 22 issue of the Commonweal magazine.

The Senator from Rhode Island has long concerned himself with the railroad industry. His proposals and insights in the Commonweal article is well worth the consideration of the Members of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAVING THE RAILROADS

(By CLAIBORNE PELL)

(CLAIBORNE PELL is U.S. Senator from Rhode Island and a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

Next year along a stretch of curving seacoast south of Tokyo, a unique railroad will begin covering the 310 miles between Tokyo and Osaka in only 3 hours, at a maximum speed of close to 130 miles per hour. These trains will be electrically automated to minimize risks. They will travel a brandnew separate high-speed line offering most attractive center city to center city service every 30 minutes during the day between the major cities, with a coordinated limited express geared to serve 10 intermediate stops.

Such an imaginative plan is urgently needed for our own troubled rail system. In the Northeast, passenger service has become increasingly unprofitable for the two principal rail carriers linked to meet and serve the Boston-to-Washington axis. The Pennsylvania Railroad is currently struggling with deficits. The New York, New Haven & Hartford is in a critical financial condition and has been in receivership since July 1961. Elsewhere in the country, rail companies are narrowly poised between profit and loss, with the overall profit percentage for the entire industry little more than 2 percent.

Tax alleviation has been suggested, and in some cases granted. But neither this nor petitions for merger—now before the Interstate Commerce Commission in complicated multiple form—will provide the ultimate answer. The railroads have simply contracted a sickness that tax relief and mergers cannot fully cure. Modernization is required but it doesn't seem possible without a broad, enlightened plan that promises psychological as well as financial rejuvenation.

The Boston-to-Washington urban complex embraces a highly mobile population of nearly 40 million people in a wide corridor only 50 percent longer than the Tokyo-Osaka area. Adapting American ingenuity to the methods now being pioneered by the Japanese, we could halve the time it takes a rail passenger to go from Boston to Washington. Rails could once again compete with airlines on approximately even terms. By airplane, the New York-to-Washington trip now takes an hour in flight, plus perhaps as much as 2 hours in ground connections. By rail, this trip could be made from center-city to center-city in 2 hours, with the obvious advantages of few or no cancellations for bad weather, and no switching from one mode of conveyance to another.

The overburdening of airlanes and highways alone should prod us into maximum, efficient use of our rail system. City planners warn that the superhighways around our cities are becoming "nooses of concrete" threatening to choke city growth and vitality. It often seems an unquestioned assumption that automobiles will carry most of the travel load in coming generations and new highways eat up the countryside as if there were no alternative. Yet 32 lanes of highway are needed to accommodate the same number of people in 1 hour as can be carried on a single track of rail.

An enlightened new plan involves more than technical skill. The overlapping and competing jurisdictions of various States, cities, and railroads point toward new forms of cooperation as the bases for rejuvenating rail passenger service.

In June of last year, I introduced in the Senate a resolution which would grant congressional consent to the establishment of a multistate authority to modernize and operate passenger railroad service between Boston and Washington. This led to the establishment of a special task force, appointed by President Kennedy, to study the implications of my proposal, and in turn to a further examination now being conducted by the Department of Commerce. Meanwhile, I have reintroduced my Joint Senate Resolution in the present session of Congress and similar action has followed in the House.

Interstate compacts have become increasingly popular, covering such varied concerns as forest fire prevention, law enforcement, conservation, and shipping and transportation (as in the New York Port Authority). Last year Congress gave its consent to the Delaware River Basin Commission, a compact including New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware.

These compacts often require strenuous effort. The type I propose must be approved by legislative bodies in my own Rhode Island, in Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland; by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia; by both Houses of Congress and by the Executive.

No matter how great the effort, however, I am convinced that the results from this investment in railroad modernization can have most instructive application in forming a pattern for other developing megalopolitan areas—in California between Los Angeles and San Francisco; in the Chicago region and eastward to Detroit; in Florida where rapid expansion is taking shape north of Miami.

I believe in a minimum of Federal subsidization. It's often said that the airlines benefit unjustly by Federal funds used in airport construction and that bus lines profit by using publicly financed roads. It's not my wish to quibble with these points, but definitely we should try to allot burdens and advantages on an equal basis, for this lies at the root of healthy competition and our raison d'être as exponents of democratic principles and the capitalistic philosophy.

Under my proposal the railroads would keep their freight service, which is the very backbone of their ability to operate successfully—and the public authority would assume jurisdiction of the unprofitable part of the business: passenger service itself. This is very different from Federal governmental ownership or control, and from Federal subsidization of private industry, which can create unfair privileges for company stock and bond holders.

The renovation of railroad passenger service through the main channel of our northeast corridor will also mean that freight will move more economically, more competitively, for the companies will be permitted to give it their undivided, creative attention. The mails carried by the railroads will be more rapid.

To finance the undertaking, I propose that the public authority raise an initial sum of at least $500 million by issuing 30-year bonds bearing a 3½-percent coupon. The issue would be guaranteed against default by the full faith and credit of the Government. Thus the bonds would have the "triple A" rating most attractive for marketing; and like many public authority bonds their interest would be exempt from Federal income taxes.

This method of financing would entail tax exemption which no private company can be permitted. The proposed sum is a major one, but if the modernization will attract merely the volume of passenger business the railroads possessed 10 years ago—a modest estimate—the proposed bond issue could be retired in 30 years.

In this country we already have railroad cars prepared to travel at nearly the velocity of the Japanese trains. They need only improved tracks. As for the cost: the Japanese undertaking, which entails the construction of a score of major tunnels and bridges, the importation of heavy equipment and surfacing operations along a circuitous route, has been estimated at $458 million. Though the Boston-Washington distance is half again as long, there is no such earth moving to accomplish. Much of our roadbed is relatively straight and level. The sum I suggest and the cost of the Japanese project might be considered to be in some related balance.

The stagnation of the railroads, with low profits and low spirits spiraling into higher fares, poor revenue, and alienation of potential riders, can be arrested if we are willing to recognize that a major action must be taken. Rapid, modern, and courteous rail service—complete with, say, dictaphone equipment, secretarial service, conference facilities, telephones, barbers, and hairdressers—could be the salvation of our railroads and an immensely productive national investment. But it must be done while the cost of rejuvenation and retooling is still within reason.

WHEAT LEGISLATION ADVOCATED

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I have advised the Senate on several occasions of new endorsements of a voluntary wheat certificate plan by State farm and wheatgrowers associations.

I have just received the November 29 report from Washington of the National Association of Wheat Growers which adds three more of that organization's State chapters to the supporters of such a bill.

The Nebraska and Wyoming groups adopted a resolution which said:

> Specifically, we propose a voluntary certificate program effective for the 1964 and subsequent crops administered on a basis of bushels for the amount [of wheat] needed for the domestic and export markets * * * with necessary acreage diversion without Government payment.
>
> It is our suggestion that in any new legislation along these lines, or in the regulations pertaining thereto, provision be made for a grower to store excess wheat at his own expense to be used to fulfill his quota during a year of crop failure.

The Oklahoma wheatgrowers resolution said:

> Be it resolved that the Oklahoma Wheat Growers Association favor a voluntary two-price certificate plan with a substitution clause effective, similar to the McGovern plan as now introduced in Congress.

I would like to repeat, Mr. President, that the growing volume of resolutions are not only evidence of approval for the certificate plan on a voluntary basis, but evidence that the wheatgrowers of the Nation overwhelmingly favor enactment of a program effective in relation to the 1964 crop.

TRIBUTE TO REV. JOHN LaFARGE—GREAT RELIGIOUS LEADER AND EDITOR OF AMERICA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this past weekend, the United States suffered another great loss. The Rev. John LaFarge, S.J., associate editor and former editor in chief of the outstanding periodical America, passed to his eternal reward.

Father LaFarge symbolizes the highest traditions of his faith, his country, and of the creed of humanity.

His long and distinguished career was crowned commencing in July 1962, when he was first appointed to the editorial staff of America, the weekly journal of opinion edited and published by the Jesuit order.

To America he brought the dedication of a priest, the wisdom of a scholar, the understanding of a profound observer of history, the vigor of a natural-born leader of men.

A champion of social justice, he was one of the founders of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference. This outstanding organization has helped assure vitality to America's rural population, just as it has assured vital contributions by it to all America's affairs.

Always a friend of the underdog, Father LaFarge helped lead NCRLC in the fight for the rights of Mexican migrants, Puerto Rican laborers, and Negro sharecroppers.

A member of a family which has made distinguished contributions to American letters, he was, in the finest sense, an outstanding spokesman for the family of man. The policies of America, under his leadership, drew praise from his own faith in the form of a handwritten letter of praise from Pope Pius XII and from members of all faiths.

Gentle but courageous, profoundly American in his roots, yet amazingly fluent in many foreign tongues and familiar with many foreign ways, a man of culture and a man of action, an eloquent voice for both priesthood and laymen, he leaves behind an unforgettable legacy. Bravely, he led causes of brotherhood long before it became fashionable to do so. Profoundly, he symbolized the tradition of service which brought a Father Marquette to explore the American wilderness.

This Nation is indebted to John LaFarge, S.J., explorer of new and noble paths for his country, who has gone to his eternal repose. And God rest his magnificent soul.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a tribute to him published in the November 25, 1963, New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FATHER LAFARGE, CHAMPION OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

On a pleasant, sunny day 58 years ago, a slim, tall young man whose genial face matched the weather, ran up to a gatekeeper at Grand Central Station. Somewhat out of breath, he said:

"For heaven's sake open the gate and let me through. I'm leaving the world on this train and must make it."

The young man in a hurry was named John LaFarge. He had just returned from Europe; he had been ordained after receiving a licentiate in theology from the University of Innsbruck, Austria, and the reason he had to make the train was that he had entered the Maryland-New York province of the Society of Jesus and was on his way to study with that sternly disciplined order at St. Andrew-on-Hudson in Poughkeepsie.

But far from leaving the world, Father LaFarge went on to become one of his church's most forceful spokesmen on many controversial subjects—especially racial justice—as editor in chief of America, the national Catholic weekly, and champion of many another seemingly lost cause.

Father LaFarge died peacefully in his sleep yesterday at the age of 83. Members of the editorial staff of America found him in bed at Campion House, their residence at 329 West 108th Street. Characteristically, a newspaper was clutched in his hand. His face was wreathed in his perennial smile; this time, he hadn't been in a hurry.

To many of his colleagues, and to the laity of all faiths as well, Father LaFarge was the embodiment of what St. Thomas Aquinas adumbrated as the Roman Catholic ideal: the balance of faith and reason. His convictions on social problems were as deeply seated as those on religion; to him, they were inextricably woven into a passionate mosaic that spelled the salvation of man.

In his autobiography, "The Manner Is Ordinary," published in 1960, he had written:

"The priest speaks for hope. He is not just a foreteller of some future glorious event. By his sacramental action as well as by his words and activities, he conveys to the world Him who is our hope. If the priest himself is accessible in the world of time, it is easier for us to communicate with the world of the eternal, who has made His home—pitched His tent, as St. John says—in time."

GENTLE PHILOSOPHY

His manner was urbane; his arguments were leanly stripped of surplus tissue; he was never known to raise his well-modulated voice no matter how heated the discussion.

"I am not so much trying to persuade people to walk on a certain road as I am to show them the road that I am convinced they are sooner or later going to walk on," he observed on one occasion.

It was this type of gentle philosophy that endeared him to a host of Protestants and Jews, who regard him as a kind of elder statesman of his church.

He was born into a distinguished family on February 13, 1880. His father was John LaFarge, the renowned painter. His mother was the former Margaret Mason Perry. Among his forebears were Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Sergeant, associate justice of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court and widely read writer on jurisprudence, and Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry, whose famous dispatch—"We have met the enemy and they are ours"—announced his victory on Lake Erie in 1813 and won him a shrine in history.

One of his brothers was Bancel LaFarge, the muralist; another was Oliver H. P. LaFarge, a General Motors executive who later became an artist; the third was Christopher LaFarge, who was one of the architects of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine in New York. His nephew was Oliver LaFarge, the Pulitzer Prize-winning novelist.

Father LaFarge was graduted from Harvard University in 1901. After his studies in Austria he pursued his graduate studies at the Jesuits' Woodstock College in Maryland. He taught at Canisius College, Buffalo, N.Y., and at Loyola College, Baltimore, Md. He began missionary work in 1910, serving a year as a chaplain at Welfare Island, N.Y. From 1911 to 1926 he did pastoral and educational work in Maryland.

While in that State he helped to found the Cardinal Gibbons Institute for Negroes at Ridge, in 1924, which was closed 9 years later for lack of financial support but which inspired the Catholic Interracial Council, the first of its kind in the United States. Father LaFarge also was a founder of this group and was its chaplain for many years.

Father LaFarge returned to New York in 1926 to join the staff of "America," and thereafter employed its columns frequently to further the cause of social justice. In his view, there is no such thing as pure race; this country has a Negro population group rather than a Negro race, and although there may be ethnic differences, they are in kind, not quality. Closer association between the two groups would not lead to miscegenation, he insisted, since they mixed much more freely while the Negro was in slavery. He also maintained that, from a biological standpoint, there is no argument against intermarriage.

His restive, far-ranging mind delved into other fields. He was fluent in Russian, Slovenian, Bulgarian, Polish, Czech, and Slovak, as well as French, German, Italian, and, of course, Latin, and was considered an authority on Slavic problems. He took an especial interest in the Catholic Church in the Scandinavian countries and for years was chaplain and director of programs for the St. Ansgar's League in New York. He was a rapt student of the Bolshevik revolution and an outspoken foe of communism. While at Harvard he studied music and became an accomplished pianist.

In an interview in 1960, he said:

"Fundamentally, I'm a realist. I am seriously concerned about the moral fiber of America. I'm more afraid of internal decay than I am of external danger—although the hypothesis of our being destroyed by nuclear weapons is a very real one.

"I see in this country a moral erosion which is the result of our very great affluence, our comfortable living, our preoccupation with personal security and our lavish expenditure on luxuries, stimulated by the ever-increasing pressure of advertising.

TOO MUCH MOMISM

"We have altogether too much momism, if you will; too much preoccupation with social conformity and a very marked lack of information and interest regarding those world issues that intimately concern us. * * * It seems that we've drifted into the notion that what is good or bad should be judged only by the question: 'What can you get away with?' "

With the explosion of the civil rights revolution, Father LaFarge's was one of the first voices to speak out against segregation, calling on his church to take an active part.

"It is not a question for Negro citizens alone [to demonstrate]," he insisted. "It's a question of justice for American citizens, and I think as American citizens, whether they are white or Negro, makes little difference. Where wrong is committed, the white man suffers morally just as much as the Negro, and the interest is equal for all."

At one time or another Father LaFarge had been a director of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference; vice president and director of the Conference on Science, Philosophy, and Religion; a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences; vice president of the American Catholic Historical Association; vice president of the Catholic Association for International Peace; and an originator of the Liturgical Art Society, in New York City.

His honors were numerous: The World Brotherhood Award, the American Liberties Medallion of the American Jewish Committee, an award from the Religion and Labor Foundation of Washington and the annual peace award of the Catholic Association for International Peace were but a few.

In addition to his autobiography, he was the author of the following books: "Jesuits in Modern Times" (1927); "Interracial Justice" (1937); "The Race Question and the Negro" (1942); "No Postponement" (1950); "The Catholic Viewpoint on Race Relations" (1956); and only last month, "An American Amen."

There are no immediate survivors. The body will rest at Campion House until 4 p.m. tomorrow, and then will be taken to the Loyola School Chapel, 980 Park Avenue. A service will be held at 10 a.m., Wednesday, at St. Ignatius Loyola Church, Park Avenue and 84th Street. Burial will be at Loyola Seminary, Shrub Oak, N.Y.

Father LaFarge's epitaph could well have been written by himself. In an article on the shrine at Lourdes written several years ago, he said:

"For those who do not believe in God, no explanation is possible; for those who do believe in God, no explanation is necessary."

TRIBUTE TO BILL DON MOYERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, few young men have been given so much responsibility in recent years as a young Texan by the name of Bill Moyers. Senators will recall his alert and helpful cooperation and his quiet but effective leadership as a top official of the Peace Corps for the past 2 years.

Mr. President, I am confident that Washington and the Nation are going to hear a good deal more about this unassuming and effective young man in the coming weeks and months.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the New York Times on November 30, 1963, entitled "A White House Adviser—Bill Don Moyers."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WHITE HOUSE ADVISER—BILL DON MOYERS

WASHINGTON, November 29.—When he returned to Washington as President a week ago tonight, Lyndon B. Johnson quickly brought to his side a former assistant in whom he placed the highest trust, Bill Don Moyers. Mr. Moyers spent that night at the Johnson home, moved into the White House with Mr. Johnson last Tuesday and has been as close to him as any man in this first trying week of the new administration. He has handled appointments for the President, helped on speeches, made television arrangements.

The assumption has been that Mr. Moyers would soon acquire a formal title as a White House aid, but he says the assumption is wrong. He plans, he says, to go back to his regular work, "the best job in Washington," as Deputy Director of the Peace Corps.

"I'm not an exciting, interesting, mysterious figure behind the scenes," he said today. "I'm just here helping a friend, and when that ends I'll drift away and never be heard of again."

No one would ever question Bill Moyers' sincerity, but the ultimate decision on what he will do is up to the President. He says that, of course, he will do whatever Mr. Johnson asks. In any case, he will clearly be a man to whom Lyndon Johnson turns for help in difficult situations.

CAMPAIGN MANAGER

The President's high confidence in Mr. Moyers is the more impressive because he is just 29 years old—younger even than most of the brilliant team that President Kennedy gathered around him.

For a 29-year-old, he has done a great deal in life. He has supported himself since he was 14. He is an ordained Baptist minister, and he has written for newspapers and television. He has also been a political campaign manager—for Lyndon Johnson in 1960.

Mr. Moyers was born in Oklahoma on June 5, 1934, but the family moved to Marshall, Tex., when he was 6 months old and he will not allow being anything but a Texan.

It was a poor family. His father, who is still living, was an unskilled laborer. To get a formal education he had to hold down a full-time job while in college. He began at North Texas State College and stayed there for 2 years.

In the summer of 1954 he came to Washington as an intern on the staff of the then Senator Johnson. Even in those few months they achieved a remarkable rapport.

Mrs. Johnson offered Mr. Moyers a job on her radio and television stations in Austin. He took it and transferred to the University of Texas there, finishing college while working full time. He was a journalism graduate—the highest ranking in university history.

He spent a year at the University of Edinburgh, Scotland, on a Rotary International fellowship, and then went to Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Fort Worth.

He had three rural pastorates briefly as a student, but it was his intention to be a teacher rather than a minister. He had accepted a position teaching ethics at Baylor University when the 1960 campaign came along.

Mr. Johnson, running for Vice President, asked Bill Moyers to join his team of assistants. Before long Mr. Moyers was the top man on the team.

Why did an old campaigner like Lyndon Johnson pick a young man with so little political experience as his closest adviser in 1960? The answer seems to be simply respect for Bill Moyers' judgment.

Certainly, to the outsider, they did not seem alike in temperament or personality. Mr. Johnson was flamboyant, earthy, often hot tempered. Mr. Moyers was quiet, simple, and always cool.

A reporter remembers the time crowds were pouring out to meet the campaign plane and Mr. Moyers said to him softly: "Put out that cigarette, you're standing under the engine."

Perhaps Mr. Moyer's very calmness fits in well with the Johnson explosiveness of energy. It is said that he is the only member of the staff whom Mr. Johnson has "never read out of the human race."

Mr. Moyers moved into the Vice President's office in January 1961, but the next month was sent out "on loan" to help at the birth of the Peace Corps. He worked closely with the Corps Director, Sargent Shriver, and earned his highest regard and friendship.

This year President Kennedy nominated Mr. Moyers as Mr. Shriver's deputy. There were attacks in the Senate because he was only 28 at the time. Mr. Shriver, in a letter, said Mr. Moyers had been picked "for one simple reason—he is the best qualified man for the job."

His Peace Corps colleagues regard him as a man of exceptional intellect but, above all, as one with what one colleague called "a tremendous feeling for people."

"Some officials here think in terms of the number of trees planted or injections given," this man said. "Bill thinks in terms of the volunteers, what they need and can do."

Mr. Moyers does not use his middle name, Don. Neither does he use the name William. He is married to the former Judith Davidson, and they have two children.

His family is his only real hobby, friends say. He tries to spend a full hour with his children before leaving for work each morning.

WEST VIRGINIANS CHEERED BY FOREST RESEARCH LABORATORY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a recent article in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail tells of the new hope for economic recovery in West Virginia that has arisen as a result of the Forest Products Marketing Research Laboratory now being operated at Princeton, W. Va., by the Forest Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. West Virginians, who once led the Nation in the output of hardwood timber, are confident that the Princeton laboratory will point the way to the opening up of thousands of new jobs in the Appalachian timberlands.

Mr. President, I share this hope with my fellow West Virginians. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I took a group of planners from the Forest Service into the snow-covered woods of West Virginia early in 1961 to convince them of the advisability of locating a forestry products research laboratory in my State. Later that year, I amended the bill making appropriations for the U.S. Forest Service to add $450,000 for such a laboratory to be located at Princeton, W. Va. Because I believe that Appalachian timber holds one of the keys to economic prosperity in the Mountain State, I have worked unceasingly in behalf of the research laboratory. This year I was able to amend the Forest Service appropriation by adding $300,000 to the $100,000 budget request for the laboratory at Princeton, and, therefore, although $50,000 of those funds was lost in the subsequent Senate-House conference, a total of $350,000 was made available for fiscal 1964.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article in the Gazette-Mail, which tells what the new laboratory may mean to West Virginia, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRINCETON'S RESEARCH CENTER—NEW FACILITY MAY LEAD STATE TO FORESTED FIELDS OF WEALTH

(By W. C. Blizzard)

The disappearance of the wooden leg, the wooden nickel, and the wooden cigar store Indian may not have affected you personally. And then again it may have, whether you realize it or not.

For West Virginia at one time was the leading hardwood-producing State in the Nation, and even now ranks eighth in that category. So materials that replace wood, such as plastics and other synthetics, have had a depressing effect upon a segment of the economy important to mountaineers.

In recent years, experts have been pointing out the value of forest products from West Virginia, and the lamentable fact that so little wood is turned into manufactured products within the Mountain State. On November 12, a new Forest Products Marketing Laboratory was dedicated at Princeton, a Federal scientific center intended to find new markets for the timber which covers most of the West Virginia hills.

At that dedication, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, Democrat, of West Virginia, again pointed up the potential of West Virginia forests and forest products. Said he:

"Our forests, which cover more than two-thirds of the land area of our State, give employment to about 15,000 persons in jobs other than those directly related to forestry management. This is insufficient for such a vast and renewable resource.

"If the present timber growth in West Virginia were converted to lumber and then to furniture or other wood products in the State, employment would reach 250,000 men."

BYRD delivered the dedication address, an honor accorded him for the excellent reason that, as a member of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, he was responsible for procuring $700,000 for the building of the Federal marketing laboratory and the initiation of an area wood-research program.

The Princeton research center is a facility of the Northeastern Forest Experiment Station with headquarters at Upper Darby, Pa. It is operated by the Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Although the Forest Service maintains more than 90 research laboratories of various kinds, the Forest Products Marketing Laboratory at Princeton is the first such facility constructed with the aim of conducting research as to how forest-based industries may make a greater contribution to the social and economic welfare of Appalachia.

The Appalachians, known to the Indians as the "endless mountains," extend from northern Maine to the middle of Alabama and Georgia. West Virginia makes up their wrinkled midriff, a midriff in which the Princeton laboratory is imbedded like a navel.

It is hoped that marketing research conducted at Princeton will alleviate unemployment in the Mountain State, helping forest-use industries to apply wooden splints to the economic dislocation resulting from automation-oriented coal mines.

How did it come about that a Forest Products Marketing Laboratory was located at Princeton, rather than elsewhere in West Virginia? It is known that northeastern forest experiment officials from Upper Darby considered many sites before deciding in favor of the Mercer County community.

One forestry official put it this way:

"A big factor was the attitude of the people and their representatives in the Princeton area. They made it plain they wanted the laboratory, and were willing to go to some pains to get it."

This alertness and aggressiveness was demonstrated by the Mercer County court in a most practical way. It gave about 96 acres of property for the use of the new research facility.

This was the old county "poor farm" property, which was not in use (these county homes for the aged indigent and aged ill have for the most part been put out of business by social security, State agencies, and welfare measures). Broken into two tracts of 32 and 64 acres, respectively, the smaller parcel contains the main laboratory buildings and a 20-acre exhibition forest which may be used as a classroom by students, 4-H groups, garden clubs, and other interested groups. The forest will demonstrate modern multiple-use forestry practices.

The larger tract will be the site of a methods-testing plant, to be completed in 1964, nearly as large as the main laboratory. Here, products and processes will be tested and evaluated for commercial applications.

The new Federal laboratory will divide its initial research into four main marketing categories: primary forest products, such as sawlogs; primary wood manufacturing (lumber, veneer, pulpwood); secondary wood products (flooring, furniture, and plywood); and wood for construction (the largest single market).

As you might guess, the laboratory building is not constructed of steel and concrete. The laminated beams in the auditorium are of oak, the walls of Appalachian cherry. Lobby panels are constructed from elm, red oak, and pecan; and parquetry floors are of beech, maple, oak, and cherry.

This beautiful building, which cost about $450,000, contains 20 offices, a 150-seat auditorium, a library, a staff conference room, a projection and storage room, a lunchroom, a soundproof computing room, a photographic darkroom, a drafting room, a central clerical room, a file room, a mail room, a first-aid room, and a fireproof vault.

In silhouette representation, by the way, the laboratory looks much like a short-legged, long-bodied, bob-tailed pup. This was no doubt unintentional, but may be an interesting Rorschach comment on the architect who designed a building dedicated to products covered by bark. Or it may have been designed by a taxpayer feeling the bite. Or a forest owner hoping for a howling success.

More calmly, now—and more seriously—the Forest Products Marketing Laboratory at Princeton is an installation of which West Virginians may be proud, a research center which will benefit not only the mountaineer economy, but all of Appalachia.

As my own contribution to the profitable uses of wood, I refer you to your television set. No, I don't mean the gleaming cabinet. I mean Ed Sullivan's facial expression.

Ed uses no unsatisfactory substitutes, such as plastic or rubber. That is certain. And he is doing well.

But perhaps this suggestion should be ignored. The stone industry may already have claimed Ed for their own.

TORTOISE AND HARE MOON RACE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the apparent relaxation of tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union has lulled some persons into believing that there is no longer such a thing as a race to the moon, that the Russians are prepared to cooperate peacefully with us in exploring outer space. A recent article by the editor of Parade magazine, written in Moscow, should dispel us of that illusion. The article points out that the Russians, despite economic problems, are still embarked on a crash program to reach and control the areas of the moon for their own purposes. We are warned not to act like the silly hare in the fable and allow the tortoise to win the race.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARE THE RUSSIANS REALLY QUITTING THE MOON RACE?

(By Jess Gorkin)

MOSCOW.—Premier Khrushchev's dramatic announcement that Russia is dropping out of the moon race has raised a whole galaxy of questions.

Some skeptics suspect Khrushchev hasn't changed his plans for landing a man on the moon but made his announcement to take the pep out of our program. They recall that the Soviets once swore they were engaged only in peaceful nuclear research while they disguised their nuclear weapons program under the innocent name, Ministry of Medium Machine Building.

Khrushchev's disclaimer has encouraged critics in the United States to demand slashes in the American moon program. They charge that President Kennedy was bluffed into blowing billions to meet a challenge which no longer exists. But anguished Western skeptics, who have been watching the Soviet space program, warn that the Russians will sneak ahead of us if we relax our vigilance and slow down our moon program to a snail's pace.

Many observers believe the wily Khrushchev is giving Russia a tails-I-win-heads-you-lose advantage in the moon competition. If Russia lands the first man on the moon, the world will herald it as a technological triumph and a propaganda victory for communism. If an American reaches the moon first, the world will merely recall Khrushchev's statement and shrug it off.

Conquest of the moon is held to be vital not only to our prestige but to our security. For as outer space becomes navigable, no one really knows what menace a Soviet moon base might constitute.

One fear is that the Soviets might use the moon as a base for lasers. This deadly system, which concentrates light into a narrow, unending and highly destructive beam, could be used to pinpoint, pick off, and pulverize U.S. satellites, missiles, or even missile sites on earth. A similar system under U.S. command could deter Soviet aggression against the free world. Some military weapons men believe that the nation which first establishes such a system, or some other futuristic weapons network on the moon, will control space and the earth in the event of war.

Despite Khrushchev's statement, the confident attitude of their scientists and the pattern of their space activities indicate to Western experts that the Soviet goal is still the moon and beyond.

A GAGARIN, NOT A GLENN

I am convinced that:

The Russians are driving full blast for the moon.

They hold a lead in manned space flight and mean to retain it.

In short, they are determined that the first man on the moon will be a Gagarin, not a Glenn.

The conquest of space has come to mean more to the Kremlin than a mere matter of national pride; it has become part of the Communist dogma. The Soviets are fanatically committed to outdoing the United States in this race. Having declared that nuclear war isn't necessary to achieve world domination, they hope to accomplish the same end by dominating space. Make no mistake, it is powerful fuel, this mixture of national pride, political ambition and doctrinal zeal. On a previous visit here I attended a meeting at which a new sputnik launching was discussed. The Soviet scientists described their achievements in space as simply another first in science for the U.S.S.R.

Many American scientists are skeptical of the value of putting a man on the moon. They claim that the astronaut simply will "go along for the ride," that instrument packages can send back better information at far less cost. Other Americans are genuinely alarmed about the high cost of the moon project. They urge that the money would be better spent on health, education, housing, and other problems on earth.

Khrushchev may joke that in the Soviet Union they say, "Who is impatient on earth, let him go to the moon." But the Russians regard the exploration of space as a most serious matter. The Russians definitely view the exploration of space in terms of Soviet Columbuses and Magellans, of men crossing and charting the vast oceans of nothingness between the planets. They are aware of the tremendous impression their space exploits have made upon the world, especially upon the new nations of Africa and Asia. Western experts believe that the Soviets intend to add to these exploits, not to back away from them.

It is true that the Russian economy is in trouble, that Premier Khrushchev has had to juggle his budget between military and consumer demands. But far from cutting back on space exploration, he appears to be pressing forward with it. He has even diverted scientists from nuclear projects to work on biophysics, the science of maintaining men in space. A Dr. Parin, known to Westerners here as a nuclear physicist, recently received the prized Lenin Medal for his work in space medicine.

As early as 1950, the Russians began to "wire" athletes in action as a preliminary to recording the reactions of men in space. I have seen "wired" athletes being tested in the scientific laboratory in Moscow's Lenin Stadium. They also rocketed dogs aloft to determine the biological effects of space flight. After the first sputnik, the Russians followed up by launching the late, lamented dog Laika in orbit. At least 8 of their first 15 space launchings were experiments leading to manned flight.

From Yuri Gagarin's historic orbit until the recent "doubleheader," when the first space rendezvous failed by a mere 2 miles, the Russians have gone all out for men in space. All their research has been coordinated toward this goal; it is the objective proclaimed by their literature. At this writing, Soviet cosmonauts have logged 382 hours, 20 minutes in space compared to 58 hours, 33 minutes by our astronauts.

RIGOROUS INDOCTRINATION

I have watched Soviet training films, which show how cosmonauts are tested and trained. The space recruits go through a bone- and brain-jarring indoctrination course, which tests their physical and psychological aptitude. They endure hours of lonely silence, suddenly shattered by flashing lights and screeching noises, to determine their reaction to space-flight emergencies. They also are strapped in whirling, catapulting devices similar to but cruder than the equipment used by our own astronauts.

Significantly, the Soviet space program is totally under military control. It reportedly is run by a Council of Ministers. Economic Boss Dimitry Ustinov assigns the priorities; Research Chief K. N. Rudnev directs the technology. But the program is administered by Defense Minister Rodion Malinovsky.

Of course, the Russians talk a lot about their peaceful goals in space just as they used to preach about the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Soviet Academician L. I. Sedov, a leading scientist and spokesman on aerospace matters, says, "There is one large team in Russia that handles all space projects. The same key men are in charge of guidance, tracking and other segments for each of the projects. It is a very large team and it can well take care of several projects in parallel. * * * We have no distinction between military and civilian projects." Western watchers agree that future Soviet spacemen, like today's cosmonauts, will wear the uniform of the Red Army. Reported military goal in space: to establish space stations in orbit, then bases on the lunar surface.

The Soviet rendezvous attempt is believed to have been part of a piggyback plan for sending a man around the moon. The idea is to launch the moon rocket from the back of a sputnik already in orbit. Comments M. V. Keldysh, president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences: "This method of launching has opened up new possibilities for interplanetary flights since it eliminates the necessity of choosing specific dates for moon flights; and it removes the restrictions connected with the fact that not all points on the earth are equally advantageous for launching."

If the Russians succeed in perfecting this docking technique—and they won't fail for lack of trying—they now have the equipment to send a man in a loop around the moon and back. Significantly, the Russians are now working on equipment that can have no purpose other than to land a man on the moon.

How does the moon competition look as it goes into the first lap? The Russians are clearly ahead in their preparations to put men in space. They know more about the medical and psychological problems, especially the problem of weightlessness.

Russia is ahead, too, in exploring the moon with unmanned rockets. One of these took pictures of the hidden side of the moon, developed the photographs on board and transmitted them back to Moscow. Four years later, we still haven't duplicated this feat.

VON BRAUN COMING UP

The chief reason for the Soviet lead, however, is the advantage of bigger boosters. This should vanish in a matter of weeks when our giant Saturn rocket, guided by specialist Wernher von Braun and his team, is scheduled to launch a 20,000-pound satellite which will outweigh the heaviest Soviet sputnik by at least 6,000 pounds.

The United States is also ahead in the number of launches; in scientific space probes; in weather, navigation, and communications satellites.

Certainly the Russians, despite their early advantage, can be overtaken in space. We are fast catching up with them in equipment, are ahead in many space fields. Khrushchev might also run into serious economic difficulties which could slow his space program down.

Is it possible that the Russians might reconsider President Kennedy's proposal of a joint moon venture? Both the United States and Soviet Union are too far along to integrate their lunar equipment, a task that would be almost hopelessly complex. As one westerner put it: "The Russians would have to change their whole concept of secrecy before we could arrange a joint moon mission." Many experts believe that an exchange of space information is the most that could come out of Kennedy's proposal.

Does Khrushchev secretly plan another classic tortoise-and-hare drama in the moon competition? Millions of experts and nonexperts think so.

THE NEED FOR STRAIGHT THINKING

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the assassination of President Kennedy has angered and revolted every decent American. However, a strong effort has been provoked to place the responsibility for this despicable act on political forces within the country which were opposed to the policies of our late President. By some curious kind of emotional thinking, the finger of accusation has been pointed at rightist and antidesegregation groups, or so-called hatemongers. A refreshing note of sobriety has been sounded in a column by Richard Wilson in the Washington Evening Star of November 27, which should remind us that the accused assassin, Lee Oswald, proudly professed to be a leftist Marxist, and that efforts to connect his dastardly deed to the actions of opposite political movements are exceedingly tenuous and farfetched.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial in the Evening Star be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Nov. 27, 1963]

Assassination Evokes Odd Views—Many Seen Linking Kennedy Killing to Racist, Rightist, Despite Facts

(By Richard Wilson)

The mood of self-examination which has overtaken the country following the assassination of President Kennedy has produced both ludicrous speculation and tortured reasoning.

We can see coming now the tracts entitled "The Conspiracy To Murder John F. Kennedy." In one version it will be an inverse antidesegregation conspiracy using a double-agent Communist to carry out the deed. In another version it will be just a plain Communist conspiracy. Additional versions will prove the ingenuity of the human mind when stimulated by 4 days of unremitting TV-radio programing.

These fantasies are not confined to the lunatic fringe. Here in Washington, simple but seriously intentioned people arrived at the strange conclusion that the murder of the President is related in some amorphous way to the slaying of a desegregation leader in Mississippi.

In spite of the simple facts of the assassination, there are many in this city who will not separate the President's tragic death from the segregation and far right issues. Their tortured reasoning is that the assassin came out of the same pot, that the city of Dallas in the reactionary Southwest had spawned them all and all were equally culpable.

Even the Chief Justice of the United States allowed himself to stray from the path of sound reasoning. The misguided could deduce from his remarks that the extremities of the right in this particular case carried a responsibility for inspiring the extremities of the far left.

It is understandable that reasonable men, shocked and perplexed, should grope for the causes of the savagely incongruous event. But why there should be supposed to be any vague relationship between the assassination of President Kennedy and the assassination of President Lincoln escapes rationality. Lincoln's assassination was indeed the act of a crazed and pitifully inadequate conspiracy that aspired to control of the Nation. That assassination was part of the great Civil War over the issue of slavery and the rights of the States.

All too often, and without sound cause, the events of today are cast in the mold of a century ago, as if the relatively peaceful demonstrations for Negro equality were revolutionary acts. All too often the reaction of the white community of the Nation is related to the cause for which millions of men sprang to arms a century ago.

These exaggerations seem to be part of the uncertain national mood. It could be expected, therefore, that the man-in-the-street last Friday, before the circumstances became known, should conclude that the attack on the President could be traced either to the segregation or the far right issues.

This notion is given up by some only reluctantly and if any twisted version can be made to fit their preconceptions they readily turn to it.

Nothing could have been more repugnant to the vibrant spirit and rational mind of John F. Kennedy.

Now a series of inquiries is beginning. One is by the FBI and the Justice Department into both the assassination and the murder of the accused assassin. Another study will be conducted in Congress in connection with legislation to make a murderous attack on the President and Vice President a Federal crime wherever committed. The State of Texas will conduct a special ex post facto inquiry.

If these inquiries are well conducted they can help to clarify whether or not Oswald, in fact, murdered the President and his probable motives; they can never prove in the legal sense, however, that Oswald was the assassin, and he will remain for all time the accused assassin.

Only a continuing self-examination by those who influence public thinking will find the root causes for the act. It may simply be that the cause lies more in the disorderly, undisciplined, and callous phases of American life than in the ideological concepts that divide the country.

But one simple fact should not be ignored. The accused, and likely, murderer was a proudly professed Marxist; he never boasted of being a segregationist or a far-righter.

THE BROADCASTING MEDIA IN COVERING THE TRAGIC EVENTS OF THE DEATH AND BURIAL OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am sure that all of America holds the communications industry in esteem for the excellent and tireless job which television and radio did in informing the Nation and the world of the tragic events surrounding the assassination of President Kennedy. The broadcasting industry brought unforgettable moments of history alive into the homes of millions.

The presentation of the sequence of events throughout the sad 3½-day period was particularly memorable because of the dedication, accuracy, and good taste of those from the broadcasting industry who worked long and often under difficult circumstances.

Their standards of excellence and public service did credit to us all as a people. Interspersed with news events brought into our homes throughout the country, and, indeed, to other areas of the world, was fine programing of music, literature, poetry and readings in keeping with the atmosphere not only of our tragedy but of our aspirations and culture as personified by President and Mrs. Kennedy in the White House.

For the broadcasting systems and stations, the economic sacrifices were indeed considerable. Yet, what they did was done without question and without complaint in fulfilling their responsibility to the public and to our society. The losses of many million of dollars, while they can never be recovered, I am sure was not, and is not, uppermost in the minds of the executives, whose concern is rather to keep faith with our Nation in the difficult sorrowful days, and in this they served nobly. There have been times when the communications media may have brought justifiable criticism in questions of taste in commercialism and programing. But, in all fairness, they deserve the public respect and commendation due them at this time.

In my own home State of Rhode Island, Mr. Joseph P. Dougherty, president of the Rhode Island Broadcasters Association, put out a letter to his fellow broadcasters. I think the letter speaks for itself, and I certainly agree with him. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Dougherty's letter be inserted in the Congressional Record at this time.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Capital Cities Broadcasting Corp.,
Providence, R.I., November 29, 1963.

To: Rhode Island Broadcasters Association.
From: Joseph P. Dougherty, president.
Date: November 26, 1963.
Subject: The tragic event.

There was no ruling from the FCC.

There was no request from any Government official, National, State, or local.

There was no directive from the NAB.

There was no suggestion from the RIBA.

Rather, there was a group of mature, responsible businessmen operating Rhode Island's radio and television stations using commonsense to make a decision to alter formats, report all the news on a noncommercial basis from shortly after the first break in the story until sign-on today.

Congratulations. You should need no further testimony to anyone from anyone.

Joe Dougherty.

CONGRESS AND THE ENDLESS FRONTIER

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in the past few years, we have seen very large expansion in Federal support for research and development programs; in fact we are approaching the $15-billion-a-year level of support. This is a sizable fraction of the entire Federal budget.

With this increase in Federal support has come an increase in congressional concern over how these funds are managed, and also how the Congress is to receive adequate scientific and technical advice in order to perform its proper role of authorization and appropriation.

One of the clearest and most perceptive statements about these problems and suggested solutions was made recently by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, our colleague Senator Clinton Anderson. Because of its timeliness and importance, I ask unanimous consent that this excellent address be printed in the Record at this point and recommend its consideration by all of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Congress and the Endless Frontier

(Remarks of Senator Clinton P. Anderson at the 1963 Annual Conference of the Atomic Industrial Forum, Inc., Americana Hotel, New York City, November 20, 1963)

How can Government best advance science in peacetime? That was a question put to Vannevar Bush by President Roosevelt in the closing months of World War II. Writing to the President, Mr. Bush said:

"The pioneer spirit is still vigorous within this Nation. Science offers a largely unexplored hinterland for the pioneer who has the tools for his task. The rewards of such exploration both for the Nation and the individual are great. Scientific progress is one essential key to our security as a nation, to our better health, to more jobs, to a higher standard of living and to our cultural progress."

The Bush report was titled "Science, the Endless Frontier." It set out a course for the Federal Government to follow in the inauguration and support of scientific programs for the broadest public benefit.

I am not going to discuss this noon the uses and complications of atomic energy because to do so before a group such as this would be like hauling atoms to Oak Ridge. And in a few hours I am going to be participating in a panel discussion of the uses of the atom in many technical areas. But I can try, however, to contribute to the overall problem of the use of atomic science and technology by illuminating the kinds of problems and considerations which technical programs face in the Washington arena. Because of the increasing interest displayed on Capitol Hill in what has come to be called "big science," I have hope that you do not mind if I discuss the relationships between Congress and science. I can speak freely since I am not an expert in either field.

The House of Representatives has created a special committee to look into the problems posed by the rapid growth of science and the heavy financial commitment of the Federal Government to scientific and developmental enterprises. In addition, a subcommittee of the House Science and Astronautics Committee in recent weeks has been examining the relationship of science and Government. Tomorrow, the Senate Space Committee, which I serve as chairman, will conduct hearings on the impact of the national space program on education and our academic institutions. We are interested in finding out how NASA's program of graduate fellowships and research facility grants is working in relation to the total Federal activity in aid to higher education. This program represents only 1 percent of NASA's current budget, but it is an extremely important item—to the agency and to the colleges.

So there is a large measure of active congressional attention being paid to the affairs of state and science. This interest and concern are reflected by several different proposals which have been made in an attempt to improve both Government relationships with science and the effectiveness of Congress in making decisions affecting science and technology. Last March, the Senate passed S. 816 which is now pending in the House. This bill proposes the creation of a Commission of Science and Technology—a Hoover-type commission—to study ways of strengthening executive and legislative policy programs and operations in science and technology development. The Commission would review undesirable duplication, scientific manpower policies, the way in which scientific information is made available and similar problems growing out of the rapid buildup of the Government's activities in science and technology. The Commission would be made up of scientists and nonscientists. It would examine the pros and cons of a Department of Science, a proposal which has been introduced in Congress on many occasions.

Senator Bartlett, of Alaska, has proposed the establishment of a Congressional Office of Science and Technology. The abbreviation for this advisory arm of Congress is COST—a very appropriate alphabetic designation because in my opinion, in that word, "cost," lies the basic concern of Congress.

And Congressman Daddario, of Connecticut, who has been presiding over the House Science and Astronautics Subcommittee's hearings into the relationship of science and Government, recommended a three-pronged program to improve Congress' ability to legislate in this area. He called for (1) strengthening of the staffs of committees which deal with problems of science and technology, (2) better equipping of the Library of Congress to gather information, and (3) the creation of ad hoc advisory committees to the appropriate congressional committees. I think the Congressman's suggestions are the most useful and I will explain why in a few minutes.

I submit that there are at least four reasons for this interest on the part of Congress.

First, there is cost consciousness. It is so familiar that it has become a cliche to recite how Government research and development expenditures have multiplied many times in recent years.

But to refresh our memories, Federal spending for research and development has multiplied a hundredfold since 1940; it exceeds 10 percent of the Federal budget, and accounts for two-thirds of what the entire Nation spends on research and development. Industry, colleges, and universities, and other nonprofit institutions account for the other third.

Another way of looking at this is from the standpoint of time and cost estimates. One of the knottiest problems in the administration of science and technology or, for that matter, the setting of policy concerning science and technology, is the fact that many budgeted costs are based on an estimate which does not hold true for any long period of time. For example, the Air Force estimated in 1960 that Project Skybolt would cost $893 million; in 1961 the estimated cost had reached $1.9 billion and by the summer of 1962—when Skybolt was scrapped—the cost estimate had climbed to $2.3 billion, and Skybolt was a year and a half behind schedule. The course of events, due either to underestimation of technological problems or overestimation of capability to achieve target dates within the dollars asked, caused the cancellation of Skybolt. Another example is the ANP project. In November 1951 one contractor estimated that it would take $188 million to deliver its nuclear powerplant for mounting an aircraft by May of 1956. By 1961, when the project was canceled, the cost of that one company had reached over $527 million, and the powerplant had never been delivered. The total cost of ANP, when it was scrapped, has exceeded a billion dollars.

Curiously, however, the money supposedly wasted on the nuclear-powered plane may yet pay valuable dividends. The positive findings of the ANP program in metallurgy and instrumentation may become the foundation for the design and development of the proposed supersonic airliner. Also, as a result of the ANP program, much technology in materials, shielding, and fuel elements has been developed which has a wide application in reactor technology of all kinds. When the Nation has a need for nuclear aircraft, the experience of ANP will certainly provide the base upon which a realistic program can be built.

Another example is the technology developed as part of the much-maligned Navajo program which was canceled after an expenditure of approximately $800 million. The guidance system developed for the Navajo program went into the Snark missile and has been used for all future generations of missiles produced since the Navajo. With modification it will continue to be the basic guidance system for missiles for years to come.

There seems to be a law of nature which, simply stated, is that knowledge, however useless at the moment of its discovery, will, at the proper moment in history, find its place in the scheme of things and make its contribution. To quote more philosophically, Newton at one time stated that if his concepts of science were better than Descartes, it is only because he stood upon the shoulders of giants—and Descartes was one of the giants.

So, when you hear about the waste in research and development, it may be only correct for that moment in history. Future use of the technology may well have been worth the expenditure.

A better way must be found to estimate the long-range costs of these programs and more accurate target dates for their completion must be determined. It is bad enough that the estimates of costs escalate to a fantastic degree, but it could be disastrous when the defense of the country may rest upon the availability of a specific system at a given time to respond to a threat. This is more important when one has made an early selection to go down one route of development rather than another and then finds that the choice was wrong.

Often overlooked in the consideration of the cost of a specific system is the cost of associated resources which must be dedicated to achievement of the goal. Support for system operational capability is often a much more expensive and complex package than is the specific project for which it is required. When the specific project is canceled, it sets off a disruptive chain reaction with serious economic implications. This leads to another critical problem. We hear much about the shortage of scientists and engineers, but I have the feeling that the problem is maldistribution and misuse of talent rather than a numerical shortage, although we are going to need more and better trained engineers and scientists over the years.

One can get concerned about this faced with the fact that often there are six or seven major contractors preparing proposals for one specific program which obviously can go to only one company. The effort that goes into the preparation of technical proposals requires large blocks of scientific and engineering talent. In some organizations, more man-years of effort are spent in drawing proposals than in the actual performance of technical missions.

For a measure of this cost-conscious mood, perhaps "the most unkindest cut of all" was the House action reducing the National Science Foundation budget by 45 percent.

Recently, William D. Carey, Executive Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget, said that "funds for research and development have come so easily in the past decade that in some quarters of the scientific community, we find a state of mind that assumes that the miracle of the loaves and fishes will go on indefinitely and that the mere assertion of a valid scientific need will suffice to turn on the financial gusher once more." So it appears that the justification for the 16th and 17th billion dollars for R. & D. will be made on different grounds than that which sufficed for the first $15 billion.

Cost consciousness, therefore, is a first reason for congressional attention to the endless frontier. Second is the belief among some Members that Congress has lost the ability to oversee effectively the vast diffusion of R. & D. activities for which it appropriates funds. As proof, take Senator BARTLETT's statement when he submitted his proposal: "At the present time," said he, "the Congress does not appreciate the importance of scientific decisions and as a result they are made, not in the Halls of Congress, but elsewhere, not by the elected Representatives but by unknown administrative officials. * * * How is a popular elected Government to control its own activities? How are elected officials to direct development of something they do not understand with implications they do not comprehend?" They are profund questions which go to the heart of our representative system.

Third, there is concern that the procedures of Congress, in some respects, may not measure up to the demands of "big science." New techniques for better obtaining information may be required so that Congress will approach parity of knowledge with the executive agencies—in other words, that Congress will have its own sources of accurate information apart from the agencies and that this source of information will enable Congress to better judge the merits in any particular research and development project.

Fourth, criticism of the space program as "moon madness" and "lunacy" gets lumped in with the criticism of heavy spending for research and development. While the space program is a large part of the scientific and technological picture, it is a long way from being a "stunt." I was somewhat amused at the way in which critics of this Nation's lunar landing mission were quick to interpret Premier Khrushchev's recent remarks as a Russian withdrawal from manned exploration of the moon. It was no such thing. We tried to say so but it finally took Khrushchev to set the critics straight.

I do, then, agree that the Congress needs various types of advice on technical matters. But it is important, first, to clarify once and for all the definition of just what scientific advice is. On examination of the content of the $15 billion being spent this year for science one will discover that only a small fraction of this figure is actually being spent for basic research. The predominant amount is being spent for hardware which is being designed and produced not by scientists but by engineers.

Let's take a minute to examine the $15 billion of Federal expenditure which too loosely gets labeled as spending for science. In reality, of the $15 billion, only $1.5 billion is for basic research, another $1.2 billion is for research and development facilities, and $12.3 billion is for developmental hardware, which is not science, but is engineering and technology with the greatest bulk spent with private industry.

The $15 billion is spent in the following manner: 67 percent through contracts with private industry, over 10 percent through grants and contracts with universities and other nonprofit institutions, and the balance by Government scientists in Federal facilities.

Most of this spending is accounted for by the revolutionary changes in defense systems which have taken place within the last decade. While the cost of defense is increasing, production line items have dwindled and the emphasis now is on fewer and more costly weapon units requiring correspondingly larger investments for research and development.

It seems to me that engineering advice is also to be included in the definition of advice. The engineers are the people who can give better estimates of cost and time than the producers of the scientific concept.

It is in the area of cost estimating of a program and the timetable required to develop and produce that Congress finds its greatest problems. I will elaborate on that point in a moment. Another important factor is that Congress needs to look on science not as a function such as agriculture or defense but simply as a factor—a factor of rapidly increasing importance—to be included in all other factors to be weighed in the solution of a variety of problems facing us.

When we look at the test ban treaty, or water pollution by synthetic detergents, or the NASA authorization bill, we see issues of public policy concerning which decisions are made not alone, or not even primarily, on the basis of technical factors but on many other factors as well—administrative, economic, political, social.

Ninety percent of the approximately $8 billion the Defense Department spends for research and development goes to produce hardware for better transport, communications, weapons, and other equipment—all of this to give the military the wherewithal to fulfill its approved missions. Knowledge of science and technology is not required for Congress to determine whether this money is being spent in consonance with assigned Defense responsibilities. The executive examines in great detail the way in which the Defense Department should operate. The detailed justification of the Defense budget to Congress reveals to the congressional committees what is hoped to be achieved with the funds. This can be measured against congressional understanding of military missions.

As an example, the Congress is fully capable of determining the role of the Air Force and the role of NASA in the total space program. This is neither a scientific nor a technical question. It weighs the broad missions of the Air Force and how best to accomplish them.

There are instances where Congress, because of its curiosity about new weapons systems, has actually pushed the services into developing new instruments of war. Witness the nuclear submarine.

I believe the kind of advice and information needed by Congress varies depending on the particular problem or situation. There are times, I think, when we need the advice of a group of the most prominent scientists we can obtain to discuss both the pros and cons of a particular question or approach to a problem, particularly where the major factor is technical in nature. For example, I believe we should have had such advice by way of education at the time of the decision of earth orbit versus lunar orbit as the best way to set up our moon program. We could have better understood the choices before us, the limitations of the alternatives and the probabilities of success and failure. On the other hand, I doubt if we could justify the full-time use of eminent scientists to review and analyze a particular agency's proposed research and development program. There might be an occasion where a panel could assist in reviewing a particular segment, such as the adequacy of the space sciences program or the basic research part of the defense R. & D. program.

Normally, however, I believe what Congress needs is the advice of a well-rounded scientific and technical "generalist," who having a scientific or engineering background is familiar with the workings of the Federal Government, and with a number of executive agency R. & D. programs, particularly with their management. Experience in coordinating the work and projects of others in terms of the overall mission or goal would be valuable. He also should be familiar with the scientific and technical community, so that he will know where to seek help when it is needed. He must have an appreciation of the values and ways of the legislative process, a feeling for public policy, and a capacity for sorting out public issues, competing values, and alternative solutions. Additionally, we need a person whose engineering background enables him to give us sound judgment on the costs of a project.

The committee structure plays an important part, naturally, in any discussion of this problem. Each committee is restricted in interest and scope of responsibility; yet many areas of congressional interest cut across many fields. For example, we cannot really review our water research and development program or our oceanographic research program, or our total basic research program, or our scientific manpower resources program, without cutting across committee responsibilities and looking at many executive department programs. Likewise, scientific and technical advice is required in many disciplines. For the Congress, or the Senate itself, to have a staff in a position to answer all of the inquiries of the various Members and committees would require a duplication of the staffs within the executive agencies. It would require people with detailed knowledge of the missions and programs of all of the executive departments. This is impractical, is too costly, and has never been the intent of Congress. Furthermore, I do not think Congress needs it.

I do not see how three or four scientists and engineers can provide the Senate, for example, with the quality and quantity of advice needed by the committees and their members. Science and technology are very general terms which we need to break down into scientific disciplines before we can analyze what kind of scientists and engineers we are talking about and whether or not they could meet our needs. How could a biologist, a chemist, and a physicist, either separately or in combination, assist the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences in determining whether to authorize funds for a deep space probe or a specific type of communications satellite system? If the physicist has a space background which enabled him to be useful to one committee then his time would presumably be taken up with that committee work and he would not be available to other committees.

Similarly, if the biologist were busy assisting the Committee on Agriculture, he would not be available to help other committees during the time when hearings were being held simultaneously by several committees. I do not see how one biologist can assist with problems of pesticides, the pollution of air, land, and water, manned spaceflight, or radioactive isotopes for cancer research. If, on the other hand, three or four experts were supposed to put us in touch with other experts, I should like to point out that this is what our permanent committee staff is already doing as the occasion demands and when it is possible to assemble these scarce professional experts. I note in one of the proposals that the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration is to determine the priority of answering requests made by Members and committees to the small group of scientists and engineers. To transfer responsibility from the proposed scientific group to our Rules and Administration Committee would not do away with the difficulties of determining priorities among congressional assignments, but instead could lead to a pattern of bottlenecks and bypassing.

Just as Congress must improve its understanding of science and technology, it is important that scientists and engineers have some appreciation of what is involved in the legislative process. This was well understood by Elihu Root when he said that "Politics is the practical exercise of the art of self-government, and somebody must attend to it if we are to have self-government; somebody must study it, and learn the art, and exercise patience and sympathy and skill to bring the multitude of opinions and wishes of self-governing people into such order that some prevailing opinion may be expressed and peaceably accepted. Otherwise, confusion will result either in dictatorship or anarchy."

Scientific advice is not something that is fixed and irrevocable. It changes with time and knowledge. The same scientific phenomena viewed from different angles pose different questions and demand different answers. The application of science may require new points of view because the frontier is changing, reaching out for new goals with new approaches. Science is too broad and it demands specialists. Men who are experts in naval reactors are not necessarily qualified to advise on reactors for space propulsion. We do not expect any single man in any discipline to be a repository of all the knowledge about his own discipline; we do not expect it in law, in medicine or any other field.

It is said that Congress, because it has maintained certain rituals for years, is a 19th century body faced with 20th century problems. I would suggest that while the precedents and practices of Congress have been maintained and are perhaps archaic in this age of science and technology, the minds of Congressmen are, in fact, products of the 20th century. There is no relationship between the rituals maintained by an organization and its mental capability. Congress could legislate as well in the 20th century if its Members still wore powdered wigs and capes instead of Ivy League clothes.

In addition to the scientific aspects and the facts assembled by engineers about a given proposal, we must ask ourselves such questions as these: What will the impact be upon our economy? What effect will it have on our foreign relations? Will it contribute to the health, education, and welfare of the Nation?

In spite of all the avenues which one may travel to get expert counsel, in the last analysis it is the collective wisdom of Congress itself which is most important. The term "scientific advice" loosely defined is an orderly organization of facts leading to a conclusion. The history of science is replete with commonsense convictions later found to be scientifically accurate. Curious men have always managed to secure for themselves skills and competent information without benefit of training in the sciences and without the calculated adoption of scientific procedures. These decisions, therefore, cannot be determined in isolation upon a completely scientific basis by disinterested officials. Such objectivity is more than we can expect from men who are creatures of their environment, and maybe more than is good for the democratic system.

I can give numerous examples from the area of atomic energy when Congress, for reasons of its own, and perhaps understandable only to the individual Members, has made momentous decisions which have withstood the challenge of history and have proven right. To cite a few:

The decision to proceed with the development of the hydrogen bomb against the advice of the General Advisory Committee;

The decision to plan a broad weapon program which required the development of large quantities of fissionable materials, even though predictions were that this country could never provide the uranium 235 and plutonium needed;

The development of the *Nautilus* and the nuclear submarine fleet, against determined opposition;

The development of a variety of power reactors.

Perhaps what I have just related will illustrate how a legislator can help shape—I hope intelligently—decisions on science and technology. The process of cross-pollination—that is, exposure to a range of problems through various committee assignments—can play a part in a Senator's decision.

So does the process of osmosis. Over a period of time, Members of Congress, through their committee assignments and awareness of the world around them, absorb some familiarity with the language and problems of the scientists and technicians. Since science is only one factor in the shaping of the good society, I would paraphrase Clemenceau that "science is too important to be left solely to the scientists."

However, I do not want to leave the impression that Congress has been infallible in its decisions on science and technology. Congress has made mistakes. In many cases, it has pushed programs too hard. But we politicians are not alone in making misjudgments. The basic theories of Newton, Galileo, Einstein, and others are now being challenged without loss of respect for these giants of science.

The aeronautical industry in 1953 completely failed to predict the space age, then only 4 years away. Prof. Simon Newcomb, a distinguished American astronomer, stated: "Human flight is not only impossible, but illogical." Newcomb published his conclusions in 1903—at the very moment the Wright brothers were about to demonstrate just how "illogical" the whole business was.

Congress is not a perfect instrument or even a near perfect instrument for making policy and laws. Certainly, I have attempted on occasion to change the procedures of Congress so that it can become a more responsible instrument of democracy. And, certainly, there is something wrong with our procedures when we find ourselves still trying to appropriate funds for the operation of Government for fiscal 1964, 5 months after the start of that fiscal year. This does not make the role of administrators any easier, and compounds the problems of managers of technical development programs.

To sum up, let me state what I think can be done to overcome the problems involved in the relationship of Congress with the "endless frontier." First, I think we need to strengthen the staffing of the committees which deal with this area.

Second, these committees should make intelligent use of ad hoc groups to give counsel on technical problems.

Third, there should be an easier flow of information between the congressional committees themselves so that Congress avoids needless duplication in repetitious hearings and overburdening of witnesses. As an example, the staff of the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee this year has had a fine and continuing relationship with their counterparts in the House. This made for a more effective handling of the space authorization bill, and I think it is going to continue to pay dividends.

Fourth, the representatives of the executive agencies should improve their method of presentation to congressional committees. I do not believe that in discussing purely scientific problems there is any coloration of executive or legislative science. It is science for the Nation as a whole. There are a limited number of people available with the broad knowledge necessary to give Congress advice on purely scientific questions Although the Office of Science and Technology is an arm of the President, it would be most helpful if its staff could testify fully and adequately before congressional committees. The separation of legislative and executive powers in this regard can be carried to an extent that does damage to programs which both branches are mutually interested in.

Fifth, at the outset, the channels for gathering information through the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress should be expanded and greater use should be made of such existing organizations as the National Academy of Science, the National Science Foundation, and the National Research Council.

Furthermore, I think it might be useful in improving the lines of communication between the scientific community and Congress if Congress could receive an annual report on the state of science and technology. Each year we receive from the President a message on the state of the Union, a budget message and various other reports. The President transmits to us through the National Aeronautics and Space Council a report on the yearlong activities in space and aeronautics. Perhaps the National Academy of Sciences, through its various committees, could prepare a report by itself or in association with others such as the Office of Science and Technology. The report would briefly discuss the major programs in science and technology and would set forth what problems might be on the horizon which would require congressional attention. Separately, but more effectively, in conjunction with the National Academy, the American Association of Professional Engineers might report on the state of engineering since engineering is such a large part of Government R. & D. programs. I would like to see this proposal pursued to the mutual benefit of the scientists, engineers, and the public.

One critical essential to the effective spending of vast sums of money, the marshaling of thousands of scientific and technical skills and the construction of large installations is long-term planning. This might be called ivory towerish. Some might even label it socialistic. But without it we travel down roads, perhaps better left untraveled. Or we find that we start out in one direction and are unable to veer to another course when a change becomes prudent. Now is a very good time to begin thinking beyond Project Apollo as to what our next major objective in space should be.

If one examines in detail the capability in space being developed by this Nation, it will be readily apparent that it is a broad-based capability that will serve this Nation well for currently planned and future space programs. For example, we may conduct flybys and instrument landings on Mars to search out extraterrestrial life. Another goal might be an orbiting space platform for scientific and military research. Still another may be the establishment of exploratory bases on the moon. We should be giving very serious consideration to these and other possibilities in space in an atmosphere somewhat removed from pressures of the moment.

There are no magic ways or easy devices to solve the problem of providing Congress with adequate advice on science and technology. Any approach that some would view as ideal would still be a long way from perfection and could also produce undesirable effects upon both science and Government. As H. L. Mencken said: "An idealist is one who, on noticing that a rose smells better than a cabbage, concludes that it will also make better soup."

You, as the doers of science, and we, in political life, have a mutual responsibility to improving the relationship of Congress and the "endless frontier." We, as concerned individuals and collectively as members of society, have a stake in this task. Each of us applying ourselves to it can do the job.

TAPE-RECORDED TELEPHONE SOLICITATION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, developments in the electronic and scientific fields have brought unprecedented benefits all our lives. I hope that these developments will continue to help us live in peace and harmony with our neighbors without having to sacrifice our basic rights to solitude and privacy.

The December 1, 1963, issue of the Chicago Sun-Times contains an article about the development of an electronic sales pitch device, which I want to bring to the attention of the Senate. The article describes a method of telephoning literally hundreds of thousands of people and having a tape recording extol the glories of a product, show, book, or whatever else is being advertised in this manner. I believe that personal telephone solicitations are bad enough, but in this article I read of electronic telephone solicitations which can barge into the privacy of any home which has a telephone and rattle off their advertising message or political solicitations.

Mr. President, the manufacturers of these new devices allegedly defend their product by saying that since the messages will be tape recorded, people will be more willing to hang up if they do not choose to listen. At one time or another in our lifetimes, we all have made a mad dash for the telephone. Many times we have had to climb down ladders, come out of the bathtub, come in from working in the garden, and leave the dinner table in order to answer the telephone. Mr. President, I do not want to have to be subjected to receiving tape-recorded telephone calls from companies advertising their products. I do not think my constituents want to be subjected to them, and I do not think the rest of the Nation wants to be subjected to them, nor should the Nation be subjected to them.

If someone began showing movies on my livingroom wall from a projector across the street, I would naturally be outraged. Picture yourself sitting in the kitchen, your wife is preparing the shopping list—and then from a truck parked in front of the house a subliminal suggestion to buy a certain brand of soup or canned ham is flashed onto the wall. What an intrusion that would be, and so, too, would be an unsolicited and unwanted mechanical telephone call.

The developers further allege that if your line is busy when the device calls, it will call you back later. Such a device could soon gain the stature of a monster. If one manufacturer begins using it, others almost certainly will do so, and soon our days could be filled by trips back and forth to the telephone answering calls from these sales-pitch devices, or "phone monsters" as I term them. We would have little or no time for our personal use of the telephone. Our personal rights would be invaded, our personal lives would suffer, and many would boycott any product of a manufacturer who applied such an obnoxious sales technique in their home.

I will introduce a bill which would, if such a device is used in Illinois, prohibit the use of telecommunication lines used in interstate communications by any individual, organization, or company through the use of any electronic device employing unsolicited prerecorded messages.

Our Nation must continue to make technological advances, as it has in the past. But we must protect ourselves from abuses which may occur through the improper use of these scientific achievements. There is a right of privacy which should not be invaded. We cannot allow the worst features of George Orwell's "1984" to become a reality.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the December 1, 1963, edition of the Chicago Sun-Times be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Dec. 1, 1963]

MASS PHONE SOLICITATIONS DEVISED

(By Dial Torgerson)

HOLLYWOOD.—You answer the phone, and a silky voice you remember from somewhere says:

"This is Gloria Glamoure and I have a grand idea for a party. Invite your friends for a dinner downtown and afterward, all of you come to see me at the Bijou, where I'm appearing in 'Practically Nothing at All,' Wednesday through Sunday. I'll be waiting."

This could happen—if a couple of bright young men succeed with their telephone advertising brainstorm.

Jeff Schottenstein and Joe Fischer have come up with a machine which can take a list of 50,000 telephone numbers, call them, tell when a voice answers, play a tape recorded message, say goodby, and hang up. Or call you back if the line is busy or if you're out.

FANTASTIC POSSIBILITIES

It's called Electro-Com, and it has some fantastic possibilities—as well as some aspects that Schottenstein and Fischer want to be very careful about.

"We're very aware of the resentment factor in telephone solicitation," said Schottenstein. "We will be very strict. We will have strict creative control over the machine, to make sure that irritating messages aren't used.

"We don't think a person should be called more than three times a month."

What if you don't want to be called? There's nothing you can do about it, anymore than you can about ordinary solicitors, except, of course, hang up.

LESS RESENTMENT

"Matter of fact," said Schottenstein, "that's one of the advantages of the machine. It's a recording, and people have no qualms about hanging up on it. The resentment factor is less than if there's a person on that phone."

The commercial uses of the device are almost literally staggering.

Schottenstein and Fischer think it could be used as the basis for a system of television ratings which could call 130,000 people while present rating concerns are calling 1,300. (The viewer's remarks would be tape recorded to be transcribed later by clerical workers.)

Or it could announce department store sales to charge-account customers, or let you know what movie is at the local theater. But in politics is where its richest fields may lie.

NOT USED COMMERCIALLY

Said Schottenstein:

"Before we perfected the automatic machine, we tried out a device where a girl dialed a number and then pressed a button, and out came the recorded message. We use it this year in 18 local political campaigns, and 11 of them won."

Only the prototype of the automated version is now operating and it hasn't yet been used commercially. Another 75 are being built, however.

NATIONALITY PITCH

Schottenstein and his associates are aware of what they call the "ethnocentric aspect" of political solicitation. In calling Chinese homes they have used Chinese pitchmen.

"We usually have someone the people know introduce the candidate, who then says a few words," Schottenstein said. "A known voice first is better."

In the same way, someone with a well-known Italian name could introduce the candidate to people with Italian names, and so on.

Schottenstein is a recent graduate of Ohio State University. His family owns soft-drink bottling franchises in Columbus. Fischer, son of a Hollywood managerial expert, went to Hebrew University in Jerusalem, and speaks five languages.

REQUIEM FOR PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in houses of worship through the land Americans have attended services in memory of our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Last Monday, the Jal (N. Mex.) General Ministers' Association conducted a united memorial service at the First Methodist Church in Jal. At that service a poem written by Jenie Burke on the day after the assassination of President Kennedy was read. The poem is entitled "Requiem," and is a moving statement of the deep sense of loss felt by all Americans.

I ask unanimous consent that the poem appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REQUIEM

How can I write
When the depth of my sorrow
Is torn with surges
Of frustration and anger—
When the tear almost shed
Looses itself in the void
The very chasm of my grief—
How can I write
What justice can be wrought
On the evil one
Who did this thing—
No power of civil society
May redress the wrong
No counter violence assuage our hurt—
The voices of powerful men
Sound small and weak
Each in a measure echoing
The thought all would speak—
To honor him is brief and pitiful
Unless we meet the challenge
    of the war he fought
Against man's abuse of man
    of the hope he brought
To the tired, the sick, the oppressed
    of the peace he sought

For an anguished world power possessed—
How then can I write
Except that we bury him
In simple dignity befitting his estate
Among the unknown heroes
And their silent comrades of our wars
Yet in this hallowed place
Will echo through the corridors of time
The war he fought
The hope he brought
The peace he sought.

—JENIE BURKE.

PROCLAMATION BY CITY GOVERNMENT OF BIRMINGHAM, ALA., ON ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement prepared by him; proclamation by the city government of Birmingham, Ala., in connection with the assassination of President Kennedy; a telegram to Mrs. John F. Kennedy; and a statement by the mayor of the city of Birmingham, dated November 22, 1963.

There being no objection, the statement and other documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SPARKMAN

Immediately upon learning of the news of President Kennedy's assassination, Hon. Albert Boutwell, mayor of Birmingham, Ala., sent a telegram to Mrs. Kennedy expressing the sorrow and sympathy of the people of the city of Birmingham. On the same day, the mayor issued a statement.

On the 23d day of November, Mayor Boutwell issued a proclamation declaring a 30-day period of mourning throughout the city of Birmingham. On November 26, at a meeting of the city council, Mayor Boutwell made a statement and offered a resolution which the city council adopted unanimously.

Mrs. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

The government and the people of the city of Birmingham, Ala., enjoin our sorrow with that of America and most of the world in the tragedy that has befallen you, your children, and families. We mourn with you, and we mourn with the Nation. We pray to Almighty God that He will in His infinite compassion bless and comfort your hearts and the hearts of all who share with you in this time of grief.

ALBERT BOUTWELL,
Mayor.

STATEMENT OF THE MAYOR OF THE CITY OF BIRMINGHAM, NOVEMBER 22, 1963

I sincerely believe that almost every man, woman, and child in Birmingham, regardless of how deep their personal political feelings may run, are shocked and saddened as I am by this terrible tragedy.

I speak for the city government of Birmingham—for myself, as mayor, and for President M. E. Wiggins and his fellow council members—in expressing to the President's personal and official families the depth of the sorrow and sense of tragedy that we share with them and with the people of the United States. In the name of the city government and the people it represents, I have sent a telegram of condolence to the President's wife and children, to express to them our sympathy in this time of their personal loss and personal grief.

Whatever forces may lie behind this terrible event, whatever persons may have inspired the striking down of a President of the United States, we can have no other feelings than one of sorrow and deep regret.

For the President's wife and children and the members of their families our hearts go out. We pray to Almighty God that He will, in His infinite compassion, comfort and strengthen them. And for the Nation we pray that divine providence will watch over and guide us in the troubled hours that will be the inevitable consequence of this sad day.

PROCLAMATION BY CITY OF BIRMINGHAM

Whereas the President of the United States of America has made the supreme sacrifice to which the courageous conduct of his office exposed him, as it has other great Americans and other Presidents; and,

Whereas his death, in the very prime of life, at the hands of a traitorous assassin, strikes a blow not only to our Nation but to the whole free world; and,

Whereas this city, its government and all its people, out of a deep and unalterable respect for the great office of the Presidency of the Nation, and out of sincere and human sympathy for the President's wife and his children and the members of their respective families, bow with them in sorrow; and,

Whereas John Fitzgerald Kennedy's death in line of duty, has wiped out, for these hours of mourning and remembrance, all temporal differences of partisan feelings and united the whole free world in regretful sorrow:

Therefore, I, Albert Boutwell as mayor of Birmingham and by the privilege vested in that office, do proclaim, with the concurrence of the president of the City Council of Birmingham and such members of the council as I have been able to consult, and do declare that the 30 days, beginning November 22, 1963, and ending at sundown December 21, 1963, shall be for the city of Birmingham a period of mourning and respect, during which the flags of the United States flown upon public buildings and other official flagstaffs of the city shall be flown at half-mast; and, that the City Hall of Birmingham, and all other of its buildings, not essential to the services of public protection, shall be closed Monday, November 25, 1963, in observance of a day of prayer for the comfort of the President's family, and the blessing and guidance of Almighty God for the newly succeeding President in his administration of the affairs of our Nation.

I hereby request the effects of this proclamation to be observed by all the boards and agencies of the city, not essential to the maintaining of necessary services to the people of this city.

I further order that a copy of this proclamation be engrossed by the city clerk of the city of Birmingham, affixing upon it the great seal of the city of Birmingham and that the same shall be forwarded to Mrs. John F. Kennedy so that the bereaved family may know the sympathy and sorrow of our city in their hour of personal grief.

And, finally, I order that copies, similarly engrossed and sealed, shall be posted, together with appropriate floral wreaths upon the principal doors of the city hall of Birmingham, and there remain until sundown, November 25, 1963.

Given under my hand at Birmingham, Ala., this the 23d day of November 1963.

ALBERT BOUTWELL,
Mayor.

Attest:

JUDSON P. HODGES,
City Clerk.

STATEMENT OF THE MAYOR TO THE COUNCIL NOVEMBER 26, 1963

Mr. President and members of the council, I wish at this time to offer for your consideration a proposed joint resolution of the mayor and the council of the city of Birmingham.

There is no need to recall to anyone the tragic event of last Friday. Actions taken by your city government to express our deep and lasting sorrow and to condemn the senseless and inexpressably evil act of violence that took the life of President John F. Kennedy have already been conveyed to the late President's wife and widow and to the Nation.

The time of mourning that loss to ourselves and the Nation is not ended. Indeed, it will cast its shadow over a long time to come. But, mourning, as we still are, the undeniable reality of this hour is that a nation, reunited by tragedy, must now proceed upon its destiny under the leadership of the man the Nation chose, along with the martyred President, as its Vice President.

I, therefore, as mayor, offer the following resolution to the council for its concurrence, so that it may be presented to President Lyndon B. Johnson as a unanimous expression of our support and confidence as he proceeds in the tasks which destiny has thrust upon him.

Whereas on November 22, 1963, the cowardly act of an assassin fatally struck down John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America; and

Whereas on that same day, by virtue of his earlier election by the people as Vice President of the United States, and by the provisions of the Constitution, Lyndon Baines Johnson, after illustrious service in both Houses of the Congress and in the Vice Presidency, has now assumed the highest office and honor of Chief Executive of the Nation, and leader of the free world; and

Whereas in the performance of that office, he has earnestly and humbly evoked the support of this Nation, and the blessing and guidance of Almighty God for its successful accomplishment: Therefore be it

Resolved by the government of the city of Birmingham, on behalf of all its citizens of all races and creeds, That we do hereby declare our unstinting support in all that he may seek to do to accomplish what is good for this Nation, and to lead it in the paths of peace and prosperity; and be it further

Resolved, That we convey to the President of the United States our confidence in his leadership, and in the high ideals and principles that have characterized his public actions in the past, and predict his future directions; and be it further

Resolved, That we, as a government and a people, do join our prayers with his and with the Nation and with the prayers of free peoples everywhere, that Divine Providence may counsel him in wisdom, imbue him with unfaltering strength of mind and courage, and bless him with continuous good health against all the trials that lie before him, before us as a Nation. And finally do we pray that the God of peace and good will among men, will bless this Nation, under its new leadership, with lasting peace among the nations of the earth, and the material blessings of plenty to us and all mankind.

Judson P. Hodges, City Clerk; Albert Boutwell, Mayor; John E. Bryan, Councilman; Alan T. Drennen, Jr., Councilman; John Golden, Councilman; Don A. Hawkins, Councilman; R. E. Wiggins, President of the Council; Nina Miglionico, Councilman; Dr. Eleazer C. Overton, Councilman; George F. Seibels, Jr., Councilman; Tom W. Woods, Councilman.

TRUST LAND FOR MEMBERS OF THE ALAMO BAND OF PUERTOCITO NAVAJO INDIANS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 649, S. 1931.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1931) to provide that the United States shall hold certain land in trust for the members of the Alamo Band of Puertocito Navajo Indians.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 2, line 2, after the word "for", to strike out "agency, school, and"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to those lands lying within the Alamo Navajo community area, New Mexico, more particularly described in subsection (b) of this section and the improvements thereon, are hereby declared to be held in trust by the United States for the use of the members of the Alamo Band of Puertocito Navajo Indians, subject to the right of the United States to use said lands and improvements located thereon for administrative purposes.

(b) Lot 3 and the southeast quarter northwest quarter of section 6, township 2 north, range 6 west, New Mexico principal meridian, and improvements located thereon.

SEC. 2. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the title conveyed by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1931) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DONATION OF LAND TO DEVILS LAKE SIOUX TRIBE OF FORT TOTTEN INDIAN RESERVATION, N. DAK.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 650, S. 536.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 536) to donate to the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe of the Fort Totten Indian Reservation, N. Dak., approximately 275.74 acres of federally owned land.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2905.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2905) to donate to the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe of the Fort Totten Indian Reservation, N. Dak., approximately 275.74 acres of federally owned lands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the House bill.

The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 2905) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, S. 536 is indefinitely postponed.

TRANSFER OF PIEGAN UNIT OF BLACKFEET INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, MONTANA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 651, S. 2279.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2279) to authorize the transfer of the Piegan unit of the Blackfeet Indian irrigation project, Montana, to the landowners within the unit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in the facilities of the Piegan unit of the Blackfeet Indian irrigation project, located in township 31 north, ranges 8 and 9 west, Montana principal meridian, including but not limited to easements, rights-of-way, canals, laterals, drains, structures of all kinds, and water rights held for the benefit of the unit, to an organization or association in form and powers satisfactory to the Secretary, representing the owners of the lands served by the unit: *Provided,* That as a condition to said conveyance, the grantee shall assume full and sole responsibility for the future care, operation, and maintenance of the unit, for which the United States shall have no further responsibility; and shall hold the United States free of all loss or liability for damages or injuries, direct or consequential, caused by the existence or operation of the unit or any of its features or structures, from and after the date of its conveyance.

SEC. 2. Upon conveyance of the Piegan unit of the Blackfeet Indian irrigation project as provided for in section 1 of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to cancel all accrued operation and maintenance charges and all construction charges with respect to the said unit.

SALE OF INDIAN TIMBER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 652, S. 1565.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1565) to amend the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 857; 25 U.S.C. 406, 407), with respect to the sale of Indian timber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 2, at the beginning of line 22, to strike out "The trust or restrictions shall be regarded as imposed for the benefit of both the owner and his heirs, and not for the benefit of the current owner alone."; on page 3, after line 22, to strike out:

(d) For the purpose of this section, the Secretary may represent any Indian owner who is a minor, or who is non compos mentis, or whose ownership interest in a decedent's estate has not been determined, or who cannot be located, or who fails or refuses to respond to inquiries, or whose interest does not exceed a one-sixteenth portion of the parcel under consideration.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

(d) For the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to represent any Indian owner (1) who is a minor, (2) who has been adjudicated non compos mentis, (3) whose ownership interest in a decedent's estate has not been determined, or (4) who cannot be located by the Secretary after a reasonable and diligent search and the giving of notice of publication.

And, on page 4, line 17, after the word "windthrow", to strike out "or other causes." and insert "or other natural catastrophes."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 7 and 8 of the Act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 857; 25 U.S.C. 406, 407), are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. The timber on unallotted lands of any Indian reservation may be sold in accordance with the principles of sustained yield, or in order to convert the land to a more desirable use, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, and the proceeds from such sales, after deductions for administrative expenses pursuant to the Act of February 14, 1920, as amended (25 U.S.C. 413), shall be used for the benefit of the Indians who are members of the tribe or tribes concerned in such manner as he may direct.

"SEC. 8. (a) The timber on any Indian land held under a trust or other patent containing restrictions on alienations may be sold by the owner or owners with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior, and the proceeds from such sales, after deductions for administrative expenses to the extent permissible under the Act of February 14, 1920, as amended (25 U.S.C. 413), shall be paid to the owner or owners or disposed of for their benefit under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior. It is the intention of Congress that a deduction for administrative expenses may be made in any case unless the deduction would violate a treaty obligation or amount to a taking of private property for public use without just compensation in violation of the fifth amendment to the Constitution. Sales of timber under this subsection shall be based upon a consideration of the needs and best interests of the Indian owner and his heirs. The Secretary shall take into consideration, among other things, (1) the state of growth of the timber and the need for maintaining the productive capacity of the land for the benefit of the owner and his heirs, (2) the highest and best use of the land, including the advisability and practicality of devoting it to other uses for the benefit of the owner and his heirs, and (3) the present and future financial needs of the owner and his heirs.

"(b) Upon the request of the owners of a majority Indian interest in land in which any undivided interest is held under a trust or other patent containing restrictions on alienations, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to sell all undivided Indian trust or restricted interests in any part of the timber on such land.

"(c) Upon the request of the owner of an undivided but unrestricted interest in land in which there are trust or restricted Indian interests, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to include such unrestricted interest in a sale of the trust or restricted Indian interests in timber sold pursuant to this section, and to perform any functions required of him by the contract of sale for both the restricted and the unrestricted interests, including the collection and disbursement of payments for timber and the deduction from such payments of sums in lieu of administrative expenses.

"(d) For the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to represent any Indian owner (1) who is a minor, (2) who has been adjudicated non compos mentis, (3) whose ownership interest in a decedent's estate has not been determined, or (4) who cannot be located by the Secretary after a reasonable and diligent search and the giving of notice by publication.

"(e) The timber on any Indian land held under a trust or other patent containing restrictions on alienations may be sold by the Secretary of the Interior without the consent of the owners when in his judgment such action is necessary to prevent loss of values resulting from fire, insects, disease, windthrow, or other natural catastrophes.

"(f) A change from a trust or restricted status to an unrestricted status of any interest in timber that has been sold pursuant to this section shall not affect the obligations of the Secretary of the Interior under any contract of sale that is in effect at the time such change in status occurs."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill (S. 1565) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ROSEBUD SIOUX INDIAN RESERVATION, S. DAK.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 653, S. 711, which is the last measure to be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 711) to authorize the sale and exchange of isolated tracts of tribal land on the Rosebud Sioux Indian Reservation, S. Dak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 1, line 7, after the word "land", to insert "located in Tripp, Gregory, and Lyman Counties, South Dakota, and"; on page 2, line 9, after the word "acquired", to insert "for the tribe"; in line 13, after the word "an", to strike out "Indian" and insert "enrolled member of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe"; in line 15, after the word "title", to strike out "shall" and insert "may", and after line 16, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. Upon request of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe, South Dakota, acting through its governing body, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to mortgage tribal interests in isolated tracts of land, in lieu of selling or exchanging them, and the proceeds of the loan secured by the mortgage must be used exclusively for the acquisition of land on the reservation within land consolidation areas approved by the Secretary of the Interior, title to the land acquired being taken in the name of the United States in trust for the tribe.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon request of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe, South Dakota, acting through its governing body, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to exchange or to sell, by public or by negotiated sale, the tribal interests in isolated tracts of land located in Tripp, Gregory, and Lyman Counties, South Dakota, and held by the United States in trust for the tribe: *Provided,* (1) That the Secretary of the Interior certifies that the tract is isolated in that it is so located or situated that it would be to the economic advantage of the tribe to sell or exchange the tract; (2) that the amount or exchange value received by the tribe is not less than the fair market value of the tribal trust land and is accepted by the tribe; (3) that any proceeds from the sale of land under this Act are used exclusively for the purchase of land on the reservation within land consolidation areas approved by the Secretary of the Interior; (4) that title to any land acquired for the tribe under this Act by purchase or exchange shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the tribe; (5) that if lands in an exchange are not of equal value the difference in value may be paid in money; and (6) that if an enrolled member of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe acquires the tribal trust land, title may be taken in the name of the United States in trust.

SEC. 2. Upon request of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe, South Dakota, acting through its governing body, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to mortgage tribal interests in isolated tracts of land, in lieu of selling or exchanging them, and the proceeds of the loan secured by the mortgage must be used exclusively for the acquisition of land on the reservation within land consolidation areas approved by the Secretary of the Interior, title to the land acquired being taken in the name of the United States in trust for the tribe.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments may be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2467.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Is the House bill identical with the Senate bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair will lay the House bill before the Senate.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the bill (H.R. 2467) to authorize the sale and exchange of isolated tracts of tribal land on the Rosebud Sioux Indian Reservation, S. Dak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the House bill.

The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 2467) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, S. 711 is indefinitely postponed.

ONCE AGAIN TITO HITS UNITED STATES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, an interesting article was published in the Sunday, December 1, New York Times. It is interesting for several reasons.

Usually the New York Times is very conscientious in its prompt reporting of news articles.

The article to which I refer carried a November 21 dateline. In other words, the article appeared 11 days after it was reported to the New York Times. The dateline is November 21, the day before President Kennedy was assassinated.

The source of the article is Yugoslavia. The article indicates that the Government-controlled Yugoslavian newspapers and periodicals have taken an increasingly sharp anti-Western and anti-United States propaganda line, and that the line was taken only a few hours, virtually, after the Senate defeated the amendment to the foreign aid bill which would have denied to Yugoslavia most-favored-nation treatment. After that action was taken to help Yugoslavia, she did what she has persistently done in the past—after the United States took friendly action toward Yugoslavia she turned around and opposed the interests of the United States. The position Yugoslavia took was particularly absurd because she criticized the United States for the recent incident on the autobahn in which the Soviet and East German troops held up American troops and prevented them from having free access to West Berlin.

The Yugoslav Government also praised Cambodia for turning down American aid, saying that this was the kind of neutralist attitude that Yugoslavia approves. This, although we have given Yugoslavia some $2 billion of aid.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YUGOSLAVS TURN CRITICISM ON UNITED STATES—PRESS ATTACKS POLICIES ON VIETNAM, ARMS, AND BERLIN

BELGRADE, YUGOSLAVIA, November 21.—Government-controlled Yugoslav newspapers and periodicals have taken an increasing sharp anti-Western line in the last 2 weeks, singling out the United States for criticism on several issues.

Western diplomats appeared to be at a loss to explain the motives for misrepresentations and denunciations that have been published here since President Tito returned last month from a visit to the United States.

The Yugoslav Communist criticism covers such subjects as U.S. policies in South Vietnam, Cambodia, the United Nations disarmament talks, Latin America, and Germany.

U.S. OFFICERS ACCUSED

Particularly irritating to Americans here has been the Yugoslav version of the incidents on the autobahn to Berlin in which U.S. Army convoys were held up by Soviet troops in a dispute over procedures.

Belgrade newspapers such as the party organ Borba, the large-circulation Politika and its new evening publication, Politika Eksspres, have attributed responsibility for the incidents to U.S. Army officers.

Moreover, several of these newspapers misrepresented the facts of the autobahn procedures to their readers, describing the Soviet attempts to get the soldiers to dismount and be counted as "regular inspection."

Tanyug, the Yugoslav press agency, yesterday misrepresented the nature of Under Secretary of State W. Averell Harriman's mission to Brazil, asserting that he had gone there to present the U.S. case against "illegal nationalization" of American companies.

Today, the latest issue of the Review of International Affairs, published in Belgrade, carried an article suggesting that the United States and other Western countries were obstructing further efforts toward disarmament at the United Nations.

INITIATIVE CREDITED TO REDS

Writing in the journal, Josip Djerdja, Deputy Chief of the Yugoslav delegation to the United Nations, asserted that all initiative for disarmament following the treaty for a partial nuclear test ban treaty had come from Communist countries.

Mr. Djerdja added that the Western Powers had not displayed the same degree of "readiness and interest" in pursuing disarmament steps as the Eastern countries.

On the question of U.S. relations with Cambodia, the Yugoslav press has slanted some reports against the United States.

Until today the anti-Western undercurrent has not been reflected in any statements by the Yugoslav Government. But this afternoon, the official spokesman of the Foreign Ministry, Dusan Blagojevic, described the Cambodian Government's decision to bar American aid as being "on the line of nonalinement and strengthening of independence." He added that such an action was "understandable and close to us."

Western observers appeared to be concerned that the increasing anti-Western tone of Yugoslav press commentaries might be a prelude to a shift in the foreign policies of the Belgrade regime.

FIGHT FOR EQUALITY IN OUTBOUND AND INBOUND OCEAN FREIGHT RATES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I recently introduced two bills, S. 2328 and S. 2329, which were designed to attain greater equality in outbound and inbound ocean freight rates and thereby assist in easing our balance-of-payments difficulties.

Monday the Washington Post carried an article entitled "What To Do About Shipping Conferences" by Mr. Harvey H. Segal.

Mr. Segal quotes Adam Smith's famous observation:

> People in the same trade seldom meet together, even for merriment and diversion, but the conversation ends in a conspiracy against the public, or in some contrivance to raise prices.

The present international shipping conferences are a good example of just such arrangements on a formalized basis. Moreover, as Mr. Segal points out, the market power of these conferences "has been bolstered by the policy of the Maritime Administration which withholds subsidies from lines that do not abide by conference agreements."

Mr. Segal then points out that the conferences engage in all of the various practices common to cartels which monopolize control over international prices:

> There is a system of dual rates which provides lower rates for shippers who agree to use only conference lines for some minimum period of time. Certain conferences offer deferred rebates to loyal customers, and the Celler committee in 1958 uncovered evidence of secret rebates in times of excess capacity or overtonnage. In addition, many conferences have pooling agreements under which the total earnings on a particular route are shared among the members.

As Mr. Segal writes, the Maritime Commission has now called upon a number of the conferences to correct rate disparities. However, "while welcome, this belated action raises some serious questions about the ability of a U.S. Government agency to perform a regulatory function within the framework of the international shipping cartels."

One of the facts which has amazed me about these shipping conferences is how little is known about their ratemaking procedures. While there may be some reasons for rate differentials between outbound and inbound shipments to the United States, Mr. Segal concludes:

> It is fair to assume that they (the conferences) have magnified the differentials—it is quite likely that they have pegged certain commodity rates at levels which work to both their disadvantage and that of the public at large.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT TO DO ABOUT SHIPPING CONFERENCES

(By Harvey H. Segal)

"People in the same trade," wrote Adam Smith, "seldom meet together, even for merriment and diversion, but the conversation ends in a conspiracy against the public, or in some contrivance to raise prices." And if the good Dr. Smith had been able to observe the activities of the world steamship operators over the past century, his tart statement would have been even less circumspect.

Ever since the later 1860's—and perhaps even before—efforts have been made to regulate competition in ocean shipping through the establishment of conferences in which operators agree to play the game in a gentlemanly fashion by fixing commodity rates on various routes.

At the present time there are scores of shipping conferences or international cartels operating openly with the support of national governments. In the Shipping Act of 1916 and subsequent amendments, Congress authorized American shipowners to participate in conferences. And their power has been bolstered by the policy of the Maritime Administration which withholds subsidies from lines that do not abide by conference agreements.

The market power of the conferences is far from absolute because of competition from nonconference lines and tramp ships. But they have over the years perfected discriminatory devices in order to retain a large share of the market.

There is a system of dual rates which provides lower rates for shippers who agree to use only conference lines for some minimum period of time. Certain conferences offer deferred rebates to loyal customers, and the Celler committee in 1958 uncovered evidence of secret rebates in times of excess capacity or overtonnage. In addition, many conferences have pooling agreements under which the total earnings on a particular route are shared among the members.

Shipping conferences came back into the news when Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS and his colleagues on the Joint Economic Committee revealed that the balance-of-payments problems are being aggravated by the wide disparities between inbound and outbound rates established in the shipping conferences. DOUGLAS' attack led to a shakeup in the Federal Maritime Commission, the agency charged with regulating rates, in which Adm. John Harllee replaced Thomas E. Stakem as Chairman.

The Commission has now taken its first significant step in an effort to regulate rates by calling upon 8 outbound conferences to correct the "alleged disparities" on some 45 commodities or provide a justification for their persistence. While welcome, this belated action raises some serious questions about the ability of a U.S. Government agency to perform a regulatory function within the framework of the international shipping cartels.

In the memorandum on ocean freight rates for steel products which Senator DOUGLAS released last June, there are enormous disparities between inbound and outbound rates, far greater than might be justified on economic grounds. However, subsequent testimony before the JEC indicates that ships on the outbound routes are more fully utilized than those on inbound runs, and this fact supports the presumption that some disparities between inbound and outbound rates would persist in the absence of shipping conferences.

But while surprisingly little is known about the conference ratemaking process, it is fair to assume that they have magnified the differentials. Because of higher capacity utilization, discipline in the outbound conferences is stronger, and it is quite likely that they have pegged certain commodity rates at levels which work to both their disadvantage and that of the public at large.

It has been proposed that the Maritime Commission pursue the well-established principles that guide the regulation of domestic utilities and eliminate discriminatory practices which conflict with the national interests. But this hopeful view overlooks several important factors. The rates charged by an electric power utility with an exclusive area franchise can be regulated without difficulty. But the shipping conference is a ratemaking body with an international membership of individual carriers, an organization that may be coerced but never controlled by the agency of a single national government.

Moreover, the conferences, like all international cartels, are inherently unstable.

When markets are slack and there is considerable overtonnage, discipline breaks down and individual members make "sweetheart" deals with shippers in order to fend off nonconference competition. In fact, one witness at the JEC hearings, the head of a chemical exporting company, remarked that the only factor that makes the dual-rate system tolerable is the existence of nonconference competition.

If the Maritime Commission is ever to control ocean freight rates, it will have somehow to strengthen the power of the conferences which constitute the only base upon which a regulatory structure can be built. But even if that could be accomplished, the cost would be very high. Ocean freight rates under a weak conference system are already higher than they would be in a free market; and effective regulation might mean an even higher and more rigid rate structure.

The alternative is a policy which would forbid American carriers from participating in the cartels. It might at first result in a greater instability of rates, but free markets offer a solution in an area where the traditional regulatory concepts have little chance of success.

"FOREIGN AID"—ADDRESS BY EUGENE R. BLACK

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Mr. Eugene R. Black, formerly President of the World Bank and currently a director of the Chase Manhattan Bank, and a tremendously able man, recently gave a very thoughtful speech before the New York Chamber of Commerce on the subject of foreign aid. Mr. Black rarely gives public addresses at the present time. The contents of this address are so useful in connection with our upcoming consideration of the foreign aid appropriations bill, I believe that this speech should be called to the attention of Members of Congress. I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks the full text of the speech be inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Mr. Black says in part:

I can and do get concerned over the fact that in the past we have been trying to spend more foreign aid than we have been able to administer effectively. We have been most reluctant to demand the conditions necessary to make aid effective in terms of economic development. We have settled for promises when we should have waited for action to justify our support. We have not developed that standard of project selection and preparation which should be the very hallmark of our work. In general we have succeeded in identifying foreign aid with large amounts of money, but not with large numbers of projects and programs which are building economic strength into the countries we are trying to help. Fortunately there has been concern in AID about these shortcomings as recent changes indicate.

I would like to suggest that we approach Congress in this direct way, and stop pretending that foreign aid is a sure cure for the political ills that plague us at the moment. Foreign aid should be presented to Congress as a means of promoting economic growth and nothing else. It should be presented in terms of projects designed to produce real wealth. It should be presented in response to actions, not promises, on the part of other countries which are seriously interested in econmic growth. It should be presented, not as a bribe for other nations to reform, but as an investment in other nations where reforms are already underway. Do this and I suggest the political benefits will come as natural byproducts.

EXHIBIT 1

FOREIGN AID

(By Eugene R. Black)

Mr. Champion, gentlemen, when I retired from the World Bank last January, I solemnly resolved that I would retire from making public speeches at the same time. For the first 40 or 50 years of my life I got along very well without making any public speeches and, on leaving the World Bank, I had hoped to return to this comfortable state of affairs. But I didn't figure on George Champion's insidious persuasiveness. He undermined my good resolutions, and he did so by appealing to the all-too-obvious need for those of us once connected with that business called foreign aid to speak out occasionally * * * to remind people that there is a problem, a very important problem, and that we have to learn to live with the problem just as surely as every new June bride has to learn to live with her mother-in-law.

The open season on foreign aid in Congress is exceptionally late and violent this year, the Appropriations Committees still have to reach their separate verdicts and the House-Senate conference, as usual, will have a job of compromising to do. In these circumstances, I do not want anything I say here to be interpreted as a lack of support for foreign aid. I believe in foreign aid. More important in the present circumstances, I think David Bell, the man charged with making the Agency for International Development work well, deserves from Congress a chance to show his mettle. Working with Mr. Bell on the Clay Committee, I was very impressed with his grasp of the complexities of his job and with the toughness of his mind.

In fact, if I could wish Mr. Bell one thing, I would wish him a clear-cut contract for at least 5 years in order that he might have a decent opportunity to put into effect some of the changes I know he wants to make. In the 15 years since the beginning of the Marshall plan we have had the ECA, the TCA, the MSA, the FOA, the ICA, and now AID. There have been 11 different foreign aid administrators, including Mr. Bell. That's an average tenure in office of less than 18 months. For a business that can't by its nature succeed in the short run, that is a formula for ineffectiveness if ever there was one.

I would also wish him some relief from his constant, and for long periods, total preoccupation with congressional reviews. Foreign aid is the only major program in the Federal budget which, in addition to the normal and necessary reviews of the Appropriations Committees, has to be authorized all over again each year in the House and Senate. In addition to that part of the foreign aid budget concerned with what I would call economic development, there is a large military aid budget which Mr. Bell must defend, yet which logically belongs in the regular military budget because after all, an important justification for giving arms and other forms of military support to foreign nations is that we thereby economize on our own military commitments and expenditures. Aid must absorb an enormous and, I think, quite unnecessary administrative overhead because it has four congressional hurdles to clear anew each year, and a bill to defend which covers an unnecessarily wide variety of subjects. Mr. Bell deserves to be relieved of some of these chores, which for so much of the year effectively prevent him from doing the job that he was hired to do.

I do hope Mr. Bell has a chance to do the job I think he can do; I do not want anything I say here to be interpreted as opposing the pending legislation, or in favor of substantial cuts in the amount requested. But I do not hesitate to say that I think the way our Government has administered foreign aid in the past has been seriously remiss in several important respects. In fact, I think it is clear now that there is a large consensus on this score in Congress, in AID itself and among interested outsiders like my colleagues on the Clay Committee.

The recent report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reflected this growing consensus in several important respects. First, the committee stressed the need to introduce more stability into the administration of foreign aid; second, the committee underscored the importance of persuading other nations, particularly former beneficiaries of the Marshall plan, to carry more of the financial burden. Finally, and I think most important, the committee made an appeal for more attention to the quality of the assistance that we give. Let me for a few minutes give my own variations on these three themes.

The Senators said that they were "unenthusiastic about aid programs * * * whose major purpose is to provide an alternative to Soviet bloc aid." Now here I think they put their fingers on one of the prime causes of instability in the administration of foseign aid in the past and of public disillusionment with foreign aid in the present. I have frequently argued that we ought to be very skeptical about crediting or debiting foreign aid for dramatic changes in the political atmosphere. It has been my experience that foreign aid has rarely gotten us anywhere in the short run. Foreign aid can be—should be—a most effective agent against communism in the long run by encouraging those policies and practices in other nations which lead to lasting economic growth. But it cannot be effective if it is turned on and off like a faucet in response to unreasonable political expectations.

I have been most interested of late to see how the Russians themselves appear to be painfully discovering the fact that foreign aid is not a very useful weapon for political skirmishes. I have over the years confidently predicted that the Soviets would find foreign aid an unrewarding business from the point of view of their political interests. Now it would seem that they are beginning to think so too.

The Soviets have a vested interest in everybody else's troubles. Buttressed by their naive belief in communism as the wave of the future, they are out to create political and economic instability as a prelude to communism. To them foreign aid is definitely a temporary business, designed to secure windfall economic and political profits.

Let's take a look at the record. No doubt some will regard Cuba as their shining success. But Russian foreign aid did not create Castro or bring him to power. Russian foreign aid only came after he was in power. The question is, "Will Russian foreign aid keep Castro in power?" This must be an embarrassing question to the Soviets; Cuba's bill which the Soviets have to pay is currently running at $1.5 million a day. Perhaps $2 billion worth of ruble aid has already gone to Cuba. Recent evidence in the newspapers suggest that the Soviets are very unhappy at this continuing drain. It would seem that the Soviets face the choice of reducing the drain by assuming ever more directly the functions of the Cuban government or of gradually backing away. Cuba, after all, is a relatively rich country, and this the Soviets know. Russian foreign aid to Cuba is almost certain to be a temporary business and so far it has clearly not been a very successful business.

What about the other countries to which the Russians have sent foreign aid in search of windfall profits? The list includes India, Afghanistan, Ceylon, Nepal, and Burma in south Asia; Syria, Iraq, and Egypt in the Middle East; Mali, Guinea, Ethiopia, Ghana, and Somalia in Africa; Cambodia and Indonesia in the Far East; and Brazil and Argentina in Latin America. These are the countries to which the Soviets have given or lent each $50 million or more which is hardly a large sum by the standards of U.S. aid, or, as a matter of fact, by World Bank standards. What about the windfall profits achieved?

In Iraq, a major recipient of Soviet aid, the Communist-backed prime minister, Kassem, lacked staying power; he was assassinated, and the Communist Party was outlawed under the succeeding regime. In Egypt, despite the Aswan Dam and considerable military assistance, the Communist Party remains outlawed—and the Egyptian government last year decided to adhere to the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the bulwark of the West's multilateral trading system. India, despite a billion dollars in Soviet aid, remains the world's largest working democracy and is clearly not aligned with the Communists.

If the Soviets have failed to show much in the way of windfall profits out of their foreign aid, their often obviously temporary and trouble-making interest in the business has been brought home forcibly to many countries. Burma has experienced the ill-effects of having its rice shipped to Russia and resold on the world market; Egypt has had the same experience with its cotton. Guinea, until recently exclusively dependent on Soviet bloc aid, has learned what it is to wait while promised Soviet delivery dates slip by and, in company with other countries, has experienced the illusion of the Soviet terms of aid, which are characteristically low in interest charges and high in the price of the goods shipped. Also, the goods have frequently been quite inferior, and there have been lots of difficulties with spare parts.

Our own foreign aid program has been similarly unsuccessful insofar as it has been used as an instrument for bartering against the Communists for the favor of the governments of the underdeveloped countries or for short-term political advantage in those countries. Foreign aid just is not suitable as a means of inoculating governments against communism or bringing about instant conversions from that political religion. Yet despite Mr. Bell's several references to the long-term problems to which foreign aid must be addressed, we still hear promises of economic and political windfall profits held out as arguments for increasing or maintaining the level of foreign aid. And recently these arguments have taken a new twist; we now hear urgent pleas to stop foreign aid when a coup d'etat is staged in a country we have been helping, and a less tolerant ruler replaces a more tolerant one, and I am afraid that here again we are pursuing unreasonable political expectations in the name of foreign aid.

Instead of trying to identify foreign aid with unrealistic political expectations, we ought to have been identifying it with high priority development projects—projects which are well engineered, well planned financially and which promise to produce things these countries want and need to earn their way in the world. Foreign aid in these countries ought to be identified with fiscal policies which offer some hope that local savings will flow into serious developments and not flee the country or disappear in inflation. Foreign aid ought to be identified, not with promises by countries of what they may do in the future, but with the first tangible steps towards action necessary to make economic growth a reality. Foreign aid ought to be identified with tax collection, not tax evasion; it ought to be identified with a healthy investment climate for foreign capital and not with the expropriation of foreign properties.

Here again there is a growing consensus, shared by the Senate committee and I know by Mr. Bell himself, that the major trouble with our foreign aid programs in the past has been too much concern over quantity and packaging, and too little concern over the quality of the product itself. I have said that a lot of the labels we have put on the foreign aid package in the past have been seriously misleading. I might add that I think there has been too much excitement over the quantities involved. Foreign aid has always been a stimulant to American exports; it is more directly now a stimulant than ever before. The Senate committee estimated that only 10 percent of current foreign aid expenditures represent a drain on the balance of payments. In view of this I cannot get very excited about the argument that foreign aid is a serious drain on our balance of payments.

I can and do get concerned over the fact that in the past we have been trying to spend more foreign aid than we have been able to administer effectively. We have been most reluctant to demand the conditions necessary to make aid effective in terms of economic development. We have settled for promises when we should have waited for action to justify our support. We have not developed that standard of project selection and preparation which should be the very hallmark of our work. In general we have succeeded in identifying foreign aid with large amounts of money, but not with large numbers of projects and programs which are building economic strength into the countries we are trying to help. Fortunately there has been concern in AID about these shortcomings as recent changes indicate.

Congress has tried in some cases to build into the foreign aid legislation some of the necessary conditions which should govern foreign aid if it is to be effective in terms of economic growth. There is for example the Hickenlooper amendment which would bar aid to countries which appropriate American property without prompt and adequate compensation. As a matter of fact, there is a new amendment to the Hickenlooper amendment which is being discussed now. That amendment goes even further than the original one and says that if any contracts or concessions are canceled by a foreign government, that no aid should be given to the country that canceled these contracts or concessions until adequate compensation has been paid, and paid in convertible currency. I'd like to say I am highly in favor of the Hickenlooper amendment and his new one. Congress has also opposed using foreign aid to support government-owned industries. I certainly favor this legislative limitation. In both cases the climate for private investment is at stake. Not only should we, as a matter of course, use our aid in every way possible to improve the climate for our own and other foreign private investments; we should also avoid encouraging the governments of these new nations to expand their operations into areas where other forms of finance and enterprise can be encouraged. There is no government now receiving foreign aid which does not have more now on its administrative plate than it can digest. So, to condone with or aid the acquisition of foreign industrial properties or to use aid to foster government-owned industries cannot, in my opinion, be justified in the name of promoting economic growth.

But most of the conditions which should govern foreign aid if it is to be effective cannot be legislated. As a matter of fact, attempts to do so would only compound further the already very difficult administrative problem which the AID Administrator faces. The tests of success in any foreign aid program are easy to state in generalities; is the program identified with high priority projects which are producing a higher standard of living? Is the Agency insisting on reasonable fiscal policies as a prior condition for its help? Does the program encourage reforms needed for economic growth? But there is no way that Congress, through legislation, can insure that any foreign aid program will pass these tests. In spite of the fact that whole libraries of books have been written attempting to define some fiscal policies, there is in practice no substitute for careful and mature personal judgment in deciding when fiscal conditions are ripe for aid and when they are not. Nor is there any reliable substitute for personal judgment when it comes to choosing among projects—when it comes to deciding what is of high priority and what is not. Our Congress cannot legislate reforms for other nations; they have to be negotiated. So, on all of these counts the AID Administrator's lot is not an easy one. He must adopt standards, deliberately; he must set conditions, consciously; and he must do these things without leaving the legitimate preserve of economic development and wandering into the purely political preserve.

Since the line between these two preserves is often very unclear, anybody who undertakes to administer foreign aid is, by definition, living dangerously. I have always thought that an international organization could offer certain protections which are particularly valuable in the administration of foreign aid—provided, that is, that the international organization is like the World Bank or the Monetary Fund, itself governed by financial principles and not simply an organization to allow a lot of recipient nations to divide up the contributions of a few donor nations. I think, as a matter of fact I know, it is somewhat easier for an international organization to ask for, to demand, and to receive the assurances and conditions necessary for effective aid without being accused of undue interference in the international affairs of the recipient countries or of trying to get some political advantage. I was therefore interested to see the Senate Foreign Relations Committee pick up this argument and lend its own endorsement in its recent report. I personally believe that the balance between bilateral and multilateral aid should be redressed in favor of multilateral aid. I would even make a guess that it will be redressed as time goes on. And as it becomes more evident that foreign aid can only be effective if it is identified with projects and programs that are in fact producing lasting economic wealth.

I do not look for or recommend any radical shift away from bilateral aid in favor of multilateral aid, but I do look for a gradual shift. I don't think bilateral aid can ever be completely free from the political pressures of the moment; to some extent it is bound to be wasted in efforts to put out political fires. In the long run, I think foreign aid will come to be accepted most readily where it is administered by organizations like the World Bank and the Monetary Fund, organizations whose primary objective is economic development and not to gain some political or commercial benefits.

But the problems besetting our foreign aid program are not basically institutional. Whether foreign aid is administered internationally, regionally or bilaterally, the important thing is the quality of the product—the conditions asked and the standards set.

I'd like to leave you with these three thoughts:

Some say that if the threat of communism were to disappear tomorrow, Congress would immediately cut off all foreign aid. I think this is a cynical argument. We don't need foreign aid because the Communists make it necessary. We malign the power and impact of our own heritage when we couple foreign aid with the twists and turns of Communist policy. We give foreign aid because it is both imperative and unavoidable that we participate in the development of those countries which, largely because of their many-sided encounters with Western civilization, are desperately seeking some escape from their poverty. We have foreign aid because the achievements of our way of life in the past have made it a matter of self-respect in other nations to ameliorate their mass poverty. The presence or absence of the threat of communism in no way alters this fact. If we are to remain a great nation in the Western tradition—if we are to remain true not just to our humanitarian tradition, not just to our economic precepts which are built on the fact that prosperity flourishes only when the maximum number of people and nations share in it—if we are to remain true to our own heritage and if we are to accept the responsibilities history has thrust on us, then we will continue foreign aid.

Second, I would like to suggest that we approach Congress in this direct way, and stop pretending that foreign aid is a sure cure for the political ills that plague us at the moment. Foreign aid should be presented to Congress as a means of promoting economic growth and nothing else. It should be presented in terms of projects designed to produce real wealth. It should be presented in response to actions, not promises, on the part of other countries which are seriously interested in economic growth. It should be presented, not as a bribe for other nations to reform, but as an investment in other nations where reforms are already underway. Do this and I suggest the political benefits will come as natural byproducts. Can we not say of our own experience that it is by concentrating on economic development that we have most successfully ameliorated our own political problems? Should we not say of foreign aid that economic development is what we are after in the realistic hope that it will yield political byproducts consistent with our own security and prosperity? We've tried putting the political byproducts first; now I think we should try putting economic development first.

Finally, I agree with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that more effort and thought should be given to ways and means of internationalizing our aid effort. The challenge of development in Asia, Africa and Latin America affects all Western nations because all Western nations have contributed so much to the kind of world we live in today—a world divided increasingly by the gap in wealth between those who have practiced economic development and those who are only just now learning how. It makes political sense, but more important it makes economic sense to pool the resources and talents of the Western nations in organizations which have no other purpose than promoting development. This is the best way, I submit, to gain acceptance for the conditions which must be met before foreign aid can do its work.

The question, then, is not: Should we continue foreign aid? Of course we should and we can afford every penny which is administered effectively. The question is: How can we improve the quality of the product? Foreign aid is one business where it should be a matter of pride to produce a quality product. And if we insist on this I predict that the growing opposition to foreign aid by Congress and others will disappear as it should.

TAX CUT MAY AGGRAVATE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, our balance-of-payments problems become increasingly serious as we confront the grim possibility of being unable to meet our military commitments to the free world overseas because of the decline of our gold balance and especially because of the rise in claims against our remaining gold.

Whatever merits the tax cut may have, it may worsen our balance-of-payments situation if it does the job it is designed to do: stimulate our economy into faster expansion.

Mr. President, in today's New York Times there appeared an excellent article by Mr. M. J. Rossant entitled "Johnson and the Dollar." This article summarizes a number of the problems which confront our new President with respect to the continuing balance-of-payments deficit. As this article indicates:

> Much of the credit for the steadiness of the dollar in international financial markets is attributed to the cooperative defensive arrangements devised by the Kennedy administration. But this defense in depth, which Mr. Johnson is commited to continue, is designed to prevent a currency crisis, not to shrink the deficit in the Nation's international transactions with other countries.

The article by Mr. Rossant also refers to an excellent study that appeared in the November issue of the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia's Business Review. I ask unanimous consent that this article, as well as the article by Mr. Rossant, be printed in the RECORD at the end of these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Philadelphia Federal Reserve article examines the question of whether a stimulus in the rate of economic growth in this country will help to solve our balance-of-payments problem. Incidentally, Mr. President, I should mention at this point that there is no indication in the Federal Reserve Bank's Review of the author of this article. However, it was written by Mr. Jack C. Rothwell, who is an economist for the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia. Mr. Rothwell also wrote a longer and excellent article which recently appeared in a compendium published by the Joint Economic Committee. This compendium is entitled "The U.S. Balance of Payments—Prospectives and Policies," and Mr. Rothwell's article begins on page 119 of that compendium. Many of the conclusions in the Philadelphia Federal Reserve's Review are documented in more detail in the Joint Economic Committee publication.

Mr. Rothwell in his review article examines the past periods characterized by the substantially differing rates of economic growth and observes how our balance of payments actually behaved during these periods. He studied every cycle since 1920.

He concludes:

> In only 2 out of the 10 cycles composing the 1920–62 period (and also in only 20 percent of the postwar cycles) was our balance of payments better off in the fast growth or expansion phase than it was in the recession phase.

He also notes:

> The items composing our net private capital flow abroad, we see that all contributed to an improvement more often in recessions than in the accompanying expansion phase. The pattern is even more pronounced in the postwar cycles than in the period as a whole.
>
> Looking next at the trade picture, our net export balance shows a 50–50 pattern during the entire period, indicating no preponderance of improvement in expansions or recessions.

One general conclusion which stems from this article is:

> The most comprehensive measure of our balance-of-payments performance is a slight edge to improvements during the expansion phase. This is true both for the 1920–62 period and the 1945–62 period.
>
> Yet the margin is small. During 6 out of 10 cycles, this combination of items shows improvement as we move from slow to fast growth; during 4 out of 10 cycles, it shows deterioration. Indeed, the test for statistical significance (the daggers on the table show which items may be considered statistically significant) tells us that we can have virtually no confidence that the 60–40 pattern did not evolve simply due to chance.

The conclusion of the author, therefore, who to my knowledge has studied the subject more perhaps than anyone else is:

> One would thus be hard pressed to make a case for the growth thesis.

The author also examines the relationship between growth and the balance of payments over longer periods of time than a single business cycle. His conclusion here is:

> In general, table IV suggests that fast-growth periods are associated with deterioration in the balance of payments (increases in outflows of funds or decreases in inflows) and slow-growth periods with improvement.

Thus:

> One might conclude that the evidence presented suggests that the growth thesis may be a case of oversimplification, that the behavior of our balance of payments is extremely complex and defies simple explanation, that there is simply no clear-cut and statistically discernible tendency for an acceleration in the rate of growth to bring about an improvement in our balance of payments.

Mr. President, on the basis of this extremely informative study, as well as the even more detailed study which appeared in a Joint Economic Committee compendium, it is my conclusion that the policymakers who have supported a tax reduction on the grounds that it will aid our balance-of-payments position are stretching a point for which there is no good statistical evidence which confirms this position and there can be serious doubt that any improvement will take place. Quite the contrary, it can be reasonably expected that some deterioration in our balance of payments may be associated with tax reduction.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Dec. 3, 1963]

JOHNSON AND THE DOLLAR—NEW PRESIDENT FACES KEY DECISIONS IN NATION'S BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS BATTLE

(By M. J. Rossant)

The dollar stood up remarkably well in the shock of President John F. Kennedy's assassination, but President Johnson still faces some important decisions in the battle to eliminate the chronic deficit in the Nation's balance of payments.

Much of the credit for the steadiness of the dollar in international financial markets is attributed to the cooperative defensive arrangements devised by the Kennedy administration. But this defense in depth, which Mr. Johnson is committed to continue, is designed to prevent a currency crisis, not to shrink the deficit in the Nation's international transactions with other countries.

THE ORTHODOX REMEDY

In forging its economic policies, the Kennedy administration sought to avoid the orthodox formula for a nation facing a deficit in its international balance of payments. The orthodox remedy calls for restraining the domestic economy until a payments surplus is achieved, but by resorting to a system of bilateral and multilateral currency arrangements, the administration managed to pursue a policy of domestic stimulation.

This cushioning technique paved the way for the expansion in business activity, now close to 3 years old and still going strong.

But it has done little to correct the imbalance in the payments position. The United States has bought time to get its international position back into balance, but the gap remains uncomfortably large.

GREATER EFFORT NEEDED

Mr. Johnson will have to decide whether he should reinforce the battery of weapons assembled by Mr. Kennedy to shrink the deficit. The late President had been disappointed in the slow progress being made to reduce the deficit and accepted the need for a greater effort.

In making his decision, Mr. Johnson will not want to put a brake on domestic expansion. Like Mr. Kennedy, he appears determined to promote a faster rate of economic growth.

Yet pressure for reducing the external sea of red ink is rising. A call for more effective action was made by Roy L. Reierson, senior vice president of New York's Bankers Trust Co., in a recent speech before the Industrial Conference Board.

Mr. Reierson, who had favored the Kennedy administration's approach, cited the "growing impatience of foreign central bankers and Government officials" at the persistence of large deficits.

According to Mr. Reierson's estimates, this year's deficit will be about $3 billion, or well above the $2.2 billion recorded last year and the $2.4 billion of 1961. He thinks that the administration must show "convincing evidence of sustainable progress" by new steps beyond those already in operation.

A similar call appears in the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia's Business Review. In an article in its November issue examining the relationship between growth and the balance of payments, it casts doubt on the popular thesis that stepping up the rate of domestic economic development will help to stem the outflow of gold and dollars.

Its analysis shows that the balance of payments registered an improvement in only 2 out of the 10 fast-growth periods between 1920 and 1962. The article suggests that the "growth thesis may be a case of oversimplification" because there is "no clear-cut and statistically discernible tendency for an acceleration in the rate of growth to bring about an improvement in our balance of payments."

ANOTHER APPROACH

While it is not against faster economic growth as one means of curing the deficit in the balance of payments, the Philadelphia Federal Reserve counsels that "we should not put all our eggs in this basket; we should not even commit half our eggs."

Instead, it calls for continuing to "strive for balance-of-payments equilibrium across the entire broad spectrum of public and private policy." And, echoing Mr. Reierson, it adds that "perhaps we should intensify our efforts."

An intensification in the battle to reduce the deficit would not involve any abrupt change in the tactics of strategy.

True, administration officials have stated that the demand for across-the-board tax reductions while primarily aimed at stimulating domestic growth, would also benefit the balance of payments by increasing the opportunity for profitable investment in domestic industry. But whether this is valid or not, they have not pinned their hopes on faster growth alone.

The fact is that the Kennedy administration did not rely on a single dramatic gesture to curb the deficit. It tried to plug up the leaks one by one, always being careful to keep its measures from hampering domestic growth.

Its combination of orthodox and radical steps was not intended to cure the deficit overnight. But this year, when the deficit worsened, the administration was forced to take special action.

In July the Federal Reserve Board increased its discount rate to slow down the outflow of short-term funds. This was followed by Mr. Kennedy's proposal to levy a tax on American purchases of foreign stocks and bonds, which had produced a big drain of long-term capital. In addition, the administration pledged to reduce the outflow of military expenditures.

Mr. Johnson's announced determination to maintain the Kennedy administration's policies to defend "the strength and the stability of the dollar" means that he will go along with this program. Even if he wanted to make a change, his freedom of maneuver is relatively limited.

He could attempt a faster reduction in military or economic aid, but this would not be consistent with his commitment to Mr. Kennedy's foreign policy. Nor can he hope for any swift increase in exports, for it looks as if the forthcoming Kennedy round of trade negotiations will be slowed down.

So, if urgent action is required, he may have to turn to monetary policy, the remedy suggested by Mr. Reierson. Along with many other authorities, Mr. Reierson believes that another increase in the discount rate would have a deterrent impact, actual as well as psychological, on the outflow of dollars.

Another rise in the discount rate might be considered a continuation of the Kennedy program. After all, the Treasury prepared the way for the last increase in the discount rate by publicly urging its rise.

But such a move would face opposition in some administration circles. A number of administration officials are prepared to go along with a more flexible monetary policy to help reduce the deficit, particularly if Congress approved a cut in taxes. But others are skeptical about the effectiveness of monetary policy in bringing about a reduction and fear that it might put a brake on domestic activity.

The issue also involves the independence of the Federal Reserve, which, during Mr. Kennedy's reign, managed to cooperate with the administration's economic policies.

Mr. Johnson will have to decide whether a stronger effort is needed, and work out his own relationship with the money managers. He has been spared any immediate decision by the strong showing of the dollar, but he may soon have to consider bringing up reinforcements for the payments battle.

[From the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia Business Review]

WILL GROWTH STOP THE GOLD DRAIN?

(NOTE.—Some say an increase in the rate of economic growth in this country will help solve our balance-of-payments problem and stem the outflow of gold to foreign lands. In this article we examine the reasoning behind this argument and take a look at some evidence which may help answer the question.)

Eighty-five feet below the busy streets of Manhattan lies a treasure in gold—over $13 billion cast in bricks, truncated pyramids, and thin sash-weight bars. Each bar bears the seal of its caster, some exotic Oriental gold merchant, or perhaps the mighty House of Rothschild. And each bar is carefully stacked in one of 118 steel wire cages, many of which evidence the preserve of a particular foreign government or central bank.

In recent years, long hours have been spent transferring gold bars in and out of these cages. The men putting in these hours are the physical manifestations of a problem which has plagued this Nation for over 6 years. They are employees of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and much of the metal they put into the cages marks the physical shift of gold from U.S. ownership to that of foreign nations. It is partial settlement of our balance-of-payments deficit.

The payments deficit stems from the fact that we have been paying more out to foreign nations for imports, investments, military aid, and the like than we have received from them for our exports of goods and services and from other international transactions. To make up the difference, we have paid out gold and dollars, and foreigners have accumulated our short-term I O U's in such forms as Treasury bills and commercial bank time deposits.

Of course, a nation, much like an individual, can't go on forever spending more than it receives. So we have been doing many things to try and decrease our deficit. These things range all the way from Government-sponsored programs to expand exports to a decrease in the dollar value of duty-free goods that American tourists may bring in from abroad. Yet the deficit has continued.

In recent months a relatively new balance-of-payments thesis has gained widespread acceptance: that the deficit can be relieved through an acceleration in the rate of economic growth in this Nation. In this article we examine the degree of confidence which might be accorded this thesis on the basis of experience with growth and the balance of payments.

But first, just what is the reasoning behind the growth thesis?

REASONING

The rationale behind the growth proposition concerns both the international capital and trade transactions between this country and foreign nations. It is reasoned, first of all, that more rapid economic growth in the United States will make this Nation more attractive to foreign and domestic investors—more attractive because accelerating growth will create a greater demand for capital and a rise in profits and interest rates. Greater demand for capital and higher profits and interest rates will cause both domestic and foreign investors to channel more of their funds into U.S. investments—into new plant and equipment, purchases of stocks and bonds, and into short-term investments, such as Treasury bills. The increased investment at home, it is reasoned, will mean a reduction of investment funds flowing abroad—funds that reached a $3.3 billion total last year.

It is also reasoned that accelerating economic growth would have favorable effects on our trade position. A higher growth rate, the argument goes, would increase income and demand for goods. Greater demands for goods during a period of less than full employment would increase production from present levels, thereby doing two things: (a) cutting unit costs of production, and (b) providing more profits so business could modernize plant and equipment, thus further cutting costs. This double-edged decrease in costs would help both our export industries and our import-threatened industries to compete with foreign goods.

It is recognized that the rise in incomes created by a hike in the growth rate might mean an increase in imports and thus an increased outflow of dollars for imported goods. But the growth proposition concludes that the combination of (a) the decrease in capital flowing abroad, and (b) the better competitive position of our export and import industries will provide more than enough counterforce to make up the increased imports and still contribute to a reduction in our deficit.

This is the argument. Let us examine it in the light of experience.

TECHNIQUE OF ANALYSIS

Since the theory hinges on growth, one might go back in history, look at periods characterized by substantially differing rates of economic growth, and see how our balance of payments actually behaved. During periods of fastest growth, for example, did the rate of capital outflow really decline in response to greater demands for capital and higher profits and interest rates? And what actually happened to the trade balance?

To answer these questions, balance-of-payments flows first were examined during different phases of the business cycle. Every cycle since 1920 was analyzed to see if discernible patterns of behavior could be established for balance-of-payments items as the cycle phase shifted from fast growth to slow growth to recession. Then longer time spans were examined to see if the expected growth patterns emerged. First, then, how did the balance of payments behave over the differing growth phases of the business cycle? The answer to this question is provided in the tables which follow. But before we examine the findings, let us take a look at the structure of the tables.

THE TABLES

Column 1 of the first three tables contains several balance-of-payments items, both individual entries and selected groupings. First, we have the total of net private capital flows abroad and then the sub-items which compose these capital flows.

Next we have private capital outflows and foreign capital flowing in, and the difference between the two, both including and excluding a portion of errors and omissions. (Errors and omissions is a catchall category which includes flows of funds which have gone undetected in the process of gathering together the balance-of-payments statistics. The category is thought to be composed of a sizable portion of undetected capital flows.)

Next comes our imports and exports, our net export balance, and finally we have combined net capital flows, trade balance, and errors and omissions.

The remaining columns contain a series of ratios for each balance-of-payments item and group. The ratios tell us the percentage of business cycles in which an improvement occurred as we changed from a slower to a faster rate of growth. For example, if in 8 of the 10 cycles occurring since 1920 the capital outflow slowed down as we moved from recession to expansion, then we would put 80 percent in the expansion column and 20 percent in the recession column, indicating that capital flows contributed to an improvement in our balance of payments 80 percent of the time as we changed from recession to the faster growth phase.

The cycles in the first two tables are broken into two time periods: the period 1920–62 and the subperiod 1945–62. Of course, our balance-of-payments data were not so good during the earlier years, but the similarity of behavior during the two periods is an indication that the data may be adequate for the type of analysis employed.

Now to the findings of the analysis. What actually happened to our balance-of-payments items as we moved from slower to faster rates of growth?

RESULTS

Looking first at the net private capital flow abroad in table I, we see a different sort of picture than we might have anticipated, given the growth thesis. In only 2 out of the 10 cycles composing the 1920–62 period (and also in only 20 percent of the postwar cycles) was our balance of payments better off in the fast growth or expansion phase than it was in the recession phase.

Looking next at the items composing our net private capital flow abroad, we see that all contributed to an improvement more often in recessions than in the accompanying expansion phase. The pattern is even more pronounced in the postwar cycles than in the period as a whole.

When we add one-half of errors and omissions to the net private capital flow abroad,[1] we see a 50–50 pattern during the entire period 1920–62, indicating no preponderance of improvement in expansions or recessions. In the postwar period, however, there is still a slight edge in favor of improvements during recessions.

After calculating the difference between U.S. capital outflows and foreign capital inflows, we once more see a 50–50 pattern during the 1920–62 period and a slight edge in favor of improvement during recessions for the postwar period.

Adding one-half of errors and omissions to the U.S. capital flow changes the pattern only slightly. In both periods we are better off 6 out of 10 recessions, and 4 out of 10 booms.

Looking next at the trade picture, our net export balance shows a 50–50 pattern during the entire period indicating no preponderance of improvements in expansions or recessions. In the postwar period, a slight edge appears during the expansion phase.

TABLE I

Balance-of-payments item	Percent of total business cycles during which item contributed to an improvement in the balance of payments [1]			
	1920–62 (10 expansions, 10 recessions)		1945–62 (5 expansions, 5 recessions)	
	Expansions	Recessions	Expansions	Recessions
1. Net private capital flows abroad	[2] 20	[2] 80	[3] 20	[3] 80
(a) Direct investments	[4] 33	[4] 67	[3] 20	[3] 80
(b) Long-term portfolio investments	[4] 37	[4] 63	40	60
(c) Short-term investments	[4] 44	[4] 56	[3] 20	[3] 80
Net private capital flows abroad plus ½ errors and omissions	50	50	40	60
2. Foreign direct and long-term portfolio investment in the United States	70	30	80	[3] 20
3. U.S. private capital flows less foreign direct and long-term investment	50	50	40	60
Above plus ½ errors and omissions	40	60	40	60
4. Exports of goods and services (excluding military transactions)	30	70	[3] 20	[3] 80
5. Imports of goods and services	60	40	60	40
6. Net export balance	50	50	60	40
7. Net export balance less difference in U.S. capital outflows and foreign capital inflows	50	50	60	40
Above including total of errors and omissions	60	40	60	40

[1] In this and following tables balance-of-payments items from which the ratios are derived are expressed in average monthly flows of funds. An improvement during the boom phase (say in capital account) would occur if the rate of outflow of funds decreased relative to that in the preceding recession period or if an outflow of funds in the recession were replaced by an inflow. NBER reference dates were used to determine cycle periods and quarterly balance-of-payments data (yearly data in the earlier period) were interpolated to arrive at the average monthly flows of funds for each cycle.

[2] Statistically significant at 90 percent level of confidence.

[3] Statistically significant at 80 percent level of confidence.

[4] Odd number because availability of data permits comparison of fewer cycles, 9 for direct investment and short-term capital, 8 for long-term portfolio investment.

The last entry in table I combines our capital flows, net export balance, and errors and omissions. As can be seen, this most comprehensive measure of our balance-of-payments performance gives a slight edge to improvements during the expansion phase. This is true both for the 1920–62 period and the 1945–62 period.

Yet the margin is small. During 6 out of 10 cycles, this combination of items shows improvement as we move from slow to fast growth; during 4 out of 10 cycles, it shows deterioration. Indeed, the test for statistical significance (the references on the table show which items may be considered statistically significant) tells us that we can have virtually no confidence that the 60–40 pattern did not evolve simply due to chance.[2]

In summary, then, private U.S. capital tends most often to cause deterioration rather than improvement as we move from recession to expansion. But after adding in errors and omissions and foreign capital inflows, the total capital account shows little preponderance for improvement during either the expansion or recession phase. Similarly, out net export balance shows no marked tendency toward improvement in either expansions or recessions. The same thing is true when we group capital, the net export balance, and errors and omissions. One would thus be hard pressed to make a case for the growth thesis on the basis of table I.

But let us go a step further. It is quite possible that the balance of payments responds to an increase in the rate of growth only after a timelag. One might reason, for example, that (a) it takes time for increased growth to be reflected in rising profits and interest rates, (b) it takes time for investors to become aware of the increased growth, higher interest rates, and profits in this country and (c) time is required for the physical arrangements necessary to direct a larger volume of investment into the domestic economy.

---

[1] No one really knows the amount of undetected capital flows counted as errors and omissions. The 50-percent figure might be considered a rule of thumb.

[2] The chi-square test was used to determine statistical significance. The hypothesis formulated was that the items contributed predominantly to neither improvement nor deterioration in our balance of payments during either phase of the cycle. A rejection of this hypothesis on the basis of the test indicated that an item did indeed contribute predominantly to improvement or deterioration. The percentage indicates the degree of confidence (i.e., 80 percent, 90 percent) with which the hypothesis was rejected. This confidence did not prove extremely high even for the items where the hypothesis was rejected.

TABLE II

Balance-of-payments item	Percent of total business cycles during which item contributed to an improvement in the balance of payments (6-month lag in balance-of-payments items)			
	1920–62 (10 expansions, 10 recessions)		1945–62 (5 expansions, 5 recessions)	
	Expansions	Recessions	Expansions	Recessions
1. Net private capital flows abroad	30	70	[1] 20	[1] 80
(a) Direct investments	30	70	[1] 20	[1] 80
(b) Long-term portfolio investments	[2] 50	50	40	60
(c) Short-term investments	[2] 56	44	60	40
Net private capital flows abroad plus ½ errors and omissions	50	50	40	60
2. Foreign direct and long-term portfolio investment in the United States	60	40	60	40
3. U.S. private capital flows less foreign direct and long-term investment	60	40	60	40
Above plus ½ errors and omissions	50	50	60	40
4. Exports of goods and services (excluding military transactions)	[3] 80	[3] 20	[1] 100	[1] 0
5. Imports of goods and services	[3] 10	[3] 90	0	100
6. Net export balance	40	60	40	[1] 60
7. Net export balance less difference in U.S. capital outflows and foreign capital inflows	60	40	60	40
Above including total of errors and omissions	50	50	40	60

[1] Statistically significant at 80 percent level of confidence.

[2] Odd number because availability of data permits comparison of fewer cycles, 8 for long-term portfolio investment and 9 for short-term investment.

[3] Statistically significant at 90 percent level of confidence.

Table II shows the recession-expansion comparison adjusted to include a 6-month lag in the payments items. Yet despite the lag adjustment, the main groups of items show a striking similarity to those in table I.

The total U.S. private capital outflow tends to cause deterioration in the balance of payments as we move from recession to expansion but, after correcting for errors and omissions and also when coupled with foreign capital inflows, the combined capital account once more shows little preponderance for improvement during either the expansion or recession phase.[3]

Similarly, the net export balance exhibits no very significant preponderance of improvements in either phase. The same pattern holds true when we group together the combined capital, the net export balance, and errors and omissions. Thus, on the basis of table II, one would also be hard pressed to make a case for the growth hypothesis.

Yet it is still possible that a very fast rate of cyclical growth might result in a balance-of-payments pattern more in keeping with the growth hypothesis. To test this possibility, a comparison was made of the behavior of the post-World War II balance-of-payments items within the expansion phase: as the cycle moved from the trough into the very fast upward phase and then leveled off into the phase of relative stability or "bumping along the top" as it is sometimes called. What, then, happened as the cycle moved from fast growth to stability? In fact, an interesting change occurred.

As shown in table III, we have a concentration of improvements in capital flows during the fast-growth phase. Both (a) U.S. private net capital and (b) the combined U.S. outflow and foreign inflow accounts show improvement in 80 percent of the cycles during the fast-growth phase. When we include errors and omissions, however, both accounts drop down to a statistically insignificant level: growth-phase improvements during only 60 percent of the cycles.

TABLE III

Balance-of-payments item	Percent of total business-cycles during which item contributed to an improvement in the balance of payments—1945–62 (5 recessions, 5 expansions)	
	Fast-growth phase	Stability
1. Net private capital flows abroad	[1] 80	[1] 20
(a) Direct investments	60	40
(b) Long-term portfolio investments	[1] 80	[1] 20
(c) Short-term investments	60	40
Net private capital flows abroad plus ½ errors and omissions	60	40
2. Foreign direct and long-term portfolio investment in the United States	40	60
3. U.S. private capital flows less foreign direct and long-term investment	[1] 80	[1] 20
Above plus ½ errors and omissions	60	40
4. Exports of goods and services (excluding military transactions)	[1] 0	[1] 100
5. Imports of goods and services	[1] 100	[1] 0
6. Net export balance	[1] 0	[1] 100
7. Net export balance less difference in U.S. capital outflows and foreign capital inflows	40	60
Above including total of errors and omissions	[1] 20	[1] 80

[1] Statistically significant at the 8-percent level of confidence.

The net export balance in every cycle shows deterioration in the fast-growth phase and improvement in the stability phase.

Finally, when we combine capital, the export balance, and errors and omissions, we have improvement during the fast-growth phase during only one out of five cycles. The predominance of capital account improvements during the upswing erodes under the pressure of the export balance and errors and omissions.

Thus, even though the growth hypothesis looks a little better on capital account in the fast-growth/stability comparison, by no means are we able to establish the proposition.

But so much for the cycle. Let us now look at the balance-of-payments items over over time periods.

GROWTH AND THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS OVER LONGER PERIODS OF TIME

Table IV shows average annual percentage changes in selected balance-of-payments items during two fast-growth periods, 1921–29 and 1948–56 and two relatively slow-growth periods, 1930–39 and 1959–62. Of course, the depression period is associated with rather extraordinary events affecting the world economy, but since the years for which we have balance-of-payments data are limited, the period is included with the obvious qualification that the period may not be representative.

In general, table IV suggests that fast-growth periods are associated with deterioration in the balance of payments (increases in outflows of funds or decreases in inflows) and slow-growth periods with improvements. The table should not be taken, however, as evidence that the reverse of the growth hypothesis is true. The observations are too few, data in the earlier period are not without question—to mention just two reservations. Rather one might say that the table does not inspire confidence in the validity of the growth thesis.

As for the individual items in table IV, percentage increases in private capital flowing abroad are greater during the fast-growth periods (though this tendency is less evident when U.S. capital outflows are coupled with foreign capital inflows). The net export balance deteriorates during the fast-growth periods and improves during the slow-growth years, as does the grouping of capital, net export balance, and errors and omissions.

CONCLUSIONS

One might be tempted to draw the conclusion from this analysis that there is a slight edge in favor of the proposition that a faster rate of growth tends to promote a worsening in the balance of payments; that imports tend to grow faster than exports during the fast-growth periods, and that businessmen tend to invest more at home—but also more abroad during expansions (e.g., "Profits look good so let's expand in Cincinnati, and while we're at it we might reconsider the subsidiary in Milan"—or—"Things look good the world over so let's stretch out for an extra 1 percent on a Canadian issue").

Yet such a conclusion is probably unwarranted. After all (and as previously mentioned) the balance-of-payments observations are relatively few; the results of all comparisons were not uniform in outcome; the data may be questioned; there is some trend in the cyclical comparisons (though from an examination of the data, this problem is considered to be minimal).

To be on firmer ground one might conclude instead that the evidence presented suggests that the growth thesis may be a case of oversimplification, that the behavior of our balance of payments is extremely complex and defies simple explanation, that there is simply no clear-cut and statistically discernible tendency for an acceleration in the rate of growth to bring about an improvement in our balance of payments.

Given this conclusion, then, what guidance might this study offer the policymaker? Perhaps the following.

---

[3] It should be noted, however, that short-term capital flows now show a predominance of improvements as the cycle moves from recession to expansion (the postwar period).

TABLE IV

Balance-of-payments items	Average annual percent change in selected balance-of-payments flows over periods associated with differential rates of economic growth[1] (minus signs indicate a deterioration in the balance of payments)			
	1921–29	1930–39	1948–56	1959–62
1. Net private capital flows abroad	−8.6	+11.8	−24.7	−6.1
(a) Direct investments	(2)	+11.6	−12.6	−1.0
(b) Long-term portfolio investments	(2)	−6.0	−59.7	−8.3
(c) Short-term investments	(2)	−4.4	−137.2	−14.6
Net private capital plus ½ errors and omissions	−11.5	+14.1	−86.3	−4.3
2. U.S. private capital outflows plus ½ errors and omissions less foreign direct and long-term portfolio capital inflows	−4.0	+7.4	−53.5	−15.1
3. Net export balance	−2.4	+5.8	−6.6	+54.4
4. Net export balance less combined U.S. and foreign capital flows	−5.4	+7.8	−9.6	+130.9
5. Above including 100 percent of errors and omissions	−9.2	+7.1	−9.4	+70.2

[1] Percent change over the period is calculated from an average for the first 2 years of the period to an average of the last 2. Simple annual rates of growth as measured by the industrial production index are as follows: 1921–29, 11.6 percent; 1930–39, 2.3 percent; 1948–56, 6 percent; 1959–62, 4 percent.

[2] Not available.

An increase in the rate of economic growth may help relieve our balance-of-payments deficit. Then again, it may not. Hence the wisdom which may be gained from this study is perhaps this: we should not count too heavily on growth as an equilibrating force; we should not put all our eggs in this basket; we should not even commit half our eggs. Instead, we should continue to strive for balance-of-payments equilibrium across the entire broad spectrum of public and private policy. And perhaps we should intensify our efforts.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSTON obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield without losing his right to the floor, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROVISION OF OFFICE SPACE, SUPPLIES, EQUIPMENT, AND FRANKING PRIVILEGES FOR MRS. JACQUELINE BOUVIER KENNEDY

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H.R. 9291) to provide office space, supplies, equipment, and franking privileges for Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, to authorize appropriations for the payment of expenses incident to the death and burial of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I am asking that this procedure be followed after having consulted with all members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. They do not object to this procedure.

I send an amendment to the desk.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina will not be read, but will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all mail matter sent by post by Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, the widow of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, under her written autograph signature or facsimile thereof, shall be conveyed within the United States, its territories and possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, free of postage during her natural life.

SEC. 2. For a period of twelve months following the enactment of this statute, the Administrator of General Services shall furnish to Mrs. Kennedy suitable office space appropriately furnished, supplied and equipped as determined by the Administrator, at such place within the United States as Mrs. Kennedy shall specify. The supplies to be furnished shall include a sufficient quantity of envelopes marked "Postage and Fees Paid" to be used for international mail. For the same period the Administrator of General Services shall, without regard to the civil service and classification laws, provide for an office staff for Mrs. Kennedy. Persons employed under this subsection shall be selected by Mrs. Kennedy and shall be responsible only to her for the performance of their duties. Mrs. Kennedy shall fix basic rates of compensation for persons employed for her under this paragraph which in the aggregate shall not exceed $50,000 during such period. The rate of compensation payable to any such person shall not exceed the maximum aggregate rate of compensation payable to any individual employed in the office of a Senator. Each individual appointed under this subsection to a position on the office staff of Mrs. Kennedy shall be held and considered to be an employee of the Government of the United States for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury, through the United States Secret Service, is authorized to protect the person of Mrs. Kennedy and her minor children for such period of time following the enactment of this Act as she may request.

SEC. 4. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to carry out the provisions of section 2 of this Act and to pay not to exceed $5,000 toward the expenses incident to the death and burial of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, including undertakers' charges and the expenses of transportation, the sum of $55,000 to remain available until June 30, 1965: *Provided,* That no payment shall be made from this appropriation to any officer or employee of the Government for personal or professional services. Appropriations now or hereafter available to the United States Secret Service shall be available for the purposes of section 3 of this Act.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the amendment would change the bill in two particulars. It would extend the period to 12 months instead of 6 months, and place a limitation of $5,000 on the funeral expenses. The House bill does not contain such a limitation. It is believed that there should be a limitation placed in the bill.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Does the Senator offer his amendment as a complete substitute for the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes; I offer it as a complete substitute.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina, in the nature of a substitute, is open to amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Carolina will yield to me, without losing his right to the floor, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, and ask that it be read.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add a new section as follows:

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to Mrs. J. D. Tippit, of Dallas, Texas, the sum of $10,000 as a token of the gratitude of the Nation for the service rendered by her late husband in connection with the search for the assassin of the President of the United States.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, on that fateful day in Dallas when our President was struck down by the cowardly hand of an assassin, Officer J. D. Tippit, in the course of his duties as a police officer, attempted to detain Lee Harvey Oswald, the alleged assassin of our late President. In the course of doing his duty, Officer Tippit was shot dead. Officer Tippit leaves three children: Allen, 14; Brenda, 10; and Curtis Ray, 4.

Officer Tippit was in the prime of his life as a relatively young man. He had an outstanding record of service to his community and to the city of Dallas prior to his murder on November 22, 1963.

It is my fervent hope that my amendment will be adopted as a gesture of gratitude and assistance to the family of Officer Tippet, who so ably and courageously discharged his duty on that fateful day.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the Senator's proposed amendment is more in the nature of a claim. We are concerned in the pending bill with a payment to the widow of the late President of the United States. The present procedure is somewhat in line with paying expenses of widows of Members of the House and of the Senate.

In my opinion, this is not the time or place to adopt an amendment of the kind the Senator from Texas has offered.

When I first came to the Senate I was a member of the then Claims Committee that considered these matters. The Judiciary Committee now has a special subcommittee which considers such claims made by various people. Such a claim goes through the Claims Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, where it is discussed. Consideration is given to how much is to be paid. Some thought is given also to the age of the widow, how many children are involved, and other considerations. All these matters are taken into consideration.

I fully agree that the widow of Officer Tippit should be paid something. However, I do not believe that an amendment of the kind the Senator from Texas has offered should be added to the bill now under consideration. His amendment should be in the form of a claim, and should be referred to the Judiciary Committee, to be considered by its appropriate subcommittee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have great sympathy toward the purpose of the amendment which is being proposed by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], the substance of which has also been introduced in the form of proposed legislation by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. He introduced such a measure during the past week.

I hope that, because of the peculiar and tragic circumstances affecting the particular incident involved, with which the murder of Officer Tippit is also connected, and in line with the action already taken by the House, the Senate may consider by itself the particular proposal with reference to the widow of the late President of the United States.

I assure the distinguished Senator from Texas that so far as the majority leader is concerned—and I am quite sure I speak for the minority leader, as well—we will do our utmost to see that the consideration of the proposal for compensation for Mrs. Tippit is brought before the proper committee as expeditiously as possible, and when reported to the Senate, given consideration as soon thereafter as possible.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the distinguished majority leader. I assure the distinguished Senator from South Carolina that I do not want to do anything untoward or improper.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I know the Senator does not. The Committee on the Judiciary handles matters of this kind. I have the utmost sympathy for the widow of Officer Tippit, as does the Senator from Texas. Having offered the amendment at this time, I am glad to know that he feels as he does. However, I think the Senator will agree with me that the alternate method is probably the best way to proceed with regard to Mrs. Tippit.

Mr. TOWER. I understand; I agree with the Senator from South Carolina and with the majority leader. I wanted to have the proposal come before the Senate, because I believe there is a moral obligation to Mrs. Tippit. I am perfectly willing to defer to the wishes of the distinguished Senator from Montana and the distinguished Senator from South Carolina and to withdraw the amendment, having been given assurance that consideration will be given to my proposal at another time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I concur in the statement of the distinguished majority leader. As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I give the distinguished Senator from Texas further assurance that this proposal will receive our consideration.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill now being presented by the Senator from South Carolina, pertaining to allowances for Mrs. Kennedy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill before the Senate is a House bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON. This is a House bill. I have just offered an amendment, which is at the desk, making certain changes.

Mr. SCOTT. I withdraw my request. If the Senator will further yield to me, I wish to say that I support the amendment. It is most fitting and proper that such a provision be included. I congratulate the Senator from South Carolina for bringing up the bill in timely fashion, and I am happy to associate myself in support of it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. It is highly appropriate that the proposed legislation should be enacted. I am glad the distinguished Senator from South Carolina has so promptly brought the bill before the Senate, so that it may be passed promptly. There can be no doubt that the flow of mail and sympathy to the former First Lady, as well as to the widow of the murdered policeman, have created a special burden. I believe it is altogether fitting and appropriate for the Congress to approve this legislation speedily.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for yielding to me. My only purpose in the request was to say that I am sure that if it were possible, every Member of the Senate would wish to do as was indicated a moment ago by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]—to be a cosponsor of the proposed legislation. However, this is a House bill, and the parliamentary situation makes that impossible.

I commend the Senator from South Carolina for the expeditious manner in which he has acted and for the amendment he has offered. As one citizen and one Senator, not only do I wish to be associated with the proposed legislation, but I strongly support it.

Mrs. Kennedy gave a demonstration and an example of dignity, courage, and poise that the Nation will never forget. It was an inspiration to a whole people at a time when a nation needed inspiration and reassurance.

What the Senator from South Carolina is now proposing and what the Senate is about to do will, I am sure, express the wishes of every citizen of the country—not only of the country, but of people throughout the world. Therefore, I commend the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his gracious remarks. Mrs. Kennedy was wonderful throughout the ordeal to which she was subjected. It is impossible to express her attitude in words.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for polling the entire committee last week concerning this most meritorious bill.

President Kennedy and his charming wife wrote a brilliant chapter during a brief period of American history. Their leadership was expressed not only in matters relating to political affairs but also in cultural affairs.

Mrs. Kennedy, in her role as the wife of the President, did much to restore the White House as a great American treasure. Through her search for pieces of early American furniture and objects of art, she helped to reestablish the residence of Presidents as a historic shrine.

Mrs. Kennedy's courage and bravery during the cruel days following the assassination profoundly impressed the world. She set a pattern of conduct for all Americans.

I congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for bringing the bill to the floor of the Senate so promptly. It is a very small thing that we do, but the guard force that will be provided for her and her children is one of the things that will help, in some degree, to lessen the anxiety Mrs. Kennedy might otherwise face.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. It is proper that the proposed amendment to include relief for Mrs. Tippit has been withdrawn, to be included in a separate bill. While I hope to see legislation passed on behalf of Mrs. Tippit, I believe it would have been inappropriate to include it in a bill which relates to the family of the late President.

Last week I introduced a bill to pay Mrs. Marie Tippit, the surviving wife of Policeman J. D. Tippit, of Dallas, the sum of $10,000. That bill is now in committee. The majority leader has assured us that hearings can be had upon that bill. The measure now under consideration is for the family of the late President, John F. Kennedy, and is for their protection and to ease the painful period of transition from probably the best known Presidential family in the history of America, to the status of private citizens. The period of time provided in this bill for that transition will be the very minimum time that will be required. More time might be needed.

I commend the able chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] for the expedition with which this measure has been handled through the committee, on which I have the honor of serving, and on the floor of the Senate today. It is one of the least things we could do for a brave and courageous family of our gallant fallen leader.

In connection with the statements that have been made about the high esteem in which the family of the President was held, having been in the motorcades with the President in Texas before his assassination, I saw crowds representing a considerable portion of the population of our State. More people saw President Kennedy in the six motorcades which he led in Texas in 2 days, before his assassination, than had ever seen any other one human being who had ever visited our State before in any comparable period of time. The people everywhere gave him a tremendously enthusiastic welcome. At Houston, the largest number of people who had ever seen one person in one parade prior to that time was the crowd that had turned out to welcome Astronaut Gordon Cooper upon his return to earth. Officers who saw the crowd that came out to see President Kennedy in Houston on the 21st of November told me that the number who saw President Kennedy were much larger—from 50,000 to 100,000 more people than the crowd that turned out to welcome Gordon Cooper. The same situation was true all over the State. Everywhere the crowds were large and enthusiastic. One of the biggest, most friendly, and enthusiastic of all was the crowd at Dallas.

The Presidential motorcade at Dallas had passed through the entire city; it had passed the last high-rise building on the parade route, on the embankment that leads down to the Trinity River Valley, in the heart of the city, but in that last high-rise building, an assassin lurked in a dark corner on the fifth floor. After that building, all the high-rise buildings would have been passed.

Texas had given President Kennedy the greatest reception that it had ever given to anyone before, when this horrible tragedy, this foul deed was done.

Commendations are due the distinguished Senator from South Carolina and to the Senate leadership, for the promptness with which they have brought this bill before the Senate. I associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], concerning what this family did for the President and for the Nation, and for the esteem in which the people held the President, for the way he had conducted himself in the office of the Presidency, and in all the functions that go with it.

His deeds were nobly done; his widow equally endeared herself to the American people for her charm, grace, and bravery at his side.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I thank the Senator from Texas for his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment in the nature of a substitute is agreed to.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment, and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 9291) was read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROSECUTION OF COMPREHENSIVE RIVER BASIN PLANS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, House bill 8667.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8667) authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION AND ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM PROJECTS IN MAINE

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President——

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Maine such time as she may desire.

Mrs. SMITH. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, in response to requests that I have made in my capacity as the senior Senator from Maine and as the ranking Republican on the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the Commerce Department, certain information which has been submitted to me is of interest to the people of the State of Maine. Because of this, I submit this information for the RECORD.

The Area Redevelopment Administration and the accelerated public works program have committed funds totaling $8,807,000 in Maine since the inception of these programs in 1961 and 1962. A review of the impact of these programs on eligible areas of Maine to date reveals that the Federal funds represented 56 percent of the total cost of the projects, $15,630,000. Many projects involved State, local, and private sources of financing as well as Federal funds.

Together, the ARA—as of October 31—and APW programs—as of October 1—had initiated 75 projects in the form of industrial and commercial loans, in worker training assistance, in technical assistance, and accelerated public works projects. These projects are as follows:

ARA and APW programs initiated as of Oct. 31, 1963

	Number of projects	Federal costs
Industrial and commercial loans (ARA)	9	$2,430,000
Public facility (ARA)	1	165,000
Training (ARA)	14	109,000
Technical assistance (ARA)	5	81,000
Public works (APW)	46	6,022,000

The total investment in connection with the industrial and commercial loans amounted to $3,875,000, with $1,445,000 coming from other than Federal sources. The total costs of the public facilities were $195,000 and of the public work $11,370,000. The costs of the technical assistance and training projects were entirely federally supported.

Areas in Maine which are currently eligible for ARA financial assistance and APW projects are those having substantial and persistent unemployment and include Aroostook County, Hancock County, Knox County, Lincoln County, Piscataquis County, Washington County, parts of Penobscot County, and part of York County. In addition to these areas, part of Androscoggin County has been eligible for accelerated public works but not for ARA loan or grant assistance.

A detailed review of the ARA projects indicated that the nine industrial and commercial loan projects will result in 616 direct jobs when the facilities are in normal operation. These jobs have been proven by experience to stimulate almost as many other jobs in enterprises supplying the project or in local businesses favorably affected by the new payrolls. The public facility project was approved as necessary to the expansion of 200 additional jobs in associated industrial enterprises. The 14 training jobs had 357 enrollees acquiring new skills for available jobs.

The specific ARA projects as of October 31, their location, and the approved Federal funds are:

Statewide, Maine Department of Sea and Shore Fisheries: study of shellfish, $44,000.

Biddeford-Sanford area, Grafton Lumber Co.: lumber processing operation, $433,000.

Biddeford-Sanford area, Rumery's Boat Yard, Inc., boat storage, $19,000.

Biddeford-Sanford area, Sanford Water District: expand water system, $165,000.

Biddeford-Sanford area, Twin Ridge Corp.: apple warehouse, $102,000.

Biddeford-Sanford area, Department of Agriculture—SCS: aerial survey of York Co., $6,000.

Biddeford-Sanford area, Surveys and Research Corp.: study impact of Grafton Lumber Co. project, $2,000.

Biddeford-Sanford area, Maine Department of Economic Development: feasibility study of plant to process marine clays, $17,000.

Biddeford-Sanford area, training: nurse aid, $5,000.

Biddeford-Sanford area, training: sewing machine operator, $19,000.

Biddeford-Sanford area, training: sewing machine operator, $5,000.

Biddeford-Sanford area, training: stenographer, $11,000.

Biddeford-Sanford area, training: sewing machine operator (Aletta Manufacturing Co.), $4,000.

Aroostook County, Greater Presque Isle Development Corp.: potato plant expansion, $1,040,000.

Aroostook County, Dumond Cedar Co.: cedar fencing plant, $56,000.

Aroostook County, Pinkham Lumber Co.: bandsaw lumber mill, $650,000.

Aroostook County, training: steno (refresher), $9,000.

Aroostook County, training: blemish remover (boot and shoe), $8,000.

Aroostook County, training: cutter, machine (boot and shoe), $4,000.

Aroostook County, training: stitcher—boot and shoe, $7,000.

Aroostook County, training: hand sewer—boot and shoe, $16,000.

Aroostook County, training: heeler—machine—boot and shoe, $9,000.

Knox County, Lime Products, Inc.: expand facilities, $39,000.

Knox County, training: sewing machine operator, $4,000.

Knox County, training: sewing machine operator, $4,000.

Lincoln County, training: nurse aid, $4,000.

Piscataquis County, Squaw Mountain Corp.: ski area, $63,000.

Washington County, Eric W. Kelly Peat Moss Co.: expansion, $28,000.

Washington County, Department of Agriculture: Forest resources inventory, $12,000.

Total, $2,785,000.

The accelerated public works projects in Maine were designed to provide jobs to the unemployed in needy areas. As of October 1, the 46 Maine projects had provided 1,634 man-months of work, with an additional 5,030 man-months of work to be provided before completion of the projects. These are onsite jobs, and do not include indirect effects of these projects on other jobs and business generally.

Matching funds from State and local sources amounted to $5,348,000. These funds added to the Federal contribution accounted for the total cost of the APW projects in Maine of $11,370,000. The approved accelerated public works projects in Maine as of October 1, by location, and the Federal costs associated with each project are:

Biddeford, Webber Hospital, $400,000.

Kennebunk, municipal building, $18,000.

Old Orchard Beach, treatment plant interceptors, $27,000.

Old Orchard Beach, sewer facilities, $112,000.

Saco, sewage treatment plant, $1,114,000.

Sanford, interceptor sewer, $172,000.

Aroostook County, fish and wildlife facilities, $12,000.

Aroostook County, fish and wildlife facilities, $13,000.

Eagle Lake Town, highway improvements, $8,000.

Eagle Lake Town, highway improvements, $12,000.

Caribou, sewage treatment, $441,000.

Caribou, library, $84,000.

Limestone Town, sewer facilities, $19,000.

Madawaska, sewer facilities, $24,000.

Madawaska, water facilities, $39,000.

Madawaska, firehouse, $34,000.

Madawaska, garage, $41,000.

Mars Hill, sewage treatment, $108,000.

Mars Hill, sewer facilities, $134,000.

Hancock County, fishery buildings, water supply, roads, $121,000.

Hancock County, fish facilities, $3,000.

Hancock County, forest preservation, $20,000.

Hancock County, stream fishway, $1,000.

Hancock County, Acadia recreation facilities, $176,000.

Hancock County, forest preservation, $28,000.

Bar Harbor Town, Mount Desert Island Hospital, $37,000.

Rockland, street improvements, $144,000.

Boothbay Harbor, sewage treatment, $435,000.

Boothbay Harbor, water facilities, $12,000.

Boothbay Harbor, sewer facilities, $73,000.

Wiscasset, treatment plant interceptors, $46,000.

Wiscasset, water facilities, $33,000.

Brownville, highway improvements, $17,000.

Washington County, construct buildings, recreation facilities, $5,000.

Washington County, recreation facilities, $360,000.

Washington County, fish facilities, $5,000.

Washington County, fish and wildlife facilities, $12,000.

Washington County, forest preservation, $285,000.

Machias, Down East Hospital, $495,000.

Calais-Baring, grading drainage and paving, $342,000.

Calais-Baring, earthfill dam, $18,000.

Auburn City, sewer facilities, $87,000.

Auburn City, water facilities, $194,000.

Lewiston City, water system, $50,000.

Lewiston City, sewer facilities, $80,000.

Lewiston City, waste treatment plant, $131,000.

Total, $6,022,000.

NEW FACILITY OPENED BY MEXICAN INSTITUTE OF REHABILITATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I noted in a recent report from Mexico City in the New York Times that the Mexican Institute of Rehabilitation is opening a new facility.

I had the privilege of visiting this institute when I was in Mexico City last year, and I can testify that few efforts in which U.S. citizens are involved have such direct and immediate and favorable impact as does the work being done by our rehabilitation specialists with U.S. surplus equipment.

I am particularly pleased because of the efficiency of this program, which operates with only 13 percent of its patients paying anything, and still does not run a deficit. More than 10,000 disabled Mexicans have been put back into the work force through the work of this institute under the dedicated leadership of Romulo O'Farril, Sr.

I am particularly pleased also to note that this fine institute is going to be emulated by other Latin American countries. This is indeed the Alliance for Progress in action.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Paul P. Kennedy, published in the New York Times on November 17, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEXICO BROADENS HELP TO CRIPPLED—REHABILITATION INSTITUTE TO OPEN DORMITORIES

(By Paul P. Kennedy)

MEXICO CITY, November 12.—The Mexican Institute of Rehabilitation, which says it is the only enterprise of its kind in the world operating with only 13 percent of its patients paying, and still not running a deficit, is opening a new facility.

It is dedicating this week dormitories for indigent men and women coming down from the mountains in need of rehabilitation. These patients have no funds to get lodging while awaiting treatment. The wardlike dormitories will house 60 men and women until they can be examined, processed and assigned to rehabilitation procedures.

None of the officials, doctors, therapists, and nurses around the institute, situated on the outskirts of the city, know how long the organization's luck is going to hold out. But for the time being at least it is serving as a model in its field for three other Latin American countries. Ten more Latin American nations have applied for advice on setting up rehabilitation procedures of their own.

GIFT FROM LOTTERY FIRST

The rehabilitation system got its start with a $1,200,000 grant from the national lottery. At that time it was under the direction of the Ministry of Health and Welfare.

In 1956 one of the country's principal publishers, Romulo O'Farril, Sr., lost a leg in a motoring accident in Europe. He underwent rehabilitation in the United States and returned to Mexico dedicated to the idea of setting up a modernized rehabilitation center in the capital. The result was the institute.

The rehabilitation system has put more than 10,000 disabled Mexicans back into the work force, where they earn about $8 million a year. This is in addition to an estimated $1,400,000 saving to the Mexican Government on dependency outlays. It is estimated there are about 14 million disabled persons in all Latin America, costing the various governments about $5,600,000 daily in dependency payments.

The United States has provided a rehabilitation specialist, David Amato, and has contributed surplus equipment. The Mexican Government has spent $5,986,000 on the program and the United States $304,000.

In addition to the thousands of Mexicans going through the institute, 350 Latin American rehabilitation technicians have been trained. They have gone back to their respective countries to begin programs of their own. These technicians include the staffs of the rehabilitation institutes in El Salvador, Honduras, and Peru, all set up under Mr. Amato's direction along the lines of the Mexican Institute.

PATIENTS BEGIN IN INDUSTRIES

The institute maintains a precept that a rehabilitated person sent home to vegetate is unrehabilitated so far as society and the state are concerned. As soon as a patient is restored to activity here, he is given an adaptability test then, as a general rule, he goes to one of the six small industries set up on the institute grounds in quonset huts.

He lives off the premises but commutes to his job, punches a timeclock and works under supervision. Wages are generally higher than the going rate for such work in regular factory jobs. He continues at the job until he proves he has regained his confidence at which time the institute's personnel finds him employment on the outside.

The small industries make automobile radios, furniture, wheelchairs, foam rubber products, and limbs and braces. Some of the industries, like the radio manufacturers, work on a profitmaking basis.

The institute's net profit in 1962 was $160,000, and in 1963 it is expected to be $300,000. Of the 1,500 capacity patient load day in and day out, 87 percent pay nothing; 13 percent pay according to ability. Of the latter, about half are considered wealthy. They are charged double the normal rates.

STATEMENT BY AFL–CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON DEATH OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the most moving and thoughtful statements concerning the tragic death of our beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, was made by the AFL–CIO Executive Council. I ask unanimous consent that the statement by the council be printed in the RECORD, together with a statement relating to President Lyndon B. Johnson and a statement entitled "Hatred in America."

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE AFL–CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY, NOVEMBER 26, 1963, WASHINGTON, D.C.

The incredible loss of President Kennedy has put a stunned world in mourning.

Taken from our midst in madness and violence was a young man of stature and strength, a man with a zest for life, who had gaiety and wit and wisdom beyond his years. And even more, taken from us was a leader of greatness and courage and compassion—a humanitarian whose love of his fellow man was broad beyond belief.

All who love freedom and their fellow man now mourn. Aside from his immediate family, none mourn him more than the working people of this world, the voiceless millions bowed with grief. Only a handful of them knew him personally. But to all he was their leader, their champion, their friend.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy earned their confidence, their trust, their friendship. He gave them courage and a sense of destiny. He led them toward great victories over adversity that only a man of compassion could understand.

Only last September, millions of the lowest paid of this land had reason to be thankful to President Kennedy. Through his leadership, millions finally won the protection of the minimum wage law. These and other millions, through improvements in the minimum wage law, had more money to spend. To the world's cynics, it was a raise of only 10 cents an hour. But President Kennedy knew it was milk and bread and shoes for millions of his fellow citizens, and because he knew, he fought; because he fought, millions were his beneficiaries.

He knew too the misery and hopelessness of people in depressed areas and, because he felt their suffering, workers who were once marked obsolete because of technological change, today have a new chance for gainful employment.

He brought homes within the grasp of many; deplored and detested the slums that degrade our land; sought the abolition of exploitation and suffering and misery. And those for whom he fought will be eternally grateful.

Most of all, John Kennedy understood the degradation and humiliation that millions of Americans of different race and religious belief know in too many parts of our land. A descendant of immigrants, a communicant of a religious faith that also knew persecution, President Kennedy put his heart and strength into the struggle for civil rights. More than any President since Abraham Lincoln, whose fate he shared, John Kennedy brought to America understanding of the struggle, appreciation of the plight of the victims of discrimination and segregation, determination that America must—and would—win this battle against hatred.

And never did John Kennedy lapse into the smugness of victory. No success meant relaxation to him. He knew always that there were new goals ahead, new victories needed; new enemies of mankind to be conquered.

The prosperity which marked his 1,031 days in office was only a source of partial satisfaction to him. As he told us only a week before his martyrdom, partial prosperity is not enough; there can be no satisfaction while millions go jobless.

That was typical of John Kennedy for across the whole spectrum of American life—economic and social—John F. Kennedy stood for progress. He had no low horizons. He had faith in the limitless capacity of America and of Americans. He was a realist in both foreign and domestic affairs and he faced the realities without fear.

It was that very courage which, when the Soviets challenged us with their Cuban missiles, brought the world through one of its most perilous periods. The surprised respect which that crucial event won from the Communist world, and from our allies as well, may well go down in history as a turning point in mankind's struggle for peace and freedom.

For even as we Americans thought of him as our leader, John Kennedy was much more than that. He was not only a national leader but a world leader. He had the respect of presidents, prime ministers, and kings; and somehow he had also won the faith and confidence of the world's people, in Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America alike.

The evidence is not merely in the assemblage of heads of state who came here to pay their last respects. Far more moving confirmation has been found on streetcorners throughout the world, from London to Laos, where the people of every race and every nation gathered to mourn a man they knew was wholly devoted to peace, freedom, and progress everywhere on earth. The flood of messages, expressing the most poignant sorrow from trade union organizations throughout the world, which we have received, evidence this fact.

There are few men in any age—men who can combine in themselves the fresh eye of youth with the wisdom of experience; the warmth of instinct with the coldness of necessity; the scholar's grasp with the politician's astuteness—men who dare to dream great dreams and yet dare to be practical as well.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was such a man and, because he was, our sorrow is all the greater.

A week before his assassination, he spoke these words to us:

"Marshal Lyautey, the great French marshal, went out to his gardener and asked him to plant a tree. The gardener said, 'Why plant it? It won't flower for 100 years.' 'In that case,' the Marshal said, 'plant it this afternoon.'

"That is what we have to do."

That is indeed what John F. Kennedy felt this Nation had to do, and he was determined to see that it was done.

This grieving Nation is left with more than memories; it has been bequeathed a program, a practical dream, whose fulfillment will be the lasting monument to the leader who conceived it.

The AFL–CIO Executive Council speaks for workers everywhere in mourning the loss of this great and beloved man, a loss all the more terrible for the manner in which it was suffered. We extend to his widow, whose magnificent courage during these tragic days has won the admiration of all, to his children, to his parents, and to the other members of his family our most profound condolences.

To his memory, we pledge our unstinting devotion to the building of the world of which he dreamed—a world in which mankind can be free yet safe, a world in which brotherhood is fact for all men.

STATEMENT BY THE AFL–CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, WASHINGTON, D.C., NOVEMBER 26, 1963

To Lyndon B. Johnson has come the awesome responsibility of leading the United States of America and the free world. That this responsibility has come under circumstances which we know are to him, as to us all, unthinkable only multiplies the burdens that are his.

The Nation and the world are fortunate indeed to have, in President Johnson, a man of vast legislative experience, who was given extraordinary responsibilities during his service as Vice President and who acquitted himself with distinction in each of these tasks. He is deeply committed to the program of his martyred predecessor and he was clearly a partner in its design and scope.

The fulfillment of this program remains of primary importance to our own country and to the cause of freedom. America must be strong in every way—militarily, economically, socially. America must be generous, wise, and prudent. America must above all be true to its destiny.

We know President Johnson shares these objectives. We know he will prove equal to the problems and challenges which will await him.

We extend to him, in this most tragic hour in the history of our great Republic, our warm, understanding, and sympathetic support.

On behalf of millions of American workers and their families, we pledge to the new

President of the United States of America our complete backing in the dark and dangerous days that lie ahead.

Statement by the AFL–CIO Executive Council on Hatred in America, Washington, D.C., November 26, 1963

The brutal assassination of President John F. Kennedy came as an overwhelming shock to the American people. Now, as the sense of shock wears off, all of our people are asking, "How? Why was such a thing possible in a civilized society?"

America and the world await an answer. Only through such an answer, complete and beyond dispute, can the American system of justice retain the confidence of the people and its good name throughout the world.

Therefore, it is wholly proper that President Johnson has mobilized the full resources of the Federal Government to uncover and make public the whole truth behind the slaying of his beloved predecessor.

But one fact is already clear. No matter what the identity or motive of the man who held the gun, hatred pulled the trigger.

Hatred—blind, bitter, savage hatred—is on the rise in America. There is the hatred of which Birmingham has become the symbol. There is the hatred exemplified by the John Birch Society and the followers of General Walker. There is the hatred of the fanatical Communists. There is no choice among them; for hatred in any form is evil.

Hatred often seeks to masquerade as a strongly held belief. But the difference is fundamental. Hatred denies the right of others to hold contrary beliefs; indeed, hatred seeks to destroy other beliefs and those who profess them.

Hatred is a clear and present threat to American society, for hatred is the antithesis of democracy. Hatred murders reason as well as men; and without reason, no free society can survive.

Let us pray that the tragedy which hatred has visited upon our land will awaken the people to this peril of their own making, and touch the hearts of those whom hatred has corrupted.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S ADDRESS TO CONGRESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last week, when President Lyndon Johnson spoke to a joint session of Congress, he spoke also to the Nation and the world. People everywhere, mournful at the tragedy which had befallen our Nation, yet anxious and eager to learn what sort of man now served as President of the United States, gained an overwhelming impression of strength and commitment. There was no question—here was a progressive spirit with deep convictions.

The impact of President Johnson's words and his manner has been measured by the editors of papers in every corner of the country. Virtually with a single voice, they have praised the message which the President delivered. One paper said:

> His first Presidential message will take its place among the best of the state papers in American history. It would be hard to improve upon it by the alteration of a single sentence or a single sentiment.

I agree, as do most of the other editorials I have read. To demonstrate what must be clear to any viewer of the American scene—that there is a consensus of admiration for President Lyndon Johnson and confidence in his leadership—I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a number of editorials relating to the speech of President Johnson and to his first days in office.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Nov. 28, 1963]

Spoken Like a President

The new President's words to Congress were fine words, fitting words, at times inspiring words. But as significant as what he said was the way he said it.

Lyndon Johnson was thrust suddenly into the White House, and to much of the country the new President was a stranger. The last two Presidents before him were sharply different in personality, but both were men of commanding public presence. In Congress, Mr. Johnson had a reputation for getting things done; he was master of the Senate, but his mastery, to most of the public, was veiled in mystery. His arena was the Senate cloakroom and the fastness of the majority leader's office, not the public platform, and even at the height of his power he never engaged the public imagination.

Even in his first days as President he was—as the tragic occasion demanded—the man at the edge of the stage, not at its center; the center belonged, still, to John F. Kennedy and his magnificently heroic widow.

But yesterday was Lyndon Johnson's day, and as he stood before Congress and the Nation he showed himself not a fluke of history, but a President. He had the presence of a President, and he said the things a President should have said.

His strong emphasis on civil rights was probably dictated not only by the evident need for action, but also by the doubts so many have harbored that he, as a southerner, would continue the pressure for such action. But it was vital that these doubts be laid decisively to rest. He did so eloquently, and it should now be clear that the man who, as majority leader, engineered the passage of the first major rights bill since Reconstruction, and who as Vice President vigorously championed the Negro cause, does mean to work as President to "eliminate from this Nation every trace of discrimination and oppression that is based upon race or color."

"Courage to seek peace, and * * * fortitude to risk war" were not the gifts of President Kennedy alone; these have been necessary qualities in every postwar President, and they are rooted in the resolution of the Nation at large. But it was well that President Johnson, at the start of his administration, reminded both friends and adversaries alike that these have not been lost.

It was well, because the world is anxiously watching to see what effect the change of Presidents will have on American policy. President Johnson will have his own style, but the Nation's purposes are unaltered, its commitments—as he also noted—undiminished.

The climactic events of the past week shook the Nation as it has not been shaken in this generation. And yet it has shown that it can carry on, and it will. Tragedy has drawn the Nation together, in a catharsis of grief and self-searching. From this it can, if it will, emerge stronger, more determined, more united.

It can and perhaps will, as President Johnson urged, "turn away from the fanatics of the far left and the far right, from the apostles of bitterness and bigotry, from those defiant of law, and those who pour venom into our Nation's bloodstream." It can resolve to get on with the business of government, not wasting itself in penny-ante politicking and futile procrastination.

Capitol Hill, as Mr. Johnson somewhat nostalgically noted, was his "home" for 32 years, and as majority leader he was a Senator's Senator, the epitome of the legislative man. When he stood before Congress yesterday for the first time as President, he made it clear that a Johnson administration will respect the role of Congress as it should be respected; but also that the man who once made the Senate run expects Congress to fulfill that role.

In asking the help, with his awesome new responsibilities, of both Congress and the people, President Johnson asked what it is in the Nation's interest to give—and what he deserves to get.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 28, 1963]

A Time for Action

President Lyndon Baines Johnson has summoned the Congress and the country to the unfaltering pursuit of those great ends to which the Nation is committed. His first Presidential message will take its place among the best of the state papers in American history. It would be hard to improve upon it by the alteration of a single sentence or a single sentiment.

What this great address said to the world is that the national objectives are not to be altered or abandoned, the national purposes are not to be forgotten or delayed, the national hopes are not to be disappointed or deferred. What it did not put into words, but what it just as clearly said, was that there is at the helm, in this crisis, the firm hand of a strong man with a steady purpose and a brave spirit. Surely, the Nation is reassured and the world is reassured.

The new President rejected the advice of those who would have had him pause, or turn aside or turn back. He spurned the counsels of political caution which might have dictated a pause in our political affairs, an interlude for reorganizing and regrouping the Government. That would have been a safe course. Even citizens who could not have admired it would have been compelled to acquiesce in it as an understandable exercise of political discretion. But the President chose the risks of a bolder and a better course.

"It is," he said, "a time for action." He called for action along the whole broad front of American purposes to which we have been committed by past promises. He asked for passage of a civil rights bill to achieve the equality "about which we have talked for a hundred years." He asked for a tax bill to buttress the national economy. He asked for education bills to "help bring the light of learning to every home and hamlet." He asked for a foreign-aid bill that will make it clear that we do not intend to "forfeit our responsibilities to this hemisphere or the world." And he asked for action on other measures long delayed in Congress, including the appropriation bills.

There is a time in the affairs of a country that calls for eulogy by words. We have lived through such a time. There is a time that calls for eulogy by action. We enter such a time. Seldom has the call to action been directed to Congress with greater clarity. The President rightly said: "Our most immediate tasks are here on this Hill." The Senators and the Congressmen can now join with the new President to help make the Government of the United States whole again—or as nearly whole as it can be made in the wake of great calamity. They can fit their actions to the words they have spoken and match their emotions by their deeds. They will be acting, in the days immediately ahead, upon a brightly illuminated stage exposed to the gaze of all mankind. None of their acts will escape the scrutiny of today or the judgment of tomorrow.

Action upon the whole broad program before them is what they owe the President who appealed to them for help and the President who is beyond all human help; and it is what they owe themselves and what they owe their country.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 1, 1963]

LOOK NOW TO THE FUTURE

The American people have in the last 10 days lived through a harrowing experience, the reverberations of which will last long into the future. But it is that future that now must occupy our prime attention.

We cannot continue to dwell on the past; we must force ourselves to realize that, in the face of even the most brutal and villainous of crimes, the Nation's life must still go on. The destiny of a great people can never hang by a single thread.

This, of course, is far from saying that the investigation into the murder of the late President and of his alleged assassin must not be pursued in every detail, until the last vestige of doubt as to the identity of the guilty parties, their motivations, and all the circumstances surrounding these crimes has been dispelled. This must and will be done. The Presidential commission, which Mr. Johnson has just designated, was exactly what was called for to reestablish public confidence that the truth will be known and to reassert in the most unmistakable terms the American people's belief in the rule of law.

But it is no disrespect to the memory of our cruelly martyred young President, who in 3 short years made so remarkable an impact on this country and the world, to look now to the future. That is the direction in which John F. Kennedy, a man of the future, would have wanted us to look. That is the direction in which his successor has solemnly asked us to look. That is the direction in which we must look.

President Johnson set the tone in his initial message to Congress. He paid the greatest tribute possible to his predecessor when he asked the Congress to act—not talk any longer, but act—on two of the most fundamental points of the Kennedy program: civil rights and taxes. Mr. Johnson could have temporized at this juncture. He could have contented himself with praising Mr. Kennedy and deferring any call to legislative action until after the new year. That he chose not to do so is a hopeful augury.

The new President has accepted the basic Kennedy position not only in domestic but also in foreign policy. He has explicitly reaffirmed American commitment to our alliances; he has already stressed his sympathetic interest in Latin American progress; he has reiterated his belief in negotiating with the Russians while maintaining a position of military strength.

Mr. Johnson affords a striking contrast to his predecessor. He does not have the youthfulness of outlook, the intellectual interests, the philosophical bent, the profound knowledge of history and literature, the sophistication, and the subtlety of Mr. Kennedy.

He does, however, have a distinct style of his own, a completely different style and one that may well prove to be highly effective in his relationship with Congress and in the enactment of a forward-looking program. He began his political life as a New Deal Democrat from Texas, which was not necessarily the easiest thing to do; through an act of fate he has reached the height of political power as a New Frontier Democrat from Texas, not necessarily the easiest thing to be.

He is frequently spoken of as a politician's politician. We think he is a good deal more than that. He has undoubted gifts of leadership; an occupancy of the White House often brings out latent qualities of statesmanship. The country is looking to him for both; now—in the next few months—is his golden opportunity to prove them to himself, to his country, and to the world.

[From the Portland Oregonian, Nov. 28, 1963]

JOHNSON COMMITTED

President Lyndon Johnson's unequivocal commitment to the major policies of his predecessor, the assassinated John F. Kennedy, in his address to the joint congressional session Wednesday, leaves him some room for maneuvering, but not much. Any deviation from the pledges he made surely would weaken the support, both in Congress and the Nation, he asked and should receive.

The address committed him not only administratively but in the political line he will follow to obtain the Democratic nomination for another term as President in his own right. He made no concessions to the Southern racists, as, indeed, he has never done. He reminded the Nation, as well as the South, of his leadership as Senate majority leader in 1957 and 1960 directed toward enactment of civil rights legislation. In urging the earliest possible enactment of Mr. Kennedy's civil rights bill, he insisted that Congress move now toward eliminating from this Nation "every trace of discrimination and oppression based upon race or color."

Similarly, he gave no quarter to those—including powerful Southerners like Senator BYRD—who are stalling tax reduction legislation in the Senate. In effect, he called for the massed power of the people to help end congressional delay, not only on these two priority items but in other fields. Congress would do well to listen.

What President Johnson said and his measured sincerity in saying it were deeply impressive. The speech was right for the occasion—humble but forceful, restrained yet revealing strength of purpose. The Nation may be thankful that the political forces which caused John F. Kennedy to select his convention opponent, Lyndon B. Johnson, as his Vice President also brought into office as his successor a man of strength, knowledge and confidence. If his conduct in office hereafter justifies the solemn pledges he made to Congress and the people Wednesday, he will get the support he asked.

[From the Providence Journal, Nov. 28, 1963]

A STRONG HAND TAKES OVER THE REINS

A steady, strong, and sure hand holds the reins of power in the White House today, and for that simple fact, the United States can be thankful on this Thanksgiving Day.

Speaking to Congress yesterday for the first time as Chief Executive, President Lyndon B. Johnson spoke with a firmness of purpose, a humility of spirit, and a strength of character that were enormously and importantly heartening to a nation just emerging from the shock of the murder of the late John F. Kennedy.

President Johnson alined himself solidly behind the ideals and programs of the late President, and the Nation, and the world—friend and foe—know exactly where he stands and how he proposes to run the Government. Continuity of governmental power has been extended to continuity of purpose.

Mr. Johnson won the heaviest applause for his appeal for passage of a civil rights bill. "We have talked long enough in this country about equal rights," he said. "We have talked for 100 years or more. It is time now to write the next chapter—and to write it in books of law." His plea could not have been stronger.

Mr. Johnson pledged support of the Kennedy tax bill, and he promised an administration of "utmost thrift and frugality." The eloquence of those passages in which he spoke of the high purpose of his administration was balanced by the terse clarity of his declarations of specific intent.

But the most important plea that Mr. Johnson made was for action. "This is our challenge—not to hesitate, not to pause, not to turn about and linger over this evil moment, but to continue on our course so that we may fulfill the destiny history has set for us. Our most immediate tasks are here on this Hill."

With wisdom born of the experience of 32 years on Capitol Hill, the President appealed directly to Congress for its help in sharing his burden. Not only did he ask Congress to stay in session and get down to hard work; he asked for help out of the fullest respect, he said, for the "independence and integrity of the legislative branch."

It must not be overlooked that Mr. Johnson caught the mood of the Congress and the Nation with his deeply-felt call for an end "to the teaching and preaching of hate and evil and violence." Applause shook the House Chamber when he urged a turning away from the fanatics of the far right and the far left in a rededicated brotherhood.

It was America's great tragedy to lose Mr. Kennedy in the full vigor of his life. It is America's great good fortune that Mr. Johnson already is demonstrating the qualities that could make him a great President.

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Nov. 28, 1963]

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S SPEECH BEFORE CONGRESS

President Lyndon B. Johnson made a distinguished speech before Congress yesterday, notable for its full and vigorous endorsement of former President Kennedy's current legislative program, and his plea to Congress to enact it.

First of all, Johnson's speech gave notice to the world that the new President is quite determined to back up American interests from Vietnam to Berlin; that America must have a military strength second to none. Johnson also recognized that negotiation is welcome in an effort to maintain the peace of the world. His speech was conciliatory, but was spoken with a firmness and dignity that is to be expected of the President of our country.

President Johnson pulled out all of the stops in calling for "President Kennedy's civil rights program." Not even President Kennedy could have spoken with more force and eloquence in his plea to bring an end to second-class citizenship in our country. Since President Kennedy's civil rights program already has passed the House, this plea to former fellow Senators should be effective.

The same thing applies to the tax cut bill. The House has passed it, and it now is stalled in the Senate. It will be nearly impossible for Senator BYRD to smother it in his committee in the face of this plea from the new President himself.

The timing of the message also will help out. Congress plans to recess on December 14, so that its Members can return home for the holidays. Considering the present mood of the country, it is possible that many Members of each house now will feel compelled to go along in order to support the new President. When the legislative jam breaks on these two big pieces of legislation, the chances are that it will carry along with it much other legislation.

It will be a good test of the confidence that Congress has in the new President. His speech echoed with skill in recognizing the independence of Congress, but at the same time asking for results.

[From the Morning Sentinel, Nov. 28, 1963]

A STRONG SPEECH

President Johnson's first major speech since he took over the reins of Government was eloquent in its simplicity and its directness.

He left no doubt where he stands on the major problems and the major issues of the day and he left no doubt that he will use his considerable talents to persuade the Congress to support these stands.

That he will follow the broad outlines of President Kennedy's foreign and domestic policies there can now be no question.

And while he pleaded for the help of both the Congress and the people of the Nation in carrying on the crushing tasks of the Presidency, he left no doubt that he has grasped the wheel of the ship of state with a firm and positive hand.

His accents were those of Texas in contrast with the accents of Boston the Congress has heard from its President the past 3 years, but the words were familiar.

On the great central domestic issue facing the country, civil rights, he forthrightly called for early enactment of the civil rights program for which his predecessor fought. Nor was it lip service. One recalls that President Johnson pushed through Congress as majority leader the first civil rights bill since Reconstruction days. He means to work with equal vigor for another. There can be no question of that.

The United States will continue to work for peace, ready to grasp the hand of all who seek freedom and justice. But it will continue to work for that peace by maintaining the strength to enforce it.

President Johnson's reception from his colleagues was warm as would be expected for one who has spent almost all of his adult life in one or the other of the two branches of Congress.

Whether he will be able to translate this warmth into support for the legislation he wants remains to be seen. One can believe that he will spend fully of his tremendous energy in an effort to accomplish it.

[From the Kansas City Times, Nov. 28, 1963]

The New President: Words That the World Needed To Hear

Lyndon B. Johnson passed his first test as President of the United States. He passed it magnificently.

His words were words that Congress, the Nation, and the world needed to hear. Certainly all were waiting to hear, and we have no doubt of the profound effect. There was, here, a reassuring simplicity, a depth of sincerity. There was that call to national unity that must be made again and again. He found, in the tragic event that had thrust him into this awesome office, the lesson that should mean so much to all Americans.

In this fashion, he paid eloquent tribute to John Fitzgerald Kennedy. But henceforth the tribute is to be in action, not in words. "Let us continue," President Johnson said, and in so saying he moved onto the stage of history as a world leader.

Ready To Lead: Getting on With the Job

Congress could not have missed the full significance of this return of a colleague, now wearing a different robe. This is a man the lawmakers know and a man who knows the lawmakers. Together, he told the assembled legislators, we have work to do, and let us be about it.

In stating the challenge, President Johnson displayed a fine understanding of the meaning of our constitutional Government. He spoke pointedly of the integrity and independence of the legislative branch of Government. He expressed his confidence in Congress and, considering the virtual stalemate that had existed on Capitol Hill, it was a necessary boost to legislative morale. At the same time, Lyndon Johnson left no doubt about his conception of the Presidency as the office of a leader.

We did not, however, detect any tone of rebuke. Instead, there was an impressive recital of the work to be done. In this case, it was firm but gentle prodding. Lyndon Johnson, however, understands the nature and the problems of Congress perhaps better than any other man. It is an understanding that he will put to use time and time again in the months ahead. Yet in his onetime post on Capitol Hill, he obviously acquired a deep understanding of the nature of the executive. He left no doubt that gentle words today may be stronger tomorrow.

On civil rights, for example, he stated the case so well in but a phrase. "We have talked long enough," he said.

On the tax bill, he used the strong Kennedy argument that this lessening of the burden of taxes is so essential to the Nation's future, to the creation of an atmosphere of incentive.

On matters of fiscal and monetary policy, he stated his determination to protect the dollar, a determination that no President, in this global economy of today, can state too often. "The Government will set an example of prudence and economy," he stated. Let us all hope that this will prove to be so.

Such specifics are essential, of course, and if no timetable was established, it was a proper and necessary bit of executive strategy. But beyond the specifics, we suggest, is the picture of this new Chief Executive of ours.

It is the picture of a man strong in his determination, a man of action capable of saying so very much in but a few phrases. The experience of years in government was apparent, yesterday, and this experience will be a strong asset of the new Johnson administration. It is also the picture of a President that in words and methods—though certainly not in philosophy—contrasts with the lingering picture of John F. Kennedy.

In the historic moment of a former Senator returning to familiar surroundings, the world had its first real view of Lyndon B. Johnson in his great new role. It was a reassuring view that ought to dispel any uneasiness that might have existed. This Nation needs to show that it is capable of decisive action, President Johnson said. In a few minutes before his former colleagues, he clearly demonstrated that he is capable of decisive leadership.

On Straight Course—Peace and Strength

The President has now set forth the basic philosophy which will guide his administration in the direction of our foreign policy. That philosophy should occasion no surprise, either at home or abroad. It had been confidently predicted in advance and, at several points, specifically foreshadowed by statements Mr. Johnson had already made, since assuming office. Nevertheless, it immensely serves the national interest to have this summing up, so magnificently sincere in tone and so straightforward in content.

Where our international affairs were concerned, the stress of the message was focused on a vigorous rededication to all the policies and programs in force under President Kennedy. The new Chief Executive eloquently paraphrased his predecessor's injunction to begin at once upon the multitudinous tasks confronting the Nation, by calling for a continuation of those efforts without interruption.

In language that could bear no misunderstanding, President Johnson declared that we would keep our commitments throughout the world. He promised that we would remain both unceasing in our search for peace and unafraid in our confrontation of those who would destroy that peace or impose their will on others. At one and the same time he thus moved to reassure our friends and warn our enemies against underestimating the strength of our determination.

In particular, the President pledged us to an undeviating support of the United Nations, to the meticulous discharge of the obligations we owe our allies, to the reinforcement of our existent programs of assistance in Africa and Asia and to our duty under the relatively new Alliance for Progress with Latin America.

Of special significance, in this respect, were some remarks which he seemed to interpolate in his prepared speech. These embodied a frank recognition that the executive branch, even though charged with primary responsibility for the conduct of our foreign policy, must have cooperation from both Houses of the Congress. Mr. Johnson not only appealed for that cooperation, in general, but urged directly that the Presidential authority not be frustrated by legislative attempts to restrict flexibility of action within an overall policy framework.

Finally, the President called the attention of his former colleagues to the immense impact of our racial policies at home on the influence which we exert in world affairs. Coming from such a source, it is greatly to be hoped that the Congress will pay heed and act in accordance.

And Together: For an End to Hatred

The President reserved to the end of his address a most stirring appeal for national unity, in the wake of the terrible tragedy that has engulfed us. He called upon all his fellow Americans for an end to the preaching of hatred and violence. He begged them to turn away from the fanaticism of the extreme right and left, alike, and to eschew the counsels of bitterness, bigotry and lawlessness which "pour venom into our Nation's bloodstream."

Using President Kennedy's martyrdom as his text in these closing passages, he required of us a new sense of fellowship that will make us one people and reestablish the spirit of brotherhood "from sea to shining sea." It was a fitting climax to a great address. And the tremendous applause with which it was greeted demonstrated how sorely the American conscience is troubled; how deeply we stand in need of rededication to the ideals of our forefathers.

No one could hear—or read—what our new President said yesterday, without a sense of solace, without a determination to strive for the goals he so impressively, yet with such personal humility, set before the Nation.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Nov. 28, 1963]

President Johnson's First Report

Lyndon B. Johnson's address yesterday gave a foretaste of what the President's countrymen and America's friends and foes abroad can expect in the months ahead.

His words conveyed a sense of strength and resolve; in his person he displayed a sureness and a confidence in his new role that should make all Americans, regardless of party, proud of a system that can so change personal leaders without faltering.

As one watched Mr. Johnson on the TV screen, one was reminded that here was a man who actively had contested the late President Kennedy for the Democratic nomination for the office in 1960. Here was a man who wanted to be President, who believed in his ability to handle the job and who took the Vice Presidency when asked to do so by Mr. Kennedy.

Although Mr. Johnson has pledged to carry on in carbon copy of Mr. Kennedy, no man can be a duplicate of another. Mr. Johnson's speech in large part might well have been delivered on an earlier and happier day by Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Johnson was undoubtedly helped in preparing it by Mr. Kennedy's staff writers. But as time goes on, the Presidency inevitably must reflect the Johnson approach rather than the Kennedy approach.

Mr. Johnson is a practical man who seeks the best but settles for the possible.

In his references yesterday to the two most important pieces of unfinished legislation Mr. Kennedy had demanded, Mr. Johnson called for the earliest possible action on the civil rights and tax cut bills.

Thus Mr. Johnson put himself squarely behind the two bills but he did not demand immediate passage.

The issues involved in both these pieces of legislation have not been changed by Presi-

dent Kennedy's death. In this time of mourning and during which Mr. Johnson has much to do, it would be far better for Congress to do only what is necessary for the Government to function.

In connection with the tax cut bill, it must be noted with commendation that Mr. Johnson promised the Government will set an example of prudence and economy. As we said with reference to the tax cut bill earlier, there will be no harm in delaying action on it until Congress sees the President's budget next year. This argument is bolstered, we believe, by Mr. Johnson's welcome personal pledge that Government expenses will be administered with frugality.

[From the Minneapolis Morning Tribune, Nov. 28, 1963]

PRESIDENT JOHNSON: "LET US CONTINUE"

President Johnson's first address to Congress struck a precisely proper and moving note. One could have no doubt about the depth of his feeling when he said, "All I have I would have given gladly not to be standing here today."

And one could feel with equal impact his sincerity when he declared, "Let all the world know, and none misunderstand, that I rededicate this Government" to the "unswerving" continuation of the policies set forth by President Kennedy. Recalling his late chief's words on inauguration day almost 3 years ago—"Let us begin"—he added his own imperative, "let us continue."

It may be hopefully significant not only of the mood of Congress but of the Nation that Mr. Johnson was most fervently and lengthily applauded after two stirring sentences in his appeal for greater tolerance among Americans for each other:

"Let us put an end to the teaching and preaching of hate and evil and violence." And * * *

"Let us turn away from the fanatics of the far left and the far right, from the apostles of bitterness and bigotry, from those defiant of law, and those who pour venom into our Nation's bloodstream."

If this mood truly prevails in Congress, and if Congress senses that it is running overwhelmingly strong and deep among the people, President Johnson may indeed win substantial legislative victories, especially in that one, extremely emotional issue on which he placed so much stress, the civil rights bill.

Many Congressmen of both parties have already felt considerable kinship with Mr. Johnson as "one of ours"—i.e., because of his 32 years of service in the House and Senate. His forthright expression of respect for the independence and integrity of the legislative branch in his message yesterday should help cement this new-found legislative-executive friendship.

At the same time, the new President made it specifically clear that he would not look lightly on any attempt at "erasing executive flexibility in the conduct of foreign affairs." He intends, it may be inferred, to be a positive leader, albeit a friendly one.

One almost dares hope that in this atmosphere of mutual friendly respect, or respectful friendliness, the new President and Congress may surprise us all with their legislative accomplishments in the next 6 months.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Nov. 28, 1963]

JOHNSON'S STRONG BEGINNING

It is a tribute to John F. Kennedy that his successor has called upon Congress and the Nation to push forward with renewed vigor the Kennedy administration program.

It is a mark of the stature of Lyndon B. Johnson that he should place above all else the enactment of the Kennedy civil rights bill. From the lips of a Texan and a southerner these words bear all the more import for every American:

"We have talked long enough in this country about equal rights. We have talked for 100 years or more. Yes, it is time now to write the next chapter—and to write it in the books of law."

And President Johnson eloquently pledged himself—and asked others to join his pledge—to the Kennedy goals:

"The dream of conquering the vastness of space—the dream of partnership across the Atlantic—and across the Pacific as well—the dream of a peace corps in less developed lands—the dream of education for our youth—the dream of jobs for all who seek them—the dream of care for our elderly—the dream of an all-out attack on mental illness—and, above all, the dream of equal rights for all Americans."

President Johnson did not ignore the needs of our alliances or the threat of our enemies. We will keep our commitments from Berlin to South Vietnam. We will remain a good and reliable friend to those who seek peace and freedom. We will remain a formidable foe to those who seek to break the peace or curb freedom: "Those who test our courage will find it strong, and those who seek our friendship will find it honorable." The sentence is worthy of John F. Kennedy.

And President Johnson dealt with hard domestic matters, too. He called for immediate passage of the tax cut bill as a means of insuring the continuation of a strong economy. His was a pledge for action now and a call for help—"I cannot bear this burden alone." And he called movingly for an end to hate and evil and violence, which have smeared too many black blots on our Nation in recent months.

This was a good beginning. It came after a series of talks with leading allies. It brought out again the side of President Johnson that many people have overlooked—his dedication since early New Deal days to a progressive philosophy.

His asking or his promising will not turn Congress into an efficient and effective body or the Nation into a brotherhood of dedicated men. Feet will still drag. Imagination will still escape many. Even hate will continue to eat at the hearts of some.

But most people will hear the call and give to the new President their heartfelt support in his time of need and trial—and the Nation's time of need and trial. Lyndon Johnson is now the leader. He brings great strengths to his task. He deserves good will and time to prove himself.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Nov. 28, 1963]

THE NEW PRESIDENT SPEAKS

If proof were needed that the Presidency of the United States is in strong hands, it was demonstrated on Wednesday in Lyndon B. Johnson's first address to the Congress since his succesion to that high office.

He spoke solemnly, unsmilingly, to a somber Senate and House, still numbed by the tragic ordeals of the past 5 days. His speech was low-keyed, in keeping with the occasion.

But it was forceful and direct, and it reflected the strength of the speaker's convictions and his determination to take hold of the burdens thrust upon him to the best of his abiltiy.

He made it clear where the Government stands; he left no doubts in anyone's mind as to the course that he will follow. His position, his policies, his commitments will be those of the murdered John F. Kennedy: where his predecessor said on his inauguration: "Let us make a beginning," President Johnson says to the American people: "Let us continue."

Many persons have been anxiously awaiting the position the new President would take on the two controversial issues that are leftovers from the Kennedy administration, civil rights and tax reduction; and the bills concerning each that are among the unfinished business of the present Congress.

Mr. Johnson made it clear what he wants done: both the civil rights legislation and the bill calling for income-tax reduction should be enacted into law quickly.

"No memorial oration could more eloquently honor President Kennedy's memory," he told Congress, "than the earliest possible passage of the civil rights bill for which he fought." And again: "No act of ours could more fittingly continue the work of President Kennedy than the earliest passage of the tax bill for which he fought."

On world affairs, the President was equally explicit. The United States will maintain military strength second to none in the world and will, at the same time, be unceasing in the search for peace. This Nation will keep its commitments "from South Vietnam to West Berlin." It will support the United Nations and keep its alliances strong.

And he flung this challenge to the foes of America and of freedom: "Those who test our courage will find it strong. Those who seek our friendship will find it honorable."

Lyndon Johnson came before Congress with a heavy heart, just as he had sorrowfully taken the oath of office as President minutes after John F. Kennedy died from an assassin's bullet. He appeared to make the deepest impression upon his hearers when he called earnestly for "an end to the teaching and preaching of hate and evil and violence" in the land.

A humble and patriotic American, suddenly loaded down with awesome responsibilities, Lyndon Johnson asked Congress for its help in the days ahead. He should receive that help—and that of all Americans.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Nov. 18, 1963]

THE NATION'S TEMPO

Lyndon B. Johnson had two choices yesterday in his first Presidential address to the Congress. He could have said all the proper things, and then have called in effect for a time of pause, while the country and he gathered and organized themselves for the work ahead—or he could have said what he did say. Actually, with Mr. Johnson's temperament and his understanding of what the Presidency is, he had no alternative but to try to pick the spirit and energies of the country up, and set us in motion again. That effort he performed superbly.

The theme of the address, sounded over and over, was action. "No words are strong enough to express our determination to continue the forward thrust of America," the President said. He said that now the ideas and ideals of John F. Kennedy "must and will be transplanted into effective action." He said: "It is our duty * * * to do away with uncertainty and to show that we are capable of decisive action * * * that we can and will act and act now." He said: "This is our challenge—not to hesitate, not to pause, not to turn about and linger over this evil moment but to continue on our course."

All this was addressed in general to the country, and some of it specifically to the Congress, in a bold combination of flattery, cajolery, and demand. "Let us meet in action," he said to the Congress. He set no time limits for action on specific legislation, but when he declared that "the need is now" he was serving notice that he does not foresee a state of do-nothingness through the rest of this year, if he can prevent it. Politically, Mr. Johnson was casting his lot on the side of movement and speed: rightly and, we trust events will prove, shrewdly.

The President's list of things to do was revealing in contents and in order of priority. In the roll of "American dreams * * * vitalized" by Mr. Kennedy he named space exploration, international partnership, the

Peace Corps, education for youth, care for the elderly, and cure for the mentally ill, but he placed above all, as the highest purpose and the first legislative imperative, a Federal civil rights law. After yesterday, no one can doubt where Lyndon Johnson stands on the issue of civil rights.

No one can doubt either where he stands generally in fiscal philosophy, or immediately on tax reductions; nor, in world affairs, can anyone doubt his determination to keep the Nation strong, or his dedication to peace. Our foreign friends and opponents alike may contemplate the key foreign policy portion of the address:

"In this age there can be no losers in peace and no victors in war; we must recognize the obligation to match national strength with national restraint; we must be prepared at one and the same time for both the confrontation of power and the limitation of power; we must be ready to defend the national interest and to negotiate the common interest."

For us in this country, at this moment, the speech's most memorable passage, the passage not to forget, was:

"The time has come for Americans of all races and creeds and political beliefs to understand and respect one another. So let us put an end to the teaching and preaching of hate and evil and violence. Let us turn away from the fanatics of the far left and the far right, from the apostles of bitterness and bigotry, from those defiant of law, and those who pour venom into our Nation's bloodstream. I profoundly hope that the tragedy and torment of these terrible days will bind us together in new fellowship, making us one people in our sorrow. Let us here highly resolve that John Fitzgerald Kennedy did not live—or die—in vain."

Those are not the words or the accents of politics or of any section or any State, South or North. They are the words and the accents of a President of the United States, setting the tone and tempo for the time ahead.

[From the Park Region Echo, Alexandria, Minn., Nov. 28, 1963]

THE NEW PRESIDENT

There is so much to be said about the tragic weekend one scarcely knows where to begin.

Perhaps it would be best to take up the consideration in reverse order—last things first, for at the moment we are still moved by President Lyndon Johnson's truly magnificent address to the Congress Wednesday noon.

We would be less than candid if we did not admit at the outset that Lyndon Johnson was not our favorite for the Vice Presidency. Indeed, Mr. Johnson has never stood at or even near the top of our list of favorite public officials.

But whatever reservations we may have had about the man's outlook (not his ability, for we have always admired that) were largely erased by Wednesday's speech.

We do not know who writes Mr. Johnson's speeches. We do know the speech writer is a gifted one if Wednesday's production was an example.

Mr. Johnson is not an orator of the caliber of Mr. Kennedy or Mr. Stevenson, but Wednesday he did as well, if not better, than at any time we've ever heard him.

He spoke sincerely, directly, simply—and movingly.

There was a poignancy in his opening remark about the late President being "the greatest leader of our time" that clutched at one's heartstrings, for at this moment, if not before, the listener suddenly realized how very much the new President loved and admired Mr. Kennedy.

There was poignancy, too, in his moving appeal for the support of the Congress and of all Americans in helping him shoulder "the awesome burden of the Presidency." The catch in his voice at this moment gave lie to any suspicion that Lyndon Johnson is an arrogant man.

But for us, listening, the most gripping moment in the entire speech occurred when the new President began reciting the creed of his belief in the programs of the New Frontier and his determination to see them through.

The spectacle of this tall Texan standing before both Houses of the Congress and appealing for all he is worth for the passage of President Kennedy's civil rights bill as "a living memorial" to the late President will live forever in our memory of a week so full of so many memories which will never be forgotten.

If ever there was any doubt that Lyndon Johnson represents all of the people of the United States, it should have been destroyed in that moment.

For those who know him well, his stand on civil rights comes as no surprise, despite his Texas origin.

The distinguished journalist William S. White said it just the other night. "Lyndon Johnson is a man without intolerance."

He led the fight for civil rights legislation in the Congress in 1957 and again in 1961. He chaired the President's committee on equal employment opportunities. The Negro community respects Johnson and appears to have great faith that he will follow in the footsteps of a President they now believe was the greatest since Abraham Lincoln.

The new President impressed us, too, in his earnest appeal for passage of President Kennedy's tax cut legislation and in his firm pledge of continued and "unswerving support of the United Nations."

Mr. Johnson is considered by many to be more conservative than was Mr. Kennedy. This is not true, and before long the Nation will discover it.

The President is conservative in that he is a practical politician who believes in compromise when compromise is necessary, who believes in being prudent and who knows the world cannot be changed overnight.

But if he is prudent, he is also consistently progressive, and in some respects, notably in fiscal matters, he probably is more liberal than his predecessor.

Mr. Johnson, for instance, not only gives full support to Mr. Kennedy's tax cut proposal, but would also, it is reported, accompany the tax cut with an increase in spending to further prime the economy and forestall a recession.

It is said, for instance, that he favors more spending for foreign aid, continued high level spending for defense programs, renewed emphasis on welfare programs (he is deeply committed to medical care for the aged under social security), supports the Peace Corps with enthusiasm, and backs public works spending whenever and wherever needed.

But he is not a Keynesian as such, for that role is traditionally usurped by intellectuals and the new President is not an intellectual. He is a practical "doer" who believes not in spending for spending's sake, but in spending for greater returns. He is, after all, a banker, along with being a rancher and a public servant.

And so the stage is set. President Johnson moves into the White House as a prudent progressive, deeply committed to Mr. Kennedy's program, determined to bring it to fruition not only as a memorial to a man he loved but also because he believes in the rightness of the program.

The man is different. The style is different. The operation will be different. The net result, we fervently hope, will be the same.

Of this every American can be absolutely certain:

We have just witnessed the assassination and the burial of a truly great patriot. But we have also just seen assume the highest office of the land another great patriot.

"I am," he once said of himself, "a free man, an American, a U.S. Senator, and a Democrat—in that order."

—J.C.O.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 29, 1963]

A STRONG START

The strength and self-confidence President Johnson has exhibited in his first grim days in office have helped to ease the paralysis that seemed to freeze the world after President Kennedy's assassination. His performance lent added solemnity to his Thanksgiving promise last night that he would strive for "a new American greatness, a new day when peace is more secure, when justice is more universal, when freedom is more strong in every home of all mankind."

Through his talks with world statesmen come to mourn his slain predecessor, his statements and his initial address to Congress, he has won applause in all parts of the free world and cautious approval even in Moscow. A measure of the uncertainty that originally existed on both sides of the Iron Curtain has been wiped away by the vigor of his pledges of uninterrupted forward movement in the fulfillment of our commitments for the defense of freedom and the pursuit of peace.

Congress responded in cordial fashion to the first message from its old friend and former leader, but Mr. Johnson is too experienced in the ways of Congress to mistake the warmth of his reception for an assurance that the long stalemate on Capitol Hill is about to end. However, at least one of his urgent calls has already had an affirmative response—his plea for preserving executive flexibility in foreign affairs.

Proposed restrictions on the sale of wheat to Soviet Russia have been rejected—restrictions that both President Kennedy and President Johnson opposed as infringing on executive prerogative. Shackles put on executive authority in the foreign aid bills also have been removed. The President may now continue to aid Communist-ruled countries at his discretion if he deems this vital to the security of the United States and the independence of the recipient countries, in particular Poland and Yugoslavia. But many restrictions remain to hamper our policy in dealing with Argentina, which has annulled American oil contracts, with Indonesia, the United Arab Republic, and especially with Cuba.

Securing adequate appropriations for foreign aid remains a formidable task in the coming days. So does the need for speedy action on civil rights, taxes, and other priority issues. The best that seems to be in store for this session is a House vote on the civil rights bill. Turning his ideas into effective action is the challenge that faces President Johnson. The momentum of his first week must not be allowed to turn into deadlock and delay on measures that have already been studied to death.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Nov. 29, 1963]

AS JOHNSON SETS FORWARD COURSE

With Thanksgiving Day over—a day in which President Johnson not only addressed a message of inspiration to the Nation but continued diligently to get a firm grip on the pressing duties and problems confronting him—the course he is setting for the country now is assuming definitive direction.

In the new President's solemn words of the past 2 days—to the American people Thursday night and to Congress Wednesday after-

noon—the one deep impression that surpasses all others is Mr. Johnson's great sincerity of purpose and steadfast resolve: Not merely to guide the Nation safely through this period of tragedy and crisis but to get the country quickly into forward motion again.

As President Johnson said succinctly Thursday night: "Our thrust is forward."

This is evident in both domestic and foreign affairs.

President Johnson's strong bid for action on civil rights and a tax cut, in his message to Congress, may have jolted some Senators and Representatives out of their lethargy. Unfortunately, however, resistance from diehard southerners on the matter of civil rights is not likely to melt away. The standpatters will remain stubborn to the bitter end. An all-out, no-holds-barred battle will be essential to enact the kind of civil rights legislation this country urgently needs.

Mr. Johnson's conversations on Thanksgiving Day with several high administration officials—most notably Secretary of State Rusk and Central Intelligence Agency Director McCone—underscore the President's grim and reassuring determination to keep the country continuously on the alert in the international arena. Any foreign power that might believe this is an opportune time to test America's defenses at home or abroad would be well advised to abandon any such notion.

The sea is stormy, and the clouds are overcast, but the hand at the helm is steady.

[From Wall Street Journal, Nov. 29, 1963]

THE PRESIDENT'S FIRST WEEK

It is now 1 week since President Johnson assumed office, and even in so short a span, so clouded in tragedy, he has done much to command respect and encourage confidence. People have been impressed as much, perhaps, by the President's demeanor as by his words and acts.

There has been thoughtfulness for everyone; for the late President's family, the Government employees high and low, the Members of Congress, the Governors of the States, the visiting heads of foreign nations. And, not least, thoughtfulness for the American people whom he has sought to address when possible, even with a special Thanksgiving talk last evening.

There has been calmness in the midst of exhausting turbulence, so that the machinery of Government slowed but did not falter. An ease of manner, as in his meetings with the foreign dignitaries in the most difficult of circumstances. An instinct for the right thing, as when he did in fact confer with those dignitaries despite protocol advice to the contrary.

And much more, all of it suggesting a President compassionate and capable, certainly one who is in charge. His words, general though they have understandably been so far, have buttressed that impression.

During this week President Johnson has pledged support, as was expected, for President Kennedy's foreign and domestic policies, with particular stress on the tax-reduction and civil-rights bills. On these and other matters, he asked Congress to act speedily but wisely.

What is notable, however, is that he has not tried to rush Congress to specific dates of action or make urgent new demands upon it. That is an indication of a man who is not likely to be stampeded but will give due thought to courses of action—an excellent thing in a President, especially in times of continuing international trouble.

Such restraint, in turn, is an important element of national confidence. In this connection, Mr. Johnson has sought to foster confidence in the many millions concerned with the Nation's business. He has expressed in down-to-earth language, his belief in free enterprise, a belief shared by most Americans. Nor is this anything new for Mr. Johnson; he has said much the same before and plainly believes it.

The President, moreover, has emphasized the need to control the Federal budget and eliminate waste from Federal spending. He has promised to demand the utmost thrift and frugality in Washington, to insist that the Government get a dollar's value for a dollar spent, and that it set an example of prudence and economy.

Though few would call Mr. Johnson a fiscal conservative, few consider him anti-business either. He has a strong economy going for him, and the business community has already given him a strong expression of confidence. This, we think, but reflects the feeling of most Americans.

None of us can yet say what kind of President Lyndon Johnson will eventually make, or what further trials may be in store for all of us. But at least this week has shown a man of ability and resolve. The Nation today is thankful that out of high tragedy can come high promise for the future.

[From the Washington Star, Nov. 27, 1963]

PROFESSIONAL TOUCH

It has been but 5 days since Lyndon Baines Johnson became the 36th President of the United States. They have been crowded days, heavily charged with emotion. But the new President has moved swiftly, efficiently and confidently. That sure professional touch which was the Johnson hallmark as Senate majority leader has been very much in evidence.

Discussions have been held with world leaders who came to Washington for the funeral of John F. Kennedy. They have been assured that we will honor our obligations. Arrangements are being made for future meetings with men of international stature, the objectives being understanding and working arrangements as essential underpinnings of peace.

At home, the vital machinery of government has been kept turning. The daily paper work is being done. The new President has conferred with congressional representatives, with leaders of the political opposition, and has appealed to the people for support.

In short, all that could be done has been done. No one is more aware than Lyndon Johnson of the trials and frustrations which lie ahead. But he has assumed the executive command and he will cope with them to the best of his ability as they arise—all of this within the framework of the American constitutional processes.

There was more, much more, than rhetoric in the observation by William Gladstone in 1878 that "* * * the American Constitution is the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

And it helps when the man who steps in to carry on has a brain and purpose of his own.

TRIBUTE TO THE NEWS MEDIA FOR GREAT PUBLIC SERVICE PERFORMED IN COVERAGE OF THE NEWS OF NOVEMBER 22–NOVEMBER 25

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I had hoped last week to pay appropriate tribute to the news media of the Nation for the outstanding public service performed in the coverage of the news in the period November 22–November 25, in connection with the tragic death of President Kennedy.

When the history of our times is written and the tragic events of the November 22–November 25 period are chronicled, I am certain that there will be a particularly glowing page for the superb coverage by America's media of information.

Probably not in our lifetimes has the profession of journalism in all its forms so well demonstrated such uniform excellence in news gathering, news interpretation, and news dissemination.

Even the great combat journalism of World War II and the Korean war seem to have been surpassed, for here were stories—not merely of violence and tragic death, but of the most profound and varied human, patriotic, and social content—breaking within our very midst, and altering the very nature of our times.

A supreme tragedy was covered with supreme distinction by all forms of journalism.

Some may have noted flaws or imperfections here or there. But I believe that, on the whole, the readers of our country's newspapers and magazines, the listeners to radio stations, and the viewers of television stations feel profoundly indebted to the men and women of the fourth estate.

By means of the various media—particularly television, because of its scope and immediacy, every adult American and every American child old enough to understand became personally involved in those almost unbelievable events. He or she was not a distant spectator, but felt himself or herself to be only a few feet away from that tragic street opposite the Texas School Book Depository, from the elevator in the Dallas city jail, or from St. Matthew's Cathedral or Arlington National Cemetery. Never before had our people been so continuously near the leaders of this Nation, or on Monday, the leaders of so many other nations.

Each of the respective media—newspapers, radio, television, magazines—played its optimal role. Each made sacrifices in ways peculiar to its particular nature in canceling other commitments, in reassigning personnel, in working around the clock, in altering publication schedules, not only in communicating to the American people the hard news of what had happened, but also in estimating why it had happened and what its ultimate meaning might be.

One can view the performance of American journalism of those 4 days from many varied standpoints.

Some who are interested in the techniques of journalism were understandably awed by the speed, the accuracy, and the precision with which the media covered the events. They represented techniques from the most classic days of personal daring and enterprise, in the tradition of Richard Harding Davis, to the newest classic days of 1963 public-service television at its best.

What may to some laymen appeared to have been as effortless, actually involved, behind the scenes, incredibly complex and difficult teamwork. I cite the complex teletype circuits and the intricate arrangements for pool TV coverage from every possible position as but two examples.

Some who are interested in the financial phases may view those 4 days from the standpoint of the staggering costs which the media willing bore—including radio and TV cancellation, for example, of their total regular commercial programing.

Some who view the events from the standpoint of the spirited competition between the media will analyze this or that "beat" by some wire service or daily, will recall how electronic journalism—TV—made news history in its breathtakingly swift coverage of unforeseen events as they transpired, and/or within minutes thereafter by videotape.

Meanwhile, still photography wrote some of its own finest chapters.

I doubt, for example, that anyone in this Chamber or anyone else in this Nation can ever forget the portrait of little John Kennedy, Jr., aged 3, bravely saluting his departed father, the President of the United States, from the steps of St. Matthew's Cathedral.

The coverage of those 4 days provided not only a lasting chronicle for history, but also a catalyst for meeting the problems and needs of the future.

Few Americans need ever be convinced again of the heights which public service television can perform, and few Americans can fail to ponder an old problem which has emerged in new forms—namely, the basic right of the people to be informed, in relation to the basic duty of law-enforcement officers to maintain security.

The great editorial pages, newspaper columns, and editorial cartoons of the land have focused attention on still other soul-searching issues posed by those 4 days—issues of the battle against extremism, the battle for the rule of law, and the battle for continuity in the Republic. What the newspaper and magazine articles and editorials may lack in speed—by hours or days—they make up in a depth which probes to the very fiber of the challenges of our times.

So, Mr. President, to the men and women of the Fourth Estate, I say a heartfelt "well done."

I offer these comments, not in a pro forma manner, but as a sincere expression of gratitude by one Senator, one citizen, one father, one American, to those who covered history so well. These ladies and gentlemen helped us to see, to hear, and to feel the tragedy of a gallant leader who was mercilessly cut down in the springtime of his life. They showed us tragedy, but they have helped us triumph over it.

America will never again be quite the same, nor will journalism.

We have sadly sustained an irreplaceable loss.

But from it, as the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy would wish, we have grown as a people.

For this, we owe very much to American journalism.

AUTHORIZATION FOR ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROSECUTION OF COMPREHENSIVE RIVER BASIN PLANS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8667) authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What time is yielded to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Wyoming desires to submit an amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Under the agreement which has been entered into, time is available for debate on amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; 1 hour—equally divided—is available on each amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So the Senator from Wyoming will now be able to proceed in the time available in connection with his amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 334, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Wyoming will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, it is proposed to strike out lines 15 through 22, as follows:

> The Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Flathead River, Montana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 403, Eighty-seventh Congress: *Provided*, That such project shall be operated and maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, and the sum of $50,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the partial accomplishment of said project.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, my amendment would deny authorization of the Knowles Dam and Reservoir project in western Montana. Earlier this year the Senate considered another form of the bill. At that time I objected to the authorization of the Burns Creek project. This bill (H.R. 8667) now comes to us without the Burns Creek project. This was a wise deletion. But the bill still includes a request for an authorization of a project which is as bad as, if not worse than, the omitted project.

The Knowles project will cost from $247 to $306 million. It will flood 59,000 acres of land including 9,000 acres of irrigated cropland and 20,000 acres of Indian reservation land. It will generate 256,000 kilowatts of power at a cost of $1,066 to $1,195 per kilowatt of installed capacity, making it the most extravagant project in the Columbia River Basin.

The only purpose for the Knowles project is commercial power production by the Federal Government. The project has little or no reclamation benefits. In fact, less than 4 percent of the cost has been allocated to reclamation, about 1 percent to recreation, and 95 percent has been allocated to power production.

If we really follow the lead of the new great leadership of President Johnson and want a dollar's worth of value for a dollar spent, this is a good place to eliminate some of the fat.

The bill would authorize first, the construction of the Knowles Dam and Reservoir by the Corps of Engineers; second, the operation and maintenance of the project by the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior; and, third, the appropriation of $50 million for its partial accomplishment.

The committee report does not indicate why the project is to be turned over to the Bureau of Reclamation after construction by the Corps of Engineers, but presumably it is on the basis of the statements of the Secretary of the Interior that Knowles should be constructed and operated by his agency. The project as proposed by the Corps of Engineers is for electric power, flood control and recreation purposes. There are no irrigation facilities planned or irrigation benefits claimed. In fact, the project would flood out more than 9,000 acres of presently irrigated land. This would be reclamation in reverse.

The Knowles Dam and Reservoir would be located on the Flathead River in Lake and Sanders Counties, Mont., 2.17 miles upstream from its confluence with the Clark Fork River and 5 miles above the town of Paradise. The reservoir would have a usable storage capacity for flood control and power of 3,080,000 acre-feet. The project would require the acquisition of over 59,000 acres of land, much of which is Indian property. The initial power installation would consist of four 64,000-kilowatt units with a total capacity of 256,000 kilowatts. Senate Report No. 648 of the Public Works Committee states that the total cost of the project would be $247 million. Annual charges are estimated at $9,549,000 and annual benefits at $12,205,000, consisting of $11,681,000—95.7 percent—for power, $466,000—3.8 percent—for flood control, and $58,000—0.5 percent—for recreation. However, it is apparent from information developed subsequent to the submission of the Corps of Engineers' report that costs will be considerably higher than the $247 million estimate with corresponding increases in annual costs.

The Knowles project has been rejected for authorization by the House on three different occasions during the past 2 years. It has been presented to the Congress by the Corps of Engineers as a flood control and power project. The Secretary of the Interior says that it should be constructed and operated by the Bureau of Reclamation. The Senate Public Works Committee straddles the issue by proposing construction by the Corps of Engineers and operation and maintenance by the Bureau of Reclamation. The confusion, indecision, and lack of clarity as to the real purpose of this project is further compounded by the deceptive authorization for appropriation being limited to $50 million for partial accomplishment of the project, evidently on the premise that no one knows what kind of creature will actually be produced at birth, since the power project cannot, admittedly, be justified economically.

Claims have been made that Knowles is needed for irrigation. I believe that soundly conceived reclamation projects are of inestimable value to the continued economic development of this country. I have and will vigorously support such projects at every opportunity. But Knowles has not been presented as, nor is it by any stretch of the imagination, a reclamation project. There is nothing in the supporting material to show that it will contribute in any way, either directly or indirectly, to economical irrigation development. Furthermore, Knowles would divert water from potential irrigation projects and would adversely affect existing irrigation projects.

As indicated earlier, the cost estimates stated in Senate Report No. 648 are far from adequate. Railroad relocation costs are reported to be deficient by $33 million. Interest during construction will amount to more than $27.5 million. These increases alone will bring the total investment cost well over $300 million. These changes, together with necessary adjustments in interest and amortization cost estimates to conform with realistic figures, will bring annual costs to $15.5 million and cost per kilowatt-hour to 9 mills. The agencies have stated that the Bonneville Power Administration will market the power at its postage stamp rates. In 1962, these averaged 2.36 mills per kilowatt-hour. For Knowles power production this would bring in annual revenues of $4.1 million. The annual deficit would reach the staggering sum of $11.5 million. The Bonneville Power Administration, which has been losing $15 to $18 million annually, no longer has any surplus to cover increasing annual deficits. If Knowles is authorized, either Bonneville Power Administration's rates will have to be further increased, over and above that required to cover current annual deficits, or the taxpayers will have to pick up the check. Neither step is necessary.

Presently pending before the Federal Power Commission are applications to license two hydroelectric projects known as Buffalo Rapids No. 2 and 4, which will develop 240,000 kilowatts of installed capacity as compared to the 256,000 kilowatts of installed capacity which the Knowles project would produce. This would permit construction of hydroelectric facilities at those sites at absolutely no cost to the Nation's taxpayers. In terms of money the Knowles project will cost seven times more than the Buffalo Rapids projects, but will produce only 1¼ more kilowatt-hours than the Buffalo Rapids sites. This only serves to show the expensive cost of the power production from the Knowles project.

Furthermore, the Knowles project destroys 60,000 acres of land, over 600 buildings, displaces nearly 1,300 people, and over 300 miles of railroad, highway, and utility lines—as against the Buffalo Rapids private development only requiring some 8,000 acres, 3 buildings, 12 people, and 15 miles of highway and utility line replacement.

Mr. President, we must give some consideration to the impact which Knowles—as a large uneconomical monument to government inefficiency—would have upon the area involved. The resulting catastrophic damage to local tax base of the construction of such an uneconomical project as Knowles is very vividly brought out by the case of Lake County, Mont., where a large portion of the 60,000 acres and improvements thereon would be taken from the tax rolls by the large reservoir created by the Knowles Dam. Fifty-five percent of the land area of Lake County is now exempt from taxation by reason of being either Federal or State lands. The county depends upon the property tax as the principal source of its tax revenues for the purpose of carrying on its governmental functions, including law enforcement, public welfare, general county administration, support of elementary and secondary schools, and support of irrigation districts which are of great economic importance to the development of Lake County. The total taxable valuation of this county is $10,871,095. The construction of Knowles Dam would remove from the tax rolls $1,009,830 of that taxable valuation. This would represent an annual direct tax loss to the county of approximately $206,000. One school district alone would lose $74,325 in tax revenues. Lake County is unalterably opposed to the construction of this project.

When I was Governor of the State of Wyoming, I became acutely aware of the financial problems associated with the maintaining of our county and local governments. Most tax revenue sources have been preempted by either the Federal or State Governments leaving only the property tax as a means for counties and local governments to sustain themselves. The loss of a quarter of a million dollars in tax revenue to counties in Western States is a most serious problem. Knowles Dam could well bankrupt Lake County. The $206,000 loss in taxes by reason of the Knowles Dam must be absorbed by the remaining tax base in the county.

Such an additional burden placed upon other lands and improvements and personal property in the county, in order to finance the necessary county services, could well be too much for the remaining lands to profitably handle.

The county of Sanders is in a similar situation. It would lose nearly $900,000 in taxable valuation. Sanders County is unalterably opposed to the construction of this project.

But there is another part of this story. The private development of two damsites owned by the Flathead Indians, to which I referred a few moments ago, would take no tax base from Lake and Sanders Counties.

Instead, private development would bring approximately $242,000 in additional taxes to Lake County alone.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Last year, in the Senate hearings, the Indians, through their counsel, appeared and testified that, in their opinion, if the Indians should build the dam the dam would be tax exempt, since it would be Federal trust property. Therefore, whether the Federal Government builds the dam or the Kootenai Flathead Tribe builds the dam, there will not be a tax return to Lake County.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the Senator. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that the Indians themselves, if the project goes through as a Federal project, are asking for $116 million, which I have not added into the additional cost of the project.

Mr. METCALF. I wished to point out to the Senator from Wyoming that, while he is correct in his analysis about what would happen if the Montana Power Co. were to build the dam—and there would be a tax benefit to Lake and Sanders Counties—the tax benefit would not accrue if the Indian tribe built the dam. It was the opinion of the tribal attorney, as it is my opinion, that as Indian trust property it would be tax exempt. That was brought out in the hearings before the Senate committee last year.

Mr. SIMPSON. Is the Senator saying that the Indians would not receive any revenue from private enterprise, if the Montana Power Co. took the land?

Mr. METCALF. No. I am saying that no tax benefit would accrue to the counties whether the tribe built the dam or the Federal Government built the dam. If either should do so, there would not be a tax benefit to the counties.

Of course, if the Federal Government takes the land, there will be a negotiated settlement, as there was at Yellowtail, as there was at Oregon, and as there have been at other Indian dams. That situation will be the same if the Montana Power Co. builds the dam or the Indians build it.

I was merely making the point that it would not make any difference whether the tribe built the dam or the Federal Government built it; there would not be any tax benefit, by way of property tax, to the counties.

Mr. SIMPSON. Is the Senator insisting that the great installation by the Montana Power Co. would not be taxable on the county tax rolls?

Mr. METCALF. No. The Montana Power Co. installation would be taxable. If the tribe built the dam, it would not be taxable.

Mr. SIMPSON. I see. I understand the Senator's position.

Private development would add $2,353,644 to the taxable valuation of Sanders County.

Additionally the Federal Government, while experiencing a revenue loss of approximately $11 million a year by construction of Knowles, would receive approximately $1 million per year in tax revenues from the private project construction. It seems utter folly to be serious about a project which would have such a devastating effect upon an area, when sensible, economical, taxpaying alternatives are available.

My good friend, Hugo Aronson, the former Governor of Montana, has estimated that the area flooded by the Knowles project will take from the economy of western Montana over $2,700,000 annually. Over a 50-year period that will amount to a loss of nearly $150 million to the economy of the State of Montana. During this same period private development of this particular stretch of the river would bring to Federal, State, and local tax units over $138 million. This does not take into consideration the fact that this project would lose to the Federal Government nearly $700 million in a 50-year period.

That is the overall period in the proposed legislation. The choice is here and now—and it is clear. We can vote to lose a billion dollars of taxpayers' money upon this outlandish project, or we can vote to bring into the various Government tax agencies $138 million and save the economy of western Montana from such a tragic impact as the loss of $150 million.

The rejection of Knowles and the construction of the alternative Buffalo Rapids No. 2 and 4 would turn loss to the Federal Government into profit at a time when our fiscal stability is being seriously questioned; at a time when our President has said we should get a dollar's value out of every dollar spent; at a time when we are being asked to raise our debt limit to $315 billion. At such a time we should take the opportunity to turn $11 million Federal loss into a $1 million Federal gain. The rejection of Knowles will do just that.

No, Mr. President, Knowles is not needed. It will be a backbreaking burden to everyone—the State, the region and the Nation. That is why the Governor of the State of Montana opposed the project. That is why the Montana State Water Conservation Board opposed the project.

Let us face it, the only reason for the pressure to authorize the Knowles project is because it will produce some very uneconomic, high-cost public power in an area where statements of public officials indicate there is no shortage—either in peaking capacity or in energy.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. In the House hearings on the bill recently the president of the Montana Power Co., Mr. Jack Covette, testified that there is a power shortage in Montana, and that power is needed in Montana. He testified that if the Federal Power Commission would grant them a license to build the dam, the Montana Power Co. would go to work right away, because there is a market for power.

I believe we are all agreed that, insofar as this area of western Montana is concerned, there is a need for additional power, and that the need will grow in the future.

Mr. SIMPSON. If the Senator will bear with me, I did not state in my text that it was said there was no lack of power.

Mr. METCALF. I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. SIMPSON. I placed it upon another basis.

Mr. METCALF. In the Pacific Northwest at the present time, as we have heard in the debate on other bills—such as the intertie bill—there is a surplus of power, and especially a surplus of interruptible power, but not a surplus of prime power.

We are all agreed—from the president of the Montana Power Co. to the private utilities, the heads of the Bonneville Power Administration, and the Northwest Power Pool—that there is a shortage of power in Montana, and that the shortage will grow.

Mr. SIMPSON. I am sure that is correct. If that had not been the case, the Montana Power Co. would not have made application to the Federal Power Commission for the two sites involved.

Mr. METCALF. That is correct.

Mr. SIMPSON. It is a good example of a growing problem emphasized by the National Reclamation Association, that is, that the Bureau of Reclamation is getting far afield and is doing a disservice to irrigation by concentrating its efforts on public power development rather than reclamation. Mr. President, much has been said about the special relationship the United States bears to the Indians of America. We have made great promises to protect their rights under various treaties negotiated between the U.S. Government and their forebears. But we have utterly failed to live up to these solemn obligations and promises. The action of the Senate Public Works Committee in recommending authorization of the Knowles project and thereby disregarding the treaty rights of the Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation is but another example of complete disregard for our moral, if not legal responsibility to live up to commitments made under treaties negotiated by the Executive and ratified by the U.S. Senate. Both major political parties of the United States have consistently promised the American Indians that their treaty rights would not be violated without their consent.

The late President Kennedy wrote in the 1960 campaign:

> There would be no change in treaty or other contractual relationships without the consent of the tribes concerned—Indians have heard fine words and promises long enough. They are right in asking for deeds.

The 1960 platform of the Democratic Party said:

> We recognize the unique legal and moral responsibility of the Federal Government for Indians in restitution for the injustice that has sometimes been done them—free consent of the Indian tribes concerned shall be required before the Federal Government makes any change in any Federal-Indian treaty or other contractual relationship.

Now, when the test comes to perform our promises and to respect the Indians' wishes, I find no voices raised in indignation at the complete and unexcusable disregard for our noble commitments made to this great minority group.

Justice Hugo Black, in a recent dissenting opinion involving Indian lands in New York—*FPC* v. *Tuscarora Indian Nation*, 80 S.C. 543—said:

> Great nations, like great men, should keep their word.

Are we no longer a great nation? Can we no longer be expected to keep our word?

The Flathead Indians have clearly and repeatedly protested the violation of their treaty through the building of the Knowles project because it will flood out two or three tribal damsites which are highly valuable, inundate a large and irreplaceable area of tribal grazing lands, and do much other damage to the economic and social well-being of these people.

Now is the time for deeds, not words. We have an opportunity to show our good faith by rejecting this project.

But this is not our only backsliding. We say that we will make payment to the Flatheads to compensate them for their lost treaty rights.

The Corps of Army Engineers has said that the Flathead Indians can be expected to be compensated either in the form of assignment of annual power or rentals, or by income derivable from negotiated lump sum payment in an amount equivalent to the net benefits which they would derive from their own development of the alternative sites—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 16, 1963, page 17036.

The Indians have placed that sum at $115 million. The corps then says:

> But we shouldn't consider this amount of money in the analysis of project feasibility.

Why not? It all comes out of the American taxpayer's pocket.

No; we are told to "sweep it under the rug" as a "social obligation" of the Congress in protecting the rights and welfare of the Indians.

Mr. President, these Indian payments would make Knowles, not a $247 million project, but, rather, a $372 million project. I want to protect the rights and welfare of the Indians—I also want to protect the rights and welfare of all other citizens of the United States. In this instance this can be done only by the rejection of this gold-plated monstrosity and allowing the Indians to promote their economic development in their own way.

I urge my colleagues to reject this unnecessary, wasteful, and harmful project, and to get on with the important business of the Senate. This body should no longer stand in the way of providing the urgent emergency appropriation authorization essential to the continuation of Corps of Engineers river and harbor and flood control projects now under construction.

In closing, I submit to my colleagues this thought: I realize that public power advocates are trying to get this and other projects, such as Burns Creek, on the agenda, to be constructed at great expense to the U.S. Government; but there are private power companies at this time ready, willing, and able, with ample money, to underwrite these projects, put the property on the tax rolls, furnish the respective communities the needed services.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Montana such time as he may need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I am, of course, opposed to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON].

In his major natural resources speech of the 1960 campaign for the Presidency, the one dam with respect to which the late President Kennedy specifically committed himself was Knowles Dam. Speaking at Billings, Mont., on September 22, 1960, President Kennedy said:

> We will not stand by and permit our resources to be wasted or taken for partial development for the benefit of special interests. We will not stand by, for example, and permit another Hells Canyon blunder in the Clark Fork Basin. I think the next President of the United States must support early authorization of the multipurpose project in the Paradise-Knowles area.

In his February 23, 1961, message to Congress on natural resources, President Kennedy said:

> The full development of the power and other water resource potentials of the Columbia Basin is a vision that must be fulfilled.
>
> I have requested the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, working with appropriate department and agency heads, to schedule a progressive, orderly program of starting new projects to meet accumulated demands.

On April 10, 1962, President Kennedy recommended construction of Knowles Dam by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Knowles Dam has been consistently recommended by the Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior.

Knowles Dam has been three times approved in committees of the Senate. It was advocated by my distinguished predecessor, the late Senator Murray, chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the recommendation being that it be built by the Bureau of Reclamation.

As the Senator from Wyoming points out, there is very little reclamation involved in this dam. Therefore, it seems more appropriate that the project be built by the Corps of Engineers. It seems more appropriate that it should have been referred to the Public Works Subcommittee. In the previous Congress it was recommended by the Public Works Subcommittee, and passed the Senate. Already this year a bill containing the Knowles Dam project was included in a bill considered by the Public Works Subcommittee, and passed this body.

I wish to make a correction. The Senator from Wyoming has said the project has been rejected three times in the House. It has never come before the House on a vote. Last year, in the previous Congress, Knowles Dam and other public power and new public works projects were contained in the omnibus public works bill. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] has told the story of what happened in that Congress. The Senate recommended the authorization of those projects. The bill went over to the House. The House suggested that it had never held any hearings on the projects, but that it would hold early hearings this year. Therefore, these projects were taken out in conference. The House itself, and the committees of the House, never had an opportunity to vote on it. This year the House held hearings on all these projects. It has not yet reported a bill. A bill has not been received. Hearings have been held.

When an authorization bill for the river basins came to the Senate, these projects were added. That bill—H.R. 6016—was passed shortly after the end of the fiscal year, and it was sent to the House. The House has not chosen to send the bill to conference. The House, instead, repassed the authorization bill for river basins, not considering the other projects, and sent it back to the Senate. The bill was amended by the elimination of Burns Creek and other projects which the Senator from Wyoming discussed.

So the House never considered this project. It has never been rejected by the House.

I shall not burden the RECORD at this time by talking about the feasibility of the project. The Corps of Engineers is a highly respected organization so far as the Senate is concerned. The Corps of Engineers has repeatedly determined that this project is feasible.

The Senator from Wyoming has raised many objections to the project. Most of them are objections that were raised in a pamphlet issued by the Montana Power Co. in an attack on me.

It seems that at sometime during his career a Senator from Montana must face the opposition of the Montana Power Co. Senator Walsh, in his memoirs, discusses a time when he had to oppose the operations of the Montana Power Co. Senator Wheeler, in his book "Yankee From the West," discusses the construction of Fort Peck Dam and how he had to oppose the Montana Power Co. My immediate predecessor, Senator Murray, in his desire to develop the resources of Montana, had to fight the Montana Power Co. Of course, our distinguished majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD, had to oppose the company when Hungry Horse Dam was constructed.

But I had the unique distinction of being opposed by the Montana Power Co. in a report to the stockholders of September 30 of last year, because of my activity in support of this project. The Montana Power Co. sent out its annual statement of income, which consists of six columns, one column of which is devoted to income, and the other five columns of which are an attack on the junior Senator from Montana.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. I want the Senator from Montana to know, as I am sure he does, that I had never seen such an attack, and that I would never join with the Montana Power Co. in an attack on the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I have discussed this question with the Senator before. I know he does not join in the attack.

I know that his amendment is based upon a deep feeling that the Knowles Dam in western Montana is not a proper project. I wish to point out where some of these arguments originated and where the record has come from. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that this material be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Montana Power Co. and subsidiaries—Consolidated statement of income

	9 months ended Sept. 30, 1962	
	This year	Increase over last year
Operating revenues	$41,577,834	$4,152,707
Operating revenue deductions:		
Operating expense, excluding taxes	10,973,337	1,054,088
Taxes, Federal income	8,922,600	1,331,400
Taxes, other	5,000,561	515,893
Provision for deferred taxes on income:		
Accelerated amortization	454,050	0
Liberalized depreciation	417,375	59,625
Depreciation and depletion	3,139,805	46,704
Total, operating revenue deductions	28,907,728	3,007,710
Net operating revenues	12,670,106	$1,144,997
Other income (net)	[1] 90,889	[1] 85,581
Gross income	12,579,217	1,059,416
Income deductions:		
Interest on mortgage bonds	1,491,866	0
Interest on debentures	394,875	[1] 2,511
Other interest and deductions	98,223	30,288
Interest charged to construction, credit	144,246	121,520
Total, income deductions	1,840,718	[1] 93,743
Net income	10,738,499	1,153,159
Dividends applicable to preferred stock	907,151	0
Net income available for common stock	9,831,348	1,153,159
Earnings per share of common stock	1.29	.14

[1] A decrease.

NOTE.—Sept. 30, 1962, on 7,607,766 shares; Sept. 30, 1961, on 7,578,386 shares.

LETTER TO STOCKHOLDERS ON INTERIM EARNINGS STATEMENT, SEPTEMBER 30, 1962

DEAR STOCKHOLDER: Knowles Dam is dead for this year. In the concluding hours of the 87th Congress, Senate and House conferees agreed on an omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill which eliminated the proposed Federal Knowles project from consideration.

The decision of the Congress not to authorize the Knowles project represents a significant victory for the thousands of Montana residents who made their opposition to the project known in letters, telegrams, resolutions, and personal appearances before the Senate Public Works Subcommittee, which held hearings on Knowles. It also indicates that Members of Congress are growing increasingly aware of the fiscal danger represented by such wasteful, uneconomic projects as Knowles.

During your company's opposition to the Knowles project, Senator LEE METCALF, of Montana, made many false, misleading, and irrelevant charges against us in an effort to draw attention away from the demonstrated economic waste of the project.

While it would be impossible in this space to answer all of the unfounded attacks on your company, I thought I should report to you the facts related to some of the more glaring misstatements released by the Senator.

Several of the Metcalf newsletters charged that it would be necessary to draw down Flathead Lake at least 30 feet lower than it now is being drawn in order to achieve the power production your company plans from the two Buffalo Rapids hydroelectric developments which would be flooded by the Knowles Reservoir.

The natural low-water elevation of Flathead Lake is and always has been approximately 2,883 feet above sea level. The channel bottom at the outlet of the lake is only a few feet below this 2,883-foot elevation, and this controls the low-water elevation of Flathead Lake at approximately 2,883 feet so that it is a physical impossibility for your company, or anyone else, to draw the lake 30 feet below its normal low-water level. These are reasons why the Federal Power Commission, in the license granted your company for its Kerr project, limited the regulation of Flathead Lake to a 10-foot drawdown between 2,883 and 2,893 feet. Senator METCALF is familiar with the Kerr license provision.

Senator METCALF also has charged that your company has the highest average rate of return of any major utility in the Nation. The Senator knows this is not true. The October 1962 issue of the highly respected Bear, Stearns & Co. analysis of electric utility common stocks shows that 13 fine utilities throughout the Nation have returns on total capitalization that are approximately the same or higher than your company's. Among these companies are such well-known utilities as Central Illinois Electric & Gas Co., El Paso Electric Co., Florida Power & Light Co., Nevada Power Co., and Texas Utilities Co.

The rate of return figures used by Senator METCALF are wrong because they do not include approximately $21 million of plant account which the Montana Public Service Commission, after exhaustive study and inquiry, has included in the company's rate base. The Montana Commission in 1958, after a full public hearing, granted us an electric rate increase which allowed us to earn a return of 5.33 percent on the fair value of our electric properties.

Senator METCALF's newsletters have repeatedly attacked the rates of your company and have compared them with rates charged by utilities and municipal systems in the Pacific Northwest that obtain much or all of their power from Bonneville Power Administration. These attacks failed to call attention to the fact that BPA pays no taxes and pays an interest rate far below the cost of money to the Government itself. They also failed to mention that BPA lost $41 million in the 4 years between 1957 and 1961, that its loss in fiscal 1961 was $14 million and that its 1962 loss has been estimated at $15 million. These losses, of course, must be absorbed by the Nation's taxpayers.

Senator METCALF's attacks on our rates ignored the fact that natural gas rates in Montana are from 53 percent to 63 percent below gas rates in other areas of the Pacific Northwest. Analysis of reports issued by the Federal Power Commission and the American Gas Association demonstrates that a typical Montana Power customer using 500 kilowatt-hours of electricity and 15,000 cubic feet of natural gas per month can heat and light his home and operate his household appliances at a cost ranging from $4.56 to $12.56 less per month than a comparable customer in four major Pacific Northwest communities. The following table shows the monthly energy bills on this comparable basis:

	Total monthly energy bill
The Montana Power Co	$21.88
Tacoma, Wash	34.44
Seattle, Wash	34.09
Portland, Oreg	26.98
Spokane, Wash	26.44

A Federal Power Commission report for 1962 which analyzes the electric bills in 374 U.S. communities shows that industrial power rates of your company are among the lowest 7 percent in the Nation and that commercial electric rates of your company are among the lowest 22 percent. The study includes communities served by publicly owned as well as investor-owned utilities.

Senator METCALF also has charged that 10 large brokerage houses in the East and Middle West hold about the same amount of stock in the company as do stockholders in Montana. The Senator knows that these brokerage houses do not own the stock themselves but that in all cases they are nominees for very large numbers of individual stockholders or for mutual funds and pension funds which are owned by hundreds of thousands of investors.

We do not share Senator METCALF's contempt for the holdings of our Montana stockholders. We are proud and gratified that approximately 12,000 Montanans own stock in the company and that these Montana shareholders who have faith in the future of the State and the company include many small investors who own from 10 to 100 shares each.

On the reverse side of this letter, you will find a preliminary statement of income for the first three quarters of 1962.

The quarterly dividend of 28 cents per share on the outstanding common stock has been declared payable October 27 to stockholders of record at the close of business October 8. Quarterly dividends of $1.50 per share on the $6 preferred stock and $1.05 per share on the $4.20 preferred stock are payable November 1 to holders of record October 12.

Your dividend check is enclosed.

Sincerely,

J. E. CORETTE,
President and General Manager.

OCTOBER 24, 1962.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, without attempting to answer all the questions raised by the Senator from Wyoming, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I had prepared in answer to the various objections which have been raised to the Knowles project be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KNOWLES DAM

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on August 19, comment was made in the other body—it appears on pages 15349–15353 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—about Knowles Dam, which the Senate has twice approved. The statements made in the House regarding Knowles Dam are, in summary, 36 points, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"SUMMARY OF STATEMENTS IN CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF AUGUST 19, 1963 (PP. 15349–15353) ON THE KNOWLES PROJECT

"1. The project will take 20,000 acres of valuable Indian land and flood two and possibly three damsites owned by the Indians.

"2. It is proposed in face of strong Indian opposition and violation of their treaty rights.

"3. Indians state that treaty guarantees them the right to refuse giving their land to the Knowles project.

"4. Treaty recognizes rights of Indians to development of the powersites, and Congress has on numerous occasions and by section 10(e) of Federal Power Act required approval of Indians before tribal lands may be used for power development.

"5. Democratic Party promised no change in Federal-Indian treaty without consent of Indian tribes concerned.

"6. Inconsistent position of Secretary of Interior as between its Bureau of Reclamation to build the dam and its Bureau of Indian Affairs which acts as trustee in the best interest of his wards, the Indians. They have indicated construction of Knowles not in their best interests; that they wish to develop their own properties.

"7. Secretary of Interior's position that, inasmuch as Indians want development it is up to Congress to determine which is best development, completely misses the point that Buffalo 2 and 4 would develop their properties, provide annual income, and would not flood 20,000 acres of their land.

"8. Knowles would not provide greater benefits to Indians than would development of their own resources or renting their resources.

"9. Assignment from Knowles of 1.1 billion kilowatts to Indians (equivalent to Buffalo 2 and 4 production) deducted from Knowles revenues would make benefit-cost ratio 0.42 (50-year life, 2⅝ percent).

"10. Project should not be recommended in light of strenuous opposition of Indians.

"11. Project is of most questionable feasibility and should not be authorized.

"12. This project is not multipurpose. Over 95 percent of benefits are power. Congress should not authorize purely power projects under the guise of multipurpose.

"13. Project actually loses $12 million annually, equal to $700 million in 50 years, over $1 billion in 100 years. This is so because corps evaluates power benefits at 6 mills per kilowatt-hour and it will be sold at a net revenue of 1.29 mills per kilowatt-hour.

"14. Standards should be set by Congress so that projects would not be feasible on a benefit-cost ratio when they actually lose $700 million to $1 billion.

"15. Taking of 20,000 acres of Indian land will have very serious effect on economy and development of Indians.

"16. Cost of payment to Indians not considered in benefit-cost ratio. Cost of acquisition of Indian lands is not considered. If cost considered, including cost of powersites which they could develop or lease, project would not be justified.

"17. Indians are receiving $238,000 annually from Kerr Dam. Considering Indians here have two sites, payment would be far beyond the $30 million involved on Kinzua Dam.

"18. Knowles would be highest cost per kilowatt-hour of any electricity in United States.

"19. It is not for flood control, not for irrigation, purely for power.

"20. Revenues from power sales will be $2,232,000; flood control benefits $447,000; recreation $58,000—total $2,733,000. That is the revenue. Costs are $13,739,000. Loss which taxpayers must pay is $11,002,000.

"21. We are taking from the Indians 19,000 acres and their only chance for a livelihood.

"22. Presentation of project has gone around proper committee of Congress and Secretary of Interior has passed his responsibility over to the Corps of Engineers.

"23. We may also be violating the treaty with Canada whereby there can be no storage projects on this river without the consent of the Canadian Government.

"24. Cost estimated at $272,964,000 (with interest/construction) but NP witness testified that railroad relocations understated by $32,970,000.

"25. The project would flood 59,000 acres including 9,000 acres of irrigated lands.

"26. It would cost from $1,066 to $1,195 per kilowatt installed capacity, making it most extravagant project in Columbia Basin.

"27. Flood control objective can be met by Canadian Storage Treaty and by other projects in basin with higher B/C ratios so it is not needed for flood control.

"28. Current B/C ratio unrealistic because (1) power benefits based on steam-electric plant cost rather than revenues; (2) because interest rate of 2⅝ percent way too low; (3) because no compensation included for Indians, and (4) because 100-year life not justified inasmuch as nuclear power will make the plant obsolete before then.

"29. If 4-percent rate used and revenues project would produce, loss would be $10 to $11 million per year.

"30. It would flood out Buffalo 2 and 4 which would result in savings to the Federal Government, taxes to Federal, State, and local governments and compensation to the Indians.

"31. Buffalo Rapids would have 240,000 kilowatt capacity, almost the same as Knowles, and it would produce tax revenues of $2,772,000 annually.

"32. Buffalo would cost $175 per kilowatt—Knowles 7 times this.

"33. Because Knowles would operate at a loss, it would not provide any irrigation assistance anywhere.

"34. It would destroy the bison range.

"35. It would flood out feeding grounds, nesting areas for pheasants, winter range for deer and elk, and destroy fine game fishing.

"36. It would disrupt economy, peoples, buildings, etc."

Mr. **Metcalf**. Mr. President, I asked the Corps of Engineers to comment on 33 of those points, excepting those numbered 5, 6, and 7, which involve the Democratic Party and the Secretary of Interior. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point the corps' excellent statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"Statement on the Knowles Project

"The Knowles project was recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his review report on the Columbia River and tributaries in the interest of flood control, power generation, recreation, and other related water uses. With 3,080,000 acre-feet of usable storage for flood control, it was proposed as one of the key elements in the major water plan for control of lower Columbia River floods. Subsequent to the initial recommendation of the project by the division engineer, negotiations with Canada concerning the Columbia River Treaty had proceeded to the point that the potential contribution which Canadian storage including Libby, might make toward the flood control and power requirements of the U.S. portion of the Columbia Basin had to be assessed. The Knowles project, along with all other projects previously recommended, was reevaluated in a system with Canadian storage, with their justification tested on the basis of meeting the flood control objectives, the power requirements, and the other water resources needs that would not be served by Canadian storage. Complete control of lower Columbia River floods will not be achieved by Canadian storage and additional projects will still be required in the United States. The Knowles project's flood control potential is less in a system with Canadian storage because the flood control requirements are less. However, as the only remaining storage above the confluence of the Snake River economically justifiable at this time and acceptable or feasible from the viewpoint of recreation and fish and wildlife interests, its 3,080,000 acre-feet of usable storage constitute a significant resource. Its development will not be solely in the interest of power. It will still be effective in contributing to complete control of lower Columbia River floods and will as well reduce flood damages sustained in the local basin area.

"The Corps of Engineers flood control objective is to control a flood of 1894 magnitude to 600,000 cubic feet per second at The Dalles. In addition to Canadian storage and Libby, an additional 7.6 million acre-feet properly located in the basin will be required to meet the objective. Of all the projects analyzed in connection with the flood control objective, Knowles is the only project remaining that is located above the Snake River in the Columbia River Basin in the United States that can be developed to provide the needed flood control regulation. Alternative plans considered included: (1) Paradise project, which is not economically feasible when added after Canadian storage; (2) Smoky Range, dropped from consideration at the request of the Secretary of the Interior because of adverse effect on Glacier National Park, (3) Ninemile Prairie, located on the Blackfoot River, and Enaville, located on the Coeur d'Alene River were both found to be uneconomical when considered after Canadian storage.

"In summarizing, there are no other projects having a higher benefit-to-cost ratio located above the Snake River that are feasible for early consideration. Moreover, the value of storage for other uses such as domestic and industrial water supply, water quality control and fish and wildlife and recreation in subsequent years can be expected to become much more important and will considerably enhance total project benefits over the useful life of the project.

"The Knowles project, with its 3,080,000 acre-feet of storage and development of 234 feet of head, will in the system with Canadian storage add some 517,000 kilowatts of salable firm power (at 71-percent load factor) to the Northwest system resources. A block of power of this magnitude will be required to meet regional loads by 1972–73. Justification for supplying power by development of the Knowles project is based essentially on findings that the costs are less and will be less than costs of development of any available alternative sources of supply. In other words, the project is economically justified and constitutes a logical and supportable development for meeting regional power needs. This in no way is intended to imply that the production cost per kilowatt-hour is as cheap as some previous projects built in the Northwest 20 to 30 years ago. We hardly expect to find any resource development or other productive values to be attained at those historical unit costs. What is shown by the justification analysis is that it is a good project for construction now, and is competitive costwise with alternative sources of power presently available. The Pacific Northwest has been fortunate, compared to some other sections of the country, in having vast hydroelectric power resource that could furnish low-cost energy. This is particularly true because of the dearth of cheap energy fuels in the region compared to other areas more amply endowed with such resources. The Northwest is fortunate still to have the hydroelectric power potential of the Knowles project, for the power produced at Knowles constitutes a cheaper source of energy than that now or in the future available in many other parts of the country.

"The Columbia River power system today is 100-percent hydro but the time is approaching when all economical hydro will have been developed and thermal plants will be required to meet the continued load growth demands. Costs of alternative sources which will constitute the only remaining source of energy for the region are the yardstick used, the measure of benefits, to determine whether Knowles or any other hydro project now being considered for development is justified. This alternative cost value in the Pacific Northwest is approximately equivalent to non-Federal publicly financed steamplants. Development of this benefit value by the Federal Power Commission and its application as a feasibility test, that is, as a measure of benefits, is in accordance with the accepted and usual standards for evaluation of hydroelectric resource projects and is clearly set forth in Senate Document 97, 87th Congress.

"Senate Document 97 standards also prescribe the policies and procedures for evaluating project costs, including the interest rate to be used, the treatment to be accorded taxes and other matters. The Knowles evaluation conforms to Senate Document 97 requirements in all aspects of the cost analysis including utilization of the interest rate as prescribed. It is a rate determined by the Bureau of the Budget and used by all agencies in analysis of water resource development projects.

"We find numerous statements being made that the Knowles project will lose millions of dollars annually because revenues, measured by the present BPA system rate, are not equal to benefits and because the interest rate used in the project analysis is too low. This represents a completely erroneous and misleading view of the relationship of justification analysis and financial feasibility analysis.

"In all power systems throughout the country, system rates reflect the average or composite of costs of all its energy-producing plants. The marketing of power from the Knowles project will be no different in this respect when it is added to the Columbia River Power System. The Bonneville Power Administration which markets and distributes power from all Federal projects in the Columbia River system establishes a composite rate which reflects the varying production and transmission costs of all the components. The present Federal system comprises 12 operating hydroelectric projects. The unit cost of providing energy at the individual projects varies from about seven-tenths mills per kilowatt-hour at Grand Coulee, which was built some 25 years ago, up to about 5 mills per kilowatt-hour at Lookout Point in Oregon. For marketing and revenue purposes, however, the entire system must be treated as a unit. It would be prohibitively complex, inefficient, and expensive to tailor each customer's rate to reflect the cost of energy used on the assumption that it was generated at one particular project. The BPA wholesale rates are established on a system basis, so that the total power revenues will pay the total system expenses. The rate so established will understandably exceed the unit cost of production at a number of the projects in the system and will be lower than the cost at others. The power to be generated at Knowles and downstream therefrom will be absorbed into the BPA system and marketed at established system rates. The production expenses will be offset in their entirety by revenue credits equal to the costs. By law, the BPA rates must be set so that total system power revenues will repay all system power costs, including marketing, metering, transmission, etc.

"The allegations, therefore, that the Knowles project will lose $12 million annually, $11 million annually, or any other amount is without foundation. With a system rate established and adjusted as necessary from time to time to insure that total costs of all projects in the system are covered, no project loses any money annually. Computation of a loss can be imputed only on the assumption that Knowles power would be sold independently of the Columbia River power system but at that system's present rate. To the contrary, Knowles will be incorporated in the Columbia River system, its power output will be sold at the then prevailing system rates and it will receive whatever share of system revenues are required to fully pay off the project costs allocated to power over the repayment period established by Congress.

"Once the reimbursement requirements of power have been discharged revenues assignable to the project will be available for irrigation assistance or such other use as the Congress of the United States deems fitting and proper. The standards used in evaluating Knowles project justification and its financial feasibility are the sound and approved policies and procedures applicable to all water resource development projects as set forth in Senate Document No. 97 and followed by all water resource development agencies.

"Although the cost of power from Knowles, when considered after Canadian storage and Libby, will be higher than the other hydro projects recommended in the Columbia River Review Report, it is a fully justified and feasible project, both economically and financially, and supportable as a logical addition to the regional power resources at this time. Therefore we should not be misled by statements that this is a high cost project, compared to others, or the most extravagant project in the Columbia Basin, particularly when the figures cited to establish this misconception are based on a comparison of total project costs per kilowatt of installed capacity. For instance we have had statements made time and time again that Knowles power would cost from $1,066 to $1,195 per kilowatt of installed capacity or that it would cost seven times as much per kilowatt of installed capacity as the alternative Buffalo Rapids development.

"Such analyses completely disregard the large expenditures included in the cost estimates for other uses such as flood control, recreation and storage for downstream power generation. The cost estimate for Knowles also provided for foundation and skeleton stuctures so that future power generating units which will double that plant capacity can be installed cheaply and readily. Such analyses also give no consideration to the power produced. For example, if Buffalo Rapids were in existence today it could produce only 1,297 million kilowatt-hours of net salable energy annually. On the other hand, if Knowles were in existence today it could produce 8,348 million kilowatt-hours annually, or nearly 6½ times as much salable energy to system resources. In the modified major water plan with Canadian storage, Knowles would produce 2,015 million kilowatt-hours of energy annually whereas Buffalo Rapids would produce only about one-half this amount.

"We have frequently heard the statement, as a further argument against Knowles, that nuclear power will make the project obsolete before its useful life is expired. This of course is not an argument against Knowles alone, but against the development of any additional hydroprojects anywhere. Nuclear powerplants will not make hydroplants obsolete but will increase their value. The remaining economical hydrosites are being rapidly depleted as powerloads increase, and in a few years the only possible source of additional electric energy will be conventional steam or nuclear. Whether conventional steam plants or nuclear plants are developed, both will operate in the base of the load while hydro will be designated to carry the peaks. This is the most economical method to operate a large system. Good examples of the forthcoming role of hydroplants can be found in the East where the utilities for constructing pumped-storage hydroplants for peaking. Under no instances has it ever been expressed by experts in the electric utility field that nuclear energy will make hydroplants obsolete.

"The construction of Knowles entails substantial relocations, principally railroads and highways. Disruption to the local economy and relocation of individuals and their homes and towns are not excessive compared to other projects of comparable size which have been developed throughout the country at great benefit to the Nation. The project will flood 59,000 acres of land, of which 9,000 acres are under irrigation. Approximately 1,300 people will be displaced and 527 buildings destroyed. Lands and buildings would be purchased and the project cost estimate includes these purchases appraised at fair market value as is customary in all projects of this type. Many of the persons displaced would relocate in the general area and they will be served by relocated railroads, highways, and utilities comparable in service ability and utility to the present facilities. New industrial and business development resulting from the project can be expected to have a favorable long-term effect, offsetting any initial adverse impact from lost taxes. Availability of water from the reservoir for additional irrigation, either through pumping or by gravity diversion from the pool, would offset lost income from cultivated and irrigated land flooded by the project. The Bureau of Reclamation has testified that there are 21,000 acres of land adjacent to the reservoir that could be reached by pumping and further has pointed out that pumping energy from the project also would be available for irrigation pumping at other more remote areas.

"Extensive railroad relocations will be required by construction of the Knowles project. Estimated relocation costs were reanalyzed by the Corps of Engineers after portions of the proposed plans were questioned by the railroad and these further studies confirmed their earlier findings as to proposed relocation routes. When the project cost estimate was updated in 1961, increased allowances were made both for highway and railroad relocations. Railroad relocation costs included in the Corps of Engineers 1961 project cost estimate amount to $91,395,000 direct, and the total, direct and indirect, is $100,535,000. The Northern Pacific Railroad witness indicated railroad relocation requirements would be $116,056,000, although this amount, according to his testimony, included $8,801,000 more than actually considered necessary by the railroad company. This additional amount was included because the Corps of Engineers estimate for relocating the branch line exceeded that of the railroad company by that amount. It is apparent that the difference in estimates by the Engineers and the railway company is not of great magnitude, and certainly not approaching the cited figure of $32,970,000.

"The Knowles project would not destroy the National Bison Range and the Fish and Wildlife Service has testified to this effect and I quote: 'Although a part of the scenic and esthetic value of the National Bison Range would be destroyed, suitable replacement of lands and facilities is considered feasible.' The project would inundate 1,990 acres of the range and make another 1,460 acres unusable through railroad relocation and fencing. Lands suitable for replacement adjoining the east side of the range are proposed for acquisition by the Service and the project cost estimate includes funds for acquisition of approximately 5,000 acres of replacement lands.

"Other lands proposed for acquisition and provided for in the cost estimate will replace upland game range and nesting areas for waterfowl that will be inundated by the project. Corrective measures for protection of the fishery resource, consisting of chemical treatment of the river and tributaries above the damsite, developments to replace lost spawning areas, hatchery facilities and restocking of the reservoir are included as a part of the proposed project plan.

"In presenting the plan for the Knowles project, the Corps of Engineers recognized the special consideration warranted the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation by reason of inundation of two powersites on their reservation. Based on precedent in similar cases the Engineers suggested that the question of just compensation be determined by the Congress of the United States. The Knowles project was recommended because it was found to provide the most complete resource development justifiable and in this respect was superior to alternative run-of-river projects at the Buffalo 2 and 4 sites proposed for development by the Indians and by the Montana Power Co. It never was contemplated, however, that an equitable settlement would not be made to the Indians for their compensable rights.

"We have a number of precedents where Indian lands required for water resource developments have included powersites comprising special and significant value to the Indians over and above the mere land values. In such cases the water resource development prospects have included in the cost estimate payment for the fair market value of the lands, but compensation for powersite values has always been a matter of negotiation, following project authorization, between Congress and the Indian tribes involved. Such compensation, moreover, has traditionally been a special cost not considered chargeable to the water resource project. This is consistent with and parallel to other programs and expenditures of the U.S. Government on behalf of the Indians which are incurred because of the special trustee-ward relationship between the U.S. Government and the Indians. Such expenditures are made to benefit or to protect and promote Indian welfare because our Government has recognized that we have a special obligation in this respect and such expenditures are nonreimbursable, justified by these obligations and benefits.

"Most water resource development projects are recommended after evaluation and consideration of a number of alternatives, with selection of that project or projects which represents the optimum development of the resource. In many cases, the alternatives considered are in the same reach of the river as the selected project and are inundated by the selected project. No payments are made for inundation of these other sites and no charge is made against the project for values of alternative sites inundated. The fact that we do make payment to the Indians for their powersites is only because of their special rights and the special relationship between the Government and the Indians and in nowise indicates that such payments should be charged against the water resource project. Normally, the Federal Government, in the exercise of eminent domain, would institute condemnation proceedings in the local U.S. district court and the court would determine the amount due the Indians as 'just compensation,' as provided in the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

"If the Federal Government's action progresses to the point that it constitutes an actual or constructive taking of Indian lands, the Indians could proceed against the Government in the U.S. Court of Claims. However, in this event, the measure of damages would be the same as under normal condemnation proceedings; i.e., 'just compensation' as provided in the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

"Also, as indicated in House Document No. 403, 87th Congress, 2d session, volume I, 'Columbia River and Tributaries.' Under the heading 'Special Considerations' on page 178, there is a discussion of 'equitable settlement' for powersites. If such a settlement can be negotiated, it would not be necessary for the Federal Government to institute condemnation proceedings or for the Indians to proceed in the Court of Claims.

"It has been alleged that the Knowles project should not be built because of Indian opposition, because of violation of their treaty rights and because development of alternative powersites would provide greater benefits to the Indians. In this regard article VI of the Constitution provides three things which are the supreme law of the land:

"1. 'This Constitution, and

"2. 'the laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and

"3. 'all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; * * *.'

"The Constitution does not provide for situations where there is conflict between two or all three of these elements. However, the Federal court has said 'A treaty with the Indians cannot rise above the power of Congress to legislate' (161 F. Supp. 376) (Jan. 11, 1957). (This was a condemnation action brought by the Federal Government against the Seneca Nation of Indians in connection with the Allegheny (Kinzua) Dam and Reservoir project.) The above is quoted from the opinion of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of New York, dated January 11, 1957. The Seneca Nation moved, in the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, to stay the district court's order of possession. The circuit court of appeals, without a written opinion, rejected the plea of the Seneca Nation.

"As a corollary, the court also held in January 11, 1957, opinion referred to above that: 'The Secretary of the Army has the power to take Indian lands for flood control purposes, provided Congress has authorized the project, and

" 'Congress had authorized construction of the project, not only with the presumed knowledge but with actual knowledge of history of the lands within the Indian reservation and particularly as to the so-called Pickering Treaty of 1794, and the proclamation by Congress of such treaty with the Six Nations on January 21, 1795.'

"Another related action was an injunction proceeding in 1958 filed by the Seneca Nation to enjoin the Federal Government from constructing the Allegheny Reservoir project. The U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia held, in a decision rendered on March 24, 1958 (162 F. Supp. 580), that:

" 'The construction of the project is authorized by law.

" 'The action of the Government was lawful.

" 'The Seneca Nation was not entitled to an injunction or any other relief in the action.

" 'The complaint should be dismissed.

"The Seneca Nation appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, which held, in a decision in November 1958 (262 F. 2d 27), that the Seneca Nation was not entitled to the injunction notwithstanding the proposed flooding would infringe Indian rights acquired by the treaty in 1794, where Congress showed by legislative history a clear and specific intention to authorize the taking of the Indian lands by eminent domain despite the treaty, as it was authorized to do. The U.S. Supreme Court in June of 1959 refused to grant a writ of certiorari (360 U.S. 909).

"Congress has the responsibility not only of promoting and protecting the rights and welfare of the Indians, it has the responsibility in this particular instance of promoting the optimum resource development plan for the national benefit. In past cases this twofold responsibility has been discharged, not by endorsing a less than optimum development but by recommending the best project, in terms of regional and national goals, and in addition, making just and equitable settlement to the Indians for their special treaty entitlements. This can be done again in the case of Knowles and the benefits to the Indians, either in the form of assignment of annual power or rentals, or by income derivable from a negotiated lump sum payment, can be expected to be fully equivalent to the net benefits which they would derive from their own development of the alternative sites.

"There has been a statement made to the effect that the Hellgate Treaty is the same type of treaty and should merit the same concern and treatment as is presently being given the test ban treaty. It is unalterably clear that there is a basic difference between the two treaties. The test ban treaty is with other sovereign nations, not subject to the provisions of the Constitution of the United States of America, laws of the Congress of the United States of America or action of the courts of the United States of America. The Hellgate Treaty is with the Flathead Tribe who are subject to the provisions of the Constitution, the laws, and the courts of the United States of America.

"It has been suggested, as a further argument against Knowles, that construction of the project may be a violation of the treaty with Canada on the grounds that no storage projects can be built in the Clark Fork watershed without the consent of the Canadian Government. The treaty contains no such proviso. Perhaps the reference is with respect to the stipulation in the treaty which prohibits diversions except for consumptive uses (and other than those specifically provided for in the treaty) which might alter the flow of any water as it crosses the boundary within the Columbia River Basin. The treaty in no way limits or restricts the development of storage where no diversion is involved and Knowles, of course, involves no diversion."

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, one of the witnesses before the House Public Works Committee this year was Archer S. Taylor of Missoula, Mont. He is a supporter of Knowles Dam. Some Senators are acquainted with his brother, Walter Taylor, who currently is engaged, under the auspices of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of the Society of Friends (Quakers), in working with the Senecas, in connection with Kinzua Dam. Both Archer and Walter Taylor are known as fair and knowledgeable supporters of Indian rights.

Archer Taylor has given me permission to have printed in the RECORD his testimony this year before the House Public Works Committee and a letter to his brother, Walter. Both documents deal with the Indian-rights aspect of the Knowles controversy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have these two documents printed at this point in the RECORD. I commend them to those who desire a clearer understanding of the Indian-rights question in connection with Knowles Dam and the degree to which a well-intended organization, from which some Senators have heard, was misled by its reliance on data furnished by the Montana Power Co.

There being no objection, the statement and the letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"STATEMENT OF ARCHER S. TAYLOR, MISSOULA, MONT., TO PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 4, 1963

"Mr. Chairman, my name is Archer S. Taylor, and I live at Missoula, Mont. I am a professional engineer, practicing as a consultant in the field of radio and television. I was one of the original organizers and the first secretary-treasurer of the Committee for Paradise Dam. My wife is today the treasurer of the committee. I am strongly committed in favor of the authorization and construction of the Knowles Dam, or if subsequent studies should indicate feasibility, the larger Paradise Dam.

"However, I am not here today to present testimony on the merits of the project itself, but rather to discuss the matter of Indian rights involved in the Knowles project. My brother, Walter Taylor, is currently engaged under the auspices of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of the Society of Friends (Quakers) in working with the Senecas in western New York in their adjustment to the Kinzua Dam. Some of you may have met him as he tried in vain to prevent the taking of Seneca lands by condemnation without consent. I am here today to support the rights of Indians with respect to our obligations under treaties made in the early years of our history.

"There has been considerable testimony and editorial opinion expressed by various persons and groups opposing the authorization of Knowles Dam because of alleged violation of Indian treaty rights. I am not a lawyer, and cannot argue the legal question of whether the mere authorization would constitute violation in itself as contrasted with actually taking land without treaty negotiations.

"However, I am ashamed, as an American citizen, of the cavalier treatment we newcomers to this continent have given the native population who inhabited this beautiful country long before our ancestors even knew it existed. And I am every bit as concerned as the Indian Rights Association or the Christian Century or the other church groups that further violations of our sacred promises be prevented.

"But even so sacred an obligation as the treaty rights of the Indians must be supported and defended by truth, or at least man's best effort to arrive at the truth. The rights of Indians are not effectively nor worthily supported by arguments in opposition to the Knowles Dam which are demonstrably false, or based on misinformation, or partisan political propaganda of vested commercial interests. This is my deep concern; and it is with considerable discomfort to myself, and to all of my friends who have been active on the Committee for Paradise Dam, that we find ourselves in disagreement with the leaders of the Confederated Tribes of the Flathead Indians. It appears to us, and to some members of the tribes who are not represented in the tribal leadership, that the tribal leaders have been somehow lead by the utility company into an alliance which will once again demonstrate the perfidy of the white man in his commercial dealings with the Indian.

"The arguments used by the Indian Rights Association and its supporters against the Knowles Dam are not arguments in defense of Indian treaty rights, but are the partisan, vested interest arguments of the Montana Power Co.

"They say: 'Actual cost of Knowles would exceed benefits' if the Indians are compensated for damsites. This argument claims a benefit-cost ratio of 1.08 to 1, but ignores the fact that the latest official figure on the benefit-cost ratio is 1.2 to 1 if constructed after Libby Dam, and 2.31 to 1 if constructed before Libby Dam. It is based on an appraisal figure for damsite value which far exceeds the revenues which the Indians might actually obtain for their power, if they themselves built the dams, since it is based on the cost of steam generation. The extent of these distortions has been thoroughly presented by Senator METCALF and by numerous witnesses in the various hearings concerning the water-use project, and I will not enlarge on them here.

"I would submit that the Indian Rights Association is not itself qualified to make a judgment as to the correctness of the official figures presented on benefit-cost ratios. I would further submit, that whether or not the dam is economically sound has precisely nothing to do with Indian rights. The only proper question is whether or not the 'authorization' in this bill constitutes in itself a violation of the treaty rights—not whether the project is sound.

"They say: 'The bison range would be destroyed, or severely damaged' by the flooding of Knowles Dam. The record shows, without contradiction, that only a small fraction of the bison range acreage would be flooded. The official position of those charged by law with administering the bison range is that adequate replacement for the lost acreage is available and will be obtained. There are technical arguments in which unofficial supporters of the bison range contend that the loss of headquarters pasture would be irreplaceable. This has been studied by the National Wildlife Service, and their testimony is otherwise.

"In any event, the Indian Rights Association is not competent as experts on bison grazing, etc. Furthermore, the question as to what happens to the bison range is immaterial to the central question of Indian rights. As a matter of fact, the official resolution of the tribes opposing the Knowles Dam states that the bison range itself was built on Indian lands without the consent of the Indians. The only proper question is whether or not the authorization of Knowles Dam constitutes a violation of Indian rights, not whether or how much the bison range will be, or should be affected by the dam.

"They claim that: 'Knowles is not the best plan for full development.' This argument is based on studies by private engineers. No matter what the controversy, of course, it will always be possible to find expert opinion to support both sides. Furthermore, when unofficial evidence is being considered as valid on one point, it must also be considered on other points. Thus, the Committee for Paradise Dam several years ago engaged a private engineer who testified that the railroad relocation costs of the Corps of Engineers were grossly overstated. Since railroad relocation is the largest part of the cost of the Knowles Dam, it is apparent that this private engineering study has as great a bearing on the benefit-cost ratio as the Indians' 'private engineering' studies have on appraisal of full development. The official agency, charged by law with responsibility to the Congress and to the people of the United States with determining these matters, appears to disagree with the Indians' engineers on this matter. In any event, the Indian Rights Association does not claim competence in the matter of conservation or full development of water resources, and relies merely on hearsay in making the claim that Knowles is not the best plan for full development. And again the question of full development is not relevant to the central question of whether or not the Indians' treaty rights are being violated by the mere passage of the authorization bill.

"They say: 'Knowles would hurt recreational areas.' This argument is based on three points: (1) the drawdown and 'mudflats'; (2) the injury to the bison range; and (3) a vague reference to the maintenance of wildlife habitat. The drawdown and mudflat argument is an emotional one, which suggests ignorance of the facts that maximum drawdown is a rare occurrence in multipurpose dams, that the full pool period will coincide with the summer-fall recreational period, and that most of the pool shoreline is steep sided with only the Moiese Valley area being subjected to significant mudflat formation. The implication is that the bison range may be of value to Indians for hunting or fishing, but it must be obvious that it is closed to such activities at all times. In order to control overgrazing, the herds are thinned each year by range personnel, but hunting is never permitted to Indians or others. It is further made clear by testimony in the several hearings on the Knowles Dam that the alternate proposal of the Indians for Ninemile Prairie and Smoky Range would have vastly more impact on wildlife conservation and on wildlife interests generally than would Knowles. The two small dams which the Indians say they want to build would produce two small lakes, little wider than the river channel itself, in almost treeless areas where access roads are almost nonexistent. It is difficult to see how this could offer recreational attraction superior to the wooded shoreline on the south side of the Knowles pool, along which U.S. Highway 10–A would be built, and which is also on the reservation.

"In any event, the Indian Rights Association has made no study of recreation in the area, and does not claim any special competence in the field of recreational uses of lands. This question is also immaterial to the central question of whether the authorization of Knowles is a violation of Indian rights.

"5. The questions as to the taking of Indian lands, valuable for grazing, for power, or for recreation, and the claim by the Indian Rights Association that the authorization of Knowles Dam would cripple the Indian economy in violation of President Kennedy's pledge to develop Indian resources, simply assume that the Knowles Dam would be built by condemnation without adequate compensation to the Indians and without their consent.

"I am here today to do what I think the Indian Rights Association has failed to do. I fully support the authorization of the Knowles Dam. I think the Indians are wrong in their judgment that the passage of the authorization bill is tantamount to the confiscation of their lands and values without consent.

"But, I think that all of us in the United States may well hang our heads in shame at the repeated instances of improper and unjust intrusion on Indian rights. I believe that once authorized to do so, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and Senators MANSFIELD and METCALF, of our State of Montana, will sincerely undertake, as they have promised, to arrive at a mutually acceptable modification of the Indian treaty terms which will permit the Knowles Dam to be built. Obviously, such treaty amendments cannot be arrived at agreeably without including compensating payments in money, or in power, or other things of value for the power damsites on the tribal lands, nor without arrangements to replace or compensate for the loss of the grazing lands, nor without arrangements to relocate equitably those Indians who would be moved from their present homes.

"I think the Indians have some cause for distrust, and some cause for fearing that our promises to them may not always be honored. I realize that it is impractical to include such promises in the line item of an omnibus public works bill, but I would hope, and urge, that in the legislative history of this project it be made abundantly clear that the Knowles Dam will be built only after negotiating an agreement with the Indians, on terms which make it possible for them to realize the full benefit of the development of the power and water resource which is within their reservation.

"Others who have, or will, testify in this hearing will have shown the distortions of fact, the misrepresentations, and the apparent abuse of the truth which have constituted the bulk of the argument by the private power utility and their agents (some unwitting) against the Knowles project. Neither these arguments, nor in fact the supporting arguments of the Committee for Knowles Dam, have any bearing on the question of a violation of Indian treaty rights.

"It is my own opinion that the Knowles Dam actually constitutes the best guarantee the Indians have of receiving value for their power damsites. They know they have had to take the Montana Power Co. to court to compel payment of additional rent for the third generator installed at Kerr Dam on the reservation. Their attorney, Mr. Cragun, testified in the Senate hearings that 'it is legally impossible for (the Indians) to get as good a deal from Montana Power Co. as they could get from building the dams themselves.' What remains, then, is to determine, by negotiation, whether compensation can be given to the Indians equivalent to what they could get by building the dams themselves. This authorization bill will have to be passed before serious commitments on this matter can be made.

"It is worth noting that in 1957 Senator Jim Murray, of Montana, together with then Congressman LEE METCALF sponsored a bill to provide for the construction of Paradise Dam which included a requirement that the Secretary of the Interior negotiate a contract with the Confederated Tribes providing for the payment of just compensation, on the basis that the owners of any property shall be at least as well off economically after the transaction as before. At that time, the tribal council supported the Montana Power Co.'s proposal to build the small dams, and opposed the Paradise bill.

"In any case, it would appear that the power resource which the Indians would have without the full development of Knowles might be insufficient to attract commercial users except Montana Power Co. It would indeed be ironic to find the Indians resisting both the Knowles development and the Montana Power Co. development, only to find themselves captive producers of power with only Montana Power Co. as a customer. Under the Knowles development, this would not happen, if the treaty negotiations are properly handled. Under Knowles, the Indians could be virtually guaranteed returns on their damsite values.

"None of us can truly, in our hearts, criticize the Indians for not trusting our word, nor could we expect them to weaken their leverage for subsequent negotiation by making premature concessions. It is nevertheless disturbing, and disheartening, to me that their position as represented both by their tribal leaders and by private agencies such as Indian Rights Association has been to pick up blindly the vested interest arguments on the public merits or lack of merit of the project itself. They seem to have overlooked, or minimized, to a large extent that history has provided ample cause for them to fear that Congress and the administration may speak with "forked tongues" as have many Congresses and administrations in the past.

"I have no doubt but that the Knowles Dam can be built without infringing on Indian rights. I have every confidence that an equitable agreement can be achieved by this Congress, with men like our Montana Representative ARNOLD OLSEN, Senator MANSFIELD and Senator METCALF working through and with the Kennedy administration, which has pledged itself to the protection of the Indian land base and to no changes in treaty relationships without the consent of the tribes concerned.

"Thank you for this opportunity to be heard."

"MISSOULA, MONT.,
"April 29, 1963.

"WALTER TAYLOR,
"Salamanca, N.Y.

"DEAR WALT: I saw Lawrence Lindley in Philadelphia Friday. It was a short visit but long enough for me to get pretty well to the meat of the problem, as I think he would agree. At that time, I had not yet received your letter of April 24, containing Harry Burks' correspondence.

"Frankly, I am much relieved that Harry's attitude was as objective as it seemed to be in his letters. I am encouraged to think that had he lived, he would have taken what I would consider to be a more tenable position than the Indian Rights Association has taken, no matter how far he dug into the conflicting points of view. So much for your first point. Later in this letter I will outline what I mean by 'tenable position.' I do not mean, necessarily, one which either agrees with me, or even supports the present bill.

"On your second point, I can fully agree that Indian internal politics are as complex as non-Indian politics—with right and wrong aspects to both the official and the unofficial position. It is not quite true, however, to charge that the Flathead-Kootenai organization is ‘nonreservation’ Indians. I suspect that it may be weighted with such, but it does include a substantial participation of reservation Indians in opposition to the official governing body of the tribes. In this connection, I would merely like to point out that Lawrence Lindley leans heavily on unofficial testimony as to availability of replacement grazing lands, impact on the National Bison Range, impact on recreational values, etc., paying no attention at all to the official position of U.S. Government agencies which make contrary judgments. It appears to me to be inconsistent to contend that we must consider only the views of official tribal leaders on the one hand, but reject official views of U.S. agencies on the other.

“On your third point: The Indian Rights Association has picked up the earlier corps figure of 1.08:1 for benefit-cost ratio, notwithstanding that the revised figure presented in the 1962 Senate hearings was 1.2 to 1. The revision was based on using a 100-year life rather than a 50-year life. I do not believe the Indian Rights Association claims or has competence to judge the merits of this situation. Furthermore if we are going to take into account additional factors, such as the special negotiated compensation to the Indians, then we must also consider that the costs of railroad relocation, which were roughly half the total cost of the project, are probably significantly inflated. The corps never made any independent study of this, but merely accepted the figures presented by the railroad itself—and when you realize that the railroad has interlocking directorates with the Montana Power Co., you can appreciate that their figures may well be inflated. The Indians rely on independent engineering counsel to set a value on their power sites; the committee for Knowles Dam engaged an independent engineering firm several years ago to analyze the railroad relocation costs. If the findings of one are worthy of consideration, the findings of the other are equally worthy. The conclusion of such an analysis including both Indian compensation and true railroad costs would probably be a standoff: little or no change in benefit/cost ratios.

“Two years ago, there were extensive hearings in the Senate at which a considerable effort was made by conservationists to get revision of the benefit-cost evaluation formulas to include such things as water pollution abatement and a number of other side benefits. If such revised formulas were to be used, the ratio at Knowles would be considerably enhanced. This is an area where you and I are in complete agreement: The formulas and methods used by the Corps of Engineers are most unrealistic. I am certain, though, this is, of course, not impartial evidence, that revised analysis of costs and benefits would still show Knowles to be a most worthwhile project.

“To show how elusive a matter benefit/cost ratios really are, consider the following. Another dam has been authorized, and appropriations made for it: The Libby Dam on the Kootenai River, which is also in the Columbia basin. The flooding from this dam would cross into Canada, and so requires treaty negotiations and agreements, just as the Knowles requires negotiations with the Indians. For several years, now, the Provincial Government of British Columbia has blocked ratification of the necessary treaty, and there is no clear indication as to whether the new Pearson government will expedite this or not. But if Knowles should be built before Libby, the benefit/cost of Knowles is much greater than the figures used earlier in my letter. Thus, Mr. Holum testified, pages 312–313:

“ ‘In either event, annual benefits exceed annual costs. The resultant benefit-cost ratios become 1.68 if Knowles is first added, and 1.08 under the extremely conservative assumption that it might be last added. (First and last refer to before or after Canadian storage in Libby Dam.) The above figures are based on an assumed economic life of 50 years. Again, may I say this is a most conservative figure.

“ ‘If the economic life of 100 years is used, which is in accord with current criteria, the benefit-cost ratios would be increased substantially.’

“On page 121 in the hearing record, table 3, line J, and page 122, table 4, line L, Mr. Bloch, the engineer hired by the tribes to present testimony on the value of their damsites and on alternate proposals, has tables showing benefit/cost ratios.

“With Candian storage, he shows 1.20; without Canadian storage, 2.31. The references indicate these are the Corps of Engineers figures in its June 1958 updated report, based on 100-year amortization. They do not include compensation for power damsites to the Indians. Without Canadian storage, if we add Mr. Bloch’s own estimate of the value of the Indians’ power, $4.65 million annually, we find that the benefit/cost ratio is still 1.57:1. On the 50-year basis without Canadian storage but after paying for Indian power, the ratio is 1.14:1.

“Now, to get to the ‘nut’ of our disagreement with the Indian Rights Association. I told Lawrence Lindley that I would agree wholeheartedly that if Knowles Dam were to be built without negotiating a settlement with the Flathead Indians, this would be a violation of Indian rights and their treaty. I most emphatically do not agree that the passage of the line item authorization of Knowles Dam in the omnibus public works bill is in itself any such violation. I specifically asked Lawrence Lindley if he would be willing to modify his statement along some such lines as: Unless compensation by negotiation with the tribes is provided, the taking of Indian lands for construction of Knowles Dam would be a violation of Indian rights. He would not consent to the qualification—contending that the mere authorization was in itself a violation.

“The plain fact is that there is no legal way for the U.S. Government to undertake negotiations with the Indians, or anyone else for that matter—railroad, white man, or Indian—until congressional authorization has been made.

“Several years ago, 1958, there was a Paradise bill (now modified to Knowles) written and introduced by Senator Murray, of Montana, which did spell out in general terms the requirement that negotiations be undertaken with the Indians. Mark this: the Indians—in particular Walter McDonald, then tribal council president—opposed this bill. If Lawrence Lindley’s position is consistent, I would believe that he would have had to support the bill at that time—had it been called to his attention. At that time, the Indians favored construction of the two small dams by Montana Power Co. The bill was never reported out of committee—to nobody’s surprise.

“One further point which you have missed completely in your letter to me of April 24. As far as I can tell, and I am deeply involved in the proponent efforts for Knowles Dam, there is no proponent of Knowles, and no agency of Government which disagrees with the Indian Rights Association on two points:

“(1) The taking of land for Knowles Dam must be by negotiation and not by condemnation.

“(2) The Indians must be provided with compensation in the form of income or income producing assets replacing the potential value of their powersites.

“Lawrence Lindley showed me a letter from the Department of Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, confirming this general approach, though admittedly cautious not to concede specifics prior to the proper opening of negotiations.

“Senator Metcalf and Senator Mansfield, and before them Senator Murray, have stoutly insisted on these principles from the very beginning.

“The leaders of the citizen’s group supporting the Knowles proposal are, without exception, liberals (as Harry Burks found out) who by nature and inclination support these principles.

“The Corps of Engineers in its call to hearing in 1958 in Missoula officially stated that the Indians’ rights would have to be given full consideration.

“There is considerable testimony in the 1962 hearing record in which Senator METCALF makes quite clear his position on this matter. This record becomes part of the ‘legislative history’ of the Knowles bill, and is a very important legal protection against violation of this ‘intent’ by subsequent actions.

“Lawrence Lindley quotes Mr. Cragun as saying that the Indians had a change of heart between the 1958 hearings and the 1962 hearings. Whereas formerly they were merely looking for ‘the best deal for the Indians,’ they now (after mature consideration) totally oppose Knowles in favor of building the two run-of-river dams themselves. I would quote the following from the hearing record:

“(Rather than copying the quotes, see pp. 3, 10, and 11 of Rae Logan’s letter to the Christian Century.)

“Lawrence Lindley contended to me that he felt that this testimony was somehow or other improperly adduced from Morigeau. But Morigeau said the same thing twice; Cragun confirmed the recognition of Indian rights by the senatorial sponsors of the Knowles authorization; and then there is this, from page 74 of the hearing record:

“ ‘Senator COOPER. How long have you been a member (of the tribal council)?

“ ‘Mr. McDONALD. I am starting my 21st year.

“ ‘Senator COOPER. You say that in this period in which this project has been under consideration, that the appropriate U.S. agency—what is it, the Bureau of Indian Affairs?

“ ‘Senator METCALF. Yes.

“ ‘Senator COOPER. (continuing). Has not discussed with the council your interest in this land?

“ ‘Mr. McDONALD. Only to the extent that the possibility of Knowles and the Paradise Dam would be built, not to the extent of valuation.

“ ‘Senator METCALF. May I interject here.

“ ‘As I understand it, Federal agencies would not negotiate with anybody until a dam project is authorized and an appropriation were made, because there is no power to negotiate either with the Indians or with private individuals. However, may I also interject that in the 10 years that I have been in Congress, I have talked to Mr. McDonald and Mr. Morigeau; Senator MANSFIELD has talked to them. We have talked about Knowles and this project.

“ ‘We have assured them that if it were authorized, that their interests under the treaty would be protected.

“ ‘We have discussed various payments.

“ ‘Mr. McDonald testified at Missoula in the Corps of Engineers hearings as the chairman of the tribal council that he and his council did not care what dam was built. (NOTE.—I understand from Lindley’s letter that it is Cragun’s position that they have changed their stand on this in favor of building their own power dams.) All they wanted was the best deal for the Indians, and of course that is what the Senate of the United States wants too: to treat the Indians in the best way, so he is not being exactly accurate with the committee, when he says there have not been any negotiations. (NOTE.—Morigeau reaffirmed this position on p. 79 of the testimony.) There have been discussions and so forth with him, but there could be no formal negotiation, as I think Mr. Holum will testify tomorrow, until there is authority for the Federal Government to go in and develop this project, and that would have to be an authorization. I say that because over the 10 years I have been in Congress, I have been very much concerned with the interests of the Indians and the Indian people in my State, and I deeply resent this statement that we are trying to set aside treaties, and that any of the congressional delegation is not very much concerned with, and interested in, protecting and leaning over backward to protect the rights of the Indians, as we have done at Yellowtail Dam over in the other area. And Mr. McDonald knows that; he knows about those conversations, that is why I asked him to come forward and testify.

" 'Senator COOPER. I am sure of that. This is again a field in which I have no knowledge, and I am sure all of us agree with our chairman that he is concerned about this, as is Senator MANSFIELD and Members of the House. But I do assume, then, that in the hearings that were held, council representatives did appear at the Corps of Engineers hearings?

" 'Senator METCALF. Yes, at everyone of the hearings, as far as I recall, members appeared; Mr. McDonald appeared and testified.

" 'He appeared at Missoula; is that not right, Walt? (Walter McDonald.)

" 'Mr. MCDONALD. Yes.

" 'Senator METCALF, I appreciate what you have said, that that was not quite accurate as to negotiations. It is true, Senator METCALF and I talked this over for many years, you might say, and he always did state that our treaty would be protected.

" 'But I was a litle bit farfetched there perhaps in saying that, and I was thinking of negotiation in other terms and I appreciate that, Senator.'

"Later, Mr. Holum, Assistant Secretary for Water and Power Development, Department of Interior testified (p. 311 of the record) in part as follows:

" 'Provision should be made to compensate adequately the Indian tribes for their flooded lands and all other interests that may be involved. It should be noted that the question of compensation respecting the property and rights of the Indians, and the special relationship of the United States to the Indian people, will require most careful consideration."

"In conclusion, on this point then, it seems to me that Lawrence Lindley has a very weak, if not untenable, case when he contends that the authorization of Knowles Dam in itself constitutes a violation of Indian rights. The record is replete with assurances, promises, intentions to undertake negotiations with Indians when authorized to do so. There is no evidence to the contrary. There is precedent for this procedure right in Montana in the Yellowtail Dam. Agricultural value of the lands taken here was $47,000. Montana Senators sponsored legislation based on a negotiated agreement with Crows, for a $5 million payment. The bill passed. President Eisenhower vetoed it. After further negotiation with the Crows, Senator METCALF then sponsored a bill for $2.5 million, with an express provision authorizing the Crow Indians to sue the U.S. Government in Federal court for an additional $2.5 million. This bill passed, and was signed by Eisenhower, notwithstanding some contention that the Indians ought to be paid only land values. The Crows have filed suit for the balance, and the outcome is not yet determined.

"Now, I want to move on to another area which disturbs me tremendously. In Lawrence Lindley's letter of January 2, 1963, to Harry, second page, he says: 'I think you will find that there is considerable partisan politics mixed in with this Knowles Dam situation. This, to me, is unfortunate.'

"He is absolutely right. But what disturbs me is that the Indian Rights Association has not taken the trouble to separate out the partisan political arguments. It has picked up a most partisan and distorted set of arguments for opposing Knowles, which at best are only one side of some very complex matters—and I might add a very partisan side of the story. It has not supported or defended its basic contention that the mere authorization is a violation of rights. Here are specific examples:

"1. The map used on the brochure you sent me is exactly the map used in what I consider to be a scurrilous brochure of the Montana Power Co., copy of which is enclosed.

"Now, this would not be quite so serious, except that the map is a gross exaggeration of the size of the Knowles Lake. I am enclosing another quite partisan anti-Knowles brochure which shows the lake more nearly in its true size, though even this one is larger than the fact, simply because the problem of drawing the lake to true scale is a little difficult—it is hardly the width of a visible line in some places.

"I don't know whether the map itself causes any crucial misunderstandings, but it certainly does make it look like much more of a flooding problem than it really is. And it puts Indian Rights Association squarely in a partisan camp—a corporate vested interest camp where it ought not to be.

"2. Two or three times the Montana Power Co.'s. brochure claims the national bison range would be destroyed. Indian Rights Association backs away slightly from this position and says that it would be 'severely damaged.' The facts are that not more than about 10 percent of the area of the range would be flooded, and the only part of this 10 percent that is of bison grazing value is the headquarters area and display pasture. An additional 7 percent or so may be made inaccessible to the bison by a new railroad line with no satisfactory way yet proposed to get the buffalo across the tracks. But even so, 83 percent of the acreage for grazing, wintering, etc., of bison, elk, deer, birds, etc., remains. Furthermore, the Corps proposal, and the Fish and Wildlife proposal, both contemplate adding acreage to the bison range—in fact they will add 4,500 acres to replace loss of 3,450 acres. There are some unanswered questions as to where a new headquarters might be located and where a new exhibition pasture might be found. The fact of the matter is that the present headquarters and pasture are most inaccessible to the touring public, and it would be my hope that they might be relocated closer to the highways.

"The argument that the range would be destroyed is supported by a number of groups who oppose Knowles for other, and often partisan political reasons. The argument that the range can be accommodated comes from the official agencies responsible. If we are going to accept the arguments of unofficial groups on this matter, then we must also give credence to 'splinter Indian groups' who favor Knowles and oppose their official leaders. In any case, Indian Rights Association is not competent to make a judgment on this.

"3. On the grazing lands, I do not have an authoritative answer. I do know that evidence has been submitted that 35 Indians use these lands—this evidence is, I believe, from the Indians themselves in the hearing. I understand that replacement grazing lands are available, and will be offered in treaty negotiations. I believe that in the House hearings held in June there will be testimony from the Reclamation Bureau as to the quality of the substitute lands compared with the inundated lands. It is very easy to say 'There are no substitute lands available to the Indians,' but it is much more difficult to prove this statement. I believe that the facts will subsequently show that there are substitute lands, so that the only true statements that can be made would have to relate to comparisons. Then, you will no doubt get into such esoteric problems as to how many acres of bottom land are equivalent to how many acres of higher land, etc., and whether compensation can be on the basis of providing for, or paying for, winter feed by other means than bottom land grazing. Again, Indian Rights Association is not competent to make a judgment on this technical agricultural matter.

"4. The argument about 'crippling Indian economy' is based on the initial assumption that the Knowles Dam will be built without providing the Indians income commensurate with that which they could derive from the two small dams. Since Lawrence Lindley and I could not agreeably rephrase the original premise, I suppose this argument flows naturally from what I initially objected to. It is nevertheless an insulting implication that we who favor Knowles Dam are unconcerned about the Indian economy.

"5. I have already demonstrated that the benefit-cost ratio argument is at least very tricky. It simply is not true to categorically state that cost will exceed benefits if Indians are compensated. The statement that the ratio is 1.08:1 is a misrepresentation of the facts, and puts the Indian Rights Association directly into the partisan politics which Lawrence Lindley abhors.

"6. For every private engineer who can be found to state that Knowles is not the best 'full development' plan, there can be found other private engineers to disagree. The plain fact is that the Indian Rights Association is not competent to make this judgment. The private engineers are not responsible for making a recommendation based on having to support it and, what is more, do not have to actually produce results based on it.

"Specifically, the alternate Indian proposal would provide only about three-fourths of the storage of Knowles. The Corps of Engineers has a goal for storage in order to protect the entire Columbia Basin against disastrous floods like the 1948 one which killed 30 to 40 people. This goal is not even satisfied by Knowles and Libby combined. Furthermore, the alternates proposed by the Indians would have many times as much impact on wildlife, and I have never heard anyone say otherwise. So, the Indians, in Lindley's brochure, complain about damage to the bison range, and loss of that game preserve, but turn around and propose as an alternate two dams which would much more seriously injure wildlife and game. One of the Indian alternate dams, Smoky Range, would seriously damage the recreational value of Glacier National Park—much more seriously than Knowles would damage the bison range, by anyone's testimony.

"This, then, leaves the argument in this position: If the Indians can be agreeably compensated with income equivalent to the income they can reasonably anticipate from their own dams, which proposal should be considered? From the storage, recreational and wildlife points of view there is no argument: Knowles is superior on all counts, and there is no countertestimony. On power, the two proposals appear to be about equivalent, though there may be a more complex transmission problem, and possibly a more complex operational and control problem with the alternates than with Knowles.

"So, even this point boils down again to the same basic argument: does the omnibus public works bill authorizing Knowles Dam preclude, or even jeopardize the adequate compensation of the Indians for their full value.

"7. Another pet argument of the partisan political opponents of Knowles which IRA has picked up is the mudflats. This is an emotional issue which stirs the imagination to all kinds of horrors. It is largely false, and based on ignorance of the area to be flooded, with which I am intimately familiar.

"The facts are as follows: First, the 80-foot drawdown is the absolute limit of potential drawdown. Perhaps the pool would have been drawn down like that to prevent the 1948 flood, but in 15 years since (I have been here since 1947) there has not been a recurrence of this extreme situation. This 80-foot drawdown is not an every year occurrence—but rather a rare extreme situation, which I would suppose would not happen more than once in 25 years, though I do not have official estimates on the frequency of occurrence predicted on the basis of past experience. This is available, however. I do not know what the average drawdown will be, but suspect it will not exceed 10 to 20 feet.

"Secondly, the Columbia River is different from most U.S. rivers in that flood crest occurs in June, with runoff starting in May or April. If the storage in the dam is to be useful, it will have to be holding its 3 million acre-feet of water during the flood crest on uncontrolled rivers. The point being, that by the time the recreation season starts actively, the pool will be filled and mudflats will be gone. Dropping the pool level will not take place until January or so, to a predicted level based on anticipated runoff determined by snow water studies which are made throughout the basin every winter. This is the practice on Flathead Lake with which we are all familiar in this area, and which has not damaged recreational property values.

"Thirdly, the pool area, for the most part, is steep sided, as a reference to the USGS topographic maps will show. The area on the east side of the pool between Moiese and the Buffalo Rapids No. 4 damsite, is a gently sloping, clay soil, and will indeed be mudflats whenever there is any drawdown. This is but a small portion of the pool area or the shoreline.

"The south shore of the lake, from Ravalli to Knowles, is largely wooded, and steep sided. Except for a few areas, it will not be mudflat even at low water in the winter and early spring. It is on Indian reservation, and in my opinion constitutes the prime recreational area. This area has no recreational value of any significance now, so that what recreational value will exist will be created by the Knowles Reservoir, and will be on the Indian reservation. Now, I do not know how much of this land has already passed to non-Indians, or is out of tribal control. This is a matter of record, however, and some research will produce the facts. But I know that much of it is still under tribal control.

"There is almost no recreational value to the two Buffalo Rapids Dams proposed by the Indians. For one thing, there are no trees in the area at all. A lone cottonwood, perhaps here and there. The canyons are very steep sided, the lake will be little wider than the present stream. One has to actually see this to appreciate the truth of what I say. I simply do not see how there could be much recreational use made of these two small pools, other than perhaps boat fishing. But this will be merely pennies compared with the land value enhancement that comes from the realistic possibilities of summer cottages, homes, motels, etc., that will be available along the south shore of the Knowles pool. Furthermore, U.S. Highway 10-A will be built along the south shore of the pool providing ready access to the lake. If it is built—at least in part—far enough up from the lake to provide some privacy to summer homes, there will be some terrific land values created here by the lake. The pools the Indians would create would be in areas in which there are now no roads. We have tried to get in there to make an on-the-spot count of homes in the pool area, but could not. Roads can be built, but there is simply no attraction there in the hot summer to bring people so far off the beaten track.

"Well, there is the whole ball of wax. I thought I could answer your letter with a two-pager—but I missed by a few hundred percent.

"The Indian Rights Association is, of course, perfectly entitled to disagree with me, or Senator METCALF, or anyone else. I consider their statement that 'the proposed Knowles Dam—would violate rights' to be a false statement unless it is qualified by an 'if' or an 'unless' clause. However, I suppose that they may properly quote the tribal council on this score. (Their pamphlet does not quote, however.)

"But, when Indian Rights Association supports its thesis with partisan political arguments, which are demonstrably either false or misleading, or misrepresentative of the facts, without at the same time presenting the other side, then I am greatly hurt, disturbed, and a little sick at heart to think that Indian rights are not being defended on more logical and sound bases.

"My alternate suggestion—which I only had a chance to hint at when I met with Lawrence Lindley—would be along these lines:

"1. Put out a brochure with an honest map of the lake.

"2. Make the statement which they seem to feel is necessary to make, that Knowles would violate Indian rights.

"3. Support this statement with an acknowledgment that there have been numerous 'promises, assurance, etc.' of negotiation, but no concrete dollar or kilowatt-hour figures, no specifics on other matters. Then cite the sad and sordid record of the past—and I can only assume because I do not know that there is a record of taking Indian treaty land by condemnation and without adequate compensation. Cite the record of the U.S. Government to make us all ashamed of ourselves: the Indian irrigation project which was undertaken on Indian lands without Indian consent (Flathead); the national bison range itself was apparently established without Indian consent (yet now they oppose Knowles by referring to the severe damage or destruction of the bison range); the Homestead Act which opened reservation lands to white ownership; the establishment of wildlife refuges without Indian consent at Ninepipe and Kicking Horse.

"But to try to support Indian rights by taking one side of a partisan political argument, after starting from at best a misleading premise, is to me unconscionable, and does Indian rights as represented by the association almost irreparable harm.

"I think the Indians have put themselves in a bad spot by working so closely with Montana Power Co., when, as Mr. Cragun testified in the hearings, they cannot possibly get as good a deal from Montana Power Co. as from building their own dams. I think there is a very real possibility that if they are left to their own to develop the two low dams, they will find themselves prisoners of Montana Power Co. in the end. And as between friendly Senators and a friendly Kennedy administration, as compared with the unscrupulous Montana Power Co. I do not have much trouble choosing where the Indians' best interest lies.

"But notwithstanding, I agree that the Indians themselves have a right to be wrong—just like the rest of us.

"I do not agree that the Indian Rights Association has a right, or can even be condoned, in the kind of propagandizing political partnership which is evidenced by the pamphlet against Knowles. Furthermore, I find I shall in the future hold as suspect other positions of the association because they have not acted responsibly in this case.

"May I repeat—that I do not mean they have to agree with me to be responsible. I have suggested an approach which would oppose the Knowles Dam—even oppose the authorization bill which I want to see passed in the worst way. But oppose it on the real grounds of Indian rights—even go to the extent of documenting and dramatizing the reason for failure to trust and rely on the assurance of LEE METCALF, the Kennedy administration, the good will of the citizens' committee for Knowles Dam, and the cautious indications of official agencies.

"What I object to is the effort to oppose Knowles on its merits—bison range, mud flats, benefit-cost ratio, 'full development plains,' etc. The Indian Rights Association is not qualified to make judgments on these matters, but is eminently qualified to state the case for Indian rights. All of its statements on the other issues are merely repeating partisan arguments about which they have no way of knowing the truth.

"I hope the above gives you a clearer picture of this situation, and my concern about the Indian Rights Association's position. I really think you and I and Lawrence Lindley are not very far apart on our basic concern with Indian rights.

"As I said when I saw you, I stayed out of the Kinzua matter because I did not understand it. I have participated in legal proceedings enough to have learned quite a bit about evidence, hearsay, opinion, expert opinion, etc. I have learned how much easier it is to make flat statements when you are not fully responsible for the project, and are not subject to cross-examination. I do not know what are the merits of Arthur Morgan's alternate for Kinzua—it may have been very good. If, however, it was like Mr. Bloch's alternate for Knowles, it would be but an incomplete and unsatisfactory answer. I simply have no knowledge, and did not want to inject myself into the case without adequate knowledge. As to Senator METCALF's lack of support for your case on Kinzua, I find that Senators are very sensitive to public works in their own State—they do not care to have projects in their State taken up by out-of-State Senators—either for or against—as they properly feel they have more knowledge and more at stake than out-of-State Senators would have. It would have been unwise, and probably unsuccessful from your point of view, and METCALF attempted to go over Senators JAVITS' and KEATING's heads on the matter. I have had some notion that there may have been some vested interest complications in the matter, so that it became much more complicated than merely a matter of Indian rights.

"I am enclosing some materials, and sending copy of this letter to Lawrence Lindley. I do hope you will read carefully both my letter and Rae Logan's. I do not expect, nor ask, that you take a position—for much the same reasons that I did not take a position on Kinzua.

"I do hope that you can understand and appreciate my position, my disappointment that such a respected organization as Indian Rights Association should handle this matter with such little understanding of the real issues involved, and the complexity of the many, many issues not directly involving Indian rights, and my hope and concern that Quakers, as represented by Ray Wilson, Ed Sanders, and AFSC, take a more sound position without becoming parties in the spreading of the Montana Power Co. false gospel.

"As surely as I understand the operation of Montana Power Co., I know that they will do all in their power to take away, dissipate, or steal for themselves the damsite values which the Flathead Indians are so concerned about. It is my opinion, which you and Lawrence Lindley are of course at liberty to disagree with, because only time can prove it, that the Knowles Dam is the very best protection the Flatheads have for their powersite values. They will derive more from negotiated compensation than they can ever derive from Montana Power Co., and I have no confidence that they can beat Montana Power Co. by building the dams themselves. (After all Montana Power Co. beat the U.S. Government at Canyon Ferry—a public dam, but Montana Power Co. got the right in the Eisenhower administration (partnership, you know) to build the transmission lines. So the only customer the Federal power generators at Canyon Ferry can have are Montana Power Co.)

"Next time I write, I will try to avoid this subject, and get to more personal matters.

"Sincerely,

"ARCHER TAYLOR."

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, portions of points No. 6 and No. 7 in the summary which I have inserted in the RECORD allude to the desire of the tribes to develop their own properties. As I reported to the Senate last week, the Flathead Indians have retreated from their statements to both the Senate and House Public Works Committees, to the effect that they planned to finance and construct Buffalo Rapids No. 2 and No. 4. The official representative and former chairman of the tribe is now soliciting throughout the Northwest editorial endorsement, of an arrangement under which the Flathead Tribe would develop these dams in cooperation with the Montana Power Co., instead of on its own. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD my comments on the new position of the Flathead Indians, the August 30 memorandum to Northwest newspaper publishers from Walter W. McDonald and the August 25 editorial, in the Wyoming State Tribune, entitled "The United States Is Breaking a Treaty, Too."

There being no objection, the statement, memorandum, and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 12, 1963]

"THE CAT IS OUT OF THE BAG

"Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of Members of both the Senate and House of Representatives a significant development concerning authorization of Knowles Dam.

"The Knowles Dam project, on the Flathead River in western Montana, was one of the projects added by the Senate to the omnibus bill, which has now been returned to the House of Representatives.

"During the hearings on this project before the Senate Committee on Public Works last year, it became clear that there could be three possible developments. One possibility could be the Knowles storage project, which I favor. Another could be construction of two run-of-the-river dams, at Buffalo Rapids sites 2 and 4, by the Montana Power Co. The third possibility could be construction of the two run-of-the-river dams at the Buffalo Rapids sites by the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, which have applied to the Federal Power Commission for a preliminary permit, as has the Montana Power Co.

"At the hearing, the desire of the tribes to construct the dams was emphasized by John Cragun, counsel for the tribes, in these words:

"'It is legally impossible for (the tribes) to get as good a deal from Montana Power Co. as they could get from building the dams themselves. There would be a sharing of benefits with Montana Power Co. which would cut in half the exploitable value of those sites to the tribes. Those sites are so valuable in comparison with any other sites, probably, in the whole United States that the matter of the tribe's financing and building them presents no problem, and they could get the entire value from them, which they could not do if Montana Power Co. builds them. The tribes have definitely instructed me to oppose the Montana Power Co. application with every means at our hands. We have done considerable engineering work in preparation for that.'

"Mr. President, the Flathead tribes took a similar position at the hearings on Knowles conducted by the House Public Works Committee this year.

"The prepared statement of Walter W. McDonald, official delegate and former chairman of the Flathead Tribal Council, refers to the tribes 'own development of the Buffalo Rapids sites.'

"The prepared statement of Counsel Cragun concludes that the tribes 'wish to rely on their own applications before the Federal Power Commission for a preliminary permit to build their own damsites.'

"Additionally, Mr. Cragun placed in the hearing record a resolution of the Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians, adopted August 18, 1962, and signed by its president, the same Walter McDonald who appeared as a witness for tribal development of the sites. The resolution states that 'the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes intend to develop these damsites and have filed an application for preliminary permit on these sites with the Federal Power Commission.'

"Mr. President, I am aware that many of my colleagues, in both the Senate and House, have had the impression, as I have until now, that three developments were possible—the Federal Knowles Dam, construction of Buffalo Rapids 2 and 4 by the Montana Power Co., or construction of Buffalo Rapids 2 and 4 by the Confederated Flathead and Salish Tribes.

"It now appears that the alternatives have been reduced to two, that a deal has been made between the Montana Power Co., and the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes.

"I have been privileged to receive a copy of the memorandum which is being distributed to editors in the Northwest by Mr. Walter McDonald. This memorandum is written in his capacity as president of the Northwest Affiliated Indian Tribes. It accompanies an editorial from the Wyoming State Tribune. The Tribune, discussing the run-of-the-river alternatives to Knowles, reveals that the Flathead Indians 'plan this development in connection with the Montana Power Co.'

"Mr. McDonald, in sending this editorial to newspaper editors, asks them to "please reprint it, condense it, comment on it, or write one of your own.'

"Mr. President, the cat is out of the bag. The expensive cultivation of Flathead Indian officials by the Montana Power Co., has borne fruit. The tribe's and its counsel's strong statements to Congress about opposition to the Montana Power Co., that tribal 'financing and building—the dams—present no problem' are now meaningless.

"And so, Mr. President, we now have but two alternatives, full development of the Federal Knowles project, or underdevelopment by the Montana Power Co., which charges exorbitant rates and ships its millions of dollars in annual overcharges to the out-of-State stockholders."

"AUGUST 30, 1963.

"DEAR NORTHWEST NEWSPAPER PUBLISHER: Would you please allow me 5 minutes?

"I am an Indian. I have lived all my life in my native Pacific Northwest (I was born and raised in western Montana, where I operate a successful cattle ranch near St. Ignatius). At the present time I am president of the Northwest Affiliated Tribes and president of the Montana Intertribal Policy Board. I am a member and former president of the Flathead Tribal Council. We have just concluded a convention of the Affiliated Tribes here in Spokane, Wash.

"In this era of talking about treaties and civil rights, we Indians are happy to find that people are waking up to something we have been shouting about for many years.

"We believe:

"Treaties are made to be kept. We expect our country to keep its end of the bargain, just as we expect other nations like Russia to respect treaties.

"The Negroes are not the only people being deprived of their civil rights. We Indians have faced this problem for many years, too.

"In both of these respects—treaties and civil rights—members of the Flathead Tribe (Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes) in western Montana are in danger of being shortchanged as a result of the proposed construction of Federal Knowles Dam. It would flood out much of our land (16,000 acres) including damsites in whose development we are vitally interested.

"The enclosed editorial from the Wyoming State Journal of August 25, 1963, tells the story of the courageous stand by Representative BATTIN of Montana in describing our plight. Please take time to read this editorial. If you would, please reprint it, condense it, coment on it or write one of your own.

"We Indians need your help in making known the threatened violation of our treaty and civil rights by Knowles Dam legislation now in Congress.

"Won't you help us?

"Very truly yours,

"WALTER W. MCDONALD."

[From the Wyoming State Tribune, Aug. 25, 1963]

"THE UNITED STATES IS BREAKING A TREATY, TOO

"'Mr. Speaker,' said Montana's Representative JAMES FRANKLIN BATTIN in the U.S. House of Representatives this past Monday, 'the Senate of the United States is currently engaged in hearings and debate over the recent test ban treaty entered into by the United States with Russia and other foreign powers.

"'Much of the discussion over the usefulness of this treaty and its benefit to the United States has centered around the reliability of Russia to live up to its treaty commitments,' observed Montana's Second District Republican Congressman.

"'Performances of Russia in the past,' he continued, 'have certainly justified the wariness of the American people to accept the solemn promises of Russia when they are broken at will by the Soviet Government.'

"Mr. BATTIN reminded his listeners that the Constitution of the United States makes our treaty obligations the supreme law of the land.

"Was Mr. BATTIN concerned with the test ban treaty?

"Not in this specific instance; what he was getting around to saying is that while we are pondering the good intentions of the Soviets in carrying out the terms of a treaty negotiated with this country, the United States itself is in the process of violating one of its own solemn commitments—made over a century ago with the Flathead Indians.

"It is doing so in proposing to build on their lands, reserved to them by treaty, and against their wishes, the so-called Knowles Dam project, a 95-percent public power undertaking of the U.S. Department of the Interior, which also has jurisdiction through its Bureau of Indian Affairs over the welfare of these very same Indians.

"The treaty involved is the so-called Hellgate Treaty signed with the Flatheads on July 16, 1855; the treaty subsequently was ratified by the United States 4 years later and is in force and effect today. It reserved certain lands for the use and occupation of the Flathead Tribes.

" 'It is the same type of treaty and should merit the same concern and treatment as is presently being given the test ban treaty,' said Mr. BATTIN, a 38-year-old Billings attorney who is serving his second term in Congress. 'Yet the Senate of the United States, the same body which ratified the treaty with the Flathead Tribes, completely ignored that treaty and proposed the authorization of the Knowles Dam in Montana in face of the strong and emphatic opposition of the Flathead Tribes who charged that such action is a violation of their treaty rights.'

"The Indians, it turns out, possessing natural damsites within their reservation, wish to develop their own hydroelectric power projects that will be smaller in scope than Knowles, will not inundate some 20,000 acres of rich irrigated farming lands owned by the Flatheads, who wish to preserve their agricultural industry, and which will bring a profitable return from power revenues. They plan this development in connection with the Montana Power Co.

"If the Government persists in its course, the Indians say, they plan to sue the United States for $116 million for violation of their treaty rights and usurpation of their lands.

"This will make Knowles, already assailed by private power exponents as a costly, taxpayer-supported project that will not pay its way, an extremely expensive undertaking.

"The public power exponents and Montana's two Democratic Senators apparently are not to be swayed, however. Nor is that great conservator, supposedly the greatest in that field since Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot, the honorable Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall.

"This matter places both Mr. Udall and the entire New Frontier in a curious position. While the Kennedy administration poses as the champion of civil rights in behalf of the Negro, it exhibits blatant disregard for those of these American Indians, the Flatheads who apparently wish only to be left alone to devise their own industrial progress.

"The Indians and Mr. BATTIN probably will be attacked by professional do-gooders as tools of the private power trust; they will be attacked, as in the Burns Creek argument, of shedding 'crocodile tears' for the Indians (in former Idaho Congresswoman Gracie Pfost's Burns Creek testimony, it was the Wyoming coal miners).

"But they cannot get around the fact that the Indians have a treaty with the United States, it is being flagrantly violated by an invasion of the Flatheads' rights and interests, and over their protests.

"Mr. BATTIN can and should call attention again and agin to this brazen breach of a solemn agreement."

Mr. METCALF. Finally, Mr. President, point No. 6 of the summary questioned the consistency of the Secretary of the Interior in the case of Knowles Dam. In this regard, I cannot improve upon the statement of the Secretary, in response to a question by Chairman Davis, of the House Public Works Subcommittee on Flood Control, during the hearings June 5, 1963. Secretary Udall said:

"Knowles Dam, as I indicated in my prepared statement, is relatively speaking a high dam; it will be primarily a producer of hydroelectric power where my Department has marketing responsibilities for all hydroelectric power. You have in this area problems of irrigation, which are the problem of my Department. You have the Indian land problem, which is again my Department. You have the fish, wildlife, outdoor recreation. All these are responsibilities of my Department. These were reasons why, among others, this was felt that this was a logical project, even though both the corps and the Bureau have studied this project under assignment by Congress in the past over the years. It was felt that this was a logical decision, just as we felt for other reasons that it was logical that major construction work in the State of Alaska, whether it is high dams or low dams, should be done by the corps, which has a major construction responsibility in the construction organization in Alaska."

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, in closing I wish to make one comment about the Indians. Ever since I first came to Congress I have served on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and have worked faithfully for the various Indian tribes. I have been critical of the operation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. I helped write into the Democratic platform the provision relating to consent by Indians. That is the point the Senator from Wyoming has raised.

However, the only time the Corps of Army Engineers or the Secretary of the Interior can deal with an Indian tribe is after an authorization is made. The Secretary of the Interior has no authority at the present time to negotiate with an Indian tribe with respect to the price of the land or the development of the land. Congress must first authorize a dam before he can talk to the Indians about it.

Some contention has been made that an authorization is a taking. I point out that if an authorization is a taking, when Congress passed the Interstate Highway Act, to build highways across Indian reservations all over the United States, there would have been involved a violation of every Indian treaty that has ever been made—not only one treaty, but every one of the treaties.

Of course, we know that an authorization is not a taking. We must negotiate with the Indians for highways. We must negotiate with them for dam projects. We must negotiate with them with respect to other matters.

Therefore, my senior colleague from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], Representative OLSEN, and I assured the Indians that we would give them full support, as we have already demonstrated we were willing to give in the case of the Yellowtail Dam, which involved the same kind of authorization for flood control.

Congress passed a bill providing for payment to the Indians not only for the land taken, but also for the power site value. Under a Supreme Court decision, a corporation cannot collect in such circumstances for the power site value. However, we gave the Indians compensation for the power site value at Yellowtail.

The senior Senator from Montana and I are proposing that we give compensation for the power site value at Knowles.

We are talking about a dam which has been determined to be feasible by the Corps of Army Engineers. It is needed in western Montana. The power is needed in western Montana. The storage is needed. The downstream development is needed. I urge that the Senate reject the pending amendment.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the senior Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, first I wish to say that I have nothing but the highest praise and appreciation for the integrity of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON]. Anything he has said is in full accord with the views he has expressed many times on the floor of the Senate. I honor him for his consistency, for his honesty, and for his frankness in stating his case.

Before I get into my remarks, I should like to state, as I have stated on many occasions—and I know I speak the views of my colleague from Montana also—that there is room for both public and private power development in our State, in the Northwest, and throughout the country.

If the Montana Power Co. had offered to build the Hungry Horse Dam, which they opposed for 5 long years, I am sure the Montana congressional delegation would have gotten behind the Montana Power Co. to help them take over the construction of that multipurpose project.

So far as the building of private power dams is concerned—and of course this is something which I believe to be within the ken of private companies—those dams are built for the purpose of generating electricity only, not for the multifold purpose of developing recreational areas, not for the purpose of developing irrigation and reclamation possibilities, not for the purpose—except incidentally—of controlling floods and the like, but purely, solely, and only for the purpose of generating power.

That is all right. In the State of Montana, within the past decade, a number of private power projects have been built. One of them is at Cabinet Gorge, just over the Montana line from Idaho; the other, further east in Montana, is the Noxon Rapids project. These two projects were built by the Washington Power & Light Co. Each of these projects generates 200,000 kilowatts of power. Where does every single kilowatt of that power go? Every single kilowatt of that 400,000 kilowatts goes out of the State of Montana. Not one single kilowatt is used to benefit or to develop our State or to bring new industries or employment and the like to our people.

Why did not the Montana Power Co. build those projects? Why did not the Montana Power Co. see to it that Montana resources were used for the benefit of the people of Montana?

They were built by the Washington Power & Light Co. Those 400,000 kilowatts go outside the State.

Incidentally, I understood that a few weeks ago some representatives of the Washington Power & Light Co. were in the State of Montana discussing things in a general way having to do with next year's election.

I am sure that the Senator from Wyoming is not opposed to all types of multipurpose projects, because he will recall that, so far as the delegations of the two States in the Senate are concerned, we all look with favor upon the development of the Yellowtail Dam, which is a multipurpose project, and in the case of the Yellowtail Dam the four Senators from the two States joined in introducing proposed legislation seeking to create the Big Horn recreational area behind that dam. Therefore, there are areas in which we agree, and there are some areas in which we disagree. I should like to ask my distinguished colleague from Montana a question or two, if he would be so kind as to answer them.

First, has the Montana Power Co. ever filed an application to build dams in the area now to be covered by the Knowles Dam, if and when the authorization is given?

Mr. METCALF. The Montana Power Co. first filed an application to build dams when the Federal Power Commission was originally created. It filed application No. 5 before the Commission. It was an application to build a dam in the general area. Then it was dropped.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Dropped by whom?

Mr. METCALF. By the Montana Power Co.

Then there was some suggestion and activity concerning the building of a dam at the Paradise site. So Montana Power Co. again filed an application; and after the suggestion that a public power dam be built, it was again dropped.

For more than half a century, Montana Power Co. has been in and out of the Federal Power Commission, suggesting that it would like to build dams at this site. But it has not followed through with a single application. It has dropped each of them. It has been acting like a dog in a manger whenever the suggestion is made that the Federal Government build a public power project.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Have any of those applications been approved by the Federal Power Commission?

Mr. METCALF. Never. Montana Power Co. has never followed through with any of them so that there could be a hearing. It has always been allowed to drop them.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In other words, if Montana Power Co. had followed through on its applications on those two occasions, and had its applications been approved by the Federal Power Commission, it is reasonable to state that there would be no project known as Knowles before this body today?

Mr. METCALF. On more than two occasions. On, at least, docket No. 5 in 1920; docket No. 2135 in 1953; dockets Nos. 2163 and 2164 in 1954; docket No. 2223 in 1956; and docket No. 2293 in 1960. There were all applications of the Montana Power Co. to build dams. Since 1920, Montana Power Co. has been in and out of the Federal Power Commission, but has never followed through on a single one of these applications.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think that record speaks for itself. It helps to explain why we are interested in the development of our own State of Montana and in the project now before the Senate.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. I am not advocating the cause of the Montana Power Co. or any other power company. I am an advocate of private enterprise, as evidenced by my amendment to this bill and also by my amendment to the foreign aid bill.

The State of Montana may need projects such as there are in the State of Wyoming, which are operated by private power companies. We are proud of the accomplishments of private enterprise in Wyoming.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I tried to say at the beginning, and shall say again, that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is a man of high integrity, great honesty, and utmost frankness. Anything my colleague from Montana [Mr. METCALF] and I say about activities in the State of Montana has no relationship whatsoever to the attitude or feelings of the Senator from Wyoming. We believe this is a matter which is our business, and we will do our best to try to attend to it.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. I concur in the statement of my colleague that the Senator from Wyoming is acting in all innocence of the facts with respect to the Montana Power Co. His opposition to this dam or this project is based upon a sincere opposition to this kind of proposal.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming mentioned Pacific Power & Light Co. That company has a small interest in the northwestern part of Montana. Incidentally, Pacific Power & Light is a company with which the Montana delegation has never had any differences. Perhaps that is because its investment is so small; but even though it is small, its service is excellent.

In Montana, where the headwaters of the Columbia and the Missouri originate, at the present time one project is in process of completion. The Yellowtail project will serve both northern Wyoming and southeastern Montana. We have a treaty with Canada—at least, it has been agreed to by the United States—which would seek to bring about the creation of the Libby project, in Lincoln County, in the northwestern part of Montana. It is a project which would extend, if finally approved by the Canadian Parliament, 40 miles within the Province of British Columbia, for the purpose of a backup reservoir.

Then there is that great dam in Montana, the Hungry Horse project, in the northwestern part of the State. When we speak of the power development of Montana, the shining light to which we refer is the Hungry Horse project, in the Flathead country.

To indicate what we hope Knowles Dam would do, if authorized, appropriated for, and constructed, I repeat that Montana Power Co. opposed the Hungry Horse project in the Flathead country for 5 years. But what has happened since the completion of the Hungry Horse project?

First. Montana Power Co. was able to install a 56,000 kilowatt generator at Kerr Dam on the Flathead River because of the storage facilities at Hungry Horse.

Second. Montana Power Co., though opposed to the construction of Hungry Horse, has a 20-year contract, entered into in 1955; and it is my understanding that it is renewable every year—this statement is subject to correction—for 50,000 kilowatts of Bonneville Power from Hungry Horse, which it buys at the rate of 2.5 mills and feeds into its own system to sell to its customers at a higher rate.

Third. That rates of REA's in western Montana have been reduced, because of Hungry Horse power, from between 8 and 9 mills per kilowatt to 3.1 mills per kilowatt.

Fourth. Because of Hungry Horse, the Anaconda Co. built an aluminum plant at Columbia Falls, Mont., which at the present time employs about 600 persons. With the expansion of the plant, it is anticipated that several hundred more will be provided with jobs.

Fifth. In Flathead County, where the Hungry Horse project is located, the assessed valuation of the county has increased from around $35 million to around $135 million.

Sixth. Because of Hungry Horse power, the Victor Chemical Co. at Silver Bow, between Butte and Anaconda, and other industrial facilities have come into the State.

Seventh. Because of these new industries, the tax base has been broadened rather than restricted, with the result that more people are paying more taxes to the counties in which these industries are located, to the State of Montana, and to the Federal Government.

Eighth. The repayment schedule of Hungry Horse is current, and more than $35 million has been paid to the U.S. Treasury.

Ninth. Hungry Horse Reservoir has developed into a great recreational and fishing area, and has contributed to the well-being of thousands of people, not only from within Montana, but from over the Nation as a whole.

Tenth. Nobody has been hurt by Hungry Horse, because the county in which it is located, western Montana which it serves, Montana Power Co., and the REA's have all benefited.

Eleventh. The Hungry Horse is an investment in America for the benefit of the people of my State and the Nation. It is fully repayable, and it is anticipated that it will be paid out in 50 years or less.

Mr. President, these are only a few of the reasons why we of Montana are so proud of Hungry Horse. But they give an idea as to why we are so interested in the further development of our State.

Montana has an area of approximately 148,000 square miles. Its population is just under 700,000. What we seek to do is to develop our own resources for the benefit of our own people; to create jobs; to provide security; and to give hope to our youngsters as they come along.

This would be a fully repayable project. It is something that would be done for the benefit of the people of the country. It is not a foreign aid program; it is a domestic loan program for the development of our own resources.

I repeat: Every dime would be repayable with interest. For more than 50 years, the proceeds from this project, as from Hungry Horse and Yellow Tail, would go into the general fund of the Treasury of the United States.

This is a project from which no one would lose, but from which everyone would benefit.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The time of the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. **McNAMARA**. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. **LAUSCHE**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. I yield.

Mr. **LAUSCHE**. In reading the report, I note a line which states that the State of Montana opposes the project. I merely ask this question for information.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. What that particular statement or opinion probably indicates is that the Governor of the State of Montana came back here and testified against this project. But he does not speak for the whole State of Montana. Neither do we; but we think we speak for a very substantial portion of the State.

Mr. **METCALF**. Those in this body who speak for the State of Montana—the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and I—and the Member of the other body who speaks for the western part of the State of Montana—Representative OLSEN—all are in favor of this project. We are the ones—not Governors or ex-Governors—who speak for the State of Montana and represent the State of Montana.

Mr. **LAUSCHE**. Does the record show that the State of Montana, through its chief executive, opposes the project?

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Yes.

Mr. **METCALF**. The Governor of Montana testified against this project.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I hope this amendment will be rejected.

Mr. **McNAMARA**. Mr. President, I too hope the amendment will be rejected. I hope the Senate will provide us with an opportunity to take the bill in its present form to conference.

As the majority leader has said, I know this project has been before Congress for a long time. On two previous occasions, the bill, including this project, has been passed by the Senate. So I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. President, if there is no further request from Senators on this side for time, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of the time under my control; and I do so.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator from Wyoming has 7 minutes remaining. Does he yield it back?

Mr. **SIMPSON**. Yes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. All remaining time has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. **McNAMARA**. Mr. President, if there are no further amendments to be proposed——

Mr. **SCOTT**. Mr. President, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, on the question of final passage, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Do the Senators in charge of the time yield back the remaining time?

Mr. **MONRONEY**. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. **McNAMARA**. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 2 minutes on the bill.

Mr. **MONRONEY**. Mr. President, I am glad by my vote to be associated with the recommendations of the Public Works Committee in reporting and urging passage of House bill 8667, as amended.

As has been explained here, the urgency of final passage and signing into law of this measure are eminent. Fifty-eight going projects are right now facing shutdown because of lack of funds. The tragedy of such forced action in loss of time, in loss of money, in loss of jobs, and in loss to the business communities in which these projects are located can hardly be realized.

To make the present situation even more ironic, the Appropriations Committee of the House and the House itself have already made appropriations to carry forward the same projects. But they were forced, because of lack of final action on H.R. 8667 or on H.R. 6016, to make these appropriations subject to a proviso that the pending proposed legislation would be enacted.

The distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas, my good neighbor, has already inserted in the RECORD, on page 22929, a list of the projects on which requested authorizations are planned to be used. In the Arkansas River Basin this includes 14 projects. Since rivers do not recognize State lines, I find that some of the 14 are in Kansas, Missouri, and Arkansas, as well as in Oklahoma. The basin authorization needed for fiscal year 1964 is $31 million. The total needed for both the fiscal year 1964 and the fiscal year 1965 is $157 million. I am grateful to the Committee on Public Works for including the authorizations needed for both fiscal years.

Also in the bill is an authorization for a very badily needed and highly justified project for southwestern Oklahoma—the Waurika project. On October 22, I inserted in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A6567, the following description of this project:

> Southwestern Oklahoma is one of the most aggressive areas about which I have ever known. The people of that section are for the most part of pure pioneer stock, with the friendliness of the South and the sturdiness of the West.
>
> The Waurika project is a multiple-purpose project which is estimated to cost $25,853,000, of which the local communities would repay $12,861,000, consisting of $2,417,000 for water supply storage, $9,628,000 for conveyance facilities, and $816,000 for irrigation.
>
> The water supply would meet present and future local requirements for the cities and towns of Lawton, Duncan, Waurika, Comanche, Temple, and Walters, in addition to serving Fort Sill and industries in the project area.
>
> This project has been endorsed by both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy, has the consent of all of Oklahoma's neighboring States, and has the endorsement of the present Republican Governor and the former Democratic Governor, my colleague Senator EDMONDSON.
>
> It has been recommended by both the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. Three times it has passed the Senate after being reported favorably by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on one occasion and the Public Works Committee on two other occasions.
>
> I hope the House of Representatives will see fit to take favorable action on this project without further delay.

Mr. President, I hope we can finalize action on this important bill without further delay. I congratulate the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the chairman, as well as the members of the committee for their patience, determination, and wisdom.

AMENDMENT TO BUY-AMERICAN ACT

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. **SCOTT**. Mr. President, there are inadequacies in the present Buy-American Act and in the regulations issued pursuant thereto from time to time. At the conclusion of these remarks I shall offer an amendment pertaining to my purpose, which is to liberalize the Buy-American Act to provide employment for more Americans, including people in the Commonwealth I represent, as well as in many other States, and to meet the severe thrust of increased foreign competition which, in particular, in such industries as the manufacture of steel and other metals and accessories relating thereto, has caused a considerable falling away in employment from time to time.

The Buy-American Act, as covered by Public Law 428, 72d Congress, approved March 3, 1933, afforded a monetary protection by all Government agencies of 25 percent. This protection was maintained until December 17, 1954, when President Eisenhower issued an Executive order which reduced the buy-American protection from 25 to 6 percent.

The 6-percent protection mentioned above was maintained in all Government agencies until July of 1962, at which time the Secretary of Defense directed all procurement under his jurisdiction to give a 50-percent monetary protection pending the result of a study then underway by the Bureau of the Budget, which was to be made to the President by September

30, 1962. This action—which I heartily commend—was taken on the part of the Secretary of Defense and was based on the national interest clause as covered by the Executive order of December 17, 1954. As of today, the results of the study being made by the Bureau of the Budget have not been forthcoming.

During all the months that have since passed, I have vainly sought explanations from the Bureau of the Budget as to why we cannot have this essential and important report. Last January I was told that the report would be made shortly. The Bureau of the Budget had already then had since September 30, 1962, in which to make the report.

Thus, today, when the outflow of gold is of great concern to the administration, inconsistency prevails in that the Defense Department affords a 50-percent monetary protection to domestic concerns under a highly temporary and tentative provision; whereas, all other Government agencies are giving only 6-percent differential monetary protection as directed by the Executive order of December 17, 1954.

There is not only a lack of uniformity in the procedures of the Department in dealing with Government contracts, but also there is a disparity of as great as 6 percent in most instances, and 50 percent in the instance of the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget has set what I believe to be a commendable standard in that respect; yet that standard is one to which industry and labor cannot repair with safety because of its tentative character and because we are waiting for the mysterious and long-delayed report from the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. President, my amendment is a buy-American amendment.

It puts into legislative language what is now an informal procurement policy as followed by the Defense Department. It would require similar policies to be pursued by other Departments of Government.

Let us first look at the history of legislation to encourage the Government to purchase products from American suppliers.

The Buy-American Act, signed into law in 1933, requires that the Government purchase only domestic goods or materials. It leaves to the President discretion to permit exceptions when domestic purchases are deemed: "inconsistent with the public interest or the cost unreasonable."

A Treasury directive in 1934 established the general rule that the cost should be considered unreasonable only when the price of the domestic article exceeded the price of the foreign article by more than 25 percent.

In 1954 an Executive order was issued—and is still in force—providing that foreign bids must be accepted when the lowest domestic bid is at least 6 percent higher. This becomes 12 percent if the American company is in a labor surplus area.

The 1954 order, however, permits a Government department head to award contracts to domestic firms, no matter how low foreign bids may be, if he believes such action to be in the national interest.

On June 27, 1962, I appealed to the late President Kennedy to intervene in the award to foreign producers of about 2,000 tons of carbon steel plate—which I believe turned out to be 2,400 tons—to be purchased by the Navy to construct three guided missile frigates.

On July 7, 1962, an official of the Defense Department, writing at the direction of the White House, said:

> I am happy to inform you that instructions have been issued to make this award to the lowest bidders offering domestic steel for reasons of the national interest, in accordance with the provisions of section 3a of Executive Order 10582.

This Executive order made possible the employment of a number of Americans who otherwise would not have been employed, had it not been for compliance by the late President with my request in this connection.

Since that time the Defense Department has followed the new policy, but only on an informal "case-by-case" basis, of giving American companies a 50-percent cost advantage in their bids against foreign companies.

Subsequently it was learned that the Budget Bureau had undertaken a study of procurement practices with an eye toward recommending a new buy-American policy for the whole Government.

On August 23, 1962, I submitted to the Director of the Budget recommendations that there be a new Presidential Executive order.

This order would provide that all purchases of $10,000 and less, and all purchases above that figure, where the domestic cost over the foreign cost is 50 percent or less, should be made from domestic sources. All cases where the domestic cost is more than 50 percent larger than the foreign cost should be referred to the head of the procurement agency. For an end product to be considered of American origin, 80 percent of its components should be of such origin.

As recently as last August I was informed by the Budget Bureau that its study of procurement practices was still underway.

Meanwhile, other departments of the U.S. Government continue to buy foreign products, observing only the 6 and 12 percent provisions of the buy-American Executive order and refusing to exercise its option—as was done by the Defense Department—to give higher percentage advantages to American suppliers.

This is particularly germane to the bill before the Senate today since appropriations authorized in this bill will be administered by the Department of the Interior which is second only to the Defense Department in the amount of goods and services it buys for the Government.

In recent years a larger and larger proportion of the contracts let by the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation has been awarded to foreign manufacturers.

During 1962 the Bureau of Reclamation placed all of its contracts for hydraulic turbines with two foreign manufacturers. These orders accounted for 89.5 percent of the Federal Government's purchases of those products for the year.

Early this year the Bureau of Reclamation awarded to a foreign bidder the contract for pumps at the mile 18 pump plant near Los Banos, Calif. The low American bid for that project was only 13 percent higher than the foreign bid.

Of course, Mr. President, that would have employed American workmen; increased American corporate profits, of which the Federal Government would have taken 52 percent; and would have improved the gross national product situation, in addition, to a minor degree.

At almost the same time the Defense Department awarded a contract for hydraulic turbines for the Corps of Engineers' Green Peter project to an American company which bid 37 percent higher than the low foreign bid.

Mr. President, the Defense Department is acting very much in the national interest in this matter and my amendment would translate this policy into law for all Government departments to observe.

Today the U.S. Government purchases goods and services that represent about 10 percent of our gross national product. I would like to see those dollars go to work for our economy.

Many of our plants are operating well below capacity. Many of our people are walking the streets looking for work which our economy should be dynamic enough to provide.

Each time a Government contract is awarded to a foreign company, it contributes to the very dangerous flow of gold out of the United States and aggravates our imbalance of payments.

Moreover these bids by foreign producers are very deceptive. They are often based upon labor wages far below our own. It has been estimated that every ton of steel purchased from foreign sources with U.S. Government funds means up to 2 days less work for an American steelworker.

When we look at the lower bid offered by foreign producers we often overlook the substantial loss of tax revenue to the Government by this contract going abroad. An authoritative study on this subject made some years ago by the National Industrial Conference Board, showed that for each dollar in the sale of a ton of steel, 30 cents eventually went to Federal, State, and local taxing bodies through corporate, personal, property, and sales taxes.

I hope that the amendment will be adopted. I should like to see it at this place and in this form. If it is not to be so, I would of course plan to introduce legislation to this effect at a later date.

Mr. President, I offer my amendment, to insert a new section at the end of the bill, and I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert a new section as follows:

> SEC. 2. In the administration of title III of the Act of March 3, 1933 (known as the Buy American Act; 41 U.S.C. secs. 10a–10d)—

(1) the cost of any article mined, produced, or manufactured in the United States and costing $10,000 or more shall not be considered to be unreasonable unless such cost is at least 50 per centum greater than the cost of such article if acquired outside the United States;

(2) an article shall be considered of United States origin only if at least 80 per centum of its component parts originated in the United States; and

(3) in any case where an article costing $10,000, or more, which was mined, produced, or manufactured outside the United States, is acquired in accordance with any provision of such Act, a report containing the reasons for such acquisition shall be printed in the Federal Register.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President——

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the Senator from Ohio. Is the Senator seeking an opportunity to ask a question?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I would like to say a word or two.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a moment?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. McNAMARA. I wish to advise the Senator from Pennsylvania that even though his amendment is an important amendment, at the appropriate time, since it is obviously in violation of the unanimous-consent agreement, I shall be forced to raise a point of order. I do not wish to do so at this time, or to any manner indicate I am trying to cut off the Senator, because that is not my purpose.

Mr. SCOTT. I understand the Senator's position.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish at least that the reasons for the point of order may be assigned at this time.

Mr. McNAMARA. The amendment is in violation of the unanimous-consent agreement under which we are operating, under controlled time. It is not germane to the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It does not have to be germane.

Mr. McNAMARA. According to the unanimous-consent agreement, it does have to be germane.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thought an exception had been made on the germaneness clause of this particular bill.

Mr. McNAMARA. Apparently, as it is printed, it is included.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will not quarrel with the Senator.

Mr. McNAMARA. I hope not. I am not looking for any trouble.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not quarrel with the Senator's statement.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Illinois has said. I was informed that the germaneness clause had not been inserted in the unanimous-consent agreement. If it has not, I wish to proceed to a vote. If it has, I shall have to abide by the statement of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to have an informal ruling by the Presiding Officer, without foreclosing the matter at this time, as to the reasons why the amendment would not be germane to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois make a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that there is a germaneness provision in the unanimous-consent agreement, and that the substance of the amendment as offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania is not germane to any provision in the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I make the point that, after all, we are dealing with some projects which will use machinery, equipment, facilities, goods, commodities, and other things; and the amendment relates basically to the procurement and acquisition of facilities and equipment which would be incorporated into the projects and finally expressed in action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment, as presented, is not germane to any provision of the bill, and therefore would be subject to a point of order. The Chair would sustain the point of order, if made.

Mr. DIRKSEN. A further inquiry which the Presiding Officer may or may not wish to answer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would an amendment dealing with the bill alone, having no relatoinship to the "buy American" statute but dealing only with facilities and equipment which might be incorporated into the projects authorized by this bill, be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that an amendment of that nature would be introducing new material into the bill, not related to any provision in the bill. This would be so even though the amendment were confined to the bill.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, at this time I withdraw the amendment I have offered and I offer a new amendment which, before I send it to the desk, I will read so that we may be prepared to obtain a ruling on it:

None of the funds authorized by this Act or appropriated pursuant thereto shall be used for the purchase of any goods, commodities, machinery, equipment or facilities of foreign origin or foreign production if the price of a comparable domestic product made in the United States, whether done by negotiation or competitive bid or whether purchased directly or indirectly, does not exceed by 50 per centum the price offered by a foreign producer or any agent acting in his behalf or by any contractor.

Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert:

None of the funds authorized by this Act or appropriated pursuant thereto shall be used for the purchase of any goods, commodities, machinery, equipment or facilities of foreign origin or foreign production if the price of a comparable domestic product made in the United States, whether done by negotiation or competitive bid or whether purchased directly or indirectly, does not exceed by 50 per centum the price offered by a foreign producer or any agent acting in his behalf or by any contractor.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. Is this not the present law under the Buy-American Act?

Mr. SCOTT. No; it is not my understanding of the present law, because the present law provides—I am paraphrasing, but it states this in effect—that where the national interest is involved, and the finding is so made, there may be an order setting aside a foreign bid where it is not more than 50 percent greater than an American bid. This proposal would write it into the law as a matter of fact, rather than have it made a finding by the Executive.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have no copy of the Buy-American Act before me. I understand it has been in effect for several years, but it is my recollection that, instead of the 50-percent differential, the differential was and is 25 percent.

Could the Chair in some manner enlighten the Senate on that particular point?

Mr. SCOTT. The Buy-American Act has been subject to various amendments since 1934. In 1954 the differential was reduced to 6 percent, and at a later date there was a change to a 12-percent differential if the bid was from a labor surplus area. But there is a provision in the act, as I recall—and I trust I am not erroneously stating this—that a differential up to 50 percent may be used and adverted to by a Government agency where there is a finding that it is in the national interest.

The only department which I know of that has done it is the Defense Department, which has acted, apparently, by a rule of thumb on a case-by-case basis.

In further explanation of the measure, the percentages I have referred to, the 25 percent and the 50 percent, have been set from time to time by Executive order. I was pointing out the fact that the Department of Defense, by regulation and interpretation of the statute, has used the 50-percent figure, although it does not appear in the statute.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, in view of the new amendment which has been offered, which changes slightly the amendment previously offered——

Mr. SCOTT. It is considerably changed.

Mr. McNAMARA. As spokesman for the Public Works Subcommittee, I am glad to accept the amendment and take it to conference and see if it can be handled. It is a worthy amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Senator for his kindness and for accepting the amendment. I hope it can be kept in the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I express the hope that the Senator from Pennsylvania, in view of the circumstances covering this matter, about which we had no notice, through no fault of his, will allow us leeway so we may study the law and make sure of what we are doing, and not run afoul of the law as it now exists, because of the chairman's acceptance of this proposal and taking it to conference.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, we have been sitting for weeks listening to witness after witness before the Finance Committee, talking about tax reduction and structural reform, for the purpose of achieving one major objective, and that is to make a deeper dent in the unemployment problem of the country.

I can understand that when a private enterprise has an opportunity to buy a foreign product for incorporation in its own product, at a price infinitely lower, it must be mindful of the cost of production. One can well understand that fact. But I find it rather difficult to understand why the Government of the United States, through any of its agencies, should bargain abroad, where there is a 15-percent difference in price, to permit the procurement of a basic commodity from abroad.

Recently a contract was let to obtain 17,000 tons of steel from Japan. The reason for it was a price differential of 15½ percent. When we stop to interpret this procedure in terms of jobs, and realize that people who have jobs pay income taxes, and the effect on revenues, it will be seen that it would have been as beneficial if the contract had stayed in this country. At least we would be making a little progress in the solution of one of the most difficult and obdurate problems that is before us.

Scarcely 1 witness out of the some 90 or 100 who appeared before the Finance Committee stated that the tax reduction and structural reform program was not designed to alleviate the unemployment problem. How does the U.S. Government, through its agencies, justify this kind of action, which is defeating the very objective that we seek to encompass as a result of the tax bill?

Perhaps this proposal requires refinement, but I believe it must be pinpointed. I am grateful to the chairman of the subcommittee for taking the amendment to conference so that the conferees can examine into it. Perhaps the language needs refinement. We must make progress in this problem. The previous administration reduced the differential to 6½ percent.

Knowing what labor costs are in this country as compared to those abroad, there is a need for our people to meet that kind of price on Government projects. It seems to me it is our first duty to look after our own industries and to see what we can do about our own jobless.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I express again my appreciation to the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished Senator from Michigan, who has the bill in hand, for their kindness and generosity in recognizing the situation and the merits of this amendment. I point out that what I have said is in condemnation of what is now being done by the Department of Defense, which is the largest single contractor. I point out that there exists a willful lack of uniformity and that since September 1962, all of labor and industry have been waiting for the Bureau of the Budget to simply write a report showing whether the Defense Department is doing the right thing.

I agree with the distinguished Senator from Illinois that perhaps the language needs refinement, since I have offered the amendment in the form of a substitution for an earlier amendment. I hope the language can be carefully considered, so that the Government may have some guidelines, and so those who bid may know whether or not they have some chance of providing employment for American workmen.

I know of specific instances of steel mills being built overseas because it was the only way that the companies could stay in competition. As a result, Asians and Europeans are hired to do work which could be done in this country if we had a clarification of the Buy-American Act.

I again thank the Senators.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to subscribe to the statements made by the Senators from Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Illinois, with regard to the need for inducing American purchasers to buy American goods.

Within the past 2 months I have received two communications from manufacturers in Ohio, pointing out that they had lost bids to foreign companies. In each of the letters, there was a recitation of the amount of business that was involved and the number of jobs that were lost, and also the amount of the taxes that had been lost to our Government.

Though the bids were stated in dollars, and were seemingly in amounts substantially less than would have been paid if the goods had been bought in our country, the ultimate result was a loss to our Government, instead of a gain. The two contracts of which I speak involved purchases by the U.S. Government of goods produced in foreign countries.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Senator from Ohio. I am very glad to learn that he feels as many of us feel who have spoken on this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators on each side yield back the remainder of their time on the amendment?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McNAMARA. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Senate approval of H.R. 8667, as amended by our Public Works Committee, is a matter of major significance to millions of Americans who reside in our great river basin areas as well as to the entire national economy. It is my hope that after the Senate acts favorably on this measure, the other body will move quickly in granting a conference so that the bill will soon be on the President's desk. The Congress has too long delayed on this important legislation.

To the citizens of our State of West Virginia its significance is heightened by the fact that it will allow progress to continue in the construction of vital navigation locks and dams on the Ohio and Monongahela Rivers. It will also enable us to carry forward with the advance engineering and design activities for several newly authorized flood control projects, and will eliminate the threatened premature termination of construction work on major projects at a time when every effort must be made to maintain employment.

The pending proposal provides for engineering and construction work on four navigation locks and dams on the Ohio River which are listed as joint projects for Ohio and West Virginia—$7 million for the construction of the Belleville locks and dam, $250,000 for planning of the Hannibal locks and dam, $9 million for construction at Pike Island, and $1.5 million for construction of the Racine locks and dam.

In view of the ravages of the floods which struck West Virginia again last winter, it is also gratifying to know that the Corps of Engineers will now be able to proceed with their full capabilities. There are authorizations under this bill of $150,000 for the Justice Reservoir on the Guyandot River in Wyoming County, $280,000 for the East Lynn Reservoir on Twelvepole Creek in Wayne County, $100,000 for the joint West Virginia-Maryland project, the Bloomington Reservoir on the North Branch of the Potomac River, and $73,000 for channel rectification of the Buckhannon River in Upshur County.

One of the most critically important projects which will now be continued under this legislation is the Summersville Reservoir on the Gauley River, for which some $10.9 million will now be released. This amount, which is almost sufficient to complete the work, relieves the contractor from the threat of interruption of funds which has been hanging over this project as well as others during recent weeks.

Finally, we would authorize $5,058,000 for continued construction of the Opekiska locks and dam on the Monongahela River between Morgantown and Fairmont.

All of these, Mr. President, are of far-reaching value to the people of West Virginia, either in terms of flood control or navigation, and it is most gratifying to know that Senate action this afternoon will move them one step further toward realization.

Mr. President, the pending measure is the product of much deliberation by the Public Works Committee. There were at the outset significant differences between the Senate and the other body, and I commend the chairman of our committee [Mr. McNamara] for his diligent efforts to reach a meaningful and effective reconciliation of these differences.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time on the bill.

Mr. COOPER. I yield back the remainder of the time on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired. The question is, Shall the bill pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. PEARSON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is absent due to illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis], the Senators from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper and Mr. Miller], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] is absent because of death in his family.

The pair of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] has been previously announced.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] would both vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 19, as follows:

[No. 260 Leg.]

YEAS—59

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Clark
Cooper
Dodd
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy
Kuchel
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Pell
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Walters
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—19

Allott
Beall
Bennett
Byrd, Va.
Case
Cotton
Dominick
Douglas
Goldwater
Javits
Keating
Lausche
Prouty
Proxmire
Robertson
Saltonstall
Simpson
Tower
Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—22

Bayh
Brewster
Carlson
Church
Curtis
Dirksen
Eastland
Engle
Fulbright
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mechem
Miller
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Sparkman
Williams, N.J.

So the bill (H.R. 8667) was passed.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House bill 8667, with the Senate amendments numbered, be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McNamara, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Cooper, and Mr. Fong the conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1243. An act to change the name of the Andrew Johnson National Monument, to add certain historic property thereto, and for other purposes; and

S. 2139. An act to provide for the disposition of the judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Kootenai Tribe or Band of Indians, Idaho.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 134) to provide that seat belts sold or shipped in interstate commerce for use in motor vehicles shall meet certain safety standards.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6518) to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Harris, Mr. Roberts of Alabama, Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Mr. O'Brien of New York, Mr. Rogers of Florida, Mr. Bennett of Michigan, Mr. Schenck, Mr. Nelsen, and Mr. Brotzman were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8747) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Thomas, Mr. Evins, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Ostertag, and Mr. Jonas were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 10. An act to extend the apportionment requirement in the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, to temporary summer employment, and for other purposes;

H.R. 130. An act to provide for the payment of compensation, including severance damages, for rights-of-way acquired by the United States in connection with reclamation projects the construction of which commenced after January 1, 1961;

H.R. 988. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the Graff House site for inclusion in Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5128. An act to extend the benefits of the civil service retirement and group life and health insurance programs to certain legislative employees, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6199. An act granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact of agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6777. An act to amend section 712 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of premiums for certain veterans holding national service life insurance policies who become or have become totally disabled before their 65th birthday.

H.R. 8462. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain real property of the United States heretofore granted to the city of Grand Prairie, Tex., for public airport purposes, contingent upon approval by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, and to provide for the conveyance of the United States of certain real property now used by such city for public airport purposes;

H.R. 8751. An act to amend the act of March 2, 1931, to provide that certain proceedings of the AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), shall be printed as a House document, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9004. An act to transfer control of Pershing Hall to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in order that such building may be preserved as a memorial to General of the Armies of the United States John J. Pershing while being utilized in the best interests of the United States.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 230. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of 5,000 copies of the study, "Tax-Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Their Impact on Our Economy—Second Installment," for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business;

H. Con. Res. 231. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of 5,000 copies of the study, "Tax-Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Their Impact on Our Economy," for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business; and

H. Con. Res. 237. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of certain opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States in cases involving the offering of prayers and reading from the Bible in public schools.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 10. An act to extend the apportionment requirement in the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, to temporary summer employment, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 5128. An act to extend the benefits of the civil service retirement and group life and health insurance programs to certain legislative employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 130. An act to provide for the payment of compensation, including severance damages, for rights-of-way acquired by the United States in connection with reclamation projects the construction of which commenced after January 1, 1961; and

H.R. 988. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the Graff House site for inclusion in Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6199. An act granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact of agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6777. An act to amend section 712 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of premiums for certain veterans holding national service life insurance policies who become or have become totally disabled before their 65th birthday; and

H.R. 9004. An act to transfer control of Pershing Hall to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in order that such building may be preserved as a memorial to General of the Armies of the United States John J. Pershing while being utilized in the best interests of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 8462. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain real property of the United States heretofore granted to the city of Grand Prairie, Tex., for public airport purposes, contingent upon approval by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, and to provide for the conveyance of the United States of certain real property now used by such city for public airport purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 8751. An act to amend the act of March 2, 1931, to provide that certain proceedings of the AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), shall be printed as a House document, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following concurrent resolutions of the House were severally referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

H. Con. Res. 230. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of 5,000 copies of the study, "Tax-Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Their Impact on Our Economy—Second Installment," for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business:

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives* (*the Senate concurring*), That there shall be printed for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives five thousand copies of the subcommittee chairman's report to Subcommittee Numbered 1 entitled 'Tax-Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Their Impact on Our Economy—Second Installment', dated October 16, 1963."

H. Con. Res. 231. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of 5,000 copies of the study, "Tax-Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Their Impact on Our Economy," for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business:

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives* (*the Senate concurring*), That there shall be printed for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business five thousand copies of the chairman's report to the Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, Eighty-seventh Congress, dated December 31, 1962, entitled 'Tax-Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Their Impact on Our Economy'."

H. Con. Res. 237. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of certain opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States in cases involving the offering of prayers and reading from the Bible in public schools:

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives* (*the Senate concurring*), That (a) there shall be printed thirty-two thousand two hundred and fifty additional copies of the opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States (including concurring and dissenting opinions) in the cases of Engel against Vitale (370 U.S. 421) and Abington School District against Schempp (374 U.S. 203). Such opinions shall be printed together in one publication.

"(b) Of the thirty-two thousand two hundred and fifty copies of such opinions printed pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, ten thousand three hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate and twenty-one thousand nine hundred and fifty copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives."

DEVELOPMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is recognized on the House amendment to the bracero bill, S. 1703, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 648, Senate bill 1111, and that it be made the pending business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1111) to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "Act", to strike out "of 1963"; on page 2, line 14, after the word "limit", to insert "any interstate compact or"; on page 3, at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "and"; in the same line, after the word "and", where it appears the second time, to strike out "Welfare." and insert "Welfare, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission."; on page 4, line 13, after the word "water", to insert "and related land"; in line 14, after the word "projects.", to insert "Such procedures may include provision for Council revision of plans for Federal projects intended to be proposed in any plan or revision thereof being prepared by a river basin planning commission."; on page 5, at the beginning of line 2, to insert "urban,"; on page 6, at the beginning of line 3, to insert "and fix the compensation of"; in line 4, after the word "advisable,", to strike out "including a staff director at civil service grade 18;" and insert "in accordance with the civil service laws and Classification Act of 1949, as amended;"; in line 6, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "(5) place one position, in addition to the staff director, above the level of grade GS–15, subject to the standards and procedures of section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, but in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grades by such section; (6)" and insert "(5)"; in line 13, after the word "individuals;", to strike out "(7)" and insert "(6)"; in line 15, after the word "and", where it appears the first time, to strike out "(8)" and insert "(7)"; on page 7, line 16, after the word "water", to insert "and related land"; on page 8, line 17, after the word "to", to strike out "date" and insert "date, to the extent practicable"; in line 20, after the word "related", to insert "resources: *Provided,* That the plan may include alternatives and it may be prepared in stages, including recommendations with respect to individual projects;"; on page 9, line 16, after the word "States,", to strike out "but a retired commissioned officer of one of the services mentioned in the Career Compensation Act of 1949 may be appointed chairman without prejudice to his retired status and may receive the compensation payable under section 206(c) of this Act in addition to his retired pay: *Provided*, That the combined rate shall not exceed the applicable maximum rate or rates set forth in such section for the chairman;" and insert "except as a retired officer or employee;"; on page 11, line 9, after the word "Council", to strike out "and not less than one-half" and insert "or agreement of a majority"; in line 15, after the word "water", to insert "and related land"; on page 12, line 4, after "(d)", to strike out "At" and insert "In the work of the commission every reasonable endeavor shall be made to arrive at a consensus of all members on all issues; but failing this, full opportunity shall be afforded each member for the presentation and report of individual views: *Provided*, That at"; in line 8, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "such time as voting is considered necessary in conducting the business of a commission the voting shall be only by the chairman, acting in behalf of the Federal members, and by the vice chairman, upon instruction from the State members" and insert "any time the Commission fails to act by reason of absence of consensus, the position of the Chairman, acting in behalf of the Federal members, and the Vice Chairman, acting upon instructions of the State members, shall be recorded"; in line 18, after "Sec. 204.", to strike out "(a)"; on page 13, line 10, after the word "plan", to strike out "and" and insert "or"; in line 11, after the word "major", to insert "portion or"; in line 15, after the word "major", to insert "portion or"; in line 21, after the word "the", to strike out "plan" and insert "plan, portion"; on page 14, line 5, after the word "proposed", to strike out "plan" and insert "plan, portion"; in line 7, after the word "the", to strike out "plan" and insert "plan, portion"; in line 13, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to strike out "plan" and insert "plan, portion"; on page 18, line 25, after "(c)", to strike out:

The commission shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements. The receipts and disbursements shall be audited by a qualified public accountant who, where practicable, shall be licensed or certified by a regulatory body of a State, and the report of the audit shall be included in and become a part of the annual report of the commission.

And insert:

The commission shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements. The accounts shall be audited at least annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by independent certified or licensed public accountants, certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State, and the report of the audit shall be included in and become a part of the annual report of the commission.

On page 19, line 13, after "(d)", to strike out "The accounts of the commission shall be open at any reasonable time for inspection by such agency, representatives of the jurisdictions which appropriate funds to the commission." and insert "The accounts of the commission shall be open at all reasonable times for inspection by representatives of the jurisdictions and agencies which make appropriations, donations, or grants to the commission."; in line 23, after "Sec. 301.", to insert "(a)"; in line 24, after the word "States", to strike out "if the planning and other activities authorized by this Act are" and insert "in water and related land resources planning"; on page 20, line 5, after the word "developing", to insert "and participating in the development of"; in line 6, after the word "water", to insert "and related land"; in line 7, after the word "resources", to strike out "plans and in participating in the development of the comprehensive water resources plans authorized in title II of this Act" and insert "plans"; after line 9, to insert:

(b) The Council with the approval of the President, shall prescribe such rules, establish such procedures, and make such arrangements and provisions relating to the performance of its functions under this title, and the use of funds available therefor, as may be necessary in order to assure (1) coordination of the program authorized by this title with related Federal planning assistance programs, including the program authorized under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 and (2) appropriate utilization of other Federal agencies administering programs which may contribute to achieving the purpose of this Act.

On page 21, line 1, after the word "water", to insert "and related land"; in line 18, after the word "water", to insert "and related land"; in line 25, after the word "water", to insert "and related land"; on page 22, line 1, after the word "all", to strike out "Federal and" and insert "Federal,"; in line 2, after the word "State,", to insert "and local"; in line 3, after the word "in", to strike out "such" and insert "affected"; after line 3, to insert:

(2) Provides, where comprehensive statewide development planning is being carried on with or without assistance under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, for full coordination between comprehensive water resources planning and other statewide planning programs and for assurances that such water resources planning will be in conformity with the general development policy in such State;

At the beginning of line 12, to strike out "(2)" and insert "(3)"; at the beginning of line 15, to strike out "(3)" and insert "(4)"; at the beginning of line 19, to strike out "(4)" and insert "(5)"; at the beginning of line 22, to strike out "(5)" and insert "(6)"; and at the beginning of line 24, to insert "for keeping appropriate accountability of the funds and"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

Section 1. This Act may be cited as the "Water Resources Planning Act".

STATEMENT OF POLICY

Sec. 2. In order to meet the rapidly expanding demands for water throughout the Nation, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the conservation, development, and utilization of the water and related land resources of the United States shall be planned on a comprehensive and coordinated basis with the cooperation of all affected Federal agencies, States, local governments, and others concerned.

EFFECT ON EXISTING LAWS

Sec. 3. Nothing in this Act shall be construed—

(a) to expand or diminish either Federal or State jurisdiction, responsibility, or rights in the field of water resources planning, development, or control; nor to displace, supersede, or limit any interstate compact or the jurisdiction or responsibility of any legally established joint or common agency of two or more States, or of two or more States and the Federal Government; nor to limit the authority of Congress to authorize and fund projects; nor to limit the use of other mechanisms, if preferred by the participating governmental units, in the water resources field;

(b) as superseding, modifying, or repealing existing laws applicable to the various Federal agencies which are authorized to develop or participate in the development of water and related land resources, or to exercise licensing or regulatory functions in relation thereto; nor to affect the jurisdiction, powers, or prerogatives of the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada, or of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico.

TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL

Sec. 101. There is hereby established a Water Resources Council (hereinafter referred to as the "Council") which shall be composed of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. The Chairman of the Council shall request the heads of other agencies to participate with the Council when matters affecting their responsibilities are considered by the Council. The Chairman of the Council shall be designated by the President.

Sec. 102. The Council shall—

(a) maintain a continuing study and prepare a biennial assessment of the adequacy of supplies of water necessary to meet the water requirements in each water resource region in the United States and the national interest therein; and

(b) maintain a continuing study of the relation of regional or river basin plans and programs to the requirements of larger regions of the Nation, and of the adequacy of administrative and statutory means for the coordination of the water and related land resources policies and programs of the several Federal agencies; it shall appraise the adequacy of existing and proposed policies and programs to meet such requirements; and it shall make recommendations to the President with respect to Federal policies and programs.

Sec. 103. The Council shall establish, with the approval of the President, principles, standards, and procedures for Federal participants in the preparation of comprehensive regional or river basin plans and for the formulation and evaluation of Federal water and related land resources projects. Such procedures may include provision for Council revision of plans for Federal projects intended to be proposed in any plan or revision thereof being prepared by a river basin planning commission.

Sec. 104. Upon receipt of a plan or revision thereof from any river basin commission under the provisions of section 204(a)(3) of this Act, the Council shall review the plan or revision with special regard to—

(1) the efficacy of such plan or revision in achieving optimum use of the water and related land resources in the area involved;

(2) the effect of the plan on the achievement of other programs for the development of agricultural, urban, energy, industrial, recreational, fish and wildlife, and other resources of the entire Nation; and

(3) the contributions which such plan or revision will make in obtaining the Nation's economic and social goals.

Based on such review the Council shall—

(a) recommend such modifications in such plan or revision as it deems desirable in the national interest; and

(b) transmit such plan or revision, including its recommendations and the views, comments, and recommendations with respect to such plan or revision submitted by any Federal agency, Governor, interstate commission, or United States section of an international commission, to the President for his review and transmittal to the Congress with his recommendations in regard to authorization of Federal projects.

SEC. 105. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Council may: (1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and print or otherwise reproduce and distribute so much of its proceedings and reports thereon as it may deem advisable; (2) acquire, furnish, and equip such office space as is necessary; (3) use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States; (4) employ and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, in accordance with the civil service laws and Classification Act of 1949, as amended; (5) procure services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals; (6) purchase, hire, operate, and maintain passenger motor vehicles; and (7) incur such necessary expenses and exercise such other powers as are consistent with and reasonably required to perform its functions under this Act.

(b) Any member of the Council is authorized to administer oaths when it is determined by the Council that testimony shall be taken or evidence received under oath.

(c) To the extent permitted by law, all appropriate records and papers of the Council may be made available for public inspection during ordinary office hours.

(d) Upon request of the Council, the head of any Federal department or agency is authorized (1) to furnish to the Council such information as may be necessary for carrying out its functions and as may be available to or procurable by such department or agency, and (2) to detail to temporary duty with such Council on a reimbursable basis such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as it may need or believe to be useful for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status.

(e) The Council shall be responsible for (1) the appointment and supervision of personnel, (2) the assignment of duties and responsibilities among such personnel, and (3) the use and expenditures of funds.

TITLE II—RIVER BASIN COMMISSIONS

Creation of commissions

SEC. 201. (a) The President is authorized to declare the establishment of a river basin water and related land resources commission upon request therefor by the Council, or request addressed to the Council by a State within which all or part of the basin or basins concerned are located if the request by the Council or by a State (1) defines the region, river basin, or group of related river basins for which a commission is requested, (2) is made in writing by the Governor or in such manner as State law may provide, or by the Council, and (3) is concurred in by the Council and by not less than one-half of the States within which portions of the basin or basins concerned are located. Such concurrences shall be in writing. Whenever, within a reasonable time, sufficient concurrences by States are not obtained to effectuate a request of the Council that a commission be established, the Council may find that the national interest requires coordinated and comprehensive planning in the region, river basin, or group of river basins with respect to which it has made a request and shall, in the event of such finding, recommend to the President an alternative means of accomplishing such planning.

(b) Each such commission for a region, river basin, or group of river basins shall—

(1) serve as the principal agency for the coordination of Federal, State, interstate, and local plans for the development of water and related land resources in its region, river basin, or group of river basins;

(2) prepare and keep up to date, to the extent practicable a comprehensive, coordinated, joint plan for Federal, State, interstate, and local development of water and related resources: *Provided*, That the plan may include alternatives and it may be prepared in stages, including recommendations with respect to individual projects;

(3) recommend long-range schedules of priorities for the collection and analysis of basic data and for investigation, planning, and construction of projects; and

(4) foster and undertake such studies of water and related land resources problems in its region, river basin, or group of river basins as are necessary in the preparation of the plan described in clause (2) of this subsection.

Membership of commissions

SEC. 202. Each river basin commission shall be composed of members appointed as follows:

(a) A chairman appointed by the President who shall also serve as chairman and coordinating officer of the Federal members of the commission and who shall represent the Federal Government in Federal-State relations on the commission and who shall not, during the period of his service on the commission, hold any other position as an officer or employee of the United States, except as a retired officer or employee;

(b) One member from each Federal department or independent agency determined by the President to have a substantial interest in the work to be undertaken by the commission, such member to be appointed by the head of such department or independent agency and to serve as the representative of such department or independent agency;

(c) One member from each State which lies wholly or partially within the region, river basin, or group of river basins for which the commission is established, and the appointment of each such member shall be made in accordance with the laws of the State which he represents. In the absence of governing provisions of State law, such State members shall be appointed and serve at the pleasure of the Governor;

(d) One member appointed by any interstate agency created by an interstate compact to which the consent of Congress has been given, and whose jurisdiction extends to the waters of the region, river basin, or group of river basins for which the river basin commission is created;

(e) When deemed appropriate by the President, one member, who shall be appointed by the President, from the United States section of any international commission created by a treaty to which the consent of the Senate has been given, and whose jurisdiction extends to the waters of the region, river basin, or group of river basins for which the river basin commission is established.

Organization of commissions

SEC. 203. (a) Each river basin commission shall organize for the performance of its functions within ninety days after the President shall have declared the establishment of such commission, subject to the availability of funds for carrying on its work. A commission shall terminate upon agreement of the Council or agreement of a majority of the States composing the commission. Upon such termination, all property, assets, and records of the commission shall thereafter be turned over to such agencies of the United States and the participating States as shall be appropriate in the circumstances: *Provided*, That sudies, data, and other materials useful in water and related land resource planning to any of the participants shall be kept freely available to all such participants.

(b) State members of each commission shall elect a vice chairman, who shall serve also as chairman and coordinating officer of the State members of the commission and who shall represent the State governments in Federal-State relations on the commission.

(c) Vacancies in a commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointments were made: *Provided*, That the chairman and vice chairman may designate alternates to act for them during temporary absences.

(d) In the work of the commission every reasonable endeavor shall be made to arrive at a consensus of all members on all issues; but failing this, full opportunity shall be afforded each member for the presentation and report of individual views: *Provided*, That at any time the Commission fails to act by reason of absence of consensus, the position of the Chairman, acting in behalf of the Federal members, and the Vice Chairman, acting upon instructions of the State members, shall be recorded.

Duties of the commissions

SEC. 204. Each river basin commission shall—

(1) engage in such activities and make such studies and investigations as are necessary and desirable in carrying out the policy set forth in section 2 of this Act and in accomplishing the purposes set forth in section 201(b) of this Act;

(2) submit to the Council and the Governor of each participating State a report on its work at least once each year. Such report shall be transmitted through the President to the Congress. After such transmission, copies of any such report shall be sent to the heads of such Federal, State, interstate, and international agencies as the President or the Governors of the participating States may direct;

(3) submit to the Council for transmission to the President and by him to the Congress, and the Governors and the legislatures of the participating States a comprehensive, coordinated, joint plan, or any major portion or necessary revisions thereof, for water and related land resources development in the region, river basin, or group of river basins for which such commission was established. Before the commission submits such a plan or major portion or revision to the Council, it shall transmit the proposed plan or revision to the head of each Federal department or agency, the Governor of each State, and each interstate agency, from which a member of the commission has been appointed, and to the head of the United States section of any international commission if the plan, portion, or revision deals with a boundary water or a river crossing a boundary, or any tributary flowing into such boundary water or river, over which the international commission has jurisdiction or for which it has responsibility. Each such department and agency head, Governor, interstate agency, and United States section of an international commission shall have ninety days from the date of the receipt of the proposed plan, portion, or revision to report its views, comments, and recommendations to the commission. The commission may modify the plan, portion, or revision after considering the reports so submitted. The views, comments, and recommendations

submitted by each Federal department or agency head, Governor, interstate agency, and United States section of an international commission shall be transmitted to the Council with the plan, portion, or revision; and

(4) submit to the Council at the time of submitting such plan, any recommendations it may have for continuing the functions of the commission and for implementing the plan, including means of keeping the plan up to date.

Powers and administrative provisions of the commissions

SEC. 205. (a) **For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, each river basin commission may—**

(1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and print or otherwise reproduce and distribute so much of its proceedings and reports thereon as it may deem advisable;

(2) acquire, furnish, and equip such office space as is necessary;

(3) use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as departments and agencies of the United States;

(4) employ and compensate such personnel as it deems advisable, including consultants at rates not to exceed $100 per diem;

(5) arrange for the services of personnel from any State or the United States, or any subdivision or agency thereof, or any intergovernmental agency;

(6) make arrangements, including contracts, with any participating government for inclusion in a suitable retirement and employee benefit system of such of its personnel as may not be eligible for or continuing in another governmental retirement or employee benefit system, or otherwise provide for such coverage of its personnel;

(7) purchase, hire, operate, and maintain passenger motor vehicles; and

(8) incur such necessary expenses and exercise such other powers as are consistent with and reasonably required to perform its functions under this Act.

(b) The chairman of a river basin commission, or any member of such commission designated by the chairman thereof for the purpose, is authorized to administer oaths when it is determined by the commission that testimony shall be taken or evidence received under oath.

(c) To the extent permitted by law, all appropriate records and papers of each river basin commission shall be made available for public inspection during ordinary office hours.

(d) Upon request of the chairman of any river basin commission, or any member or employee of such commission designated by the chairman thereof for the purpose, the head of any Federal department or agency is authorized (1) to furnish to such commission such information as may be necessary for carrying out its functions and as may be available to or procurable by such department or agency, and (2) to detail to temporary duty with such commission on a reimbursable basis such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as it may need or believe to be useful for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status.

(e) The chairman of each river basin commission shall be responsible for (1) the appointment and supervision of personnel employed by such commission, (2) the assignment of duties and responsibilities among such personnel, and (3) the use and expenditures of funds available to such commission. In carrying out the provisions of this subsection, the chairman shall be governed by the general policies of such commission with respect to the work to be accomplished by it, and the timing thereof.

Compensation of commission members

SEC. 206. (a) Any member of a river basin commission appointed pursuant to section 202 (b) and (e) of this Act, shall receive no additional compensation by virtue of his membership on the commission, but shall continue to receive, from appropriations made for the agency from which he is appointed, the salary of his regular position when engaged in the performance of the duties vested in the commission.

(b) Members of a commission, appointed pursuant to section 202 (c) and (d) of this Act, shall each receive such compensation as may be provided by the States or the interstate agency respectively, which they represent.

(c) The per annum compensation of the chairman of each river basin commission shall be determined by the President, but when employed on a full-time annual basis shall not exceed the maximum scheduled rate for grade GS-18 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; or when engaged in the performance of the commission's duties on an intermittent basis such compensation shall be not more than $100 per day and shall not exceed $12,000 in any year.

SEC. 207. (a) Each commission shall determine the proportionate share of its expense which shall be borne by the Federal Government and each of the States. Each commission shall prepare a budget annually and transmit it to the Council and the States. Estimates of proposed appropriations from the Federal Government shall be included in the budget estimates submitted by the Council under the Budgeting and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended, and may include an amount for advance to a commission against State appropriations for which delay is anticipated by reason of later legislative sessions. All sums appropriated to or otherwise received by a commission shall be credited to the commission's account in the Treasury of the United States.

(b) A commission may accept for any of its purposes and functions appropriations, donations, and grants of money, equipment, supplies, materials, and services from any State or the United States or any subdivision or agency thereof, or intergovernmental agency, and may receive, utilize, and dispose of the same.

(c) The commission shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements. The accounts shall be audited at least annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by independent certified or licensed public accountants, certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State, and the report of the audit shall be included in and become a part of the annual report of the commission.

(d) The accounts of the commission shall be open at all reasonable times for inspection by representatives of the jurisdictions and agencies which make appropriations, donations, or grants to the commission.

TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES FOR COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING GRANT AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 301. (a) In recognition of the need for increased participation by the States in water and related land resources planning to be effective, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Council for the next fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and for the nine succeeding fiscal years thereafter, $5,000,000 in each such year for grants to States to assist them in developing and participating in the development of comprehensive water and related land resources plans.

(b) The Council with the approval of the President, shall prescribe such rules, establish such procedures, and make such arrangements and provisions relating to the performance of its functions under this title, and the use of funds available therefor, as may be necessary in order to assure (1) coordination of the program authorized by this title with related Federal planning assistance programs, including the program authorized under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 and (2) appropriate utilization of other Federal agencies administering programs which may contribute to achieving the purpose of this Act.

ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 302. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 301 for any fiscal year the Council shall from time to time make allotments to the States, in accordance with its regulations on the basis of (1) the population, (2) the land area, (3) the need for comprehensive water and related land resources planning programs, and (4) the financial need of the respective States. For the purposes of this section the population of the States shall be determined on the basis of the latest estimates available from the Department of Commerce and the land area of the States shall be determined on the basis of the official records of the United States Geological Survey.

(b) From each State's allotment under this section for any fiscal year the Council shall pay to such State an amount equal to its Federal share (as determined under section 305) of the cost of carrying out its State program approved under section 303, including the cost of training personnel for carrying out such program and the cost of administering such program.

State programs

SEC. 303. The Council shall approve any program for comprehensive water and related land resources planning which is substituted by a State, if such program—

(1) provides for comprehensive planning with respect to intrastate or interstate water resources or both in such State to meet the needs for water and water related activities taking into account prospective demands for all purposes served through or affected by water and related land resources development, with adequate provision for coordination with all Federal, State, and local agencies having responsibilities in affected fields;

(2) provides, where comprehensive statewide development planning is being carried on with or without assistance under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, for full coordination between comprehensive water resources planning and other statewide planning programs and for assurances that such water resources planning will be in conformity with the general development policy in such State;

(3) designates a State agency (hereinafter referred to as the "State agency") to administer the program;

(4) provides that the State agency will make such reports in such form and containing such information as the Council from time to time reasonably requires to carry out its functions under this title;

(5) sets forth the procedure to be followed in carrying out the State program and in administering such program; and

(6) provides such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for keeping appropriate accountability of the funds and for the proper and efficient administration of the program.

The Council shall not disapprove any program without first giving reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering such program.

Review

SEC. 304. Whenever the Council after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a State agency finds that—

(a) the program submitted by such State and approved under section 303 has been so changed that it no longer complies with a requirement of such section; or

(b) in the administration of the program there is a failure to comply substantially with such a requirement, the Council shall notify such agency that no further payments will be made to the State under this title until it is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure. Until the Council is so satisfied, it shall make no further payments to such State under this title.

Federal share

SEC. 305. (a) The Federal share for any State shall be 100 per centum of the cost of carrying out its approved program less that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the entire United States, except that (1) the Federal share shall in no case be more than 66⅔ per centum or less than 33⅓ per centum, and (2) the Federal share for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands shall be 66⅔ per centum: *Provided*, That in no event shall the Federal share exceed a State's allotment under section 302.

(2) The Federal shares shall be promulgated by the Council on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the entire United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. The first such promulgation shall be conclusive for the first fiscal year for which payments are made under the provisions of this title and the succeeding fiscal year, and a promulgation shall thereafter be made for each succeeding two years and shall be conclusive for such years.

Payments

SEC. 306. The method of computing and paying amounts pursuant to this title shall be as follows:

(1) The Council shall, prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter or other period prescribed by it, estimate the amount to be paid to each State under the provisions of this title for such period, such estimate be based on such records of the State and information furnished by it, and such other investigation, as the Council may find necessary.

(2) The Council shall pay to the State, from the allotment available therefor, the amount so estimated by it for any period, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this paragraph) by which it finds that its estimate of the amount to be paid such State for any prior period under this title was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to such State for such prior period under this title. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Treasury Department, in such installments as the Council may determine.

Definition

SEC. 307. For the purpose of this title the term "State" means a State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 401. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of title I and II and the administration of title III.

Rules and regulations

SEC. 402. The Council is authorized to make such rules and regulations as it may deem necessary or appropriate for carrying out those provisions of this Act which are administered by it.

Delegation of functions

SEC. 403. The Council is authorized to delegate to any member or employee of the Council its administrative functions under section 105 and the detailed administration of the grant program under title III.

Utilization of personnel

SEC. 404. The Council may, with the consent of the head of any other department or agency of the United States, utilize such officers and employees of such agency as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Employee benefits

SEC. 405. The Civil Service Commission of the United States is authorized to contract with any commission established under section 201 of this Act for coverage of the river basin commission's employees in the employee benefit programs of the Federal Government, as provided in section 205(a)(6) of this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, I wish to state that this bill has been made the pending business, but no action on it will be taken this afternoon.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE V OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED—HOUSE AMENDMENT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1703.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1703) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 510 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking "December 31, 1963" and inserting "December 31, 1964".

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana [putting the question].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana will yield, and if it is agreed that in doing so he will not lose his right to the floor, I wish to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JAVITS. First, Mr. President, I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. First, Mr. President, will the Chair restate the motion which has been made by the Senator from Louisiana?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the Senator from Louisiana has moved that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to Senate bill 1703.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, under the rules, is it in order to move, as a substitute, that the House amendment be referred to a committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That would be in order, under rule XXII, which sets forth the various motions available to the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. Then, Mr. President, with the permission of the majority leader, and if the Senator from Louisiana will permit, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well; but I point out that I still have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a moment ago I moved that the Senate concur in the House amendment to 1703.

When the bill was sent to the Senate by the House a few weeks ago I consulted with a number of Senators, and particularly with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY]. It was agreed that it would be useless to send the bill to conference, because we could debate the issue involved by making a motion to concur in the House amendment.

The House amendment would eliminate from the Senate bill the so-called McCarthy amendment, which would have the effect of killing the bill.

The McCarthy amendment provided, in effect, that there be given to American workers the same opportunities given to Mexican workers; as to workmen's compensation, occupational insurance coverage, housing, and so forth. The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry concluded that with such language in the bill the effect would be more or less to kill the bill.

Mr. President, the Mexican farm labor program has been before Congress since 1951. It was enacted at that time in order to provide effective control procedures for the movement of Mexican nationals into the farmlands in the United States. Prior to the enactment of the program covered by the bill now before the Senate, many Mexicans swam across the Rio Grande into the United States to work for whatever wages they could obtain. Immigration authorities found that as many as 500,000 Mexicans had entered the United States without authority.

Because there were no control features and because there were so many so-called wetbacks involved it presented a special problem to both the Mexican and United States Governments.

Many of us believed that this problem could be handled much better by providing a law, under which the United States and Mexico could enter into an agreement whereby the Mexican laborers could be sent into the United States in quantities sufficient to take care of what is more or less stoop labor.

Mechanization has relieved the pressure for many workers. However, in the absence of adequate machinery, it was and is necessary for the farmers in California, in Arizona, and in many of the border States as well as the States of the interior, to obtain additional labor, for the reason that laborers could not be hired locally. It is difficult to hire Americans to do stoop work; to gather cotton, to harvest fruits and vegetables, and to do other things of that kind.

As a result of the passage of the act in 1951, the employment of Mexicans was handled in a more orderly manner, and the wages agreed upon and fixed were, of course, more equitable. With the adoption of adequate control procedure fewer and fewer Mexicans came into our country illegally.

In subsequent years, the act passed in 1951 was amended in order to satisfy some of the opposition to the program which arose. It seems that many individuals felt that the program should not be reenacted for a number of reasons. Some felt that it did not do justice to the Mexicans. Others felt that the American worker was not given the same opportunity to be employed as the Mexican worker.

The Mexicans who are hired and contracted for are provided with housing, transportation, insurance, a guarantee in regard to being crippled, and various other things including a firm contract to work. In other words, both employers and employees are protected.

Requests were made to amend the bill so that American employees would receive the same benefits as would accrue to Mexican laborers.

As time went on, and as cultivating and harvesting machinery was improved, the number of Mexican laborers decreased considerably. Today the number of Mexicans who come into the country to do stoop labor is a pittance as compared to what it was in 1951.

As machinery was developed, improved, and became more complex, the committee saw fit to add to the law provisions which made it almost impossible for Mexican labor to be employed except to do stoop work or manual labor. Prior to the last two extensions of the Mexican labor law, Mexicans were permitted to do other than stoop work.

The law for which an extension is now sought provides just that; namely, that the Mexicans who will be employed next year in this country will be employed principally to do stoop labor.

I am told that unless the extension is granted, many of the crops in California, Arizona, and other States bordering on or located near Mexico will suffer considerably. Particularly is that true of the State of Texas, where many crops are grown for which it is necessary to have a large number of laborers.

So far we have been unable to invent machines that make it possible to pick melons, lettuce, or other vegetables of that kind, or even to pick certain kinds of beans.

It is therefore necessary that the law be extended.

When the bill was before the Senate, the proponents of the measure desired an extension of 2 years, instead of 1 year. The committee saw fit to provide merely for an extension of 1 year, in the hope that the measure could go through the Senate without too much difficulty. But when the bill was presented to the Senate, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] offered his amendment, which, in my opinion, had the effect of nullifying the law.

The McCarthy amendment, in including work period guarantees, went beyond the request of the Secretary of Labor when he presented a draft bill to the Senate on March 26.

The first amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota, which contained the language finally adopted, plus an additional section, lost by a tie vote of 45 to 45. The amendment which was adopted was agreed to by a vote of 44 to 43—only by 1 vote. Subsequently, a motion by the Senator from Minnesota to table a motion by me to reconsider the third reading was rejected by a vote of 45 to 45, and the motion to reconsider the third reading was then rejected by a vote of 45 to 45.

The House Committee on Agriculture rejected the McCarthy amendment by a vote of 28 to 4.

The McCarthy amendment was offered in the House by Representative ROSENTHAL as an amendment in the nature of a substitute for an amendment offered by Representative ROOSEVELT. Representative ROSENTHAL's amendment was defeated in the House by a vote of 79 to 131.

I call attention to the votes in the Senate to show how close they were. In the House, however, the vote was overwhelmingly against the McCarthy amendment. I express the hope that the Senate will agree to the simple motion I have made. So far as I am concerned, I wish to give assurance to the opponents that I shall not move in the future to extend the law any further than the year 1964.

It is my belief that by giving this notice in advance, the proponents of this law will be warned that the Senate will not act again on this measure and that they must begin to look elsewhere for relief.

I am sure that in Texas, and probably in other States, such as California and Arizona, particularly, many crops are now growing that will mature in the early part of next year. If the Senate fails to extend the law, there will be much loss to the farmers who are now engaged in planting and cultivating crops.

I wish to state to the Senate something else that may occur. There may be a reversion to the old method of Mexicans swimming across the Rio Grande, in violation of our immigration laws. If that is permitted, labor from Mexico will continue to come into this country, as was true before 1951. Wages will be lowered. No doubt the Mexicans will come in greater numbers than would be true otherwise.

I express the hope that the Senate will vote favorably on the motion I have made. If that is done, all persons will be on notice that, beginning in 1965, other methods will have to be used to provide for stoop labor. What they will be, I am unable to say at this time. However, the farmers will at least be warned in advance.

I wish to repeat again that the motion merely extends the existing law for 1 year. No changes are made in the existing law, except that the year of expiration is 1964 instead of 1963. By so doing, I feel confident it will be of assistance to farmers. It will also assist Mexicans in that they will work under the same conditions as in 1963.

I do not know what the effect will be on our relations with Mexico. A good many proponents of the bill take the position that unless there is an extension it will do violence to our relations with Mexico. I do not know that it will do that. However, it is something that we must consider. There is no doubt that many Mexicans who come to this country and send their money back to Mexico do perform a service, by more or less giving dollars to Mexico that Mexico needs. The adverse effect on our relations with Mexico if this bill is not extended has never been discussed or determined by the committee. However, during the debate some time ago the matter was brought up, and it was said that it would cause some friction between our countries. I hope it will not be so.

When the question of the labor contracts between the United States and Mexico was first discussed, I attended the conference in Mexico City. We had very cordial relations then. I hope that the cordial relationship will continue in the future.

I have nothing further to say, except that I hope the Senate will agree to the motion that I have made.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I commend the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for his statement regarding his determination that this program shall end after 1 year. I accept his statement. I am sure that he will not, as he said, again propose an extension of the program.

Of course, he does not speak for the people who have advocated this legislation through the years. The record shows that from the beginning of this program in 1951 it has been presented as a temporary program, and that every time it came under debate, the argument was made that the program would be extended for only 1 more year or for 2 years more.

In each of those debates, when it was proposed that certain standards and requirements be established to give protection to potential American migratory workers, the argument was made that we did not need to set up such protection because the program was to be phased out in 1 or 2 years.

Therefore, in the course of approximately 12 years we have heard the same argument made over and over again, and the same presentation of the program has been made, namely, that it is a temporary program designed to meet a problem for only a short length of time.

Again today we find ourselves in the same situation. I should like to review the history of the case which has been made for an extension, a reextension, and still other extensions of the program since 1951.

When the program was proposed in 1951, the Senate debated the bill from April 26 until May 7, when it finally passed the bill. At that time it was strongly opposed by the late Senator Chavez, of New Mexico, who personally knew something of the problems of the migratory workers in the Southwestern States.

At that time I was a member of the House Committee on Agriculture. I recall the arguments that were made in committee and in debate on the floor of the House. Two principal arguments were advanced in support of the program. One was that the Korean conflict had resulted in a manpower shortage. The Government of Mexico at that time opposed having Mexican nationals come to work in this country under the exploitative conditions which prevailed then. Most of these workers came in illegally, and were generally described as wetbacks. Officials of the Mexican Government came to our country, and asked us to provide for some kind of protection for their people who were coming into the United States to work in the cottonfields and in the production of vegetables and fruits and other crops in the southwestern part of our country.

It was stated that it would be necessary to enact legislation if we were to have an orderly and decent program; otherwise, these officials said, no Mexicans would be permitted to come.

This was a threat on the part of the Mexican Government, and a protest on the part of the Mexican Government, against the kind of treatment that its nationals had been receiving.

Therefore, a temporary measure was proposed. The program for the importation of Mexican workers came before the House for consideration on June 26, 1951.

Representative COOLEY, who handled the bill on the floor of the House, made the following statement:

> American agriculture has embarked upon a greatly expanded program. High production goals have been fixed and the farmers of the Nation have been called upon to produce the abundance which will be needed. American agriculture has been called upon again to fill the bread basket of democracy. We can recall with great pride how the American farmer discharged his assignment in World War II. Our farmers performed magnificently and actually amazed the world with their production.
>
> The bill which we are presenting seeks to deal with an unfortunate situation. It is unfortunate that we do not have in America sufficent farm labor to harvest the abundant production of our farm labor. There is no question about a shortage of farm labor. Everyone familiar with the situation is apparently willing to admit that there is a great need for a great number of laborers for the farms of America.

Representative POAGE advanced similar arguments. He said:

> Last year we were barely able to pick that cotton crop with the labor force that was available—and it included a substantial number of Mexicans, both contract Mexican nationals and illegal entrants. Since that time there have been thousands of American boys who have left those farms and gone to work in the industries of the Nation, in the war plants, and in the Armed Forces of the country. Our own labor force is not nearly as large as it was 1 year ago. We were barely able, with a long picking season, to gather 9,750,000 bales of cotton. With 16 or 17 million bales this year and a smaller force to gather it, how can we hope to have that fiber without the help of our neighbors to the south? How can we hope to save the beet crop of America without someone who is willing to get down on his hands and knees and do the stoop labor required to do it?

Representative Clifford Hope stressed that it was a temporary program, stating:

> The Committee on Agriculture held extensive hearings on this bill. We gave it a great deal of consideration in executive session. We heard a large number of witnesses. We heard all the different viewpoints, and as a result of this very exhaustive consideration we bring you this bill which I feel does what it sets out to do. It is a temporary measure but one which will meet the present situation. It will help alleviate the shortage of certain types of farm workers and will enable our farmers to help meet the obligation which has been put upon them by the Secretary of Agriculture to produce the greatest amount of food and fiber that has ever been produced by the farmers of this country.

The same view was expressed by Representative Hill of Colorado who said:

> Yes. There is another thing I want to say, and that is this is a temporary bill. This bill expires on December 31, 1953. What we are trying to do here is to take care of the situation during this war emergency.

Mr. President, the Korean conflict has been over for 10 years.

Great changes have taken place in planting and harvesting crops. Mechanization has eliminated much of the hand labor formerly required for cotton and some other crops in which braceros were used.

At the same time we have gone from a period of a somewhat tight manpower situation in 1951 to one of widespread unemployment. Unemployment for the past 5 years has been at the average yearly rate of 5.5 percent or more. The Department of Agriculture has estimated unemployment and underemployment among our rural population at a rate equivalent to 4 million workers. In 1962, California growers contracted or recontracted for 127,000 Mexican nationals under this program—but at the same time the estimated annual average of unemployed domestic workers in California was 395,000, or more than twice the number of Mexicans who were imported under this program.

Across the Nation, the number of farms and farmworkers has declined sharply since 1952. In 1962 alone the number of hired farmworkers averaged 4 percent less than in 1961, and the number of family farmworkers was down 3 percent last year.

All these facts indicate that if displaced and unemployed farmworkers were offered conditions of work regarding transportation, housing, and work period guarantees comparable to those enjoyed by Mexican nationals, the needs could be met without using foreign workers.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the Senator arguing that if a contract were entered into, let us say, by workers from Illinois, the farmer could enforce that contract in the same manner as he is capable of enforcing a contract involving Mexican labor?

Mr. McCARTHY. It would depend upon the terms of the contract. If it were a formal legal contract, it would be enforcible at law.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator knows, if a contract were entered into by an American worker who went from Illinois to Nevada, the worker could not be forced to work. He might work for 2 or 3 days and then leave. However, if a Mexican laborer refused to work, he would be deported. Personally, I do not believe there would be any way by which to enforce a contract between an American laborer and a farmer. It would be impossible to do so, under the law .

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand the Senator from Louisiana to urge as an argument for the bracero bill that Mexicans can be held to involuntary servitude, whereas Americans cannot be?

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not argue that at all. I said that if a Mexican refused to work, he could no longer remain in the country; he would have to return to Mexico. The inducement for him to remain in this country is that he continue to work. On the other hand, if the worker were an American, such a contract would be illegal under the law, as I understand it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I suspect that the labor contract of an American is what is termed an at-will contract, which is not binding. The Senator from Louisiana is saying that the great advantage of bringing in Mexicans is that no matter what the conditions, no matter how poorly they may be treated, they must continue to work under penalty of expulsion from this country. I think that is involuntary servitude; and under the 13th amendment, involuntary servitude is outlawed by the Constitution.

Mr. McCARTHY. The proceeding under this law is one of providing rented "slaves." It is not a question of having to buy them and take responsibility for them for a long period of time. Essentially, the commitment is similar to that under slavery, except that it is a sort of temporary servitude; and the penalty for not working, as the Senator from Louisiana has said, is that the workers will be returned to Mexico. They are, of course, free to leave their work and return to their own country. The pressure on them is that if they refuse to work, they must return to their own country.

Mr. ELLENDER. A Mexican is free to leave whenever he desires; but the condition under which he may remain in the country is that he must work under the contract he entered into. If after a few days of employment he wants to quit, he may quit; but he must return to Mexico; he may not remain in this country.

Mr. McCARTHY. If Americans were offered employment, and offered the same terms as were offered Mexicans, I assume from the statement of the Senator from Louisiana that they would be offered such employment only on the counterconsideration that they would not be free to leave their jobs and find employment in other areas. This is a consideration. But if Americans were offered similar terms and conditions to remain, most of them would seek this kind of work and continue to work and fulfill their obligations, if there were a contract.

Mr. ELLENDER. There would be no way to enforce such a contract.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is quite correct. There would be no weapon or pressure to use on the Americans. But I am satisfied that if they were offered comparable terms, they would be willing to work and to fulfill the contract.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The 13th amendment of the Constitution provides:

> Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

It seems to me to be somewhat regrettable at this stage that there can be involuntary servitude for Mexicans but not for Americans, and that therefore Mexicans can be brought in.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think there is any question but that this kind of control over the workers is one of the reasons that many employers desire a continuation of the program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I once spent some weeks in Arizona and happened to meet a Mexican living there who had apparently entered this country illegally. He was in mortal terror that he would be shipped back. He was scared to death of his employer, because he believed his employer knew he had entered this country under difficult circumstances. He was afraid he might be sent back, so he did not feel himself to be a free agent.

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly the Mexican workers constitute unfair competition for potential American agricultural workers. The conditions that have been described are important considerations. Mexican workers are carefully screened, so it is not necessary for an employer to take run-of-the-mill Americans, as he would have to do if he hired his employees from American workers. Most of the Mexicans come alone, so the growers do not have their family responsibilities to be concerned with.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator will concede, I am certain, that if the proposed extension is not granted, there may be a recurrence of conditions that existed prior to 1951, when Mexican labor came by the thousands, some of them swimming across the Rio Grande, and becoming known, as the Senator stated a while ago, as "wetbacks." Many of them had to remain hidden, too, in order to escape arrest by immigration officials. My fear is that there might be a recurrence of that situation.

Certainly the type of contract that is now entered into with the sanction of both the American Government and the Mexican Government is not, by any means, of the kind described by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] as a slavery contract, because a Mexican can enter the United States and leave the next day, if he desires.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The important point is that if he quits, he must return to Mexico.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the only difference.

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe the argument just made by the Senator from Louisiana about the danger of a recurrence of the wetback problem and illegal entries of Mexican workers if the legislation is not continued is subject to challenge.

This very argument was made in the debates as long ago as 1951. It was stated that because of the wetback problem, the Mexican farm labor bill should be passed.

At that time the Senate adopted an amendment offered, I believe, by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], which would have made some improvement in the situation, but the amendment was lost in conference. As a result, the program did not play a significant role at that time in solving the wetback problem.

Two years ago, I wrote to Commissioner of Immigration Swing on this particular point and asked whether he thought the passage of the legislation had had any significant effect on the wetback problem. He replied that it did not play any significant part in the solution of the wetback problems. In his letter, he said:

> U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
> IMMIGRATION AND
> NATURALIZATION SERVICE,
> *Washington, D.C., February 8, 1961.*
>
> Hon. EUGENE J. MCCARTHY,
> *U.S. Senate,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR SENATOR MCCARTHY: Your letter requesting information as to the possible effect of proposed modification of Public Law 78, addressed to the Attorney General, has been referred to this Service for reply.
>
> In response to your first question, the Service does not believe that the enactment of Public Law 78 on July 12, 1951, brought about a significant reduction in illegal wetback entries. From the attached table it will be observed that for at least 3 years following the enactment of that law the apprehension of wetbacks rose appreciably to the alltime high of over 1 million in the year ending June 30, 1954. The provisions of Public Law 78 were largely inoperative in certain areas of the country because of the availability of wetback labor. Not until the stemming of the tide of illegal entry during the year 1954 was the lawful importation of Mexican braceros firmly established as the chief source of alien agricultural labor in the United States.
>
> In this connection you may be interested in the enclosed article on the subject which appeared in the July 1956 issue of the I & N Reporter. This article contains statistics as to the number of agricultural laborers admitted annually during the years 1950 through 1956. On page 8 of this article there is a partial answer to your second question in the paragraph which reads:
>
> "The so-called wetback problem no longer exists. The southern border has been secured. The Immigration and Naturalization Service now has control over the illegal entries of Mexicans. However, continuous efforts must be made by the Service to maintain this security and to prevent illegal entry. The continued support of the Mexican Government, employers of laborers, other agencies, and the Congress is needed to assure the success of this program."
>
> If bracero or domestic labor is not available in the United States, the pressure of illegal entry on our southern border will undoubtedly increase. If the Service is given the same authorized manpower, however, I am confident that the control of the border can be maintained.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> J. M. SWING,
> *Commissioner.*

That is the judgment of the Commissioner of Immigration on this point.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Does the Senator know of anyone in the United States who is a better authority on this subject than the Commissioner of Immigration?

Mr. McCARTHY. No. I think he is the expert on whom we must rely.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that on this subject he can speak with greater authority and greater knowledge than anyone else; and is it not also true that we must accept his judgment on this subject, unless we obtain contrary evidence?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, for he is the best source of information on this question.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Does the Senator know of any hard evidence of any kind which is contradictory of the statements made by Commissioner Swing?

Mr. McCARTHY. No. All the evidence sustains the statements he has made. It was clear that effective control came only when our officials improved control of the border and began to use all their strength, as well as that of the Mexican Government, to stop such illegal entries.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So the argument that the bracero program is necessary in order to prevent illegal entries by Mexicans is not supported by the evidence we have and the statistics which are available, which demonstrate that the bracero program has nothing whatever to do with prevention of illegal entry by Mexicans into the United States?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the evidence fully sustains the position implied by the Senator's question.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I understood the Senator from Minnesota to say that the Commissioner of Immigration stated that in 1954—which really was 2 years after the act went into effect, although it was passed in 1951—the apprehension reached an alltime high. I wonder whether there is in the Commissioner's statement anything to show that after the passage of the bracero bill, the Immigration Service of the United States made an intense drive to round up all the illegal entrants into the United States—an intense drive which it had not made theretofore. I have personal knowledge of this, at least insofar as it pertains to my own State. I also have personal knowledge that many of those who were rounded up—some of whom had been in the State 10 or 11 years, and thus had been able to circulate in the labor market, wherever they could get work—were then returned to Mexico.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes. The Commissioner's statement was that it was not the enactment of that law which caused the decline in the number of wetbacks who entered and the number who were returned by the Immigration Service, but, rather the cause was the more thorough enforcement of the immigration laws.

Mr. ALLOTT. I would agree with the Commissioner's statement in this respect: During that period the Immigration Service, for some reason—I suppose it was to make the law partially workable—conducted a drive, with which I am in wholehearted accord, to return those people to Mexico. But I would go further, and suggest that I do not think anyone can correctly contend that the wetback situation—of course, I refer to the illegal entrants, not to those who have entered under the bracero law—would be improved to any extent if this bill did not become law for another year. It would become worse, because these people—and anyone who has been to Mexico to any extent knows this—look to the United States with eyes of envy and wonderment, and wish to come to the United States because those who are in the United States do so much better than those in Mexico. Therefore, I would not wish to state for a minute that the enactment of this law would shut off the incursion of wetbacks; but neither do I think that it can be successfully argued that this incursion will not increase—because I think it will increase to some extent.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is a possibility. All I can do is set against the Senator's opinion the statement of the Commissioner of Immigration, who says:

> If the Service is given the same authorized manpower, however, I am confident that the control of the border can be maintained.

We must wait to see what the actual results will be before we can determine who is more nearly correct—the Senator from Colorado or the Commissioner of Immigration.

Mr. ALLOTT. Has the Senator from Minnesota ever been to Brownsville, Nogales, El Paso, or any of the other border towns, and seen there the many thousands of people who daily cross the border between the two countries, by crossing the bridges, and who are subject to only cursory examination? It would be almost impossible to provide the Immigration Service with a force sufficiently large to be able to check on those who thus walk back and forth, across the border, let alone to check on those who go up the river. Unfortunately, the river does not have as much water as it used to have in it at various places. So those who wish to cross the river there do not have to swim across it; generally they can wade across it. Sometimes they can actually ride across it. So it is very difficult to maintain effective control for a distance of a thousand miles or more, and thus prevent the illegal entry into the United States of Mexicans who seek to cross that river at one point or another. It would be almost impossible even to check on those who seek to cross the border at El Paso and at various places farther down the river. That job would require perhaps double the present force.

Mr. McCARTHY. Again, all I can do is cite the opinion of the Commissioner of Immigration, who stated, in his letter, that the Immigration Service could handle the situation. I have cited the best available authority—the Commissioner of Immigration—who, I am sure, has seen the situation which has been described to us by the Senator from Colorado, and who was personally and directly active for many years in this field.

Mr. President, I oppose the motion that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1703.

The Senate should follow the traditional procedure in connection with proposed legislation when there is a substantial difference between the Senate version and the House version.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, has said that if the Senate provision is retained, the House will refuse to accept it. But I submit that this shows there is a substantial difference between the two versions, and that therefore, if for no other reason, a conference should be held, in order to discuss the difference.

If the differences were so slight that the House would accept it anyway, we could say, "Why go to conference on a minor point?"

But here he acknowledges that this is a major difference. The only argument made against going to conference is that the House will not accept the Senate version. If this were the case, each time a major difference between the House and Senate occurred, the argument could be made that because of this difference we should surrender to the House and accept their version because the differences are so great.

If we look into it further than that, we make a kind of "numbers" argument, saying that the reason why we should give in to the House on this issue is that the amendment offered by myself and a number of other Senators was passed by a single vote. Then we have to look up the vote in the House on the same issue. When we do so, we really get into difficulty, because the record in the House shows that when they first voted on extension of Public Law 78 last May, the whole program was rejected by the House. The vote was 174 to 158 against extension. Then on October 31 the House reversed itself and approved a 1-year extension by a vote of 173 to 158. There were two votes in the House. On one occasion the vote was 174 against extension and then later the vote was 173 in favor of extension; in both cases there were 158 on the other side. So if we consider the total vote in both rollcalls—counting House Members twice—the difference comes out to a single vote. The numbers game really does not take us very far.

We are moved back again to the question of whether the action of the Senate in adopting the amendment, even though it was by a single vote, should be sustained in conference.

The will of the Senate stands today, as it did on August 15. A majority of Senators supported the position that the Senate was willing to extend this program for 1 year only on the condition that employers make a reasonable offer to provide some benefits to domestic workers before they turned to importing Mexican nationals.

The immediate question is: Shall the Senate accept the judgment of the House Committee on Agriculture—which removed the Senate amendment from S. 1703—or shall the House be required to consider the decision of the Senate at least in conference?

This special legislation, I believe we should note, provides benefits for only about 33,000 of the more than 3 million farmers in the Nation .

This program adversely affects American farmworkers who are already underprivileged. It should not be extended unless some action is taken to safeguard the rights of these citizens.

There is evidence that the special benefits that a few growers get from this program gives them a competitive advantage over family farm operators who grow the same crops in other sections of the Nation. We should not be authorizing the importation of foreign workers at a time when our rural population suffers from great unemployment and underemployment.

All the defenses made for this program, and all the pleas to let the growers have Mexican nationals for 1 more year, cannot hide the central fact that this program has depressed the economic and social conditions of domestic migratory workers. It has adversely affected the welfare of American citizens who, even before the program was established 12 years ago, were the most underprivileged group in the United States.

In 1952, when the Mexican farm labor program went into effect, male migratory farmworkers in the Nation averaged $7.35 per day. During the last 10 years as many as 400,000 Mexican nationals annually have entered the United States under Public Law 78 to compete with Americans. In 1961, the average wage of male migratory farmworkers was $6.70 per day—65 cents per day less than they averaged in 1952. This was a period in which wages throughout the economy rose sharply and in which costs for the necessities of life also greatly increased.

A wage of $6.70 a day is $40.20 for a 6-day week, or $160 per month. But these workers would praise the Congress if our action would only guarantee them $160 per month; for these men do not work regularly. They work during special seasons, depending on the weather and depending on the size of the crop—and they suffer from extensive seasonal unemployment. In 1961 they averaged only 109 days of farmwork a year. They managed to get a few days of nonfarm work, but the report of the Department of Agriculture shows that the total wages earned—farm and nonfarm—of the male migratory farmworkers, who did 25 days or more of farm wagework in 1961, was $1,039.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the table from the Department of Agriculture publication "The Hired Farm Working Force of 1961," relating to wages of migratory farmworkers.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 34.—*Average days worked and wages earned at farm and nonfarm wage work by persons who did 25 days or more of farm wage work, by migratory status, and sex of worker, selected years, 1949–61*

Year, migratory status, and sex	Farm and nonfarm			Farm			Nonfarm		
	Days worked	Wages earned		Days worked	Wages earned		Days worked	Wages earned	
		Per year	Per day worked[1]		Per year	Per day worked[1]		Per year	Per day worked[1]
1949:	*Number*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Number*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Number*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*
Migratory	119	594	4.95	89	448	5.00	30	146	4.80
Male	135	739	5.50	98	549	5.60	37	190	5.20
Female	82	234	2.85	67	198	2.95	15	36	2.35
Nonmigratory	173	719	4.15	148	574	3.85	25	145	5.85
Male	190	818	4.30	165	655	3.95	25	163	6.65
Female	102	291	2.85	76	224	2.95	26	67	2.55
1952:									
Migratory	124	884	7.15	87	600	6.90	37	284	7.75
Male	144	1,101	7.60	99	731	7.35	45	370	8.15
Female	65	259	4.00	53	222	4.20	12	37	3.10
Nonmigratory	169	911	5.40	140	698	5.00	29	213	7.40
Male	195	1,074	5.50	161	815	5.05	34	259	7.70
Female	68	265	3.90	58	234	4.00	10	31	3.20
1954:									
Migratory	156	1,033	6.60	124	794	6.40	32	239	7.35
Male	166	1,160	6.95	135	899	6.65	31	261	8.30
Female	117	565	4.80	81	410	5.05	36	155	4.25
Nonmigratory	169	972	5.75	145	800	5.50	24	172	7.05
Male	187	1,119	5.95	161	919	5.70	26	200	7.60
Female	91	344	3.75	75	287	3.80	16	57	3.45
1956:									
Migratory	143	1,178	8.25	116	935	8.05	27	243	9.15
Male	157	1,369	8.70	126	1,069	8.50	31	300	9.55
Female	91	500	5.55	81	458	5.70	10	42	4.35
Nonmigratory	162	958	5.90	140	776	5.55	22	182	8.10
Male	189	1,188	6.30	163	958	5.90	26	230	8.95
Female	86	295	3.40	73	254	3.45	13	41	3.25
1957:									
Migratory	131	859	6.55	115	745	6.45	16	114	7.25
Male	148	1,045	7.05	129	900	7.00	19	145	7.55
Female	80	304	3.80	75	280	3.75	5	24	4.45
Nonmigratory	147	898	6.15	127	737	5.80	20	161	8.05
Male	168	1,095	6.50	145	895	6.15	23	200	8.70
Female	78	270	3.50	67	233	3.45	11	37	3.55
1959:									
Migratory	143	911	6.40	119	710	6.00	24	201	8.40
Male	156	1,025	6.60	128	782	6.10	28	243	8.70
Female	88	447	5.05	81	418	5.15	7	29	4.05
Nonmigratory	165	1,063	6.45	142	852	6.00	23	211	9.10
Male	188	1,278	6.80	162	1,019	6.30	26	259	9.95
Female	85	314	3.70	72	271	3.75	13	43	3.25
1960:									
Migratory	157	1,016	6.50	123	819	6.65	34	197	5.90
Male	174	1,170	6.70	138	949	6.85	36	221	6.10
Female	90	444	4.95	66	336	5.05	24	108	4.55
Nonmigratory	170	1,143	6.75	142	889	6.25	28	254	9.20
Male	190	1,339	7.05	160	1,040	6.50	30	299	10.05
Female	96	427	4.45	76	335	4.45	20	92	4.60
1961:									
Migratory	136	902	6.65	100	677	6.25	27	225	8.40
Male	144	1,039	7.20	115	774	6.70	29	265	9.20
Female	101	340	3.40	82	280	3.40	19	60	3.25
Nonmigratory	160	1,083	6.75	139	919	6.60	21	164	7.75
Male	183	1,306	7.15	160	1,112	6.95	23	194	8.60
Female	83	326	3.95	67	265	4.00	16	61	3.85

[1] Rounded to the nearest 5 cents.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, this situation would be unthinkable for any other economic group in the Nation. Protests would be heard from coast to coast if auto workers or steel workers or chemical or laundry workers or retail clerks were averaging only $6.70 per day—to say nothing of what would happen if we approved a law authorizing the Department of Labor to enter into an international agreement with a foreign nation to import its nationals to compete with these workers. But the persons involved here are the homeless ones, poorly educated, unorganized, moving from place to place with no leaders from their own ranks able to speak for them.

And now we are asked to extend this program which discriminates against these people, which increases their burdens, which makes their task of living even more difficult, without even making an attempt to go to conference or to hold the Senate amendment which provides for these neglected citizens a minimum of protection.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Minnesota said that people about whom he has been speaking are people who have been drifting from their home base and have no voice in Congress which can be raised for them. I believe he is correct.

Is it not true that the real weakness of these people is the fact that, by and large, they are people who do not live permanently in one State? The chances are they are not registered to vote. Few if any do vote. It is very obvious they are not the kind of people who could bring any direct, political, organized pressure to bear. The result is that they have no political strength and no political muscle. If there is no appeal to the conscience of the Senate in recognition of the needs of these people to have some opportunity to take part in the great economic progress we have enjoyed in America in the past few years, they will be left out because they are people that do not have the kind of pressure and force needed to have their problems brought to the attention of Congress.

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe the best evidence of that is the manner in which the legislation was treated by Congress this year. The Senate committee bill which provided for a 1-year extension, was reported to the Senate without any hearings. I believe the Senator knows that if there is any support or opposition to a bill that is well organized in the country, the least concession made to that organized group is to hold hearings and permit people to come in and testify before the respective committees of Congress dealing with the proposal.

The bill was reported to the Senate without any hearings.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Can the Senator from Minnesota imagine what would happen if proposed legislation to authorize the importation of some manufactured goods that would compete with an industry which was well established in this country should come before a committee? Can the Senator imagine a situation in which no hearings would be held to permit a manufacturer to appear before a committee of Congress and protest?

Mr. McCARTHY. It is extremely difficult to imagine circumstances under which no hearings would be permitted to be held. Even the Department of Labor had not been heard on this particular proposed legislation. It appeared as though the advocates wanted to do the deed both quickly and quietly. Fortunately, the Department of Labor was able to express its views through a side window at the hearing held by the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

At that hearing it was possible to obtain testimony from the Department of Labor and Under Secretary of Labor John F. Henning testified on the administration position regarding the extension of Public Law 78 on July 30. Excerpts from his testimony are as follows:

> With an inexhaustible supply of alien workers at our very borders we find, conversely, that the terms and conditions of employment offered domestic workers not only remain static but in many cases are less favorable than those offered domestic workers in areas where no alien workers are employed. We find, further, the incredible situation where alien workers are offered better terms and conditions of employment than are afforded our own agricultural workers competing for the same jobs.
>
> Essentially, Senator, it is because of this that we submit Public Law 78 is a broad law; it is a wretched law that should be buried. Being an American citizen places one at a serious disadvantage under the option of this law, because the simple fact is that under the present system an employer can refuse to offer domestic workers the same terms and conditions that he is required to offer alien workers. If the domestic worker refuses to accept the job at less favorable terms, the employer is permitted to bring in Mexican workers who are then afforded the very terms and conditions which were denied to our own workers.
>
> This situation exists basically because of the limited authority vested in the Department of Labor under Public Law 78. The legislative history of that law makes it abundantly clear that the Congress did not intend to permit the Secretary of Labor to require, as a condition of obtaining Mexican workers, that all of the same terms and conditions afforded Mexican workers be offered first to domestic workers. It is for this reason that we would oppose any further extension of Public Law 78 without amendments which would bring the required job offers made to Mexicans and to domestic workers to an approximate level. * * *
>
> In a very real sense, the availability of domestic workers depends largely upon the terms and conditions of employment offered. The exemption of agricultural employment from most social legislation such as minimum wage, unemployment insurance, and to a significant extent old-age and survivors' insurance, makes such employment unattractive to our own unemployed domestic workers. Low wages, poor working conditions, inadequate housing facilities in the area of employment, complicate the recruitment picture. With a large reservoir of foreign workers available there is a propensity to depend upon this source of labor supply rather than to extend more attractive offers to domestic unemployed workers. The result—employment of Mexican workers in this country at the expense of unemployment of domestic workers.
>
> We are thus confronted at this time with the simple question of whether we should continue to any extent subsidizing, at the expense of the taxpayers of this Nation, a farmworker program which prolongs and aggravates this unfortunate situation. The resultant unemployment not only saddles the local communities with all the costs attendant upon giving public assistance and other forms of aid to unemployed workers, but it exacts a terrible price in loss of human dignity and human resources—a price that dictates the need for everyone to extend every effort to avoid these consequences.
>
> The amendment recommended by the administration, and transmitted to the President of the Senate on March 26, is designed to narrow the existing differential. Its objective is to make the job offers more attractive without imposing any undue burden on agricultural employers. It would require—this is the administration position on Public Law 78—it would require employers seeking to obtain Mexican workers to offer to domestic workers workmen's compensation or occupational insurance coverage, housing, and transportation expenses equivalent to that furnished Mexican workers. Mind you, this would not close the gap. The Mexican worker is guaranteed the right to collective bargaining with the growers, a right denied American farmworkers; he is guaranteed employment under the contract period, 75 percent of the contract period is assured him, but the gap would be narrowed here in a significant manner.
>
> None of these provisions would require employers to incur any greater expense in obtaining domestic workers than they are now assuming in obtaining and utilizing Mexican workers. The costs of employing domestic workers under this proposal would be substantially less than the costs of employing Mexican workers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the first sentence of article 8 of the Migrant Labor Agreement of 1951, as amended, reads as follows:

> Mexican workers shall not be assigned to work nor permitted to remain in localities in which Mexicans are discriminated againsts because of their nationality or ancestry.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Under this provision, which provides that neither Mexican nationals nor Americans of Mexican ancestry shall be discriminated against, communities have been forced to admit these groups to community facilities, such as swimming pools, parks, playgrounds, schools and the like.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes. There was testimony—or at least statements—to the effect that in order to obtain such workers segregation practices regarding such facilities had been discontinued.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, a public accommodations law prevails for Mexicans and Mexican-Americans; is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. It would apply to Mexican nationals in this country, but not necessarily to Americans.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is the point. As I understand the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, which was adopted by the Senate, it provides that American workers shall not be discriminated against in comparison with Mexican workers on the job; that is, they shall have the same labor rights, including workmen's compensation, housing, transportation, and work period guarantees; is that true?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes. Those are the limits, really, of what we ask.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If we agree to the proviso that Mexicans and Mexican-Americans shall not be discriminated against socially in comparison with Americans of non-Mexican ancestry, why should there be any objection to having Americans treated as well as Mexicans on the job? Should not nondiscrimination be a two-way street? Mexicans should not be discriminated against socially in comparison with Americans, and Americans should not be discriminated against economically in comparison with Mexicans.

Mr. McCARTHY. That seems a most logical case.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is that not what the Senator from Minnesota really is trying to establish?

Mr. McCARTHY. I really do not ask that American workers be treated as well as Mexican nationals. I ask only that the gap between the kind of treatment given Mexican nationals and the kind of treatment given to Americans be somewhat reduced.

There is an argument in support of the Mexican national program. It has established some standards. The standards for the most part were written in Mexico City, for migrant workers, to be applied only to Mexican nationals. At least the program has established some standards to which we can point, as we try to improve the conditions of American migratory workers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yet we are told that if we provide a greater degree of comparability in working conditions for Americans as compared with Mexicans, the big planters and farmers will reject the bill; is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is what is presented as a kind of threat. I do not consider it a threat. It is almost in the nature of a hopeful promise. But that is the situation as we consider the question of whether we ought to go to conference and insist on the terms the Senate adopted several months ago.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator has said that Mr. Henning of the Department of Labor testified that the bill was a wretched bill which should be buried unless something like the McCarthy amendment were adopted. In taking that position I presume the Under Secretary was speaking not merely for himself as an individual, but was speaking first for the Department of Labor; and, second, for the Kennedy administration; is that not correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe that is the only conclusion which could be reached.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The position of the Kennedy administration—and President Kennedy was President at that time—was that the bill should not be passed unless American domestic agricultural migrant workers were given exactly the same protection as Mexican workers are given.

Mr. McCARTHY. They did not go so far as to say exactly the same.

Mr. PROXMIRE. At least, to the modest extent which the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has urged on the Senate and has succeeded in getting the Senate to adopt.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have a letter from W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor, dated November 1, 1963. The letter is in response to an inquiry from me requesting the administration's position on the extension of Public Law 78. He said:

> The administration has continued to maintain the position I indicated before the House Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower of the Committee on Agriculture on March 27. We support a 1-year extension, provided the act is amended to require employers seeking to obtain Mexican workers to demonstrate that they have offered to domestic workers workmen's compensation or occupational insurance coverage, housing and transportation expenses equivalent to that furnished Mexican workers.
>
> We are opposed to an extension without these amendments.

The position of the administration, as stated on November 1 by the Secretary of Labor, was that without amendment the extension for 1 year was opposed by the administration; that it would rather have the program end.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So the administration would oppose the measure as it would be before the Senate if the Ellender motion should prevail?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is the only possible interpretation that can be put upon this letter.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The administration is against it. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senate bill, in effect, told the growers that the Senate would go along with a 1-year extension, provided the growers were willing to take a limited step toward recruiting domestic workers.

We did not ask the growers to provide American workers with the same benefits they provide Mexican nationals under the International Agreement. Undoubtedly that would have been denounced as revolutionary.

Rather, the benefits required by the Senate bill are very limited in comparison with the benefits guaranteed to Mexican nationals under the International Agreement.

It is interesting to read some of the guarantees which the Mexican Government insists upon before it will let its citizens come to work in our Nation.

The statement of conditions in the International Agreement runs 22 pages, in double columns. I am sure many American migratory workers would like to work under a contract which provided such guarantees.

For example, article 8 of the International Agreement provides:

> Mexican workers shall not be assigned to work nor permitted to remain in localities in which Mexicans are discriminated against because of their nationality or ancestry.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of article 8 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTICLE 8. PROHIBITION AGAINST DISCRIMINATION

Mexican workers shall not be assigned to work nor permitted to remain in localities in which Mexicans are discriminated against because of their nationality or ancestry. Within a reasonable time after the effective date of this agreement and from time to time thereafter, the Mexican Ministry for Foreign Relations will furnish the Secretary of Labor a listing of the communities in which it considers that discrimination against Mexicans exists. If there is concurrence by the Secretary of Labor that there is such discrimination in any such area, he will not issue, or where appropriate will withdraw, the authorization provided for in article 10.

If the Secretary of Labor does not concur, the appropriate Mexican consul may request a statement signed by the chief executive officer or officers or the chief law enforcement officer of the community in which the Mexican workers are to be employed, pledging for the community that—

(a) No discriminatory acts will be perpetrated against Mexicans in that locality; and

(b) In the event that the Mexican consul reports the existence of acts of discrimination against any Mexican because of ancestry or nationality, the local governmental officers who signed the statement will have such complaints promptly investigated and take such community and individual action as may be necessary to fulfill the community pledge.

The Mexican Government will permit employment in such areas if such pledges are furnished.

If, notwithstanding the foregoing, the Mexican consul reports that discriminatory acts have been committed against Mexicans because of their nationality or ancestry in a locality where Mexican workers are employed, the Mexican consul having jurisdiction in the locality may request the representative of the Secretary of Labor to join the Mexican consul in a joint investigation in which event the procedure prescribed in article 30 of this agreement will be followed.

Explanatory note: The use of the word "authorization" is simply an editorial change to conform the language in this provision with the appropriate terminology contained in articles 1 and 10.

Joint interpretation and amendment of March 1954

The Government of Mexico will not include "counties" under article 8 of the agreement in the list of towns, communities, localities and places where it is considered that discrimination exists against Mexicans on account of their nationality or of their ancestry.

Mr. McCARTHY. We do not include such protection in the Senate bill. As I read the article, it goes beyond the protections provided in the proposed civil rights bill for American citizens. The prohibition is not confined to certain kinds of public accommodations, but refers to communities.

Article 21 of the same agreement gives the Mexican workers the right to elect their own representatives "who shall be recognized by the employer as spokesmen for the Mexican workers."

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point the text of article 21.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTICLE 21. REPRESENTATIVES OF MEXICAN WORKERS

The Mexican workers shall enjoy the right to elect their own representatives who shall be recognized by the employer as spokesmen for the Mexican workers for the purpose of maintaining the work contract between the Mexican workers and the employer: *Provided*, That this article shall not affect the right of the Mexican worker individually to contact his employer, the Mexican consul, or the representative of the Secretary of Labor with respect to his employment under this work contract.

Joint interpretation of August 1954

This article is designed to assure that Mexican workers are permitted to elect, by a majority vote, a representative for the sole purpose of presenting to their employers only those complaints arising out of failure of the employer to comply with the Migrant Labor Agreement of 1951, as amended, or the work contract.

The elected representatives may be an individual or individuals from the workers' own numbers, or from any legitimate and bona fide labor organization and the employer must recognize such representatives as spokesmen for the workers. This interpretation does not in any way deprive the worker of the right to be represented in any case by a Mexican consul.

A worker may personally or through the elected representative present his claim to the employer and the employer is, under article 21, required to deal with either the worker individually or the elected representatives on complaints arising out of the work contract.

If, however, an individual worker desires to have his complaint presented by a personal representative other than the one elected by the majority of the workers pursuant to article 21, the employer is required to recognize such representative only to the extent that such recognition is required by Federal or State law.

Mr. McCARTHY. We are not proposing that American farmworkers be given the right to organize or elect their spokesmen to represent them, although the international agreement gives such rights to Mexicans imported under this Act.

Article 32, in effect, provides a guarantee that the United States will pay Mexican workers their wages and other cash benefits if the employer defaults. An American worker, of course, can go into court and sue if he does not get paid, but this is a costly and time-consuming process. Under this article, the Mexican workers have the strongest guarantee possible for collecting their wages—the pledge of the U.S. Government. I am certain that American migratory workers would be pleased to have the Government guarantee their wages in this fashion—but the Senate amendment does not ask for this protection.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD article 32 of the international agreement.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTICLE 32. GUARANTEES BY U.S. GOVERNMENT AND SECONDARY LIABILITY OF ASSOCIATION MEMBERS

(a) The Government of the United States guarantees the performance by employers of the provisions of this agreement, including the work contract, relating to the payment of wages, which shall include for the purpose of this article cash wages and all other forms of remuneration to a Mexican worker, and relating to the furnishing of or payment for transportation. The employer agrees that he will reimburse the United States for any amounts paid by the United States in pursuance of such guarantee.

(b) The Government of the United States shall, with respect to any amount found to be due from a defaulting employer, pay to the Mexican Government, as agent of the Mexican worker the amounts determined to be due within 20 days after the final determination has been made as to the employer's indebtedness, or as promptly as possible thereafter. With respect to any contributions found to be due from a defaulting employer pursuant to article 25 of the work contract the Government of the United States shall make payment under its guarantee directly to the Government of Mexico for transmission to the Mexican Social Security Institute.

(c) Where there has been a final determination, finding an association in default of its obligations to a Mexican worker under this agreement, arising out of the association's violations of the terms and provisions of this agreement, in the event of the association's failure to pay any amount found due, the individual members of the association for whom Mexican workers are obtained shall be liable for such amount to the extent of their pro rata share as members of the association. In the event of such final determination, arising out of the association member's violation of the terms and provisions of this agreement, the association member shall be liable for any amounts found due from the association if the association defaults.

(d) The employment of any Mexican workers by a member of an association shall constitute acceptance by such member of the obligations provided under the terms and provisions of this Agreement.

(e) Whenever the Secretary of Labor determines that the individual liability of a member of an association is not necessary to assure performance of the association's obligations to the United States, he may waive such liability.

Explanatory note: The purpose of the amendment contained in paragraph (a) of article 32 is to indicate the extent of the U.S. Government's guarantee to the Mexican worker.

The amendment contained in paragraph (b) of article 32 is designed to clarify the authority of the Government of the United States to pay to the Mexican Institute of Social Security contributions due that agency from a defaulting employer. The amendment contained in paragraph (b) also authorizes the Government of the United States to pay any amount due a worker from a defaulting employer to the Mexican Government on behalf of the Mexican worker. This provision contemplates that payment to the Mexican Government shall constitute payment to the Mexican worker.

The amendment contained in paragraph (c) of article 32 is for the purpose of spelling out the liability of the individual members of an association to the United States in the event of the association's default under its contract.

The amendment contained in paragraph (d) is to provide assurance that the employment by any member of an association of any Mexican workers shall subject that member to all of the obligations and responsibilities provided under the terms and provisions of the agreement and the standard work contract.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, article 35 involves the U.S. Government in using its moral influence with the State and local authorities "to the end that Mexican workers may enjoy impartially and expeditiously the rights which the laws of the United States grant to them."

It further guarantees that no Mexican workers shall be employed if the employment presents a menace to their health or safety.

I ask unanimous consent that pertinent sections of article 35 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTICLE 35. PROTECTION OF MEXICAN WORKERS

(a) The Government of the United States of America agrees to exercise special vigilance and its moral influence with State and local authorities, to the end that Mexican workers may enjoy impartially and expeditiously the rights which the laws of the United States grant to them.

(b) No Mexican workers shall be employed or remain employed where their employment by the employer would present a menace to their health or safety.

Mr. McCARTHY. Article 11 guarantees that all employment of Mexican workers shall be governed by terms of the work contract. The work contract runs 13 double column pages and includes numerous items not generally provided by contract for domestic workers—nor are these benefits provided in the Senate amendment.

The work contract includes a provision that "subsistence shall be furnished to the worker at no cost him whenever he is not afforded the opportunity to work 64 hours or more in each 2-week period." This provision is in addition to the work period guarantee.

Also:

> When the employer furnishes meals to the Mexican worker, they shall be furnished at cost, but in no event shall the charge to the Mexican worker exceed $1.75 for three meals.

This is a kind of "truth in feeding" amendment, I may say to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

If the employer does not provide restaurant facilities, the work contract requires that:

> He shall furnish, when requested by Mexican workers, preparing their own meals, necessary cooking utensils and facilities, including fuel ready for use for cooking purposes.

Mr. President, the Senate bill does not include these nor many other benefits listed in the International Agreement and the Standard Work Contract. The bill adds only four of the many items which would have to be included if we legislated that the employer must offer the same benefits to American workers that he offers to Mexican nationals.

And even with these four items the Senate bill does not require identical benefits, but only comparable ones.

The Senate bill provides that if growers want Mexican nationals they must first offer American workers the following:

First. Workmen's compensation or occupational insurance coverage comparable to that provided Mexican nationals.

This is not an unreasonable requirement. This is not unemployment insurance. It is workmen's compensation in case of injury or illness incurred in line of work.

Second. Housing provisions comparable to those offered Mexican nationals. This proposal is not new. It was discussed by Mr. Goldberg when he was Secretary of Labor. In his statement before the Senate Committee on Agriculture, June 13, 1961, he stated that the Department would not expect growers to furnish housing for an entire family since the present agreement only requires housing for single Mexican nationals. He stated:

> For example, take the housing situation. The Mexican laborer coming to the United States comes up himself; he doesn't bring his family. We wouldn't want this to happen to us; we want a man to live with his family as much as possible, and not leave his family stranded somewhere, usually on relief. The impulse to move his family is an impulse to support his family with dignity. So it would be unfair to the growers to insist that they provide housing for a family when they only provide housing for a single worker under the system which operates under the Mexican labor program.
>
> But we can do this. We have reliable statistics which demonstrate what the cost of providing that single housing is and we can give the domestic worker the financial equivalent of that cost so he can apply it toward the housing of his family.

Third. Transportation comparable to that offered Mexican nationals. This also is a reasonable request, and Secretary Goldberg had suggested this back in 1961. Mexican nationals have their transportation costs paid by the grower. He testified how the Department would handle this matter if domestic workers were guaranteed a comparable benefit. He stated:

> Take the transportation allowance. Today in most instances, as I pointed out, the domestic worker must pay for his own transportation.
>
> Now we could allow the domestic worker the same transportation allowance which now is being paid by employers to bring in Mexican labor.
>
> Now I read the record—you can take some horrible examples—and I found the statement made, "Well, this means that the Secretary will require that a grower who will want labor will recruit it in North Carolina and have to pay the expenses of bringing labor from North Carolina up to the State of Washington."
>
> This is the case, the horrible example.
>
> Well, in the first place, that is an extremely unlikely occurrence, as you, Senator, can testify better than anybody, your workers are not going to uproot themselves from your fine State and go wandering all the way across the face of the Nation.
>
> However, it is very interesting that when our farmers, when some of these growers

> wanted Mexican labor, they sent them across the face of the Nation and paid for them.
>
> Our figures show that transportation allowances were paid for Mexican labor at that and even greater distances.
>
> But if we get this amendment, as I hope we will, I can say to you quite categorically that we are going to administer it in the spirit of reasonableness, that we are going to issue regulations—and this is a firm commitment in this record—that will assimilate the cost on a sensible basis comparable to what is being paid by employers for Mexican labor. And here, too, that is a statistical matter, and we can easily work out how this is to be done.
>
> Now, I have also seen the objection raised that there are safeguards in the Mexican labor program to see to it that if a worker does not fulfill his commitment, the transportation allowance is refunded to the employer. There is no reason why we cannot work out arrangements which we have worked out by voluntary agreement in our annual workers plan whereby our employment services—our Federal Employment Service, together with our State employment services—now recruit people and send them considerable distances. And we work out arrangements, under those plans, to protect the employer by reserving the transportation allowance and providing if there is a breach that it is deductible from the amount of compensation which is available to the worker. And this is not hard to do. And I would be perfectly willing to work out our regulations so that we can take care of this particular problem.

Fourth. Work period guarantees. The international agreement provides that the employer shall guarantee Mexican nationals the opportunity to work for at least three-fourths of the workdays of the period during which the work contract is in effect. If it is reasonable that Mexican nationals have a work period guarantee, a comparable benefit should be offered to domestic workers who also have to travel. One reason, of course, for labor shortages in local areas is that domestic workers from the surrounding territory cannot afford to come as easily as Mexican nationals since they have neither transportation benefits nor a minimum work period guarantee.

I submit that on all counts the arguments are against the extension of the program unless this very limited and modest amendment, which was adopted by the Senate after prolonged debate, and after three or four very serious test votes, is adopted. The least we can ask is that the decision made by the Senate be taken to conference with representatives of the House of Representatives.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the Senator from Minnesota. I take it that what he is saying is that he hopes there will be an emphatic "nay" vote on the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. McCARTHY. I urge, on the merits of the case we have made, and also in protecting what I consider to be the integrity of an action taken by the Senate, that the motion before the Senate be rejected.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, it has been said that the poor are always with us; I am beginning to think that the braceros will always be with us. In this session, 200,000 foreign workers who are used primarily by three States have taken up a great deal of the time and energy of the Congress. The House of Representatives has voted twice on a bracero bill. The measure is now before the Senate for a second time. It is unfortunate that the eloquence and energy that have been devoted to extending a temporary program still have not been turned toward legislation to help the more than 2 million American men, women, and children who follow the crops.

It is even more ironic that the Congress seems to have shown more concern for the well-being of foreign workers than it has for American citizens. The bill before us now is a simple 1-year extension of the Mexican farm labor program. It does not contain the Senate amendment which would insure that the job offer to American workers contains the same benefits offered to the Mexican. If the Senate does not insist on its amendment, the Mexican worker will continue to receive workmen's compensation protection, free transportation to and from his job, adequate housing, and a guaranteed amount of work. The American citizen is still not assured these benefits and protections.

The claim has often been made that braceros cannot displace American workers because a farmer must first prove that he has been unable to find Americans to do the work. But the grower must only offer to Americans the same wage as he does to the bracero. The American worker must get himself to the job, scramble for decent housing when he gets there, and still not have any assurance that the job will last long enough to make his effort worth it. The interests of the bracero are looked after and carefully protected by the Governments of the United States and Mexico. The American migrant is completely on his own.

It is obvious that the bracero has a considerable advantage over the American worker. The American may receive a similar wage offer, but he has none of the protections and benefits offered to the Mexican. In August, the Senate acted to rectify this unfair situation. Under the terms of the amendment, the grower would be required to offer the same housing, workmen's compensation protection, and transportation, and guaranteed work period now given to the Mexican. This amendment incorporated the recommendations of the Secretary of Labor. In fact, administration support for still another extension of this "temporary" program was conditioned on the inclusion of these provisions.

This amendment will impose no burden on the farmer. For 12 years he has been willing and able to provide these benefits for the bracero; surely he can and must do the same for his fellow citizens.

I know that many of my colleagues feel that the bracero program should come to an end. Its longrun effect has been to deprive tragically underemployed Americans of the work they know best. It has held down agricultural wages. It has prevented the construction of decent family housing for American workers. It has made several of our largest agricultural States unnecessarily dependent on a foreign labor supply.

Recognizing that an abrupt cutoff might impose hardships on those growers whose production had become completely tied to a foreign labor source, the Senate agreed to the 1-year extension asked by the Secretary of Labor. But—and this is a very important but—the Senate only agreed to an extension which included the amendment so eloquently urged by Secretary Wirtz. The Secretary stated on behalf of the administration that, "We are opposed to an extension without these amendments."

If we must continue this program for another year, let us at least correct one longstanding injustice. Fairness to our own citizens demands that the Senate insist on the administration amendment which it has already approved. I and many of my colleagues voted to extend the bracero program only because it contained this fairness amendment. Without it, the program remains a continuing injustice, and I cannot support it. I hope my colleagues who favor this program will keep in mind that the House bill is not acceptable to the administration. If the Senate accepts the House version, I hope the President will veto the bill.

The hardships the bracero program has imposed on the American farmworker have continued too long. As this imported labor program comes to an end, growers should recognize that only better treatment of American workers will bring them the stable and reliable labor force they need. Practical economics, as well as humanitarian concern, compel the American farmer to do for his fellow citizens what he has been willing to do for the foreign worker. Legislation has been introduced which will lift the American migrant from second-class citizenship to full participation in the American way of life. Let the farmer support that legislation, and he will find that he has all the workers he needs. But he cannot any longer avoid providing decent working conditions and decent wages for American workers by relying on a foreign labor source.

BRACERO PROGRAM TERMED NECESSITY FOR WYOMING

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in this modern age it is difficult to remember that there are still many jobs that must be performed by hand and, unfortunately, our American civilization has progressed to a point where many Americans, without employment, find some occupations so uncomfortable that they will not perform them.

This is the case in the cultivation of sugarbeets, a major industry in the State of Wyoming. Although much of this agricultural operation has become mechanized in recent years, there are still jobs which cannot be done by machine—thinning and hoeing for example—without serious loss of productivity.

In the Wyoming beetfields these jobs are now done by imported farmworkers from Mexico—braceros. Many people have complained that by importing these workers we are denying jobs to local workers in a time when unemployment has become all but chronic in many areas of the Nation. The truth is that there have been many attempts to use local people for these jobs and invariably those recruited for such labor do not stick to the job and cause considerable hardship to the farmers who must find last minute replacements for them. The braceros have proved that they can and will do this type of work and I support the extension of the legislation to permit their entry into the United States for that purpose, as I have on every occasion since coming to the Senate.

The State of Wyoming has 23 counties, 8 of which are major sugarbeet producers. Sugarbeet processing factories are located in the towns of Torrington, Worland, and Lovell. The production of sugarbeets and, therefore, a large part of our agricultural economy is based upon the continued supply of economical labor for this difficult field work.

It is very possible that within a few years new chemical and mechanical processes will make even this type of manual labor unnecessary. Until that time, the use of braceros is a necessity for Wyoming's sugarbeet industry.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMINICK. I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FRAUDULENT WAREHOUSE RECEIPTS OF SOYBEAN AND OTHER VEGETABLE OILS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, within the past couple of weeks considerable publicity has been given to the mysterious manner in which a multimillion-dollar swindle in fraudulent warehouse receipts of soybean and other vegetable oils has been perpetrated by the Allied Crude Vegetable Oil Refining Corp., of Bayonne, N.J., one of the Nation's biggest suppliers of oil for export.

The Wall Street Journal of November 22, 1963, carried an article on this transaction entitled "About $15 Million of Soybean Oil Gone, Dealer Says—Forged Orders Are Claimed." In this same paper there was notice of two brokerage firms being suspended as the result of the loss they were expected to sustain as holders of some of these faked warehouse receipts. I understand that these brokerage houses have since been reinstated or taken over.

Yesterday, December 2, 1963, the Wall Street Journal carried another long article on this same subject; this time the article was entitled "Outdoing Billie Sol—How Phantom Salad Oil Was Used To Engineer $100 Million Swindle—Commodity Dealers, Storage Firms, Banks Duped at Big Tank Farm in New Jersey."

Since this story first broke I have received numerous calls concerning the possible connection this company may have had with the soybean oil deal which I denounced in the Senate under date of August 15, 1963. On that date I called attention to the fact that in 1961 the Department of Agriculture had sustained a sizable loss under contracts for the procurement of 500 million pounds of refined salad oil and shortening—principally soybean oil. This oil had been bought by the Government on the excuse that they were supporting the price of soybeans. In reality on the date of the purchase the market for soybeans was considerably in excess of the support price.

It was later found that in accepting delivery of this oil practically all of it had been of an inferior quality or was packed in leaking containers, with the result that it was rejected in the numerous countries throughout the world as unfit for human consumption.

My remarks concerning that scandalous situation may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 15.

Following the recent disclosure of a multi-million-dollar swindle in forged warehouse receipts for vegetable oils, I began getting inquiries as to whether or not the same company, the Allied Crude Vegetable Oil Refining Co., was involved in both swindles.

The answer is yes, Allied Crude & Vegetable Oil Refining Co. was involved in both transactions. I have conferred with the Comptroller General, and in the light of the recent developments he has approved the release of the complete report in connection with this first case, dated December 27, 1962, No. B-149686. This complete report is now available at the Comptroller General's Office to anyone interested in obtaining a copy.

In addition to this report of December 1962, a supplemental letter was received from the Comptroller General's Office under date of February 26, 1963. This second letter outlines in greater detail certain aspects of the case.

The Comptroller General, after conferring with the Department of Justice, has agreed to release the full report of December 27, 1962, and to the release of the supplemental information as contained in his letter of February 26, 1963, minus two sections concerning pending or contemplated litigation.

Accordingly, I am at this point asking that there be incorporated in the RECORD first, the Comptroller General's letter of December 2, 1963, authorizing the release of this material. Second, I ask that there be printed that portion of the Comptroller General's letter of February 26, 1963, the release of which they have approved. The Comptroller General's report itself is too voluminous to have incorporated in the RECORD; however, as stated earlier, it is available at his Office upon request.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, December 2, 1963.

The Honorable JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Reference is made to our conversation with you concerning the release to the press of our report of December 27, 1962, and supplemental letter report of February 26, 1963, regarding certain aspects of the procurement of salad oil and shortening by the Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture.

We have reviewed the contents of those reports both in this office and with Department of Justice representatives. We have found no objection to the release of the report of December 27, 1962, and will do so in accordance with your request.

As indicated to you in our telephone conversation of November 27, there are certain portions of the letter of February 26, 1963, the release of which might adversely affect the interests of the United States in pending or contemplated litigation. We are enclosing a copy of that letter, with suggested deletions on pages 6 and 8 thereof, as discussed with you, in view of our understanding that you may wish to insert an appropriate part of the letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Enclosure.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, February 26, 1963.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Further reference is made to your letter dated December 31, 1962, requesting additional information on certain aspects of the procurement of salad oil and shortening by the Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, which was the subject of our report to you dated December 27, 1962 (B-149686).

We have obtained from files made available to us by the Department of Agriculture and the Maritime Administration the following information pertaining to the matters and the companies mentioned in your request. Your attention is invited to the fact that we have not independently checked the accuracy of this information.

SHORTENING CORP. OF AMERICA, INC.

Corporate information

Address: 542 Henderson Street, Jersey City, N.J.

Officers: President-treasurer, Anthony De Angelis; vice president-secretary, Alfredo Suarez; directors, Anthony De Angelis, Alfredo Suarez, Maurice Samel, Vito Scaminaci.

Principal stockholders

Details regarding stockownership in the Shortening Corp. of America, Inc. (Shortening Corp.) were not available in files of the Department of Agriculture. Also, our inquiries of other sources did not disclose the ownership of the stock.

Summary of the violation for which Shortening Corp. was suspended from participating in programs financed by Commodity Credit Corporation

The Shortening Corp. was included in a group of firms suspended on July 14, 1961, from participating in programs financed by the Commodity Credit Corporation because the group may have been involved, or affiliated with parties involved, in the submission of allegedly false shipping documents in connection with a shipment to Spain of soybean oil financed by the Commodity Credit Corporation under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1701), commonly referred to as Public Law 480. This transaction, which involved an outlay of about $1.2 million by the U.S. Government, was not eligible for such financing. Under title I of Public Law 480 the Commodity Credit Corporation generally provides dollars, through reimbursement to domestic banking institutions, to finance the sale and exportation of surplus agricultural commodities to certain nations in exchange for foreign currencies.

While Shortening Corp. did not appear to be directly involved in the transaction, it was included with those suspended because information available to the Department of Agriculture indicated that the corporation's President, Anthony De Angelis, controlled a firm—Allied Crude Vegetable Oil Refining Corp. (Allied)—that did appear to be directly involved in the matter. The suspension was terminated on July 24, 1961, after a settlement amounting to about $1.5 million had been agreed upon by the parties to the suspension.

A summary of the facts in the case, as disclosed by information in the files of the Department of Agriculture, follows.

On January 27, 1958, the Governments of the United States and Spain entered into an agreement whereby the United States agreed to finance, pursuant to authority contained in title I, Public Law 480, certain surplus agricultural commodities to be purchased in the United States by Spain. Pursuant to this agreement, the Department of Agriculture issued a purchase authorization on February 11, 1958, for Spain to buy soybean and cottonseed oil, valued at up to $41,800,000, with financing to be provided by the Commodity Credit Corporation under terms of Department of Agriculture regulations governing title I transactions. Subsequently, on April 18, 1958, a U.S. exporter entered into a contract to sell to the Government of Spain 7,900 metric tons of soybean oil. On the basis of shipping documents indicating that 3,506 metric tons of soybean oil had been shipped to Spain in April 1958, the Commodity Credit Corporation paid the exporter, through a commercial bank, the sum of $1,186,642.

Information in the files of the Department of Agriculture indicated that an official of the Foreign Agricultural Service was informed that part of the soybean oil sold to Spain by the exporter had been shipped prior to April 18, 1958, the date of the sales contract in question. If such was the case, the shipment would not be eligible for financing, since the Department's title I regulations provided that, except for cotton, commodities shipped from the United States prior to the date of sale under the title I program would not be financed under the program. Therefore, the Department instituted an investigation of the matter. Reports on the investigation were issued on August 1, 1958, and November 14, 1958, by the former Commodity Stabilization Service—now designated as Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service—Department of Agriculture.

According to the investigation reports, evidence was developed indicating that the shipping documents showing that the 3,506 metric tons of soybean oil had been exported in April 1958 were false and that the oil had, in fact, been shipped to Spain on March 4, 1958, prior to the date of the sales contract. The reports contained evidence that the exporter had obtained the soybean oil from Allied and that Allied had obtained for the exporter the necessary shipping documents required by the Commodity Credit Corporation before it would finance the sale. Also, the investigation reports indicated that an ocean carrier may have been involved with Allied in submitting the allegedly false shipping documents.

On August 4, 1958, the Department of Agriculture forwarded to the Attorney General copies of various documents, including its investigation report dated August 1, 1958, for appropriate criminal and civil frauds action and for other action to protect the interests of the Government. The investigation report dated November 14, 1958, was forwarded to the Attorney General on January 14, 1959.

In March 1960, the Department of Justice filed a civil suit against the exporter and the commercial bank that paid the exporter on behalf of the Commodity Credit Corporation and that subsequently was reimbursed by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Department of Justice sought a judgment in the sum of $1,186,642 together with interest and costs. Subsequently, civil frauds action was filed against Anthony De Angelis, Allied, the ocean carrier, and one other individual, seeking recovery of double damages and forfeitures allowable by law under the False Claims Act (31 U.S.C. 231).

According to information contained in the Department of Agriculture files, the soybean oil that had been shipped to Spain in March 1958 was subsequently disposed of by sale to the Government of Spain in June 1960 for dollars in the amount of $1,040,680. A memorandum dated July 5, 1961, from a vice president of the Commodity Credit Corporation stated that the sale was consummated by and with the agreement of the U.S. Government, the exporter, the ocean carrier, and Allied. Information in the Department's files indicated that the Commodity Credit Corporation was reimbursed $20,251 out of the sales proceeds for certain expenses incurred in the sale and that the balance of the proceeds ($1,020,429) was deposited with the U.S. Government to be held until the lawsuits were disposed of.

At the suggestion of the Department of Justice, the Commodity Credit Corporation on July 14, 1961, suspended Anthony De Angelis, Allied, the ocean carrier, and affiliated firms from participating in any programs financed by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Department of Justice suggested this action so that the Commodity Credit Corporation would not be in a position of jeopardizing the outcome of the pending court action by continuing to do business with the parties charged with alleged violations of the False Claims Act.

On July 24, 1961, the Attorney General accepted a compromise offer made by Allied and the ocean carrier in settlement of all claims against any and all defendants in the civil actions, and on that date, in accordance with the terms of the offer, the Commodity Credit Corporation terminated the suspension against the affected parties and affiliated firms.

Records of the Department of Agriculture show that under the terms of the settlement the Commodity Credit Corporation retained the $1,020,429 received previously by the United States from the sale of the oil, plus an additional $466,000 which was to be paid by Allied and the ocean carrier as follows: $150,000 upon acceptance of the offer by the United States and the balance of $316,000 in 12 equal monthly installments bearing interest at the rate of 4 percent a year. Agency records show that these amounts were paid in accordance with the terms of the settlement.

Also, the defendant's offer of settlement, as accepted by the Government, provided that the offer was not to be deemed an admission of liability but that it was made solely by way of compromise and settlement of the pending civil frauds actions. In this connection, the Department of Agriculture files indicate that the exporter was not aware that the oil had been shipped to Spain prior to the date of the sales contract.

Other violations with which Shortening Corp. has been charged

Our review of the files at the Department of Agriculture did not disclose other violations with which the Shortening Corp. has been charged. However, the files show that the president of Shortening Corp., Anthony De Angelis, was reported as being the controlling official in two other firms (Adolf Gobel, Inc., and Allied Crude Vegetable Oil Refining Corp.) which were the subjects of investigations by agencies of the Department of Agriculture.

1. Adolf Gobel, Inc. (Gobel), was the subject of an investigation report dated December 3, 1952, concerning possible false claims on deliveries to the Department of Agriculture of smoked pork products purchased for distribution under the Department's school lunch program.

According to the files, this matter was disposed of when the Department of Agriculture, with the approval of the Department of Justice, accepted an offer of settlement submitted on February 6, 1953, by Anthony De Angelis, as president of Gobel, whereby Gobel would pay $100,000 to the Government. The $100,000 represented an estimated $50,000 in actual damages suffered by the Department of Agriculture and $50,000 in forfeitures under the False Claims Act. Agency records show that the $100,000 was paid.

Gobel's offer of settlement contained the following statement:

"This offer does not constitute an admission that any act or omission on our part was of such character as to subject us to any liability under the contracts or the statutes referred to."

In addition, by letter dated May 21, 1953, the Department of Agriculture notified Gobel that the firm had been debarred from participation in any contracts of the Department for a period of 5 years because of the contractual irregularities in this case.

[Deletion.]

SCARBURGH CO., INC.

Corporate information

Address: 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

Officers: President, Jakob Isbrandtsen; vice president, Alexander S. Abdirkin; treasurer, David H. Whamond; secretary, Roy F. Pierce; assistant secretary, Henry A. Scherrer; directors, Jakob Isbrandtsen, M. S. Crinkley, A. E. Rising, Jr., W. M. Isbrandtsen, and Roy F. Pierce.

Principal stockholders

Scarburgh Co., Inc. (Scarburgh), is a wholly owned subsidiary of Isbrandtsen Co., Inc. According to records of the Maritime Administration, Jakob Isbrandtsen is the sole trustee of two trusts that own about 65 percent of the voting and about 56 percent of the nonvoting common stock of Isbrandtsen Co., Inc., and is cotrustee with Albert E. Rising, Jr., of a third trust which owns about 33 percent of the voting and about 28 percent of the nonvoting common stock. Jakob Isbrandtsen owns about 2 percent of the voting and about 14 percent of the nonvoting common stock. The preferred stock is owned primarily by the three trusts and by several related companies.

Summary of the violation for which Scarburgh was suspended from participating in programs financed by Commodity Credit Corporation

As previously noted a group of firms was suspended by Commodity Credit Corporation on July 14, 1961, from participating in programs financed by the Commodity Credit Corporation because of possible involvement in the submission of allegedly false shipping documents that caused the Government to finance an ineligible sale under title I, Public Law 480. Scarburgh was included in the group of suspended firms because it was a wholly owned subsidiary of the ocean carrier that appeared to be involved in the transaction. The records and investigation reports of the Department of Agriculture disclosed no evidence that Scarburgh was directly implicated in the case.

Scarburgh's suspension was terminated on July 24, 1961, after a settlement had been agreed upon by the parties to the suspension.

Our review of the files of the Department of Agriculture did not disclose any other

violations with which Scarburgh had been charged.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest that both the SEC and the appropriate committee of the Congress examine this case, first to see what has happened and then, how and why it happened and make recommendations as to what steps can be taken legislatively or otherwise to provide protection for legitimate investors and to prevent its reoccurrence.

LEGISLATIVE DELAYS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, in times of tragedy and crisis our national institutions are tested. The American people, and indeed the people of the whole world, now are following governmental affairs with intense interest. Must the loss of a great President plunge us into a period of weakness and futility, or will we rise with renewed determination to carry on the task of perfecting democracy?

President Johnson has already shown the courage and competence the Members of this body knew he possessed. The world now sees that our executive branch is in good hands. But what of the Congress?

The founders of our Nation believed in a government of law, and a government of law requires lawmaking. Yet the lawmaking function of the U.S. Government has now run into grave difficulties which only the lawmakers themselves can remedy. We cannot expect outside help. We cannot gloss over our difficulties with apologies or with unrealistic reviews of our alleged accomplishments. The facts against the record of this Congress are, at this point, beyond refutation. Here we are, on December 3, with major appropriations for a fiscal year that is nearly half gone still not yet enacted.

Can the Congress still submit to tactics of delay and to petty haggling while the public looks on with growing scorn and dismay? A threat to the Nation remains as long as business as usual and creeping paralysis prevail on the Hill.

In the wake of tragedy the Nation's press and millions of private citziens have begun to analyze more carefully the prevailing attitudes toward Government. Violence, hatred, and bigotry have been decried in volume. We have had a new diagnosis of the disease of political extremism, of unreasoning violence growing out of abject disgust for established law and order.

Identifying the disease is not enough, however. We all know that good health is the first step in preventing disease. The health of the legislative branch is in our hands, and at this moment we are letting it decay through our neglect.

The people of this Nation cannot understand why a few Members of the Senate should be able to block the whole Senate from considering and voting on measures of immense public interest. While they appreciate the great checks and balances written into our Constitution, they do not see the necessity for so many additional checks and balances in the internal operation of the Congress that the only product is inaction.

This is not a time for explanations or elaborate defenses of the status quo. It is a time for decision. One of the first orders of business should be action on proposals designed to improve legislative procedures. Our Rules Committee has already considered three of these and has reported them to the Senate. They have been on our calendar since September. Many Senators favor them.

Two of these measures are simple resolutions. They were the outgrowth of a bipartisan study early this year by the ad hoc committees named by the majority and minority leaders to recommend means of expediting the Senate's business.

Senate Resolution 89, relating to germaneness of debate in the Senate. This resolution provides that at the conclusion of the morning hour, or after the unfinished business or pending business has been laid before the Senate and for the 3 succeeding hours, all debate, motions, and appeals must be germane. It provides for exceptions on the basis of unanimous consent or on motions without debate. The senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] introduced Senate Resolution 89 for himself and 30 other Senators.

Senate Resolution 111, relating to meetings of committees while the Senate is in session. This resolution provides that no standing committee shall sit without special leave while the Senate is in session after the conclusion of the morning hour, or after the Senate has proceeded to the consideration of unfinished business, whichever is earlier. As the Rules Committee points out in its report, adoption of this resolution would enable committees to continue in session while the routine and relatively unimportant business of the morning hour proceeds on the floor. Surely now is the time, Senators, to declare that no longer shall one Member, by refusing unanimous consent, delay the work which many other Senators seek to do. The senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] introduced Senate Resolution 111 for himself and others.

The Rules Committee also gave careful consideration to the third proposal still pending, Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, which the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] introduced. The committee redrafted this resolution after hearings. As now presented to the Senate, it would establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress to be composed of six Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and six Members of the House to be appointed by the Speaker. The committee would be equally divided between the majority and the minority parties.

The Rules Committee restricted to structural matters the area of study by the proposed joint committee, avoiding ideological pitfalls such as rule 22. It rightfully took the position that Members of Congress are fully informed concerning the pros and cons of the present rules of floor procedure. Furthermore, the Constitution provides that "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings."

Comprehensive reports are available on all three of these measures, and, therefore, I will not recite the detailed provisions of them. They are not complicated. They do not commit us to any great or sudden changes.

This is not a time for timidity. It is not a time for business as usual. This is no time for politics as usual. It is a time to keep uppermost in our minds the objective of restoring confidence in government among those Americans who, however misled or misinformed they may be, have found reason to view the established order with distrust, scorn, or hatred.

Mr. President, the brutal truth of recent events demands action. It is time for the Congress to take stock, to shape up. To do otherwise would be to risk the fate of other democracies, no less noble political institutions of the past, that through neglect and decadence became mere debating societies—their former power absorbed by all-powerful executives.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that I understand an informal agreement has been reached to have the yea-and-nay vote on the pending Ellender motion on the bracero bill held at 1 o'clock tomorrow, I feel I am not interfering with the business of the Senate by asking unanimous consent that two editorials published this morning in the New York Times and Washington Post, respectively, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

These editorials make the point that the civil rights bill has been before Congress for almost 6 months, and that there seems to be very little prospect that it will be voted on by the other body this year.

Both of these two eminent and influential newspapers urge that Congress take action and at least bring the civil rights measure before the Senate before adjournment for the Christmas holidays.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 3, 1963]

TOO MUCH DELAY ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The declaration by Representative ALBERT, the House majority leader, that he sees no possibility of a House vote on civil rights in this session is deeply disquieting to all who hoped President Johnson's strong plea for quick action would break the long stalemate in Congress. Once again the deep-freeze tactics of Chairman SMITH of the Rules Committee are preventing the House from expressing its will on a measure which the Nation needs and which, there is good reason to believe, a majority in both parties favor.

The result of this footdragging is bound to be an intensification of the resentment that has prompted Roy Wilkins of the NAACP to warn that his organization will set up a purge list of Congressmen hostile to civil rights legislation. Mr. Wilkins, whose sound judgment has been exhibited repeatedly over

the years, must be aware that purge lists are a double-edged sword—aggravating divisions in the community and often backfiring against the causes they are supposed to serve.

Organized labor learned this lesson in the immediate postwar years, and has been careful to avoid any suggestion of a national purge list ever since. Civil rights groups will continue to make their greatest progress—as has been suggested by Bayard Rustin, principal organizer of last summer's March on Washington—by broadening their ties with all the other community forces that share their determination to make equal opportunity a reality for all Americans.

The place where this progress is most emphatically needed today is in the House. The defeatism of the majority leader ought not to become the death knell for the sense of urgency President Johnson tried so hard to impart. "We have talked long enough in this country about equal rights," he declared. "We have talked for a hundred years or more. It is time now to write the next chapter, and to write it in the books of law."

Representative BOLLING of Missouri has announced that he will circulate a petition to bypass the Rules Committee and thus break the logjam. He will have to buck the traditional reluctance of the House to force discharge of a bill before Chairman SMITH has signified his imperial pleasure to have it go forward (except where handouts to veterans are concerned). He is also up against the apparent resolve of Congress to adjourn for the Christmas-New Year holiday on December 20.

With all these handicaps to overcome, his effort will require a supreme demonstration of support from the leaders of both parties and from the country if it is to produce a vote this session.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 3, 1963]

TOUCHSTONE

It is time for a showdown on civil rights. The issue has plagued and divided the country far too long. Congress simply cannot, in good faith to the American people, go home for the holidays without at least bringing the civil rights bill to a vote in the House.

There are two devices by which the bill can be brought to a vote. One is for the House Rules Committee to send the bill to the House floor without delay. It should do so at once. The House Judiciary Committee has held full and fair hearings on the bill and has reported a sound and effective measure. Additional hearings in the Rules Committee can have no other purpose than obstruction. The Rules Committee's function is simply to fix the conditions for debate on the House floor. It can fulfill this function before the House meets tomorrow if Chairman HOWARD SMITH will stand aside, or if a majority of his committee will take the measure away from his obstructive control.

The other device is a discharge petition. Representative RICHARD BOLLING, a member of the Rules Committee, has already set this procedure in motion. It can be successful only if the petition obtains 218 signatures, a majority of the House membership; and it cannot bring the bill to the floor for debate until December 23, 2 days before Christmas.

It would be harsh to make the Members of Congress stay in Washington through Christmas. But it is worth remembering that other Americans, in the service of their country, will be spending Christmas in South Vietnam, in Korea, and in other distant outposts. And if Congressmen, forced to stay here for the holidays, want to know who killed Santa Claus for them, they can look to the man who compelled recourse to the discharge petition: HOWARD SMITH.

If the discharge petition is necessary, let the signers make themselves known. For this will, in itself, be the touchstone, the decisive vote, on civil rights. Those who sign the petition will be recorded and known as supporting civil rights; those who fail to sign will be identified as opposed.

President Johnson and his legislative spokesmen can do no less than compel Congress to remain in session until the House acts. Postponement will be a betrayal of the hopes and faith of millions in the orderly processes of representative government. No Member of the House can, in good conscience, go home to observe the birthday of the Prince of Peace without casting a vote in favor of the brotherhood of man.

INJUSTICES IN EXISTING TAX LAWS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an able article entitled "Machines Are More Important Than People (Yes or No?)," written by Philip M. Stern, and published in the New York Times magazine of December 1, 1963. Mr. Stern is writing a series of articles which make a strong case for tax reform and which point out with great cogency and exactitude the many injustices and paradoxes contained within existing tax laws.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACHINES ARE MORE IMPORTANT THAN PEOPLE (YES OR NO?)

(By Philip M. Stern)

The following is an attitude test. Do you agree or disagree with these statements?

1. Repairing a dented fender is more important than fixing a broken arm. (Yes; no.)

2. People should not try to educate themselves for a better job, but should be content with their present job. (Yes; no.)

3. The boy working his way through college is less deserving than the football star on an athletic scholarship. (Yes; no.)

4. People should be penalized for continuing to work beyond age 65. (Yes; no.)

5. People should be encouraged to go into debt rather than to live within their means. (Yes; no.)

6. Places of learning are less important than places of worship. (Yes; no.)

7. Machines are more important than people. (Yes; no.)

8. The inventor of, say, a new pretzel bender is more important than the writer of a new book, play, poem, song, or symphony. (Yes; no.)

9. A blind person deserves financial help, but a paralytic does not. (Yes; no.)

10. People who work for a living are less deserving than those who don't. (Yes; no.)

11. The work of money is entitled to a greater reward than the work of people. (Yes; no.)

If you disagree with eight or more of the above statements, it is not time to see your doctor—but it may well be time to see your Congressman or Senator and ask him a few questions about our tax laws.

Why? Because every one of the above statements is contained in those laws. Of course, you won't find them stated in just the way they are in the attitude test; nor, in most cases, did the writers of the tax laws intend to make such value judgments when they framed the tax code. The fact is, though, that no tax law can be free of such judgments, and when, some weeks hence, the members of the Senate Finance Committee begin writing amendments to the pending tax bill and to the tax code itself, they will doubtless insinuate some new moral precepts into the statute, just as their predecessors did before them.

As the attitude test shows, many of the value judgments in the tax laws do not coincide with what a preponderance of Americans believe.

Most people are probably unaware they exist. Even now, for example, you may be highly dubious that the tax laws really do draw the conclusions on which the attitude test was based. Where, for example, does it say that repairing a fender is more important than fixing a broken arm? Well, section 165(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code provides that all so-called casualty losses—even the most minor ones, such as dented fenders—are tax deductible, whereas section 213(a)(1)(B) states that, for those under 65, medical expenses that come to less than 3 percent of income are not deductible. (The House version of the pending tax bill allows casualty deductions only for items in excess of the first $100; but these days, even a fender may well cost more than $100 to fix.)

Americans schooled to revere the virtues extolled by Horatio Alger will surely be shocked to learn that the tax laws discourage initiative, self-advancement and the quest for knowledge. Yet consider the case of Nora Payne Hill, a Danville, Va., schoolteacher very much in the Horatio Alger tradition. Although Miss Hill could have fulfilled her State teaching requirements right in Danville, she chose to journey to New York to attend Columbia University summer school, in the belief that "she could do a better job in Danville by so doing."

The Tax Court sternly disallowed the deduction of her $239.50 of summer school expenses, applying the accepted rule of law that educational expenses incurred in the pursuit of a higher position are not deductible. The expenses of standing still, yes—those are deductible—but not those devoted to moving ahead in life. "However commendable (Miss Hill's) conduct may have been," the Tax Court found, her journey to the fount of knowledge was not necessary to maintain her present position. Besides, the court observed, "she said she loved to go to summer school."

Happily, a higher court reversed the Tax Court as "unreal and hypercritical" and allowed Miss Hill her $239.50 deduction—but only because it exonerated her of the sin of trying to elevate herself to a higher station. Had the appeals court suspected her of such a sinister motive, it would have upheld the Tax Court, for the rule against self-advancement must be maintained. (The rule is defended on practical grounds: Unless some line is drawn to define what educational costs are "ordinary and necessary" business expenses, it is argued, all educational outlays would have to become tax deductible, and the drain on the treasury would be formidable.) A group of research chemists, similarly, was not allowed to deduct the costs of attending law school in order to become patent chemists; and a psychiatrist was denied a deduction for the expenses of his own psychoanalysis—a prerequisite to his advancement to the status of a qualified analyst.

Now that being born in a log cabin has gone out of style, a modern equivalent for the aspiring politician is the claim of having worked his way through college—preferably by waiting on tables. While such industriousness thus appears to enjoy great public approbation, the law takes a more critical view. It taxes the hard-earned income of the college waiter, but leaves untouched the athletic "scholarship" which enthusiastic alumni bestow upon the football hero (and which the law treats as a gift).

In order to ease what are commonly called the "twilight years," Congress has compassionately conferred on those over 65 a tax credit on the first $1,200 of their income from pensions, dividends or other investment income. But the elderly are encouraged to suppress any desire to supplement that income and to keep busy, for the moment they earn more than $1,200 a year, the tax credit begins to fade away. When their earnings reach $2,400 it vanishes entirely.

Their unearned income, however, can rise to any height without penalty. So long as all remunerative work is meticulously avoided, the tax credit retains its full glory. Once they have safely reached the age of 72, though, they may once again join the ranks of the gainfully employed without adverse tax consequences.

"Poor Richard's Almanack" and similar fountainheads of wisdom are replete with admonitions about the evils of borrowing and the virtues of living within one's means ("He that goes a-Borrowing goes a-Sorrowing. * * * The Borrower is a Slave to the Lender").

Benjamin Franklin would doubtless be horrified, therefore, by the manner in which the tax laws make the Government of the United States an active partner in encouraging people to stray from the balanced family budget. For, after all, since interest payments are tax-deductible, Uncle Sam bears a part of the cost and makes borrowing less expensive. Modern-day economists, to be sure, might well applaud the ample use of credit; but Poor Richard would never condone such erosion of fiscal virtue.

Wherein do the tax laws either state or imply that institutions of learning are inferior in importance to institutions of worship? Section 511(a)(2)(A) states that if a college or any other charitable organization owns an "unrelated business," such as a macaroni factory, the profits of such a business are subject to regular taxes.

However, if the same macaroni factory is owned by "a church, a convention or association of churches," the macaroni profits are immune from taxation. "The exemption conferred for our spiritual needs," observes Louis Eisenstein, tax attorney, "also embraces the worldly pursuit of profit."

Judging from the tax law, the inventors in our midst are clearly to be revered over our authors and composers, for while section 1235 specifically confers a tax blessing upon the fruits of the inventor's imagination, section 1231(b)(1)(C) just as specifically denies that tax favor (the special 25-percent capital-gain rate) to authors, composers, and artists.

In the eyes of the tax law, it appears, any invention—even the aforementioned pretzel bender—contributes more to the well-being of society than, say, a Faulkner or Hemingway novel, a Robert Frost poem, an Aaron Copland symphony—or, perhaps a Rodgers and Hammerstein Broadway musical.

As to the preference shown the blind, the story is simple: Congress has sympathetically conferred an extra $600 exemption upon those to whom sight is denied—but this expression of compassion for the handicapped mysteriously began and ended there.

And who, reading the tax laws, can doubt that machines are more important than people? After all, when a businessman invests in a machine, he is entitled to take tax deductions on the cost of that machine over its useful life. But the tax laws give him no comparable merit points for investing in his son (by sending him to college).

Moreover, the tax laws are most understanding about the aging of machines. A year-by-year allowance is made as machines lose their zip and zest and approach the age of retirement. But leaving aside the minor concessions made at age 65, the tax laws sternly forbid any recognition of the gradual aging of human beings—except, perhaps, in one instance.

The initial purchase price of professional baseball and football players, bought and sold precisely like indentured slaves, may be "depreciable." But do not rejoice for the players, for they derive no benefit. Only the purchaser of the ball club is thus blessed.

Any youngster reading the biographies of the titans of America's past (the Franklins, Jeffersons and Lincolns, the Lewis-and-Clarks, the Andrew Carnegies and the Henry Fords), cannot escape the deeply held American precept that it was heroic personal effort—hard work—that made these men and their country great. "Poor Richard's Almanack" confirms this wisdom ("Diligence is the Mother of good luck. * * * Idleness is the greatest prodigality").

Yet in many respects, the tax law seems to frown upon those who work for their living—or, at least, to smile warmly upon those who don't. Some of these respects have already been mentioned: the comparative penalty, for example, suffered by those who work beyond the age of 65, or who wait on table to get a college education. Wives, moreover, may be said to be discouraged from working since this reduces the tax advantages their husbands derive from matrimony.

But these are peripheral disadvantages compared with the dramatic preference accorded unearned income over earned income. Those blessed with large holdings of corporate stock, for example, derive their dividends income through the managerial efforts and talents of others but are nevertheless favored with the "dividend credit," a tax concession denied those whose income is wholly earned. Others may, without lifting a finger, inherit great wealth generated by the efforts of their forebears, and pay not a penny of tax when they receive it.

But by far the greatest advantage enjoyed by unearned income is the special capital-gains tax rate, which openly proclaims that the work of money is entitled to a greater reward than the work of people. Lawyers (and other high-paid professionals, such as doctors or engineers), it is said, live well, but die poor. Why? Because they perform the work of people, and for their efforts they are taxed at the regular income-tax rates, ranging up to 91 percent. Others, on the other hand, who have the means to put their money to work, are favored with a tax rate that rises no higher than 25 percent.

This is not to depreciate the value of capital, an essential ingredient in society. But capital without human effort counts for little—indeed, it is the addition of human effort and ingenuity that brings capital to life.

In times past, the American tax laws have sought to favor this human factor through a preferential "earned-income credit." But human effort requires no such preferential recognition. What is wrong with simple equality, which can be effortlessly achieved by taxing the work of money and the work of people according to the same rates—including, of course, an averaging device for smoothing out "bunched" income of various sorts?

These and many other value judgments are scattered throughout the tax law—although few are as overtly stated as section 152(b)(5), which expresses a deeply ingrained American attitude toward mistresses (it denies their benefactors the right to claim them as dependents). Most of them are subtly buried in the inscrutable legal verbiage of the Internal Revenue Code. But as the Duchess said, "Everything's got a moral—if only you can find it."

AMENDMENT OF TITLE V OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED—HOUSE AMENDMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1703 to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a vote on the Ellender motion, now pending, at 1 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, with the following proviso: That there be a morning hour until 12:30 p.m.; and that the half hour between 12:30 p.m. and 1 p.m. be equally divided between the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] and the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], or Senators whom they may designate, each side to have 15 minutes, with the vote to take place at 1 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Pell in the chair). Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, reduced to writing, is as follows:

Unanimous-Consent Agreement

Ordered, That the Senate proceed to vote at 1 p.m. on Wednesday, December 4, 1963, on the motion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] to concur in the House amendment to S. 1703, to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes: *Provided,* That the time from 12 noon until 12:30 be used for the transaction of routine morning business, and that the time from 12:30 until 1 p.m. be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy] respectively.

AMENDMENT OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, AS AMENDED

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar 643, S. 1698.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 1698) to amend section 511(h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to extend the time for commitment of construction reserve funds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the proviso at the end of section 511(h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "*Provided,* That until January 1, 1964, in addition to the extensions hereinbefore permitted, further extensions may be granted ending not later than December 31, 1964."

Sec. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall take effect December 31, 1963, or on the date of enactment of this Act, whichever date first occurs.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tonight, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Montana what measures he will ask to have laid before the Senate following the yea-and-nay on the Ellender motion tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The pending business is S. 1111, to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, and for other purposes.

It is hoped that following the disposition of that bill, in which the Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. DOMINICK] have an interest, it will be possible to have the Senate consider Calendar 462, H.R. 82, to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to provide for the reimbursement of certain vessel construction expenses; Calendar 502, S. 927, to amend title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to remove certain limitations with respect to war risk insurance issued under the provisions of such title; and such other measures as may be ready for consideration.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE V OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED—HOUSE AMENDMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1703, to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, it seems to me that the opponents of the motion of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] have based their argument largely on two phases: First, that if the bracero program did not exist, it would be possible to fill the requirements of agricultural labor with domestic labor.

Their second position is that whether that be true or not, the elimination of the program would automatically benefit domestic agricultural labor, and therefore be good so far as the country as a whole is concerned.

It does not seem to me, upon analysis, that this point will stand up. Public Law 78, which is what we are dealing with, contains specific requirements. Such requirements must be certified by the Secretary of Labor prior to the time that any braceros can be recruited under contract. In order to make this point crystal clear, I shall read these provisions into the RECORD:

> No workers recruited under this title shall be available for employment in any area unless the Secretary of Labor has determined and certified that (1) sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified are not available at the time and place needed to perform the work for which such workers are to be employed; (2) the employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed; and (3) reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers for such employment at wages and standard hours of work comparable to those offered to foreign workers.

Simply stated, these three provisions require certification by the Secretary of Labor, before any bracero program can be made effective in any particular area of the country, that there are not enough domestic agricultural workers available for jobs in an area. In order to preclude a contention that workers were not available when, in fact, they had not been offered sufficient wages, a second finding is made necessary; namely, that the braceros who may be brought into the area will not adversely affect wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed. In other words, there cannot be competition from braceros which will adversely affect domestic labor.

The third requirement is proof that one has made a reasonable effort to recruit domestic agricultural workers before braceros may be imported into an area at all.

When those three requirements have been fulfilled, then, and only then, is anyone entitled to have bracero labor brought into a particular area where there is a labor shortage.

I have before me a letter from the Grower-Shipper Vegetable Association of Central California, commenting on the need for the bracero program. In my opinion, it is an exceptionally good letter. I should like to read excerpts from it into the RECORD, because the points made bear upon what I was discussing; namely, the argument that there really is no need for the importation of Mexican labor, and that an adequate supply of domestic agricultural labor can be obtained if only agricultural employers try hard enough to obtain them.

The letter begins:

> Vegetable and berry production in the central coastal area of California is practically a year-round operation. We commence harvesting in April and are harvesting in large quantities from the first of May until the first of December. This area ships approximately 60,000 carloads of fresh vegetables throughout the Nation. Our major vegetable crops are lettuce, celery, carrots, broccoli, onions—dry and green, tomatoes, artichokes, brussels sprouts, cauliflower, green and dry beans, sugarbeets, and strawberries. Ninety percent of the fresh vegetables and berries are shipped out of the State and are distributed throughout the country for consumption.

I think it is important to note that not one of those crops is in the surplus category. So in dealing with this bill, we are not in the process of debating a measure which would result in the importation of additional labor in order to make available additional surplus crops.

I read further from the letter:

> We grow and ship from 20 to 45 percent of the Nation's supply for several of these commodities.

In other words, in this one area in central California, 20 to 45 percent of the entire country's supply is grown.

Then it is stated in the letter:

> At the peak of our harvesting season, May and September, we have historically used approximately 12,000 supplemental workers. From March 20 until January 1, we use a minimum of 2,000 to 3,000.
>
> For the last 2 years the Department of Labor would not certify for supplemental workers for the months of January and February and it has been necessary for some of our growers to reduce their acreage during the winter months. We have recruited several thousand domestic workers from the San Francisco, Sacramento and San Joaquin areas. These workers have proved quite unsatisfactory as they only worked a few hours to a few days and left.
>
> If the growers are able to continue their historic production it will be necessary to recruit domestic agricultural workers. It is doubtful if there are available workers willing to go into agricultural production in numbers up to 12,000. Many of these people, of course, would be family people and we would be required to furnish suitable housing for families which we presently do not have to accommodate such large numbers. Because of the vagaries of agriculture, we would not be able to afford them a continuity of employment as agricultural crop production does not permit continuous employment. Were we placed in a position to have to depend on domestic agricultural workers recruited from areas throughout the country, the cost would be prohibitive in that thousands of them may mentally think they can do the work but would not be able or care to do the work required. Obviously the welfare problem would be of staggering proportions.

Mr. President, I also have before me a letter dated July 22, 1963—it really is a series of statements—from Agricultural Commodities, Inc., of Phoenix, Ariz. This organization is a central Arizona farmers association engaged in growing and shipping fruits and vegetables which require foreign supplemental field labor.

On the same point, this organization submits some excellent material, from which I read, as follows:

> There has been much said about the decrease in the number of Mexican nationals contracted during the past 3 years.

This point was brought up during the debate in an effort to show that Mexican labor is not needed, because its use has been decreasing over the years, and that therefore the smaller number needed can be replaced by domestic workers.

The statement by this group continues as follows:

> This primarily is due to the increased use of cottonpicking machines. The need of Mexican stoop labor remains about the same it has been for several years and there is every indication this trend will continue for many years to come.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The statistics certainly prove beyond any doubt that we have fulfilled every responsibility and in many instances have gone beyond the requirements of the law.

The reference is to the Arizona State Employment Service, established by a law which requires that domestic agricultural workers coming into that group shall be placed in employment if physically possible.

I read further from the statement:

> This is confirmed in statements from officials of the Arizona State Employment Service that at no time has a foreign worker taken the place of a domestic.
>
> The attached records show that in spite of our efforts to attract, recruit, and employ domestic labor, especially stoop, the State officials over a period of years have found it necessary to certify the contracting of supplemental Mexican nationals in order to get the job done.
>
> We have never been accused of cutting any corners or failure to provide work for all available domestic labor and it will be noted that during a congressional farm labor hearing in Phoenix in 1958 Mr. E. P. Theiss, regional director of AFL–CIO for Arizona and New Mexico, testified he was not opposed to recruitment of Mexican nationals and not opposed to the extension of Public Law 78.

This is quite an interesting statement, in view of some of the comments made on the floor of the Senate; I refer to statements that, in general, the unions are opposed to this program. Apparently the person who was most closely associated with it, insofar as Arizona and New Mexico were concerned, did not feel that way.

I read further:

> It is an absolute fact based on performance and recommended by Arizona State Employment Service officials and supported by documentary evidence, attached hereto, that supplemental foreign labor is urgently needed.

Mr. President, I could cite many more examples of this sort.

I hold in my hand a letter written by Mr. James C. Hanagan, of Lamar, Colo.; his letter was addressed to the Reverend James H. Kane, of Pueblo, Colo. A copy of the letter was sent to me. In the letter, Mr. Hanagan replied to a series of editorials protesting against extension of the bracero program. One of the things he pointed out in his letter—and it is of extreme interest—is that the very nature of domestic migrant labor makes it almost impossible for those engaged in that work to have any established family life or any continuity of schooling or any ability to provide for the domestic migrant laborers the education which we are so desperately trying to give to so many people in this country. In the letter, Mr. Hanagan points out that if this program is ended, and if an effort is made to increase the number of domestic migrant laborers, and if that effort is conducted with sufficient force to bring into the program enough domestic workers to take care of all the crops, the result will be by virtue of this program itself, the creation in the United States of a whole new group of younger people who, because of the nature of this employment, will not be able to have access to the desired educational facilities. In the letter, Mr. Hanagan goes into some detail in discussing this point.

He makes one more point which I tried to make during the previous debate on this subject. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has mentioned this point. In addition to the problems which we might have from the welfare point of view and the education point of view, as a result of developing a new group of domestic migrant laborers, we also have the question of the exploitation of the Mexicans if this program is rescinded and if Public Law 414 is allowed to remain on the statute books. On that point, Mr. Hanagan writes:

> Let Congress repeal Public Law 78, and you will see the most flagrant exploitation of our American labor group since slavery days. There simply won't be nearly enough able and willing workers to perform the necessary stoop labor in the growing and harvesting of certain fruit, vegetable, and other specialized crops.
>
> Then I suggest that you visit the Spanish-speaking settlement of some southern Texas city, San Antonio for example, next March or April; and you will see the mad rush by sugar companies, canning companies, fruit and vegetable packers, corporate farms and the like vying for the workers' favor. Then you will see the Spanish speaking exploit the Spanish speaking because of their generally poor education, low standard of living, and lack of ambition; the recruiter interested only in his fee. Why should he care for the old, the sick, or the young so long as the recruiting fee is paid on each? No doubt he has contacted his Congressman asking repeal of Public Law 78, as such action would certainly put him in "tall clover."

(At this point Mr. PELL took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I have quoted the statement of a man who is writing with deep compassion for the migrant laborer. He feels that, until we have had an opportunity to prepare a schedule ahead of time as to how to take care of these problems, repeal of the program at this time would be one of the worst things we could do, not only in relation to the importation of Mexicans who are coming across the border, but also from the point of view of our own domestic agricultural migrant labor supply.

In that same connection, I hold in my hand a short article from the El Paso Herald Post, dated November 5, 1963, entitled "Wetback Total Soars in October." It reads:

> A heavy increase in the number of illegal entrants from Mexico was reported today by the U.S. immigration border patrol.
>
> Apprehensions during October of this year exceeded 600 in greater El Paso, twice the number usually made in October, Patrol Chief Herman Moore said.
>
> The total does not include juveniles who are caught and shooed back across the Rio Grande.
>
> Nearly all those apprehended are adult males seeking jobs here or trying to make their way into the interior of the United States. Seventy-five percent of the wetbacks are caught near the border within 72 hours after they cross. The others are nabbed at highway check points, on trains or buses, or at work.
>
> Most of the illegals cross at night. Some carry small bundles of clothing.
>
> Immigration officials said the number of wetbacks caught is the highest in 7 or 8 years. Curtailment of the bracero import program and economic conditions in Mexico are believed to have stimulated the wetback influx. A Juarez newspaper estimated that there are 35,000 unemployed "chiefs of family" in that city alone.

The point I am making is to reiterate that the reason we put the bracero program in to begin with was to try to do something to prevent the exploitation of the Mexican laborer under conditions through which Mexicans out of work would come to the border and try to slip across to try to get some kind of work in this country. All kinds of abuses occurred because of that practice. No one was responsible for any of the conditions under which they were working. If we, in effect, repeal Public Law 78, as has been suggested on the floor of the Senate, all that we shall do will be to revive the evil that we tried to stop in the first place.

So, when we hear that the bracero program is bad, in and of itself, and that we should no longer go on with it in the interests of humanity and welfare, it is not necessarily a fact.

The fact is that the bracero program has been well operated. It has been operated well. It has been of substantial value to the U.S. agricultural economy throughout the country. The program has been beneficial not only to our agricultural economy, but also it has been conducted in such a way that it has not hurt domestic agricultural labor. It has been carried on in such a way that it has been of great help to Mexicans themselves.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The last statement of the Senator that the Senate amendment would not help the domestic worker shapes the issue. Is not the issue which is before the Senate whether we shall pass the House bill, which provides for a simple 1-year extension of the Public Law 78 program, or whether the Senate shall insist on a conference with the House, in which would be considered a 1-year extension of the Public Law 78 program and the McCarthy amendment? Such procedure would help the American domestic worker by providing that, before the Mexican worker could work in a community, the American worker would have to have offered to him some of the job and personal protection that the Mexican worker is given. Is that not the issue?

Mr. DOMINICK. The issue is whether the Senate will concur with and pass the House version, which provides for a simple 1-year extension of the act without the McCarthy amendment.

The assumption of the Senator from New Jersey that the bracero program can be put into effect in any area of our country with any harm to domestic agricultural labor is erroneous. In my comments at the start of the debate I cited the three requirements that must receive certification by the Secretary of Labor before any braceros can be put into any area. I do not know whether the distinguished Senator from New Jersey is aware of the details of those requirements, but they are fairly explicit.

In general, the requirements provide that braceros cannot be employed in any area in which there is domestic agricultural labor available, that the employment of the braceros cannot adversely affect domestic agriculture workers similarly employed, and that farmers in the area have made reasonable efforts to attract domestic workers to take on those jobs and they have been unable to do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to ask an additional question. In the Public Law 78 program and the treaty with Mexico there is most precisely written the requirement that a community which seeks Mexican national labor cannot discriminate within the community because of the national origin or, indeed, the ancestry of the worker. Is there any requirement that would provide that the community had to eliminate discrimination in public accommodations against Americans before Mexicans could be brought in?

Mr. DOMINICK. No; but I hope that we shall get some action on that question during the present Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. What I have stated is not one of the requirements under the McCarthy amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. But some of the other protections that Mexican nationals are afforded are not afforded to our own American agricultural workers.

I am not disturbed because, after the Mexican Government had hammered out job protections for Mexican nationals who come here in response to seasonal need, we have granted those protections; what bothers me is why on earth we cannot do as much for our own people—Americans, our citizens. Why can we not do the same for them? Why should we not go to the House of Representatives and insist that we do? The Senate has adopted an amendment which would impose that requirement. It would protect our own people, though it would give them only a part of what we give to Mexican nationals.

Honestly, is there any human reason or any debater's logic that would deny Americans what we give Mexican nationals?

Mr. DOMINICK. We are talking about two wholly different subjects. The Senator has made some very good points——

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Those are the provisions of the McCarthy amendment, which the Senate has adopted. The issue is whether we shall go to conference or take the old program of a 1-year extension that we have had for years without any protection for American workers.

(At this point Mr. Metcalf took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator is trying to say that we should take up labor legislation, which would come from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, instead of the bracero program, which comes out of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, tie the two concepts together, and do something about it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I hope that the Senator from Colorado has supported some of the proposed legislation related to labor that has been reported out of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare dealing with migratory farm workers. We have not had too many record votes on those issues, but I am sure that in the back row—as I, too, am in the back row—the voice of the Senator from Colorado was loud and clear for the American worker and for his family. I was glad to hear the Senator express concern about the youngsters of American migratory workers and their lack of education.

One of the bills passed by the Senate is at the other end of the Capitol. Let us work together to have it passed.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. DOMINICK. The point I was about to make related to the question of the value of this program to the Mexican economy. In the daily Congressional Record for June 26, page A4066, is an article inserted by Representative Gathings, of Arkansas. It is written by David Weber. It has a dateline of Mexico City. It strikes me as being extremely good. I wish to read, not all of it, but a portion of it, in the context at this point. It reads in part:

> Mexico could be in serious trouble if the United States closes its doors to "braceros," the migratory farmworkers who every year go north of the border to help bring in the crops. * * *
>
> If the bracero is legislated out of existence, they fear, Mexico's economy and possibly its political stability will suffer.
>
> Bracero dollars, about 35 million of them every year, have traditionally made up a third of Mexico's favorable balance of payments. More significant than the loss of dollars is the burden that these 200,000 workers would throw on the already strained rural unemployment in Mexico.
>
> The lack of food, work, and land—exaggerated in recent years by persistent droughts and Mexico's inexorable population growth—has turned the docile peasant into an active and angry political factor that is particularly worrying to the Government because of next year's presidential election. If the bracero is added to the huge rural unemployment lists, the situation could be explosive.

That is only a portion of the article, which continues in like strain.

These points were emphasized in the hearing on the bill. The representative from the Department of State, Mr. Sayre, explicitly said that this is one of our most important programs insofar as our aid to Mexico is concerned.

My distinguished colleague [Mr. Allott], in the process of discussing the situation in Colorado, pointed out quite clearly that $1 of bracero money earned and taken back to Mexico was worth $5 of foreign aid, and this is another reason why the program should be continued.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to have some help from the Senator from Colorado with respect to certain questions of fact involved in the bracero problem, because I wish to be sure I am correct in the conclusions I have previously drawn. I know of no one who is better qualified to tell me whether or not I am correct than the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. If I cannot do it, I will call on my distinguished colleague.

Mr. MORSE. I am sure the Senator can.

A few minutes ago the Senator from Colorado read the terms and conditions our Government officials must apply before braceros can be hired in any community in this country. Am I correct in my understanding that the terms and conditions which must be met in any community before a bracero can be brought in guarantee full economic protection to any American domestic worker who is available for work on the farms?

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator is correct. The Secretary first must certify that there is not adequate domestic labor available at comparable wages before the braceros can be brought in.

Mr. MORSE. That was my next point. If it is found that there is not adequate domestic labor available, employers can look into the possibilities of obtaining bracero help; is that correct?

Mr. DOMINICK. That is correct. Before they do that, once again, they must not only show that they have looked in their own local area but also that they have made reasonable efforts outside their area to bring in domestic workers, and have been unable to do so.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true that they also must offer the same pay and working conditions to American domestic workers that they would offer to and provide for bracero workers?

Mr. DOMINICK. That is correct, with two exceptions, I believe. I do not believe it is necessary to offer housing to the domestic laborer, insofar as the entire family is concerned, if the family is being brought in. Obviously, if they are to obtain them, they must provide housing, but this is one reason why they do not like to go too far afield. They do not know how long a person, if imported, will stay. With the braceros only coming in—the head of the families, males only—farmers do not have that particular problem.

Mr. MORSE. What basis in fact is there, then—if any—for the argument which is used against the bracero program, that it discriminates against American domestic workers?

Mr. DOMINICK. I really do not believe there is any basis for it. That is one of the points I was trying to bring out. I am glad the distinguished Senator from Oregon has brought it out.

Mr. MORSE. Has the Senator any reason to believe that a part of the opposition of organized labor in this country to the bracero program may be related to the fact that the braceros perhaps would not be considered potential members of American organized labor?

Mr. DOMINICK. I hesitate to reply in the affirmative, because I have never had that statement made to me by the head of a union. I have usually been told that the problem is that they are trying to put on a drive to unionize agricultural workers and that so long as there is a right to bring in braceros it is very difficult to do so. This is a part of the problem that must be dealt with. Whether the other statement is true or not I do not know.

Mr. MORSE. I do not believe the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Oregon have to yield to any other Senator in our desire to protect American domestic workers, but it seems to me that those who argue that there is some discrimination against American workers because they are being denied jobs by the bracero program have a duty to submit the evidence to show that domestic workers are available. Some of us who come from areas where braceros are used know that domestic workers are not available.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. They cannot possibly be obtained. If the program is dispensed with, it will put upon the farmers in those areas a problem with respect to losing perishable crops.

If an American labor organization could provide the domestic workers, I would certainly insist that the domestic workers be hired. But it is the duty of the Secretary of Labor to determine that domestic labor is not available before the braceros are hired in the first place. That is true, is it not?

Mr. DOMINICK. That is absolutely correct. I wholly agree with the distinguished Senator.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. Is it not true that bracero labor is not less costly than the hiring of domestic migrant workers?

Mr. DOMINICK. It is not a bit less costly.

Mr. TOWER. The requirements are somewhat severe; are they not?

Mr. DOMINICK. They are, because of the transportation and housing that must be paid for by the employers.

Mr. TOWER. So if a farmer were able to obtain American labor, he would use it and thereby keep his costs down; would he not?

Mr. DOMINICK. I believe so. Most farmers have been scrambling to obtain help of almost any kind, and they have not been able to get it.

Mr. TOWER. I did not hear the earlier remarks of the Senator, in which I understand he touched on the effect of the bracero program on American-Mexican relations. Is the Senator aware that the bracero program accounts for Mexico's second biggest source of dollar earnings?

Mr. DOMINICK. I had the pleasure of listening to the distinguished Senator from Texas point out this fact very clearly in our previous debate. I think it is extremely important to emphasize that fact.

Mr. TOWER. Is it not true that the United States has a favorable balance of trade with Mexico?

Mr. DOMINICK. It is.

Mr. TOWER. So this program actually contributes to the trade intercourse between Mexico and the United States, and we are the indirect beneficiaries, in that the Mexicans buy more from us.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is a very good point.

Mr. TOWER. I wonder if the Senator is aware of the opinion of Mexican ambassadorial and consular officials with reference to the bracero program?

Mr. DOMINICK. I cannot say that I am, other than the statement of the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Sayre, in which he explained that this was an extremely important program to Mexico.

Mr. TOWER. If the Senator will indulge me, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement from the Embassy of Mexico, contained in the report of the committee, to the effect that the bracero program has worked very well, and that there is no doubt that the program has been a firm foundation for good relations between the people of the two countries.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Embassy of Mexico

The Ambassador of Mexico presents his compliments to His Excellency the Secretary of State and has the honor to inform him of the position of the Government of Mexico with respect to the decision taken by the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States on May 29 last, rejecting the bill that would have authorized the executive branch of the United States to extend the international migrant labor agreement that expires on December 31 of this year.

The Government of Mexico considers that there would be no call for any observation whatever concerning the aforesaid action, had the need for Mexican labor that has existed for a number of years among the farmers in various parts of the United States disappeared, or if systems other than those used so far were available to meet that need. It is not to be expected that the termination of an international agreement governing and regulating the rendering of service by Mexican workers in the United States will put an end to that type of seasonal migration. The aforesaid agreement is not the cause of that migration; it is the effect or result of the migratory phenomenon. Therefore, the absence of an agreement would not end the problem but rather would give rise to a de facto situation: the illegal introduction of Mexican workers into the United States, which would be extremely prejudicial to the illegal workers and, as experience has shown, would also unfavorably affect American workers, which is precisely what the legislators of the United States are trying to prevent.

The Governments of Mexico and the United States have for many years been faced with the problem of the illegal entry of Mexican workers into U.S. territory in search of work. The maximum number of arrests made by the Immigration Service of the United States reached 803,618 in 1953, a year in which only 201,380 workers were contracted. Since that time the efforts of the two Governments to eliminate illegal entries, at the same time leaving the door open under the legal procedures of the international migrant labor agreement of 1951, produced the desired results, the number of arrests having been reduced to 31,106 in 1959, during which year 437,643 workers were contracted.

Despite the fact that in 1960 the number of contracted workers began to decrease markedly, the number of illegal workers did not increase, the conclusion being that the Mexican workers have understood and accepted the fact that if they cannot obtain work by contract, it is because they would not obtain it either by entering the United States illegally. Here are some pertinent data:

Year	Contracts signed	Deportation
1960	315, 846	28, 492
1961	291, 420	31, 350
1962	194, 978	12, 283

In the last 3 years there has been a considerable increase in the number of Mexican farmworkers who have applied for and obtained residence visas to come to the United States, through letters issued by farmers and growers in the United States who have offered them employment. It is estimated that no less than 32,000 farmworkers obtained their documents in 1961 and possibly some 40,000 in 1962. The statistics on the contracting during the last 5 years show that there were barely 50,000 jobs for the workers during the 12 months of the year, open at various times during the year and in various States, so that in order to be able to work without interruption during the entire year, it would be necessary for the workers to move from one place to another. Since it is impossible to achieve precision and coordination even with the means available to the two Governments, it is concluded that the aforesaid increased number of resident farmworkers do not have permanent work but in fact continue in their status as seasonal workers, working for an employer for 6 or 8 weeks and then returning to Mexico in the hope of being called upon to work for another short period—an operation that is repeated two or three times a year. As may easily be seen, this situation will create problems for both Mexico and the United States, since during the jobless seasons the worker with a residence visa will burden the economy on one of the two countries, with the same consequences of accepting ill-paid work, obtaining official assistance, etc.

There is good reason to believe that the absence of an international agreement governing temporary employment of farmworkers will lead to an increase in the types of migration pointed out above.

Finally, it should be considered that on various occasions when at international meetings on migrant worker problems representatives of the Government of the United States have indicated their purpose of decreasing the contracting until the elimination point is reached, the Mexican representatives have requested that an attempt be made to make the decrease gradually, in order to give Mexico an opportunity to reabsorb the workers who have habitually been working in the United States and thus to stave off the sudden crisis that would come from an increase in national unemployment. The stoppage of the contracts at the start of 1964 would leave approximately 200,000 persons out of work.

It is not considered that the contracting of Mexican workers under the international agreement has produced unfavorable effects on American workers. Quite the contrary. The benefits granted the contracted braceros, in the matter of insurance covering occupational accidents and illness, the extremely careful regulations on lodgings and transportation, and the constant inspection of food have provided a pattern that can be followed for domestic workers who lack such protection. And with regard to the wage increase obtained for Mexican workers on various occasions, chiefly in the year 1962, what was obtained through the effort of the Mexican Government and the cooperation of the Department of Labor of the United States, to such an extent that in some localities the wages are higher than those paid to domestic workers, represents the reason why this type of work is now looked upon as acceptable by the American workers.

It was precisely the presence of the "wetbacks" in the fields of the United States that created a situation undesirable from every standpoint, since those persons have not even the most elementary kind of protection and were the victims of exploitation in respect of wages, because they were forced to accept whatever pay was offered to them, and domestic workers were unable to compete and found themselves compelled to move to other areas. The lack of an agreement to facilitate contracting as long as there is a shortage of farm labor, which the Mexican workers have been covering, would tend to bring about a return to that situation. And although Mexico would make efforts to prevent it, as was indicated by the Secretary of Foreign Affairs of Mexico at a press conference on June 5, the willingness of American employers to give work to the wetbacks explains why in many cases the Mexican workers violate the law of the United States, and it is very important for the Government of this country to solve this problem.

The virtual extinction of discrimination against and segregation of persons of Mexican nationality in areas of the United States where such practices once existed can decisively be attributed to the contracting of Mexican workers under international agreements. The need for labor which only the Mexican could supply but which was not authorized for localities where special schools were maintained for Mexicans, or where they were segregated in restaurants, theaters, etc., and discriminated against in respect of wages, etc., led the authorities concerned to put an end to that situation.

There is no doubt that this has been a firm foundation for the good relations between the peoples of the two countries.

In this connection, it is appropriate to note that in September 1954, the President of Mexico stated in his annual message to the Congress that efforts were being made to solve the difficult problem caused by the exodus of Mexican farmworkers, "acting in full and friendly cooperation with the Government of the United States in this task, in order that those who go to work may do so under the protection of existing agreements." And if indeed the contracting should come to an end, it is hoped, as the Secretary of Foreign Affairs said during the press conference mentioned above, that the two Governments will act vigorously and determinedly to prevent the illegal traffic of workers, which benefits neither Mexico nor the United States and is a constant point of discussion between the two Governments and the communities where the braceros who enter illegally work.

(Initialed.)

WASHINGTON, D.C., *June 21, 1963*.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Texas. These are extremely important points, and ones that should be emphasized. Heaven knows, we spent enough time on the foreign aid bill. If we have a program which is so much more effective, at one-fifth the cost, for that reason alone it should be adopted.

Mr. TOWER. The State Department has always recognized the fact that the bracero program has made an important contribution to good Mexican-American relations. In a Federal district court suit brought by the American Federation of Labor, seeking to force the Federal Government to ban laborers living in Mexico from crossing the border to labor in Texas, the State Department notified the court that a ruling against the Federal Government might have adverse effects on international relations. So it is apparent that the State Department is concerned with this program and recognizes that bracero labor promotes good relations between the United States and Mexico.

Mr. DOMINICK. I share the view of the Senator from Texas. I appreciate his support.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I was very happy to hear the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Colorado. I join him in support of the motion of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, chairman of the Agriculture and Forestry Committee, that the Senate concur in the House-passed version of the so-called bracero bill.

The hour is growing late. I believe that all of the statistical data—if not all, a great deal of it—has been inserted in the RECORD, both this afternoon and in the previous hearings and debate in the Senate. Therefore, I intend to confine my remarks, which will be reasonably brief, to what I consider to be the chief issues in the Senate and to try to explain them in a cold, logical, and, I hope, humane way, for the benefit of the Senate and of the country.

I am shocked to find there are so many people in this country who have picked up the slogan of "slave labor," or something like that, and who have marched up and down the street, almost literally waiving this banner, without an investigation into the facts.

I had occasion to read the hearings in the House at some length before the measure was taken up in the Senate earlier this year. I was astounded at the number of witnesses testifying in the House committee against the bill who stated, in effect, "We have had reported to us this or that."

I wish to make it plain that what I am discussing on the floor of the Senate this evening is what the Senator from Colorado knows of his own knowledge. I speak about this problem not from an academic standpoint, not from reading a series of reports. I discuss it not on the basis of listening to somebody who has read somebody else's report, and who has become enthusiastic about some slogan or banner behind which he wants to walk up and down the street. I talk about it as a person who knows of the problem, who has lived with it 33 years of his life. Except for the time spent in the Senate, those 33 years have been spent in eastern Colorado, in a farming community. I have represented farmers, trying to help them solve their problems and working with them. From that experience I speak tonight.

First of all, let us discuss the need. There is no question that not only in my State, but in other States, such as California, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, Utah, and Wyoming, there is an agricultural need for what has been referred to as stoop labor.

I do not like the term, but everybody knows what it means. I do not like the term because to me it is un-American in its aspects and concepts. But it designates the kind of labor a man does in the field, which is hard labor—the picking of beans and tomatoes, in which he actually stoops, and even travels on his knees along the rows to pick the vegetables, to cut lettuce at the stalk, to thin beets. These are activities that are referred to as stoop labor.

While I personally detest the term, I use it because everyone else uses it and everyone knows what we are talking about.

In the Western States, though there has been an improvement, for example, in the kind of seeds used to grow sugarbeets, which eliminates much of the thinning of sugarbeets, and we have gone this far to help eliminate the need for stoop labor, such labor is still needed to thin sugarbeets. How can a machine determine which cucumbers should be made into pickles or which ones are of the right size or of the right maturity to go into the hopper with the brine? It cannot be done. How can a machine determine when tomatoes can properly be harvested? Of course, it might be able to pick out the tomatoes which we unfortunately have to be contented with in this city, and which may be called tomatoes only because they bear a superficial resemblance to the kind we are blessed with in the West.

I see the Presiding Officer [Mr. METCALF] nodding his head. He knows what I mean. I am sure the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is present on the floor, also knows what I am talking about.

So the need for this kind of labor is established.

We talk about machinery. It is true that important advances have been made in machinery. Sugarbeets are now harvested completely by machinery. Yet just a few years ago it was done with a plow, and essentially by hand.

We are making further advances in the picking of other vegetables. However, the cold fact, which cannot be denied, is that a certain amount of this labor has to be obtained if the American people, the consumers, are to have these vegetables of Arizona, Colorado, Texas, California, or wherever they may be grown, in their homes at a reasonable price, which they can afford to pay.

I do not believe that any of the opponents are advocating for a moment that we should try to deprive the American people of these products.

Therefore the program contemplates the need, and it also contemplates the machinery factor, which I do not believe will ever—and I use this term advisedly—do away completely with stoop labor, no matter how far it has gone.

The next question I wish to discuss is the question of the American market for labor. The cry has rung out several times, again and again, that this makes slave labor out of their own Spanish-Americans, as we call them—other people call them Mexicans—and that it depresses the labor market.

Of course, all of this is absolutely false. I refer first of all to the colloquy which occurred on the floor a few moments ago between the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] and my colleague from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], in which the Senator from New Jersey asked, "Why not provide the same things for American labor?"

What could stand out as more plausible and just? I am for it. Everyone is for it. However, there are some fundamental differences between the kind of labor that is available in the American market, when it is available, and if it is available, and the kind of labor that comes over from old Mexico.

The first great difference is that when laborers come over from old Mexico—and they go through their own Government, and the contract is essentially a contract between the two Governments—the workers come over as adult males;

they do not have their families with them.

The first question that arises is, "We want to be fair. We want to give the same treatment to Americans that we give to the Mexican nationals, the braceros, who come in."

If we are to be fair, what must we do? Is it a fair and equal condition of employment for the employer to transport the local man and his wife and three or four or five or six children across the country, and pay for this transportation and for the housing for such a family? This is not a comparable condition of employment. It is not possible to provide the barrack-type of buildings that are used for braceros. We cannot provide that kind of building for an American farm family. It is not possible. They must have more room. At the least they must have the family-type accommodation, not the barrack-type accommodation.

The experience of this country has been, I am sorry to say—and I went into this in some detail—that we have not been able to utilize our American labor because, for one thing, our labor does not want to do this kind of labor. I read from page 16 of the House report on the bill, as follows:

> As noted in the tables above, most domestic workers are local people requiring neither transportation nor housing.

In my own experience, in the majority of cases that is true in Colorado.

The report continues:

> To endeavor to establish such requirements with respect to some but not all domestic workers would involve insurmountable administrative complications and embroil farmers and Department officials in constant controversies.
>
> It is reasonable to require a farmer to pay transportation from the border and return for a group of Mexican workers who normally complete their contract terms because they must return to Mexico if they leave the employment of the farmer. But to require farmers to pay transportation from distant points to domestic workers who may leave his employment the day after they arrive would be an unreasonable requirement.
>
> Any relationship between the use of braceros and displacement of American workers classified as hard core unemployed can be judged by the experience in Michigan. The Michigan Employment Security Commission, in attempting to place urban unemployed into seasonal agriculture jobs found fewer than 1 out of 20 stayed on the job long enough to have a successful work completion record.

What does this mean? Does this mean that our workers are incompetent and worthless? I do not think so. It means that people who have been accustomed to a higher type of work will not go back into the fields to do stoop labor if they can possibly help it.

The second point I wish to address myself to—and I see the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon in the Chamber—is the point that he raised when he addressed questions to my colleague from Colorado. I read the three requirements from the law, Public Law 78, as it was enacted:

> The Secretary of Labor must determine and certify that (1) sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified are not available at the time and place needed to perform the work for which such workers are to be employed.

Let me interpolate something at this point. There has not been a year in my service in the Senate when I have not been besought at one time or another by farmers in Colorado who could not find domestic labor to do their work and who were having a difficult time convincing the local and State employment service and the Secretary of Labor that the workers were not available.

So the employers wait while their crops ripen in the fields, and sweat it out, hoping that they will be able to obtain workers to harvest their crops before they are overripe and destroyed.

If any of the critics of the bill think it is easy to convince the Secretary of Labor that there are not sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified, and not available at the time and place needed, let him try—in the spring, summer, or fall—to convince the Secretary of Labor.

The second condition that must be met is:

> The Secretary of Labor must determine that employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and the working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed.

Next:

> That reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers for such employment at wages and standard hours of work comparable to those offered to foreign workers.

We thus have three standards that must be met. Who must be satisfied? Not the farmer, not the local community, not the State, but the Secretary of Labor himself must be satisfied: First, that workers are not available; second, that the employment will not adversely affect their wages; third, that reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers to the jobs.

The other side begs the question again and again, but they will not face the fact that it is the Secretary of Labor of their own administration who must make this determination; the farmer himself has no control over it.

I now move to another phase of my argument. The assertion has been made that the bracero program in the United States has contributed to a moral breakdown of the braceros themselves. I wish that some of the critics would take a short trip to Mexico. I wish they would travel through the countryside and see the people who come to the United States to do stoop labor, and see how they live at home.

I know farmers who employ braceros. I have been in the housing that is provided for them. I have seen the extra food that farmers provide for the braceros. I have seen the plentiful supply of water that is provided for them. Yes, even though it is not called for in the contract, I know of the medical facilities that are provided for braceros. The farmers provide many other benefits that any decent, ordinary American would provide. There is no class of people in the whole world who are more decent or have a greater sense of anxiety about being their brother's keeper than the farmers of this country. I am not talking about corporation farmers; I am talking about the individual family farmers whom I know and have known all my life.

Does it break down a man's morality to live in a little hut composed of twigs and thatches in the mountains or on the plains of east Mexico, but who when he comes to the United States to work can live in clean barracks and have decent food, good water, and medical care? In all probability, he gets better water in this country than he has ever drunk before in his life. Also, he is provided with showers. Probably he never heard of a shower or saw one before. Often he has to be taught to use a shower and a toilet. Do such improved conditions help to break down the morality of braceros who come to this country? Let us not be so stupid or so silly as to think so.

Considering the financial aspect of the situation, the distinguished Senator from Texas has said that the program affects the balance of trade between the United States and Mexico to the extent of some $37 million a year, although this is decreasing, as has been said before. What does this mean to the bracero who comes into the United States? Let us consider the question from his standpoint. I have already discussed the conditions under which he lives. In Mexico, the earning power of that type of person is about $100 a year. That indicates how people of that class live in Mexico. I do not say that in disparagement. I only wish they could live as we in the United States live. But when such a man comes to the United States and works a maximum of 210 days a year, which is what the law will permit him to work in the United States, he usually takes back with him, if he works a full season, between $500 and $600. Can we, considering our own prosperity, possibly imagine what $500 or $600 means to that man's family in Mexico, when the family before that time lived on $100 a year? Their standard of living is raised.

The Ambassador from Mexico made a statement to the State Department—I do not have it before me at the moment, but there is no question about it—approving this proposal, as did the Government of Mexico.

I wish to read from the remarks of Representative TALCOTT, of California, at page A5126 of the daily RECORD of August 12, 1963. He was referring to an editorial that was published in the Odessa, Tex., American. The editorial concludes:

> It ought also to be noteworthy that the Mexican consul in San Francisco took occasion to disagree publicly with the Congressman who said the bracero program was degrading to Mexicans.

Mr. President, I could continue on this point for a long time. However, I think I have adequately covered it. I do not believe there is any question that from the standpoint of living, morality, and the effect on the man's own family when he returns to Mexico, the bracero is much better off when he comes to the United States. Strangely enough, considering the remarks of some of the opponents of my position that our own labor market is depressed, I do not regard that to be the situation. We still must consider the requirement that the Secretary of Labor must make the determination that the program does not depress farm labor in the United States.

For example, I notice that the minimum wage paid braceros in Colorado was 90 cents an hour. I had a hand in that 90-cent figure. The people of my State were not concerned about it. The rate originally had been fixed at $1 an hour. I visted the office of Secretary of Labor Goldberg in the spring of 1961 and said, "We do not want this amount to be reduced. The farmers of Colorado do not want it to be reduced below $1 an hour. They do not care about its being lower than $1. All we want is to have our rate equalized with that of Texas and some of the other States."

Texas still has a 70-cent rate; Colorado has a rate of 90 cents. On a piecework basis, the rate averages 90 cents an hour for a pay period which cannot be more than 2 weeks or less than 1 week.

What is the situation with respect to wages paid to domestic farmworkers in Colorado?

Based on the minimum wage provided in the Sugar Act of 1948, there is a wage of $1.05. I have just noticed a publication in the Federal Register of November 20, 1963, in which the Secretary of Agriculture has set the same wage for the coming year.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement on this particular aspect of the situation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALLOTT: BRACERO

We have heard much about how braceros depress the agricultural wages. However, I think it has been adequately demonstrated that the braceros themselves are fully protected in their rights with work and wage guarantees enforced by the Secretary.

In the November 20, 1963, issue of the Federal Register on page 12282, there appears a notice to "interested parties" regarding public hearings to be held for the purpose of receiving evidence likely to be of assistance to the Secretary of Agriculture in determining fair and reasonable wage rates "for persons employed in the production, cultivation, or harvesting of sugarbeets for the 1964 crop." This authority to establish wage rates is granted the Secretary in the 1948 Sugar Act (61 Stat. 929; 7 U.S.C. 1131), and specifically contained in subparagraph (c)(1) of section 1131, of title 7, U.S.C., which provides in substance that before subsidy payments will be made to the farmer under this act all wages must have been paid to workers in full; and that they must have been at a rate not less than the rate to have been determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable; and that if such wages have not been paid then the Secretary may withhold an amount equal to the amount of accrued but unpaid wages from the farmer's payment and pay that amount directly to the worker. In Colorado there were 8,657 farmers in 1961 who were receiving such payments and thus subject to the provisions of the Sugar Act that I have just mentioned. I believe that this figure represents virtually all of the sugarbeet farmers in the State of Colorado, just as 39,826 producers in all States receiving payments under the Sugar Act in 1961 represents the vast majority of all the sugarbeet producers in the United States.

This is just one example of how the executive branch of the Government is not only fixing the wages of the domestic farmworker but is also guaranteeing the payment of those wages. Now we are asked to believe that the Secretary is not performing his lawful duty and is not establishing a fair and reasonable wage. I would not so indict the Secretary.

[From the Federal Register, Nov. 20, 1963]

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND
CONSERVATION SERVICE.

SUGARBEETS: 1964 CROP; WAGES AND PRICES IN STATES OTHER THAN CALIFORNIA, AND DESIGNATION OF PRESIDING OFFICERS

Pursuant to the authority contained in sections (c)(1) and (c)(2) of section 301 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended (61 Stat. 929; 7 U.S.C. 1131), and as further amended by Public Law 87–535 and Public Law 87–539, and in accordance with the rules of practice and procedure applicable to wage and price proceedings (7 CFR 802.1 et seq.) notice is hereby given that public hearings will be as follows:

At Salt Lake City, Utah, on December 6, in the Bankruptcy Court Room No. 220, Federal Building, 350 South Main Street, beginning at 9:30 a.m.

At Fargo, N. Dak., on December 18, in the community room, Metropolitan Savings & Loan Association Building, 303 North 5th Street, beginning at 9:30 a.m.

At Detroit, Mich., on December 20, in the Sky Room, Pick-Fort Shelby Hotel, beginning at 9:30 a.m.

At San Antonio, Tex., on January 7, 1964, in the assembly room, Gunther Hotel, Houston at St. Mary's Street, beginning at 9:30 a.m.

At McAllen, Tex., on January 9, 1964, in the Fairway Motor Hotel, South 10th at Wichita Street, beginning at 9:30 a.m.

The purpose of these hearings is to receive evidence likely to be of assistance to the Secretary of Agriculture in determining (1), pursuant to the provisions of section 301 (c)(1) of the act, fair and reasonable wage rates for persons employed in the production, cultivation, or harvesting of sugarbeets for the 1964 crop in States other than California, on farms with respect to which applications for payments under the act are made, and (2), pursuant to the provisions of section 301(c)(2) of the act, fair and reasonable prices for the 1964 crop of sugarbeets in States other than California, to be paid under purchase or toll agreements by producers who process sugarbeets grown by other producers and who apply for payments under the act.

To obtain the best possible information, the Department requests that all interested parties appear at the hearings to express their views and to present appropriate data with respect to wages and prices.

The hearings after being called to order at the time and places mentioned herein, may be continued from day to day within the discretion of the presiding officers and may be adjourned to a later day or to a different place without notice other than the announcement thereof at the hearings by the presiding officers.

C. B. Freeman, D. E. McGarry, W. S. Stevenson, and C. F. Denny are hereby designated as presiding officers to conduct either jointly or severally the foregoing hearings.

Signed at Washington, D.C., on November 15, 1963.

E. A. JAENKE,
Acting Administrator, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

[F.R. Doc. 63–12142; Filed, Nov. 19, 1963; 8:48 a.m.]

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, in Colorado, the average wage of domestic workers is $1 an hour. In almost every instance, the average hourly wage for farmworkers in Colorado, without room and board, is $1.16. It can hardly be said that braceros in Colorado have depressed farm wages in that State.

I shall bring my remarks to a conclusion. My colleague [Mr. DOMINICK] spoke of a letter from Mr. James Hanagan, of Lamar, Colo. I refer again to this letter because I have known Mr. Hanagan for many years. He lives about 4 miles from my hometown, and on what is known as the old Koen Ranch. I shall read a part of his letter, because it was not solicited by me or by my colleague. It is addressed to the editor and business manager of the Southern Colorado Register, Rev. James A. Kane, who has been both vituperative toward and critical of both my colleague [Mr. DOMINICK] and me concerning this matter.

The covering note, which is handwritten, reads as follows:

OCTOBER 28, 1963.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: Note the different approach to the solution of a difficult problem.

Thank you for your support of the bracero program.

Respectfully,

JIM HANAGAN.

I wish to read the concluding paragraph of his letter, which is as follows:

> I sincerely urge you to work for the extension of Public Law 78 to aid our migrant farmworker and his family, forced to move from place to place as the season demands; to improve our relations with the Mexican Government, and especially with the Mexican people; to produce an abundance of food for a hungry world; and to help insure the independent operator of the family-size farm with a supply of seasonal labor. Then we can look for further improvement by working for an orderly increase in farm labor wages as conditions and profits warrant.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAMAR, COLO.,
October 28, 1963.

Rev. JAMES H. KANE,
Editor and business manager, the Southern Colorado Register, Pueblo, Colo.

DEAR FATHER KANE: I have followed with keen interest your editorials of recent weeks on the matter of the bracero program and agree wholeheartedly that no effort should be spared in the improvement of living conditions and job opportunities for the so-called migrant farm labor force. However, I am beginning to doubt, with all due respect to your sincere intentions and the intentions of your staff, the wisdom of many of your statements and proposals. Here in Colorado, and all Western States as a matter of fact, we are concerned primarily with our citizens of Mexican descent, and it was in light of this fact that I came to analyze your editorials and statements and disagree to the point where I felt it necessary to answer.

Is it a good policy to continually refer to our Spanish-speaking citizens and our migrant labor force? Such a reference to me simply sets aside a minority group as something special; and when we do this, it further jeopardizes the eventual achievement of equal rights by all of our citizens. What does the average uninformed citizen of our Western States think when he hears a group on a street corner engaged in an antimated discussion in Spanish? He is led to think that they are Mexicans or citizens of Mexican descent, that they are farm laborers or common laborers of some other sort, and that they are capable of performing only the most menial of tasks.

If I were the ambitious son of parents of Mexican descent and migrant farmworkers, I would definitely consider the continual reference to my ancestry and type of work as derogatory and a millstone around my neck. I would note that very seldom do you hear a person of English ancestry referred to as "that Englishman" or of Irish descent as "that Irishman"; but that it is commonplace to hear references to "that Mexican" or to "that Negro." Instead of feeling proud of my ancestry and my ability to speak two languages, I would feel a desire to get away from "my own" in order to advance and fulfill my ambitions.

I often wonder what kind of education I would have gotten had my parents been migrant farmworkers. Why should I bring up such a conjecture at this point? It is because I feel certain that education, or rather the lack of education, is the real reason for our migratory farm labor problem; but we cannot blame the children of a migrant domestic laborer for their lack of interest in school, when they are forced to move on at about the time they are getting started in a different school. Then when they discover that they are a year or more behind others in their age group, it becomes increasingly difficult to hold that enthusiasm for education.

We had better be calling for an end to this nomadic way of life for family groups or doom another generation to be classed by a future annual meeting of the diocesan directors of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference as, "the poorest of the American poor, the migrant farmworkers." We had better be making it mandatory to have at least finished 12 grades of schooling and to make it possible for those duly qualified to continue with higher education. If this means adding more families and individuals to relief or welfare rolls, then it will have to be done; or we will still be butting our heads against a stone wall in 10, 20, and 30 years from now in trying to solve this perplexing problem.

Let Congress repeal Public Law 78, and you will see the most flagrant exploitation of our American labor group since slavery days. There simply won't be nearly enough able and willing workers to perform the necessary stoop labor in the growing and harvesting of certain fruit, vegetable, and other specialized crops. Then I suggest that you visit the Spanish-speaking settlement of some southern Texas city, San Antonio for example, next March or April; and you will see the mad rush by sugar companies, canning companies, fruit and vegetable packers, corporate farms, and the like vying for the workers' favor. Then you will see the Spanish speaking exploit the Spanish speaking because of their generally poor education, low standard of living, and lack of ambition; the recruiter interested only in his fee. Why should he care for the old, the sick, or the young so long as the recruiting fee is paid on each? No doubt he has contacted his Congressman asking repeal of Public Law 78, as such action would certainly put him in tall clover.

Then we must also look to the pitiful waste of certain crops should the extension of Public Law 78 be defeated, and in this regard I haven't the slightest doubt. There not only will be shortage of labor in many areas of the Nation at critical times, but there will be those not physically qualified to perform some of the more strenuous tasks in addition to those refusing to perform this work, the so-called stoop labor.

Please understand, Father, that I speak with a certain amount of experience in this field. I have been an independent farm operator for the past 12 years and have employed both domestic farm labor and Mexican braceros. Prior to this time I was employed by the American Crystal Sugar Co. as an agriculturist out of their Rocky Ford plant, from 1948 to 1951 inclusive. In this capacity much of my duty was concerned with the anticipated need, placement, movement, and utilization of the sugar beet labor force.

In the early spring of 1948 I was sent on a tour of a part of the labor recruiting areas of Texas and New Mexico to meet the company recruiters and to ascertain as nearly as possible the amount of labor that would be available for the Rocky Ford district. In Texas this area starts at about Lubbock and extends south, both east and west, with the heaviest concentration in the lower Rio Grande Valley. In Lubbock I met with a Mr. Sullivan, who was in charge of labor recruiting for the American Crystal Sugar Co. and a Minnesota canning firm, and other company representatives from Nebraska, Iowa, and Minnesota. I went as far as Eagle Pass with the group as it was intended that I would be in charge of the office there. In New Mexico I was accompanied by Mr. Dan Jaramillo, labor supervisor for the Rocky Ford district, now deceased, and we met with every recruiter employed by the company as well as the one at El Paso, Tex.

During the Second World War, I also had experience with another minority group, as I was assigned for almost 2 years as a commissioned officer with the 1327th Engineer General Service Regiment composed of colored troops. An engineer general service regiment was the pick-and-shovel gang of the army during the war; so I had ample opportunity to note the serious handicap suffered through little or no formal education.

In a democracy such as ours, as I understand it, every citizen is supposed to have equal opportunity to make of himself what he will in accordance with his desire and ability. I want to ask what kind of equal opportunity a migrant farmworker has when he is forced to continually move from job to job because of the seasonal demands of his work? Repeal Public Law 78, and we will doom not only another generation of migrant workers to unequal opportunities but greater numbers each year because of supplying the food requirements of a growing population.

I can think of no better way, and certainly none with so little expenditure of public funds, of presenting our American way of life to the Mexican people than through the bracero program as provided under Public Law 78. Also, I can think of no better deterrent to a communistic takeover in Mexico than through this program, and I understand that here is a real danger. I would wager, on this account, that communistic elements both in this country and in Mexico are subtly lobbying for the repeal of Public Law 78. Please, not to be taken in again as we were in Cuba. Remember the televised picture of the procession of victorious Castroites entering Havana with the statue of our Blessed Lady at its head. We wonder how many millions of Cubans and Americans too, ruefully remember that day, dawning with such a display of splendor and magnificence and then ending with dashed hope, as the crackle of rifle and machinegun fire gave notice to the world the true aim of the revolution as the mass of executions was begun.

I sincerely urge you to work for the extension of Public Law 78 to aid our migrant farmworker and his family, forced to move from place to place as the season demands; to improve our relations with the Mexican Government, and especially with the Mexican people; to produce an abundance of food for a hungry world; and to help insure the independent operator of the family-size farm with a supply of seasonal labor. Then we can look for further improvement by working for an orderly increase in farm labor wages as conditions and profits warrant.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES C. HANAGAN.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, before I conclude, I shall refer to only one further point, namely, the contention by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] that his amendment should be adopted. Earlier this year when the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz, and various others testified before the House committee on this bill, they then had under consideration a 2-year extension. I feel that I must comment on this matter, because the Senator from Minnesota has referred to it.

The bill was called up suddenly in the House, immediately after one of the longer vacations this year; and very few Members there knew about it. I think it significant that this time, when they knew the bill was coming up, it was passed by the House by a vote of 173 to 158.

The amendment suggested by the Senator from Minnesota provides for certain things which sound very good; but nowhere in the record or in the reports can one find—no matter how carefully they are examined—even one place where the Secretary of Labor has suggested a possible means by which the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota could be carried out. It could not be carried out.

I realize that probably this bill can never again come before the Senate. I, too, am practical; I know that the barrage and the campaign of slogans about this bill have been conducted in such a way that probably it would be impossible for the bill to be passed by Congress another year. I am not unrealistic in my approach to the bill; but I am sufficiently realistic to know that many Colorado farm people—not corporations—and Colorado small canneries will be affected by this proposal, and ultimately so will the consumers in Colorado, California, Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona.

Is it possible that some of those in the large population centers in the East have their own personal interest in this matter, and are seeking larger markets for their products, with almost certain knowledge that in the Western States the production of many commodities will thus be reduced, with a consequent increase in price?

There is before the Senate a proposed 1-year extension, which is completely logical. I have said that I have no illusions about the future; but for this 1-year extension it is completely illogical to recommend, as the Senator from Minnesota has done, a workmen's compensation program, for example.

Even if we were considering a 2-year extension, I doubt very much that the Secretary of Labor could devise the necessary regulations and procedures which would have to be gone through in order to provide for the desired result by the end of 2 years.

However, we are considering a 1-year extension. This is a logical extension; and it is logical without the addition of the language proposed by the Senator from Minnesota, which could not possibly have any meaning during the 1-year extension, because the conditions and terms he proposes by means of his amendment could not possibly be put into effect before the latter part of the present year. Anyone familiar with governmental procedures knows that to be true.

There is also a practical difficulty with the Senator's proposal, which on its face would seem to be a very good one. For example, the workmen's compensation laws are handled by the individual States. So if the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota were to be adopted, it would be necessary to turn to the individual States for implementation of such laws.

I appeal to the Senate to concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives. I could submit for the RECORD a wealth of material, tables, and figures which support my position. However, I do not presume to judge the conditions which exist in Oregon, New York, Ohio, or Michigan, and I hope other Senators will not engage in the unjustified presumption that they can correctly judge the conditions which exist in Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, and California, about which they know nothing.

Our farmers need this 1-year extension. What they will do after it ends, I do not know. Somehow they will either make the necessary accommodations or will go broke or will have to change to some other kind of farming. But they definitely need this 1-year extension. I do not think those who take a contrary position are less sincere than I am; but, as I have said, I speak of a subject with respect to which I have approximately 33 years of personal knowledge, because I have lived with these people and I know their problems.

Therefore, I hope the Senate will support the motion of the Senator from Louisiana that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

I yield the floor.

THE OREGON DUNES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the Oregonian of November 25, 1963, entitled "Dunes Compromise," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DUNES COMPROMISE

> This newspaper has been less than enthusiastic about various proposals, originating with the late Senator Richard L. Neuberger, to set aside a long section of the Oregon coast in a national seashore park.
>
> The bulk of the area between Florence and Reedsport, on the ocean side of U.S. Highway 101, is already in public ownership—U.S. Forest Service and the State of Oregon (the beaches themselves and several parks). The sand dunes to be "saved" are not threatened by private appropriation. The counties involved could zone the lands adjoining the highway to prevent roadside slums if they could get together. The State game commission adequately controls hunting and fishing on the lakes and streams, and would continue to do so under the Federal bills proposed. Public access to the lakes and beaches is assured.
>
> Nevertheless, there is a subtantial body of public feeling that the establishment of an Oregon Dunes National Seashore not only would preserve the playground from commercial encroachment but would attract many thousands of tourists from other States. The dunes are spectacular, though not comparable to some of the scenic resources of national parks. The main result of establishing a national seashore, as we see it, would be the attraction of more visitors because of national park advertising.
>
> If the Oregon Dunes Seashore is to be created under national park auspices (Department of Interior), the bill approved by a Senate Interior Committee appears to be a reasonable compromise, with one exception. Its provisions are closer to those advanced by Representative ROBERT DUNCAN of the Fourth District than those urged by Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER and the Interior Department. But Senator WAYNE MORSE's demand that private properties not be condemned was bypassed when the main committee amended a subcommittee's version Friday. Condemnation power was restored, a threat to 15 residences and 2 commercial properties.
>
> The 30,000 acres of the park, as approved by the Senate subcommittee and included in the Duncan bill, would extend on the west side of the coast highway from Florence to Lakeside, south of Winchester Bay. Thus the dunes area just north of Coos Bay now being tapped for water for industrial uses would not be included. An easement would permit use of Siltcoos and Tahkenitch lakes water by the International Paper Co. at Gardiner. Scenic integrity of a strip east of the highway would be protected by Federal authority in obtaining easements—a provision which may be hotly opposed. Residential property within the seashore's boundaries could be used for 25 years. But no additional building would be permitted. The attraction of the park may be expected, however, to enhance commercial service values in communities near but not within the park.
>
> There has been a running fight on the coast about the desirability or lack of desirability of establishing a Federal seashore. But we have not detected any burning interest among the bulk of Oregon's citizens. Existing State, Federal and county authorities could do a great deal to enhance the already high recreation advantages of the dunes and lakes area. But if a national park is a better answer, the compromise bill comes as close to resolving the basic issues as the disputants may expect.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the editorial states at the beginning:

> This newspaper has been less than enthusiastic about various proposals, originating with the late Senator Richard L. Neuberger, to set aside a long section of the Oregon coast in a national seashore park.
>
> The bulk of the area between Florence and Reedsport, on the oceanside of U.S. Highway 101, is already in public ownership—the U.S. Forest Service and the State of Oregon (the beaches themselves and several parks). The sand dunes to be saved are not threatened by private appropriation. The counties involved could zone the lands adjoining the highway to prevent roadside slums if they could get together. The State game commission adequately controls hunting and fishing on the lakes and streams, and would continue to do so under the Federal bills proposed. Public access to the lakes and beaches is assured.

The editorial continues:

> If the Oregon Dunes Seashore is to be created under national park auspices (Department of Interior), the bill approved by a Senate Interior Committee appears to be a reasonable compromise, with one exception. Its provisions are closer to those advanced by Representative ROBERT DUNCAN of the Fourth District than those urged by Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER and the Interior Department. But Senator WAYNE MORSE's demand that private properties not be condemned was bypassed when the main committee amended a subcommittee's version Friday. Condemnation power was restored, a threat to 15 residences and 2 commercial properties.

Later in the editorial, the Oregonian states:

> There has been a running fight on the coast about the desirability or lack of desirability of establishing a Federal seashore. But we have not detected any burning interest among the bulk of Oregon's citizens.

Mr. President, I feel very bad that the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee saw fit to report this bill in the absence of a united Oregon delegation.

As the senior Senator from Oregon, I serve notice tonight that I shall oppose the bill.

I believe the Senate should think a long time before it proposes to subject a State to the establishment of a Federal park under such fact situations as exist in connection with the Oregon Dunes, and particularly when there is not a united delegation, and when the State government also has some interest in the matter.

I have urged the majority leader to give consideration to the postponement of any consideration of the bill for some time until more negotiating can be accomplished at both the Federal and State level.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator. I understand that one of the Senator's main objections to the bill revolves around the question of condemnation and the condemnation amendment that was reinserted in the bill. I was not present when the bill was reported. I was occupied in the Appropriations Committee at the time. In view of the land grants that seem to have gone pretty wild and rampant in the past few years with relation to some of the park activities, does the Senator not think that this might be a very good point at which to resolve the policy of the Senate with respect to that subject?

Mr. MORSE. I shall do my best to help the Senate to resolve the policy at this point.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator. The question is one of the main policy considerations that we must determine. It is one of the questions that has caused the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a great deal of trouble. Personally I am inclined to the point of view of the Senator from Oregon, though there are times when I think the power of eminent domain must be used.

Mr. MORSE. I do, too.

Mr. ALLOTT. We find in many places a big grab to include large chunks of land. For example, we find that approach in relation to converting Sleeping Bear into a national park. Then the Government would either use the power of eminent domain as a permanent club over the heads of those who live there, or else take away homes that the people have enjoyed for years. I believe it is time for us to take a hard look at the program. I appreciate the Senator's courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Colorado. I agree with his observation.

From time to time I shall speak in some detail in regard to a good many of the legal ramifications of the bill and in regard to a good many of the questions of public policy that are raised by the bill. But tonight in my first comment on the bill, I wish to say that I have heard many Senators compare the situation in Oregon with the dunes situation in Indiana, the Cape Cod situation in New England, and some other park proposals elsewhere in the country. There is little resemblance, if any, between the Oregon situation and the situation in those other States.

The people of my State ought to have every opportunity to speak through a united delegation on this subject and not through a split delegation. I believe that the Governor of my State, as the head of the government of my State, has an official interest in the subject. I happen to be one who believes that he ought to be consulted before action is taken on the dunes bill that was reported by the Senate Interior Committee.

From my desk on the floor of the Senate today I wish to say to the Secretary of the Interior that I am exceedingly displeased by his course of conduct in connection with this issue.

Mr. President, most of the area is publicly owned now, as the editorial in the Oregonian points out. The situation is not similar to the Indiana situation, in which, if we were going to protect the public access to the area and to the water abutting it, we would have to condemn.

I taught the law of eminent domain for a good many years as I served as professor of real property at the University of Oregon School of Law. On the basis of the facts, I am satisfied, as I shall develop in great detail from time to time on the floor of the Senate, that the proposed park does not involve the type of case in which the power of eminent domain should be approved by the Congress.

I have sent to Mr. Udall, the Secretary of the Interior, a letter asking for full details concerning property which is privately owned in every public park in this country under Federal jurisdiction and every piece of private property in other Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. I have also requested similar information of the Forest Service.

Mr. President, we can have a park in the dunes area of Oregon without taking a square foot of private property. We could create an adequate park with public property only. In fact, it is more park than the public would ever use.

Mr. President, if we write into the bill the provision of condemnation we in effect take great property value away from present owners of property. We pull the rug out from under some of the most important aspects of land ownership. We depreciate the value of that property to the tune of large sums of money.

It is that kind of conduct on the part of the Federal Government, acting through the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Udall, that I resent. I shall do what I can, as the senior Senator from Oregon, to protect the private property interests of my constituents involved in this controversy.

Mr. Udall has known this for 2 years. I urged him to try to work out with me an acceptable compromise, and he has never consulted with me about it since I served notice on him of my position. He knows that the only time this matter was ever discussed with me was in my office months ago, with certain members of the Oregon delegation. In that conference I served notice on Mr. Udall that I would not support a bill with the condemnation procedure in it. I also made clear to him that I would be glad to see what could be done to arrive at an acceptable compromise of this matter. He took it upon himself to ignore me and to ignore those people of the State of Oregon who share the viewpoint of their senior Senator with regard to the dunes park. I intend to do whatever I can to protect the rights of those people against the Secretary of the Interior.

That is not the only issue on which I intend to do what I can to protect certain people and interests in my State against certain policies of the Secretary of the Interior. He is going to hear more about those, week after week. They include certain electric power rights which are precious to the people of my State, of the Pacific Northwest, and of the Nation.

Mr. President, I still believe it is possible to draft a dunes bill which will be acceptable to a united Oregon delegation. I stand ready and willing to work to that end. But such a bill cannot include a condemnation procedure against private property in the area, because the requirements of the situation do not call for it, particularly when we consider the importance of private property ownership rights under our system of government.

I understand there is some support for a condemnation provision in the bill affecting the State of Oregon because in another area outside the State of Oregon there is some saloon or joint or some old gold mine property which apparently cannot be reached except by condemnation. If public necessity shows that condemnation in that instance is necessary, let us consider a bill to provide for it. If the facts support it, I will support the bill.

I do not know why we should have the idea that it is necessary to have a uniform program of condemnation; namely, that whenever a bill involves any proposal for a Federal park there must be a condemnation procedure in it. As a legislative body we ought to weigh the conflicting interests—both public and private—and then relate the power of eminent domain to particular facts in specific cases.

I am very unhappy about the bill which has come from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It has raised a controversy which need not have been raised, and which has many ramifications which I believe will be unfortunate.

I intend to continue to pursue my obligation of keeping faith with commitments I have made in my State for years; that I have made up and down the coast of the State of Oregon in the areas affected by the bill. I have told group after group that I would do what I could to protect their interests against condemnation. I intend to do so.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the close of my remarks on the dunes bill there be printed an amendment to the bill which I now send to the desk and ask to have printed.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment submitted by Mr. MORSE to Senate bill 1137 is as follows:

On page 2, line 7, insert "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 2.".

On page 2, line 14, beginning with "purchase", strike out all through "Secretary" on line 3, page 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "donation, or purchase with donated or appropriated funds, such lands, submerged lands, waters, or interests therein, as he considers commensurate with the adaptability of such lands and waters to the purposes of this Act, but in no case shall (1) the Secretary have the authority, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section and section 4(a)(2), to acquire any such lands, waters, or interests for the purposes of this Act by condemnation, and (2) any lands, submerged lands, waters, or interests therein, acquired on or after the date of enactment of this Act by condemnation by anyone be made a part of the seashore established by this Act. The Secretary".

On page 3, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following new subsection:

"(b) In any case where the owner and the United States agree, the power of condemnation may be used as a means of acquiring a clear and marketable title, free of any and all encumbrances."

On page 5, beginning with line 11, strike out all through line 18, and redesignate succeeding subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (b) and (c), respectively.

On page 7, line 2, beginning with the colon, strike out all through the period on line 8 and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: "except that the Secretary shall have no authority to acquire any such scenic easements or other less-than-fee interests in land by condemnation."

On page 7, beginning with line 9, strike out all through line 15, and renumber succeeding sections accordingly.

TRIBUTES TO JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have received a letter and a series of telegrams from individuals and chambers of commerce in my State expressing profound sorrow of the shocking, tragic assassination of our late great President, John F. Kennedy. I ask unanimous consent that the telegrams may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Salem, Oreg.,
November 25, 1963.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

The composition of this telegram was taken considerable hours after which we come to our first conclusion: That the citizens of the United States of America and peoples of the world have lost a dedicated and beloved man. Our heartfelt sympathy to the members of the Kennedy family.

Stanley Grove,
Manager, Salem Area Chamber of Commerce.

Florence, Oreg.,
November 25, 1963.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We know that both yourself and Gov. Mark Hatfield consider that you represent all of us in Oregon in your expressions of sympathy to the Kennedy family and to our Government caused by the loss of this great and good young man. We must reaffirm that ours is a Government of law and that acts of assassination or subversion must be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

Howard Campbell
President, Florence Chamber of Commerce.

Eugene, Oreg.,
November 23, 1963.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Senator: As one of your supporters from Eugene, Oreg., we regret the horrible loss of a fine man. Please convey our condolences to the First Lady of the land, and stand by us. We need good men.

A Republican.

Portland, Oreg.,
November 23, 1963.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Mrs. Hannah and I want to express sorrow and concern at the tragedy which struck our Nation today in the assassination of our President. His death is a personal loss for all of us and the hate which motivated this crime is poisonous sore in our society. More than ever we are grateful for your strength and statesmanship and pray for your good health that the President and our country may continue to have the benefit of your wisdom and courage. May God bless you and our other leaders in this time of trouble.

Sincerely,

James B. Hannah.

November 23, 1963.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Foreign Relations,
Washington, D.C.:

Profoundly consternated please receive retransmit our condolences your coleaders Government in this grave hour which afflicts world.

Luis Gonzalez Family.
Senator Alfonso Lara.
Senator Eugenio Gomez.

Lima, Peru,
November 23, 1963.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Es esta hora de dolor para el mundo democratico presentole profundo pesar.

[Translation]

In this hour of grief for the democratic world, I express to you my profound sorrow.

Celso Pastor.

Yakima, Wash.,
November 25, 1963.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

The climate of the country is such that it needs the comfort of inspiration. Give us the opportunity for which we long to ease the passion in our hearts. Can you not make concrete use of our nobler concepts of democracy by setting up a monument to the man worthy of his breadth and scope to which the peoples and the nations of the world can subscribe.

J. E. Kostiner.

Grants Pass, Oreg.,
November 22, 1963.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

The assassination of our President is the most tragic thing that has ever happened to our country. Mr. Morse, may I suggest that you do everything in your power to have the portrait of President Kennedy depicted upon the silver dollars which will soon be minted.

C. G. Murray, Jr.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a letter from the mayor of the city of Glendale, Oreg., may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

City of Glendale, Oreg.,
November 23, 1963.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: As our Oregon representative, in our U.S. Senate, we as a city, would ask that you relay our condolences and sympathy, to Mrs. Kennedy, during this tragic ordeal.

We realize, that through better chosen words, you will be better able to do this. Also to express the monumental loss, to our Nation, the world, our State and not least of all to our city. What a tragedy that such a brilliant, humanitarian leader's and statesman's life should be lost, while serving his country so well.

You may rest assured that this community's prayers will be with Mrs. Kennedy, yourself and the remainder of our leaders, during this great time of trial and stress, within this great Nation of ours.

Thank you, in advance, for doing this most difficult job, during a most difficult time.

Sincerely yours,

Ralph E. Place,
Mayor.

Mr. MORSE. In part the letter says:

Dear Senator Morse: As our Oregon representative in our U.S. Senate, we as a city, would ask that you relay our condolences and sympathy, to Mrs. Kennedy, during this tragic ordeal.

We realize, that through better chosen words, you will be better able to do this. Also to express the monumental loss, to our Nation, the world, our State and least of all to our city. What a tragedy that such a brilliant, humanitarian leader and statesman's life should be lost, while serving his country so well.

I do not know how anyone could use more beautiful, more eloquent language than the mayor used in this letter. I would not attempt to improve upon it. Therefore, when I received the letter, I forwarded it immediately to Mrs. Kennedy.

FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, turning now to another matter, I am greatly disturbed and concerned by a news report today—which I hope is not accurate—that the President of the United States is urging upon House leaders a compromise appropriation on foreign aid in the amount of $3.4 billion.

Mr. President, a $3.4 billion appropriation for foreign aid cannot be justified. Yet this newspaper story purports to assert that conferences have been held which seek to "button up" an agreement with House leaders and members of the House Appropriations Committee for a commitment to the amount of $3.4 billion.

I am not only concerned about that, but I am concerned about every report I have received to date about the progress being made in connection with the conference that is being held on the authorization bill for foreign aid. If these reports prove to be true, then the result will seem to be a weakening of the position of the Senate in the passage of the authorization bill for foreign aid.

Of course, there will be those of us who will vigorously oppose such a conference report, as we will oppose any appropriation proposal for $3.4 billion.

I want to say most respectfully to the President of the United States and to members of the House Appropriations Committee that if it is true they are seeking to reach a settlement at $3.4 billion, I do not think the American people will go for it. I think, day by day and week by week, increasing thousands of the American taxpayers are recognizing the need for a drastic overhauling of the foreign aid program now—not next year; now.

An appropriation in excess of $3 billion would be unthinkable. An appropriation in the neighborhood of $2,500 million or $2,700 million would be more sensible. An appropriation of $2,500 million or $2,700 million could do a great injustice to the American people and to the foreign aid program if there were not some changes made in policies with respect to the expenditure of that amount of money.

I was very much interested in some of the television comments I listened to over the weekend, including the comment of the Chancellor of West Germany, Mr. Erhard. I wish to go on record as disagreeing with much of what the German Chancellor said. I consider it completely gratuitous on the part of Mr. Erhard to suggest a settlement of differences between De Gaulle and the U.S. Government. When the American people get all the facts in regard to Franco-American relations, they are going to recognize that there is only one settlement that can exist, and that is for the United States to get out of France so far as any aid is concerned. The getting out is long overdue.

When the American people get all the facts in regard to the economic relations between the United States and West Germany, I believe the answer will be that at least five divisions out of the six ought to come out of Germany. I was not at all impressed by Chancellor Erhard's comments concerning the possibility of any reduction in American forces in West Germany.

I want the American people to recognize now that the time has come for them to make clear to our Government what American foreign policy should be, for unless the American people start making clear what that foreign policy should be, and what the foreign aid program should be, I am greatly concerned as to whether or not the best interests of the American people in the field of foreign policy are going to be protected.

We cannot keep this up. I shall, either later this week or next week, as soon as I can complete my research on the subject, make a major speech on U.S.-Latin American policies. My major thesis will be that the United States—and the United States alone—must determine the contributions and the administration of America's contributions to the Alliance for Progress program in Latin America.

I warn the Senate of what is happening in certain offices downtown in AID and State. They must recognize that the debate this year on foreign aid is clear handwriting on the wall that they cannot continue with the policies they have been following. However, it does not follow that they have any desire or intention to change those policies to conform to the criticisms that were uttered on the floor of the Senate in the historic debate that was recently concluded on the foreign aid bill.

I have been briefed in regard to some of the conversations that have taken place downtown since the close of the debate. I am making these comments because I want certain gentlemen downtown to know that I know what they are up to. What they are up to is to devise procedural devices to get around the Congress of the United States. In one of those conferences there was enthusiastic discussion that "What we need to do is commingle the American taxpayer's funds with other funds," as is done in the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. Then they will be able to make the arguments, in connection with the Alliance for Progress program, that are made, as I have sat in the Foreign Relations Committee and listened to representatives of the executive branch of the Government say, "After all, these are not our funds alone. These funds are international funds."

It has always had an effect on the Foreign Relations Committee of following a course of action that, in my judgment, does not give to the American taxpayer the protection he is entitled to receive from his Government.

One of the great foreign policy issues that faces the American people is the procedural issue. As I have been heard to say so many times, for so many years, the procedures that are adopted determine the substantive rights of the American people. The procedural "gimmick" that some officials downtown are at work on now, is to get our Alliance for Progress contributions in a procedural position so they will not be administered unilaterally by the United States, but multilaterally by an international commission.

What these bureaucrats downtown want, Mr. President, is to get a lump sum authorization and appropriation, and get that money into the hands of an international commission, and then argue that the Congress should not then attach any strings to the expenditure or administration of those funds.

I warn my administration that the senior Senator from Oregon will discuss that subject matter, if that becomes administration policy, from every platform in this country on which I can stand and tell the American people the great danger that that program presents to them.

In effect we would take away from Congress effective controls that Congress must keep, because Congress has the duty under the Constitution of the United States, indelibly written into that Constitution, to protect the interests of the American taxpayer, in making clear to any Executive at any time that he can spend money only in accordance with the law, based upon appropriations by Congress.

It can be argued that we can give away this precious protection of the American people, but I propose to make very clear to the American people, to the best of my ability, if Congress follows that course of action, who will be responsible. Those who will be responsible will be every Senator and every Representative who votes to transfer this very important check upon foreign policy to some international commission.

I have no doubt what the answer of the American voter will be once he understands it, because if Congress does that, as a Senator and as a citizen I say that every Member of Congress who votes for giving away that check so precious to the American taxpayer should be licked at the polls, Democrats and Republicans alike.

We are dealing with a basic substantive matter in respect to protecting the American people with regard to their rights to ultimate control of American foreign policy.

That is what I say to the bureaucrats downtown who in the last 2 or 3 days have been in conference trying to figure out how they can get around Congress as a result of the debate that has been held here on foreign aid, in which some of us pointed out the shocking inefficiencies and wastes, and have pointed out that foreign aid in many places in the world has been the cause of shocking corruption, to the everlasting discredit of the Nation. As we have brought out these facts we have been greatly handicapped because we had to labor under the muzzle of classified information, which prohibited our telling the American people what we really know are some of the facts about the corruption which has come to honeycomb American foreign aid in many parts of the world.

In spite of that, I am confident that once the American people understand this issue they will share the point of view of those of us who are critical of American foreign aid as it is presently administered.

I hope the new administration will take a long, hard, and thorough look at the administration of foreign aid.

I wish to make one further point. It is always interesting, in a controversial issue such as this, to note how certain stereotypes, certain dogmas, certain emotional sanctions, or slogans develop and are repeated over and over again as substitutes for fact and logic.

One of these dogmas, one of these stereotypes, one of these slogans is that the United States must keep its commitments.

Who says we should not? However, what proof is there that a reform of foreign aid, essential to protect the rights of the American taxpayer, violates any commitments? Who in this administration wants to stand up and say that Congress is committed to continue to waste hundreds of millions of dollars of American taxpayer money? Who in this administration wants to stand up and claim that the United States is committed to carry on the inefficiencies which the Comptroller General's classified reports show honeycomb American foreign aid administration? What do they mean by "commitments"?

Let me also make perfectly clear that no President of the United States has the constitutional authority to make any commitment in regard to the expenditure of American taxpayer dollars that cannot be reviewed and changed by Congress.

We in Congress must never permit the moment to arrive when we will allow a continuation of waste of American taxpayer dollars in any foreign aid program on the basis of a representation that we are committed to continue it.

The time has also come to teach some of these foreign governments the meaning of the American constitutional system.

One of the principles they ought to be taught is that our system consists of three coordinate and coequal branches of Government. Congress is not subordinate to the executive branch of the Government.

Everyone in the executive branch of Government, from the President on down, should have his memory refreshed in regard to that constitutional truism.

I wish tonight, as I shall in much greater detail from time to time in the future, stress the point that there are no commitments to continue wasteful, inefficient, and corrupt foreign aid. What Congress appropriates in one session it can take away in the next, if in the opinion of Congress the interests of the American people call for the exercise of that check.

I would have my bureaucratic friends downtown remember it. I hope when they have their next session to express concern about what was disclosed in the recent debate on foreign aid by some of us, and therefore meet to see what they can do to make a bureaucratic end run play around us, they will remember we are on guard for the interests of the American taxpayer.

I do not intend, on the basis of any argument anyone wishes to make to the effect that one has been made to me in recent hours about unity in the party, party loyalty, and partisan considerations, ever to elevate any of those considerations above the trust that I owe the people of the State of Oregon to do what I can to bring to an end the inefficiency, the waste, and the corruption that has come to characterize so much of foreign aid under both Republican and Democratic administrations. The issues of foreign aid must not be swept under the rug. We must not stand by silently while political forces go to work in the name of party unity and try to whip up support for a continuation of unsound policies.

I close by saying that any appropriation of $3.4 billion will continue many unsound policies. I register my vote right now against them.

I yield the floor.

CHANGE IN NAME OF ANDREW JOHNSON NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1243.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Metcalf in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1243) to change the name of the Andrew Johnson National Monument, to add certain historic property thereto, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

> That the Andrew Johnson National Monument established by Proclamation Numbered 2554 of April 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 1955), pursuant to the Act of August 29, 1935 (49 Stat. 958), is hereby redesignated the Andrew Johnson National Historic Site.
>
> Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior may procure with donated or appropriated funds, by donation, or by exchange the following described lands, or interests therein, located in Greeneville, Tennessee, and when so acquired such lands shall become a part of the Andrew Johnson National Historic Site:
>
> Beginning at a point which is the intersection of the east right-of-way line of College Street and the north right-of-way line of Depot Street;
>
> thence continuing along the north right-of-way line of Depot Street south 62¼ degrees east 165 feet to its intersection with the west side of Academy Street;
>
> thence leaving the north right-of-way line of Depot Street and continuing along the west right-of-way of Academy Street north 38 degrees east 93.4 feet to a point;
>
> thence leaving the west right-of-way of Academy Street north 64¾ degrees west 184 feet to a point on the east right-of-way line of College Street;
>
> thence with the east right-of-way line of College Street south 25¾ degrees west 83.7 feet to a point of beginning, containing 0.35 acre, more or less.
>
> Sec. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, but not more than $66,000 for acquisition, restoration, and development costs, as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

THE SENATE LEADERSHIP

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, on last Wednesday our majority leader [Mr. Mansfield] spoke briefly and placed in the Congressional Record a statement of the accomplishments of the Senate this year, and of his concept of the role of the Senate leadership.

It was typical of the majority leader to shorten his oral statement, and place the bulk of his report in the Record, rather than to take the time of the Senators to read it in full. The Senate had other business to transact before it could recess for the Thanksgiving holiday. The majority leader quickly disposed of the matter which was of concern to him so that we could complete the day's business as early as possible and get away.

But those Senators who have not read the majority leader's statement would do well to read and study it. It is on pages 22858–22859 of the Record for Wednesday, November 27, and deserves the careful attention of all of us.

Senator Mike Mansfield is one of the truly democratic leaders of our time with a lowercase "d" in democratic. His philosophy of the equality of Senate Members, the rights of each of our constituencies—of our individual and joint responsibility for making the Senate a great and respected institution, is of the very essence of democracy.

In the body of his unread statement, Mr. Mansfield wrote:

> Within this body I believe that every Member ought to be equal in fact no less than in theory; that they have a primary responsibility to the people whom they represent to face the legislative issues of the Nation. And to the extent that the Senate may be inadequate in this connection, the remedy lies not in seeking shortcuts, not in the cracking of nonexistent whips, not in wheeling and dealing, but in the honest facing of the situation and a resolution of it by the Senate itself, by accomodation, by respect for one another, by mutual restraint and, as necessary, adjustment in the procedures of this body.
>
> The constitutional authority and responsibility does not lie with the leadership. It lies with all of us individually, collectively, and equally. And in the last analysis, deviations from that principle must in the end act to the detriment of the institution.

There is an often repeated statement that:

> Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

The majority leader of the U.S. Senate is an outstanding exception to any such dictum.

Before the senior Senator from Montana stated his views on the leadership function, some of us who occupy the back row in the Senate were appreciative that he not only advocates democracy, but practices it. Our majority leader has not deviated in the slightest when potential power was thrust upon him.

Under Senator Mike Mansfield, the Senate "club" has been composed of 100 Members, and it has functioned well, at least insofar as the Senate as a whole is concerned.

A measure of the performance of the Senate which the majority leader did not mention, but one which lies on the desk of each Senator, is the Senate Calendar. There is no great backlog of bills. There is no bill on the Senate calendar ready for consideration that has been kept off the floor. We have not recessed or taken long weekends in the face of urgent, unfinished business.

If there are measures that are lagging, critics must look for them at places other than the Senate leader or the calendar.

Mr. President, I think that Majority Leader Mike Mansfield is doing the Senate and the Nation a great service in his direction of Senate affairs, and that he has prescribed the proper medicine for any ills that may afflict this body:

> An honest facing of the situation * * * and, as necessary, adjustment of the procedures.

We do have problems. Not all of the measures have come to the floor which should have come so that the Senate could work its will. Some have failed to reach the Senate in good time. Some adjustments are needed, and we should make them in the democratic manner symbolized by our leadership.

Let me also pay my respects to the minority leader. In the hours immediately following the President's assassination, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], in his effort to convey to others something of the humanity of John F. Kennedy, told a little story of Mr. Kennedy insisting that a gift turkey presented by the Senator from Illinois should not be taken away before the children had seen it.

The story told us as much about the teller as it did about the late President. It gave an insight into Senator Dirksen's sense of values. To the minority leader, a significant mark of the greatness of this slain world leader was his thoughtfulness for other people, in this instance for the children. Senator Dirksen's effort to interpret the President to the people of the Nation—to enhance John F. Kennedy's greatness by this little narrative—mirrored himself. He admired considerateness because he is himself considerate. That is a basic attribute of a true democrat—with a lowercase "d" again, of course.

It is to the great credit of the minority leader that when honest differences were involved, he has opposed the majority vigorously, but he has not used obstructionist tactics whereby a minority might thwart the will of the majority and make our democratic system ineffectual.

My allusion to the minority leader has a second purpose.

As he mirrored his own character—his own values—in his story of President Kennedy, so we mirror ourselves in all that we do.

When we call for leadership that solves all problems for us, gets our work done and lets us go home to rest after the leadership's great exertions, the mirror image is not a flattering one.

Mr. President, I know I speak for many Senators when I congratulate the majority leader on the report he placed in the Record last Wednesday. I give him profound thanks for the quality—the profoundly democratic quality—of his leadership.

The late President Kennedy, our beloved and gallant leader, was a man of remarkable courage and personal integrity. He was also a man of moderation and restraint, one who respected the opinions of others. He refused to browbeat Congress or the American people. Those same virtues have marked the leadership of Senator Mike Mansfield.

No realistic observer, including Senator MANSFIELD, has ever contended that the Senate is above criticism. But if reforms are needed, our majority leader has shown us the way that they should be achieved—democratically.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. BURDICK. I commend the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota for the comments he has made this evening. I, too, was impressed by the report of the majority leader which was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I associate myself generally with the remarks of the Senator from South Dakota.

However, I should like to add a footnote. In addition to discharging the tremendous duties imposed upon him, the majority leader has continued to serve his constituents from the State of Montana well and faithfully. The eastern part of Montana and the western part of North Dakota are similar in economy and in the makeup of their people. We have common problems. They are problems related to agriculture, water, and other resource developments.

During my tenure in the Senate I have always found MIKE MANSFIELD well able to take care of the interests of his area. I have found that in addition to assuming the burdens of the position of majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD has continued to serve his own constituency well. We have cosponsored much legislation that deals with our areas, and I know he is serving the State of Montana and the people of Montana ably and effectively.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator from North Dakota for his remarks.

I think the new Members of the Senate are particularly appreciative of the constant courtesies and attention to our needs and all our problems and all our requests that we have received from the majority leader. The fact that he is humble enough to talk at any time to the lowliest Member of this body is one of the marks of the greatness of the majority leader.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. McGOVERN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I am immensely gratified that the Senator from South Dakota has referred to the leadership of my distinguished senior colleague, Mr. MANSFIELD.

I do not think I need remind any Member of the Senate of the respect, affection, and veneration I have for Senator MANSFIELD. He has been a colleague of mine for more than 10 years, both in the other body and in this body, and he has been a wise counselor and guide.

I have been somewhat embarrassed about bringing up this subject matter, because Senator MANSFIELD is so close to me. So I am grateful to the Senator from South Dakota for giving me this opportunity to express my gratitude for the friendship Senator MANSFIELD has shown to me and to all other Senators, including all those in the back row, and to comment on the excellent leadership he has shown.

I feel that Senator MANSFIELD's type of leadership as the majority leader demonstrates, as the Senator from South Dakota has said, true democracy. It has restored to the Senate the leadership of the various committee chairmen; and every Senator feels that he has an opportunity to speak in the course of the debate on the various subjects and controversial issues considered by the Senate. There is never any question of recrimination or reward or punishment. Every subject is debated on the basis of its merits; and each Senator's opinion—regardless of whether he is the most junior Member of this body or is the distinguished President pro tempore, who has served in the Congress for more than 50 years—is respected by the majority leader; and he, in turn, has the respect of all the other Members of the Senate.

As one who works very closely with Senator MANSFIELD, I was glad to hear the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] say that Senator MANSFIELD not only is the majority leader of the U.S. Senate and not only serves on two of the most important Senate committees and is faithful in his attendance at their meetings, but at the same time takes time to work for the most lowly constituent in Montana. Anyone who writes to Senator MANSFIELD—and I know this, because I have worked closely with him—and requests the assistance that a U.S. Senator can give, receives it. Senator MANSFIELD takes time to work for every constituent in Montana, just as he works for the welfare and the benefit of his largest constituency—the U.S. Senate and the Government and all the people of the United States.

Again I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his remarks.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, as the Senator has said, I think it is interesting that Senator MANSFIELD has so remarkable an appreciation of the problems of his own State and also of the problems which face the other Members of the Senate, and also that he has so keen an insight into the international problems which face us today.

Mr. METCALF. He is one of the great experts in this body on international affairs.

Mr. McGOVERN. I agree. I have found his insight and understanding of foreign relations to be equal to his great grasp of our domestic problems.

I think one of the reasons why many Senators have been reluctant to speak out on this subject is that we have felt that Senator MANSFIELD needed no defense, in that his brilliant record speaks for itself.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I now move that, in accordance with the order previously entered, the Senate adjourn until tomorrow, at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 4, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, December 3 (legislative day of November 29), 1963:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Maj. Gen. Andrew Jackson Goodpaster, O21739, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army), in the grade of lieutenant general.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Lt. Gen. Carson A. Roberts, U.S. Marine Corps, to have the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list in the Marine Corps, effective from the date of his retirement.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Senator Mundt's Statement on Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, during the House Ways and Means Committee hearings last month on the proposed medical care for the aged through social security, I called to the attention of that committee the obstacles and barriers which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has placed in the path of the State of South Dakota in its efforts to implement Public Law 86–778, the Kerr-Mills Act for the people of that State. Because I think my statement will contribute to the solution of this matter, I ask unanimous consent that my statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My primary purpose in testifying today is to call to the attention of the Ways and Means Committee barriers and obstacles which have been placed in the path of implementing the Kerr-Mills program, Public Law 86–778, in my State of South Dakota and in other areas as well. I think your contemplation of this situation is vital because of the testimony that will likely be presented during these hearings that Kerr-Mills has not met the problem of providing medical assistance to the older citizens of this country who have need for such assistance. I am convinced that when full implementation of Kerr-Mills is completed and each of the several States has had the experience of several years of administering and improving their programs with the full and vigorous assistance of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which agency is charged with the execution of the act, then and only then can the final determination of success or failure be applied. Any such judgment before that time is highly premature.

South Dakota's legislature began studying the possibility of implementing the Federal law in its 1961 session only a few months after the enactment of the Federal act. The legislature initiated a study through its Legislative Research Council to determine the need and scope for the program in the State. This cautious approach approved particularly valid because of experiences in other predominantly rural States which initiated extensive programs only to face difficulty later in working out scope and financial support.

I was pleased to cooperate with the South Dakota Legislature in 1963 when they decided to adopt their rather unique approach in solving the problem of providing medical assistance to our elder citizens. The implementing legislation provided for a "pilot" program to determine within a short time, the number of needy persons, the extent of their need, and a more accurate determination of the cost of the full program. The State department of public welfare was empowered to enter into a contract for the purchase of prepaid health coverage for eligible individuals. The law includes a provision that their insurance carrier must operate without profit or loss. The prepayment aspect of the plan and the "pilot" program will curtail high administrative costs of this medical assistance plan. The State legislature acted on the belief that it is conforming with the Kerr-Mills Act, Public Law 87-778 as amended by section 122 of Public Law 87-543.

The high regard I have for the Kerr-Mills approach in solving the problem brings me to the recent report of the Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly to the Senate Special Committee on Aging. Frankly, gentlemen, I am disturbed at what I consider the erroneous conclusions drawn by the majority in that report. For just a few minutes, I should like to dwell on several points in that report.

The Senate special committee report acknowledges and admits that the Department of HEW should attempt to help the successful implementation of Kerr-Mills program at the State level. In fact, on page 17, section 3, it is stated, "The Department clearly has responsibility to assist the States in implementing the enabling legislation." It goes on to state, "All evidence available indicates that the Department has accepted and fulfilled that responsibility to the extent possible."

Gentlemen, it is my contention that this last statement is inaccurate. It is my intention to point out that while the Congress clearly obligated the Department of HEW in administering this public law, to provide constructive assistance to the States, the exact opposite was attempted in many instances by various members of Department staff.

The Senate committee report accuses the States of "distortion of congressional intent" in some of the medical aid for the aged programs which have been implemented. I say the Department is guilty of failing to carry out congressional intent by a program of deliberate sabotage of an act passed by this Congress and signed by the President.

First, instead of disseminating helpful and constructive information to the public about this law, staff members of the Department have, on many occasions, made public statements and written articles in which the Kerr-Mills law was maligned, ridiculed, and described in half-truths and false generalities.

For instance, Donald Kent, Ph. D., of the Department staff made the following statements in a meeting in Springfield, Ill., on April 7, 1962: "Kerr-Mills is just the same old relief program * * *. Relief is too expensive. * * * I believe we are facing the same tired old proposition that some people are more important than others and that we shouldn't worry too much about the less important ones."

On April 17, 1962, Mr. Ivan Nestingen, Under Secretary of the Department, told the Nashville, Tenn., Sertoma Club that the Kerr-Mills program was not working; it could not do the job, but could only supplement the King bill. He said "90 percent of the funds being spent are being spent in the three States with smallest population."

In Madison, Wis., on March 31, 1962, Mr. Wilbur Cohen stated at a meeting of the Wisconsin Committee on Health Insurance for the Aged Through Social Security, "There is a great deal more to fear from the Kerr-Mills bill because by definition it is socialized medicine with a vengeance."

Mr. Phillip H. DesMarais, Deputy Assistant Secretary of HEW addressed a group in Hartford, Conn., on March 26, 1962, and passed out literature which stated, "Kerr-Mills does not adequately take care of the near needy or even many of the very needy.

"Means-test medicine in many cases does not let you choose your own hospital and doctor.

"Means-test medicine can mean danger to health and safety."

Mr. DesMarais also spoke to at least one other group on the same subject. That was in Chapel Hill, N.C., on April 13, 1962.

On March 19, in Houston, Tex., Mr. Nicholas Zumas, Assistant Under Secretary, held a similar meeting.

In my own State, in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., a workshop conference was held on April 6, 1962, at which Mr. Dean Coston, Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary, was the featured speaker. The important feature of this meeting, which drew only about 30 people, was that it was open only to persons who opposed Kerr-Mills and supported King-Anderson. Although Mr. Coston was appearing at taxpayers' expense, the chairman of the conference stated in a letter dated April 2, 1962, that no organization could send a representative unless the organization supported King-Anderson.

And on April 25, 1963, Mr. Ivan Nestingen spent approximately 6 or 8 minutes of a 20- to 25-minute talk before the Chattanooga, Tenn., Rotary Club deriding Kerr-Mills, using such phrases as "administrative monstrosity," "optical illusions," and "not a program which a great Nation like ours can be proud of."

Gentlemen, in these stated instances, we have public servants, paid with public funds, traveling at public expense, going about the country trying to destroy public confidence in a law enacted by this committee and the Congress. Not only do I question the legality of such use of Government funds, but I believe they have deliberately distorted the intent of this committee and this Congress.

Now let me turn to more specific attempts by HEW personnel to sabotage Kerr-Mills. This is at the State legislative level and one instance occurred in my neighboring State of Iowa.

Iowa has had enabling legislation for medical aid for the aged since 1961, but at the time the bill passed, no funds were appropriated. In 1963, a new bill was introduced in the legislature providing that those eligible for old-age assistance benefits would not be eligible for medical aid for the aged. Before this bill could be acted upon, HEW wired the Governor's office saying the provision to exclude old-age assistance recipients "is not acceptable."

Gentlemen, I call your attention again to the section of the Senate special committee report which accuses the States of "distortion of congressional intent" by transferring old-age assistance recipients to medical aid for the aged. How can the majority report of the Senate committee condemn this practice and HEW at the same time uphold it by refusing to accept a medical aid for the aged program which seeks to prevent the action? In fact, HEW in a later telegram to the Iowa legislature again stated that approval could not be given to a program which denied assistance to persons because they had received old-age assistance benefits.

The story of HEW's contradictory statements to Iowa is a long one and many other examples such as the ones just mentioned can be documented for this committee if it wishes. Suffice it to say that HEW has not carried out its responsibility of assisting in the implementation of Kerr-Mills in Iowa.

This brings me to a similar set of circumstances in my own State.

The story of HEW delay in South Dakota's case is most distressing. The plan submitted by the South Dakota Department of Public Welfare provided that the State would purchase insurance contracts for persons over age 65 who were eligible under the standards established by State law. The purpose of the insurance approach is to provide for eligible recipients a program most similar to what persons with greater income would secure for themselves. Public Law 86-778 provides for the insurance mechanism but it becomes obvious that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been most reluctant to see it used.

Chronologically, the South Dakota story goes like this:

During both the 1961 and the 1963 legislative sessions, Mr. Alfred Poe, Kansas City Regional Office, HEW, met with State welfare department officials, legislators, and representatives of the vendors of health services. He was appraised of every draft of the bill, its amendments, and its final wording. On February 11, he sat in on a joint meeting of the State senate and house committees on health and welfare, the welfare commission, and the Governor, and made statements to the effect that major changes would have to be made in the program before Federal approval would be forthcoming.[1] Under questioning by Governor Gubbrud, he admitted that there was actually nothing in the South Dakota law that would cause it to be turned down but there were questionable areas that would require elaboration.

The bill was signed into law March 11, 1963, and a plan submitted by the State welfare department to the regional HEW office on June 10. According to a statement made by the State director of public welfare at a welfare commission meeting in Yankton, S. Dak., on August 29, the plan was mailed from Kansas City to Washington on June 17. On June 28, a representative of the South Dakota State Medical Association was told at a meeting of HEW personnel that the plan had not as yet been seen in Washington.

In August, a letter was transmitted from the Washington office of HEW to Kansas City, indicating that the questions posed by Mr. Poe in his letter of transmittal of the plan to Washington should be answered before the plan was approved. The questions put to the South Dakota department were basically the same points already discussed on the previous occasion. After the questions were answered by the State department of public welfare in early September, no further word of plan approval or disapproval was evidenced by HEW.

---

[1] Associated Press dispatch, Feb. 12, 1963.

On October 18, a representative of the South Dakota State Medical Association, and the State director of public welfare met with HEW officials in Washington at which time they were told that one more statement was needed from the South Dakota attorney general before approval could be given. This information was secured and relayed to proper personnel in the Bureau of Family Affairs, HEW, on October 24, at which time the medical association representative was told that the plan would go to the Commissioner for decision without delay. It seemed that this timetable would be followed when information was given to Congressman BEN REIFEL, on October 25 that the plan would receive a decision "this week."[2] On November 6, Mr. REIFEL's office was told that the material was in the hands of general counsel and would go to the Commissioner soon for a decision. To date, no decision has been made.

To the elderly in South Dakota who may have need of such a program, the Department of HEW has withheld care for a period of 6 months which, in fact, will mean a longer delay because of the time involved in setting up the mechanics of the program after approval.

Can any other conclusion be reached than that the Department has been deliberately delaying approval because the program might well prove a workable design for the rest of the Nation to emulate thereby weakening the argument for H.R. 3920?

ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

I would also like to refer to a portion of the report of the subcommittee that charges excessive administrative costs in the operation of some of the Kerr-Mills programs.

The point may be well taken that Government administrative costs are high. This does not exclude Federal Government administrative costs as contemplated in the social security approach. This is precisely the reason that the South Dakota Legislature wanted the claims paying function, the statistical function, and liaison with the vendors of care maintained by nongovernmental agencies trained and equipped to do such administration. The State welfare department's contract with Blue Cross and Blue Shield obtains the services of two organizations which have combined administrative costs in acting as fiscal agents for South Dakota's old-age assistance program of less than 3 percent.

It is my understanding that Kansas Blue Cross and Blue Shield offered to administer that State's OAA and MAA programs at one-half of 1 percent. This is a striking illustration of the need to give the South Dakota plan an opportunity to prove itself.

CONCLUSION

It has been said before this committee and in countless other places that Kerr-Mills is not a perfect program for providing the Nation's elderly with health care. I have attempted to show why. It is the victim of a planned program of interference on the part of the Department of HEW, King-Anderson supporters in the Congress, and welfare workers and officials at the State and county level. These people, many in places of immense power, have used every means at their disposal to discredit Kerr-Mills in the eyes of the public, to confuse State legislatures in their attempts to enact proper programs, and to demean potential recipients of MAA benefits with meaningless redtape used under the guise of the means test. How could any program work perfectly with this kind of hamstringing at every turn?

Given a reasonable chance Kerr-Mills can and will develop into a mechanism which will answer the health care problem for every needy aged person in this country. But time must be allowed. Since the act was passed in 1960, only 3 years ago, 28 States and 3 other jurisdictions have implemented the act and have it in operation. Ten other States have enacted laws which will become effective shortly or which are awaiting approval of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Of the 12 States which have not passed cooperating legislation, 5 will meet in regular session early next year with the opportunity of acting. In the State of Texas, the electorate voted on the 9th of this month to remove constitutional barriers so the legislature can act in its next session to implement Kerr-Mills in that State. As a matter of record, only 3 of the 50 States have done nothing at all. This is a highly enviable record when it is realized that since 1960 Congress has always had legislation pending which would establish the social security oriented program and the possibility has thus existed that any State medical assistance program with its committed State funds might quickly be superseded.

I urge the committee to consider this problem carefully before enacting a compulsory program of compulsory health insurance attached to the social security program. "Medicare" is a gross misnomer for this approach because it provides no medical care at all. It is simply a very inadequate and partial program of hospital insurance and certain other limited services and does not give the aged or the needy the kind of care that they require. The Kerr-Mills Act, on the other hand, recognizes that after retirement one may have a variety of ailments and so it provides for doctors and surgeons and hospitalization and nursing and drugs and dental benefits.

The reason Kerr-Mills can give a more adequate protection against a compulsory universal program is simple. This Medicare program, being compulsory, requires that it be available to everybody so it is available to the wealthy as well as to those who don't need it at all instead of limiting it to those people who require assistance at the time of an ailment in old age.

Another reason the compulsory Medicare concept is wrong is that it does nothing whatsoever to protect the young family during its working years. It requires them to pay a tax sometimes as long as 45 years on the gamble that maybe after age 65 they will need some health benefits and on the improbable hope that nothing will happen to the family until that time.

In addition, past history assures us that social security taxes will continue to rise sharply. No one can foretell with any degree of accuracy the upper limits of that increase.

Originally, the social security tax was set at 1 percent each on the employer and the employee on the first $3,000 of annual wages. Now it is 3⅝ percent each on income up to $4,800. The tax on the self-employed has risen during the same period from 2¼ percent of the first $3,600 of income to 5.4 percent on the first $4,800. For many taxpayers, the social security tax already takes a bigger bite out of income than the Federal income tax. Even without the enactment of Medicare, the tax rate must be increased to provide for an actuarially sound trust account. By 1968, the employee-employer total tax will be 9.25 percent. Estimates based on actual claim experience of insurance companies indicate that within 6 years the estimated cost of the program will require a joint tax on a $5,000 income of 11 percent. This estimate is based on present benefits provided by the pending legislation. Once enacted there is little question that pressures would be engendered to expand the scope of the program, increase the benefits, provide for longer periods of time, and to lower the age limit. All this would of course substantially increase the wage tax and the employers tax for all American workers.

There is another feature of the compulsory wage tax and the corresponding tax upon employers for the limited health services proposed by the King-Anderson bill which I strongly dislike. That is the fact that this would be a system of regressive taxation for health purposes entirely violating the concepts of progressive taxation which have so long served us so well in the field of income taxes. In short, the health tax would entirely ignore and violate the ability to pay concept of taxation. It would in fact tax the very poor and the very rich at precisely the same tax rates on that first important segment of their annual income which serves as the tax base. For some Americans, for example, their entire income would be subject to this new tax grab while for the wealthy and the well-to-do by far the larger percentage of their income would be exempt from any health-tax assessments or payments. In many ways this proposed Federal health tax is far more unjust to those with marginal incomes than would be a Federal sales tax which some are now proposing in lieu of Federal income taxes.

Another important consideration which seems to me to argue against the compulsory social security approach is that in establishing such a program we are taking an irreversible step. I say irreversible because we will be requiring people to pay taxes to a program from which they cannot benefit until age 65 so, once started, it would be exceedingly difficult to discontinue. To take such a step at this stage strikes me as very unwise. We are venturing into an entirely new area so far as the Government is concerned. We cannot predict with accuracy at this point what problems and difficulties will be encountered. This being the case it seems to me that any program established should be highly flexible so that it can be easily modified to meet unexpected problems which are bound to arise. From this standpoint the pending proposal would be most unsatisfactory.

I urge the committee to ponder well this extremely important and far-reaching and irreversible decision and I strongly urge sufficient time for the Kerr-Mills Act to be tested in the laboratory of life so that its true worth can be examined and evaluated. Until that is done, I strongly urge this committee and the Congress not to take the irreversible step of meeting the King-Anderson bill.

---

[2] Associated Press story dated Oct. 29, 1963.

Radio and Television Coverage of Recent Sad Events

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I believe that recognition should be given to the television and radio networks for their coverage of the death of our esteemed President, John F. Kennedy, his burial, the transition of Government, and the meeting of the world leaders with President Johnson. In paying tributes to the networks, we should also recognize the part that the independent radio and television stations played in giving the people of the United States the factual story. They all completely disregarded their commercial obligations and assumed the tremendous cost involved. I also noticed that the networks made all of their programs available to stations that are not ordinarily associated with them.

A serious crisis was averted by their report of the transition of Government. We must remember that the majority of our people had just viewed a shocking, tragic event—one that had not occurred before in the lifetime of the great majority. They needed to know that ours was a continuing Government—that the Constitution was to be upheld—that in time of great crisis that there were no political parties—that we were as one in the support of the new President in his conduct of international affairs.

This they saw with their own eyes when upon the landing of the Presidential plane in Washington, President Johnson was met by the Republican and Democratic leaders of the Congress and immediately assured of their complete support.

We must remember that these pictures were flashed around the world. This was a most needful thing. Many of the foreign countries believe that the assassination of a national leader is a signal for opposition political parties to seize control of the reins of Government. There are even those who might have wished to take advantage of the confusion that they would have believed to have followed such an action.

You may be certain that every foreign embassy was following every action and reporting on it to their governments. They saw a rapid and most orderly transfer of Government. The possibility of any adverse movements was completely averted.

The American people had immediate knowledge of the security of our Government—the leaders of the foreign nations of the world had immediate knowledge that our new President was the spokesman for all of the people.

The radio and television networks and the individual stations recognized their responsibility to the Nation. They well earned the title of a great American institution—one to be saluted by all of us.

Rachel McMasters Miller Hunt, Distinguished Daughter of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Roy Arthur Hunt, of Pittsburgh, Pa., has been one of America's most talented and eminent women. Rachel McMasters Miller Hunt has received signal honors from many quarters for her accomplishments in horticulture and botany, as a master craftsman and designer in the execution of fine bindings of beautiful books, and as a highly respected authority on the medieval and renaissance literature about plants and gardens. We in Pittsburgh lost a true and generous friend of our city in her passing on February 22, 1963, and America has lost a true genius of the highest renaissance level, accomplished and outstanding in many fields.

Mrs. Hunt, the wife of Roy Arthur Hunt, chairman of the executive committee of the Aluminum Co. of America, was born at Turtle Creek, Pa., June 30, 1882. She was the daughter of Mortimer and Rachel McMasters Miller and attended Thurston School in Pittsburgh and Miss Mittleburger's School in Cleveland.

She was instrumental in founding numerous organizations in the fields of horticulture and literature. She was honorary vice president of the American Horticultural Society in 1956, was active in the Distinguished Daughters of Pennsylvania, the National Society of Colonial Dames of America, and had held many chairs in the national offices of the Garden Club of America. She was one of the founders of the Garden Club of Allegheny County, Pittsburgh, Pa. She served for many years as an elected trustee of the associates of the Yale Medical Library, and of the John Carter Brown Library of Brown University. She was the first woman ever to be invited to speak before the erudite membership of the Grolier Club in New York City.

It has been in recognition of her achievements that she was awarded the Bulkley Gold Medal of the Garden Club of America and later its Distinguished Service Award of the New York Botanical Garden, the Gold Medal of Honor from the Herb Society of America, and a special certificate of meritorious service from the Pennsylvania Horticultural Society. In 1961 she received the Gold Medal from the Distinguished Daughters of America, and 3 years previously had been named Woman of the Year by the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce.

Mrs. Hunt was the author of many books and scores of papers in the fields of horticulture and literature. Most notable of the former was her monographic study of "William Penn and Horticulture." She was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of legal letters by the University of Pittsburgh in 1954 and the honorary degree of humane letters by Carnegie Institute of Technology in 1960.

Without question, Rachel McMasters Miller Hunt's greatest contribution has been the assemblage over a half century of collecting of what was the most important and largest private library of botanical and horticultural books in America. This highly specialized library was given by her and her husband to Carnegie Institute of Technology, together with funds for the fine new modern building which houses it, in 1961. As the Rachel McMasters Miller Hunt Botanical Library, it represents today the world's only center devoted exclusively to the bibliographical research of botanical and horticultural literature and to the rendering of service to the public and scholars alike who are concerned with these fields.

Rachel Hunt was not a mere collector of books. She knew the books she acquired. She read French, Latin, and Italian easily and concentrated on the collection of books in those languages as well as those in English.

Rachel Hunt collected and studied illustrations as well as the extensive writings in these fields. She endeavored to bring together representations of the original paintings and drawings by botanical artists and illustrators that had been reproduced in the books of this subject area. On her passing she had brought together more than 3,000 water colors, several hundred black and white drawings, and in excess of 2,500 prints of botanical portraits and garden scenes. The greater part of these are works that were produced prior to 1850 and the oldest go back as early as 1540. The world's greatest botanical artists are represented and her collection of works by the great Belgian artist, Pierre-Joseph Redouté—1759–1840—is considered to be the most representative and complete available in America—surpassed only by the great collections once held by French royalty and now in the archives of various museums in Paris. Students today may consult these works at the Hunt Botanical Library and study with them the files of correspondence by both the artists and the authors concerned. Here are to be found more than 16,000 pieces of manuscript and autographed letters written by the men who contributed to the development of botanical or horticultural science during the 17th to 19th centuries.

Not content to have a library only of books, paintings, prints, letters, and manuscripts, Rachel Hunt also sought and brought together the finest collection of botanical portraiture available on this side of the Atlantic. Here are to be found the engraved likenesses of more than 300 botanists of the 16th to 18th centuries. Portraits in oil were also collected. Included is the only painting known to have been made from life of the great English herbalist and physician, John Parkinson. Also included is the only painting—a miniature—known to have been made from life of the renowned 18th century French naturalist, Michel Adanson.

No facet of botanical literature received greater attention and affection from Rachel Hunt than did that represented by the herbals: those early works of medical botany which dealt with plants then believed important for their properties of curing or alleviating human illness. Her collection of these is certainly the finest held privately in this country and includes many rare items of the incunabula period, those books published from the time of the Gutenberg Bible's printing in 1454 to the end of that century. More than 120 volumes are in this collection, six are the only copies known in America and two are the only copies known anywhere. It is a collection that matches favorably today with the great collections that have been assembled at the National Medical Library, the combined libraries at Harvard, and the fine collection at the Missouri Botanical Garden in St. Louis.

As a student of bibliography, and one to recognize the importance of adequate documentation of rare books, Rachel Hunt was the first person anywhere to promote and produce a catalog of her works (now being completed) that has been recognized and acclaimed as the finest bibliographical production in the field of biological science of all time. Her sponsorship and production of this fine work, both as to content and design, is a monument to her penchant for high scholarship and perfectionism. For the excellence of its content it has received the cherished Oberley Award for works in bibliography. For the excellence of its typographical design, its second volume was chosen as one of the Fifty Books of the Year for 1962.

Rachel Hunt was a woman small in physical size, but mighty in intelligence, the vigor and charm of her personality, in the height of her standards of excellence, and in her capacity to achieve her goals and objectives through undaunted determination and hard work.

In addition to her husband Roy Hunt, who participated with her in her wide interests, she is survived by 4 sons and 11 grandchildren. Not only has the field of botany and horticulture been enriched by her accomplishments, but all who are in any way associated with these two fields throughout the world will continue to be enriched by the fruits of her planning and foresight in the establishment and perpetuation of the Rachel McMasters Miller Hunt Botanical Library at Carnegie Institute of Technology in Pittsburgh.

Rachel Hunt is a glowing example of the tremendous influence on our U.S. culture and progress, that a dedicated American woman can have, in her goodly heritage that she has given to all of us in Pittsburgh, in Pennsylvania, and our good country.

Speeches by Hon. Wayne L. Hays and Hon. Leslie C. Arends, Before NATO Parliamentarians Conference, November 7, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the current and continuing concern over the future of the NATO alliance. It is a concern which will and must occupy the attention of the new administration and the Congress in the coming months for it is a matter of supreme priority to make certain that the free world's position is not weakened.

As we in the Congress consider these problems, I feel it would be well to have the principal speeches made at the recent annual NATO Parliamentarians Conference on November 7, 1963, by Representatives Wayne Hays, chairman of the House delegation, and Representative Les Arends, ranking minority member of the House delegation, readily available for further reference and I, therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, am placing the statements in the Record today.

As a member of the House delegation, I found their statements to be important contributions to the work of the Conference and able expressions of the American position; and certainly ones which should not go unnoticed and unread here at home. The statements follow:

Statement by Hon. Wayne L. Hays

We of the U.S. delegation welcome questions on the military and political value of a multilateral force. This force is now under study on a noncommitment basis by a seven nation working group meeting here in Paris. It will come into existence only if (a) it proves to make military as well as political sense, and (b) if enough members of the European side of the Alliance want it.

As for the military value of a multilateral force, the U.S. Navy, as Vice Admiral Ricketts, Deputy Chief of Operations, has told many of your civilian and service military chiefs, is convinced that the multilateral surface missile fleet would not only be feasible but also a militarily effective and powerful deterrent force.

The multilateral force, as our Navy envisages it, would have the latest version of the Polaris missile, would be deployed and operated in European waters in such a way as to give it high survivability, and would thus be a force the Soviets would have to respect. It would not be simply a "first strike" force. Indeed, we contemplate it would be put at the disposition of SACEUR for use against targets selected by him which directly threaten Europe or support any Soviet attack.

Those are the conclusions of our military authorities. We do not put them up on a "take it or leave it" basis. These conclusions are now undergoing multinational examination in a military subgroup in Washington. There, military men of seven NATO countries are now conducting a war game designed to test just these conclusions as to survivability and military value of a multilateral force.

We often get the question why, if an MLF is so good, the United States has not already invested in surface missile ships of this type. One conclusive reason lies in the United States geographic situation. Our Polaris submarines must operate worldwide from home bases in the United States, removed by thousands of miles from the European and Pacific theaters. The necessary range of these nuclear submarines is bought at considerable cost. The MLF would operate in European waters from a European base and would obtain the necessary survivability by dispersion, the method of operation of the warships, and the characteristics of the warships.

Let me digress here for a moment and say that these would be warships and there would be no attempt to have them seem anything else, except that on a radar screen they would look like merchant ships. To give you some idea of the difficulty the enemy would have in identifying these ships, let me recall to your mind our own experience when a group of rebels captured a Portuguese merchant vessel and sailed it through American waters for a week. There was considerable comment that the American Navy could not find it. Well, it is not generally known but it is a fact that the American Navy had to fly down and literally read the name on the bows of 400 ships before they found the one they were looking for. This gives you some idea, in the waters of Europe where there are literally thousands of merchant ships, of the difficulty the Russians would have in pinpointing each and every one of these ships of a multilateral force. Our people have concluded that it would be an absolute impossibility.

The additional substantial costs of nuclear submarines as carriers of the missiles would not be needed and would not add significantly to the military value of a European-based force. Furthermore, the surface warships would facilitate the indispensable factor of mixed manning.

The U.S. authorities do believe in the military value of an MLF. That is why they have gone on the basis that, if enough of our European allies want the MLF, the United States would envisage putting up something like one-third of the cost.

The President and the Secretary of Defense would not be contemplating that if this were a second-rate military ineffective political force. In other words, we just would not be spending one-third of the cost for something we did not think would be useful militarily.

The U.S. view of the MLF is not that it would be a frill, an extra or even superfluous addition to an already adequate alliance nuclear deterrent. If it comes into existence, it will be programed, like U.S. Polaris submarines and United Kingdom V-bombers, as a basic part of alliance nuclear strike forces.

The question arises, should European members of NATO want the MLF? That is for them to say. Many of us in the United States can understand a feeling that the burden of maintaining the nuclear deterrent of the alliance should not be left only to the United States. Certainly, this feeling has already been strong enough to lead two NATO members to the great effort of developing their own independent force de frappe. If our European allies do want to participate in the nuclear deterrent, we do believe that the MLF is one of the best ways to do it. They would then be part of a militarily first-rate, modern force, without oppressive costs for anyone of them, and in a way which would strengthen rather than go against the integration of the alliance.

The question arises, would MLF costs be excessive and be paid at the expense of needed conventional forces? We in the United States believe that strengthening of NATO conventional forces and thus improving the balance of NATO nuclear and conventional forces is necessary and is within the capability of our allies. As for the MLF, however, the multilateral approach which is inherent in it would make participation in the nuclear deterrent feasible without undergoing the level of costs which burden countries going it alone in the strategic nuclear field. To use some figures which would not be too far off of estimated costs, if the MLF cost $3 billion over a 10-year period, a 10-percent share would be $30 million a year. Many of our allies could afford one or more shares with that price tag—and without encroaching on required defense outlays in other fields, taking into account the rate at which national income is rising here and the gap between what many of our European allies allot to defense as compared with U.S. defense allocations.

As for the U.S. veto, let me put the question back to my colleagues here: would it not be only right that substantial contributors to an MLF will want a voice in decisions as to its use? The United States is no different from others. Furthermore, would you want nuclear war to be launched unless the United States—whose nuclear forces would continue to be the major element of Alliance nuclear power—were joining in without any delay or doubt? The indivisibility of management of nuclear war is indispensable, here as elsewhere, for the effectiveness of the deterrent and for the solidarity of the alliance.

The MLF at this time is an idea put forward for discussion. It has not been considered, let alone adopted, by the Congress of the United States. What it is designed to do is to provide for fuller sharing of the burdens and responsibilities of nuclear defense in the alliance, in a way which will unite rather than divide the alliance. If there are other ways of achieving these purposes, we certainly hope that our allies will put them forward for consideration, which they will surely receive on the United States side.

Let me say further that I am known in the American Congress as a long-time friend of France. As a matter of fact, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee—a previous chairman—once jokingly called me his representative from France on the committee. I was the first to speak up in the Congress and defend General de Gaulle, but this does not necessarily mean that friends must always be in agreement. I would say to France that if she develops her force de frappe she will not be alone. She does not need to expect that she alone in Europe, outside Russia, will be able to have this weapon, without Germany and without other nations developing it too; perhaps not as soon but inevitably they will.

I would like to say also to those who have at least raised the suspicion that the United States would not consider an attack on Hamburg or an attack on Copenhagen or an attack on Brussels as a reason for going to war, that the United States would consider an attack on any one of those cities exactly as it would consider an attack on New York.

I further say to you that, if any of you doubt that, you have only to recall to your memory what happened only a year ago. As I said in the Political Committee, when the Russians had missiles in Cuba which were operative and which were coming into operation, which would reach every city in the United States except Seattle, Wash., the American Government made the decision to face them down and transmit word to Moscow that either the missiles had to go or we were prepared to go to war with nuclear weapons and to take the consequences. I would think that you would think that if Brussels or Copenhagen or Luxembourg were destroyed the United States would consider this just the same as if New York were destroyed. We are realists in the United States and we would know that if Russia made an all-out decision to attack any one of these cities or Paris or London or Rome, they anticipated a worldwide nuclear war and that they would get exactly what they were anticipating.

I want to say one further word, and again I think my French friends should think about this: There seems to be some difficulty economically in Europe and—I said this to a group of visiting Germans the other day, and I said the same thing to a group of visiting French that I spoke to in Washington—it is inconceivable to me to believe that Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, Belgium, and the Netherlands are going to put up 65 percent of the capital for an economic cooperation and let France have 65 percent of the directors. I think this inevitably is going to fail. I am hoping that the French Government will reconsider its position and decide to join with the rest of the free world in an economic alliance that really has some substance and that will really do the job. I would say to them that I think we in the United States are willing to do our share in that kind of a partnership.

I have one final word, Mr. Lord President, and then I have finished. I should just like to throw out one word of counsel to my friends of the Labor party in the British Delegation. If they should come to power in England—and we have read in the papers that they well may—I think they may find that the path of doing business with Moscow is not going to be strewn with roses, and that the difficulties of doing business with Moscow are going to be just as great for a labor government as they are for a conservative government, or as they were for a Republican Government in the United States and as they have been for a Democratic Government. I think you always have to keep in mind that if there is a detente it is because Mr. Khrushchev thinks at that moment it is good for Russia. Whatever decision he makes, whatever agreement he comes to, I think you always have to keep in mind that he is not interested in what good it does for Great Britain or the United States; but his primary interest is what advantage does this give to Russia. If it does not give Russia a clear advantage, is it worth going forward with? I think this has to be kept in mind at all times. I am not one of those—and there are some in my country—who think that we ought not to talk with Russia, that we ought not to sell them wheat, that we ought not to do business with them. On the contrary, I think I was the first in Congress to speak up in favor of the wheat deal. I said I was for it for three reasons: one, it will help our gold problem a little; two, it will get rid of a little bit of our surplus; three, and most important, it shows to the world that Russia with its vast agricultural regions under its communistic system is not able to produce the food for its own people, whereas the United States under free enterprise system is able not only to produce the highest standard of living in the world for its own people, but is able to sell food to 50 other countries and help to feed the Russians besides. I would not like you to think that I am against everything Russian, everything which has the word Russian in it. I am a realist and I know that Russia is here, that Russia exists in the world. We cannot bury our head in the sand and ignore it. However, I would again advise my friends in Great Britain that it is not the easiest thing in the world to do business with the Russians.

STATEMENT BY HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

We have listened to our NATO parliamentarian colleagues with great interest as regards the problem of sharing responsibility for the nuclear deterrent of the alliance.

With respect to the distinguished speakers, we first wonder whether the representative of the United Kingdom, Mr. Walker, is speaking for his Government, or his party, or for himself personally. Mr. Walker has said we face a definite choice between the required buildup of conventional forces or the establishment of a multilateral force. Should we assume that this constitutes a promise by the United Kingdom representative to build up British conventional forces and augment the BAOR to fulfill SACEUR's requirements? Immediately, let me say we would welcome this declaration, for we believe all NATO members should meet their NATO commitments and, we believe, there should be an equitable sharing of the burden for our common defense.

The United States, I am proud to say, has for long fulfilled its NATO commitments, and it does so today, even in spite of current balance of payments difficulties, which in large measure derive from America's effort to bolster the free world's defenses and hopes for a better economic future. In fact, some of our congressional colleagues cannot be here today because they had to remain in Washington to take part in the great debate on our foreign military and economic assistance program. Naturally the U.S. efforts directly relate to the problem of the sharing of the burden which should be the common obligation of all members of our great Atlantic alliance.

The United States wants to do its utmost to build a strong NATO; we only ask that others do their part. The United States looks upon our defense as interdependent. Again and again we have stated—and I state it now as a Member of Congress—that we would regard an attack on any part of the NATO area as an attack upon us. The United States wants to insure that the alliance realistically has the means to deter such an enemy attack and, if unfortunately deterrents fail, that the alliance has the defence forces to deal with an aggressor. The United States believes that we together in this Atlantic alliance can do what is necessary. Under the protection of the defensive shield of NATO over the past 16 years we have seen both Europe and America become more prosperous and our economic and social life greatly improved. Surely we can pay the costs of our defense insurance. The United States does not believe that we confront a choice in economic terms between adequate conventional forces and adequate nuclear forces, nor between SACEUR's conventional force requirement or SACEUR's nuclear force requirement. Economically we can afford to do both, if politically we have the will. So far there has not been a choice; it has been neither or nor; neither adequate conventional forces nor a shared burden with respect to nuclear forces. We have a time-honored American expression: he that has a glass house should not be the first to throw stones. So, over the years while America has fulfilled its NATO commitments, the NATO conventional defence requirements have not been fully fulfilled by our partners, although we are still waiting with faith. Meanwhile, in the nuclear area members of the alliance have been pulling away from each other and the cardinal principle of interdependence has been weakened. We believe that the alliance ought to pull together in the whole spectrum of our defensive deterrent and this responsibility should be shared.

Just as we seek to share the burden in the area of our conventional defense, the U.S. Government seeks to find a way to share responsibility, and even ownership, in the area of our nuclear deterrent. The U.S. administrations since 1960 have made a far-reaching proposal in this regard. They have offered one conception—full nuclear consultation and an Atlantic multilateral force—and nobody else has yet suggested any other. We, as American parliamentarians, may have various views on the American Government's proposal, and we are considering them among ourselves in our Congress. We are specifically awaiting the outcome of the studies now being made among seven countries—Belgium, Germany, Greece, Italy, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States—in Paris in the MLF working group and in Washington in a military subgroup. We think all of us should await the completion of these studies and if our governments recommend the establishment of an MLF we shall want, in our national legislatures, thoroughly to study the recommendation in all its aspects; at the time we could then also appropriately consider such recommendations in the NATO Parliamentarian Conference.

Meanwhile, it might be appropriate for me to state, if only in a general way, what the U.S. administration has in mind as a concept. The United States seeks to provide a means for every member of NATO who desires to share in the responsibility for the absolute weapon which constitutes the principal element of our alliance deterrent, and this without causing the national proliferation of nuclear weapons. The U.S. administration seeks this in order that the Atlantic alliance might be more cohesive and united in common purpose and effort; it seeks the mutual recognition of our interdependence; and it seeks a practical way to further common responsibility and knowledge about the alliance's nuclear deterrent. To do this it has suggested the possibility of establishing an Atlantic force, multilaterally owned and manned, which would be an addition to any arrangement for deeper consultation and exchange of information in the nuclear field, and would be an addition to the necessary effort that must be taken to provide appropriate conventional defense. We all know SACEUR has declared there is a requirement for MRBM to deal with targets that especially threaten Europe. Obviously, the multilateral force would go far to meet SACEUR's stated requirements, especially as the missiles of such a force would, I understand, be assigned to SACEUR for targeting and would help fulfill his strike plan.

We think that we parliamentarians should debate this subject further when we have the completed studies being prepared here in the NATO building by representatives of our governments, and I hope we shall have a chance to discuss the matter in the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference.

Our American Heritage—Birthplace of Thomas Alva Edison, Milan, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, Thomas Alva Edison, his name, his accomplishments, his awards, are known to every schoolboy and schoolgirl.

Many are familiar with his home at Glenmont, Llewellyn Park, West Orange, N.J., now a museum operated by the National Park Service. However, not many are aware of the home built in 1840 by Edison's father, where Thomas was born in 1847. The attractive town of Milan, Ohio, where the birthplace of the great inventor, Thomas Alva Edison stands, is located 12 miles south of Sandusky on Lake Erie in the area known as Ohio's vacation land.

The red brick house, built by the inventor's father was restored by his wife and daughter, Madeleine (Mrs. John Eyre Sloane). Mrs. Sloane is president of the Edison Birthplace Association, Inc., and the major contributions for its support have been made by her. Mrs. Sloane deeded the birthplace and land to the association and she and her brother, Charles Edison, deeded to the association the house next door and an area of land going down to the old Canal Basin and the Huron River.

For several years I have been honored to be one of the trustees of the Edison Birthplace Association, Inc., a nonprofit organization formed in 1950. In order to insure its permanent preservation the Edison Birthplace Association, was formed with a board of trustees and provision for contributing memberships. This association now owns and maintains the museum. Memberships are used to provide a living endowment fund for its preservation and development.

It is important that the National Park Service recognize this historic shrine for future generations by designating it as a National Historic Landmark under their National Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings in their subtheme study "Inventions and Scientific Discoveries." This is presently under consideration.

Lest we forget the incredible contribution Thomas Alva Edison made to our lives, I am listing below his principal inventions and discoveries:

PRINCIPAL INVENTIONS AND DISCOVERIES OF THOMAS ALVA EDISON

In 1868: Electrical vote recorder.

In 1869: Universal stock ticker and unison.

In 1872: Motograph, automatic telegraph system, duplex, quadruplex, sextuplex, and multiplex telegraph systems and paraffin paper and carbon rheostat.

In 1875: Discovered "Etheric force," an electrical phenomenon that is the foundation of wireless telegraphy.

In 1876: Electric pen used for first mimeographs.

In 1877: Carbon telephone transmitter, making telephony commercially practical. This included the microphone used in radio.

In 1877: Phonograph.

In 1879: Incandescent light. Radically improved dynamos and generators. System of distribution, regulation, and measurement of electric current—switches, fuses, sockets, meters, etc.

In 1880: Magnetic ore separator.

In 1883: Discovered the "Edison effect," the fundamental principle of electronics.

In 1885: System of wireless induction telegraph between moving trains and stations. Patented similar system for ship-to-shore.

In 1891: Motion picture camera.

In 1896: Fluoroscope. Fluorescent electric lamp.

In 1900: Nickel-iron–alkaline storage battery.

In 1914: Electric safety miner's lamp. Process for manufacturing synthetic carbolic acid.

Recognition as an historic landmark, without cost to the Government, will help insure preservation of the birthplace for future generations. Since it opened in 1947 the annual attendance has increased to some 16,000 persons and over the years, 166,165 people have visited it. Needless to say, a great number of the visitors are schoolchildren who obtain from it the inspiration to emulate Thomas Alva Edison's contributions to humanity.